



## **Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Orlando, Florida, USA, 2016 June 25 and 27**

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 in Orlando, Florida, USA, on Saturday, 2016 June 25, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2016 June 27, 8:30-11:30 A.M. The full agenda of the meeting is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?cat=33>.

CC:DA Chair Ms. Dominique Bourassa (Yale University) reported on motions and other actions taken by the committee between January and June 2016 (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/CCDA-Chair-2015-2016-4.pdf>). Ms. Tina Shrader (National Library of Medicine) becomes the next CC:DA Chair following ALA Annual.

Library of Congress Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/LC-2016-06.pdf>), including some of these highlights:

- Over thirty positions in Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) are currently open to internal LC and/or external applicants, the most promising situation in a decade.
- The project to update the name and subject authority records associated with place names in Malaysia (RDA 16.2.2.9), first announced at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference, has been completed.
- Currently underway is a project to update geographic name headings for places in Taiwan to reflect current Board of Geographic Names (BGN) policy, mostly corresponding to Pinyin Romanization, which the BGN adopted in 2010.
- The BIBFRAME Pilot 1.0 officially ended in March 2016, but has been extended for some formats to July 2016. The BF Vocabulary 2.0 was released in April 2016.

ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) reported on JSC/RSC activities between January and June 2016. Her full report is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/RSCrep-kpg-2016-2.pdf>. Among the highlights:

- The RSC has established a new protocol with LC's Network Development and MARC Standards Office.
- There has been no additional progress on the planning for a North American RDA Committee.
- Ms. Glennan has been reappointed to a second three-year term as the ALA RSC Representative.

Ms. Glennan's proposal for "Greater Flexibility in Creating Variant Access Points" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/RSCrep-kpg-2016-1-rev.pdf>) found RDA to be unnecessarily restrictive in the creation of variant access points. In the U.S. however, institutions have been ignoring many of the restrictions, for instance, creating multiple variants for musical works with more than one identifier (opus number versus thematic index number, as a common example). The proposal outlines essentially the same basic change spread out over RDA Chapters 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, broadening the instructions and relying upon individual application profiles to apply restrictions where different communities so choose. No every possible variant should be made, of course. CC:DA accepted the proposal unanimously. It will be tidied up, fixing a few errors and inconsistencies and the go on to the RSC as an ALA proposal.

The report of the Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/TF-Accomp-Mat-2.pdf>) was discussed. Feedback from the RSC suggests that greater distinction should be made between accompanying carrier and accompanying content. The group's charge was to investigate seven issues to result in the joint Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (CCC) and CC:DA discussion paper, which was the eighth charge:

1. RDA 1.5 and 2.2.2.1 define comprehensive and analytical descriptions and the respective treatment of accompanying material in each circumstance. The task force determined that, in spite of implications that a choice of predominance may be necessary in some cases, it is not generally required that a predominant component be chosen.
2. In evaluating the definitions of accompanying material in RDA 2.2.4 and Appendix J, the group recommended moving away from the term "accompanying material" toward a more consistent notion of predominance, revising such related terms as "unit" and "component part," greater use of accompanying material Relationship Designators, and more guidance such as flowcharts in best practices documents.
3. RDA is inconsistent in how it defines the phrase "the resource itself," with comprehensive description including accompanying material and analytical description excluding it. Accompanying material needs to be included as part of "the resource itself" in all cases.
4. Accompanying material needs to be reconsidered in the context of Mode of Issuance (RDA 2.13.1.2). Where accompanying material once implied physical separateness, that is no longer the case (for instance with remotely-accessed resources and with DVDs that include a predominant film as well as complementary materials). Further consideration of this aspect may more properly be in the realm of the Aggregates Working Group.

5. RDA 3.1.4 on “Resources Consisting of More Than One Carrier Type” needs to be generalized to allow catalogers to describe accompanying material even with the same carrier type as the predominant part.
6. There appears to be no meaningful distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material. The “accompanied by” concept in RDA Appendix J.4.5 Relationship Designators further confuses things by seeming to be different from other RDA meanings of the phrase.
7. Examples of the description of accompanying material should reflect carriers rather than content, even where the accompanying material and the predominant part have the same carrier type.

The Aggregates Working group hasn’t yet considered the issue of predominance regarding aggregated parts of a resource and it may turn out that the phrase “accompanying material” could no longer be needed, using aggregate or multipart instead. Work on the task force report will continue, in anticipation of forwarding it to the RSC during July.

RSC Chair Mr. Gordon Dunsire presented “RDA Internationalization and Application Profiles: Applying the Global to the Local” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/RDAInterAP.pdf>).

