

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
2005 Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts
January 15 and 17, 2005**

Members present:

Mary Larsgaard, Chair
John Attig
Michael Chohey
Peter Fletcher
Cheri Folkner
Kristin Lindlan
Elizabeth Mangan
Dorothy McGarry
Jay Weitz

Laura Smart, Intern
Patricia Thurston, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Charles Wilt, ALCTS Executive Director

ALA Liaisons present:

Stephen Smith, ALCTS/AS
Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/CCMC
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Great De Groat, ALCTS/NRMIG
Larry Heiman, ALCTS/PARS
Kevin Randall, ALCTS/SS
Robert L. Maxwell, ALA/ACRL
Rebecca Culbertson, ALA/GODORT
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT
Shelby Harken, ALA/LITA
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
Anna Ferris, ALA/NMRT
Robert Hall, ALA/PLA
Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/RUSA
Cynthia Whitacre, ALA/SRRT

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, AALL
Daniel Starr, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Gertrude Koh, CLA
Karleen Darr, MedLA
Kathy Glennan, MusLA
Greta De Groat, OLAC
Paul Weiss, PCC
Mary Lacy, SAA
Dorothy McGarry, SLA

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
 - AMIM2** = *Archival and Moving Image Materials*, 2nd ed.
 - 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

CJK = Chinese, Japanese, Korean
CoP = Committee of Principals for AACR
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*
DCRM(B) = *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*
FRANAR = Functional Requirements and Numbering for Authority Records (IFLA Working Group)
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
GMD = General material designation
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*
ISBN = International Standard Book Number
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
LC = Library of Congress
LCCN = Library of Congress Control Number
LCRI = Library of Congress Rule Interpretations
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
LRTS = *Library Resources & Technical Services* [ALCTS official journal]
MAGERT = ALA/Map and Geography Round Table
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.A.)
NRMC = ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Committee
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SCCTP = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)
SMD = Specific material designation
VRA = Visual Resources Association

*Saturday, January 15, 2005 — 2:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Boston Marriott Copley Place, Grand Ballroom F*

889. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

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

890. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

[CC:DA/Roster]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

891. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[[CC:DA/Agenda/51](#)]

Larsgaard had no changes to the agenda. Peter Fletcher moved that the agenda be adopted. Michael Chopey seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

892. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2004 Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida, June 26 and 28, 2004: Chair

[[CC:DA/M/870-888](#)]

Betsy Mangan sent in two changes (already made to the minutes before the meeting). There were no additional changes. John Attig moved to approve the minutes. Mike Chopey seconded. Minutes were accepted.

893. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, July-Dec. 2004:

[[CC:DA/Chair/2005-2005/4](#)]

Motions made and votes taken July-December 2004

- A. Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2: Report to be forwarded to JSC and an ALA document; July 29, 2004 and August 11. 7 votes yes; 0 votes no. The document was forwarded to JSC.
- B. Task Force on Rule 21.0D (revised proposal; August 9, 2004). 6 votes yes; 1 vote no. The discussions about this proposal were extensive, for about a week. The point of the proposal was to prefer consistency with the source of the terms over consistency that might go against the source of the terms. The discussion on abbreviations included such major points as perhaps AACR3 should not have any abbreviations at all. The substance of this discussion, along with the proposal, was forwarded on to JSC by the ALA Representative to JSC.

- C. Task Force on Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs: Recommendations were accepted, 6 votes yes; 0 votes no. The report included a number of recommendations about the rules in 2/12-2/18 and how they should be handled in AACR3. The recommendations of the task force were forwarded to JSC as an ALA proposal, with the exception of the recommendations about the future of the task force. The section on recommendations about the future of the task force contains CC:DA concerns, not JSC concerns, and was left out of the report that was forwarded to JSC.
- D. Resolution for Matthew Beacom. This resolution gave CC:DA members a great deal of pleasure, and is in recognition of Matthew Beacom's 8 years of service, 1996-2000, as a voting member, and as ALA representative to the JSC, serving as chair for that body 2003-2004. He served on 8 task forces, a notable accomplishment in itself, and organized a preconference on FRBR. Even though he is no longer a voting member, he continues to chair two CC:DA program committees for ALA 2005, one on AACR3; and another on cataloging cultural objects. This was a formal resolution, and CC:DA's thanks for many years of hard work and continuing contributions to CC:DA.
- E. CC:DA's comments on "Guidelines for standardized cataloging for children." The vote was 8 yes, 0 no. CC:DA accepted some draft comments on cataloging materials for children, including comments made during the CC:DA discussion of these draft comments. The chair of CC:DA then forwarded these comments to the chair of CCS.
- F. Other discussions and actions: During the October JSC meeting, there was some discussion that the rules pertaining to the technical description of digital media in AACR3 needed more attention. The offer was made, and accepted by JSC that because ALA has been so actively involved in examining the rules for Areas 5 and 7, it is appropriate for ALA to take a serious look at these rules, to put together a task force, called the "Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital media," and offer some proposals for revisions to the Draft of AACR3 part 1.

Larsgaard asked for a motion to reaffirm the votes and actions taken by the Committee since the 2004 Annual Meeting. John Attig so moved. Michael Chohey seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

894. Report from ALA Publications: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director for Publishing at ALA Headquarters

The Publishing Department includes "ALA Editions" which is the imprint that publishes AACR2. As a result of AACR2, the Publishing Department is also a Co-Publisher with CILIP (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals) in the UK, and the Canadian Library Association.

Chatham expressed the Publisher's support for the development of AACR3, and a commitment to working with JSC. Success of AACR2 in its new format is still strong. The publisher is coming out with a substantial update to rules on cartographic materials, published at end of February 2005.

The Concise AACR2 (4th edition) has been published. This edition went through extensive review by the JSC. Concise serves a real need, as evidenced by the success of its unit sales.

A question from the Committee raised concerns about the rushed nature of the process for AACR3.

Chatham responded by explaining the relationship between the process and the project funding. A joint meeting occurs approximately every 18 months, between the Committee of Principals (COP), the trustees of the fund (the treasury that watches over the revenue, costs, and expenses), and the three publishers. The publishers would be supportive if JSC felt it needed to reconsider the schedule. The funding allocated to support the project becomes thinner as the process goes along. A recent projection of expenses shows that funding could cover the process through 2008 and into 2009.

The Committee raised issues related to the published format and the way people use the rules. Many catalogers would like to see an electronic database version of the rules, from which several outputs could be derived. An electronic database would allow one to manipulate the display, providing customized views of the data. One could also print out the rules, if one wanted a simple, linear sequence of the rules. An electronic, authoritative text from the publisher that allows catalogers to manipulate the information in various ways would be the most useful.

Chatham responded that the publishers had not discussed the format possibilities since the last CoP meeting. The publishers are committed to the relationship with the Library of Congress, and Cataloger's Desktop, at LC. Chatham also mentioned a suggestion for an electronic version that is independent of the Library of Congress. The product lends itself to the database format, but the programming would be very complicated. The publishers also wonder what the impact of the electronic version might have on the print version of AACR. The issues are programmatically, financially, and conceptually complex. The publishers will listen carefully to the advice and guidance of the cataloging community.

Another question raised issues about the production process. A number of committee members find it frustrating that there is no direct connection between the editorial text that committee members use to determine the correct content of updates, and the version of the text that is used for actual publication. Some sort of transformation happens to the text, requiring that everything be re-proofread. The committee hopes that AACR3 might provide an opportunity to design a means of allowing a better flow of data between the JSC and the editor, and the publishers.

