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 Annual Conference in New Orleans, Louisiana
June 23, 24, and 26, 2006**

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

   John Myers, Intern
   Penny Welbourne, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:
   Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
   Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group
   Glenn Patton, OCLC
   Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress

ALA Liaisons present:
   Stephen Smith, ALCTS/Acquisitions Section
   Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
   Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
   Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/Collection Management & Development Section
   Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
   Greta De Groat, ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
   Larry Heiman, ALCTS/Preservation & Reformatting Section
   Kevin Randall, ALCTS/Serials Section
   Manon Théroux, ALA/Association of College & Research Libraries
   Rebecca Culbertson, ALA/Government Documents Round Table
   Laurel Jizba, ALA/International Relations Round Table
   Shelby Harken, ALA/Library Information & Technology Association
   Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/Map & Geography Round Table
   Anna Ferris, ALA/New Members Round Table
   Robert Hall, ALA/Public Library Association
   Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/Reference & User Services Association
   Cynthia Whitacre, ALA/Social Responsibilities Round Table

Non ALA Liaisons present:
    Kathy Winzer, American Association of Law Libraries
    Daniel Lovins, Association of Jewish Libraries
    Daniel Starr, Art Library Society of North America
    Laurel Jizba, Association for Recorded Sound Collections
    Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association
    Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
    John Hostage, International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions
    Karleen Darr, Medical Library Association
    Kathy Glennan, Music Library Association
    Greta De Groat, Online Audiovisual Catalogers
    Paul Weiss, Program for Cooperative Cataloging
    Mary Lacy, Society of American Archivists
    Dorothy McGarry, Special Libraries Association

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
    CC:DA = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
    CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
    CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
    CDS = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service
    CONSER = Cooperative Online Serials Program
    CPSO = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
    DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
    FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
    GMD = General material designation

IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IRRT = ALA/International Relations Round Table
ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
LC = Library of Congress
LCRI = Library of Congress Rule Interpretations
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.A.)
ONIX = Online Information Exchange; ONIX International
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RFID = Radio Frequency Identification
SMD = Specific material designation
URL = Uniform Resource Locator
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Friday, June 23, 2006 — 1:30 p.m.–3:45 p.m.
Marriott, LaGalerie 2

955. Welcome and opening remarks

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors. She reported that *5JSC/LC/5/Rev* (Internationalization) and RDA Chapters 6–7 were made available on Tuesday June 20. She outlined the format of the proceedings for the meeting, particularly noting the change in the scheduled ending of the meeting in order to allow the many interested parties in the room to attend the forum on LC's series authority record (SAR) decision.

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

Committee voting members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

957. Discussion of the draft of Part A-II of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA)
[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2006/1]
[5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapters 6 and 7, Addendum, and cover letter]

Larsgaard opened discussion of the Draft of Part A, Chapters 6–7.

Bowen reported that based on a lot of the feedback for the former Part I, the JSC decided to reorganize RDA by merging the former Parts I & II into Part A, with Part III becoming Part B. The former Chapter 6 has been redistributed into the other chapters of Part A. Please see the cover memo for further specifics.

Larsgaard asked the group to focus on general comments. She clarified that she would enter general remarks into Confluence, but individual members would be responsible for recording their agreement/disagreement with the general comments and for recording their comments on individual rules.

Attig opened discussion with several overview comments:

1. He likes the new layout of the text; the paragraph numbering is better.
2. It is less clear now whether the different bulleting styles are effective.
3. He likes Chapter 6, especially how it introduces of a taxonomy of relationships.
4. He likes that it includes **all** the ways of expressing these relationships, not just access points.
5. He's less enthusiastic about the duplication. He recognizes what is effective for print is not necessarily effective for Web and vice versa.
6. He has mixed feelings about the comprehensiveness of the taxonomy, specifically the assumption that all are potentially reciprocal.
7. There is a lot of use of the word "may". Consequently, a lot of clarification/decisions will be required during implementation.
8. The labeling of Optional elements is useful.
9. Referring to a relationship as an element is not accurate. The result of the technique one uses is an element, but the relationships themselves are not.
10. He would like to see the special rules eliminated. They are special cases that ought to be able to be incorporated. He acknowledged that the special rules in Chapter 7 will be more difficult not to include. But at least they are nicely segregated.
11. One specific comment, he is disappointed that the Rule of Three is alive and well in 7.2.2.4, while it has been eliminated in other places.

Larsgaard then asked for responses to Attig's comments.

Regarding the taxonomy:

- Larsgaard thought there was a need for a category of "Other relationships."
- Weiss noted that FRBR terminology is less used in Chapter 6 and agreed on the need for "Other relationships."
- Maxwell reported he had to try to figure out what the categories of relationships actually were. He sought input from Tillett regarding her input [since she had done significant work on taxonomies in the context of FRBR].
- Tillett replied she was not consulted; the taxonomy was a decision by the editor drawing on significant cases from AACR2.
- Weiss took up an observation from Part I that there is significant textual bloat in Chapter 6 in the way that the same instructions are essentially repeated for each category of relationship. He would prefer to see a single statement of the conventions followed by a listing of examples appropriate to each category rather than all of the repetition.
- Randall noted that many of the relationships were brought over from AACR2 and may need to be re-examined.

Regarding comprehensiveness:

- It will be impossible, perhaps even unwise, to attempt to address all relationships. Instead, the major ones should be identified and a category of "Other" should be given to cover minor and/or emerging relationships.
- There will be a lot of maintenance to incorporate reciprocal relationships into the "original" sources' records. Hillmann responded that the selection of technique may impact the amount of work. Use of links may allow references to be system generated. Weiss commented that relationships by nature are reciprocal, but we may not have to enter all of them on both ends. He doesn't see it as a requirement.
- Glennan was surprised at the format/format relationship. While she understands it is optional, in FRBR terms, this refers to "manifestations". Currently this is done with notes rather than the full range of techniques offered in the draft. Weiss thought that the format/format (and the

edition/edition) relationship should be handled through the inherent relationship between a "work" and its "expressions" and handled through the work/expression citation.

- Attig found it interesting that the relationships between the Group 1 entities were not handled in Chapter 6.

Regarding implementation decisions:

- Whitacre reported that the CCS Executive Committee is putting together a task force on RDA implementation in response to CC:DA's request from Midwinter. The CCS Executive Committee is meeting at the end of Annual to determine the charge and membership. Weiss reported that PCC (including CONSER) is also working on implementation.

Regarding labeling of optional elements:

- Weiss agreed with Attig that it is not appropriate to say embedded citation is an optional element; it is an optional technique.

Regarding "Special Rules":

- Larsgaard particularly sought the input of the appropriate representatives.
- Weiss agreed with Attig that the Chapter 6 special rules are merely special cases of the main rules.
- Glennan agreed, speaking for herself, that some of the specific cases in Chapter 6 can be folded in to the other rules. But some of the others, Adaptations for instance, have details that are important. She is not in a position to speak representatively at this point however. Winzer similarly said that her first reaction, her personal opinion, was, "Why is this separate? It is okay to incorporate this into the examples." But she needs to consult with her law colleagues.
- Schmierer observed that it is important if these are put in the "general text" that we not rely on the examples alone to illustrate the point to be made. We need to specify what is required, what is the desired outcome, in the text of the rule. Winzer agreed.
- Weiss said, "The test is, if the rule wasn't there, would the result be the same?"
- Randall did not think these rules covered new ground.
- Starr said that removing these special rules will make the general rules stronger and the whole package more appealing to non-text-based catalogers.
- Maxwell observed that throughout the rules, we seem to be putting AACR2 into a new format. He agrees with Weiss and suggests that it is a good time to question if we should continue to do the same as before.
- Glazier said that the rest of Chapter 6 still seems to be text based, which may be why the special rules are retained.
- Bowen said that if you are going to put forward a proposal, it would be useful to include specifics of where to move the text in that proposal.
- Weiss suggested that the JSC could find guidance in Tillett's dissertation and in Smiraglia's work. Maxwell agreed that these would be excellent sources for improved terminology.

Regarding "Special Rules" in Chapter 7:

- There was discussion between Attig and Weiss that the Chapter 7 special rules are more specific and not covered under the general rules, unlike the situation in Chapter 6. Questions were raised whether some of the rules ought to be generalized for applicability to more than one format. Also, would application of the rules now be more difficult by requiring catalogers of these formats to use both general and specific rules. Glennan responded to this last issue by pointing out that while things might be split up in a print RDA, this would be mitigated by the capabilities of the electronic RDA.

Regarding the Rule of Three:

- Attig said that the Rule persists only in selection of a primary access point. If there are more than three authors, is authorship so diffuse that one enters under title, or is entry under the first author meaningful?
- Adam Schiff (from the floor) observed that in bibliographies with a citation for a work with 4–5 authors, that work is entered under the first author. We should follow that. It's consistent with general bibliographic practice and it's simpler.
- Maxwell agreed but countered that there are times where there are too many, for instance in an encyclopedia.
- Weiss replied that the draft indicates we should be guided by the content of the chief source. Further, he would like to see editors and compilers as primary access points also.
- Attig observed that the rules seemed to be focusing on works of authorship. The AACR concept of mixed responsibility is not well presented in Chapter 7.
- De Groat reported that she could not figure out how to enter a motion picture under these rules. What is multiple authorship vs. primary authorship in the context of a motion picture? She described several scenarios. She cited the Synchronicity concert example under 7.2.1.4.4 with a name as primary access point.
- Martha Yee (from the floor) discussed the movie *Gone with the Wind*. She observed that the draft includes rules on works based on previously existing works. The rules as written describe situations where one would enter under the author of the original work or under the author of the adaptation. But they don't cover the situation of mixed responsibility and mixed nature, as would be the case with *Gone with the Wind*. A whole category of rules seems to have disappeared.
- Schiff observed that there are a lot of cases and examples but a shortage of principle-based explanations. Further, the principles that were in AACR2 are not all that intellectually defensible, being holdovers from a card environment. Weiss agreed that there is a lack of philosophy in Chapter 7. Hillmann agreed strongly, saying that in order to extrapolate to the non-MARC metadata world, the principles need to be laid out.
- Randall asked if there are principles outside of the library world that we could draw from, in order to keep things more in line, when addressing motion pictures and other mixed responsibility resources in Chapter 7.

Regarding the techniques for recording relationships:

- Hillman expressed a concern regarding the conventions for recording relationships in 6.1.2. Does the order of the list give you a priority of applying the rules? What does one do when multiple relationships are present? Randall replied that we are already using one or more of these methods under AACR2. One takes any and all that seem appropriate to the functioning of the catalog. Hillmann then asked, how is that a principled approach?
- Mangan had a problem understanding the differences between the five options. Other than the access point option, they all devolve to what formerly were notes. Schiff replied that in many cases they are in a non-500 field that generates a note and access point. Weiss agreed with Mangan and thought that the editor had introduced artificial and unhelpful complexity into the rules. There are either controlled access points or parts of descriptions. We should define what the differences are between the techniques and provide guidance in their use. The use of the term "embedded" is problematic, since in a sense all of the techniques embed something in the record. Schiff agreed that embedded description is problematic but after re-reading, it has become clearer. Maybe the order needs to be reconsidered, to group the note-like and access point-like options together.
- Weiss thought that it might be helpful to consider "expression of relationship" as one element and that the five techniques are different ways of recording that element.

