



## **Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, 2014 June 28 and 30**

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 Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, on Saturday 2014 June 28, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2014 June 30, 8:30-11:30 A.M. The full agenda is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?tag=agenda>.

CC:DA Chair Mr. Peter Rolla (University of California, San Diego) reported on motions and other actions taken by CC:DA between February and June 2014 (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/chair20140601.pdf>). These CC:DA meetings in June 2014 are the last in Mr. Rolla's term as chair. At the end of these meetings, he was succeeded by Mr. Robert Rendall (Columbia University).

Library of Congress (LC) Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/LC201406.pdf>). Some of the highlights of his report:

- The *Cataloger's Desktop* user interface is to be overhauled and simplified in mid-September 2014.
- The *RDA Toolkit* had releases in February and April 2014, including 28 and 62 new, deleted, or revised Library of Congress/Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements (LC/PCC PSs), respectively. The next update to the PSs will be in October 2014. The August 2014 release of the *Toolkit* contains no changes to the PSs or to the English text of RDA; it will be devoted exclusively to an update of the German text and the addition of policy statements from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB).

- The National Library of Malaysia has asked LC and the PCC to follow the alternative passed by CC:DA for RDA 16.2.2.12, which includes both state and country name as part of local place names for Malaysia.
- The Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BFI), known as BIBFRAME, has moved into its test implementation phase, including testing of the editor interface.
- Two new ALA-LC Romanization Tables have been approved so far during 2014, Coptic and Romanian (Cyrillic script). Corrections and revisions have been made to the Malayalam and Non-Slavic Language tables. Three tables are in various stages of revision:
  - Tibetan: The revision proposal based on the Wylie transliteration scheme being developed by Ms. Luran Hartley (Columbia University) is expected to be submitted to LC by 2014 August 1.
  - Uighur: The revision proposal, initially submitted by Mr. Wayne Richter (Western Washington University) in 1999, is expected to be ready in early July 2014.
  - Mongolian: The revision proposal, initially submitted by Mr. Richter in 1998, needs additional editorial work and does not have a target completion date at this point.

All current ALA-LC Romanization Tables are available at  
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsol/roman.html>.

ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), reported on JSC activities between January and June 2014. Her full report is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/KPG201408.pdf>. Three new working groups have been created: the JSC Places Working Group, the JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group, and the JSC Technical Working Group. The existing JSC Music Working Group was “refreshed” and the RDA Examples Group 3 was dissolved in favor of having an Examples Editor, Ms. Kate James (LC). A draft set of principles and guidelines for RDA examples is currently under review.

There was follow-up on two proposals originally presented at the CC:DA Midwinter meetings in January 2014:

- Clarifying Instructions for Sequences of Plates (RDA 3.4.5.9): The base instruction is to record plates if they are unnumbered or if they are referred to in a note. It also clarifies the definition of “plate” beyond the definition in the current proposal (see the CC:DA blog at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=1058>), without the word “text.” The entire “If/and/then” sequence in the proposal for 3.4.5.9 was deleted, so that the revision begins with “Record the sequence ....” An example of a note will be added, illustrating a case where the number of figures does not correspond to number of plates (physical leaves). Ms. Glennan will do a final pass on this proposal because of the extent of editorial changes and CC:DA will vote on it during coming weeks.

- Clarifying core element status for “not identified” elements in the Distribution and Manufacture Statements (RDA 2.9 and 2.10): This has come to known as the “Cascading Vortex of Horror.” Any unknown publication element must be included because it is RDA Core, but following elements may be omitted. This is the single place in RDA where we are purposely told to record that something is not found. Mr. Reser raised questions concerning the continued efficacy of “Core If.” (In the case of published resources, place, publisher, and date are core, and all three are needed if one or more are present.) The proposal’s “Background” statement will be expanded to include some of the CC:DA discussion for JSC consideration to consider changes to “Core” and “Core If.” The proposal was approved to send forward to the JSC.

The Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data did not meet its goal of creating a discussion paper on a machine-actionable model for complex extent in time for this meeting. The group is examining the RDA/ONIX Framework’s terms of extent and analyzing whether they are content or carrier attributes, and is nearly ready to hand this off to the related JSC group. Ms. Diane Hillman (Metadata Management Associates) is working on simplifying the excellent spreadsheet compiled by Mr. Francis Lapka (Yale University) on this. The group hopes to submit a discussion paper in time for ALA Annual in January 2015.

