



## **Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 2017 January 21 and 23**

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 Atlanta, Georgia, USA, on Saturday, 2017 January 21, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2017 January 23, 8:30-11:30 A.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 July and December 2016 (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Chair15-16-2.pdf>).

Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/LC-ALA-2017-01.pdf>), including some of these highlights:

- Roughly thirty positions in Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) have been filled by either internal or external applicants during 2015-2016.
- The BIBFRAME Pilot Phase Two begins in early 2017, with a focus on testing BIBFRAME vocabulary 2.0.
- The Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division (COIN) of ABA are in the process of being merged over the course of 2017.
- The proposed new Deseret ALA-LC Romanization Table (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/deseret.pdf>) has been approved.

ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on RSC activities between July and December 2016. Her full report is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/RSCrep-2016-3.pdf>. Among the highlights

of Ms. Glennan's report, her presentation on RDA developments (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/RDA-MW17.pdf>), and her presentation on "Synchronizing the Open Metadata Registry and the RDA Toolkit" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Registry-Toolkit-MW17.pdf>), as well as Ms. Shrader's prospects for upcoming CC:DA work:

- Ms. Linda Barnhart (University of California, San Diego, retired) will serve as RSC Secretary-Elect as current RSC Secretary Ms. Judy Kuhagen (Library of Congress) prepares for her April 2017 retirement.
- Mr. Daniel Paradis (Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec) is now the RSC Translations Team Liaison Officer.
- Ms. Renate Behrens (DNB) is now Europe's lone representative to the RSC.
- New Zealand and ACOC are forming the Oceania RDA Community (ORDAC).
- Formation of the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC) is expected to be in place by 2019, although it requires the restructuring of RDA to be nearly final, as well as its own constitution and working principles. It is likely to include representatives from ALA, CCC, LC, and possibly others, to account for succession planning and backup. Since August 2016, RDA Glossary changes have been made only in the Open Metadata Registry (OMR), making them visible directly in the RDA Toolkit.
- The Encoding Format vocabulary formerly part of RDA 3.19.3 has been removed because the list consisted of a hodge-podge of inconsistent terminology. The terms may still be used, but they should no longer be considered a controlled RDA vocabulary.
- RDA Relationship Designators have been deconstructed into general definitions and scope notes, with all "see" references having been removed. The definitions that also include instructions will be reworked as part of the RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project (3R).
- Future fast-track changes will include: the replacement of the term "resource" with either the proper WEMI term or the term "entity," as appropriate; the integration of "agent" (with "collective agent" as part of 3R); the removal of the phrase "in this order" in favor of leaving the order as implied (resulting in no changes to actual North American practice).
- Among the goals of the 3R Project are to promulgate the "four-fold path" (the options of unstructured description/note string, structured description/Authorized Access Point string, identifier, and URL) generally throughout RDA and clarifying mediated and unmediated transcriptions. Ms. Glennan doubts the 3R Project's one-year timeframe (April 2017 to April 2018) because of the volume of issues that have been crammed into it. Because of the freeze in changes to the Toolkit during that period, there will be a lull in proposals, but "housekeeping" issues will continue, including the development of NARDAC and its relationship to CC:DA.

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Liaison Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) reported on PCC activities (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PCC2017-01.pdf>). Among the highlights:

- A Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) Task Group on Supplements and Special Numbers to Serials is working on harmonizing LC-PCC PS 2.12 with other related and sometimes contradictory policy statements.

- Standing Committee on Training (SCT) guidelines on Relationship Designators in Authority Records should be available in early 2017.
- The white paper on outstanding issues regarding aggregate works should lead to a joint SCS-SCT task group to develop best practices to be formed during early-mid 2017.

Ms. Glennan's presentation on the *IFLA Library Reference Model* (IFLA-LRM) is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/IFLA-LRM-MW17.pdf>. RDA will be regarded as an instantiation of the LRM. RDA will reflect a greater emphasis on relationships, with some former attributes now transformed into relationships. RDA is free to define more attributes than are found in the LRM.