Chatham agreed with the committee. He then went on to explain that the JSC is now working off what has come to be called an "InfoBase". The InfoBase is a word transcription of the underlying digital file. JSC can copy and paste content from AACR2 into a word document, and edit, modify, and revise the document. From that point the text is sent to a printer, who does impose printer codes in order to get the file printed as a text. There is not a direct transfer from the coding that exists in the transfer back to the printer's files. The publishers have to recode the manuscript they get from the JSC, by way of the MSWord files, back into a compositor's (machine) language. Much is changing in printing technology, and the problems related to the current process of coding and recoding text could be resolved over the next couple of years.

Jennifer Bowen briefly described the 2005 update. The deadline for getting the text back to the publishers is set for the end of January. The update will be very modest, consisting of 6 pages.

Chatham thanked the committee for the opportunity to meet, and commented on the importance of maintaining communication regarding this important project.

895. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Bowen

[\[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2004/1\]](#)

The October 2004 meeting was Bowen's first as the ALA Representative to the JSC. She expressed her appreciation both for the privilege to serve as ALA Rep, and also to colleagues on CC:DA and the JSC, for their help and support.

JSC meeting, October 18-21, 2004, Cambridge University:

The JSC is getting used to a new way of doing business, as this project requires that initial documents come out of JSC, and not from the constituencies. This meeting was the first official meeting with Tom Delsey in his role as AACR3 editor. Delsey has a signed contract, which includes certain deliverables, and a production schedule. The schedule is very ambitious, with 2007 the current proposed date of publication. The co-publishers would like to complete the project in as timely a manner as possible, to enhance the revenue stream for the new edition. JSC is pushing things through at a faster pace than in the past, recognizing that there is a balancing act between going too fast, and going too slowly.

The production time lines for parts 1, 2, and 3 all overlap. While discussions about part 1 are taking place, Tom Delsey is working on part 2. Part 2 will be available for discussion in May 2005. And while discussions about part 2 are occurring, Delsey will be working on part 3. The JSC is paying Delsey for a certain number of drafts over a certain period of time. Delsey and the JSC need to stick with the schedule and deliverables in the contract. If the schedule changes, there could be financial consequences, and the contract would need to be renegotiated.

The tight production schedule could also mean that JSC members might not be able to come back to constituencies with every issue that comes up in discussion. It's very important that the ALA representative understands the concerns and issues that ALA feels are important, and understands the background of the opinion of ALA, so that she may interpret what ALA's view is when an issue of concern for ALA comes up in the JSC discussion. The clearer the directives that come from CC:DA, the better.

The ALA Rep's report was distributed in early December.

2005 revision package:

The national-agency review is concluded at the end of January. JSC will send this information to the co-publishers.

JSC has a new document that came out January 10th, *4JSC/Rule revisions/2005*. The document outlines the text of the new rule revisions. Included in the revision packet for 2005 are:

- Capitalization of single letters. *BL/7*
- Colored illustrations. *ALA/51*
- Rule A.40. *ALA/56*
- Turkish word "bir". *ALA/57*
- Cartographic-materials issues. *ALA/59*. JSC discussed and approved this revision at Cambridge in October. This revision affects rules: 1.1C1, 3.0D, and 3.3B7 of AACR2.

The revision packet will be more than 6 pages because of the preliminary materials that have to be revised; length of revised rules is about 6 pages. There is still some question about whether the index will need to be reissued.

Designations of function: This revision will not be in the 2005 revision. The relevant document is *4JSC/ALA/58/rev*, a result of the work of the CC:DA Task Force on rule 21.0D. CC:DA had recommended some changes to the rule that would make it possible to use more designations of functions. There was some concern on the part of CC:DA members about the use of abbreviations; when CC:DA sent the revisions forward, ALA identified some areas of concern for discussion, one of those areas being abbreviations. JSC members were also concerned, and did not want the revision to go forward until the JSC had looked at these issues; JSC also recognized the lack of urgency to resolve this issue because catalogers can use these designations of function already, and that there are implications for AACR3. JSC decided to discuss this issue as part of AACR3, rather than put this revision forward now.

JSC has requested that ALA make a motion and approve the withdrawal of this document. Attig moved to withdraw the recommendations to revise rule 21.0D, and the related appendix B9 that was in *4JSC/ALA/58/rev*. Lindlan seconded. The motion passed.

Ongoing JSC Activities:

Abbreviations:

The JSC wanted to conduct a thorough discussion of abbreviations, and the use of abbreviations throughout the rules. Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative to JSC, offered to author a CILIP response, in the form of a discussion paper on the use of abbreviations in the rules, by February 14. JSC will have an all-inclusive discussion about the use of abbreviations, including looking at the nature of the use of abbreviations in the past, as far as trying to save space on catalog cards; considerations of common usage; and also facilitating keyword access and transcription.

Handling Rule Revision Proposals during Preparation of AACR3:

The JSC also discussed handling rule revision proposals for AACR2. JSC decided not to put a moratorium on rule revisions of AACR2 while working on AACR3. For the sake of expediency, rather than asking constituents to submit well-developed proposals for rule revisions, the JSC will conduct brief preliminary discussions about proposals, in order to establish where the proposal fits in the AACR3 project, and where best to direct the proposal. In order to avoid confusion, the JSC recommends that proposals that are essentially rule revisions to AACR2 be written as rule revisions to the current text of AACR2, rather than trying to write them as proposals for the AACR3 draft.

Public Communication regarding AACR3:

The JSC is forming an international outreach group that will be assisting the JSC in spreading the word about AACR3. This group will help the JSC communicate information directly to people within the whole library community, about what AACR3 is designed to do, its structure, and progress. This group will also help JSC direct information about AACR3 beyond the library and cataloging world. Matthew Beacom will be chairing that group, which is just being formed. As an example of the kind of thing this group will do, Matthew Beacom, John Attig and Jennifer Bowen will be presenting a panel discussion at the ACRL conference, April 2005. JSC is very pleased to have a larger pool of people, beyond JSC membership, talking about AACR3.

JSC Examples Working Group:

JSC is forming an Examples Working Group. This group will be small, international group, to work directly with Tom Delsey. Denise Limb from the National Library and Archives of Canada will be the chair; Jay Weitz will be on the group. The group will go through all the examples in AACR2, and also the AACR3 drafts, and make recommendations about which examples should go, which should stay, and when the documents need new examples. As some have noted in Part 1, the examples have not yet been thoroughly reviewed.

Issues relating to Parts 2 and 3:

The contract included a task for Tom Delsey to develop an informal document for the JSC to use internally, in order to look at the functions of the catalog. This document articulated the objectives underlying the choice of access points, and provided a checklist for the JSC to use while looking at Part 2, in order to ensure that the JSC included everything it needed in the rules. JSC became concerned that the document and discussions were similar to the statement of principles coming out of the IME ICC (International Meetings of Experts for an International Cataloguing Code: <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/index.htm#IME-ICC>) statement on the International Cataloguing Code. As the JSC document was an informal document for internal use, the document will probably not be incorporated into the introduction of AACR3.

Delsey created a second document on Parts 2 and 3, containing a preliminary proposal for an outline of what Part 2 might look like. The document discussed taking what is now in chapter 21, and moving the chapter contents around to make a more logical progression. Delsey attempted to differentiate between choosing primary and secondary access points in the current rules, vs. choosing primary and secondary access points for works and expressions. Delsey is trying to separate those two concepts into different chapters to make choice of access points clearer.

The JSC and Delsey started a discussion about eliminating card catalog-based terminology currently in Parts 2 and 3. Examples include terms such as “main entry” and “headings,” that have card catalog-based connotations. The JSC discussion provided Delsey with preliminary feedback needed to draft Part 2. Delsey is currently working on Part 2. The JSC will see a preliminary draft of Part 2 in April, and will ask Tom to make changes before it comes out for general review.

