



Report on the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference (Virtual) 2020

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 virtually as part of the ALA Annual Conference 2020, Thursday July 9, 3-5 p.m. Eastern; Monday, July 13, 2-4 p.m. Eastern; and Wednesday, July 15, 1-3 p.m. Eastern. 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 January and June 2020 (https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/chair_2019-2020-2.pdf).

Report from CC:DA Task Force to Review the Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables. Task Force Chair Mr. Peter Fletcher (University of California, Los Angeles) presented the draft report (https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/TF_Romanization_tables_2020_06_12.pdf). The LC revision document does not go into enough detail about the current process. Historically, CC:DA and the Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials (CC:AAM) have each had distinct roles in approving Romanization tables. CC:AAM has made decisions about languages under its purview. For languages not covered by CC:AAM, Romanization table revisions have first gone to such specialist groups as the Slavic Cataloging and Metadata Committee of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and then to CC:DA. LC’s Ms. Jessalyn Zoom explained that there was no intention to change the process necessarily, but to revitalize it and open it up to account for all the relevant language stakeholders. Both CC:AAM and CC:DA will retain their historically independent roles in the consideration of changes to Romanization tables; CC:DA will continue to rely on the advice of other specialist language communities, as appropriate. Both CC:DA and CC:AAM created task forces to consider the questions and have

combined their recommendations into this joint report. The draft will be revised to clarify the roles of each entity involved in the reviews.

Report from the Library of Congress Representative. Library of Congress Representative Ms. Melanie Polutta submitted her report on activities and news from LC (<https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/LC-2020-02.pdf>). Her report included these highlights:

- LC has been working mostly from home since mid-March 2020.
- Mr. Karl E. Debus-López, chief of the US Programs, Law, and Literature Division (USPRLL), has retired. Ms. Caroline Saccucci, Section Head of the CIP and Dewey Section, is acting division chief.
- Mr. Leslie Hawkins retired as CONSER Coordinator and senior cataloging policy specialist in February 2020.
- As a result of the Voyager 10 upgrade at LC, the April 2020 updates to the Descriptive Cataloging Manual and LC Guidelines included the validation of many MARC elements.
- LC and PCC continue to work closely on the project to convert existing Policy Statements to the new form necessitated by the Beta RDA Toolkit. Currently, only a few PSs are available in the Toolkit on an experimental basis.
- Using commonly identified titles for compilations of poetry by one agent (RDA 6.2.2.10) was successfully tested as a pilot and implemented on June 1, 2020 (<https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/policy/PolicyOnPoetryCompilations2020-06-01.doc>). PCC is looking at possibly expanding the practice, which greatly simplified authority work.
- Conversion specifications in both directions between MARC 21 and BIBFRAME 2.0 are now available for testing (<http://www.loc.gov/bibframe>).
- Training on the Library of Congress Classification, designed for LC staff but suitable for anyone using LCC, is now available at <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcc/index.html>.

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 January and June 2020. Their full report is at https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/NARDAC_report_2020_2.pdf. Among the highlights:

- Mr. Damian Iseminger (LC) will succeed Mr. Gordon Dunsire as Technical Team Liaison to the RSC and chair of the RSC's Technical Working Group on January 1, 2021.
- NARDAC continues to refine the proposal for the Exhibit Curator element, hoping to present it to the RSC in November 2020.
- Instructions on String Encoding Schemes (SES) are moving out of RDA into community spaces so that they may be maintained by those communities.

- Consideration of diachronic works continues, including the place of ISSNs in the Beta Toolkit series statement.
- The creation of the new ALA Core division from the merger of ALCTS, LITA, and LLAMA has no impact on NARDAC's Terms of Reference.
- The LC-PCC Task Group on Data Provenance in the RDA Beta Toolkit issued its final report on July 1, 2020 (<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/taskgroup/Data-Provenance-TG-Final-Report.docx>).
- Ms. Honor Moody (Harvard University) began her two-year term as RDA Examples Editor on January 1, 2020.
- The next RDA regional organization to be formed will be that for Latin America and the Caribbean. In December 2019, RSC members participated in a videoconference sponsored by the Biblioteca Nacional de México to discuss the formation of the RDA Latinoamérica y el Caribe (ALyC) Group.
- Unconstrained element labels will not replace RDA elements, but they can be displayed to users as part of individual community vocabularies.
- There is no current timeframe yet for taking down the original RDA Toolkit.
- The RDA Toolkit YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo>) includes many free, brief instructional videos on new RDS concepts and on using the Beta Toolkit.

