Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 2017 June 24

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 Chicago, Illinois, USA, on Saturday, 2017 June 24, 1:00-5:30 P.M. The full agenda of the meeting is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?cat=33.

CC:DA Chair Ms. Tina Shrader (National Library of Medicine) reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between January and July 2017 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Chair_16-17-3.pdf).

Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/LC-2017-06.pdf), including some of these highlights:

- The merger of the Policy and Standards Division with the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division will likely take place during Fiscal Year 2018 after the new structure is completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2017.

- A new history of the card catalog, *The Card Catalog: Books, Cards, and Literary Treasures*, has been published by the Library of Congress Publishing Office and features a forward by Librarian of Congress Dr. Carla Hayden.

- NDMSO revised BIBFRAME and published BIBFRAME 2.0 in March and April 2017, allowing the conversion of data to BF 2.0. In June 2017, ABA began training the 40 former pilot participants in BF 2.0, with an additional 27 cataloging staff to begin training in July. By August, the BIBFRAME Pilot will resume with approximately 65 catalogers and copy catalogers using BF 2.0.

- The new, free MDSConnect service makes available some 25 million bibliographic records from LC's online catalog available for bulk download at http://www.loc.gov/cds/products/marcDist.php, the largest release of records in LC history.

ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on RSC activities between January and June 2017. Her full report is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/RSCrep-2017-1.pdf. Among the highlights of her report:

- Ms. Judy Kuhagen (Library of Congress) stepped down as RSC Secretary to become 3R Project Consultant.

- RSC Plus consists of the full RSC and the chairs of each RSC Working Group. RSC Plus met in May 2017 and will meet again in October 2017.

- Aside from incorporating the four-fold path throughout RDA, the 3R Project is expected to "reshuffle" RDA more than change it.

- Ms. Glennan, Mr. Reser, and Mr. Bill Leonard (Library and Archives Canada) hope to put together a structure for the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC) by November 2017. The Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (CCC) is currently dealing with its own internal administrative issues, which is complicating things. Sharing responsibilities through a rotating NARDAC chair is one option being discussed.

The 3R Task Group reported on planning for structural changes to the Toolkit, designing a new user interface, drafting new chapters for the twelve entities and integrating the IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM) into RDA.

- Sources of information, essentially accounting for the provenance of data, will be standardized throughout RDA.

- The "Manifestation Statement," an exact transcription from the source (which would preserve capitalization, spacing, line breaks, etc.), will be one of the options in the four-fold path. Normalized transcriptions will be considered a form of recording the data. Instruction for both basic and normalized transcriptions will be developed.

- Incorporating the Nomen entity will necessitate some reconsideration of existing RDA elements and their relationships. The implementations of Nomen and Time Span will affect RDA instructions on multipart monographs, serials, and continuing resources. The fact that the ISSN for series seems to contradict the LRM is a big concern.

- The Aggregates Working Group document was generally supported by the RSC, but areas of controversy remain. The notion of "integrated aggregates," collaborative works that incorporate other works (for instance, a song and its text) was problematic, as was the absence of information about serials. WG Chair Ms. Deborah Fritz (MARC of Quality) noted that serials specialists Mr. Ed Jones (National University) and Mr. Clement Oury (ISSN International Centre) were included in their discussions.

The report from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) is available at (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/PCC-2017-06.pdf). Among the highlights:

- The PCC is applying for ISNI umbrella membership, which would allow selected institutions to work within the ISNI database to create and maintain identifiers.
- Implementation of the recommendation to remove ISBD punctuation that coincides with MARC coding is proceeding. OCLC and LC are compiling test records.

- Work on Authorized Access Points (AAPs) for translations continues. Existing authority records for expressions, qualified only by subfield $l will be regarded as undifferentiated, and will no longer be created. Work authority records will continue to be required but will not include subfield $l for the original language.
- The Standing Committee on Automation has changed its name to the Standing Committee on Applications and has updated its charge.

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met on Saturday, 2017 June 24, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2017 June 25, 3:00-5:30 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2017_age.html. Mr. Matthew Wise (New York University) was appointed to another two-year term as MAC Chair. Following are the summaries of each of the five proposals and three discussion papers and their respective outcomes. A more detailed report compiled by CC:DA Liaison to MAC Mr. John Myers (Union College) has been distributed to the CC:DA but at the time of this report it had not yet been made available on the CC:DA site.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2017-08**: Use of Subfields $0 and $1 to Capture Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) in the MARC 21 Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-08.html).

