

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services  
(A division of the American Library Association)  
Cataloging and Classification Section

*Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access*

**MINUTES**

**Minutes of the meeting held at the  
2004 Midwinter Meeting in San Diego, California  
January 10 and 12, 2004**

**Members present:**

Mary Larsgaard, Chair  
Steven R. Arakawa  
Michael A. Chopey  
Peter Vincent Fletcher  
Kate Harcourt  
Kristin Lindlan  
Dorothy McGarry  
Jay Weitz  
Matthew Wise

Lynnette M. Fields, Intern  
Cheri A. Folkner, Intern

**Ex-officio representatives present:**

Matthew Beacom, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee  
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress  
Cynthia Whitacre for Glenn Patton, OCLC  
Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group

**ALA Liaisons present:**

Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM  
Kay E. Lowell, ALCTS/CCS/CCMC  
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI  
Mary Woodley, ALCTS/NRMC  
David Van Hoy, ALCTS/SS  
Robert L. Maxwell, ALA/ACRL  
Rebecca Culbertson, ALA/GODORT  
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT  
Shelby E. Harken, ALA/LITA  
Dorothy McGarry for Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT  
Kevin A. Furniss, ALA/NMRT  
Robert Hall, ALA/PLA  
Cynthia Whitacre, ALA/SRRT

**Non ALA Liaisons present:**

Kathy Winzer, AALL  
 Daniel Starr, ARLIS/NA  
 Laurel Jizba, ARSC  
 Gertrude Koh, CLA (represented by Mary Woodley, 1/12)  
 Karleen Darr, MedLA  
 Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA  
 Paul Weiss, PCC

**CC:DA Webmaster:**

John Attig

**Notes:**

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. Due to background noise, inconsistent use of microphones, etc., tapes of the meetings are of variable quality. The interns regret any loss of detail.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, but a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

**AACR** = *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*

**AACR2** = *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision*

**ACOC** = Australian Committee on Cataloguing

**ALCTS** = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

**ANSI/NISO** = American National Standards Institute/National Information Standards

Organization

**BL** = British Library

**CC:AAM** = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials

**CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**CCC** = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

**CCMC** = Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee

**CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section

**CDS** = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service

**CILIP** = Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals

**CPSO** = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office

**CSSC** = ALCTS/Serials Section, Committee to Study Serials Cataloging

**DCMES** = Dublin Core Metadata Element Set

**DCMI** = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative

**DCRB** = *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books*  
**FRANAR** = Functional Requirements and Numbering for Authority Records (IFLA Working Group)  
**FRBR** = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*  
**Hallam** = *Cataloging rules for the description of looseleaf publications: with special emphasis on legal materials*  
**IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions  
**IRRT** = ALA/International Relations Round Table  
**ISBD(CM)** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Cartographic Materials*  
**ISBD(CR)** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and other Continuing Resources*  
**ISBD(ER)** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Electronic Resources*  
**ISBD(G)** = *General International Standard Bibliographic Description*  
**ISBD(M)** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications*  
**ISBD(NBM)** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Non-Book Materials*  
**ISO** = International Organization for Standardization  
**ISSN** = International Standard Serial Number  
**JSC** = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**LC** = Library of Congress  
**LCSH** = Library of Congress Subject Headings  
**MAGERT** = ALA/Map and Geography Round Table  
**NISO** = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.A.)  
**NLC** = National Library of Canada  
**NRMC** = ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Committee  
**OLAC** = Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc.  
**PCC** = Program for Cooperative Cataloging  
**SAC** = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee  
**SCCTP** = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)  
**VRA** = Visual Resources Association

***Saturday, January 10, 2004 — 2:00 to 5:30 p.m.***  
***Convention Center, Room 6D***

**844. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair**

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

**845. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group**

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

**846. Adoption of agenda: Chair**

[CC:DA/A/49/Rev]

Matthew Wise moved that the agenda be adopted; Michael Chohey seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**847. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2003 Annual Conference, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 21 and 23, 2003: Chair**

[CC:DA/M/820-843]

Chohey moved that the minutes be accepted; Dorothy McGarry seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**848. Report from the Chair**

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, July–December 2003: [CC:DA/Chair/2003-2004/3]

Larsgaard reviewed her written report, highlighting those sections where extensive discussion took place and where task forces were formed. Those items were:

- Multipart monographs: basis of description (21.2B2, 21.3A2, etc.) [4JSC/LC/55/LC follow-up]. The Committee accepted the proposal with the modification of replacing “first” with “earliest” in rules 21.2A1 and 21.3A2.
- Basis of description, etc. (1.0A) [4JSC/LC/59]. The Committee accepted the proposal with the following modifications: in rule 1.0A2 in the first sentence, change “first” to “earliest”; and in rule 1.0A2 a in the column under “Basis of description” change all occurrences of “First or earliest part” to “Earliest part” and change “First and/or last parts” to “Earliest and/or latest parts.”
- SMDs [4JSC/CCC/6/Rev/; related documents 4JSC/CCC/7 and ALA response and 4JSC/ALA/36/Rev/ALA rep follow-up/2 and ALA response]. CC:DA's response to the JSC in early August was to offer in one document general reflections on the concept of common usage, followed by specific recommendations on the list of SMD terms in 6.5B1 (including revised proposals).
- Outline for Chapter 25 [4JSC/Chair/71/Rev/Chair follow-up/6]. The ALA representative to the JSC will send a summary of CC:DA's discussion on this topic to the JSC, with CC:DA anticipating a chance to comment later on the rules proposed.
- Four task forces were formed:
  - Task Force on Specific Material Designations was charged to write a background paper on SMDs, focusing on the principles, purposes, and structures of the SMDs; the relation of SMD terms to natural language (terms in common use); and the relation of the SMDs to other parts of the description.
  - Task Force for the Review of *Guidelines for OPAC Displays* was formed to review the IFLA document *Guidelines for OPAC Displays*.
  - Task Force for the Review of *Guidance on the Structure, Content, and Application of Metadata Records for Digital Resources and Collections* was formed to review the IFLA document *Guidance on the Structure, Content, and Application of Metadata Records for Digital Resources and Collections*.