Report of the CC:DA 3R Task Group. Mr. Robert Maxwell (Brigham Young University) reported on the task group's work on the proposal to add dd the elements "curator agent of work" and "curator agent of work of" to RDA (<https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Curator-ARLIS-Proposal.pdf>).

- The proposal from the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) includes four possible shortcut models for the relationship between curators and catalogs: between an agent and an exhibition corporate body, between an agent and an item, between an agent and a manifestation, and between an agent and an exhibition as an aggregating work. The final model is the preferred one.
- Depending upon how the RSC reacts to this proposal, it could lead to other such shortcut proposals. Shortcuts allow one to skip a WEMI level so that not every level must be described unless necessary. For instance, a curator contributes to an exhibition, but also has an impact on the exhibition catalog. Relationship shortcuts are discussed in the Beta Toolkit, Introduction to RDA, Data Elements (https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/en-US_ala-64950324-8390-37c0-a1fc-5799f0259b0a/p_tt5_phc_y3b).
- Shortcuts come in handy when an agent applies to one entity, such as a screenwriter and a film, but is actually attached to another entity, such as its screenplay. Because the RSC is considering a new element for Event, we don't want to touch the definition of exhibition at this point, as it may have other implications. ARLIS and OLAC might want to consult on the potentially overlapping aspects of this proposal.

Report from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Liaison. Mr. Everett Allgood (New York University) submitted his report (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/PCC-2020-02.pdf>). Among the highlights:

- The PCC Standing Committee on Applications has created a pilot mapping between the Relationship Designators in the original RDA Appendix I and the BETA Toolkit Relationship Elements.
- The efforts to reconcile RDA, MARC, and BIBFRAME will not be seamless or without losses. We will always end up with a hybrid because RDA will always deal only with parts of a description. Subject treatment, for example, will not be part of RDA.

Work and Plans for CCDA.

- With the merger of ALCTS, LITA, and LLAMA into the new ALA Core division, the continuation of CC:DA will be taken up by the PROCEDURES Review Task Force. CC:DA will certainly continue, but its charge needs to be reviewed for currency. The charge refers to the RSC and needs to be revised to refer to NARDAC. The CC:DA's audience needs to be reviewed in case LITA and LLAMA offer any new opportunities. Any joint ALCTS/LITA committees would now be under the same division. The successor to CaMMS will determine the disposition of some existing groups. The future organization of Core into six sections is available at <https://core.ala.org/sections/>.
- Disposition of existing CC:DA task forces:
 - Cataloging Ethics Task Force. Its timeline got pushed back because of the pandemic, so Ms. Ros will call for members soon, now that draft document is available.
 - Procedures Task Force. Its first document has been completed. It is working on a second document about representation, including how the creation of CORE might have an impact. International standards and a document for submissions will be future efforts.
 - 3R Task Force. Because most of its work has been completed, this group has not been busy lately. It remains useful for Ms. Bourassa and Mr. Hearn as a sounding board for ideas and will stay in place until the 3R Project is officially complete.
 - Virtual Participation Task Force. ALA and/or CORE changes could have an impact on virtual participation, including such considerations as moderation of meetings by ALA or a change in virtual platforms. An eventual end to the pandemic could also have an effect. In the future, use of a common and stable platform could be an advantage, as could following a regular pattern of scheduling. Cloud storage capacity could also be a future issue.
 - RDA Toolkit Training Opportunities Task Force. There may be more training opportunities now. The group needs some guidance as to whether it is useful to go forward right now, given that RDA remains a moving target. That makes putting

together training materials difficult. Some of the available training is expensive, which needs to be another consideration for institutions strapped for funding.

- Romanization Tables Task Force. The group is looking at the LC procedures for reviewing Romanization tables to revitalize the process according to what LC and CC:AAM say. Ms. Jia Xu (Yale University), the liaison between CC:DA and CC:AAM, says CC:AAM will reach out to work on a joint report from the parallel task forces.
- Mr. Adam Schiff (University of Washington) brought attention to the “Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records” (<https://alair.ala.org/bitstream/handle/11213/14591/Best%20Practices%20for%20Recording%20Faceted%20Chronological%20Data%20%28002%29.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>), issued by the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies (SSFV) on June 19, 2020. The subcommittee would appreciate CC:DA’s comments on these best practices for fields 045, 046, and 388, by August 31, 2020. Ms. Ros quickly created a short-term task force, including a call for members and a charge (“Task force to create a formal response from CC:DA to the ALCTS/CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee’s Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records”). SAC has already approved the final preliminary Version 0.9.

Other New Business.

