

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 Annual Conference in Chicago, IL
June 25 and 27, 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
Ed Glazier, RLG
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Charles Wilt, ALCTS Executive Director

ALA Liaisons present:

Stephen Smith, ALCTS/AS
Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/CCMC
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/CMDS
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Greta 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

ALA Liaisons present (*cont.*)

Cynthia Whitacre, ALA/SRRT

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, AALL

Daniel Starr, ARLIS/NA

Laurel Jizba, ARSC

Judy Knop, ATLA

Thomas Duszak, CLA (6/25)

Gertrude Koh, CLA (6/27)

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 a misunderstanding with the staff of the hotel, tapes were not made for the meetings. The minutes have been constructed from notes taken during the meetings by the interns, and by John Myers, who became an intern for the 2005-2007 time period.
- 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
CRG = ALCTS Council of Regional Groups
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.)
NRMIG = ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SCCTP = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)
SMD = Specific material designation
VRA = Visual Resources Association
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, June 25, 2005 — 2:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Chicago on Wacker — Grand Ballroom A

909. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

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

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

[[CC:DA/Roster](#)]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

911. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[[CC:DA/Agenda/52](#)]

Larsgaard called for a motion to adopt the agenda. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted.

912. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2005 Midwinter Meeting, Boston, MA, January 15 and 17, 2005: Chair

[[CC:DA/M/889-908](#)]

Larsgaard called for a motion to approve the minutes. Dorothy McGarry so moved. Kristin Lindlan seconded the motion. Paul Weiss and Everett Allgood suggested corrections. Larsgaard called for a vote to accept the minutes incorporating the corrections as discussed. The motion passed.

913. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, January–June 2005:

[[CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/8](#)]

Larsgaard summarized the Committee's work as described in document *CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/8* which was distributed via email. Larsgaard highlighted other actions during this time period. ALCTS/CCS appointed a Task Force on identification of CC:DA representatives. The Task Force is to recommend metadata groups for representation on CC:DA. CC:DA will receive a copy of the report when the CCS Executive Committee has accepted it. Also, ALA is now testing community software/groupware. Larsgaard is working with Charles Wilt to initiate the transfer of CC:DA work from the Confluence web site.

Larsgaard called for a motion to accept the report with the voting record as indicated in the document *CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/8*. John Attig so moved. Elizabeth Mangan seconded. Larsgaard called for a vote. The motion passed.

914. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 1: Bowen

General Report on the April JSC meeting: From AACR3 to RDA

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2005/2]

Draft of Part 1 of AACR3: General Feedback

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide]

Sources of information in RDA

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev]

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev/ACOC response]

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev/CILIP response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ALA response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ CCC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ ACOC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CILIP response]

General Report on the April JSC meeting: From AACR3 to RDA

Jennifer Bowen began the report by noting that there will be time for additional discussion during the Monday 6/27 meeting. The biggest outcome of the April meeting is the new direction for the rules. There was serious discussion of the responses to the draft of Part I. Most of the constituencies responded that they wanted the JSC to take a more progressive approach. The JSC considered many options but reaffirmed that it was time for continuing with a new edition. Bowen reminded the audience about the Sunday morning 6/26 presentation on the AACR3 process. One outcome of the JSC meeting was the recognition that catalogers are not the only stakeholders in the new edition. Administrators, systems people, and other metadata communities (such as Dublin Core) also have a stake. Bowen has reported to the ALCTS Board of Directors and the Big Heads meeting. These groups were encouraged about the change in direction being pursued by the JSC.

The AACR3 name will be changed to *Resource Description and Access* (RDA).

The recognition of other stakeholders reaffirmed the need for a large outreach and marketing effort. A committee has been formed to address this function and the CoP is hiring a project manager for RDA.

There is a new timeline; this will affect the work of CC:DA. Larsgaard read the new schedule and asked CC:DA to plan ahead in order to schedule the work. An outline of the prospectus is due by the end of July. From Oct. 2005–Apr. 2006 there will be a draft of part I released and constituency review. From May 2006–Sept. 2006 there will be a draft of part II, and constituency review. From Oct. 2006–Apr. 2007 there will be a draft of part III, and constituency review. From May 2007–Sept. 2007 the Introduction, Appendices, and Glossary will be completed. Publication is expected in 2008. Larsgaard said that CC:DA will continue to use Confluence until the Committee has determined that the ALA groupware will fulfill its needs.

Mangan asked if the prospectus required comment or if were only for information. Bowen stated that constituency review was not expected. The prospectus is to provide a contextual framework for the review of the draft of part I. Barbara Tillet added that the prospectus is more than an outline, it will have excerpts and sample information. Allgood asked if there will be a review of the general introduction, appendices and glossary.

Bowen responded to a query about the new timeline, which is very similar to the timeframe for the initial draft part I. Bowen said that everybody has learned from the experience last time and is thus better able to comment within the allotted timeframe.

Weiss said that he had heard much appreciation for the JSC opening up the draft to constituency review.

Bowen discussed how the JSC worked with a consultant at the April meeting to frame their approach to outreach efforts. Marketing will be the responsibility of the publishers. Weiss asked if there was anything the JSC wanted CC:DA representatives to communicate to their constituencies. Bowen recommended the one page summary available on the JSC web site. Weiss reminded the group that the JSC web site has a timeline of all of the presentations about RDA which contain slides and he had found them useful in communicating with his constituency.

Weiss asked about the constituency review of the general principles and introduction. There is concern about leaving it to be the last task. There is a need for overview principles like the introduction to the last draft part I. Weiss called for a constituency review of the entire RDA so there can be a "big picture" review.

Draft of Part 1 of AACR3: General Feedback

Bowen thanked Folkner, Attig, Lindlan, Larsgaard and Mangan who helped to write the constituency response to the JSC and expressed her appreciation for the members who commented in Confluence. Bowen surveyed CC:DA to see how many people reviewed the draft and found that over 200 people participated.

The JSC has a process in place to use the comments they received. Nathalie Schulz has compiled a table-format discussion guide [*5JSC/AACR3/1/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up*] for the responses. The JSC reps are going through it to identify where there is general agreement in the comments. They also will identify and resolve those things where there is strong disagreement or where comments are unclear. All comments will be dealt with. At this point the work is on a high level. They will err on the side of being cautious. Bowen asked the group, before Monday, to consider if there was anything the Committee felt strongly about in the reviews from other constituencies that will require further discussion.

