

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
2010 Annual ALA conference in Washington, D.C.
June 26 and 28, 2010**

Members present:

John Myers, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Sylvia Hall-Ellis
Kevin Randall
Lori Robare
Penny Welbourne
Kathy Winzer
Bob Wolverton
Martha M. Yee

K.R. Roberto, Intern
Peter Rolla, 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 (represented June 28 by Jay Weitz)

ALA Liaisons present:

Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI
Steven J. Miller, ALCTS/NRMIG
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/PARS
Laurence S. Creider, ALA/ACRL
Karen A. Weaver, ALA/GODORT [absent June 28]
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Susan L. Cheney, ALA/LITA

Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/CCM

Non-ALA Liaisons:

John Hostage, AALL & IFLA

Elizabeth Lilker, ARLIS/NA

Diane Hillmann, DCMI [absent June 28]

Chamya P. Kincy, MedLA

Mark Scharff, MusLA

Kelley McGrath, OLAC

Peter Fletcher, PCC

Dorothy McGarry, SLA

Thomas Duszak, CLA (represented by Chiyono Sata)

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 the actual voting members rather than of representatives/liasons of particular agencies or groups. 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/liasons 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 nonvoting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liasons” are used.

V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2005 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

AFNOR = Association Française de Normalisation

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America

ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

ASTED = Association pour l'Avancement des Sciences et Techniques de la Documentation
ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association
CC:AAM = ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:CCM = ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CC:DA = ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
CDS = LC Cataloging Distribution Service
CETM = ALCTS/CCS/Continuing Education Training Materials Committee
CETRC = ALCTS/CCS/Education, Training, and Recruitment for Cataloging Committee
CIP = Cataloging in Publication
CLA = Catholic Library Association
CoP = Committee of Principals for AACR
CSB = Cataloging Service Bulletin
DC = Dublin Core
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
FRAD = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Authority Data
FRBR = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
FRSAD = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
HTML = Hypertext Mark-up Language
ICP = IFLA's International Cataloguing Principles
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS = Integrated library system
ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LCPS = Library of Congress Policy Statements
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MAGERT = Map and Geography Round Table
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MusLA = Music Library 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 = ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging

PLA = Public Library Association
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RDA = Resource Description and Access
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SKOS = Simple Knowledge Organization System
SLA = Special Libraries Association
VIAF = Virtual International Authority File
XML = Extensible Markup Language

*Saturday, June 26, 2010, 1:30–5:30 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, Regency A*

1103. Welcome and opening remarks

John Myers, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm and welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1104. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to sign in.

1105. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/A/62]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. **Hall-Ellis** moved to adopt the agenda, with **Glennan** seconding. The motion carried unanimously and the agenda was adopted.

1106. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2010 Midwinter Meeting, January 16 and 18, 2010

[CC:DA/M/1088-1102]

Glennan moved to approve the minutes, with **Hall-Ellis** seconding. The motion carried unanimously.

1107. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions and other actions, January 19-June 18, 2010:

[CC:DA/Chair/2009-2010/3]

In accordance with CC:DA procedures, the Chair presented the following motions previously approved online for confirmation:

- ***Greek Romanization Tables (2009)***: The motion was that CC:DA authorize formation of the "CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Proposed Romanization

Tables (2009) for Ancient and Modern Greek” for the purpose of submitting a response to the Library of Congress.

- ***Report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Proposed Romanization Tables (2009) ...*** : The motion was that CC:DA accept the report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Proposed Romanization Tables (2009) for Ancient and Modern Greek and use it, along with subsequent discussion, as the basis of a response to the LC proposed romanization tables for Ancient and Modern Greek.
- ***Review of Romanization of Greek:*** The motion was that CC:DA authorize formation of a “CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Romanization of Greek.”
- ***Review of ISBD Consolidated (2010 edition):*** The motion was that CC:DA authorize formation of a “Task Force to Review the ISBD 2010 Consolidated Edition.”
- ***Report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Romanization of Greek:*** The motion was that CC:DA accept the report from the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of the Romanization of Greek, to form the basis of an ALA response.

A motion to confirm approval of these actions was made by **Randall**, seconded by **Winzer**. The motion carried.

The **Chair** offered an explanation for the multiple task forces concerning Greek romanization. Also, during the Romanization tables review process, it became clear that there is a need for better communication regarding the process between relevant parties. Proposed guidelines appear later in the Committee’s agenda for this conference.

The **Chair** recognized the members of both Greek Romanization Task Forces, which were comprised of the same individuals: Helen F. Schmierer, Chair; David T. Jenkins; George Johnston; Robert L. Maxwell; Anthony Oddo; and Robert Rendall.

1108. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet

[LC Report, June 2010]

[Greek romanization table]

[Draft procedure for romanization proposals]

Tillet presented a concise version of the full Library of Congress report for the Committee, and encouraged those in attendance to take a look at the full report online to see what is happening in areas other than cataloging. She mentioned that LC has various webcasts and presentations related to cataloging at its exhibit booth, number 3751.

Due to a large backlog at the Copyright Office, 51 staff members were temporarily reassigned to process copyright claims submitted in print form. They cleared 200,000 claims, surpassing the Library’s original goal of 100,000 claims by April 1. As a result of these reassignments, fewer items were cataloged.

She reported on developments concerning the national test of RDA, which arose in response to the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control's recommendation. LC collaborated with NAL and NLM to plan the test period, which started this week. On Sunday, the three libraries will hold two sessions to discuss the process; the first session will be for vendors, and the second will be a general interest meeting for participants. LC contracted with R2 Consulting to investigate distribution of bibliographic and authority records, resulting in Study of the North American MARC Records Marketplace, which will be presented at the PCC participants' meeting on Sunday afternoon. The U.S. National Libraries RDA Test Steering Committee is co-chaired by Christopher Cole (National Agricultural Library), Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine), and Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress).

Tillett announced that there is an RDA training site on LC's website at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDAtest/rdatraining.html>. The purpose of this site is to explore new practices using RDA, and these practices are fluid, especially as they can be modified due to Test feedback. The site includes all LC webcasts on RDA and FRBR. Additionally, the "train-the-trainer" supporting material of the RDA test is included in both PowerPoint and MS Word formats. All constituents are welcome to reuse and repurpose this documentation in their local settings. The only exceptions are the *Library of Congress Policy Statements* (LCPS); these are the official, if tentative at this point, policy decisions for LC. As such, they are issued in PDF format and are not open to external editing. LC requests that they be credited in any redistribution of the materials from the RDA training site. **Tillett** took a moment to acknowledge Judy Kuhagen's work publicly, noting that she has been responsible for all of the documentation and internal training for RDA testing participants. The training can be done in two half-day sessions, with all of the information available online.

The pilot project to automate the harvesting of ONIX data from publishers in order to build MARC 21 records continues to go well, with four catalogers assigned to work on it. The catalogers harvest data and use in-house software to generate MARC records. There are plans to test this process in RDA.

The Law Section continued to work on the retrospective conversion project to assign K schedule classification numbers to previously unclassified legal documents; as of the end of April 2010, 10,271 items had been reclassified.

LC completed its joint project with OCLC to add geographic coordinates to the data in authority records, with coordinate data supplied by the OCLC Office of Research from the information found in FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology). Relevant NACO records have been redistributed. LC and OCLC are now thinking about how to add coordinates to LCSH, which will be a more complicated process.