- Myers pointed out that the five are presented as options, from which one may pick and choose. What is lacking is guidance on how each might serve the needs of a given agency; when they might be more or less appropriate. In other places in the draft, there is language to address whether a given option is supported by a presentation standard. Attig observed that there is no expression of priority among these options. There are a lot of possibilities with very little guidance on making choices between them. He suggested that we should concentrate on the guidance for making the choices.
- Schiff observed that in 6.2.1.2.1c1, an embedded description in a sequence of contents notes is different from current practice.
- Glazier raised a concern that there was nothing explicit in these rules to address the independent description of the other related resource. Weiss pointed to other sections in Chapters 6–7 to address this.

Regarding the use of "Citation":

- Attig asked Bowen to address the use of the term "citation" in this draft, since there appears to have been a change in what it means. Bowen replied that her understanding was that it previously referred to a controlled access point but this has changed in the draft, possibly due to some miscommunication between the JSC and the editor. The editor is falling back to an AACR2 use, although it was not explicitly defined in AACR2. Mangan noted that it is defined at 1.1.8. Weiss found the definition acceptable, but the directions in the subsequent paragraphs as to how one can make the citations are problematic. He thought there would be one formulation for a citation so that everyone would refer to something the same way, not the multiplicity of options offered. Bowen responded that she does have some concern about whether we will run out of terms. For instance, now that we are no longer using the term "uniform title", how will we refer to that, especially as a distinct component in a name-title access point? Tillett reported that it was difficult to convey the JSC's thoughts on this issue to the editor when it was discussed in Chicago. Hillmann was concerned that "controlled access point" is still too loosely defined. It is structured but not necessarily externally controlled by an authority file. As such, it is still too open to variability, being merely a textual notation, and won't support interconnected access.
- Schiff observed that initial articles are included throughout the examples of access points. Weiss clarified that access point is just something that is indexed, where controlled access point is something structured per part B.
- Maxwell asked if we understood "citation" in one sense and the draft doesn't follow that, why can't we just say, this is wrong?
- Schiff suggested the ISBD format as a form of citing a resource.

New topics by other members and representatives:

- De Groat noted the alternative at 6.4.2.2.1c.1, in the rules for reproductions, to record elements of the description for the source and the reproduction in parallel. This is not available in other relationships. She wondered if this was to address concerns previously expressed about the need to know information about both resources. Attig replied that her question was addressed in the cover letter. Weiss said that this was another example, however, of important details being lost in the constant repetition.

- Further, she questioned what is done for a DVD with multiple films on it? As a set of reproductions, how are all the details for the originals recorded? It is ambiguous whether these are contents or reproduction details. Weiss agreed, saying that the issue is that multiple relationships are not covered.

- Mangan was concerned about how the section headings are formulated. She cited the example of derivative work/expression. The labeling seems to be backward in terms of the results one would

retrieve. Weiss said that changing the chapter name was a mistake, the chapter should be "Relationships with Other Resources". Hostage responded that the rules at this point are not talking about the thing you have, but about the relationship to something else.

- Starr was surprised that Chapter 6 is before Chapter 7. We're talking about relationships with other works before we've completed the task of describing the resource. Randall responded that Chapter 6 is talking about relationships. One has already described the item in hand from the earlier chapters. He agrees with the current alignment of Chapters 6 and 7. Starr replied that description and access are becoming so melded. Chapter 6 is talking in large part about access, but the access points are not developed until Chapter 7.

- Glazier asked who determines how the online version of the rules will link various pieces of data in terms of which rules are collected if one specifies a specific format. Bowen replied that is part of the content development on which the editor is working.

- Weiss listed his comments:

  1. On a positive note, he appreciates the further specification of options.
  2. In the use of "may", it is unclear why the editor is shifting between the imperative and indicative voices. He cites an example at 6.1.2, where the language shifts.
  3. He likes the order of Chapters 6 and 7, but he thought primary access point rules would be in Part B. He assumed Chapter 7 would be about relationships with other people.
  4. Given that we want RDA to be used by other communities, it's embarrassing that we're not looking at their work and standards in formulating it.
  5. In Chapter 6 it is further muddying the waters with things in Chapters 1–5 that refer to contents. Contents reflect whole/part relationships and should be removed from Chapters 1–5 and shifted to Chapter 6.
  6. The concept of how to express the inherent relationships between the FRBR Group 1 entities of "work/expression/manifestation/item" is not clear.
  7. A more specific comment, he thinks that 6.4 can be merged with 6.6. Further, 6.3 and 6.5 can also be merged.

- Mangan noted an issue with the format/format relationship, which requires the same publisher. She cited the example of large print books that often have a different publisher from the regular print version. Weiss said that it needs more FRBR influence.

- Schiff asked what does "prominently" mean throughout Chapter 7? Does it mean on the chief source or something else? Several replies answered that we'll know when the glossary comes out. Weiss reiterated his comment that it is hard to evaluate the draft without the glossary.

- Maxwell reported, in reference to Chapter 7, that he has never understood the principles behind the rules for musical works that include words. In assigning principle responsibility to the composer rather than the writer, he would like to see some elucidation of principles. He cited the example of Marion Anderson singing at the Lincoln Memorial.

- Myers reported concern with the rules regarding performances at 7.2.8.5.1a.1. As formulated, they do not well serve the non-specialists populations served by generalist catalogers. Glennan said it was an issue to take up with the JSC, not the Music Library Association. Bowen responded that the draft represents a consensus between the Music Library Association and the Association for Recorded Sound Collections. There are some instances where performers have primary access, but this is a concern for her because that rule is not prominent. Myers responded that it is still too restrictive. Glennan reported that there is a mix of opinions in the Music Library Association regarding the lessening of primary access by performer. Bowen said that the intent is to have a principled approach where the primary access point is for the party responsible for the

work rather than for the expression. Myers said that it is theoretically elegant and consistent, but less workable in practical terms. Schiff cited an example of a motion picture written, directed, produced, and with cinematography by one person that could have name main entry. Weiss said that it is important to specify these are recordings of performances. Further we have to be clearer about the definition of performance. For example, is a motion picture of animation a performance if there is no spoken text? Is an impromptu recording of a speech a performance? A recording of whale songs? There is something that all recordings have in common that needs to be addressed.

▪ De Groat revisited Maxwell's earlier comment, citing rule 7.8.8 on libretti. Glennan mentioned that 7.8.8.2 is new and that it would allow for the entry of a libretto that is only the text to be under the author. De Groat then discussed the analogous situation of screenplays. If the work is considered primary, then a screenplay should be entered under the primary access point for the motion picture, whatever that may be. And perhaps the score and soundtrack should as well. She also questions what does "performance" mean? For example, versions of *Otello* – is that to be considered primarily performance of the opera, although there have been editing and camera decisions incorporated into the recording? Or Zeffirelli's movie *Otello* which is performed to a pre-recorded score for the soundtrack but with a lot more editorial and cinematographic decisions. At what point is this no longer the work of the composer? The rules are very difficult to apply when you get to this level. The examples are not clear in showing whether they are spoken word or moving image performances. Traditionally, spoken word performances have been entered under the author of the text, but LC has been moving towards entry under the radio program for broadcast performances.

▪ Allgood observed that the previous half-hour's discussion seems to indicate a need to address underlying principles. They may need better explication or exploration. Hostage observed that in dealing with recordings and the primary access point, we may be applying a principle but for the user the results are absurd. He cited as an example a compact disc of two songs performed by Kenny Rogers but entry is under the composer of one of the songs. Attig said that this reinforces the question raised earlier about the proper place for the rules on primary access point. We can't base any decisions on the assumption that the primary access point is the only one to be provided. It does have a place in the rules, however, and it is important that we determine what that place is. Maxwell responded that except under these rules the only required access point is the primary access point, all else is optional. Yee said that the function of the primary access point is to identify the work quickly in displays of thousands of records. It is not a matter of denying access under other access points, but a matter of identifying this work in the best possible way. Allgood added that there is also the role in developing the citation. Weiss agreed and disagreed with Yee. It is not required to predetermine how large displays will be broken up. A lot of systems do this algorithmically. He questions whether we need to predefine how these files are going to be broken up or instead allow systems to configure them on the fly. He thinks primary access point is still important in determining how we want to refer to something else. And we may want to define one as a default for those systems that won't do anything else. We need to be clear about the purpose, it goes back to citation. To that end, 7.2 does not belong in Chapter 7. It is not about relationships; it is about identification; it is about how we formulate the citation. Randall said that he likes Weiss's emphasis on identifying. The focus should be on what's most useful when looking at a record in its barest form. The primary access point may have to be dependent on the manifestation. Myers wondered, in the context of the order of Chapters 6 and 7, whether the determination of access points ought to be first in the rules. This suggestion was not met favorably.

- ▪ Attig observed that citation serves not just identification, but also collocation. Therefore it is risky to base it too much on individual manifestations. Weiss disagreed, saying that there are multiple ways to collocate and that they do not have to be predefined.

Larsgaard thanked everyone for participating, announced the next day's meeting in the same venue and adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

Saturday, June 24 2006 — 1:30–5:30 p.m.
Marriott, LaGalerie 2

958. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Mary Larsgaard opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. She welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors. She noted that Bowen and Tillett would have to leave at 3:15 p.m. for the RDA forum and provided other details on the order of the meeting.

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

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

960. Adoption of agenda: Chair
[CC:DA/A/54]

Larsgaard called for a motion to adopt the agenda. Two changes were made. Agenda item 8 (break) will be only 15 minutes and items 10 and 9 will be reversed in order. Attig moved to approve the agenda as modified and Mangan seconded the motion. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted.

961. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2005 Midwinter Meeting, San Antonio, Texas, January 20, 21, and 23, 2006: Chair
[CC:DA/M/930-953]

Larsgaard called for a motion to approve the minutes incorporating the corrections received previously and discussed here. Attig moved to approve the minutes and Mangan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

962. Report from the Chair
Chair's report on CC:DA motions, January–May 2006:
[CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/6]

This report covers motions from January 24, 2006 to May 31, 2006. Larsgaard thanked the group for all the hard work between Midwinter and Annual. This report is to comply with CC:DA procedures to confirm email votes by a motion and vote at the next meeting.