Among the highlights:

- The three European representatives of the former JSC (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals [CILIP], British Library [BL], Deutsche Nationalbibliothek [DNB]) have been collapsed into a single European representative (Ms. Renate Behrens, the DNB representative). Mr. Alan Danskin, who had been the BL representative, remains as the liaison to both the European RDA Interest Group (EURIG) and ONIX.
- The existing WEMI entities in RDA are entirely compatible with FRBR-LRM, which is intended as a model and not for practical or operational use. That is supposed to be the function of RDA.
- The LRM moves from the notion of “attributes” to that of “relationships.” The “nomen” is the bridge between things and strings.
- The “RDA Reference” consists of the RDA element sets and value vocabularies (Glossary, Relationship Designators, instructions). Work is underway to improve the consistency and completeness of the Glossary. Everything in the Glossary needs to be in Open Metadata Registry (OMR). A good deal of this cleanup work is driven by comments and suggestions of the Translations teams, which ask clarifying questions and point out inconsistencies. Many terms used in the RDA instructions are not defined in Glossary but need to be. A promising possibility would be linking the RDA Glossary to IFLA’s *Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing* (MulDiCat), which references terms in more than 25 languages.
- Application profiles (APs) are the policy statements and/or best practices documents created by specific communities. APs specify each element, how it is aggregated into logical units of information, and if it’s mandatory, optional, repeatable, associated with a Vocabulary Encoding Scheme (VES), and associated with a Syntax/String Encoding Scheme (SES). SESs are aggregated values that combine into a statement such as date, place, and name comprising a Publication statement. Core elements are not necessarily mandatory. Local Application Profiles apply local practices. There may be local vocabularies that can be used in place of the RDA global

vocabulary. There may also be local refinements to vocabulary terms. This can accommodate terms that may be gender-specific in certain languages – such as the male “acteur” and the female “actrice” in French – which can be broken into Person male/female.

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Liaison Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) reported on PCC activities (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/PCC-2016-06.pdf>). Spring 2017 is the projected goal for the white paper from the Work Entities Task Group. The PCC Standing Committee on Training has been keeping its September 2015 *Report on Available Linked Data Training Resources* (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sct/documents/PCCSCTFinalReportonAvailableLinkedDataTrainingResources.docx>) updated with new references. The Relationship Designators in Authority Records Working Group will likely be asking for more elements, valid in MARC but never implemented for NACO use, to be implemented.

ALA Publishing reported that through May 2016, there were 2851 active RDA Toolkit subscriptions, down about 5% from last fiscal year; 184 new subscribers; a 94% renewal rate, up 10% over recent years; 8969 users, up 5%. Revenues are slightly lagging. Sessions are over a million, up 20% over last year. There were 688 copies of *RDA Essentials* sold. Toolkit subscribers from the non-US market are currently 43% and 54% of users. In anticipation of changes to be needed because of the FRBR-LRM, there was no print RDA release this year. The next Toolkit release in August 2016 will include updates to all translations (or so ALA Publishing hopes). Catalan and Norwegian translations are slated for 2017. French and Italian translations of the German Policy Statements and translations of Registry elements are also forthcoming. The Glossary and Registry will be more fully integrated so as to allow links to be dispersed throughout the Toolkit as appropriate; that is, Glossary definitions will be available wherever the term appears in the instructions. An RDA User Group is being formed to assist with the Toolkit restructuring and redesign.

The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) “Revision Proposal for RDA Instructions for Laws Governing More Than One Jurisdiction (6.29.1.3)” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/AALL-2016-2.pdf>) was passed eight to zero. It is intended to apply only to single laws governing multiple jurisdictions, which is an existing but unusual situation.

Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) submitted its proposed “Addition of New Controlled Vocabulary for 3.19.6 Regional Encoding” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/OLAC-2016-01.pdf>), which passed eight to zero with some changes. Video game numbered regions were set aside because they are not standardized across the industry; only the alphabetic video game regions C, J, K, and U/C were considered to be standard. Except for the two “region C” designations, all other parenthetical qualifiers have been dropped. Region-free encoding will be standardized using the controlled designation “All regions.” RDA 3.21.1 will still allow region information to be transcribed as it appears without any loss of information. RDA 3.19.6 accounts for the controlled versions of the regional encoding data.

Ms. Dorothy McGarry, retired from the University of California, Los Angeles, was acclaimed for her service to CC:DA in various capacities as she steps down from the committee. Since 1982, she has

served as CC:DA Chair, two stints as a voting member, and three stints as the Special Libraries Association (SLA) liaison.