Attig clarified that comments geared specifically to the Draft of Part I of AACR3 and other comments on corrections to AACR2 are no longer on the table. Bowen said that CC:DA may be asked to draft rule revisions for some of those.

Bowen directed the group's attention to page eight of *5JSC/AACR3/1/Editor follow up/1*. A couple of things on the outline for part I are not what ALA suggested. Our suggestion regarding the arrangement of part I in ISBD order wasn't adopted. Editor Tom Delsey proposed an alternative structure more like a data dictionary. The JSC adopted it as the direction for the new outline.

Bowen asked the Committee to think about it for the Monday meeting and requested general comments on the proposed outline/arrangement.

Mangan stated that the only part of ISBD area 3 that was put in was the numbering. There is a need for musical, mathematical and geographic identifiers. She made the same comment at the JSC meeting. Attig said that we had put that comment into the CC:DA response.

Weiss said he liked the continued reference to the principles in the outline. Having the principles in Chapter 1, up front, is a good idea.

Mike Chohey asked how other metadata communities were identified as potential stakeholders. Do we know that they are looking for a better standard than ones they are developing? Are we assuming that we're creating bibliographic records with RDA for something other than a catalog? Most metadata standards of which he is aware are geared to a resource of a lower granularity. Are we creating a guide for something broader than a library catalog? There are implications for things like subject access.

Attig said the key piece is to focus on RDA as a content standard. You can put the information into whatever context you can envision. Catalogers would probably put it into a catalog, but that is not the only possible location for records.

Weiss said that PCC is doing strategic planning, and they came up with a list of assumptions about the role of cataloging in the next five years. One assumption is that the primary tool that users will use for resource discovery is not going to be the catalog. Instead, the catalog will be used by catalogers and by automatic harvesters.

Bowen said she heard the same sentiment at the Big Heads meeting. Data in our OPAC is the source of some of the data discovered by our users so there is a need for compatibility. There may be an opportunity here to develop a content standard where there is more of a possibility of compatibility. We hope that other metadata communities are aware of our standard.

Weiss asked if the JSC is looking at the standards of other communities to see how they can inform RDA. Bowen indicated yes.

Attig said that the outline reflects the terminology work we've been doing with FRBR. Delsey used the table of attributes in chapter six of FRBR to establish the data elements of some of these chapters. The purpose and scope documents of RDA will reflect FRBR.

Bowen brought the discussion to the notion of separating content and display standards. RDA is to be a standard for content that can be displayed in other ways besides ISBD. The JSC's intent is for catalogers to be able to use RDA to create a record that is perfectly compliant with the ISBD. There are various levels to talk about with ISBD display. Punctuation is not relevant to the metadata communities. The next level is the order of ISBD areas. We're moving away from that. Looking at page 15, at the structure of chapter two, it looks very ISBD-like. In section 2.1 there are things that we would think go in the note area (why look at the title when you're doing the title and statement of responsibility, then again in the notes, and again in the edition, etc.). You can present the data in the ISBD structure if you choose to do so. There is much to figure out (for example what to do with parallel titles). Bowen asked for comments.

Attig said there are many different aspects of the ISBDs, some of which are those of a content standard. The logic of what we're doing with some of the elements is in conflict with the ISBDs, and we need to decide how far we are willing to break from the ISBDs.

Bowen said that the JSC is putting the ISBD details into an appendix and reminded the Committee that earlier CC:DA discussion did not support this approach.

Weiss commented that following the data dictionary approach of putting all title related elements in the same place will make training much easier. We can't always have 100% consistency between AACR and ISBD or we won't ever have improvement.

Chopey asked Tillett and McGarry how much relation there is between FRBR and ISBD. Tillett said that the FRBR Study Group looked at the general requirements for a bibliographic record during its analysis but there is a separate ISBD Review Group. They are looking at how to move forward with the ISBDs. It's a time of flux, and all the communities are talking with each other to move forward together. McGarry said that the ISBDs are very definitely a content as well as a display standard. There has been discussion of restructuring the ISBDs into a single standard rather than seven separate standards. There will be more information about this after the next IFLA meeting in Oslo.

Weiss commented that it's great that different projects are informing each other.

Sources of information in RDA

Bowen asked the group to look at Preferred Sources of Information in *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1* and *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response*. They have different approaches. The rule in the editor follow-up is 2.0.2.2 (p.18) and in the LC response it's moved to 1.2.4. Delsey has asked if there are places where it could be homogenized some more. Bowen asked the Committee to look at it and see if we are comfortable with it. The Australian response was that all current types should be minimized and the LC approach was ok, but needed clarification on other sources. They felt variation with past practice was ok. The Canadians felt the LC approach was too stripped down and would lead to further revisions as explanation was required. CILIP felt there would be lack of clarity if it was too stripped down but that some simplification was necessary.

ALA responded by saying it required further discussion. Bowen solicited the thoughts of the Committee.

Weiss said it was useful to think of the purpose of sources of information. One is to make it easier for the cataloger to know what to do, and two is to have consistency between records. When we look at each approach we should see which of them better addresses the purposes.

Bowen said we could look at the full approach and see what needs removal or look at the scaled down approach and what needs to be added. Weiss suggested that we should start with the simple approach.

Attig asked if we were discussing chief sources or prescribed sources and pointed us to page 15.

Kevin Randall stated he would like to see all the sources in one area, Weiss disagreed and stated that the data element approach required putting the source of information for each element with each element.

Larsgaard suggested that the group think about it for Monday.

Attig said there are three things we need to think about: (1) Whether we're going to define sources for each element or to have a general area for defining sources; (2) whether we're going to have a rule that defines the title proper; and (3) what should be the source of the title proper?

915. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet

[Report available at: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/lc0506.pdf>]

Tillet said that the entire report was available from the LC CPSO web site at <http://www.loc.gov/ala>. LC is doing a cataloging documentation survey and would like input from CDS customers. The survey is available at <http://www.loc.gov/cds/survey/>. Tillet summarized the report which she distributed to the Committee and highlighted items of interest. On page three there is a section on using machine algorithms to populate MARC records. On page four there is news on receiving shelf-ready items. On page five there is more information on expanding the cataloging in publication (CIP) program. LC is developing a project for electronic cataloging in publication (ECIP). Cornell is working with it now. Northwestern University and Northwestern University Press will be working with it next. On page six there is a section on new policy regarding LC communication. Especially important is the priority order that CPSO uses to respond to inquiries. Tillet reminded the Committee of other channels for communicating such as the PCC, etc. The status of Indian tribes is being increased to that of nations (jurisdictions) for names (LCNAF) and subjects (LCSH). The new LCRI update for 2005 incorporates all of the music cataloging decisions. Statistics are available on page eight of the report.

LC is very close to implementing Unicode (expected by fall). Several cataloging policy decisions will emerge from this, such as exploring the non-Roman variant forms of names. LC implemented an open-URL resolver and an electronic rights management (ERM) solution. LC has updated "Understanding MARC Authority Records."

LC will do tours and special training for visitors upon request.

Tillett solicited questions. Attig had a comment about page six regarding headings for government parks. The way it's implemented has given his institution problems using authority records. In the records field 151 is replaced by 110 but has the same LCCN. Tillett said that was not intentional and she would investigate it.

Weiss asked if there was a list of the music cataloging rule changes that have been made. Tillett said yes.

Weiss asked about Deanna Marcum's vision for the future of cataloging. Tillett said that Ms. Marcum's vision for the future of cataloging is in process.

916. NISO standards update: Landesman

Betty Landesman reported on NISO actions since January in chronological order. Z39.86-200x on specifications for digital talking books was approved. Z39.78-200x on library binding was up for 5 year reaffirmation. There is no word yet on the official outcome. The new NISO "registration" process (a lighter weight review and accreditation than a standard) has a 30 day review period. The registration for ODRL (Open Digital Rights Language) was approved. The balloting on Z39.84-200x Digital Object Identifier ended on April 7, but there is no outcome yet. The balloting period on Z39.19 for monolingual thesauri ended on May 25. Z39.29-2005 on bibliographic references has been approved. ISO/DIS 19005-1, the PDF Archival standard (PDF-A) received unanimous approval to become an international standard. It provides a way to preserve an electronic document's appearance over time. NISO has been doing strategic planning. A blue ribbon panel issued its strategic planning recommendations on May 3. The report is available at <http://www.niso.org/secure/brrpt05.pdf>.

ALA was designated the maintenance agency for Z39.7.

ISO 3297, the ISSN standard, is still under revision. The NISO working group reached consensus at its November meeting. A new title or work level ISSN assignment will be available to add to the "cluster" of ISSNs associated with a resource (for example a print and electronic version of the same title). The first ISSN assigned to a cluster will be the TISSN. At the same meeting an ISSN users group was established.

Larsgaard solicited questions.

Weiss commented that NISO sometimes fails to report on the status of votes.

Landesman announced she had been reappointed as the NISO representative.

917. Report on FRBR in 21st Century Catalogues: An Invitational Workshop: Attig, Bowen, Glazier, Patton, Thurston, Tillett, Weiss

[Workshop website: <http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/default.htm>]

OCLC sponsored this workshop. CC:DA-affiliated participants shared their informal impressions of the proceedings. Tillett provided a general introduction and overview. OCLC asked for a working group to come together to look at areas within FRBR that needed to be reexamined. There is a link to that report on the workshop web site. At the end of the report is the list of action items that will be discussed at the next IFLA meeting in Oslo. Attig said it was a fascinating workshop and international in nature due to it being a meeting of the FRBR Review Group. It dealt with a variety of issues. He noticed a dichotomy between the people thinking about FRBR and the people doing things with FRBR. There is tension between the conception of the model and the use of it as a tool. OCLC is identifying issues with the other ways of looking at things and is looking for guidance on how to do it right. Tillett commented that one of the action items is to come up with more "best practices" for implementers.

Weiss thought in the end there was more consensus than he expected. There is slight frustration that this group, considered to be experts, has a lack of understanding of FRBR. It is important to remember that FRBR is a conceptual model. To implement it you have to think about it. It's not intended to be a design document. FRBR is a way of thinking about things. The discussion on aggregated works was of particular interest to CC:DA. It was the first presentation from Ed O'Neill. The consensus was that most of the people in the room disagreed with him. Ed's approach was that aggregated resources were aggregates only at the manifestation level. The group agreed that it's a whole-part relationship. Weiss said that any bibliographic item is simultaneously all four FRBR entities.

Attig noted that there were several presentations regarding the application of the model to serials. The consensus was that the best way to look at this was the recursive work model. You decide which part of the work is relevant for your user group. The second presentation was about augmented works (such as introductions, illustrations). The manifestations that you're dealing with are loosely defined.

Attig is interested to notice that most of the interest is in the FRBR group one entities and extends very little beyond that.

Attig asked Glenn Patton when we can expect FRANAR to be available. A draft for world wide review should be available within the next month or so. Patton acknowledged the very generous support of the British Library for FRANAR's development.

Attig says Godfrey Rust's presentation regarding digital rights management for the record industry offered some ways of thinking about ontologies. Think about event-driven modeling (such as decision making processes).

Weiss said it's related to modeling done with Digital Library Federation electronic rights management (ERM) work. He added that he was impressed with the OCLC's commitment to FRBR work.

Randall asked if there was a need for something that explains FRBR in layman's terms.

Tillett authored a report for LC entitled "What is FRBR?" that is available on the web.

Attig reminded the audience about an issue of *CCQ* on FRBR edited by Patrick LeBeouf. There is a considerable amount of literature on FRBR that is available. Tillett mentioned the FRBR site has an extensive bibliography.

Larsgaard called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.

*Monday, June 27, 2005 — 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Chicago on Wacker — Grand Ballroom A*

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:27 a.m.

918. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Chatham

Don Chatham, ALA Publishing, reported that ALA Publishing intended to have a Project Manager for publication of RDA and a search committee has been formed. The following qualifications are being sought:

- Project management skills
- Marketing, public relations
- Communication with diverse communities

The hiring process should be according to the following schedule:

Posting 7/5/2005
Interviews 7/25/2005
Offer 8/15-22/2005
In place for the JSC meeting in October

Weiss asked if the Project Manager will/can telecommute. Chatham replied, "Yes." He continued that ALA publishing is performing market research on issues and communities, working out the relation of RDA to *Cataloger's Desktop*, and working on transferring Bibliographic Formats to *Cataloger's Desktop*. An agreement was just reached to transfer the *Cartographic Materials* cataloging manual to *Cataloger's Desktop*. Bowen asked about inclusion of the 2005 update to AACR2 and Chatham replied in the affirmative.

919. RDA as an electronic product: Bowen

Bowen opened by stating that the JSC wants to hear about what the constituencies want it to do. They are writing the functional requirements. They want RDA to work well with *Cataloger's Desktop* but also to work for people who are not using *Desktop*.

Larsgaard continued by stating this was an opportunity to discuss "wants" with the key people being present, to provide input to Don Chatham and his staff. She asked what the wish list is.

Weiss requested that enough metadata be attached to each rule to allow users to focus on specific formats. Bowen replied that it was on the table and Delsey is aware of the high level of encoding required for that. Attig commented that the metadata is an aspect of the content and should go through the JSC process. Publishers can take care of the administrative metadata but the descriptive metadata should be vetted by the committee. Weiss sought clarification that administrative metadata will be included for RDA. Chatham replied that in developing the database online authoring (*Booklist, Choice*), ALA Publishing worked with three developers and found one engaged in what we do. It will be an informative process. The big part will be sitting down with content experts to determine: how?, why do that?, what does it lead to?

Attig commented that the metadata would essentially be hierarchical but would be complicated as there are rules that exist on several levels. Chatham continued that metadata is key; with *Booklist*, ALA Publishing spent a lot of time on how it was organized and to include readers advisory as well, as a specific example, the appeal factor is included in the metadata, but not in the review. Bowen complimented ALA Publishing on the work it has done for those products and asked if the framework developed for them would work for RDA. Chatham responded that it probably wouldn't be usable off the shelf as it would need to be customized in order to develop the XML with complicated attributes and to develop the information architecture. They are hoping that with an online product, the hierarchy can be separated but still maintained. They are hoping to reduce redundancies.

Weiss noted that it would be a pseudo-hierarchy and that there were difficulties with the current version that would need to be weeded out during the publishing process of RDA.

Bowen commented that it involved a whole new level of creating content, more of a huge task than originally thought, similar to *Cataloger's Desktop* coding. Bruce Johnson of CDS replied that the technology used was InfoBase, now migrated to XML, but it is not as elegant compared to what it could be, since it was machine translation. The RDA coding will be XML from the start, with well thought out structure. For example, all rules related to music were grouped in a particular way and the rules were fielded in a particular way, but it may not need to be that complicated.

Attig said that it seems a fundamental decision to determine what aspects to bring out in the metadata. He has been working on a document with Hugh Taylor. Larsgaard agreed that this was her question as well. Attig continued that they have made progress but it is by no means complete.

Weiss advised not just to include scoping notes, but to clarify uses, to think about how catalogers think about these elements.

Allgood followed up with two points. One, having assembled a subset of rules, it is important to be able to save; once saved, to save that subset as a new product. The other was the idea of date-stamping things. Attig mentioned a point made yesterday regarding archiving. Weiss reinforced this by commenting that it would help training.

Gertrude Koh continued along the training aspects of the product; that as you are designing for training, remember that students are the primary users; rules are repeated. The *Concise AACR* never served teaching purposes well, and library educators would appreciate their point of view being considered in RDA. She hopes to be able to pull repeated rules that students refer to. Bowen replied that they would appreciate more detail about which rules were repeated so they can be addressed editorially. Attig pointed out that students were another target for marketing research.

A comment from the floor was that in *WebDewey* there is the ability to create user notes; this would be very desirable in RDA. AACR on *Cataloger's Desktop* is too slow and requires lots of scrolling. One ends up going back to the print version; it's important for RDA to have browsing capabilities, better indexing, and keyword access.

Helen Schmierer also noted that many using the rules don't always have Web access. A CD-ROM version should be considered. We do a disservice when we don't remember that not all have Web access. Bowen agreed and noted that a print version also will be available.

Randall asked if the product would be centralized and distributed via the Web or if there would be a Windows/client interface, adding that he didn't like browser interfaces. Attig replied that it would be expensive to have two applications.

From the floor Adam Schiff noted that a problem encountered is printing. It needs to be easy to print sections of the rules for training purposes. Weiss added he had heard from many people that RDA would benefit from following the lead of the CONSER documentation by providing images of real sources of information, not just the transformed type we now have in AACR2. Bowen replied that the JSC is considering it.

Attig asked the group to consider the authoring environment. Noting that he had said this before but to be on record: Regarding the authoring environment [of AACR], this represents an opportunity to fix a source of frustration; that the results of the revision process can go directly into the product. He asked if this could be improved with the new product.

Tillett mentioned that the JSC talked about wizards to lead people through things for training, that they could be coordinated with local utilities.

Ed Glazier commented that there are older generations of users that have font-size concerns, and requested that adjustable fonts be considered.

Stephen Smith noted that it would be essential to have usability testing; especially with staff it would be vital.

Chatham noted that it was important to get ALA Publishing staff closer to the process. He introduced Catherine English as Marketing Director; Jenni Fry, Managing Editor; and Troy Linker, Director of Publishing Technology. Linker replied to some concerns that had been expressed, agreeing with the need for searchable text, ways of shortcutting browser searching. He further commented that programming the

attributes would be complicated so there would need to be good error checking. Chatham continued that they have more confidence in their capabilities after working on the *Booklist/Choice* products. He also added that the JSC lead is essential.

Weiss asked if less technical support would be needed for the browser. He stated that any kind of customization able to be built-in will be loved. Regarding the proofreading step, he suggested that the JSC avoid proofreading and instead spend time on more important things. Bowen replied that the JSC is putting together a list of functional specifications. She will be speaking about establishing a market research group to establish what needs to be done.

Randall asked that Web content be distributed on CD.

Discussion closed with Bowen and Larsgaard thanking all for their contributions.