- Task Force to Review ISBD(G) was formed to review the revision of ISBD(G).

Larsgaard asked for a motion to reaffirm the votes and actions taken by the Committee since the 2003 Annual Conference. Jay Weitz so moved. Kate Harcourt seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

#### **849. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet**

[LC Report]

Barbara Tillet reviewed her written report. Some of the items she highlighted are listed below:

- Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team (BEAT): This is a specially funded initiative to enrich the content of LC bibliographic records. Two projects involve table of contents data that are hyperlinked to the corresponding bibliographic record.
- Juvenile headings and summaries: LC suspended adding these to CIP galleys for non-fiction juvenile titles after January 1, 2004. These titles will continue to receive regular CIP cataloging.
- Unicode implementation: LC hopes to have Unicode implemented in bibliographic records by the end of this year. CPSO has begun discussing plans and policies that will be affected by the implementation. Information will be posted on the CPSO web page when there is something to share.
- Romanization tables: A draft revision of the Kurdish Romanization tables will be available for comment through April 30, 2004. CPSO will be working with the National Library of Greece to review the table for the Greek alphabet and changes to Modern Greek orthography; this review will begin in February 2004. Once both revisions are complete, it is likely that a new edition of the tables will be published.
- Cataloger's Desktop on the World Wide Web: CDS is developing a web version of Cataloger's Desktop. There will be a beta version test period, followed by a product release targeted for June 2004.
- Seventh edition of LC Classification Outline: This is now available on the CPSO web page.
- IFLA documents out for worldwide review: ISBD(G); Guidelines for OPAC displays; Guidance on the structure, content, and application of metadata records for digital resources and collections; and FRAR (Functional requirements for authority records) are out for review. See <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/sc.htm#l> for current texts and instructions on responding.
- Draft statement of International Cataloguing Principles: This statement, which expands the "Paris Principles," results from an international conference of invited participants held last summer in Germany. It will continue to develop as other conferences are held throughout the world in the next few years. The next conference is planned for Buenos Aires this year. Subsequent conferences are scheduled to be held in the Middle East in 2005, in Seoul in 2006, and in Durban in 2007.

#### **850. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director**

The first update to AACR2R, 2002 revision was issued in July. The sales numbers for the update and the full-text block were almost equal through December 2003.

ALA is still working on the Infobase, an online version of AACR2, which will allow copying and pasting the formatted text into rule proposal documents. The process has been much more complex than anticipated. After completion, the Infobase will be converted into a web product. ALA is making

progress and will keep the JSC informed. Matthew Beacom asked if the web conversion is primarily a tool for the JSC. Chatham confirmed that it is a tool for the JSC.

A promotional web site for AACR2 is being developed with ALA's partners in the UK and Canada and will link to the JSC web site.

*Cartographic materials* has been released, and sales are going well. Chopey asked if it would be available in Cataloger's Desktop. Chatham responded that it wouldn't automatically be available in Cataloger's Desktop, but he would be supportive of including it. There has not been any discussion with LC about it.

The revision of *Concise AACR2* is underway, and the manuscript has been sent to the JSC for review. The review process should culminate in March. Paul Weiss asked about the sales of the *Concise* product. Chatham didn't have the sales numbers, but felt that the product was certainly worthwhile.

John Attig asked about whether there would be a publicly accessible web version of AACR. Troy Linker of ALA Editions stated that negotiations are underway with LC to have it available in LC's web version of Cataloger's Desktop.

### **851. Follow-up on proposed revision to Appendix D, Glossary - Coloured illustration: Attig**

[CC:DA/Attig/2003/2/Follow-up]

Attig reviewed the status of the proposals on the glossary definition. CC:DA had proposed the definition be deleted from the glossary, since it seemed to be meaningless and contradictory. The JSC rejected that proposal, but suggested some revisions. In CC:DA/Attig/2003/2/Follow-up Attig recommended a new definition. Beacom suggested making the rule to describe colored illustrations as such optional. David Van Hoy suggested that the current definition probably resulted because of sepia photographs and maps in shades of blue. Because of that, he was somewhat uncomfortable with the black, white, gray solution and he liked Beacom's suggestion. Daniel Starr pointed out that for art libraries recording of colored illustrations is very important and it should not be made optional. This is especially important as more and more material is being moved to off-site storage facilities. The art library community would prefer not to get involved with defining color. One knows it when one sees it. If there must be a definition, Attig's suggested definition does what is needed. Starr also stated that the art library community does not consider black, white, and gray to be colors; they are hues.

Beacom contended that since this is a dictionary definition, CC:DA could propose that the glossary definition is unnecessary. Attig commented that it seemed that the JSC believed there needed to be a definition. Beacom agreed and felt it was unlikely any JSC members would be persuaded to delete the definition.

Weiss pointed out that the rule in the paper should be 2.5C3 not 2.5B3.

Beacom felt that the proposed definition could be misinterpreted and suggested a slight re-phrasing of the wording.

Weiss stated that since the JSC did not approve the proposal last time, CC:DA should move on to new business. Attig asked if he was suggesting withdrawing the proposal.

Larsgaard stated the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 will make the Committee address this issue when it sees that different chapters treat colored illustrations differently. She felt withdrawing the proposal would be appropriate.

Attig responded that the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 shouldn't be making substantive changes. He asserted that the definition is broken and needs to be corrected. Weiss replied that the modified definition isn't much different than the current definition. Wise suggested that the rules should move toward something like "mention the color aspect if it is considered to be important." Chohey stated the preliminary work on area 5 of the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 indicates it will not be easy to make the color aspect consistent and he suggested postponing the decision.

The Committee agreed that it should not postpone the discussion. Several options for wording of the definition were discussed. Chohey moved that the Committee put forward Beacom's revision of the definition: "Coloured illustration. An illustration containing any colour. Black, white, and shades of gray are not to be considered colours." Kristin Lindlan seconded the motion. The motion carried 7 to 1.

## **852. Rules for early printed monographs (AACR 2.12-2.18): Attig**

[CC:DA/TF/Attig/2003/4]

Attig described this document as a series of high-level questions to help develop a discussion paper for the JSC. He asked if this document should be forwarded as is to the JSC.

