Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, San Francisco, California, USA, 2015 June 27 and 29

Submitted to the Standing Committee of the IFLA Cataloguing Section by the IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

The American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met at the ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco, California , USA, on Saturday 2015 June 27, 1:00-5:00 P.M.; and Monday 2015 June 29, 8:30-11:30 A.M. The full agenda of the meeting is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=2053.

Ms. Dominique Bourassa (Yale University) succeeds Mr. Robert Rendall (Columbia University) as CC:DA chair following the San Francisco meetings. The next meetings of the committee will be on 2016 January 9 and 11, at ALA Midwinter in Boston.

Mr. Rendall reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between January and June 2015 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CCDAChair2014-201506.pdf).

Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LC-2015-06.pdf), including some of these highlights:

- Librarian of Congress since 1987, Dr. James Billington announced his retirement effective 2016 January 1. Various organizational realignments are taking place coincident with this major change, in an attempt to strengthen LC's information technology and related functions.

- A Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME) pilot is scheduled to begin in July 2015 and continue for three months, involving use of the BIBFRAME editor and profile editor. It intends to answer questions about the adaptability of library data to the Linked Data environment.

- Beginning on 2015 July 1, all LC catalogers will provide Relationship Designators for all creators following the new "Training Manual for Applying Relationship Designators in Bibliographic Records." Guidelines for RDs in Authority records remain under development.

ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on JSC activities between January and June 2015. Her full report is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/JSCrep-kpg-2015-6.pdf. Among the highlights:

- The Committee of Principals met in April 2015 and agreed on the new governance model, which moves to regional representatives, including just one from North America. They are working out how to get to their goal over the next three to four years.

- An archives working group will be formed before the end of 2015.

- As part of the restructuring, we ca expect there to be more use of working groups rather than constituency groups.

- The JSC deferred fast track action on adding "transgender" to 9.7.1.3, to allow for wider consideration of personal information in authority data.

The Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3 revision proposal (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/tf-MADE_RDA-Chap3-rev2015-06.pdf) was discussed. Extent for textual resources differs from other extents in that it accounts for how the resource presents itself in terms of pagination and foliation. Discussion led to a general philosophical question of carrier/"blankness" (including unprinted pages, blank tape, and white space surrounding an image) versus a measurement of content/substance (including page numberings, the actual length of sound on tape, the actual size of images). Reaction was positive to recording the number of volumes in all cases.

The ALA/ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section proposal on "References to Descriptions" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/RBMS-2015-1.pdf) attempts to revise RDA Chapters 24 and 26 and Appendix J "to accommodate the referential relationship between a resource and a description or enumeration of that resource contained in another resource such as a bibliography or catalog." The proposal will be revised to take into consideration relationships at all WEMI levels.

In a discussion of CC:DA's meeting format and its need for microphones, it was noted that, in order to cut expenses, ALCTS has tried to cut CC:DA's allocation of microphones for its meetings. The ACLTS Board will be discussing the issue during ALA Annual. The committee is convinced that it can justify its need for more microphones in part because of the size of CC:DA. Because CC:DA's representation extends well beyond that of ALCTS (and even beyond ALA itself), its needs should be supported at the ALA level rather than at the division level. There may also be possible Americans With Disabilities Act issues regarding the lack microphones making the meetings inaccessible for the hearing impaired. It

was also noted that CC:DA's major area of work, namely RDA, is a major generator of revenue for ALA Publishing.

The Task Force to Investigate the Instructions for Recording Relationships in RDA presented two proposals:

- "Revision to 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/tf-relationships-8.pdf): There is a need to coordinate the various proposals for Chapter 3 changes that are emanating from several task forces. RDA 3.1.4 may be eliminated all together or be revised to serve as a "table of contents" to the instructions that follow.

- "Additional Instructions in Chapter 27 for Structured Descriptions of the 'Contained in' and 'Container of' Relationships" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/tf-relationships-9.pdf): The reworking of the "Container of" relationship is trying to reconcile current practice with the development of a more principled approach to the ambiguity of the WEMI level of contents notes. The distinction between structured/formal notes and unstructured/informal notes may no longer be useful. The task force still needs to consider the treatment of accompanying material in this context. Relocating contents notes into RDA Chapter 2 might help to deal with some of these problems, leaving the remainder to be dealt with in an evolved discussion paper to contribute to an ongoing discussion.

JSC Representative Ms. Glennan presented three proposals:

- "Create RDA 2.17.14, Note on Identifier for the Manifestation" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/JSCrep-kpg-2015-3.pdf), which was accepted.

- "Create New Sub-Instructions in RDA 2.17 for: Other Information Relating to Numbering of Serials (RDA 2.17.5.6) and Other Information Relating to a Series Statement (RDA 2.17.11.5)" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/JSCrep-kpg-2015-4.pdf), which was accepted.

- "Clarify Sources of Information Instruction for Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper (RDA 2.4.2.2)" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/JSCrep-kpg-2015-5.pdf) was not brought up at the meeting but was subsequently discussed and accepted via e-mail.