Tillett provided an update on the Authorities & Vocabularies Service at <http://id.loc.gov>. LC is working with the National Library of Spain and the National Library of Chile to investigate the creation of multilingual versions of LCSH; LC is also collaborating with the Université de Laval for providing RVM (Répertoire de vedettes-matière) content. The

final results of the pre- versus post-coordination of LCSH report are available on LC's website at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/pre_vs_postupdate.pdf.

The change from the Cookery to Cooking subject headings project is done, thanks to Libby Dechman's hard work. **Tillett** stated that they are soliciting suggestions about which significant heading change projects should be next; to send recommendations, contact anyone in the Policy and Standards Division.

The Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) has 22 participants, with new members including Library and Archives Canada (LAC), the Getty Research Institute, and the NUKAT Center of Poland. Other libraries that have requested membership are the National Institute of Informatics (NII) of Japan, the National Library of Slovenia, and the National Library of Hungary.

Lastly, **Tillett** noted that LC continues to work on increasing the number of simultaneous users allowed to access its online catalog. The goal is to not have any potential users be locked out.

Allgood sought clarification about the process of clearing 200,000 claims of copyright. **Tillett** said that it involves registering new copyrights and working from paper forms. **Robare** asked if there was information regarding which applications were using the SKOS application. **Tillett** replied that only the raw numbers are available, but generally not the source of the queries. There is a short list of those working with LC on the project, but not a breakdown of usage statistics. **Attig** asked about content of the Authorities & Vocabularies site. **Tillett** replied that it includes LCSH, Thesaurus of Graphic Materials, preservation level roles, and preservation events; for further information, please check the website at id.loc.gov/authorities.

The **Chair** asked if LC has considered reaching out to other libraries for help on expanding law reclassification. **Tillett** suggested going through PCC to work on this; this project is within the U.S. and Publisher Liaison Division, of which Karl Debus-López is the Chief. **Tillett** hopes that LC catalogers are looking at member copy to discover K class numbers.

After finishing the LC report, **Tillett** moved on to discuss the reports presented by the Task Force for the Review of the Proposed Romanization Tables (2009) for Ancient and Modern Greek and the subsequent Task Force for the Review of the Romanization of Greek. She thanked the Task Forces and CC:DA members for all of their work. A key lesson learned was the need to revisit how such proposals are communicated to the larger cataloging community: there was no response to the notice in the CSB. They are now reviewing the utility of the CSB. The **Chair** reported that he uses the CSB primarily for heading changes but, while noting the emergence of the new table, failed to see the call for feedback within the main text of the CSB. **Tillett** continued, crediting Bob Hiatt with drafting a new document to cover the process for developing or revising transliteration tables in response to the Task Forces' suggestions, and **Tillett** hopes that all of CC:DA will comment after this conference ends. The commenting period for the Greek

romanization proposal closes on June 21st; so far, outside agencies that have responded indicate approval for the latest revisions to the table, which basically make no changes. **Tillett** is personally disappointed because U.S. libraries are lagging behind with regards to Greece's changes in orthography, though she certainly sympathizes with libraries that do not have the staff resources to change all of their Greek transliteration retrospectively, including changing Cutter numbers as needed. The **Chair** reported that the CC:DA task force's response had been accepted by the committee and would be forwarded shortly as the ALA response. He sought further inputs from the committee and explained what the overall thrust of the cover letter would be – that ALA approves the table and acknowledges the procedural and economic realities that are precluding major change, but feels that there are benefits to the earlier proposals and that further progress will be needed. **Schmierer** suggested that ALA's response emphasize that the orthography changed nearly 30 years ago. She recommended that CCS further discuss transliteration and its importance, remarking that there are languages with more than one transliteration system.

From the audience, Bob **Maxwell** expressed dissatisfaction that no changes were really made. He considers Ancient Greek and Modern Greek to be two separate transliteration processes, and he would like to split them into two separate tables; **Tillett** suggested that ALA consider creating a proposal. **Schmierer** mentioned that this is recommended in the Task Force's report. **Tillett** asked if it was mentioned in the most recent report, which she has not yet seen; the **Chair** clarified that the Task Force's support of the two-table system was stressed in the initial 2009 report, and was also reiterated in the new second report.

The **Chair** turned discussion to responding to the LC draft procedural guidelines, asking if Committee members have read them and have input. **Schmierer** identified what she feels is the greatest pressure point: what is our obligation to transliteration systems, especially those created and maintained by ISO? Also, how do we proceed if a country has its own recommendations for transliterating its alphabet? **Tillett** replied that the latter is mentioned in the guidelines, but LC would like suggestions on how to word it best for stronger emphasis. The **Chair** asked about ways to facilitate ALA's involvement in the process: should ALA be notified first about projects in process? **Tillett** asked for ALA to submit desired timeframes, commenting that CC:AAM is familiar with this process, due to Asian languages being transliterated very frequently. The **Chair** then inquired about how ALA should best handle scripts and languages that fall into gray areas with respect to CC:AAM's purview, such as Ladino (an Iberian language rendered in Hebrew characters) and Coptic (an African language rendered in a variation of Greek characters). **Tillett** replied that CC:AAM handles those languages, with CC:DA traditionally addressing European and Native American languages rendered in scripts from those areas, though ultimately ALA is the body that makes these procedural decisions.

Attig suggested consulting with CC:AAM so that ALA could offer a single stance for this discussion. The **Chair** reported that this will be discussed at Sunday's CCS Executive Committee meeting. **Maxwell** mentioned that if the document is called the ALA/LC Romanization Table, then it is technically a joint publication, so ALA could also conduct a review. **Tillett** clarified that the publication is joint with regards to

content, but is actually published by LC; community members are free to make any suggestions they wish. **Glennan** said that the review process seems to be directed towards people who want to submit proposals to LC, but not vice versa. **Tillett** felt that a process wherein LC solicits proposals would work the same way. LC has essentially done all the work that it can with regards to these languages, so they imagine that proposals would have to come from outside agencies. While the internal LC process is very informal, being conducted either face-to-face or via email, they are willing to document that process if it would be useful for CC:DA.

1109. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

[Issues deferred until after the first release of RDA: ALA decisions]

Attig's term as the JSC Representative expires at the end of this conference; he has volunteered to serve another three-year term and his offer has been accepted. He also noted he will be term limited at the end of this subsequent term, so someone else will have the opportunity to step up and serve at that point. Potential candidates should review their other commitments carefully and express their interest to appropriate parties, like himself, so that they can be brought into the work process.

He announced that RDA is now published, which was met with applause; ALA Publishing is planning to celebrate at the Monday meeting. He acknowledged the broad collaborative efforts of the committee in reaching this milestone. The announced release date was June 2010, and this goal was met. The JSC enhanced the display of Unicode data and the search function before publication, both of which have improved, but are still works in progress. Since Midwinter, JSC completed two rounds of reviews to the text of RDA, checking all of the changes made to the base text since June 2009; created a database of approximately 1500 reports of errors (many duplicates and mostly resolved).

