Cataloging Video Resources with RDA: Lights, Camera, Action!

Richard Paone
Dickinson School of Law
Pennsylvania State University

This article will focus (no pun intended) on cataloging optical media (DVDs and Blu-Ray discs) in RDA. I will cover the basics, which, in most cases, should suffice. For more detail, I recommend referring to the RDA Toolkit and Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21 (Version 1.1 November 2017) (https://www.olacinc.org/sites/default/files/DVD_Bluray-RDA-Guide-Version-1-1-final-aug2018-rev-1.pdf), which much of this article draws from. Most video resources that we as law library catalogers will see are single unit resources, that is, a single disc containing a movie, television program, etc. (“film”), perhaps accompanied by bonus material on the same disc. In this case, the description is based on the film, not the film and its bonus materials collectively. Generally use these criteria to find the appropriate source of information that identifies the resource as a whole:

- Look for a source of information that contains a title covering the resource as a whole.
- If none is found and there are multiple works on the disc, determine if there is a predominant work. If so, look for a source that identifies the predominant work. Use this source to identify the resource as a whole.
- If there is no source that identifies a predominant work, treat the resource as a collection, and use the sources that identify the individual parts of the resource as a collective source of information to identify the resource as a whole.
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Hello again, friends and colleagues. There is still snow on the ground as I write this column, but hopefully, by the time this issue of TSLL is published, we are finally starting to see signs of springtime again.

This can seem like a quiet time for LSRD-SIS, as we are currently waiting to hear from AMPC about conference programming and from our membership via the biennial survey and board nominations, but there’s a lot that is going on just beneath the surface. It is springtime in the LSRD year as well, and so much of our work now is planting the seeds that will sustain our SIS and its work through the seasons to come.

Of course, in this metaphor, the seeds are people, the members of LSRD who have always been willing to volunteer their time and effort and enthusiasm for our SIS. We are a relatively small section within AALL and have a continual need for new volunteers for all our important roles—and new roles for experienced volunteers—so I hope that any members reading this have responded to our calls for volunteers or will consider doing so soon.

The Nominating Committee will be filling three positions on the executive board in the election this spring: Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer, and Member-at-Large. These are each interesting roles that provide distinct opportunities for involvement, administration, and leadership within LSRD (and AALL, as the chair also serves on the SIS Council). It will be too late by the time of this publication to nominate for this year’s election, but we do have elections every year, and it’s never too early to think about self-nominating next time around.

I know well that the idea of standing for election, or working on an executive board, can seem daunting, especially for a newer member who maybe doesn’t know anyone yet—and that’s the best reason to do it! Having served on the board for several years now, I can attest that it has been a rewarding journey of professional development and personal growth.

Beyond the board, we also have a handful of committees in need of chairs and rosters, as well as representatives to assign to FROG and TSLL, so we are trying to connect with volunteers any way we can. There was a volunteer question on the biennial survey, and we have added a new volunteer form and updated brochure to the LSRD website; we really want to find a way for all our members, new and old, to get involved in whatever way best suits your interests and personality. We look forward to hearing from you!

Kevin Carey
Ohio State University
Dear Fellow TS-SIS Members,

I recognize that many of you already pained by racial injustices may be further impacted by national events in January and February. In January, an insurrection at the U.S. Capitol was followed in February by a prolonged arctic outbreak that gripped the nation. Although none of us has control, each one can respond, first with self-care, then to those in need. My wish is that all are safe, protected, and free from harm and that we move into March with hope, optimism, and a copious amount of self-efficacy.

AALL Annual Meeting and Conference

I am grateful and optimistic as I share news from our organization. In early February, the AALL Executive Board announced plans to host a July virtual conference, Leading with Wisdom & Insight. Along with announcing a virtual meeting, AALL extended the grants and scholarship application deadlines to May 1, 2021. See more information at the grants [https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/grants/](https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/grants/) and scholarships [https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/scholarships/](https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/scholarships/) pages. There is ample time for members to apply for needed funding.

Additionally, AALL released that the keynote speaker this year is Tina Tchen, President & CEO of Time's Up. Ms. Tchen will share her perspective and insights on workplace culture, the power of diverse teams, and the importance of keeping equality at the forefront of the global agenda. More information about Ms. Tchen is available at [https://myemail.constantcontact.com/AALL-2021---Keynote-Speaker-Announced.html?soid=1103444292058&aid=E0SrIQCV9bo](https://myemail.constantcontact.com/AALL-2021---Keynote-Speaker-Announced.html?soid=1103444292058&aid=E0SrIQCV9bo).