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met on Saturday, 2016 June 25, 8:30-10:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 2016 June 26, 3:00-5:30 p.m. The MAC agenda is available at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2016\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2016_age.html). Here are the summaries of each of the eleven proposals and fourteen discussion papers and their respective outcomes:

MARC Proposal No. 2016-03: Clarify the Definition of Subfield \$k and Expand the Scope of Field 046 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-03.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes clarifying the meaning of the sentence “Dates contained in subfield \$k may not be coded elsewhere in the formats” as currently defined in subfield \$k (Beginning or single date created) in field 046 (Special Coded Dates) of the Bibliographic format and making it clear that the dates that are recorded in 008/06-14 may additionally be recorded in 046.

Outcome: The need for a predictable place for the date of creation was widely recognized. The proposal was approved with suggestions to break up, revise, and clarify the first sentence of the field definition and scope and to make consistent all MARC references to “Before Common Era” and “B.C.E.”

MARC Proposal No. 2016-04: Broaden Usage of Field 257 to Include Autonomous Regions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-04.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) to include autonomous regions so that regions with strong film cultures can be used in this field. This will involve changing the name of the field and changing the field definition and scope.

Outcome: Problems with the meaning and the political implications of the term “autonomous” were discussed, along with those of such other possible terms as “political regions” or “cultural regions.” No firm conclusions were reached, but there was sentiment for a broadening of the field definition. OLAC will likely come back with a reworked proposal that opens up use of the field for any sub-national region, allowing OLAC to narrow it down to the areas it intends through its best practices document. It was also pointed out that the final sentence of the subfield \$a definition (“May contain the abbreviation [S.I.] when the country or autonomous region is unknown”) needed to be deleted.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-05: Defining New X47 Fields for Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-05.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes the establishment of a new X47 series of fields to accommodate coding of named events used as subject access points in the MARC Authority and Bibliographic formats.

Outcome: The necessity and efficacy of separately subfielding such numerical designations as “1st Battle of” and “2nd Battle of” was debated, but came down on the side of continuing not to do so. Other thesauri could have their own divergent practices. The proposal passed unanimously. OCLC should be able to generate a list of named event headings that would require changes.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-06: Defining Field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-06.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes defining field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) (R) for the MARC 21 Holdings Format to contain copy specific technical specification relating to the digital encoding of text, image, audio, video, and other types of data in the resource.

Outcome: The British Library suggested the creation of additional controlled vocabularies akin to “rdacontent” and “rdamedia,” where appropriate. The proposal passed unanimously.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-07: Defining Subfield \$3 in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-07.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes the need for subfield \$3 (Materials specified) in Field 382 (Medium of Performance) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: This proposal passed unanimously. The MARC Steering Committee is considering a process similar to the RSC’s “fast-track” proposals that would allow certain types of “noncontroversial” proposals such as this one to move quickly without the need for MAC action. Included could be the definition of such standardized control subfields \$3 and/or \$5 across multiple fields.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-08: Redefining Code Values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-08.html>).

Summary: This paper presents a proposal to redefine four code values and define one new code value in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, in order to bring the code values in line with RDA and clarify their use.

Outcome: This proposal passed unanimously.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-09: Recording Distributor Number for Music and Moving Image Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-09.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a way to unambiguously record distributor numbers separately from publisher numbers in Field 028 (Publisher Number). At the same time,

it proposes changes to language in Field 037 (Source of Acquisition) to clarify language that confused its function with that of Field 028.

Outcome: This proposal passed unanimously. It was further suggested that either adding a “blank” (“No Information Provided”) option to the Second Indicator or doing away with the indicator all together might be a good idea.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-10: Punctuation in the MARC 21 Authority format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-10.html>).

Summary: Libraries from German speaking countries do not provide punctuation when content designation identifies an element sufficiently. This paper proposes coding to indicate the absence of punctuation redundant to field and subfield coding via a Leader position.

Outcome: With the clarification that this proposal was limited to the provision of terminal punctuation, not internal punctuation, it was passed unanimously.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-11: Designating Matching Information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-11.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a way that information about matching two records can be expressed in the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats.

