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
2009 Midwinter ALA conference in Denver, Colorado
January 24 and 26, 2009

Members present:
John Myers, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Sylvia Hall-Ellis
Robert Maxwell
Kevin Randall
Lisa Robare
Paul Weiss
Kathy Winzer

Alexandra Crosier, Intern
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, Intern
Patricia Hatch, CC:DA Webmaster

Ex-officio representatives present:
John Attig, ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC

ALA Liaisons present:
Kieko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/CC:CCM
Steven J. Miller, ALCTS/NRMIG
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/PARS
Manon Théroux, ALA/ACRL
Shelby Harken, ALA/LITA
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT (represented by Mary Larsgaard)
Bob Hall, ALA/PLA
Ken Wade, ALA/RU.S.A

Non-ALA Liaisons:
John Hostage, AALL
Elizabeth Lilker, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Thomas Duszak, CLA
Diane Hillmann, DCMI
John Hostage, IFLA

Chamla Kincy, MedLA
Mark Scharff, MusLA
Greta De Groat, OLAC (represented by Martha Yee)
Peter Fletcher, PCC
Dorothy McGarry, SLA

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 some cases are exact quotes included.

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, and 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:

AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision
AALL = American Association of Law Libraries
AASL = American Association of School Librarians
ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate
ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries
ALA = American Library Association
ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Association of North America
ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections
ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association
CC:AAM = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:CCM = Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CC:DA = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
CDS = LC Cataloging Distribution Service
CIP = Cataloging in Publication
CLA = Catholic Library Association
CoP = Committee of Principals for AACR
DC = Dublin Core
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
DCRM(S) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)
FRAD = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Authority Data

FRBR = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
FRSAR = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records
HTML = Hypertext Mark-up Language
ICP = International Cataloguing Principles
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS = Integrated library system
IME-ICC = IFLA Meetings of Experts on International Cataloguing Code
ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LCCN = Library of Congress Control Number
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MAGERT = Maps and Geography Round Table
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RU.S.A Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MusLA = Music Librari Association
NAL = National Agricultural Library
NASIG = North American Serials Interest Group
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM = National Library of Medicine
NRMIG = Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS = Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA = Public Library Association
RBMS = Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RDA = Resource Description and Access
RU.S.A = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = Subject Analysis Committee
SKOS = Simple Knowledge Organization System
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, June 24, 2009, 1:30-5:30 p.m.
Marriott, Colorado Ballroom F

1058. Welcome and opening remarks

John Myers, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. He welcomed visitors and committee members.

1059. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives
[CC: DA/Roster/2008/July]

The **Chair** and members introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to sign in.

1060. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/Agenda/59]

Winzer moved to adopt the agenda; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

1061. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2008 Annual Conference, June 28, 29, and July 1, 2008

[CC: DA/M/1039-1057]

The **Chair** mentioned several minor corrections to the minutes:

On page 8, the sentence, "Glennan replied... instruction," should be "instructions". And the section "[Note: In the event...", should be "Note: Subsequently ...." On page 17, the third quote from the top of the page is attributed to Elizabeth Lilker, which should have been Patricia Thurston. On page 9: "Part -II-What's next?" end of first sentence, need to add the word "system", so it says "authoring system." On page 10, under "CDS Update", DCRM(S) - add at the end of that sentence "in collaboration with ACRL RBMS." On page 11, second paragraph starting "Genre/form records", second line after "motion picture" please add "and radio program." And in the next sentence please expand "music and law" to also include "cartography, literature, and religion." Just before 1046 (further down p. 11), need a space for MARC 21 (it's correct under the MARBI report later).

There were no other corrections. **Maxwell** moved to approve the minutes; seconded by **Robare**. Motion carried unanimously.

1062. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, June - December 2008:
[CC:DA/Chair/2008-2009/2]
[CC:DA Report of Strategic Comments on RDA]

Hall-Ellis moved to approve the Chair's report on CC:DA motions; seconded by **Randall**. Motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** reviewed the process by which comments on the complete draft of RDA were gathered, extracted, and forwarded to the ALA representative to the JSC. The drafting process of the ALA response is ongoing.

The **Chair** thanked the Task Force on the Review of Proposed ISBD Area 0 for their work in spite of short time and connectivity problems.

Currently, there are three email lists: the private [ala-ccda] list; the [ccda] list used by the membership; and the [rules] list, viewable by the public. At ALA Annual 2008, CC:DA agreed to migrate all committee work to the [rules] list. The Chair will work with Charles Wilt after the meeting to complete the migration.

At the previous night's CCS Executive Meeting, Attig mentioned several constraints that would impede implementation of CC:DA's recommendations as listed in the Report of Strategic Comments, most importantly, the ALA's governance structure and a lack of time and resources. There was also a minority view that was given at the meeting. The final recommendation to ALCTS was to focus on implementation and how these implementation efforts could compensate for RDA's shortcomings. The Chair will ask Mary Woodley, Chair of CCS Exec, for a formal report prior to CC:DA's Monday meeting.

Ratkovich thanked the Chair for his work on the Strategic Comments.

1063. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

Attig began by explaining that although he had hoped to have a discussion of the major issues raised in

comments on the full draft of RDA, he has completed a first draft of only about a third of the comments. He began at the end of the text, so many substantive issues are yet to be raised on the discussion list. He has begun a blog
(http://www.personal.psu.edu/jxa16/blogs/resource_description_and_access_ala_rep_notes/) as an informal way to communicate as he works through the draft. He will continue to post during the JSC meeting in March. While he is not looking for comments, readers should feel free to do so.

