

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
2007 Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, Washington
January 20 and 22, 2007**

Members present:

Cheri Folkner, Chair
John Attig
Kathy Glennan
Robert Maxwell
John Myers
Laura Smart
Paul Weiss

Felicity Dykas, Intern
Penny Welbourne, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Glenn Patton, OCLC [*represented by Jay Weitz 1/22*]
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress

ALA Liaisons present:

Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Greta De Groat, ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
Kevin Randall, ALCTS/Serials Section
Manon Th  roux, ALA/Association of College & Research Libraries
Shelby Harken, ALA/Library Information & Technology Association
Mary Larsgaard [*for Elizabeth Mangan*], ALA/Map & Geography Round Table
Teri Knapp [*for Robert Hall*], ALA/Public Library Association
Ken Wade, ALA/Reference & User Services Association

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, American Association of Law Libraries
Daniel Starr, Art Library Society of North America
Laurel Jizba, Association for Recorded Sound Collections
Daniel Lovins, Association of Jewish Libraries
Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association
Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
John Hostage, International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions
Chamya Kincy, Medical Library Association

Mark Scharff, Music Library Association
Greta De Groat, Online Audiovisual Catalogers
Peter Fletcher, 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
 - ALCTS** = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
 - AMIA** = Association of Moving Image Archivists
 - CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service
 - CONSER** = Cooperative Online Serials Program
 - CoP** = Committee of Principals for AACR
 - CPSO** = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
 - FRBR** = IFLA’s *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
 - IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
 - 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

RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
SMD = Specific Material Designation

Saturday, January 20, 2007 — 1:30–4:20 p.m.
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Evergreen Ballroom

973. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

974. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

[CC:DA/Roster/2006/July]

Committee voting members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The Chair routed a copy of the CC:DA roster, asking that each person initial it to show his/her presence and make any necessary corrections to the information.

975. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[CC:DA/A/55]

The Chair distributed copies of a memo from Tom Delsey, RDA Editor, on the subject “RDA Database Implementation Scenarios” and asked that members review the memo before Monday’s meeting. She indicated that John Attig mentioned it in one of CC:DA’s electronic discussions.

The Chair announced that there would be an item added to Monday’s meeting following agenda item 20. This will be a report from the Task Force for the Review of the Statement of International Cataloging Principles. The report will be allocated ten minutes.

Myers moved to accept the agenda as amended. Glennan seconded the motion. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted.

976. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2006 ALA Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA, June 23, 24, and 2006: Chair

[CC:DA/M/954-972]

A few corrections to the minutes from the CC:DA meetings at the 2006 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans were submitted prior to this meeting. The Chair asked if there were additional corrections and there were none.

Attig moved to approve the minutes as amended. Maxwell seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Attig pointed out that since the changes submitted prior to the meeting were already included in the copy of the minutes posted online, the minutes could stand as posted.

977. Report from the Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2006-2007/3]

The Chair stated that she would read from her report beginning with the results of the electronic votes that had been cast from June through December 2006. She would then talk about a few other actions that

CC:DA took during the time between Annual and Midwinter. She said she would ask for a confirmation of the electronic votes.

After the Chair read the results of several of the votes, Weiss suggested that each motion and its subsequent votes need not be read since members had copies of the report. After confirming that this was acceptable, the Chair noted that the issues and votes were documented in the Chair's report. Attig moved to confirm the votes taken by electronic mail. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

Other Actions by CC:DA during this time period:

The Chair stated that most of CC:DA's work between Annual and Midwinter consisted of reviewing drafts of RDA. Because of the large number of documents that required review, the deadlines for responding to each were staggered. Members put comments in the Confluence groupware (a "wiki" or online collaboration tool) currently being used by CC:DA. Comments from those outside CC:DA were gathered through a web form that was available on the ALCTS website. The two sets of comments were compiled for CC:DA members' review and response.

In late August, CC:DA members engaged in extensive email discussions in an attempt to come to agreement about some of the bigger issues for which they had initially failed to reach consensus. Those issues included mixed responsibility, performances, and bibliographic relationships in Chapter 6, the RDA development process, and the order of Chapters 6 and 7 in RDA.

The Chair indicated that several members made particularly helpful comments. She thanked them publicly: John Attig, Bob Maxwell, Paul Weiss, and a small group that worked with Weiss on the RDA development process issue. Others whose responses were particularly helpful included Everett Allgood, Manon Thérout, Keiko Suzuki, Greta De Groat, and Kathy Winzer. The Chair indicated that it had been a lot of work and the assistance was appreciated.

Task Force on the Review of ISBD Consolidated

A Task Force on the Review of ISBD Consolidated was formed during this period and received their charge at the end of July 2006. The Task Force issued two separate reports: one that reviewed the ISBD itself and was used as the basis of the CC:DA response to the ISBD Review Group (issued October 12), and another that identified elements possibly in conflict with or viewed as having a direct impact on AACR2 and/or RDA (issued October 24). Betsy Mangan chaired the Task Force; other Task Force members were Rebecca Culbertson, Greta De Groat, Kathy Glennan, Kristin Lindlan, Helen Schmierer, and Paul Weiss. The CC:DA response to IFLA was successfully submitted. Since its work was completed, the Task Force was officially discharged with much thanks from the chair of CC:DA.

Task Force to Review the Statement of International Cataloging Principles

A Task Force to Review the Statement of International Cataloging Principles was formed during this time. Although no deadline for an official response has been set, members of CC:DA thought it would be prudent to appoint a task force and to be able to move quickly once the statement and invitation to comment is sent out. The Task Force has a three-fold charge: 1) to prepare an interim review paper on the latest available draft to be submitted to the CC:DA chair by May 15, 2007; 2) to be the primary body within CC:DA to compare and contrast the statement with the latest available version of RDA; and 3) to prepare a report for CC:DA that will form the basis of the ALA response once the statement and invitation are released. Everett Allgood chairs the Committee. Its other members are John Attig, Laurel Jizba, Ed Jones, Bob Maxwell, Dorothy McGarry, Hideyuki Morimoto, and Keiko Suzuki.

Revisions to FRBR Section 3.2.2: Definition of the Entity Expression

Because of the short turn around time, no task force was formed to review the revisions to FRBR section 3.2.2 (on the definition of the “entity expression”). Instead, CC:DA members entered their comments on the revisions into Confluence and Attig used the comments to prepare a draft response. Tillett shared the Library of Congress response for the CC:DA’s consideration, and the CC:DA draft response was then revised to incorporate CC:DA discussion resulting from the LC response. CC:DA’s final response was sent to the Chair of the FRBR Review Group and the Chair of the Working Group on the Expression Entity on December 18th. The CC:DA Chair thanked Attig for all of the work he put into this task.

Online Communities/ALA Groupware Options

CC:DA began using Confluence software hosted by the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) under the tenure of the past Chair. It is the goal of CC:DA to migrate to ALA-hosted groupware in the near future. This will free the past Chair and UCSB from the responsibility of maintaining Confluence for CC:DA. Towards this end, the Chair and Laura Smart took a three-hour training course on October 18, 2006 on Online Communities, a groupware package that duplicates much of the functionality of the CC:DA website (currently maintained by John Attig), but for which content would not be publicly available. The Chair mentioned that while the training was interesting, she did not find the software to be very intuitive, nor does it appear to offer the same features as Confluence.

Because of the duplicative nature of Online Communities, the amount of time it would take for training, and because of other issues, a decision was made not to migrate to Online Communities at this time (although that decision can easily be revisited if functionality or circumstances change). CC:DA needs to migrate to a document collaboration software package that is hosted by ALA. ALA currently offers MediaWiki software. Since Confluence is also a wiki, training issues would be minimal. A trial version of MediaWiki will be set up for use by CC:DA members after the 2007 ALA Midwinter Meeting. If the trial is successful, CC:DA will fully migrate to the ALA hosted wiki by the 2007 ALA Annual Conference. If a decision to use Online Communities is made in the future, the CC:DA wiki should be able to be incorporated into Online Communities.

Weiss pointed out that we aren’t getting what we hoped to get from the ALA product. Smart agreed.

Concern also was expressed about our archival content in Confluence. Myers asked what would happen to old CC:DA documents that are currently in Confluence if CC:DA were to migrate to MediaWiki. Larsgaard said that the content in Confluence can be archived by saving the documents. Smart did not think it would be too much trouble to migrate that content to the new groupware. The main issue is that documents moved out of Confluence cannot be organized in a particular order. Attig said that we need to look at the broader issues to determine what we want to do. Larsgaard said that there is a new version of Confluence and she will find out if the new version will enable us to archive all the CC:DA pages in a logical fashion and structure. The Chair stated that if the data is exported, it will at least be available.

Weiss thanked Larsgaard and the UCSB for having hosted Confluence for so long. Larsgaard expressed her gratitude to the technology people at UCSB, who selected Confluence after having looked at several other products. The Chair thanked Smart for helping out with the review and training of ALA groupware.

The Chair asked if there were any other questions about information in the Chair’s report. There were none.

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

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JB/2006/2]

[Outcomes of the October JSC meeting]

Bowen said that for her JSC report she would begin with preliminary items, including the ALA comments on the RDA development process, and she would indicate where the Committee stood with respect to the issues as she went along. She also stated that she would address the recent article written by Diane Hillmann and Karen Coyle entitled “Resource Description and Access (RDA): Cataloging Rules for the 20th Century” that was published in *D-Lib Magazine* (January/February 2007, Volume 13, Number 1/2). She requested that CC:DA use today’s time to raise any general questions that need to be considered, but that specific comments be reserved for the CC:DA meeting on Monday. Following her preliminary review, Bowen stated she would report on the JSC meeting held in October 2006, and would go through the written report page-by-page, adding a couple of comments on each section. If there were any major issues, she suggested that a list of those be kept to discuss on Monday.

On a personal note, Bowen stated that her three-year term as ALA representative to the JSC will end following the 2007 Annual ALA Conference. She declined to serve for another three-year term, primarily because her day job has changed significantly. She is now working with the development of an extensible, “next generation catalog” that requires a major portion of her time. Bowen began talking to ALA about naming her successor in October 2006 in order to provide an opportunity for that individual to work with her throughout the remainder of her term. Although a preliminary name has been brought up with the ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Section for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Executive Committee on Tuesday, at this point no one has been identified or contacted. Bowen expressed regret that she will be unable to complete the entire three-year term on her own. She will work with the new representative to identify areas he or she might take over and to establish a time frame for the transition.

Bowen indicated that her experience as the ALA representative to the JSC has been an interesting one. Her new responsibilities at her day job will be interesting, too. She mentioned that the conversations she has had about next generation catalogs while working on RDA are proving to be particularly helpful. Bowen echoed the Chair’s thanks for the help given with the tremendous number of RDA documents that have been going back and forth. She specifically identified John Attig, Everett Allgood, Keiko Suzuki, Kathy Winzer, Bob Maxwell, and Paul Weiss and she commented that all had done a “great job.”

Another process that is ongoing deals with the triage of Part 1 of RDA. Bowen said she would talk about this more later. She said that she has a very helpful group working on this and she expressed her appreciation to them: Kathy Glennan, Kathy Winzer, Dorothy McGarry, Penny Welbourne, and John Attig.

Bowen began her report on the October JSC meeting with the JSC discussions about the ALA response to the RDA development process. She indicated that she would put those discussions in a broader perspective. She would then bring in the perspective that comes from Hillmann and Coyle’s article, which she said she thinks is an articulate summary of a lot of what has been discussed at CC:DA meetings. She thanked the authors for expressing their concerns, adding that she thought such discussions needed to occur more often in the library world. We should be looking at the lessons learned by those who are working in a totally digital environment and who have gained a lot from people outside the library profession as well as from their own work. Bowen added that we should be thinking about whether such discussions can take place within the development of RDA and, if they can, to what extent they can take place. She expressed her hope that the conversations would continue, because they are really necessary. The discussions that ALA has been having and the comments it has contributed in the past — and will continue to contribute in the future — have helped insure that RDA will be a better

standard. Bowen said we need to look at whether the RDA development process is the place to be discussing the broader issues of what is meant by “bibliographic control.”

Bowen underscored that CC:DA needs to be conscious of the limitations to the process, which became increasingly clear to her following the JSC meeting. There are “some very severe constraints.” One of these is that the JSC operates on the basis of agreement among different equal constituencies. Six constituencies from four different countries must agree. This limits the number of changes that can be accomplished. Also, the time frame within which the JSC needs to develop RDA is firmly set and is not under its control.