Outcome: As with the discussion paper that led to this proposal, discussion ensued about how this data could be considered institution-specific and/or temporary. Changes and additions included:

- Subfield \$a: The second sentence was reworded as “A sub-process may be added.”
- Subfield \$c: Definition changed to “Describes the confidence of the matching process of the institution” with the remaining sentences omitted. Correction of the subfield \$c example to a point between zero and one was suggested.
- Subfield \$d: Clarification about the use of subfield \$d for the date of the report generation should be borrowed from Authority 883 subfield \$d (Generation Date): “Date on which the process report was generated. This also serves as the beginning of the period of validity. Date is recorded in the format yyyymmdd in accordance with ISO 8601, *Representation of Dates and Times*.”
- Subfields \$x for Nonpublic Note and \$z for Public Notes were added.
- Subfield \$0: The precedent of Authority 682 subfield \$0, defined as “Replacement Authority Record Control Number” was cited as justification for this nonstandard use of Subfield \$0 as well as a subfield name change.

The proposal was accepted as amended with a vote of ten approving, one opposing, and six abstaining.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-12: Designation of a Definition in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-12.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a way of giving a definition in a MARC Authority record.

Outcome: Subfield \$a was redefined as “a formal definition.” Subfield \$u was added to allow a link to an online definition. Examples should include subfields \$v and \$5. The proposal passed with three abstentions.

MARC Proposal No. 2016-13: Designation of the Type of Entity in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-13.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a way of coding which type of entity is described in a given MARC Authority record.

Outcome: The second sentence of the field definition has been reworded as follows: “The field can be repeated if different *methods*, models, or styles of subdividing are used to describe an entity. Subfields \$a and \$b have been made Nonrepeatable. The proposal passed with one abstention.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP17: Redefining Subfield \$4 to Encompass URIs for Relationships in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp17.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses the redefinition of subfield \$4 (Relator code) in the Address field (371), See From Tracing fields (400, 410, 411, 430, 448, 450, 451, 455, 462, 480, 481, 482 and 485), See Also From Tracing fields (500, 510, 511, 530, 548, 550, 551, 555, 562, 580, 581, 582 585) and \$4 (Relationship code) in Heading Linking Entry fields (700, 710, 711, 730, 748, 750, 751, 755, 762, 780, 781, 782, 785, 788) in the MARC Authority Format. It also discusses the redefinition of \$4 (Relator code) in Heading fields (100, 110, 111), Subject Added Entry fields (600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 654, 662), Added Entry Fields (700, 710, 711, 720, 751) and \$4 (Relationship code) in Linking Entry fields (760, 762, 765, 767, 770, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 780, 785, 786, 787) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: The need to more clearly distinguish the use of subfield \$4 for URIs for relationships from the use of subfield \$0 for URIs for things was broadly recognized. The subfield \$4 for “Relationship Code” should be limited to work-to-work relationships and to allow both MARC and non-MARC codes (or their URIs). The subfield \$4 for “Relator Code” should be limited to relationships other than those of work-to-work and should be limited to MARC codes (or their URIs). This is all emblematic of the larger issue across the MARC formats of the same element being expressed as text and being expressed by an identifier. The British Library will draft a proposal reflecting the MAC discussion.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP18: Redefining Subfield \$0 to Remove the Use of Parenthetical Prefix “(uri)” in the MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp18.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses modifying subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in the Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings formats so that dereferenceable HTTP URIs may be recorded without the parenthetical standard identifier source code prefix code “(uri).”

Outcome: Because “http” defines a URI, the “(uri)” prefix is redundant. The German National Library voiced a concern that not so identifying URIs would introduce a syntactical inconsistency with URIs as the only identifier lacking a parenthetical prefix. The discussion paper was transformed into a proposal and then approved as a proposal with one abstention. The only substantive change was to incorporate a clarification that the parenthetical prefix “(uri)” was to be omitted in all cases where a syntactical URI is present, removing the option of including the prefix if desired.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP19: Adding Subfield \$0 to Fields 257 and 377 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format and Field 377 in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp19.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes adding subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to certain fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats that currently do not have subfield \$0 defined. MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: Country of Producing Entity (257) and Associated Language (377). MARC 21 Authority Format: Associated Language (377).

Outcome: This discussion paper was transformed into a proposal and passed unanimously as a proposal. This is another example of an issue that could potentially be treated as a MARC “fast-track” proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP20: Recording Temporary Sublocation and Temporary Shelving Location in the MARC 21 Holdings Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp20.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield \$k (Temporary sublocation or collection) in the 87X fields (Item Information – General Information) of the MARC 21 Holdings Format and the redefinition of subfield \$l (Temporary location) to specify the temporary shelving location to provide more specificity to the temporary holdings information so that it can be easily identified in machine processing and to allow for its use relative to circulation policies.

Outcome: There was a clear preference for establishing the set of three subfields in parallel with field 852 subfields \$a, \$b, and \$c. The apparent inconsistency between mentions of 87X (876-878) in the paper’s summary, background, and discussion versus

the later references (in the “Advantages,” the examples, and Question 5.1) to field 876 alone was noted. OCLC will rework this paper into a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP21: Defining Subfields \$e and \$4 in Field 752 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp21.html>).

