This is my last column. I have the 40-year pin from AALL, and for most of those years, I’ve been writing a column on law cataloging. This is on all the things I probably would not put in writing but for the fact that for me, RDA stands for retirement day approaching.

To summarize in advance, the major problem, especially as applies to classification, is that when they created positions for law classification specialists (such as Jolande Goldberg), they neglected to require that the specialist be a “prophet” with a certified crystal ball so that the K schedules could reflect the world as it would be 50+ years in the future. The problem is that much of the K schedules reflect the world of 50+ years ago (and some of the other schedules are worse, cf: Psychology misplaced in B next to philosophy, religion and witchcraft when it belongs in H or R, not to mention the embarrassing range in HV for “degeneration”).

For most other cataloging areas, the problems result from poorly thought out rules that have been mitigated by the willingness of law catalogers to act rationally in ignoring rules that, if strictly followed, would lead to absurd results. Due to “Linked Data” and sharing metadata with non-law libraries (which began about 50 years ago when shared online catalogs replaced having separate law library card catalogues), we probably should conform the “de jure” rules to match our “de facto” practices.

“Enacting jurisdiction” and RDA. 6.29.1.2, “Laws governing one jurisdiction” says to enter laws under the “jurisdiction governed.” If we actually fol-
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Spring is almost upon us, and that means it’s election time! The OBS-SIS Nominations Committee has put forward an excellent slate of candidates for the positions of Vice Chair and Member-at-Large. Many thanks to committee chair Jackie Magagnosc and committee members Lauren Seney and Alan Keely. If you want to get involved in ways other than serving as an OBS-SIS officer, please let us know. We have many other opportunities for involvement!

Here are the candidates for 2020-2021:

**Vice Chair/Chair Elect**
Larissa Sullivant
Head of Collection Services
Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

**Member-at-Large**
Keelan Weber
Head of Cataloging and Resources Management
Schmid Law Library, University of Nebraska - Lincoln

This year’s election will also include a vote on the name change of OBS, so please don’t forget to vote! The proposed name and related discussion can be found on this OBS-SIS Community thread ([http://bit.ly/OBS-SIS-Future-Name](http://bit.ly/OBS-SIS-Future-Name)). Any voting on changes to the bylaws will take place at the Annual meeting in New Orleans, so make sure you attend the business meeting!

Spring also means that AALL registration is open. Programs and activities of interest include, but are not limited to:

- The joint SIS sponsored screening of the documentary “Change the Subject,” followed by the joint SIS Dine-Arounds
- “Finding the Silver Lining in ILS Migrations” (Sponsored by OBS-SIS)
- The OBS Hot Topic and OBS-SIS Local System User Groups Roundtable, which will both carry on the conversations around ILS migrations
- “Data, Stats, Go: Navigating the Intersections of Cataloging, E-Resource, and Web Analytics Reporting” (Sponsored by TS-SIS)
- “Open Source Alternatives to DigitalCommons”
- “Facilitating Open Knowledge: The Intersection of Wikidata and Libraries”

And many more! For the full slate of programs see the conference agenda ([https://www.aallnet.org/conference/agenda/](https://www.aallnet.org/conference/agenda/)).

While the educational programs are a draw, I think most of us would agree the best part of the annual conference is getting to talk face to face with many of the people we email throughout the year. I look forward to seeing you all in New Orleans!

*Jessica Pasquale*
*University of Michigan*
Hello Fellow TS-SISers,

I’m writing this on a cold February morning and dreaming about AALL’s annual conference in New Orleans. Ah, one of my favorite cities (and one I’d love to move to, even with all the heat and humidity. Heat sounds good right now). The nearly impossible work of scheduling all the TS Board, committee, roundtable, and hot topic sessions is finished, and, while there will always be overlap of meetings, etc. of interest, I think that is minimalized as much as possible. And not all the morning meetings start at 7:00 am—just some of them. And New Orleans is famous for its coffee if you need a boost that early. For me, the excitement of seeing many friends and colleagues again gets me up, and I’m looking forward to our many educational programs, too.

But not all of us can go to the annual meetings, and we’ve been kicking ideas around for a couple of years now, so it’s time to start working on them seriously. Technology allows us to communicate in many more ways than being in the same room at the same time. Webinars, Slack, and video-conferencing are all becoming mainstream now if they weren’t in earlier years, and we should use them effectively. AALL HQ has software for webinars, and some of us have these programs available at our workplace. Serving our educational purpose means redefining what we mean by “educational programs” to explore smaller programs that aren’t a four person panel with slideshows and embedded videos but fit nicely on our desktops and laptops and may be more focused. A program at the annual conference on how to design a webinar and what programs are available to work with isn’t likely to happen, nor would we want to limit this type of program to a single event. But a webinar on this topic is perfect—not too long or complicated to arrange, requiring one or two people to present it.

The Membership Survey has just been done, and the preliminary results are encouraging. There is an interest in learning these communication tools, as well as support for more focused webinars on topics that are more specific and can be addressed better in shorter sessions instead of a full AALL program. One new thing to me is the number of librarians who did not plan to be technical services librarians but now have TS responsibilities, mostly due to staff reductions. Our fellow firm librarians ask for more specific training, very practical stuff and not the high-level theoretical discussions on the RDA Toolkit and BIBFRAME (I find I agree with them many days). These newer TS librarians need our attention, and we must find out how to help them.

We will be sharing more information from the Membership Survey and also other comments and concerns as we review them further and see the analysis. In the meantime, please send me or any other Board member your needs and wants and any suggestions for webinars or programs you would like to see. It may take a bit of time to get things set up, but we do need to explore other ways of connecting with each other and serving as a resource for all TS members. Keep an eye out for the Volunteer Survey that is coming out shortly, and please be generous with your time and expertise.

Pat Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago
Cost Analysis for News Databases

David Sanborne
Cook County Law Library, Chicago

The Cook County Law Library recently looked into acquiring a news database. This column will examine the variables to take into consideration when considering acquiring news databases specifically, but it should be readily applicable to most types of database acquisitions. When considering which news database to acquire, the Cook County Law Library looked at five factors: integration with existing products, availability of remote access, cost, overlap with existing subscriptions, and quantity of content.

Major legal research database vendors offer news products that integrate with their other databases. This is presented as a selling tool, since it allows users to access news resources alongside other resources without juggling multiple logins, cross-reference news and cases, and generally increases ease of use. This has the potential to be especially valuable for libraries with a set group of patrons who have individual logins. In a public law library environment, where access to the big name legal research services is based on number of terminals rather than number of accounts, this is less desirable. Integrating news sources with legal research databases means a patron seeking to use a news database has to take a legal research database seat, whereas when news and other databases are decoupled, terminals can be allotted more efficiently, and patrons who only want to look for news sources can use a general public terminal. Similarly, a standalone product that includes remote access opens up the availability of that information significantly beyond an onsite only product integrated with another product that is only usable from a small number of terminals.

Cost is obviously an important consideration in any budget-conscious environment, but comparing the cost of different services needs to be done in context of the final two factors: subscription redundancy and the amount of content the service includes. Subscription redundancy is fairly easy to ascertain. In the context of the vendors considered by the Cook County Law Library, there was little to no overlap with existing library collections. This is unlikely in libraries that subscribe to multiple news resources or with extensive print newspaper collections, but it can present an opportunity to save money (by cancelling individual subscriptions to titles included in the database) or to examine whether the cost of the database is worthwhile if it duplicates content available elsewhere in the collection.

News databases vary widely in the quantity of resources available. Some vendors have different packages that may include different embargoes, archival periods, and scope of coverage. Some packages are geographical, enabling libraries to acquire hyper-local content. It is important to consider cost alongside quantity of coverage. It is fairly simple to calculate a cost per title for different vendors, but this oversimplifies the situation as it falls into the classic “TV cable package” issue where you are likely to be paying for titles that will be used rarely, if ever. For services that offer a relatively small number of titles, you can either omit the less popular titles or include only the most popular titles when calculating cost per title. This technique is less helpful when looking at databases that include hundreds or thousands of titles, but making a brief list of “must have” titles, or common titles across vendors, can give a general idea of the value for money from each vendor.

Another way of calculating value is cost per expected use. For the Cook County Law Library, looking at acquiring a new type of product and therefore not having any historical data with which to calculate expected usage, this was not an extremely helpful technique. This technique works better as a way of comparing potential new vendors to existing vendors, especially when there is a high degree of overlap in coverage.

In the case of the Cook County Law Library, the stars aligned and the lowest cost quote received was also the vendor with the highest number of resources and the most local content. This meant that there was more attention paid to other aspects, especially access restrictions and database integration, when comparing resources. Still, taking a systematic look at these five factors helps to provide an evidence-based justification for selecting a news database.
Report from ALA Midwinter Meeting

Report from ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC)—Stephen Hearn & Dominique Bourassa—Highlights/Notes

- RDA Beta is now in a stabilized period. RDA Beta to become the production version on December 15, 2020.
- RSC considered the idea of creating a new Collective Agent entity for meetings, conferences, congresses, expeditions, festivals, fairs, etc. The new entity would be defined not to overlap with the Family or Corporate Body entities.
- RSC reviewed a briefing paper on “RDA metadata implementation scenarios” which suggests updating and expanding the set of scenarios for implementing RDA using different approaches to metadata structure and encoding, including linked open data. The new scenario content is expected to appear in the January release of RDA.
- Additional briefing papers on Expression excerpts and Content elements related to aggregated expressions were presented. Discussion of these papers has continued following the Santiago meeting, and NARDAC has provided comments on them.
- RSC reviewed the report from NARDAC on element labels for unconstrained RDA elements. A response to NARDAC received in December from Technical Working Group chair Gordon Dunsire has clarified a number of points which limit options for some kinds of changes to labels.
- The work on labels is ongoing.
- The Curator element proposal initiated by ARLIS/NA was taken up as a pilot to test the process for making post-3R Project proposals to RSC. The proposal has not yet been submitted to RSC, but there has been useful discussion with RSC about the form this proposal and others to follow should take.
- ALA Publishing offered a series of Orientation webinars over the summer of 2019 reviewing aspects of the Beta RDA. Thomas Brenndorfer presented the Relationships topic in the webinar series. ALA Publishing plans to repeat the series in the first quarter of 2020.

Comment from Stephen Hearn: Process change [for proposals] shouldn’t mean everything should proceed at breakneck speed—some could be spread out.

- NARDAC level concerned about transparency: RSC concerned about transparency AND streamlining, i.e. minor changes might not require full blown formal proposals.

Comment from Kathy Glennan (RSC Chair): Proposals to RSC don’t have to wait for a formal submission time; they can be calendared to a later date.

Comment from Dominique Bourassa: Draft proposals can be reviewed for informal comment before being sent as formal proposal.


Report of the PCC Liaison, Everett Allgood—Highlights/Presentation notes

- Policy on minimally punctuated bibliographic records: in force.
• Standing Committee on Applications (SCA): SCA created and tested a regular expression document to be used in MarcEdit for removing punctuation from MARC bibliographic records according to the PCC Minimally Punctuated Bib Record guideline (the regex document will be posted on PCC SCA webpage https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/resources/macros.html).

• Standing Committee on Standards (SCS): SCS is in the process of forming a task group on language codes to consider the use of alternative code lists such as ISO 639-3 that cover a larger number of languages than the MARC list.

• LRM Training Task Group: The group has completed 12 training modules, each meant to be about 5-10 minutes worth of reading, which are currently under review by the Standing Committee on Training (SCT). SCT hopes to finalize at ALA MW and release as soon as possible.

• URI Training task group and RWO training: The task group has prepared training materials for use initially by members of the PCC URIs in MARC Pilot. Among other things, the training covers: 1) The four rules of Linked Data; 2) Strings vs. things; 3) URIs vs. authorities; 4) Reconciliation; 5) Preliminary PCC Best Practices for URIs. The SCT URI Training task group will provide targeted training to members of the PCC URIs in MARC Pilot in February 2020. Although this training will be for pilot members only, the intent is that the training materials will have much wider use beyond the scope of the pilot itself.

• NACO Participants’ Manual review: The outdated NACO manual has been targeted by SCT as needing updating. SCT member John Hostage completed a quick review of the NACO manual. At ALA MW, SCT will discuss next steps, including the possibility of charging a future group to do the work.

• Linked Data Training: SCT will be working with the Linked Data Advisory Committee to form a joint task group. The draft charge for this new group was put on hold while we focused on Sinopia training (see report above).


Report from Library of Congress representative, Melanie Polutta - Highlights/Notes

Staffing changes

• Les Hawkins retiring (not on written report)

• Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division: When the former Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division (COIN) merged to form the Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division (PTCP) in June 2019, the new organizational structure called for two section heads or first-line supervisors. The vacancy announcement for these positions closed in November 2019. Judith Cannan, chief of PTCP, and a selection panel are tasked with making the selection from among the qualified applicants.

Descriptive Cataloging Manual: Minor updates were made to the Descriptive Cataloging Manual. The 008/33 section of DCM Z1 added instructions on provisional coding for government bodies in Hong Kong and Macau, in order to record a longstanding practice in this area. A minor update was made to the 667 document to allow for recording subtitles in a 670, if they could be recorded as a title proper. Other instructions in Z1 were made to update links or references to the ongoing moratorium regarding use of the 024 in authority records. All other updates to the DCM were for internal LC documentation.

Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements: The Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements remain frozen as a result of the RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project (commonly known as the 3R Project); see https://www.rdatoolkit.org/3Rproject. The stabilized English-language text that resulted from the project has been released on the RDA Toolkit beta site, and work on the development of policy statements and application profiles for that revised RDA text has commenced. Four joint LC-PCC task groups have been charged to make recommendations regarding these policy statements: Diachronic Works, Aggregate Works, Element Labels, and Data Provenance. A designated team of Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division staff members has been working on preparing the policy statements, following a plan submitted to the PCC Policy Committee, and will be consulting regularly with the PCC throughout the development process: https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/PoCo-2019/BetaRDA-PoCo-Decisions.pdf
Change of Authorized Access Point for Kiev, Ukraine: The authorized access point for the capital city of the Ukraine was Kiev (Ukraine), based on the conventional name “Kiev,” as determined by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names. The BGN has now changed the status of the name “Kiev” from conventional to variant, and there is no conventional name. As a result, the authorized access point for the city has been changed to Kyïv (Ukraine), which is based on the ALA/LC Romanization Table for Ukrainian. All associated LCSH authority records have been updated, and LC is in the process of revising all of the associated name authority records.