A discussion paper on “Production Statement (RDA 2.7) Transcription Guidelines” wants to treat the production statement much differently than publication, distribution, and manufacture statements because of the significantly different purpose that the production statement serves for unpublished resources. This will require considerable reworking of the current instructions in RDA 2.7. This paper, which will be considered in the context of the related British Library paper in progress, moves closer to the practices of *Cataloging Cultural Objects* (CCO), relying less on transcription (although not as extremely as does CCO). DCRM(M) talks about recording what is accurate, and only then transcribing what is on an unpublished resource. This paper will serve as the basis of a discussion paper to be forwarded to the JSC and may potentially lead as well to future related work for unpublished resources regarding title, at least. CC:DA voted to authorize Ms. Glennan to create the JSC discussion paper.

Three proposals from the Music Library Association’s Bibliographic Control Committee (MLA-BCC) and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers Cataloging Policy Committee (OLAC-CAPC) were discussed:

- The paper “Addition of New Chapter 3 Elements for Optical Disc Physical Standard, Optical Disc Recording Method, and Optical Disc Content Type” tries to account for technical aspects of optical discs that are currently missing but that can be determined and understood by generalists and be helpful for users:
  - Optical Disc Physical Standard is intended to identify the kind of machine needed for the resource. CAPC has suggested using the *AV & Nonprint Glossary* (<http://olacinc.org/avglossary/>) as source of terms and to add terms for any that are needed.

- Optical Disc Recording Method describes how the data are put on the disc, either “stamped” (usually mass-produced resources) or “burned” (usually smaller production runs or unique resources).
- Optical Disc Content Type needs to be renamed because of the conflict with RDA “Content Type.” It is intended to identify either Audio, Video, or Data, in most cases. Adding a short list of the most common terms to RDA, might be the best idea, with reference out to the *AV & Nonprint Glossary* for any additional terms.

Additional work needs to be done for ALA Midwinter by Ms. Hillman and Ms. Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon) on this proposal, so that RDA elements for these concepts and all controlled vocabularies will be compatible. The whole issue of including controlled vocabulary lists within RDA is a larger one for the JSC.

- Revision Proposal on Recording Duration (RDA 7.22) attempts to formalize the consistent uses of “approximately” and of abbreviations for time periods, to codify flexibility of choice for catalogers to record various types of durations and how they may be expressed, and to standardize what to do when stated and actual durations are not the same. Expressing the duration of the whole and the durations of parts not mutually exclusive. Among the suggested changes: that the different subinstructions for various kinds of durations be consolidated, that machine-actionability also be considered, that instructions be divided between when the duration is stated on resource and when it is not, that “performance time” (RDA 7.22.1.5) needs to be generalized to include performed text. Ms. Tracey Snyder (Cornell University) will revise the proposal in light of these discussions.
- The paper on Basic Instructions on Recording Statements of Responsibility (RDA 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.17.3, 7.23, 7.24) proposes to delete RDA 7.23 and 7.24 elements and to accommodate these instead in appropriate areas of Chapter 2. In RDA 2.4.1.1, the current sentences referring to Chapter 7 will be reformulated into sorts of examples without direct reference to Chapter 7. The proposal was accepted with pending revisions.

The work of the Task Force on Appendix K had not quite been completed when Dan Lipcan (Metropolitan Museum of Art), representing the Art Libraries Society of North America, left CC:DA earlier in 2014. The JSC has approved the use of gender-specific relationship terms (granddaughter and grandson versus grandchild, for instance). A new chair and reconstituted task force is being formed, including remaining members of the group Mr. Robert Maxwell (Brigham Young University), Mr. Randy Roeder (University of Iowa), and Mr. Adam Schiff (University of Washington). Structural work has been done on the group’s report, but content work still remains. Ms. Glennan hopes it could be completed by Midwinter.

Mr. John Myers (Union College), the CC:DA Liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), reported on the activities of the MAC. My OCLC colleague Mr. Rich Greene attended his final MAC meetings during this conference and officially retired from OCLC on 2014 July 1. He had served on MAC’s predecessor

organization the Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) since 1979/1980. I have been assigned to be his successor in the position of OCLC Liaison to MAC. My report follows. The meeting agenda can be found at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2014\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2014_age.html).