920. Report of the ALA Representative to the JSC: Bowen

Bowen went over the list of items to cover:

- 1) Report on the Report to ALCTS Board
- 2) Revisit leftovers from Saturday – Sources of Information, with John Attig
- 3) Levels of Description – skipping, no document
- 4) Simplification of Rules for Publication Information [5JSC/LC/2]
- 5) Response to AACR3 part 1 draft – short [5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide]
- 6) GMD/SMD working group – quick [5JSC/Chair/6]
- 7) Call for Simplification of Special Rules (AACR2 Ch. 21) [5JSC/Chair/5]

1) Report to ALCTS Board

Bowen was invited to report to the Board, attendees were listed.

The Board heard about our concerns and Big Heads concerns.

Bowen generally filled in what was described at Big Heads.

Bowen re-iterated that people are happy with the new direction.

The Board is helpful and wants to help with communication.

Other ALA groups are not interested usually, but with RDA, they care a lot.

It is becoming clear that the role of the ALA Representative is broad and includes representing all of ALA, not just CC:DA.

The ALA Representative needs to communicate with many groups including, for example, the Big Heads and Medium Heads groups; ALCTS will facilitate.

The Board wants notification when the Prospectus is out and provided an Executive Summary.

ALA as a whole is reflected in CC:DA, how are generalist catalogers included? CC:DA voting members could fill a role.

Weiss noted that it seems like outreach may be too much for one person; we should tap the general voting members of CC:DA to do it, even assigning individual people to be responsible for particular groups. Bowen heartily agreed and stated that the more outreach, the better.

Attig continued that there is a lot of positive energy about RDA at this conference and this is a result of the work we've already done. We need to think about how to keep it going. We need to take it out, individual to individual to let them know what's going on. We should contact the other groups we deal with.

From the floor Schiff said that there were many people at the program [the Sunday presentation on RDA, featuring Bowen, Tillett, and Attig] who had comments but were cut off [due to lack of time]. There is a need for a town hall style Q&A session rather than a program. Weiss elaborated that we

could tap into CRG to tie-in with state associations. Bowen noted that the JSC has an outreach group and suggested that perhaps CC:DA needs one too. From the floor Jimmie Lundgren suggested there might be ways to help funnel information through the CRG Listserv™.

Mary Lacy asked if the notes from yesterday's program would be distributed. Larsgaard replied that the content of the program was not recorded but the notes would be posted on the website.

From the floor John Myers asked if beta testing could be opened up to a wider community than CC:DA, perhaps even at the alpha testing stage. He suggested that we should solicit people from institutions that are not affiliated with CC:DA. Bowen asked if it should be sent to small public libraries and that kind of thing. Patricia Ratkovich commented that CCMC had three sign up for just such a role.

Robert Hall asked for guidance on distribution (of RDA). With AACR3 he had volunteers but didn't want to break the rules surrounding distribution of drafts. Bowen replied that the JSC needs to discuss the process of distribution. Larsgaard said that, in public libraries specifically, there are many, many public libraries but only one Bob (Hall), our specialist groups are clustered in university libraries so they have multiple levels of representation that are lacking for public libraries. We need to figure out a way that he won't get overwhelmed because his constituency is so large. Hall replied that he would like to be more overwhelmed, like with a Task Force meeting. Such a meeting might be a good way to tap into the networks of public libraries. Larsgaard suggested that PLA might want to form a Task Force.

Weiss continued with a follow-up that it was important to get feedback from the generalist catalogers at small institutions. For example, public libraries don't have map specialists, but still catalog maps. He suggested that beta testers get free copies. From the floor Myers noted that there were other underrepresented groups such as special libraries and smaller academic libraries. Attig replied that these constituencies may be more interested in the concise edition of the rules but would still be interested in contributing to the process. Hall asked for guidance on how to tap into public library networks. Keiko Suzuki noted that her committee (CC:AAM) has formed a Task Force since it has five subordinate area studies associations and colleagues who don't come to ALA but have an interest in reviewing RDA. She asked if there is a limit on membership. Larsgaard replied that there is a need to be practical about what can be accomplished. Smaller committees get more done. We do need to make sure that non-Roman scripts are represented. She recommended keeping the size manageable, and making clear that it is a lot of work — no fair to take a draft and not comment. Somebody must also compile the comments at the end.

2) Sources of Information [documents from LC and the RDA editor]

Sources of information in RDA

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev]

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev/ACOC response]

[5JSC/LC/1/Rev/CILIP response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ALA response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ CCC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ ACOC response]

[5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CILIP response]

Bowen noted that other JSC constituencies are split about which approach to take. She asked for follow-up discussion. She turned the floor over to Attig as leader of the discussion on Saturday.

Attig opened with the comment that there are three questions to deal with: First, whether we are in agreement that sources should be specified for each area? He noted that both proposals take this course, and asked if there was any disagreement.

Weiss asked if the source rules would be all in one place or if they would be next to each element? Attig replied they would be in one place. Weiss continued that it could depend on how complex the rules end up being. He observed that the LC approach consolidated them into one place but the other approach had rule specific placement, which he thought was better. Randall requested that they just not be done both ways as that would be very confusing. There was a comment from the floor that in having all the title information together it would be a logical extension to have the source of information there also. It would also reduce the amount of flipping back and forth. Schmierer asked that since we don't know how re-writing will look, are we being premature? Shouldn't we characterize how we want the end product to look without absolutely deciding an outlook? It may be better to suggest a general direction rather than an absolute choice. Bowen sought clarification to go with the proposals as they stand for now. Glazier commented that with an electronic version, you could assemble the rules as desired.

Attig raised the next issue, of a simplified version of the rules for sources for data other than title proper. "For other data elements, it doesn't matter ..." The only complexity, like chief source, is for title proper. Tillett commented that in terms of the basis of description vs. priority of sources, it's only necessary to prescribe for title proper. Attig replied that was what he was trying to say. Randall asked about the source of a series title. Attig continued that it comes down to rules for sources of title proper. Look at the LC proposal with more categories, and compare it to the current rules, using Tom's outline. Is there anything in the simpler proposal that is a damaging change?