Change of ADM1 names in France and Norway: France reorganized its regions, the ADM1 level 3 territorial designations, in 2016. PTCP’s current BGN representative, Veronica Ranieri, has ensured that new NARs exist for all of the new region names, but she continues to resolve questions of relationships with the older names for the regions. Norway has also reorganized its ADM1 level territorial names, but that change only took place officially in January 2020. As a result, BGN has approved the name change, but not yet updated its database. Ms. Ranieri will create those NARs as soon as BGN has made its changes.

BIBFRAME: Work has also focused on providing a fuller level of interaction with a live BIBFRAME 2.0 database consisting of the complete BIBFRAME conversion of the LC bibliographic file. Features of the database include user search capability and use of Linked Data queries to highlight relationships between resources. Search results in the BIBFRAME 2.0 database can be refined by subject facet. Merging and matching BIBFRAME 2.0 work descriptions in the database is underway and will continue to be refined throughout 2020. Data from the BIBFRAME 2.0 database is being distributed via the LC Linked Data Service: https://id.loc.gov/.


BIBFRAME is the mover of this proposal (but MARC still will be present for at least a decade).

• A review body is wanted in place in February (see proposal text).
• There was discussion of the history of romanization and romanization tables, why romanization is important, and why the decision to romanize and romanization itself are separate issues.
• There was discussion on structure/expectations of the makeup of the review board and how board members were determined.

Comment from a past chair of CC:DA: Comment period for changes by scholarly community is missing from the current proposal.

• CC:DA chair will reach out to CC:AAM to form a joint task force.


Because of coming changes to ALA to have fewer face-to-face meetings, the Virtual Participation Task Force is actively seeking a platform to make virtual meetings a reality. One platform under consideration is Zoom. The Task Force is working on implementation of the Zoom platform with the ALCTS office (with WebEx still available as backup). Issues of management and implementation still remain, including time limits on sessions and scheduling of sessions.
Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Group, Robert Maxwell—Presentation notes


Notes on work with the ARLIS/NA revision proposal on curators
- The Task Force assisted CC:DA in preparing revision proposal for curators (ARLIS/NA)
- The curator proposal was forwarded to NARDAC, but not forwarded to RSC, i.e., it was held back.
- From this experience, feedback was provided to CC:DA for future proposal work.

The 3R Task Force is able to get quick comments in asynchronous work, can consult with various communities.

Comment from the ARLIS/NA liaison to CC:DA, Karen Stafford: Given that the curator proposal was held back, ARLIS/NA is anxious about the proposal process.

Response from Dominique Bourassa, NARDAC: The proposal is tabled at NARDAC because the proposal process is still being discussed/formed.

Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes, James Hennelly—Presentation notes

Mini-release to be made soon: Updates include cleanup, user-created content features fix, improvements to search, and submenus for better navigation

Accessibility report for RDA Beta toolkit now available

2020 release schedule
- Next full release April/May; Possible release Aug/Sept
- December 15, 2020: date of switchover from Beta to production

Switchover to production—access
- Beta will be accessed at access.rdatoolkit.org
- Original RDA will be accessed at original.rdatoolkit.org
- Links to original site will not break

Countdown clock
- Will not begin with December release
- Requires approval from RSC & RDA Board to begin
- Countdown clock will run for a year
- This delay will give flexibility to communities/agencies completing translations, policy statements etc.

Policy statements (PSs)
- Analysis, planning, writing of PSs is underway
- PSs creation will proceed with coordination of application profile (AP) development
- Sample PSs on Beta site in Spring

Translations continue to be made
- Mostly on RDA Reference translations
• Only stable text will be sent to translation teams

3R Orientation efforts
• New webinar concepts webinar in February (repeat of previous sessions—see notes from the NARDAC presentation)
• New approaches to training/orientation to include practical application; simplifying tools/focusing exercises; more events with different pricing points
• ALA Midwinter pre-conference event
• New online workshop series this spring

Announcements regarding RDA print products
• Updated title Introducing RDA (Chris Oliver) to be published this spring
• An RDA glossary will be published
• Other titles to be published: RDA Essentials (Brenndorfer); Bob Maxwell’s updated RDA text; An RDA workbook (James)

Announcement on Draft Code of Ethics for Catalogers from the CC:DA Chair
• To be posted to CC:DA site when available.
• Discussion: CC:DA would endorse a code of ethics document but not be involved in its authorship.

Note: The CC:DA meeting usually held on Monday (January 27) was cancelled.

---

**CLASSIFICATION**

**Environmental Law Reclassification 2020**

Over the last few years, the law cataloging community has been discussing revisions and updates needed to the Library of Congress law classification schedules. Law is a dynamic, ever-evolving discipline, and the organization of legal resources based upon classification must also be dynamic. Aaron Kuperman has frequently noted in his *Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL)* classification columns how many areas of the schedules need to be updated, especially in the earlier common law schedules (KD-KE-KF). Computer law, terrorism, and environmental law were three of the areas mentioned as most in need of revision. In this column, I will focus on how environmental law has been reflected in the Library of Congress classification.

*Classification: Class KF, Law of the United States,* is the earliest law schedule, dating from 1967 (Final Draft revised as of May 1, 1967). It served as the model for all common law jurisdictions. At that time, environmental law did not exist as a discipline. Most major American environmental statutes were passed from the late 1960s through the early 1980s. The Environmental Protection Agency was created by President Nixon in 1970.

KF3775, the current most general number for US environmental law, first had the caption "Public health. Sanitation." The 2004 KF cumulation still uses the same caption, but has a note "Including environmental pollution." The 2008 KF cumulation finally has "Public health. Environmental law." The most current schedule uses the caption "Environmental law. Public health" with a note "Including environmental pollution and sanitation." The U.S. environmental law/public health range is KF3775-3816, sandwiched between "Social legislation (KF3330-3771) and Medical legislation (KF3821-3832).
Class KD (Law of the UK and Ireland, 1973) and KE (Canada, 1976), following the KF model, were also developed prior to the recognition of environmental law as a discipline. They lump together environmental law and public health.

The schedules for Latin America, KDZ and KG-KH, originally using class KF as a model, classify environmental law as a subsection of public health law.

All these older schedules classify legal works on wilderness preservation and wildlife protection under public land law (e.g., KF5635-5646), not with environmental law.

Since the introduction of Classes KD, KE, and KF, environmental law has come into its own as a discipline separate from public health. This is reflected in how the subjects are treated in the more modern LC classification schedules: Germany (KK); France (KJV); Other jurisdictions in Europe (KJ-KKZ); Asia and Eurasia, Africa, Pacific Area, and Antarctica (KL-KWX); and Law of Indigenous Peoples in the Americas (KIA-KIZ). All these classification schedules have separate sections for environmental law and public health. They also include wilderness and wildlife preservation and conservation as part of environmental law (e.g., KIE1504-1511).

In 2019, Jolande Goldberg, Senior Law Classification Specialist at the Library of Congress, and Tania Diaz-Marrero, a law cataloger in the Laws Team in the same institution, created a preliminary outline for environmental law. They used the environmental law section of the more current schedule KK (Law of Germany) as an organizational model for a draft revision of the environmental law area in the KF schedule. I spent a week at LC in Fall 2019 and modestly helped out with this effort.

The draft revision was discussed prior to and during the 2019 AALL Conference. Further revisions were made. Most of them appear on the publicly available “Library of Congress Classification Tentative Monthly List 03” (March 16, 2020). This tentative list gives the classification numbers that have been cancelled in KF, as well as any new or revised numbers. I came to the Library of Congress (LC) the week of February 24-28, 2020 and worked with Jolande and Tania in reclassifying all the U.S. environmental law monographic titles in LC's collection that focused on air, soil, and water pollution, including marine pollution. Reclass of serials in this area was done by a different group, but in many cases, we provided suggested call numbers.

While most of the reclassification went smoothly, several more challenging cases caused us to stop in our tracks, requiring substantive discussion and restructure of the reclassification draft. Despite several instances of this nature, we were able to finish it on Friday, February 28. For the present, works on wilderness conservation and wildlife protection have been left in the Public lands section of the KF schedule, given the limited range of numbers available for expansion in the environmental law section.

Below I will enumerate some of the major changes to the schedules and one of the challenges which we encountered.

KF3775-KF3816 now serves only as the general range for works on public health. Environmental law has been moved to a new section, KF3817-KF3820.6, immediately before the area on medical legislation (KF3821-KF3832). General works on environmental law are classified in KF3817, not KF3775:

Previous: KF3775 General works on environmental law or public health
Revision: KF3775 covers only general works on public health

Previous (since 1967): KF3786-3790 Water pollution. Drainage
Revision: KF3818.3 Water pollution (general)

Previous (since 1967): KF3812-3812.5.E55 Air pollution
Revision: KF3818.2-3818.24
Tobacco smoking. KF3812.3 remains the number for Tobacco smoking but is now under the hierarchy of Public health—Indoor air pollution, rather than Environmental law/Public health—Air pollution.

Selected numbers for topics previously not represented in the schedule:
Environmental justice (KF3817.2)
Organization and administration (KF3817.4)
Environmental protection and planning (KF3817.6)
General number for Pollution (KF3818)
Marine pollution (KF3818.36; formerly just under broader Water pollution)
Soil pollution (KF3818.4)
Specific pollutants (KF3818.82 A-Z; many newly established, such as Petroleum. Oil, KF3818.82.P48. This number would be used for works that discuss oil pollution in general. Works on oil pollution of the sea would go under Marine pollution. Works on oil pollution of a specific river or lake would go under KF3818.32 A-Z, Water pollution. Specific bodies of water, A-Z).

The Environmental damages section has been expanded.
KZ1299.A-Z now has Cutter numbers for air, marine, noise, and soil pollution in addition to the previously established water and hazardous substances cutters.

Changes in K Schedule
The section on liability for environmental damages (K955-K956) has been expanded. K956, oil pollution damages, is now under two newer broader topics: Water pollution and Marine pollution. Soil pollution has also been added.

Special challenges
Almost immediately, we encountered issues with the classification of works discussing a suite of legislation often referred to as the Clean Water Acts. These issues necessitated extensive revisions of name authority records. The authorized name of the first landmark statute on this subject is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The name authority record (LCCN 81054302) was somewhat confusing. A note on the record stated that the law dated back to July 17, 1952, and some other sources cited other dates in the 1950s, whereas most sources date the law to June 30, 1948 (P.L. 845). The 1948 statute was amended on numerous occasions but took on its modern form when completely rewritten in 1972 as the act entitled the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL92-500), with significant changes since then including the Clean Water Act of 1977 and the Water Quality Act of 1987. The authority record also had a see reference from the Clean Water Act of 1977. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act began to be more commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act, especially after the passing of the 1972 amendments. We updated the authority record with the correct date of enactment of the statute and removed the confusing cross reference. I reclassified one book with the misleading title: “The Clean Water Act thirty-year retrospective,” 2004 (LCCN 2005276183). The title actually refers to the 1972 amendments, not the original 1948 statute. However, the book contained history and documents relating to water pollution legislation dating from the passing of The Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I decided to classify it under the general number for water pollution (KF3818.3) as it seemed too broad to link with either the original 1948 statute or later legislation.

Work remaining to be done:
We want to move on to revising the environmental law sections for the older KD, KE, and Latin American schedules. We will then update the environmental law sections of the remaining schedules for which we expect far fewer revisions will be necessary.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Jolande Goldberg with the compilation of this article. All errors are, of course, my own.

(See Endnotes on next page.)
No doubt most of us are familiar with the recent kerfuffle that occurred last year concerning Bloomberg Law and the ABA/BNA Lawyer’s Manual on Professional Conduct (“Lawyer’s Manual”). For those who aren’t, on November 21, 2019, Mary Whisner of the Gallagher Law Library at the University of Washington School of Law sent a message through ALL-SIS that Bloomberg Law would no longer publish the Lawyer’s Manual in print. Ms. Whisner explained that “[o]ur law students and faculty would still have access through Bloomberg Law, but local attorneys and members of the public will not.”

According to Ms. Whisner, their library’s Collection Development Librarian contacted the Bloomberg Representative to find out “whether it would be possible for us to subscribe to an ethics module for public access. The answer was we could ONLY provide access to this key resource by purchasing Bloomberg Law Patron Access for library visitors, with a price tag of nearly $14,000.”

Early in December 2019, Ms. Whisner started a new thread started on ALL-SIS restating the issue. Comments about lack of access poured in from librarians nationwide, including, “[t]his title is a core resource for county law libraries… [o]ur set is used by both attorneys and judges,” and “[w]e need to escalate this to AALL. We need to put pressure on the ABA to make this title available.”

Fast forward to January 2020. Jenny Silbiger, the State Law Librarian of Hawaii State Judiciary, posted on ALL-SIS that her Bloomberg Law representative had “reached out to me this morning saying they just got word they will be offering a segmented, IP authenticated access to Lawyer’s Manual.” Libraries would be offered IP-authenticated subscriptions so that internal users and the public would continue to have access. Thanks to efforts of CRIV and AALL, the situation had been resolved.

But has it? For this resource, maybe, but what about all the other ABA/BNA Manuals that are now suddenly available only in digital format? This despite Bloomberg Law’s assurances that BNA books would continue in print. As a reminder, back in 2018, CRIV got together with Bloomberg Law (Bloomberg BNA at the time) to discuss plans for access to BNA content. CRIV Vendors Liaison with Bloomberg BNA: https://crivblog.com/2018/09/17/criv-vendor-liaison-with-bloomberg-bna/.

In no uncertain terms, Bloomberg Law expressly stated that they were moving towards digital only publishing. However, they assured CRIV and AALL that they would carve out exceptions for the ABA/BNA Manual of Professional
Conduct, which they said “would continue in print for the foreseeable future,” and BNA books, which would “continue in print and are not impacted by this policy.” See the statement below:

1. Discontinuing Print Titles for Existing Subscribers:
Bloomberg BNA is moving toward digital-only publishing. This decision is grounded in the reality that more and more libraries are moving away from subscribing to print titles. Bloomberg BNA stopped selling print titles to new subscribers over two years ago and is now moving existing subscribers to the same electronic-only access model. Three publications will continue in print. Tax Management Portfolios (TMP) and Corporate Practice Series (CPS) will continue in print until a date TBD. No print sunset has been determined at this time. Subscribers will be notified in advance when an end date is determined. The ABA/BNA Manual of Professional Conduct will continue in print for the foreseeable future. BNA Books will continue in print and are not impacted by this policy. (Emphasis added).