Arakawa stated that the prototype and consistency documents lead him to think a prototype of chapter 2 with early printed monographs incorporated would be helpful since there has been discussion of incorporating electronic texts in chapter 2. He asked if there would be a separate section for electronic texts as there is currently for early printed monographs. Attig responded that these are two different situations. His understanding was there was never any intention to merge the rules for early printed monographs with the rest of chapter 2. Chohey agreed with Attig and added that merging the rules would not be practicable. He felt only a few additional rules would be needed to incorporate electronic texts into the scope of chapter 2, but many additional rules specific for rare books would be needed to merge the rare book rules with the rest of chapter 2.

Arakawa felt merging the early printed monographs rules with the rest of chapter 2 would rationalize the numbering so that there wouldn't have to be separate numbering. In addition, the separate rules are normally used by a cataloger who doesn't use DCRB and who only occasionally catalogs that type of material. He noted that just as Pat Riva was concerned that some of the special rules might be overlooked if they were all included in chapter 1, these special rules may be overlooked if they are in a separate section in chapter 2.

Attig commented that this is beyond the scope of the discussion paper. Larsgaard asked the Committee to concentrate on the document at hand. Robert Maxwell asked if this document is in preparation for an actual discussion paper. He recommended the rare book cataloging community be brought into the discussion. Attig responded that it is a preparatory document.

Beacom commented that if the document is forwarded as is, it may result in the JSC doing the work of a task force. The document would be more powerful if the questions were answered. The questions could be used as the organizing principle of the document, which could be forwarded once the questions are answered. He felt the urgency from the JSC on this isn't so great that it couldn't wait until the September 2004 meeting. He recommended that CC:DA set up a task force to answer the questions.

Larsgaard asked Beacom to clarify the timeline for the document; Beacom responded that it would be appropriate to have the document ready for discussion at next Midwinter meeting. Beacom also suggested reaching out to those who catalog rare books occasionally, since they would most likely be the users of that part of AACR2. Maxwell reiterated that the rare book community would want to be involved. Larsgaard stated that she will talk to the chair of RBMS about making this a joint task force

with a report deadline of Dec. 1, 2004. McGarry moved that a task force be formed. Arakawa seconded the motion.

Ed Glazier asked about the sequence of publication and revision as listed in part e on p. 6 of CC:DA/TF/Attig/2003/4 (i.e. "DCRM rules shall conform to the structure and language of the latest revision of AACR2 to the extent possible ..."). Maxwell clarified that this does not refer to the chapter in AACR2 on early printed monographs.

Larsgaard called for a vote on the motion. The motion was approved.

### **853. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Beacom**

[CC:DA/JSC rep/MLB/2003/2]

Beacom characterized his report as informational since no actions are required of the Committee today. The 2004 amendments package will go to the publisher in February and should be published this summer. The amendments include:

- A new index
- Multipart items rules
- Basis of description
- 9.5B1, 9.5B3, and 9.5B4 rules and examples
- SMD option for conventional terminology added to chapters 6 and 7
- Punctuation in dimensions
- Correction to example in 3.1F1
- Additional example in 3.4B3
- Changes to rule 12.E1
- Modifications to Inaccuracies (1.0F1) and Transcription of series titles (1.6B1 and 1.0F1)
- Changes to the rules for Malay and Indonesian names

*Concise AACR2* will go under review by national libraries in early 2004. Attig asked about the scope of the revisions of this publication. Beacom couldn't answer; Larsgaard will ask Chatham.

The next JSC meeting will be held in April in Ottawa and will include a joint meeting with the Committee of Principals where the groups will discuss AACR3 and details about the hiring of an editor. This discussion will include the role of the editor, his or her relationship to the entities involved, and payment. There will be a full-day meeting on the reorganization of part I. Much work will feed into that discussion including the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 documents; position papers by Huthwaite, Delsey, and Attig; Task Force to Reconceptualize Chapter 9 reports; and the Task Force on Alpha Prototype of Reorganized Part One report. Tom Delsey will also participate.

Beacom reported that access to JSC papers will remain as is. CC:DA can alert the JSC secretary of task force members who need access to the papers. Access to documents of the JSC is not as open as access to MARBI documents, but not as restrictive as conditions imposed by other national and international standards bodies. In the past when documents from the JSC have been distributed, the documents have been taken out of context and misunderstood. Perhaps the documents need a watermark or a note that indicates they are not for distribution.

Attig asked for clarification about what an individual can re-distribute for the work required of members and liaisons. Weiss mentioned that when he was the NISO representative he had the same problem with distribution of documents. He never sent documents out; he asked those interested in commenting on standards to contact him for copies of the documents. Harcourt felt this model would allow the member or liaison to put the documents in context and that would be beneficial.

Beacom continued his report by noting that as AACR3 approaches, yearly amendment packages will be less likely. New rule revisions will be rolled into the new edition. In fact, the 2004 amendments package may be the last published.

Chopey asked if the editor will be a cataloger and if there will be nominations for editor. Beacom didn't believe there would be nominations. He clarified that the editor will not impose his or her vision on AACR. The process will continue to be collaborative and consultative.

### **Authority control**

[4JSC/LC/54/LC follow-up/2]

This is an early proposal and will be revised to include series. CC:DA should wait to respond until the revision is completed. Judy Kuhagen of LC hopes to have the revision ready by the end of February.

### **Punctuation of language examples**

[4JSC/Sec/7/Rev]

Beacom clarified the first paragraph in the document. It isn't clear from the text whether a semicolon is replacing a comma or vice versa. In the body of the document, it is clear what punctuation is being used.

### **“Considered to be important”**

[4JSC/Sec/6/Rev]

The JSC secretary was asked to look at using the phrase “considered to be important” consistently instead of using similarly intended variants. No response by CC:DA is required. Beacom stated that people have contacted him about similar phrases in part II that also need to be reviewed. He noted that CC:DA had preferred a different phrase: necessary for identification or otherwise considered important to users of the catalogue. The JSC decided on the more concise phrase since it occurs so many times; the fuller explanation would be in the introduction to the rules.