The JSC made further changes to the RDA Toolkit. It has updated the mappings. It has reexamined the set of complete examples that had been issued with the full draft of RDA; various constituencies, especially ALA, identified gaps in the original set of examples. About half of the revised examples have been submitted, thanks to the help of Adam Schiff and Kelley McGrath, among others. The complete examples will have two records each, one with RDA element citations and one with MARC coding. Now that RDA is out, the JSC will have more time to work on the set of examples, which will be published as documents on the JSC website.

In spite of the error-checking, it is likely that the RDA text still contains errors. **Attig** asks that people use the error reporting function in the RDA interface. Messages sent using this mechanism will automatically go to the JSC tracking system.

The JSC surmises that the RDA revision process will be similar to the AACR2 revision process: a constituency submits proposals to the JSC, other constituencies review the proposals and provide comments. The process will eventually be reevaluated to see if the current configuration of the JSC is appropriate, or if it needs to add more members,

especially representatives from additional national libraries that are committed to the use of RDA.

The next JSC meeting is not yet scheduled, but should be in March or April 2011. Proposals are due two months before the meeting; in this case, they will consequently be due very near to Midwinter, so CC:DA will need to have them in-hand well before Midwinter so it can act on them in a timely fashion. In the meantime, the JSC is currently busy reviewing internal procedures, working out the environment for receiving and publishing proposals, and moving forward without the assistance of a designated editor. It is expected that RDA testing will generate its own set of proposals, which will be given priority. Consequently, there is no need to generate proposals just to fill the JSC agenda. While proposals do not need to be submitted during this first round of revisions as “there will always be a next round,” CC:DA should have its priorities clear as to when it would like to advance prospective proposals. **Hillmann** asked about using newer collaborative tools to expedite the process, especially for smaller changes.

Returning to the unresolved issues document, **Attig** reported that AALL has already submitted a proposal, and he had asked them to resubmit it after checking the published version of RDA. The JSC would like to hear from other constituencies about proposals on which those constituencies are working and the timeline for submission.

With regards to proposals coming directly from CC:DA, several issues had been identified as priorities. The first deals with the separate instructions for governmental corporate bodies and non-governmental corporate bodies. The proposal is to merge those two categories into a single set of instructions to cover all corporate bodies. **Attig** recommended formation of a task force to work on this proposal. **Robare** made a motion to authorize formation of a CC:DA Task Force to Develop a Proposal to Change the Rules for Governmental and Non-governmental Corporate Bodies, **Glennan** seconded. The motion carried. The **Chair** reported Randall had offered to serve as chair and other prospective members had also volunteered. A signup sheet to volunteer as task force members was circulated among CC:DA members and the audience.

Attig presented the second issue, concerning how RDA continues the AACR2 practice of having inconsistent rules for describing heads of state and heads of government. He recommended formation of another task force to address this. **Hall-Ellis** made a motion to authorize formation of a CC:DA Task Force to Address Inconsistencies between the RDA Rules for Heads of State and Rules for Heads of Government. **Randall** seconded. The motion carried. The **Chair** reported that Winzer will serve as chair and circulated an additional task force member signup sheet.

Attig presented the third issue, the lack of rules addressing the creation of access points for ruling executive bodies. This was raised by Adam Schiff from his work in the Examples Working Group and he created a fully-formed proposal. There is some complication in whether ruling executive bodies constitute heads of state or heads of government. The final proposal will therefore be contingent on resolution of the rules

addressing those bodies. He recommends incorporating this issue into the charge for the Heads of State/Heads of Government TF.

Attig shared the last issue concerning rules of description for accompanying material. There is no mapping in RDA for the MARC 21 tag 300 subfield \$e because accompanying material is considered a relationship. The new mapping suggests MARC field 501 or a 78X linking entry field, both of which assume that there is already an existing record for the accompanying manifestation. This is fine for incorporating or linking to a full description of a related manifestation but does not allow for an unstructured description solely of the extent statement for the non-dominant component. He plans to study the issue further, to see if a minor adjustment to the rules may be in order, or if existing rules for multiple components can be clarified for this case. If warranted, he may come back to ask for assistance to develop a proposal. **Ratkovich** observed that this is very common for children's materials, especially for non-bibliographic items that accompany the primary item, such as 3-D glasses. The 300 \$e has worked well for them. **Attig** agreed that unstructured description (i.e., the free-text 300 \$e) has worked, but it is not clear whether the RDA rules adequately address it in the manner desired.

After Midwinter, there will likely be proposals submitted by other constituencies. **Attig**, **Robare**, and the Chair have started a discussion on how best to address these proposals. Their current plan is to post them publicly with timelines for submission. Perhaps it would be useful to have a smaller group of senior, experienced people to organize this process and establish internal deadlines. Any suggestions on how to improve the process are welcome.

Schmierer asked about how to deal with typographical errors; is there a plan to fix these as soon as possible? **Attig** thinks that these straightforward types of errors will enter a work queue but more complicated errors will require more formal proposals.

Winzer asked if the CC:DA wiki will continue to be available in order to work on these proposals. The **Chair** replied that while the CC:DA wiki on the ALA site has been dormant for some time, it still is available. Wiki passwords will go to the incoming chair (i.e., **Robare**). **Winzer** thinks the wiki could prove useful in order to organize all the proposals. **Attig** thinks it could work well if used internally, and is not publicly available, to work on ideas. **Robare**, as wiki administrator, will need to create a new page for the Committee to use.

Allgood inquired if ALA has officially stated that RDA is the new cataloging code; **Attig** is not sure if a formal action will be necessary. **Allgood** wondered if there is a need to specify that the task force to revise RDA will be working with RDA and not AACR2. **Attig** said that this would be explicitly stated in the charge. **Randall** queried if anyone present remembered if there had been a formal statement from ALA when AACR was published; **Attig** did not remember anything formal occurring. The **Chair** observed that CC:DA's charge has been updated to address RDA specifically and as a standing matter addresses descriptive cataloging standards in general. A formal announcement of RDA's

adoption is probably not within CC:DA's purview – the issuance of the standard is up to the CoP, and its adoption is up to the wider U.S. cataloging community.

Welbourne asked if other countries are also conducting a testing period before making a decision about whether to adopt RDA. The **Chair** said that the decision to adopt RDA is now dependent upon its constituencies; so far, it seems that all of the countries involved other than the United States have already decided to adopt this standard. While RDA adoption is not a foregone conclusion in the U.S., it is reasonable that the working premise for the testing period is a favorable outcome leading to adoption, not rejection. **Hostage** stated that even if the national libraries decide to implement RDA, this is not a requirement for individual libraries to use it. And it's not something for CC:DA to weigh in on, other than to address the cataloging issues presented. **Creider** noted the U.S. does not have a centralized cataloging authority; this will ultimately be a library-by-library decision. Since most libraries are driven by LC's work, however, many of us will go along with its decision. In 1981, the New York Public Library decided not to adopt AACR2, but ultimately reversed this decision in the face of the resulting cataloging workload. Cataloging codes have been ignored in the past: the preliminary 2nd edition of the ALA Cataloging Rules "inspired a bit of a revolt." **Allgood** pointed out that CC:DA's charge involves cataloging codes—plural—and we can revise RDA. **Randall** noted that the U.S., like many other countries, has a shared database; does this mean that we will have to follow OCLC's interpretation of this standard? How will OCLC's standards be affected, given that they accept records from all over the world? **Patton** stated that there is no universal cataloging code in the world; while RDA could possibly provide this in the future, the reality will probably be that there will never be a single cataloging code. This has been implicitly accepted by OCLC, since it already accommodates other countries' national cataloging rules, such as the French-language AFNOR/CSA standard. The **Chair** noted that we have traditionally considered OCLC *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* a pseudo-standard code, as it includes LC cataloging decisions that are not AACR2-compliant; perhaps there is a need for OCLC to reexamine that documentation. **Randall** observed that *Bibliographic Formats* does follow certain standards, such as pre-AACR2 records only being valid for retrospective conversion, thus creating a quasi-universal standard. The Chair thinks that there may have been a de facto consensus in the past with regards to OCLC's coding standards. **Ratkovich** asked if ALA will issue an official statement on RDA if/when it is approved? **Attig** does not think that is necessary, as we will support it in whatever ways our communities do. **Hillmann** agreed with Attig, commenting that catalogers are "living in a state of perpetual metadata heterogeneity" as she read in an uncited source.