Attig summarized some of the activities that have taken place since the CC:DA meeting in Anaheim, beginning with the teleconference reports sent out by the JSC Secretary, Natalie Schultz. The first teleconference focused on the core element set. This and other discussions resulted in what is now section 0.6 in the General Introduction. Core elements reflect back to FRBR/FRAD user tasks. The JSC decided that there are no formal standards to use as referents in this case. FRAD will not be referenced in detail because it doesn't have sufficient analysis of attributes and relationships in relation to user tasks. A document drafted by the British Library's Alan Danskin discusses the core element set—how it relates to the user tasks section and how to use it. It includes a section on the strengths and weaknesses of the core set. The core element set is meant to be a baseline; a record based on core elements alone may not be adequate but can be said to follow RDA. We need to provide a rationale for these decisions based on FRBR user tasks, specifically those listed on page 3 of Danskin's document. This document will be used as a tool by the JSC in evaluating comments on the core element set. Attig was skeptical about the JSC's interpretation of some of the FRBR recommendations. For example, he saw no justification for excluding Place of Publication from the list of core elements when it is assigned a high value in the FRBR tables. Attig intended to include those comments in the ALA response to the draft.

Discussion on the core elements:

Schmierer expressed concern that the term "core" is used in so many other contexts that it is difficult to focus on what it means in this specific situation; calling them principal elements or prime elements or anything else would help. **Hillmann** agreed with Schmierer. She argued that mandatory core elements should be defined separately for different contexts (formats and materials).

Weiss advised that the rules preclude using the word "should" and that the JSC needs to clarify their intentions about how the core element set would be used to define an RDA record. **Hillmann** added that machines don't know what to do with "should."

Weiss recommended that anything that has RDA elements be called an RDA record, but records that follow the core element set be identified as something more meaningful. **Attig** noted that the core element set could provide a particular view of the instructions that would include the most heavily applied and essential elements. **Weiss** added that they may not be the most important for all types of materials, but they would be the most relevant *across* formats. **Attig** reported that the JSC had received good input for elements essential for cartographic materials and hoped that other groups would contribute as well. **Weiss** suggested "generic" as a more suitable term than "core".

Glennan pointed out that many of the core elements are conditional. **Hillmann** agreed that this is a problem; machines cannot handle conditional as well as humans can. **Attig** noted that distinguishing entities from others of same or similar name is an objective. Can we say we're addressing this objective if we make no requirements? **Glennan** explained that core elements are playing more than one role: they are core elements to be recorded, as well as present to generate a preferred access point. The conditional option becomes a problem when recording a particular element is necessary to identify a work. **Attig** noted that restructured RDA access points are not elements. **Myers** echoed Glennan's concern about these "quasi-core elements" when it comes to distinguishing between entities. Hillmann has introduced identifiers for machine-driven linkage between records. Our constructed access points are visual, humanly-intelligible identifiers for entities. He suggested that framing a formally constructed access point as an identifier might help. **Attig** replied that access points are made up of elements but are not themselves elements. He has taken the point that conditional things are problematic. **Glennan** was

inclined to include things like key, number, etc. in the core element set that may not be needed as access points in most cases.

Weiss supported Attig's approach over Glennan's. He was leaning toward having different core element sets for different communities. He thought the hardest work would be coming up with the element set. Even title, he mused, is not relevant to all resource types, (specimens, for example, don't have titles or require them for identification). **Hillmann** thought it would be safer *not* to create a core element set, particularly one that is appropriate across different communities. She suggested picking the most general case (textual materials) and creating a set just for that to be used in initial schema. Later, other communities could add their own schema. It is not as difficult for a machine to deal with as you'd think. **Maxwell** said he was not unhappy with the way it is written now, though he does support changing the word "core".

Randall needed clarification about why the IME-ICC principles were rejected in favor of FRBR. **Tillett** replied that the ICP uses "essential elements" and "additional elements" which function on a different set of principles. **Randall** mentioned that the ICP could be an additional set of resources for construction of the core element set. At the moment, ICP seems to be considered less relevant. **Attig** said the JSC could look at it.

Weiss commented that the one thing needed was clarity. **Attig** summarized that there was disagreement over the need for a distinguishable set of elements. He said he would report the various arguments.

Schmierer argued that we should not backtrack; we've developed a clear understanding of what the distinguished elements should be for formats we've been working with for a long time. We need to identify some of these classic circumstances and acknowledge that there will be new formats coming along which will require additional development. **Weiss** disagreed.

Attig asked for recommendations for elements necessary to visual materials, music, and other formats that were not sufficiently accounted for in the draft. The JSC "recognizes that there is not even coverage for elements in the core set at this point."

Weiss noted that extrinsic conditionals are not good, but intrinsic conditionals are.

Hillmann posited that it would be less important to include special sets of core elements in the rules than to start conversations within user communities in order to begin work on building the schema. **Attig** agreed that these conversations have started and should continue. **Weiss** recommended that CC:DA create a task force to work on a short document to guide different communities through this process. **Hillmann** responded that some of this has been done by DCMI. **Attig** added that the workflows feature in the RDA product provides similar guidance.

Attig continued his report. ALA had requested that non-human individuals be included in the definition of persons; the JSC agreed to explicitly broaden the definition, but decided not to add examples of non-human individuals at this time. Further instructions would be given later to apply the general instructions for the heading.

The JSC discussed appendices I, J, and K, resolving structural differences between them. Attig apologized for problems in appendix J and thanked Randall for identifying numerous errors therein.

Hillmann said that she was trying to register Appendix J. **Attig** asked that Hillmann delay doing so until he gives it to Nannette Naught, as the relationship designators in particular are very preliminary. **Hillmann** argued that strict versioning will prevent problems. **Attig** and **Tillett** cautioned Hillmann to postpone action until after the JSC's March meeting.

Within the Glossary, **Attig** said the JSC had considered whether a definition of Edition was needed and decided to leave it out. They determined that the scope of Edition Statement gives enough information; a definition in the glossary will only lead to confusion. **Robare** stated that catalogers' understanding of what edition means is central. It will be a challenge to communicate. **Attig** countered that explaining that

editions are expressions, except when they are manifestations, will further confuse people. "If we're trying to focus on the FRBR categories, edition will make your mind spin."

Attig said the JSC had tried to clarify the definition of Volume to indicate that volumes may be bound or fastened together. There is an expansion in the rules for unbound volumes.

The JSC merged Technique and Version into an element called "Other distinguishing characteristics of the expression." They have been unsure about what to say about the relationship between preferred title and the title proper of a manifestation. At the moment, the draft doesn't address this issue. **Attig** noted that he believes the first manifestation or expression of a work is a very useful concept, one that RDA doesn't fully use.