Attig suggested the secretary look at similarly intended phrases in part II, particularly in chapter 21 where the phrase “for access” seems to be widely used and could go without saying. Beacom will talk to the secretary about that.

Weiss asked what, after this standardization, will be the difference between “optionally” and “if considered to be important.” Beacom replied that is a good point, though it isn't clear that the phrases mean the same thing now.

Kevin Randall from Northwestern University, prefacing his comment by saying he hadn't seen the document, asked about including the concept of identification in the explanation for meaning of the phrase. Access isn't the only important aspect of the bibliographic description; identification is important as well.

### **854. Task Force on FRBR Terminology: Arakawa**

[4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/Sec follow-up/LC response, sec. 5]

[CC:DA/TF/FRBR terminology/7]

Arakawa reviewed the task force report, CC:DA/TF/FRBR terminology/7. Most of the comments of the task force concern the term “materials,” which is used in more than one way. The task force felt that “physical carrier” is more limiting than “carrier” and would like LC to clarify its distinction. The task force didn't see a need to replace “format” with “physical carrier.”

Larsgaard asked if the Committee was in agreement to send the report forward to the JSC. Beacom stated he had lost track of what CC:DA is actually recommending. Arakawa clarified the recommendation and read from p. 2 of CC:DA/TF/FRBR terminology/7 "Pending further clarification from LC, TF would recommend continuing to use 'format.'"

Weiss added that he also had found it difficult to find the recommendations in the document and suggested that the recommendations be presented in boldface in the future.

McGarry suggested that Beacom take forward to the JSC what he understands from the paper and this discussion, asking CC:DA if he needs further clarification or information. Wise so moved. Lindlan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

[4JSC/LC 60]

[CC:DA/TF/FRBR terminology/8]

Arakawa began by stating that the task force provisionally supports the LC recommendations. There was substantial comment within the task force on the definition for "analytical entry," and the task force suggested a second definition be added. The task force also discussed extensively the definition for the term "text." The task force felt the definition seemed on the verge of moving the scope of the term beyond printed resources and recommends not changing the definition at this time. Arakawa highlighted other definitions where the task force disagreed with the LC recommendations, including "issue," "kit," and "multimedia."

*[Note to reader: The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m., but discussion of this agenda item continued on Monday. That discussion is included here for clarity.]*

Arakawa reviewed the controversy within the task force over the definition of "bibliographic resource," indicating that much of the discussion revolved around the phrase "the generic entity that is the object of a bibliographic description." One suggestion on the task force was "the object of a bibliographic description" and another was "an entity that forms the basis for a bibliographic description." Wise stated that "entity" needed to be retained since it encompasses things that don't have obvious physical form. Weiss supported retaining the original LC phrase of "a generic entity." Lindlan felt the word "generic" didn't have a purpose in the definition. Beacom explained that the term "bibliographic resource" would be used in situations when a generic term is needed and not when the terms "work, manifestation, expression, or item" were appropriate. Tillett further elaborated that the phrase originally resulted from harmonization discussions within IFLA and the ISSN communities when looking at continuing resources. Tillett stated that the JSC's use of "generic entity" is for general cases where work, manifestation, etc. are not appropriate. She added that it is an intentional use of the term "generic entity." Larsgaard's impression of the discussion was to keep the LC wording.

In order to respond to the JSC by March 22, the Committee decided to complete this discussion online. Specific terms that need to be discussed will be determined and an e-mail discussion will focus on those terms.

***Monday January 12, 2004 — 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.***  
***Marriott, Marina Ballroom G***

**855. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair**

Larsgaard welcomed everyone back for the second day of the meeting. She also stated that because there were guests making reports, she was rearranging the agenda.

**856. Report from the Task Force on Rule 21.0D: Bowen (for Caldwell)**

[CC:DA/TF/Rule 21.0D/4]

Jennifer Bowen, reporting for Ann Caldwell, stated that different task force members worked on different parts of the document, and each did not see what the others had written until near the end of the process. Bowen stated that 21.0D is an optional rule for adding relator information to headings. The task force looked at the usefulness of this information and how it relates to FRBR. Bowen pointed out some of the potential problems with using these designations such as for a person who performs multiple functions of one work or who is related to only a portion of a collective work.

The task force recommended expanding the rule to allow relator information to be used in more situations. The task force also recommended that the rule remain optional.

Arakawa asked what would happen if relator codes were added, as in the first example in the task force report, and the automation system couldn't recognize the difference between a relator term and a middle name. Glazier responded that decisions should not be based on the inadequacies of local systems to recognize subfields.

Attig stated that he sees three actions the Committee could take: deal with the report as a whole, forward the rule revision proposal, or support the LCRI. The Committee decided to begin with the rule revision proposal. Attig stated that something that is not an instruction is usually not included in AACR. The first sentence of the proposal is not an instruction and if the rule proposal was sent forward, he felt the JSC would request the first sentence be removed.

Mathew Wise agreed the JSC would not like the first sentence, but thought the information was important and could be worked into the second sentence.

Weiss suggested that CC:DA send forward something that included statements of principle and rationale. Harcourt added that when something is an optional rule, it is important that the rationale for exercising that option be clear. McGarry suggested that the rationale be included in the second sentence. She proposed that the first sentence be removed and the second sentence be reworded to include "for purposes of identification, collocation, or file arrangement."

Weitz moved that the Committee approve the proposal with McGarry's wording. The motion was seconded. The exact text of the proposal was clarified to be "When desirable for the purposes of identification, collocation, or file arrangement to show explicitly the relationship between a person or corporate body named in a heading to a resource being cataloged, add to a heading for a person or a corporate body a term or other designation of function to show the relationship clearly." The motion was approved.

Larsgaard asked the task force to submit its final report. Attig suggested that discussion on the LCRI be deferred until action is taken on the rule revision proposal.

Larsgaard thanked the task force and discharged it.

**857. Rule revision proposal from Croissant: Hostage**

[CC:DA/Croissant/2003/1/Rev]]

This rule revision proposal brings the Appendix on capitalization in line with changes in the rules for German capitalization. Hostage reported that this proposal was initially considered by CC:DA at the Toronto Annual Conference. At that time, the task force was asked to review examples in the rules to see if any needed to be revised to conform to the rule proposal. No examples in the rules were found that would be impacted by this rule revision proposal.