1110. Report on PCC activities: Fletcher

Fletcher submitted a written report that the Chair was unable to disseminate in time for this meeting. The Task Force on Non-Latin Script Cataloging Documentation submitted a final report to the PCC Standing Committee on Standards (SCS); this report can be viewed at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/scs/PCCNonLatinGuidelines.pdf>

As a result of this report, the SCS is now working on guidelines for encoding non-Roman data in MARC fields. The BIBCO standard record (BSR) was implemented in January 2010. The SCS has been very busy issuing documents for changes to the initial form of the BSR, reviewing punctuation for the 260 and 490 fields, best practices for parallel fields, and reviewing final reports of their task groups. The groups are: Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Electronic Resources (Leader/06 code 'm'); Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Projected Visual Materials; Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Graphic Materials; Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Music; and Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Cartographic Materials. The reports were discussed at May's PCC OpCo meeting and will be voted on during this conference.

The PCC OpCo had an interesting discussion about ISBD punctuation in bibliographic records; RDA does not have punctuation requirements, which is a significant training issue, even though OPACs manipulate punctuation regardless. The group is examining what new MARC fields and subfields will be needed for RDA implementation; if there are any large record conversion projects as a result, vendors should be involved in the process. PCC strongly recommends not upgrading AACR2 records to RDA, or vice versa, at the national level; the same applies for creating parallel AACR2 and RDA records for the same manifestation. The SCS discussed how to proceed when their policies and recommendations differ from LC's decisions. In those instances, the issues will be referred to the PCC Steering Committee.

Allgood asked about whether OCLC will accept parallel records during this transitional period. **Fletcher** said that OCLC plans to create guidelines, with **Patton** commenting that OCLC has been working on this, but has not yet uploaded the guidelines. OCLC will be meeting with RDA testers on Sunday morning. OCLC does not want parallel records based on cataloging rules. The **Chair** said that he was under the impression that there would be a set of resources described in parallel. **Patton** elaborated on this set, called the Common Set, with records in both types. The Common Set will consist of twenty-five original records and five copy; OCLC has proposed using the institutional record (IR) functionality to cluster the records emerging from the testing efforts. Each testing institution will create one AACR2 record and one RDA record, both of which will not be done by the same cataloger. **Patton** said this decision is to avoid large numbers of duplicate records, emphasizing that this is a one-time-only practice for the transition period.

1111. Report on LITA activities: Cheney

LITA has been very busy creating multiple programs for this conference and encourages attendance.

1112. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Hatch

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2010/2]

The new page on the ALA site is up. It currently includes a membership roster, history, and a link to the old PSU site; the plan is for it to resemble the PSU site closely, but with no header. Cascading Style Sheet (CSS) issues have not been resolved just yet. For the time being, it's a question of maintaining what is already there; Attig has been diligent about posting Hatch's updates to the PSU site. ALA would like to see a difference between content on the ALA units' sites and the content such units have on ALA Connect. They hope that Connect will hold documents such as agendas and minutes, with other information about the units on the ALA unit site. This is a matter for further discussion.

Hatch reported she is not seeking reappointment. The **Chair** thanked Hatch for her service. He reiterated the need for a new webmaster, and volunteers or suggestions to fill this important post are welcome. **Cheney** offered to post the call to the LITA email list.

1113. Report from the RDA Training Task Force: Mendez

Luiz **Mendez** made a brief report, commenting that CC:DA is an ideal forum because it represents so many different communities. The RDA Training Task Force is hoping to offer brief webinars, ideally running 45 to 60 minutes, on specific topics. The Task Force wants to provide continuing education; there is already a good amount of training on content creation in RDA, but the Task Force also needs examples. **Mendez** encouraged anyone with suggestions for specific topics or trainers to contact him.

Pinckard asked if the webinars will be freely available. **Mendez** doubts it, as they will be in the same category as other ALCTS webinars as part of the current training regimen. **Ratkovich** asked if there is anything being done besides webinars; **Mendez** thinks that cataloging manuals in specific formats are a possibility. **Hall-Ellis** inquired about training alternatives for people who can't access webinars. **Mendez** stated that the Task Force is considering on-site training.

1114. Report from the RDA Programming Task Force: Abbas

Abbas began the report by clarifying the difference between the Programming Task Force and the Training Task Force, with the former's charge being to present programs at ALA-affiliated conferences. There are obvious overlaps between the two groups, and they try to coordinate efforts between them. Midwinter 2011 will have testers talking about their experiences. **Abbas** encouraged people to send ideas on program development or potential speakers to jmabbas@ou.edu. They have also been surveying different email lists and monitoring different programs sponsored by other communities such as SAA and SLA. Some of their programs include Robert Ellett's presentation at the RDA 101 preconference, **Kincy**'s presentation at the California Library Association Conference, and numerous programs at the Texas Library Association Conference. **Abbas** encouraged people to attend Sunday's RDA Update Forum. The 2011 preconference is still being planned, but will address very specialized areas such as special collections or special formats, and will be in half- or full-day form. The Task Force has been contacting

vendors to learn how they will handle the transition; the vendors have stated that they are waiting for RDA's publication and clients' reactions before implementing any changes.

Creider mentioned that the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee is working on guidelines for cataloging special collections using RDA, with Stephen A. Skuce serving as chair. **Attig** was pleased that the RDA Programming Task Force is investigating programming related to vendors; he said that many vendors are far behind in this area and encouraged libraries to contact their vendors about it. **Glennan** commented that the Music Library Association is planning half- or full-day RDA training, so the Task Force should work with other groups to find out about their programming plans. **Abbas** asked for suggestions on the best mechanisms to do so, and **Glennan** recommended posting on large email lists or going through CC:DA channels. **Robare** stated that there may be many RDA-themed programs in 2011, and perhaps the ALCTS Programming Committee should coordinate this effort; **Attig** observed that this coordination is in the Task Force's charge. **Glennan** said that MLA will offer training at its conference. More music specialists attend MLA instead of ALA, which is probably true for other communities as well. **Allgood** said that Glennan's point is well-taken, and the Task Force should aim for a general cataloging audience instead of a specialized one, which is already working on its own programming. Further, having the testers speak is a very good idea. **Tillett** commented that Troy Linker has created an RDA clearinghouse for people to post any RDA-related training materials, and that he wants this to be used across the world. **Abbas** reported that the RDA 101 preconference had 190 participants; the day was very long and people became oversaturated. This preconference will be producing at least two webinars.