2. Requiring Bloomberg Law subscription for continued access to print Tax Management Portfolios:
As accounts come up for renewal, libraries that wish to continue to receive the print version of Tax Management Portfolio must license one or more seats to Bloomberg Law. Libraries that prefer electronic access only are not required to continue a print subscription. Libraries also have the option to subscribe to Bloomberg Law: Tax and other Bloomberg BNA publications currently for sale on a designated-user license, as opposed to the entire Bloomberg Law platform. Bloomberg Law: Tax includes access to the Tax Management Portfolios. A standalone patron access terminal for just the Tax Management Portfolios is not available. The Patron Access Terminals have access to all of Bloomberg Law.

For libraries that provide public access in state, public, and government libraries, a Patron Access electronic license to the full Bloomberg platform is required. Libraries have the option to pay the additional cost to keep Tax Management Portfolio or Corporate Practice Series in print until they cease publication. Patron access must be provided at a single-user access point and is priced at $13,390 per seat. Some libraries may require multiple seats with the number determined during the renewal process. (Emphasis added).

This was re-stated in the November 2018 CRIV SHEET on page 13. (Note that BNA Books are now Bloomberg Law Books).

Despite Bloomberg Law’s assurances about BNA books, other ABA/BNA Books and BNA Books (Bloomberg Law Books) are now only available in digital format. Here is a list of all the titles that are now only available digitally: https://books.bloomberglaw.com/pages/digital-books. I have gone a step further and made a chart of the ABA/BNA digital only materials. See fig. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ABA Section</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Fraud and Abuse: Practical Perspectives</td>
<td>ABA Health Law Section</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bloomberglaw.com/legal_search/browser/463780">https://www.bloomberglaw.com/legal_search/browser/463780</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Care Litigation</td>
<td>ABA Health Law Section</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bloomberglaw.com/legal_search/browser/463734">https://www.bloomberglaw.com/legal_search/browser/463734</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two years have passed, and I gather we have reached that foreseeable future Bloomberg was talking about in 2018. Based upon what Ms. Whisner said in her post, the original terms of accessing the Lawyer’s Manual mirrors the terms of their access to digital TMP, except for the cost increase: “Patron access must be provided at a single access user point and is priced at $13,390 per seat.” This shows, if nothing else, Bloomberg Law is both consistent and committed to its goal of all digital content.

Thanks to CRIV and AALL’s negotiating skills, Bloomberg agreed to create an IP-authenticated access to subscription separate from Bloomberg Law in order to access the Lawyer’s Manual. As grateful as I am for this compromise, I remain a bit suspicious. How much will this resource cost? Making the resource IP-authenticated does not mean that it will not be cost prohibitive. And what about all the other digitized books? Could we also get a standalone IP-authenticated access to those as well? Because libraries who once paid less than $1,000k for a print resource will have difficulty spending $14,000k for a subscription to an entire research platform for access to a book we were assured would “continue in print.”

Granted, it is possible that Bloomberg Law updated its position on BNA Books, particularly since the name change. I am not privy to the inner workings of CRIV and AALL’s vendor conferences. But given the umbrage taken over the restricted access to the Lawyer’s Manual, I don’t think anything formal was announced. If it was, it wasn’t loudly announced.

Mary Whisner’s shout out on ALL-SIS shows the collective power CRIV and AALL possess in terms of bargaining power with vendors. It illustrates how we can bring vendors to the table and get them to change their policies when access and cost become too burdensome. Perhaps CRIV and AALL could take advantage of this willingness to negotiate and investigate Bloomberg Law’s digital-only access to other ABA/BNA titles while we have their attention. Let’s keep our momentum going.

---

Welcome to the third installment of TSLL’s “Conference Round-up” column. The goal of this column is to facilitate sharing of conference experiences beyond AALL’s Annual Meeting. This issue’s column features two reports from ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia. Whether at a national conference such as ALA, a regional conference, or a local workshop, there is a wealth of information being shared that can be reported back to our peer technical services law librarians. If you have the opportunity to attend a local, regional, or national conference, or workshop with content of interest to technical services librarians and would like to provide a short summary, please contact me at jkm95@cornell.edu.

Bibliographic Conceptual Models Interest Group
ALA Midwinter, Philadelphia, PA
Sunday, January 26, 2020

Cate Kellett
Yale Law School

Speakers: Ian Bigelow, Head of Cataloguing Strategies, University of Alberta Library; Kevin Ford, Linked Data Technical Specialist at the Library of Congress

On Sunday, January 26, 2020, the Bibliographic Conceptual Models Interest Group met at ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia. The program consisted of two presentations on the concepts of SuperWork, Opus, and BIBFRAME Hubs.
Ian Bigelow, Head of Cataloguing Strategies, University of Alberta Library, presented *Modus Operandi: Creating the SuperWork in Share-VDE and the Opus Level of Description*. The focus of his presentation was on the need for a model to connect works in a Linked Data environment. Our movement toward automated data interchange makes it especially necessary for a common identifier and universal application to form connections at the work level. Standard identifiers in Bibframe must: (1) be clearly identified with a predicate; (2) have universal or at least wide application; and (3) be able to create them for use in MARC, BIBFRAME, and through conversion from MARC to BIBFRAME.

The Share-VDE Work ID Working Group was created in 2018. Their charge is to: (1) review the Share work clustering outline and submit feedback on potential improvements; (2) review the use of primary identifiers in the Share-VDE data set and provide feedback; and (3) engage with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging to identify and/or develop best practices for use of these identifiers in BIBFRAME and MARC data.

The working group found challenges with existing vocabularies such as OCLC Work ID and LC Work ID because they are not universal and/or not ready for use yet. One issue is that there is no universal definition of *work*. The LRM definition is the “intellectual or artistic content of a distinct creation,” while the Bibframe definition is the “highest level of abstraction” and “reflects the conceptual essence of the cataloged resource: authors, languages, and what it is about (subjects).” Work to expression relationships can currently be expressed in BIBFRAME, but these ultimately are work to work relationships that are hard to express as hierarchical relationships. As a solution, they created the new concept of SuperWork as their highest level of abstraction to aggregate equivalent or near equivalent BIBFRAME Work clusters. Identifiers for Share-VDE SuperWork are created algorithmically based on unique clusters of elements for BIBFRAME Works, excluding RDA expression level elements.

At the end of his presentation, Mr. Bigelow explained the concept of *Opus* as an entity that permits the grouping of works that are equivalents or near-equivalents. As a subclass of work, it is defined as a group of elements that form the shared content of aggregated works. SuperWork and Hub are two examples of this highest level of abstraction. SuperWork and Hub are similar but not the same and must be differentiated as separate vocabularies. The Share-VDE Work ID Working Group is currently identifying SuperWork properties and relationships in BIBFRAME and incorporating these updates into application profiles for BIBFRAME in Sinopia. We need best practices and standards to identify how to set up these profiles, how catalogers should interact with SuperWork, and how much should be automated.

The second speaker, Kevin Ford, Linked Data Technical Specialist at the Library of Congress, gave a presentation entitled *On BIBFRAME Hubs*. LC introduced Hubs at ALA Annual in June 2019 as a solution to some of the weaknesses of the BIBFRAME Work entity. For example, there previously was not a way to translate title or name/title access points from MARC to BIBFRAME. Instead, they came out as anonymous resources or blank nodes. Now Hubs allow the aggregation and collocation of resources. For example, all the Spanish translations of Mark Twain’s *Tom Sawyer* can be gathered into a hub. Hubs are similar to Share-VDE’s SuperWork concept, though they were developed separately and are not identical, as Mr. Bigelow explained in the first presentation.

Hubs are composed of a single contributor plus a title, or sometimes just a title. In MARC authority records, this includes the 1xx + $t or just the 130. In MARC bibliographic records, this includes the 1xx + 240 or just 130, 600, 610, 611 + $t or just 630, 700, 710, 711 + $t or just 730.

A Hub allows us to make connections to other data. It’s a way point, not part of a rigid hierarchy. For example, it is not always an RDA Work. The name *Hub* was chosen because the word is simple and brief. It means a place where things come together. It is intentionally abstract: it is not a starting point or an end point, but rather a point of intersect along the way. As such, Hubs are not the focus of a cataloger’s main work. Mr. Ford created a profile for BIBFRAME Hubs that catalogers will be able to use in the future.
Technical and Public: a Write-up of ALCTS Technical Services Workflow Efficiency Interest Group Meeting
ALA Midwinter, Philadelphia, PA
January 2020

Jesse A Lambertson
D'Angelo Law Library (University of Chicago)

I co-chaired ALA Midwinter 2020’s ALCTS Technical Services Workflow Efficiency Interest Group (TSWEIG) in Philadelphia. My co-chair is Gina Solares. Both presentations focused on orchestrating changes to collaborative (interdepartmental) workflows. Jennifer Eustis' presentation, “Welcome to Your New Job: Streamlining Inherited Workflows & Processes,” detailed her method for refining inherited workflows. She mostly focused on changes to batch record loading procedures at University of Massachusetts Amherst. Cara Calabrese's presentation, “The Evolving Workflow: Moving Streaming Video Acquisitions to a Mediated Model,” represented an example of a trending topic this year—how Miami University transitioned to a mediated model for licensing streaming content. Below, I describe, briefly, these two presentations.

Jennifer Eustis started our session by saying one may have ‘passed-down’ or ‘inherited’ workflows on the path of our work journey. Rarely (if ever) does a professional work ONLY in brand-new positions with no history. At UMass Amherst, Eustis received ‘passed-down’ batch workflows which were made more complex through: staff turnover, shifting batch loading responsibilities, and shared metadata issues in the Five College Consortium. She described a few of the challenges of inherited workflows and that these challenges informed her information gathering process: documentation, gaps in knowledge, training, and trust. In her presentation, Eustis related how she approaches passed-down workflows and manages those gaps by info gathering in four areas: Institutional Knowledge, Tracking & Planning, Documentation, Evaluation & Assessment. With these four areas as her guide, Eustis can then determine stakeholders, deadlines, opportunities for change, etc. All this takes a while.

She acknowledged that major workflow changes require training and planning. Change does not usually come easily. Eustus emphasized ‘people over process’ deliberately to ensure people could jump to the necessary changes in a reasonable and organized way. A ‘Batch Loading Team’ was formed. This group worked on multiple cleanup projects, which included moving documentation to CORAL from the old spreadsheets, distributing work so that no single person was responsible, implementing an evaluation method, and, finally (though it is still work in progress), moving much of the CORAL documentation to Trello (some of you may have heard of it). Jennifer reiterated this is a work in progress—so maybe there will be a Batch Loading Workflow # 2 Session in the future...

The second presentation at our IG session was by Cara Calabrese, whose scenario involved a larger focus on library resource users—those who request content that will eventually be streamed (and that requires licenses and metadata). Specifically, this was about Kanopy orders and looking for a cost effective mode of delivering these streaming resources to users—as denoted by her presentation’s subtitle: 'Moving streaming video acquisitions to a mediated workflow.'

She said the previous ER librarian had begun a mediated streaming proposal—but it did not get implemented. The truth is, Calabrese found it just by digging around in library documents. Calabrese said she was excited to get the new mediated workflow into action—but there were communication breaks in the process that weren’t clear (something we also saw in the first presentation). A positive side of this change was that as the proposal was already in development, the vendors were already staged to adapt, and the librarians became aware. There were still pieces of the request process relative to the discovery layer that need attention, but the mediated workflow was put into effect.

It was great for the library staff at Miami University library to solve the issue of communication to those who request resources. Previously, no request was acknowledged as received and the request went to a single person’s e-mail, rather than to a process-oriented handle. The new process increased transparency by sending the request to a non-specific e-mail many would be able to see. She hopes to produce auto-reply templates to make the process more transparent to those who request items—but that functionality does not exist yet. The current procedures have taken on different forms—depending on to whom the procedures are communicated.
The presentations were followed by quality audience questions centered on: technology of solutions, management of change, and communication challenges. Eustis & Calabrese each listed the tools they used in their workflow streamlining, including GSuite, LibAnswers, MarcEdit, and spreadsheets. Slack, OpenRefine, Object Oriented Programming (OOP), and Trello were also used. When the inevitable question was asked on the issue of management of change, Eustis replied how important it is to invest in robust working relationships with colleagues to coordinate these concerns (which are very real in some situations). In response to questions about communicating changes to faculty, Calabrese described how important it is to have consistent messaging from the ‘library,’ with emphasis on flexibility and quick response-time.

The session went slightly longer than the allotted time—but was educational and enjoyable.

Kuali/OLE ‘vs’ Sinopia Cataloging for Antitrust Writing Awards 2016: A Descriptive Account of Dual Cataloging in MARC and BIBFRAME

As I stated in my previous Description & Entry Column, I wanted to highlight a little of the cataloging process in Kuali/OLE (OLE) before it goes the way of the dodo bird and is replaced by FOLIO (2020/2021).

Herein, I write column #2 doing that—with a focus on what is usually original cataloging in MARC in OLE and metadata production in BIBFRAME in Sinopia. The intent here is to not to do an absolute side-by-side description but to show some of the differences. The order of operations for us, currently, is to catalog in MARC first and then re-catalog in Sinopia. Should be fun and educational.

First, we realize for that for acquisition and inventory purposes, we always must have a ‘stub’ record in OLE onto which we attach order info and inventory.

The ‘stub’ record:

This record will be overlaid by the original record created in Connexion.

In process…
The record will eventually become RDA (https://access.rdatoolkit.org/) and BSR (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf) compliant.

Eventually, after the original record has been completed in Connexion and the (OCoLC) number has been created, I will copy this digit into OLE into a new 035 (in order to overlay).

New MARC tags are added this way:

Gotta make sure to format the 035 correctly, or the system will not know which record to overlay.

Export the newly created record to a directory on the machine (F5 in Connexion)

Import the record by the ‘New Batch’ tool

The new record looks so much better (partial view)
Now, on to the Sinopia re-cataloging…

The mode of interaction with the item-in-hand changes a bunch when working with BIBFRAME—one must attend to the division between the Expression and the Manifestation relative to the LRM in ways that were not so obvious in MARC. In BIBFRAME, besides the Item, there is a Work and an Instance (which is mostly a split between the Expression and the Manifestation in the WEMI). No client exists. The whole process takes place in a web UI via browser (Firefox is my default).

One can see that in order to catalog a monograph in-hand, three entities are required to be open (which are currently used as tabs within the Sinopia UI). They are linked by URI (each entity will have a URI and will be managed by resources such as: ‘Has Item…’, ‘Instance of…’, ‘Holding of (Item of)’. In this terminology, one sees the relationships and the inverse relationships inferred (which is very important in the LRM). Not a strict working out of the LRM—but in a coded situation, decisions have to be coded into the system for actual use beyond the theory.