Bowen said that her motivation in participating in this process — and what she assumes is motivating a lot of others to help her and to spend hours of their time in so doing — is the desire to contribute to the profession and to move it forward. “We want to do something significant and be proud of what we have done.” She indicated that in this situation we don’t have full control over the outcome. We can put a lot into the process, but ultimately we don’t completely control the outcome. The JSC and the organizations that are represented in the JSC have been delegated the job of writing the content that goes into RDA, but only within the constraints that have been developed for how that process is to operate. Ultimately, RDA is the project of the Committee of Principals (CoP). The CoP assigned the task of writing the cataloging rules to the JSC and the CoP has been working closely with the publishers to set time lines. The JSC can only operate within the constraints that have been put in place by the CoP and issues need to be looked at from that perspective. It is evident that CC:DA members are not happy about the constraints and wish that the CC:DA proposals had received more support from the JSC.

Bowen added that we need to take stock of where we are and what we have gotten out of the process. She indicated that she thought the JSC would agree with CC:DA members that some things could have been done differently (e.g., not trying to develop RDA one section at a time) had the JSC known in advance how difficult the process would be. The JSC is aware that goals and strategic plans need to be re-evaluated to make certain that they are realistic and kept up to date. It is possible that the development of RDA should have taken place outside of a consideration of AACR2, as has been suggested by ALA. But five years ago nobody was talking about completely starting over. In retrospect, maybe the JSC should have tried to persuade the CoP to do so at that time.

Another concern expressed by ALA is that the JSC has tended to focus on details rather than on the big picture. She hoped that this would be one of the topics that could be discussed in greater detail on Monday so she can share CC:DA’s perspective with the JSC, especially considering that the JSC does have a role in deciding what issues will be looked at in the time remaining.

Bowen asked that we all keep in mind that what we are doing here is very difficult. We are not just trying to write rules for a digital future; we are trying to bring the whole past along with us, including our legacy metadata and our print and physical collections. This is a tall order. We also are constrained by the reality of the degree of changes in cataloging with which libraries can cope. If we come out with something extremely radical that will work with digital materials, it could have a negative impact on copy cataloging. The fact that we are hearing criticism from all different perspectives — from the opinion that we need to be much more radical to serious concern about the number of changes that are being made — should tell us that this task is a difficult one.

Bowen shared an email message sent by the Chair of the JSC, Deirdre Kiorgaard, which had specific comments regarding the five concerns stated by CC:DA:

“Although the JSC took the ALA comments very seriously, and recognized ALA as representing the major constituency, only some of the ALA concerns were shared by other constituencies. For some constituencies, the more pressing concern is any possibility of a significant delay in the releasing of RDA.”

In her email, Kiorgaard also noted that other constituencies are concerned about the usability of the web product. Kiorgaard suggested that we should “keep pressing home the message that we will get the fundamentals right in RDA, but not every detail. One phrase that comes to mind is ‘The perfect is the enemy of the good.’”

Bowen added that some of the concerns expressed by ALA have had a significant impact on the RDA product; “we have done rather well.” The JSC and CoP have agreed to extend the original deadline so that there will be time to review the entire draft at the end of the process. Other constituencies also would like to see a prototype of the online product. Bowen expressed her awareness of the concern as to whether there will actually be enough time to review the whole RDA document at the end of the process and suggested that this be one of the issues that CC:DA discusses further on Monday.

With that one exception, the other five constituencies did not share ALA’s other concerns, nor did the CoP; the CoP was perplexed that ALA alone has had these concerns that are not shared by others. The CoP does not want any additional delays and wants to get RDA “out there.”

Bowen asked us to keep these things in mind for our discussion on Monday. She has invited Marjorie Bloss, the RDA project manager, to speak at that time about the project management perspective.

The RDA process benefits from the kinds of concerns we express, but we should not expect that the development of RDA will stop to address all of those concerns. Bowen has talked to ALA “higher ups” about this and has been assured that ALA will not pull out of the process. ALA wants this to go forward.

Another contribution from CC:DA that will make RDA a better product is its request for clarity about the operating principles — e.g., information about the data models. This is a major achievement. Tom Delsey, RDA Editor, prepared a new scope and structure document to address the concerns regarding the data models. There also are issues with the content, but, from what Bowen has heard thus far, people generally do think this is a good first step.

There will be another meeting with members of the RDA development process and members of the Dublin Core and other online communities to talk about the data models. Even if there are things in the document with which ALA disagrees, they can be the catalyst for taking the discussion further.

The fact that the JSC did not request responses to the scope and structure document does not mean that CC:DA cannot prepare one. Bowen expressed her hope that CC:DA would talk about such issues on Monday and that it be a strategic discussion. CC:DA should look at what CC:DA and ALA can do both now and in the next six months. How can we structure our discussions? What can we bring to the table to press issues as we move forward? In having such discussions, we must keep in mind the major structure of the entire process as it has been defined.

Bowen asked for questions and clarifications.

Weiss observed that the CoP is a joint group and that since ALA is a membership organization and has a representative, we do have means of input. He stated that it is not true that we have no control over what the CoP does. If we have strong feelings we can take something to the ALA Council.

Bowen agreed that is a possibility. She followed by stating that what she has heard from the ALA people to whom she reports is that their concern is for the overall good of the organization. ALA does represent us, but ALA also has to be fiscally sound, and make certain that “its own house is in order.” AACR2 was a very lucrative product. ALA is putting hundreds of thousands of dollars into the development of RDA and it must come out of that process with a product that it can sell. ALA will make money on this and that will help ALA to survive. While we could take any concerns we might have to Council, the Council will ultimately have to consider what is best for ALA. Sometimes the bottom line may rule and it may finally come down to money.

Bowen reviewed the revised timeline for the release of JSC drafts of the report. Revised Chapter 3 will come out in March 2007, with responses due in July. Because most of the discussion on Chapter 3 will take place before the 2007 ALA Annual Conference, there will not be an opportunity for much further discussion at the CC:DA meetings. Chapters 6 and 7 are being reversed. These revisions will most likely come out in June, right before ALA Annual.

Weiss commented that there has been confusion about the rollout date. Bowen said that there will be a version released before the rollout date, but it won't be the final version. There is enormous interest outside the United States in this product and IFLA sees this as an opportunity to showcase RDA and demonstrate what it looks like.

Tillett indicated that the JSC has heard from Germany, France, Slovenia, and others in Europe, as well as countries in Asia. They are very interested in using RDA, and they want it now. They are excited by it and support what they view as an internationalization of the code.

Randall asked whether the JSC is confident about being able to finish Part B on schedule. He pointed out that after spending the past two years going through Part A, that process has not yet been completed. Bowen replied that at the October meeting, the JSC looked at its priorities as to what to have ready next. It was decided that a complete Chapter 3 and then revised Chapters 6 and 7 were of primary concern. The JSC believes that most of Part B will look pretty much the same as it does in Part II of AACR2. There will be different contexts for control and guidelines for work identifiers will change, but the access points will not be that much different because ultimately the JSC does not want there to be too many discrepancies. Bowen agreed with comments made that the work will be tight at the end.

A request was made to hear more about Part B and the ways in which it will not be "too different from AACR2." Bowen said that this has been discussed at various presentations. Basically, Part B will cover the same territory as AACR2 Chapters 22-26.

Weiss wanted to know why Part B is not being shared if it already exists. Bowen replied that it is not ready to be shared. She noted that usually the editor creates an editor's draft. The JSC looks at these drafts and comments on them. The October meeting was devoted to looking at Chapter 3. Part B was not discussed at that time. It was decided, however, that some content from Chapter 7 will be moved to Part B and Delsey is working on that.

The JSC has looked at the editor's draft of Chapter 3 and made comments about it. Some of the changes will be delineated in a cover memo issued with the revised Chapter 3 when it is released for review. Chapter 3 will now be called "Carrier." There will be greater alignment between Chapters 3 and 4. An addendum to Chapter 4 will be issued. The JSC looked at Chapter 3 from a more analytical perspective to keep it more in line with FRBR. Some points in Chapter 3 are being moved to Chapter 4 because they are more related to content than carrier. Information on expression, such as recording duration, which is an attribute of the expression, is being moved to Chapter 4. Tactile assistance (Braille) is an attribute at the expression level and will be moved to Chapter 4. Information at the manifestation level will stay in Chapter 3. Because of these changes, parts of Chapter 4 will also be reissued for comments.

Maxwell asked whether CC:DA would be able to see the revised Chapter 4. Bowen responded that Delsey is currently putting the finishing touches on it. It will not be reissued. The JSC has not as yet seen the revised Chapter 4 and does not want to put out another draft of something it has not discussed.

Accompanying material is something that the JSC will continue to discuss. It is thought that there is no need to have a separate element for carrier information for accompanying material. Accompanying material is viewed as a component of the resource that is being described. To describe the extent of the accompanying material the element for carrier information can be repeated.

Weiss asked how we will be able to determine what pieces of data are related to the accompanying material. Bowen said that the information will be put in the appropriate place in the MARC record, which will define the structure. Weiss replied that this type of information needs to be in RDA so that it is identified for all data models. He stressed the importance of knowing what data is related to what. Bowen said we will have to see if what is in RDA works.

Bowen highlighted the change in the use of abbreviations. JSC made a decision early on to reduce the use of abbreviations significantly. In Chapter 3 abbreviations will not be used except for units of measurement that are readily understood.

Attig asked for clarification of this point: does that mean there will be no abbreviations in extent or does it mean there will be no abbreviations in Chapter 3? Bowen said that this applies to all of Chapter 3. Exceptions will be made in cases of common usage. Glennan asked about abbreviations that are more commonly used than the un-abbreviated form, such as “stereo” and “mono.” Bowen said that “stereo” and “mono” are now considered to be words themselves and are no longer abbreviations. The use of “b & w” for “black and white” was raised as another possible example.

Weiss inquired about item no. 4 on page 7 of the JSC report, stating that he didn’t understand what the following sentence means: “Resources that exhibit characteristics of both audio and digital resources (e.g., an audio CD) may be described in terms of either resource type, or of both.” He expressed concern that two options are being given for describing a type of resource. Weiss, Hillmann, and Bowen discussed whether audio is going to be treated differently than digital text or video. Bowen clarified that the statement was meant to describe the case where an audio CD could be played on either an audio apparatus or on a computer, with a choice of how it could be used. Two statements of extent, one that describes it as an audio and one, which describes it as digital, can be used to bring out both aspects.

Weiss still felt it indicated that videos are being treated differently than audio. Bowen said the confusion may be due to the way she worded her report.

As there were no more comments or questions on Chapter 3, Bowen proceeded to a report on Chapters 6 and 7. Chapters 6 and 7 are the reverse of what they were when first released. Most of the other constituents wanted to see these reversed; when this was discussed by CC:DA via email, there did not appear to be particular concern one way or another.

The JSC is reviewing the appendix in the ALA response to Chapters 6 and 7 that discussed the taxonomy used to describe relationships between resources. Maxwell and others developed a statement of concern and a proposal as to how Chapter 6 (now Chapter 7) could be organized. The RDA editor worked with that proposal and as a result of its discussions, the JSC has developed two outlines as options for reorganizing that chapter. One outline is based on Barbara Tillett’s taxonomy of bibliographical relationships and the other is based more strictly on FRBR.

This document on the reorganization of Chapter 7 is an internal JSC working document. Bowen shared it with people who were involved in the discussion at 2006 Annual (Paul Weiss, Bob Maxwell, and John Attig). On Monday Weiss, Maxwell, and Attig will report on the two options.

The JSC had additional discussions about the terminology used in Chapters 6 and 7. There was a lot of concern raised about the use of the term “citation,” which has a very particular meaning in the law community. The JSC ultimately made the decision not to use that term at all.

Weiss pointed out that the JSC report (page 8) indicates that wording should be used to distinguish between the “naming” and the “describing” of an entity more clearly. Weiss asked in which instance the word “citation” had appeared.

Bowen said the word “citation” had been used in a “squishy” manner. It meant both things depending on where it appeared in the text. The terms used will now be: “naming the work” or “describing” or “referencing” it informally. The JSC will try to be more rigorous in the use of those words.

The term “meta-description” was found to be confusing to everyone. That term will not be used.

Bowen described the JSC’s discussion on the designation of roles, which is “relator-type” information that ALA has been actively promoting for several years. The JSC decided that the general introduction is the best place in RDA to describe why those roles are important and what they will contribute to the bibliographic description.

At their meeting in October, the JSC heard the report from the second Examples Group, chaired by Adam Schiff. The Group did a tremendous amount of work on Chapters 6 and 7. Bowen indicated that the work of the group was appreciated by the JSC.

The JSC heard from the Appendices Working Group, chaired by Judy Kuhagen. Bowen asked if there were any questions or concerns about the work of that group. Weiss asked why there was an appendix on capitalization in RDA. Bowen said that JSC decided that the appendix was needed for Part B, not Part A, so it will be discussed later, along with an appendix on abbreviations.

Bowen said that the JSC has prepared a report to describe how RDA will affect MARC 21 to allow changes to be made to MARC 21. That document has been given to MARBI and will be discussed at the MARBI meeting. The report includes a mapping of MARC 21 elements to RDA and suggests various discussion items for MARBI, in particular new elements that will be needed for carrier, media, and content types. Also, there will need to be new value to indicate that a record has been created using RDA.