1115. Review of ISBD Consolidated Edition, 2010: Creider

Members of the Task Force to Review *ISBD: International Standard Bibliographic Description* (2010 consolidated edition) are Larry Creider (chair), Everett Allgood, Rebecca Culbertson, Elizabeth Jain Fletcher, Sara Shatford Layne, Kristin Lindlan, Wayne Richter, and Helen Schmierer. So far they have written approximately 26 pages of comments on the over 300 pages of the ISBD Consolidated, 2010 edition. The major themes and issues are defining relationships between RDA and ISBD, though the group is not entirely certain how ISBD can be defined when RDA has not yet been completely adopted. Some of the specific concerns include:

- Double punctuation: ISBD prescribes ending all elements with punctuation. In areas where RDA recommends using punctuation, such as the edition statement, this can create problematic double punctuation.
- Confusion on the difference between prescribed source and preferred source.
- Providing many references for "older monographic resources" but not serials of the same vintage that warrant attention to the same details.
- For the signature statement the rules are self-contradictory – the rules say to use an "ideal copy" but then say to specify the source copy for the signature statement.

- ISBD contains a statement about different countries using different terminology to distinguish between editions and printings; this is accurate for languages, not for countries.
- The relationship of ISBD to both FRBR and the new ICP, especially principles for description, needs to be clarified.

The draft response will need a quick turnaround.

Tillett asked if there are specific guidelines for discontinuing the use of the general material designation (GMD). **Creider** said that this is discussed in the controversial Area 0, which as Tillett noted is still provisional. Discussion ensued regarding the place of reviewing again the Area 0 within the more general review of ISBD consolidated.

Schmierer asked about how much of the Area 0 content is reflected in RDA. **Attig** replied that the instructions in RDA and ISBD's Area 0 are based on the same source [the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization], but went into very different directions; compatibility is questionable and it may be very difficult to reconcile the two approaches mechanically if not intellectually. **Robare** confirmed that the CC:DA Task Force on the Review of the Proposed ISBD Area 0 (January 2009) did discuss this issue.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:02 pm

*Monday, June 28, 2010, 8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, Yorktown/Valley Forge*

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at 8:07 am and welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors. He then introduced Ron Murray of the Library of Congress who made a presentation to the committee.

1116. Presentation, From “Moby-Dick” To “Mash-Ups”: Thinking About Bibliographic Networks: Murray & Tillett

The meeting opened with a presentation from LC's Ron Murray, entitled: “From ‘Moby Dick’ to ‘Mash-ups’: Thinking about Bibliographic Networks.” The ‘bibliographic networks’ in the title refers to the network of bibliographic data that exists for given bibliographic resources, not the system networks employed to share bibliographic records.

The presentation opened with a video mash-up of contemporary adaptations of *Moby Dick*: a video clip of Orson Welles's “Ishmael” reading; the trailer from the 1951 movie; and “Orson Whales,” a short film consisting of animated images of illustrations overdrawn on pages of the text from two copies of the novel. The video images were accompanied by an audio mash-up of: Orson Welles's “Ishmael” reading; other Orson Welles sound clips; Led Zeppelin's “Moby Dick”; a “Chartres Cathedral” audio track from Welles' documentary *F For Fake*; and others.

The presentation then moved into a discussion of modeling theory, presenting an outline for a “Cultural Heritage Resource Description Theory,” in order to explore some aspects of FRBR. An analysis was offered that bibliographic data, particularly with respect to composites and derivatives, was oversimplified if presented in terms of strictly hierarchical relationships rather than networked relationships, hierarchical trees being a subset of networks without cross connections or “reticulations.” Two aspects of modeling were outlined: descriptive modeling to document observed phenomena, and design modeling to identify system requirements. Later in the presentation, the evolving images from the study of nuclear physics were used to show how modeling imagery has transitioned from representations that are rooted in familiar images, which do not necessarily serve well the non-visible phenomena being modeled, to more abstract imagery that better serves the modeling.

The heart of the presentation was an analysis of the manifestations of Moby Dick using a “FRBR paper tool” consisting of a circle representing a named resource and a linked frame as an attachment for descriptions from which could be suspended resource descriptions corresponding to the FRBR Group 1 entities (or similar entities from other domains, e.g. archival entities fonds, series, file, item).

To demonstrate the ability to command a larger view of complex bibliographic relationships, a series of diagrams traced the bibliographic relationships between five significant manifestations of Moby Dick: the 1851 American edition, the 1851 London edition, and the 1851 publication of the chapter “The Town Ho’s Story” in Harpers, and the 1970 and the 1990 critical editions. The diagrams illustrated bibliographical relationships between these five manifestations and others, as revealed in G. Thomas Tanselle’s *A Checklist of Editions of Moby-Dick 1871-1976*. Also included were a significant number of manifestations lacking documented “genealogies” to these five manifestations but that are traditionally connected in library catalogs to the work *Moby Dick* through use of a uniform title.

In addition to facilitating reasoning about complex resource description structures, the diagrams are also intended to inform information system design and implementation. Grouping and linking bibliographic data to match what is depicted in a diagram will be accomplished differently, and with varying success, across different information technologies. The diagrams then indicate what resource description capabilities are achievable for a given information technology.

PDFs of the slide show (~25 MB) are available at:

<http://files.me.com/kandroma1/h3h5oo>

or in compressed form at:

<http://files.me.com/kandroma1/2w2uo7>.

The slide show can be viewed online on the Slideshare.net website; Murray has posted a comment with an index to selected sections of the show and the questions the section tries to address:

<http://www.slideshare.net/RonMurray/from-moby-dick-to-mashups-revised>

Allgood observed that in the presentation Murray had said that the current configurations of how we do linkages, with name-title or uniform title headings, which are one dimensional links among records, are dangerous in an automated environment. **Allgood** then asked if Murray had an idea of how we can move beyond that, and if RDA is moving towards a safer environment for linkages. **Murray** explained that with the one-dimensional linkages that play the role of a uniform title, once you have retrieved all the materials that meet the condition, you still need a way to distinguish the items retrieved. In the *Moby Dick* diagrams, everything there satisfies a uniform title requirement, so what do you do next? You either need other categorical assignments to narrow things down, which basically reproduce set operations like “this minus this plus that,” or you need relationships between the resources and their descriptions that let you selectively move to particular resources on the basis of particular interests. For example, in the diagram with red dots, the dots correspond to the first publications and to one set of unified publications. With this *Moby Dick* network, then, you can then place the user within networks according to the specific interests they have. You want to put scholars where everything is brought together and analyzed. For casual users it might not matter where they go. The navigational capabilities within the retrieved set show the relationships that exist between entities. This is the FRBR navigation component visualized. **Tillett**, answering the question of whether RDA is moving us to a safer environment, said absolutely yes. RDA is meant to be embraced not just by librarians or catalogers but all the other contributors out there in the world. They can, with the types of links and connections that they know about, enrich and augment the metadata provided by the library community. She really hopes that RDA will move us in that direction. **Murray** added that the document that provided the data for his presentation is G. Thomas Tanselle’s *A checklist of Moby-Dick publications*. This work contains citations of each publication, then a short paragraph describing how the publication cited relates to the others. When the book came out, people read the narrative and made connections in their minds. **Murray**, however, read the narrative and drew actual lines. In this case, the descriptions of a resource by those who practice textual criticism and analytical bibliography can overlap with our descriptions and consequently can be used to enrich a common view of the work. **Tillett** commented that in the future we are imagining, we as catalogers will already have this universe of metadata for our re-use and connection, and we can augment it with the experts contributing their relationships and connections. Hopefully future systems should make it simple, and allow us to put something simply into an existing network. It is an exciting time, imagining what future systems can do.