*MARC Advisory Committee Report, ALA Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, 2014 June 28 and 29*

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC, the successor to MARBI) met on Saturday morning, June 28, and Sunday afternoon, June 29, at the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas, Mr. Matthew Wise (New York University) presiding. Three proposals and three discussion papers were on the agenda:

Proposal No. 2014-04: Adding Miscellaneous Information in Topical Term and Geographic Name Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-04.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes a way to designate "miscellaneous information" in topical term fields and geographic name fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. In addition, the paper proposes the re-definition of subfield \$g "Miscellaneous information" as a repeatable subfield in fields where it is already defined.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. This constitutes more a structural than a semantic change. Different systems will either use or not use this structural change to subfield \$g according to their needs.

Proposal No. 2014-05: Designating Relationships Between Subject Headings from Different Thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-05.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes a way to designate relationships between entries of different thesauri in a MARC authority record.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. The distinctions regarding equivalent, broader, narrower, and related mappings that are made in this proposal are widely used in world of thesauri. The Canadian and Spanish communities were also amenable to this proposal.

Proposal No. 2014-06: Defining New Field 388 for Time Period of Creation Terms in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-06.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes the establishment of new field 388 in the Authority and Bibliographic formats to record the time period of creation or origin of works and expressions.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. All international partners who had voiced an opinion were in favor of this proposal. This acceptance had some additional fallout. It may have some impact on FAST. Ms. Sally McCallum (LC) noted that field 370 (Associated Place) should have been defined for the Bibliographic as well as the Authority format, as should all such fields that may apply to the FRBR Work. She will deal with the Bibliographic 370 and will double-check to be sure other fields were not overlooked. Bibliographic field 648 (Subject Added Entry – Chronological Term) had its First Indicator defined as “Type of Date or Time Period” as part of MARC Update No. 16 in April 2013, but this implementation is now rescinded. That implementation was to have been part of the OCLC-MARC Update 2014, Phase II, but is now considered withdrawn. Bibliographic 648 will continue to be defined strictly for subject use for “Date or Time Period Covered or Depicted.” Because the 648 First Indicator had not yet been implemented in Connexion, no conversion of existing records should be necessary. The captions for the 388 field and for the subfield \$a were both edited to read “Time Period of Creation Term.”

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP05: Adding Dates for Corporate Bodies in Field 046 in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp05.html>).

SUMMARY: This discussion paper considers the options for accommodating date of establishment and date of termination of a corporate body.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. Two options were put forward. Option 1 defined two new subfields, subfield \$q for “Date of Establishment” and subfield \$r for “Date of Termination.” Option 2 broadened the definitions of existing subfield \$f, “Birth Date” to include “Date of Establishment,” and subfield \$g, “Death Date” to include “Date of Termination.” International responses were split between the two options, but after discussion, a straw poll came down on the side of Option 1 being cleaner for display and for mapping to RDA elements. The captions and/or definitions of the two new subfields may need some editorial work, especially to take into consideration the ambiguities surrounding the beginning and ending dates of corporate bodies (founding, incorporation, period of activity).

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP06: Defining Values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp06.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper considers the definition of values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 to sequence sources of acquisition.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. There was general agreement that if this use of Bibliographic field 037 were to be approved, it would apply only for acquisition sources that are universally applicable, not those that are specific to a particular institution. There were various objections to this proposal, including the violation of Provider-Neutral principles, the use of ISSNs with the "ISSN" designation as "stock numbers," the potential for extensive ongoing data maintenance. Subfield \$3 (for differentiating suppliers of chronological portions of a continuing resource) and/or subfield \$5 (identifying a specific institution) were also discussed as possible additions to a proposal. It was noted that the lack of an acquisitions format has caused us to try to squeeze this sort of data into the Bibliographic and Holdings formats.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP07: Broaden Usage of Field 088 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp07.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 088 (Report Number) in bibliographic records to include series numbers (in particular for series in technical report and government publications) by deleting the sentence "Not used to record a number associated with a series statement" in field 088's field definition and scope.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. Series numbering often serves a double role as report numbering, as well. The original restriction on not using Bibliographic field 088 for numbering associated with a series statement was likely intended to reduce redundancy, although it has always been difficult to distinguish report and series numbers of these similar types. The aim of this paper was to assist in retrieval, with general agreement that a new field was not necessary.

## Business Meeting

The Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus for Music (LCMPT) has been made available at <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/performanceMediums.html>.

MARC 21 Update No. 18 ([http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21\\_update18\\_online.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update18_online.html)) was made available on April 28, 2014.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP01: Designating Never Published in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp01.html>) had been discussed in the MAC meetings at ALA Midwinter in January 2014, concluding with the recommendation that the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB) look into using the existing Bibliographic field 366 (Trade Availability Information). Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann reported that field 366 would meet the DNB's requirements. Using usage statistics compiled by Mr. Roy Tennant (OCLC), the DNB was able to determine the most useful ONIX Code for their purposes, specifically from List 54, Availability Status Code "AB" for "Cancelled" to be used in subfield \$c. The DNB will not use subfield \$m (Identification of Agency). The DNB plans to begin use of field 366 in mid-September 2014.

