

Society of American Archivists
Representative to American Library Association (ALA)
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) and
the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)
Interim Report 2013-2014

I recently attended the meetings of CC:DA and MAC at the ALA Midwinter meetings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (January 24-27, 2014). These meetings continued the work and discussions on changes to *Resource Description and Access* (RDA), as well as accommodating the needs of specific constituencies and institutions. In the case of CC:DA, much of the discussion centered on the actions taken by the Joint Steering Committee on the Revision of RDA (JSC) in their meetings in November 2013.

While some of the topics covered in these two committees did not necessarily impact archival descriptive work, there continue to be various proposals that may be of interest to our community and should be considered by SAA technical subcommittees in associated areas. I have included a summary of summary of the discussion of these points below, with an additional list of other CC:DA and MAC actions.

CC:DA

Recording of Production Date

At the meeting the ALA representative to the JSC brought a proposal for changes to RDA to resolve a conflict between the instructions for selecting and recording the date of production of unpublished materials. In the proposal, it was recommended that the guidelines be aligned with the instructions for date of publication, which would make production dates a transcribed element. This change was opposed by both myself and a liaison from the rare books/manuscripts community, both on the basis of compatibility of practice and on the principle that dates given on items do not necessarily reflect its date of production. It was recommended that the general section on sources of production (RDA 2.2.4) be revised instead to clarify that this should not be a transcribed element, and a revised proposal is expected for ALA Annual.

Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K

It was announced that the JSC had not approved the ALA proposal to expand the list of relationships designators provided in RDA for linking creators. Among their recommendations were the creation of a separate list for generic relationship designators (those that apply to more than one FRBR Group 2 entity), the introduction of a greater number of hierarchical levels, the removal of one-to-many

relationships, and reconciliation with terms listed in FRAD. While some of the terms may be submitted as Fast Track proposals, it was determined that the task force would make the requested changes and a revised proposal would be prepared for ALA Annual and the 2014 JSC meetings.

The expansion of the relationship designator vocabulary in RDA should be quite useful in archival authority work, both in the Library of Congress Name Authority File and in other applications. Work continues to make this vocabulary available through the Open Metadata Registry for use in linked data applications, which will also likely benefit the archival community once these changes have been made.

Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA

The discussion paper on machine-actionable data submitted by ALA was closely reviewed by the JSC, and it was requested that the task force work to put together a proposal for consideration at ALA Annual and the 2014 JSC meeting. This work is to be coordinated with a JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group, and will focus on elaborating the Aspect-Unit-Quantity model described in the discussion paper (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-ALA-Discussion-1.pdf>). Gordon Dunsire, the chair of the JSC, spoke in the CC:DA meetings on both the representation issues and collaboration with ONIX, focusing on the need for changes to improve compatibility with linked data principles.

While this work is being undertaken independently of the ongoing revision of EAD, it seeks to address similar issues to the proposed <physdescstructured> element. This should not necessarily slow the EAD revision process further, but it is hoped that the new version of EAD will be compatible with the RDA model.

Creator Proposals from Other Constituencies

There were a few proposals for RDA changes from other constituencies related to describing creators that may be of some value to the archival community. The first of these was a small revision proposed by the British Library to allow for recording a period of activity as a date for a corporate body (e.g., "active 1980s"), which was accepted. Similarly, the Library of Congress had proposed that the rules allow for the language of a family to be recorded. This was also accepted by the JSC.

However, the JSC did postpone action on the proposals that had been submitted regarding places and subjects. In the case of place names, a JSC working group was established to consider the issues and develop new proposals. It is unclear when this group's work is to be completed. With the subjects discussion paper, it was decided to hold off on changes until after the revision of the FR models in 2015.

Updates from Other Organizations

As part of their meetings, CC:DA also receives a number of reports from other organizations and representatives, including the ALA Representative to the JSC, the Library of Congress, and ALA Publishing. Some points of interest to archivists from these reports include the following:

- The Library of Congress representative reported that a stable version of BIBFRAME had been completed, and is available to the community for testing throughout 2014. The project has also released a collection of test records, conversion tools, and an entry module. More information is available at <http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/>.
- The Library of Congress representative also announced that due to the government shutdown in late 2013, updates to the Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements in the RDA Toolkit have been delayed until the February 11, 2014 update.
- The Program for Cooperative Cataloging liaison announced that beginning in January 2015, all records submitted through their program must be encoded as RDA.

Other Issues

A number of other proposals and discussion items with lesser impact on archival practice were addressed at the CC:DA meetings. These included the following:

- A proposal to clarify the requirements for recording a publication statement for published works. This proposal, referred to as the "cascading vortex of horror," was referred to a small working group for revisions.
- Further discussion on the recording of performer and artistic credits, begun at the previous meeting, were continued. The JSC is looking for a principled approach to these potential changes, and the Music Library Association and OLAC liaisons agreed to develop a proposal for ALA Annual.
- A discussion paper was circulated examining the differences in the RDA rules between recording Playing Time of recordings and recording Performance Time of notated music. This will be developed as a proposal for consideration during ALA Annual.
- A proposal for changes to the list of relationship designators between FRBR Type 1 entities was reviewed by the committee, the effect of which was to clarify the terminology for catalogers and researchers. These terms will be submitted as fast track proposals to the JSC.

MAC

Conference Name Location Qualifiers

The Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM) submitted a proposal requesting that subfield \$c be made repeatable for the X10 and X11 fields of the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats, in order to allow location information associated with conferences to be recorded in a more granular fashion (see <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-02.html>). For example, instead of recording

110 2# \$a American Library Association. \$b Conference \$c (Washington, D.C. and London, England)

this would instead be recorded as

110 2# \$a American Library Association. \$b Conference \$c (Washington, D.C.; \$c London, England)

Implementing these changes would require modifications in encoding practice, as well as in the creation of these authorized access points. The proposal was approved by the committee, although implementation of its provisions will be determined by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC).

Recording Digital File Characteristics

The British Library submitted a proposal requesting the renaming and redefinition of field 347 subfield \$f to clarify the information recorded as the encoded bitrate of a streaming audio or video file, rather than its current label "Transmission speed" (see <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-03.html>). This proposal was accepted by the committee, and the MARC documentation will be updated accordingly.

Other Issues

Other items discussed in the committee with a lesser impact on archival descriptive practice included:

- Defining indicator values for Field 588 (Source of Description note). This proposal, primarily benefiting serials catalogers, was approved with limited wording changes. The full proposal is available at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-01.html>.
- Defining a subfield value for "miscellaneous information" in the 65X fields of the Bibliographic and Authority formats. This discussion paper will likely be revised as a proposal based on feedback from the committee, though perhaps only implemented in the context of German libraries. The full discussion paper is available at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp03.html>.
- Designating a serials record as never published. This discussion paper was reviewed and returned with comments to the German National Library. The full discussion paper is available at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp01.html>.
- Recording relationships between terms from different thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority format. This discussion paper will be revised as a proposal based on feedback from the committee. The full discussion paper is available at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp02.html>.
- Recording RDA relationships designators in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. This discussion paper was reviewed by the committee, but based on the discussion it appeared that the first option proposed (relying on local best practices) will be followed, requiring no

additional action. The full discussion paper is available at
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp04.html>.

Respectfully submitted,

Cory Nimer, SAA Representative to CC:DA