Yee remarked that those who work in the humanities are aware that the various expressions of a complex work do not have a hierarchical relationship to each other. She hopes, however, that Murray is not suggesting that there is no hierarchical relationship between all of those expressions and the work. It is still very useful to be able to say at the top, work level that all these expressions are authored by Herman Melville, all go back to something published in 1851, all are set in the 19th century whaling industry, so we do not have to repeat what is true of the work at every expression level. **Murray** pointed out that in his diagram there is actually only one work level description – or actually two, one for the 1851 New York publication and one for the excerpt. For

everything else there, its intellectual information can be inferred from its connection to the 1851 item. In that sense there is a means for tracing back through an inferential process to descriptions that can be applied to everything that has a certain kind of a connection. It is informational but it could be authoritative as well. Sometimes hierarchical structures are intended to carry both an authoritative sense as well as an information sense. What you see in the diagram are two works that Melville scholars declared equally authoritative, which is interesting from a Melville scholarship point of view as well as a bibliographical description point of view. How it relates to a hierarchical structure is the question opened by the structure in the diagram. This could be authoritatively constructed and verifiable but that does not necessarily require a hierarchical structure. **Tillett** added that there is a hierarchical piece in it, and that a network can embrace hierarchies. The four FRBR group 1 entities have direct links but they are not always hierarchies. Within FRBR itself the expression to work connection is not just a one-to-one relationship. Some people who have translated it have tried to make it a one-to-one connection all the way down, but it really is more complex than that.

Nannette **Naught** suggested that the beauty of this is that it is polyhierarchical. Hierarchy is subject- and specialty-based. As someone who comes from outside of libraries, she finds that this presentation could make RDA relevant to multiple audiences, and that is the tag that she has been seeking. As an outsider, she has been concerned with how to take RDA to systems outside of libraries, and something like this will expose RDA, if we can learn to talk about it. **Murray** said that the concept of polyhierarchy came from a National Institutes of Health researcher named Bodenreider, who has written a paper about polyhierarchy and what it means for information systems. Bodenreider referred to everything in graph theoretical terms, which is a graph that has no cycles in it and all the arrows point in one particular direction. That is a very abstract way of talking about hierarchy, but what you get from it is that polyhierarchies are basically sets of trees that are all headed in one direction, each of which has its own interpretation. **Murray** was careful earlier to point out that what are called phylogenetic networks occur when you start piling trees on top of one another. Looked at as a whole it is not a hierarchy because you can pull out tree-like structures. A tree is a network that does not have cross branches. If you retain the notion of hierarchy and you put it too closely together to the part you will miss the opportunity to see everything from a larger graph-like structure.

The **Chair** referred to a slide from the presentation with a paragraph of text that cited a number of documents. It was a paragraph from FRBR citing the works upon which it was based. The slide then showed the paragraph with the text that wasn't citations grayed out. This is the imagery he is taking away from the presentation. The data structures we are looking at are like that paragraph of text. We pick one particular way of highlighting the networks within the text, but there are other ways we could parse the information in those paragraphs. It is a matter of figuring out what kinds of structures within this web of information we want to highlight. We select some, while other communities select others. When you overlay them you can see the whole network. You can also selectively view things to see a tree of one nature or of another, or to see some other smaller, less robust web within the structure.

Some of the diagrams reminded **Attig** that we are almost always dealing with incomplete information. Even though the presentation was based on the definitive work of *Moby-Dick*, there was a significant part of it where the relationships had not been established. He was impressed by how Murray made sense of it in a way that combined both the known and unknown in ways that could make this meaningful to people who are trying to follow the research. **Murray** commented that in working on this particular bibliographic phenomenon he did not want *Moby-Dick* to become his Moby-Dick. He took Tanselle's device seriously. There are a lot of things out there and a lot of connections to be made, and you try to make the ones you can and to appreciate the situation and see what you can do next. It will be forever incomplete but that doesn't mean it can't be increasingly complete. In discussing the network structure and the institutions that create, grow, assure the quality of, and use networks we are making certain statements about the missions of these institutions: they will create and maintain and grow and pay attention to the structure as it evolves over time. We are definitely not looking at something that appears and will be stable forever after. The whole concept of networks and information systems mimic the social networks created by humans. They are growing and changing all the time, but they are not totally incomprehensible. We need to figure out how to not just build them but to make sense of them. How we create and monitor and add to networks will be a function of our institutional mission. This will include making sure things are connected; seeing what is connected and what is not; and contacting other communities whose descriptions can be used to enhance the network. There will be a reason for being other than just to create bibliographic records for individual books. There will be a lot of room at top level for people who are interested in network perspectives on resources like this as well as in thinking about how cataloging in its current form will be transformed into a resource description network.

Thomas **Dukleth** from the audience asked what we have in RDA that will solve the problems of ambiguity of association, where we have something which is likely an expression or manifestation something with confidence level "y" and of something else with a different confidence level. One can question multiple relationships about that uncertainty with whatever respective confidence level is held regarding each one of those relationships. **Murray** replied that he discussed this in the theory section. He originally envisioned this in terms of how people in different cultural communities describe things of interest to them. He started out by thinking there is a certain kind of Newtonian perspective involved here, a point of view which says that judgments are made that are accurate and absolute for all time. This is a Newtonian observer, describing an unchanging universe. After 1904 this has changed, and instead of a Newtonian observer making absolute judgments that apply for all time there are now observing systems and observed systems. The observing systems observe a phenomenon and create descriptions of it, and whether or not the descriptions are true for all time is a philosophical question. If your cataloging or description theory says that whatever you say applies for all time then you have difficulty dealing with differences in description. People in psychology have notions of individual differences or group-based differences or cultural differences that try to explain why people don't give the same response. Whether or not our institutional approach towards describing things allows for differences or ambiguity in description is a cultural question that we have to work out. There are lots of ideas for

establishing links that have not been fully investigated. **Dukleth** clarified that the code isn't necessarily Newtonian or post-Newtonian in dealing with absolutes, but it is up to an interpretation that is drawn from the inferences made. **Murray** replied that the observer's point of view and rule interpretation become part of what happens when the description is made. Whether the judgments are likely or unlikely becomes the question of how you understand your role. **Tillett** commented that this ties into RDA, which puts more emphasis on cataloger's judgment to make decisions appropriate in a particular situation. The cataloger provides what they can but it is not cast in stone for all time. People can add to it, or it can be augmented with social tagging to add value, and so on.

1117. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director, and Troy Linker

Linker announced that ALA Publishing has been active since Midwinter, especially in regards to RDA and the Toolkit. In the last six months ALA Publishing has launched and continued to update and enhance www.RDAToolkit.org, which is the informational and marketing website and the mechanism for disseminating information about the Toolkit. Two sessions of an RDA Toolkit webinar were hosted on February 8-9, 2010, to promote the beta site, the same demonstration as at ALA Midwinter. The webinars were well-attended and good feedback about them was received. The webinars were recorded as web videos and posted to the RDA Toolkit website. To date there have been 3,100 plays of the two videos.