TS-SIS

In preparing for the Annual Meeting, the TS-SIS Executive Board submitted two outstanding program proposals for consideration by the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC): (1) RDA Deep-dive (2) Subject-Based Collection Evaluation. The AMPC will soon meet virtually to select programs, and conference details will follow. Additionally, TS and LSRD have begun considering a second summit. News and volunteer opportunities will be sent out as planning progresses.

Since the summit last July, the TS-SIS Professional Development Committee (PDC) has been extraordinarily active in providing discussions, roundtables, and webinars for members. The Working Parents Discussion Group, hosted by Lauren Seney, meets monthly, and the Management Issues Roundtable, with host Alan Keely, meets quarterly.

Additionally, the PDC's webinar planning group, Alan Keely, Jackie Magagnosc, Jennifer Mart-Rice, Alexis Zirpoli, and Annie Mellott, has hosted two webinars. The first was a tech-savvy webinar entitled From Task Management Apps to Accessible Training and Procedures: Tools & ADA Compliant Tech for Teleworking Librarians. Rachel Evans and Mari Cheney highlighted helpful apps with tips and tricks useful in the office and the telecommuting environment. The second webinar was Building Your Emotional First-Aid Kit. In this session, Alexis, Annie, and Jennifer gave participants a wealth of resources for something we may all need, and that is self-care. If you were not able to attend the webinars and wish you had, you are in luck! Thanks to Marijah Sroczynski, TS-SIS web coordinator, TS-sponsored webinars now have a link on the website. Both webinars are posted at [https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/education-training/webinars/](https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/education-training/webinars/).
I am sure that there are unnamed members who have contributed to the successful programming. On behalf of TS-SIS, thank you to all who have participated and contributed.

Just as AALL has extended the timeframe to apply for grants and scholarships, so has TS-SIS. Applications for the following TS grants are being accepted until May 1, 2021:

- Marla Schwartz Education Grant
- New Member Grant
- Experienced Member Grant
- Active Member Grant

More information is available on the TS-SIS Awards and Grants page: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/.

TS also sponsors grants for the AALL Virtual Management Institute. Congratulations to Rachel Decker and Aaron Retten, this year's award recipients. Rachel and Aaron will attend the virtual event being held March 23-24.

A reminder that research support is available to TS and LSRD members through FROG (Funding Research Opportunities Grant). The LSRD/TS FROG Committee awards up to $1,000 in grants in a single year. Find more information on the website: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/obs-ts-frog/funding-research-opportunities-grant/.

Thank you, donors, for your generous contributions to the Marla Schwartz Educational Grant. The fund received $495 in donations between December and February. Heather Kushnerick, First-Year Member-at-Large, organized two fundraisers, held on Giving Tuesday and National Hearts Giving Day. Thank you, Heather, for your TS volunteer spirit.

As shown by the many TS volunteers, no one has control over the weather or national emergencies; we control ourselves and our contributions to any cause. I am inspired by TS members who continue to make a difference in and around our organization by volunteering time, expertise, and insight. The door is always open to those who wish to contribute and gain experience. If you are inspired to present a program, participate in a task force, or update our website, please let us know by reaching out. Our contact information is available on the TS-SIS website: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/about-us/leadership/.

Now, onward and forward.

Carol Morgan Collins
TS-SIS Chair, 2020-2021

---

**Acquisitions Workflow Management**

Part 1: Process Mapping

David Sanborne
Cook County Law Library, Chicago

Whether preparing for staff turnover, succession planning, or simply trying to maximize departmental efficiency, process mapping can be a valuable tool for identifying how acquisitions work is performed. Process mapping provides a basis for further improvements. Process mapping can identify waste, inefficiencies, and provide a good starting point for developing written documentation to standardize workflows and minimize mistakes.

The most basic process mapping tool used by the Cook County Innovation Institute (C2I2) involves creating a flowchart using sticky notes. This is usually done in a participatory way with all employees involved in the process.
contributing. Involving everyone helps to break down knowledge silos. Using sticky notes for each point in the flowchart means making adjustments to the chart and experimenting are easy. Using a wall or whiteboard for the sticky notes provides a visual overview of the entire process and makes it easy for all participants to view the chart.

One important thing to keep in mind when creating the flowchart is that while work may be done in batches (one employee might upload multiple invoices to the business management system at one time; the next employee might approve a large number of invoices once a week), the flowchart should follow the lifecycle of a single item. For acquisitions, this generally means a single book. Because the actual acquisitions process is so complicated, acquisitions managers should consider developing flowcharts for smaller parts of the process. Instead of looking at the entire acquisitions process, for example, one might create a flowchart for the process of receiving and paying an invoice.

