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
2006 Midwinter Meeting in San Antonio, TX
January 20, 21, and 23, 2006**

Members present:
Mary Larsgaard, Chair
John Attig
Cheri Folkner
Elizabeth Mangan
Robert Maxwell
Laura Smart
Sherry Vellucci
Paul Weiss
Jay Weitz

John Myers, 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 (absent 1/23)

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 (absent)
Greta De Groat, ALCTS/NRMIG
Larry Heiman, ALCTS/PARS
Kevin Randall, ALCTS/SS
Manon Théroux, ALA/ACRL
Rebecca Culbertson, ALA/GODORT
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT (absent 1/23)
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
  Heidi Lerner, AJL (absent 1/23)
  Daniel Starr, ARLIS/NA
  Laurel Jizba, ARSC
  Judy Knop, ATLA (absent 1/23)
  Thomas Duszak, CLA
  Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core
  Mary Woodley, Dublin Core
  W. Curtiss Priest, IEEE (absent, replaced by Hodgins)
  Wayne Hodgins, IEEE (absent 1/23)
  John Hostage, IFLA
  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 in order to collocate items related to specific topics
       for clarity.

  II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is
       laborious. Only in the case of some comments are exact quotes made.

 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
CCO = *Cataloging of Cultural Objects*
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
CRG = ALCTS Council of Regional Groups
CPSO = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
CRCC = ALCTS/Serials Section, Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee
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

Friday, January 20, 2006 — 10:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m.
Marriott Rivercenter, Salon I

930.   Welcome and opening remarks

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

931.   Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives
            [CC:DA/Roster]

Committee voting members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

932.   Discussion of the draft of Part I of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA)

Larsgaard opened discussion by pointing out a couple of points for the overall structure of the discussion. First, the Chair requests overview comments on draft as whole by voting members, then by liaisons and representatives, and then by the audience. Then comments will be taken on Chapter 1 to be finished by noon. Comments should not be repeated. Weiss pointed out that it is important to know where there is agreement. Larsgaard acknowledged this point but asked the Committee to limit this to stating, "I agree." Then lunch will run from noon to 1:30. After lunch, we will discuss Chapter 2, again major, general comments only, not typos or specific examples. The 4-5:30 time will be available for any Task Forces to get together to decide if they need to report as a task force. Chapter 3 just came out yesterday, so we will not hear from the SMD Task Force. After Chapter 2, we will deal with any other remaining chapters. We will review those over lunch for which ones potentially to discuss.

Larsgaard reported that Jennifer Bowen, the ALA Representative to the JSC, is at another meeting, and would join the committee after lunch. Bowen provided in writing particular points to review, which Larsgaard read: "It's important to keep in mind that CC:DA will need to be selective about putting forth comments in the ALA response to the draft. First of all, we need to be selective because some of the major decisions have already been made about RDA and at this point they are not going to be reconsidered in the preparation of Part I, such as the separation of ISBD presentation information to an Appendix or the overall organization of Part I. That isn't going to change at this point. We can say that we disagree, but it's unlikely it's going to change. We also need to be selective about what comments we put forward from purely practical purposes. Remembering the process from the first draft of Part I ... we won't have time to deal with every issue that comes up with the draft. Even if they were all included in the ALA response, the JSC wouldn't have time to deal with all of them. The JSC spent the majority of its five day meeting in October going through comments from the first round and at that only got through a fraction of all the questions that had come up. There will be even less time to discuss

Part I at the upcoming April meeting of the JSC because the JSC will be devoting much of the time to discussing the upcoming draft of Part II. CC:DA needs to identify the big issues, the most important issues with Part I, that affect the usability of the code. For example, problems that might make RDA guidelines difficult to apply, or where the results of applying them, from a library's point of view, are really unacceptable." Bowen further recommended that Friday's meeting focus on identifying these big issues, so that we can continue discussing them at the Monday CC:DA meeting. Larsgaard clarified that Saturday's meeting would focus on major JSC topics so it would be Monday before we got more discussion of the draft of Part I again. Jennifer's comments were continued: "In prioritizing ALA comments, we do need to accept that we can't fix everything that someone didn't like with AACR2 at this stage. Each issue from AACR2 would require significant discussion within the JSC. If addressing rules that carry over from AACR2 turns out to be a high priority, then ALA will need to pick out the most important issues and develop separate proposals for the JSC to consider. ... Please keep in mind, we're catalogers, we like things to be perfect, we want RDA to be perfect when it's first published. I can guarantee you that RDA won't be perfect, but we already know how to handle that. The continuous revision process that was in place for AACR will start up again as soon as RDA is published. ... And then we'll keep working through the issues that didn't get addressed in RDA."

Larsgaard turned to John Attig who reported that the announcement regarding Chapter 3 was issued at noon the previous day. It will be added to the public JSC site with the rest of the draft. It and the report of the GMD/SMD Task Force were put up on the internal site for constituency review. We'll have to comment on them within the same time frame as the rest of Part I. However, because it came out so late, we won't discuss it at this meeting; Jennifer Bowen will discuss it further on Monday and we'll do some planning on how to approach the handling of these two documents. Attig observed that if all the task forces want to meet, there will be overlap. He asked who wanted to meet. De Groat indicated she would. Mangan asked what was there to meet on without Chapter 3. Attig replied that there were organizational matters to address in a meeting. No other task forces indicated a need to meet. Weiss suggested having small group lunches as topics emerge, on the model of last year's meeting. This met with approval and it was suggested that the situation be revisited before lunch.

Larsgaard opened the overview comments on the draft as a whole by summarizing a couple of comments from Confluence, "One comment was that the text resources, real or online, still seem to be in many ways the focus of the rules and that non-text media ... perhaps are not receiving the attention that we would like. The other one was a concern that one of the big points that the JSC has in mind is that this [RDA] be a code that not only catalogers and libraries would be able to use and perhaps that it may still be something that only a cataloger can love."

Overview comments from voting members

Mangan stated that she had two issues that she found problematic. One was the redundancy in the draft – it's more redundant than AACR2. Another issue was that the identification of rules that apply to a specific type of material was inconsistent – sometimes not given at all, sometimes given in labels, sometimes buried in the text of a rule. This has to be consistent and up front when it applies to only one material, so that when someone is reading the rules they can know what to skip. All types of material, including archival, need to be clearly identified, which they have not been. There seem to be two types of options being included, one is for librarians and the other is for metadata users not to use parts of our rules, for example if they don't want to use Appendix A as the source of abbreviations because they are using another source. These instances need to be clearly identified. Attig responded that from the JSC discussions, he didn't think that was true. Weiss asked for clarification that it wasn't the JSC's intent. Attig continued

that the impetus for this rule came from the Library of Congress. Mangan commented that she thought there was agreement that "numbering" was only to be limited to serials but it has been generalized again to everything, because it isn't clearly labeled that it's only for a type of material, it's simply in there. Lastly, a perhaps not so general comment, "scale" and "coordinates" are not in the identification chapter and yet are listed as mandatory elements in the list of mandatory elements for "identification," which seems to be a big contradiction.

Maxwell stated that he liked the fact that definitions are right in the rules. He liked that they seemed to have overcome the aversion to not using negative rules. But he does object to being told what we can't discuss from the comments of Jennifer's that were read. It seemed to him rather high handed to say, "We've made these decisions between the last time we discussed and this time and they're just not going to be changed, so don't even discuss them." This seems to be because an artificial timeline that the JSC has decided is going to be the timeline, and we've got to meet that timeline, so therefore why should we discuss these issues. So it seems like all the work we did with the first draft, that we are not to discuss those things again. So for example, to go to a forbidden topic, he's not in principle opposed to separating the ISBD punctuation, the presentation from display. But he thinks it is extremely confusing to a generalist. For instance 2.6.5 is a good example of this; removing the ISBD punctuation from the numbering which means you must have four separate lines in the examples. He said that it was great in theory but in practice it doesn't work and reiterated that he strongly objects to being told what we can't discuss.

Further discussion ensued in which Weiss responded that he had similar concerns and had spoken with Jennifer Bowen earlier; she wasn't trying to shut down discussion but trying to optimize our time. If there is huge outcry, the JSC will have to consider it. So if we feel strongly, then we need to say it and then the JSC will have to decide what to do. Attig took up the discussion, agreeing with Weiss and stressing that, "if we want to take up these really big issues, we have to realize that they are really big, and that they have to be really important to us, because essentially what we're doing is scuttling the process. ... We're telling them to stop the process. That's what we did a year ago, and it worked. If we feel it is that important we can do it again, but we have to be careful."

Attig said that we have yet to work through the implications of the separation of content from presentation; there are still some things that turn out to be major dissensions, including the distinction between a formal statement and a note. "It is possible to distinguish between transcribed data and cataloger supplied data. But in areas where you are not dealing with transcribed data, the difference between the note and a formal statement is simply how you tag it, and that is not content." It's hard to look at this in isolation. Because RDA doesn't mandate presentation doesn't mean there won't be one we have to follow. Some things will be moved out of rules and put elsewhere. Maxwell and Attig indicated they thought that this approach may be more confusing. The other point Attig made was that there is "still some uncertainty in the way the rules are structured as to what is treated as a separate data element and what is combined into a single data element which you can make in a single statement." For example there are a number of title elements that are grouped together. It isn't absolutely clear that each of these is to be treated as a separate data element.

Mangan observed that one of the objectives is that RDA is supposed to be in simple English, but it required several readings at times and still left things unclear to her. Another concern was redundancy, not just generally, but in that on numerous occasions one is directed to a reference that says the same thing as the text from which one was referred; nothing was added.

Weiss commented that, "this is a tremendous improvement over what we saw last year." He thanked the JSC for its effort. But he strongly agreed with Mangan that there is tremendous redundancy and "textual bloat." He agreed with the comment that it's something "only a cataloger would love." "If [the] JSC is still committed to having this document being used outside the traditional cataloging community, there is still a lot of work to do." In contrast to comments by Maxwell and Attig, he does like the separation of ISBD into a separate section, it's clearer to him. He does think that some of the examples, at "numbering" for instance, could be identified more clearly as being a set of elements for one resource, which would be a vast improvement. He agreed with Attig about the concern of "what's a data element and what's not a data element." There needs to be a section up front to declare what we mean by data element. He also agreed with Mangan regarding the readability. The high academic style of the document may not be best for this application, especially if we want it to be readable by all sorts of users. "There is quite a bit more work to do on definitions. There are inconsistencies, there are terms that are used in multiple ways, there are some terms that are used technically but aren't defined." If we still have a goal that this is a document for the broader metadata community, we need to use the terminology of descriptive metadata in their language, not in the limited scope that we have traditionally applied. Regarding the structure of Part I, the structure for Chapters 2-6 is still not very obvious to him. In 0.14, it says that Chapters 2-6 each support a specific user task. He thought this would mean they'd be focused on a specific task each; instead they each are mostly for a single task, but still are mixed together. He would prefer a more consistent structure. In terms of FRBR, "either do the 'Group 1 element way' or the 'User task way' but having it half [of] both makes it less clear."

Attig addressed the redundancy issue by reminding the group that it is not meant to be a linear document, it's supposed to be online with hypertext. Unfortunately, the drafting situation is linear. The publication environment can have much of the redundancy hidden. Mangan pointed out that a print version was also intended and that would have to be linear.

Smart stated that she had nothing to add other than to agree with the redundancy concern, that the ISBD separated out was good, but that the data elements need work.

Vellucci agreed with Smart. Weitz indicated he had nothing further to add.

Weiss voiced a concern about how the "Introduction" is to work with the overall document and that we're suffering from how the document is being worked on in separate sections. Much of the introductory matter in Part I seems as if it would also apply to Parts II and III and should therefore be shifted to the overall "Introduction." We need to know about script issues of everything not just Part I. We need to move rules and information to the level at which it truly is appropriate. To return to readability, "it is important to split out background information from actual instruction. The introduction to Part I blurs that quite a bit." He would prefer that all the background material be pulled out to an unnumbered introduction; then when one is in the rules it is just the imperative voice telling one what to do.

Overview comments from the liaisons and representatives of CC:DA

Starr stated that he liked not having the ISBD punctuation, but noted that it still slips in on occasion. He observed that with an electronic version of the product, it's possible to have different versions of the examples, with and without the punctuation. He had a general comment, regarding the consistency of approach. In particular, at the instructions at 1.6.8, regarding titles, we're instructed to transcribe the mistakes and then correct them in a note, but then later, when recording the title proper of resources issued in successive parts, we are instructed to correct the typos, and record the mistakes in a note. "I feel strongly that we should be correcting obvious

mistakes." [Expressions of agreement around the room.] But whichever approach the JSC should decide to approve, it should be consistent throughout the document. In a similar vein, we are moving towards more complete transcription, but 2.4.0.7 includes omitting unnecessary parts of personal names from the "statement of responsibility," "I think it is a step back in terms of transcribing information, especially in an electronic environment." Weiss said that "there's no need for abbreviation in our environment today. We don't need to save the disk space."

Glazier remarked that he had "metacomments," comments about process and the timetable. The timetable ends with the publication of the rules in 2008, but there is nothing in there for a training schedule or an implementation schedule, things that might be necessary for systems to adjust how they work in accordance with the changes in the rules. These are part of the process that need to be considered because the day of publication is not going to be the day people are ready to adapt and adjust to the new rules. At what point is the text set in concrete for the electronic form? Attig responded that the text will be finally determined at the end of 2007 to support the 2008 publication. The text will be set as it is determined through the course of the process. It is assumed that the electronic product will be the easiest thing to do. There were several minutes of discussion about implementation. Glazier pointed back to the publication and implementation timeline of AACR2, and stated that it was not too soon to address those issues. Larsgaard reported that it was a very formal process when AACR2 came out and the couple of years over which it took place were essential. Discussion continued on who had driven the process then and the number of players involved today. Whitacre said, "We've already been talking to our administrators. We're going to have to go through training for a little bit. We're going to have to work with our copy catalogers. Catalogers are going to have to go to get this training. We need to start thinking *now* about the money issue, because we project budgets so far in advance that we don't want to be left out." Weiss suggested that Larsgaard should take this to the CCS Executive Committee, to which Larsgaard replied that she was anticipating this very need.

Schmierer spoke of her concerns. She quoted from p. 5 of the draft, "Examples and the proofreading are going to follow later." She raised the point that both of these can have a major effect on the final product, as proofreading often veers into the realm of editing. With that in mind, the purpose today should be to draw our "line in the sand," to say "these are matters of concern to us." She encouraged the group not to use the meeting time to argue for specific solutions, but rather to use it to ensure that the actual concerns are raised with the whole group. She had two further concerns regarding publishing. "I'm very concerned that the Web product is driving everything." She is not averse to a Web product, but suggested that a printed page would be more useful in a training environment. It may be necessary to consider some different presentation options for the print version from those for the Web version. For example, she likes the suggestion to switch between ISBD and non-ISBD Web versions, but in a print version, it may be necessary to provide separate full appendices holding ISBD and non-ISBD examples.

Her other concern dealt with a possible *Concise RDA*. In the past, the *Concise* version of AACR was under a separate contract and left to the editor. She proposed that a *Concise RDA* ought to emanate from the JSC or jointly with CC:DA. She raised a concern about the organization, using "title" as an example. The rules should be structured to distinguish whether the resource has a title or not. If the resource bears a title, then one set of rules are followed. If the resource does not bear a title, then there should be an alternative set of rules to follow. This will save those dealing with non-published material from having to "wade through all the rules." Attig responded that the JSC has decided to have direct control of the *Concise* and its development is under consideration.

Jizba agreed strongly with Schmierer regarding the example just given for structuring the rules on "title." Given the amount of work she does with non-published materials, Schmierer's proposed structure would be very helpful. She listed a number of standards to which she must refer to in order to construct a title. It would also be helpful to have a separate path in the RDA draft that would directly point you to a path for "no title" and also to a path that avoids using ISBD punctuation but does provide standardized data element presentation.

In response to Schmierer's comments regarding a *Concise* version, Weiss said that, "If we need a *Concise*, we have failed," especially in regards to use by the larger metadata community. He disagreed with her comment on training. "There is a generational difference. My generation is more linearly focused." In contrast, he believes that today's students are more used to nonlinear manuals, to hyperlinked environments.

Randall raised a concern about removing ISBD from the rules, pointing out that there are two major components of ISBD: content standard and display standard. Many of the concepts of ISBD areas and elements were dropped out in the draft. A specific example occurs in the "title and statement of responsibility area" where parallel titles currently are put in that area if they are from the same source as the title proper but not put there if from a different source. The current draft gives no hint about how to deal with this, regardless of where the parallel title appears. Another issue is the use of the single record approach for resources with electronic versions. It would be beneficial if there was some mention of this approach, especially as an option with appropriate guidance given. Along with that, remote resources themselves don't seem to be given enough prominence in the rules. There are too many options in the rules that will result in multiple versions of records. This will result in the need for further specialized user guides. What we need is consistency.

Maxwell expanded on Randall's single record approach comments, to point out that this is not unique to the serials community. Monographic catalogers also routinely use the single record approach to provide access to print and electronic versions of the same text.

Woodley (filling in for Hillmann as Dublin Core representative) spoke, "I agree with Paul – if we need to write a Concise, then we have failed." Regarding "titles," we need to look at other standards, at communities' practices. She does like splitting display from the rules. She recommends putting punctuation in an Appendix and also putting options in an Appendix. Possibly develop a hierarch of options – some options available to everyone, but some options specifically mandatory for libraries.

Mangan voiced some concerns for the cartographic community. She said that "projection" is not addressed for cartographic materials, and "magnitude" was added, but she doesn't know where it came from as it was not in AACR. "Epoch" and "equinox" are not covered as they were previously in AACR. They've been moved to something they don't go with, and they're no longer treated as separate elements.

