



## **Report on the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Midwinter Conference, Seattle, Washington, USA, 2013 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 Conference in Seattle, Washington, USA, on Saturday 2013 January 26, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2013 January 28, 8:30-11:30 A.M.

New CC:DA Chair Mr. Peter Rolla (Harvard University) reported on motions and other actions taken by CC:DA between July and October 2012 (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/chair201301.pdf>).

New Library of Congress (LC) Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/lc201301.pdf>). Some of the highlights of his report:

- With the retirement of Ms. Barbara Tillett as Chief of the Policy and Standards Division in November 2012, Mr. Tom Yee became acting chief. Mr. Reser became LC Representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) in December 2012, with Ms. Kate James as his backup. Ms. Tillett will continue to serve as JSC Chair through December 2013.
- LC published “Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/news/bibframe-112312.html>) in November 2012. This high-level model was developed by Mr. Eric Miller of Zepheira.
- In the October 2012 release of the Resource Description and Access (RDA) Toolkit, Library of Congress Policy Statements became Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging

Policy Statements (LC-PCC PS, or PS for short). This reflects the fact that the PSs represent a collaborative set of statements for both the Library of Congress and the PCC.

- The U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee issued its final quarterly update on January 4, 2013 ([http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/RDA\\_updates\\_04jan13.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/RDA_updates_04jan13.pdf)), finding that activities related to RDA preparation and implementation had progressed sufficiently for a joint implementation of RDA in 2013.
- RDA training of LC staff should be completed by March 31, 2013. All LC training materials have been made freely available on the Catalogers Learning Workshop Website at <http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/RDA%20training%20materials/index.html>.
- Revisions of the “Subject Headings Manual” and the “Classification and Shelving Manual” in light of RDA are underway.
- During 2012, seven new and ten updated ALA-LC Romanization tables were approved. All current tables are available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsr/roman.html>.

The ALA Representative to the JSC, Mr. John Attig (Pennsylvania State University), submitted his report (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/jsc1301.pdf>) on the JSC meeting in Chicago, November 5-9, 2012. He also reported that the December 2012 release of the RDA Toolkit included Chapters 6, 9, 10, and 11 reworded by Ms. Chris Oliver (McGill University). Next will be Chapters 2 and 3, with all of the remaining chapters in progress. As changes are made to RDA, the RDA vocabulary and element sets registry is being kept up-to-date. After six years in the position, Mr. Attig will end his term as ALA Representative to the JSC at the end of the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago, June 2013. The process to replace him is underway. The JSC itself is also revising its structure so that the Chair will no longer also be the representative of a constituency. The new Chair will be one of the current JSC members, but a new person will be chosen to represent that person’s constituency. A full account of the proposed JSC changes can be found at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/jsc1301a.pdf>.

The Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K reported on its work to date (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TFappendixK201301.pdf>) and aims to have completed its work by ALA Annual 2013. In discussions, it was decided to restore to the list the gender-neutral terms (such as child and parent) that had previously been removed. Mr. Dunsire is studying the desirability of making each of the designators into verbal phrases (for instance, “is [blank] of”) in order to clarify the direction of the relationship.

The Task Force on Instructions on Recording Relationships submitted its paper (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TFrelationships201301.pdf>) attempting to clarify the distinctions between structured and unstructured descriptions and to come up with a principle-based explanation of the proper relationships of contents notes to Works and to Manifestations.

The report (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/tfchicago4.pdf>) of the Task Force to Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the *Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition*, was discussed in the absence of its chair (who encountered travel problems). Discussion concentrated on those issues with a high impact, generally affecting Authority records. Mr. Gary Strawn (Northwestern University) ran some preliminary tests to measure the impact of various hyphenation issues, finding that there might be problems with some programmatic conversions because of capitalization differences among languages.

Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on the activities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/pcc201301.pdf>). Among her points:

- Approval of the “PCC RDA BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application Profile” (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf>), which has been expanded to include all bibliographic formats.
- Approval of the “Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA Version,” now including serials and integrating resources (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PN-RDA-Combined.docx>).
- Recommendations from the “Report of the PCC Access Points for Expressions Task Group” (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20groups%20and%20charges/PCCExpressionTGFinalReport.docx>) are being incorporated into the LC-PCC PSs by the PCC Standing Committee on Standards.
- The “Report of the PCC Post-Implementation Hybrid Bibliographic Records Guidelines Task Group” (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20groups%20and%20charges/PCC-Hybrid-Bib-Rec-Guidelines-TG-Report.docx>) advocated the continued co-existence of hybrid records, the use of machine conversions where feasible, and local decisions about manual recataloging where necessary.
- The PCC Policy Committee followed up on the “PCC Relationship Designator Guidelines Task Group Report” (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20groups%20and%20charges/PCC-Relat-Desig-TG-report.rtf>) with the decision to add designators to both AACR2 and RDA records programmatically where needed.

Ms. Tracey Snyder (Cornell University) reported on the evolution of the Music Library Association (MLA) Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) RDA Music Revisions Facilitation Task Force into the JSC’s RDA Music Joint Working Group. By bringing together music specialists from LC, MLA, the Canadian Association of Music Libraries (CAML), and eventually, the European RDA Interest Group (EURIG), the JSC hopes to assure that music-related RDA proposals are coordinated and developed with the proper expertise. Although proposals will be submitted directly to the JSC, CC:DA will continue to have the

opportunity to comment on them, as they do with proposals from other non-ALA constituencies. There was some concern that this JSC move could inspire other special constituencies to start to bypass the CC:DA process.

CC:DA Webmaster Ms. Melanie Polutta (LC) introduced the new official CC:DA Web site, which is the CC:DA Blog page at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/>. The former ALA site (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/index.html>), covering 1995-2012, is now frozen.

RDA Conference Forums and Task Force head Ms. June Abbas (University of Oklahoma) reported on the various RDA programs held at ALA Annual 2012 in Anaheim, California. A preconference on “RDA: Back to the Basics” is planned for ALA Annual 2013 in Chicago, as well as a standard “RDA Update Forum” and a session on strategies for implementation.

ALA Publishing Services’ Mr. Troy Linker noted several changes to the RDA Toolkit, including: the renaming of the LC-PCC PSs, the new ability to toggle links to the PSs on and off; the open availability of the authoritative mappings, so that access no longer requires a Toolkit subscription; the new ability to share workflows either locally or globally. The update schedule for the Toolkit has been the second Tuesday of each even-numbered month, but the scheduled update for February 2013 has been postponed, tentatively until April 2013. This postponement includes: RDA Toolkit Multilingual interface, French and German RDA translations, RDA Fast-track changes, RDA Reworded chapters, and LC-PCC PS changes. As soon as the rewording of all of the remaining RDA chapters is completed and reviewed by the JSC, a new print compilation of RDA will be released, tentatively in mid-2013, and annually thereafter. A concise version with the working title of “Essential RDA,” including base and Core instructions, will later be made available in print, as an e-book, and in the Toolkit. An update to the MARC mapping is complete and approved, but can’t be incorporated into the Toolkit because of the updating delays. ALA Publishing is looking for a means by which to make this available in the meantime.

MARBI Liaison Mr. John Myers (Union College) reported on MARBI actions. Because I was able to attend one of the two MARBI meetings, I have included additional details on the discussions for which I was present.

- MARC Proposal No. 2013-01 “Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-01.html>): Presented by Mr. Strawn, this proposal puts forth two new Authority fields, 672 (Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record) and 673 (Titles Not Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record), to make titles related to the authorized entity machine-actionable. The proposal was simplified from earlier iterations in proposing the fewest subfields to serve the stated purpose. The proposal passed with the following alterations:
  - In the case of both proposed fields, the “Field Definition and Scope” was edited to add field 111 in the first sentence.

