



Report on the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Midwinter Meeting, Seattle, Washington, USA, 2019 January 26 and 28

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, Seattle, Washington, USA, on Saturday, 2019 January 26, 1:00-5:30 p.m. The Monday, 2019 January 28, 8:30-11:30 a.m. session was given over to a special session on “A Deeper Dive into RDA.” The full CC:DA agenda is at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3465>.

Report from the Chair. CC:DA Chair Ms. Amanda Ros (Texas A&M University) reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between July and December 2018 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/chair_18-19-1.pdf). It was also announced that Ms. Diane Hillmann (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative) has retired and DCMI does not intend to replace her at the present time.

Report from the Library of Congress Representative. Library of Congress Representative Ms. Kate James submitted her report on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/LC-2019-01.pdf>). Her report included these highlights:

- LC was not affected by the United States government partial shutdown during December 2018 and January 2019.
- Former LC Representative Mr. Dave Reser is now in the ILS Program Office.
- Ms. Ivey Glendon joined the Policy and Standards Division as a senior library automation specialist on January 7, 2019. She replaces Mr. Bruce Johnson, who retired in December 2017 as the Cataloger’s Desktop product manager.
- Mr. Randall Berry, chief of the Asian and Middle Eastern Division of ABA, retired on June 29, 2018. Mr. Paul Hahn is serving as acting chief.

- An appendix, “Implementing Changes in the MARC 21 Authority Format,” was added to the *LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data* (<https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsol/lcmarsuppl.pdf>) in October 2018.
- Because of the RDA 3R Project LC-PCC Policy Statements remain frozen.
- The *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* has a new section Z12, “Special Projects for Name Authority Records and Bibliographic Records,” added in October 2018. It provides background information and instructions about special projects for authority records in the LC/NAF, such as the Dance Heritage Coalition Access Project and the Pinyin Conversion Project, as well as information about LC bibliographic records changed during these projects.
- To better support linked data, “multiple” subdivisions are being cancelled in the LC Subject Headings. These subdivisions have automatically given free-floating status to analogous subdivisions used under the same heading (for example, “Buddhism [Christianity, etc.]” Individual authority records will be created for each valid, complete heading string, based on a multiple subdivision. These authority records will be generated and distributed during the first quarter of 2019. LC acknowledges the assistance of OCLC Research in this effort.
- Beginning with the October 2018 Summary of Decisions appearing on the Tentative Lists, statistics on the approximate number of proposals for classification numbers, subject headings, genre/form terms, etc. that were approved on the list, as well as the number that were not approved, not necessary, or marked “resubmit” will be included.
- The general LCSH policy to qualify headings for individual ethnic groups by the adjective for the continent, region, or country of the group, followed by the word “people” will henceforth be applied consistently, with the word “tribe” no longer being used.
- Sexual and gender minority hierarchies have been revised to align with the treatment of other minority groups.

Report of the ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC). ALA Representative to NARDAC, Ms. Dominique Bourassa (Yale University) reported on NARDAC and RSC activities between July and December 2018. Her full report is at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/NARDAC-2019-1.pdf>. Among the highlights:

- Mr. Stephen Hearn (University of Minnesota) has replaced Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) as ALA Representative to NARDAC. Mr. Thomas Brenndorfer (Guelph Public Library) is the new NARDAC Representative to the RSC.
- Western biases in RDA will be investigated at the request of EURIG.
- The projected completion of the 3R Project is December 2019.
- The channels of communication between CC:DA and RSC with the “light layer” of NARDAC now in between are currently a bit awkward, but once the 3R project and the RDA freeze are over and CC:DA can return to the regular cycle of considering proposals, that should improve.

- Non-human entities, including animals, are no longer RDA entities, but are instead outside of the RDA model, defined as “Related Entity to Work or Expression.”). This whole issue is still under development. The LC Policy and Standards Division will issue a white paper on non-human entities later in 2019.

Report from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Liaison. Mr. Everett Allgood (New York University) submitted his report (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/PCC-2019-01.pdf>). Among the highlights:

- The new PCC Directory is now available.
- The PCC Standing Committee on Standards SCS is revising some of the explanatory text in the Provider-Neutral guidelines in order to provide users with more context.
- The PCC Standing Committee on Training has been working on training for the IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM). They will soon be working on NACO training for the OCLC Record Manager interface.

Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Group. Task Group Chair Mr. Glen Wiley (University of Miami) has stepped down and has been replaced by Mr. Bob Maxwell (Brigham Young University). The group intends to take a more organized approach to evaluating the RDA Beta Toolkit.

Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit Changes. Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported that RDA subscriptions and users are up about half a percent, with most of the growth in Europe and some in Latin America. ALA had lowered prices for LIS schools, which has cost lots of money. Among the highlights of his report:

- About 150 usable submissions have been received from the feedback button on the RDA Beta Toolkit. All constructive feedback is appreciated, regardless of whether it is backed up by a group such as CC:DA or is submitted by a single individual. Even after the stabilization of the English text, feedback will be welcome.
- ALA Publishing is close to an agreement on a Portuguese translation.
- It is a big challenge to get information from Latin America and Africa, both of which are geographically large and diverse.
- A Policy Statement Working Group has been created to discuss how PSs will work in the new RDA. Included in the group are Mr. Gordon Dunsire (RDA Technical Team Liaison Officer), Ms. Linda Barnhart (RSC Secretary), Mr. Thurston Young (British Library), and Ms. Kate James (LC, RDA Examples Editor).
- The Toolkit’s graphic browser could be last piece to get finished because of its complexity. In element and entity files, it will be used as an animated navigation tool allowing one to move through the RDA structure once it’s ready, educating the user about RDA while using it. It is expected to be available either in April or June 2019.

- Regarding the Citation Numbering, each citable chunk of text will get a number. The RDA print version will have to be totally rethought because of its size in order to keep it a viable product.
- RDA Essentials is to be updated during 2019.
- Ms. Chris Oliver (University of Ottawa, Chair of the RDA Board) is updating her “Introducing RDA” for the second half of 2019.
- An RDA Orientation Project will try to assure that users are comfortable with the Toolkit, core RDA concepts, and the LRM. It will also give guidance to assist LIS trainers. There is the possibility of an online course on the creation of Application Profiles. Mr. Hennelly wants to see how LIS are teaching RDA and intends to make connections with that community so that they can be helped.
- The 3R Project will not be fully complete until around January 2020, so users can expect about two years from now before the “classic” RDA goes away, to be preserved as PDFs. There will be more flexibility for sharing things locally and globally. There will soon be a report on the Beta’s accessibility rating.

Report on the Virtual Participation Task Force. Chair Ms. Jessica Hayden (University of Northern Colorado) reported that the task force report was approved in November 2018 by CC:DA, but has not yet been tested or made available generally. There may be limits to the numbers of remote participants, if needed. The recommendations could have broader application with the ALCTS/LLAMA/LITA merger talks because all three organizations have expressed interest. Mr. Bob Maxwell suggested that audience participation could be unlimited, but this may come up against ALA rules about conference registration, for instance.

Discussion on CC:DA Communication.

- **Committee reports:** There will always be a need for certain groups to report, but once we get back to considering proposals, we’ll need more time for that than for reports. Perhaps reports should be submitted earlier so that CC:DA can review them before the face-to-face meetings. That will allow us to devote more of the meetings to the discussion than to the reports.
- **ALA Connect, blog, discussion list:** ALA Connect in its standard configuration is not robust enough for the kinds of work that CC:DA does. Ms. Ros will be in touch with ALCTS regarding its intentions for moving committee work to ALA Connect, which would be open for all to comment.

Discussion of Possible Task Forces.

- Revision of CC:DA procedures. These were last updated in 2011, and before that, in 2007. Among other things, the creation of NARDAC would need to be incorporated. Once we are more clear about how proposals will proceed in the future, we could begin moving ahead with

any such proposals we have in mind currently, even before we know what the exact procedures would be.

- Vocabulary and Ontology Task Force.
- Application Profile Development Task Force.
- If revisions to the CC:DA charge are needed, a task force would need to be created to deal with that.

A Deeper Dive into RDA. This special session took the place of the Monday, 2019 January 28 CC:DA session.

Mr. Gordon Dunsire: Nomen and Appellations

- Everything has a name, we call that Nomen; Nomen has a Nomen string; RDA Entity has appellation Nomen, which has Nomen string.
- Statements can be made about a Nomen string: who assigned it, a time span.
- Categories of Nomen: Common name (Name of RDA Entity) preferred name, variant name; Browse Name: access point for RDA entity AAP (inverted proper names, for instance), Variant AP; Identifier (ISSN, etc.).
- Recording Methods: Unstructured (common name), Structured (browse name), Identifier (identifier).
- skosxl: Simple Knowledge Organization System Extension for Labels; literalForm "nomen String."
- BIBFRAME: Classes/Entities of Nomen including Identifier, title, VariantTitle, AudioIssueNumber, etc.
- Nomen is essential for name authority control but only Nomen String likely to be used in our context.