- A. Constituency review of RDA Part I draft, motion to authorize a response, passed 3/20/2006 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

- B. Persistent identifiers and URLs, motion to authorize a response, passed 3/23/2006 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

- C. RDA Part I Internationalization, motion to authorize a response, passed 3/24/2006 (5 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

D. Family names, motion to authorize a response, passed 3/27/2006 (5 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

E. GMD/SMD Working Group: Proposal for content and carrier terms in RDA, motion to authorize a response, passed 3/28/2006 (5 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

F. Revision proposals and Rule revision proposals relating to technical description of digital media, motion to transmit the report of the TF on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media, passed 3/29/2006 (5 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

G. Charge and roster of Task Force on the Review of ISBD(A), motion to form the TF, passed 4/6/2006 (6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

Other Actions by CC:DA during this time period:

A. Draft of RDA, Part I. (January through late March): CC:DA members and represented groups commented on the draft and associated documents. Non-CC:DA members also commented on the draft via a Web form. Attig, Bowen, Larsgaard, and Myers worked to compile responses. Bowen, Attig, Allgood, Suzuki, Théroux, and De Groat wrote or drafted the ALA responses on the draft and associated documents.

B. TF on Technical Description of Digital Media reported out several recommendations, to wit:
   1. Formalize "File Format" as a data element within the Technical description
   2. Formalize "File Size" as a data element within the Technical description
   3. Apply "Duration" to digital media
   4. Move "Disk and tape characteristics" from Other technical details to Notes on other technical details
   5. Retain "Digital representation of graphic images" as a separate element
   6. Generalize the instructions for recording "System requirements"

C. TF on the Review of ISBD(A) reported its comments on the draft.

D. Groupware implementation: Laura Smart is taking a lead role in the migration of CC:DA committee communications from Confluence to Groupware.

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

Regarding Groupware, Smart reported that it currently does not seem to meet CC:DA's needs in terms of version control and archival control. The intention is to review workflows in light of the abilities and downsides of the Groupware software. Larsgaard expanded upon Smart's statements underscoring that the group would continuously need a working software but that the transition to the Groupware was advisable.

Mangan noted that she was bothered by approving a response before the response was drafted. Attig reminded the group that this was in keeping with its history of reviewing a proposal, discussing it, and then authorizing the JSC rep to write the response. Discussion on the development and posting of the response ensued. Attig raised a concern about the ISBD(A) Review TF and its report, whether there was a separate vote to accept the report, to which the Chair replied that, in consultation with CC:DA's parliamentarian, it had not been deemed necessary when the TF was set up.

963.   Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part I: Bowen
[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2006/1]
[Outcomes of the April JSC meeting]
[Strategic plan for RDA, 2005–2008]
[*5JSC/Policy/3/Rev*: Inclusion of terms in the Glossary]
[*5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapters 6 & 7*, addendum and cover letter]

Bowen referred to her written report on the April 2006 JSC meeting. The following action items were noted in it:

- Review other JSC constituency responses to the draft of Part I to identify those with which ALA might wish to disagree or which warrant further discussion. (Deadline, July 28)
- Develop a citation list of specialist cataloging standards and/or manuals. (Deadline, July 31)
- Comments (not an official response) on an RDA Editor discussion paper on mode of issuance. (Deadline dependent on date of issuance)
- Response to forthcoming RDA instructions 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2 (Instructions issued by August 7. Response deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to revised ACOC proposal on URLs [5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev]. (Deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to revised LC proposal on Internationalization [*5JSC/LC/5/Rev*]. (Deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to the draft of RDA Part A-II
    - o Comments in Confluence by August 14
    - o Agree/Disagree phase complete by August 21
    - o Response deadline Sept. 18
    - o Potential new proposals due by August 7
- Response to the Appendices Working Group report. (Deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to new LC proposal on Breton initial articles [*5JSC/LC/7*]. (Deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to forthcoming ACOC proposal on Maori initial articles. (Deadline, Sept. 18)
- Response to new LC proposal on Bible headings [*5JSC/LC/8*]. (Deadline, Sept. 18)

The following items were noted as warranting particular attention in the new draft:

- Family names – examine for the influence of *5JSC/LC/6*.
- Primary access for performers (7.2) – examine for workability as it replaces the AACR2 rules for main entry for sound recordings.
- Chapter 7, special rules – further evaluate recommendations from *5JSC/Chair/5/Rev* in light of the RDA structure.

In opening discussion of her report, she outlined her overall report and added that she will only touch briefly on the Draft of Chapters 6–7.

Mangan raised an issue with the statement of purpose addressing "comprehensive set of guidelines" when the JSC is referencing the need for further manuals. Bowen replied that the JSC acknowledged ALA's earlier concern, but RDA overall is meant to be comprehensive.

The JSC approved making many more working documents public. [Applause] The PDFs are available publicly; the Word documents, with cross references, are still under password protection.

RDA Lite is not ruled out, but does not seem feasible under the current timeline. The JSC would like further feedback from metadata communities on how they would use it. Allgood asked, "Didn't part of this concern about generating an RDA Lite come from our discussion about how other metadata communities would use RDA, and that something like this would be more attractive to them than something as dense and library centric as RDA is going to be?" Bowen replied in the affirmative and also noted concerns about pricing. Allgood asked whether we have a mechanism to approach these groups.

Weiss suggested having the JSC ask Beacom to identify communities with whom to do outreach, and assigning the IEEE and DCMI representative to consider this and report back?

The JSC met for five full days to review the constituency reviews of the draft and to work on parts II and III where the highest issues were addressed. The remainder of the comments on part I were put into a table for review by the JSC representatives as to relevancy and to points of agreement or disagreement. Bowen asked the group to review the other constituency responses to find points of major disagreement. There was discussion whether responses should go directly to Bowen or the entire list. Attig noted that the table would probably be posted and could inform the group's efforts.

The JSC discussed at length our concerns about the relationships between data elements. Bowen feels that the results addressed our concerns. Weiss and Allgood approved. Attig responded to an issue raised by Allgood, that the particular issue being addressed was "Works without a collective title". Weiss revisited some comments on Chapter 6 made at Friday's meeting that an "über-element" for relationship information be developed.

The JSC accepted our offer to put together a list of related and supporting manuals for other standards. Théroux asked if forthcoming standards were wanted. Bowen replied yes, if they would be out by 2008. A document has been set up in Confluence and suggestions should be submitted by July 31. Attig said that we should think widely and internationally. Weiss offered Jizba as IRRT representative to take on the international standards. Schmierer asked for more precision about what we think is appropriate to send forward in terms of supporting cataloging manuals. Bowen replied that the intention was to include accepted standards, not local manuals. Attig said that what he heard Schmierer ask is, "What is a cataloging manual?" Where are the boundaries to be drawn – cataloging and metadata broadly, cataloging manuals as content standards, or as guidelines for application? Weiss responded that we should submit everything and let the JSC sort out the details.

The JSC has provided some rationale for re-organizing RDA. Does anyone have any concerns about how the sections have been reorganized? Mangan asked about where rules from Chapter 6 are going to be incorporated back into Chapters 1–5. Weiss said the change from Parts I, II, and III to Parts A and B makes sense but that the organization of Chapters 2–5 is still not principle based. He favors Randall's comments that organizing by user task is not the most practical since some elements apply to multiple user tasks. It would be better to organize according to the Group 1 entities. If we're going to organize by user tasks however, we should do so consistently. Bowen acknowledged his comment but noted that further reorganization is unlikely. However, if ALA feels strongly about this, we could still put this forward in the ALA response. Randall is not sure what doesn't work with the current sequencing. Any element can serve any FRBR user task. Weiss feels that structure is important and will be harder to change later. Bowen replied that any further re-organization will affect the schedule. Allgood also expressed deep concern about structure and underlying principles, on his own behalf and the behalf of several others, both members and non-members of CC:DA. Bowen asked what organizing structure he favored. He replied that the drafts seem only loosely to follow the Principles and Objectives document. Agreeing with Weiss, he would rather see a delay to get things right. Weiss responded he is not convinced that re-organization would cause much of a delay. He outlined his vision for organizing along the lines of Group 1 entities. He would like to see the chapter scopes and titles be more useful in aiding the user of RDA to find a rule; they currently seem arbitrary. Maxwell questioned how an FRBR-ized, hierarchical record would be parsed out by the rules in the first part. Elements should be labeled as to their applicability to each Group 1 entity. Bowen thought that it might be able to accomplish this.

Allgood echoed Randall's sentiment that many of the rules we use in cataloging will further various user tasks. Schmierer said that what's being asked for here is a clearer articulation and relationship between the Principles and Objectives, the user tasks, and the rules. People are concerned that there will be a lot of "losing your way" in the final product. She suggested a table as one potential solution. Bowen said she would be happy to hear specific suggestions to make improvements. She suggested looking at

Chapters 6–7 for improvements there and extrapolating those solutions back to Chapters 1–5. Allgood affirmed that he wasn't calling for a complete reworking, but some further work seemed warranted. He raised the possibility that the introduction will resolve some of the issues also. Bowen replied that while the text of the General Introduction is not available, the Prospectus will list the topics. Weiss reported that he and Schmierer attended a meeting at ALA Editions with the prospective contractor, at which concerns about not losing one's way were brought up.

There were positive responses to Bowen's query about the additional numbering of paragraphs.

Bowen was satisfied with the JSC's response to the improved labeling options. This was echoed by members. Bowen added that Big Heads responded that they wanted options and modularity. They will need to discuss implementation of options however.

Regarding terminology, Weiss still disagreed. Glennan commented that we're seeing some awkward constructions. Bowen asked for specific changes in Confluence. Weiss said that it's not just in specific places, but it's a matter of the overall writing style, which is highly academic and not accessible. Attig said that specific examples will help illustrate our concern. Allgood said that we have been down this path before with AACR3. Weiss said that the accessibility of the text is also an issue for library educators.

The JSC received a lot of comments on mode of issuance but did not have an opportunity to discuss it, but the editor is writing a Discussion Paper that will offer suggestions for how those rules can be reorganized and to provide principles behind them. Randall asked if we will need to respond to it. Bowen replied that it is a Discussion Paper not a proposal. It will be distributed but there won't need to be a formal response. Discussion followed with the Chair assuring the Committee that the Discussion Paper would be a topic of interest for CC:DA and once issued would be a matter of discussion.

There were many comments regarding the mandatory/required aspect of data elements. The JSC will review all elements for this detail. The new draft of Chapters 6–7 shows this and it will be carried back into Chapters 1–5 and into 1.4 where the data elements are listed. There is not a document at this point. There are three elements that are always required: title proper; type of carrier; and primary access point. Then five other elements are required if applicable to the resource: statement of responsibility or an access point in lieu of it; edition statement; title proper in series; numbering within series; resource identifier. If they are present, then those elements are required. There are several other requirements for resources that have particular characteristics – for non-remote, non-digital resources, extent is required; for published resources, publisher and date of publication are required; for serials, earlier and later title variations and numbering are required; etc. Everything else is optional. Weiss liked how the labeling was incorporated into Chapters 6-7. This solves some of the problems raised the last time about aggregating sub-elements.