- In light of CC:DA’s revised procedures, does the CC:DA meeting schedule need to be adjusted for smaller meetings that might accommodate NARDAC and RSC schedules, especially now that special and virtual meetings are possible? That will depend upon what is on the NARDAC and RSC dockets. But those schedules may end up being too short for meaningful work to get accomplished. The CC:DA blog may remain the preferable venue for business in many cases. RSC Chair Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) noted that when things are back to “normal,” the RSC expects to resume meeting one face-to-face once annually in its quarterly schedule. That meeting will remain the most agenda intensive.
- Mr. Maxwell will represent CC:DA on the PCC Standing Committee on Training’s group preparing to develop RDA Toolkit training.
- The next CC:DA meeting date is yet to be determined and could be either in person or virtual depending on the pandemic. The terms of voting members have been extended because of the pandemic, except for Ms. Teresa Keenan (University of Montana), who is unable to continue. Ms. Ros also extends her term to help with the transition.

Report on the MARC Advisory Committee. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) met virtually in conjunction with ALA Annual 2020 from 10:30-a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Eastern on Tuesday, June 30; Wednesday, July 1; and Thursday, July 2. The MAC agenda is available at https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2020_age.html. The report of the MAC Liaison to CC:DA, Mr. John Myers (Union College) is available at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/MAC->

[2020-2.pdf](#). Following are the official summaries of the five proposals and ten discussion papers and my reports of their respective outcomes.

Library of Congress Report

- New MARC 21 to MODS 3.7 mapping (February 2020) (<https://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/v3/mods-mapping-3-7.html>).
- New BIBFRAME 2.0 to MARC 21 conversion specifications (<https://www.loc.gov/bibframe/>) published. Specifications in both directions will now be updated in parallel. The eventual goal is to avoid LC staff having to double-key records in both MARC and BIBFRAME.

Proposals

- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-03:** Modernization of Field 856 in the MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-03.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes the modernization of the existing field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) in all MARC formats, including making nine subfields obsolete, clarifying the use of existing Second Indicator values, and defining a new Second Indicator value for Portion of Resource.
 - **Outcome:** This is OCLC's proposal, following up on [Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP01](#). The nine subfields proposed to be made obsolete were approved unanimously. The consideration of changes to the Second Indicator will return as a new discussion paper.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-04:** Defining a New Subfield for Illustrative Content in Field 340 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-04.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding a new repeatable subfield to Field 340 (Physical Medium) in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format to record the illustrative content of resources.
 - **Outcome:** The rewording of the definition of subfield \$p (Illustrative Content) suggested by OCLC was accepted. Possible changes to the name and scope of field 340 may be the subject of a discussion paper at ALA Midwinter 2021. The proposal was accepted.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-05:** Renaming Field 345 and Defining New Subfields for Aspect Ratio in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-05.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.

- **Outcome:** The discussion got completely off the track into a discussion of the aspect ratio of a still image, which in cataloging terms is simply expressed by its dimensions. The proposal was accepted.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-06:** Defining a New Field for Manifestation Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-06.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes defining new field 881 to accommodate Resource Description and Access "Manifestation Statements" in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.
 - **Outcome:** A new field for Manifestation Statement must be flexible enough to accommodate both manual and automated transcription and may need an indicator to allow for either standard (unsubfielded) or enhanced (subfielded) formatting. The proposal passed.
- **MARC Proposal No. 2020-07:** Recording the Extension Plan for Bibliographic Works in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-07.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes that the new RDA element "extension plan" is encoded in the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats.
 - **Outcome:** The ISSN International Centre, CONSER, and the RSC need to consult about the implications of a repeatable field for extension plan. Leader/07 (Bibliographic Level) and Leader/19 (Multipart Resource Record Level) may need to be reconsidered to accommodate extension plan. Some of this may be accounted for by application profiles created for different communities of practice. With subfield \$3 (Materials Specified) being added, the proposal was accepted.

Discussion Papers

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP08:** Subfields for Recording Date of Assignment of Dewey Decimal Numbers in the MARC 21 Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp08.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes provision in various fields for the dates on which a classification number is assigned for electronic versions of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) scheme in MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, Classification, and Community Information formats. These changes will bring MARC up to date for the current Dewey publishing environment and allow catalogers to more meaningfully describe the classification of a work given the continuously updated nature of 21st-century Dewey.