Take a look at the ‘Item’ in Sinopia (this is the same resource I was cataloging in MARC).

This image is not the entire UI of the item template, but it goes to show that Item metadata is simple and technical: Barcodes, Call Nos, Locations, etc.

I feel it’s easiest to catalog starting with the technical, inventory-oriented metadata and then work my way back to the Work (Expression).

In the above image, one can see the URI for the Item minted. In the image below, one can see that same URI in the Property: ‘Has Item…’ Eventually, the Work (Expression) will be minted, and that empty Property to the left will have a URI in its place. And, of course, at this point, we are looking at the Instance, and the URI has not been minted for it yet.
But let’s look at some of the major differences of cataloging in a LOD environment (which Sinopia really is).

This data (these two dates) are literals. That is, they are simply keyed and saved in the form.

![Date and Copyright Data](image)

But this data, place of publication and publisher, are interacted with completely differently. In MARC (as seen in Connexion client), we know from years of carpal tunnel producing cataloging, this data is ALL keyed in the tag (264 here).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>264</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>New York : #b Institute of Competition Law, #c 2016.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#c © 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sinopia changes the game as a complex LOD proof of concept:

![Sinopia LOD Proof of Concept](image)

The system works in the background to query some files, such as LCNAF, LCSH, etc., and returns some values. This feature still needs much tweaking, but, assuming the form of the name has been entered correctly, the result returns what we need. I click that option with my mouse, and it is added to the Property Template with the id.loc.gov URI in the triple.

So, when I click that, the URI itself takes me to Library of Congress’ Linked Data Service…

![Library of Congress URI](image)
The same thing for the Issuing Body or Publisher (might be the same).

As the work progresses, one can save the data entered by clicking the Save button in the top right of the UI.

One other key difference in working out the workflow…

The Templates for each Work, Instance, or Item are created beforehand in an editor designed specifically for that task—and the saved data keeps the triples.

Wanna preview the RDF (the view below is of the Instance in Turtle)?

But as I am working on another resource, I remember: oops, I forgot to add that title on the spine…or something… I can search the Sinopia system to bring up the saved data.
I should get a Work and an Instance back (since all the data is indexed in a keyword sense)...

And I do!

Navigating GitHub for meaningful communication about software platforms (with no intention of learning git or coding) – Part 2

Wilhelmina Randtke
Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative

Not-programmer things to do on GitHub

Figure 1, above. Screenshot of the GitHub for the Islandora Foundation, showing multiple repositories. In the screenshot, the following repositories are visible “documentation:” “islandora_paged_content” and “islandora_defaults.” Scrolling down would reveal a total of 66 repositories. The repository “documentation” is instructions on using the software. Other repositories are pieces of code, each of which does something specific (for example, show a series of images in sequenced order to display all pages of a book or allow a menu in the web interface for configuring options when a search is run on the site). The key thing is that the authoritative version of what is conceptually one single software platform and one single documentation manual is spread across numerous repositories on GitHub. And supporting libraries, which are necessary to run the software platform, are not represented on the Islandora Foundation GitHub because the supporting libraries would be used in an out-of-the-box way when the platform is installed.
Stepping back: Remember not all activity is on GitHub

One key thing to remember is that an absence of activity on GitHub does not mean an absence of activity. Closed source software will likely have no public code or will have limited public code for the purpose of supporting interaction with application programming interfaces (APIs). Any organization managing or writing software is extremely likely to have some communication tools which are only available to members of the organization and so won't be a public GitHub. Having a public face involves a few extra steps, including checking over what is made publicly available for passwords, and is extra work. So, an absence of activity on GitHub for a person, organization, or software platform does not mean an absence of activity. Think of checking GitHub as similar to checking a single listserv archive when you are looking for information about a specific software platform.

Also, the amount of public activity from a user account on GitHub does not indicate how active the person is in coding. An absence of activity from a user account does not tell you anything.

Non-programmer activity: Find examples of projects using a software platform

A common need for libraries is to do exploration of several possible software solutions for a need and determine which is best. One way of doing this is to identify who else is using a software platform and contact that organization for information about their experiences. Activity on GitHub is done through accounts which can belong to either an organization or a person. It's not necessary to know git or to understand GitHub well in order to be able to use GitHub to locate people and organizations using a software platform.

In git, one of the ways you can interact with code is to "fork" the code. At heart, a fork is a copy of a codebase that you keep. You can modify it, then you can also examine your own "commits" (i.e. saves) and quickly pull up and review any commits (i.e. saves) made to the source you forked (i.e. copied) from. So, you can easily combine your changes with any changes to the source as that original source gets updated over time. Doing this involves a deep dive, in order to understand what changes to make and to make them. So, anyone who has forked a repository and is regularly saving changes to the fork is likely taking a deep dive into that software platform and engaged. Those are the big installs and power users, likely the people who know where good examples of a software platform can be found and who is using the platform. These are people who are likely to know answers to questions you might have.

In GitHub, once you have located the source for a software platform, you can see forks of each repository.

Each individual repository can be forked. An organizational account cannot be forked. Going back to Figure 1, in order to comprehensively see fork activity, you would have to click into all 66 repositories on the Islandora Foundation GitHub account and view forks from there. Approach this like citation trails in research, where going back over things or comprehensively following citation trails will lead you to the same handful of most important papers. The repositories displayed near the top of the list are the most recently updated. Each repository should have both a descriptive name and when you click into it should display a neatly written README file (should meaning an aspirational goal or best practice and not necessarily the norm). A good approach is to think about what about the software is important to you, for example, zooming in on photos, displaying citations in Blue Book format, or any other need you have. Then, skim for repositories that seem as if they might be related and click on the name of a few repositories to view them. Once you are viewing a single repository, you will see links in the top right of the repository's page for "Watch," "Star," and "Fork." Each has a number next to it, which is accounts that have performed the action. Clicking the number pulls up the list of GitHub accounts which have performed that action.

Figure 2, next page. Homepage of the Islandora Scholar institutional repository portions of the software platform showing links in the top right for “Watch,” “Star,” and “Fork.” Clicking on the list of forks gives a list of 59 user accounts, each of which has copied the code to their account and may or may not have made customizations or shared changes back. Of those 59 accounts, a quick skim shows a handful of accounts with acronyms of large universities. These are institutions which have likely assessed the software in-depth or which currently use the software. If you are considering software to meet a need at your libraries, it may be useful to contact them for advice and pointers.
Figure 3, above. A list of accounts that have forked the repository shown in Figure 2. There are numerous accounts. Skimming reveals some institutional accounts, which are circled in red in this screenshot. Those institutions have at some point interacted with this code, and so it's possible to do online searches or contact the institution to find examples of the software platform in action or to talk with someone who might be able to share experiences of running the software. While these are likely to be the power users and will slant towards more technically resourced institutions, the people there may be familiar with who else is using the software and may be able to refer to other users with different levels of resourcing.
Non-programmer activity: Find specific people who have trusted access to the code

One of the responsibilities of my current job is to locate bug fixes, and if they look good, then walk things through in my organization. I am with a large consortium, which runs multiple open source software platforms for digital publishing but which only contributes code and only takes a deep dive on a small fraction of those projects. This can sound well-resourced and technical, but at the same time, fixes generally need review by talented employees with the skill level to understand a change and approval from employees who would be affected in case anything goes wrong. Like in many libraries, I am nontechnical and working with technical employees in other departments. IT is housed separately from the library side of things. If a desired change is a sanity check, then that's a much easier ask than a deep dive is. If I can identify what is and isn't a sanity check, that helps to move some changes forward. For software that the consortium runs but does not contribute code to, often it's important to connect with an expert in the open source community in order to be able to trust a bug fix before implementing it. To do this, I can use GitHub to identify core developers on a software project and people who are able to change the authoritative versions of software made publicly available on GitHub.

What this is useful for is when I've asked a question on a listserv or a support forum and gotten some possible answers. The closer the person giving the advice is to the authoritative version of the software, the more likely that the recommended fix is a sanity check rather than a close look for technical people inside my organization.

To see user accounts on an institutional GitHub account, look along the right-hand side of the organizational GitHub page, and look under the heading labeled “People.” You can see this in Figure 1. Mousing over each person's profile image shows the username. Anyone added to the organizational GitHub account has trusted access to at least one repository, and advice on a listserv or support forum coming from that person is likely to be more authoritative. That may make the difference between being able to resource a review at all or not or may play into what needs to be done to review the recommended change (i.e. how many hours of a person's time to ask for).

Non-programmer activity: Report bugs and "me too" on bugs that are an issue for your organization.

In software development, bug reports and feature requests are generally tracked in some kind of ticketing system. Two common ticketing systems which allow members of the public to participate (with approval) are GitHub issues and the Jira ticketing system. Some software communities will use both.

The way bug reports and feature requests are used is generally to keep a list and keep notes about items on that list. Most are not used to make forward progress on an item, so the fact that a ticket or issue exists doesn't mean there is or will be any action on the item.

Generally, open tickets/issues will be reviewed periodically. It might be that there is a conference call or email discussion to comprehensively review open items, to review items that have had any activity in the past 6 months, or some other criteria. Generally, the goal will be to identify whether any items should be acted on. With limited resources and a large list of wants and bugs, it's not possible to do everything.

Ticketing systems are a way for people and organizations using the software to communicate priorities and needs.

GitHub's built-in ticketing system is GitHub Issues. Each issue is stored on a repository. But the common way to handle issues (i.e. support tickets) in GitHub is for an organization to put all issues on a single repository. This might be the most generic repository or a dummy repository with no content specifically created to hold issues. It is extremely uncommon to have issues spread across many repositories, and instead, if GitHub is used, the issues for an entire conceptual software platform will all be stored in one place even though the code is stored in several places.

The best way to locate the ticketing system for a code base is to use a search engine. It may or may not be in GitHub. It is common for organizations publishing code with GitHub to use a different platform as a ticketing system.
The best way to use a ticketing system is:

- When a problem in the software or a missing feature impacts your ability to do work, look for the authoritative ticketing system for reporting problems with the software and give feedback there.
- Usually, if you have the problem, someone else will have had the problem, too. So, first search for an existing support ticket. Then, interact with the ticket. GitHub will allow you to upvote or comment on an existing issue, and doing this can put that issue on the agenda of meetings held between computer programmers who are active in software development. It can also help to get a fix for the issue resourced, because most people contributing to open source are doing so as part of employment and are working on problems that are either a high priority for their employer or are high profile and so are viewed as a form of publishing that raises the employer's profile and clout. More activity on the ticket shows that there is general interest in moving it forward, and that activity on it will increase the clout of whatever organization coded a fix. If you are able to find the ticketing system for a software platform and add a me-too comment or upvote the ticket/issue, then it is more likely that the issue will be resourced.
- Consider bringing the ticket to the attention of others who you know are affected by the same bug or who want the same feature. This is especially effective if you have discussed the item with someone at another institution and know that it's important at the other organization, too.

Opening a ticket is another possible way to interact with a ticketing system. Most software communities restrict who is and is not able to open a ticket, and most needs of a software are already known and reported but not yet resourced. The most meaningful activity for people using software is likely to be expressing which existing and known needs should be prioritized.

Figure 5, next page. A GitHub Issue for the Open Journal Systems journal publishing software. Another user has made a me-too comment and added detail on needs of his organization. From this view, it is possible for anyone with a GitHub account to click the smiley face and upvote the issue or to scroll to the bottom and add a comment describing how the issue affects people using the software.
In January 2019, Project COUNTER released its Code of Practice 5 (COP5), which was a significant update from COP4 (released in 2014). While there is already a large body of literature discussing COUNTER since its inception, this seemed like a good time to re-introduce the standard to newer librarians, summarize the changes in COP5, and review some of the advocacy efforts related to expanding COUNTER to legal content providers.

What is COUNTER?
For the uninitiated, Project COUNTER (http://www.projectcounter.org) is an international non-profit membership organization of libraries, publishers, and vendors. Since its launch in 2002, it has developed its Code of Practice, which is a standard designed to count usage statistics of electronic resources in a library setting, which enables more reliable, consistent, and comparable statistics across platforms. Compliance with COUNTER is not mandatory, but many information vendors have voluntarily made their usage data COUNTER-compliant at the urging of librarians whose institutions and organizations require “cost-per-use” and other metrics to justify their electronic resource spending. Usage data has always had a multitude of problems, and COUNTER aims to alleviate some of those problems through standardization and wide-spread adoption.

The arrangement of COP5 uses three categories of metrics: 1) Usage, 2) Access Denials, and 3) Searches. These metrics are delivered in four types of Master Reports: 1) Platform Reports, 2) Database Reports, 3) Title Reports, and 4) Item Reports. Master Reports have additional metadata to describe the type of database or platform and include a series of added elements and attributes which provide more granular information about items and usage. Users have the option of viewing Master Reports in full or using pre-filtered “standard views,” which represent common use cases. Admittedly, COUNTER data uses a specific vocabulary, and those new to COUNTER might want to consult their Friend-
As promising as this committee sounded, it’s safe to say that COUNTER is not the standard amongst specialized legal e-resource vendors. Listed below in alphabetical order is a summary of COUNTER-compliant legal e-resource vendors/content providers as of February 2020. This list draws from the existing Register of COUNTER Compliant Publishers & Vendors; it is not exhaustive, but attempts to include the most common legal information vendors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTER-Compliant Legal E-Resource Content Providers/Platforms:</th>
<th>NON-COUNTER-Compliant Legal E-Resource Content Providers/Platforms:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Brill</td>
<td>✗ AILA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>✗ ALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ CQ Press</td>
<td>✗ Bloomberg Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ EBSCO</td>
<td>✗ Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction (CALI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Edward Elgar</td>
<td>✗ Continuing Education of the Bar-California (CEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Gale</td>
<td>✗ William S. Hein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ JSTOR</td>
<td>✗ LexisNexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Oxford University Press</td>
<td>✗ LLMC Digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ ProQuest</td>
<td>✗ PLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td>✗ Thomson Reuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Wiley</td>
<td>✗ West Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Wolters Kluwer (Kluwer Law Online only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the non-COUNTER compliant vendors do supply usage statistics. However, vendor-defined metrics are often not well-defined, lack internal standardization, and are not comparable to other similar database usage statistics. In the past, vendors have reasoned that their statistics are better and non-COUNTER compliance allows them to supply more detailed and database-specific metrics. Specifically, William S. Hein explained that COUNTER isn’t a good fit for Hein’s content and suggested that it would be good if content providers could agree upon alternative metrics when COUNTER isn’t a good fit (Dunn, 2016). To become COUNTER-compliant, vendors must implement the technical infrastructure to generate the COUNTER-specific reports, use a COUNTER validation tool to make sure the reports are correct, and undergo an independent audit within six months of agreeing to become compliant and annually after that. Vendors have mentioned that the time it takes to become COUNTER-compliant, in addition to keeping up with annual audits and updates to the Code of Practice, makes compliance difficult, if not impossible.