ALA had argued against the provision in previous drafts that called for the preferred access point for a part to be based on the name of the whole plus the name of the part. The JSC agreed, and reinstated provisions from AACR2 25.6.

Jizba repeated her concern that distinctions between preferred title of work and title proper be clarified. There are as many complications that arise with print materials, she argued, as there are with sound recordings. She was unsure how core rules would apply to title. **Attig** explained that the title proper is the title of the manifestation, the preferred title of the work is the title of the work. He reiterated that the relationship between the preferred title of the work and the concept of first manifestation is not clear.

Attig continued: "loose-leaf" will be used to describe a type of updating resource, not a binding format. The JSC clarified the rule on unnumbered pages, leaves, and columns to be consistent with practices for rare materials. They deleted some exceptions for recording Extent of notated music, as the general instructions were deemed sufficient. They had a "fascinating discussion about skin, parchment, and leather." They rejected some requests to add some specific types of video formats, as there is a provision that allows for whatever term in use. They investigated encoding formats and discovered that JPEG2000 is a new standard and not a version of the JPEG standard.

The JSC has agreed to stop using the title of the first work as the title of the compilation. Instead, there will be separate access points for each title with an alternative instruction to name the work using a devised title. **Glennan** asked how one would devise a title for an unnamed compilation. **Attig** replied that there are instructions in Chapter 2 for devising titles.

The assumption written into the instructions on preferred access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies is that one would wish to distinguish different persons, not only in the preferred access point, but in variant access points as well. This is not current U.S. [NACO] practice. He commented that the U.S. would have to decide how to apply this provision; RDA doesn't require that variants be distinguished.

The JSC decided to adopt a more contemporary spelling of the Q'ran/Koran. It isn't an exact systematic transliteration, but is in common usage in many sources.

The JSC's final conference call dealt with the General Introduction.

In early December, ALA responded to 5JSC/Chair/13 on eliminating the exception for serials at 1.1.4.1.1, as well as other issues regarding acronyms and title changes for continuing resources. The JSC consensus was consistent with the ALA positions.

The current chair of the JSC is Marge Stewart from Library and Archives Canada. She insisted on a 6-month term, which will expire at the end of June, 2009.

Attig noted that there are three documents to which CC:DA must respond: the full draft and two follow-ups to 5JSC/LC/12. He praised Glennan and Scharff on work they did in the responses to 5JSC/LC/12.

1064. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

[LC Representative's Report to CC:DA, January 2009]

Tillett reviewed the following portions of her report (and referred members to the full report for further details): ALA Midwinter Exhibit Booth; International Cataloguing Principles (IFLA); Virtual International Authority File (VIAF); ABA Reorganization; Policy and Standards Division (Formerly CPSO); Cooperative Cataloging Programs; Bibliographic Enrichment Team (BEAT); Cataloging in Publication (CIP); Shelf-ready cataloging; Cataloging Distribution Service Integrated Library Systems Program Office (ILSPO); Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO).

Tillett mentioned the following bits of information which are not included in her report: Eight potential partners have submitted applications to join VIAF, and an additional five libraries have made inquiries. A beta version of www.viaf.org will be available soon. Also, Worldcat identities is tied into the VIAF work. After working through personal names, VIAF will expand to include geographic, corporate, and then uniform titles. They will probably never work on subject headings.

LC's production statistics are down for the FY08 due to the reorganization. LCSH numbers are up, however, because of the added authorities created from the validation string project. **Tillett** requested feedback regarding the usefulness of these strings and noted that their display can be turned off in ClassWeb.

LC pays a premium for shelf-ready cataloging supplied by vendors, so they hope these services are of value to participating libraries.

Discussion:

Weiss asked Tillett what criteria would be included in RDA testing. **Tillett** stated that specific testing criteria have not been created, though some preliminary ideas are under development. Test results will be shared with entire world through a public website. LC will begin the test once there is an online RDA, with the timetable dependent on that release. Staff training will take three months, followed by three months of actual testing, followed by several months of evaluation. The twenty partners selected to participate will be given free access to RDA for the purpose of the testing. The testing methodology will be freely available, so anyone can and should try it and submit feedback. LC is trying to get a wide range of people engaged: book jobbers, all kinds of libraries, library educators –the whole gamut, including non-MARC communities.

Attig asked whether there would be a test environment to provide support for RDA, or if testers would use existing systems. **Tillett** responded that testers would use existing systems.

Scharff inquired if records from the testing process would be distributed in OCLC. **Tillett** replied affirmatively**.** A set of records will be assigned for testing in both RDA and AACR2 and feedback will be solicited via Survey Monkey. LC will coordinate with OCLC on distribution details. **Hillmann** noted that it will be important to distribute to open source people as well.

Jizba hopes that data is captured about prior knowledge of AACR2 that catalogers bring to the testing process. She suspects some catalogers will leave things out of their records because RDA is written in a manner that assumes a certain familiarity with AACR2. Our current production environment (MARC) assumes a rapid approach to decision-making. **Tillett** repeated that all levels of staff, types of libraries, and students will participate and a survey will identify background information on each individual.

Schmierer asked if the R2 report, created by an outside consultant, will be delivered to LC as a private document. **Tillett** said she assumes it will be public, given that it's part of the response to the LC Working group on the Future of Bibliographic Control and Deanna Marcum wants to be completely open about that process. The RDA testing website will include all relevant information as quickly as possible, including training materials.

Tillett apologized for LC's miscommunication about the LCSH SKOS program; it was brought down prematurely. LC's IT folks have given a 6-8 week timetable for the release of the official site (id.loc.gov),

which will include LCSH and MARC code lists.

