+

Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., USA, 2019 June 22 and 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, Washington, D.C., USA, on Saturday, 2019 June 22, 1:00-5:30 p.m.; and 2019 June 24, 8:30-11:30 a.m. The full CC:DA agenda is at https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3657.

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 January and June 2019 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/chair_18-19-2.pdf).

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/2019/06/LC-2019-02.pdf). Her report included these highlights:

- The former LC Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division (COIN) have merged to form the new Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division (PTCP), with Ms. Judith Cannan as its new division chief.

- The ongoing effort to support linked data though the elimination of "multiple" subdivisions from LC Subject Headings. The initial focus has been on the topical subdivision "Religious aspects. As of the end of May 2019, some 470 authority records have been cancelled, resulting in the creation of 3691 individual authority records. Progress on the project is kept up-to-date on the "Spreadsheet of Multiple Subdivisions to be Cancelled" at http://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/subject/Multiples%20Cancellation%20Project%20progress.xlsx.

- The LC authority file, LCSH, and LC Classification have all been updated to reflect the new official names of North Macedonia (formerly the Republic of Macedonia) and Eswatini (formerly Swaziland).

Report of the ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC). ALA Representatives to NARDAC, Chair Ms. Dominique Bourassa (Yale University) and Mr. Stephen Hearn (University of Minnesota) reported on NARDAC and RSC activities between February and June 2019. Their full report is at https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/NARDAC-2019-02.pdf. Among the highlights:

- Ms. Honor Moody (Harvard University) is the new RDA Examples Editor, succeeding LC's Ms. Kate James. Their terms overlap between May and December 2019 to allow for a transition.

- April 30, 2019, marked the stabilization of the English text of RDA, allowing work on translations, Policy Statements, and examples to proceed.

- The earliest projection for the completion of the 3R Project is currently seen as some time during the first half of 2020.

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/2019/06/PCC-2019-2.pdf). Among the highlights:

- A Task Group on Metadata Application Profiles (MAPs) has been formed to develop practices and expertise on MAPs.

- Phase I of the limited use of ISBD punctuation in bibliographic records, allowing the option of omitting terminal periods in descriptive fields, has been implemented.

- The PCC has formalized its relationships with the ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee's Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies and OCLC's FAST Policy and Oversight Committee to advance the use of linked data value vocabularies.

Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Force. Task Group Chair Mr. Bob Maxwell (Brigham Young University) submitted his report (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/3R-TF-2019-3.pdf). Among the highlights:

- The TF explored the RDA Beta Toolkit by taking one bibliographic record and one authority record and attempted to ferret out the RDA instruction that justified each part of the description. This was followed up with systematic looks at many sections of the text and many links.

- The TF's complaints about the opaqueness of the language in RDA were generally disregarded by the RSC.

- The TF is examining the different ways in which the term "resource" is used in the RDA text.

- The newly defined element "preferred title for expression" needs further guidance.

Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit Changes. Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported the following:

- Release Notes will likely be in the Toolkit's "Resource" tab.

- The Toolkit is being evaluated for accessibility by a professional group. Changes to improve accessibility are expected to be made in August.

- The December 2019 or January 2020 release may include one translation and some policy statements as tests.

- There will be training on how to teach RDA after the 3R Project is completed.

- The Visual Editor was dropped because it was much more expensive than anticipated. For now, breadcrumbs will be used and any suggestions for improvement are welcome.

RSC Presentations and Discussions. RDA in English is Stable: Now What?

- **Introduction.** Ms. Kathy Glennan (RSC Chair, University of Maryland)

  - Translations will reveal more problems of clarity and consistency, which will be cleaned up.

  - Examples are not considered an official part of RDA. They may vary among translations.

  - The countdown clock for shutting down the current Toolkit doesn't begin until all three entities – RDA Steering Committee, RDA Board, and RDA Copyright Holders – agree.

  - RIMFF 4 will greatly inform the creation of application profiles.

- **Basic Information About Translation Process and Policy Statement Development.** Mr. James Hennelly (Director, ALA Digital Reference)

  - Only the seven original RDA translations will count for this initial content completeness, but there will later be two additional translations, Hungarian and Arabic, post-3R.

  - RDA Reference is the glossary plus more, including vocabularies and element sets.

  - A Policy Statement Working Group is formed. A template has been created to accommodate Policy Statements nearly everywhere they might be needed. They must determine the Policy Statements' minimum usability point.

- **Policy Statement Development from the BL Perspective; RDA in MARC.** Mr. Thurstan Young (British Library)

  - Mapping must be created between current Policy Statements and where they would now go in the Toolkit. BL Policy Statements tend to be short and less detailed than those of other institutions.

  - The newly reconvened MARC Working Group will look at what needs to be defined or changed in MARC 21. After stabilization, NDMSO began to form a MARC WG to identify and prioritize MARC needs. It will begin to meet to create discussion papers in September 2019. Its membership is still being formed. Data provenance elements may prove to be the most problematic for MARC.

- **Application Profiles.** Mr. Gordon Dunsire (RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer)

  - Customizing RDA for local applications will involve the creation of Application Profiles, which are specifications for metadata.

- o Coherent description includes "primary" relationship elements. Minimum description includes appellation elements. Effective description includes general (common) and specialized elements.

- o Vocabulary Encoding Scheme (VES) provides controlled values for an element, including a preferred label or structured description, notation or identifier, and IRI. Local Vocabulary Encoding Schemes must be compatible with the semantics of the RDA element in scope and coverage and should be mappable to the RDA VES if one exists. The local concept must be broader than, narrower than, or equivalent to the RDA concept.