Once the chart is assembled, library staff can look at the entire process step by step, identifying any unnecessary steps or wasted work. At the Cook County Law Library, we noticed that every staff member involved in approving invoices was creating their own physical copies, resulting in duplicated work and excessive records to manage. While making an extra photocopy of an invoice might not be incredibly time consuming, in the words of fictional business efficiency expert Kevin Malone “many small time make big time.”

Eliminating extra photocopying is an example of the type of low hanging fruit that process mapping is perfect for identifying. Over a relatively short period of time, the amount of time and money saved by reducing duplicated work exceeds the initial time investment required to create the flowchart.

References


Endnotes

1. Part of the Cook County Office of Research, Operations, and Innovation (https://www.cookcountyil.gov_agency/ROI)
2. For an example of what this type of flowchart should look like, see Ken Miller, *The Change Agent’s Guide to Radical Improvement* (Milwaukee: ASQ, 2002), 114.


- CC:DA Blog still hosted on ALCTS server, will change to CORE (still early)
- Conscious effort not to make too many changes too quickly (staffing issues), large changes down the road


- ALA Zoom account is problematic for CC:DA in its current iteration. CC:DA is still using an institutional (i.e., university) Zoom account for flexibility/customization by Committee Chair
- One example: transcription/captions may not be available through ALA Zoom account
- Discussion: A recommendation that the Virtual Participation Task Force be reconstituted with a revised charge: This Virtual Participation Task Force is charged with identifying potential uses for ALA Connect for CC:DA work. This could include use as a discussion tool for the full committee or for a task force. It could also be used for storage of committee files or administrative data. The Task Force shall present its preliminary findings for discussion at the 2021 summer virtual meeting, and [will] submit recommendations to the full Committee by October 1, 2021.
- The Charge was changed by CC:DA vote.

Report from the Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records CC:DA Task Force, Kathryn Lybarger – Highlights/Notes

- The Task Force had some questions about the recommended best practices and also proposed one substantial change: using 046 $k instead of 046 $o to record creation dates for individual works within an aggregate. [The task force believes] this would lead to more consistent cataloging and also be more in line with the definitions of these subfields (as described in the MARC subfield proposal for 046 $o and $p); it is also the interpretation of OLAC as used in their best practices for cataloging DVD and Blu-Ray videos.
- The Task Force has yet to receive a formal response from the SAC Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies
- The CC:DA Chair officially discharged the Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records Task Force


Report and Q&A from ALA Publishing, James Hennelly – Highlights/Notes

- Update from ALA Digital Reference: 3R Project brought to a close with 12/15 release
- 3R Project included many accessibility/technological advances
- Work continues on RDA translations: Norwegian complete, Finnish soon, others uncertain
- Work continues on Policy Statements: BL and LC-PCC continue to build; MLA BP beginning work in CMS
- Further Toolkit development beyond the 3R Project continues: Visual browser; Mapping tool (MARC, BIBFRAME, etc.; the original Toolkit only has flat, non-dynamic mapping)
- Orientation efforts continue
  - Continuing RDA Lab Series: Training in modules, 6 modules in 4 webinars
  - Toolkit demos
  - YouTube channel ([https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo](https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo))
  - Print products
    --Glossary
    --Introducing RDA: A guide to basics after 3R
    --RDA workbook (to come): based on the Lab Series, possibly out before end of 2021
    --RDA essentials (to come)
Question on RDA Toolkit Community Section from Stephen Hearn: Are the accessibility standards the same as rest of the site? Answer from James Hennelly: They should be the same.

Culturally Competent Collection Development Policies

Adrienne DeWitt
Campbell University

This February, I had the opportunity to attend AALL’s “So You Wanna Practice Cultural Competence,” (https://www.aallnet.org/forms/meeting/MeetingFormPublic/view?id=428B4000000DF) part of AALL’s “So You Wanna…” series (https://pegasisblog.wordpress.com/2021/01/10/so-you-wanna-live-interview-series-2020-2021/). This live panel discussion was a follow up on the first interview held last May, in which the panelists addressed how law librarians can acknowledge issues such as implicit bias and appropriately handling culturally sensitive situations. In February’s session, the panel broadened the question to what we can actively be doing to manage culturally competent communication in both our classrooms and our workspaces. Both sessions were engaging and eye-opening, and I hope that AALL considers continuing this program.