There are tentative plans for the JSC members attending the 2007 ALA Annual Conference and MARBI to meet at the conference.

Mode of Issuance. The RDA editor prepared a discussion paper on “mode of issuance” that was just sent out to the constituencies. It was not released to the general public. At its October meeting the JSC only discussed those items that related to extent in Chapter 3. A question was raised about whether extent would be required for things that are not yet complete. Other parts of the paper will be discussed at the JSC meeting in April 2007.

Specialist Manuals. ALA indicated that RDA should include references to other specialist manuals, as appropriate, and offered to put such a list together. Two “huge lists” were prepared by CC:DA. Although the JSC agreed that these lists were of value, it was concluded that the lists should not be part of RDA. Instead the JSC proposed that the lists could be published and maintained in a wiki. The JSC has asked ALA to create one list and submit it. Since there is no rush for this to be accomplished, CC:DA has time to look for additional resources. One way to approach this might be to establish a task force to complete the work. Jizba commented that even though the list of specialist manuals will be a separate document, it would still be helpful to refer to it in RDA. Bowen said there will be a link to the wiki from RDA.

JSC Future Work. The response table that was compiled by the JSC secretary after all the comments were received on Part 1 contains about 1,000 lines. Bowen believes that the JSC was on its fifth pass through the document to identify those areas of agreement and disagreement and to remove issues that have been resolved in an attempt to “whittle down” the list. All of the Chapter 3 comments have been addressed and the decisions of the JSC will be reflected in its upcoming draft. Some elements have been incorporated into other chapters.

The JSC is now focusing on the comments made about Chapter 2. “Sources of information” is especially difficult since it is an area for which both ALA and other constituencies put forward a number of comments. The RDA editor has prepared a discussion guide to be used by the JSC members during an

upcoming conference call. Bowen indicated that she might want to consult with CC:DA about some of the options.

Following its review of Chapter 2, the JSC will move on to Chapter 4.

In summary, Bowen stated that the JSC believes that one of its primary obligations is to follow up on comments from constituencies. This requires that it focus on details, since that is the nature of the comments it receives. The JSC is still working on Part 1 — a process that started last summer — because it takes time to go through the resolution process for comments.

This concluded Bowen's report about what is going on behind the scenes.

Planning for CC:DA's meeting on Monday, 22 January 2007

Bowen asked what big issues should be discussed at Monday's meeting. She indicated that both Chapters 6 and 7 should be included. Weiss added that ALA's involvement in the RDA development process should be another topic and Hillmann identified the scope and structure document. Bowen added to the list the implementation scenarios document.

979. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

[<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/lc0701.pdf>]

Barbara Tillett distributed the Library of Congress report. The report is available on the LC website as well. She said that she would highlight information that was relevant to CC:DA.

Tillett pointed out that page 2 of the report includes a section on "Library Services," which is where cataloging operations are located within LC. The Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control was formed and includes people outside of LC. The Group is examining possibilities for the future of bibliographic description. A final report will be submitted to Deanna Marcum, Associate Librarian for Library Services, in November 2007. The Working Group is chaired by José-Marie Griffiths, Dean of the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. One concern that will be addressed is how bibliographic control can support management and access to library materials in the evolving technological environment in which we live. Three regional meetings — in Oakland, Chicago, and Washington, DC — will be held in 2007. The themes of the meetings will be: 1) users and users; 2) structures and standards; and 3) economics and organizations. Background papers will be available to "kick off" the discussions. The regional meetings will provide an opportunity for the Working Group to hear from attendees.

Tillett pointed out that the Library of Congress cataloged a record number of items in FY2006 that included 346,182 bibliographic volumes. Full and core level original cataloging, the most expensive cataloging category, increased also. This work included complete description, full analysis, and classification. The creation of new authority records also increased, with the exception of series authority records.

The redesigned LC website, which was launched on January 4, 2007, is now organized along a topical format rather than according to the hierarchical structure of LC. Tillett expressed her belief that this redesign will help users to navigate through the information on the website. Information on the current CPSO website is accessible via the new website.

Tillett pointed out that BEAT (the Bibliographic Enrichment Activities Team), which is responsible for adding links to publisher descriptions, author information, reading group guides (ONIX format), table of contents, etc., had made 636,415 links from Library of Congress catalog records to ONIX-derived enhancements.

BEAT was also involved in a project to add access to pre-1970 Congressional hearings. The hearings were then moved to the custody of the Law Library. In July 2006 Google began to digitize the hearings, a project that is still going on.

The Cataloging in Publication (CIP) program finished a draft report of a survey completed in August. The report, called "Poised for Change," is being discussed at ALA. While the CIP program has grown, the resources to support it have not and ways to do CIP differently are being discussed.

Tillett said that ECIP (electronic CIP) information that the publishers provide is now the standard mode of communication for receipt of CIP records. This information can quickly be turned into brief bibliographic records. Exceptions exist that indicate when paper CIP applications will be accepted. If publishers do not meet the criteria, their requests will be returned to them.

The new CONSER standard record will be implemented in two stages, with the first phase beginning on February 1. Training on the use of the standard record is already occurring at this ALA conference. The Library of Congress will be reviewing all of its LCRIs for needed changes. The CONSER standard record includes some radical changes and CONSER asked for feedback from the JSC on these. It is hoped that the JSC can discuss the new standard at its upcoming meeting in April.

LC has initiated discussions with major authority record exchange partners (a.k.a. NACO nodes) — OCLC, the British Library, and the National Library of Medicine — and with the Library and Archives Canada regarding non-roman data in authority records. Tillett stated that we can learn a lot from the Library and Archives Canada, as they are already dealing with more than one language (French and English) in their authority records. There is early agreement to use regular MARC 21 tags for non-roman data (4XX fields for "see" references) and to treat the non-roman headings as variant forms. 7XX fields will be used to link to authorized non-roman script forms so that libraries can use their local systems to "flip" to those forms for catalog displays. LC will be working with ILS vendors to accommodate the use of non-roman data in records.

LC and PCC continue to provide series training despite LC's decision not to create series authority records any longer.

LC has been meeting with catalog managers from other national libraries — the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library — to discuss how the national libraries can work together to implement RDA.

There will be a number of revised LC classification schedules coming out in 2007. There have been a number of changes, particularly in the science and technology schedules.

CPSO recently completed a project to add Chinese characters to the names of individual authors listed in PL2661-2979. It has started projects to add Arabic and Greek characters to names as well. As a result, many more non-roman characters will be showing up in class schedules.

There is a new automated process for submitting classification number proposals via Class Web, which will help to streamline the process — something that is especially needed given the reduced staff environment at the Library of Congress.

Work with form/genre headings continues, especially with terms related to moving images and music. LC is looking at moving image headings proposed through AMIA and other lists. LC had hoped to have a draft for review prior to the 2007 ALA Midwinter Conference, but additional time was needed to complete it. Tillett put the implementation of terms used in music on hold so that staff could work on the completion of a new edition of the Class M schedule. She expects that the work on the music genre terms will resume in March.

The database improvement unit in CPSO has been correcting obsolete subject headings. To date they have updated 875,000 headings. Death dates have been added to over 1,000 name headings.

The Cataloging Distribution Service is currently offering 30-day trials for Cataloger's Desktop and Class Web. A list of training resources, developed jointly with ALCTS, also will be forthcoming shortly. Included are the "latest and greatest" training packages available.

Tillett pointed out that LC is now offering many of its updates in free PDF versions. She requested feedback on this process: do people like this or do they prefer the standard paper updates?

Tillett indicated that *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* has just been published. She described this as "a wonderful tool." A separate publication on descriptive cataloging of rare serials will be available in the future, followed by one on music.

Tillett apologized for the slower than usual distribution of resources. More than 40% of the CDS staff retired in 2006 and four more people are expected to retire soon. She would appreciate receiving emails from anyone who runs into problems. She is doing her best to replace one or two of the vacant CDS positions over the next few months, but the volume of work is really more than this can address. The staff currently includes eighteen people. The customer service area was reduced from approximately nine positions to one; consequently people are being repositioned. Tillett thanked all present for their understanding and reiterated that "we need to be there for you."

Tillett discussed the metasearch product that will search databases and the LC catalog. The initial beta testing has been completed and LC is interested in receiving feedback about it. Also, the number of sessions for the LC catalog has been increased. CC:DA members indicated that they have seen an improvement. Tillett pointed out that the software now provides a timeout warning and that if users log back in they are returned to their previous search. Maxwell requested that this be implemented for the authority database as well. Tillett indicated that this is on a different platform, but that she would take the suggestion back to LC.

In response to a request for questions, Patricia Ratkovich indicated that she had heard LC is considering not adding 520s (summary notes) for children's material. Tillett did not know about this, but will e-mail LC for more information before Monday.

980. Report from the CC:DA Task Force to Maintain "Differences Between, Changes Within": Randall

[CC:DA/TF/Differences/3]

Kevin Randall provided a report on the progress of the Task Force to Maintain "Differences Between, Changes Within" document. He said that this had been a long and difficult process; he detailed this in his report. Three significant factors affected the work of the Task Force. First, the two published versions of the publication (printed and PDF) were not identical. The pagination was off, as blank pages were inserted in the printed version for notes. Second, the final manuscript as it was approved by the Task Force differed from that which was published. Although the Task Force sent its changes to ALCTS in May, the changes were not made until December. Then the Task Force discovered that new errors had been introduced.

The Task Force recommended that CC:DA continue its practice of appointing task forces to create documents, but recommended that CC:DA should consider self-publishing those documents. If they cannot be self-published, a plan must be developed for working with ALCTS on editing and proofreading the documents before being released.

The Chair said that she will bring this up with the CCS Executive Committee and will mention the difficulties encountered by the Task Force along with its recommendations.

The Chair pointed out that, on the positive side, we do have a publication. Randall pointed out that it is the out-of-date version that is available.

The Task Force was set to be discharged following Midwinter, but there is still a need to insure that the necessary corrections are made and that those corrections are accurately reflected in the final publication. Attig commented that it is important for the Task Force to remain in place until the corrected document is published.

A discussion on extending the duration of the Task Force ensued. It was voiced that the Task Force has worked long and hard and that CC:DA would like to have it see this through to the end. The Chair extended the duration of the Task Force until the completion of the final published product.

Randall reiterated the need to have more control over the actual product, since too many problems arise when there is one set of individuals responsible for creating the document and a different group responsible for its publication.

The Chair thanked the Task Force for its work and expressed her hope that the product would be available by the 2007 Annual ALA Conference.

981. Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Landesman

Betty Landesman announced that her term ends at the conclusion of the 2007 Annual ALA Conference. She does not know who will be appointed to replace her.

Landesman stated that her report would include updates and organizational/personnel questions related to NISO. There were no actual sponsored meetings scheduled for this ALA Midwinter Conference. Instead NISO is holding small meetings. This is a new approach that they are testing out.

ISSN revision

The ISSN revision was approved by NISO and ISO. The biggest change was that instead of a medium-neutral ISSN, there will be a linking ISSN. It will not be a new identifier, but will have the new function of collocating while still differentiating continuing resources.

Z39.93, The Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI) Protocol

SUSHI provides automated services for counter statistics for electronic resources. The standard was issued as a draft for trial use in October. It is not in the voting cycle, but is available for anyone to try out.

Attig inquired whether this was a new process. Landesman said that it has been used before, although she has not previously seen a draft standard that was open for all to try.

ISO/CD 10957, International Standard Music Number (ISMN)

The Chair asked how we might best approach the ISMN document and Landesman said we have until March to make comments. The Chair asked if the music people want to take a look at this. After an affirmative response, she said she would create a section for this on the CC:DA wiki.

982. Report from the Task Force for the Revision of the ALCTS Online Publication “Guidelines for Cataloging Microform Sets”

The Chair reported that the guidelines are now published and have been available on the ALA website since the end of December or beginning of January. The publication has a new title: *Guidelines for Cataloging of Record Sets*.

The Chair officially discharged the Task Force and thanked it for all its work.

983. Review and discussion of active task forces: Chair: TF Chairs

[CC:DA/TF/Consistency/1]

[CC:DA/TF/FRBR Terminology/1]

[CC:DA/TF/SMDs/1]

[CC:DA/TF/Technical Description of Digital Media]

The Chair indicated that this was to be a review and discussion of active task forces listed on the CC:DA website, although a number of them have not been active of late. She asked that chairs indicate if the committee charges are still relevant.

Attig pointed out that some of the task forces have been kept in place in case they were needed for further review of RDA drafts.

Task Force on Consistency Across Part 1 of AACR

Attig, Task Force Chair, stated that the Task Force's comments were included in an AACR3 draft and have appeared in drafts of RDA. RDA has changed significantly from AACR3 and the expertise the Task Force members developed with respect to AACR3 is no longer relevant to RDA. He suggested that the Task Force be discharged and that CC:DA collectively review any drafts.