Mr. Thomas Brenndorfer: Appellation Elements

- Thomas Brenndorfer went through all 96 RDA elements to standardize recording methods and descriptions.
- There's one recording method for each appellation element: unstructured description, structured description, identifier.

- Structured Description – Access Points: based on name or title of entity includes additional elements that must be chosen; AAP for Work, creator entity is added for identification.

Mr. Thomas Brenndorfer: RDA-ONIX Framework: New Content Types and New Carrier Types

- Structured method of devising new content and carrier types in accordance with the RDA-ONIX Framework, built into RDA.
- Attribute set for Content Type: character, sensory mode, image dimensionality, image movement, form/genre, capture method, label.
- Carrier: Storage Medium, Housing format, Intermediation tool.

Ms. Kate James (Examples Editor): Relationship Elements

- Relationships connect, are reciprocal, identify one thing by relating it to something else; can be expressed as graph, RDF Triple, RDA relationship element.
- Domain: entity that is described by an element.
- Range: entity that is the value of a relationship element.
- Res have domain and range entity; range entity is a recorded value; sometimes multiple recording methods are available to record value, each has a corresponding inverse relationship element.
- Narrower relationship elements inherit the domain of their broader relationship element.
- Verbalized Labels: have verbs (*Work has preferred title of work Nomen*).
- Alternate Labels: often former labels that have changed significantly.
- WEMI to Agent Entity Relationship Elements Breakout: agent has 4 entity subtypes (person, family, corporate bodies, collective agent); relationship elements applicable to each subtype were defined at Agent level.
- Relationship Designators have become Relationship Elements, now equal to any other element, some attributes have become Res.

Mr. Jamie Hennelly and Mr. Gordon Dunsire: Application Profiles and Policy Statements

- Application Profile: specification of the metadata that is used in an application (entities, elements, vocabulary encoding schemes, possibly preferred encoding method); AP tells you which elements to use (can function as a front-end to the Toolkit); APs can drive a

Data Input Form (such as RIMMF), APs can serve as data validation (metadata conformance); AP can be used for data extraction.

- Layered/Nested profile: Coherent description of an information resource (primary relationship elements), Minimum description of a resource entity (appellation elements), Effective description (specialized and general/common elements).
- Each optional recording method and instruction option has a separate IRI and ID that can be referenced by an application profile; profile can specify vocabulary encoding scheme or string encoding scheme.
- Standard conditions (diachronic work, musical work, etc.) could be collected into condition databanks that could help create application profile for that particular condition (such as format).
- Policy Statements: Planning Group consisting of PS writers from BL, DNB, LC, RSC Secretary, RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer, Toolkit Director; will set up requirements for PS files and how PSs display, markup and functionality, guidelines for placement and content; creating shell documents for all current PSs and create potential links to all places where a PS might be attached

Ms. Kathy Glennan: RSC in the Post 3R Era

- Lots of varieties of internal RSC communication, using collaborative work spaces, fewer face-to-face meetings.
- Many changes will remain on hold even after April 2019, so as to maintain text stability especially for translators (errors can still be corrected).
- New proposal process (quarterly rather than annual) will need to be developed, more reliance on WGs and Regional groups; may or may not need new terminology for “proposal”, “fast-track”; lots of issues still to be determined.
- More REs, new proposal process.

Report on the MARC Advisory Committee. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met at ALA Midwinter in Seattle on Saturday, 2019 January 26, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2019 January 27, 2:30-5:00 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2019_age.html. One fast-track approval was announced, that of Authority field 055 subfield \$2. Following are my summaries of the three proposals and Three discussion papers and their respective outcomes.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2019-01:** Designating Open Access and License Information for Remote Online Resources in the MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-01.html>).