The next JSC meeting will be held in Chicago, IL, April 24-28, 2005. The committee needs the extra day (5 full days total) to go through all of the comments regarding Part 1, received from all the constituencies. The JSC will also look at the draft of Part 2.

The JSC will be meeting at same time as the Committee of Principals. At this time they do not anticipate having a joint meeting, although both committees recognize the strong need for interaction and coordination. The major tasks for the meeting will be to review the comments on part 1, prepare the draft for Part 2, and begin talking about Part 3.

Discussion of Part 1 of AACR3:

Distribution and Constituency Review:

“Guidelines for in-house distribution of drafts of AACR3 by CC:DA members and liaisons”:

[\[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2005/1\]](#)

JSC is trying to provide as wide a review of the draft as possible, balancing the needs of the constituencies, editor, and co-publishers. While the co-publishers would like everyone to be conscious that these drafts are copyright material, The JSC is also aware that guidelines need to be in place that will ensure broad distribution for review.

The JSC and the Committee of Principals (COP) have two important concerns. One concern is that the draft not be taken out of context. During the review process, people need to give the drafts a hard look; but people also need to have the background in order to judge whether work is going in the right direction. The second concern is that catalogers will see the draft, and start using it. There is need for broad review within a controlled environment, in order to avoid misunderstandings about the purpose and use of these drafts.

The CoP has just agreed to a “Limited Extended Distribution” ([CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2005/1](#)). This document was written in response to a query from Kevin Randall about whether he could distribute copies of the draft of Part I of AACR3 to colleagues within his own institution. CC:DA members and liaisons are invited to distribute the draft within their own institutions according to the guidelines in this document. The JSC hopes these guidelines will broaden distribution in a controlled environment, by inviting practicing catalogers to try out the ideas and see what works. CC:DA members and liaisons will provide the context for the draft, and answer questions, and should distribute this document to people who are willing to spend time reading the text and to provide useful feedback for the review process.

ALA will have a much broader review because of CC:DA’s comprehensive representation. More persons will be able to read the draft than any other JSC constituency. CC:DA is encouraged to continue addressing questions and comments to ALA’s Representative to JSC, and asked to bear with JSC as it works through the process.

Time Line:

Many factors govern the time line for this project, including the publication schedule and the editor’s contract. The February 14, 2005 deadline was set by JSC for constituencies to get comments on the draft of Part 1 to representatives, in order to have sufficient time to sort through and compile responses in a format that will be useful for the JSC, and for JSC to identify the major issues causing the greatest concern. These issues will be brought back to CC:DA for discussion.

Bowen requested that reviewers should keep the following questions in mind:

- Does the draft achieve what we all want it achieve?
- Are the goals that JSC has set for the document being met?

- The JSC is basing the draft on the objectives and principles. Some of the objectives and principles contradict each other. Which objectives and principles have we achieved? How can we achieve the right balance?
- Is the new arrangement of rules usable? Are the rules usable in this form? Is the format easy to understand?
- Are the rules easy to use? What can we do to make them easier to use?
- Is the language easy to understand?
- Are the rules easy to understand?

Comments on ways to make these rules easier to use would be welcome.

The JSC is considering an electronic format with hyper-links between the chapters, ameliorating the cumbersome nature found in the print format.

The CoP would like to broaden the use of AACR beyond the library community. JSC is discussing whether we will call the new rules AACR3, or another name, “Resource Description and Access” (RDA). There is a strong desire to make this document a standard for both the library community and for persons who are not catalogers in libraries but are working with metadata.

ALA needs to come to consensus on some big issues. The ALA Rep to the JSC will need a clear viewpoint in order to represent ALA, and bring concerns forward to JSC.

896. CC:DA procedures for comments on draft Part 1: Chair

The timeline is very tight. Task Forces have a Jan. 31st deadline to submit reports on the draft of Part I of AACR3 to CC:DA. The Task Forces include:

- Consistency Task Force
- Early Materials Task Force
- FRBR Terminology Task Force
- SMD Task Force

CC:DA provides several different ways to make comments on the drafts.

- One way is in a meeting like the Omnibus Task Force Meeting on Friday, 14 January 2005, 9:00-5:30. These meetings are open to anyone who is interested.
- A second one is the face-to-face time during CC:DA meetings. The CC:DA discussion needs to focus on major issues.
- A third way of submitting comments is through the Confluence Database. This database provides a means of formally recording comments, including both major issues and smaller matters that cannot be discussed at CC:DA meetings because of time constraints. Task Force Chairs are encouraged to submit comments for Task Force members who are not in CC:DA. The Confluence Database itself is to be used only by CC:DA members and designated Task Force Members. Task Force chairs can decide whether to generate a single Task Force response from their membership, or represent comments individually. The procedure for using the database has been distributed to CC:DA, and designated Task Force members.

People who are not on CC:DA or a Task Force are encouraged to look at the CC:DA roster and contact a CC:DA member who represents their particular cataloging community. People may submit comments to their CC:DA representative; and the representative will then contribute those comments to the Confluence Database. The JSC and CC:DA want to hear from as many parts of the community as possible.

Reviewers are requested to read the draft carefully, and to provide a reasonable remedy to problems or issues that need addressing. While the members of CC:DA may not always be able to reach consensus, CC:DA will have to come to a decision that will represent the ALA position.

897. Discussion of Draft of Part I of AACR3

John Attig led the discussion. Three documents served as the basis for the discussion:

1. "AACR3 Resource Description and Access, Part I Description, Background"
[\[CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/3\]](#)

John Attig created this 4-page discussion document. The document is available on CC:DA web site and will be available on the JSC web site. It includes information that went out with the cover material that came with the draft.

Several items in this document were relevant to the CC:DA discussion:

- Objectives and principles
- Outline of chapters in Part I

Some of the major features of the draft are:

- Focus for the description
- General Material designations (terms under consideration)

2. An 8-page document, photocopied on two, double-sided pages, that summarized comments from the Omnibus Task Force meeting on Friday, 14 January. This informal document was available to those present at the meeting. It will not be distributed, as it was created solely to facilitate the CC:DA discussion.
3. A single, double-sided page, "Significant issues in AACR2 that remain unresolved in AACR3." This document written by Alice Jacobs, Everett Allgood, John Myers, Kate Harcourt, and Paul Weiss, describes major comments that came up during the Omnibus Task Force meeting on Friday, 14 January. The Chair thanked this group for writing the document on such short notice, and noted that time to discuss the document would be reserved during the Monday meeting.

The discussion began by going through major points brought up during the Omnibus Task Force Meeting on Friday.

A thought-provoking, in-depth discussion about the overall structure of the draft, and its compatibility with other standards, dominated the discussion. The stated intention is for AACR3's usefulness to extend beyond the library community. Arguments were made regarding

the need to review the draft's compatibility with current and emerging standards in our own field, and in related industries.

Concern was also expressed about the structure of the draft. One set of arguments showed that the draft was largely a rearrangement of the current rules. Another set of arguments expressed the difficulties of using sections A2 and A3, and their relationship with the general section A1. Very specific examples were given showing a need to rethink the document's current structure.

One immediate suggestion was to consider using FRBR terminology, and also think about how the structure of the overall document could be changed to make it more adaptable to the way other communities work.

Committee members agreed that while there might not be consensus on every issue related to the rules themselves, there was agreement that we need to think of the way these rules will affect the way users search our catalogs, and how these rules facilitate our daily work. We need to find balance in the principles. The detailed comments about the construction of specific rules and their related issues, and where these rules might be located, were also discussed. Concerns also included the placement of instructions for the use in the general introduction, instead of in a separate section. The draft does not yet have an introduction for review, and there are not yet adequate instructions that describe the way people should use the document. The discussion concluded with an expression of appreciation for the substantial amount of work that has been done by all parties to this project.