Regarding transcription issues, the JSC decided that certain elements will be labeled as transcribed elements, distinct from those that are non-transcribed. The verb "record" will indicate an element is not transcribed. This will simplify the application of abbreviations. These transcribe/record markers will be retrofitted into the previously developed chapters of Part I. This will also facilitate "take what you see."

Bowen referred the issue of numbers and numerals expressed as words to LC/5/Rev.

Regarding inaccuracies, the JSC continues to move toward "take what you see".

Regarding notes, ALA had many concerns about "Notes" and the many elements relegated to notes, and that in moving away from ISBD areas, these are not as much a concern. The JSC discussed these at length; some have been removed from the category of note, they are just an additional element. The results are more in line with what ALA was seeking.

Regarding sources of information, this topic is still on the table, since the JSC did not have time to discuss it.

Regarding content and carrier, the JSC had two efforts to examine replacements for the GMD/SMD. There was the GMD/SMD Task Force and there was work with the book publishing community (ONIX) to develop a consistent list of carriers. There will be a proposal from the editor to incorporate this underlying framework into RDA – media category, type of carrier, type & form of document. This proposal will be issued this summer and will need an ALA response. Mangan asked if it would only address books. Bowen replied that all media would be addressed. Weiss asked if the framework is to be an external framework, much like FRBR is. Bowen replied in the affirmative, that it would not be a practical tool for practicing catalogers. It will be the underlying framework. Attig said that they are close to finalizing it and it is worth looking at when it is made public. What is going into RDA will lie on top of it and relate to the categories and provide the terminology. Weiss greeted the news of a joint project with ONIX with enthusiasm. Schmierer asked, as a reciprocal enterprise, whether the publishers will agree to use RDA. Bowen replied that they are actually discussing that. Specifically, they are looking at our authority control structures to inform their work on controlling copyright.

Bowen updated the group on various Part I (now Part A) proposals:

- There will be a revision of ACOC/1 on URLs.
- Other constituencies will respond over the summer to the Digital Media TF report that we put forward.
- A revised Internationalization document was just issued. It will be reviewed at the Monday meeting.

There were other ALA comments on the Part I (now Part A) draft that were outside the scope of the ALA response. Bowen has put forth summaries to the appropriate groups.

Discussion of Chapters 6-7 (formerly, Part II), will continue on Monday. It is possible to propose rule changes. Bowen reminded the group that the deadline will come up quickly, however.

The Examples Group is continuing its work and the JSC is starting a second group to work on the remaining chapters as the first group needs to update earlier examples actively as the rules are revised. The Chair and membership of the second group will be announced shortly.

The Appendices Group has been formed. In order to expedite this work, the group is comprised of members who work together well and are geographically close. Attig reported that the group will specifically address Capitalization, Abbreviations, and Initial articles.

ACOC and CCC are developing draft mapping of MARC21 elements to RDA elements that the JSC will review. This should result in proposals to MARBI. Work will take place to map RDA to ONIX also.

Regarding the Glossary, there is a new policy document addressing which terms will go into the glossary. Unfortunately, a response is not requested, so we may comment in Confluence but there isn't a formal mechanism for feedback. Sally Strutt, the immediate past chair of the JSC, is reviewing the AACR2 glossary and the inputs to date.

The next JSC meeting is in Washington in the fall; there will be a few seats for observers.

964.   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. 2158.

Beecher Wiggins will be talking at the booth about cataloging at LC. She distributed and noted a brochure which outlines training materials for the Cataloger's Learning Workshop. LC has a user survey, please participate.

She noted the passing of Henriette D. Avram, developer of the MARC format.

The Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate is in the process of considering a reorganization of 7 divisions: 5 geographic, with the remaining 2 for Overseas Office Administration and for a combined Collaborative Programs, Standards, and Training (including CDS and CPSO).

There are additional resources that have been added under the Bibliographic Enrichment Activities Team (BEAT).

Karen Calhoun came to LC on 4/18 after submitting her report on the future of cataloging. LC managers are still reviewing the recommendations to see how to respond to them. This will be an on-going activity. Wiggins has just started to hold meetings.

There has been some concern about CIP sending out a survey, but in fact they do so at every five year anniversary. There are three separate surveys. The one for libraries and publishers is currently open for comment (and will close on August 18).

Tillett drew attention to the LC series decision and the forum on Friday. She thanked Rhonda Lawrence for her positive support of LC staff and Beacher Wiggins for standing up and claiming the decision for his own. Judy Kuhagan has updated all of the LCRIs that are affected by the change in the series authority decision.

A new resource has been developed by LC retiree Isamu Tsuchitani, *Descriptive Cataloging Guidelines for Pre-Meiji Japanese Books*, which she commends to everyone. It is available in PDF at http://www/loc.gov/catdir/cpso/premeiji.pdf.

Regarding the Unicode implementation, there are some special characters that are now enabled that were not available previously, including those for degrees, copyright, Euro, sharp, and flat. The British Library will begin its implementation on July 1. LC has some projects that will change things programmatically. There are ongoing discussions with OCLC about the Unicode implementation also. Weiss asked if the copyright symbol for the MARC tag 260, subfield c would be implemented. Tillett replied in the affirmative.

Tillett pointed out some pertinent statistics. Compared to last year, LC is ahead of where it was last year in a number of categories. The statistics reflect the efficiencies of some new software at pulling copy and at pulling metadata directly from the web.

MARC21 documentation has been converted to XML format. LC is looking at using XML to support the future output of all MARC documentation.

Larsgaard thanked Tillett for her report.

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

Randall reported that the TF has been working on identifying changes needed or desired in "Differences Between, Changes Within." The marked up copy of the print version was submitted to Christine Taylor of the ALCTS office. The TF is waiting for a draft back from the ALCTS office, now expected around the end of July. Then a deadline for final review will need to be established. He is uncertain what the resulting review, revision, and publication timeline will be. Larsgaard asked about the impact of the online version. Randall replied that it is meant to be a paper version with a PDF available online. It should be immediately available once everything is approved.

He reported the following lessons learned and recommendations from the process:

1. Before a full manuscript is given to ALCTS for publication, work with them ahead of time regarding the layout of the final product.
2. A proof needs to be thoroughly read by the authors.
3. Ensure that all formats in which the document will be issued appear the same. There are three formats for DBCW, but the page numbering ended up changing between them. There were extraneous pages for notes inserted into the print version.

Randall asked what further was needed from the TF. Larsgaard replied that the TF should keep the Chair informed of progress and to consider publicity efforts.

Allgood wondered how the "version creep" can be avoided in RDA, since it will similarly be issued in various versions. Attig responded that is part of the Principles and Objectives document and the JSC will be addressing it.

Schmierer reported problems with printing the PDF. She urged that all the "bells and whistles" be taken out of the PDF to preclude those problems. Randall replied that would be the case. Schmierer further reported that there were rumors that there would not be a print RDA. Voices around the table refuted this. She replied that she only wanted to inform the committee of the persistence of the misconception.

Larsgaard thanked Randall for his report and the TF for its work.

966.   Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Landesman

Landesman reported on the following standards:

- Z39.71 Holdings Statements for Bibliographic Items – a re-ballot was conducted, ALA voted yes, standard passed;
- Z39.87 Data dictionary for Technical MetaData for Digital Still Images – a re-ballot was conducted, ALA voted yes, standard passed.

Further, NISO formed a Technical Committee to create guidelines for best practices for the use of RFID, chaired by Vinod Chachra, CEO of VTLS, Inc.

She reported on the following ISO standards, noting that representatives do not actually vote, rather NISO votes instead based on the representatives' input:

- ISO 832:1994 Bibliographic Description and References
- ISO 3901:2001 International Standard Recording Code (ISRC)
- ISO 10444:1994 International Standard Technical Report Number (ISRN)
- ISO 15701:2001 International Standard Musical Work Code (ISWC)

These were up for their 5-year review. The ISRN standard was recommended for withdrawal because the registration authority had resigned and due to general lack of use. The others were recommended for confirmation.

- ISO/FDIS 3166-1 Codes for the Representation of Names of Countries and Their Subdivisions, Pt. 1, Country Codes
    Final Draft prior to publication; comments and recommendations due June 27, 2006.

- ISO NWI 27729 International Standard Party Identifiers (ISPI)
    A new standard to define specifications for parties (persons and corporate bodies); comments and recommendations due June 29, 2006.

Ahead is the ISSN standard revision. Comments due by October. ISO DIS 3297. The term "medium neutral ISSN" has been replaced by "ISSN" and "ISSN-L."

Lastly, regarding the status of NISO, she does not have much new information. She reported to the ALCTS Board at Midwinter. She referred to the Roy Tennant report that made recommendations in how NISO conducts its operations. The ALCTS Executive Committee discussed the "NISO question" at its April meeting. They spoke to Lynn Bradley of the Washington Office who in turn intended to discuss it with Rick Weingarten of ALA's Office for Information Technology Policy. They are now waiting on Lynn Bradley to report back to them before proceeding.

NISO has changed its mission statement. It now reads, "NISO fosters the development and maintenance of standards that facilitate the creation, persistent management, and effective interchange of information so that it can be trusted for use in research and learning." The NISO Board will present a set of proposed changes in its by-laws and operating procedures to its membership in 2006. What that translates into is presentations at this conference by the NISO Framework Committee in sharing its work on shaping a new standards program. These are at AVIAC meeting yesterday and the NISO Standards Roundup tomorrow.

Schmierer asked about the ISPI document, since IFLA has been working on approaches for an international, cooperative, cumulative authority file, and whether IFLA has made any comment on the document and its impact on international authority files. Landesman hasn't seen anything yet, but she is only notified if input is required from NISO. Schmierer asked whether the ISO document noted the committee members. Landesman didn't have it at hand, but it could be provided after Annual.

Larsgaard announced the next meeting on Monday 8–12:00, and adjourned the meeting at 3:54 p.m.

Monday, June 26, 2006 — 8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.
Marriott, LaGalerie 2

967.   Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

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

968.   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.

A company was hired to produce just the prototype for the RDA in order to get a better idea of what the costs might be. A follow-up meeting was held with them to discuss costs for further work. Weiss and Schmierer were invited to Chicago to review the algorithms and contribute to the discussions. The prospective publishers realized that they did not have enough information to provide a good estimate, but they were able to give a ballpark figure that Chatham described as "not as much as I had feared." The next step is to request bids for the job. ALA Publishing Services wants to track the implementation process to determine how well the online product is working out, etc.

Chatham reported that they are continuing to talk to "the market." They've arranged for meetings while at Annual with a number of vendors, including OCLC, ExLibris, RLG, Endeavor, VTLS, Sirsi/Dynix, and LC, and are hoping to set something up with III. In addition, Chatham has met with the Big Heads and Medium Heads, and has invited them to the ALA studio for a demonstration of the prototype, and to talk with them about it. Staff and Marjorie Bloss sat in with the tables at Medium Heads to discuss how we communicate from a sales perspective with each of these market sectors. Chatham is also talking to the

public library community, including several libraries in the New Orleans area, and has a meeting scheduled with a large public library in Chicago.

