Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access
2023 Winter Virtual Meeting
Agenda

Monday, 2023 February 6, 12:00 am-3:00 pm EST / 11:00 am-2 pm CST / 10:00am - 1 pm MST / 9:00 am-12:00 pm PST

Meeting recording: https://ala-events.zoom.us/rec/play/_Ue8FBqrB37J4iZ5ZedvHqO7MnISs6ot5qTGg5USisQfgRHbRu8_Vulsbm_PJrMjVUNKKJHhsO2jpM9K.26hnJw1n-ne_sKLm?continueMode=true&_x_zm_rtaid=7DfWEgiYSq--Y1wBgbf_dw.1676648739835.2c5aba4e37ccde4e703044628078beac&_x_zm_rhtaid=912

(Agenda times in CST, please adjust as necessary for your time zone)

Welcome and opening remarks: Chair (11:00, 5 min.)

Meeting logistics: Guajardo (11:05, 5 min.)

Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group (11:10, 10 min.)

Adoption of agenda: Chair (11:20, 5 min.)

Report from the Chair (11:30, 10 min.)

- Currently CC:DA has no interns as a result of the pause but hope to have them in place by ALA Annual 2023
- ALA Connect for CC:DA members (private): https://connect.ala.org/core/communities/community-home?CommunityKey=cf1e946e-06f8-426c-91e1-f87d304359a2
- There is also the public CC:DA page: https://connect.ala.org/core/communities/community-home?CommunityKey=289a372f-3ec1-4cb0-8a75-902a1a18deb3
- Four voting members rotating off, CC:DA members must be ALA and Core member
- Reconstituting CC:DA, deciding what to do about ALA Annual, updating the roster; one proposal dealt with from NARDAC.
- Current roster: https://www.ala.org/core/member-center/sections/metadata-and-collections/committee-cataloging-description-and-access

Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo (11:40, 10 min.)

- Move of CC:DA blog from ALCTS domain to Core domain; no final decisions about whether it will simply move or start over; timeline to be determined
- Viability of existing ALCTS links is to be determined
- Jenny Levine (Core): current uptime is good; redirects will be a problem; getting the CC:DA blog its own domain will help for future.

Report of the MAC Representative: Myers (11:50, 20 min.)

- All four proposals were approved.
- four discussion papers, two were fast-tracked; 368 subfield $d DP will return as proposal; DP01 for 264 subfield $s will return as a paper.

Discussion of MAC papers (12:10, 40 min.)

- Problems with MARC to BIBFRAME back to MARC prompted 2023-DP01; contentious
- Everett: could this return as another Discussion Paper or as a proposal.
- John Myers: Could be either but hopes for another DP
- John's report: https://connect.ala.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=2c3d0a52-cd18-7d88-806e-76fc1e63f81e&forceDialog=0
- Honor: 264 elements are transcribed but structured
- Bob Maxwell: Looks like a Manifestation Statement, which we already have
- John: variability of 264 data, presence of role terms were problematic for BF; catalogers try to format the 264 data but not to formally structure it
- Kathy: BF wants to retain the ISBD punctuation, which would make it not strictly a purely transcribed Manifestation Statement
- Regina: BK may look at 245 and its comparison to 264 in terms of transcription, mixing of types of data
- Keith Knop: Also 490 comparison, just because data are not controlled doesn't mean it cannot be classified.
- John: Pat Riva suggested that the data BF considered to be extraneous can often be used to help us assign relationship elements (publisher, distributor, printer, etc.)
- Further discussion about role of CC:DA liaison to MAC as having responsibility to represent CC:DA but also be trusted to determine own position where there is lack of guidance from a constituency.
- kalan Knudson Davis: when we do trace publishers, printers, and publication places, in terms or special/rare collections cataloging, we do it as access points. And it seemed like there wasn't a strong understanding of why transcription is super important to 264s and the "identify" user task; like the 264 $a have $8 linkage to a particular newly defined MARC field to contain that string.
- Kathy: output created in BF going to MARC: I think this is tied to LC's "obligation" to continue to provide MARC data to the bibliographic utilities.
- Keith: My understanding is that BIBFRAME (and other schema) have a lot of trouble with MARC's reliance on order of information for context, so when a single 264 has multiple a + b subfields it ends up disconnected. Though I would rather have ambiguous place-publisher correlation than place and publisher conflated.
- Kathy: I wonder if we ever end up going down that path if OCLC could protect the 264 from overlay with such redistributed records.
- Regina: I think exploring possible solutions is needed. I also think a more specific description of the problem that BF developers are trying to solve will help, especially with specific examples of problems. I believe there is a better solution that can result from community discussion.
- MGDs: https://loc.gov/aba/rda/mgd/

Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Polutta (1:40, 20 min.)

