Please see the [CC:DA blog](https://ccda.blogspot.com/) for the complete agenda and links to many reports and documents.

Peter Rolla reported on CC:DA actions, including the authorization of ALA responses to three music RDA revision proposals, as well as the approval of a revised version of the discussion paper from the Task Force on Instructions for Recording Relationships, submitted to the JSC as 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3. The task force will continue its work and develop revision proposals. Rolla also announced that a task force will be formed to investigate [pseudonymous corporate bodies](https://ccda.blogspot.com/), as exemplified by musical group R.E.M. in a paper by Adam Schiff that was discussed at Annual 2013 in Chicago.

**Report from the Library of Congress Representative** (Dave Reser)
Reser reported on personnel changes, the federal budget situation, the LC-PCC PSs, RDA development, updates to authority records for the Channel Islands, development of the ALA-LC romanization tables, *Cataloger’s Desktop*, the upgrade of LC’s ILS, and the Bibliographic Framework Initiative. January 2014 saw the retirements of Tom Yee, acting chief of the Policy and Standards Division, and Joe Bartl, head of the Bibliographic Access Section in the Music Division.

**Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee** (Kathy Glennan)
Glennan reported on the November 2013 meeting of the JSC, summarizing JSC activities as well as the outcomes of JSC discussion of 2013 RDA revision proposals. Excerpted here is Glennan’s report on the three 2013 music proposals:

**6JSC/Music/1: Proposed revision to instruction on ... two or more parts**
This proposal was the result of a charge from the JSC to the RDA Music Joint Working Group to determine whether the instructions for recording the numbers of parts that had been revised in the case of musical works (6JSC/CCC/7, 2012) could be applied more generally. After reviewing the proposal, the JSC decided that the instructions should not be generalized. However, the music-specific instructions relating to suites were approved. LC will prepare a proposal addressing the missing instruction for parts of parts in 2014.

**6JSC/Music/2: Proposed revision to instruction 6.14.2.5, Preferred title consisting solely of the name of one type of composition**
The proposal sought to clarify the instructions for recording a preferred title consisting solely of the name of one type of composition. The Working Group prepared a revised proposal (6JSC/Music/2/rev/2), primarily to clarify the choice of language of the title and the use of cognate forms. The revised proposal was accepted, with the addition of sub-instruction numbers and captions: 6.14.2.5.1, Choice of Language and 6.14.2.5.2, Singular or Plural Form; some wording changes; and the designation of the instruction for *étude, fantasia, and sinfonia concertante* as an exception.
6JSC/Music/3: Proposed revisions for medium of performance (RDA 6.15.1, 6.28.1.9, 6.28.1.10, and Appendix E.1.1)
This proposal suggested extensive revisions to 6.15.1 (the instructions for recording medium of performance as an element) and 6.28.1.9 (the instructions for using medium of performance in an authorized access point representing a musical work). The objective was to remove restrictions from the instructions on recording the element, but to move those restrictions to the instructions for constructing the access point. Thus complete descriptions of the medium may be recorded in the element, although that level of detail will not necessarily appear in the access point. The JSC approved the proposal with modifications. The Working Group prepared a follow-up document reflecting the discussion: 6JSC/Music/3/follow-up.

Five proposals from the ALA Representative to the JSC (Kathy Glennan)
B. Date of Production and Date of Manufacture elements: CC:DA decided to wait until the February update of the RDA Toolkit before finalizing this, since it will include a change that would affect this. CC:DA will likely propose giving priority to a source within the resource for Date of Manufacture but not for Date of Production, since an unpublished resource may bear a date that was added by an owner or a dealer long after production.
C. Core elements in Distribution and Manufacture Statements: CC:DA discussed this issue at great length. Most people in the room felt that Interpretation #2 is desired. CC:DA agreed that the situation needs further exploration via examples. A few people volunteered to generate examples. CC:DA may charge a task force to look into this issue.
D. Revision of RDA 9.19 to address placement of instructions regarding “Spirit”: CC:DA decided to wait until the April update of the RDA Toolkit before taking action, since it will include a change that may solve the problem.
E. Problems with RDA 3.4.5.9, Leaves or Pages of Plates: A small group of people will investigate this issue and communicate with the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data.