1065. Report from the Chair of the Implementation Task Force: Miksa

Miksa reported on implementation-related presentations at Midwinter as well as events scheduled for ALA Annual in Chicago. These include a preconference scheduled for 8:30 – 5:00 on July 10th entitled *Making the Connection*, with Bob Maxwell, Barbara Tillett, and Tom Delsey as speakers. The preconference will focus on concepts and ideas in FRBR and FRAD that catalogers need to grasp before approaching RDA. The second Annual event will be a 4-hour program on July 11th, *Look before you Leap: Taking RDA for a Test Drive*. They have lined up a few speakers, but would like to get someone from the RDA/MARC working group. The program will focus on comparing AACR2 to RDA, testing, workflows, and education.

The task force has a programming proposal out to PLA. They have repeatedly tried and been turned down by AASL. **Miksa** commented that she sees a lot of promise from the testing period; she hopes to see some usability analysis and a "thinking out loud" method. What are they thinking as they are making these records? **Miksa** said she wants to start an implementation website as early as possible, something more structured than the RDA-L listserv.

Miksa estimated that the preconference would have an audience of about 100 and the program, 300-400. **Attig** suggested the preconference cap be raised to 150. **Schmierer** contended that attendance would relate directly to its price and that even 200-250 people might want to attend. She believes the program should be in a room for 750. "This is a time for absolute transparency; the minute people think that they are being denied access to information because the meeting room isn't big enough, doesn't do any of us a favor." **Miksa** replied that she had asked the programming committee for schoolroom seating at the preconference. **Myers** reiterated Schmierer's point about having enough space for program attendees. **Miksa** noted that the preconference could not be too large, as it involves materials and hands-on exercises.

Glennan noted that the 4-hour program conflicts with the Saturday CC:DA meeting.

Following up on trying to get AASL involved, **Miksa** said they were turned down for the preconference as well as for a program. She noted that other cataloging program proposals have been denied by AASL. **Ratkovich** said she would bring it up at the Cataloging of Children's Materials meeting.

1066. Report from the ISBD 0 TF: Robare
[Request to Review ISBD Area 0]
[Final Report of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD Area 0]

Robare thanked the other task force members for their work. She then presented highlights from the report and the task force's general impressions. They were pleased with the proposal and impressed overall, considering it an effective early warning device for users. They appreciated the high level of consistency with other standards. Regarding the report's encouragement to record as many content formats and media types as applicable, the task force was concerned about how these would be displayed to the user. An option to focus on the predominant form when there are multiple forms might be more useful. On the other hand, they considered the designations multi-form/multimedia in the examples provided to be unhelpful as well.

The task force has various questions about how Area 0 would be expressed in MARC, as well as a question about the relationship between content form terms and content qualification terms. They wanted more explicit guidance on distinguishing the difference between using a single content term with multiple content qualifiers and using the same content term repeated with individual qualifiers. The proposal's scope note for the content term "Movement" excludes moving images. The task force wasn't sure if this

was a deliberate choice or an oversight, as it doesn't mesh with the terms for music and confounds description of dance videos. Finally, the task force wondered why carrier types were not included in Area 0, as they believe users would be interested in carrier type as an early warning device.

Discussion:

Attig noted that several comments fell short of actual recommendations and suggested that CC:DA discuss some of these issues in order to formulate recommendations. **Robare** replied that the short time frame prevented full discussion. She asked for the group's thoughts on multiple content forms and media types (p. 2).

Weiss preferred that both options be allowed, with context determining which technique to apply. The task force should recommend adding language to focus on the predominant form. **Winzer** agreed, noting that displays could be programmed to show the top three or four terms. **Weiss** added that another option would be to record the predominant form plus the phrase "and others."

Hostage wondered why there wasn't a stronger critique of the terms' complexity. He also took issue with the syntax: the recommended punctuation for content form media type is "preceded by a plus sign." **Robare** agreed that the amount of detail and specificity of language on p. 2 of the report was lacking; the task force could strengthen their recommendations in this area.

Hostage commented that displaying "unmediated" as a media type seemed unnecessary. **Robare** agreed**.** She said she was not always sure how to interpret the distinction between "mandatory" and "mandatory if applicable". The instruction for recording information on sensory specification (p. 5) is an example of where "mandatory if applicable" is unclear. **Maxwell** pointed out that the definition of unmediated is unclear. How would it apply to a music box or a playaway?

Theroux noted that there was discussion of Area 0 on the special collections cataloging list. Contributors commented that here was no way to differentiate between manuscript and printed material. **Schmierer** responded that the ISBD does not extend to manuscript materials.

Weiss said he was surprised that there was no relationship to FRBR elements.

Attig contended that, although both the ISBD Area 0 and the RDA elements are based on RDA-ONIX framework, they are incompatible. There are some ways in which Area 0 differs from the framework and Attig was glad these had been pointed out in the CC:DA comments. The two take different RDA-ONIX attributes and combine them in different ways; they do both use pre-coordinated terms, but there is no way to reconcile them without going down to the layer of the RDA-ONIX attributes. He is not sure this would be a valid objection according to ISBD's aims. Also, he noted that carrier type in the ISBD structure is in Area 5—the SMD—and that's why it wasn't part of this discussion.

Weiss asked why the RDA-ONIX framework wasn't mentioned in the report. **Robare** replied that it was mentioned in the cover letter as a foundational standard.

At the bottom of p. 3, **Attig** noted, some of the differences are documented, but he doesn't believe the general structure is any less compatible with the framework than RDA is; they're both a step away in different directions.

The **Chair** welcomed the need to authorize a response, but recognized the need to convert the task force's report into that response. **Weiss** suggested that the report as it stood didn't need much change. The **Chair** inquired if Robare would be able to reformulate the report based on the preceding discussion. **Robare** replied affirmatively and listed the points that were discussed.

Schmierer suggested that specific recommendations appear very early in the report, followed by observations and editorial comments. She observed that IFLA loves the passive voice and when they can't use passive, they will use a conditional verb. **Robare** said she had intended to separate out the editorial comments in a batch, but was pressed for time. She will follow Schmierer's suggestions.

The **Chair** called for a motion to authorize a response on the review of ISBD Area 0 based on the report of the task force and the discussions at CC:DA. **Weiss** moved; **Glennan** seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

1067. Renewal of the CC:DA Charge: Chair
        [Charge]
        [Charge Form]

The **Chair** inquired if any members had additional revisions to offer.