- Report from the Library of Congress Representative

- PTCP has lost several folks; 3 new policy specialists hired
- Folio chosen as access platform; training dates are unclear
- 375 for gender in Authority records in DCM Z1 has changed
- Official RDA to be adopted no sooner than June 2023, still in flux; MGD and PSs still updating; two-month/four-month update schedule
- "Indigenous people" changes to occur fairly soon.
- computer etc. games all becoming Computer games in LCSH thanks to OLAC CAPC
- Family name access points paper released on February 3; requesting comments on policy change: https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/subject/FamilyNARs-white-paper.pdf
- Looking at moving form subdivisions such as "Drama" out of LCSH and into LCGFT

Break (12:50, 10 min.)

Discussion of Procedures Task Force (1:00, 40 min.)

- JSC to RSC, ALCTS to Core, etc., but more complicated than that
- There had been representation from ALCTS sections but all of those sections are now in Core Metadata and Collections Section
- Did not have enough resilience in leadership; just Chair, sometimes with past chair support, but informal and inconsistent – this needs to be more formal to make it more resilient; Vice Chair/Chair/Past Chair model, which CC:DA has already approved, and which Core is promoting this model among all committees
- Remote meetings as a result of pandemic; when CC:DA meets remotely, it has to be outside of the corresponding ALA window; using a three- or four-week window or smaller.
- Kathy: Could the next two meeting dates be set at the committee's June/July meeting, within that general meeting time framework?
- John: can present options at annual
- Amanda Sprochi: perhaps midwinter virtual meeting and in-person at Annual (each year or every other year?)
- ALA Schedule: https://www.ala.org/conferencesevents/node/7/; need coordination with such groups as SAC and MAC
- Tina Marie Maes: I like the idea of having the virtual meeting always two weeks after [Meeting] and always on certain days. It's easier to plan ahead. I think I could travel once a year for a committee. Not sure about other public librarians.
- ALA Annual 2023 survey: https://connect.ala.org/core/discussion/annual-meeting-format#bm00071883-4c05-4151-83e7-f3ea56afcf55
- Term of four years on CC:DA (counting voting membership and chair) may no longer work because it means that there could be only a year of chair-ship and could be chair after being an actual member for only a year
- Kathy: I like the Music Library Association model: there are always two of the following: Vice Chair/Past Chair + Chair. It's a 4-year commitment: vice chair/Chair for 2 years/past chair. It's hard to balance the need for "new blood" with the importance of "corporate memory" embodied in the committee membership.
- Representation document: historically, OCLC was not the only bibliographic utility as it is now but what about "emerging" utilities (SkyRiver?)

Friday, 2023 February 10, 11:00-2:00 pm EST / 10:00 am- 1:00 pm CST / 9:00 am-12:00 pm MST / 8:00 am-11:00 pm PST

Meeting recording: https://ala-events.zoom.us/rec/play/6DP-1ort2WZw_LjRyKQPZmFMv7uMO21hLl664Um0dG2X8H29MKXoBcqmxdhPK-KjnqSGtyyvJfG0iwG9.34GwYaENYI5xdX3G?continueMode=true&_x_zm_rtaid=7DfWEgiYSq--Y1wBgbf_dw.1676648739835.2c5aba4e37ccde4e703044628078beac&_x_zm_rhtaid=912

(Agenda times in CST, please adjust as necessary for your time zone)

Welcome and opening remarks: Chair (10:00, 5 min)

Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group (10:05, 10 min.)

Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2022 Annual Meeting: Chair (11:25, 5 min.)

Report from the PCC Representative: Moody (10:15, 15 min.)

- Covers July 2022 through present: https://higherlogicdownload.s3-external-1.amazonaws.com/ALA/a4ec95cf-b53f-1aa4-2997-9e25e4818baf_file.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAVRDO7IEREB57R7MT&Expires=1676654111&Signature=ErX9JQ2S%2BrmImkAfIJWbuZR5H8Q%3D
- Policy meeting in November 2022
- Strategic planning session in November 2022
- BF Summit in November
- Identity Management Advisory Committee formed (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/advisory/identity-management.html) – Hayley is on this committee.
- DEI guidelines for metadata approved (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/resources/DEI-guiding-principles-for-metadata-creation.pdf)
- New TG on gender in metadata formed; NACO members should not add gender to authority records and delete when found; comprehensive look at recording of gender in MARC A and B; https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/taskgroup/TG-on-Gender-charge.pdf
- BF Interoperability Group (BIG); Nathan: right now looking at different BF versions and will look at MARC interoperability later (https://wiki.lyrasis.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=249135298), https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibframe/TaskGroups/BIG/BIG-TOR.pdf

Report from the NARDAC Representatives: Maxwell and Schiff (10:30, 15 min.)