*Monday, January 17, 2005 — 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Boston Marriott Copley Place, Grand Ballroom F*

898. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Larsgaard welcomed everyone back to the second day of the meeting and announced a change in the agenda. Item 19 will be changed to a general report on the CC:DA web presence with two parts. Part A will be the webmaster report from Attig; part B will be the discussion of the Task Force to Investigate the CC:DA Web Presence. Item 20 on the agenda will be the report from the Task Force to maintain the CC:DA publication "Differences Between, Changes Within," with chair Randall presenting.

899. Report from the CC:DA Program Planning Task Force for ALA Annual 2005: Beacom

The program on AACR3 at annual will take place on Sunday at 8:30 AM -12:00 PM. The speakers will be Barbara Tillett, John Attig, and Jennifer Bowen; they are closely involved with the rules and have a well-informed point of view of where we are in the process and where we are going. Different perspectives were considered – such as insider/outsider, and having persons from large technical-services departments talk about their experiences implementing changes in the cataloging code, etc. – but the speakers were selected for their direct experience with the code. Tillett will speak about the historical and conceptual background of the AACR3 and its relation to other international activities such as FRBR, IFLA/ISBDs, etc. Attig will speak to the development of part 1 because of his work with the Consistency Task Force. Bowen will speak

to parts 2 and 3 because of her work on JSC's Format Variation Working Group. The task force members are Beacom, Attig, Dede, Fletcher and Folkner.

Weiss commented that a big room is needed because it will be very well attended. Beacom confirmed that the biggest available room was requested, to hold 300-400 people. Two display screens were requested so that more people may see the presentation. ALCTS is trying to limit conference expenses, so handouts are limited to one sheet. The speakers' presentations will be put up on the Web site a week in advance. The handout will be a flyer with information on the time, location, speakers and a URL for the handouts. Program announcements will include the URL for that web site.

Attig asked if co-sponsors for the program had been considered. Beacom confirmed there will be co-sponsors, in name only, to help publicize the event. OLAC, MARBI, RUSA, and others are being considered. This program will be attractive to catalogers but we want to broaden it to as many other communities as possible, such as metadata librarians, service unit heads and other administrators.

Jizba commented that IRRT is seeking co-sponsorships and recommended contacting Nancy Bolt. Beacom indicated he would contact IRRT.

900. Report from the CC:DA Planning Task Force for the *Cataloging Cultural Objects* Program: Beacom

The program will be on Saturday at ALA Annual from 8:30 AM to noon. The task force members are Beacom, Ferris, Koh, Patton, and Woodley. The speakers will be: Elisa Lanzi, director of the Imaging Center at Smith College, who was an editor of CCO and was a leader in the Visual Resources Association to get COO produced; Maria Oldal, Head of Cataloging and Database Maintenance at the Pierpont Morgan Library of New York; Ann Whiteside, Fine Arts Librarian at the University of Virginia; and Jonathan Furner, formerly an assistant professor at the UCLA Department of Information Studies, now an editor of Dewey. A large room and two screens were requested for this program.

The VRA is a co-sponsor and has provided funding to support the speakers. Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group is another co-sponsor. This interest group has discussed having a guided discussion on cataloging cultural objects after its meeting time on Sunday (opposite the AACR3 program), to have people discuss their experience using COO. Other co-sponsors are still being considered.

901. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Tillett reviewed her written report for CC:DA and recommended that those interested in the complete annual report from CPSO find it on the CPSO website. Some of the items she highlighted are listed below:

- LC has completed the Library Services unit realignment. Library Services is the part of LC that deals with library functions. Deanna Marcum, the associate librarian for Library Services, has made new reporting lines at the director level. There are now 5 directorates and the one that cataloging is most involved in is Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access. There are also some cataloging operations in the Collections and Services Division (for

example, maps, photographs, motion pictures and sound recordings). CPSO is still responsible for cataloging policies library-wide. The realignment and the change of name to Bibliographic Access is a philosophical change to emphasize service to users. Beacher Wiggins continues to head Bibliographic Access but now has responsibility for Acquisitions as well. Nancy Davenport, former Acquisitions head, has moved on to be the president of the Council on Library and Information Resources.

- LC has increased the number of simultaneous users on the catalog to 500. At most times people get in on first attempt; this includes the web authorities site. The addition of a proxy server to handle incoming Z39.50 queries more efficiently has helped. LC is still working on implementing Unicode and is hoping to have issues resolved by the end of the calendar year.
- LC is now using multiple commercial off-the-shelf software instead of one single product.
- The Bibliographic Access divisions came up with a new strategic plan, available on the cataloging directorate web page.
- Arrearage reduction (backlog) in rare materials is 93% completed. Over 4 million items in arrears are down to around 290,000, which is a working backlog of about 1 year. LC is continuing to reduce arrearages in manuscripts and sound recordings.
- The Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team (BEAT) is looking at automating inclusion of data with bibliographic and authority records with machine programming, using ONIX to link to table of contents and linking to summaries/reviews. In February it will have another test of using ONIX links to tables of contents to automate generation of MARC 505 fields. LC is interested in catalogers' reactions to that.
- The Cataloging Distribution Service has made additions to Cataloger's Desktop with more resource links to Canadian, NLM, and National Agricultural Library materials. ClassWeb now has links to LCSH and Dewey. Currently they are exploring making links to the name authority records. This will be tested for the second half of 2005.
- CDS has made some good training materials available for purchase in conjunction with ALCTS and PCC.
- CIP has new guidelines and is working with publishers to include their summaries in the record.
- Copy cataloging. LC is trying to increase its cooperative record use and experimenting with new workflow models. In one project it proposes that all copy cataloging be changed to encoding Level 7 so users of the copy-cataloging records will know there isn't full authority control. This is still under discussion.
- Electronic resource cataloging. In cataloging web resources the focus of attention will be on subject access rather than descriptive access.
- CPSO implemented the 2004 update to AACR2 in September. Regarding Greek Romanization, CPSO proposed changing their translation table to match international use. U.S. libraries are still not ready to make the change; thus the office will be rethinking the whole approach looking toward automated transliteration schemes.

- AACR3 work. Tillett wrote a background paper, "AACR3: Resource Description and Access," that is available on the JSC web site.
- In classification there is a project to add 053 fields for biography classes to name authority records for individuals and corporate bodies in the field of music.
- The total number of volumes cataloged is up, as is the number of authority records created.

Larsgaard asked if there were any questions for Tillett. A question was, does the change in the encoding of the cataloging level apply to PCC records? Tillett said that it does not.

902. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[\[CC:DA/MARBI rep/2005/1\]](#)

Following is a summary of MARBI's discussions.

- **Proposal number 2005-3:** "Definition of subfield \$2 and second indicator value 7 in fields 866-888 (Textual Holdings) of the MARC21 holdings format" was approved with minor editorial changes.
- **Proposal 2005-04:** "Hierarchical Geographic Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format" was sent back to authors for further revisions. MARBI stated a preference for option 2 – the coding and sub-fielding of fields 662 and 752 should parallel – if the proposal is returned to MARBI.
- **Proposal 2005-02:** "Definition of Subfield \$y in Field 020 (International Standard Book Number) and Field 010 (Library of Congress Control Number) in the MARC 21 Formats" was rejected. MARBI has asked that LC and the sponsors of this proposal work together to revise definitions of existing subfields \$a and \$z in the MARC documentation of the 010, 020, and 024 fields, as well as any other applicable fields. MARBI also asked that consideration be given to including instructions to catalogers for using the 775 and 776 linking fields and subfields to record other editions and manifestations.
- **Proposal 2005-01:** "Definition of Field 766 in the MARC 21 Classification Format" was approved with amendment that field be made repeatable.
- **Proposal 2005-05:** "Change of Unicode mapping the extended Roman 'alif' character" was approved.
- **Discussion paper 2005-DP01:** "Subject Access to Images": This paper will come back following revisions. There was a clear preference from MARBI that the paper not create a new block of 6XX fields. The paper should fully explore possible solutions via the use of relater codes and investigate the possibility of 6XX fields that perform double duty describing about-ness and of-ness. There will be further discussion on the MARC list as to the functional requirements this paper will need to explore.
- MARBI will respond with a letter of approval and support in response to a letter from the Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials urging MARBI to expand the character repertoire to include the Unicode Universal Character Set beyond that included in the MARC-8 subset.