- In the case of both proposed fields, the subfield \$a was renamed to “Title proper,” meant to include title subfields \$a, \$n, and \$p.
  - Subfield \$f (NR) for “Date” was added to field 673, with the clarification in both fields that the “Date” was whatever was found in the source.
- MARC Proposal No. 2013-02 “New Fields to Accommodate Authority Records for Medium of Performance Vocabulary for Music in the MARC 21 Authority Format” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-02.html>): Proposes a set of Authority X62 fields for the controlled vocabulary currently under development as the “Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus for Music “ (LCMPT). Approved.
  - MARC Proposal No. 2013-03 “Making Field 250 Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-03.html>): Proposed making field 250 repeatable for multiple edition statements, in particular to accommodate “Musical Presentation Statements” heretofore coded as MARC 254. Approved.
  - MARC Proposal No. 2013-04 “Defining New Code for Score in Field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-04.html>): Because of the broader definition of “score” in RDA, MLA requested that several of the existing MARC codes for “Format of Music” be redefined and that a new code “l” for “score” be added. Approved, pending further work on the code definitions.
  - MARC Proposal No. 2013-05 “Defining New Field 385 for Audience Characteristics in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-05.html>): So as to accommodate audience characteristics terms from the “Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials” (LCGFT), new field 385 is proposed. Approved, with changes including the elimination of subfield \$u (Uniform Resource Identifier) and the addition of subfield \$n for codes to correspond to subfield \$m for the “Demographic Group Designator.”
  - MARC Proposal No. 2013-06 “Defining New Field 386 for Creator/Contributor Group Categorizations of Works, Expressions, and Persons in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-06.html>): So as to accommodate group category terms for creators and contributors from LCGFT, new field 386 is proposed. Approved, with changes similar to those made for Proposal No. 2013-05, the elimination of the field’s use for name entities, and some other minor work.
  - MARC Proposal No. 2013-07 “Defining Encoding Elements to Record Chronological Categories and Dates of Works and Expressions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-07.html>): So as to accommodate chronological aspects of entities described, new subfields for Bibliographic and Authority fields 046 and new

First Indicator values for the Bibliographic 648 are proposed. Approved, pending further development of an analogous Authority 648 field and some additional work.

- MARC Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP01 “Identifying Records from National Bibliographies in MARC 21 Bibliographic Format” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-dp01.html>): Presented by Mr. Ted Fons (OCLC), this paper presented options for identifying Bibliographic records from national bibliographies. MARBI preferred the use of field 042 (Authentication Code). No further MARBI action is needed. OCLC will apply for any necessary new codes.
- MARC Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP02 “Defining Subfields for Qualifiers to Standard Identifiers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-dp02.html>): This paper was thought to be analogous to the recent addition of subfield \$q for “Qualifying Information” to field 028, but generated considerably more controversy, especially in the continuing resources community. Ms. Regina Reynolds (LC) noted that neither CONSER nor the ISSN International Center allows repeatable 022 fields (in spite of MARC 21), instead putting ISSNs for other versions in field 776. The use of 022 subfield \$y has become messy as the repository of much more than just incorrect ISSNs. This paper will likely come back as a proposal, but limited to fields 020, 024, and 027, with 015 being added. The paper is trying to solve an existing problem of qualifying data being forced into a subfield in which it doesn’t belong. It does not intend to exacerbate any problems with the 022 field.
- MARC Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP03 “Defining a Control Subfield \$7 in the Series Added Entry Fields, for the Type and the Bibliographic Level of the Related Bibliographic Record” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-dp03.html>): Presenter Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) clarified that the Germans use MARC 21 only as an exchange format, not as a cataloging format. The data proposed for this application of subfield \$7 was admitted to be redundant of data in the linked record, but in German systems, the linked record may not yet be present. It was determined that only positions /2 (Type of Record) and /3 (Bibliographic Level from Leader/07 of Related Record) would be needed. Because the subfield \$7 defined in field 533 already deviates from the standard subfield \$7, there were no objections to another application of subfield \$7 deviating from the standard. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.
- MARC Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP04 “Separating the Type of Related Entity from the RDA Relationship Designator in MARC 21 Bibliographic Format Linking Entry Fields” (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-dp04.html>): Mr. Bill Leonard (Library and Archives Canada) presented this paper intended to devise a manner of “hiding” the parenthetical qualifiers for relationship designators; this has been a common objection to RDA among its detractors. Mr. Attig pointed out that the JSC is trying to come up with a general solution to relationships, including looking at display issues, making sure that the designators are unambiguous, and investigating the possibility of a machine-actionable relationship between

subfields \$4 and \$i. He also reported that Mr. Gordon Dunsire (CILIP) agrees with the direction of this paper, that it is necessary to have an explicit manner to record display text. This will return as a proposal.