Larsgaard encouraged those present to provide positive comments as well as negative. She then revisited the timetable: return from lunch by 1:30 and work on Chapters 0 and 1 through 3:00, take a break, and then take up Chapter 2 from 3:15-5 p.m. There may not be time to address the other chapters and Chapter 3 won't be discussed due to its recent issuance.

De Groat pointed out some consistency issues with respect to FRBR concepts. What is a resource: is it a work, or a manifestation? In the chapter on content, what is meant by content? She reiterated the view that it is very physical- or print-centric. Spoken word sound recordings have fallen through the cracks. There are many issues regarding "inside/outside the resource"

that are ambiguous, particularly for online materials. Bracketing is less for print, but more for non-print resources. Many online materials may have every descriptive element bracketed.

Vellucci made two overview comments. The first follows on that raised by De Groat, regarding FRBR elements, especially "work" and "expression." RDA is very focused on "manifestation," which is natural, but there aren't any definitions. Discussion ensued regarding the Glossary. Attig mentioned that the Glossary developed and distributed with AACR3 was not appended to the RDA draft but would be part of RDA. Weiss pointed out that these terms lack the beginning-of-the-chapter definitions that are otherwise prevalent. Vellucci questioned whether these terms ought to be included early in the text? This was met with widespread agreement. She raised the further concern that in all the discussion regarding levels of description – analytics, multi-level – nowhere are these related to FRBR Group 1 entities. She voiced a second concern from her role as a faculty member. For students, what will be the pricing structure? For educational institutions, what will be the arrangement for licenses serving multiple users? For example, *Cataloger's Desktop* has been problematic with regard to licensing for library schools. Several committee members spoke to this matter, indicating that it was not a comment issue or even a JSC issue. However, Bowen as the ALA Representative and Don Chatham of ALA Publications could serve as conduits to the Committee of Principals. Vellucci stated that students may want to buy a print version rather than an electronic one, but in the print context, there is too much "to'ing-and-fro'ing" without the hyper-linking available in the online version. She suggested that a 'workflow chart' be considered, which Attig agreed was a good idea.

A number of comments ensued regarding pricing issues. Mangan pointed out that RDA will likely generate the need for further supplemental manuals, with correspondingly smaller print runs, and higher pricing. Vellucci said that such manuals are now part of Cataloger's Desktop, but the pricing and limits are difficult for the library school environment. Woodley reminded the group that other standards are free and readily available. Consequently, other metadata communities will not pay to use RDA; they'll go in another direction.

Hodgins raised a concern about extensibility. In terms of meeting the first stated goal of RDA, there is little reference to extensibility to those who are not librarians. Nor is there reference to general extensibility of the framework. Another concern deals with the content. The notion of dealing with historical tradition of large and static collections seems to have been implied and stated. But this just scratches the surface of going digital and of mass compilations. Splitting content from presentation is a step in the right direction. But there needs to be more in addressing metadata to support the consumable result. It doesn't address the content object model on which you are framing your process and it is hard to justify the resulting set of rules.

Woodley offered a Dublin Core perspective. In its development there was concern about expansion beyond the original 15 data elements, so they relied on use of an abstract model, with application profiles for specific user communities. How you create a registry of communities would be another layer of JSC/CC:DA. It may be useful to draw on the Dublin Core experience. Hodgins confirmed that IEEE would be equally willing to share its experiences in metadata development, in particular their joint experiences of finally resorting to an abstract object content model to resolve the issues involved in establishing interoperability of Dublin Core and IEEE developed metadata.

Lacy praised the new draft, stating that it was much easier to read than the draft of AACR3. While it may be much easier for catalogers than anyone else, it still is a big improvement. She repeated the favorable assessment for separating ISBD punctuation from the rules. She noted that it did creep into the examples, but did not view it necessarily as a problem. She liked the option

of examples in one format or the other. She is very pleased with integration of the archival community into the rules.

De Groat offered a minor ISBD rebuttal, stating that there was at least one rule that she misunderstood because of the lack of ISBD punctuation and had to review it in AACR2 with the punctuation. She cautioned that we need to be careful with examples.

Glennan shared the concern regarding the term "resource." Sometimes it is used in an item-in-hand specific context and at other times in a broader context, particularly the assessment that the container is not considered part of the product for sets of audio CDs issued in a container. Part I seems to divide the world into analog and digital, but they're not necessarily opposites of each other. Then specifically in Chapter 1, it divides the world into tangibles and intangibles. We need to be consistent in how we divide the world, rather than cutting it one way in one place and another way some place else. She is concerned that a number of rules, especially in Chapter 2, are divided into multiple bullets that are not otherwise identified, but sometimes have references to them. From an organizational standpoint, this could cause some problems but she is not anxious to introduce further numbers into the rules. It seems to her that all of the punctuation rules are gone, whether ISBD or not. She sees a reference to *Chicago Manual of Style* rules but only in terms of capitalization; there is nothing about various transcription issues that are otherwise dealt with in AACR2, such as the comma between a city and jurisdiction or the mark of omission.

Weiss agreed strongly with Randall regarding the lack of single record approach. Also he is disconcerted to see that previous input on reproductions and originals is not incorporated. RDA retains the AACR2 approach, which is not followed in the United States. This should at least be inserted as an option. Regarding Starr's comment on correcting errors, Weiss pointed to the new objective or principle of attribution. He feels we may have gone too far with that in transcription issues. Following up on comments by others, he stated that RDA was, "an improvement. It's still a very old fashioned standard. It does not take into account many of the ways that most standards are structured now …" He reinforced Vellucci's earlier comment, that we need to include FRBR to a much higher level.

Schmierer found merit in using the FRBR concepts. She cautioned against wholesale incorporation of FRBR terminology into the rules at this point, when the use of that terminology is out of our control, is still under development, and may shift. It is amazing how well FRBR works in our existing catalogs. She expressed concern that there is growing hostility toward the Entity-Attribute model used in FRBR. We ought to take the best of it, incorporate that into the rules, and move on from there. In an indirectly related concern, the rules don't address the possibility that information doesn't all have to reside in one record. She suggested the potential use by some communities of "holdings" records. The important issue is whether the system can bring the information together. The original/reproduction issue could be addressed this way, with the original/reproduction aspect recorded in holdings records rather than in the bibliographic record. She is not suggesting that the rules should push people in this one direction, but if the resource description covers multiple "entities" then it would be helpful to allow the incorporation of such data in holding records.

Duszak inquired about the development of a successor publication to the LCRIs. He was told that the LC representative would be reporting on Saturday.

Larsgaard encouraged visitors to use the ALCTS online form. She outlined the mechanisms for incorporating those comments into the CC:DA RDA review process. She solicited favorable

comments as well as unfavorable ones. Attig explained the value of providing specific problematic examples and of suggesting solutions. Larsgaard affirmed this.

The meeting broke for lunch with two possible lunch discussions for interested parties: a discussion regarding serials and integrating resources rules led by Regina Reynolds (Head of the National Serials Data Program) and a discussion regarding the abstract content model led by Woodley and Hodgins.

Following lunch, Larsgaard brought the committee back to order and restated the plan for the afternoon's discussions – focus on major problems/comments; desire to get through chapters 0, 1, and 2 by 5 p.m.; state problems/solutions/comments succinctly. She provided examples of major vs. minor situations. She reminded speakers not to repeat other's comments and provided a recap of major themes expressed in the morning. She then opened the floor for reports from the lunch discussion groups.

Report of the Abstract Model Lunch Group (Woodley)

Woodley led off the report of the group. RDA is a great improvement over the AACR3 draft but it does not live up to its initial promise expressed in the Goals and Principles section. As a standard, it needs to be modeled according to the current methods for creating standards if we expect other communities to use it. Another point: starting out with an abstract model creates a framework on which the specifics can be developed. The model can be static, but the specifics that are being developed can be changed within that framework. That may be what the goal and principals were trying to do but the results still echo back to print as the model with other media/formats as exceptions to that. The group suggests three abstract models: service, resource, and metadata. FRBR provides the abstract model for resource and service. They would like to refer back to a presentation by Barbara Tillett of a workflow/ontology tree, that starts by dividing the world into self-describing vs. non-self-describing. Then under self-describing resources you can further divide into published resources vs. resources referred to externally. An abstract model would also increase the ability to be consistent within all the rules for the specifics. The application profiles or community practices could then be changed with more fluidity within that model. It is desirable to keep it extensible in terms of technology. They want to be able to change how technology allows you to express and transmit that data – as a community, we've gone from in-house MARC to XML to RDF, etc.; so you want to retain that technological flexibility. Chapters 1, etc., are still geared towards resources that are static and traditional. We need to break away from that model so as to address new types of resources like data sets and web pages from its conception. Eighty five percent of the "dark web" is not consumable directly – services, etc., that are customizable, ephemeral, and that the library is not addressing currently. The current RDA structure may not be able to address this.

Hodgins emphasized that there are multiple abstract models. There is a need to address the fundamental change of the resources themselves. To date we have done well to address the changes in static resources like audio, video, film, etc. On the other hand, this document does not address the fundamental changes in the nature of resources – being more dynamic, having levels that are not pursuable. The paradigm that RDA is implicitly and sometimes explicitly following is referencing the consumable level. He reinforced the previous comment regarding use of abstract models for each of resource, metadata, and services.

Jizba distributed a handout of a model on taxonomies that was drawn up during lunch.

Comments on this Lunch Discussion Group's report

Vellucci thought that the suggested three abstracts models could serve well the stated RDA goal of bringing communities together.

Jizba responded favorably to RDA's goals to expand coverage beyond the traditional cataloging role. She noted the growth of new types of resources, of conglomerations that are not self-describing, outside the normal fixed publication process. Fulfillment of RDA's goals will help us address these resources.

Woodley pointed out that from an educational standpoint, she as an educator is moving away from teaching students solely in terms of MARC. Graduates increasingly will end up working outside the traditional cataloging/library setting. In shaping RDA we want to look at what the future is and how it will not just be libraries.

Report of the Serials/Integrating Resources Lunch Discussion Group

Reynolds stated that the primary issue was with overlapping and conflicting terminology, to which the group had a simple solution and a more involved one. The clearest consensus was on eliminating the category "successively issued resources." There is a confusing cluster of resources referenced under this term, sometimes referring to different modes of issuance and other times to different types of resources. For instance, there are confusing distinctions in 2.3.1.7 in the exceptions. We should be specific about what we are referring to – multipart monographs, serials, etc. – so that people can consistently refer to the appropriate rules for the category of resource with which they are dealing. That is the simple solution.

The more complex issues followed. There was a suggestion for the web version that there be behind the scenes coding for the rules as applying generally, to serials, or to integrating resources, so that users can pull together just what they need. There was a reply that this is the intent and that Tom Delsey, the RDA editor, has started tagging things that way but it's not apparent in the print version. Attig observed that the point remains that there are labeling ambiguities in the text that need to be resolved.

Report of the more complex issues continued. The query was raised as to whether it was possible to revisit some decisions so as to remove some of the key differences between the way serials and integrating resources are described for interpretation of the catalog records by users. Having exactly opposite ways of dealing with the two categories of resources is difficult for those catalogers who work with both. The impediments of describing serials in terms of the current issue and ways around them were discussed by the group, for example use of a stable title, a provisional title that could be benchmarked, etc., but these are points for a larger discussion.

Comments on this Lunch Group's report

Weiss pointed out that there are also concerns regarding serials and monographs. He sought clarification on the issue of successively issued parts. Regina Reynolds reiterated that there is inconsistency in use. Sometimes the rules refer explicitly to serials and sometimes explicitly to multi-part monographs, but then at other times they are lumped together under successively issued parts. It's a matter of consistency and comprehensibility. These underlying concepts of mode of issuance that contribute to the model aren't necessarily helpful within the specific rules.

Overview comments on Chapter 0

Weiss repeated his earlier comment that it's important to separate background information from instructions.

Vellucci addressed 0.1.1. She pointed out that, in referring to relationships to other standards, the indicated standards are very traditional book oriented. While there are some archival standards, many other communities are left out.

Weiss addressed 0.1.5, citing the first sentence, "Part I is designed to be used both as an instructional manual and a reference tool." While he found this a laudable goal, he did not feel it was well achieved here. Further, he did not feel that an instructional manual was an appropriate goal. The way people learn things and the way they refer to things are different. With that in mind, RDA should be a reference tool only.

Overview comments on Chapter 1

Woodley raised a question on Chapter 1 that has a parallel in Chapter 2. In 1.3, there is a section on "changes requiring a new description." But then in 2.3.1.12 and 2.3.1.11 the information on when a new description is required, in terms of major or minor changes, is varied, and we don't see the words "when to make a new record." It might improve clarity to reorganize that into a new section, "When to make a new record."

Weiss tied this to Vellucci's earlier comment about the workflow chart, recognizing that one can organize the document by how people do the work or alphabetically by data element, but one has to pick one organization structure in the end. It would be desirable to have the other method available somehow.

Attig pointed out that this is relevant to earlier discussions about redundancy and about structuring the rules. We may not be serving anyone by separating rules that deal with the same thing. We definitely don't serve anyone well by repeating the rules because we've put them in two different places.

Weiss addressed 1.1. He applauds the splitting of the definition from the exemplars and hopes it continues in other parts. The one thing about which he was concerned was that the first bullet implies that RDA will use one term, "resource," with multiple meanings. Bowen replied that was not the intent.

Weiss said, "The definition of resource still has some aspects that need to be worked on." The current implication is that only things that have a catalog description are a resource. We want to be able to refer to something as a resource whether it has been cataloged yet or not.

Reynolds addressed changes requiring a new description, noting that there are some types of changes that are not listed. She pointed out two specifics: change in format from print to online; and significant changes in edition statement. Woodley responded that they were in 2.3.1.11-12 as she had described previously, where there was some repetition of the material from Chapter 1 to which Reynolds was referring.

Attig commented that in 1.3, "it would be very helpful to have a general rule, not just an exception for serials."

Weiss raised a concern with 1.1.2. First, he likes that the draft explicitly included intangible resources because physical units may not be the best way to think about that. However, regarding the section on modes of issuance, two of the bullets use the term "issue" and two don't. Some

people interpret that to imply published and some don't. He assumes it doesn't mean published but that it can mean assembled collections. We should be explicit.

Weiss commented on 1.2, the types of description – comprehensive, analytical, multi-level. At first he liked it, but now is not certain it should be included here, wondering, "What is it that RDA is creating?" Is it records or is it descriptions of resources and the relationships between them? This hopefully will be resolved in Part II.

Glennan voiced a concern with 1.1.2, mode of issuance. She has an intellectual problem with the terminology of "single unit." She deals with things that are in one box but have two discs and a booklet. They're clearly not issued separately, so they function simultaneously as a resource issued in two or more parts and as a single unit. Weiss commented that this is an example where texts/books are construed differently in libraries than are some of the other types of materials. Starr said, "I think it's a case where we all know what we mean but I don't understand when someone else expresses it." Is a book jacket, errata slip, or a portfolio of plates part of a single physical unit? Weiss said, "It's absolutely essential to make this clear to people without our backgrounds."

McGarry raised a concern with 1.4 with the bullet on optionally providing a controlled access point instead of including a statement of responsibility in the transcription. One has to transcribe these; otherwise you don't know what is on the resource if the access point changes later on. It will affect record identification and selection. Weiss said that this highlights the huge divide in the community, between those who want transcription and those who don't. Attig said, "We're coming from a tradition that makes a very definite distinction between description and access and are reaching out to communities that don't have any concept of the distinction. We have to recognize that this will be applied in different ways in different communities." Weiss clarified his previous comment that the differences exist within the library cataloging community itself; there are huge divides between different parts of our community. We need to decide how to work and play together in ways that people feel are productive. Schmierer responded that one of the things we may want to consider is to provide guidelines for when to make a transcription of the statement of responsibility mandatory. For instance, with a publication with a formal statement, it should be mandatory. In contrast, if the title is being supplied, it may be sufficient to supply only the access point. Randall spoke against making the statement of responsibility element optional. Later on you may lose any connection between what is on the resource and in the record because of changes to the access points. This will hinder the ability to do name authority work in the future, to track past usage, and possibly even just to identify the resource through the record.

Woodley further reported discussion at lunch where the issue of the term "mandatory" was discussed. "Mandatory" for our community may not necessarily mean that it is mandatory for those who want to use our metadata set. Perhaps we need to consider setting up a separate section where library best practices are specified.

Schmierer addressed 1.2, proposing some simplification of the many categories it contains.

Winzer raised the point that replacement volume sets are still not addressed in the draft, which she admits will complicate Schmierer's proposal for simplification in this rule.

On a new transcription concern, Randall addressed the rule concerning words or letters used repeatedly. He pointed to the *Canadian BIBLIOGRAPHIES canadiennes* example. This is a result of the intent of the designer to present something eye-catching, but it's not necessarily how the resource is presenting itself. He pointed to another example, *The wonderful world of witches*,

where the common 'w' in the three words may be represented by only a single big 'w' resulting in *The wonderful orld of itches*, under the rule as now written.

Attig commented that there is a divide between describing resources that are self-describing and those that aren't. RDA has not decided how it wants to deal with resources that are not self-describing. What we're hearing today is that RDA should deal with them as thoroughly as those that are self describing. That is not the philosophy currently embodied in this draft but it does sound as if this is becoming a fundamental organizing principle for Part I. Weiss disagreed with this, observing that the "serial people" are more in line with the "non-self-describing people," in not wanting strict transcription.

Weiss expanded on Randall's observations, noting that there are numerous significant options now available in the rules and the resulting records could be very different. Consequently, he would like to see more meta-metadata. With these significant options, he would like to see this information coded in the record, so that a cataloging manager can decide where to route such records, to students, copy-catalogers, or original catalogers. He pointed to Schmierer's concern about transcription vs. non-transcription; with this meta-coding, one would know what you were getting in the record with respect to the transcription issue.

