+

Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Midwinter Meeting, Denver, Colorado, USA, 2018 February 10 and 12

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 Midwinter Meeting, Denver, Colorado, USA, on Saturday, 2018 February 10, 1:00-5:30 p.m. and Monday, 2018 February 12, 8:30-11:30 a.m. The full agenda of the meeting is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3248.

Report from the Chair. CC:DA Chair Ms. Tina Shrader (National Library of Medicine) reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between July and December 2017 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/chair_17-18-1.pdf).

Report from the Library of Congress Representative. Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser submitted his report on activities and news from LC (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/LC-2018-02.pdf), but was unable to attend the meeting in person because of the United States government shutdown. His report included these highlights:

- The BIBFRAME 2.0 Pilot is intended to offer a more realistic simulation of a cataloging workflow including the creation of both BF and MARC descriptions, input of non-Latin scripts, the incorporation of authority data, and "a fuller level of interaction with a live BIBFRAME 2.0 database consisting of the complete BIBFRAME conversion of the Library of Congress bibliographic file." The pilot continues at least until June 2018 using nine profiles: monographs, serials, rare materials, notated music, cartographic resources, Blu-rays and DVDs, 35 mm AV, sound recordings, and print and photographic resources.

- Work on the merger of the Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division continues.

- Some 25 million MARC records have been made available free for bulk download in UTF8, MARC8, and XML formats.

- Bruce Johnson, Cataloger's Desktop product manager, retired from the Policy and Standards Division in December 2017 after 33 years of service at LC.

Ms. Sally McCallum (Library of Congress) reported that the December 2017 MARC 21 Update No. 25 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update25_online.html) was later than usual because of the large number of fields that needed to be edited.

Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Group. Ms. Amanda Ros (Texas A&M University), Chair of the 3R Task Group, reported that the group asked for the current RDA text to remain available for a longer period after the conclusion of the 3R Project and the release of the new version of the RDA Toolkit.

Report of the ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee. ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on RSC activities between July and December 2017 Her full report is at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/RSCrep-2017-2.pdf. Among the highlights:

- Ms. Judy Kuhagen (Library of Congress) retired from her role as 3R Project Consultant at the end of August 2017.

- Ms. Glennan will serve as RSC Chair-Elect for one year to become Chair on 2019 January 1 for a four-year term.

- Ms. Ebe Kartus (University of New England, New South Wales, Australia) will become Wider Community Engagement Officer.

- The Oceania RDA Committee (ORDAC) and the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC) become a formal part of the RSC governance structure, with single representatives from these regions. The ORDAC and NARDAC representatives replace those from ACOC, ALA, CCC, and LC and the current representatives who do not assume these new positions may serve as co-opted members of the RSC during 2018. Co-opted representatives will also temporarily represent otherwise unrepresented areas (Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa).

- Actual implementation of the new version of RDA will not coincide with the release of the new Toolkit, expected in June 2018.

- Although a more responsive RSC with more timely decisions would be appreciated by all, that would be difficult. Imposing the new regional organizations such as NARDAC onto the RSC structure will not make that any easier.

- Punctuation marks will be removed from element names in the RDA Registry and hence in the Toolkit. Apostrophes, hyphens, and other marks are subject to too much variation. Some hyphenated words will become single terms ("Timespan"), whereas others may be reformulated to eliminate possessives ("Name of Publisher").

- The substance of the RDA Appendices will remain in the Toolkit but may move out of RDA proper into the "Resources" and/or "Tools" tabs, for instance, as appropriate.

- Gendered languages pose particular problems when Relationship Designators (RDs) and other terms are formulated. Because RDs are also elements, they can be interfiled under the entity to which they belong. Some solution is needed for the proliferation of RDs that are overly narrow in scope.

Report from the PCC Liaison. Mr. Everett Allgood (New York University), liaison from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) presented his report, which is available at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/PCC-2018-02.pdf. Among the highlights:

- Work on the new PCC strategic plan for 2018-2021 is underway.
- A white paper from the Linked Data Advisory Committee, *Linked Data Infrastructure Models: Areas of Focus for PCC Strategies*, examines making the transition from MARC to LD.
- Using test records from LC, NLM, and OCLC, functionality and display of bibliographic records with limited ISBD punctuation will be tested through 2018 July 1.
- The Standing Committee on Training (SCT) has appointed an ISNI Training Task Group chaired by Mr. John Hostage (Harvard Law School) to develop a curriculum for the PCC pilot project to create and maintain ISNI records and use ISNI tools.
- SCT is also working on a Library Reference Model (LRM) Training Task Group.

Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit Changes. Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported that at the end of 2017, the RDA Toolkit had 2748 active subscribers and over 9300 users, for an average of about 3.4 users per subscription. Roughly 50% of the subscribers were from the U.S. The renewal rate was about 94%. There was a 20% increase in Toolkit sessions in 2017 over 2016. Toolkit training webinars will be upcoming. The Norwegian translation is expected to be made available on March 8, at which point the Toolkit will be officially frozen Mr. Hennelly gave a rough advance demonstration of the new Toolkit. The opening screen will include blocks for recently added Instructions, news, documents (such as workflows and maps), recently viewed instructions. Vocabulary terms can be moused-over for popup displays. User-created notes can be organized in folders. Highlighting can be used to create links to specific passages. Policy Statements will display in the right column, limited to about fifty words, but the full text can be accessed via a click. There will now be shared ownership of contributed documents that will be locked while another person is editing it. The editor available in the Toolkit will be in HTML, not a Word editor. The Glossary will link back to element pages when appropriate. Each Toolkit release will include a document of changes. Old PDFs will also be available with PDF comparison tools to allow. The large table in the Music Library Association's Best Practices document will be accommodated. The full English RDA text is now scheduled to be available on 2018 June 13, possibly with one set of Policy Statements. There will be a follow-up release in September with more PS sets and some translations. The RSC is still trying to figure out the issue of numbering. There are more details and presentations available on the RDA Toolkit site at http://www.rdatoolkit.org/3Rproject/SR4.

Presentation on RDA Pop-up Meeting in Chicago. Ms. Glennan reported on the RDA Pop-up Meeting for the special materials communities that was held at the ALA Annual Conference in June 2017 in Chicago. Among the elements discussed there that will be included as part of the 3R Project are:

Audiovisual Materials interactivity mode (AV), choreographic medium of performance, musical opus number, cartographic prime meridian and relief type, etc. LRM's Representative Expression will be moved from Work to Expression level. The RSC still has all the documents that were submitted at the pop-up meeting, (not all of which have been dealt with in the 3R Project, so that unaddressed concerns should not have to be resubmitted.

New Directions for CC:DA. Ms. Diane Hillmann (Metadata Management Associate), the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI) liaison, spoke on "New Directions for CC:DA," followed by a discussion. The most valuable aspects of CC:DA and MARBI/MAC have always been the intelligent discussions of issues. Because of the changes in the RDA governance structure, there is a pending change in the nexus of where things happen. The question is what can CC:DA do in this upcoming new world. CC:DA is an organized, existing group with shared goals and the need to learn together. It has always discussed cataloging instructions and larger policy issues, as well as how all of this affects users, but this may no longer be sustainable. There are many cataloging specialist communities; each needs to determine what they need from RDA but have not yet gotten and how to accomplish those things. Libraries have long been used to a "closed world" but things are evolving onto a more "open world" where things that we've always valued have been losing and will continue to lose value. Not everything will be converted into or out of MARC in the future, specialized groups will feel increasingly marginalized. Such things as vocabulary extensions, decentralized cleanup, human and machine provenance, application profiles for mixing and matching data, mappings such as RIMMF, and working with vendors to ingest and output RDA data will continue to grow in importance. Flexible best practices may be preferable to strict and limiting standards. More collaboration and alignment among ALCTS, LLAMA, and LITA may be desirable. PCC wants to become more international, so perhaps CC:DA could take on some of the PCC's traditional roles in documentation and training. CC:DA meetings at ALA should be devoted more to doing what can be done only face-to-face, with less report reading and more business being conducted virtually. CC:DA could evolve into more of a lobbyist for metadata among library administrators. A task group will be formed to explore virtual meetings and the contributions of liaisons.

Report of the MAC Liaison. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met on Saturday, 2018 February 10, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2018 February 11, 3:00-5:30 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2018_age.html. The report compiled by CC:DA Liaison to MAC Mr. John Myers (Union College) is available at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/MAC-MW18-Final.pdf. Following are my summaries of the single proposal and six discussion papers and their respective outcomes.

Since the previous MAC meeting in June 2017, there were two fast-track proposals implemented: Bibliographic field 384 (Key) was made Repeatable and subfield $3 (Materials Specified) was added; Bibliographic field 382 (Medium of Performance) was clarified.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2018-01**: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Cartographic Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-01.html).

Summary: This paper proposes adding a new value in position 04 and making some modifications to definitions in other positions in the 007 fixed field for maps in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats to better accommodate digital cartographic resources.

Outcome: Any parallel changes needed for the Globe 007 field would need to be a separate proposal and include use cases. The proposal was accepted unanimously with some minor modifications.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP01**: Defining New Subfield $i in Fields 600-630 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp01.html).

  Summary: This paper discusses adding subfield $i (Relationship information) to the 600-630 group of fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The subfield could be used to record a subject relationship designator term to identify more specifically the nature of the relationship between the resource being described and an entity that is topically related.