Report from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data (Francis Lapka)
Lapka reported that the issue of dimensions of still images will be folded into the task force’s work. The task force may also take on the issue of recording duration, informed by preliminary work by MLA and OLAC (see below).

Presentation from Gordon Dunsire, Chair of the JSC, with Q&A and open discussion
Dunsire gave a presentation called “RDA for machines” (available for viewing on his website), in which he expounded upon the correspondence between the RDA/ONIX Framework and the RDA elements of Content type and Carrier type. He gave examples of the Framework’s Base Categories for Content and Carrier as well as an explanation of RDA Qualified Categories. Dunsire concluded by imagining the potential of the Aspect-Unit-Quantity model that is in development to make the data relating to Extent and Duration more machine-actionable.
Report from the MAC Representative (John Myers)  
Myers reviewed the proposals and discussion papers discussed by MAC. All three proposals were approved, and three of the four discussion papers will be made into proposals. Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP04, concerning user-friendly public display of RDA relationship designators, will not be made into a proposal. Instead, best practices for display text will be issued.

Report from the PCC Liaison (Lori Robare)  
Robare reported that the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) has set an end date of December 31, 2014 for PCC AACR2 original cataloging and that new authority records for undifferentiated personal names are no longer allowed. PCC will issue guidelines for maintenance of existing undifferentiated personal name authority records. Robare summarized the activities of PCC’s Standing Committee on Automation, Standing Committee on Standards, and Standing Committee on Training since ALA Annual 2013. She also reported that there is interest in creating new BIBCO funnels in areas where NACO funnels already exist (such as music).

Report from ALA Publishing Services (James Hennelly)  
Hennelly reported that the past fiscal year saw steady growth in subscriptions to the RDA Toolkit, as well as a high renewal rate, and that there has been a change in the pricing structure for subscriptions. The print version of RDA has sold several hundred copies. The e-book version of RDA is also available and affordable. Both will be updated annually. The planned Essential RDA is behind schedule, but Thomas Brenndorfer of Guelph Public Library will likely be the author. The RDA Toolkit will be updated in February (fast-track updates), April (revisions approved by the JSC in November 2013), and approximately August (revisions to the French and German translations). New translations of RDA are in the works.

Report of the CC:DA Webmaster (Melanie Polutta)  
Polutta reported that she will continue to investigate alternatives to the CC:DA wiki for posting documents and commenting on them. She also reported that she will finish her term as of ALA Annual 2014.

Update from the TF on Place Names (Kathy Glennan and Robert Rendall)  
There will be a new JSC working group on place names in RDA. It is thought that the CC:DA task force will continue to exist and will work directly with the new JSC task force.

Update on Discussion paper from OLAC/MusLA on technical and performing credits (Kelley McGrath and Tracey Snyder)  
For reference, a summary of the discussion of this paper at ALA Annual 2013 follows: “McGrath presented a description of the problem of inconsistency between the Statement of Responsibility element in RDA chapter 2 (which maps to MARC 245 $c) and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter and Artistic and/or Technical Credit elements in RDA chapter 7 (which map to MARC 511 and 508, respectively), as well as a summary of the four options that OLAC and MLA had considered. (1) Make a principled distinction between entities associated with the work (statement of responsibility) and entities associated with the expression (credits). This would not be feasible for certain types of sound recordings, or for print materials that name editors and translators (contributors to the expression, traditionally recorded in the statement of responsibility area). (2) Make no distinctions, and record all responsible entities, including
performers and other contributors, in the statement of responsibility area. This would result in unwieldy catalog displays and increase the burden on catalogers transcribing such statements. (Alternatively, all entities could be recorded in notes instead of the statement of responsibility area, which one CC:DA commentator recommended for video cataloging.) (3) Make SOR a non-core element, and rely on access points or identifiers. This would result in loss of recorded usage of varying forms of name. (4) Allow cataloger’s judgment for dividing information between the SOR and notes, possibly utilizing 2.20.3 (Note on Statement of Responsibility) or 2.4.1.6 (More Than One Statement of Responsibility). Although these two possibilities under option 4 are not without their problems, they may be the most viable of the various solutions considered. A few music specialists present at the meeting spoke of the desirability of transcribing a performer’s name to record usage while manipulating information about the performer’s function (such as providing instrument names in English when the resource presents them in another language). OLAC and MLA will continue work on this issue.”