Cultural competence requires us to look beyond ourselves and take a holistic look at how our institution reflects these practices. This made me think about how it might be reflected in collection development. For example, how would a student working on an assignment on legal issues with the LGBTQ+ community feel if they came to a librarian for research help and found that the collection had few on-site materials to assist them in their research? That student would no doubt feel excluded, even if the reasons for not having these materials were justified by the library’s collection development policy.

Of course, most libraries simply don’t have the budget to collect all available materials. Selection criteria are necessary to make sure we are collecting the best resources to meet our patron’s needs. Moreover, as law librarians, we might focus on collecting LOC cataloged KF materials and leave the broader social science LOC categories to our undergraduate or special libraries within our own academic institutions. At the same time, diversifying our collection within our budget restraints and criteria needs would only benefit the collection, increase library good will, and support our diverse student populations.

After the February session, I began looking at other libraries’ collection development policies to see how they added cultural competence and diversity to their collection development criteria. In particular, I looked at collection development manuals that have been updated within the past two years (2018 – 2020). I also looked beyond law library collection development practices to include public and academic libraries. Finally, I discovered some excellent LibGuides from children and young adult librarians on collecting diverse resources (https://guides.masslibsystem.org/inclusivecollections).

For those who are interested in updating their collection development policies, I have created a short list of helpful resources. Personally, I want to thank AALL and the May 2020 and February 2021 panelists Shamika Dalton, Savanna Nolan, Clanitra Stewart Nejdl, and Dr. Michele Villagran for producing this excellent series.

- Beloit College (https://guides.beloit.edu/culturalcompetencies)
- Massachusetts Library System (https://guides.masslibsystem.org/c.php?g=990302)
BIBFRAME to MARC Conversion
Updates: Two Tracks

Jesse A Lamberton
University of Chicago

The future of metadata production, discovery, and workflows is seeing a future of change before it. Specifically, this change will come in the form of more leveraged Linked Data technology and Resource Description Framework (RDF), of which one such RDF schema is BIBFRAME. Some of these elements overlap; some do not. I will not go deeply into that in this column but am watching these pieces come together and develop, etc. Here, I just want to focus on some of the efforts that are underway related to metadata conversion efforts, mostly from the starting point of RDF converted to MARC.

The two tracks of conversion being worked on with library involvement (and I am sure there are various situations out there working along this on their own terms, in different places around the world) in my context, that I am aware of, are the Library of Congress’ BIBFRAME2MARC conversion, focused on converting their own BF production as RDF/XML to MARCXML, and the related efforts, using a fork of the Library of Congress BIBFRAME2MARC converter that has been adopted by the LD4P community in Sinopia. These are parallel paths but are not the same because the URIs and things on the LC side are in their own platform while the Sinopia side is its own platform and is declared to be an RDF editor that works with BIBFRAME but does not need to be a BF editor only.

1. The Library of Congress process is viewable and cloneable from their GitHub profile (https://github.com/lcnetdev/bibframe2marc) and clearly delineates that it is a 1.0 transform, which implies that more efforts are expected to come in the future. This is surely the case. This transform being used and tested by LC is using their own huge data store. One can take a glance at an example from the LC side on their Bibliographic Framework Initiative, where one can compare the RDF/XML to the MARC (viewable in text form at: https://id.loc.gov/tools/bibframe/comparebf-lccn/2018958785.txt). That view also permits the entry of any specific LCCN to look at the converted MARC. I am not sure if this demo page is converting live or simply displays the already converted data. The site does not state; I would assume the latter. If the reader wants to look at the specifications for this transformation they use, that can be viewed at their conversion specifications page (https://www.loc.gov/bibframe/bftm/).

It is very cool that LC has such a huge dB of data to work with. That data has already been converted to BF in most cases, so, with this conversion protocol, **I think** it is being converted back to MARC. I could be wrong, but I believe the real plan is that the dual-entry cataloging workflows at LC are hoping to be stopped so that BF can skip the dual entry and rely on BF MDSs conversion to MARC – and eventually, hopefully, to stop all conversion to MARC in the future once the whole metadata universe shifts away from MARC. That is very cool if that is the plan. We shall wait to hear LC updates in the future as these workflows are tweaked and shared. One comment I have about this is that their
data on the BF side and on the MARC side is produced and converted on the same platforms and thus has a lot more uniformity. This certainly makes experiments and testing on conversions simpler. The scale of the efforts, and the creation of the HUB, a LC local implementation of the more abstract LRM:Work that BIBFRAME does not currently acknowledge in the BIBFRAME:Work, is ambitious and impressive. But, we are all curious about how LC’s BF work will interoperate with outside utilities and, of course, the future of LSPs (ILSs). Time is required here as well.