Starr observed that it is not an issue of self-describing or non-self-describing but of a cataloger who can think vs. one who can't. In order to present ourselves well to the world, we need to take the attitude that catalogers are intelligent enough to correct typos and interpret a graphical device on a title page so as to transcribe it the way it was meant rather than mindlessly moving from the top to the bottom of the title page.

For Weiss the crux is whether we are developing a resource-focused or a user-focused document. If it is resource-focused then it should adhere to strict transcription, but if user-focused then use "intelligent transcription." This is where an abstract model would help decide when the imperatives for providing a service and describing a resource are in conflict.

Jizba, Starr, and Weiss spoke about transcription and adjustments for stylistic effects on the title page and about creating titles for resources that are non-self-describing. Weiss spoke on the need to rely on cataloger judgment, pointing out that AACR2 does not tell one how to identify what actually is a title. We have to rely on some base level of recognition to spare the need for extensive rules on how to recognize a title.

Myers commented that there is ongoing tension in our work between the way things are and the way things should be. In a perfect world, everything would have a title page with a title, our work would be simple, and RDA would be a pamphlet. We need to acknowledge the tension that *Canadian BIBLIOGRAPHIES canadiennes* can both be seen as a transcribed piece of data and as an access point that an intelligent person can translate into *Canadian bibliographies, Bibliographies canadiennes*. So we need to take as our principle that transcription is our guide for the title proper, if that is what we want to do. Then we can acknowledge transcription is not the most elegant solution in some cases. In those cases either we say that we conform to our principle of transcription but provide an alternative access point or we say that we have a situation that is not well addressed by our principle, so we are temporarily suspending it for this instance to make an intelligent correction and provide the transcription as the alternative. He wouldn't say which way we should go, but he thinks awareness of this decision point is what should guide us as we move forward. It is up to us to decide, make a recommendation, and move on.

Starr observed that this would be possible in 1.1.6. if the words "even if" were changed to "unless" in instances where the design indicates something was meant to be read more than once.

De Groat brought several threads together, mentioning a discussion on "hidden monographs," which she described as resources, typically resources on websites, that present themselves as a monograph but are so easily changed that we don't know it is a monograph as we traditionally have defined one. Here transcription will not work: the content remains constant, but the title or statement of responsibility may end up changing. It's intended to be monographic in a sense, but little tweaks happen over time. She's uncomfortable with the fixed categories of *monograph*, *serial*, and *integrating resource*, when there are more grey areas emerging. Also, the LCRI on reproductions is not working now, when the original has yet to be cataloged, or the online version that is supposed to reproduce the print version is actually different.

Woodley pointed out that in 1.1.6.8 one transcribes and then makes a note correcting the inaccuracy. We don't live in a vacuum; we have students coming in to the OPAC through a link. If the linkage leading them there is corrected but that correction only lives in a note then there is the possibility for problems if there is not an additional access point.

Maxwell also spoke on 1.1.6.8, saying that we've talked about how smart catalogers are, but this is assuming that a cataloger will never make a typo. The use of "[sic]" says, "this is not a typo." If we remove that signal, we are assuming there will be no catalogers' typos. Attig clarified the issue saying that it's forcing us to verify in every case, even if it's been verified once. Weiss said it would be more useful to have another sub-element, rather than "[sic]" to indicate that the transcription is the correct presentation of an erroneous original. Maxwell responded that it was not the removal of "[sic]" per se to which he objected but that there needs to be some signal that I, as the cataloger, have done my job correctly.

Maxwell continued with a comment on 1.6.7, questioning the distinction in the second half of the rule, where we abbreviate and where not. Weiss thought 1.6.7 should be removed altogether. Bowen responded that the JSC is considering a task force to address all abbreviation practices.

Culbertson said that she frequently deals with titles that come from a publisher who is famous for machine transcription leading to frequent inaccuracies but you can just notify the publisher to correct them. She raised the possibility of resolving inaccuracies that way, to which there was a reply that that approach is less feasible for physical resources. She suggested at least an optional section for allowing electronic resources to be corrected before recording the mistakes in a cataloging record.

Glennan raised a new issue regarding mandatory elements for a description in 1.4. When one gets to the rest of the rules, they are written as if the elements are mandatory, even when not listed in 1.4. They are not explicitly identified as optional. Is there a good way to designate this, maybe not in the print product but in the electronic version? Weiss responded that many print standards do provide this indication. For example, the MARC format designates "required/not required" for each field. To follow up, it would be desirable to have a style sheet for every data element specifying "required/not-required," "transcribed/not-transcribed," "repeatable/not-repeatable," etc. Woodley mentioned that the Dublin Core does that and also specifies punctuation standards that apply to that field.

Starr raised a concern with 1.5. We have a list there of elements to transcribe in the script in which they appear but by the time you get to the actual elements, there needs to be reinforcement. Weiss recommended an appendix to summarize this.

Weiss was concerned about the use of authority control as an argument for transcription. We shouldn't require those who don't care about authority control to live with its strictures. It is misleading to state that we have this long tradition of transcription. He listed a number of aspects that we don't transcribe, including punctuation and capitalization, among others. He suggested

the development of different application profiles, like those that Woodley described. RDA won't be a "one size fits all" solution. As a manager, he wants to know what level of work was done so he can send it to the right person. Lastly, in dealing with an unfamiliar language, someone may not recognize inaccuracies. He suggested a coding level for such instances.

Schmierer agreed that we have many people dealing with materials when they are not familiar with the language. In that point of view, transcription from the title page is the way to go, despite the concerns expressed by others and shared by her. If there is an inaccuracy and you recognize it, you should be required to make a note and then provide an access point if appropriate. It's important that we have recovery mechanisms if we are going to have simple rules for transcription. It's not necessary to change the transcription, but there needs to be a requirement to add the explanatory note and the improved access points to make the record useful. Transcription of the "statement of responsibility" will also be an important aid to those unfamiliar with a language in matching the resource to a record. These are things we have to weigh off against each other. Our long history of sharing with other libraries distinguishes us from the newer metadata communities. In our rush to embrace these other communities, we should not abandon our own lessons learned.

Suzuki commented on the option in rule 1.5. This option doesn't allow for a transliterated form, and we would like to add the option that the agency can put it in a transliterated form. Woodley responded on other communities and the sharing of metadata. In harvesting metadata, the other communities have not learned from our mistakes. In order to learn from us though, they need to find RDA usable. We need therefore to have a standard that will be self-apparent to them as to why it is important.

Weiss commented on options. There is more than one type of option, "and" and "or" options. "And" options are ok, since more data is never a problem. The "or" options are more problematic because they can affect record choice, which is why metadata coding can be important to indicate the decision process.

Théroux expressed a concern of the Rare Books community. There are several places where the Rare Books community would appreciate further options regarding transcription. They would prefer not to supply diacritics when not present (1.6.3), would prefer not substituting abbreviations for transcription (1.6.7), and find that the option at 1.6.2 is not complete enough to cover all instances of numbers.

Attig reminded the group that 1.4 is the result of a history of trying to deal with the levels of description. He posed the question of whether it is sufficiently clear that it is simply a base level that is intended to be an intelligible set of elements that will meet the requirements. Weiss thought it adequately expressed this intention. He raised a concern that Chapters 2 through 6 are not just about "identify" but also about "select," with Chapter 5 being about "obtain."

Jizba pointed out that we need to be clear on what is mandatory for libraries and not necessarily for use by other communities. Weiss referred to an earlier comment by Mangan that this section might be well served by focusing on the mandatory elements for all types of resources, rather than mixing in resource-specific elements.

Glennan raised a concern about the list of elements and how non-library users would not understand the differences between "numbering," "numbering in series," and "resource identifiers." We're still trapped in library jargon. Weiss added to these "analytical entry" and "title proper." Starr also expressed concern about the list and those in 1.4-5, where a number of terms are introduced. In the electronic version the terms can be hot linked to the definition. He acknowledged the need for some jargon so that we can effectively communicate amongst

ourselves. Jizba felt the issue was further amplified by the fact that the terms are not only library specific but are also mandatory.

Attig thought that the concerns about the listing of data elements before they are defined might be another effect of a linear reading of the document. Weiss disagreed, saying that the terminology will still be jargon regardless of where the definition occurs. Schmierer raised the possibility of focusing the afternoon's discussions on things we really disagree with rather than issues that still might be open for the JSC.   Attig disagreed, finding value in providing input to the JSC on things that are still unresolved. Bowen replied that we need to address the things we most care about. Concerns for issues that are "hard and fast" can be addressed on Monday. As mentioned earlier, Examples and Chapter 3 are off the table for the moment. She expressed appreciation that no one has expressed a desire to re-arrange Part I totally. We do need to talk about short-term issues and long-term issues, things that we can address before publication and things we won't be able to address before publication. That is what needs to be sorted out in the next several days.

Weiss responded that the two biggest overall issues are with the extensibility/inclusivity issue with other communities and emerging resource formats and with the structure, which will be hard to change later. There are other things like the definitions and the abstract model that can also be touched on. We don't want to be spending that much time on specific rules that can be adjusted later.

Larsgaard requested comments on Chapter 2, starting with Overview comments, of which most may have been covered previously, and then cover Specific comments section by section. Other things can be covered by Confluence or by the ALCTS form for non-Committee members.

Hodgins shared some observations made during lunch at Weiss's prompting. The question at lunch was about the relevance, is it worth the effort? Hodgins' response was that libraries clearly play a major role with the communities that IEEE represents. The library community is at a juncture for deciding the relevancy of that role. RDA is doing a good job of improving the addressing of that role, but is not addressing emerging formats and opportunities. There is a need to address fundamental revolutions in content in models that are ever more dynamic, assembled of smaller, granular components. Content is being consumed in ways that were not intended when it was created. While glad to see these addressed in the goals, he is disappointed that they are not really tackled in the product. The question then for this group and the JSC overall is whether to improve on what it has been doing, or beginning to address this new set of problems.

Overview comments on Chapter 2

Mangan asked a question of Tillett or Bowen about what the new phrase, "a separate source" at the beginning of the chapter in 2.1.1 means. If there is no "separate source," what does this mean? Discussion with Attig and Bowen ensued, with the conclusion that this meant a source referring to the part, not the comprehensive whole.   Mangan requested that it be defined in the document.

Weiss suggested that a way to reduce redundancy would be to have a general section on notes at the beginning of Chapter 2, with context specific rules later on.

Weiss continued with some lunch comments saying, "In the direction that we're going, the distinction between note and a non-note is becoming less clear. John [Attig] brought this up earlier; what is a data element? At what level does a data element function – the title as a whole or the individual parts or are they sub-elements?" Attig amplified, "And to what extent is it merely a matter of presentation?"

Heiman made a comment on presenting examples. Presenting them as a list without punctuation is confusing. Bowen replied that the examples as written are only placeholders. There will be new examples developed in various formats for the presentation standards. Discussion ensued about the ability to groom the example presentation format in the Web-version.

Vellucci made an observation about the format of notes, that it appears ISBD structure is used in the case of formal notes and ISBD punctuation is dropped in the informal notes. Past practice has been to provide examples of informal notes but one is not tied to that format.

Glennan raised a couple of concerns from the music rules that she hopes are not more broadly applicable. In some cases we're not doing a decision tree within the rules. For example, applying other resource identifiers in 2.12.2, we have a confusing sequence that refers back to itself. Another example, in 2.12.2.3, bullet 2 seems to be based on an option based on the example that follows, not the actual rule. Attig expanded on this stating that there are a number of instances where the level of granularity for the references is ambiguous.   In some cases it is good to have the broader context but in some instances it simply is not clear to what you are being referred. Bowen replied that if we find things that are really confusing, those are things we should be clear about in our response.

Glennan continued with another concern, in 2.1.1, the first bullet, "Choose the source of information identifying the entire resource as a whole…," but later rules for certain kinds of materials don't give us that option. This rule seems to be somewhat in conflict with the later rules. Bowen asked to have the specific point of conflict identified when comments like that are submitted.

Comments on 2.0, Purpose and scope: [none]

Comments on 2.1, Basis for Identification

Weiss pointed out a need for a definition of "basis." We here may know the definition from our conversations, but we need to make clear the difference between the "basis" and the "chief source" to others for whom it would not be self-evident. Bowen asked if he had a suggestion and Weiss replied that he will put something in writing.

Randall asked if in 2.1.1.1, the first bullet, #2, do we understand "not sequentially numbered" to mean out of numerical sequence? With a set, when the whole thing finally exists, a person cataloging later is not going to want to go through to determine which is the first published. Shouldn't volume 1, when finally published, be the source? In serials, if you base the record on v.12, but find v.7 with changes within, then you revise the description. Will this principle be applied to monographic sets as more information is obtained? Bowen asked if this would this be more of a maintenance issue. How would you provide guidance for the initial cataloging of this? There were various comments regarding the applicability of this rule, and whether it applies to the situation described by Randall – does "not sequentially numbered" mean that the parts of the resource are not numbered or that the parts of the resource are numbered but not in the sequence of publication. There was agreement that this should be clarified and that there was a need to address the maintenance issues raised by such circumstances. Schmierer observed that these rules are written in a "then-if" structure as opposed to most others in an "if-then" structure. She suggested that changing them to "if-then" might clear up the confusion. From the floor, Kristin Lindlan observed that nobody shelves such sets by publication date, but by volume number. Glennan observed that the big problem is whether you have the complete thing or are encountering it for the first time and have v. 6. There has to be allowance for allow cataloging from v. 6 without guessing at v. 1. Hostage suggested that the desired path is to choose the

lowest numbered volume rather than the earliest published one. Larsgaard referred further comments to Confluence.

Comments on 2.2, Sources of Information

Attig commented that there is a missing concept here and cited the earlier example by De Groat. There are things that are well described in something that is technically not part of the resource itself. We need to recognize these external sources as legitimate sources and thereby avoid using excessive bracketing. We need to clarify the status of containers, because there are certain types of media where the container will be the best source to use. Weiss said, "and accompanying material," to agreement by some others. Woodley noted the need to recognize library-specific or community-specific resources as a source, with the option to identify that source and put it in a note and avoid bracketing. Attig observed that bracketing is essentially a matter of presentation. Weiss identified a need for a device to indicate that an element comes from another source, which will eliminate brackets and which can then be displayed or not.

Weiss expanded on Woodley's comment, stating that we need to eliminate the word "preferred." It has a high-level meaning to us, but to other communities is less weighted. We need to deal with multi-type resources. In a situation with three kinds of resources, what are we going to take as the source? Schmierer responded that if we throw out "preferred sources" then this will affect 2.2.3-2.2.4.

Starr observed that in 2.2.3, bullets 'c' and 'd' are essentially the same thing. In authority work any other published description is de facto a reference source. What is the distinction being expressed here? Weiss and Starr discussed authoritative vs. informal sources. Bowen reminded the committee that that this is a carryover from AACR2. Weiss suggested that it may be a good time to clean it up to which Bowen re-iterated the need to focus on larger issues and to remember that there are constituencies in three other countries to convince that something is broken.

Lacy remarked that the exception provide in 2.2.4 was very fortuitous but may be controversial, to which Weiss agreed that it was controversial because he disliked the direction in which the exception would take us.

Weiss noted that in 2.2.2 it says, "do this, unless one of the conditions below applies," but it doesn't address the situation of when more than one applies. We need to deal with the situations when multiple things happen and when nothing applies. He provided an example from 2.2.2.a) ii).

Glennan commented that 2.2.1.4 would mandate the use of the label for a CD, unless one could possibly resort to 2.2.3. One is still stuck with calling the container title something outside the resource. It is troubling that musical presentation is lumped into "Other." A problem of this approach is when the container is the only source for a collective title.

Weiss commented that this section is one area where the draft is less text centric. Myers disagreed since the sequence from 2.2.1.1 through 2.2.1.4 is one of the more egregious text-centric sections of the draft since text has its own section at 2.2.1.1, printed images has its own at 2.2.1.2, moving images has its own at 2.2.1.3, but then everything else is lumped into 2.2.1.4. Weiss replied that there should only be rules for how materials are treated differently, not to make explicit each category for the sake of specifying it.

Mangan questioned if "label" meant something different in RDA from AACR2. A "cartouche" as used by the cartographic community for example is not a "label." "Label" has to be better defined, and applicability spelled out beyond just music or electronic resources. Further, the

cartographic materials community loses a lot when we lose accompanying material and container as sources.

Bowen sought clarification on the issue. What the JSC is trying to do with "sources of information" is to simplify things. It considered two proposals: an LC proposal that simplified things considerably, and the editor's proposal that took everything, laid it out, and asked what is important and what can we do without. We never really responded to that. The JSC looked at a couple of different ways to simplify "sources of information." The result is not as simple as the LC proposal, but the sentiment that the JSC heard was that the LC proposal was *too* simple. Reviewing what the rules in AACR2 do, these are the categories that emerged. With this somewhat more principled approach, do we need to reincorporate the exceptions and then provide reasons for why it's important to restore them?

Weiss responded that "source of information" is an excellent illustration of Woodley and Hodgins' earlier point about abstract models. Different people have different understandings of what the purpose and value of "source of information" is. Once we have the framework of understanding for that, we can answer the questions Bowen is posing.

Woodley agreed with Weiss that maybe we don't need to make such distinctions as "label." One can use other language, such as "prominent title" or "prominent source of information," but that could be different from community to community. The Library community will need to develop amplification for the text resources with which it is primarily dealing.

Mangan responded to Bowen's, "What can be done?" that we could turn the second into the first and place the generic before the specific. Labels apply to only two types of materials, so this specificity should be subordinate. Throughout the document Mangan found the specifics before the general. Bowen asked her to write it up in Confluence.