  Outcome: If this idea of RDA-style Relationship Designators in Bibliographic 6XX fields was enacted, LC would prohibit their use in its records with LCSH headings. The British Library feared that such a notion would threaten to explode the MARC format into essentially four separate formats, one for each element of the WEMI stack. The addition of subfield $i to subject fields could result in nonsensical strings when certain subdivisions are present. There are no actual use cases for this yet. It was argued that this use of subfield $i would be not for LC subject headings themselves, but rather for RDA entities (mostly personal and corporate names) from the name authority file acting as LCSH-compatible headings, in spite of the 6XX Second Indicator values. With that in mind, the use of Second Indicator value 7 with subfield $2 could be a compromise. The question arose, why would RDA stipulate relationships that would not be allowed in MARC? Subfield $4 URIs already express the same relationships that RDs would convey in subfield $i but in a less user-obvious manner. The authors of the discussion paper will explore bringing it back in a more focused version, taking into account the objections of LC and BL (not using LCSH examples, for instance). Should the idea eventually win approval from MAC, there's always the option that individual communities can make their own recommendations for use via best practices.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP02:** Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Accessibility in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp02.html).

  Summary: This paper suggests adding new subfields in field 041 (Language Code) for accessibility modes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to allow for machine sorting.

  Outcome: Some minor changes and corrections were made, including the "iso639-3" code in subfield $2 examples. The possible inclusion of coding for Makaton ("a language programme using signs and symbols to help people to communicate. It is designed to support spoken language and the signs and symbols are used with speech, in spoken word

order." https://www.makaton.org) was discussed, but it was determined not to be a language itself. This discussion paper will return as as proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP03:** Inventory of Newer 3XX Fields that Lack Subfield $3 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp03.html).

  Summary: This paper looks at the new 3XX descriptive fields in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format that lack a defined Subfield $3—fields 377 (Associated Language), 380 (Form of Work), 381 (Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression), and 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work)—and discusses which fields could be improved by having a defined subfield $3 available for use.

  Outcome: There was general support for the paper, along with a desire for more guidance from the Music Library Association in particular on the use of specific rather than generic identification of contents in subfield $3. Non-music examples were also encouraged. The discussion paper was converted into a proposal and passed unanimously.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP04:** Multiscript Records Using Codes from ISO 15924 in the Five MARC 21 Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp04.html).

  Summary: This paper describes a way to cover all scripts in multiscript records according to Model A by using codes from ISO 15924 as the "script identification code" portion of subfield $6 (Linkage) in all five MARC 21 formats.

  Outcome: The paper was summed up as trying to "make MARC even more Unicode compliant than it already is." In UNICODE, every character is self-defining in that it automatically includes metadata identifying itself and its script. This paper would make that information more obvious to catalogers. A need for some sort of solution was acknowledged, but we need to know more about if and how systems use this data The definition of another 066 subfield now may now be a useful idea. This paper will likely return as proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP05:** Adding Institution Level Information to Subject Headings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp05.html).

  Summary: This paper explores different ways of designating in a MARC record that a subject access field in the 6XX region has been added according to the policy of a specific Cultural Heritage Organization. While the preceding Discussion Paper 2017-DP05 focused on subfield $5 in the 6XX fields of the MARC Bibliographic format, this Discussion Paper introduces a second option by using and extending field 883 (Machine-generated Metadata Provenance).

Outcome: There was wide agreement on the propriety of using field 883 with the definition of a new Second Indicator value and other changes aiming toward generalizing field 883 for use beyond just machine-generation. Although there was some sentiment for the use of subfield $5 for other local subject practices, that would have to be proposed separately. The paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP06:** Versions of Resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp06.html).

  Summary: This paper explores different ways to designate in a MARC record that a resource is available in a specific version, e.g. as preprint, postprint, publisher's version, etc., including, but not limited to values from NISO-RP-8-2008 "Journal Article Versions (JAV): Recommendations of the NISO/ALPSP JAV Technical Working Group".

  Outcome: Keeping this information in field 250, with the addition of a newly-defined subfield $v, the addition of subfield $2, and a controlled vocabulary led to the possibility of a new field in the 2XX range. The use of controlled vocabularies was stressed. Any new subfield or field would not end the current practice of including transcribed or supplied version statements in field 250s. This will return as a proposal.

Following the consideration of MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP03, which was converted from a discussion paper to a proposal, I asked if there was a standardized manner in which such conversions were documented on the MARC website. This seemed particularly important regarding each document's representation in the respective keyword indexes, one to proposals (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/key-p.html) and one to discussion papers (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/key-dp.html). Currently, only a brief notation of the conversion is added to the discussion papers in question, but LC acknowledged that, for historical and archival purposes, a more robust solution would be advisable.

Respectfully submitted by

Mr. Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist

Metadata Policy, Global Product Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2018 February 5