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met on Saturday, 2017 June 21, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2017 June 22, 3:00-5:30 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2017\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2017_age.html). Following are the summaries of each of the seven proposals and five discussion papers and their respective outcomes. A more detailed report compiled by CC:DA Liaison to MAC Mr. John Myers (Union College) may be found at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/MAC-MW17-Final.pdf>.

MARC Proposal No. 2017-01: Redefining Subfield \$4 to Encompass URIs for Relationships in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-01.html>).

Summary: This proposal recommends the redefinition of subfield \$4 (Relator Code) in the Address field (371), See From Tracing fields (400, 410, 411, 430, 448, 450, 451, 455, 462, 480, 481, 482, 485), See Also From Tracing fields (500, 510, 511, 530, 548, 550, 551, 555, 562, 580, 581, 582, 585) and subfield \$4 (Relationship Code) in Heading Linking Entry fields (700, 710, 711, 730, 748, 750, 751, 755, 762, 780, 781, 782, 785, 788) in the MARC Authority Format. It also discusses the redefinition of subfield \$4 (Relator Code) in Heading fields (100, 110, 111), Subject Added Entry fields (600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 654, 662), Added Entry Fields (700, 710, 711, 720, 751) and subfield \$4 (Relationship Code) in Linking Entry fields (760, 762, 765, 767, 770, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 780, 785, 786, 787) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: Relator Codes are generally understood to be MARC Relator Codes and to relate entities to Works, Expressions, Manifestations, or Items (WEMI). Relationship Codes are generally outside of MARC, may take the form of either Relationship Codes or Relationship URIs, and relate WEMI to WEMI. The proposal was accepted.

MARC Proposal 2017-02: Defining New Subfields \$i, \$3, and \$4 in Field 370 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-02.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfields \$i (Relationship Information), \$3 (Materials Specified), and \$4 (Relationship Code) to field 370 (Associated Place) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. Subfields \$i and \$4 would be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the

relationship of the associated place recorded in the field to the resource being described. Subfield \$3 would be used to indicate that an associated place applies to only a part or portion of the resource.

Outcome: There was general agreement on this proposal, with some discussion of the possible need for an indicator or subfield to identify the data as Work-level or Expression-level. This will be studied further and may become a future proposal. With some rewording, the proposal was accepted.

MARC Proposal 2017-03: Defining New Subfields \$i and \$4 in Field 386 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/201703.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes adding subfields \$i (Relationship information) and \$4 (Relationship code) to field 386 (Creator/Contributor Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. The subfields will be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the relationship of the creator/contributor terms recorded in the field to the resource being described.

Outcome: With some rewording and the need for usage guidelines recognized, the proposal was accepted.

MARC Proposal 2017-04: Using a Classification Record Control Number as a Link in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-04.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a linking mechanism from a MARC Bibliographic or a MARC Authority record to a MARC Classification record by using a subfield \$0, containing the record control number of the MARC Classification record as an identifier.

Outcome: Bibliographic and Authority fields 083 were removed from the proposal. The proposal was accepted as amended.

MARC Proposal 2017-05: Defining a New Subfield in Field 340 to Record Color Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-05.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes defining new repeatable subfield \$g in field 340 (Physical Medium) in order to record the color content of resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: Subfield \$g was changed to read as follows:

\$g: Color characteristics of content (R)

Color characteristics of the content of a resource. Achromatic values (white, gray, and black) are considered to be colors.

The proposal was accepted as amended.

MARC Proposal 2017-06: Adding Subfields \$b, \$2, and \$0 to Field 567 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-06.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes adding subfield \$b (Controlled Term), subfield \$2 (Source of Term), and subfield \$0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) to field 567 (Methodology Note) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.

Outcome: Subfield \$a would no longer be mandatory, as the newly-defined subfield \$b could appear without it. The proposal was accepted.

MARC Proposal 2017-07: Adding Value “No information provided” to the First Indicator of Field 070 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-07.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses adding value “# = No information provided” to the first indicator (Existence in NAL collection) of field 070 (National Agricultural Library Call Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: No representative from the National Agricultural Library was present, so additional discussion of generalizing the field beyond use by NAL itself, as opposed to documenting the use of the NAL’s old U.S. Department of Agriculture classification scheme, seemed imprudent. It was noted that in OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards, First Indicator “blank” was marked as “obsolete. The proposal was accepted.