- MARBI is in agreement that there is a need for a joint program with CC:DA on AACR3 and its progress to date. Attig, Bowen and Allgood will draft a discussion paper/progress report for MARBI to be available in early May following the JSC meeting. MARBI also discussed a possible meeting on Cataloging Cultural Objects at ALA annual.

Larsgaard asked for questions.

Q: (Attig) Regarding the timing of this meeting on Cataloging Cultural Objects: We had talked about a meeting on Monday afternoon during the MARBI time slot. There's a program opposite it with which we don't want to conflict. We're looking at possibly having this as part of the MARBI meeting on Sunday afternoon. There are two issues involved: updating MARBI on what's happening with AACR3 (information CC:DA doesn't need to hear again); and the separate issue of AACR3 topics that CC:DA and MARBI need to discuss together. We'll continue exploring that in terms of how much time we might need; a focused discussion would take about an hour and a half. Matthew Beacom is still considering whether he wants issues regarding Cataloging of Cultural Objects included in that discussion.

Q: (Tillett) Is there a timeline or any action regarding Unicode and the expansion of the MARC repertoire?

A: (Allgood) There was no formal action; MARBI decided it was more like a project being requested, rather than a specific decision to be made, and MARBI has already made a decision that it is moving in this direction.

A: (Attig) MARBI didn't take any more action itself on this topic, but Sally McCallum did announce that parts of the decisions that needed to be made prior to implementation will be presented as a proposal at the Annual meeting. She was not specific about what is involved.

903. Continuation of discussion of draft Part 1 of AACR3: Bowen, Attig, Larsgaard

Larsgaard gave the deadlines for responses to the draft. Reports from task forces are due by Jan.31; the last day for CC:DA and constituency responses to be entered into Confluence is Feb.11. Larsgaard and volunteer assistants will edit out the punctuation oddities and any redundancies in the comments. Comments should be made in template order and should include rule number. In order to eliminate redundancy with Maxwell's task force, Larsgaard will not compile comments on the part of the template for early materials.

Attig asked if comments on AACR3 included in Task Force reports should be included in Confluence. Larsgaard answered, not if the comments are already included in the report, since the reports will be in Confluence.

Mangan suggested that each non-CC:DA commenter include organization name in Confluence. Larsgaard agreed that each constituency commenter include the acronym of group after last name. She will include that with the Confluence instructions when she resends them.

Weiss asked how straw poll information from the task forces would be included if task force information wasn't entered onto Confluence. Larsgaard agreed that there would be loss of straw

poll information but that there was no time to do any double entry. Attig commented that one way or another the task force reports will have to be approved by the group.

Larsgaard provided the schedule and outline for the AACR3 discussion. The order of discussion will be:

1. GMDs/SMDs. Bowen will offer background on the JSC approach (on response template, this is parts of #1, 2, 9, 10, 12)
2. FOCUS OF DESCRIPTION/CHIEF SOURCE OF INFORMATION (template #3, 9)
3. RESOURCES ISSUED IN SUCCESSIVE PARTS (template #5) AND INTEGRATING RESOURCES (template #6)
4. PUBLICATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC. AREA (template #11)
5. NOTE AREA (template #13)
6. ORGANIZATION OF RULES (template #2) and general comments from CC:AAM by Suzuki
7. RESOURCES IN UNPUBLISHED FORM (template #4)
8. ASSEMBLED COLLECTIONS (template #7)

If there is time, CC:DA will discuss Early Printed Resources (Template #8), Style (Template #15), and Typos (Template #16); CC:DA will rely on the Task Force report for Early Printed Monographs for Early Printed Resources comments, and on individual committee members' comments on style and typos.

Larsgaard thanked the informal committee (Jacobs, Allgood, Myers, Harcourt, Weiss) who created a discussion paper, "Significant issues in AACR2 that remain unresolved in AACR3" (also referred to as the "Group of 5" document) during the Friday meeting and noted that while there was no time for further discussion during this meeting, the document would be placed on Confluence and comments could be made on it there.

1. GMDs/SMDs

Bowen said there isn't anything in the introduction to the draft AACR3 about what JSC is trying to accomplish with GMDs/SMDs. When the Format Variation Working Group looked at expression entities in FRBR, it did an exercise in deconstructing the current GMD. One goal of that was to find a way to provide a marker in a bibliographic record that would indicate mode of expression. The working group tried to take existing GMDs and separate out what is content information and what is carrier information in order to facilitate the use of FRBR theory and terminology in the bibliographic record. The process became complicated because of, e.g., synonymous terms, and the group never came up with a definitive way to do the separation. Another issue the group found with GMD is, why is it in the title area? Whether it stays in the title field needs to be addressed. There is a need to be consistent with the ISBD community. The working group also discussed whether GMD could be used for content and SMD for carrier.

The work of the group was passed on to Tom Delsey as editor of AACR3.

What we see in the draft of the rules was the best attempt to fix the GMD, and it is recognized that there is more work to be done. In the draft of part I, content and carrier terms that are

broken out follow the general order of the chapters in sections B and C; that may be another issue for further review.

Larsgaard thanked Bowen, and summarized major points that came up in the Friday meeting on GMDs and SMDs: each GMD term should be in the glossary; for users, sound and audio are going to be synonymous; something is conceptually wrong with having the same terms in both columns (both GMDs and SMDs); and GMDs as compound elements rather than single data element. Larsgaard asked for additional comments or questions.

Attig commented that there are related issues in terms of scope of the chapters that are very closely related to this. The most important issue is the scope definition for the chapter on digital media. We avoided issues on specific terms in order to make time for general issues but we need to make time for both. Attig thinks the group that met on Friday was very close to consensus on making a recommendation that we go ahead and disconnect the GMD from the title area. We should propose that we leave the ISBD on this point, and define it as a separate data element somewhere independently in the record.

Kathy Glennan wondered whether it makes sense to consider whether GMD should be one aspect (content) and the SMD should be one aspect (carrier), because we run into problems in both when we're trying to combine these two things. We need to decide whether or not this is the way to go.

Larsgaard asked Bowen if the Format Variation Working Group looked at this only for GMDs. Bowen answered that the JSC did not look at SMDs at all, just GMDs. The JSC looked at the consequences of separating content and carrier. There is also a need to look at the consequences for the SMDs as it will have an impact on cartographic materials and music. ALA needs to decide what it will support.

Larsgaard summarized the discussion as being a matter of the balance of principles. The JSC says it would be responsive to our users if the GMDs were focused on content and that SMDS are carriers primarily with option of secondary content term. It would be easy for catalogers if GMDs were content and SMDS were carriers, but this isn't responsive to our users. Bowen answered that she wasn't sure that JSC included the primary/secondary option for the GMD in the draft.

Mangan disagreed with the concept of the GMD being content and the SMD being carrier, especially for cartographic resources. If that is the case, the GMD has to be hierarchical. Saying everything is a cartographic resource tells the user nothing about what type of cartographic resource it is.