Mangan commented on the tables, noting that she liked the LC proposal with the "Other" category that allows expansion for future developments. The single manuscripts category should come out because they would fall into one or the other categories by default. In Tom's list, what does "Maps, etc.;" include? There needs to be a scope note. Globe equals Model, but not to map catalogers. She favors the LC approach. Attig replied that this preference for the LC approach is our basic response. Is there any additional complexity that this radical simplification would cause damage to?

Chopey commented that since we were thinking about RDA as more usable for digital projects – a lot of these will need cataloger supplied titles. He suggested we consider prescribed words like in Chapter 4.

Bowen asked whether we should try to resolve the first issue — LC 2.1.1.2: Order? Then work on "Title lacking."

Kathy Glennan commented that in terms of simplification we can live with this, but to consider order of preference as Caption to Cover vs. Cover to Caption. We can adjust, but there is a need to acknowledge the implications.

Greta de Groat commented that she likes the LC proposal for videos with the flexibility to use affixed labels (rather than title frames), as the current rule for them is widely ignored. Attig responded that this would be a change, that traditionally we have preferred internal sources instead of labeling, and that we may need a rule to mandate a "Source of Title" note. Schmierer noted that we should record the areas where we're not in agreement and why. She also requested that a comment be recorded in the minutes about the robustness of discussion. Weiss added that this applied particularly to the discussion about sources of information. Having covered the necessary areas of discussion, Larsgaard and Bowen brought discussion to a close.

3) *5JSC/LC/2 Response*

Simplification of rules for publication information [5JSC/LC/2]

Bowen noted that there will be commenting via Confluence but that it would be easier to discuss here than on Confluence. The proposal is to simplify the rules for Area 4.

Mangan said that she would like A1.4c, not to have the last statement — not have as an option; always identify the place. Weiss offered that instead of treating things optionally, consider treating them as a level of description issue. We shouldn't force things for all audiences using RDA, such as school libraries, that might not need place of publication. Mangan continued that in long experience, when we've tried to simplify, it's come back to bite us. Bowen thanked Weiss for connecting it to levels of description. She continued that the JSC is talking about putting different levels of description in the rules but that text is not yet available. Tillett said that one of the driving factors in LC's simplification of the rules was reliance on levels of description. A higher level of description allows for multiple occurrences of an element.

Lindlan commented that first publication time frame is easier to ascertain by the person creating the cataloging; it's better to include it then.

Laurel Jizba asked if the level of document was going to be written in. The way it's currently written, "optionally" applies to everything. Tillett added that this would be up front in the rules. Weiss replied that it would be more useful to have it in each place. The JSC has not discussed whether we're going to have both options (up front and in each place). Bowen then stated that the question is, "Do we want to require it, if the information is known?"

Chopey suggested having electronic encoding incorporate level of description. Daniel Starr added that if we are thinking about rules for the future, we are still focused on printed material; we need to consider the possibility of keeping the section for unpublished materials more open, for example, including place of creation for unpublished works of art. Allgood pointed out that "self-describing" vs. "non-self-describing" is an important distinction. Weiss asked the group to remember "one-cataloger" shops that might ignore RDA, so to please make each rule a separately numbered rule. Some decisions would be best made at a policy level, with others on a piece-by-piece basis. Bowen brought the group back into focus, pointing out that "self-describing" concerns would be addressed more fully later. For the time being, was it okay leaving it to be addressed through either the mechanism of optionality or level of description? Larsgaard reminded all that Confluence was available for further comment. Bowen followed up on Starr's comment about the date of creation (p. 3 of *5JSC/LC/2*) in part III, to ask for better wording in Confluence.

Mangan raised the issue of Date(s) in A1.4e – there needs to be allowance for wider ranges of dates for reprints that are separated in time, 50 years for example, and one wants to record both. The current wording is too restrictive. Tillett echoed her support of wording to address that situation. Larsgaard re-enforced the use of Confluence to develop appropriate wording. Robert Maxwell continued on A1.4e, to address "published as it appears" (last paragraph on p. 2) where it directs one to record it as it appears and then give the Arabic numerals for the date in brackets. Tillett replied that this is related to the principle of transcribing what one sees. Attig pointed out that this would be a change, to which Tillett concurred while re-iterating the transcription principle involved. From the floor Schiff commented that there would be systems implications for display because of which fields the date might be drawn from. De Groat expressed some confusion about bracketing vs. non-bracketing. The wording is still unclear and she would have difficulty applying the rules as written. The source of information for title represents a change and people will be confused. Weiss noted that he often gets questions from media catalogers as to what constitutes a container. FRBR has not sufficiently

permeated the rules to address the possibility of date of creation being different from date of manifestation. Date of creation can be important. Bowen agreed that more discussion was needed.

Attig commented on the readability of the draft. It needs a readability test because it is so dense. There could be room for simplification. Weiss suggested that layout could help with simplification. Bowen asked if the committee was comfortable with the general approach at this point, rather than focusing on details.

Starr re-iterated the concern about unpublished materials and expressed a desire for a set of parallel rules and to discuss options for that. Bowen asked for rewording through Confluence.

Attig answered a question about approaches to simplify levels of description — using the levels of description as a way to simplify the presentation of the rules would be very useful. Larsgaard agreed. Schmierer also agreed with Attig. She continued that we come back to the same two or three things: everyone is still operating on their own ideas of how levels are going to work; everyone is still operating under their own conception of how sources will work; we're also alternating between published and unpublished materials. There is a need to set boundaries. Larsgaard inquired when the document on levels of description would come out and received the reply that it should be out by the end of the following week. Bowen asked if there was a general consensus regarding the merit of the current approach to levels of description. Larsgaard asked for any further comments and suggested wording in Confluence. Bowen reminded everyone that the deadline was Sept. 12. Weiss pointed out that it was difficult to evaluate things piecemeal. Bowen replied that the editor was trying to get as much input as fast as possible so that it could be incorporated into the Prospectus and to support quick turnarounds.

Hall closed discussion on *5JSC/LC/2*, by expressing appreciation that public libraries are being included in the discussion. He continued that there are wealthy public libraries and public libraries at risk. It isn't always accurate to assume public libraries will take the lowest level of description.