The Chair asked for comments, and hearing none, officially discharged the Task Force. She thanked its members: John Attig, Chair, Steven Arakawa, Michael Chohey, Carroll Nelson Davis, Greta De Groat, Robert Ewald, Peter Fletcher, Kathy Glennan, John Hostage, Alice Jacobs, Bruce Johnson, Kristin Lindlan, Nancy Lorimer, Elizabeth Mangan, Bob Maxwell, Dorothy McGarry, Pat Riva, Jay Weitz, Cynthia Whitacre, and Mary Woodley.

Task Force on FRBR Terminology

Everett Allgood, Task Force Chair, reported that the primary impetus for this Task Force was to have a task force available to respond to RDA drafts. CC:DA no longer responds in this manner and the charge of the Task Force can be accomplished more effectively through online discussions.

The Chair asked for comments. Attig indicated that he thinks that there are still issues remaining and agreed that a task force may not be the most effective way to deal with these issues. Allgood noted that there is far more to terminology than just looking at the words.

The Chair discharged the Task Force and thanked the members for their work: Everett Allgood, Chair, Steven Arakawa (member, 2002-2004), John Attig, Peter Fletcher, Kate Harcourt, Laurel Jizba, Betsy Mangan, and Dorothy McGarry (Chair, Feb.-June 2003).

Task Force on SMDs

Mary Larsgaard, Task Force Chair, said the Task Force was set up before the use of the wiki began. She requested that the Task Force be discharged in light of the fact that we now communicate in other ways.

The Chair officially discharged the Task Force, thanked it for its work, and read the names of its members: Mary Larsgaard, Chair, Michael Chohey, Robert Freeborn, Laurel Jizba, Elizabeth Mangan, Jay Weitz, and Matthew Wise.

Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media

Attig commented that ALA's recommendations were discussed at the October meeting of the JSC. It would be useful for the Task Force to follow up on this. The Chair indicated that since the CC:DA website did not include an end date for this Task Force, it would continue to exist at least through the upcoming annual ALA conference.

The Chair said that CC:DA would reconvene on Monday morning.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20.

***Monday, January 22, 2007 — 8:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m.
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Evergreen Ballroom***

984. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The Chair passed around an attendance roster for CC:DA members to sign. She also distributed a sign-in sheet for visitors and asked that they include their names and contact information. The Chair reminded people that an additional item was added to today's agenda, which was a report from the Task Force for the Review of the Statement of International Cataloging Principles.

Barbara Tillett provided answers to several questions that came up on Saturday about children's subject headings and summary notes. Summary notes will continue to be added for works of fiction. While there have basically been no changes made in the past couple of years to the assignment of children's subject headings to non-fiction, there has been on-going discussion about now adding subject headings to works of fiction.

Tillett also responded to a question she had received about users being timed out of LC's National Authority File website. She reported that at an LC presentation on Sunday, it was announced that LC will soon be implementing the same timeout feature in the LC/NAF that is already a feature in the LC online catalog.

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

Chatham thanked CC:DA for the opportunity to provide an update on the publishing side of the RDA process, and to review some considerations on the working draft.

The internal RFP (request for proposal) process, the product development process, and the marketing process are now coordinated with the development schedule of the JSC. Chatham reported that an excellent job has been done in the systems planning, and in synchronizing the development and marketing events that have to coincide with these events in order to generate activities along such lines. This has especially been the case with marketing strategy, and anything that might be relevant to outreach.

Chatham has been working closely with the JSC to create a business plan that is synchronized with the RDA development process, especially in terms of marketing and outreach.

ALA Publishing Services has also employed a database development manager to facilitate the selection of an outside vendor. The database development manager and her team have been at the 2007 ALA Midwinter Conference for the past several days and attended the RDA forum. Chatham described her as "a real supporter with a lot of knowledge." On February 15, 2007, she will meet with Tom Delsey to begin looking at validations of the online products and the architecture and the logic behind the product in preparation in order to capture — in a programming sense — the thinking, or process that goes on behind what is in the mind of the cataloger. Chatham underscored the importance of having catalogers help throughout this process. Preliminary specifications will be developed, along with provisional criteria for the selection of vendors.

Chatham indicated that ALA Publishing Services is conscious of the need to share its strategic plan with the JSC, and it will be developing a platform that the JSC can then use to revise the final manuscript. That platform will be demonstrated at the October meeting of the JSC and will incorporate any adjustments made to date. It will be finalized between December 2007 and June 2008. During that time there will also be product development based upon the first draft content for demonstration at the upcoming IFLA meeting. That in turn will generate a second prototype (besides the first prototype that is available at <http://www.rdaonline.org>). Adjustments will be made at that point. After further testing based on the first phase content, that product should then be ready to make into a final structure. The second prototype will be demonstrated at IFLA.

The final text will be incorporated in the product scheduled for release in January 2009, and the assumption is that the process of loading that final content into a structure should go very quickly. Final acceptance testing will also occur in January 2009 in preparation for a smooth release of the “final” RDA product.

The database development manager is responsible for the relationship between the structure of the existing platform and the final product. If the final product changes a lot, it will affect the final cost. The challenge that ALA Publishing Services faces is to be prepared for working with first draft content. Chatham again expressed confidence that the first draft content will be sufficiently viable to allow for a rapid transition once the final manuscript is completed.

ALA Publishing Services plans to have focus groups at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference. These groups will primarily concentrate on print product considerations in order to determine what types of print materials will be most beneficial in the suite of products that RDA online is going to represent.

Work is also continuing on RDA prototypes that will be available for sharing with constituents and markets on the international front. Another ongoing consideration is the coordination of work with vendors. Chatham said that throughout the development process, marketing messages are being created that will stress the benefits of the RDA product.

With respect to the position of the co-publishers, Chatham expressed confidence that the feedback mechanisms that are being developed and discussed throughout the international cataloging communities will prove successful to the final outcome. The JSC’s final product will be relevant because it has been recognizing all of the contributions that are being brought forward.

As an expression of that, when the topic was discussed at ALA, the American Library Association leadership was very interested in making certain that the RDA development process moved forward according to schedule. In order to help facilitate this, ALA chose to donate \$150,000 to the process, indicating that it is confident that the members of the team here will be successful in developing this very complex and very difficult product.

Chatham introduced members of ALA Publishing Services involved in the RDA publishing process: Jenni Fry, Troy Linker, and Katherine English.

Weiss commented that he has had a fair amount of interaction with ALA Publishing— particularly with the two ALA publishing colleagues sitting at the table — and stated that he really does think “... they are on the same page that we are, and that they are really smart and creative and wonderful and responsive.” Weiss urged that individuals talk to them and tell them about any perceived problems, rather than “just sitting back and grumbling about it.” Weiss expressed his genuine appreciation for all the ALA Publishing Services is doing.

Chatham thanked Weiss and stressed that he and his colleagues are very interested in hearing what people in the field have to say — that such contact is vital.

Bowen took the opportunity to thank Chatham publicly for his trip to Mexico last Fall to attend the 2006 Dublin Core conference, which gave him the opportunity to hear some of the concerns related to the development and publication of the RDA product directly from members of that community. She stressed that it was time well spent.

Patricia Ratkovich asked Chatham to clarify if the prototype would be available at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference.

Chatham said that yes, that would be the case, and that ALA Publishing Services would also be working with focus groups at Annual as well.

Weiss asked how people were going to be selected for the focus groups.

Chatham responded that they would be looking for volunteers, certainly, but that the Publishing Services staff was also asking people in the field to offer recommendations. He indicated that English had already talked to a number of people — probably 7 or 8 — in preparation for her efforts to develop a marketing plan.

Weiss stressed that even though he knows it has been talked about before, he wanted to stress once again how important it is to include representatives from public libraries, school libraries, and smaller university libraries.

Chatham definitely agreed. He said that the group English has put together is very aware of the broad spectra that need to be taken into consideration, and understands that the more it can learn about those different groups, the better it will be for everyone concerned. He indicated that it is especially sensitive to the concerns that are heard from the public library community, and added that systems librarians were another group that it needs to hear from.

Jizba asked if the focus groups would be concentrating on the print product at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference.

Chatham clarified that while print considerations are the primary concern, there may be other topics that focus groups will address as well.

Jizba expressed her belief that focus groups should also be involved in determining how best to market the RDA product.

Chatham thanked her for making that suggestion. He said that as marketers, ALA Publishing Services has to think of customers and the range of their demographics, as well as the fact that there are different needs at different levels — directors have needs when they hear about a product that might not be the same as those of front line catalogers. He added that they had to address a number of broad-range concerns, including financial ones.

Weiss reiterated the importance of considering all the different constituents involved, to which Chatham replied that decisions had to be made in that light.

986. Tom Delsey's "Alternative Outline" for the Revised Chapter 7 [formerly Chapter 6]: Bowen

Bowen recollected that the committee had decided it would take a little time to talk about the alternative outline that Tom Delsey had been working on for Chapter 7 — which was formerly Chapter 6 — before beginning a discussion about RDA development issues. Delsey's outline was an internal JSC document that was created in response to ALA concerns about the taxonomy used for bibliographical relationships. Maxwell proposed several alternatives that might incorporate Barbara Tillett's taxonomy of bibliographical relationships.

Although copies of Delsey's outline had not been made available to all members of CC:DA, Bowen had shared it with those who expressed specific concerns about that issue in their ALA responses: specifically, Bob Maxwell, Paul Weiss, and John Attig. She suggested that they be the ones to describe the issues, and to provide their sense of which way it should go. Bowen asked Maxwell if he would begin with a description of the outline.

Maxwell pointed out that instead of the unfamiliar relationship types that had been used in the first draft of the chapter, the revision presented two possible organizations: the first option was organized by FRBR entities, while the second was by Barbara Tillett's bibliographical relationships. The differences only occur at the first level — FRBR or relationships. Presumably within each relationship there would be a hyperlink to the section that would tell how to break out the bibliographical relationships.

Maxwell made particular note of two items in the proposed revision of Chapter 7. For one thing, the shared characteristic relationship was left out entirely. It was not clear why, since these are in fact the most common type of queries patrons make of databases. This might be the place in RDA where some discussion or guidelines could be given for helping our databases do better with keyword searches (a common type of shared characteristic query). "Shared characteristic" is also fundamental to the concept of authority work because authority work enables shared characteristic queries on authors, titles, subjects, etc. A section about shared characteristic relationships could, of course, get out of hand, but at least introducing the concept into RDA so that people have it in their minds as they are cataloging would be a good thing.

The second point Maxwell made was that the outline was not complete: some FRBR entities did not have all the corresponding Tillett relationships, and vice versa. In one case this was clearly correct — by definition the equivalence relationship can not apply to works or expressions, so that obviously should be reflected in the structure. But in other cases, it wasn't as clear that it was correct to leave out a relationship from a given group one entity. For instance, there was no provision for a derivative relationship with a manifestation or an item, but instances occur where that might be needed (a play derived from a specific copy of a short story, for instance, that perhaps was annotated or had some other characteristic that influenced the play in some way that another copy would not have done; or a poem inspired by one of the poems in the Kelmscott Chaucer, which has particular illustrations that are different from other manifestations in this English expression of Chaucer).

Maxwell went on to point out that the difference between the two options as described depended upon how one thinks that people will approach the rules. Will they approach them as FRBR entities because that's a main basis for RDA? Also, people might possibly be more familiar with FRBR terminology than with the Tillett taxonomy. But presumably there would be introductory guidelines to Chapter 7 on recording relationships between resources.

Maxwell questioned whether whole/part relationships would work with aggregate items — especially series and serials — in RDA. He also wondered whether special rules for music, art and law should be incorporated into the main section. He said that it was his feeling that they should be.

Attig asked Maxwell which option he preferred. Maxwell responded that he wasn't certain, since there were aspects to each that he liked. It probably came down to which concept people were more familiar with — FRBR or relationships.

Weiss indicated that he thought that either approach was a much better prospect than what had initially been proposed. He said that during lunch he and Tillett discussed the continuing need to remind ourselves that in a web format, linear relationships are not as important. Order doesn't matter so much. Which one is more intuitive really depends on how you approach things.

But Weiss felt that there was still a lot of condensing or generalizing that Delsey could do here that would be helpful. Chapter 7 is basically looking at the three ways to reflect a relationship: identifier, name and description, which is much clearer than what had appeared in the earlier draft.

Weiss pointed out that the other thing he really liked was that 7.2 is the same in either option — what Delsey was calling a “primary relationship,” Weiss was calling an “inherent relationship” — the ones that are there by definition. Weiss felt that it was good to bring that out up front — those are mandatory and the others are optional.

