Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Midwinter Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 2020 January 25

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, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, Saturday, 2020 January 25, 1:00-5:30 p.m. The usual Monday morning second meeting was cancelled. The full CC:DA agenda is at https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?cat=33.

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 2019 (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/chair_19-20-1.pdf).

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 June and December 2019. Their full report is at https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/NARDAC-2020-1.pdf. Among the highlights:

- Ms. Melanie Polutta replaced Ms. Kate James as LC representative to NARDAC in October 2019. In November 2019, Mr. Hearn replaced Ms. James as Back-Up Representative to the RSC. Mr. Thomas Brenndorfer (Guelph Public Library), was appointed to a second and final term as NARDAC Representative to the RSC.
- The date for the switch from the Beta RDA site to official status is set for 2020 December 15, but the beginning of the yearlong countdown to the closing of the original Toolkit will occur later, as agreed by the RSC and the RDA Board.
- There is discussion of a new Collective Agent entity for meetings, conferences, congresses, expeditions, festivals, fairs, etc, which would be defined not to overlap with the Family or Corporate Body entities.

- The guidelines for proposing changes to RDA that RSC Chair Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) presented to CC:DA at ALA Annual 2019 are moving toward being formalized. Included is a quarterly proposal and review cycle rather than an annual cycle, which will mean corresponding changes to gathering and recording community responses.
- RSC is moving toward asynchronous online meetings, with only one in-person meeting each year.

Report from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Liaison. Mr. Everett Allgood (New York University) submitted his report (https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/PCC-2020-01-rev.pdf). Among the highlights:

- The PCC Guidelines for Minimally Punctuated MARC Bibliographic Records (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/PCC-Guidelines-Minimally-Punctuated-MARC-Data.docx) is now in effect.
- The Standing Committee on Applications has made available a regular expression document that may be used in MarcEdit to remove punctuation from MARC records in accord with the aforementioned guidelines (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/resources/macros.html).
- The Standing Committee on Standards is forming a task group to consider the use of alternative and wider-ranging language code lists such as ISO 639-3.
- The Standing Committee on Training is working on training for minimal punctuation, Sinopia, LRM, URIs and RWOs, and series policies. Revisions to the NACO Participants Manual are also under consideration.

Report from the Library of Congress Representative. Library of Congress Representative Ms. Melanie Polutta submitted her report on activities and news from LC (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/LC-2020-01.pdf). Her report included these highlights:

- Work on the development of Policy Statements and application profiles for the revised RDA text is now underway. Joint LC/PCC task groups are working specifically on Diachronic Works, Aggregate Works, Element Labels, and Data Provenance.
- The Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division (PTCP), which handles NUCMC, has concluded a pilot project using the Social Networks and Archival Context (SNAC) project of the National Archives and the University of Virginia to create bibliographic records in WorldCat as well as associated authority records.
- LC will not follow the minimal punctuation alternatives from the PCC but has begun a pilot to accept cataloging copy that does follow the guidelines and to study the impact.
- LC upgraded its ILS to Voyager 10 in November 2019, including validation of MARC Bibliographic and Authority elements not previously implemented in recent years. Full implementation of the authority elements will be coordinated with the other NACO nodes.

- To support linked data, work citations in Authority field 670 for LCSH, LCGFT, LCMPT, and LCDGT records will have LCCNs and other control numbers such as OCLC numbers preceded by the parenthetical MARC agency code in subfield $w as the last element in the field.

Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Romanization-2020-01.pdf) presented by Mr. Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress).

A new Romanization Tables review body will be established in February 2020 and have a broader representation of communities to address Romanization issues, create new tables, revise existing tables, and explore the possibility of less Romanization. Although the need for tables is still acknowledged, it may be less than in the past. Any decisions about whether and when romanization will be used are separate from the need to have the tables themselves. Data will inevitably be lost as we move toward linked data, but we must decide what can be dispensed with and what remains valuable.

Report on the CC:DA Virtual Participation Task Force. Presented by CC:DA Webmaster Mr. Richard R. Guajardo (University of Houston).

Choice of Zoom virtual meeting software. ALCTS wants to be the keeper of recordings. Screen sharing is flexible and there are chat capabilities. It might be easier to have strictly virtual meetings than to try to conduct an in-person meeting with some virtual participation. Meetings are currently limited to an hour and an ALCTS official must be on each call.

Report on the CC:DA Procedures Review Task Force Presented by Mr. John Myers (Union College), CC:DA Liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee.

The CC:DA website has both a marked-up (https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/1-procedures-markup_draft.pdf) and a clean (https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/1-procedures-plain-text_draft.pdf) version of the procedures document.

