



## **Report on the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, 2018 June 23 and 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 Annual Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, on Saturday, 2018 June 23, 1:00-5:30 p.m. The Monday, 2018 June 25, 8:30-11:30 a.m. session was given over to a special discussion on “RDA in MARC 21.” The full CC:DA agenda is at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3329>.

**Report from the Chair.** CC:DA Chair Ms. Tina Shrader (National Library of Medicine) reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between January and June 2018 ([https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Chair\\_17-18-2.pdf](https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Chair_17-18-2.pdf)).

**Report from the Library of Congress Representative.** Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser submitted his report on activities and news from LC (<https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/LC-2018-06.pdf>). His report included these highlights:

- LC is doing market research for “a next generation library service platform” with the expectation of issuing a Request for Information later in 2018.
- Work on the merger of the Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division continues.
- A new business-focused Library Enterprises Directorate began within the Office of the Chief Operating Officer on 2018 May 1. A new Library Collections and Services Group (LCSG) will bring together the Law Library of Congress, Library Services, and the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. A Digital Innovations Lab will be a new part of the Office of the Chief Information Officer. All of these changes are part of an LC-wide realignment to “support the Library’s user-centered future direction.”
- The use of Relationship Designators will be expanded for all Agents in new full-level original RDA bibliographic records, going beyond the current policy for Creators alone. RDs will continue to

be optional for copy cataloging, minimal-level cataloging, and the maintenance of existing records.

- As part of the LC BIBFRAME Pilot, the entire LC bibliographic file was converted to BF. In June 2018, a bulk download of the BF Work and linked Instance descriptions was made available for export and experimentation.

**Report of the ALA Representative to the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC).** ALA Representative to NARDAC, Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on NARDAC and RSC activities between January and June 2018. Her full report is at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/NARDAC-2018-1.pdf>. Among the highlights:

- The RDA preconference at ALA Annual was fully booked with one hundred attendees.
- The RDA Toolkit Beta will be in constant flux, with more complete instructions on aggregates and serials and a better-defined scope for collective agents among the elements to look forward to.
- The review of ISBD and its relationship to RDA is beginning.
- Linking in the Toolkit will be expanded to include such vocabularies as UNIMARC alongside of MARC 21.
- The RSC will be more of an executive decision-making body than has been the case until now.
- A major Toolkit release is expected in September 2018. Completion of content, addition of LC-PCC Policy Statements, and inclusion of translations are expected in early 2019.
- The RSC strives for a balance between RDA as a global standard and RDA as a basis for local practice.
- ALA Publishing claims to be extremely flexible about Toolkit pricing issues for individual cases.

**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/2018/06/PCC-2018-06.pdf>) in absentia. Among the highlights:

- LC's Mr. Reser has distributed a spreadsheet of pending changes to the MARC Authorities format that have been postponed in recent years. The NACO nodes are currently reviewing and commenting on the list in advance of coordinating implementation.
- Testing of bibliographic records with limited ISBD punctuation was slated to continue through 2018 July 1.
- The Standing Committee on Automation has changed its name to the Standing Committee on Applications.

**Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit Changes.** Mr. Jamie Hennelly of ALA Publishing reported that library school subscriptions moved to a flat rate. Because of the 3R Project, new subscriptions were down this year, roughly 8500 to 8700 subscriptions, including many more consortial subscriptions. Document views and searches were up significantly. Revenue from outside the United States is about 40%, U.S. versus non-U.S. users are split 50/50. A print equivalent of

the Beta Toolkit would be an unmanageable 3000 pages, but some sort of print product will still be made available. Free Toolkit webinars will begin in August 2018, led by Mr. Hennelly. Some points of interest from the demonstration of the Toolkit Beta:

- All profile names now need to be unique.
- The four tabs are: Entities; Guidance; Policies, which will include policy statements; and Resources, which will include many current RDA Appendices. There will be a mapping tool that will allow maps to more than just MARC 21.
- One will be able to subscribe to documents by title or by institution, such as LC.
- Views can set the policy statements to display, but one can select other PSs from each element.
- “RDA Template” will enable bibliographic format views of the instructions.