**Advocacy Efforts: Have We Given Up?**

AALL recognized COUNTER’s importance early on and became a member in 2005. As noted above, however, specialized legal information vendors continue to be absent from the list of COUNTER-compliant content providers. To address the issue, the Project COUNTER Task Group formed in 2007 under the TS-SIS Serials Standing Committee. This committee advocated to lower the financial barriers for smaller or non-profit vendors to become COUNTER-compliant, created a sample letter for librarians to send to vendors to urge COUNTER compliance, and assembled a bibliography of COUNTER resources.

In 2009, AALL created a Vendor Liaison position tasked with advocating for law librarians on issues of importance to AALL. Under her leadership, in 2011, AALL created a document entitled *Shared Principles for Law Librarians and Legal Information Vendors* (AALLb, 2011). The *Shared Principles* formed the framework for a vendor colloquium held the same year. The colloquium resulted in the formation of a working group to refine AALL’s *Shared Principles* and develop an action plan. Goal 1-C of the action plan was to “identify and promote methods of demonstrating return on investment (ROI) and reporting usage statistics and metrics” (AALLa, 2011). The final report of the working group recommended the formation of an ad hoc committee with representatives from various SISs, the Public Relations Committee, the Vendor Liaison, and vendor representatives to “develop a shared understanding of statistics and metrics.” As promising as this committee sounded, it doesn’t appear ever to have formed, and no report was produced with any...
By 2012, it seems the momentum to advocate for COUNTER-compliance had slowed. Reports from the Serials Stand-
ing Committee at the Annual Meeting indicated vendors were unlikely to respond to a single request from the Task Group and instead wanted to hear an outcry of support from individual users. There were no reports from the Project COUNTER Task Group in 2013. In 2015, AALL discontinued its Vendor Liaison position and formally transferred responsibilities to CRIV. To the extent it could, CRIV maintained pressure on vendors to become COUNTER-compliant, and reports in the C. According to the November 2011 CRIV Sheet, the vendor colloquium working group disbanded the same year (Reppe, 2011).

Conclusion

E-resource usage statistics are a valuable dataset to evaluate many acquisitions and collections trends. The need for standardization in this area has also echoed throughout the years, with COUNTER being the most prevalent standard around which we can rally. For law librarians not already familiar with COUNTER, COP5 can be intimidating. The metrics included are useful, and generating reports is more straightforward than in previous codes of practice, but the terminology is highly technical. Their resources and guides ease the learning curve and make it easier to start incorpo-
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In honor of awards season, I would like to present six outstanding podcasts that cover leadership best practices, professional development, and other work issues. To get you started, I’ll include two excellent episodes of each series. Spoiler alert: although I highly recommend them all, none is as entertaining as *Parasite!*


This weekly, interview-format podcast tackles a wide range of work issues. I often pick up something genuinely useful from episodes I think will be completely irrelevant to my work life. Episodes are usually less than 30 minutes long, and the hosts (*HBR* senior editors Alison Beard and Curt Nickisch alternate as hosts) are great conversationalists who keep the discussion moving.

**Episode 708: Why Meetings Go Wrong and How to Fix Them**

Expert guest Steven Rogelberg, author of *The Surprising Science of Meetings*, offers practical tips such as designing agendas as set of questions to be answered at the meeting and scheduling meetings before or after lunch to make meetings less of an interruption to the workday.

**Episode 715: How One CEO Successfully Led a Digital Transformation**

Nancy McKinstry, Wolters Kluwer CEO, describes the difficulties in their transformation from print to digital (90% of their revenue is now from digital), why she believes diverse teams are the most innovative, and how to grow a more diverse management team.

**The Broad Experience: A Conversation about Women, the Workplace, and Success** [http://www.thebroadexperience.com/](http://www.thebroadexperience.com/)

Journalist Ashley Milne-Tyte hosts this fantastic resource for working women. While concise, each episode thoughtfully covers an important personal or professional topic through a nice mix of anecdotes and research. Milne-Tyte believes that her focus on women of all ages and backgrounds distinguishes her show from others.

**Episode 143: True Equality: When It's Ok to be Mediocre**

Pilita Clark, *Financial Times* editor and columnist, believes that many women feel that they must always work at superhuman levels, ‘leaning in’ to everything, but these women should regularly give themselves permission to perform like mere mortals.

**Episode 114: My Answer is No (If That’s Ok with You)**

In her private practice, author and psychiatrist Nanette Gartrell has observed women struggling to set limits. She discusses how to set workplace boundaries without alienating colleagues and provides six practical steps to weighing the risks of saying no.

**Safe For Work** [https://wondery.com/shows/safe-for-work/](https://wondery.com/shows/safe-for-work/)

**Dear HBR** [https://hbr.org/2018/01/podcast-dear-hbr](https://hbr.org/2018/01/podcast-dear-hbr)

These two podcasts explore real-life workplace dilemmas submitted by listeners. Each episode of *Dear HBR*, hosted by senior editors Alison Beard and Dan McGinn, centers on a specific workplace issue and includes a subject expert to help tackle multiple listener questions on that issue. Episode 17: Ineffective Leaders and Episode 48: Motivating Employees are two good places to dive into this series. *Safe For Work* is less structured and more informal than *Dear HBR*. Episodes usually begin with an industry expert addressing a workplace challenge. Next, podcast hosts, Liz Dolan, a former marketing executive, and journalist Rico Gagliano, field callers’ questions about a variety of work prob-
lems. How to Recover from a Catastrophic Comment (December 9, 2019) and How to Succeed as a New Manager (February 4, 2019) typify this podcast’s entertaining and illuminating content.

**How’s Work with Esther Perel [https://howswork.estherperel.com/](https://howswork.estherperel.com/)**
Couples psychotherapist and best-selling author Perel believes that our personal experiences in relationships strongly influence our workplace behavior. This ‘relationship dowry’ colors how we communicate, collaborate, and compete. Each episode of this podcast is an unscripted, one-time counseling session, and while the podcast won’t provide quick answers to specific topics, listeners who enjoy learning through storytelling will appreciate Perel’s nuanced and enlightening takes on a variety of workplace issues.

**Episode 7: Stuck in a Job, for Years**
Two sisters join Perel to discuss how the older sister can extricate herself from a job she has held for 20 years; the conversation explores issues of boundaries, overcoming fear, and how toxic personal relationships make you more likely to tolerate toxic workplace relationships.

**Episode 4: Laid Off and Starting Over**
Perel helps two colleagues, recently laid off from the same company, process the trauma of being fired, overcome the fear of failing, and reset their relationship from mentorship to equal partnership.

Even though anxiety disorders affect 40 million Americans over the age of 18, mental health issues are often taboo workplace topics. Business consultant and journalist Aarons-Mele and her guests explore how leaders and employees can work together to create a climate where everyone can thrive.

**Season 1, Episode 12: Mental Health in the Office: Difficult Conversations**
Aarons-Mele and her two guests discuss how high achievers, often people-pleasers who hate saying ‘no,’ can set appropriate boundaries to help reduce unnecessary workplace anxiety. Also includes a thoughtful exploration of the pros and cons of disclosing mental health conditions and how managers and colleagues can appropriately respond to disclosures.

**Season 1, Episode 13: Designing a Mentally Healthy Workplace**
This episode examines practical tools and strategies to support employee well-being as well as various ethical, legal, and social issues involved in addressing mental health issues. One excellent takeaway was that managers who open up about their struggles with a particular issue—not necessarily even a mental health issue—help create a climate that encourages employees to be open about their struggles.

Honorable mentions:
Getting Ethics to Work [https://www.prindleinstitute.org/media-resources/getting-ethics-to-work/](https://www.prindleinstitute.org/media-resources/getting-ethics-to-work/)
How I Built This [https://www.npr.org/podcasts/510313/how-i-built-this](https://www.npr.org/podcasts/510313/how-i-built-this)

Happy listening!
Introduction
The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened two meetings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Action was taken on two proposals and seven discussion papers during the meetings. Two themes emerged during the meetings: 1) continued development of MARC standard to facilitate “roundtripping” data from MARC to BIBFRAME (BF) back to MARC, and 2) how to incorporate new elements from the RDA Steering Committee’s 3R Project into the MARC standard. The Library of Congress BIBFRAME Update Forum at the ALA Midwinter Meeting 2020 included details about BF to MARC conversion, which may be useful to review in conjunction with the MAC Meeting report below. The presentations can be accessed here: http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/news/bibframe-update-mw2020.html. This report is organized with each discussion paper/proposal in bold with a summary underneath of the related discussion.

If you would like to provide feedback on any of the discussion papers or proposals, please provide feedback on the Metadata Management Committee listserv or to me directly. The complete texts of all discussion papers and proposals considered at the 2020 Midwinter meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee are available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2020_age.html

Proposal No. 2020-01: Defining a New Indicator Value for Human-generated Content in Field 883 of the MARC 21 formats
URL: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-01.html

This paper was generally supported, although several asked for the definition of the proposed label for first indicator 2 to be changed. Some wanted it to be a binary (machine-generated vs. not machine-generated). Some advocated for the label to not include the word “human” and instead represent the intellectual process that a human uses versus the automated process of a machine. This sparked a debate as to whether a machine process is, in fact, intellectual seeing as how it had to be generated by a human at some point. The proposed changes will be modified to reflect the suggestions from MAC.

The proposal passed unanimously.

Proposal No. 2020-02: Adding Subfield $0 to Fields 310 and 321 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
URL: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-02.html

The proposal was generally supported, although the primary concern in “roundtripping” MARC data is that there is no “current” and “former” frequency designation in BF; therefore, frequency data would be mapped from BF to MARC in only the 310 field. In existing MARC records where date ranges are not provided alongside the current and former frequencies, problems being able to distinguish the two arise. LC responded that they will do their best to migrate data from BF correctly into MARC so that current/former distinction is maintained.

The proposal passed with one abstention.

Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP01: Modernization or Replacement of Field 856 in the MARC 21 Formats
URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp01.html
Preparation for this discussion paper first came up at ALA Annual 2019 with Proposal 2019-01, which passed but was only partially implemented in favor of awaiting something that more thoroughly addressed the issues with field 856. The issue is that existing subfields in field 856 cannot adequately accommodate all of the information about access and about usage that our current electronic environment requires. As the discussion paper identifies, “field 856 [remains] saddled with alphabetic subfields of limited, if not downright obsolete, utility.” Sally McCallum (LC) pointed out at the beginning of the discussion that the point of this paper is to “clean out” the 856 field and get rid of subfields that are not needed anymore, not to redesign it completely in one paper. Updating the 856 field will be an iterative process with likely more discussion papers presented at future MAC meetings. She later indicated that this discussion paper will probably come back as multiple proposals: one outlining which fields to deprecate in field 856, another to define the current access and usage needs, and possibly even a third discussion paper to evaluate the indicator values and clarify any confusion about linking to a “resource” vs a “related resource.”

**Deprecating “unused” subfields in 856**

Included in the discussion paper is a list of usage statistics for each of the 856 subfields provided by OCLC, LC, and others from which they have identified subfields that could be eliminated (and possibly repurposed in the future). There was consensus that we should be assessing the usefulness of the current subfields and that many of the subfields identified would be good candidates for removal. More statistics were requested, including indicator value usage and holdings counts, for example, to provide further clarity before deciding which subfields to eliminate. MAC Chair Matthew Wise pointed out that MAC does not typically like to reuse subfields, which was later mentioned as justification for a new proposed field 857. If the new 857 field is defined, the “unused” subfields in 856 wouldn’t need to be deprecated. It was also observed that this discussion paper doesn’t address changes to field 856 across all MARC formats, but future proposals probably should.

**Creation of a New MARC field 857**

The discussion paper proposes three options: 1) Retain 856 without the “unused” subfields, 2) Retain 856 without the “unused” subfields and define a new field (857) for Open Access titles, or 3) Make field 856 obsolete and define a new field (857) in which only the currently required subfields are defined. Generally, people were against making field 856 obsolete, and there were some problems identified with the creation of a new field. Some questioned why the new 857 field needed to be restricted to open access resources. Instead, if option 2 could be changed to keep 856 and perhaps use 857 with appropriate subfields to define multiple “flavors” of access, that would be a better solution. The discussion was reminiscent of the 260/264 discussion with others wondering if 856 could be left as a legacy field for general electronic location and access information while crafting a new field that is more up-to-date. It was also pointed out that if a new field is created, there would be four MARC fields (506, 540, 856, 857) that would all deal with access and restriction, which is too many fields and would likely introduce confusion. There was a mix of opinions about the three options and no real consensus in support of any one of the options.

**URL/URI and Access Restrictions**

Lastly, several people pointed out that the subfields aren’t the only problem, but also the intermingling of URLs/URIs and their related access information. The mix of URL and access information is problematic, especially for serials. Many serial titles are hybrids of open and restricted access, and future proposals should consider solutions that take this into account. Others were reminded that different communities use different approaches to relay access information. Institutions may use a single record approach with a mix of 506/540 and 856 and others use a two-record approach, but changes to these fields should account for either.

This discussion paper will return as one or more proposals.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP02: Adding Subfield $0 to Fields 504 and 525 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**


LC is currently mapping supplementary content from bytes in field 008 to an identifier from a controlled vocabulary such as the RDA Registry or the BF Vocabulary. When LC reverses the process and converts BF data to MARC, it
wants to have some place to encode BF IRIs as a means of facilitating a loss-less transformation.

The main issue discussed was the intermixing of free-text and controlled terminology in the same field. If data from MARC is being mapped from fixed field values to BF, when that data is returned to MARC, the free-text in $a would be lost. Some asked, therefore, for further clarification on the relationship between $a and $0 and argued that eye-readable notes need to be retained in the data transformation process (for example, the free text note “Includes bibliographical references” is more meaningful than the term “bibliography” alone). As a solution, some suggested putting the controlled terms in one of the 3xx fields and preserve $a as a note. However, a field like 340 inherently records manifestation and 504/505 inherently describes the work, and mixing the two descriptions risks making things worse.