The retiring Mr. Greene reminisced about his long tenure on the committee, citing it as among his proudest professional accomplishments.

Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) reported on the activities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). On 2014 June 20, LC and the PCC issued a joint statement in support of BIBFRAME (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/bibframe-pcc.html>). The PCC will end all AACR2 cataloging as of 2015 January 1. Self-instruction PDFs are available for all RDA NACO training and for training on Relationship Designators for Bibliographic records; Authorities training materials will be available next.

Current CC:DA Webmaster Ms. Melanie Polutta (LC) rotates out of the position, to be replaced by Mr. Richard Guajardo (University of Houston). From now on, the Webmaster should be contacted directly to get a profile set up. Mr. Guajardo will look into the prospects for better marking up of documents for comments on the blog.

Mr. James Hennelly of ALA Publishing Services reported that subscription and usage through the end of May 2014 was up 15% and ahead of budget projections. There are 6600 users (subscriptions are priced per user since January) with a 90% renewal rate. There has been a decrease in page views but an increase in sessions, suggesting that users are getting more efficient in using the RDA Toolkit. ALA Publishing has a new arrangement with the DNB for RDA Toolkit access for 400 institutions across Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The MLA Best Practices document has been added to the Toolkit as a PDF but will eventually be more interactive, similar to the LC-PCC PSs. The August release of the Toolkit will include an updated German text. The October release may include British Library options (PS-like) and an update to the French translation. The Spanish translation is expected in February 2015 and the LC update in April 2015. There is interest in adding Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM) documents to the Toolkit. The Chinese translation is complete, but is available only in print right now. The soon-to-be-implemented new content management system for The Toolkit should simplify editing and authoring. The RDA print update for 2014 is in progress but about 70% of pages have changed, so this needs to be worked out; in any case something will be available in late 2014. Some 481 print units of RDA have been sold, but only three e-book versions this year. There is speculation that a tablet version might be better received.



The Task Force on Recording Relationships reported that their work on structured relationships is in progress.

The Task Force on Pseudonymous Corporate Bodies reported that it is also looking at pseudonymous families and fictitious bodies, for the sake of consistency. In wondering why the JSC did not take this up in the first place, it was guessed that the issue was probably just overlooked. The group will try to keep practices parallel to those already in RDA for both pseudonymous persons fictitious persons.

Ms. Glennan presented three additional proposals:

- Using the Mark of Omission in Preferred Titles (RDA 6.2) is an attempt to document current practice for multipart and continuing resources. Mr. John Hostage (Harvard Law School) objected to beginning a preferred title with a mark of omission, citing common sense and the convenience of the user. In the context of a title proper, an initial mark of omission is understandable, but is much less so in a constructed preferred title. In a straw poll, it was decided 19 to 14 to make an exception for not allowing a mark of omission at the beginning of preferred titles. Mr. Reser suggested looking at how the exceptions for the removal of initial articles was dealt with in RDA for principled guidance on the preferred title issue. Ms. Glennan will revise the proposal to include that exception and then put forward to the JSC.
- Date of Expression for the Bible and Parts of the Bible (RDA 6.24.1.4) was excepted with the proviso that additional explanation is needed for the “Bible. French. Martin” example at RDA 6.30.3.2.
- Creating Instructions for Using Nominative Case for Titles (RDA 6.2) and Names (RDA 8.5) now also includes names of places (RDA 16.2.1). Various complications of grammatical cases were pointed out (genitive, possessive, ablative, locative). This proposal is trying to describe current practice but may inadvertently be introducing more confusion and/or overlooking other cases that need to be considered. In general, the revisions for name and place aspects seemed acceptable, but the title aspects need more work. Ms. Glennan requested assistance with wording and examples from those with expertise in inflected languages, including the DNB. It was also pointed out that it needs to explain why catalogers would be changing things to nominative case at all.

The RDA Subcommittee of the Subject Access Committee (SAC) is considering work on the subject access portions of RDA, including subject Relationship Designators. This work will not require CC:DA approval because SAC has dealt with it, but any individuals are welcome to comment once the SAC proposal has been shared.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist, WorldCat Quality Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2014 July 8