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

- Among the fixes being worked on are italics issue on spacing, cleaning up linking practices, user created content features, Citation Numbering practice clean up, search improvements.
- The new RDA meets accessibility goals and the report about that is online.
- The next full release will be April or May 2020, with a possible release in August or September 2020. The December 15, 2020, release will include the switchover of the Beta site to become the official RDA in the sense that it will be the version at the http://access.rdatoolkit.org/ link. The countdown clock does NOT start in December because RSC and RDA Board approval is still necessary for the clock to start.

- Translations, Policy Statements, application profiles remain in progress. Work on the PSs is ongoing with samples to be in the Beta site in the second quarter of calendar 2020. Seven translations will be carried over and two new ones will be added.
- In February 2020, repeats of the New Concepts webinars will begin. Ms. Kate James, working as a contractor for ALA Publishing, will be presenting new webinars later in 2020. Ms. Chris Oliver's *RDA Basics*, revised to account for 3R, will be available during the second quarter of 2020. Mr. Thomas Brendorffer's *RDA Essentials* revision will also be available soon.

Update on Code of Ethics for Catalogers. A draft for public comment is expected in April 2020, with August or September 2020 the goal for a final version. The code will cover working conditions, subjects, and classification, among other topics. There are concerns about our having enough time to give it the consideration it deserves. A task force will be formed to consider the forthcoming drafts.

Upcoming Work for CCDA.

- The proposal on review procedures will go to NARDAC The RSC's concern for its own workload and schedules will trickle down to concern for the workloads and schedules of all those who must also have input, including NARDAC. The RSC will try to be more communicative about agendas.
- CC:DA is reaching out to the Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials (CC:AAM) to form a joint Romanization Tables Task Force to formalize procedures. There is a 2O1O LC document online (https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romguid_2010.html) that can serve as basis for new procedures. Consideration of questions about the continued propriety of Romanization at all must be separate from the formalization of procedures.
- Mr. John Myers will formulate the five remaining questions in the marked-up CC:DA procedures draft. The procedures group will also work on the "how to submit a proposal" document, including internal NARDAC considerations, RSC responses, and the dynamics of standard proposals versus fast track proposals.

Report on the MARC Advisory Committee. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met at ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on Saturday, 2020 January 25, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2020 January 26, 2:30-5:00 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2020_age.html. Following are my summaries of the two proposals and seven discussion papers and their respective outcomes.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-01**: Defining a New Indicator Value for Human-Generated Content in Field 883 of the MARC 21 Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-01.html.)
    - **Summary:** This paper proposes a way that metadata provenance information can be extended in the MARC formats from fully or partially machine-generated metadata to any type of metadata, including intellectually assigned metadata. The approach outlined is the definition of a new value "2" for "Created by a human cataloger" as the

first indicator of field 883 in all five MARC formats. The name of the field is to be changed from "Machine-generated Metadata Provenance" to a broader scope, and the name of the first indicator position is to be changed from "Method of machine assignment", accordingly.

- **Outcome:** There was considerable debate over the lines between machine generation and human manipulation, regardless of the extent of that manipulation. The field does not imply anything about any fields not linked to field 883. Field 883 had originally been intended for association with subject fields. "Not Machine Generated" might be the best option for the new First Indicator. There was consensus on deleting the last sentence of the definition. Passed unanimously as amended.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-02**: Adding Subfield $0 to Fields 310 and 321 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2020_age.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format that currently do not have subfield $0 defined: Field 310 (Current Publication Frequency) and Field 321 (Former Publication Frequency).

  - **Outcome:** Making field 310 repeatable does not make sense because there can be only a single *Current* Frequency. The nonrepeatability of subfield $0 is contrary to most other subfields $0, which are repeatable. There is a question of whether subfield $0 can be tied to a particular subfield rather than to the whole field. More work is needed on this proposal to work out the field 310 definition issue. By the time of the January 26 meeting, the whole issue was reconsidered. The Library of Congress will not use field 310 in an incorrect manner, so the current definitions will stand. The important point of the proposal was to add subfields for identifiers, making field 310 repeatable to accommodate identifiers from multiple sources. Adding subfields for identifiers paragraph in Section 2 was the important thing. Conversion of records from BIBFRAME to MARC will not result in contradictory fields 310; current and former frequencies will continue to be properly distinguished. Ms. Sally McCallum (LC) repeats the observation of Mr. Beacher Wiggins (LC) that, although some data may be appear to get lost in the round trip between BIBFRAME and MARC, MARC has so much built-in redundancy that less data may be lost than expected. Proposal passed.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP01**: Modernization or Replacement of Field 856 in the MARC 21 Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp01.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper considers options for the modernization of the existing field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) and/or the definition of a new field 857; a new subfield $e to account for access, use, and reproduction information; and the possibility of reassigning the existing subfield $7 for access status.