Comments on 2.3, Title

Glennan expressed her major concern with 2.3.8.3, which directly relates to the categories under discussion. We have been talking about four different sources for title proper from 2.2.1.1-2.2.1.4. This rule omits any rule for "Other," so where one uses the label as the preferred source for an audio CD, one is required to provide a source of title note since there is no d) section to correspond to 2.2.1.4. This is extremely undesirable from the music cataloging perspective. They don't want to supply a "source of title" note for every CD cataloged.

Weiss replied that this was the point in the document where the thought came to eliminate the "source of information" totally, and to have catalogers specify from where in the resource as a whole they had taken each element. Tillett remarked that this basically was the LC proposal. Weiss said that determination of "source of information" is what drives the decision for "title proper" and "variant title." However, they should all have access points anyway.

Starr commented that the most egregious print-centric example is at 2.3.0.1, where it states that the "title normally appears in the resource", which consequently dismisses whole categories of materials where the title does not appear in the resource.

Woodley shared a comment from lunch that "title proper" needs to be reworded as library jargon.

Jizba commented on 2.3.7, stating that it was somewhat useful. Currently when devising titles she has to go to five or six other standards for real help. This is an improvement but she would like to see even more guidance on creating a title when none exists for the resource. Weiss asked what the purpose of further guidance would be on devising a title, what would that achieve? Jizba replied that it would improve consistency, interoperability, and ease of sharing records.

Weiss recommended eliminating 2.3.0.3 entirely, as it says nothing new. It belongs in chapter 1.

Woodley commented on 2.3.0.4, second bullet. She contrasted the treatment specified here with that specified for films in AACR2. We need to make it clear there is a principle here rather than having exceptions for different formats.

Randall raised a number of concerns throughout 2.3 regarding parallel and variant titles. In 2.3.1.12, there will be implications for major and minor changes, if for example the French part is dropped from the *Canadian BIBLIOGRAPHIES canadiennes*. In 2.3 overall, there are various instructions to "record 'whatever' in the same order as the 'whatever' to which the 'whatever' corresponds." He wanted to know where and how these things were recorded so as to show their relationship to each other. Attig responded that if these are separate data elements, there is no relationship. In 2.3.4, Randall stated that he is uncertain whether the rules are talking about recording "variant title" as an access point, as a note, or as both. Attig replied that we are recording it as the content of the "variant title" element. In 2.3.3.5, Randall observed that it doesn't say that "parallel other title information" comes from the same source as "parallel title." A discussion by several members about the source of "parallel title" and "parallel title other information" ensued. This led to the observation that removing the ISBD specification has broader consequences than just removing punctuation.

Jizba expanded on her earlier comments for constructing titles. She referred to rules at 2.3.0.5, 2.3.2.2, and 2.3.7.3 as examples of what might inform the process for devising a title. But there are more rules for content in devising the title that need to be included. It would be nice to have a clean statement of how to devise a title, rather than going through multiple rules. Bowen asked her to provide recommended text in Confluence for 2.3.7.

Woodley remarked that the issue of "parallel titles" came up in Dublin Core; people are uncomfortable with the traditional library approach. "Title" is a repeatable element, making all of this easier. She suggested that the 245 be made a repeatable field so as to avoid convoluted rules for taking this here and then taking that there. Weiss strongly supported Woodley's comment. We should have one section on "title," with an instruction to pick the main one.

Starr raised an issue of consistency between 0.1.2 where the rule directs that "descriptive data elements … should reflect common usage," but at 2.3.8.3 we have here a whole series of notes where the abbreviated syntax used is unintelligible. He recommends at a minimum including definite articles in the notes provided there.

Maxwell commented on 2.3.3.3. He realizes the instructions here on recording "other title information" are a logical extension of the list of mandatory elements, but he was uncomfortable with generalizing this beyond serials and integrating resource. There are good reasons for including this rule with respect to serials and integrating resources but he asked that it not be extended to monographs.

Glennan commented on 2.3.1.9. In resources lacking a "collective title," she notes that there are no instructions if you have "other title information" dispersed with the individual titles you are transcribing. Similar to discussions on parallel title concerns, it is unclear how and whether you transcribe them, and where, and how this makes sense in the final record. Weiss asked if this was a data issue or presentation issue. Attig replied that these are separate data elements. As far as RDA is concerned there is no relationship between the data elements as such. More and more we need to understand the relationships as intellectual and not as structural. We are used to having it specified in the rules but now it won't be. Those relationships are covered by ISBD structure or MARC content designation.

Schmierer commented that it would be worthwhile to have several introductory paragraphs to elaborate on a concept as pivotal as "title," so that individuals have an idea of where the rules will take them. How one has the title in resources that are published or have a formal presentation, and resources that are not; it is in the context of formal presentations where one has all these gradations which need to be acknowledged in the rules. When devising titles, on the other hand, the rules will not incorporate these gradations, but will devise a title that incorporates the whole. The concept of "title proper" will have to remain, despite lack of enthusiasm by some. For formal presentations, we need to be able to assemble or reassemble elements in a way that has meaning to us. That kind of textualization has been left out in many places throughout the rules. It would be very helpful to provide two paragraphs or so of conceptualization, not only for those of us in the AACR tradition but also for those we are inviting into the tent.

Woodley reiterated that we need a better term for "title proper." Bowen asked if it was the concept or the words that were causing the problem. Woodley responded that it was the semantics. Weiss said that the "title proper" basically is a "meaningful manifestation identifier."

Weiss commented on 2.3.0.7, stating that it is unrealistic to expect other communities to understand and apply this. We should eliminate it and return to the practice – with respect to layout of the title page – of using the "lower" title as "title proper" and the "upper" title as "series." This example is why an abstract model is important. We are treating the same things in different ways, which makes it harder for training and consistency. In broadening RDA beyond the Anglo-American cataloging community, grammatical dependence or independence may be more complicated in languages that do not use cases. Bowen asked for a discussion paper on the first issue and asked for alternate wording on the second issue. Attig spoke of the experiences of the Rare Book community in finding that the concept of "grammatically independent" even within a single language is not always clear, and we may be better served by moving this concept to a set of exceptions rather than generalizing it to other grammatical conventions.

Mangan raised a concern about rules for serials being generalized to everything, for instance "numbering" but also "title" in 2.3.3.3, last paragraph on "currency of contents." "Currency of contents" is important to cartographic catalogers, where it is given as "other title information," but this rule imposes serial practice to record the information in a note.

Overview comments on 2.4, Statement of Responsibility

Woodley liked the "statement of responsibility" being treated as a separate element as is done in other communities.

Mangan commented on 2.4.3.3, stating that all the specifics on "statements of responsibility" are related to specific formats before the general case is provided in 2.4.3.7. This is an instance where the general should come first and then provide the concerns of specific formats. Weiss disagreed, preferring the arrangement as given. He said that this goes back to work at NLM on encoding. For computers, you have to provide the exceptions first, and in training, with the general rules first you might only see those. Mangan and Weiss discussed their viewpoints further before Maxwell reminded everyone that the rules in question are all dealing just with "notes." Bowen reminded the committee that in the online version you won't see the non-applicable rules.

Schmierer followed up on Jizba and Woodley's comments about devising titles and separating elements. There are no instructions here on devising a "statement of responsibility." These rules in fact incorporate "statement of responsibility" as part of the devised "title." There needs to be a

distinction between devising a "title" and devising a "title with a statement of responsibility," so you know when you are putting the "statement of responsibility" in a different element.

Woodley raised some questions about the examples in 2.4.0.4 and the second bullet at 2.4.0.1 and how these are recorded. Discussion re-enforced the "statement of responsibility" as a separate element, and explored how the intellectual relationships between separate elements would be conveyed. The JSC cover memo was referred to as a valuable resource in sorting out this new territory.

Glennan said she couldn't find anything in 2.4.0 on whether the presence of a birth and death date for author in the "source of information" could be ignored. Second, she was surprised that in 2.4.0.3 a distinction has been made about roles and their importance, which to her is tied to access points of Part II.

Maxwell said he would like to push for transcribing what's there. [Applause.] He is also pleased that the "rule of three" is now optional. He is puzzled about the ongoing "title" issues.

Larsgaard thanked everyone for participating, announced the next day's meeting at the Marriott Plaza San Antonio, Hidalgo Ballroom A/B, and adjourned the meeting at 4:56.

Saturday, January 21, 2006 — 1:30–6:00 p.m.
Marriott Plaza San Antonio, Hidalgo Ballroom A/B

933.   Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. She welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

934.   Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives
[CC:DA/Roster/2005 July/Rev]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

935.   Adoption of agenda: Chair
[CC:DA/A/53]

Larsgaard called for a motion to adopt the agenda. Mangan moved and Vellucci seconded the motion. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted. Larsgaard noted that despite 6:00 being on the schedule, we would finish by 5:30.

936.   Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2005 Annual Conference, Chicago, IL, June 25 and 27, 2005: Chair
[CC:DA/M/909-929]

Larsgaard noted the difficulties at the ALA annual meeting the previous summer in the arrangements for the venue to provide recording services. She called for a motion to approve the minutes incorporating the corrections received previously and discussed here. Attig moved and Mangan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

937.   Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, July–December 2005:
[CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/3]

This report covers motions from July 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005. Larsgaard thanked all the hard work between Annual and Mid-Winter. This report is to comply with CC:DA procedures to confirm email votes by a motion and vote at the next meeting.

A. Proposal to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21, Special Rules, motion to authorize a response, passed 7/25/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

B. AACR3 Area 4 example of simplified rules, motion to authorize a response, passed 7/27/2005 (7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

C. Rule proposals for archival and manuscript resources, motion to authorize a response, passed 9/13/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

D. Report of Task Force to Review DCRM(B), motion to accept the report, passed 8/31/2005 (5 yes; 0 no; 2 abstain).

E. Levels of description, access, and authority control, motion to authorize a response, passed 9/7/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

F. AACR3, Part I, 2004 Draft on rules C1.5B2.2 and glossary definitions, motion to authorize a response, passed 9/8/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

G. Status report of Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media, motion to accept the report, passed 9/12/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

H. Proposals to simplify AACR3 Ch. 21, Special rules, motion to authorize a document, passed 9/13/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

I. Rule proposals for musical format information (eliminating Musical presentation statement area (5.3)), to authorize a response, passed 9/15/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

J. Task Force to Review FRAR, motion to accept the report, passed 9/22/2005 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

Maxwell moved to confirm the actions conducted by email and Folkner seconded the motion. The motion passed.

938.   Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part I: Bowen

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2005/3]
[Strategic plan for RDA]
[Prospectus for RDA (rev.)]
[Objectives and Principles (rev.)]
[Policy and procedures for the JSC (rev.)]

Bowen outlined her report. She will provide a follow-up on the report of the October meeting and then discuss contextual concerns regarding the draft of Part I of RDA since the previous day was spent examining the draft itself. She appreciated all the comments on everyone's concerns.

A major accomplishment is that the draft is now publicly available. [Applause.] The JSC is very happy with this Committee of Principals decision and is happy to see this change and with the resulting input. The JSC is now adapting to the public relations issues and outreach efforts. It has put out further documents to help people in their review of RDA. The Prospectus has been revised and an RDA FAQ is available on the RDA website; please check it and a modified version of it published in the *ALCTS newsletter*. It is hoped that additions to the FAQ will be made as things develop. An *ALCTS newsletter online* feature will be a semi-annual feature to reach a broader audience. There is the RDA list (RDA-L) as a forum for people to comment exclusively on RDA. It will provide a narrower focus that AUTOCAT would and will avoid issues surrounding the moderated nature of and restrictions on addressing commercial products on AUTOCAT. In planning for how to handle all of the feedback from public review, the JSC is planning to have comments come through the existing national organizations and national libraries. For ALA there is a comment form on the CC:DA website. Those comments will be incorporated into a separate document in Confluence to be evaluated for input into the ALA response. Weiss asked about responses from other non-JSC-represented countries. Bowen replied that we should redirect them to the appropriate forum, particularly those without JSC representation will be handled by a form on the JSC site for compilation by the JSC Secretary. Weiss asked about PCC as an international organization. Bowen replied that it will have to decide which route it wants to follow, so there is no duplication. From the floor, Adam Schiff asked whether RDA-L comments will be compiled. Bowen replied that they are not considered to be officially submitted. They are being read and monitored by the JSC, and are being looked at for threads and concerns, but for inclusion in a response, concerns and comments have to be routed through an organization. Schiff, Weiss, and Bowen discussed the need, appropriateness, and mechanism for reminding RDA-L subscribers that RDA-L postings are not official submissions before Bowen accepted a compromise suggestion that a reminder be posted in the week before the deadline.

Bowen reported that Marjorie Bloss was hired as the RDA Project Manager, just in time for the JSC October meeting. She is well known to many and knows our issues well. Kathryn Deiss is working as a PR consultant on "what is RDA?" She will be facilitating the focus group meetings tomorrow. There is an outreach group with Matthew Beacom chairing. The JSC is reaching out both to groups we want to inform about RDA and groups it wants to hear from about RDA; it is a two-way street. Bowen has been giving seven different reports to groups at this meeting. It is hoped that Bloss will be taking over some of this at future meetings.

The RDA Forum is taking place during this CC:DA meeting. A CCS group is in charge of this Forum which arose out of discussions at ALA Annual. It is targeted for ALA members who are not in CC:DA, who would not otherwise be well informed about the process. She will report back on what kinds of questions are raised. There will be another at Annual, with the intention that it will become a regular feature. She thanked Matthew Beacom, Norm Medeiros, and Charles Wilt.

Next is the RDA focus groups, which are something that Don Chatham of ALA Publishing has put together to preview the prototype developed by the editor Tom Delsey, Chatham, and an outside agency. It was intended to have three sessions – educators, vendors, and catalogers. Educators met last night and that group went well. [Affirmed by several members.] Weiss responded that there were good questions back and forth from all parties. Bowen said that tomorrow morning's session will be for catalogers. It will be a scripted demo and then questions. It's not a working system but a prototype with a set path. The third session with vendors was cancelled due to scheduling issues for them. They hope to reach the vendors later, possibly with conference calls or a session at Annual. Schmierer asked if the focus groups would be held again

at Annual. Bowen replied that she hopes so. It won't be the same but they hope that this will not be a one time thing. They want to get broad representation from various kinds of libraries, not just from big academic libraries but also from smaller libraries and people who don't attend ALA. Schmierer asked if they are contemplating taking it on the road, to PLA for example. Bowen replied that they are definitely trying to reach out through conference calls or more sessions. Weiss responded that he really appreciates the background documents. He found reading those before reading the RDA draft was very helpful.

Bowen next discussed those documents and provided context for them. The Strategic Plan has already been approved by the CoP. There are four goals, with a separate section on achieving each.

Goal 1 is to have RDA ready for publication by 2008. What does that mean for those working on the drafts? – that we have to balance community input so that RDA is ready on time. We have to prioritize our issues so as to meet our timeline. We don't like that, but the reality is that if we tackled every issue, the JSC would never get through them. The AACR3 response table had over 1000 entries from all of the constituencies and the JSC worked for months and never got through the Glossary or the Area 5/Chapter 3 (GMD/SMD) material. The JSC got through maybe half of the comments. Then they have the succeeding parts to start while addressing the issues raised for Part I. Remember that RDA will be published in 2008 and then the revision process begins. That's job security for all of us. In formulating an ALA response, we need to balance long-term and short-term concerns. A wonderful thing about RDA-L is that people are thinking really big, looking forward to the future and thinking about "do we really want to catalog these things, or treat them differently?" Yesterday the idea of an abstract conceptual model was raised, but she doesn't think that will happen in the time frame. It is necessary to think about the task at hand in the short-term while keeping an eye on long-term, bigger issues.

Goal 2 is to achieve consistency in the rules. One thing that is very appropriate in the response consideration of areas where we may be causing problems by trying to achieve consistency, areas where we haven't yet achieved consistency, or areas where we rearranged or moved something and that has caused a problem.

Goal 3 is the compatibility of records created under RDA with AACR2 records. Description and access points created through the RDA guidelines will be independent of the format medium or system used to store or communicate the data. We are commenting in terms of the rules not in terms of tagging. RDA-L has many comments expressed in terms of tagging. It is remarkable how much we as a community think in terms of the MARC format rather than the rules. RDA needs to be independent of MARC 21 or the Dublin Core. Publication in 2008 means implementation in 2009, so we need to think about the direction these formats might move.

Goal 4 is that RDA will be developed as a descriptive resource standard, optimized as an online tool. We need to keep in mind that, as mentioned in the cover memo to the Draft of Part I, redundancies in the text are an intentional part of the design of RDA to facilitate the reference structure of the online product because people will not be reading it linearly. She acknowledged Weiss's previously expressed concerns. Bowen, Weiss, and Mangan discussed the redundancy issue further, particularly with respect to an eventual print version. Mangan found the redundancies in the draft, and the lack of labeling, to be frustrating, especially when the references were solely to a redundant statement. Bowen explained that her understanding was that the redundant text is needed as something on which to hang the coding. Mangan felt that there must be some way to suppress it in the print version. Schmierer hoped there was some way in the paper presentation that we're given to review, that when the redundancy is there for a reason, that we don't have to worry about it, so you don't end up thinking you are

misunderstanding something. We get sidetracked by redundancies there. There is no clue at this point. She asked if a grey-out or strike-through could be incorporated. Bowen reiterated that we are constrained by the paper draft format for an ultimate web product. Weiss mentioned discussion the day before about context and "bread crumbs" to show you where you've been, especially in an education context. It was felt that it was more important to know where you are in the document rather than repeating text. Bowen replied that as the process goes on we can learn more about what's needed and what's not. Her concern at the moment is that this is something that could be done, but what other things do we want the editor to spend his time on. Weiss closed by observing that this is already being coded and then asked if Troy Linker could develop the output to use that coding. One shouldn't need repetitive text to support tagging.

Bowen thought it would be more appropriate to address the redundancies generally rather than point out each case, unless there are conflicts between them that would be important to note.