  Summary: This proposal outlines a method to capture URIs in the MARC 21 Formats in a manner that clearly differentiates between:

  o URIs that identify a 'Record' or 'Authority' entity describing a Thing (e.g. madsrdf:Authorities, SKOS Concepts for terms in controlled or standard vocabulary lists) and,

  o URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual).

  To that end, the paper proposes restricting the use of the $0 to URIs and control numbers that refer to Records describing Things, and defining the $1 to include URIs that directly refer to the Thing. Note: Standard vocabulary terms from controlled lists, such as MARC lists, are not generally considered Authority 'records'; however, when those terms are represented as SKOS concepts and assigned actionable/dereferenceable URIs, they do carry with them 'record-' like data in a particular vocabulary scheme. The latter are referenced in this paper as Authority 'records' in conjunction with more traditional Authorities in a record format.

  Outcome: It was pointed out that not every RWO has a corresponding authority record and that it would be prohibitive to try to create all of those records. Field 257 was added to the proposal and the subfield $1 was made repeatable. Long discussion. The proposal was accepted as amended.

- MARC Proposal No. 2017-09: Defining Field 758 (Resource Identifier) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-09.html).

    Summary: This paper proposes establishing a new field 758 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format to identify related resources.

    Outcome: There were concerns about primary relationships within WEMI and secondary relationships to related resources and about the necessity for subfield $4 (Relationship/predicate). Subfield $1 was added to the proposal. The PCC Standing Committee on Standards will develop best practices. The first sentence of the definition was reworded as follows: "An identifier for a resource that is either the resource described in the bibliographic record or a resource to which it is related." The proposal was accepted as amended.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2017-10**: Rename and Broaden Definition of Field 257 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-10.html).

    Summary: This paper proposes renaming and broadening the definition of field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) in the Bibliographic format so that jurisdictions that have strong film cultures and are often treated as countries can be used in this field, even if they are not legally recognized as countries.

    Outcome: The proposal adds to the field definition a disclaimer that intends to avoid the political issues. The names of both the field and the subfield $a were changed to "Place of Producing Entity," corresponding to the LRM Place entity. The final sentence of the subfield $a definition, referring to the outmoded "[S.l.]" was deleted. The proposal was accepted as amended.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2017-11**: Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-11.html).

    Summary: This proposal presents options for recording the RDA data element Accessibility Content (7.14) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.

    Outcome: There was concern about the inclusion of subfield $p. Because it was intended to be free text, the name was changed to "Devices, Equipment, or Software Note." The necessity for subfield $a was questioned because the contents of subfields $b, $c, $d, and $e rendered $a as redundant. Subfield $a may therefore need clarification. The proposal was tabled for further consideration and work within the adaptive technology communities, the Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM), and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC).

- **MARC Proposal No. 2017-12**: Defining Subfields $u, $r and $z in Field 777 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-12.html).

  Summary: This paper proposes the need for subfields $r (Report number), $u (Standard Technical Report Number) and $z (ISBN) in Field 777 (Issued With Entry) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

  Outcome: The proposal was accepted.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP06**: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Cartographic Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp06.html).

  Summary: This paper reviews adding new values for some 007 fixed field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate digital cartographic resources.

  Outcome: There was discussion about the usefulness of further work on coded fields such as 007 at this point in the life of MARC 21. The suggested addition of "remote" to 007/01 is redundant of 008/29 and 008/23, which already differentiate remote from direct access resources, so code "t" is not needed. The discussion paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP07**: Repeatability of Subfield $s (Version) in MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format Fields (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp07.html).

  Summary: The paper discusses the need for making subfield $s (Version) repeatable in fields X00, X10, X11, and X30 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats and fields 240 (Uniform Title) and 243 (Collective Uniform Title) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

  Outcome: Although subfield $s would not be appropriate in Bibliographic 1XX fields in either an RDA or PCC context, to keep MARC 21 internally consistent, the repeatable subfield $s is needed in 100, 110, 111, and 130. The discussion paper was converted into a proposal and was accepted.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP08**: Definition and Repeatability of Subfield $d in Field X11 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp08.html).