Weiss commented that he found the first sentence "to make a continuing assessment of the state of the art and suggest the direction of change in the field of descriptive cataloging" amusing and pretty, but perhaps not accurate. The **Chair** disagreed.

At the last meeting in Anaheim, the **Chair** noted, CC:DA began to move into uncharted territory with discussion about group three entities. There was a comment from the audience about infringing on the Subject Access Committee's turf. The **Chair** requested comments on potential overlap between CC:DA and SAC regarding group 3 entities. **Weiss** responded that the charge already states that subject access is SAC's domain. **Glennan** countered that there is probably nothing in SAC's charge to instruct them to work with the ALA representative to the JSC. Someone has to communicate the ALA position. **Attig** agreed that there is overlap that needs to be worked out; on the other hand, it is not yet clear exactly what RDA will include regarding subject access. **Weiss** suggested that Attig, the Chair**,** and the current chair of SAC discuss the issue. **Tillett** noted that there's a precedent in CC:DA for having joint groups and this may be just such an occasion.

The **Chair** commented that he sensed RDA would deal more with recording and structuring entity terms and less with how to apply them, so this technical distinction might keep us clear of infringing on SAC's charge. **Attig** suggested that a SAC liaison join CC:DA. **Schmierer** proposed leaving the language open until group 3 entity issues are brought to the fore.

Scharff reminded CC:DA of previous discussions in which it was determined that "code" is not a popular term. He asked if there were a more appropriate term that anyone might suggest. **Weiss** suggested "standards". **Randall** suggested "guidelines". These two suggestions engendered general disapproval from the group. The **Chair** offered to refer this issue to the [ccda] list. **Attig** commented that the JSC refers to RDA as a cataloging code.

The **Chair** proceeded to address the portion of the charge form about conflicts. Conflicts with the RDA Forum have been resolved, but the RDA program for next Annual does constitute a conflict. He asked if we should raise this issue specifically. **Attig** replied affirmatively. **Glennan:** observed that there would have been a conflict with the RDA FRBR Interest Group on Friday, January 23, had CC:DA's meeting not been cancelled.

Concerning question two, **Attig** noted that the last time CC:DA came to CCS' attention was in regard to its membership. He asked if there were any organizations formerly represented whose presence was now missed and if any new ones ought to be added. He argued that CC:DA's views on this need to be included in the report to CCS. **Theroux** explained that as the ACRL representative she reports to four different groups. She and past representatives have been drawn from the special collections cataloging community; the Slavic cataloging community and others might feel underrepresented. There's also a conflict between CC:DA and the Slavic committee's meeting. The **Chair** noted that he had a conversation with someone about representation for European languages as well. **Attig** explained that, in the past, representation outside of RTSD (Resources and Technical Services Division) was at the divisional level. With the newer structure, the existence of various cataloging communities within several divisions is something we must take into account. Representation should be more direct wherever there's a pool of people dealing with cataloging issues.

The **Chair** promised to continue certain conversation points on the listserv.

Due to compression of the agenda, the **Chair** announced that CC:DA would reconvene at 8:30 a.m. on Monday, January 26.

Monday, January 26, 2009 — 8:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m.
Marriott, Colorado Ballroom F

1068. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. He welcomed visitors and committee members.

1069. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham described the three "opportunities" the Publishers were planning for RDA online. The first would include just the basic text of the rules, which would be search-able and browse-able, available for a one-time fee. The second option would include a toolkit that enables collaboration, available on a subscription-model. A third would include all of the above, plus access to additional resources used to enhance the cataloging process. The Publishers are providing the basic rules version for those who've stated they don't need extra bells and whistles; but the full value and significance of the product lies in its accompanying tools. The schema in the toolkit is derived from the entity-relationship diagram. The ERD, the various schema, and records created within the subscription tool will be open data, exportable from the website. Tools are XML-based and thus applicable at the consortial level. "The consortial purchase option compounds the benefit of sharing workflows and sample records."

Chatham explained that the pricing structure is dependent on current cost projections holding up. They anticipate charging $100-125 for the basic, one-time purchase. The subscription model would be sold in stages based on ranges of concurrent users; for one concurrent user, the price would be no more than price for the basic purchase, and probably less than $100. From that point on, access would be sold in segments of 2-4, 5-9, 10-14, etc. users. For the 2-4 concurrent user model, the price would be $400 for 4 users, or roughly $100 each.

Attig contended that there will have to be significant savings of scale, otherwise large organizations won't be able to afford it. **Myers** reasoned that libraries with fewer than the maximum number of users in a pricing bracket would have no incentive to buy the concurrent-user subscription rather than multiple single-user licenses. He suggested the baseline price of a concurrent-user bracket be based on the lowest number of users in that range.

Patrick Hogan asked Chatham to clarify his earlier comments about the value of purchasing the toolkit. **Chatham** replied that there would be an incentive to buy the subscription model over the basic model; it would have added-value and be slightly less expensive. He wasn't sure they'd be able to scale down the price at the smaller concurrent subscriber levels. He reiterated that the cost would be no more than $100 per user.

Weiss asked if there will be a library school discount. **Chatham** said that they were planning on it. They are considering how to provide free access to disadvantaged institutions. They may try to secure funding specifically for this objective.

Maxwell noted that temporary access for additional users would be necessary for short-term training periods. **Chatham** said that temporary increases would be possible, but that research indicates keeping pricing as simple as possible.

Glennan hypothesized that institutions would need more concurrent users at the beginning, as people

slowly become familiar with RDA, but would want to scale back over time. She was concerned that libraries wouldn't have sufficient access during the first year due to cost. **Chatham** repeated that one of the Publishers' general objectives is to make it cheaper than what people are currently paying. They will need to see how many customers will buy in at the different levels. AACR2 worked on a single-user mode, but behaviors will change with the use of RDA and FRBR.

Poehlmann asked who would make the decision about what defines "financially disadvantaged".