As a practical matter, if understood correctly, I raised the issue that if the content in $a does not match an existing URI, then $0 is omitted and $a would subsequently be lost in the “roundtripping” process. Looking at the RDA Registry, there is no vocabulary for supplementary content, and the BF vocabulary only include 14 entries, which is woefully lacking given the number of descriptive terms used in cataloging legal supplements (pocket supplements, pocket parts, advance sheets, special pamphlets, legislative service, etc.). When asked if LC would be able to expand the controlled vocabulary, they responded that they would be happy to work with AALL on that. The second issue is that the 525 field also includes frequency and format for supplemental material, which again, if understood correctly, would be lost. LC did not offer a response to that concern, which can be raised again in the proposal stage.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP03: Defining New Subfields in Field 340 to Record Illustrative Content and Sound Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

URL: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp03.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp03.html)

This paper was well received. Most agreed that illustrative content and sound content have to be accommodated in MARC. Some would like the possibility of using field 344 for sound characteristics to be further explored. Others suggested changes to the proposed language of the subfield definitions, explaining that the proposed language seems to imply a binary choice regarding the presence or the absence of illustrations, not the recording of the various types of illustrations that are present. There were mixed opinions as to whether a URI should be coded in $0 or $1, which is a discussion that extends beyond just this paper. Some also expressed a desire for more 3xx fields for each type of data, rather than moving it all to 340.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP04: Renaming Field 345 and Defining New Subfields for Aspect Ratio and Motion Technique in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**


This paper was well-received and was referred to OLAC for further refinement to the proposal stage.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP05: Reinstatement of Field 241 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

URL: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp05.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp05.html)

Sally McCallum introduced this paper by explaining that transliterating was a way of accomplishing something that MARC could not accommodate and was not a formal LC policy. LC is now proposing to reduce how much they transliterate titles, seemingly with the aim of going to a strictly vernacular cataloging policy. There was strong opposition to eliminating transliteration, and many people spoke out with good reasons for keeping it. LC further explained that they are not trying to get rid of transliterations completely but acknowledged that we are in a mixed environment. They also made sure to express that this is just a reinstatement of the field and does not implement a policy decision.
The proposal specifically requests for field 241 (Romanized Title) to be reinstated, and some read that to mean 880 would become obsolete. The discussion clarified that 880 would not become obsolete, but that library systems would have need to accommodate both fields. Unfortunately, however, the LD4P (https://www.ld4l.org) is attempting to take WorldCat records, submit them for BF transformation, and then roundtrip back to WorldCat. During the transformation process, they would lose any 880 fields since the BF vocabulary would map to 241. Several questions arose, such as whether 245 could be repeatable instead of reinstating 241 and what would happen with legacy 880 data. Some asked how would this affect authority work. Others asked that the name of the field be changed to “Transliterated” instead of “Romanized” and the field definition to read “one script to another” to avoid westernization.

This paper doesn’t deal with all the other fields that contain transliterated information (statement of responsibility, contents, etc.), and it was acknowledged that there needs to be more work done to understand how much transliterated information is needed. The suggestion was made to have LC change their local validation files and explore the impact of reinstating 241 locally first and then come to MAC with the results of their exploration.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP06: Defining a New Field for Manifestation Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

URL: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp06.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp06.html)

The MARC/RDA Working group started its work in December, and 2020-DP06 and 2020-DP07 are a result of their work. The paper asks for a place for “Manifestation statements” in MARC, which are unstructured statements at the manifestation level. Manifestation level statements were described as a very “low level” of cataloging, without many (if any) alterations.

Some of the points of discussion included an explanation of why field 881 was chosen. In some way, this field is representative of lots of existing MARC fields. There was some discussion of using a 2xx field, but the question is really, which MARC field can represent the whole record? It’s neutral from the other MARC fields, and it displays at the bottom, which is distinct from the “regular” fields. Others asked if the field needs to be subfielded, and it seems like there should be subfields, but perhaps this is a policy decision regardless of what subfields MAC decides are available. Someone suggested that $a be reserved for when the rest of the field is not subfielded. Others suggested that authors may need to develop indicator values that show whether the field uses the available subfields or not.

The authors will take the different options and incorporate them into a forthcoming proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2020-DP07: Recording the Extension Plan for Bibliographic Works in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**


This paper attempts to incorporate the new RDA “extension plan” element in MARC. The “extension plan” is based on the anticipated schedule for diachronic works; it is about the intention of the work rather than looking at it in retrospect. Most everyone recognized this is a need and there is a benefit to recording this information in MARC. Some questioned if there was a need for a current/former extension plan (such as the case with frequency), however; Kathy Glennon (RSC) explained there would be no need for a current/former extension plan because a change in extension plan would require a new record. Additionally, if a serial ceases, it doesn’t mean that the extension plan changes. Some asked for a $b, which would parallel those used in existing 33x fields.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.
Deadline extended to 30 April 2020: Action needed to access new OCLC file exchange servers

The deadline has been extended to 30 April 2020 for OCLC members to update host names to new OCLC servers for SFTP, SCP, or FTP file exchanges. Please visit https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Exchange_files_with_OCLC to see the host name changes.

New OCLC macrobook for Connexion Client

- **Generate043** has been revised to generate 043 codes for new or changed names of countries including Eswatini (formerly Swaziland), North Macedonia (formerly Macedonia (Republic)), and Cabo Verde (formerly Cape Verde).

- **GenerateAuthorityRecord** has been revised to: (1) update the list of countries used in field 370, used to create codes for field 043, and used to generate 781; (2) add the code "lcdgt" to the $2 menu for 374; (3) change the menu for 375 to plural terms with $2 defaulting to lcdgt; (4) fix a bug that resulted in some 781 fields being generated without a field tag

- **Punctuation Add** is a new macro which adds punctuation to fields in either a single record or all records in a local or online save file. This macro could be used to locally add punctuation before exporting records that lack punctuation in accord with the new Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Optional punctuation policy. It adjusts the coding in Leader/18 (Desc) and in field 040 as needed. Do not use it to add or restore punctuation permanently to a master record that is correctly coded with Leader/18 "c" and does not contain punctuation.

- **PunctuationDelete** is a new macro which removes punctuation from fields in a single record or all records in a local or online save file. It is based on the PCC Optional punctuation policy and may be used by PCC catalogers who are authenticating a bibliographic record as "pcc" in accordance with the policy. It may also be used for local editing to remove punctuation from any record prior to export if desired. The macro adjusts coding in Leader/18 (Desc) and in field 040 as needed.

Download from the OCLC Cataloging Software Downloads page: https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Software_downloads/Cataloging_software_downloads

**WorldCat Validation Release Notes, February 2020**

Later this month, OCLC will install changes to WorldCat validation, including the following new features and enhancements:

- **OCLC-MARC Validations of New MARC Codes Announced November 2019, December 2019, and January 2020.**
- **OCLC-MARC Bibliographic Update, Fiscal Year 2020, Third Quarter.**
- **OCLC-MARC Authority Update, Fiscal Year 2020, Third Quarter.**
- **OCLC-MARC Holdings Update, Fiscal Year 2020, Third Quarter.**

Bug fixes include:

- Correction of Validation Rules for Bibliographic Field 015.
- Removal of Obsolete Values for Bibliographic Field 243 First Indicator.
- Correction of Repeatability for Bibliographic Field 341 Subfield $a.
- Harmonization of Bibliographic Fields 650/690 and 651/691.
There’s a good chance you have heard about (or read about, or researched in-depth) the controversy surrounding NARA’s decision to blur an image from the 2017 Women’s March in Washington, DC for a sign promoting their exhibit, *Rightfully Hers*, as first reported in an article in *The Washington Post*. In case you don’t remember, NARA blurred out certain words on signs held by the protestors in the photograph: Trump’s name was blotted out as were any words related to female genitalia, both anatomical and vulgar. Museum staff members made the decision to alter the photo and David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States (AOTUS), supported that decision. The rationale behind the alterations included that they wanted to avoid accusations of partisanship or complaints that they displayed vulgar language in a family friendly federal museum, and that the photo was commercially licensed and not an archival record. While Ferriero has apologized and NARA replaced the photo with the unaltered original, there are problems with this whole situation.

To start with the most obvious, simply because the photo was not the property of NARA doesn’t mean they get to alter it. Indeed, unless they were given permission by the photographer to alter the image, it should not have been an option. Museums aren’t allowed to alter artwork to suit their needs. I feel like there’s a law, or possibly a whole branch of the law, that deals with this. There are certainly professional standards that apply. There is the Museum Best Practices for Managing Controversy, which includes procedures for safeguarding institutions against self-censorship. It’s part of their free speech commitment. There are also guidelines and boilerplate language to assist in the preparation of potential controversy. The Society of American Archivists has a Code of Ethics to which all archivists are supposed to adhere. I can image that the NARA exhibit staff may not be trained archivists. The AOTUS, however, most certainly is and knew better at the get-go. Photographs are historical documents in their own right. They are, quite literally, snapshots in time. Archivists are duty bound to preserve them.

Alterting history is nothing new; we all know that history is written by the victors. Egyptian Pharaohs destroyed statues and carved over steles to erase their predecessors from history or to take credit for their projects. The Romans did it so often there is an actual term for it: *damnatio memoriae*, or condemnation of memory. Images would be destroyed, names would be erased from transcriptions, and, in the case of the damned being an emperor, their laws would be rescinded. Throughout history, from ancient times to Stalinist Russia to present-day gas lighting, historical and current events have been altered to suit the powers-that-be. The difference this time is that it wasn’t the government altering an historic image to suit their narrative. It was the National Archives. The repository of our national history altered a photograph that millions have already seen, and they used partisanship and protecting the youth as their reasons (insert Socrates and/or hemlock joke here).

The power of the photograph from the Women’s March lies in the mass of women and men exercising their right to free speech alongside their freedom to assemble. It is no different, in that respect, from the powerful images we see of civil rights marches and anti-Vietnam War protests from the 1960s and 1970s. These images make history come alive and speak to us. It allows us, in some small way, to experience the past. Altering photographs changes the historical narrative, and it is not the place of museums, libraries, archives, or other public education institutions to make history more “family friendly.” History is full of bad language, slurs, xenophobia, racism, sexism, and every other ism, not to mention genocide, justifications for genocide, and endless examples of man’s inhumanity to man. None of that is “family friendly.” However, history is also full people trying to right wrongs and to make the world a better place. It is all part of our collective past, and it is our duty to preserve it and present it to the public in all its imperfect glory.
In January, LexisNexis launched its new LexisNexis Digital Library in collaboration with Overdrive. It was originally launched in 2012 and has been completely re-designed. The primary users are attorneys, law students, law librarians, judges, library patrons, and other legal professionals. It offers access to more than 3,800 LexisNexis titles from legal publishers and titles from Overdrive Marketplace. Anecdotally, eBooks have slowly gained more traction in legal publishing, even with the issue of legal style standards and citation. There are many advantages to using an eBook, such as searching across volumes and treatises. The focus of this column is to highlight the major developments of the new platform.

The new LexisNexis Digital Library introduces three main enhancements: a new application for offline reading, new workspace from homepage, and an enhanced reading experience with tools. When a user first accesses their Digital Library, their home page will be blank. As the user reads titles and annotates, the page populates with titles that have been read. On the left-side of the page, there is a menu containing: Home, Browse Library, My books, My annotations, Export queue, and My tags. From the menu, select “Browse Library” to view your organization’s collection and to review titles recently added to the collection; below that is a list of subjects. One difference between the platforms is that the top-right menu on the classic site, with jurisdiction, practice area, and featured collections, no longer exists on the new platform. It is replaced on the “Browse my Library” page on the bottom with the heading “Subjects,” and random subjects are listed. Below those is an “All subjects” heading that you can click on to view all subjects. All annotations are compiled into the “My Annotations” page, and a user can select desired annotations to copy or add to their export queue. The export queue allows a user to export annotations automatically to Google drive, PDF, or CSV format.

The “one click” to read experience, replacing checkout, was released with the new Lexis Digital Library for those organizations with simultaneous use subscriptions. The caveat is that there are a few organizations that do not subscribe to simultaneous use. If an organization purchases the simultaneous use package, then a patron can read as many Lexis published titles as desired, without any restrictions. Lexis has an agreement with some publishers: American Bar Association, American Health Lawyers Association, ALM, and the Florida Bar Association, which they call “alliance titles.” These titles continue to be restricted to single use for our package; however, separate packages are available for titles from some of the alliance partners which can be purchased for simultaneous use. To access a title, you can browse and select a title from the “Browse library” page, or you can use the search bar across the top of every page, which populates recent searches. The new title information page displays the table of contents much more prominently, and on this page, you can search a single eBook before opening it. To begin reading a title from a web browser, click “Read.”
One of the major developments is the new mobile application for offline reading, ensuring access to treatises, deskbooks, and practice guides anytime. The application is available for download from Google Play and the Apple App Store. Titles will download automatically if a user is connected to the Internet via wireless. To have access to a title offline, you must click the download link. Search for titles online using the search bar at the top, which populates with recent searches. In the mobile app, I conducted a test search using “intellectual property” and retrieved 111 results, which were then displayed using “All titles” and “Sets.” On the results list page, a user can filter by content type, jurisdiction, and practice area. The default sort is by relevance, but you can also choose release date or title. From my test search, I had five content type options: deskbook, index, practice guide, study aid, and treatise. I selected deskbook and treatise, and then clicked “apply.” My results were narrowed to 100 results. The results list page provides the title, edition, and release date, with the option to “Read.” In the application, touch “Read” to access the content, and the eBook will open, filling your iPad, tablet, or phone screen. Alternatively, touch the “title” to learn more about the title, and on this page, a user can copy the link, add tags, and use the “Search this set” feature. Using the “search this set” on a phone has a drawback since the excerpted text is only partially displayed. Below the text is the option to “Go to passage,” which opens the eBook directly to the excerpted passage with the relevant text highlighted. One observation is that sometimes when first opening the eBook, there is a short delay for the text to optimize. The reading experience is very similar to reading in a web browser because the user interface is comparable, including the features within the eBook, such as “annotate,” “search across the book,” “view table of contents,” and the “menu.”

Later this year, Lexis plans to improve the table of contents, offer the ability to distribute deskbooks virtually using “push” capabilities, and make offline reading easier for laptops and desktops. In the future, there are plans to add functionality for maintaining annotations and to develop the advanced search. In conclusion, I briefly covered the new personalized workspace, simultaneous use, and the new mobile application. In my opinion, the eBook experience is greatly enriched with the release of the new LexisNexis Digital Library, particularly the ease of use with the mobile app.