Attig stated he believed there was general consensus for two-part GMD terms, and that it was the list of terms which generated the most discussion. Attig agreed that they discussed whether the GMD was a single or two data element. How this is implemented will be an important aspect. The use of "or" (in the rules) is the problem. A cataloger doesn't always have to use both terms. Hidden implicit options make it hard to evaluate results.

Beacom commented that there was a need to think about how to display the GMD differently.

Larsgaard restated a comment from Friday that GMD is a record-level matter, and not related to just one field.

Weiss said that the Format Variation Working Group considered that, if the terms were split apart in the record, they'd be recombined for display. In this case, one would need to have a table or appendix to show how this recombining for display would be done. There is a general philosophical question of whether the AACR3 is to be a content record or a display record.

Jizba agreed with Beacom that there should be two different parts to the GMD and with Attig that the title is not the place for the GMD. Her main concern was that, no matter where in a record the GMD is, a user can search on the term or terms. Details can be worked out on what field or area to put it in. Jizba asked what will ALA be comfortable proposing?

Bowen said this is the first issue for the MARBI discussion paper and observed that the group was close to consensus. Bowen asked if ALA was ready to say we're comfortable with the two columns (two lists of terms) and in support of the JSC.

Tillett said the term "mixed content" was used on the content side and the term "multimedia" on the medium side, there historically so catalogers could avoid having to list all possibilities. But thinking from the user perspective, one does want to have multiple terms under content and multiple terms under carrier; therefore these areas should be repeatable, so catalogers can use as many terms as apply. The IFLA group on GMDs suggested the use of a plus sign for additional terms so that those factors can be brought out.

Mangan expressed support for Tillett's suggestion.

Weiss said that there are other reasons for wanting multiple terms; one is for multiple types of content. These terms are currently not mutually exclusive (ex. you can have data sets as sound or images rather than text). He expressed strong support for the idea.

Larsgaard summarized the discussion: we're comfortable with the idea of having the GMD as a separate data element from the title area; we like the idea of helping our users as much as possible by giving them multiple terms; we're not going to discuss what those terms are now (we'll use Confluence for that); and repeatability (multiple values) is important.

Beacom said that decoupling description from display would give catalogers much more flexibility.

Larsgaard suggested moving the discussion to area 5. She asked Bowen to discuss the issue around the scope of "digital." Attig corrected Larsgaard and said the issue was the scope of chapters. In the summary document of Friday's discussion it's the first topic under item 2. There are a number of terminological issues, but "digital" is probably most important. Major categories were removed from the definition of "digital" in the scope of chapter C.7. Digital music and digital video are in other chapters. We need to decide where the problem is. Is the problem with the scope, or with the name of chapter C.7? What we want to do is change the scope so that a single chapter covers all digital materials. If we do that and we get down to area 5 and the SMD, does that mean we use the SMD terms that are currently specified for

digital materials, or does it mean we have added the SMD as applicable to sound and digital video to the chapter on digital media?

Mangan commented that it was discussed on Friday about there being no guidance in the draft for using multiple chapters, and that this guidance is needed. For example, if you have a digital resource, you have to use a combination of SMDs from other areas, plus SMDs for digital materials, to come up with a description. Jizba commented that there should be instruction in Area 5 of the digital chapter on how to take digital-ness into account and then refer back to the other chapters for the SMD. The only case where this wouldn't work is if you truly had mixed media.

Attig responded that this guidance could appropriately be included in the introduction to part I as a general instruction.

Weiss commented that one option would be for rule C7.5.1 to have an instruction that if you have digital media, put the word "digital" in front of the SMD, and then refer to the other chapter for the rest of it.

Attig commented that we have a direction in which to go, but much work left to do before we make specific recommendations.

Glennan commented that we must decide how important the digital aspect is for some materials and where that information goes in the display. For sound recordings, digital is a secondary characteristic, but for some other materials, it's a primary characteristic. We should pursue Paul Weiss's line of thought to reconcile the two aspects.

Attig concurred and Weiss commented that the word digital can be used in three different ways.

Attig summarized the discussion of the digital issue. The scope of chapter C7 should cover all digital materials; it must be used in conjunction with other chapters; and there should be language in the introduction to instruct people to use other chapters when necessary. Within chapter C7 there is a need for language on how digital materials can fall into the scope of other chapters and some instruction on how to create the SMD for that. Attig asked if Weiss could assist in coming up with a list of terms for the SMD. Weiss was unable to assist due to his schedule in getting PCC feedback on AACR3 prior to the deadline. He agreed that the scope of "digital" should be in the rules and not in the introductory philosophy.

Attig said there was a separate issue in that there are instructions in the introduction and we need to make the point that they should be removed and put in with the instructions.

Larsgaard reminded the group that all comments will be going onto Confluence and not to be concerned that this discussion will be lost. She called for ten more minutes of discussion on theoretical problems with SMD without details on exact terms.

It was noted that GMDs have the same issues with content/carrier as do SMDs and asked if we should separate out terms in SMDs also. Another issue is that GMDs have content first, SMDs have medium first. Is this something we should be consistent about? We need to make a conscious decision.

Mangan agreed, and said the SMDs is the one area which is the least consistent in application across the type of application. The carrier has not been broken out like the others. This is inconsistent, especially with non-book materials. If content is being brought in for books, it should be brought out explicitly as text.

Beacom said that display is not a problem if the terms are separately tagged.

De Groat said there is the optional rule of adding terms from table 2 to the carrier. But, if you look at table 2 for video and audio, it tells you specifically that the optional rule doesn't apply.

Weiss said that the number of options in AACR3 part 1 seem to be increasing rather than decreasing. If people apply the options differently, more inconsistency will result.

Attig noted that there are some options that aren't labeled as options. For example, the number of physical carriers or the numbers of components for both are optional but not labeled as such. There will be a problem if people aren't aware that there is a national recommendation on the subject. Weiss said that cataloging managers need a list of all the options.

Mangan said that the general rules ought to apply to all types of materials.

Attig said there can't be supplementary rules in subsequent chapters if there isn't a general rule. We have to address, as an organizing principle, definitions of what goes into part I.

Weiss disagreed with Mangan, saying it's very difficult to say there are things that won't apply to a specific type of material. He gave the example of playing time. A text could say, "Do this in an hour."

Larsgaard encouraged the committee to continue thinking about Area 5, and moved discussion on to item 2 of the AACR3 discussion.

2. *Focus of description and Chief source of information* (template #3, 9)

Several comments came up about this during the Friday meeting: the rule does not show what a chief source is; there are problems with the content format for serials/periodicals; there are problems for music, cartographic materials and early printed monographs. What does the rule as stated mean – do you pick one? can you combine them? The main problem is that these chief sources of information seem to apply mainly to book materials.

Attig said that in AACR3, all of the rules for selecting a chief source are in part A.1, while in AACR2 this was in each chapter. Is it successful to create all the rules on this in one chapter, or do we need supplementary chapter explanations? In many cases there is nothing in the general chapter that applies to the resource a cataloger is working on, and suggested listing sources of information in order of preference.

It was noted that one other option to enable having all the rules on this in one place in the rules would be continuing to add footnotes. Mangan said there was a problem with the option

of using the entire resource for all materials as the chief source of information. Do you want books to use the entire resource? That would be problematic.

Attig suggested that order of preference should be higher in the information to ensure that people don't miss it. It should be clear that in most cases you're using the order of preference.

Weiss agreed, stating that it is unclear when to use another source. What are we trying to achieve? We're trying to have everybody use the same rules for focus of description.

Lindlan said that it's impossible in serials cataloging to do this. If you change the chief source from current rules – a serial might have a title change in the middle of the run and not because it's a real title change – it will cause problems.