Peter Fletcher commented on the usage of “an die zwanzig.” Hostage stated that in this case “an die zwanzig” is being used as a cardinal number, and would not be capitalized.

Lindlan moved to accept the proposal and send it on. The motion was seconded by Harcourt and approved.

**858. Report from the CC:DA/MARBI Program Planning Committee for 2004 Preconference: Hayes**

Larsgaard reported that Susan Hayes was not present and summarized Hayes’s report for the Committee. The preconference, “Back to the Future: Understanding the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records Model (FRBR) and its Impact on Users, OPACS, and Knowledge Organization,” will be held Thursday afternoon and all day Friday, June 24-25. Lunch will be provided and the fee will be \$299.00. This preconference will demonstrate how FRBR will influence the future development of information standards within the library community, and acquaint technical services and IT professionals with the implications of the FRBR model for cataloging rules, MARC formats and other emerging standards for electronic technologies.

The scheduled speakers and preliminary summaries of topics are:

- Allyson Carlyle, University of Washington - “The FRBR Model”
- Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress - “FRBR Basics”
- Glenn Patton, OCLC – “Why FRBR?”
- Tom Delsey, Independent Consultant – “The FRBR Future”
- Vinod Chachra, VTLS – “FRBR Applications in an LMS/OPAC”
- Sally McCallum, Library of Congress – “FRBR and MARC”
- Jennifer Bowen, University of Rochester – “How FRBR Will Affect Library Users and Staff”
- Diane Visine-Goetz, OCLC – “FRBR and the Fiction Finder Project”
- Olivia Madison, Iowa State – “FRBR and Library Services”
- Speaker not yet determined – “FRBR and Serials”

**859. Rule Revision Proposal from CC:AAM: Chohey**

[CC:DA/CC:AAM/2003/1/Rev]

This proposal to delete the Turkish word “bir” from Appendix E was presented at the 2003 Annual Conference. The proposal originated from the Middle Eastern Library Association, which feels strongly that “bir” should not be treated as an article.

Chohey reported he spoke with Bob Ewald about the relationship between the AACR Appendix and the MARC list of initial articles and which should be changed first. Ewald indicated that the Appendix should be changed first and the MARC list would be updated to reflect the changes. To date there has been no official response from the National Library of Turkey, but an informal contact indicates that the National Library of Turkey will agree with the revision. Glenn Patton expects a letter from the National

Library of Turkey soon. Shi Deng, from the floor, confirmed that a response should be coming from the National Library.

Chohey moved that the proposal be accepted and that the letter from the National Library of Turkey be attached when it arrives. Wise seconded the motion and it was approved.

Attig commented that Glenn Patton has indicated that some ALA filing rules will need to be changed after this revision is made. Beacom suggested waiting until after the revision is passed to deal with that. Weiss remarked that ALA Publications will need to be contacted. Larsgaard answered that she would talk to Chatham about this.

Shi Deng thanked Chohey, CC:DA, and CC:AAM.

### **860. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood**

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2004/1 (preliminary)]

Allgood reported that MARBI met on Saturday and Sunday, and had a light agenda. Proposal 2004-01 was accepted as written. Proposal 2004-02 was accepted with a slight revision to type code "a." Proposal 2004-03 was accepted with a revision to indicators and examples. Proposal 2004-04 was accepted.

Discussion paper 2004-DP-03 was submitted by RLG. MARBI requested a formal proposal that will be revisited at the Annual Conference in Orlando. Discussion paper 2004-DP-01 was submitted by the Music Library Association. This will be submitted as a proposal with revisions. Discussion paper 2004-DO-02 was submitted by MAGERT. This will be submitted as a proposal with further exploration requested.

### **861. Report of the Task Force on Consistency Across Part I of AACR2R: Attig**

Area 2: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area2/3/Rev/2]

Area 3: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area3/3/Rev/2]

Area 4: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area4/3/Rev]

Area 6: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area6/3/Rev]

Area 7: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area7/3]

Prototype: [CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Prototype/2003 December]

Attig began the discussion by stating that the work continues to be extensive, and that today's discussion will focus on area 7. The work on areas 2, 3, 4, and 6 has been relatively well received and there aren't many outstanding issues. Attig added that the issues for discussion in areas 2, 3, 4, and 6 tend to be either that the task force disagrees with the JSC and would like to re-argue the issues, or that the task force would like the JSC to consider added factors.

#### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 2/3/Rev/2**

In the earlier drafts for chapters 2-12 the task force used the phrase "edition information" instead of "edition statement" to refer to the entire area. The edition statement happens to be one of four elements within the edition area, and the task force felt that using the phrase "edition statement" to apply to the entire area was potentially misleading. The JSC preferred the phrase "edition statement" and the task force has used "edition statement" in these drafts, but would like to re-argue the issue.

The task force also proposed moving one of the rules that applies to rare books, 2.15B, to a general rule in chapter one. 2.15B deals with edition statements that are grammatically connected. There was an objection from the JSC to doing this, and so it is not included in this proposal. But the task force feels that the example in chapter 1, "the compact edition of the Oxford dictionary," illustrates this rule and is the correct way to do this. The task force feels strongly that in this case the edition statement should be

included in the title proper, and that it is important that this be a general rule. The task force would also like to re-argue this issue with the JSC.

Tillett noted that changing the name of the area to "edition information" would ripple through ISBD. Attig replied that the task force was not necessarily proposing to change the name of the area, which is currently "Edition," but he could see how that could be the implication. He will rewrite the proposal slightly, and include something about the name of the area in the description of the problem.

Arakawa moved that the Committee approve *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 2/3/Rev/2*. The motion was seconded and approved.

### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 3/3/Rev/2**

The proposal combines two different versions of wording found in the JSC minutes for chapters that do not have an area 3.

Arakawa moved that the Committee approve *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 3/3/Rev/2*. Fletcher seconded the motion and it was approved.

### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 4/3/Rev**

Attig noted that the task force was asked to move the references to the rules for change in various pieces of publication information to a related rule. The current rule for multi-part items, 1.4D4, treats the change of publisher in a multipart item the same as multiple publishers for a single part. This is not compatible with the principle of "basis of the description for multipart" that was approved earlier, so it is unlikely that this will continue to be the rule. This problem has not been solved permanently, and the task force wanted to point that out to the JSC.

Attig then noted that the task force was asked to generalize a number of rules. Arakawa stated that the rules for sound recordings were moved from 6.4D2 to 1.4D4. Attig added that there will be a follow-up on this concerning a trade name that might be treated as a note or a series. The task force will probably add this as a comment instead of a proposal because it is so late in the process.

Harcourt moved that the Committee approve *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 4/3/Rev*. Lindlan seconded the motion and it was approved.

### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 6/3/Rev**

Attig stated there were several issues that required further discussion. A new example has been included at 1.6G1. The task force felt it may not have been clear in the initial proposal that the numbering was a division of the year. The example in the proposal now is "Background paper ; 2000, no. 3" with an explanation that numbering appears as "no. 3, 2000" and the numbering restarts each year. Lindlan stated that serial catalogers would like this example.

The task force proposed a reference from 1.6G2 to 12.6G2. 12.6G2 states that, for serials, the cataloger should not record numbering for series if the series numbering changes with each issue. The JSC felt this reference was not necessary, but the task force feels strongly that it is useful, and that it should be included.

The JSC suggested that the task force combine a rule that dealt with resources belonging to more than one series and resources whose series title changes. The task force did not see these as rules that could be merged and is still discussing this issue.

Judy Kuhagen suggested a good solution to the problem of chapter 11 and that of reproductions in general. The task force wants the instructions on reproductions to be general, and not pertinent only to

microforms. With respect to 1.11C, which instructs the cataloger what to do with series and what to do with edition and publication information, Kuhagen pointed out that if a reference is added in area 6, it must also be added in areas 2 and 4. The task force did that. There are also chapters that do not have an X.11 rule. It might be appropriate to add it in all chapters and the task force will be investigating this.

Attig concluded his comments on area 6 by stating that there are more unresolved issues for series than for the other areas.

Arakawa moved that the Committee approve *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 6/3/Rev.* Fletcher seconded the motion and it was approved.

### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Prototype/2003 December**

Attig commented that the prototype was done at the request of the JSC to illustrate how the proposals would look when put together. The introduction of the prototype indicates that this is solely for illustrative purposes. Attig was glad that the task force was able to include some of area 7 in the prototype, because it gives a more balanced view of what it will eventually look like. Without the inclusion of area 7, chapters 2-12 had very little content. Attig asked for reactions to the prototype. Lindlan stated that she liked it, and she didn't think she would. She wanted the task force to look carefully at the see references in chapter 12 and chapter 1. Sometimes there is no additional information given, and things appear to be circular. Attig agreed that sometimes things appear to be circular even if they are not, and this will be addressed at the end of the process.

Arakawa noted that this was a wonderful tool for getting an overview of relationships. He added that it was convenient, and easy to flip back and forth. He was concerned that if all the examples were moved to chapter 1 there might be some navigation problems and it might be difficult to determine what format of material was being referenced. Attig replied that the working premise was that examples that illustrate general rules should be in chapter 1, and the format of the material shouldn't matter. He added that the examples will need to be examined very carefully to make sure that a rule that was covered by an example is not lost.

Weitz moved that the Committee approve and forward *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Prototype/2003 December.* Matthew Wise seconded the motion and it was approved.

### **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 7/3**

Attig began the discussion of area 7 by stating that this is only the beginning and everything is still tentative. The task force felt that this may not be ready to send forward, but thought it was important to get it in the prototype. The task force made an editorial decision early on about whether they should proceed with area 7 as they had done with the other areas: try to achieve consistency and then move all the general rules to chapter 1. Because notes tend to be so specific, the task force is recommending that no note rules be deleted from the chapters at this time, even if the note rules are repeating almost exactly what is in chapter 1. The task force found quite a bit of consistency; e.g., notes on parallel titles and other title information, but was not sure if it was a good idea to be entirely consistent. The task force felt it might be better to duplicate the notes so that there would be a complete list of notes in each chapter with appropriate examples.

Beacom was concerned about not generalizing the notes in chapter 1. All the other areas have been generalized except area 7, and this would introduce a complication that would not be helpful in the big picture. He felt that by making an exception for area 7, the consistency would be broken. Attig responded that in the other areas there would be a missing rule number. Beacom replied the consistency work will change how the rules will be used. The cataloger will know to look in chapter 1 for guidance

on notes that are consistent across all formats and to look in the chapter for the specific class of materials for any additional rules.

Wise commented that the order of information is determined by the order of the rules. If a bibliographic resource has characteristics of multiple classes of materials, it is hard to know in what order to put the notes. Attig replied that the task force is proposing that there be a rule in chapter 1 for every subrule in the format chapters, and that it be a single sequence. This would make the order of notes clear, and should address concerns about note order for objects that have notes taken from more than one chapter. Glazier stated that this discussion is predicated on the rule to give notes in the order listed, and he questioned why note order is important; especially since catalogers are now instructed to list the note that is considered most important first. Weiss strongly supported Beacom, adding that many catalogers catalog many forms of materials, so it would be important to have everything together in chapter 1. Lorimer added that when cataloging multiple formats, it's very useful to have a list of all the notes for each format together. Attig concluded by stating that he would add something to the deferred action stating that this is the direction of thinking at this moment and in future drafts the other direction will be explored.

Attig felt that it was important to keep the order of notes consistent with ISBD areas, with miscellaneous notes put at the end. The task force wants a copy specific note to be the last note. Weiss added that he is concerned that the order be clear, and Beacom added that it is good to follow the pattern of ISBD areas.

Attig then moved the discussion to 1.7A5. The task force came up with an extended version of the scope and form statement that relates it to the FRBR user tasks and the bibliographic entities. The task force was not in agreement that this was the best course, so it was added as an alternative to consider, and was put in the proposal's introductory material. The task force felt this was important because notes tend to be the least specifically defined area in the bibliographic record. Chohey commented that this appears to be a list of things to test to determine when to give a note. He felt the general statement worked, and he was concerned that there might be a danger in leaving something out. Harcourt stated that it would be very good for training, and Lindlan added that she liked it, but wondered if there was something in chapter 1 or chapter 0 that covered this type of information. Attig agreed that this might be better in a general introduction rather than in the rule.