MARC Discussion Paper 2017-DP01: 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-dp01.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses the need to capture URIs in the MARC 21 Formats in a manner that clearly differentiates between:

- 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,
- 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 that refer to Records describing Things, and defining the subfield \$1 to record URIs directly referring to the Thing.

Outcome: There was considerable anxiety about using the last of the available numerical subfields (subfield \$1). Some legacy cleanup would be needed because subfield \$0 has been used both for RWOs (Direct Reference) and for authority records (Indirect Reference). The paper will likely come back as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper 2017-DP02: Defining Field 758 (Related Work Identifier) in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp02.html>).

Summary: This is a discussion of the possibility of defining a field 758 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats to identify related works.

Outcome: There is a need to allow for identifiers (such as Wikidata) that may not split name and title, hence the suggestion that subfields \$a and \$t be combined into a single subfield for “label.” The eventual proposal will need definitions as well as clear distinctions between Authority and Bibliographic usages. The discussed splitting out of subfield \$1 for RWOs from subfield \$0 for authority records also needs consideration. The paper will return as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper 2017-DP03: Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp03.html>).

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

Outcome: An Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) task group was recently formed to deal with this very question and will work with the Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM) to come up with a unified proposal with a broader outlook embracing Web resources and tangible resources. Use of the 007 field was discarded. Incorporating a First Indicator value of “blank” for “no information provided,” adding subfields \$0 and \$3, and making provision for “accessibility hazards” such as flashing content were also suggested. CCM and CAPC will cooperate on a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper 2017-DP04: Defining Subfields \$u, \$r, and \$z in Field 777 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp04.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: No one remembers why the field remained so serial-centric even through Format Integration in the 1980s and 1990s. Similar changes to fields 760 and 762 would be requested only if legitimate use cases could be determined. The paper will return as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper 2017-DP05: Providing Institution Level Information by Defining Subfield \$5 in the 6XX Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp05.html>).

Summary: This paper explores a way to designate in a MARC Bibliographic record that a subject access field in the 6XX region has been added according to the policy of a specific Cultural Heritage Organization. The approach taken is defining a subfield \$5 (Institution to which field applies) containing the MARC Organization Code to the 6XX fields.

Outcome: The National Library of Medicine (NLM) supported the paper, but most of the other respondents did not. Different Language of Cataloging constituencies would not

likely use records in other languages, but the use of subfields \$5 in 6XX fields could lead to the proliferation of local practice abuse. This paper may or may not come back in some future form.

CC:DA Chair Ms. Shrader reported on the programming changes that are in store for ALA conferences beginning with the ALA Annual Conference in 2018. She has been assured that both CC:DA and the ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) will retain their regular meeting times in the conference center.

Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported that the RDA Toolkit currently has 2600 active subscriptions, although that is trending downwards. Renewals stand at 94% and revenue is on track. Print units sold were 67. There will be no new print version until after the 3R Project is completed. There were about 1000 copies of *RDA Essentials* sold and no new version now until after 3R. About 37% of Toolkit sales are non-U.S. In August 2017, all RDA Toolkit translations will be up-to-date with the April 2017 frozen English version. The 3R Project will result in a new Toolkit with responsive design, especially for tablet devices and will address W3C accessibility standards. RDA instructions and related PSs will be able to display side-by-side. Examples will be enhanced, when possible and appropriate, with thumbnails of actual images from the resource (such as title pages). Mr. Hennelly's report and slides on the status of the 3R Project are accessible at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Status-Report-on-3R-project.pdf> and <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/3R-Project-MW17.pdf>, respectively.

Ms. Deborah Fritz (The MARC of Quality) reported on the Aggregates Working Group's model for aggregates ([http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CCDA\\_Fritz2017-1.pdf](http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CCDA_Fritz2017-1.pdf)). By using shortcuts, relationships can occur at various WEMI levels. Distinct Works/Expressions within an aggregate may all be described or may be described as selectively as desired. The group is still trying to define within the RDA context the distinction that the LRM makes between whole/part and aggregates. The group is still working on applying its model to serials and will then work on applying it to music and to moving images.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist

Data Services and WorldCat Quality Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2017 March 8