  Summary: The paper discusses the need to redefine and enable repeatability for subfield $d (Date of meeting) in field X11 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats.

  Outcome: The discussion paper was converted into a proposal and was accepted.

Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported that the RDA Toolkit currently has 3.3 users per subscription, with a 94% renewal rate. There is a growing number of users despite a decline in subscribers because of multiuser subscriptions. This is all pretty much on target for this fiscal year. Since ALA Midwinter in January 2017, there have been the February and April 2017 releases. This includes the Swedish policy statements, although there is no full Swedish RDA translation. This is considered a "reference translation," which is more easily and more quickly kept in sync with the latest RDA release, unlike full translations. There will be a small August release of a few LC PSs, but there will be no changes to English RDA, only to translations to try to catch up. A Norwegian translation and possibly others are in planning stages, but will wait until after the completion of the 3R Project.

Mr. Hennelly also reported on the 3R Project, which intends to restructure data and work processes, redesign the Toolkit and the user experience, introduce more responsive design, increase accessibility, allow for integrated displays, enable user content creation tools, introduce new instructional views based on such special areas as music and rare materials, among other things. To allow for personalization, there will be a need for account profiles and easier administration of the profiles. The current site should be accessible through April 2019 (or a year after new site is published). The 3R Project will incorporate the LRM, the four-fold path, and the new RDA element set. There will be synchronization of the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) and the Toolkit for glossary terms, scope instructions, Appendices I-K, and controlled vocabularies. "Agent" replaces "person, family, corporate body." "Resource" will be replaced by the appropriate entity in the WEMI stack. Elements will be referred to with indefinite rather than definite articles. Regarding the LRM, "Res" will not be implemented, but "RDA Entity" will be used instead. "Person" in the LRM excludes non-humans, but RDA will include the possibility of access to non-human names. The four-fold path – unstructured data, structured data, identifiers, and International Resource Identifier (IRI) for linked data applications – is being promulgated throughout RDA. There are five new entities from the LRM: agent, collective agent, Nomen, place, and time-span). The new "manifestation statement" is a WYSIWYG unmediated and unnormalized transcription. Relationships are elements and elements are relationships. The status of core-ness is still to be decided. "Recording" instructions will be consistently worded. A new numbering system has not yet determined, but the old RDA numbers will still be searchable. A standardized structure for each "chunk" is under consideration, including definition/scope, user tasks, sources of information, and the four-fold path. Examples will be expanded, with each appropriate four-fold path included.

Mr. Dunsire reported on both the RDA Special Event and the RSC meeting held in Chicago, 2017 May 16-19. He presented his PowerPoint "Appellations, Authorities, and Access Plus." He described how agile/chaotic everything has been. "RDA Entity" is a subclass of "Res." "RDA Entity" covers all types of RDA things, all of which have appellations or Nomen. Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items are all created by Agents. An Item can only be modified by an Agent. The LRM blurs the distinction between attributes and relationships. Unstructured descriptions have no internal structure that may be parsed by a machine. Structured descriptions have an internal structure. Identifiers are "local" or not globally unique. IRIs are globally unique. The emphasis shifts from "authorized form" to the

maintenance of different forms (in a resource such as VIAF). The "represented name of the creator" becomes the way to account for non-human entities not being persons in the LRM. According to the principle of representation, how the resources presents itself does not need to be sensible, merely representative of the resource in an unmediated form. Regarding non-human agents, all that may be known of the agent may simply be that it has a Nomen, with that Nomen being regarded as the "represented name of the creator (work)."

In place of the usually scheduled second meeting of CC:DA, on Monday, 2017 June 26, 9:00-11:30 a.m., members of the RSC met with representatives of various specialist cataloguing communities to discuss RDA coverage of such materials and how improvements might be made. The idea for the meeting was a last-minute development. To help focus the discussion, it was pointed out that the creation of a new entity would require the addition of a new RDA chapter, so the strong preference was to use the existing entity structure. Element sets may be extended via an alternative label for an existing RDA element or by creating a narrower element. Value vocabularies may be extended through alternative vocabularies, alternative labels, and/or narrower terms. New terms are also implicit. Not everything discussed in this meeting can be in place for April 2018, however.