Attig spoke next, indicating that he did not have a great deal to add. He did point out that one of the implications of trying to organize things by two different organizational principles is that when you pick one first, you will have to repeat things at a second level, although Weiss had suggested a way of avoiding that. Attig thought FRBR was a bit less redundant, but if Weiss’ approach was taken, then that wouldn’t really matter. ALA had been stressing all along that FRBR is the conceptual foundation for RDA, and since we shouldn’t be thinking about a linear approach, then either option would bring out the FRBR characteristics.

Weiss pointed out that the other possible advantage of going with organizing by FRBR entities is that it will build on the relationships introduced in Chapters 1-6.

Attig interjected that he had been waiting for an opportunity to “get this off the table.” It would be particularly helpful if in section 7.1, which describes the conventions that are used to reflect relationships, a distinction could be made between an “access point” and a “link,” since they work in absolutely opposite directions. Having something to help in articulating how they work in information retrieval systems would be an advantage and so he wanted to request that such information be added at some point.

Weiss said that for him, a shared characteristic relationship is one that happens explicitly. You have the same title, the same period. But he wasn’t sure how that could be expressed. Maxwell pointed out that it should be acknowledged in the rules, since that is how most people search. Weiss agreed that it should at least be mentioned.

Attig indicated that he would like to see it there because the shared characteristic relationship could actually be used to create an access point from any data element, even though the rules don’t state exactly how to construct it. It could extend the rules and establish the framework for part B.

Allgood agreed that he thought having added Tillett’s bibliographical relationships made sense. Then, as Weiss had pointed out, you wouldn’t have to identify secondary elements under each — that it would suffice to have 7.0 describe the purpose and scope of the chapter; 7.1 discuss the general guidelines on recording relationships between resources and talk about technique; 7.2 focus on primary relationships; and 7.3 on “other relationships.” This would eliminate the need to repeat all of those other sections.

John Hostage also felt that you didn’t need specific instructions or examples for each type of relationship, since they basically all end up being the same instruction.

Weiss agreed that if in 7.1 you know the techniques, then 7.3 could just be used for a “description of a description,” without having to repeat the instructions again since you have already told people how to do that.

Maxwell said that in some situations, one particular technique may be more appropriate to use than another, and so they really did need to be described since they were not all the same.

But Hostage indicated that which technique is appropriate for which relationship is dependent upon the context within which the cataloger is working — that it is not a “universal thing.”

Weiss interjected that some relationships are independent but some are not — that the item “de facto” will help inform catalogers about how best to organize it.

Jizba supported the need for flexibility in writing this chapter, so that context could be considered. She stressed the need to allow for that possibility.

Weiss said that he did not want catalogers to think that they had to dither for an hour in order to make a decision about how best to go forward, if they were not immediately certain as to which relationship they had.

Tillett indicated that perhaps it is because she has dealt with these relationships for too long, but she thought that the relationships are so very different from one another that it is pretty obvious — catalogers would not be spending any time trying to figure out what type of relationship they had in a given situation. “I don’t think that is going to happen. But I’m biased.”

Weiss said that the nonlinear structure could make it clear and make both sides happy about that.

Bowen felt that she had a sense of the type of feedback that the JSC would like to receive. She proposed that she inform the JSC that CC:DA liked both options, although there was a slight preference for option A, with FRBR entities used for the primary arrangement. The point was to instruct Tom Delsey in what direction to go, since the JSC will not be revisiting this chapter. The current discussion would allow the JSC to make more informed decisions. Bowen added that she did think that it would seem a little strange to the JSC if CC:DA were advocating something other than using FRBR as the primary arrangement, since ALA had basically been favoring FRBR all along. Tillett indicated that both option A and option B are tied back to FRBR relationships — that it was not as if option B did not follow the FRBR model.

Bowen agreed and said she thought that was clearer after having seen both options.

Myers indicated that even without having seen the document, he felt that organizing by FRBR lent a greater internal consistency to RDA, so he would prefer option A.

Bowen did not think that the CC:DA had to come out with a strong opinion one way or the other, and that as several CC:DA members had already pointed out, either option was really much, much better than what had appeared in the earlier draft. While she would certainly put forward what CC:DA felt the advantages of option A were over option B, she did not want to actually say that CC:DA preferred one over the other, since it could wind up that if CC:DA strongly favored option A, the JSC might prefer option B. There was no need to make a choice between them. She added that since there were other issues about which the CC:DA did feel very strongly, in this case we could say that either option was ok.

Attig said Bowen’s comments answered a question he was about to ask as to what Bowen felt would be the most useful information she could have to take back to the JSC.

Weiss clarified that his preference would be for the selection of whichever option resulted in the shorter text. He also pointed out that one of Tom Delsey’s questions had been about the whole/part relationship at each level, and that should be kept in mind.

987. CONSER standard record and RDA: Bowen

[CONSER documentation]

[5JSC/Editor/1: Analysis of proposed CONSER standard record]

Bowen began by explaining that this item had been placed on the agenda at the request of the JSC, which had been asked if it felt the new CONSER recommendations were moving in the same general direction as RDA. But because some aspects of the proposed CONSER standard record included items the JSC has not as yet discussed, the JSC was not comfortable in saying that, “Yes, we endorse the CONSER standard record recommendations as being consistent with the RDA development.” CC:DA had been asked to talk about the issues in that light.

There were several CONSER documents to discuss, all of which should be viewed in terms of their relationship to RDA. This is why Bowen requested that the discussion guide and summary that Delsey had originally prepared for the JSC be put forward as a public document, since it indicated where the JSC is in discussing each of the issues. There is also the CONSER documentation, with the recommendations divided into three first-stage implementation items and then three second-stage implementation items.

Bowen suggested that for the purposes of discussion, it might be easier just to go through the recommendations in the order in which they appear in Delsey's analysis. [Recommendation 1 of the CONSER Working Group was not included as the chairs of the Working Group withdrew it after discussion with LC CPSO.].

Peter Fletcher indicated that he had an additional document to pass around that requested a change to the draft document. He then distributed this to CC:DA members.

Diane Boehr [from the audience], who co-chaired the working group that developed the CONSER standard record recommendations, reported that CONSER members had voted against a phased in implementation at the CONSER meeting the day before, preferring instead to wait until the JSC has had a chance to review the proposals. She explained that the document Fletcher was distributing related to a recommendation that was accidentally omitted from the first set of elements the JSC was requested to consider. The JSC was therefore being asked to look at the whole document as it was originally intended to be viewed.

Bowen expressed concern about adding another proposal at that point, without even having agreed to put it on the agenda. She indicated that it should be the decision of the Chair of CC:DA as to whether or not the document would be discussed at this time. The Chair replied that she did not see how it could be if there had been no time even to look at it before this moment.

Weiss stated that his understanding had been that all of the CONSER documentation had just been sent for our information. Was it actually going to be reviewed now?

Bowen reiterated that it should be the decision of the CC:DA Chair as to whether the new document would be added to the agenda and discussed along with the other documents, or treated separately. Weiss stated that situations such as this occur all the time. Bowen maintained that they should be considered as separate documents.

Fletcher restated Boehr's point that this was really not a new document but a part of the original CONSER draft documentation.

Bowen pointed out, however, that this was in fact a new document and therefore did have to go through a different document stream, and if the CC:DA Chair would like to have it discussed today, it should be done so apart from the rest of the documents. The Chair requested an explanation as to why this document hadn't been sent with all the rest of the documentation.

Boehr explained that it was included in the initial documents of the recommended mandatory data elements, and had been a part of the original documents that went up on the CONSER website in the first draft. However, somehow it was omitted from the list of appended rule changes that were needed to support the CONSER recommendations, and the omission was not caught until December.

The Chair said that she would like the CC:DA to discuss what it had originally agreed to discuss, and then see if any time remained to talk about the new document.

Bowen, referring back to the originally scheduled items for discussion, indicated that the first recommendation pertained to uniform titles for translations and language editions (Recommendation 2a).

Weiss felt that there were a couple of things in Delsey's "Analysis of the Proposed CONSER Standard Record vis-à-vis RDA" document that were new to him, such as the several places where Delsey talked

about the relationship between different manifestations of the same work, what is appropriate for identifying the relationship of the manifestation to the expression, and of the expression to the work. “It is confusing to me why he did that.”

Bowen indicated that this had been a discussion document that Delsey prepared on short notice.

Maxwell asked for clarification as to what the issue was in using uniform titles.

Boehr explained that the problem in cataloging occurs if you have a translation of a serial that is entered under the title of the original language, and that title in the original language changes, but the translated title remains the same. Currently, you would be forced to create a new record just because the original title changed. The new recommendation calls for using a title or name/title added entry to keep the records together instead of using a uniform title for the work as (or in conjunction with) the main entry heading for a translation or language edition. A new record would no longer have to be created.

Weiss indicated that a better way to solve that problem would be to say that you don’t base a title change on a uniform title. Boehr responded that an entry is needed to collocate records for different manifestations of the same work, but that it doesn’t need to be the primary entry. How could it then be indicated that the uniform title had changed?

Weiss answered that, if he understood Boehr’s example correctly, you wouldn’t say that the title changed. If the related title doesn’t change, then the rules should not require that a new record be made. Weiss said he thought this would be a much better way of handling such situations rather than to lose the authority control.

Boehr pointed out that without question an entry would be needed to collocate those titles in order to maintain the relationships wherever possible instead of losing the authority control.

Weiss indicated that the whole idea behind RDA was to handle relationships — to the extent possible — through controlled vocabulary, through authority control.

Boehr agreed that we seem to require full access, but that nothing in Delsey’s document seemed to indicate that fact. We should be insisting on that, and perhaps need to clarify the situation.

Weiss said that if a controlled access point is to be used to reflect the primary relationship, then maybe it should be a required element in RDA.

Boehr again agreed, pointing out that’s why we would not have to create a new record if the title in the original language changes. Weiss said that should then be the goal, which would make Tom’s interpretation correct.

Tillett reminded the group that this document was written by Delsey for the JSC. She pointed out that in RDA, the whole idea about the main entry and added entry goes away, which is why she felt that the proposed CONSER standard record was in the spirit of RDA, since it is justifying the need for maintaining access to the original work, whether through the use in MARC format of a 1XX or a 7XX field. She underscored that you still want to make that relationship clear and make sure that if it changes over time, it reflects that change over time.

Maxwell said that it was his understanding that with translations it was the same work rather than a related work, to which Weiss responded that it is a related expression.

As an example, Maxwell stated that if he had a language edition of a work in German, under the current rules using MARC 21, he would put it in 130 field. If it is put in a 730 field, then it is the item that is being described.

Boehr argued that if that was the case, then you would no longer have the one in German — that the whole thing was related to expression.

Weiss stated that if you are talking about a language, then it is a work, not an expression that is the primary relationship of an expression. One implication of moving from main entry to secondary entry through the CONSER idea is that you are not linking to the original work but to another expression of that work. So what were we trying to do? Were we to consider whether we agree or disagree with the proposed RDA development along these lines?

Bowen reiterated that the question is if the CONSER standard record recommendations were in the spirit of the changes that are going forward with RDA. It was her sense that this one is doing so.

Weiss raised the point that all indications of similar relationships should be treated the same for both monographs and serials — that it was of less importance to him which option was followed than that monographs and serials were handled in the same way.

Bowen asked if the CC:DA was comfortable in saying that the CONSER standard record recommendation for the treatment of uniform titles for translations and language editions was in the spirit that RDA is going as long as we don't do things differently for serials than what is being done for monographs.

Hostage said that he was still not clear on this: were we saying that it would be ok to put a new edition of some minor change under just the author and the title, along with the original? What would that resolve?

Boehr felt that part of the problem is that we are so used to doing things the way we have always done them in the past that we tend to craft what we will be doing in the future in terms of how they will be displayed in our current cataloging environment. This proposal is trying to move us forward to a point where we no longer have to try to pre-coordinate that display. In other words, we could wind up with a system that states: "this thing is an expression of that work and that thing is an expression of the same work," for the sole purpose of having the item display properly within our current on-line catalogs. So in other words, we don't have to plan — and should not be planning — for the future on the basis of what our current on-line catalogs are capable of handling. Boehr summarized by saying that the standard record was intended to make things a lot simpler.

Weiss pointed out that the other implication brought out by Delsey is that indicating the primary relationships between manifestation, work, and expression should be required.

The Chair asked if there was a consensus on this issue.

Bowen repeated that as we are going through these documents, we should be asking "is this ok or do we have problems with it in terms of the direction we are currently going with RDA?" That being the case, she suggested that the committee move on to the recommendation 2b, which is to use uniform titles to distinguish between identical titles.

Weiss again stressed the need for consistency in the treatment of monographs and serials.

Bowen indicated that the larger question was: how far can we go when the reality was that people working in very different cataloging environments needed to be accommodated?

Hillmann stated that it seemed to her that we have to be both the agent of change as well as the supporter of the disenfranchised. The policy could be set up as a preference: If you have the identifier, then use it; if you don't have the identifier but want to bring the items together in the catalog, then use a related entry. It is not saying that you must have an identifier, etc., etc. If we are going to be agents of change in moving this community forward then it should be clearly stated in RDA.