The Co-publishers of RDA announced several additional offerings, including a solo user license designed to support smaller institutions. Feedback from CC:DA and other constituencies led to this decision. They also announced a double-user offer, to help users more easily manage the RDA learning curve. The Co-publishers also announced that they would be offering a print version, for use in education. Exact details and the timing of the print version are not yet available. In May ALA Publishing launched the sign-up process for the open access period. There are over 2,200 sign-ups so far. The sign-up process is currently a manual process. The automated process is not yet created, one that will automatically build the account, but it is hoped this will be available in the future. Over two-thirds of the sign-ups have been institutional accounts, and one-third solo users. Fifty-three percent of the sign-ups have been from the U.S., eleven percent from Australia, ten percent from Canada, and four percent from the U.K.

Most recently, ALA Publishing hosted three live webinars demonstrating the Toolkit on June 17-18 to talk about the open access period. There were over 1,100 registrants but many with multiple viewers in the same room. These webinars were also recorded and are available as videos on the website.

And last week the RDA Toolkit was launched. This begins the open access period, through August 31, 2010. Nineteen hundred accounts have been set up so far, and about half are solo user accounts. This release is a definite milestone and a big achievement but the work is certainly not finished. In regards to the update process of RDA, content will not change except under the direction of the JSC. ALA Publishing assumes this will

resemble the AACR2 update process. No substantive changes will be made without consulting the JSC, and even typos will probably need to be verified by the JSC. ALA Publishing will add some functionality to the site over time and might add additional documents. Most prominent are the LCPS, on which they have been working, and there may be others. Links will be added between the LCPS and the RDA content, and also links between RDA and AACR2 content. ALA Publishing is working to enhance the site by adding more functionality and wants to add quickly multiple language support along with some other user-configurable options.

ALA Publishing has established the RDA Toolkit Support Center, which has an e-mail address, rdatoolkit@ala.org. It will be monitoring the various listservs, but the fastest way to get attention is through the support center. It is managed by a group of people, so if Linker is unavailable someone will be there to answer questions. So far the majority of requests for support have been related to user names and gaining access to the site. The Support Center staff are committed to answering questions as quickly and efficiently as they can. **Linker** introduced several ALA Publishing staff who have helped bring about the RDA Toolkit: Mary Mackay, ALA Publishing's Director of Marketing, who has helped with messaging and with getting information about the Toolkit out; Steven Hofmann, who has run the booth and has also been instrumental in helping with messaging and improvement of the site; Alison Elms, who will manage subscriptions, talk with consortia, and get IP addresses set up. **Linker** finished by offering his thanks to the JSC, CoP, and many people in the room, for comments in meetings, direct emails, postings to AUTOCAT, and beta testing. The RDA Toolkit has been shaped by and is better for the comments from this group.

Mangan asked whether the links from the AACR2 rules will be in place during the open period. **Linker** hopes so, and said that it is a short-term priority so they should be in during the trial period. **Attig** asked when the print product will be available, and **Linker** replied that they have the first unedited draft at the booth so people can see what it will look like, but there is still some review to be done. They should have more information in July but it will probably not be available until later than that. They have not announced the pricing but should have better information about it later as well. The website accidentally included some incorrect pricing information for a few days. For budgeting purposes, **Linker** estimated it would be in the \$150 range. They will also have a print component of the element set view, which was complicated to do and should be available later in the summer or fall.

Ratkovich has been an advocate for the print product, and recounted a story that highlights the lack of connectivity around the world. In Durban, South Africa an IT company sponsored a 60-mile data transmission race between a pigeon carrying a memory stick with four gigabytes and the ADSL service of the country's biggest web firm Telkom. The pigeon took two hours and in the same time the ADSL line had only carried four percent of the data. With just an online product we have to worry about connectivity issues like this, and even in the United States some areas do not have connectivity. For school librarians this is a major concern.

From the audience, Peter **Murray** from Ohiolink asked if there are plans for an electronic distribution outside of the online RDA Toolkit. **Linker** replied that there are no solid plans to do it. The interface of the Toolkit was designed to be optimized for the rule set, so the data would lose something if put in a different structure. ALA Publishing is going to research this issue but probably not this year, so it might be an enhancement further down the road. It might be an ebook or a similar format. The RDA content is in a complicated XML structure and it benefits from a lot of encoded metadata in the XML. It will be necessary to work through those processes, but because the content is in XML it will be easier to translate into some other output format than it would have been from a different source code. ALA Publishing is not able to allocate resources to this issue however until after the launch phase. It will continue to explore this and try to do it, but it will require research and it will need to be sure it is useful and not a disservice to users of RDA. **Murray** then commented that in addition to the ebook format, others might be able to take the raw standard and turn it into other derivatives that benefit other communities. He encouraged ALA Publishing to consider other distribution mechanisms for the raw XML, to enable others to do more creative things with it. **Linker** then commented that ALA Publishing is preparing some Help sheets for RDA, most importantly a linking guide. It wants to have robust linking deep into the Toolkit, and will publish a guide for that. It will post to the site one-sheet guides on several topics, including advanced searching and linking to RDA. Those will be PDFs posted freely to the site.

The **Chair** brought up the example of the *Differences between, Changes within* document, a single, small document that was maintained by CC:DA in two separate formats, print and digital. In doing so, the committee ran into significant challenges in keeping the documents in sync. Because of these complexities, ALA Publishing does need some leeway in maintaining the file so there are not various disparate versions of RDA existing simultaneously. **Attig** commented that RDA is driven by a single XML file, which should take care of the problems the **Chair** mentioned. Maintaining RDA should be easier than AACR2 because of having one single file. **Linker** agreed with Attig. He worked with the SGML file that ran AACR2. AACR2 in Cataloger's Desktop is a completely different file, and so every update had to be done in both places. ALA Publishing did not want to get back into that situation with RDA. On this topic, he wanted also to recognize Nanette Naught and her IMT team. They were essential in helping to build a single XML file. This way when a change is made, it is made to the XML file and then pushed out to the website and to the PDFs that run the print copy. ALA Publishing will use XML for what it was truly designed for, and will make one change to a central location and then push it out from there.

Paul **Weiss** from the audience asked about the current situation and future plans for translations of RDA. **Linker** replied that there are meetings being held with several groups that want to translate the product. This has been deferred somewhat in order to get to the launch phase. There were discussions with the RDA developer after the RDA Forum at this conference. After taking a couple of days to catch their collective breath, they will start thinking about the development changes they need to do to support multiple languages. Several translation partners have wanted to work with them. French is a priority for Canadian libraries. The Canadians want to move quickly since they

cannot implement RDA until they have a French version of it. ALA Publishing is in talks with ASTED, the Canadian French-language library association, which will coordinate French translations for most Francophone countries, to find a version acceptable to almost all. Hopefully there will be more to announce, on both the development side and the translation side, before Midwinter. The intent is to translate the text electronically, then perhaps export a print version out of the electronic version, in a process similar to the master XML file. Some languages have tricky display issues, but ALA Publishing will continue to work through those issues.