Bowen had little to say on the Prospectus except that there is a new version. It is to provide a context of what the whole will look like when all the rules are put together. The changes in the revision deal with rule numbers.

Bowen moved on to the Objectives and Principles document. This document is a work in progress. It started out as just being for Part I. It was part of the cover memo but is now a separate document. It has been updated with the addition of Objectives and Principles for Part II, and incorporates comments made on the previous version. It explains that the Objectives and Principles govern the *design* of RDA, as opposed to the *functionality* of the records when RDA is applied.

When you read through the Objectives and Principles, it appears that some of them seem to be in conflict with each other. We want to determine how to balance them in relation to each other. For example, what kind of balance is desired between representation vs. accuracy, that is, how the resource represents itself vs. applying additional information to correct or clarify the data from the resource. There is conflict there and that made up much of the discussion on Friday. The JSC is moving in the direction of a "take what you see" approach with respect to transcription – how the resource represents itself – and then providing supplemental information. Tillett said that one can correct inaccuracies by making an access point or a note. Bowen reported that this possibility was raised the day before, but it's not explicit in Part I, while the access point issues would be covered in Part II. Maybe this is something for the ALA response, that references to these instructions need to go in both ways between the Parts I and II in order to provide clearer guidance. Attig said that perhaps it's unfair to evaluate the principles in isolation in each part rather than from the whole document. There are potential conflicts that have to be balanced. Weiss pointed out Bowen's earlier difficulty remembering whether something was in the principles or objectives and said that it's not clear to him what is a principle or an objective.

Bowen said that it's not explicitly in the Objectives and Principles, but the JSC is trying to make the rules principle-based and we should keep that in mind as we make comments. The JSC is not trying to include every exception that might have been left out. The intent is to provide a sufficiently clear general rule so that the cataloger can figure out what to do. She referred to an example from RDA-L regarding a title in the form of a crossword puzzle. The JSC doesn't want to provide explicit instructions on how to transcribe such a resource. The cataloger has to be able to figure that out on his/her own and provide additional access points for alternative interpretations of the title.

Weiss commented on the principle of Common practice; where it talks just about citations, he'd like to see this expanded to general situations of all non-transcribed data. Attig reminded the

meeting that there is also Common usage which covers terminology rather than practice. In response to further comments, Bowen offered that we may want to see this worded differently as we deal with Parts II and III.

Schmierer observed that for all the emphasis on "access" in the title, the word "access" has disappeared from the Objectives and Principles. We need to encourage adding access points. The concept of "access" needs to be included. The document is written at a level of abstraction that causes one to lose track of what's being addressed. Weiss liked the way the JSC did this document, it made sense to him. Bowen asked that further discussion on Common practice be deferred to Part II, where it will be more on topic. Weiss thought that principles and objectives were more important than all the rest of RDA at this point and he values the time Bowen has allotted to discussing them.

Next Bowen discussed the policy document, *Statement of Policy and Procedures for JSC,* which documents how the JSC does its business. The JSC wanted to acknowledge that it's doing things differently. The new document describes the roles of the RDA Project Management Committee and of the Editorial Team. The RDA Editorial Team is the source of the drafts of RDA. In particular, item 1.3 states that the Policy and Procedures document is only relevant until RDA is published, and then the JSC will go back to the constituency model for the source of revisions.

Bowen mentioned a section about submission of proposals for changes to AACR2. We are still seeing them, and we need to decide how to incorporate those – whether to take them up in RDA, whether RDA has moved beyond them, or how to take them up as future revisions.

Mangan asked if Chapter 3 will be taken up at the April meeting, since Principle number 6 specifies four month's lead time for the RDA drafts. If not, would there be more time to comment on it. Bowen replied that the JSC will take up some of Chapter 3 at the April meeting but since it is not complete they will continue work on it after the April meeting. According to the cover memo the deadline for responses would remain 3/20/2006, so this means the same deadline in Confluence for Chapter 3 as for the rest of Part I.

Bowen reminded the committee that there is a separate Confluence document for comments arising from AACR3; before resubmitting a comment previously made, please go back to the response table and see what the other constituency responses were, to take these into account before submitting something as a comment to RDA. Also remember to formulate comments in terms of rules and not MARC tags. Please do not submit comments through two different channels. For AACR3, some comments were submitted through both the LC and ALA response, which was confusing. LC staff should submit comments only through LC's response. Also agencies such as PCC, CONSER, and CRCC should pick one route. Multiple copies will overwhelm the JSC. Weiss asked how the JSC will know if a comment has significant support. Bowen replied that if it's in the ALA response that would carry weight. Regarding the AACR3 table, an accounting of each entry would overwhelm the JSC, but the editor is closely tracking them by line number as the new drafts are being developed.

Bowen asked if there were questions. Schiff asked about examples; people have posted examples on RDA-L. Bowen replied that the JSC is not requesting comments on examples during this round; the JSC Examples Group is working on them.

Randall asked about the protocol for handling examples given to members or that we develop on our own. Weitz replied, with the caveat he was a member and not the chair, that the JSC Examples Group has been working linearly through the text. If you do collect cases of examples, then you could forward them to him or to the members who represent your constituency. Weiss asked whether to send them now or later. Weitz replied that the sooner the better; the

membership is on the JSC website. Weitz said that he's sure some of members will monitor the RDA list.

939.   Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Tillett drew members' attention to the copies of the summarized report and noted that the full version is online. The LC exhibition booth is no. 469, with many presentations: *Classification Web*, *Catalogers' Desktop*, simplified user interface/content Table of Contents for *Cataloger's Desktop*. This is partially a result of the documentation survey from a few months prior; LC has heard lots of comments and is trying to make changes.

She highlighted several sections from the summary. Retirements have had a significant impact on operations. To offset the cost of pay outs from both the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program and the Voluntary Early Retirement Authority, LC has been unable to fill the resulting vacancies. LC has lost some key corporate memory. LC will probably be sending out apologies for not getting back to people sooner or for finding that things have fallen through the cracks. Patience was requested while LC reorganizes. There are things they will have to stop doing.

Several programs and initiatives were mentioned: The National Book Festival; the Thomas Hampson Tour; the World Digital Library; the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center; the Veterans' History project; and the StoryCorps collaboration with the American Folklife Center.

LC implemented the Unicode version of Voyager in November, during which there was a short period when access was limited, but the previous levels of access have now been restored and LC is working to expand access. LC is including all the finding aids that are indexed through EAD so they can be made accessible through the OPAC. They are also available to RLG for data harvesting and further accessibility through their archival resources site. There are focus groups here at ALA to get feedback on improvements to the website.

There is turnover at the overseas offices. There has been extensive training at the overseas offices on the ILS so they can catalog onsite. That hopefully will result in faster availability to people using those materials.

The Casallini Shelf-Ready Project is conducting a test to buy catalog records in conjunction with purchasing the material. There are acknowledged concerns in the PCC community about restrictions on purchased records.

John Byrum, head of Bibliographic Enrichment Activities Team (BEAT), retired and was replaced by John Celli. PCC will be honoring Byrum on Sunday at its meeting. There are further details in the summary. This spring, CIP will be conducting two online surveys on this program and ways of improving efficiency and reducing costs.

In CDS, ten people were lost to retirements and Tillett is now acting chief. There is a review of the entire organization in Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access with a view to merging operations with natural synergies.

From the Documentation Survey, the results indicate an ongoing desire for print versions to supplement the electronic versions. These are to be made freely available as PDF files. Paper versions are still available for purchase.

The server-based migration in CDS is experiencing delays. Regarding the Unicode implementation for the MARC Distribution Service, 90% of the programs are functioning without any problem. In the 10% of the distribution problems are included the delete records that have diacritics. The missing records will be redistributed. It will be possible to distribute UTF-8

records on request in the near future. LC is still migrating documentation from MUMS to Voyager.

Dates in authority records were discussed. LC has explored options for closing an open birth date when a death date is readily available. LC will not be pursuing this strongly to avoid maintenance overhead and is not looking at adding dates where none are required to avoid a conflict. The final rules will be promulgated in the LCRI published with the February 1 issue of the *Cataloger's Desktop*. Tillett noted that LC has been working with OCLC to provide an alert service for the resulting changes to authority records. Glenn Patton reported that OCLC is working on an RSS feed, derived from an existing report generated out of the load table, but it is not trying to get back in the authority control processing business. OCLC is working on the final details and will have the information available to sign up for in the service.

Tillett reported on the LCRI from the Manuscripts Group that is out for comment. The due date for responses is January 30. There is a change in the C1 of the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* regarding implementation of subfield $u in tag 670 of authority records. In the MARC 21 authority format, there is the corresponding change for tag 670 subfield $u and also guidelines for the use of the 043 tag in authority records. In Appendix 1, names related to Forests, Parks, and Reserves and U.S. tribal entities recognized by the U.S. are to be treated as jurisdictions. In Appendix 2, however, Canadian instances of the same are maintaining the status quo. Now that Unicode is being implemented at LC, they are working through issues, starting with the 13 special characters – degree, sharp, flat, etc.

Tillett reiterated that, with the end of AACR, the LCRIs will end as a tool *for those rules*. In the past, many didn't hear this distinction and only heard the end of the LCRIs. There will be a new series to document cataloging decisions in the RDA context, probably called Cataloging Decisions, to address RDA and MARC format implementation.

Culbertson asked about digital Table of Contents data being universally created as machine generated 505s. Tillett replied that is was a special project and not routine operations to add these digital tables of contents. Weiss asked if there was anything the non-LC community could do to help as they evaluate operations in February. Tillett replied that she would be happy to receive suggestions at her direct email: btil@loc.gov. Due to the personnel losses in CPSO, they will have to revisit the list of emails to which they reply; they may just make the fix and not reply back. A copy of the new CPSO communication policy is posted on the CPSO public Web site. It would be very helpful to receive feedback on other areas where people would like efforts focused. Weiss replied that development of *Cataloger's Desktop* is a major concern. Tillett replied that it is under CDS and there are additional people helping with it. Schiff asked about people working on distributing records in new scripts. Tillett replied that they can't do that immediately due to the limitations of MARC 21 format. Cyrillic and Greek are two potential scripts since they are in MARC 21. There is some resistance from cataloging managers, because demand is low at LC. But she wants to hear from you if you have a demand.

Larsgaard thanked Tillett for her report.

940.   Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Landesman

Larsgaard reported that there were some scheduling conflicts and miscommunications on scheduling with Landesman. There have been some ongoing difficulties in NISO. Landesman had wanted to provide her report to CC:DA after her meeting on Monday afternoon with the ALCTS Executive Board, by which time we will be adjourned. Weiss subsequently provided a report from the floor on Monday, here included.

Weiss presented an extemporaneous NISO report. In summary, there has been concern about the direction NISO seems headed. There have been several board and standards development committee resignations over dissatisfaction with the situation. Pat Harris is no longer there. There is concern that NISO appears to be moving away from library related standards. Landesman reported she is not getting communications from NISO. NISO is hardly doing any standards development work on its own. The only two are the metasearch initiative and the digital/virtual reference projects. Otherwise, it is solely passing through ISO standards. One of the agenda items for the Monday afternoon ALCTS Board meeting is for the ALA Washington Office and Landesman as ALA representative to share information on the situation. Priscilla Kaplan, who resigned from the NISO Board a couple of years ago, wrote a column in the September 15, 2005, issue of *Library Journal* [www.libraryjournal.com/aricle/CA6256258.html] with the recommendation that the library community develop its own standards committee, so there may be change over the next few months.

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

De Groat reported that the task force is working on its report. Attig reminded the group that new proposals are due February 14, so this will be the first document for CC:DA to vote and act upon. You will get it as soon as it can be done but after the February 7 deadline for entering comments in Confluence on the Draft of Part I. In response to a question from Weiss about this document's relation to the Chapter 3 document, Attig replied that there was an early awareness that the AACR rules on digital objects needed to be reworked to modify the rules of its successors, AACR3 and now RDA. The SMDs are still missing, but other aspects of extent are treated.

One thing going into the draft of the task force's report is further work coming from the Appendix to the status report presented at Annual. In that Appendix, the task force surveyed the data elements for technical description in various metadata standards. The task force will go through those and compare them to what's already in the rules. Where they feel something is significant, they will propose an addition to the rules and find an appropriate place to include it.

More importantly, there are more general issues. The document outlining them has just been shared with the task force so those issues haven't been discussed yet. What's in RDA Chapter 3 as "other technical details" (300$b in the MARC 21 format) are the disk and tape characteristics. The inclination of the task force is to recommend these be moved to a "technical details note", because they are not significant. Additional guidance is needed on when to record "technical description" for digital materials. There are many rules with "when considered important," that the task force feels are inadequate. What is needed is guidance on when you really need to know this kind of information so as to select or use a digital resource. There is a need to distinguish between things that are standard and obvious like a web browser for a web page and those that are true and important but are transparent – you just click and it happens. The next thing Attig suggested as needing to be done, is to consider the many rules in the Chapter 3 draft with the instruction, "if there is information that cannot be given succinctly, give it in a note." This is carried forward from AACR2, but there is no guidance about what this means. For digital materials, he proposes that a definition be given. For instance, if there is one file or file type or a predominant file type, give it in the "technical description element," otherwise it goes into a note. Weiss commented that the purpose of this was to keep the size of the physical details area under control, but since this is no longer an issue, perhaps we need to reevaluate this whole issue of note vs. formal statement.   Attig responded that succinctness may no longer be a consideration. Larsgaard commented that this is an issue of "is it helpful to the user?" It may not be easy for a cataloger to find the information but if it's not included in the record, then the users will have to

plow through the Read_Me files to figure out what they need – software, hardware and peripherals – in order to use the information. Weiss commented that you don't want someone to drive an hour to your campus and discover, "Oh, I can't use that." Another thing to remember is that the rules will be used by one-cataloger agencies who may not recognize when a specialized technical detail is important to include. Attig concluded that it would be good to include a general "When in doubt, include it."

The task force is still deciding what to do with digital graphic representation. In the draft it is moved from Chapter 4 to Chapter 3, so it is recognized that it is part of "technical description. The task force has received some information on the potential needs for "technical description" of technical graphics such as architectural renderings, so the task force may be able to make a recommendation based on an appropriate scope for digital graphical representation not just for cartographic resources but all graphics. Weiss added, "still vs. moving [graphics] also." Attig continued that on the other hand they are clear that this is a specific example of a much more general data element that applies not just to graphics but to all types of digital resources, like file format. The task force is working to define this data element so that the digital graphic representation specifications will be a specific application under a more general data element.

The extent to which the task force will be able to deal effectively with types of media that were not covered adequately under AACR2 is questionable. Where it knows what to recommend, it doesn't mind including that recommendation. But for all sorts of things it is not yet clear what may be needed. Weiss thought that even if we don't know what to do with these types, there was value in listing them, to remind the JSC that it needs to deal with them, e.g., streaming video and RSS feeds. Attig concurred and reported that these had been included in the preliminary report.

Weiss asked what the timeframe was for commenting on this report. Extensive discussions ensued about the competing priorities and deadlines with the RDA draft. In the end, Attig responded that the document would be delivered to the committee as soon as possible after the February 7 deadline for RDA comments and then comments on the task force report are due to the JSC by February 14. He will consult with Bowen on the schedule and also whether the report will need to be rewritten, although he thinks it can go directly through. Larsgaard asked him to see if CC:DA can get an extra week or two. Attig replied that he thought the JSC would have been satisfied with a proposal for a change to AACR2. Such a proposal could have been done by now, but it was the choice of the task force to wait for the new draft.

Larsgaard thanked Attig and the members of the task force (De Groat, Chopey, Mangan, and Beacom).

942.   Report of the Task Force to Maintain "Differences Between, Changes Within": Randall

The task force has been dealing with the whole issue of what is the definitive final version because the print and the PDF versions differ. The task force is pondering how much real need there is for a revision for this publication, with the imminent demise of AACR2 and the birth of RDA, although realistically RDA implementation will be in 2009. With that in mind, what kind of timeline is needed for a new version on the *Differences* document? We need to consult with ALCTS Publishing. Is a new PDF version alone a more realistic, quicker way of publishing? And what kind of financial considerations are involved with which format it is in? There are only a few serious changes with rules but many formatting changes. Something will be forthcoming in the spring.

Larsgaard informed the group that this task force has a working life of two years, which means it will end on March 8, 2006, unless we renew it. Weiss wondered if we should dismiss and reconstitute the task force when we are closer to RDA implementation, and free the members to work on more important things. Randall replied that the task force could put out a report by that time, not a new document, but a report of what it has found and answer, "do we or do we not proceed?" Schmierer raised the point that we should not lose what they have discovered now, that we should extend the task force for six months so it can report at Annual and we can acknowledge what it has found then. Further, she would argue against only a PDF version because many printers cannot handle PDF files. Attig recommended that this be resolved as a Chair's action. Larsgaard and Randall will communicate to determine the longevity of the task force, especially in light of any feedback from ALCTS Publishing on financial aspects.

Harken asked if the task force had compared its document to 2.3.1.4 on major/minor changes. Randall replied that it hasn't, with the recent release of the draft of Part I of RDA.

Larsgaard thanked Randall for his report and the task force for its work.

943.   Report of the Task Force for the Revision of the ALCTS Online Publication "Guidelines for Cataloging Microform Sets": Culbertson
> ["Guidelines for Cataloging Microform Sets"]
> [CC:DA/TF/Cataloging Microform Sets/3]

Larsgaard provided some background on the genesis of the task force. The ALCTS Publication Committee reviews its publications every 3-4 years. We received a formal request from it that CC:DA review this and determine if it was worth updating or abandoning, and if worth updating, that we write the revision.

Culbertson reported that the publication is only 2 pages long. Also, it's not from 3-5 years ago, it's from 1989. The words "electronic" or "digital" are not even mentioned. The task force did rewrite it and is still promoting the use of record sets. She quoted recent feedback, "Your work will save our catalogers hours and hours of time to work on something else."