- **Cartographic community.** Mathematical data elements are the main concerns.
  - o Scale: In AACR2, the term "scale" was required, but not in RDA 7.25. The AACR2 practice should be reinstated.
  - o Coordinates: RDA 7.2 should be made core. The creation of the Klokan bounding box tool has facilitated ease of including coordinates in fields 255, 034, or the combination of these to reduce redundancy. Degrees, minutes, and seconds should be standardized into decimal form.
  - o Projection: RDA 7.26 should be made core, especially for digital resources. Codes for projections could become a value vocabulary.
  - o Prime Meridian: Greenwich has always been the implicit Prime Meridian unless otherwise stated. But especially for older maps and atlases, there should be a new instruction for recording the Prime Meridian, perhaps even the re-establishment of the obsolete 008/24-25 Prime Meridian element in MARC 21.
  - o Relief: RDA 7.27 needs to be better emphasized via a new and clearer RDA instruction; it is more explicit in FRBR.
  - o Place of Publication: Possible use of MARC 752 to account for places more specific than those at the city level, particularly for historical maps. This would allow searching for such places as counties and city sections.
- **Audiovisual community**.
  - o 3D versus Tactile: There needs to be a principled way to distinguish "standard" three-dimensional resources from tactile resources intended for the sight-impaired. Many such resources can be used both by the sight-impaired and others.
  - o Relationships: Clearing up the ambiguities among publisher, producer, distributor, and so on for audiovisual materials.
  - o Aggregates: Commercial resources such as videos are often aggregates that don't quite fit into the current conceptual models.

- o Video game genres.
- o Full screen versus wide screen.
- o Vocabularies for video formats.
- o Rights information.
- o Languages and the many different modes of language, including captions, subtitles, Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (SDH), intertitles, etc.
- o Accessibility data.
- o Clarification of "unmediated," especially for Playaways.
- o The analog video (RDA 3.18.2) versus digital video (RDA 3.19) split leads to real-world confusion.
- **Music community**.
  - o Medium of Performance: Refinements are needed regarding representative expression, alternative medium of performance, doubling, etc.
  - o Vocabularies: Playing speed, pitch center, carrier terms, types of optical discs, thematic catalogs, and other vocabularies are hidden in RDA.
  - o Publishers, copyright holders, distributor, etc. ambiguities.
  - o Questioning the usefulness of stating such standard elements as CD speed.
  - o Relationships: Creator as applied to jazz, pop, world music. AAPs and their appropriate qualifiers, including for performers.
  - o RDA is still skewed toward Western classical music.
  - o There is disagreement in the community as to which level some elements should be dealt with (LRM, RDA, PSs, BPs).
  - o Use of external genre/form vocabularies.
- **Archival/Museum community**.
  - o DACS/RDA alignment (available on the Society of American Archivists website at https://www2.archivists.org/standards/DACS/appendices/appendix_c_crosswalks).
  - o Physical access requirements (originals versus reproductions that must be used for preservation purposes, for instance), especially for digital resources
  - o Appraisal and approval notes.
  - o Archival authority records provide more context than most bibliographic authority records, including sources of data, related authorities, dates of relationships, types of entities.
- **Rare Materials community**.
  - o Custodial history/provenance and its agents, time-span, place.
  - o Material evidence of provenance, including documentation of provenance.
  - o Description of bindings, item-specific color information, conservation history, exhibition history (work/relationship, agent?).
  - o Description of manifestations.
  - o Graphic materials description, including production methods, base materials.
- **Government Documents community**.
  - o Need for a Relationship Designator "is sponsoring body of."
  - o Unspecified types of report numbers need to be better accounted for.
  - o Technical reports and contracts.

- o Clarification of government body relationships, mergers, splits.
- **Dance community**.
  - o Performed movement content type.
  - o Dance notation, medium of performance for dance, including male/female.
  - o Expression of dance even when it is not notated or visually recorded on film or video. FRBR accounted for manifestations in human memory.
- **Serials community**.
  - o Major/minor title change issues need to be harmonized with ISSN standards.

Subject analysis remains out of scope for RDA for now. Not everything discussed in this forum will be ready for April 2018. At some point, there will be templates made available for new RDA text. Specialized instructions also need to be understood by generalists, not just by the specialists. In North America, all concerns not handled by a specific WG will go through NARDAC.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist

WorldCat Metadata Quality, Global Product Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2017 July 26