The wonderful thing about occupying a position that straddles technical and public services is that I get to see things from different angles and (ideally!) can more readily connect the dots between the many moving parts of an academic law library. A question at the reference desk from a patron struggling to find a particular title in electronic format prompts me to double-check our corresponding catalog records and ensure they are up-to-date. A discussion with a colleague in technical services about a change in publisher for a popular treatise serves as a reminder for me to see if we need to update our databases listings and research guides. With this in mind, it comes as no surprise that I often find myself looking at new articles, blog posts, and other publications in law librarian literature that focus on public services topics and then pondering the related technical services issues. It doesn’t work with everything, but reading an article on a predominantly public services topic frequently gives me at least one idea for a technical services spin-off.

One example is Jennifer Behrens’s recent article, “Unknown Symbols”: Online Legal Research in the Age of Emoji, 38 Legal Reference Services Quarterly 155 (2019) (available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3463766). This excellent article discusses the capability of online legal research systems to properly display and retrieve titles with emoji and emoticons in search results and the ensuing challenges for researchers. It got me thinking about a possible related technical services article: examining the potential challenges that titles with emoji and emoticons pose for an ILS and/or discovery service and ensuring such titles are cataloged and display correctly.

If any readers of this column want to run with this idea, you have my full support, though with full idea credit going to Jennifer Behrens! And the next time you are stuck trying to come up with a topic for an article, blog post, chapter, etc., consider reviewing recent law library literature on public services topics. When viewed through the lens of technical services, it just might have you finding all kinds of inspiration!
For this issue’s column, I report the results of a very brief survey of 16 of my law librarian colleagues. The survey was so brief that it included only the following question:

**Question:**
From a Technical Services and/or Public Services perspective (please specify), what do you see as the top two serials issues in the next several months (2020)?

The colleagues who responded included both technical services and public services librarians, ranging from law school library directors and law firm library directors to additional librarians in both kinds of libraries. This survey was quite informal and most decidedly nonscientific. Nevertheless, I hope that you find the results informative and perhaps thought-provoking.

1. **Access**—11111 11111 1 (nearly 70% of respondents)

- Downsizing print
  - 1. Let subscriptions go
  - 2. Because so many companies are gobbling each other up, print materials no longer available in print; only online
  - Will have to exchange; alternative resource

  ACCESS limited # of seats; or non-subscriber

  ACCESS & Marketing combined—our attorneys receive e-mail alerts from publications and then want to read the article. Of course, access is limited and causes a lot of frustration for the attorneys and the librarians. Often times, we already have subscriptions to similar publications that the attorneys are not aware of, despite our best efforts to disseminate that information. So finding ways to keep the attorneys up-to-date on current subscriptions is an issue.

As a public services librarian primarily working with law school faculty in a university system, my interest is primarily motivated by making sure we have the access that we need.

I’m interested in “big deal” negotiations, “big deal” cancellations, and “read and publish” deals, and the resulting impact of those negotiations, deals, and cancellations on the price of and **access** to resources.

Ensuring that patrons are able to easily access electronic serials (public)

- Access to serials becoming greater as they move online

  A firm reference librarian wrote: As a reference librarian, downloading an article is much easier and a lot faster than having to physically copy it. I also spend one day a week working remotely. If serials are accessible online it makes my job much easier, as I don’t have to locate someone in the office to grab it for me. This becomes particularly true as our attorneys expect assistance after hours and on weekends.

  From the Public Services end, if I am looking for a journal or other serial, I check the catalog and expect to find it (if it’s something we have)
Second issue, we have a large number of public patrons as well as local bench and bar that come to the library. We have cut huge numbers of print looseleafs and practice materials. In large part, those materials are frequently not available through a nearby law library for many of these patrons. While these patrons are not our primary mission, I think it is disturbing how this trend may contribute to a general narrowing of the materials relied upon in practice.

Are print subscriptions dying? How close are we to online-only open access publication for legal periodicals? Have we reached the point at which online publication is not perceived as a lower-value or status publication in legal scholarship?

2. Pricing—11111

The top serial issue is increased pricing/subscription renewals. I don’t think this response is very surprising. However, as you know, our budgets cannot keep up with the increases, and we will have to spend more time deciding what can be cut.

I know pricing has been an issue for a long time,

I’m interested in “big deal” negotiations, “big deal” cancellations, and “read and publish” deals, and the resulting impact of those negotiations, deals, and cancellations on the price of and access to resources.

This is also a problem for academic law libraries that are part of a university. The bundling issues are even more expensive for university libraries, and they aren’t able to maintain the same level of subscriptions. This impacts our interdisciplinary work and sometimes means that the law library has to make expensive purchases that we didn’t previously.

Are print subscriptions dying? How close are we to online-only open access publication for legal periodicals? Have we reached the point at which online publication is not perceived as a lower-value or status publication in legal scholarship? Will law schools continue to subsidize their print law journals which can no longer support themselves by selling print subscriptions?

3. Other issues

a. Duplicates—1

Eliminating duplicate serials that we have in electronic and print forms (technical)

b. Paper v. digital—1

With magazines and newspapers, I see their use declining here in our library.

Now the question eventually comes: do we continue purchasing [paper] serial content?

c. Bindery—1

Fewer and fewer people are using binderies. We use the binderies once we collect enough of a certain serial and have it bound into a hard-bound copy. However, the only bindery in GA closed so we have to send ours to one of the Carolinas, and we have to have a certain large amount for them to have someone come pick them up without access fees. So now, we have to look at the fact that our patrons are not using our serials (see problem 1), but now it is costing us more to have them bound. Now the question eventually comes do we continue purchasing serial content.

d. Serials management—11

Another serial issue for us is staff time spent on serials management, especially claiming and lately tracking format changes. Maybe the issue is actually lack of publisher/vendor communication. We must communicate repeatedly with
a vendor in order to receive a claimed issue. Furthermore, we have recently noticed a significant number of publication format changes for which we did not receive notification. So, for example, it’s only after noticing that we didn’t get the print and tried to claim it, that we find out that the title is now online-only.

Cataloging issues involved with print serials migrating to electronic format

e. **Legal Publishing—1**

How will the US News faculty scholarship impact (which is primarily based upon serial publications) rankings change the landscape of legal publishing? Will law faculty hiring be skewed to scholars with the greatest impact? What will be the effect of Hein’s integration of ORCID IDs? Will the law faculty buy-in and establish ORCID IDs?

f. **Quality—11**

Quality—Is the information still of a quality to be in demand and thus justify purchase and collection? (Plus, the issues of quality degradation of the BNA titles leading us to cancel Bloomberg altogether.)

g. **Marketing—111**

If it is digital, how do we make it visible so that it gets used.

Communication with attorneys as their old print resources disappear

ACCESS & Marketing combined—our attorneys receive e-mail alerts from publications and then want to read the article. Of course, access is limited and causes a lot of frustration for the attorneys and the librarians. Often times, we already have subscriptions to similar publications that the attorneys are not aware of, despite our best efforts to disseminate that information. So finding ways to keep the attorneys up-to-date on current subscriptions is an issue.

The following is a list of serials title changes:

  v. 1 (2001-02) – v. 18 (2018-19)
  (OCoLC 611527771)
  **Changed to:**
  **UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law**
  v. 19 (2019)-
  (OCoLC 1135639886)

The following is a list of serials cessations:

- **Human Rights & International Legal Discourse**
  **Ceased with:** v. 13 (2019)
  (OCoLC 156983028)

- **McGill Journal of Law and Health**
  **Ceased in print with:** v. 10 (2016-17)
  (OCoLC 466306421)
  Continued online at [https://mjlh.mcgill.ca/issues/](https://mjlh.mcgill.ca/issues/)
  (OCoLC 259080870)

- **New Perspectives Quarterly**
  **Ceased with:** v. 36 (2019)
  (OCoLC 14636448)

- **OECD Observer**
  **Ceased with:** v. 2019
  (OCoLC 1964492)
Headings of interest to law catalogers have appeared recently. “Smart contracts” and “Shell companies” are two such headings. “Automobile title loans” and “Beneficial ownership” are two others, the latter referring to the right to enjoyment of property to which another person holds title. In the area of criminal law, “Rape kits” and “Chain of custody (Evidence)” are available, perhaps because we hear about them so often on television police procedurals. “Prison newspapers” and “Prisoners as journalists” are available for works on prisons. “Sex discrimination in the mass media industry” is a useful new heading to describe an old problem, as is “Sexual harassment in the civil service.”

Headings for mass shootings, school shootings, and the states in which they occur continue to appear. “Parkland Shooting, Parkland, Fla., 2018” has been added, as was “School shootings–Florida.” We also have “Charleston Church Shooting, Charleston, S.C., 2015” and “Mass shootings–South Carolina.” Both “Mass shootings” and “School shootings” subdivide geographically but continue also to be established state by state. So far, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Nevada, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia are established under “Mass shootings,” and Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Virginia are established under “School shootings.” Perhaps more will appear as time passes.

Under classes of persons, we have a number of headings. “African American conservatives,” “Education students,” and “Bookstore owners” appeared. “Sexual minority college students” now takes “Identity.” Other new headings include “African American women suffragists,” “Children of communists,” and “Church archivists.” The Used For term “Latinxs” has been added to “Hispanic Americans” and “Latin Americans.” One interesting heading is “Chernobyl liquidators.” This refers to the Soviet workers who sealed off the Chernobyl reactors after they exploded. The former heading “Sikh Americans” was cancelled in favor of “Sikhs–United States.” “Women atomic bomb victims” is available.

The term “Blackface,” established earlier, is now joined by “Brownface.” “Black wall streets” is used to describe the business sections of black neighborhoods. It will be useful in describing works about riots that resulted in the destruction of such city sections. Rather than create a separate subject heading “Jim Crow laws,” the Library of Congress has decided to tack it on to “African Americans–Legal status, laws, etc.” as a Used For term. This is an unfortunate decision as closely related as the terms are. On the bright [?] side, we now have “African American superheroes” and “Superheroes, Black.”

In the area of religion and law, we have “Yashan (Jewish law)” and “Conflict management in the Qur’an.” On a more secular note, we may now use “Vulgarity in motion pictures,” something which sells a lot of popcorn. “Pornographic comic books, strips, etc.” joins “Erotic comic books, strips, etc.” Artistic merit (as defined by the cataloger?) distinguishes the two. “Airport codes,” those three letter codes, was established, as was “County seats.” “Concentration camp uprisings,” “eSports (Contests)” and “Koreatowns” may now be used. “Heterosexism in mental health services,” “Homophobia in mental health services,” and “Human behavior--Evolution” round out this column.
Many of us have our hands in multiple pots. Sometimes we are working with repository records and other times records in our ILS. While embarking on what I mistakenly thought would be a simple series of tasks (linking from 856 fields to our freely accessible, digitized versions of the same items to our IR), I happened to uncover much messier data than expected. What a perfect opportunity to do some house-cleaning! In case you have undertaken similar work and are considering comparing, cleaning, and (eventually) updating records in multiple locations, here are a few tips and resources I have found helpful on my own journey:

**Have a good list from the repository.** My initial cleanup of Digital Commons items was fairly straightforward. I sat down with our International Law Librarian Anne Burnett to talk about the collection. We batch-downloaded the series as a spreadsheet and updated the fields that did not match so that they did (example: type was not the same for each, some were articles, some dissertations—this one was easy, updated them all to be "dissertation" type). Then I saved it and re-uploaded the batch sheet.

**Have a good list from the ILS.** The same set of items in our library catalog was more difficult to get a solid list of. We are in Innovative's Sierra, so I needed to use “create lists.” This time sitting with Associate Director for Collection Services Wendy Moore, we generated a list of items (not bibs). We made several lists because we quickly discovered that what we thought our control field was, the 502, was inconsistent. Catalogers had changed over the many years these records were created, and at a certain point, the 502 had changed from having only two periods in this item's abbreviation to having three (ex. LL.M. to L.L.M.). This minor flaw made things a bit more difficult. We ended up instead using the donor note field to get closer to the ideal number of items from my repository list. In the future, the location might also be a field to use for pulling this sort of list—but part of the ILS record cleanup was updating location codes since items had recently been shifted from reserve to the basement.

**Fix your controls so they actually work.** I ended up going with the list that had the highest item count (although now I had more than what was in my Digital Commons list) and updating these records first. Now they will have consistent 502s and correct item locations. To verify the proper 502, Wendy and I consulted our office copy of the AACR ( Anglo-American Cataloging Rules) - "Section 2.7 B13 Dissertations". Although LL.M. was not listed as a specific example, the rule states that you use: "Thesis followed by a brief statement of the degree for which the author was a candidate (e.g., M.A. or Ph.D.), the name of the institution..., and the year in which the degree was granted.

To do this, I used a combination of Global Update in Sierra and manual/individual edits. I added 856 fields to the records as well with subfield u (linking to the Digital Commons series landing page for this collection) and subfield 3 (for the text I wanted to appear as the hyperlink access point).

**Export a better list from the ILS.** Now that I had a proper list from Sierra, I exported it to a text delimited file, then imported it into an Excel spreadsheet. I was ready to compare it to my repository spreadsheet and figure out what was missing in Digital Commons. To figure this out, I started by doing a "save as" of each spreadsheet, then narrowing both sets of data down to only the fields that I could use to compare between the two: Title, Author, and Publication Date (year was really what I was looking for). This presented further problems - not all titles in Digital Commons looked like what should be matching titles from the ILS records (ex. many repository title fields had been entered in all caps). For Author, Digital Commons separated last and first name fields, but in the MARC records, this was a single field. For Publication, the formatted date in Digital Commons records was very detailed and specific, while the only match-point...
in the ILS records was the 260 field, which included publication date at the end as the subfield $c$. The 502 might again prove useful if the 260s were too difficult (since the "year in which the degree was granted" appeared at the end of this field for each item).

**MarcEdit, OpenRefine, and beyond.** At this point in my process of this particular project, I am playing around with a combination of editing in MarcEdit, as well as a number of tricks I am reading up on for OpenRefine ([https://github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine/wiki](https://github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine/wiki)) cleanup. If you are totally new to OpenRefine, there is a really handy wiki with screencast intros ([https://github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine/wiki/Screencasts](https://github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine/wiki/Screencasts)) that I appreciated before diving in. An extremely helpful resource I have come across has been Comparing Two Sets of Data in OpenRefine How-To ([https://openlibraryenvironment.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/GOKB/pages/655657/Comparing+Two+Sets+of+Data+in+OpenRefine](https://openlibraryenvironment.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/GOKB/pages/655657/Comparing+Two+Sets+of+Data+in+OpenRefine)). This entry shares step by step how to "Normalise titles to do comparison" using three main transformations. For my particular set of data, the value.fingerprint transform has given me good results, removing case from both sets of titles. There is also an excellent page with more information specific to working with and cleaning up dates ([https://openlibraryenvironment.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/GOKB/pages/655740/Dates](https://openlibraryenvironment.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/GOKB/pages/655740/Dates)).