ALA Publishing is also talking with other publishers of traditional print products who made the conversion to an online product – such as the University of Chicago Press with the *Chicago manual of style* – to explore common issues. They are working for simultaneous release of the print and online products. Troy Linker has also begun to address the issue of how to refer to the print product. RDA is a suite of products. The online product will be used to produce the other products. As work proceeds with the content, it will be prepared for both an online as well as print output, and it will be designed so that it remains feasible to produce both. The main concern about the print product is the format, for which they are in the process of developing a design, working with constituents and stakeholders to do so.

Chatham indicated that there is still a lot of work to do, including developing an RFP to send to vendors for cost estimates. They are still far away from having specific pricing information, although there is nothing so far that suggests that the final print product will cost anything more than what we currently have [i.e., AACR2 in the binder]. "We hear you. We were at the RDA Forum yesterday and the question came up, as to how many of you would still like a print product, and over half of the audience indicated that they would – so we hear you and we will make that happen. We still have a lot of confidence in the online product. People acknowledge the value of the online version and its desirability. It lends itself to an online format and we have nothing at this point to suggest that the end product will be anything other than a desirable product."

Hall asked if there are pricing options for purchasing in a network context. Chatham replied that they are looking at a variety of pricing structures. This is an important issue for systems – public and academic consortia.

Attig said that the committee is also interested in the editorial process for maintaining the product and whether that is being included in the specifications. Chatham replied that they are definitely reviewing that. It will be part of the cost structure. They currently are debating the scheduling of the updates – quarterly, annually, biannually.

Allgood asked about the existence of a demo of the online version. Chatham replied that it is available in a Flash version at www.rdaonline.org. The demo has an option for screen resolution and audio or non-audio. The script is incorporated into the presentation. In addition, there is an online survey of 12 questions. Please revisit the demo and take the survey.

Ratkovich asked if it was permitted to pass the demo on to constituencies. Chatham replied that they want that. They want it open to as broad a group as possible. They'd like to know what is working and also what things are not relevant or desirable.

Weiss said that it would be important to receive alerts when changes have been made and to have the previous and current versions for training.

Larsgaard thanked Chatham for his report.

948. Report of the MARBI Representative: Allgood
[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2006/2 (preliminary)]

Allgood reported on the following:

Proposals:

    2006-06 – Definition of field 034 for geographic coordinates in the MARC 21 Authority Format: This paper proposes the addition of field 034 to authority records for geographic coordinates associated with places. This field would eventually form the basis for coordinates-based retrieval of all cataloged

records containing those geographic terms. Approved with minor changes. Will add subfields r, s, y, and 2.

2006-07 – Definition of subfield $u (URI) in Field 852 (Location) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats: This paper proposes the definition of subfield $u in Field 852 to contain a URI to link to information about the repository identified in $a and $b. It needs to be clear that the URL is for the depository, not the resource.

2006-08 – Addition of subfield $r in field 865 to accommodate date of issuance for indexes in the MARC 21 Holdings Format: This paper proposes a change to the MARC 21 Holdings Format to allow for compatibility with ONIX for Serials. It proposes the addition of subfield $r in field 865 for date of issuance for indexes when date of coverage is recorded in the 865 chronology subfields.

2006-09 – Lossless technique for conversion of Unicode to MARC-8: This paper specifies a lossless technique utilizing Numeric Character References for converting unmappable characters when going from Unicode to MARC-8 for systems that cannot handle Unicode encoding. It is intended to be an alternative to the lossy technique approved in 2006-04. The MARC Advisory Committee recommended that both a lossy and a lossless technique be officially adopted.

Discussion papers:

2006-DP04 – Data elements needed to ascertain copyright facts: This paper analyzes the information that would be needed in a MARC 21 record to be able to ascertain facts concerning copyright status. This would aid the user in making a reasonable judgment about what use is allowed of the resource, and is particularly important in the digital world where resources are accessed outside the context of the originating archive. It suggests using a single field to contain all copyright information, even if repeating other data somewhere else in the record, because of the complications. It will return as a second Discussion Paper, due to the issues it raises.

2006-DP06 – Defining separate subfields for language codes of Summaries/Abstracts and Subtitles/Captions in field 041 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic format: Currently, the language codes of summaries, abstracts, subtitles and captions are all contained in subfield $b of field 041 (Language code) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. At the June 2005 MARBI meeting, however, it was pointed out that coding the language of summaries and abstracts in the same subfield as the language of subtitles and captions provided ambiguous language information.

2006-DP07 – Recording set information for multipart cartographic materials: This paper explores the historical methods of recording information for multipart cartographic materials, identifies relevant item-specific information to record, and proposes several possible ways of recording the data using MARC 21 Bibliographic and/or Holdings Formats. This discussion is intended to lead to the establishment of standards for recording and sharing cartographic set data. It will return as a second Discussion Paper.

2006-DP08 – Techniques for incorporation of Former Headings into MARC 21 Authority Records: This paper discusses the incorporation of former heading information into MARC 21 authority records, in cases where the former heading might not be considered a valid or useful reference, to facilitate the locating of instances of the former headings in bibliographic records that may need to be corrected. Several techniques are discussed for supporting this requirement to hold former headings in authority records.

From the business meeting, MARBI received three reports of interest to CC:DA on:

- An ALCTS program, sponsored by MARBI, being developed for the 2007 ALA Annual Conference on the MARC Content Designation Project conducted by Professor Bill Moen at the

University North Texas School of Library and Information Sciences. The proposed title is: "The Future of MARC: An Empirical Approach."
- An update on the current state of *Resource Description and Access (RDA)* from Jennifer Bowen.
- The ongoing transition of the German and Austrian libraries to the MARC format by the Deutsche Bibliothek.

Larsgaard thanked Allgood for his report.

970. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2, Discussion of the draft of Part A-II of RDA: Bowen
[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2006/1]
[*5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapters 6 and 7*, addendum and cover letter]
[*5JSC/LC/5/Rev* (Internationalization)]
[*5JSC/LC/7* (Breton initial articles)]
[*5JSC/LC/8* (Bible uniform titles)]

Bowen outlined the plan for proceeding – the first three LC proposals, then RDA Chapters 6–7.

5JSC/LC/5/Rev (Internationalization)

Tillett reported on *5JSC/LC/5*; it was previously released and updated recently for the rule renumbering in RDA. They also changed to accommodate RDA changes in transcribe and record. She reported further specific changes in the written proposal:

- added section F ("Proposed revision of 2.2.2: More than one preferred source of information")
- added section P ("Proposed revision of 3.5.0.4: Measurements") [applicable for countries that use measurements]
- added section Q ("Proposed revision of 7.9.5.1: Treaties, etc. between two or more national governments"; "Deletion of 7.9.5.2: Treaties, etc. between four or more governments"; and "Revision of 7.9.5.3:Agreements contracted by international intergovernmental bodies")
- added section R ("Proposed revision of 7.9.5.4 [renumbered as 7.9.5.3]: Agreements contracted by the Holy See")

Mangan noted that nothing was done to Chapter 4 regarding cartographic materials; scale and cardinal directions are still in English. Tillett replied that they would be happy to receive a proposal.

Weiss asked why the primary access point for treaties between two and three governments was being changing to title, rather than using the general rules. Tillett replied that it had appeared in an earlier proposal, and was more in keeping with international practice. Winzer asked if the law library community was consulted regarding the change for treaties. Tillett replied that it was but after receiving inconclusive feedback, LC went forward with this proposal. The law library community can provide subsequent feedback. Suzuki, Bowen, and Tillett discussed the process for international comment on the proposal.

Schmierer thought that section iv was no longer needed given the revision of 2.2.2.

Larsgaard provided preliminary details for using Confluence and the various levels of documents. She is aiming for a July 1 ready date for the Chapters 6–7 pages. There are 7-8 other documents for CC:DA review which she also will try to have ready by July 1.

Attig asked whether the comments at this meeting will be incorporated, or do members need to remember what they've said for re-inclusion in Confluence? Larsgaard replied that the Interns were recording the general comments, which she would then incorporate into Confluence, but specific comments would be the responsibility of each member.

Weiss thought that a lot of material in the proposal is valuable, irrespective of the internationalization issues.

Allgood thanked LC for section E.

There was a question from the floor asking for the deadline on public comments. Larsgaard replied that the CC:DA deadline was 8/14, so the Webform deadline would be 8/7.

Schmierer expressed confusion about the document's use of "record" and "transcribe"; which is it meant to be? Tillett replied it should be "transcribe." Schmierer then noted that in section H, it specifies recording in Arabic style. Tillett acknowledged that it is misleading to have it under the heading "Transcription," but the element is actually a recorded element. Bowen observed that detail should be part of the ALA response and asked Schmierer to put it in Confluence. Allgood would also like further clarification of section H. Maxwell observed that it does seem opposite from the direction of the other documents. Bowen replied that the JSC decided this would be a non-transcribed element. Maxwell didn't see how this would help internationalization. Schmierer asked for further details on how the JSC came to the decision. Bowen and Tillett thought it was part of the ISBD agreement but the details would be recorded in the JSC minutes when they became available.

Bowen referred members to Confluence for commenting on the Breton articles proposal (*5JSC/LC/7*). She also alerted the group to a forthcoming proposal from ACOC on Maori articles.

5JSC/LC/8 (Bible Uniform Titles)

Bowen opened discussion on the Bible Uniform Titles proposal, *5JSC/LC/8*.

Weiss said this was a good follow on to 5JSC/LC/5, since it really addresses the issue of internationalization. We should go further. The initial discussion pages are great and we should follow those findings rather than just offer them as options. The Bible means different things in different places. For any other uniform title, we would deal with that with the addition of qualifiers and he doesn't see a reason to treat the Bible any differently. Attig observed that another problem with the options approach is that it would be very difficult to support within a single authority file. One would only be able to take advantage of the option if not already using an authority file that has made a decision on the issue. So, a qualified approach would be more feasible. Weiss especially likes the spelling out of the testaments; getting rid of abbreviations is a good thing. He asked for further explanation about the thinking behind eliminating the intermediary level of testament for the individual books. Tillett replied that some traditions don't have testaments but they do have the same name of the book.

Draft of RDA Chapters 6–7

Larsgaard outlined how discussion would proceed. First there would be a review of some comments from Friday, then a call for further general comments, then specific comments on Chapters 6–7, part by part. The Chair requested that for Chapter 7 comments, specifically for Law and Music, the representatives and specialists from those communities be given the lead in those comments. She then provided a recap of the comments from Friday.