Attig said there was a need to look at the hierarchy of chief sources to see if it works and agreed with Mangan that it is difficult to include "whole resource." If the goal for prescribed source of information was to avoid having to put information in brackets, then what's happened is completely the opposite. We should do something else; we could go back to a table or to what the consistency task force recommended – the prescribed source is the whole item, and one uses brackets only when information is taken outside of the source you are cataloging.

Mangan agreed that perhaps this is another place for a table.

Weiss commented that tables were especially necessary if multiple chapters in B & C apply.

Winzer asked if we were to say for prescribed sources that the whole resource is the source then what's the point of having a chief source of information defined in the first place?

Weiss said that another comment from the Friday meeting was that focus of description seems to merge the two concepts of chief and prescribed source and he didn't think they should be looked at in the same way.

3. ***Resources issued in successive parts*** (template #5) ***and Integrating resources*** (template #6)

Larsgaard asked if putting all things issued in successive parts in the same section would work, and solicited comments.

Weiss said there are two aspects that are important to keep separate: do we want the rules for serials to be different from the rules for multipart monographs; and do we want to have those in two separate areas.

Attig said that the general effect of this is to make the rules that apply to serials applicable to other materials. This is less a question of whether it works for serials than whether it works for non-serials.

Larsgaard said that the specific example that came up on Friday is how would we feel about having the MARC21 field 362 available for monographs, and the upkeep issues that come

with that. She gave the example of a German monograph that goes beyond a lifetime and acts very serials-like.

Attig said that even for serials constructing display is confusing. People think 362 looks like holdings when it's not. Also, multipart monographs are not usually issued in numeric order. A questioner asked if this wasn't an application issue rather than a rules issue?

Weiss said he needed more time to think about applying serial rules to monographs. Randall said this is adding complexity to a cataloging process that people aren't used to and asked everyone to imagine our cataloging units and the impact this will have. The situation replacement volumes and integrating resources was noted. Winzer said that AALL had just submitted a proposal to LC to call replacement volumes integrating resources as sort of a subset of the integrating resources chapter.

Larsgaard asked for other comments. She then summarized the discussion by saying we all agree we have some more thinking to do on this, but that the general feeling is that putting all resources issued successively in the same place in the rules may not be the best idea.

Attig agreed, saying that most of the discussion about this has been about numbering, but there are other things we need to think about. Bowen said we needed to talk about whether numbering should be moved out of A2 into A1.

Everett Allgood expressed support for the idea, expressed by John Attig, of folding the three areas of section A into one part.

It was noted that one concern expressed since the revisions of Chapter 12 in AACR2 is the combination of finite and continuing resources. In the draft of part I, we still have a mixture, and now we have finite multipart resources with continuing resources, with similar problems resulting. There are transcription issues with continuing and finite. Transcribing for continuing resources is a lot less specific and this is an important distinction.

Weiss said it is difficult because of dictionary definitions of "successive." The word volume is used in two different ways.

Larsgaard agreed that we need a glossary definition. She summarized the discussion, saying CC:DA has issues with the idea of combining continuing resources and multipart monographs.

4. *Publication, distribution, etc. area* (template #11)

Larsgaard noted that authorities are going to be dealt with in part 2 of AACR3.

A comment from floor was that the "Group of 5" did not achieve consensus about the publication area.

Weiss said we need a glossary definition on whether things are published or unpublished.

Attig said there were a number of comments on topics that should be changed, e.g.: give the publisher in the shortest possible way instead of saying give the publisher; mixed feelings

regarding *s.l.* and *s.n.* abbreviation (English as currently being more widely recognized than is Latin by library users); and that there is a difference between publication information not being applicable (as in the case of unpublished material) and not having information to transcribe. In the last-mentioned situation, leaving the data element blank is ambiguous and limits what you can do in certain cases; although we don't like the Latin abbreviations, we need something as a placeholder to indicate that in this material there is a publisher information, and the cataloger don't know what that information is.

Weiss asked why do we do those abbreviations only with publisher and not in other areas?

Bowen asked if we could find out more from AALL specifically what the issues are? Winzer said the issue was not the abbreviation, but rather where or not an item is an unpublished work, or if the cataloger just doesn't know where it came from.

Weiss suggested putting the instruction about published and unpublished materials at the top of the rule to avoid problems in training.

5. *Note area* (template #13)

Larsgaard noted that in the Friday meeting, attendees expressed that there is difference in definitions between "accompanying" and "ancillary," and that "accompanying" is the better word.

Attig said the major point on Friday was the suggestion that notes that are related to other areas of the rules should be more closely associated with those other areas. He was not prepared to support that idea. The whole ISBD structure that separates these things out is an example of how ISBD is trying to be a display standard. A different way of laying those things out would make those relationships more clear. This is a longer-term issue that is not something we can usefully pursue at this time.

Larsgaard said there was another discussion whether there should be a prescription as to the order of notes. The two schools of thought were the ease of brain dump (listing notes as they come to mind) versus having a prescribed order (for consistency; e.g., to help in comparing records).

Beacom agreed with Attig that we're too far along in the time frame to deal with note ordering. While the GMDs/SMDs issue has been discussed for a long time, such is not the case with note order. We need a discussion paper on the note issues.

Mangan stated that half of the notes have nothing to do with the description at all. At this point we shouldn't get that involved with it.

Daniel Starr said another reason to keep it separate is that other areas are transcription and the notes are description.

Larsgaard noted that we might want to request a discussion paper from PCC on the purpose and order of notes.

6. *Organization of rules (template #2) and general comments from CC:AAM by Suzuki*

Larsgaard asked Keiko Suzuki to read the statement sent by the CC:AAM.

Suzuki read, "The CC:AAM has discussed the draft of AACR3, Part 1, and is deeply concerned with its application of cataloging rules to the language of our regions. The existence of cataloging manuals for various languages is witness to the inadequacy of the current rules. CC:AAM will therefore forward to CC:DA its concerns for consideration." She also said CC:AAM will forward, before the Feb. 11 deadline, the comments citing specific places where the current rules inadequately address cataloging situations for material of these regions with proposed solutions. Suzuki said we're deeply concerned about the application of languages/scripts in AACR.

Weiss asked for some examples of issues which area studies catalogers had for the AACR3 draft pt.1.

Suzuki said that while it used to be that the cataloger could use scripts on the item in a card catalog, the ability to use the items own script was lost and still not available for many languages/scripts since we moved to cataloging on computers. We have been relying on systematic romanization, which is not really perfect solution for access and time-consuming cataloging practice for many languages. We understand these are technical issues involved, and not really purely about cataloging rules. Yet, AACR has preference to English. Thus, we would like AACR to clearly acknowledge that romanization practice for nonroman scripts materials.

Attig asked Suzuki if she could make a distinction between her comments that apply to pt.1 and those that apply to pts. 2 and 3.

Bowen agreed with Attig. Bowen said if there are concerns about what's going into parts 2 and 3 that now is a good time to bring it up since were early in the process. She suggested a discussion paper.

Bowen asked that anybody disagreeing with a comment on Confluence to be sure to put that in so that JSC can know where there is consensus or not. JSC needs names associated with comments, so that we can go back to people if they have questions.

Weiss asked if there was some logistical thing we can do in Confluence to note how many people agree/disagree? Larsgaard said, input "agree" and one's name.

Mangan asked if Feb.11 is a realistic deadline for Jennifer to write her ALA response to JSC.

Bowen said her deadline is March and that she had six weeks from Feb.14 to take it in. Feb.14 is the deadline by which Larsgaard is going to edit the comments.

904. Report on CC:DA Web presence: Larsgaard

[\[CC:DA/TF/Web presence/3\]](#)

Larsgaard said that Attig would present this section in two parts. Part A would be 10 minutes on the web page and Part B would be a report of the Task Force on Web Presence.