Lilker asked when RDA would be available in Cataloger's Desktop. **Chatham** responded that he sees cataloging processes changing. "Theoretically, the RDA toolkit will be able to do everything that Cataloger's Desktop does and possibly more." **Maxwell** pointed out that catalogers will still use Cataloger's Desktop, so the cost of using RDA is automatically more; libraries will have to subscribe to both services. He strongly urged Chatham to fold RDA into Cataloger's Desktop. **Chatham** replied that they can include in RDA theoretically everything that is in Cataloger's Desktop. **Maxwell** asked if that included DCRB and LCRIs.

Robare asked if updates would be a separate cost. **Chatham** replied that part has not yet been worked out. We can either update the flat file and make new purchase, or sell the updates separately, but that causes integration problems, since the updates need to be integrated into the basic file.

Weiss: On a positive note, he was excited that the schema will be available free on the web. He is more and more concerned about Cataloger's Desktop; if RDA goes into competition, we may end up with neither. In next few weeks, we need to tell Don why we need both.

Hillmann: The web model has a large impact on the viability of the Cat Desktop model; we need to see for the benefit of the community as a whole how that is anticipated to happen.

Scharff asked if one-time users would be downloading files or accessing a website**. Chatham** replied that they would have access to a website. **Maxwell** asked if perpetual access to all editions would be provided. **Nanette Naught** explained that, as an XML-based product, all updates of RDA would be retained and available. How these are sold depends on how frequently they're issued.

Tillett stated that LC spent several years talking with ALA publishing about Cataloger's Desktop. Cataloger's Desktop is produced by CDS on a cost recovery basis, based on LC's cost of producing it. The cost would go down if RDA were not included. LC would like to include RDA in the same way that Classweb includes Dewey: users have to pay OCLC to get to Dewey, but the links are built into Cataloger's Desktop. There are requests out for contracts for the next generation of Cataloger's Desktop based on market research. As soon as the contract is let, then we will have more information.

Hillmann replied that she didn't mean to say the planning was done in secret, but that the market survey may not be helpful. We are entering a time of great upheaval, of changes in how people are accessing information. While we are very happy about some of the plans to access LC via a web-services model, those changes have an impact on how the tools will operate and the business model behind them. She is not sure that all of that is encompassed in a next generation tool without a consideration of the web-services dynamic. **Attig** responded that it is being taken into consideration, and that the new platform for Cataloger's Desktop will be more advanced than anything being considered for RDA. **Chatham** also said that we need to move along in the development process before we come to any conclusions about pricing. The publishers are trying to keep it as low as possible.

Winzer inquired about the timeline. **Chatham** replied that they will receive the final manuscript from the JSC in June, and plan to release the online product in the third quarter of 2009. **Bloss** repeated this information and reported on the testing and decision timeline for the three U.S. national-level libraries (LC, NLM, NAL) with the possibility that implementation could occur by late 2010. **Tillett** reminded the committee that the U.S. is not the only player and contributors to OCLC exist worldwide. **Bloss** clarified that implementation was unlikely to be simultaneous across the world or cataloging communities.**Attig**

noted that there would be coordinated implementation of U.S. libraries awaiting word from LC, which **Tillett** corrected, replying that LC would not be coordinating the implementation of other libraries.

Randall asked when there would be a constituency review of the product, since all we can review now is the content. Navigability testing is part of product testing. **Chatham** replied that a publisher usually has the proofed content in hand, but that his experience is that things always change. This time they tried to do the programming concurrently with the content. A beta-testing process means more time; they will just have to see and that we might have an embryonic constant beta. **Attig** stated that he was not comfortable with constant beta**. Weiss** added especially when one is paying for it. **Chatham** replied that that is the real world. There will be a committee of ten catalogers who have free trials, and will get to work with it before there is any payment. If the bugs are major, then the functional specs would need to be addressed; it becomes a change order, which is an expensive thing. It has been contracted to get this thing out on time. Do you wait for phase two? Then we may do more than just a free trial, because it would be good for the street-level cataloger. **Weiss** said he had a clear understanding on where the content is, but where is system development? The demo is supposed to be up in February. **Chatham** said that he is meeting with the developers tomorrow, and that initially things look good for a third quarter release.

1070. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood
[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2009/1 (preliminary)]

Attig presented the report in Allgood's absence. He summarized actions taken on proposals and discussion papers. Details are available on the MARC Advisory Committee website. Attig's comments on proposals related to RDA are recorded below.

2009-01/1: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format. All of the new elements were approved. MARBI agreed to add "where applicable" to most of the new elements, as well as a provision to add an associated date. The source of information would be added to each in a subfield to be determined. This could preclude the need to add a 670 to record source of information for a particular element. Subfield 0 was added in order to link the terms in this field to authority records if appropriate.

2009-01/2: New content designation for RDA elements: Content type, Media type, Carrier type. The newly added fields are: 336 for content type, 337 for media type, and 338 for carrier type. In addition, new codes were added to a number of 007 and 008 elements to cover RDA values that had not previously been included in MARC. **Attig** had suggested to MARBI that serious consideration be given to individual RDA/ONIX attribute values because that is what underlies these codes; recording them will yield maximum flexibility.

2009-01/3: Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation Records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. The proposal to add field 883 to identify the FRBR Group 1 entity or entities that were "represented by the majority of the information in the record" was rejected. It was felt that labeling records created in a scenario 2 implementation would not be helpful and might in fact inhibit development of scenario 1 implementations.

2009-DP01/1: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records. There was agreement that a widely defined subfield should be added to most of the authority and bibliographic formats. This would create a problem when a URI is associated with more than one subfield in a field. The resulting proposal should address these situations as unambiguously as possible.

2009-DP01/2: Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K. The main problem is that relationship designations in Appendix I may be part of the preferred access point for the work. When that happens, the relationship becomes part of the name of the work and therefore part of the controlled access point, part of what you want to control through authority records. Using the same subfield (e) probably will not work. Another issue is the placement of the relationship designator. Depending on the context, you might want to place it before or after the name. **Attig** recommended the rule not specify the order of

subfields. Finally, there was general agreement that coded equivalents for designations should be supported in MARC 21.