*Continued from page 1*

lowed this rule for federations (such as the United States and Great Britain), it would lead to entering legislation pertaining to a single member (e.g., a state) under the name of the member, which would be absurd since our users inevitably focus on whomever “enacted” the legislation (the first thing they ask is “who passed this ,$%&*# law?”). Whom it “governs” or “affects” is a subject matter, addressed in the 650 $z entry under jurisdiction governed, that also violates a basic principle of cataloging that the primary access point (“main entry” as we said when I was young) is the creator (author), not the subject. We are reasonable in seeing the jurisdiction as the author of its laws. In all federations, some statutes apply to only one member (state, province, etc.), and even in non-federal jurisdiction, some laws apply only to one smaller unit (e.g. a state law applicable to a single county or city). In the United Kingdom, many national statutes apply only to one of the member kingdoms (who have very distinct legal systems, especially Scotland with its Roman rather than Common law-based system).

The mischievous language to enter under “jurisdiction governed” apparently crept into the codes in the 19th century to deal with the unique circumstances posed by the Canadian and Australian constitutions. Their origins were in constitutional conventions not radically unlike the American one, but for technical reasons, they needed the signature of Queen Victoria, who, being a good constitutional monarch, referred the matter to the British Parliament, which enacted the constitutions as British statutes, even though they were created (authored) by the Canadians and Australians. A special rule was added to enter them under the jurisdiction “governed,” and over time, that was given as a general rule (which catalogers fortunately have ignored for the last 150 years). The cataloging rule should be that if a statute is authored by one jurisdiction but for a technical reason is formally enacted by another, regard the intellectual author as the "creator."

**RDA ignores “customary law.”** As written, RDA suggests that “laws” are enacted by jurisdictions. While that is true in most “civil law” systems, in systems based on customary law, laws evolve over time, sometimes nudged by legislative enactments. This is the case for Jewish and Islamic law, indigenous legal systems, and what is probably the most important customary legal system in the world, the Anglo-American Common Law. In the United States in the 21st century, the unenacted, customary, common law governs key areas, including the right to privacy, insider trading, and the presumption that someone charged with a crime is innocent until proven guilty. “Law” to someone from a common law background (most Anglophones), not to mention someone from an Islamic, Jewish, or indigenous legal background, is not necessarily something "enacted."

The 19th century catalog codes, written by Panizzi and Cutter, made no such mistake but used more specific terms (e.g. enactments) rather than “laws.” We create access points (headings) for the creation of statutes, codes, acts, decrees, etc. Laws based on custom and tradition cannot be “cataloged” under descriptive rules. This mistake was introduced by 20th century catalogue codes but has had little impact since we law catalogers simply ignored it; however, it makes it hard to translate our cataloging rules into languages such as Spanish, where derecho and lei have very different meanings (cf French: droit and loi; German: recht and gesetz), all of which translate as the English word “law.” The solution is for
RDA to go back to describing its “laws” with more specific terms that make it clear it refers to formal written legislation enacted by jurisdictions (and, in general, RDA should avoid terminology that impedes translation into languages used by libraries we want to copycat from).

**RDA doesn’t realize that ALL “regulations” are “laws.”** By definition, administrative regulations are laws. They are secondary legislation, or delegated legislation, issued by the executive based on a statutory authorization, but they are legally binding, just as legislation enacted by the “parliament.” They can be really important pieces of legislation, such as the Emancipation Proclamation (freeing rebel owned slaves during the Civil War), or quite uncontroversial, such as the Library of Congress Regulation stating that all law books must be in the custody of the Law Library of Congress (something very important to us and probably no one else), or even trivial, such as the resolution of the local library setting hours that branches will be open and the policy on overdue books. These are all “administrative regulations,” and they are all “laws.” The statement in RDA about “Administrative regulations that are not laws” is a non-sequitur. If it isn’t legally binding, it isn’t a regulation. Not understanding that administrative regulations are a type of laws leads to the next problem.

**RDA doesn’t understand British and American administrative law.** RDA says the British administrative regulations are laws, and American ones are not, and catalogers should apply this to the world’s several hundred jurisdictions, most of which use the Roman-based civil law and entirely different principles. A rule by example is probably a poor idea, but worst of all, they get the British model wrong.

The real difference between the British and American systems pertains to types of legislation issued by a head of state without approval of the legislative branch. In the American system, a President’s Executive Orders can be challenged as not having been authorized by statute, no differently than any regulation issued by a lower level bureaucrat (which is why we enter them under a corporate heading for the president). In Britain, those administrative regulations issued by the king or queen “in council” (i.e. in the Privy Council) rather than “in Parliament” are treated in a similar way to acts of parliament, meaning they can’t be challenged in court and are therefore entered under jurisdiction. Administrative regulations issued by British bureaucrats other than the monarch are not immune to challenge, and under our rules should be entered under the name of the agency.

To reflect the reality of the legal system as understood by the users of our metadata, RDA should say: Enactments by the Head of State or Head of Government that are considered primary legislation equivalent to acts of the legislature (e.g., British Orders in Council) should be entered under the name of the jurisdiction and treated the same as legislative enactments. All other administrative acts, including those emanating from the Head of State, that are considered to be secondary or delegated legislation (e.g. American Executive orders), should be entered under the issuing agency. The examples should be the Emancipation Proclamation (the most famous executive order in American history), a British Order in Council, a serious regulation by a British government ministry, and something from a local agency that is utterly trivial to show that “administrative regulations” are not just for the rich and famous (perhaps a library’s schedule of fines for overdue books).
The Anglo-American NAF, LCSH and changing jurisdictions. The Serenissima República Véneta and the Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg may still exist on paper (look at official documents), but the modern cities are mere cities, not significant independent city-states, and when our subject headings use the modern name for a historical work on the independent countries (and in the case of Venice, a regional superpower), we look ridiculous. When a jurisdiction is profoundly transformed, such as from an empire to a city, we should not use the heading for the modern city for the former empire. An example of the correct approach is the use of "Rome" for the empire it once was and "Rome (Italy)" for the city it now is.

The UF from “Ottoman Empire” to Turkey, and the LCSH prohibition of differentiating between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the post-World War I republic, are absurd, especially for jurisdictions in the Middle East and Europe that are now independent, and especially for law books. The "Raj" (British Empire in India) had a radical change in governance and was split into multiple jurisdictions (at least three, arguably more), and using the heading "India" for both causes confusion, especially for legal history works involving parts of British India that are not part of the modern Republic of India. "Palestine" is the better way to approach the matter, since we treat each jurisdiction carved out of British Palestine as a separate jurisdiction, though we could use a qualifier to distinguish "Palestine" the region equivalent to the "Holy land" in American perceptions (and with nebulous boundaries) from the British mandate that existed as a jurisdiction for thirty years. If a jurisdiction is so radically changed in its boundaries and legal structure that it is unrecognizable to anyone outside of the Library of Congress, the NAF and LCSH should mandate separate headings.

A disregard for legal reality exists with “England and Wales.” According to the NAF, Wales ceased to exist in 1536, and England ceased to exist in 1707. While the legal disappearance of Wales is accurate, it continued to exist as a non-jurisdictional region of England until 1999 when it became a jurisdiction within England. England (and Scotland) joined to form a federation, but continued to have separate bureaucracies and legal systems, so saying that “England” became “Great Britain” in 1707 is as rational as saying that Virginia and Pennsylvania “became” the United States in 1789 (or 1776 if you prefer). In the case of “Wales,” it turns out that the English briefly referred to the country as “England and Wales” in the 16th century, but that soon passed until modern times when they again started referring to the country as “England and Wales” (which they do at present). Looking at the LC headings from a perspective of law and history, “England and Wales” is a variant for “England,” and “Great Britain” (or “United Kingdom;” the difference is whether Ireland is included) is a federation including “England and Wales” (in official documents, it is conjugated as singular, and there is no comma after England), Scotland, and Northern Ireland. LCSH correctly realizes that Britain is a federation but does not acknowledge that for legal purposes and public administration, Wales has been and for the most part still is a part of England. While Wales is just as distinct from England as Scotland and Ireland in sociological, linguistic, and political matters, in legal and administrative matters, it is a region of England. This leads to many catalogers seeing “England and Wales” in the book in hand and adding a heading for “Wales” even though there is nothing in the book pertaining to Wales; thus a user looking for information about Wales will find lots of records with “Wales” that are only about England. Note this is only a problem with the NAR as used by LCSh; the LCC schedule correctly treats “England and Wales” as the name of the country (though the Wales section needs radical expansion to reflect the establishment of a “devolved” local government for Wales).

The refusal of LC to recognize the existence of the European Union as a jurisdiction is a serious problem. The EU has its own money, military forces, an elected legislature, courts, and a central bank, none of which the United States had under the Articles of Confederation, yet everyone then and now agrees that the United States from 1776-1789 was a country, not an international organization. Again, LCC gets it right, but having to follow the NAR’s insistence that the EU doesn’t exist means that, using LCSH, there is no way to distinguish between the law of the European Union on a subject (which classes in KJE) and the comparative law of the members states (which usually classes in KJC). This is not mandated by RDA and can be fixed by LC applying the usual principles of cataloging. Once a place has set geographic boundaries and is capable of making laws, with organs filling executive, judicial, and legislative functions, it is a jurisdiction and should be established as such in the Name Authority File and should be used in $z of 650 headings.

Editions re-cataloged as serials. It is more efficient to regard a work as a serial rather than as a monograph producing new expressions on a regular basis. However, the culture of serial cataloging is such that they are highly skeptical of having a natural person (i.e. a mortal human) as the creator of the work. Thus, even when one person is the sole author, not to mention when one sole author retires and hands the work over to a successor, they insist on treating these per-
sons as editors as best. Often they neglect to even make 700 headings for them. Meanwhile, in the real world (where the people who use our metadata live), these works are still being cited by the name of the author, not the title, and users are likely to identify the works by author. The serial catalogers are ignoring part of RDA by failing to recognize the creators of the work, and while we are hardly in a position to complain about strict compliance with RDA, we should ask them to recognize that these works have human creators (not mere contributors). In general, if the legal community cites something in a certain way, catalogers should anticipate how they will do their research and make our metadata meet their expectations.

Classification problems: no crystal ball. As I said above, LCC has failed in its ability to predict future developments. While this is reasonable (after all, if a cataloger could accurately predict the future, they would probably change careers to run a hedge fund, or at least bet on sports events), it does mean that we have problems. How were we to know that Nigeria and India would keep changing state boundaries and splitting states (unlike the United States, which did this only once)? Given the history of the region, we should not have assumed the Soviet Union would last very long. How were we to have known that countries best known for their poverty might within a lifetime join the ranks of the affluent (and affluent countries tend to publish more law books), e.g. Ireland and Singapore. We were anxious to recognize Hong Kong as a part of China (a politically correct move at the time), but that means putting a major common law jurisdiction into a tiny table designed for non-federal systems typically using civil law. Over time, we failed to realize how countries would evolve, which is why we largely ignore that Pakistani states are important autonomous jurisdictions whose legal publishing doesn’t fit into an arrangement designed for minor districts of non-federal systems. At least we finally noticed that American Indians were jurisdictions with legal systems and that the small range next to “military law” (no excuse for that; the War Department stopped running the Bureau of Indian Affairs when Jefferson Davis was the Secretary) was insulting and ridiculous (I would have put them in KFY, but KI is clearly an improvement).

For subjects that developed since the schedules were first published, we need a greater willingness to make repairs. The older schedules missed the boat on Environmental law (this is being fixed, though at least the more recent common and civil tables got it right to begin with). Intellectual property, civil procedure, securities, human rights, and bankruptcy are among areas that have been radically transformed during our lifetimes (well, during my lifetime, which takes you back to the mid-20th century). BTW, did I mention computers…?

One of the biggest and most subtle changes has been the globalization of law. Those in civil law countries fall in love with common law ideas (innocent until proven guilty, trusts, vigorous defense lawyers in open proceedings), and those in common law countries have adopted whole areas of civil law without realizing it (the existence of administrative law, the distinctions of public and private law). Many very unglamorous areas need fixing. Consider the poor development for administrative law, especially in KF (just ask where the Chevron deference classes are), which reflects that administrative law only started to develop as a part of American law in the 20th century. “Obligations” may be a civil law concept, but people write common law books on it, and the same holds true for “Private law” and “Public law.” And one should note that “Private law” and “Public law” could be the basis for a more hierarchical arrangement without displacing any numbers, which would help users of the schedules.

Guess what, we aren’t using paper schedules anymore. The argument for not customizing each jurisdiction’s schedule to reflect the terminology used by that jurisdiction is the difficulty of doing so. That was true back in the 20th century when we used printed schedules. Now it is online. In KF, we have always customized New York and California, but why not other states? Texas is now the second largest and growing, and Louisiana has a very distinct legal system. In fact, every state (and country) has unique aspects which should be reflected in our schedules.

In Africa and Asia, we have customized captions for Japan, China, and India, but why not for everyone? Clarify what periods go in the “120” numbers for history in the Afro-Asian schedules. Print the dates of the constitutions. Use the correct names for courts, public officers, and legislative bodies. A handful of schedules (French and German law, some EU law, and much of the religious law) are bilingual, so why not make all the schedules bilingual? It is tremendously useful for catalogers and users to have correct terminology in the local language rather than generic English terms.
The same holds true for LCSH. The printed “Red books” would get too bulky if we added too much material. But adding foreign legal terminology won’t take up any more space on your desktop than the current version and would make it radically easier for users of the system. We can’t fix the problem with LCSH (and LCC to a lesser extent) that legalese may be incomprehensible to the general public or even offensive to those ignorant of the legal system, such as “Aliens” (which has come to imply non-humans) or “Data protection” (which pre-dates computers and had nothing to do with making backups). These problems are inherent in a controlled vocabulary serving both specialized and general users, but nothing but lethargy prevents us from adding foreign language terms, which would make LCSH much more useful.

**Conclusion.** We need the humility to realize that some aspects of our work are a “fool’s errand.” A controlled vocabulary is inherently problematic if used in an environment that brings together different professions and levels of education as well as diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups. No system can get around the fact that the world is constantly changing, and new topics and new ways of looking at topics are constantly developing. In 50 years, much of what we believe and know will seem quaint and dated. Our system of creating metadata, which is almost 200 years old, can provide tremendous added value to users of contemporary resources, and our goal needs to be to keep our metadata system viable for future generations.