In addition, Mr. Myers talked a bit about the demise of MARBI following the meetings at ALA Annual in Chicago, June 2013. LC's Ms. Sally McCallum noted that the work of the MARC Advisory Committee, which has long met conjointly with MARBI, would continue, and that it would welcome continued assistance in the future development of MARC and its successor. CC:DA will name a liaison to the new Metadata Standards Committee. Exactly how everything will eventually be formulated and interrelated remains in flux.

Ms. Deborah Fritz of The MARC of Quality (TMQ) presented a demonstration of "RDA in Many Metadata Formats" (RIMMF) (<http://www.marcofquality.com/rimmf>), which was developed starting in 2010 as a teaching and visualization tool outside of the context of MARC and other familiar metadata structures. According to LC, RIMMF also meets the requirements for a prototype RDA input form. It is not intended to be a cataloging tool, per se, but instead helps catalogers understand and apply the new decision-making processes that RDA demands. RDA has the potential to lead to the development of better cataloging software and the creation of better discovery tools. RIMMF reveals the relationships built into RDA, showing clearly how RDA differs from AACR and how RDA may be much more simple and intuitive once divorced from MARC. RIMMF also makes clear the new mindset of data elements instead of bibliographic records, "forcing" the distinctions among Work, Expression, and Manifestation that MARC cannot manage. It will also help expose problems within RDA and its structure. To that end, Ms. Fritz submitted to Mr. Attig a set of issues and questions about RDA that have arisen in the process of developing RIMMF (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/fritz201301.pdf>). It was Mr Attig's feeling that none of the issues raised would require large efforts to deal with, but that he and Ms. Fritz would work together on some proposals. He also suggested that some of the issues could be resolved via application profiles and that not everything would require changes to RDA itself.

Mr. Attig also reviewed the set of "Follow-Up Actions for ALA" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/actions201301.pdf>) he had compiled for CC:DA's consideration. Among his recommendations and related issues:

- The Rare Books and Manuscript Section (RBMS) Bibliographic Standards Committee will provide instructions for dealing with unnumbered sequences and other oddities of printing and numbering.
- Ms. Glennan and Mr. Attig will work together on some issues regarding dates associated with persons
- Mr. John Hostage (Harvard University) and Mr. Attig will confer on authorized access points for hearings in RDA Chapters 6 and 11.

- Mr. Attig will work with a small group on a proposal to delete abbreviations for place names from Appendix B.
- Mr. Rolla created a task force, and will compose its charge, to deal with the treatment of larger/smaller places. This will be informed by the work of the Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K and a larger effort in progress in the Subject Access Committee regarding places as Type 3 entities.
- The work of the Task Force on Sources of Information has been declared complete and the group was dismissed.
- Work will continue on machine-actionable data elements in Chapter 3, with additional input needed from the map, music, art, and rare materials communities.
- MLA and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) asked to take the lead regarding inconsistencies between the Statement of Responsibility element in Chapter 2 and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter, and Artistic and/or Technical Credit elements in Chapter 7. The consensus seemed to lean toward consolidating the elements rather than carrying on past practices. there could also be some impact on the Core status of the Statement of Responsibility.
- An informal group working under the auspices of the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) on preferred titles for parts of sacred scriptures has been inactive, but its work had raised many related questions. Mr. Attig and Mr. Myers will confer on this and report back to CC:DA on what needs to be done.

Mr. Dan Lipcan (Metropolitan Museum of Art) reported that the art library community has begun looking at RDA and its use for art catalogs and related literature. Although they are just beginning to discuss the issues, it is already clear that RDA continues the cataloging tradition of being text-biased. The community is looking into such notions as embedding the type of medium (prints, watercolors, etc.) into conventional titles and the relationship of the artist to the exhibition catalog (not as author, but as what?), with the intention of bringing issues to CC:DA sometime in the near future.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist, WorldCat Quality Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2013 February 14