Discussion:

Hillmann asked if people felt it would be useful to include the codes for relationship designators as part of a formal registry. **Attig** replied affirmatively. **Hillmann** continued that there was no need to register these in MARC. If there is agreement on that, it would be an interesting thing to bring up, as to how it could be handled. **Attig** replied that this was another discussion paper, but that Hillmann should put it on the MARC list.

Weiss asked, "Why codes?" **Attig** replied that we do that for relator terms; it is how we have done it in the past. **Hillmann** stated that the text of the property is used as the URI, which is different from the efforts for the relator terms, at least how they were done in DCMI. It might be time for a technical discussion on that issue. **Attig** stated that the list of relators, subfield e, is open-ended. **Hillmann** responded that there is no link for the relator list, which might be interesting to be able to look at. **Tillett** replied that it would be up in 6-8 weeks.

Patton asked, "What pieces of what was approved would be needed in testing?" **Attig** replied that there was no discussion on this point, but in his opinion the new fields would be needed. They are important but not part of initial implementation. **Patton** replied that it is one of OCLC's big concerns. **Attig** responded that if it's a concern for you, it's a concern for the rest of us. **Patton** noted that it will not be an instant update

1071. Report of the CC: DA webmaster: Chair
[CC:DA/Webmaster/2007/1]

Hatch reported that ALA's migration to Collage has encountered some difficulties; this affects ALCTS and, therefore, us. The good news is that ALCTS has given some thought on how to address the ALCTS part of the ALA site, and has created a virtual group consisting of members from the ALCTS divisions that met first on January 16. This group has established a wiki and is now undertaking the tasks to get all of the ALCTS sites migrated and running. She thanked John Attig, because it was very helpful to post updates to the PSU site. **Attig** commented that only a single page for the committee is up on the CMS, which is embarrassing. **Hatch** agreed that it is out of date, and that correcting that was a high priority. **Weiss** asked if Hatch was optimistic that it would work. **Hatch** replied that they are testing often, so she will know soon.

1072. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2: Attig

Attig asked if there were further comments on RDA content development.

Weiss voiced his concern with Cataloger's Desktop and RDA vying for purchase in the library community as a whole, and his sense that Chatham did not understand this issue. **Attig** added that his main concern is that the intellectual content of the Desktop is valued; he had no confidence that ALA Publishing would invest the intellectual effort. **Winzer** posited that Chatham misunderstands what is in Cataloger's Desktop, and perhaps does not understand what we do with these resources. **Hillmann** suggested that catalogers have a good feeling about Cataloger's Desktop, but it is only that, a feeling, when we need to look at the short-term and the long-term. It would work better to write our concerns down, email them to Chatham, so that he hears from many points of view, rather than trying to reach a consensus, which carries some dangers. **Attig** commented that relying on anecdotal individual responses allows Chatham to discount them. **Hillmann** disagreed. **Weiss** suggested that we write up individual points and send it from CC:DA. He related that he went to talk to Chatham after the forum, saying that the functionality of several of the documents are unclear, and that some of the links to MARC and LCRI will

need to be licensed. **Maxwell** pointed out those licenses will not be free. **Glennan** expressed her concern that the Co-Publishers were not concerned enough about the barriers to implementation—integration pricing, print product, and Cataloger's Desktop—if decisions were being made so that people would have reasons to stay with AACR2. **Randall** noted that these are a barrier to increasing cooperation internationally.

Hall expressed his surprise that Chatham said there was no interest in print**. Ratkovich** added that the whole community wasn't against print. AASL turned the RDA implementation people down, because they feel they haven't been listened to. **Hillmann** said she did not hear rejection of the print product but some concerns. People might like the on-line product. The publisher needs to wait for the text to settle down before doing the revisions needed for a print product. **Ratkovich** replied that publishing even a part of it in print would be better, but her impression was that it was not in consideration.

Yee argued that alternative market research on RDA and Cataloger's Desktop is needed. Such research which would be more convincing than individual liaison's opinions, though it would require a significant investment. The **Chair** noted that one would think the publisher would have down this kind of market research. **Bloss** said she had some information on the question about market research. The group spent a couple of years asking about print product, and approximately 58% said they were interested in a print product. She agreed with **Hillmann**'s assessment that after the testing is done, many areas will need to be revised. The current text would require revision and an extraction created, as we do not need the repetition that is in the online version. The main question is what is going to be the size of the interest request and what is going to be the cost?

Schmierer commented that the business model is not within the purview of this committee; CCS or the ALCTS Board are the appropriate groups to pressure the publishers. We should remember that the Co-Publishers are a group of three organizations, not just ALA. The people we have to persuade of RDA's worth are heads of departments and units. She advised CC:DA write a reasoned report to CCS and ALCTS regarding these issues.

Attig noted that something can be done with the original. He disagreed that updates would be fast, but anticipated that the text in June will be the same on day one implementation. There will be changes but it is going to take some time to get them out.

Randall pointed out that not everyone will be implementing on day one. He inquired about OCLC's preparedness. Will we be able to follow AACR2 or will we have to use RDA? **Attig** commented that there is currently a wide variety of standards in OCLC. There are different ways RDA can be implemented; standards are not as monolithic as they once were. **Weitz** replied that it's not up to OCLC what everyone out in the field uses to catalog. They are taking comments from the standards communities, and implementing the new fields approved this past weekend. We are taking our cues from you. **Maxwell** stated that he assumed OCLC does not want duplicate records, and therefore needs to know when people change over. Will there be a code to distinguish that it is an RDA record? **Adam Schiff** replied that Beacher had said that LC was planning to distribute both RDA and AACR2 versions of records. **Tillett** clarified that was only during testing. **Attig** responded that the code for 040 subfield e is for the rules for descriptive conventions; and a byte in the Leader will indicate whether the record follows ISBD or not.

Deborah Prince said that because of changes in validating the MARC record, new codes for RDA, and no 245 subfield h, she can see where confused people could create records with a mish-mash of codes as Hillmann described. We need to be able to validate so that things will be distinct, that parallel cataloging code records exist and you mustn't mix standards.