**Virtual Participation Task Force.** The goal is to increase the flexibility and efficiency of CC:DA, with an emphasis on individual virtual attendance rather than on fully virtual meetings. Another option would be asynchronous meetings over the space of a day or two.

#### **Follow-up Discussion on Possible Task Forces.**

- Vocabulary management, in conjunction with the ALA Cataloging and Metadata Management Section Subject Analysis Committee.
- Training within ALA for administrators on Linked Data. CC:DA would want to partner with other training-related groups within ALA, so as not to impinge on their territory.
- Creation of application profiles and community standards for RDA.
- Possible renewal and refreshing of the 3R Task Group, which could help the RSC with work on the Beta Toolkit with direct and specific feedback on assigned areas, for instance.

#### **RDA in MARC 21.**

- **RDA and Data Encoding: The Impact of the 3R Project (Mr. Gordon Dunsire):** The Toolkit Beta was released on 2018 June 13, 2018. A complete English version is expected to be available by the end of 2018. Many attributes have now become relationships and more inverse relationships have been established, resulting in more elements all together. The “Nomen” allows us to talk about labels as though they were things. There are currently 13 entities and over 1700 elements; Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Place have not changed. Item always exemplifies a Manifestation. Person is restricted to human beings and does not cover “non-human personages.” The four data-recording methods are now explicit. RDA now better accommodates data outside the wider world of professionally cataloged metadata. Unstructured Description (including transcription, free-form notes, and uncontrolled human-

readable appellation) can be reliably processed only to extract keywords. Structured Description (including access points, structured notes, names and titles from authority control systems, and terms from controlled vocabularies) “may be processed to extract the component values of a combination using a string encoding scheme or syntax encoding scheme.” Identifiers (from external or local agents or a controlled vocabulary) is a local machine-readable appellation that is not universally unique. A Linked Data IRI (Internationalized Resource Identifier) is a universal machine-readable appellation that is guaranteed to be universally unique based on Semantic Web technology. ); Data Provenance (what might be called “meta-metadata”) records a content standard used for metadata, a syntax encoding scheme, and a vocabulary encoding scheme.

- **MARC 21 in RDA Toolkit (Mr. Jamie Hennelly):** Currently under development is a mapping tool from RDA to MARC 21 using RDF. This will allow different display options. MARC is searchable in the Toolkit now.
- **RDA in MARC 21: Accommodating 3R (Mr. Thurston Young, British Library):** New RDA entities include:
  - RDA Entity (an abstract class, no content designation needed in MARC 21).
  - Nomen.
  - Place (a given extent of space, already has content designation in MARC).
  - Timespan (temporal extent, already covered in MARC).

RDA Guidance chapters include:

- Recording methods.
- Manifestation Statements: Unstructured description. There is currently no content designation for this in MARC 21, as MARC is “too granular” in forcing us to subfield. We could define new indicators or subfields or fields to accommodate Manifestation Statements. This would allow encoding of title page content using scanned data.
- Representative Expression: Identifies and distinguishes expressions. There is currently no content designation in MARC 21.
- Data Provenance: Inferences about the context and quality of the metadata. There is partial content designation in MARC 21, mainly at the description level, but absent at the subfield level.
- Diachronic Works: A work intended to be embodied over time rather than as a single act of publication, as a successive determinate plan, a successive indeterminate plan, an integrating determinate plan, an integrating indeterminate plan, or a static plan (not embodied over time). The extension plan is not accommodated in MARC but could be recorded.

The MARC standard is 50 years old with limited scope for additional content designation. BIBFRAME could make such accommodations. MARC could be amended over the next one or two MAC cycles through 2019.