Attig did not believe it was a dichotomy as much as it was a case where we do have to have some form of an identifier. But the identifier is still the identifier. It's one of those things that we aren't yet used to asking systems to pull out for us. "I think that's a dichotomy that we are struggling with and I think it is

really important that we get beyond the fact that we have broken systems and start to talk about what we need to have happen.” And again, the question is: controlled access point or identifier?

Hostage stressed that we still need to have principles and standards as to what this identifier is going to point to because of catalog displays. We still need to have the identifier included in the name. We need to know what it is that the system is putting together as the name.

Bowen indicated that she hoped we would come back to this issue when we began to talk strategically. One thing we should be thinking about is where in the chapter we propose this issue be considered, what it should say, and try to suggest some possible wording. “It is important to really focus on what we need strategically, given where we are right now.” It was not enough in the RDA development process to just say that we need identifiers; we need to say specifically how that fact will be indicated in RDA.

The Chair asked if the Committee was ok with this recommendation. The ensuing silence was interpreted to mean “yes.”

Maxwell indicated that he was still not clear — were we saying that we are not going to create uniform titles? Attig clarified that we are not going to require them.

Weiss added that in the past we depended on uniform titles as the main way to distinguish between things, but that we can't rely on identifiers in certain situations.

Bowen pointed out that underlying this whole discussion is the question as to whether or not uniform titles are required. They are not now. The discussion as to whether or not uniform titles will be required in RDA has not as yet taken place within the JSC. But if CC:DA had a strong feeling about that issue, it should put it forward on a more general level as a proposal.

Tillett reminded Committee members that conceptually it will no longer be “uniform titles,” but rather “preferred title for a work,” “preferred title for an expression,” etc.

Hostage said that it was difficult to give up the concept of uniform title because CONSER is still using it. Bowen pointed out that CONSER has had a requirement for a uniform title, but AACR2 did not. The discussion should be about the direction in which RDA should go — should uniform titles be required or not?

Hostage indicated that he would not want to see uniform titles required because there are other ways to collocate records for different manifestations of the same work.

Adam Schiff [from the audience] pointed out that there are rules to resolve a conflict that might arise if two different bodies each issue works that have the same title.

Weiss indicated that these rules are used on an “as needed” basis.

Maxwell restated his belief that uniform titles should be required to identify the work.

Allgood agreed with Weiss and Bowen that we are in an interim period, and that until we reached the point where we had an identifier, then serials, for the most part, should not give up their requirement for uniform titles.

Bowen said that her purpose in having this discussion was to get people started thinking about the subject, but she understood that at this point we needed to move on.

Weiss expressed his agreement that we need to identify the work. “We agree in concept about the relationship; we just disagree about how it will show up.”

Myers summarized by saying that the fundamental issue was whether the CONSER standard record proposal would still allow us to meet the FRBR user tasks and beyond the RDA, and that that should be the benchmark against which these proposals are measured.

Bowen asked if the Committee would agree with Weiss in stating that a work identifier is essential, but that there were ways of accomplishing that goal without requiring a uniform title.

Rhonda Lawrence [from the audience] provided an example to show just how controversial is the issue of uniform titles. She said that at the library where she works, users like the concept of a uniform title, because it helps them to differentiate between reports. She underscored that this is an extraordinarily controversial topic, and that fact needed to be recognized.

Bowen asked if she should report back to the JSC that while we see the need for the identifiers, endorsing the CONSER standard record would not align with the direction in which RDA is going.

The Chair indicated that at this point the Committee needed to move on to Recommendation #3, which pertains to parallel titles.

Attig suggested that since all of the remaining recommendations deal with optional elements in RDA, the Committee did not really need to discuss them.

Maxwell raised the point made by Delsey about the statement of responsibility (Recommendation #5) which in the current draft of RDA is designated as a required element of description, but has been recommended as optional by CONSER.

Bowen felt that this issue had already been discussed, and that the JSC had the feedback it needed. She suggested that the Committee move on to Recommendation #7, which deals with “numbering area.”

Weiss pointed out that we currently record that information in two different ways, but that the current suggestion is that instead of two options, just one should always be selected.

Bowen added that a comment had been made that we move away from structured numbering.

Tillett said that as a result of that earlier discussion, LC was going to prepare a revised LCRI to suggest that the unstructured be the norm.

Weiss indicated that while he thought it was ok if CONSER wanted to make structured numbering a requirement, that RDA should not do so.

Attig stated that the more critical issue concerned the content of the note — whether that should be structured — and that that issue needed to be addressed in RDA.

Hostage pointed out that there was some disagreement about using the terms “beginning with ...” and “ending with ...”, and the question was how to come up with alternative terms that did not make the user think that this is something that the library owns.

Boehr indicated that we need to move away from making it so difficult to instruct people on how to create a CONSER record.

Bowen said that she felt the Committee had covered everything on this topic that she needed to take back to the JSC, adding that her understanding was that the main area about which we had reservations was 2b (“Uniform titles to distinguish identical titles”).

The Chair pointed out that the Committee was well over the time limit on this discussion. Bowen thanked the Committee members for having taken the time to help her on this issue.

Fletcher asked where the Committee stood with respect to his “little surprise” document. After some discussion and clarification, the decision was made that Fletcher could submit the proposal to CC:DA via the listserv for discussion and a vote.

Bowen reminded the Committee that the deadline for the CC:DA response to the CONSER standard record was February 5, 2007.

988. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2, including discussion of the RDA development process: Bowen; Folkner

[RDA Scope and Structure]
[Strategic Plan for RDA, 2005-2008]
[RDA Objectives and Principles]
[Prospectus for RDA]

Bowen pointed out that the Committee had already heard a great deal from her on the topic of the RDA development process. She said that she would like to give the RDA Project Manager, Marjorie E. Bloss, an opportunity to talk about the issue since Bloss had a slightly different slant on it and could provide the Committee with a sense of where things stand from a broader perspective.

Marjorie E. Bloss began by talking about the RDA development process to clarify what is currently going on with RDA. She explained that as the project manager, it is her role to coordinate between all of the various groups that are involved.

At the uppermost level of the process is the CoP, which is over the JSC. Bloss reports to the Chair of the CoP. At the next level is the JSC, whose members are the individuals writing the rules. The third group, the Co-Publishers, consist of the three national associations (the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals) who will serve as the joint publishers of the work created by the JSC. These are the groups that are responsible for RDA.

Bloss' responsibility is to see that the three groups interact with one another and that no one is "left in the dark."

She gave as an example of this interaction the agreement to an extension of the RDA development process that was just recently reached. The previous 2008 release date has been extended to 2009 because ALA had indicated that under the existing schedule there would be insufficient time to review the RDA product as a whole. This concern was shared by the other five constituencies of the JSC.

At the meeting in October 2006, the JSC was asked to come up with recommendations as to what it envisaged as a revised process. This was then sent to the CoP to make the decision as to whether or not to go with the recommendation. The CoP expressed reservations because of the number of organizations that would rather see RDA come out sooner rather than later.

Bloss stressed the importance of keeping in mind the RDA is a project — so there is a time line with a beginning, middle and an end, along with a stated budget. If, therefore, the timeline is extended, the financial implications of doing so have to be considered as well. ALA gave the project an additional \$150,000, which meant that the process could continue beyond the date originally scheduled for its conclusion. The JSC could now also plan to have a meeting in April or May of 2007 to bring together representatives from other organizations, such as the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).

Bloss indicated that this should provide a general idea as to the structure of the RDA process.

There is also an RDA Project Management Committee, which meets regularly via conference call every month or two to review such things as how the project is progressing from budgeting and scheduling perspectives. There are several other issues that are also always discussed relative to the RDA project, including outreach and the final end-product, to insure that everything is in sync.

Following the decision to extend the time line, the current Chair of the JSC, Deirdre Kiorgaard (the Australian Committee on Cataloging representative) sent out a revised time line to make certain that the process of developing the content was in keeping with the newly projected date for release of the final RDA product.

Bloss said this describes what the management of the project entails, and should underscore the point that the development of RDA is a project that can not go on forever. ALA has every intention of seeing that there is a product by the beginning of 2009.

Bloss also wanted to reassure CC:DA members that there are a number of different groups that are looking at this process. Her role is to bring it all together. To assist her in this, there is an RDA Outreach Group that reports to her. It is chaired by Christine Oliver (McGill University Library, CA), and its membership includes Everett Allgood (New York University Library, USA); Matthew Beacom (Yale University Library, USA); Robina Clayphan (The British Library, UK); Gordon Dunsire (University of Strathclyde, Centre for Digital Library Research, UK); and Ebe Kartus (RMIT University Library, Australia).

After asking if there were any questions and hearing none, Bloss thanked the CC:DA for providing the opportunity for her to talk.

Bowen expressed her hope that the Committee could think strategically about all of this given what it had just heard about the project and its management. "Whatever else happens in this discussion, I hope we can include that."

Allgood began the discussion by "playing devil's advocate." He referred to an e-mail that Weiss had sent out. There had been a meeting to discuss the contents of the e-mail the past Friday, January 19. Allgood wanted to talk about some options that came out of that discussion.

Bowen responded that what she had said a moment before referred to Option #1, and that while ALA has had some real impact on the future of the rules, in continuing from this point to work with RDA, it would become increasingly difficult to alter the document too much more given the current timeline.

Allgood indicated that he, Weiss, and Diane Hillmann intended to work on an "alternative document" that would spell out their ideas and what they thought of the current RDA process.

Bowen requested clarification as to whether what was being talked about here was a re-wording or a new structure.

Weiss responded that they were planning to come up with a new structure.

Bowen indicated that she did not think a new structure was possible at this point.

Weiss responded that he, Allgood and Hillmann thought it is.

Bowen cautioned that if that was what they were planning to do, then to go ahead and do so, but with the understanding of what the overall process entailed.

Attig indicated that, on the other hand, such a document would also be a way to express what some of the major concerns are. It didn't have to be viewed as "just" a substitute document. A better understanding of what our concerns are might have a positive impact on the overall process.

Weiss clarified that the group's goal is to come up with what they think RDA should look like, and then to share those thoughts with the rest of the JSC. He pointed out that some CC:DA members felt frustrated that they were constantly being expected to remain in a response mode, and that Allgood, Hillmann, and he felt that they could express themselves better in writing. It was their intention to have something ready before the Dublin Core meeting, which was scheduled for March 16-17, 2007 in Barcelona.

Hostage said that while this may not be the appropriate time to bring it up, he felt that what needed to be clearly stated were the basic principles behind the RDA development process. If there was a way that someone could just write up the principles behind RDA, the editor wouldn't have to write them himself. Bowen asked if that was what they were talking about writing — i.e., general, overarching rules?

To which Weiss responded that that was very much what they had in mind to do.

Hostage said that he was thinking about something such as what is meant by title — that is the type of thing that should be made clear in the basic principles.

An audience member indicated that it was important to make a distinction between rules and principles, and that what Weiss was talking about were principles.

Weiss responded that whatever the “group of three” came up with, it should not use the word “rule,” which RDA did not use either.

An audience member stated it seemed as if everyone kept being told that information such as this would appear in the Introduction to RDA. But what he thought he heard Weiss saying is that a group has been formed within CC:DA that would like to inform the content of that overview.

Weiss replied that the “group of three” ultimately wanted to practice what they had been preaching, and to go from the top down, from the general to the specific.

An audience member pointed out that we did go through some restructuring and that RDA is definitely the better for it.

Weiss indicated that the “group of three” would develop something and then would provide an opportunity for others to respond to it.

Myers suggested that the process should be thought of as a project, such as building a house. The project has been developed to the point where the architectural plans have been drawn. But we are suddenly being asked to select the colors that will be used in painting the walls, even though the actual structure, itself, does not yet exist. We have had no opportunity to examine the wiring and plumbing, or the foundation that will support the building. We need to see that the studs and wiring and plumbing are properly put together before we can see the drywall hung. That is what has been argued for all along with RDA — something that tells us it is going to hold up when we sign off on it.

The Chair indicated that CC:DA was basically being presented with two options: the one that Weiss, Hillmann and Allgood were proposing, and the other being what Bowen was proposing.

But Bowen pointed out that the two options were not mutually exclusive. She requested that when the “group of three” works on its document or documents, it do so in specific terms as to what it wanted to see in the RDA introduction, etc.

Weiss responded that they were going to propose a standard and see whether or not the JSC could then incorporate that into RDA.