4) *5JSC/Chair/5*: Rules in Chapter 21

Call for Simplification of Special Rules (AACR2 Ch. 21)
[*5JSC/Chair/5*]

Bowen reported that she had sent a special note to the communities that are directly affected by Chapter 21. Specifically, input is being sought whether there are case-based rules that can be removed and is there a way to simplify the language so that non-specialists can understand the rules. It is important to let the JSC know which rules should be kept in case other communities want to remove something that you deem important. They want to know how to simplify, and also important rules to keep, discuss, or revise.

Attig reminded the group that proposals are due by July 11 and asked if there needed to be an official response. Bowen replied that a paragraph was sufficient. Weiss asked if there was a sense of the response. Bowen replied, "We like **all** these rules."

Rebecca Culbertson reported that GODORT would be sending a response. Starr reported that ARLIS doesn't have a strong concern either way. The biggest issue is the name of artist as the author. Bowen asked him to write up a paragraph for her. Glennan reported that MusLA will give a response but she is finding it difficult to comment on Chapter 21, when she doesn't know what it will look like. She continued that she is looking for principle based reasoning for proposed changes and that there is some concern with places for performer and composer. Kathy Winzer reported that AALL is trying to evaluate rule-by-rule. In doing so, they have found some places for simplification and elimination of redundancy, but overall they need the rules. Judy Knop reported that there is a sense in the theological cataloging community that, "if we can't have these rules, maybe we need our own manual." Glennan

said a similar response came from the music catalogers. From the floor Rhonda Lawrence emphasized that the legal rules must remain in the proposed RDA and definitely need a separate section.

Lawrence continued that if RDA was too simple, it would spawn a cottage industry of specific manuals. Mangan said that her impression was that the JSC is expecting RDA to engender more interpretive manuals. Bowen replied that that was true to an extent. The JSC was hoping for a manual to cover the basics but not cover everything for every specialist community. Supplemental manuals to cover that extra level of detail would not be a bad thing. Hall said that there was a distinction between cataloging manuals and specialized sets of rules. He further agreed that some communities may need to write such specialized rules. Attig pointed out though that the goal is to create a principled set of rules, as widely applicable as possible. Bowen reminded everyone that this is just the first stage, that nobody wants to disenfranchise communities. Allgood asked if the new code will refer to specialized rules. Bowen replied in the affirmative and Allgood said that this would be a good step.

From the floor Schiff addressed a comment to Tillett that there are a lot of LCRIs to Chapter 21, some that simplify the rules and others that complicate them. In the LC process, how does doing away with the LCRIs come into play? Tillett replied that LC is reviewing Chapter 21, in light of the LCRIs, and is looking to simplify it, with a principled approach. LC's comments are coming soon. The LCRIs will end as an integrating resource tied to AACR but LC will still state a set of decisions in a new document series.

Bowen reported that in the discussion with Big Heads about where to simplify Part 2, there was concern whether there might be changes in primary access points between AACR and RDA, and concern how those changes would affect retrieval as well, specifically in regards to collocation in WebPACS. But they want the JSC to look beyond the limitations of current OPAC, to consider other types of justifications like the ease of cataloging. There needs to be enough principle-based rules so that we can get away from the case-based approach.

Weiss commented that the recent change in the Romanization of Chinese names changed the way headings are indexed, so we've lived through this kind of change before.

5) GMD/SMD Working Group

GMD/SMD Working Group
[5JSC/Chair/6]

Bowen announced that the JSC formed a Working Group on the GMD/SMD issue. The Chair is Patricia Thurston, while membership is still in development. The JSC worked hard on the charge, and didn't want the Group to have to redo the taxonomy work.

6) Responses to Part 1 Draft

Incorporating Responses to AACR3 Pt. 1 Draft into RDA
[5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide]

Bowen reported that the response table is available as an efficient tool. Each of the JSC Representatives will go through it and indicate which items their constituencies agree with, disagree with, and what needs further discussion. She would like to hear any strong responses. Winzer inquired about the GMD/SMD recommendations and whether to leave that for the Working Group [supra]. Bowen asked to save those. Mangan asked what she saw as a procedural question, whether the updated version would show how ALA responded. Bowen reported that points of agreement were included in the draft, and points of disagreement and discussion would go into the agenda for the JSC meeting. There may be a need for rule revision proposals. She asked if it was important to have the Secretary create that document. Attig shared that the important part for CC:DA is Bowen's report summarizing the agreements and disagreements. Larsgaard reminded the group about upcoming

deadlines on the program of work to be done before the October 10-15 JSC meeting. Attig asked if things should be discussed at Midwinter, but Bowen replied that the work needs to be done before then, so discussions should be conducted by e-mail.

**921. Report from the Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media:
De Groat**

De Groat summarized the work accomplished by the Task Force. The charge was changed with the dropping of AACR3, to examine the functional requirements for the rules of technical description of media. These will be based on the Task Force's examination of other standards and going through each element. The Task Force has an August 1 deadline. Attig has already drafted a report template for members to insert responses so as to facilitate contributions. Attig pointed out that, given the status of RDA, they were concentrating on data elements rather than what should specifically go into the rules. Larsgaard thanked them for their work and report.

**922. Report from the Planning Task Force on the *Cataloging Cultural Objects*
Program: Beacom**

Matthew Beacom reported that the program was held on Saturday, attended by 275, and was well received. The follow up is that the CCS Executive Committee approved a Pre-Conference in 2006 with Beacom as Chair that will draw from the existing program. The Committee and speakers were listed. Anna Ferris and Mary Woodley will continue over into Pre-Conference development. He continued that his sense was that the program went well, but they forgot to get evaluation forms out so they will have to rely on word of mouth, and to please tell him if you hear any comments, positive or negative. Weiss inquired if he had a sense of whether people were coming for general professional development or for planning to implement. Beacom replied that he didn't have a way of knowing but that his sense was that people were coming because they dealt with visual materials and wanted to see where the field was going. Attig inquired about the status of the *Cataloging Cultural Objects* document. Beacom reported that it was nearing publication: available June 2006 from ALA Editions. Woodley said that the Networked Metadata Interest Group was very interested due to digital library projects that dealt with museum objects, especially in terms of an interest in displaying such objects in the OPAC. Larsgaard thanked and discharged the Planning Task Force.