Rhonda Lawrence commented that the Committee needs to focus on the function of the rules. She felt that the task force may be attempting to do too much. Objectives such as training could be addressed elsewhere. Attig agreed but added that the task force wanted to make the conceptual underpinnings more explicit. Yue Li commented that catalogers want to have guidelines on the order of notes, and would like consistency across formats. Starr stated that the rephrasing of the first sentence was a great improvement. Making the point that notes contain useful information "in addition to" as opposed to "that cannot be fitted into other areas" is much more rational. He added that lengthy other title information can be fitted into the title field, but it is much more useful not to. Attig agreed that those were very good points and the task force would keep them in mind for the next proposal. He added that he didn't think the proposal should be changed now. The task force was trying to make sure that it was clear that notes serve a function of connecting part I and part II of the rules; notes are used to indicate relationships that will justify access points when in chapter 21. Weiss agreed with Starr, and suggested that the proposal be changed now. Attig asked if taking the first sentence from the alternate version would work, and there was general consensus that it would. The new first sentence will be: "Notes contain useful information in addition to that given in other areas of the description."

Harcourt noted that Tillett's authorities document states that "it is important that standards and procedures used in a particular catalog be documented and followed consistently." She wondered if this document needed a statement like that because notes are not used consistently. Attig replied that it is difficult to be consistent in the wording of notes. Harcourt answered that she was not talking necessarily about the wording, but that notes be applied consistently. Chohey added that for training purposes it would be

better. Listing principles makes it harder to be consistent. Weiss commented that there are different types of consistency. He felt it was important to give the rationale for the rules, not only for training, but if the principles are kept in mind, cataloging of new types of materials will be easier. He would rather be consistent in principles than be consistent in output for the note area. Attig stated that the task force would take all these comments under advisement.

Attig then moved on to a discussion about a rule covering more than one situation; e.g., parallel title and other title information in same rule. Most of the rules separated quite easily, until the task force got to notes that were more or less related to area 2. The notes seemed to be in three different categories: those on the edition area, those on bibliographic history, and those on relationships to other works. Although the rules separated fairly easily, the process broke down when they tried to separate the examples. The task force asked the Committee for guidance. Beacom stated that edition, bibliographic history, and relationships to other works would be hard to separate because often the concepts blend into one another. A different approach might be to decide that these things go together and unify them. The examples might lead the way, showing how unified these three types of notes are. Weiss noted that the rule can be split fairly easily, and he would prefer to see it split into the three areas. It bothers him less that the examples are not easily separated. There are instructions to "combine notes when appropriate." Attig stated that it was a problem that the note on relationships to other works appears only in chapter 12. Lindlan added that relationships to other works is more than a note, it is a linking relationship and should be addressed in the rules.

Attig commented that in the preliminary rules there are two ways to refer to other bibliographic entities: citation form (main entry plus the title proper) or transcribed form (title proper / statement of responsibility). In chapter 1 there is no preference, but in chapter 12 there is a preference for citation form. The task force used citation form from chapter 12, but wanted guidance from the Committee. Lorimer wondered how this would apply to contents notes. She felt the music community would not want to make uniform title notes in the contents notes for all the pieces. Weiss thought it would be appropriate to deal with contents notes differently, and Attig added that the task force hadn't yet dealt with contents notes. Lawrence added that the law community would not want to make citation notes for treaties. Attig concluded that the task force may need to rethink this.

Attig continued by stating that for the moment they have left 9.7B1 (nature and scope, and system requirements and mode of access) as it is, only because they have not gotten to it yet. He added that this will not be the last time they will be looking at area 7.

Lindlan moved that the Committee forward *CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area7/3/Rev* to the JSC. The motion was seconded by Harcourt. There was discussion concerning whether area 7 was ready to be sent forward. Attig was concerned about not sending it forward because it was included in the prototype. Beacom suggested that area 7 not go forward until it was finished and stated that it would be fine that area 7 was in the prototype. The prototype is for illustrative purposes only. Attig will add something to the cover sheet for the prototype to indicate that it includes area 7, but that the revisions for area 7 are not yet finished. The motion to forward area 7 was defeated.

## **862. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig**

Attig reported that the web site has been updated since the Toronto Annual Conference. The site includes only current reports. He did a test of web search engines, and all CC:DA documents were retrievable, but were untitled because he has not filled out the titles in HTML. He has created a document registry index so that things can be searched. He would like someone to assign descriptors to the documents. Weiss suggested that this might be an appropriate task for the interns and would give them a sense of history of the Committee. Chohey added that everyone submitting reports could be asked to provide keywords. Attig added that he has not had content management training from ALA yet.

**863. CC:DA Task Force(s) on Web presence and CC:DA publications: Larsgaard**

[CC:DA/Chair/2003-2004/2]

Larsgaard stated that the document presents two options: one CC:DA task force to work on both web presence and publications or two different task forces, one working on web presence and one working on maintaining currency of documents. Larsgaard believes that the best option is to form two task forces. Whitacre strongly supported this option. She mentioned that maintaining the CC:DA Publication "Differences Between, Changes Within" would be a very big task. Attig added that the two charges are very different. Arakawa agreed that it would be better in principle to have separate task forces. Attig added that a task force to maintain the web presence has already been established.

Lindlan moved that a task force be established to maintain web publications. The motion was seconded by Wise and approved.

**864. Proposed changes by CCS Executive Committee to CC:DA liaison policies: Larsgaard**

[CC:DA/Chair/2003-2004/1]

Larsgaard reviewed the document, and voiced support for it. Attig added that this proposal was dealing with a specific request. If CCS approves the change, it goes to ALCTS, and if approved there, CCS can deal with the specific request. Larsgaard will be reporting at the CCS executive committee meeting on Tuesday. Woodley raised a concern about Interest Groups still having liaisons to CC:DA. Bowen replied that does need to be reflected in the document. She added there would be an opportunity to look at representation in general. She had spoken to Charles Wilt about committees transferring to Interest Groups. The intention of ALA is to keep Interest Group representation if the scope of the group has not changed. Lindlan voiced her support of the change, and Larsgaard stated she will voice approval at the CCS executive committee meeting.