- **Summary:** This paper proposes improved ways of indicating open and restricted access, as well as license information, for remote online resources through coordinated changes to the MARC 21 fields 506 (Restrictions on Access Note), 540 (Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note), and 856 (Electronic Location and Access).
- **Outcome:** Discussion of this proposal took 70 of the 90 minutes of the Saturday morning meeting. Proposed jointly by the German National Library for the Committee on Data Formats and by OCLC, it passed unanimously with some alterations and clarifications:
 - Section 5.1: Changes to field 506 shall apply to both Bibliographic and Holdings formats.
 - Section 5.1.1: Field 506 First Indicator definitions will change as specified, but the indicator labels will not change.
 - Section 5.1.2: Field 506 subfield \$g definition will read, "Date when the resource becomes freely available," removing the reference to embargo.
 - Section 5.2:
 - Field 540 shall be added to Holdings format, with the specified changes to both Bibliographic and Holdings formats.
 - Field 540 subfield \$g definition will read, "Date when the resource changes its use and reproduction rights," removing the reference to embargo.
 - Section 5.3.1:
 - Field 856 subfield \$7 is not repeatable; its coding must apply to all subfields \$e and \$u in the 856 field. When subfield \$7 coding does not apply to all subfields \$e and/or \$u in the field, use multiple fields 856.
 - Field 856 subfield \$7 position/0 will reverse the values so that they correspond to those in field 506 First Indicator ("0" for "Open Access" and "1" for "Restricted Access."
 - Field 856 subfield \$7 position/0 value "0" for "Open Access" will remove the sentence referring to the *Budapest Open Access Initiative*.
 - Field 856 subfield \$7, suggestions that "No attempt to code" be represented by the fill character or pipe [ASCII graphical vertical bar (|) (7C(hex))], rather than by the proposed "x" were rejected because the pipe character cannot be used in variable fields in MARC 21. According to *MARC 21 Specifications for Record Structure, Character Sets, and Exchange Media, Character Sets and Encoding Options: Part 1, General Character Set Issues*

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/specifications/specchargeneral.html#fill>), " the use of this fill character is limited to variable control fields such as field 008 (Fixed-Length Data Elements)."

- Section 5.3.2:
 - Field 856 subfield \$e final sentence shall read, "It may contain a free-text term, a standardized term, or a URI."
 - Field 856 subfield \$e definition should refer back to subfield \$7 position/1, corresponding to the latter's reference to the former; the coding of subfield \$e must therefore also apply to all subfields \$u in the 856 field.

The comments from the RightsStatements.org Technical Working Group from 2019 January 24 could lead to some further clarifications or separate best practices recommendations.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2019-02:** Defining Source for Names and Titles in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-02.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes defining \$2 for source vocabulary in the 100, 110, 111, and 130 Main Entry fields, the 240 Uniform Title field, the 700, 710, 711, 730, and 758 Added Entry fields, and the 800, 810, 811, and 830 Series Added Entry fields in the Bibliographic Format.
 - **Outcome:** The proposal brought to the surface several longstanding issues, including the distinctions between headings actually in an authority file versus headings simply constructed according to the particular standard, the possibility of identifying (perhaps in field 040) a "default" authority file with only exceptions being identified in subfield \$2. Best practices will need to be developed for these changes to work and be consistent. The proposal was approved with a change to the subfield \$2 definition for the Bibliographic 800, 810, and 811 in Section 3.3: "... from which the name-title heading was assigned."
- **MARC Proposal No. 2019-03:** Defining Subfields \$0 and \$1 to Capture URIs in Field 024 of the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-03.html>).
 - **Summary:** This is a proposal to capture machine actionable and parseable URIs in the 024 field of the MARC 21 Authority Format by adding:
 1. Subfield \$0 for 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,

2. Subfield \$1 for URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual).

The proposed changes facilitate conversion from MARC to RDF by differentiating MARC subfields for standard numbers or codes that are not machine actionable URIs, already accommodated in 024 \$a, from machine dereferenceable HTTP URIs.

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:** The proposal passed unanimously, noting that the MARC 21 definition of subfield \$0 in Appendix A would need to be adjusted.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP01:** Coding Externally Hosted Online Publications in the MARC 21 Holdings Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-dp01.html>).
 - **Summary:** This discussion paper recommends the addition of a code to Holdings Format 008/06 (Receipt or acquisition status) which represents online publications made accessible via a third party platform.
 - **Outcome:** This paper will return as a proposal, revised to better accommodate the different mechanisms that apply to electronic resources over the original application to print.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP02:** Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Intertitles and Transcripts in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-dp02.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding two new subfields in field 041 (Language Code) for the language of film intertitles and the language of accompanying transcripts for audiovisual materials.
 - **Outcome:** This paper will return as a single proposal, to apply only to silent films and with a more precise definition of intertitles. References to "printed text" in subfield \$t will be removed and clarified.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP03:** Defining a Field for a Subject Added Entry of Unknown Entity Type in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-dp03.html>).

- **Summary:** This paper explores options on how a subject added entry can be accommodated in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format when the type of entity is unknown. The existing field 653 (Index Term – Uncontrolled) is analyzed, and a new field with one of the field numbers "620", "652" or "670" is discussed.
- **Outcome:** This paper will return as a proposal, possibly of even wider scope to include an Authority format equivalent. There was considerable debate over exactly what "uncontrolled" means both in theory and in practice. The option of using field 653 was pretty roundly rejected with a preference for a field in the 66X, 67X, 68X range that doesn't obviously "rhyme" with an already established standard usage.

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

2019 February 8