Attig noted that the CC:DA web page on the ALA site is months out of date and there is no immediate prospect of getting it less out of date. Attig uses the site hosted at Penn State for current documents. Attig will attempt to remove everything from the ALA CC:DA web page to except a link to the up-to-date site. Attig said there wasn't much other news beyond the task force report.

Larsgaard summarized the task force report on the web presence: everyone is very pleased with the webmaster's work; the site does what it needs to do; and the ALCTS office has staffing gaps so it would be too much for them to assist. Attig will be on sabbatical from July–December 2005. Larsgaard will work with interns to see what can be handed over to them.

905. Report from the CC:DA Task Force to Maintain “Differences Between, Changes Within”: Randall

Randall reported that the task force met Friday afternoon; it is figuring out the charge with respect to how the publication should be maintained. Members decided to compile lists of any changes that need to be made due to changes in fact (e.g., rule numbers in the AACR2 updates). A second list of changes due to errors that were introduced into the document during the publication process will be made. Issues such as style, tables, etc. don't really affect the use of the document as such, but will be recorded. Another list made will be of desired changes. The task force will use these three lists to see what kind of approach should be taken to maintain the document. Should the document be a web sheet? Should it be turned into an integrating resource? The task force will continue doing work on this during February.

Attig said in the past when we have set up task forces to maintain/review publications, one of the tasks is to solicit comments from those who use the document. There wasn't a large amount of checking with users during the course of development of this document, so it would be worth the task force's time to get comments from users, especially concerning any problems using the document.

Randall suggested that the third list include more advertising of the document. It's on the ALCTS home page; how can it be more visible? Where can we put out the question so we can get more comments? Ideas on this are welcome.

906. Proposal to correct example in AACR2 12.3G1, Change in numbering: Randall

[\[CC:DA/Serials Section/2004/1\]](#)

Randall stated the problem: there is an implication in the rule that when a cataloger closes off a numeric designation, the cataloger uses the entire designation – just as with the first issue – and the examples reinforce that. The only example of closing out a new series, second series, etc., is

ever shown is in 12.3G. The proposal is to take out the underscored part of the last example in page one of the proposal, so that the last issue is not given the entire designation.

Lindlan agreed with the intent but asked if it created an inconsistency with the previous example. Randall asked for clarification. Lindlan said that numbering on a new series or second series often drops off and is not supplied before starting another series.

A commenter from floor noted that since there are only three numbers in the second sequence, supplying them in brackets is appropriate.

Attig clarified that it's only the example that needs to change. The rule itself is perfectly clear.

Randall agreed. The rule is perfectly clear. The example was incorrect. But there is the difficulty of probably needing more clarity in closing off the numbering for a designation.

Randall noted that 12.3F is where it talks about serials. He read the rule. The examples only use the first series numbering; it is the only place in the rules where we are given an example of how to record the last numbering of a series. There have been a number of records over the years that have incorrectly closed off the numbering of series. Randall said that this change is for AACR2. Bowen said that if this only for the example, then they have followed the right procedure.

Larsgaard requested a motion on whether the committee accepted this proposed revision. Attig moved that CC:DA accept the proposal and forward the correction of the example to JSC. The motion was seconded. Larsgaard called for a vote. The motion passed.

907. NISO standards update: Landesman

In the past 6 months, Z39.29 was balloted. There are three additional standards to note: Z39.18, "Scientific and Technical Reports: Presentation & Preservation" is under revision; Z39.78 "Library Binding" is up for its five-year affirmation; and Z39.86 "Specification for the Digital Talking Book" is up for revision of the 2002 standard.

Landesman explained the NISO registration process. There's a new process that complements and extends the consensus process providing a lighter-weight review and presentation of new procedures organizations are using. It is not a full NISO standard. In this registration procedure, a procedure is submitted to NISO; and NISO reviews it according to certain criteria. If the standards development committee approves it, then it goes out to NISO voting members on a 30-day ballot, a very fast turnaround schedule. The choices are support, non-support, or abstain. When 15% of voting members support it, it's adopted. Examples of this are: MODS; METS; SRW and SRU (protocols for querying databases and returning search results); and the archival resource key (ARK) persistent identifier scheme.

Landesman noted that so far, the standards and light weight procedures have to do with metadata. Is CC:DA interested in finding out about these, keeping in mind the quick turnaround time required?

Attig said he thinks it's an issue and asked Landesman if there was a way of letting this committee know about proposals so we can distribute the information about it for people to view.

Lindlan requested clarification regarding the 15% approval required for lightweight registration procedures. What if 85% disapprove?

Landesman confirmed only 15% approval was required. This is intended as a vehicle for standards-like things (guidelines, best practices etc.) developed by recognized organizations to get put out there.

Weiss said this new process was put into place when he was the ALA representative to NISO. He agreed it's a good idea but expressed concerns. While there is still an opportunity to express major concerns when NISO considers registrations for formal standards, there is the issue of competing registrations on the same topic.

Landesman commented that registration does not imply NISO's endorsement, nor does it permit or preclude NISO continuing this with the standards process. Registration expires after 18 months and needs to be renewed. Organizations must report to NISO every six months about the uptake and use of the registration.

Larsgaard asked Landesman to send her an email whenever registrations come up. She will get it to CC:DA and persons can respond to Landesman directly.

Landesman reported that the thirteen-digit ISBN has been formally adopted as ISO 2108. Another item is ISSN revision, ISO 3297. She asked Regina Reynolds to explain these. Reynolds stated that the revision of the ISSN is to answer concerns about separate ISSNs for print/online/CD-ROM serials, particularly in the U.S. community, a concern that is not shared elsewhere, since ISSNs are used in different ways in different countries. The committee on ISSN achieved consensus that the base ISSN should remain where it is now. The information on print/online/ etc. should be included in an annex to the number. There will be instructions on how to make a title level ISSN (t-level); when ISSNs are distributed, one will be designated the t-ISSN, and this information will reside in the ISSN level at the international level. A new NISO standard, InfoURI, is being considered. Another piece of an ISSN solution is the development of a resolution service at the ISSN center in Paris. It is recognized that there is more to a family of continuing resources than different editions; there is the notion of a super-record or authority record for the family. There is investigation of being able to retrieve all of the information if you input any of the family's ISSN. There is an ISSN user group being created that will meet when ISSN committee meets so they can have input into the development.

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

Larsgaard said CC:DA had three items of other businesses. The first item is the report from the Task Force on Early Printed Monographs, chaired by Robert Maxwell.

Maxwell reported that the task force has almost finished its response to the draft of part I of AACR3, and will get it to CC:DA quickly.

Larsgaard noted the second item of business was that the CCS Executive Committee had accepted a final report on a task force examining representation on CC:DA. This will be sent to the CC:DA listserv as an attachment for comment. The report has the goal of ensuring that all relevant

communities have representation on CC:DA. The report is well worth reading. Comments should be in to Larsgaard by the end of February.

Item three of other business is that there will be a couple more documents to review. Larsgaard will initiate task forces about it after the February work on the draft of part I of AACR3. There is one on the ISBD(CM) and another document on cataloging for children.

Larsgaard asked if there was any other new business.

Weiss made a clarification. He said he misattributed some of the general philosophical statements he made during the Saturday meeting (in the "Group of 5" paper from the Friday meeting) and wanted to correct that. Weiss expressed appreciation to Thurston doing the notes from the Friday meeting so quickly, and to Attig and Larsgaard for their work on CC:DA's discussions on the draft of part I of AACR3.

Larsgaard announced the next CC:DA meetings will be held at ALA Annual 2005 in Chicago, on Saturday afternoon and Monday morning. She thanked everyone in advance for their work on AACR3 in the month to come and for participation in CC:DA's Midwinter. Larsgaard adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Smart, CC:DA Intern
Patricia Thurston, CC:DA Intern