**865. CC:DA liaison to the ALCTS Metadata Enrichment Task Force review and comment on report by Marcia Bates, "Improving User Access to Library Catalog and Portal Information": Layne**

[<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/2.3BatesReport6-03.doc.pdf>]

Layne reported on Marcia Bates's Sunday presentation. The key points in the report are:

- Subject – Bates is proposing that a cluster vocabulary be created. The task force is working on functional requirements for a prototype. At the beginning this would be limited to topical subject terms. When more experience has been gained in this area, other types of clusters would be added for names, works, etc. There would also be a way to cluster authority records and provide access from variants, to variants, etc.
- Grouping and linking of bibliographic families as they relate to FRBR. The idea is to create a database of bibliographic families. Records would still be created as they are now, but there would be a division of labor for creating the families. Different institutions would be responsible for different bibliographic families.

**866. CC:DA Task Force on SMDs: Larsgaard**

[CC:DA/TF/SMDs/3]

Larsgaard reported that the task force met Saturday night and is on a tight timetable. The preliminary report is due in February. The task force will have a new draft to CC:DA by January 30. Larsgaard asked Beacom when the JSC needs the report. Beacom replied that the initial request was to have something in time for the April meeting, but if CC:DA is not ready by that time to forward something, the JSC will have to wait. Larsgaard replied that the task force will try to get something done as soon as possible. She asked the Committee if there were any substantive issues that the draft fails to address.

Tillett commented that on page 11 of the draft the task force has laid out options for dealing with SMDs. She would rather the task force not go down that path. She felt the document should focus on the principles, structure, and levels of SMDs. She also suggested that the task force should address whether there should be consistency, the purpose of SMDs, and granularity; she felt the document should not focus on when to apply an SMD. Beacom agreed with Tillett and added that at the Midwinter Meeting Wise spoke about the three functions of the SMD, and whether they are being covered in the rules. Beacom added that the task force should look at what the SMD should accomplish, and whether it does so. Attig added that the SMD is part of a continuum of identifiers. This fits in with the work of the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2. Arakawa commented that this is a terminology question that leads to a principles question. There are underlying issues between intellectual content and carrier. He added that it would help if there were a better term to identify the distinction. Wise commented that one of the big pieces of distinguishing between intellectual content and carrier will be done by Jizba, who will construct a matrix, with "cognitive data" as the focus. "Cognitive data" will be "enfixed" by carriers. All this should be pulled out in the matrix. The task force will be mapping potential groupings of characteristics into "short-end versions." Beacom suggested that the task force talk to the Format Variations Working Group that attempted constructing a matrix for GMDs. He added that having something ready for the JSC in April may be too soon. He recommended that the two groups should work together and have a preliminary document for CC:DA to review at Annual. Weiss added that he thinks that when the two groups work together they will end up with one set of principles. Beacom commented that he thought the JSC would appreciate a more finished document.

**867. NISO standards update: Landesman**

Betty Landesman gave a brief update on the standards arena. She reported that two standards are up for five-year review, and will be going out for ballot to be reaffirmed.

- Z39.20 – Criteria for print indexes for print material. She did not bring this to CC:DA for discussion.
- Z39.71 – Holdings statements for bibliographic items. This was brought to CC:DA for discussion.

The options for Z39.71 are to reaffirm, which means that it is fine; withdraw it because it is no longer applicable; or needs revision before it can be reaffirmed.

NISO has recommended reaffirmation for Z39.71. Landesman stated that January 23, 2004 is the deadline for voting, and she needs comments from CC:DA by January 15.

Concerning Z39.71, the Committee decided because this was a standard on holdings information rather than bibliographic description, a task force was not needed. Martha Yee commented that the UCLA Film and Television Archive is using the holdings format to create holdings for preservation. She would like to see more detail in the extent of holdings and would like an investigation of whether a revision might be productive. Landesman stated that if it was the feeling of the group that the standard should be revised

before it could be continued, ALA's vote will be to go back to the drawing board, convene a committee and redo the standard. David Van Hoy agreed that the standard could not be reaffirmed as it stands. Allgood asked if it was possible to recommend that the standing committee revise the standard. Landesman answered that it does not work that way, and that it is not possible to make that recommendation. Larsgaard concluded the discussion by stating that she would get a document reflecting the comments stated today to Landesman by January 15.

Landesman also reported on a new ISO standard, ISO1586:2003 – Dublin Core Metadata set, and added that an Open URL standard is expected to be out for ballot soon.

#### **868. Review of CC:DA by CCS Policy and Planning Committee: Banusch**

Banusch stated that the CCS Policy and Planning Committee is a new group but it has its roots in old groups. There are two groups currently under review: CC:DA and CC:AAM. The questionnaire has already been started. Banusch asked that people let him know if there were any issues that needed to be brought to CCS Exec., such as barriers to getting work done effectively. Larsgaard thanked everyone who responded with suggestions for changes. Everyone was in agreement that the workload is very heavy. Larsgaard plans to have the revised document to the Committee by February 15. The completed document is due from the CC:DA Chair to the CCS liaison by March 1.

#### **869. Other new business, reports from the floor, announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair**

Larsgaard announced that the next meeting will be in Orlando on Saturday, June 26, 2:00-5:30, and Monday, June 28, 8:30-12:30. She also announced that the Task Force on Preconference Planning will have a meeting at the Annual Conference and the Task Force on SMDs will meet on Sunday, June 27, 8:00-10:00 p.m. The meeting time for the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 will conflict with the preconference. Attig will let Larsgaard know later when the task force will meet.

Attig reported on the Program of work:

- CC:DA has acted on all proposals that need to go to the JSC.
- Comments on the IFLA document are due on February 13
- Responses to JSC documents are due on March 22. FRBR terminology is still being worked on.
- Three documents have not been received yet.
- The revised document on Authority Control from LC is expected in February.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheri Folkner, CC:DA Intern  
Lynnette Fields, CC:DA Intern