JSC Chair Mr. Gordon Dunsire made a presentation on "Engaging with RDA: Governance and Strategy" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/RDA-Gov-Strategy.pdf) followed by a question and answer period. RDA is now about ten years old and been translated into other human and machine languages in the interim. A review of RDA's governance structure began in 2014, foreseeing increased international community involvement in RDA development during the period 2015-2020. This

is intended to be flexible, effective, and reflective of the various user communities, with more working groups and better succession planning. What is currently the Committee of Principals will become the RDA Board. The RDA Steering Committee will consist of six regional representatives (North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania, Latin America/Caribbean), the Chair of the RDA Board, the representative of ALA Publishing, the Examples Editor, a Technical Team Liaison, a Translations Liaison, and so on. Permanent standing working groups will include Aggregates, Music, Archives, Places, Capitalization, RDA/ONIX Framework, Fictitious Entities, Relationship Designators, plus the Technical Working Group and the Translations Working Group. The full strategy will be published later in 2015 and will include ideas for the recognition and adoption of RDA internationally and for sustainability and funding. The Library Reference Model (LRM) is the new name for the Consolidated FRBR and Functional Requirements family. of documents. RDA for Cultural Data will be developed by an Archives Working Group, making LRM compatible with FRBRoo and with museum data. RDA for Linked Data will include the RDA Registry, RIMMF, RDA Toolkit Technical Committee, RDA Development Team, and Technical Working Group. The common goal will be making RDA the standard for international discovery systems. Among the issues raised:

- Concern about the disconnection of equal representation of the six regions on the RDA Steering Committee in spite of the disproportionally European and North American expertise, effort, and predominance of RDA use.

- The RDA content developers appear to lose power, whereas the money-makers (CoP), who profit from all the work done by the content developers, will remain unchanged. ALA, CLA, and CILIP are the owners of RDA. It has been decided at this point not to have a closer relationship with IFLA.

- RDA development will now depend upon regional input. Will a North American representative have to hop around to ALA, CLA, and other national conferences to get that input? The Steering Committee has yet to work this and many other details out, with guidance from CC:DA.

- Those who have had a voice in RDA need to continue to have a voice and to feel that they do. The current expertise cannot be lost. Each region can set up its own representative process to some degree. Europe has EURIG, rather than input directly from individual countries, and a study of the structure of EURIG may be instructive for North America.

Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) presented the PCC Report (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/PCC-2015-06.pdf), including news that the Policy Statements created from notes in the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) and CONSER Standard Record (CSR) were included in the April 2015 Toolkit release, asking for feedback on Mr. Kevin Randall's Serial Global Workflow draft now in the Toolkit, and noting that 3.5 million records will have ISNIs added.

MARC Advisory Committee Liaison Mr. John Myers (Union College) reported (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/MAC-2015-06-Final.pdf) that all three

proposals passed, the discussion paper will come back as a proposal, and the URI paper will result in some MAC and PCC actions. My own report as OCLC Representative to MAC follows:

MARC Advisory Committee (MAC). Saturday, 2015 June 27, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2015 June 28, 3:00-5:30 p.m. OCLC Representative.

The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2015_age.html. Mr. Matthew Wise (New York University) was reappointed as Chair for another two-year term.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2015-DP02: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-dp02.html).

Summary: This paper proposes defining new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate digital sound recordings.

Outcome: The specifics of the discussion paper, focused on accommodating digital resources in the Sound Recordings 007 field, led to a wider discussion of the potential value of reworking several or even all of the 007 fields better to account for both tangible (Playaways, USB drives, etc.) and remote electronic resources. Such revisions and expansions may have value in assisting a transition to a post-MARC environment. There is also some need for certain 007 elements that have historically applied to mechanical characteristics (such as speed and type of material) to be clarified so as not to require more specific coding for remote resources. The paper will return as a proposal, with the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM) possibly conferring with OLAC on some details.

MARC Proposal No. 2015-07: Extending the Use of Subfield $0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) to Encompass Content, Media, and Carrier Type (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-07.html).

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in fields 336, 337, and 338 in the Bibliographic Format and 336 in the Authority Format.

Outcome: For the sake of consistency, defining subfield $0 on the Holdings 337 and 338 was added to the proposal, which passed unanimously.

MARC Proposal No. 2015-08: Recording RDA Format of Notated Music in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-08.html).

Summary: This paper proposes defining new field 348 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats for recording the RDA data element Format of Notated Music.

Outcome: Discussion focused on the need for guidance (along the lines of text in the 33X fields) about using the same field when terms from the same vocabulary are used and separate fields when different vocabularies are used. It was further noted that similar guidance would be useful in other 34X fields, as well. The proposal passed unanimously.

MARC Proposal No. 2015-09: Defining 670 $w (Bibliographic Record Control Number) in the MARC 21 Authority Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-09.html).

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield $w (Bibliographic record control number) in the 670 field (Source of Data Found) of authority records to contain a bibliographic record control number of the title being cited.