McGrath and Snyder reported that they intend to work with OLAC and MLA in 2014 to propose deleting the references to 7.23 and 7.24 in 2.4.1.1. Additionally, they plan to propose new instructions for recording credits in the early part of chapter 7 (attributes of the work) that will correlate with existing instructions for recording credits in 7.23 and 7.24 (attributes of the expression). OLAC and MLA could then provide community-based guidance on deciding what information to record as statements of responsibility and what information to record in notes on the content of the work or expression.

**Recording duration** (Kelley McGrath and Tracey Snyder)

Excerpted here is a summary of the issue and solution described in the paper: RDA 7.22.1.3 (Playing Time, Running Time, Etc.) contains a great deal of detail about how to record the playing time or running time of an audiovisual resource, including provisions for abbreviating terms for units of time, recording a time that is not stated on the resource, and recording an approximate time. However, RDA 7.22.1.4-6, which deal with duration for other types of resources, do not contain such provisions. Consequently, music catalogers referring to 7.22.1.4 (Performance Time) have felt unsure how to record an approximate performance time for notated music. Some take the example “about 1 hr., 10 min.” in 7.22.1.4 to mean that the word “about” should be used for an approximate performance time for notated music, in contrast with “approximately” for audiovisual resources, as detailed in 7.22.1.3. Others interpret the example in 7.22.1.4 to be a transcription from a resource bearing the word “about” and wonder if they should use “approximately” when supplying an approximate performance time for notated music, since that is the practice detailed in 7.22.1.3 for audiovisual resources. In November 2013, the RDA Music Joint Working Group proposed the following text as a LC-PCC PS for each of the instructions that suffer from a lack of clear guidance (7.22.1.4-6):

Record the time and abbreviate terms for units of time as instructed in appendix B (B.5.3).
If the time is approximate, record the approximate time preceded by *approximately*.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION**: The proposed Policy Statements are likely to be published, but a more comprehensive solution is needed. Tracey Snyder (MLA) and Kelley McGrath (OLAC) propose to work with their respective cataloging communities in developing a formal proposal.
for CC:DA in 2014 that would bring consistency and clarity to 7.22. One possible approach could be to add a new section at 7.22.1.3 (and renumber the sections that follow) called Recording Duration, which would contain basic instructions on recording duration (including abbreviating units of time, recording approximate duration, etc.) that would apply to the subsequent instructions. (This approach can be seen at 3.5.1.3 Recording Dimensions.) With a new 7.22.1.3 in place, the subsequent instructions can be revised accordingly. **Does CC:DA agree with this approach?**

CC:DA decided that MLA and OLAC will work together to develop a proposal early in 2014 and share it with the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data. As we get closer to ALA Annual, CC:DA will need to figure out if the proposal should stand on its own or be incorporated into the work of that task force.

**Fast track proposal on Appendix J** (Peter Rolla)
CC:DA indicated general agreement with the work done so far on revising a selection of terms and definitions in Appendix J, both as presented in the initial paper and as amended on the CC:DA blog. Rolla, Snyder, and Glennan will continue work on this proposal, with input from CC:DA as needed.