**923. Report from the Program Planning Task Force for ALA Annual 2005 (Program on
AACR3/RDA): Beacom**

Beacom reported that the program was held on Sunday, and listed the speakers. He continued that it was a great program, but again there were no evaluation forms. He shared, "It was amazing to be in a room of 600 catalogers and lovers of the catalog." Larsgaard listed the committee members: Fletcher, Attig, Folkner, and Dede. Beacom thanked and praised the committee for a wonderful job. Weiss reported, "Judith Hopkins said it was the best program she ever attended." [Applause] Schmierer asked if there would be information forums at future ALA meetings on RDA development, since many people would welcome the opportunity to discuss it and it would be a good public relations opportunity. Beacom enthusiastically responded to the idea and asked Tillett, Bowen, and Attig if they would be available for such forums, lasting ninety minutes. From the floor Schiff pointed out that there is the Discussion Group structure in CCS. Bowen reported that she will be visiting groups, possibly speaking to the Medium Heads of Cataloging at Midwinter. From the floor Mary Woodley said that she missed the Sunday presentation due to a schedule conflict and that it would be helpful to have the presentations available for non-attendees. Bowen replied that the slide programs were already mounted on the Web. Attig added that Bowen's reports were there also. Beacom continued that there is a need for Bowen to visit with groups and for an RDA update for a larger audience. He suggested the program approach or including the

presentation in future CC:DA meetings. Larsgaard suggested that she make some time for it at Midwinter. She then thanked and dismissed the Task Force.

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

Randall reported that the Task Force met the day before to discuss the document, to identify changes that needed to be made to it because of updates to AACR2. The members examined some editorial issues arising from the publishing process. There are differences between the print and PDF versions. This makes the review process difficult, due to the multiple iterations. They have identified areas for more research, especially for Integrating Resources. They are going to come up with a schedule/plan for work to be done and desired revisions to present to CC:DA in late fall for CC:DA approval in Midwinter. Attig asked how much feedback had been received after the call for comments. Randall replied they had received about three, and would welcome more. Randall reported that they had also discussed how to issue the edits and that the whole document will need to be republished for it to work. Larsgaard thanked Randall for the report and the Task Force’s work.

925. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood [\[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2005/2\]](#)

Allgood summarized two MARBI meetings, covering the reports and proposals they dealt with. The status of four proposals:

2005-04R went through with some changes.

2005-07 approved with minor changes.

2005-08 broke the variable fields into 2 parts. Change to 048 field was approved and moved to the second indicator. Change to 008 field.

2005-06J approved with the provision that LC define the use of another subfield rather than \$e in addition to the fields already in the proposal to include fields 662 and 664.

The summary of four reports:

AACR3/RDA report from the CC:DA representative: There was interest from the committee to receive the drafts, especially the Prospectus in July.

Equal access to non-Roman resources: Returned to ALA for the next steps.

Using MARC21 with FRBR: Noted the importance of identifiers for Work/Expression.

Unicode report: A listserv was set up for those working on it: Unicode-MARC@loc.gov. MARBI wants to have a list of best practices developed, especially for the uniformity of the conversion code.

Allgood continued that the new MARBI meeting schedule was 10 a.m.-12:30 Saturday, 1-3:30 p.m. Sunday, and 4-6 p.m. Monday.

Larsgaard thanked him for his report.

926. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

Attig reported that there was not much to report other than that the website was going well. He will do his best to ensure it continues during his upcoming sabbatical. Weiss commented that he’d like to see it as a model for other ALA components. Attig replied that one important aspect was that it was not an ALA site

(i.e., it was not on the ALA server). He further reported that one page on the ALA web site had been updated regarding Midwinter decisions. Larsgaard thanked him for his report.

927. Report on CCS Executive meetings: Chair

Larsgaard reported that the CCS Executive Meetings were held 8-10 p.m. on Friday, 9-11:30 a.m. on Saturday, 8 a.m.-1 p.m. on Sunday, and Tuesday morning. She attended Friday evening's meeting on programs; things looked good with our programs. She missed the Saturday meeting. She will go to the Tuesday meeting to report on the Committee's conference activities and will send a report on the Task Force for New Stakeholders, once approved by Executive Committee. Attig queried about a timeline. Larsgaard reported that a one-year time-frame was expected.

928. New Business: Chair

Larsgaard announced that public review is invited of DCRM(B), and a CC:DA review is specifically requested. Reviews are due August 21, 2005. She requested a motion to establish a Task Force to review DCRM(B). Attig moved. Mangan seconded. No discussion. Motion carried, 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. [Sign up sheets distributed.] Larsgaard announced that she will follow up with a written charge to the Task Force and establish the roster.

Larsgaard solicited other new business.

From the floor Beacom requested a mechanism for outreach for RDA, and suggested an RDA Forum Task Force set up by CC:DA. The group would be responsible to ensure that there is a public forum for discussing RDA at Midwinter and Annual. Bowen suggested that scheduling a Forum would be easier. From the floor Schiff suggested that CCS could create a new Discussion Group instead. Discussion and a review of the by-laws ensued. Larsgaard will check at the CCS Executive Meeting as to which approach would be preferable.

Larsgaard announced that four voting members are rotating off; four new members and an intern are coming on. The new members are Robert Maxwell, Laura Smart, Sherry Vellucci, and Paul Weiss with John Myers as the new intern. Rotating off are Dorothy McGarry, Kristin Lindlan, Michael Chohey, and Peter Fletcher. She recognized Chohey and Fletcher for the many Task Forces on which each has served, and recognized McGarry for winning the Margaret Mann Citation and for being a mentor to many. She thanked Smart for taking on more difficult work as she transitions from intern to voting member. [Applause]

Larsgaard reported that the next meetings would be at Midwinter on Saturday afternoon and Monday morning but she is waiting for CCS Executive meetings to determine what the exact time frames for meetings would be.

929. Reports from the Floor

Attig gave some alerts regarding Midwinter: The new Part 1 Draft will be available and there will be a day-long Friday meeting to review it for a response. Documents will be made available as soon as possible and Confluence or GroupWare will be used for comments.

Weiss shared that Larsgaard would be chairing for another year. [Applause]

Larsgaard called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.