Glennan remarked that the Toolkit currently has the ability to accommodate individual profile mappings and workflows, and also has the ability to accommodate documents generated by the JSC and LC such as the LCPS. She asked if accommodating documents from other organizations was part of the future development of the Toolkit, for example PCC documents or Music Library Association documents for best practices. Currently, those documents can get into the Toolkit if they are sponsored by an individual, but that seems like a short term, not a long term, solution. **Linker** expects that there will be other authoritative documentation added to the Toolkit, but ALA Publishing has not worked out the proposal and acceptance process yet. There will probably be a group that will evaluate what should go in. He does not want it to be overwhelming, and Workflows was created to handle some of this, but certainly some documents do belong in the document collection as opposed to the Workflows. ALA Publishing will communicate the process for promoting a document to the document collection and how the evaluation process will work.

Welbourne observed that she is incredibly impressed with the quantity and quality of changes since Midwinter. It is extremely commendable that some of the points raised at Midwinter were taken very seriously. The product as it exists now reflects that. **Linker** thanked her, and said that ALA Publishing tried hard to do that. It was not an easy task, but it plans to support the product for a long time and it needs to fit the needs of the communities. It is trying to make it a global product, so it will be a balancing act going forward. The comments were right on and the changes that came from them were useful, so ALA Publishing tried to make as many as they could.

Thomas **Dukleth** from the audience asked if ALA Publishing was considering a license for the as yet unreleased XML schema. His clients are interested in adapting those for record modeling purposes. He would utilize it not only for his own work but also for user groups that need an adaptation of description. **Linker** replied that ALA Publishing has not addressed this issue but it can. The idea is to have the schema available in the tool and not behind a firewall. Nanette **Naught** confirmed that the schema are freely available. **Linker** remarked that ALA Publishing does need to close the loop on the licensing issue. He will take this as a to-do item from this meeting and make sure everything is in place. The other site licenses are posted as PDFs on the website. They will also come up with a license for downloadable schemas. He will add it as an FAQ and if a new license is needed, it will be added as a PDF to the site.

Attig commented that at the meeting on Saturday, CC:DA started getting organized for revisions to the text of RDA. The open question is what the processes will look like and what sort of technical environment there will be for making revisions. There are still no answers, but he wanted to reinforce that the process is beginning. It is important that CC:DA and its constituencies get answers to these questions as soon as possible. **Linker** agreed, that this is part of what ALA Publishing needs to do and that it will probably have an on-site meeting with the JSC to hash out this issue and the multiple languages issue. ALA Publishing needs to figure out how to denote on the display what is changed. It also needs a mechanism to allow the JSC to communicate changes and to manage the change process. This is on top of the priority list. Changes won't be seen in the Toolkit right away but ALA Publishing is trying to be ahead of the game. It wants to start the process now so it is available when the JSC is ready.

Chatham briefly, in a ceremonial note on behalf of ALA Publishing, expressed his thanks for the enormous time and effort given to this extended and complicated process which led from principle to practice, and from concept to culmination. He wanted to manifest an expression of appreciation for the Committee's work with a modest item, a cake. He asked Tillett and Attig to represent the many hands involved in the historic breakthrough by being the ones to cut the cake.

1118. Report from the MARBI Representative: Everett Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2010/2 [preliminary]]

Allgood presented the highlights from the MARBI meetings on Saturday and Sunday related to the following proposals:

Proposal no. 2010-06: *Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats*

Approved, with the clarification that subfield 0 is not being defined for the 1XX block of fields in the MARC 21 authority format. Standard numbers such as international standard name identifiers for authority 1XX fields will be recorded in the 024 field.

Proposal no. 2010-07: *ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format*

Approved with editorial revisions. This has ramifications for RDA implementation. As libraries start encoding RDA records with MARC, they will input the value "i" in the leader byte 18 for RDA records with ISBD punctuation. The 040 subfield e will be entered as "rda". Libraries that use RDA without ISBD punctuation will encode leader byte 18 blank and field 040 subfield e as "rda."

Attig commented that there is a third category, of records cataloged according to ISBD punctuation provisions but where punctuation would not be recorded where it would be redundant. The Germans are planning on using this but we are not aware of anyone else doing so.

Proposal no. 2010-08: *Encoding Scheme of Coordinate Data in Field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats*

This proposal was turned down. LC will revisit the topic with the communities that presented it to determine if it needs to come back in a revised form. The primary reason it was turned down is because nobody was there to advocate how to implement it.

Proposal no.2010-09: *Addition of Subfield \$u to Field 561 (Ownership and Custodial History) to the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats*

This proposal was approved.

Discussion Paper no. 2010-DP04: *Encoding the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats*

Option 2 was preferred because as the discussion paper notes it requires no changes to the MARC 21 format. No further action is therefore required from MARBI. MARC 21 documentation will be updated to include examples of encoded ISTC codes.

Discussion Paper 2010-DP05: *Language Coding for Moving Images in Field 041 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format*

This paper will come back to the committee as a proposal.

1119. 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** gave a report from the CCS Exec meeting. The only item of note for CC:DA was a follow up to an item from **Tillett**'s report, the proposed Procedural Guidelines for Romanization Tables. The **Chair** passed the information on to CCS Exec with our feedback. The chair of CC:AAM attended the CCS Exec meeting, but his committee had not yet met. He did not therefore have any immediate feedback from their perspective, but he will provide it to CCS. There will be a combined report from ALA to LC, coming through CCS. The chairs involved will coordinate, to make a coherent response.

The **Chair** asked for reports from the floor, and **Ratkovich** reported on a paper in progress by a member of her committee, and shared the rough draft. CCM did a survey of 400 school librarians. Approximately 70 percent didn't know what RDA was. Some had heard of it because they took a cataloging class or because they knew catalogers in public or academic libraries. The school librarians surveyed said that the cost of RDA, including the cost of training and webinars, would probably prohibit them from participating. Her committee feels that one of its duties is to get the word out to everybody. They are going to concentrate on state and regional organizations and try at least to give them the avenues for training. The **Chair** expressed a hope that the news of a print version would alleviate some of the financial concerns, and also expressed his thanks to Ratkovich for being one of the resounding voices on the Committee to help make the print version happen.

There was no further business from the floor. The **Chair** announced several changes to the personnel of the Committee. He congratulated Lori Robare on her appointment as chair and welcomed the two new voting members, Peter Rolla and Patricia Dragon, and

the two new interns, Gayle Porter and John Ilardo. The **Chair** expressed his thanks to Kathy Glennan, who has served for four years as a voting member and before that as the MLA liaison. John Myers and Kathy Glennan are both term limited and will be rotating off the Committee. The **Chair** also recognized the many years of service of Helen Schmierer, Patricia Ratkovich, and Everett Allgood as liaisons for PARS, the Cataloging of Children's Materials, and MARBI, respectively. They have really been in the trenches as RDA developed and the **Chair** thanked them for their invaluable contributions. Myers has accepted an appointment as the MARBI liaison. As outgoing chair, he declared that it has been a privilege and honor to serve such a dedicated, knowledgeable, and hardworking group of colleagues. This Committee and the community it serves can be immensely proud of its accomplishments and the release of RDA.

The next meeting of the Committee will be at the regular times, Saturday 1:30-5:30 and Monday 8:00-12:00, January 8 and 10, at ALA Midwinter in San Diego.

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 11:15 am.