- **Outcome:** This discussion paper from OCLC's Dewey Editorial Team prompted considerable debate over what would be the best manner in which to record the currency of Dewey Decimal Classification numbers from print-on-demand and WebDewey sources. The paper will return as a proposal.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP09:** Chronology-Only Data in Holdings Fields 853-855 and 863-865 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp09.html>).
 - **Summary:** For chronology-only publication patterns, the current MARC Holdings standard requires that first-level caption and chronology data be stored in the first-level enumeration fields, requiring the presence of subfield \$a in fields 853, 854, 855, 863, 864, and/or 865. This paper recommends that the requirement be changed to require the presence of either subfield \$a or subfield \$i in Holdings fields 853, 854, 855, 863, 864, and/or 865.
 - **Outcome:** OCLC will consult with the International ISSN Centre and CONSER to help determine the disposition of the proposal to come.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP10:** Changes to Fields 008/21 and 006/04 for Type of Continuing Resource in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp10.html>).
 - **Summary:** The current options for type of continuing resource in 008/21 and 006/04 do not provide enough granularity for useful faceting or statistical reporting in the ISSN Portal and likely in library OPACs. Additionally, more granularity is needed for research and scholarship concerning global production of continuing resources. The ISSN Network would like to add additional codes to 008/21 and 006/04 to provide facets for searching in the ISSN Portal and for gathering statistics on types of continuing resources to which ISSN are assigned rather than depending on the non-standard solution it now uses.
 - **Outcome:** Some of the proposed definitions may need refinement. The paper will return as a proposal.
- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP11:** Adding Subfield \$0 to Field 022 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp11.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to Field 022 (International Standard Serial Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, in order to provide a place in the ISSN field for the ISSN URI.
 - **Outcome:** When the paper comes back as a proposal, both subfields \$0 and \$1 and both Bibliographic and Authority formats will be included. A new field 023 for Clustering ISSNs may also be proposed.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP12:** Moving Form of Musical Notation from Field 546 to Field 348 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp12.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes moving Form of Musical Notation from Field 546 (Language Note) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to a redefined or unused subfield in Field 348 (Format of Notated Music) and renaming Field 348 “Notated Music Characteristics.”
 - **Outcome:** A third option was discussed. It would retain the current definition of field 348 subfield \$b for “Format of Notated Music Code,” in the event that a stable code list is established, in addition to defining the new subfield \$c for “Form of Musical Notation Term” The paper will come back as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP13:** Defining New Subfields in Bibliographic and Authority Field 046 for Expression Dates and Related Elements (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp13.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding subfields for expression dates, materials specified, and explanatory notes to the MARC Bibliographic field 046, and subfields for materials specified and explanatory notes to the MARC Authority field 046. It also asks MAC to consider whether 046 subfields \$u and \$v should be added to the Bibliographic format.
 - **Outcome:** The issues of Bibliographic subfields \$u (Uniform Resource Identifier) and \$v (Source of Information) will be deferred for the more general consideration of data provenance in MARC records. In a straw poll, there was a slight preference (19-13) for using an indicator to identify the Type of Entity in Bibliographic 046. The paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP14:** Defining a New Subfield for Sound Content in Field 344 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp14.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper proposes adding a new repeatable subfield to Field 344 (Sound Characteristics) in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format to record the sound content of resources, in addition to expanding the field definition and scope to record "silent" as a sound characteristic.
 - **Outcome:** With the broadening and refinement of field 345 beyond actual motion picture film to moving images in general, this “sound content” aspect may make more contextual sense there. Some support was voiced, however, for broadening the “sound content” aspect to cover resources it was not intended for. The paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP15:** Changes to Supplementary Content Information to Accommodate URIs and Notes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp15.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper presents two options for augmenting supplementary content information to accommodate URIs and free-text notes. The first option proposes the addition of subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to field 504 in the MARC Bibliographic format and changing the field definitions for fields 504 and 525. The second option proposes the creation of a new MARC field 353 to store coded supplementary content information.
 - **Outcome:** Option 2 for the creation of a new field 353 (Supplementary Content Characteristics) received broad support. The paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP16:** Recording the Mode of Issuance for Manifestations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp16.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper discusses the potential for encoding the RDA element "mode of issuance" in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format.
 - **Outcome:** This paper is related to and has some of the same issues as MARC Proposal No. 2020-07 for "extension plan." There was much discussion of catalogers making what could turn out to be incorrect inferences about both the extension plan and the mode of issuance of a resource and whether such records could be corrected or left as is (with corrected "duplicates" being created). It was noted that none of the elements proposed by the MARC/RDA Working Group this time around are required by RDA Conformance. The paper will return as a proposal.

- **MARC Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP17:** Recording the Type of Binding for Manifestations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp17.html>).
 - **Summary:** This paper discusses RDA's controlled list of values for "type of binding" and how to code this data in the MARC Bibliographic format.
 - **Outcome:** Discussion touched upon the unfortunate real-world implications (more duplicate records) of conforming to IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM) theory. The paper will return as a proposal.

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 July 21