NARDAC Report to
CCDA 2023-02.docx

- Report on ALA Connect:
- Three proposals considered at recent RSC meeting
  - Multipart monograph/serial terminology (http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-RSCSecretary-2022-2-NARDAC%20response.pdf)

- o Four "restriction on" elements in Manifestation and Item (http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-RSCSecretary-2022-3-NARDAC%20response.pdf)
  - o Manifestation "place of" elements (http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-RSCSecretary-2022-4-NARDAC%20response.pdf)
- Series of webinars in March 2023 based on the June and October 2022 sessions
- Kathy Glennan: "For those of you interested in larger RDA governance topics, the RDA Board has a new North American rep: Judith Cannon, who will serve for a 3-year term."
- Honor Moody: "Changes made as a result of the Manifestation "place of" elements were "released in the December RDA Toolkit update."

Discussion of RDA personal name instruction task force (10:45, 45 min.)

- NARDAC asked CC:DA to look at personal name instructions in RDA, from Kate James's comments about compound surnames to begin with, string encoding scheme instructions that probably belong in community guidance documents. Nomens and access points for personal names is a bit of a mess now in Official RDA
- Here's the start of Kate James's comments: A value of Person: surname is preceded by a part of a value of Person: name of person that is initialized" (which means you have a name of person that consists of a given name that is an initial and a compound surname.). Here's an example of that: "G. Smith-Johnson." The OPTION says, "Record a value that omits the part that is regularly or occasionally initialized." If I follow that OPTION, then this becomes my access point for person:" Smith-Johnson." Why would I just omit the "G." that is regularly initialized and is a part of the person's name?
- Revise what remains in Official Toolkit, determine what needs to be moved to community resources; straw poll determined interest in creating such a task group; must be member of either CC:DA or Core
- Task force on Personal Name instructions as outlined in the NARDAC document: group created.
- With Kate and Cynthia's permission, Kate's name was put into nomination to serve on this task group. Amanda will post the link to the NARDAC document in ALA Connect

Break (11:30, 10 minutes)

Work and plans for CC:DA: Chair (11:40, 30 min.)

- Annual meeting preferences 57.1% in person; 22.9% virtual, but many said either was OK. Need to set expectations for new and future members. There were enough to have a voting member quorum in-person; three voting members are not able to attend annual in 2023.
- Amanda Ros suggests one in person and one virtual each year.
- Mary Burns suggests a bridge year
- Decision: Midwinter always virtual; Annual 2023 virtual; annual 2024 and onwards in-person
- Currently: 24 liaisons, 8 voting members; Amanda Sprochi wants to check with organizations that have had liaisons in the past (Special LA, SSA,CYAC) if they want to start again; kalan Knudson Davis suggests Open Rules for Cataloging (ORC); new organizations would need to apply (there is a set process); Amanda is just exploring at this point; Everett suggests NASIG (North American Serials Interest Group) liaison

- Need a more formalized Chair process (Elect, Chair, Past); Procedures TF is looking into this
- With NARDAC in the picture, CC:DA could now take up making its own proposals, perhaps.

Continuation of any discussion from the previous meeting (12:10, up to 30 min.)

New business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair (12:40, 10 min.)

- Next meeting TBD within 3 weeks after ALA Annual; Doodle Poll forthcoming

*****

MARC Advisory Committee Virtual Meetings

2023 January 31 through February 2, 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Eastern, each day

Meeting recordings: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/recordings.html

Business meeting/Library of Congress report/Other

• Structuring Annual meeting three days for two hours or two days for three hours (Wednesday and Thursday)? Allowing people to get home from ALA. Still virtual. More comfort breaks. Vote 16-0 for two days.

• MARC Update No. 35 was issued in December 2022 and the 60-day embargo on elements will end on February 20, 2023.

• There were no fast-track proposals since the previous MAC meeting

Proposal No. 2023-01: Defining a New Field to Record Electronic Archive Location and Access in the MARC 21 Formats

SOURCE: ISSN International Centre, Paris, and the National Library of Finland

SUMMARY: This proposal describes defining a new field 857 (Electronic Archive Location and Access) to enable libraries to specify a persistent identifier or location of the resource in a digital archive repository or Web archive, and record the name, date ranges, and completeness of relevant archived content.

Outcome: New field 857 allows richer description of archival contents. There was broad support with some reservations. Subfield $d was changed to "Date range of archived material. In subfield $f, frequency will be incorporated into the definition. Approved with changes.