The idea is to create record sets. This not only includes the traditional microform sets but also born-digital materials. The idea is that, if the record sets are created using sufficiently good standards, libraries will be able to download them into the catalog without more verification work.

Glazier reported that RLG has not offered this capability for many years.

Mangan asked for an explanation of record sets. Culbertson responded that record sets represent a group of related titles tied together by acquisition, for example title from the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). Mangan sought clarification that these are cataloged separately but somehow tied together, and that they were applicable to any format. The response was, "Yes," to both questions and that LC has used this technique for map sets in the past. Schmierer elaborated that often these are sets after the fact and provided examples. Others provided further affirmations and examples.

Culbertson reported that the task force decided against explicitly including data elements in the document but has included a link to a set of data elements appropriate to different levels of cataloging.

Weiss observed that it was unclear if the records for the originals are pre-AACR2. He asked what the task force's expectations were. Should the description stay pre-AACR2 but the access points be updated?

Larsgaard solicited any further input, reminding the group that it was going to be a Web-only document. Maxwell asked what would the publication mechanism be and whether it might be published in the section newsletter as the previous version was. Weiss said that it is not ALCTS policy, but it is possible. Larsgaard will take it up with Charles Wilt after the Comments period for the draft of RDA Part I. She asked Culbertson to take the comments and consult with the task force to give a further report at Annual.

Larsgaard announced the next meeting on Monday 8-12:30, and adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

Monday, January 23, 2006 — 8:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m.
La Mansion del Rio, Iberian Ballroom A/B

944.   Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

945.   Report from the Task Force on Planning for the *Cataloging Cultural Objects* Program

The pre-conference on *Cataloging Cultural Objects* is being put on through a CCS task force. The group, which was a task force of CC:DA, first put on a program at the last Annual conference. The pre-conference will be one-and-a-half days on June 22-23, with a half day on the June 22nd, and a full day on June 23rd. There will be ten speakers from the library, archives, and museum communities. Beacom characterized the first module as an introduction to CCO and why we need it. Ken Hama of the Getty Foundation will be the keynote speaker. The second module will cover subject access and controlled vocabularies. The third module will offer case studies and examples of how to use CCO, one each for a library, an archive, a museum, and an image collection.

946.   Report from ALA Publishing Services: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham provided an update on how things are going with RDA from the publisher's perspective, focusing on the preparations for and status of the prototype.

ALA Publishing recognized a charge from the functional requirements document for a web-accessible version of RDA developed by the JSC. From that they derived two goals: 1) to make it easier to zero in on relevant instructions; and 2) to offer customized versions tailored to specific needs.

He reported on development efforts by ALA Publishing. He described previous collaboration on other projects with a database developer, Coe-Truman Technologies. ALA Publishing suggested that the JSC meet with them for analysis and design of a web-based product. Troy Linker, Marjorie Bloss, and Chatham worked with Tom Delsey on behalf of the JSC. Delsey provided an outline of RDA chapter 1, an RDA style sheet, and an initial outline of functionality. The outcome of several high level meetings was to plan on incorporating three focus groups – Catalogers, Educators, and Vendors. ALA Publishing has worked on the prototype during a short period of time, resulting in several versions with various stages of refinement. It has worked to

include and test functionalities that were thought to be relevant. This was completed last week and presented to the JSC. It has been brought to San Antonio for educators both at the ALISE conference and at ALA. They hoped to demonstrate to vendors but weren't able to get them together to meet as planned. One vendor did join the catalogers' session held yesterday, with approximately 20 or so attending, and which they thought went well. From the educators' session, grades ranged from B+ to A-. From the catalogers there was a sense that the range of the concepts in the prototype was appropriate to the range of audiences for RDA. From the sole vendor at the catalogers' meeting, there was a positive sense that vendors would be interested in working with RDA.

ALA Publishing is exploring the Webinar/Web CT format for the prototype to provide wider dissemination and remote CE opportunities. It wants to reach out to share the prototype with the vendor and other wider communities. It wants to work with consortia and their concerns and with the public library community as well, although it is uncertain what the response would be and how much the response would be driven by the vendors. And it wants to reach out to the metadata communities in general. "The point is outreach, we want to share this concept and this direction ... to make it the product that it has the potential to be."

The developers want to focus on the logic and rationale behind the processes. Their facility is to take that logic and translate it/program it into an online database product. Much of what happens in the cataloging task is intuitive and there is work involved in translating that into a database.

The first structural element in the prototype is an option for choosing a "version" or a "mode of access": Full mode, concise version, and a customized version. Then there is an option for interfaces: search/browse, a smart sheet/worksheet, and a step-by-step. The search/browse is most relevant to the expert users. One of the elements that worked well was a series of drop down menus affording a selection of options for headings and captions, definitions, and examples. There were pop up boxes with instructions and examples. There was also mouse-over functionality to provide definitions. The smart sheet allows the user to pick a number of worksheet styles – RDA, ISBD, MARC 21, Dublin Core, etc. Then the prototype product displays the elements in that worksheet and an example. There is a button on the right for the RDA instructions for that particular element or worksheet style. This is where they think there will be value for the vendors. The vendors can have the RDA button in their system and go into RDA from the vendors ILS form. There has been some back and forth whether to install this as an input form itself in RDA. This might be useful in an education or training situation. A student could look up the rule, enter the data, and save the results for output and grading. There has been an expression of a desire to save the session as a file or have PDFs of the session for a course-pack to be used beyond an elemental training mode. "Paul [Weiss] was in with the educators' group … and spoke eloquently to the training issues." The step-by-step interface provides the user with a guide through the data creation process primarily through drop down menus for type of content, media type, mode of issuance, type of description, and level of detail. Some of the elements that seemed to emerge with a particular interest were the customizing function, the drop down menus, and the mouse over. There was an interest in customizing by inclusion and by exclusion, using a series of check boxes to give an output of just those selections or conversely of everything but those selections. There was a desire for a better range of context – one level up was insufficient. "Breadcrumbs" should be provided to allow users to get back where they were or to keep track of where they've been. The "breadcrumb" practice should be available wherever it makes sense to keep track of context. Saving customized views for reference and sharing would be highly desirable. There was a suggestion to add a mode or module for training. Context kept coming up. There was a suggestion to include a button to "show me where I am" in the table of contents. WebDewey was suggested as a good example of hierarchical presentation. There

were other good design suggestions such as viewing output and replies in a side-by-side fashion with the sample of the rules, but it is uncertain if these can be incorporated.

Larsgaard reported that she had attended the prototype demonstration. She strongly recommends a web version of the mockup so that more people can view this demo. She offered CC:DA as guinea pigs. She called on Bob Hall to share the response from many PLA members. Hall acknowledged that many public libraries are in consortia and really don't do their own cataloging, but typically just classification and holdings. At a formal meeting yesterday on the cataloging concerns, there were thirteen members in attendance, which was a large number for this group. Smaller libraries are concerned about the price. They have small, stand alone systems and aren't on OCLC. They look at bigger library catalogs for subject analysis because they can't afford the *Subject Cataloging Manual*. Hall asked about pricing for RDA. Chatham responded that the cost of RDA has been an expressed concern. He does not have a price estimate at this point, as the product is so prototypical. The intent so far was to get feedback to see if the product as conceived was heading in the right direction. The next step would be to engage the developer again in several design and analysis sessions with the JSC to focus on how it works, what it does, how it does it. The designers come back and say how much that will cost. Then there are negotiations to balance price with functionality. The result may be versions 1, 2, and 3 that are specific to market segments. Attig reiterated this point to say that one of the options is a range of products. Chatham continued, saying that the current product was just a test, a "spot job" with the developer, rather than a full development contract. That would be the next step since so far the feedback has been "a go." Randall commented that this sounds really exciting, he was envisioning something like the electronic AACR2, just a little fancier; but this is much more and is wonderful. The question he has is would all of CC:DA be able to see this prototype? He would be more interested in a firmer idea of what the web product will be, so as to better evaluate the draft.

Ratkovich reported that the cataloging community for children's resources echoes the public libraries' concerns. In their meeting they had a variety of binding vendors (Bound-to-stay-Bound, Perma-Bound, etc.), high school catalogers, and children's librarians who catalog. Their main concern was cost. They realize it is primarily a web version but they need a workable print version that they are more likely to be able to afford. Hall commented that PLA members had no problem with a print version, they had no problem saying that their thought process was linear. Woodley said that in the context of her work with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) community, she reminded the group to make the pop-ups ADA compliant. Chatham replied that had come up multiple times. They haven't addressed that yet, focusing on primary functionality. Mangan asked for a new presentation at ALA Annual to demonstrate further developments, possibly to CC:DA. Maxwell expressed a desire for an e-book version.

Attig made a comment on behalf of those who were at the prototype demonstration. He reported that it was "an extremely successful exercise" and he encouraged ALA Publishing to take it to different audiences and to provide updates as development proceeds.

Chatham reiterated that this really came out of the functionally requirements that came from of the JSC. Delsey's contributions were driven by the JSC, reflecting the engagement of the JSC with the concerns expressed. Weiss asked Bowen if that document could be more widely disseminated. Bowen replied that it was developed as a preliminary document for the publisher and that there wasn't broad support in the JSC to share it more broadly. Chatham responded that they've already moved beyond it with Delsey's work. He noted that there was a good working relationship among all involved.

Larsgaard thanked Chatham for his report.

947.   Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2, Discussion of the draft of Part I of RDA: Bowen
            [CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2005/3]
            [5JSC/RDA/Part I]
            [5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3 (forthcoming)]
            [Report from the GMD/SMD working group (forthcoming)]

Bowen outlined the plan for proceeding: to work through Chapter 2, then the rest of the draft exclusive of Chapter 3 (due to its recent release), then recap things at the end. The primary concern is running out of time. Larsgaard warned the group that Confluence will not be ready for comments until she sends an email advising that it is ready. Until then, read the draft of Chapter 3 and the JSC task force report and make drafts of your thoughts for subsequent cutting and pasting into Confluence when it is made available.

General comments on 2.4 (continued)

Larsgaard reminded the meeting that it had left off at 2.4, in particular with discussion of the "statement of responsibility" and transcription issues.

A comment from the Floor: "Try to imagine taking an intelligent non-librarian and explaining to them why we're going to say this statement is a 'statement of responsibility' and that statement is a note on a 'statement of responsibility'." The speaker wondered if this is one place where the distinction has essentially vanished. Weiss supported this comment.

Glennan revisited a comment from Friday on associating pieces in this new environment of individual elements. Where she had addressed "other title information" on Friday, now she raised the similar concern for "statement of responsibility". In the case when there is no collective title, how are the respective "statements of responsibility" associated with the individual works? Attig replied to address this concern both specifically and generally. He reminded the group of the basis of this point that Glennan made, that what we see in the draft are instructions for recording the content of individual data elements with very little on structuring related data elements. There is no structure to say that they are related, e.g., in publication information – a particular instance of place and a particular instance of publisher – there's nothing to say, "record this before the name to which it applies." What has happened is two things; we made a decision to make a data dictionary and document the content of individual data elements, and we also made a decision to flatten the hierarchical structure. It is possible to do the one without doing the other. It is good to focus on the data elements but it is important to include the relationships between the data elements. He suggests that ALA recommend the restoration of the relationships between data elements. We've lost something that is an essential part of the nature of the data we're dealing with. Bowen asked if he could make a specific recommendation on how to work such a thing into the current structure, that would be helpful. She acknowledged the difficulty of doing so. Weiss remarked that he and Attig had discussed this and were thinking that some general statements to address it would be good in Chapters 0 or 1 with the later chapters referring back to it, all without seriously affecting the current structure of the document. Attig clarified two concerns, the first being how the ISBD areas are more than a presentation issue. The other is which particular elements have important relationships, e.g., where we want to justify recording the "place of publication" before the "publisher" to which it applies. There is a limited number of places where this is important. The "statement of responsibility" to a "title" is not always important except when there is no collective title.

Larsgaard informed the group that she would make a list of the overview comments, both good and bad, about the draft as a whole and enter them into Confluence in order to save people some work. The issue under discussion would be one of them.

Discussion resumed. Woodley stated that she was not so worried about "place of publication" being structurally linked to the "publisher's name"; however, the issue of relating different "statements of responsibility" to the appropriate "title" is important. She suggested that at 2.4.0.1, when it says "Statements of responsibility *may* appear in conjunction," change that to, "*should be recorded* in conjunction when you need to structurally relate the statement of responsibility to the title." Weiss responded that it won't be possible to do this in the display if it's not coded.   Stating "in conjunction with" would put a display issue into RDA when it actually would be part of the structural metadata for the record. Woodley offered an example using MARC 21 and stated this is not one of the things done well in Dublin Core nor do the other metadata standards deal well with it. It is difficult. Attig observed that this relates to another general issue that of repeatability, when a data element is repeatable, it is necessary "to relate instances." Bowen asked whether the guidelines in RDA need to allow you to relate the elements or whether we ought to rely on the schema or communications format to show these relationships. We will have an ISBD appendix, but do we want to try to make up for that deficiency and make sure it is in the guidelines themselves. Attig thought that there needs to be something at a fairly high level in the rules saying that, if you are applying RDA in a context that doesn't support hierarchical data structures, you won't be able to do this. It is not part of presentation, but rather is part of the structure of bibliographical data. It belongs in the guidelines for recording the data. Weiss agreed that it is about the content and not just markup. Schmierer recommended against abandoning what we already know about the relationships between various kinds of data. She reminded the group that these records also feed into larger enterprises like bibliographic citations. If we are trying to identify and discriminate between publications that may have similar characteristics, this is a very important part of performing some of these discriminations. It would be a mistake to rely on an appendix. There is growing concern that people will not have enough leverage with vendors to get the displays they need. Hillmann observed that when thinking about RDA in relation to other communities, one thing to think about is that by expressing the relationships within RDA it supports the notion that such relationships exist, even if an external standard doesn't support it. It's important that it is supported, but not mandated, in RDA.

Specific comments on 2.4

Randall commented on 2.4.0.3. There are some major differences of opinion about the option of providing only a controlled access point in lieu of recording a statement of responsibility. There is strong feeling that we need transcription of the name(s) as it (they) appear(s) on the resource. The form of a heading used in an access point lieu of the "statement of responsibility" may change so it does not resemble the form on the resource. Is this something where we would just rely on local or cooperative guidelines? Bowen replied that each cataloging agency would decide how to implement this. She suggested that this is a decision the JSC feels strongly about and that it is unlikely to change. Maxwell remarked that in that case, if the JSC has made this decision, then they need not only to say it, but to help us to agree with them and to explain why we are going "back to the pre-AACR2 rule." AACR2 took this option out, but now it is put back in. Bowen replied that this is an area where transcribing "statement of responsibility" is not common practice in the broader metadata community. We want to afford them the ability to exercise this option. Woodley confirmed that in Dublin Core and other metadata standards it's not common to transcribe the "statement of responsibility". These communities will exercise the option. A

statement of "library best practices" could control the use of this option. She would rather rely on authority records to track the various forms of the names. Théroux stated that the argument of relying on authority records is circular. You need the usage in order to establish the name, but if you don't record the forms as found on the pieces, you don't have evidence of usage. Mangan observed that some of the options seemed geared for other metadata communities, but none of the options are specified as such. It would be helpful for them to be explicitly labeled for which community they are primarily intended. Tillett responded that the Cataloging Managers at LC were one of the main contributors to the inclusion of this option, so it's not just coming from non-library communities. Maxwell then replied that the statement that any individual institution can do what it wants with respect to the option is unsatisfactory because it doesn't lead to consistency in sharing records. In particular if LC, as the primary source of cataloging copy, is going to take the option, institutions that do want the statement of responsibility transcribed will then have to add it in.

Maxwell then commented on 2.4.0.7. He does not see the necessity of this rule; instead simply transcribe. Bowen then asked, since we're moving in the direction of recording what you see when transcribing, what would you feel about an option just to record everything? Several responded that the basic rule itself should be just to record everything. She then sought clarification whether we would then need an option to allow omission of titles or whether to delete the entire rule. While several were in favor of deleting the rule, Weiss observed that it would be necessary to have the option for situations when metadata was harvested from external sources (like Dublin Core). It would be easy in the context of original cataloging just to record everything, but we should leave the option in for these other instances of harvesting data. Maxwell responded that he doubted Dublin Core will follow arcane rules about whether to leave out "Dr." Attig replied that Dublin Core is unlikely to transcribe the statement of responsibility anyway. Bowen asked for confirmation that the group is recommending elimination of the rule. The consensus of the group and the statement of the Chair was in the affirmative.

Starr raised a concern with the definition of "statement of responsibility" in the whole area of 2.4. With various "statements of responsibility" from the different media being recorded in one area, we see different treatments from different rules, e.g., in 2.4.3.6, where for motion pictures and video recordings, we're talking about technical production details and whom to include and whom to omit. We could expand this to cover other media to be more helpful, e.g., creation of artistic expressions such as copy editors, contract photographers, etc. There are many technical "statements of responsibility" that aren't included, when we are specifically addressing a few. Perhaps more time is warranted on the definition.

Randall commented on 2.4.3.1. He asked why "subsidiary" is included in the rule on notes for the "statement of responsibility". He cited some examples of non-subsidiary notes on the "statement of responsibility" from serials cataloging. Attig replied that if the responsibility were non-subsidiary, it would be in a formal statement. It is necessary to have something to distinguish what goes in a formal statement and what goes in a note. Weiss replied, "or we get rid of the distinction." He observed that there were kinds of notes on "statement of responsibility", outside of serials cataloging, for example affiliations of the author in a note, even though it is a non-subsidiary role. Théroux added that in works with anonymous or pseudonymous authorship, you may want a note of attribution, which again is not a subsidiary role.