- o String Encoding Scheme (SES) specifies how a string value of an element is constructed: the values of other elements (variable), boilerplate (fixed), the order of elements (fixed), and the form of delimiters between values such as punctuation (fixed). It must be possible to deconstruct a string down to the original values that were used to construct it.

- o Customizing RDA requires management, maintenance, documentation, and the ability to synchronize with any RDA changes.

- **Future Processes for Changes to RDA.** Ms. Kathy Glennan

  - o Future processes for changes to RDA remain under development. Examples are not included. Expect discussion papers, proposals, fast-track elements. The regional groups will make sure that proposals are proper. Directions may come from the RSC but some proposals will come from the various communities and be undirected.

  - o It will be necessary to balance the need for feedback with the need for speed. RDA's quarterly update schedule does not align with CC:DA's twice-yearly schedule. CC:DA may need to hold asynchronous meetings over a period of days because of the wide time differences. We hope to have preliminary procedures drafted early August 2019.

Non-Human Personages and New RDA: Considerations for the LC/NACO Authority File. Ms. Kate James (LC)

- Aligning RDA with the IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM) was one goal of The 3R project. RDA may differ from LRM as long as it remains consistent. RDA may have expansions and may have omissions.

- LRM limits persons to individual human beings, allowing for those who are assumed to have lived. "Non-Human Personage" is a term suggested by the Fictitious Entities Working Group. The term includes real animals.

- Res includes Non-Human Personages because Res includes everything. RDA Entity includes all other entities defined in RDA but Non-Human Personages are not RDA Entities. Nomen is the appellation of an RDA Entity. A Work may have "related entity of work" that is not an RDA Entity such as a Non-Human Personage, but it cannot have an Agent relationships to a Work, Expression, etc.

- Instructions for identifying Non-Human Personages cannot be part of RDA and their authority records cannot be coded as RDA, but they may remain as LC Subject Headings. These records

for Non-Human Personages will need a to-be-defined code in field 040 subfield $e and field 075 subfield $2 ("lcnhps" is a possibility).

- Our cataloging tries to reflect the truth as found or provided for in the model. Mr. John Meyers (Union College) reminds us that the model must accommodate observed phenomena and that this loophole solution may suffer the fate of epicycles in the geocentric model of the universe. Mr. Adam Schiff (University of Washington) notes that the field 075 vocabulary can be devised to help with this and that we should look to how the Germans have already used it. Mr. Stephen Hearn (University of Minnesota) wonders if a local VES could be devised with specific terms to account for real animal actors and such.

Future Work and Plans for CC:DA. Chair Ms. Amanda Ros

- Ms. Ros will remain as chair for another year.

- The Virtual Participation Task Force will need to consider the possibility that CC:DA may no longer be part of ALA Midwinter. It also needs a new chair although Mr. Richard Guajardo (CC:DA Webmaster, University of Houston) may be willing to act as co-chair.

- CC:DA's procedures need to be revised to change references from "JSC" to "RSC," account for NARDAC in the charge, and other things as we resume the formal consideration of proposals. A Procedures Task Force is being formed.

- The 3R Project Task Force can work on the "curator as creator" issue raised by ARLIS, which might be the easiest of the current issues and could serve as a template for how CC:DA will now deal with proposals.

- Felicity Dykas (University of Missouri–Columbia) suggests that CC:DA should consider training needs for the new RDA, especially for libraries that can't afford current training. This would need to be in coordination with the continuing education elements of ALA This TF has now been created.

- Mr. John Meyers asks if CC:DA needs to be involved in the MARC Advisory Committee and NDMSO efforts to deal with the new RDA and MARC issues, but Mr. John Attig (Pennsylvania State University) suggests that CC:DA involvement might get in the way. But it still might be good for CC:DA to make itself available to advise.

- CC:DA could work on pseudo-elements in music, law, religious communities, official communications. Art has already been folded into the general instructions. There is a need for a consistent approach. The IFLA statement on International Cataloging Principles is being realigned with current practices and conditions and may provide guidance on new access points.

Report on the MARC Advisory Committee. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met at ALA Annual in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, 2019 June 22, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2019 June 23, 2:30-5:30 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2019_age.html. The official minutes from the meeting are available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/minutes/an-19.html. Following are my summaries of the three proposals and two discussion papers and their respective outcomes.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2019-04**: Coding Externally Hosted Online Publications in the MARC 21 Holdings Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-04.html).

  - **Summary:** This proposal recommends that changes are made to the Holdings Format character position 008/06 (Receipt or acquisition status) in order to accommodate online publications which are made accessible via a third party platform.

  - **Outcome**: Approved with a slight rewording of the 008/06 definition for code "6: External Access" to "Online content accessed via a third-party platform, e.g., through a publisher's website, content provider, etc."

- **MARC Proposal No. 2019-05**: Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Intertitles and Transcripts in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-05.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**:

- Discussion of difficulty of distinction between transcript and libretto   need for separate subfield for original language ($o of transcript   discussion surrounds defining subfield $t as requested (simple   , using $m for original language or adding $o for original language of transcript   straw poll clearly favors first option $m definition stays the same. Acceted defining $t and leaving $m as it is.

-

-

-

-

  - 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).

- o **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.

  - o **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).

  - o **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.

  - o **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).

  - o **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.

- o **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).

  - o **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.

  - o **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 August 2