- **General Discussion of Implementation of Changes:**
  - Ms. Diane Hillman (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative) had concerns about squeezing RDA into MARC, especially as we are in the process of moving beyond MARC, and about the impact on current and future distribution systems. RDF is based on triples rather than quadruples, so data provenance is already a large complication especially in the context

of how much or little value that data provenance adds. Provenance is mostly at the record level currently, rather than at field or even subfield level.

- There is a need for a new MARC 1XX for Timespan. We need to talk less MARC so that vendors have an incentive to look more seriously at post-MARC structures.
- Mr. John Meyers (Union College) pointed out that the dichotomy between bibliographic data and authority data may no longer serve us well.
- Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) noted that MARC retains its value as a communication format. Field 883 (Machine-Generated Metadata Provenance) already exists and could easily be expanded to accommodate intellectually created metadata in addition to machine-generated.
- We must make clear to vendors how serious it is to move beyond MARC. In MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP08 (Use of Field 024 to Capture URIs) we are in the process of defining script support at the field level.
- Does CC:DA need to reconstitute the RDA MARC Working Group? Both RDA and MARC expertise is imperative. There are already some PCC groups working on this.
- We need not be dependent upon the MARC Advisory Committee cycle for things that are important enough. There is also the issue of coordinating implementations among all of the NACO nodes.

**Report on the MARC Advisory Committee.** The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met at ALA Annual in New Orleans on Saturday, 2018 June 23, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2018 June 24, 2:30-5:00 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2018\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2018_age.html). The report compiled by CC:DA Liaison to MAC Mr. John Myers (Union College) is not yet available online. Following are my summaries of the four proposals and five discussion papers and their respective outcomes.

- **MARC Proposal No. 2018-02:** Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Accessibility in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-02.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding new subfields in field 041 (Language Code) for accessibility modes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to enhance machine actionability.
  - **Outcome:** All respondents supported the proposal with various suggestions for clarification. OLAC suggested that intertitles be separated from subtitles and that transcripts be assigned to their own subfield. The proposal passed unanimously with amendments.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2018-03:** Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-03.html>).
  - **Summary:** This proposal presents options for recording the RDA data element Accessibility Content (7.14) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.
  - **Outcome:** All respondents supported the proposal. Subfields \$0 and \$1 were dropped until vocabularies are developed and the subfields are needed. Subfield \$8 was added to both fields 341 and 532, with field 532 Indicator 1 value "2" changing to "Accessibility deficiencies." The proposal passed unanimously with amendments.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2018-04:** Versions of Resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-04.html>).

- **Summary:** This paper proposes two ways to designate in a MARC record that a resource is available in a specific version, e.g. as preprint, postprint, publisher's version, etc., including, but not limited to values from NISO-RP-8-2008 "Journal Article Versions (JAV): Recommendations of the NISO/ALPSP JAV Technical Working Group."
  - **Outcome:** Most respondents preferred Option 2, which defines a new field 251 "Version Information." It needs to be clarified that the field is intended for both online and printed resources. Field 251 should be limited to controlled vocabularies, with the function of field 250 remaining as it currently is. Subfields \$3, \$6, and \$8 are added to field 251. Option 2 passed unanimously with amendments.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2018-05:** Multiscript Records Using Codes from ISO 15924 in the Five MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-05.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper proposes ways on how to designate that the content of a MARC 21 field is written in a specified script by using codes from ISO 15924. The options are: "script identification code" portion of subfield \$6 (Linkage), designation in field 066 (Character Sets present), and designation in field 546 (Language Note).
  - **Outcome:** Most respondents preferred the subfield \$6 solution with the use of four-character codes. The subfield \$6 option was accepted with one abstention.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP07:** Designating Sources for Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp07.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper explores some reasons for extending the use of \$2 for source vocabulary to the 1XX and 7XX name entry fields in the Bibliographic format, and the implications of doing so.
  - **Outcome:** All respondents except OCLC wanted subfield \$2 to be optional. The British Library wanted to maintain a distinction parallel to that of subfield \$0, for authority files that establish a preferred form of name, and subfield \$1, for Real World Object sources that do not establish a preferred form of name (such as VIAF, ORCID, ISNI, and identity management systems). Best practices will need to be carefully documented. This paper will return as a proposal, possibly with an accompanying discussion paper covering name/title issues.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP08:** Use of Field 024 to Capture URIs in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp08.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper discusses the need to capture Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) in field 024 (Other Standard Identifier) of the MARC 21 Authority Format in a manner that clearly differentiates between:
    1. 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. URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual).