Hillmann added that whether or not this was something that could be incorporated into RDA by the JSC could not be predicted, but that the exercise was worth doing. She indicated that she felt part of the problem had to do with the fact that, in a sense, these are not implementation scenarios, but rather what the data is going to look like, for which these kinds of documents were critical. She pointed out that no one even knows what integrated library management systems (ILMS) product vendors will have to offer in two years. And given that there are only a few vendors who remain in the business, we should not be trying to fit what we are currently doing — which is acting like having a chain attached to your leg — into the reality of what we are trying to develop for the future. Hillmann expressed a very strong attraction to scenario 1. In terms of what was being discussed, their document would serve to clarify many of the discussions that have been had in the past. The other options include all of the disadvantages of what we are trying to do currently where things are not specified appropriately. “I don’t see them as anything that gives me great hopes.” Such activities could be especially useful to help focus CC:DA discussions appropriately.

Jizba said that this was the point she had been trying to make. “These are different scenarios — think of a bowl of fresh fruit.” But what she didn’t hear from Bloss was a discussion about the writing. If this document were given to someone at the National Library of Australia to write who had not been privy to all of the discussions that went on around the issue, what would be the result? This would not be a question she could answer because we don’t know how these things are being written. But the clarity with which this is being written is all important. She felt that this is a concern that she shared with many others. “Let’s have it at least written well.”

Myers asked what was wrong with having a wiring diagram right in the document itself.

Another audience member said that she had been so impressed with Part 1 of RDA because it does clarify the direction in which RDA is going. She indicated that laying out the direction from the beginning is what she likes so much about Neal-Schuman publications, and that she would very much like to see something along those lines in the introduction to RDA.

Attig indicated that this would point in the direction of understanding that there are several models for database implementation rather than just a single model.

Alice [from audience] agreed that she had the same question, and was wondering if there had been any outreach attempts to ILS vendors in order to get them thinking more creatively about how they might design their products in the future.

Bloss responded that those working on the RDA project have been reaching out to vendors from the very beginning, asking them to take a look at, for example, the initial on-line RDA prototype. Vendors were very definitely among the groups being included in the discussions. At the ALA Annual Conference last year there were a number of one-on-one sessions held with vendors for this very purpose.

Weiss clarified that he thought Alice was referring to outreach to the vendors to discuss how they were going to use the product.

Bowen added that meetings of the “FRBR Implementers Group” had begun working with vendors at ALA conferences who have some interest in implementing FRBR in their integrated library system (ILS) products about five years ago, and that each of the ILS vendors has a “FRBR contact” person. She said that this has been a very active group.

Attig also pointed out that yesterday morning’s MARBI meeting had begun with a discussion about the communications environments within which vendors do these types of descriptions.

Maxwell added that while vendors could choose to ignore us, it would be a different matter altogether if OCLC were to say that they were going to implement a database based upon relationships.

Hillmann said that one of the nice things about a picture like this is that we can visualize it in our own heads and test what we are actually doing against it. One thing that came out for her, she added, was that when you looked at Scenario #1, there is a link between the manifestation and work [Weiss interjected “that should be removed”] and that is what we should be considering. She asked if that was what we wanted to do. If we wanted RDA to work in more than just a library environment, then we needed to think about things such as how this structure would work in a number of different contexts.

Hostage expressed his thought that there was something to think about in all three scenarios, and asked if we could not aim for Scenario #1, but also support parts of Scenario #3.

Allgood said he wanted to make a point that he has made in the past, and that is “If we go back to the options thing, I think that we have one other option. This year we have only one more of those meetings.” Bowen pointed out that the JSC went through the RDA principles at every meeting.

But Weiss indicated that he did not think the JSC was following those principles.

Bowen responded that in order for the JSC to address such a statement, it needed to know in what specific cases it was not following the principles, rather than just hearing a general statement such as “the JSC doesn’t follow its own principles.”

Attig asked Bowen what opportunities the CC:DA would have to comment if it discovered any issues with regard to those sections of RDA that were going to be distributed in the near future. Would there be opportunities for commenting on Chapters 1-5, which we’ve already gone through? If we have issues that we think should be considered in Chapters 6 or 7, how should those be dealt with?

Bowen replied that with respect to Chapters 6 and 7, once Chapter 3 had been sent out for review, then the RDA editor would begin working on revising Chapters 6 and 7, which she believed would be available for initial comment by the JSC at its April meeting. She indicated that there was always an editor’s draft to look at just for the purpose of making initial comments.

If there were things that CC:DA members would like to see in that the revision of Chapters 6 and 7, she thought that she could put them forward informally. And if she had some wording based on the old draft, she would see if the RDA editor could incorporate it. “There is that window of opportunity for Chapters 6 and 7 that you could take advantage of, if you wanted to do that.”

Attig interjected that there was even more opportunity to do this for Part B, to which Bowen agreed.

But Bowen said that for the next few months, CC:DA should probably focus its attention on Chapters 6 and 7. As far as Chapter 3 was concerned, that would just be a draft to which ALA should prepare a response. She asked that the Committee talk about what level of comments it wanted to make on Chapter 3. “It’s probably one of the chapters that lends itself the most to detailed comment because there is so much detail having to do with the different types of materials.” And then the revised Chapters 6 and 7 would come out.

Bowen clarified that the Committee should begin by talking about how to approach the draft of Chapter 3, and then follow that with a discussion as to how to approach Chapters 6 and 7, because she strongly felt that they were two separate processes, each of which required different strategies to be developed.

Weiss said that the Committee wouldn’t know until it had seen the draft as to the level of detail at which it is inclined to comment.

Bowen agreed that was true. But she indicated that there were hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of detailed comments that ALA previously put forward on Chapter 3 alone, thereby providing a huge number of potential comments that it could put forward on this again. But ALA has also noted that it doesn’t really want the JSC spending its time resolving these comments. She pointed out that there was a real kind of “inherent tension here” — that the JSC sees as part of its job the need to respond to what is put forward by way of comments. Attig referred back to Bowen’s comment that there were “hundreds of comments on Chapter 3 that weren’t gone over by the JSC.” But since they were now included in the historical record, he assumed that part of the CC:DA’s working operation should be not to put forward those same comments again.

Bowen said that she was hoping such would be the procedure, and appreciated Attig saying that — that the Committee should always make a conscious decision not to put forward the same comments again.

Attig indicated that the Committee might have to make an exception if there was an issue that really needed to be brought up again, but as a general working procedure, he thought it was helpful. On the other hand, he pointed out that there would be a tremendous amount of new material in Chapter 3 for which it would be appropriate to respond. “There’s an awful lot in there and an awful lot that is in detail,” including definitions and labels for at least all of the categories. Those would be important details to comment on, along with the general overall structure or presence or absence of items. He felt that whatever approach was agreed upon would include a combination of things.

Weiss thought that it was legitimate for the JSC to say that they did not have time to go through all of the comments initially made about Chapter 3. Because the draft has changed, Weiss felt it was up to the respondents to go through the original ALA comments and see which ones they thought were still relevant so that the JSC could focus on the bigger picture.

Kathy Glennan indicated that part of her concern here was having the ability to input into the wiki whatever someone felt was important, and to do so at whatever level of detail; and then perhaps decide that of those comments, which were the most important to put forward. “But I would hate to see us self-censoring, with the idea that we have to keep the ALA response under two hundred pages.” Yet since that, in turn, puts more burden on the editorial process of getting our response together for Chapter 3, she did not know how Bowen wanted to pursue it. “But I just hate to have people self-censoring.”

Weiss thought it was fair for the JSC to ask that comments be prioritized and put into Confluence in an order that would be most useful to it. If the JSC felt that structural comments should come first, and then typographical things later — it could be done either way. He recognized that the JSC has an incredible amount of work to do, and felt that ALA should do what it could to help the JSC get through this.

The Chair pointed out that the last time this was done, Bowen had to do most of the work herself, but she no longer had that kind of time.

Bowen said that she thought it would be most useful to have the comments in rule number order, which then made it much easier to go through them. If CC:DA could find some way in which those could then be prioritized, so that when she or the new JSC representative for ALA went through them they could say that comments on rules go one direction, comments on typos go elsewhere. She indicated that she and Attig have been talking about coming up with some conventions to assist in this process. If there were some sort of mechanism whereby comments could be separated out into groupings such as “high priority” as opposed to “typos,” something like that might be useful. She explained that she already has to sort out comments regarding “typos” from the others, since comments on typos, or comments on examples, go forward in a separate stream. Comments with respect to examples go to the Examples Groups, and comments about typos will be in a separate stream as well. So if the Committee could think up some new conventions that could be added to streamline the process, that would be something that would help. Weiss suggested that the CC:DA Chair and Bowen discuss the issue and come up with the rules — then tell Committee members what those rules are, so they can follow them.

Bowen added that if a comment had been put forward earlier that was not acted upon, then we should follow up on it at this time. Somehow, those comments should be flagged for special attention — that the JSC should receive those as the absolutely highest priority. What would be most helpful is if such comments could be flagged in a way that would allow the JSC to go back to the response table and see what happened during the initial review.

Weiss pointed out that it was very difficult to go through all those comments on the comment tables. To which Attig responded that if the ALA members did not do so, then it was the ALA representative who had to do it.

Bowen added that if anyone wanted to put through a comment on a different topic, they could also do so.

Weiss pointed out that for the ALA members to go through the response table required that each individual remember which specific comments he or she had made.

Myers said that being able to identify your specific comments was why it was suggested that an individual first make comments in a Word document that could then be saved.

Bowen did not remember which version of the Response Table is on Confluence. But she did know that the JSC did not put out a revised version of the Response Table for Chapter 3 to reflect any of the Chapter

3 revisions after last summer's version of Chapter 3. This means that we would have to go back to that older version.

Bowen indicated that if there are big issues with Chapter 3 as far as needing some sort of general guidelines that aren't there, then that is the type of thing we can talk about and put forward. But if there are things that appear to be missing in Chapter 3, the JSC needed to have specific wording as to what should go in, where it should go in, and what the wording should be.

Weiss referred back to part of his comments earlier, indicating that the current structure of RDA does not lend itself to doing that very well.

Jizba indicated that she had made her comments with what she felt the specific wording should be, but that they were merely summarized, and she did not know what to do about something like that.

Bowen said that she could not really address that without knowing what Jizba's specific comments had been.

Jizba asked that if the JSC representative wanted those making comments to be more helpful, then the JSC representative should tell us what to do.

Bowen stated that what would be most helpful would be specific guidance, such as offering specific wording, since, for the most part, the JSC tells the editor what should be the wording of the rule.

Jizba said that she had been told that it was the editor who made the decisions as to the wording.

Bowen indicated that only once in awhile did the JSC make a decision and then say, "Tom, please go back and re-write this." The JSC's operational mode is to put forth rule revisions that have specific wording before giving them to the editor.

She added that the other thing she does routinely is to summarize comments. If someone sends three pages about an issue, she does not always put forth all three pages. Sometimes she will instead just summarize the content. She again pointed out the need for ALA to be conscious of not putting forward another two hundred page response.

Jizba asked Bowen if, then, all she wanted are the details.

Bowen requested that she just be given something that is as specific as possible — that the JSC could look at and say, "Oh, ok that can go in here." A comment that merely says, "This rule isn't clear," should instead be asking if the rule means this, or does the rule mean that.

Weiss added that he knew that was what he did. But the problem was if it isn't clear, then how are we to know what is supposed to be there?

Bowen restated the importance of phrasing comments in such situations in terms of "does it mean that in this situation we do this and this and this, or does it mean that we do that" — but to just say "this isn't clear" is not that helpful.

Jizba indicated that there have been times when she did just that, but it didn't seem to make a difference.

Bowen explained that she usually has about three weeks to go through hundreds of pages of comments, and that if something is not clear the first time, then she needs to go on. But if it appears to be something that other people have said, "Yes, I agree," and she is still not clear on it, then she goes back to the person who first made the comment and requests clarification. She added that one of the reasons that the "agree/disagree" process is used is as a check for her to request additional guidance when needed. That process seems to be one that works, and she proposed that it be continued in the future.

Bowen asked for discussion on whether there were other big issues pertaining to Chapter 3 and before moving on to issues pertaining to Chapters 6 and 7.

Weiss asked how we could do so when we haven't yet seen the re-writes.

Bowen said that she just wanted to know if there were further thoughts anyone wanted her to put forward to the JSC, especially in light of the earlier discussions about having an impact on the process, and wanting to influence what goes into that other draft. This would be the time to do so.

Attig said that he would like to see clarification as to what is an access point, and had been intending to add something about that to the online discussion.

Bowen indicated that such a comment is exactly the type of thing she had been talking about. If there were other topics anyone would like to see somewhere, then put forth some wording, such as "well this maybe could go in Chapter 7..."

Bowen said that in the discussion earlier today about the value of identifiers vs. controlled access, it sounded as if we wanted to say that "this is the best case, this is the best practice" — so that would be one action item. The other would be what she could get in writing from Maxwell as far as the outline goes. But were there any other big, overarching things?

Schiff said that he had been hoping that the latest examples would be incorporated into Chapter 2, but that he had recently heard those will be incorporated into the new draft and not carried over.

Bowen responded that Delsey has been working on that as his time permits and is trying to incorporate all of these.

The discussion then moved to the Scope and Structure document.