1073. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Mary Woodley,

Chair

Woodley began by thanking the committee for their herculean effort in the last few years despite the amount of frustration in developing the content standard, documentation of which was brought to the CCS Executive Committee by both John Attig and John Myers. In spite of CC:DA's concerns, CCS Executive has acknowledged that the timeline was not going to change, and RDA is going to go forward, with the content as it has been developed. Our main job is to monitor the test and the evaluation of the test. She urged the committee members to go to meetings to see the product. CCS has decided to create a task force to monitor the RDA Implementation Task Force's site, CC:DA reports, and the national libraries' testing as a finger on the pulse, to get an idea of where people are coming from; whether or not the product is okay to go forward, and if not, to send it to be improved. OCLC will keep CCS apprised of what they expect and what they are going to do as part of testing and assessment if the national libraries decide not to go forward, or whether American libraries will go forward.

Discussion:

Winzer commented that the report submitted to CCS didn't focus completely on our concerns, especially the barriers to training access and to the product training implementation. **Woodley** answered that the product must be cost effective, reiterating that cost will be on a sliding scale, as well as a print version. **Attig** repeated the concern about technical access. **Woodley** said that access to the product will be monitored during testing to see if it is indeed a barrier. **Weiss** reiterated his concern that the RDA product and Cataloger's Desktop needed not to compete, and that the RDA product might lose LC money, since libraries would not be able to afford both products. **Woodley** responded that Cataloger's Desktop was outdated technology and should not be included with the RDA product; also that a combined product might be ideal, but not pragmatic. **Attig** clarified that Cataloger's Desktop will be updated. **Woodley** commented that content is more of a concern than pricing implication, technical access, or functionality of RDA online. The **Chair** felt that, despite our concerns, we must wait for the testing phase.

Hatch brought up that training could be a big barrier to implementation, because the training materials should be printable. They need to figure out the trainers, and model it on the SSCTP. **Woodley** said that was in the last part of RDA Implementation Task Force meeting. They started doing some good programming, including an aggregator website, the Tillett presentations, and workflows, but she agreed they needed to be more active in having workshops and training materials in multiple formats for different catalogers. They need to address different needs: webinars, train the trainers, podcasts. CCS agreed that they need to speed up that process. Right now they are doing it in baby steps, so as not to outstrip the testing and assessment. They are having more workshops on FRBR and FRAD, which can be done now. **Hatch** commented that there was no reason a training outline couldn't be published soon. **Woodley** replied that there would be.

Ratkovich commented that her constituency wants a print version, due to lack of connectivity or funds. **Woodley** responded that human editors would have to create the print product. **Ratkovich** asked whether she could give her constituency some kind of time frame, perhaps a year or two. **Woodley** assured the committee that a print product would be edited after the testing and implementation of the online. **Bloss** commented that the producers of RDA hear the interest for the print product; especially for rural communities, and will push for some sort of timeline.

Hall mentioned a concern about implementation, especially if there is staggered implementation. Copy catalogers, reference librarians or those in a consortium, may see things they do not understand, or download records that they cannot use. **Attig** commented that while the difference in the process will be large, the difference in the product (i.e., the records created using RDA) may be small

Weiss expressed enthusiasm about some aspects of RDA. **Woodley** agreed that we have made great strides in some areas.

Maxwell commented that the committee needed to see a plan, with dates for 2010 regional workshops,

along the lines of the AACR2 training plan. **Woodley** agreed. The **Chair** noted that CC:DA will take that up.

Weitz delineated the OCLC role in RDA implementation. OCLC got the RDA document at the same time as everyone else. OCLC staff are involved in the RDA implementation task force, other task forces, and in programs. OCLC staff has joined staff in the three national libraries and are actively dealing with preparing for implementation. OCLC made the transition to Connexion hoping to have more of a relational database than it had. They are also looking at some sort of FRBR for Worldcat that may allow both AACR2 and RDA records to coexist and to relate to one another, perhaps by ISBN. They are also investigating ONIX based data as a basis for records. **Schiff** asked if OCLC would create a template for RDA record input. **Attig** noted that OCLC would redesign work forms. **Weitz** added that OCLC needed to adapt to new displays, and new information; and that they would consider templates.

Suzuki asked how she should communicate information about RDA to her groups. **Woodley** noted that ALCTS CRG would determine how best to distribute the workshops and the train-the-trainer sessions. It is their task to determine how many trainers will be needed and whether training should be face-to face. **Attig** stated that several sites will distribute training materials. **Woodley** further mentioned that cost benefits would be presented to library directors and deans, hoping to bring them on board, since they are the ones who must support the implementation of RDA at their institutions.

The **Chair** thanked Woodley for her report and for taking questions.

The **Chair** asked for new business, or reports from the floor. He then announced that the NISO report will be given at the annual meeting, and thanked the committee for their work on the several NISO proposals that had come forward.

The **Chair** encouraged anyone interested in serving on CC:DA to fill out the volunteer form at the ALCTS website on the first page, or contact the **Chair** directly, via his email, which is on the CC:DA website. The next meeting is in Chicago in 2009.

The **Chair** asked whether the committee wanted to move the Saturday meeting, which would conflict with the program on RDA, to Friday from 1:30-5:30. **Maxwell** noted that the Friday meeting would conflict with the preconference. **Robare** asked about the possibility of changing the time of the program. **Harken** said the preliminary program was already published, and the deadline for the final program is February 1. **Schmierer** noted that it would be easier to move the CC:DA meeting; also that Saturday is a prime time day for the audience that the program hopes to reach. **Weiss** strongly agreed. The **Chair** asked Harken to investigate changing the program; once the **Chair** knew the possibilities, the committee would vote electronically. Meeting times for ALA Annual 2009 will be Friday, July 10[th,] 1:30-5:30 p.m.; Saturday, July 11[th,] 1:30-5:30 p.m., and Monday, July 13th, 8:00-12:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 am

      Respectfully submitted,
         Alexandra Crosier, Intern
         Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, Intern