Outcome: Proposal passed unanimously.

Informal Discussion Paper: "URIs in MARC: A Call for Best Practices," by Mr. Steve Folsom (Cornell University) (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fuHvF8bXH7hldY_xJ7f_xn2rP2Dj8o-Ca9jhHghIeUg/edit?pli=1).

Summary: To draw attention to the need for standardized best practices for capturing URIs in MARC Bibliographic and Authority records, which will allow libraries to more easily define entities, as aspired to in PCC's current 3rd Strategic Direction.

Outcome: MAC can deal with fields where there is inconsistency in the application of subfields $u and/or $0, and where those subfields need to be defined, particularly for access points. Content itself is the bailiwick of the PCC, not MAC, so policies on the use of URIs, and any proposals, would need to be developed within the PCC. MAC supports the intentions of the paper, but defers to the PCC on these policy matters.

Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) reported that, although the German Authority File was originally the consolidation of four smaller German files, its international participation is set to expand. Local elements will need to be defined internationally within MARC Authorities regarding types of relationships, temporal aspects, language, script, and possibly others. DNB expects to be presenting five to ten proposals at the MAC meetings at ALA Midwinter 2016 relating to these ideas.

CC:DA Web Master Mr. Richard Guajardo (University of Houston) reported that a new tab for "Task Forces" has been added and other tabs were realigned to keep their numbers under control.

Ms. Bourassa and Mr. Rendall continued discussions about encouraging feedback from CC:DA participants. Overall, there is a roughly 15% participation rate on the CC:DA blog. Even "agree" responses are welcome. To encourage participation, all proposals now have an abstract to assist when they are distributed to constituencies.

ALA Publishing reported that through May 2015, there were about 3000 active subscribers and 8200 active users, higher than expected. New subscriptions have slowed, but the renewal rate remains steady at 82/85%. RDA will probably slightly surpass its revenue goals for 2015 because of the changes to the pricing model. Page views have increased 8%. Some 474 print units and 7 e-books have been sold. There have been three RDA training courses offered so far this year, with revenue on-target. Now that the Spanish translation is available as of March 2015, they hope to expand into Spanish training. RDA Essentials has completed its editorial review, is now moving into production, and should be available in early 2016. The August and October Updates are coming up. The German translation will be updated in August and Spanish in October. The French translation is getting caught up more slowly. The idea is to have each translation updated in August for the previous April Update. It's possible that Italian and Finnish translations may be added in October, but they are more likely in February 2016. The RBMS PSs are coming up sometime in 2016, most likely. There is some rethinking of the RDA Elements set in the Toolkit. Toolkit/Registry synchronization will be made automatic in the future. The RDF Triples Store will be added to the Registry. A Catalan translation is in the works. "Reference translations," featuring translations of controlled lists while the text proper remains in English, are in the works for Scandinavian and related languages.

The Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K submitted "RDA Appendix K Revision and Expansion" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/6JSC-ALA-25-2015-06-draft.pdf) for discussion. Person-to-person family relationships are now all gender-neutral where possible (spouse, sibling, child, parent). The current MARC structure does not allow relationships to be indicated between 4XX variant names for the same person, so an option for relationships within a name is needed. "Attributive relationship" needs slight reworking to make clear that it does not always entail a willful assumption of another's identity. There is overlap in both the tasks and the membership of this Appendix K group and the JSC's Relationship Designator task group, so the two entities should be informing each other, especially regarding the proposed changes in the structure of Appendix K. At the same time we want to avoid any delays in the implementation of proposed new RDs. Mr. Dunsire suggested carrying on with the Appendix K work and submitting the proposal to the JSC. The proposal was approved.

Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) representative Ms. Kelley McGrath submitted "Addition of New Chapter 3 Elements for Optical Disc Physical Standard, Optical Disc Recording Method, and Optical Disc Data Type" (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/OLAC-2015-1.pdf), incorporating descriptive elements for optical discs into RDA. The proposed vocabulary has been added to the Open Metadata Registry since the previous version of the proposal. RDA currently confuses the physical type of disc and the method of recording data on the disc, which is actually describing a type of disc rather than how data get recorded. The distinction is stamped/commercial disc versus burned/local

disc, which could be a production method subcategory. More broadly, RDA needs to support external vocabularies that remain separate but are accommodated, something particularly important for specialist communities. OLAC should create its own vocabulary (specific types of burned discs, for example). The JSC has refused to point from RDA to specific external vocabularies but offers only vague references to such externals. Mr. Dunsire notes that the JSC is unlikely to start adding references to specific external vocabularies, preferring instead the use of application profiles that are stored in the Registry. Such a use model has been established in the new treatment of "color content" treatment. A finished version of the OLAC proposal is needed by 2015 July 17.

Respectfully submitted by

       Jay Weitz

       Senior Consulting Database Specialist

       Data Infrastructure and WorldCat Quality Management Division, OCLC

       IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

       2015 August 7