Weiss restated that he thought what Delsey had done in the Scope document was "fantastic," especially having the element/subelements to explain how things relate to one another. Bowen explained that the revised Scope document had been prepared in response to concerns raised by ALA. But even though the JSC had not requested a response to the Scope document that did not preclude ALA from putting forth informally any comments it might have.

The Chair asked how many other CC:DA members besides Weiss thought that we should send comments to the JSC about the revised Scope document.

Weiss indicated that he thought it was inappropriate for the JSC not to have asked for comments on the new Scope document.

Attig agreed with Weiss that if the Committee had comments on the Scope document, then they should go forward with them.

Hillmann indicated that she thought what Weiss was saying was important. One of the values of a document like this is to be able to say that when we have a rule, we can test it against something like this. She asked if Bowen was suggesting some mode for the group to provide comments, since there was not enough time to do so today.

Bowen said that she had wanted to get a sense of whether or not CC:DA members would want to make comments on the document, which she had suspected they would. She had the impression that most of the comments had to do with the wording, itself. She asked if a blank document would be the easiest way for commenting, or if the full document should be on Confluence.

The Chair asked for clarification as to the timeframe for so doing. Bowen responded that since this was an informal document, there is no timeframe. But since the JSC meeting was to be held in April, it would be very helpful to have any comments — either on Confluence or via an informal e-mail response — by mid-March.

Weiss felt that there should be a formal response, and asked why the JSC had not requested one.

Bowen clarified that she had in fact argued the case before the JSC that there should be a formal response, and that one of the reasons she had done so was because she had wanted to know how the CC:DA felt about this document. But her argument for a formal response had not been accepted by the JSC, primarily because of the number of other documents that it had to deal with, the RDA timeframe, and the JSC's operating procedure to respond to any comments it receives. The JSC is still dealing with Chapters 0, 1, 2 and 5 comments, and will then have the Chapter 3 comments, followed by those for Chapters 6 and 7. She believed that this was the rationale for the JSC not putting the Scope document forward for formal comments.

Myers suggested that the details as to the nature of ALA's response could probably be worked out on the CC:DA listserv.

Bowen pointed out that in the short term, we will have a revised Scope document with comments. She requested a volunteer to go through and put those comments together, which Weiss indicated he would do.

Larsgaard said that non CC:DA members who have comments should pass those along to their constituency representatives on the CC:DA; if someone had a comment that was really important but did not have a constituency representative, then those comments should be passed on to a voting member of CC:DA.

Bowen said that she needed to know that the group had a plan to move forward because the draft for Chapter 3 will be coming very soon. She pointed out that there will not be another ALA meeting before that next draft. The draft for the revised Chapters 6 and 7 will come out only about a week before the CC:DA Friday meeting at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference, something like what happened when Chapters 6 and 7 came out the week of the 2006 ALA Annual Conference. Before we could really look at it, we were meeting on it.

Bowen then clarified that the Friday meeting at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference would be used primarily to discuss Chapters 6 and 7 since by that time the review of comments pertaining to Chapter 3 would almost have been completed.

989. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2007/1 (preliminary)]

Allgood said that he would take the documents in the order in which they had been discussed at the MARBI meeting.

Proposal No. 2007-01: Definition of subfields \$b and \$j in field 041 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format:

- Proposal approved with minor editorial revisions.

Proposal No. 2007-02: Incorporating invalid former headings in 4XX fields of the MARC 21 Authority Format:

- Proposal approved with the amendment that value 'h' will be defined in subfield \$w, byte 1. Value 'h' will represent: "Do not display in any reference structure."

Proposal No.: 2007-03: Addition of subfield \$5 (Institution to which field applies) in fields 533 (Reproduction Note) and 538 (Systems Details Note):

- Proposal approved with the amendment that the subfield \$5 will also be defined in the corresponding MARC 21 Holdings fields (i.e., 843 for reproductions and 538 for System details.)

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP02: Use of field 520 for content advice statements:

- This paper will come back as a proposal with a new indicator value defined and subfield \$c defined to record the source of the statement.

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP04: Definition of Field 004 (Control Number for Related Bibliographic Record) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format:

- OCLC wrote this paper seeking guidance and input on how to represent the link between institutional records and master records as they migrate the RLG database to OCLC.
- While MARBI recognizes the value of this form of linking ability, the committee was unable to reconcile how best to implement based on this paper. The paper may come back to MARBI as a revised Discussion Paper though there are no formal plans for that at present.

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP03: Recording the linking ISSN (ISSN-L) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats:

- This Discussion Paper will come back as a proposal.

Discussion Paper No.: 2007-DP01: Changes for the German and Austrian conversion to MARC 21:

- MARBI was pleased to discuss this thoroughly researched and well-considered paper detailing several revisions to the MARC 21 formats. Many of the elements will come back to MARBI as proposals; some of the others may require further discussion.
- This process represents a significant step toward the internationalization of record sharing among libraries and institutions.

Allgood said that MARBI was also pleased to receive and discuss two RDA reports that were the product of two separate initiatives mentioned in Jennifer Bowen's RDA report to MARBI at the 2006 Annual ALA Conference.

- RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization [PDF Document; 519.48K] (Requires the free Adobe Acrobat Reader)
- RDA/MARC Report [PDF Document; 2.80MB] (Requires the free Adobe Acrobat Reader)

This was part of the ongoing process of keeping MARBI informed of the RDA development process.

990. Change to rule 5.5B1, Extent of item for notated music: Scharff

[CC:DA/MLA/2006/1/Rev]

Mark Scharff thanked CC:DA for the opportunity to put forth these issues from the Bibliographic Control Committee of The Music Library Association.

He explained that the major change that was being proposed was eliminating the use of "v./p./leaves of music" in favor of using "score" for all notated music not in part format (and not in a more specific score format, such as vocal score, miniature score, etc.) He indicated that this change was in the spirit of the recent change in AACR2 that broadened the definition of score. In addition, consistently referring to this type of notated music as "scores" would simplify the cataloguing rules as we move to RDA. It is strongly recommended, however, that the current distinction between musical parts (not all instruments/voices represented) and musical scores be retained when describing carriers, since this information is well understood and heavily used. He asked if anyone had any comments or questions.

Weiss said that he thought it was a good idea and that the CC:DA should support it.

Attig moved that the proposal be accepted and moved forward. Weiss seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Bowen indicated that since the JSC already had a working copy of Chapter 3, she thought that what she would do in the proposal is to add the relevant rule numbers for Chapter 3 when it is put forward.

991. Report from the Task Force for the Review of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles: Allgood

Allgood said that there was not much to report, but that the Task Force had asked him, even though this may be inferred in the charge, to present the charge to CC:DA and ask for a straw poll vote for explicit approval for this direction of the Task Force.

The Task Force met on Friday and members of the group felt it important to the overall mission of the Task Force to prepare an interim review paper on the latest available draft of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles which impacts the development of future international cataloging rules, looking at the principles both generally and specifically as to how they impact RDA. This is an opportunity for CC:DA to contribute to the development of this process and so the Task Force will present its comments to CC:DA.

Weiss said that he was a little confused. Was the Task Force asking if CC:DA would accept comments from the Task Force on this subject, or if the CC:DA should send comments to IFLA?

Allgood responded that the question was whether or not CC:DA would accept comments from the Task Force.

Weiss replied that yes, it would, as long as there is then some place for CC:DA to send the comments to. He suggested that CC:DA receive the comments and then see if there was a place to which they can be forwarded.

Allgood indicated that that was the problem: there was no mechanism at this point for putting the comments forward.

Tillett asked if, since there was no place or person to send those comments to, would it not just be a waste of time to prepare a document? She said that she thought it was really productive and useful to have this Task Force formed in order for them to begin a discussion on the subject with the rest of CC:DA. But she reiterated that there is no place in IFLA right now where specific comments could be sent — that there will eventually be a place, but that such a process is not yet in place. She added that if CC:DA wanted to “jump the gun,” then that was fine, but to do so in a constructive way.

Weiss said that even if there was not yet a mechanism in place for CC:DA to send comments, that it was still a good idea for the Task Force to present its comments to CC:DA.

The Chair indicated that she did not know of any reason why the Task Force could not go ahead and prepare its comments to be discussed by CC:DA, and asked Larsgaard for her opinion.

Larsgaard suggested that the Task Force go ahead and include all of the comments it wishes to make on the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, whether or not they have to do directly with RDA, since this is a very important document and the Committee would appreciate receiving anything from the Task Force that it thought was relevant information for CC:DA.

Allgood asked that a straw vote be taken at this time to determine whether or not the Task Force has the explicit approval of CC:DA for the Task Force to be moving in this direction.

The Chair ask for a show of hands on the question: Does CC:DA want the Task Force to comment on the document? The straw poll indicated CC:DA approval for the Task Force to send its comments on the document to CC:DA.

992. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business, reports from the floor, announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

The Chair reported on the Friday evening CCS Executive Committee meeting. She had been able to attend most, but not all of it.

First, with respect to the RDA Implementation Task Force, a chair or co-chairs should be identified by the end of Midwinter, and the members should be appointed by the 2007 ALA Annual Conference.

Second, the strategic plan for ALCTS should be out shortly. A tracking database is in development that should be available in January and that would be a dynamic and useful tool. It would be viewable by all members, but could only be edited by certain higher level people.

The Chair asked if there was any other business.

Weiss said that he knew the CC:DA had talked about this issue before, but he wanted to bring it up again — his concern that the CC:DA is violating the ALA code with respect to open meeting rules by having a closed listserv. He still thinks that CC:DA should open the list for anybody to subscribe to if it is to fulfill the spirit of the ALA rule.

The Chair asked for Larsgaard's interpretation of the matter.

Larsgaard indicated that, while Chair of CC:DA, she had looked into this matter. The regulations concerning ALA listservs indicate it is not a violation of the open meetings rule to have closed e-mail lists. At one point she had been thinking about using AUTOCAT as a forum for discussion topics, but the logistics of getting comments to the Committee were unworkable. She did suggest that CC:DA work with Charles Wilt to set up a second listserv that would be completely open to anyone.

Myers pointed out that we should keep in mind that AUTOCAT is not the only listserv community out there. People also subscribe to OCLC and specialist community's listservs. Maxwell responded that that being said, there was nothing that suggested we couldn't have an open list. He agreed with Weiss that anyone should be able to subscribe but only CC:DA would be able to respond.

Attig indicated that this was actually a "perfect segue" into an issue he has wanted to bring up. In 1994, CC:DA appointed a Communications Committee. One of its suggestions had been that the CC:DA develop a website — and a website was subsequently developed, as well as a brochure for international cataloging standards, and a number of other products. He said that he felt this might not be too soon to start looking again — very broadly — at a strategy for a creating a new CC:DA Communications Committee, and proposed that the CC:DA put forward a proposal asking everyone to look into this, especially in light of all of the technologies that exist now that weren't there at the time the first Communications Committee came into being.

Maxwell said that while he thought it was very important that the CC:DA investigate the idea of re-creating a Communications Committee, in the meantime he would support Weiss and his expressed concerns regarding open listservs.

Weiss asked if there were any members who thought this was a bad idea and would oppose having an open list.

Glennan asked if there was any point to having such a list if what you wanted was the feedback.

Weiss clarified that that was not his point. "I think our constituencies should be able to see how CC:DA makes its decisions. It is different from, but sort of like the Congressional Record where you can go back and look at what a particular senator said about a particular issue on any given day."

Weiss asked if the Committee could delegate to the Chair — or have the Chair delegate to someone — the task of seeing how this can be done and what it would take to make this happen.

The Chair indicated that she could certainly investigate whether this was a possibility, what would be involved, and a suggested timeline.

Attig said that if that were the case, then he would like to make a motion that CC:DA establish a Task Force for Marketing. The motion was seconded.

Weiss indicated that he was still not very clear as to how this task force would be used: for marketing RDA. Would it be trying to get out the word about what the CC:DA was doing?

Attig responded that the task force could work on the website, or any number of issues, but that CC:DA needed to start thinking about both what the message should be and how to get it out there.

Weiss suggested that it would be good if we could have at least one member that was not a member of CC:DA as a “test case.”

The Chair asked if there was any other discussion and, if not, then she would like to call for a vote.

There were no abstentions, and none opposed; the motion passed.

The Chair advised that the next meeting of the CC:DA would be held at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. She noted that the times for those meetings would be:

- Friday, June 22nd, 1-5:30
- Saturday, June 23rd, 1:30–5:30
- Monday, June 25th, 8-10 and 1:30–3:30

Because of the ALCTS 50th anniversary event, CC:DA would not be able to meet straight through the morning on Monday. That is why Monday afternoon is on the schedule — so that the time will be available if we need it.

The Chair then asked for a motion to adjourn.

Weiss made the motion to adjourn, which was seconded. The motion carried.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Felicity Dykas, Intern
Penny Welbourne, Intern