General Comments on Chapter 6

Attig shared an issue in need of further discussion, specifically the scope of the chapter, and aside from the fact that the name is changed, why it doesn't include all relationships and why it's about the related work rather than about the item in hand. A better approach would be for it to address all relationships more broadly, in a more principled, more structured way. It should be discussing what is related rather than what you say when referring to it. In response, Randall suggested framing each section in Chapter 6 as "Relationship with …". Mangan reiterated her earlier concern about confusion between derivative and

source or reproduction and source, that when searching the term in a web based product, one will be led to the wrong place. The instructions are otherwise clear, but misdirection is a concern.

Randall further observed that all of the rules in Chapter 6 seem to be characterized as general guidelines, and asked if there are any special guidelines, as in sections of Chapter 7.

Schmierer asked Attig how the chapter might be titled or the information in it approached in order to address his concerns. Attig suggested it should be titled "Relationships," the taxonomy should be complete, and it should use the language in the literature. Weiss clarified that it can't just be relationships, since Chapter 7 involves relationships, it should rather be "Relationships with other Resources." Hillmann said that if at some point or another we will be able to use more linkages rather than text to make relationships explicit in our records, then that is what is important – it is the relationship that we express. She questioned what the ultimate goal of the draft text was in that regard. She hoped that we will ultimately be linking between the two related items rather than dealing with embedded text. The same is true for Chapter 7. We ought to start thinking that way rather than about parsing text, etc. "It's not about how you word the note to express the relationship, but the fact that the relationship is supposed to be expressed at all." Maxwell said that he had the same confusion expressed by others with respect to whether one is dealing with the item in hand or the reciprocal item of the relationship. Also, there is an implication that the reciprocal recording is not optional. Bowen asked how it could be made more clear and whether he was suggesting leaving out the reciprocal relationship altogether. Mangan suggested keeping the source and derivative instructions together, so that it would be possible to see clearly which rules were applicable to the item in hand.

Tillett observed that the group focused on 6.6.2 during Friday's meeting, but there is also 6.6.1.2, which she thinks is clear. Weiss said that everyone needed to think about it to come up with clearer wording. Schmierer addressed Attig's comments and offered solutions. Schiff did not see a problem with "may". All elements are optional, so certain communities will decide one way or the other whether to record them reciprocally. Attig agreed with Hillmann. He feels there is too much concentration on what you do, when the emphasis should instead be on identifying the nature of the relationship.

Weiss said there is duplication of contents relationships in Chapters 1–5, when it should be concentrated in Chapters 6–7. Bowen replied that the JSC is working on moving it to Chapter 6. Weiss noted however that the addendum still has it in Chapter 4.

Weiss asked if Bowen or Tillett could address why primary access point is in Chapters 6–7 rather than in part B. Is RDA moving in a direction further from AACR2, in that the important aspect of the primary access point is to have one, where the actual choice is less important, hence the simplification? Bowen replied that the intent is to have the selection more principle based.

Glennan observed that in comparing Chapter 6 with the addendum to Chapter 4, she thought Chapter 6 may be more formal but there is a lot of overlap of relationships in noting bibliographic history. She asked if there is an effort to bring these things together. Hillman replied that it's a time relationship. Glennan observed that perhaps the examples are throwing off perception of the scope of each chapter. Bowen asked if we need to comment on it, or should the examples group address it? Weiss said that it's more than examples. Bowen asked if we are saying that any recording of bibliographic history be addressed as a relationship. Weiss said that he wouldn't put any publication data in Chapters 2–5; instead placing it in Chapter 7 as part of the relationship to the corporate body. We need to decide which relationships are special enough to go in Chapters 6–7, and which are unimportant enough to go in Chapters 2–5. There needs to be a principle about where to find the information.

Mangan observed that there never was a section on relationships before; the relationships were embedded throughout the text. In the draft, some of them have been pulled out and put here and others have been put elsewhere. They all need to be drawn out and placed in Chapter 6. Starr said that the discussion has clarified some issues for him. Chapter 6 is about description and access but there are times when you just

want to describe the relationship without dealing with the access points. Schiff observed that many of the examples seem to be option d), the informal reference. He cited page 6-28, where several relationships are "mish-mashed" together.

Allgood revisited the comprehensiveness of the taxonomy, citing Tillett's thesis and Smiraglia's book.

Schiff noted that in the Appendix under "contents," there are different treatments of contents notes, some of which reflect aggregate/component relationships, but others that are not specified. Bowen replied that she thought the editor was trying to make a distinction there, to which Weiss replied that he thought it was an artificial distinction.

Yee raised a further situation of mixed authorship that is not addressed, that of a modification of a pre-existing work that is also a performance. There are two different places to look, neither of which provides adequate direction. There needs to be direction on priority of application. Attig responded that it was an important point to be addressed in some detail, but one to take up under discussion of Chapter 7 and the entire issue of mixed responsibility.

Bowen sought clarification on some relevant rules from the Addendum, that the rules under 4.7, Context and 4.10, Bibliographic history, should be moved to Chapter 6. Larsgaard summarized that what has been said is that it would be more logical and easier if all the relationships are dealt with in one area of the text. Attig countered that it could be argued that it is useful to have all the elements dealt with in one place. Maxwell suggested that cross references would address that. Glennan said that she was hesitant to make a recommendation without a full amended text of the previous draft to put these rules all in context. Hillmann said that what has surfaced is a principle. The group sense was that further review and consultation with constituencies was needed.

Bowen returned to the Addendum, establishing that 3.22, 4.7, and 4.10 should be moved to Chapter 6. Weiss also suggested 5.6, but others thought it was better positioned in Chapter 7.

Attig raised another general issue, that the duplication seems to be repeating the specification for the techniques at each relationship. He recommends separating the techniques from the description of and decision process for the relationships.

Allgood restated the issue of readability. Weiss said the text is not "accessible."

Specific comments on 6.0

Larsgaard observed that many of the general comments had already addressed purpose and scope.

Specific comments on 6.1

Attig asked if, after the general comments on the techniques as a whole, there were comments on individual techniques?

Glennan called the text at 6.1.2.3 a "reality check" but was surprised to see it in the rules. Weiss shared some confusion at the purpose of this rule.

Weiss observed that there are 5 categories of techniques, but several can be collapsed to identifiers, access points, and descriptions. Schiff sought clarification of 6.1.4.0, asking about the retention in the example of initial articles in the access point. Bowen replied that it is a detail for the Examples Group. Schiff continued, asking if in 6.1.7 with the ISSN coming before the title, is it a principle issue or an example issue? There were several reminders that the examples were not under discussion and would be referred to the Examples Group.

Randall identified the footnote to 6.1.6.0.1b, as another source of confusion. Larsgaard suggested that it went back to the readability issue. Bowen asked for suggested simplifications. Randall quipped that he

would once he figured out what it was trying to say. Hillmann observed that the footnote seems to be trying to say that the convention is not to pick one and only one, but that they can be used in combination. She suggested that could form part of the discussion of how to use the conventions. There was general agreement that this would be advisable.

Rhonda Lawrence suggested that, as a principle, footnotes be avoided if at all possible. Either the text is sufficiently germane that it should appear in the main text, or is otherwise of interest but can be placed in an appendix. This is another instance of the academic style issue.

Hostage said that he doesn't feel the text in 6.1.3 and elsewhere, "or by using an encoded value for the relationship," is necessary. This is just a technique. The important aspect is the description you are creating. This can then be implemented in different ways. The back-door reference to MARC values doesn't seem necessary. Weiss agreed that it belongs in the Introduction rather than the rules.

Kristin Lindlan observed that in 6.1.3.0.2, the referenced rule (6.1.4) does not address the case of serials cataloged under previous rules. There was general disagreement that this was a rule issue, but more of an implementation concern. Weiss suggested simplifying the text there and requested Lindlan to submit her concern for the CONSER comments. Randall said that the instructions should not be driven by the citation forms of earlier standards. Hillmann thought if you define something that is not in accord with the formal statements of the current rules, then it by default is an informal statement. Schmierer observed that there is a terminological change that is necessary to keep in mind when reviewing these rules. There is a distinction between *access point* and *controlled access point*, which is a powerful change. *Access point* gives the cataloger much broader leeway to describe and provide access as best as possible.

Specific comments on 6.2

Mangan reiterated the recurring concern of using the term being defined within the definition, or scope in this case. She recommended incorporating the "i.e. text" into the scope rather than using it within parentheses.

Schiff was concerned that the conditions placed on the use of the informal reference at 6.2.1.2.1d.1 would significantly reduce the occasions when one can use a contents note. Bowen replied that was not intended and asked for new suggested text. There was further discussion on the best approach to resolve this.

Lawrence asked where recording earlier and later titles of integrating resources is described in this section. Several replied that 6.10 addressed those rules.

Hillmann was concerned that the options did not adequately discuss or address the implications of their utilization. Without such discussion, there was the possibility of a proliferation of textual notes that cannot be manipulated by machine. There would be benefit in identifying a principle that says, "use the most unambiguous and easily machine-manipulable technique." Randall said that regarding instructions to use the most easily manipulable, he thought a direction to use the technique most appropriate to the context in which the record will be used would be appropriate. Glazier observed that we should not confuse the encoding and machine readable implementation of any of these techniques. There is nothing per se to prevent them from being machine encoded. They all have current MARC equivalents, which may change as MARC and RDA are reconciled, but this is not relevant.

Mangan reminded the group that our first recommendation was that there are too many options – they resolve to either an access point or a strictly descriptive technique. It is not necessary to go through the various descriptive techniques when we've already condensed the instruction to "use an access point or a description of the relationship." To which others added, "or both." Trying to sort out when to use "embedded description" vs. "informal reference" diverts energy from our main point.

Schiff agreed with Hillmann that in an ideal FRBR world, where we can identify and control all of the various component parts, the first 3 options would be best, but that would be cost prohibitive. Starr

asked, if in formulating the principle of description and access, is it citation that is muddying the waters in trying to combine both. There were replies of "no." There were various comments and further discussion, after which Weiss agreed with Starr but the issue remained unsettled.

Specific comments on 6.3

Weiss said that it's the inherent relationship issue that needs to be dealt with.

Specific comments on 6.4

Weiss commended the JSC or the editor on the language here, in the use of "source" vs. "original," since a lot of reproductions don't necessarily derive from the original.

Schiff observed that the scope is text-based; there are other kinds of reproductions, which are covered later in the rules, but should be acknowledged here.

Culbertson said that the definition of "reproduction" in 6.4.2 is too broad. She has wording for Confluence.

Jean Altschuler contrasted the scope of 6.4.0.1.1 on Source/Reproduction relationships with that of 6.2.0.1 on Aggregate/Component relationships, where in the former the order of terms in the scope is flipped from the order of the terms in the heading for the relationship. There were contrasting opinions expressed about the importance of consistency and clarity.

Attig reminded the group that it was specifically asked to review the alternative at 6.4.2. Weiss replied that he wasn't sure what the difference was between the main rule and the alternative. Other responses are referred to Confluence.

Specific comments on 6.5

Randall asked if there should be an indication in the scope at 6.5.1.1 of what is not a related format and hence belongs in another relationship. For example, a cassette version vs. a CD version with bonus tracks; is this a format/format relationship? Weiss thought that was a general comment on the need to define the relationships more fully.