The paper further considers differentiating MARC subfields for URIs that are alphanumeric standard numbers or codes already accommodated in 024 \$a and

dereferenceable HTTP URIs promoting the conversion of MARC data to linked data format.

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 PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC preferred Option 2. The British Library suggested there be no requirement to convert existing data. The paper will return as a more detailed proposal.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP09:** Improving Subfield Structure of Field 245 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp09.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper describes two options for a more granular subfield structure of Bibliographic field 245 (Title Statement) to improve data exchange with other more granular formats, matching (and merging), displays, and indexes.
  - **Outcome:** Considerable doubts were raised over such a major overhaul to the most important MARC bibliographic field, particularly in light of the voluminous legacy data in every existing record. Some believed that the paper did not go far enough, suggesting that additional research was needed into identifying and parsing out as much field 245 data as possible. Others believed that in the era of the RDA/LRM Manifestation Statement, the undifferentiated string of free text offers all that is necessary. It was suggested that the paper merely offers more of the same rather than any greater detail, especially in not clarifying the increasingly important relationships among the various pieces of data. The goal of any such proposal should be to make 245 subfielding a genuine and usable replacement for ISBD punctuation. Any examples would need to be more complex than those provided, reflecting more of the complexity of existing 245 fields. Because there was clearly no consensus, a straw poll was taken. Eight voted for more detailed and careful research into the characteristics of existing 245 fields, with the result being a revised discussion paper, with more careful consideration of the findings and recommendations of the PCC ISBD and MARC Task Force "Revised Final Report" (<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/isbdmarc2016.pdf>). Twelve thought that, given the complexity of existing data, the advent of the Manifestation Statement, where we are in the history and development of MARC, the ideas in this discussion paper might not be a fruitful line of inquiry.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP10:** Designating Access to Online Resources in Field 856 in the MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp10.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding a new subfield to field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) containing a numeric designator indicating accessibility (restricted, open, or partly restricted) to the online resource linked in the URI in

subfield \$u. For the purposes of this paper, an “open access” document can be reached without requiring payment or a login.

- **Outcome:** This paper originated with Danielle Bromelia in OCLC Discovery, with significant input from Cynthia Whitacre, Roy Tennant, and Jay Weitz. The British Library was insistent that only the options of “open access” and “restricted access” had meaning, rejecting a third “hybrid” option. Taking a cue from the final paragraph of Section 4 of the paper, LC’s Sally McCallum made a case for a full revamping of field 856, which would need to be a separate future paper. It was suggested that this paper and the 2018-DP11 section on field 856 be combined into a proposal. The OCLC group is already working on the follow-up.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2018-DP11:** Open Access and License Information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp11.html>).
  - **Summary:** This paper explores ways on how to reflect open access and license information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings formats. It analyzes the existing fields 506 (Restrictions on Access Note), 007 (Electronic Resource), 008 (Fixed-Length Data Elements), 540 (Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note), and 856 (Electronic Location and Access) and makes suggestions for extensions to cover needs identified by the German speaking part of the MARC community, in cooperation with OCLC.
  - **Outcome:** The German National Library and OCLC will collaborate on a revision to this paper, minus the section on field 856.

Following up on the issue I raised in the ALA Midwinter 2018 meeting, LC announced that discussion papers converted to proposals and subsequently passed, “MARC Fast-Track Proposals,” are now listed on the “MARC Proposal” page (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/list-p.html>), identified with the designation “FT.”

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

2018 July 18