Summary: This discussion paper presents the need for subfields \$e (Relator term) and \$4 (Relator code) in Field 752 (Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: Subfield \$2, which is already defined for Bibliographic 752 and so was not part of the paper, was redefined as “MARC code that identifies the source list from which the *geographic name* was assigned.” The discussion paper was transformed into a proposal with minor edits and passed unanimously as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP22: Defining a New Subfield in Field 340 to Record Color Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp22.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses defining a new repeatable subfield in field 340 (Physical Medium) in order to record the color content of resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: The proposed subfield should be made Repeatable for multiple color contents. The field definition will need to be broadened to include color content. The Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) should work with the RSC on a reasonable vocabulary as they rework this paper into a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP23: Adding Subfields \$b and \$2 to Field 567 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp23.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfield \$b (Controlled term) and subfield \$2 (Source of term) to field 567 (Methodology Note).

Outcome: The addition of subfield \$0 was suggested. An equivalent field should be added to the Authority format. More examples are needed, especially ones showing the relationship between the free-text subfield \$a and the coded subfield \$b. This will return as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP24: Define a Code to Indicate the Omission of Non-ISBD Punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp24.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses the need for an additional code in Leader/18 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to indicate that non-ISBD punctuation has been omitted.

Outcome: The preference was to leave the definition of code “blank” as it is and to define the new code “n” for “Non-ISBD punctuation omitted.” Because the situation of AACR2 cataloging with punctuation omitted can already be accounted for in a combination of Leader/18 coded “c” and field 040 subfield \$e coded “acr”, that does not have to be accounted for solely in Leader/18. The discussion paper was transformed into a proposal and passed as a proposal with two abstentions.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP25: Extending the Encoding Level in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp25.html>).

Summary: This paper proposes a way of extending Leader position 17 - Encoding Level in combination with field 042 (Authentication Code) in the MARC Authority format.

Outcome: Field 042 already contains codes for agencies alone (such as “pcc”) and for evaluative values within an institution (such as “ukblderived”). There is also precedent for the codes changing as the Authority record “grows up” (such as “msc” and “lcd”). This discussion paper can be withdrawn with no further action, as the German National Library can simply submit their specific codes for MARC approval

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP26: Designating a Norm or Standard Used for Romanization in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp26.html>).

Summary: This paper explores options to designate in a bibliographic record which transliteration and Romanization norm or standard has been used during the creation of the record, or during the creation of parts of the record.

Outcome: Comments generally preferred Option 3, defining both field 067, for record-level data, and field 881, for field-level data when needed. The whole issue needs to be more deeply investigated, with an eye toward the Linked Data future. This paper will likely come back as a revised discussion paper.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP27: General Field Linking with Subfield \$8 in the Five MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp27.html>).

Summary: This paper describes the reasons why a general designation of field linking with subfield \$8 (Field link and sequence number) is needed. This applies to subfield \$8 throughout the MARC format, i.e. MARC Bibliographic Data, MARC Authority Data, MARC Holdings Data, MARC Classification Data, and MARC Community Information.

Outcome: Option 2 defining a new field link type “u” for “General linking, type unspecified” was preferred. The discussion paper was transformed into a proposal and passed as a proposal with two opposed and four abstentions.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP28: Using a Classification Record Control Number as a Link in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp28.html>).

Summary: This paper explores the options of linking from a MARC Bibliographic record to a MARC Classification record by using the record control number of the MARC Classification record as an identifier.

Outcome: Option 1, using subfield \$0, with the possibility of extending this to Authority fields, as well, was preferred. This will return as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP29: Defining New Subfields \$i, \$3, and \$4 in Field 370 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp29.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfields \$i (Relationship information), \$3 (Materials specified), and \$4 (Relationship code) to field 370 (Associated Place) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. Subfields \$i and \$4 would be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the relationship of the associated place recorded in the field to the resource being described. Subfield \$3 would be used to indicate that an associated place applies to only a part or portion of the resource.

Outcome: This will return as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2016-DP30: Defining New Subfields \$i and \$4 in Field 386 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp30.html>).

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfields \$i (Relationship information) and \$4 (Relationship code) to field 386 (Creator/Contributor Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. The subfields will be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the relationship of the creator/contributor terms recorded in the field to the resource being described.

Outcome: This will return as a proposal.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist

Data Services and WorldCat Quality Management Division, OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2016 July 8