Schiff observed that the scope notes at the beginning of this and the succeeding section are almost identical. This may be necessary due to format but it is not satisfactory. This also was felt to be a general comment.

Ann Sitkin said that the format/format relationship is too restrictive in limiting by publisher. There was agreement from several voices.

Specific comments on 6.6

Maxwell said that the cataloger doesn't need to agonize over the nature of the relationship, as the techniques are the same. It would be preferable to offer the types of relationships as examples of such, but the specific relationship doesn't have to be identified in order to use the techniques. Weiss agreed that energies shouldn't be over-expended on the types of relationships but there are times when it is worthwhile to indicate the nature of the relationship between two resources.

Mangan took issue with the scope of 6.6.2 because "derivative" covers revisions, but if the revision has a new title, then it is to be treated as a successor. She would expect revisions to fall under Edition/Edition relationships, although as currently written that relationship is limited to simultaneous editions. Myers said that Mangan's comment spoke directly to Maxwell's observation about wasting time on identifying the nature of the relationship. Maxwell clarified that he didn't mean that distinguishing between the types

of relationships is never important, just that it isn't always important and so perhaps the rules could indicate when those occasions might be.

Specific comments on 6.7

Weiss said that accompanying material is being handled inconsistently. Larsgaard agreed.

Specific comments on 6.8

Mangan said that there are more relationships between editions than merely between those that are simultaneous. Hillmann asked if to a certain extent the issues with the edition/edition relationship and its permutations are similar to the format/format relationship, in the sense that it's the vertical aspect of the relationship rather than the horizontal that is important? Weiss compared format/format to a manifestation level difference, with edition/edition to an expression level difference. Schiff had a problem with "same time" and referred to an LCRI that defines "simultaneous" as occurring in the same year. Weiss responded that there are thoughts to recommend removing the "same time/simultaneous" condition. Attig expressed disappointment at seeing "edition" added to the rules, as the definition of the concept of edition is difficult to reconcile with FRBR.

Specific comments on 6.9

Weiss thought the whole section should be removed; it is a specific example of aggregate/component relationship which is addressed elsewhere. Randall said that some of the examples appear more like a subscription relationship, where the resources just happens to arrive together in a plastic wrapper.

Specific comments on 6.10

Randall referred to the scope of 6.10.1.1.2, which restricts preceding resources with respect to edition, to those issued under a different title. He asked how the situation is to be dealt with when there is no title change. Weiss said that it's not conceptually sound. Maxwell asked if it was a carryover from AACR.

Weiss said that the definitions are absurd; they are circular references.

Mangan offered a general comment that she took these to be mutually exclusive relationships, but there seems to be overlap between some of them. Getting back to Maxwell's point, there are resources with multiple relationships, even with the same other resource. Providing general instructions at the beginning of the chapter, and then describing the kinds of relationships may improve that. She felt that the material repeated in the predecessor/successor section was an attempt to maintain the "serials language."

Randall repeated the sentiments of others that he didn't see much distinction in the instructions for the techniques. He recommended eliminating the current structure and replace it with just the techniques and a list of possible relationships.

Specific comments on 6.11–6.13

Larsgaard asked for some primacy to the comments from specialists here, which was misunderstood by several members. She clarified that, while everyone could comment in Confluence, she thought that the specialists' comments might be most productively shared during the committee's face-to-face meeting time.

Weiss said that small libraries have all of these kinds of materials and don't necessarily treat them as they are treated by specialist communities. We should make sure that the rules support both the needs of specialists and these small libraries.

Weiss drew attention to a relationship not previously covered, that is developed in 6.11, the "companion" relationship – for example, music that is then given text, music that is then given choreography – like illustrative plates applied to a text or a teacher's manual. Attig asked if the non-musical examples Weiss offered were of the "adjunct" variety. Weiss thought that they did seem more like those covered by 6.11.

Glazier said that while the concept of "performance" is addressed in Chapter 7, he wondered if the relationship here was between the resource of the performance and the resource representing the work being performed. Tillett replied that it was an inherent work/expression relationship that we need to make explicit.

Hillmann offered that it might help, in light of large changes that have been suggested, to generalize those particular special community relationships and then determine if they are necessary. If we end up using a different taxonomy of relationships and are able to extend them or change how these relationships are defined, these might better be addressed at that time.

Mangan thought that previous discussions in CC:DA were that these are not necessary. It is now the responsibility of the specialists to convince us that these are special, different relationships, not previously covered, and hence need to be retained.

Glennan reminded the group that the Music Library Association wrote a response last summer to Chapter 21 simplification and proposed some simplifications and rearrangements. Her thoughts, without prior consultation with the Association, are that these were in AACR because these questions come up and need to be addressed. The most important thing is that the text addressing these situations be preserved somewhere; examples alone may not be sufficient. Jizba said that it didn't matter where in the rules they were located as long as they were there.

Schmierer said that what is being dealt with in these special rules is "1 or 2 degrees off" of the categories that have already been discussed. Part of the reason is that the more general rules on relationships deal with resources, without addressing whether they represents a *Work*, *Expression*, or *Manifestation*. These special rules however address the situation of overlapping works; it is necessary then to come to a conclusion as to which work, which aspect will be dealt with first. From that point of view, some of them could be dealt with in a general statement but they have yet to be addressed by the preceding rules.

Mangan revisited a technique offered from the previous chapters of Part A, of labeling a format specific rule as such but retaining the text under the general rule. Weiss said it is more an organizing issue than a content issue. Larsgaard confirmed that was the consensus she was hearing.

Randall thought that the category in 6.11.4 seems too limiting in restricting its scope to dramatic works. Mangan said that it was a component to component relationship. Randall asked why it was limited to only dramatic works, when there are non-dramatic works to which it could apply.

Attig said that there would be virtue in a generic "Other" relationship category at the end, so that a cataloger wouldn't be left with a situation where none of the others apply and hence couldn't do anything. This would be less important under the reorganization that has been discussed which focused on the techniques, but it would still be advisable. Weiss amplified on this, that an "Other" category could address situations where a cataloger was uncertain as to the exact nature of a relationship.

Weiss then asked if the situation of multiple relationships needed to be explicitly addressed or would they just be dealt with separately. Tillett said it depends on your taxonomy. Mangan observed that if you separate the techniques from the relationships, then it wouldn't necessarily matter how many relationships existed, one would merely apply the techniques repeatedly.

Attig said that a critical point is that we want to discuss an alternative taxonomy of relationships. He suggested that perhaps Bowen and Tillett could develop a high level strategy for putting this into our response.

General comments on Chapter 7

Larsgaard restated Friday's concerns regarding mixed responsibility and the definition of performance.

Hillmann presented a general comment, that it seemed that the attempt to find a generalized notion of primary access point was going to be contentious, because each compromise, old and new, results in winners and losers. It seems the chief reasons we want a primary access point are the issues of creating citations and sorting the display. To reflect the way the world is changing, she suggested that we drop primary access point and just have access points. Then define those access points in a manner that allows each community to formulate its own way of dealing with them. To that end, there would be an increased need to attach roles to these access points. This approach is in synch with internationalization efforts and the adoption of universal authority records. It will save a lot of hassle if we drop the primary access point. Weiss supported this, but several voices in the room did not.

Weiss shared an example, a collection of poetry that is spoken and with music composed for it. In a poetry collection the primary access point would be the poet but in a music collection the primary access point would be the composer. The context is important in determining how one wants to deal with the primary access point, in support of Hillmann's statements. Jizba responded that AACR1, in the introduction, referred to cataloger's judgment and the needs of the agency. It was lost somewhere, but it still pertains. We need a well defined discussion of the options.

McGarry said that many still need primary access point for collocation of the physical item and displaying citations. Machine manipulation is not the answer; you need to enter something in the first place for the machine to manipulate. There may be disagreement on the selection of the primary access point, but its function is still important.

Attig said that, to the extent that the primary access point is still justified, it is closely tied to the identifiers of works, which may not yet be adequately addressed in Chapter 7. Randall asked how one applies the techniques in Chapter 6, specifically citation, without primary access point.

Weiss largely agreed with McGarry regarding the functions of the primary access point, but is not sure there is a need to pre-coordinate it. He would prefer that time be spent in assigning role indicators rather than deciding on primary access points, with corresponding flexibility in the catalog. He agreed with Randall regarding need to refer to other resources since we don't presently have an adequate identifier system. So while he acknowledged the need for citations, he didn't fully agree that this necessarily requires a primary access point.

Mangan acknowledged that in a machine environment it's not necessary to have a primary access point but ultimately it would be necessary to identify which access point is to be treated as primary for a given context. From her experience using LC classification, the elimination of the primary access point, would result in an explosion of Cutters for titles beginning with "Map."

Starr agreed in theory with Hillmann, but noted that Weiss's example shows the weakness of it in practical terms. Will each library have to examine each record to determine if it fits their needs? If "main author" becomes a relator code, someone still has to make that decision.

Hillmann acknowledged the legitimacy of the difficulties raised. She thought the primacy of functions could be addressed through community profiles. It's not going to be perfect but it's not perfect today. Presently, you can't tailor the results to address how the user entered the search, with a hard coded primary access point. The NextGen Cataloging folks are orienting things towards what the user expects or is interested in, where we're still arguing for the cataloger's needs. This mindset we hold is going to get in the way of creating a cataloging code for the future and not for the past. We can cope with issues like citation, through the use of unambiguous identification, which admittedly we don't have completely now, but we've made a start. There are ways to complete a transition to that. We need to start looking at those rather than trying to figure out how to make what we've done in the past work for the future. There

are many things we know how to do well, let's do them with an orientation that is going to get us further. Glennan, in response to the comment about community profiles, said that we need to figure out if the community needs can be codified as clearly as that.

Randall said that the present work with primary access point is following a very long citation tradition, which he doesn't see as our place to change. We can't change the academic world's practices to meet our needs to formulate a cataloging rule. We aren't yet at a time where we can make this kind of drastic change. The technology won't support it for enough people.

Weiss liked the use of relator codes from Starr's and Hillmann's comments. He thought it would then make primary access point optional. For those agencies that desired it, primacy could be encoded. He cited Bowen's report from the Big Heads meeting, that they liked modularity, being able to use as much as you need. Relator codes would afford more flexibility. Schiff rather liked the idea of using relator codes, but thought that coding for primacy would be a nightmare with a multiplicity of codes for primacy under each function. Glennan reported that she assigns a lot of relator codes in her work, but they are all equal in value; there is no code for indicating primacy. This would be further complicated with a collection of multiple works, with a need to show primacy for each work. Starr said that Glennan's case was an example of why the community approach will not work; he would not assign relator codes for a musical work. He would provide access points, but they wouldn't be invested in the relator codes. Such records will then have to be re-examined by specialists desiring to use them. In contrast, they would accept entry under the composer of a musical score that is illustrated, because they realize that it is a score.