Proposal No. 2023-02: Adding Subfield $3 to Field 041 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

>   **SOURCE:** Music Library Association (MLA) and Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

>   **SUMMARY:** This paper proposes adding subfield $3 (Materials specified) to field 041 (Language Code) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, as well as changes to the MARC 008/35-37 (Language) and 041 field documentation to support this addition.

>   **Outcome:** There was general support for the proposal with the proviso that community best practices would be needed. Approved.

Proposal No. 2023-03: Adding Subfields $0, $1, $2, and $5 to Fields 720 and 653 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

>   **SOURCE:** PCC Standing Committee on Standards

>   **SUMMARY:** This paper proposes adding subfields $0 (Authority record control number or standard number), $1 (Real World Object URI), $2 (Source of standard number or URI), and $5 (Institution to which field applies) to two fields for uncontrolled data in the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: 720 (Added Entry – Uncontrolled Name) and 653 (Index Term – Uncontrolled).

>   **Outcome:** Fields 720 and 653 would be used for terms that are not "controlled" in the usual sense but can be linked to a URI or standard identifier. Subfield $2 was removed from the proposal for future consideration in another paper. Subfield $7 was added to the proposal for field 720, as it is already defined in field 653. With these changes, the proposal was approved.

Proposal No. 2023-04: Defining a Field for Ownership and Custodial History in Structured Form in the MARC 21 Formats

SOURCE: D-A-CH Working Group on Provenance, Task Group on MARC, in cooperation with the German National Library and the Committee on Data Formats

SUMMARY: This paper proposes how copy-specific ownership and custodial history information and material evidence represented by authority data and controlled terms can be accommodated in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Holdings, and Authority formats, by the definition of a new field 361.

Outcome: Although there was broad support, there were concerns about conceptual overlap between the two indicators and other aspects of the paper. With the February 1 discussions in mind, Reinhold Heuvelmann returned on February 2 with a substantially revised proposal that included the following major changes:

1. Move Indicator 1 "Type of ownership and custodial history information" to subfield $o "Type of ownership and custodial history information" and use subfield $7 "Data Provenance" to provide information about subfield $o contents.
2. Define Indicator 1 "Privacy" in the manner of the other "Privacy" fields such as 541, 542, 561, and 583.
3. Remove Indicator 2 "Type of accession," with the possibility of future use of the K10plus vocabulary in field 541 subfield $c.
4. Move subfield $i "Date in structured form" to subfield $k "Date in structured form."
5. Move subfield $j "Date in unstructured form" to subfield $l "Date in unstructured form."

With these and a few other changes, the proposal was approved.

Discussion Paper No. 2023-DP01: Defining a New Subfield in Field 264 to Record an Unsubfielded Statement in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

SOURCE: Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO), Library of Congress

SUMMARY: This paper proposes adding a new non-repeatable subfield to field 264 (Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture, and Copyright Notice) in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format to record an unsubfielded imprint or provision statement.

Outcome: Although it was recognized that BIBFRAME needs to solve this issue, there was little support for the new subfield in field 264. The authors of the paper were encouraged to try to come up with a more acceptable solution with our discussions in mind. This will return as another discussion paper.

Discussion Paper No. 2023-DP02: Adding Subfields $0 and $1 to Field 658 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

SOURCE: Den norske katalogkomité (The Norwegian Cataloguing Committee)

SUMMARY: This paper proposes adding subfields $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) and $1 (Real World Object URI) to field 658 (Index Term-Curriculum Objective) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Outcome: The paper was broadly supported and was transformed into a fast-track proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2023-DP03: Renaming and Redefining Field 368 Subfield $d in the MARC 21 Authority Format

SOURCE: PCC Standing Committee on Standards

SUMMARY: This paper proposes a renaming and redefinition of subfield $d (Title of person) in field 368 (Other Attributes of Person or Corporate Body) of the MARC 21 Authority Format to allow recording of titles associated with persons other than those covered by the current subfield definition.

Outcome: Bringing field 368 into alignment with current RDA and NACO practice was well supported. The change of "simply" to "only" in the definition of subfield $d ("It excludes terms of address that ONLY indicate gender or marital status such as Mr. or Mrs.") was accepted. The paper was approved and transformed into a fast-track proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2023-DP04: Attributes of Family in the MARC 21 Authority Format

SOURCE: PCC Standing Committee on Standards

SUMMARY: This paper proposes new and revised fields and subfields for accommodating address of family, field of activity of family, and occupation of family, and considers two options for recording other attributes of families in the MARC 21 Authority Format.

Outcome: There seemed to be no consensus on which option to follow, but a straw poll revealed a preference for Option 1, which means that changing the name of field 368 is no longer necessary. This will return as a proposal with details of Option 1 being fleshed out in light of the MAC discussions.