- **Outcome:** The duplication of subfields in separate fields 856 and 857 would require a good deal of migration of data. The fallout in local systems was also emphasized. Subfields $c (Compression Information), $p (Port), and $s (File Size) were singled out for retention. The repurposing of existing subfields was frowned upon, which would mean that Section 3.2 Option 2 precludes Section 4.2 Option 1. The ISSN Center relies greatly on field 856 and disruptive changes would necessitate a revamping of how they work. It was noted that, although CONSER began with single record approach, it has moved over time to favor separate records for print and electronic, the distinction also favored by the IFLA LRM. Limiting a new field 857 to only open access resources would not be enforceable or practical. Analogies between the debate over fields 260/264 and over fields 856/857 were pointed out and might inform this discussion. That could mean allowing field 856 to remain as is and defining field 857 as a modernized version, specific to URIs with accommodation for access restrictions. Possibly following Section 4.2 Option 2, which allows both fields, without field 857 being limited to open access URIs, but possibly being limited to URIs for the resource itself (current 856 Second Indicator value 0). Use of field 856 Second Indicators, especially value 2 for Related Resource, has always caused confusion. If field 856 is retained, Section 3.2 Option 1 definition of subfield $e is mandated. Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek), the DNB's Committee on Data Formats, and Mr. Jay Weitz (OCLC) will cooperate on next steps in the process, which may be a refined follow-up discussion paper or multiple proposals. If field 856 is retained, it is possible that no subfields need to be deprecated. There could also be clarification of a field for the resource itself.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP02:** Adding Subfield $0 to Fields 504 and 525 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp02.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format that currently do not have subfield $0 defined: Field 504 (Bibliography, etc. Note) and Field 525 (Supplement Note). Revised definitions for each field are also suggested.

  - **Outcome:** There is an additional need for a subfield to accommodate such converted coded data as from MARC 008. NDMSO will look into the possibility of using codes in addition to controlled vocabularies, as is the practice in field 33X. Paper will return revised as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP03:** Defining New Subfields in Field 340 to Record Illustrative Content and Sound Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp03.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding new repeatable subfields to Field 340 (Physical Medium) in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format to record the illustrative content and sound content of resources.

- **Outcome:** Some adjustment of field 344 may be called for to accommodate silent films. The definition of field 340 subfield $p (Illustrative Content) was clarified to read "The type or types of illustrative content present in a resource." Paper will return revised as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP04:** Renaming Field 345 and Defining New Subfields for Aspect Ratio and Motion Technique in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp04.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper proposes renaming field 345 from "Projection Characteristics of Moving Image" to "Moving Image Characteristics" and adding new repeatable subfields to record the aspect ratio and motion technique of resources.

  - **Outcome:** OLAC will be brought into this discussion to help address the many things that are not addressed by the paper. Depending upon the extent of the changes, the paper will return either as a revised discussion paper or a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP05:** Reinstatement of Field 241 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp05.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper proposes the reinstatement of Field 241 (Transliterated Title) with updated indicators, subfields, and a revised field definition and scope.

  - **Outcome:** Because transliteration work tends to be costly and inconsistent, LC wants to limit its use to just title data rather than other parts of a bibliographic record. LC is experimenting with this and they don't know where they will end up, possibly imposing the limitations on some character sets and not on others. At this point, LC is not intending to distribute any of these experimental records. It was suggested that LC use a locally-defined MARC field rather than reinstating field 241. Many concerns were expressed about legacy data and the mixture of different practices within the same record. This paper will return as a revised proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP06:** Defining a New Field for Manifestation Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp06.html).

  - **Summary:** This paper describes defining a new field to accommodate Resource Description and Access "Manifestation Statements" in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.

  - **Outcome:** Although it was pointed out that what might be more useful is a link out to an image of the pages from the manifestation, that is already accommodated by the standard field 856 subfield $u. The use or nonuse of subfielding in the proposed field could be an institutional choice similar to the optional subfielding of fields 505 or 518. The subfields were included in the discussion paper because they are all individually

identified manifestation elements in RDA. There may be a need for an additional subfield to identify the transcription guidelines that were followed, as with rare materials. Subfield $a could be reserved exclusively for the nondifferentiated Manifestation Statement. The preferred order of subfields follows the order of data on the source and assignment of subfields in Option 2. Both subfields $i (Source of Information) and $z (Other Manifestation Statement) were favored. The paper will return as a revised proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP07:** Recording the Extension Plan for Bibliographic Works in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp07.html).
    - **Summary:** This paper discusses the potential for encoding the new RDA element "extension plan" in the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats.
    - **Outcome:** The discussion paper is based on the stable RDA ONIX Framework. The RSC anticipates no additional elements that would need to be defined in this respect. It may be advisable to include an indication of either currently published or ceased publication, as with Continuing Resources. The paper will return as a revised proposal.

A fast-track implementation of Bibliographic field 751 (Added Entry-Geographic Name) subfield $g (Miscellaneous information) was announced. It was included in MARC Bibliographic Update No. 29 in November 2019 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bdapndxg.html).

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

2020 March 20