Schmierer said we are working on an application profile representing our best understanding of what our constituency would accommodate at this point. "We are, in the words of Roe Franklin, dealing with the 'trickle of the Renaissance'. It has informed our notions, in the West, of what constitutes authorship and responsibility for publications." She felt we have loosened many of our ideas, we are not nearly as restrictive in our rules as we used to be, but that a single day at the end of a conference is not the time to decide to throw out Charles Cutter and a few others, just because it seems like a big idea whose time has come. These things are organic and the rules may change, may broaden over time to adopt other approaches. But this is the application profile we have to go with now.

Yee said that we've had experience with a shared catalog environment in which we have work identifiers according to one set of rules. The software still can't work with them, can't adequately generate FRBR-ized displays, even with authority records to identify equivalent statements. Consequently, she has no faith in systems being able to deal with the situation in which we lack agreements on how to identify works and leave it up to individual institutions. Until we see evidence that systems people can understand what a work is, we need to retain our current means of identifying works to our users. [Applause from various quarters]. Hillmann replied that library systems can be unsatisfactory, but we shouldn't be defining our cataloging code in response to that.

Mixed responsibility

Attig observed that AACR2 distinguishes the case when you have multiple parties performing the same function, in which case you pick the first one. This is distinct from cases where they perform different functions. In one case the function of one is more important than others. The other case is the multiplicity of roles making it impossible to assign priority and therefore entry is under title. The complexity of these issues and assigning priority underlies much of the "case law" of Chapter 21. This is something we want to move away from. On the other hand there are some situations where there is consensus that priority should be assigned. We do need the concept of mixed responsibility, distinct from shared responsibility – you can't encompass it under a rule to "pick the first." We need to identify cases where you can identify a priority of functions and then the rest with mixed responsibility are entered under title.

Weiss suggested another possible principle, if you have an aggregate work with one party associated with all of the subworks, then that party might get primacy. He contrasted examples of popular music written by many but performed by one party versus music written by one but performed by several parties. In the former, entry should be under the performer, while in the latter, it should be under the writer. Attig agreed with the caveat that one must recognize that aggregate works are only a subset of those works covered by mixed responsibility.

De Groat said that this is closely tied to the performance issue. She cited the example of a concert video of The Police, with entry under the band. There are multiple parties involved from the composers of the individual songs being performed to the producer of the video. She also finds it really difficult to find a principle addressing where primary responsibility drops off. She offered an example of a video written, edited, and directed by someone, but contrasts the possibilities of an interview video with significant contribution by the interviewee vs. a documentary video with voiceover by the writer, but visual content still derived from another source vs. an abstract film. There would be a lot of hair splitting to draw the line here.

Larsgaard asked if this overlaps with what constitutes performance. [Agreement].

Schiff asked if an animation is a performance? If a documentary is a performance?

Glennan observed that a recording of a performance inherently is a mixed responsibility (unless one party does absolutely everything, from conception to performance to recording). Schiff latched onto this to remind the group that such instances do occur however. Jizba offered 7.7.3.1c) as a possible way to address the situation.

De Groat further provided the distinction between an individual simply pointing a camera to record a performance and to a crew of people making decisions about camera angles and lighting. Then there are differences between stage direction, recording that performance, and film adaptations of the original stage work, where the entire plot may have changed. How does a cataloger know and determine that the same work is being dealt with, being performed?

Weiss asked if Bowen or Tillett had any information from the JSC or indication of the feelings of the other constituencies. Tillett replied, "We just got it too."

Schmierer thought that if mixed responsibility is not addressed in Chapter 7, then it will devolve to relationship questions to be covered in Chapter 6. Weiss countered that the two chapters address Group 1 vs. Group 2 entities. Schmierer responded that it was not clear to her; looking at the language being used, when someone performs something, is that a case of two overlapping works together or is one an expression of the other? A comment yesterday was that *Work*, *Expression*, *Manifestation* are not as clearly delineated in these rules as they might be so that one might know where one's gaze might be directed. We are all reading into "resource" whatever way we feel serves us best for a given rule. A little more precision would be helpful. Weiss replied that such clarification belongs in Chapter 1 or the Introduction, not just in Chapters 6–7, as an understanding of *Work*, *Expression*, *Manifestation*, and *Item* are crucial to understanding the whole of RDA.

Myers said in terms of developing the taxonomy of relationships and in terms of relationships for mixed responsibility, there does seem to be a need for an undergirding examination of the relationships between the Group 1 entities to provide a better structure to lay out the rules that are be wrestled with. Attig replied that even when it's there it isn't always explicit, specifically the rules for modifications of works at 7.2.4–7.2.5. It was suggested to the editor that a way of cutting down the rules for modifications of works would be to distinguish between new works and new expressions of the same work. That effectively is the distinction between 7.2.4 and 7.2.7, but it doesn't say so. There are ways to make it clearer how these things relate to our conceptual tools, as Schmierer has suggested. Weiss said that

Chapter 7 is the least FRBR-ized. One of the ways it could be more conceptually grounded, in addition to the entities and attributes of the entities, there are attributes of relationships.

Mangan said that 7.3 has expanded greatly from AACR2, going from half a page to 4-5 pages, breaking out many functions that fundamentally have the same relationship to a work. Furthermore, the breakout is very text-centric.

Schiff said there are significant problems with the treatment of integrating resources. Rule 7.1.4.3 refers back to serials treatment that is not current practice for integrating resources, as integrating resources have a wider range of changes to address. Further, 7.3.8 addresses the addition of access points for later iterations, but there is no rule to provide for the addition of access points for earlier iterations.

Weiss reported discussion at the CONSER RDA Group, where 7.2.1.4 was discussed. The possibility was raised of dropping the entire rule here and instead relying on the general rule at 7.2.0.1.1. There wasn't complete agreement on this, but there was interest in seeing its implications developed. Lindlan said that serials catalogers agonize over this way too long. Is it of such great concern whether the journal of some association is entered under corporate body or title? Weiss reinforced Randall's comment that we should follow user citation practices and then cited the *Chicago manual of style* which devotes one sentence to it, "if they're responsible, use them just like a personal name." Lindlan further cited that case of the nature of a serial changing from being about the corporate body to being about other things. Maxwell observed that 7.2.1.4 limits the number of times you would have corporate main entry where the general rule would expand them. Weiss said that one advantage for serials with corporate body main entry is that there would be fewer times where a qualifier would be required. Yee said that it seemed absurd under AACR2 that the National Center for Health Statistics would not be responsible, be the author for the statistics it gathered and put forth. Corporate bodies are authors and we are denying reality if we say they aren't. [Scattered expressions of agreement] Attig asked Tillett if there is anything close to agreement in the international context on what should be entered under corporate body. Tillett replied that the statement of principles does not deal with main entry; while RDA covers description and access, it is not mandating main entry. Glennan made a general comment about a situation that comes up several times, one of which is at 7.2.8.5.1a.1, namely that the rule statement is awkward and results in entry under title if her reading is correct. If that is what it means and there are no other exceptions, then we should drop the flowery language and just state the instruction to provide title main entry clearly. Schiff indicated some other cases where this kind of language appears.

Larsgaard thanked all for their discussion contributions and shared some details how the comment pages would be structured in Confluence as well as the intended timeline for her to create them.

971.   Change to Rule 5.5B1, Extent of item for notated music: Glennan
[CC:DA/MLA/2006/1]

Glennan thanked Bowen for taking the proposal back to the JSC and the JSC for considering it. She shared some of the background on the development of the proposal. She noted that, while the cataloging group investigating this was unanimous, the broader community held a variety of viewpoints. Historically the music library community has applied dictionary definitions to distinguish between scores and pages of music. But this has been hard to apply, even by trained music catalogers. This is further a problem in that the rules don't really address the collected works of a composer with volumes of instrument-specific music, which we have described as volumes of music. The music community is still interested in distinguishing between the specific categories of scores, hence the move to frame pages of music under the rubric of "score." This is at some deviation from the ISBD. It was a challenge to develop a concise, functional definition and be able to distinguish between parts and full scores.

Weiss asked if this is a request to change AACR2, not RDA. Bowen confirmed it is being framed as a change to AACR2 for ease of citing the rule, since the text of RDA is in flux. There will be no further

updates to AACR2, so the resulting change will be folded into RDA. Weiss observed that the GMD/SMD are still being worked on. He found these to be curious as part of extent, since they are not different carriers. Starr expressed concern that this might open up a Pandora's box since in his community there have been requests for statements like "1 artists book" and "1 illustrated book" which are well known terms in his community but not others. Various members provided clarification that this would not add new terms, but would rather be removing one, "pages of music" and then generalizing an existing term. The ability to add pagination after the SMD was confirmed. There was discussion about some of the language in the definition. Minor amendments resulted in a final, FRBR compliant definition, "Score: a representation of music in graphical, symbolic, or word-based notation."

Weiss made a final observation that it will be important to distinguish between the definition and the amplifying explanatory text, to keep these distinct.

Maxwell moved to accept the amended proposal with a second by Mangan. 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, the motion passes.

972.   Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings and other business: Chair

Larsgaard reported that the Board meeting dealt nearly exclusively on the tactical plan for ALCTS, which for CC:DA primarily concerned programs, which are well in hand.

She asked the representatives going off CC:DA to work with their replacements and to continue to use Confluence to input comments in conjunction with the new representatives so as to provide continuity.

She recognized Ed Glazier. He reported that he is making his last appearance as RLG rep, since RLG is ceasing on Friday with its merger with OCLC. He has been here since June 1981 and has sat here most of that time with Glenn Patton who will soon be a co-worker. He said that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to represent the RLG in this capacity. It has been an interesting 26 years. RLG is glad to have had a seat at the table. [Standing ovation] Larsgaard responded that it has been CC:DA's honor to have him as a member.

Larsgaard reported on changes to the voting membership. Rotating off are Jay Weitz and Mary Lynnette Larsgaard. She shared an anecdote of instructors observing Weitz among the attendees at a map cataloging workshop and asked, "Why are you here, you know everything!" To which he replied, "No, that isn't so." And then they exclaimed, "We get to teach Jay something!" She continued to cite his many contributions and closed with, "We have been very fortunate to have him." [Applause]

Larsgaard noted, regarding her time on the committee, "It has been an honor and pleasure for me to be your chair. It's always educational; I've learned a great deal." [Applause] Weiss said that we have appreciated your sense of humor and expertise, your institution's hosting of Confluence, and corralling those of us that needed it.

Larsgaard reported that there are two new voting members: Kathy Glennan and John Myers; a new intern: Felicity Dykas; and a new Chair: Cheri Folkner. [Applause] Weiss noted that for the first time the committee has a spousal pair in Suzuki and Lovins.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:51 a.m.

        Respectfully submitted,
            John Myers, CC:DA Intern
            Penny Welbourne, CC:DA Intern