Bowen observed that a "statement of responsibility" is transcribed, but a note is not, so you have much more freedom with a note. She offered that criterion as the distinction between these two data elements rather than considerations of primary vs. subsidiary contributions. Attig revisited a

general point made previously that in some cases the distinction between a note and a formal statement really is just a matter of presentation. He welcomed the suggestion to concentrate on the supplied comments on the facts and let the formal transcribed statements be a matter of presentation, of deciding which tags to use based on the presentation standard you are using. Schmierer thought that it was still desirable to suggest where the line might be. She suggested that the line might be that when offered two sources, one adjacent to the title and the other elsewhere in the resource, then the "statement of responsibility" be taken from the source adjacent to the title, and information from all other sources be put in a note. She sees a tendency for people to get "statement of responsibility" from anywhere when inputting bibliographical records.

Overall comments on 2.5

Maxwell asked whether "edition" was ever defined. Attig replied that it is in the glossary developed for AACR3 that was not included in the draft of Part I of RDA. Vellucci raised a question of semantics in the two bullets in 2.5.0.1. The first bullet refers to "edition information" in a general sense. The second bullet refers to "versions" but only in the context of unpublished resources. What about published works issued in versions? Attig replied that published versions meet the definition of "edition." Weiss said that this is one of the examples of unhelpful definitions, "x information being defined as information about x." Larsgaard responded that this was one of the large issues raised on Friday. While Attig agreed that there are instances of unhelpful definitions, he disagreed that this was one of them. We're trying to concentrate on what the ISBD calls an "edition statement" rather than on the concept of "edition," so perhaps the definition of "edition statement" needs to go here. Weiss agreed with this distinction between "edition statement" and "edition information." Bowen voiced Tillett's comment that the "edition statement" definition is at 2.5.1.1. Judy Kuhagen further pointed out that at 2.5.1.4, there is guidance about different terms that show up for this concept of "edition" and "version."

Specific comments on 2.5

Woodley sought clarification on 2.5.0.3. She wanted to confirm that we have nothing but abbreviation in the examples. Larsgaard replied that yes, these are just a place holder. There have been repeated calls to eliminate abbreviations, the use of which date back to the space restraints of the unit card.

Randall commented on the definition in 2.5.0.1. He thought it might be helpful to explain that Edition information may include "edition statement," "edition statement of responsibility", etc. Otherwise, it sounds like it is addressing the "edition statement" only, rather than the entire "edition area."

Mangan commented on 2.5.2.3, last bullet. She observed that the text says, "when describing the first edition, record all statements of responsibility as statements of responsibility," and a change is needed to this wording.

Shi Deng commented that 2.5.1.2 doesn't address multiple edition statements from multiple places in the resource. This is prevalent in Chinese publications, where the cover might state that a resource is the revised edition, but the colophon still states it is the first edition. Bowen replied that we are trying to simplify the rules. There is tension between a rule that is principle-based and a case-based rule that will address specific situations. We need to focus on whether the general principle is sufficiently clear for a cataloger to apply in these circumstances. She doesn't know if this is a case where that is possible, but in general that is the intent. Attig said that this may be an example of Western European bias; the rule is clear on what you should do, but gives you the

wrong answer in this case. Weiss said that there are two instances to deal with, one is when the same "edition statement" appears in different forms – first edition vs. edition1, the other is what Shi Deng is talking about, when the "edition statements" are different. This could be handled easily by allowing the "edition statement" to be repeatable. Schmierer observed that there doesn't seem to be an acknowledgement in the draft that a publication may have more than one "edition statement" and that is the problem. She sees the situation of multiple edition statements on Western publications as well. This needs attention. Weiss offered the example of Windows(tm) software. Bowen asked for a suggested change in wording that would accomplish what we want, for instance "record edition statement or statements" to allow for the possibility of multiple statements. Weiss observed that "statements of responsibility" is usually stated in the plural and we should be able to incorporate similar treatment here. Schmierer suggested that the plural be placed way back in 2.5.0.1. Woodley confessed that she would hate to always add "first ed." that appeared on every colophon. She would transcribe the edition statement that most uniquely identified the piece. One should be able to ignore the non-unique statement.

Randall noted that in 2.5.0.6 there's nothing to indicate when changes in edition statement indicate a new manifestation. Winzer said that is a comment that belongs in 1.3, Changes requiring a new description. It needs to be developed there. There needs to be direction that when an entirely new edition is issued, there should be a new record. Weiss and Winzer discussed the differences between the treatment of monographs and integrating resources. Larsgaard asked the speakers to continue the discussion in Confluence.

General comments on 2.6

Mangan commented that she thought it was decided that numbering would be restricted to serials, and received confirmation. She replied that the heading then needs to be explicit. Attig responded that limiting the scope of the data element in the definition was probably not the best approach. Randall commented that the examples are confusing all through the section and he was reminded they were placeholders. He continued that there's nothing in the rules that seem to indicate that you're going to put together the three possible types of numbering. Attig responded that this was another example of relationships between elements and it would be important to indicate those relationships.

Specific comments on 2.6

Weiss commented on 2.6.6. If we go to the concept of repeatability, this wouldn't be needed. This rule does specify recording the data in order, but we don't specify that elsewhere.

Reynolds commented on 2.6.1.3 and 2.6.2.3. She reported that the Access Level for Serials Group is considering this. In the online environment it is just as easy to determine the numeric or chronologic designations as if you had the first issue in hand. The cataloger can readily see the image of the first issue, even if the text is not accessible. This information is useful to users and it is baffling to those outside our community when we don't include this data even though it is readily available. We'd like to see this reconsidered.

Randall commented on 2.6.6, saying that some would like to see an option to record alternative numbering in a note. Weiss asked what the value of this would be. Randall replied that a much less prominent numbering system would be less useful and if placed in a note would result in a less cluttered record. Attig replied that this would be an issue of presentation. Hillmann reported that in Dublin Core there is no such thing as notes, so the more RDA says, "use notes," the less useful it will be in the Dublin Core context. She strongly suggests against using a note here.

Starr asked the general question that if the rule is not centered on display, why is this section limited to serials? There are many resources that have numbering or chronological designations that could use this area. It seems an artificial distinction to direct that this information be recorded into a note in the case of monographs but into this area in the case of serials.

Randall followed up on Hillmann's comments about the lack of notes in Dublin Core or other metadata schema. He didn't understand the existence of rules on notes throughout the rules at all. While notes can be highly relevant to us working on library records, what meaning will these rules have to others for whom notes are irrelevant?

Attig provided some history on the issue. He reported we saw a version without the limit to serials and we asked to have it changed. The question now is should we reconsider it which will be difficult to change given our initial position. Weiss responded that we could have it an option; where before it was mandatory to include "numbering" for everything but now it is mandatory to limit it to serials.

General comments on 2.7

Glazier commented on 2.7, 2.8, and 1.4. He observed that in the mandatory elements of the description at 1.4, the draft says "publisher, distributor, etc." is a mandatory element. However, the complicated rules at 2.7 and 2.8 specify at the end that one doesn't record a "publisher" or "place of publication" if the resource is unpublished. It seems contradictory to say that the element is mandatory when there are cases when it doesn't occur. He raised the same issue in the situation of analytics. He feels that this needs to be cleaned up in terms of consistency. Woodley reported that she and Weiss had observed a number of similar cases with elements specified as mandatory. She observed that we've dropped the language "mandatory if applicable." She suggested that rewording the section to include that would be helpful and that it needs to be said up front.

Glennan returned to the issue of transcription and its alternatives. She did a sample cataloging record, with "The" at the start of the "publisher's name." She saw nothing to address this. Following the principle of transcription it would be included, but if we then wish to index the publishers, this will be problematic. Bowen replied that this came up before, in the AACR3 deliberations. There were some communities then that said it is time to make "publisher" an access point. If the transcription principle is followed then she feels "The" should be included. She suggested that probably the time to address this issue is under "access" (that is, Part III of RDA). Mangan commented that "publisher" is almost always an access point in cartographic materials; it is recorded as specified in the rules and then a controlled access point is added. Weiss restated that this is another example of why we can't fully evaluate Part I without Part II and the rest. Attig said that the issue isn't whether to make "publisher" an access point, which would be an issue for Part II. The issue rather is whether to normalize the descriptive element to make it better suited for access. He didn't think we were at the point where we would recommend that. Transcription is still the governing principle. Randall commented that when using the "publisher statement" for access, that keyword is the chief means of access. In that case, not abbreviating is the crucial way to improve access, which would also benefit the cataloger in not having to worry about how to abbreviate something, but just recording what is seen, including "The." Maxwell said that he was in support of the rule as it stands. The cartographic community is not the only group performing authority work on publishers, and it would be nice to have this data available in doing that authority work.

Specific comments on 2.7 [none]

General comments on 2.8

Schmierer asked why "place" does not appear before "publisher," since that is the typical bibliographic citation format. Attig replied that there are a number of places where the order of the rules doesn't represent the order of entering the elements in the record. The logic of this is that the "place of publication" logically follows on whom you decide is the "publisher." This makes sense to him. Winzer said that she thought it was because "place" is no longer a mandatory element.

From the floor an observation was made that this is another place where keyword access is important. It was requested that consideration be given to not abbreviating here and just transcribing.

Specific comments on 2.8

Mangan commented that she would go for strict transcription. She has a problem with the instruction to use Appendix A to abbreviate the "place."

Mangan commented on 2.8.0.3, second bullet. She would prefer to supply a higher order jurisdiction in brackets with the "place of publication" rather than provide it in a note. Weiss replied that this brings us back to the "great transcription wars." He senses there is general support for either end but not the middle of the spectrum. Either we transcribe everything without question or we go in the other direction. But in this instance we're trying to do both. Schmierer observed that if one reads the instruction carefully, if a book is published in London, you will have to have a note to specify the United Kingdom and this seems a good place for an option. Woodley responded that this is an issue of whether we are recording this for us or our users? Our users don't care where a resource is published as long as it is what they want. The note is adequate for catalogers.

Glennan commented on 2.8.0.4 regarding the issue of transcription of more than one "place of publication." In her experience, she has run across instances with seven places on the chief source, so can we put in an option? Winzer disagreed with Woodley's comments. In law it's very important to know London, Ontario or U.K., so that her users can tell whether it's British or Canadian law. Weiss responded to Glennan that he would like us to consider that the first "place of publication" is required and the rest are optional rather than having all this extra text in the rule. Woodley acknowledged Winzer's comment but thought that users would be less likely to look at the "place of publication" than at the subject headings to make the determination of the jurisdiction of coverage for law resources. Randall responded that this could also apply to resources other than law materials where there may not be geographic subject headings to clarify the situation, especially for Special Collections materials.

Attig responded to Weiss's comments about the extremes of the spectrum regarding transcription. He feels one can distinguish between modifying what you see and adding to it. There are cases where it is helpful to add and this is a case where it has traditionally been found helpful.

De Groat reported that the OLAC list and the Network Resources Metadata Interest Group (NRM IG) have each found "place of production" to be a confusing concept. We are instructed to provide no "place of publication" if a resource is unpublished, but then in 2.8.4.2 we are instructed to give "place of production" for unpublished resources, which will then look the same as a "place of production" in the catalog record. Lacy asked whether recording "place of production" was an option, since it wasn't a mandatory element.

De Groat commented on 2.8.5.3. She stated that she is trying to figure out where one puts down the original "place of production" for a motion picture. There is confusion between what is stated at 2.8.5.3 (Details relating to place of publication, distribution, etc.) and at 4.10.0.3 (Describing related content). The people represented by OLAC and the NRM IG would like this data to be part of the "identification of the resource."

A speaker from the floor noted that 2.8.5.4 b) and 2.7.4.4 b) are fine provided "that occur after the first/earliest issue or part" is stricken from them.

General comments on 2.9

Weiss said that, on a positive note, he was glad "copyright date" is dealt with as a separate element.

Specific comments on 2.9

Vellucci noted that 2.9.0.5, the fourth bullet is referring to supplying the date of the last update; it is specific to loose-leaf resources, but there are other updating resources.

Maxwell noted that 2.9.1.3, second bullet directs one to supply an approximate date if the resource is lacking a date, but does not address the case of one knowing the date even though it is lacking.

De Groat commented on 2.9.1.3, second bullet, regarding instructions to supply an approximate date. She observed that there would be no difference between the resulting supplied date range for the first decade of 2000 vs. all of the century – [2000s?]. Ensuing discussions supported the use of [2000-2009?], although others observed that users of RDA will fall back on the examples for guidance.

Mangan observed that 2.9.1.3, last bullet eliminates the possibility of recording the date of a manuscript, which is important in maps. Bowen replied that this element is "date of publication" which would not apply to an unpublished resource. Attig pointed out that the rule then refers one to the "date of production," which would apply.

Myers commented on 2.9.1.3, second bullet. He acknowledged the earlier instructions about not commenting on examples but observed that the examples provided in this rule are lifted from AACR2 with the exception of the range of dates. Bowen replied that is wasn't intentional. Myers raised a further general concern about small ranges that cross decade boundaries or century spans, in that AACR hasn't dealt well with them in the past.

Shi Deng commented on 2.9.1.3, second bullet. She said that she foresees difficulty applying this to digital resources. If one applies this to recording data from digital resources, one can record what one sees or otherwise supply it. But if one is harvesting data, there may not be a date to harvest. Therefore she would like an option to not include supplied data.

De Groat noted in 2.9.1 and 2.9.2 that a distinction is made between "date of publication" and "date of distribution," but where does "date of release" fall? How is this to be treated? Attig replied that release falls under "date of publication." She continued to comment on 2.9.3 with respect to "copyright dates." It has been a long practice when dealing with videos, to de-emphasize the "copyright date" that appears on the packaging, which may be the only date available, but different packaging may otherwise have the same content in terms of the resource. This leads to duplication problems where the "copyright date" doesn't mean anything. Glennan commented that sound recordings have a similar problem with the "phonogram date" relating to

recording, but the "copyright date" not necessarily being applicable to the data at hand, just to the packaging.

Lacy commented on 2.9.1.3 and 2.9.5.3, last bullet, regarding the treatment of undated material. She asked whether the contrast to record "[date unknown]" for published materials but "[undated]" for archival collections would be a problem. She asked further that when data is obviously being supplied as in a case like this, what is the rationale for square brackets? Weiss replied that the original rationale was that it didn't take up a lot of space on a card. Is there now a better way to show that the information came from another source? Maybe we should be more flexible. Schiff reported that there was an interesting discussion on RDA-L, persuasively arguing that in the situation when we record "[date unknown]," the publisher does know the date even when it is not on the item. It would be preferable then to record "[date not given]."

De Groat asked whether 2.9.5 includes unpublished dissertations. It explicitly identifies archival resources and collections, but it doesn't state whether dissertations are covered, although one could assume so. Also she is not sure what constitutes a "collection" and whether it means just a collection of actual items or can also mean resources burned onto a CD-ROM. Weiss responded with another call for inclusion of the glossary.

De Groat asked if there is some reason in 2.9.5.2 to restrict to the dates only to those that appear. What if we know the date(s) from another source? In relation to motion pictures, the date of original production is important and we would like to have that more prominent than a note and possibly have it required if known or available.

Weiss revisited some earlier discussions on the use of notes, if the importance to a user community is a factor in deciding whether to make an element an access point or a note. Earlier discussions had focused on the criterion of transcription. Perhaps there needs to be a change in terminology. A note sounds less important, but if the issue is of transcription or not, perhaps a better term could be found. De Groat added that there are MARC tagging issues involved, too. The digitization date is of less interest than the original date of production.

General comments on 2.10

Weiss commented that this was another case of more redundancy than needed.

Specific comments on 2.10

Randall contrasted the instructions at 2.10.1.4 with those at 2.10.1.2 on where to get the series title. How is "prominent" defined here and to what purpose? This seems strange. From the floor, Schiff commented that the problem is the instruction here doesn't match the rules for treating the series as a serial; they should yield the same title proper. From the floor, Kuhagen responded that "sources" was one of the last things resolved in Part I; this is a case of an unresolved loose end.

Culbertson commented on 2.10.5.3. She observed that there are ISSNs available from outside the resource that could be recorded. There also could be more than one series with an ISSN that needs to be recorded. Weiss recommended the elimination of section 2.10.5. The ISSN should be recorded in the serial record and authority record and not recorded in each analytic, since it is a statement not an access point. Culbertson disagreed with this, observing that some systems are capable of indexing the series ISSN and providing access through it. Randall observed that recording an incorrect ISSN is not helpful without a note to explain. From the floor, Schiff said that it could be separately coded in MARC 21. Larsgaard reminded the group that we need to focus on this code and its rules, not on the standards. Attig clarified that there wasn't consensus

on Weiss's suggestion. Then he sought clarification on the issue of recording incorrect ISSNs. Randall replied that it would be best either to add the correct ISSN or not to record the incorrect ISSN at all. From the floor, Schiff said that he doesn't have a problem with transcribing the resource as it presents itself, but Randall's point is valid that the correct ISSN is beneficial for collocation. Also, it wasn't his intention to raise MARC 21 to divert discussion, but he has no problem with recording both correct and incorrect ISSNs because MARC 21 can support separate subfields for each. Attig responded that if we recommend that this not be limited to just the correct ISSN, it was more an issue of MARC 21 implementation. Weiss did not feel that this was an issue for the "identify" function, but of linking, which will be addressed by for Part II. Woodley disagreed, saying that ISSNs are an important identifying element. An ISSN is used all the time in link resolvers as an identifier. She'd like to see ISSNs remain. Weiss responded that this was in regard to series, not serials. Woodley stressed that ISSNs are important for series. Maxwell said that if a resource has a number on it, that is important for the "identify" function.

General comments on remaining Chapter 2 sections

Reynolds commented on 2.12. She feels it would be reasonable to be consistent in light of the discussions on series ISSNs. The parenthetical "corrected/incorrect" troubles her greatly. It has not been practice generally to apply this. Catalogers would be tempted to supply the incorrect ISSN. She gets emails all the time saying, "Correct this ISSN, the publisher is misprinting it." She thinks we should transcribe, and provide a place to record the corrected form.

Mangan commented on 2.11. Firstly, it needs to be clearly labeled as not applying to all materials. Next she contrasted "frequency" here with "scale" for maps and why one was considered important to the "identify" function and the other wasn't. Discussion ensued regarding the scope statements of the chapters and the place of "scale" in identifying a manifestation or an expression.

Discussion on Chapter 2 was closed with a reminder to use Confluence. Larsgaard will input major points of discussion expressed at the meeting into Confluence. Committee members will be individually responsible to enter into Confluence those things they feel need to go into the ALA response. We need to be realistic about the time frames under which we are working.

General comments on Appendix D

Larsgaard noted that D.0, 2, and 3 are not available, so discussions will start with D.1.

Attig noted there are additional things that have been moved out of the rules. His only example is from Chapter 3, order of the technical details. The order is not specified in RDA, but does need to be addressed. Weiss suggested that order should also be specified in D.1.2.3.

Weiss complimented the JSC for creating Appendix D. He feels that many more people understand the difference between presentation and content now with this in place. He suggested though that there should be further appendices for more than just OPAC and ISBD formulated presentation. Vellucci supported Weiss' comments and reported that in education it's easier for students to understand the content and the rules if they are not attached to a specific format.

General comments on Chapter 6

Attig feels that this is a fairly fundamental distinction between item-specific data and anything else. He likes keeping it separate. Weiss disagreed, thinking it should be integrated into Chapters 2-5 as appropriate. Attig replied that if we do integrate this into the other chapters, then there

needs to be a clear distinction between "copy-general" and "copy-specific" information. Weiss agreed that at least the item-specific information is here and identified as such.

Woodley would like accessibility information, especially with respect to ADA, included in this section. Weiss said that this is not item-specific information, but refers to a different manifestation.

Starr would like to see a provision for the owning institution's name at the beginning of each item-specific note.

Mangan observed that in the cartographic community, restrictions on access are not always copy-specific, but may refer to the manifestation. Weiss commented that was why he wanted these details split up into the appropriate chapters, so they can function at different levels.

Attig thinks there needs to be a clearer indication of what to do in the case of unique items; does everything or nothing get treated as item-specific when the item is unique. Weiss thought it was clear.

Maxwell reported that there was a discussion in the Rare Book community last year that there are many different ways of identifying the institution to which an item-specific note applies, and we don't need to specify that here.

Updates since Saturday's meeting

Bowen reported that the RDA Forum was a really successful event. There were very good questions and most of the people were already engaged in the process. She feels that as time goes on, others will come in. There were about 250 in attendance.

She has reported to MARBI what was going on and talked about the need to work together to create a mechanism to coordinate development. There is nothing specific yet; mostly they were talking about how to talk about it. She asked whether they were interested in developing the content in any particular area such as mapping RDA elements to MARC 21 fields. There did seem to be a sense that this would be a good project. She will propose to the JSC the creation of a joint Working Group, to develop that and present it to MARBI for approval. Weiss made two comments. First, if we do these forums at each ALA, we need to be clear in the PR as to the content. Next, other questioners felt their questions were shot down or trivialized. He acknowledged his own shortcomings in this regard and pointed out that we should be aware that what is clear to us may not be so to them. We should be sensitive to this. From the floor, Beacom thanked Weiss for his comment. He reported that the task force for putting together the Forums is comprised of himself, Norm Medeiros, and Helen Schmierer. They are very receptive to hearing comments for improvements, so he appreciates the comment about making compassionate responses. Beacom observed that in working together we all get to know each other and our styles of interaction, but that outsiders may not appreciate or be aware of these personal interactions. The task force will be working from the questions and comments at the forum to frame them as questions in the FAQ online. Future forums may have more of an update aspect. This one, as the first, had to bring up the entire past. Bowen responded that it will be challenging to balance the background and update information. We don't want to cover 'the whys' again but we have to acknowledge that newcomers will want to or need to know this. But the level of detail can change. Weiss made the suggestion to include the URL for the FAQs in the publicity. Beacom responded that was exactly the kind of excellent feedback the task force was seeking. Schiff suggested adding links to the previous talks.

Recap and Discussion of Issues in need of Clarification

Sources of information: Bowen observed that there was a range of comments on "Rule 2.2, Sources of Information." The JSC is trying to simplify this. It tried differentiating based on self-describing vs. non-self-describing resources. That didn't work well, so the JSC went with the structure in the draft. She heard that this is too text-centric. She heard that the JSC took out too many exceptions and should put some back in, and the earlier LC proposal to use the entire resource should be used. Weiss suggested a straw poll. Bowen proposed three options: 1) The JSC is generally going in the right direction; 2) Some of the more specific points should be put back, this is too simple; 3) throw out the rule and use the whole resource.

The straw poll was taken of all CC:DA members and representatives with the following results: Option 1 – 1 vote, Option 2 – 11 votes, Option 3 – 21 votes. Attig observed that the results seem clear, but for practical purposes he would advise including the second approach as a back up. Schmierer commented that in the vote we limited option 2 in a way that's not understandable and she doesn't understand option 3. In the context of using the entire resource, there are many instances where one will have to filter through a great number of things in order to make a decision.

Bowen asked for further guidance on formulating Option 3. Attig observed that an unstated aspect is that the source from which you take the title still needs to be specified. Weis reported that from a PCC perspective, in NACO there is a difference between "source" and "location." We should talk about two different terms. One is the "mine" from which to pull things, which might include title page, colophon, cover, etc. The other is the specific place from which you drew the data. It's a difficult concept to convey in training. Bowen restated that the committee is recommending taking information from anywhere on the resource, but define what is and isn't part of the resource. She cited footnote 1 on p. 2-6, and Weiss responded it should not be relegated to a footnote.

Maxwell sought confirmation of his understanding that Option 3 would require a note in every case. Weiss replied that that wasn't the assumption of everyone who voted for it. Bowen asked if the definition of the resource as expressed in the footnote was acceptable. There were expressions of disagreement. Attig responded that there is a need for work on the exclusions, otherwise everything will require a note. Glennan commented, "I think it's just a violent reaction to the way footnote 1 is worded right now, for people that that [i.e., it] doesn't work for."

Bowen responded that in working on this, to come up with a way to simplify sources, there was the need to address the exceptions to sources and the exceptions to what's part of the resource. If we go with Option 3, but then develop all these specifics as to what constitutes the container for different media, she doesn't know if that will be acceptable to the JSC.

Woodley commented that the a) and b) parts of 2.2.3 are problematic because they refer to a container that is not an integral part of the resource. This may not be clear to everyone. Hillmann commented that it should be the whole resource, there's not a good notion in this community on citing where you found the data, because the resources are digital, and there isn't much language on describing a "where". What seems to be developing is less the notion of "where found," but of "who said." The statements that represent an element name are at a level of granularity other than the record. You don't have to deal with the problem of record creator A and record creator B saying different things. People coming into this may not be able to deal with the concept of "source" in the way that catalogers do. Ratkovich responded that this particularly comes into play with kits. The more things we can look at in defining the resource, the better off we will be.

Bowen summarized some other topics of concern.   One of them is that the rules are too Western-centric and too text-centric. She asked for specific examples and suggestions of how to fix this. A big topic as far as the metadata community is concerned, is that "data is data," but we haven't included topical data [i.e. subject headings] in RDA. This is not a logical divide to the metadata community. Should there be high level rules to address topical data? She doesn't want to discuss this now, but it is something we should be considering. Attig responded that he thought this is a Part II issue, but Weiss disagreed.

Revisiting "sources," Bowen asked, "if we use the footnote definition on 2-6 without changes, would people still support using the entire resource"? Mangan responded that she remembers that in the LC document there were still categories that modified what constitutes the resource. This seemed a simple solution. This would put back what we need but still make it part of the whole resource. Tillett confirmed this interpretation. Attig thought it was simpler than what we have now. Woodley commented that what we're asking for is a rewriting of the definition of resource and she recommends changing "excludes" to "includes." Weiss commented that footnote 1 as it is now does not work regardless of the option used. De Groat concurred that her problem is with the footnote, otherwise she liked the rule. The AV community will have the biggest problem with the footnote.

Bowen then sought confirmation that in looking at all the options, the 5JSC/LC/1 proposal is the best. She asked the committee to review LC/1 and asked Larsgaard to insert a place holder in Confluence for LC/1 for people to add comments.

Larsgaard reminded members and visitors alike to comment online, via Confluence or the ALCTS web form. When doing so, state the problem and provide possible solutions. Attig shared that it is a good idea to provide comments on what is in the draft even if we end up going a separate route. In response to a question about the possibility of a system crash at the deadline, Larsgaard stated that she will accept emails if people can't get in to the website. Mangan expressed concerns about the deadline and workload of Chapter 3 comments; Larsgaard extended the deadline for comments on Chapter 3 and the GMD/SMD Task Force report to February 14. There was further discussion about CC:DA vs. non-CC:DA deadlines, with a final consensus that the deadline will not be publicly changed but late entries won't be refused.

948.   Report of the MARBI Representative: Attig for Allgood
            [CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2006/1 (preliminary)]

Attig gave a verbal report in place of Allgood.

Proposals:

2006-01: Approved a proposal for some coding changes in field 047, so non-MARC codes can be encoded.

2006-02: Approved a proposal to add a subfield for relator terms to X11 tags; since $e is used already, a new subfield code (probably $j) will be used instead. In rejecting another alternative, MARBI reaffirmed the principle that fields and subfields, once defined and implemented, are never redefined for a different purpose.

2006-03: Approved a proposal to support the use of standardized terminology in field 506, Restrictions on Access Note): the addition of a new subfield $f standard terms, of subfield $2 for the source of the terms; and indicator values to show whether or not there are restrictions.

2006-04: Approved a recommended technique for Unicode to MARC8 conversion, dealing with characters that have no equivalents in MARC8. The technique approved defines a "placeholder" character to be used in these cases; this does not allow round-trip mapping. MARBI also indicated that a technique that does support round-trip mapping without loss of meaning should be developed.

2006-5: Approved some additional subfields in the Holdings format for data elements that are part of the ONIX Serial Record Notification (SRN) record.

Discussion papers:

2006-DP01: Supported the addition of tag 034 to the MARC 21 authority format so that coordinates could be recorded in a structured way. A proposal will be considered at the 2006 Annual Conference.

2006-DP02: Endorsed the concept of codes providing "content alerts" to identify sensitive material (sex and violence) in material for the visually impaired. Recommended that the codes be added to field 521 (Target Audience Note). A proposal will be considered at the 2006 Annual Conference.

2006-DP03: Had a lively discussion about the recording of former headings in authority records. The discussion centered on whether former headings would be used for processing, i.e., to "flip" the former headings to the new headings; it was noted that the former headings may conflict with valid headings in the authority file and that processing would be risky. MARBI was interested in considering at least two alternatives: a note field (683) in which the former heading could be recorded for information and use of the 4XX fields (with additional coding to allow control of display and processing). A proposal is expected for the 2006 Annual Conference.

2006-DP04: Discussed some additional adjustments to the Holdings format based on elements in the ONIX Serial Release Notice record, specifically whether there was a need to distinguish coverage dates from issue dates. MARBI asked for a proposal.

Business meeting:

LC announced that the conversion of the MARC documentation to XML format was taking longer than expected, but that the 2005 updates would be available shortly.

A representative from the Deutsche Bibliothek reported on their decision to move to MARC 21. They have begun the process of identifying what needs to happen for cases where there is no equivalent in MARC 21, whether they will abandon their format practices or ask for extensions in MARC 21 to support their practices. Specific proposals may be made by the 2006 Annual Conference. There were major discussions about collective sets. The German cataloging community has reaffirmed that they will make a record for every volume in a collective set whether it has a distinctive title or not; they will also make a collective set record with links from individual records to the collective set level but not vice versa; they will not put contents notes in the collective set records but will use inter-record linking instead and seek MARC 21 support of that.

The MARC Content Designation Utilization Project will be collecting data from WorldCat to create a report of WorldCat project utilization studies. Data will be available in a year. For further information, see www.mcdu.unt.edu.

As part of the ongoing implementation of Unicode, LC will be reviewing the MARC documentation to remove restrictions to MARC-8 characters. [report revised 5/06]

949. Report of the Task Force to Review the Draft *Functional Requirements for Authority Records* (FRAR): Schmierer
[CC:DA/TF/FRAR/4]

Schmierer listed the members of the task force and acknowledged with thanks that CC:DA accepted the first of the task force's reports. This second report is of items from the first report that had the most interest to the committee and the most impact on RDA. They are chiefly related to chapters we have not yet seen but seem important to bring out. There is vocal opinion that the entity-attribute model is objectionable. Secondly, the unique identification of a work, expression, manifestation typically requires the name of the creator. "And this created a firestorm of unhappiness, criticism, and everything else. We did propose, and we hope, that an example will be included in the revised FRAR document to dispel the notion that because there was no example [using author-title] that this method of identification was no longer possible." John Attig developed an appendix that lays out where the specifications in FRAR exist in documentation that we have.

Attig elaborated on how many of the attributes in the model are not considered data elements in either AACR, RDA, or MARC 21. They inform the decision making process but are not necessarily separate data elements. It seemed that putting them into a table of where they stand would be useful. This first draft was developed from memory when he did not have the actual standards documents at hand. If it is to be acted on, it needs to be recompiled to ensure accuracy. The time to act on it is when FRAR is finalized, as there is little point in addressing implementation issues from a draft of the rules. He is not clear what one would do with it, since there are various ways of articulating the model in the rules. In a MARC 21 context, much of this may be appropriate to record in a 670. At the point where both FRAR and RDA Part III are issued, we may want to look again at this comparison and see what needs to be treated as data elements and addressed in the rules.

Weiss asked whether CC:DA wants any action. Larsgaard replied that the portion of RDA that this concerns is Part III. If the task force is willing, she would like to keep the task force rather than discharge and reconstitute it. Attig responded that there is merit in discharging it, since it has met its charge. Larsgaard acknowledged this. After discussion, there was consensus that the task force's report should be accepted and it should be discharged to be reconstituted at a later date.

The Chair thanked and discharged the task force.

950. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings: Larsgaard

Larsgaard reported that she attended the Friday night meetings of the CCS Executive Committee and brought forward the point that we need to be thinking ahead about RDA implementation. She will work with Cynthia Whitacre to review successes from AACR2 implementation with a focus on what is appropriate in the current environment and what to do the first year, the second, etc.

Marjorie Bloss reported that she will be proposing at the April JSC meeting that we address the issues of implementation and training. She will report further as things develop.

Attig suggested that the schedule be keyed to the implementation date rather than the publication date. Larsgaard replied that we can't do implementation until we have publication – AACR2 was delayed by 2 years, for example. Bloss said that we need to try to figure out how much time is needed for training, given the timelines we have. This is not only a U.S. concern, but a concern of all JSC constituent member nations. Larsgaard said that we should also consider utilities and

ILS vendors. Maxwell said that with the JSC letting everyone see RDA ahead of time, people will be better prepared to deal with this. Bloss said, "Part of my role is doing outreach. Matthew and I complement each other on this. I have been trying to identify key players, and telling them, 'let me keep you in the loop'. ... Keeping a number of different stakeholders in the loop is a major part of my task." Attig reminded Bloss and everyone that while we are very interested in this aspect of the process, we are presently very much occupied with the review of the drafts, so this shouldn't be our job. Bloss replied that is why we should be planning now how to do this, identifying key parties, considering potential training models and the scale of the training.

951.   Report of the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

Attig reported that he has taken and will be taking extensive sabbatical time, including a trip to England in May/June, which may delay preparations for ALA Annual, but he will do his best to avoid that.

His institution has implemented tools for obtaining statistics on web usage. In 2005, CC:DA had over 200,000 hits on the site, although most were on the graphics and stylesheets. There were 59,500 hits on the HTML pages; the committee roster and the announcements pages were the most used. There were 22,500 hits on individual documents, of which the background document for the AACR3 draft was by far the most popular. [revised with updated information, 5/06]

952.   New business

Attig moved the following resolution:

Official CC:DA Resolution

Whereas, **Ed Glazier** has served this committee well for twenty-five years, from 1981 to 2006 as *ex officio* representative to CC:DA from the Research Libraries Group;

And whereas, during that time period he has missed only a few CC:DA meetings, which surely must qualify him for some special award for masochism;

And whereas, Ed has provided sage and pragmatic advice to the committee on a wide range of issues and topics;

And whereas, the only time he has proved not to be peerless was the CC:DA meeting at which he elucidated the best route for CC:DA to take in its response to the JSC concerning British JSC documents concerning English nobility;

Therefore, be it resolved that CC:DA gives Ed Glazier a toast and our thanks for his many years of hard work and contributions to CC:DA as RLG's *ex officio* representative; and we don't quite have the nerve to say, "and another twenty-five years of the same"!

The motion was seconded by Weiss and accepted by acclamation.

953.   Reports from the floor

Vellucci spoke to make people aware of a project under development by a joint committee of ALCTS and ALISE. They are developing a clearinghouse: Metadata Education and Research Information Center (MERIC). It is being developed in prototype at the University of North Texas under Bill Moen. The concept is to have educational materials and learning object materials

deposited with the center or linked to through it, so that a wider community can use them for training and education purposes. In a year, they expect to be depositing training resources on RDA there. She asked people to participate if they have such resources.

Larsgaard reported that the next meeting would be at ALA Annual in New Orleans. The Friday meeting will be a half day, in the afternoon, with the Saturday afternoon and Monday morning meetings on the current timetable. Notice will be forthcoming regarding the venues, once they are set.

The Chair entertained a motion to adjourn, which Mangan moved and Folkner seconded. The meeting adjourned at 12:16 p.m.