2. LD4Ps BF2MARC converter is also a repo on GitHub as RDF2MARC (https://github.com/LD4P/rdf2marc), is built on Ruby, can be run internally in the Sinopia editor while logged in, and can be cloned and run locally from the command line (CLI). I have been testing both options, but with more time being given to the CLI version. It is fundamentally the same, running internally behind the scenes, grabbing the URI of the Sinopia:Instance currently open, and looking for associated Work and Administrative Metadata. It then provides an opportunity to download a decent MARC record that can be upgraded, get Call#, and expand things like Genre/Form or other subject vocabularies. The CLI version is technically doing the same thing, but as described in the directions at https://github.com/LD4P/rdf2marc#usage, runs a single command on a specific URI and produces what is being called an ‘operational’ MARC record in the directory from which the command is run and the repo is cloned.

This context for this conversion tool is the RDF Editor Sinopia, the LD4P built fork from the LC BIBFRAME2MARC converter. This editor is described by the Stanford team, who is primarily the lead organization on the Sinopia development front, as an RDF editor, not a BIBFRAME editor. Even though it is clearly and obviously a fork from the Library of Congress BIBFRAME2MARC editor, LD4P is simultaneously using it as a BIBFRAME editor and an RDF editor. If anyone saw the 2021 ‘Midwinter’ ALA CORE IG Week Virtual session of Bibliographic Conceptual Models IG, some folks from the University of Washington libraries have been specifically editing their Resource Templates (the base organizational model for format-specific aspects such as monographs, serials, 2-D/3-D objects, etc.) as RDA in RDF, which has a much more granular structure and is clearly more intended to handle entities than BIBFRAME – which is not mapped so clearly to RDA or the LRM. I think this approach is a good one, but because it is one library working so intentionally with RDA in RDF and LC seems to be putting its eggs in the BIBFRAME basket, there are clearly some ‘forked’ intentions out there in library-land regarding how to create metadata in RDF. I could go on and on about this subject, but I simply want to draw attention to the Sinopia track and its current status, as of Winter 2021.

Conclusion: I like being involved in the LD4P community. I like it a lot. My rational for my involvement is about learning and contributing to the community, not because I think that BIBFRAME or Linked Data is absolutely ‘better.’ What these elements do is work better with current web technology and open the metadata to browser friendly technologies and can be operable with other applications using state-of-the-art serialization operations. My humble opinion is that we should contribute our knowledge to the community as widely as we are able. In fact, these changes need as many persons to engage as are able. The changes coming are significant; not everyone will be happy with those changes, yet they are underway right this moment. I hope with this column to quickly draw attention to some of those changes in a very limited way.

The Standoff in Australia over Links to News Articles: Australia Versus Google and Facebook

Introduction

Australia is currently considering a law which would require large market dominant websites that link to news articles to pay a fee to the news publishers in exchange for being able to link. Initially, the law would apply only to Google and Facebook, based on findings that these two companies dominate the market, but could potentially apply to other companies or websites if there is evidence to show a bargaining power imbalance. As a result, Google threatened to pull out of Australia entirely (but now seems to have begun contractual negotiations with publishers in anticipation of the new law), and Facebook has blocked users in Australia from posting or viewing links to material from news organizations.
This clash is significant because the proposed law is a big step in regulating internet content providers under antitrust and might serve as a model for other countries to follow.

**Background:** Australian Competition and Consumer Commission showing market dominance of Google and Facebook in internet advertising revenue and news consumption

The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) is Australia’s government agency tasked with enforcing regulating monopolies and with consumer protection. In July 2019, the ACCC released a 623-page report regarding the impact of online search engines, social media, and digital content aggregators on competition in the media and advertising services markets. The report covered news among many other topics, including privacy, spread of misinformation, and data collection about users.

Key findings from the report regarding market dominance include: Traditional broadcast media is more heavily regulated than media delivered through digital platforms. Google and Facebook are the two major digital platforms in Australia. Advertiser funded digital platforms tend to be based on collecting user data for highly personalized marketing. More than 70% of websites have a Google tracker, and more than 20% of websites have a Facebook tracker. This highly personalized marketing is the way that Google and Facebook make money. Just under 40% of time spent online by Australians is spent on sites operated by Google or Facebook. 95% of general searches in Australia are performed using Google. Almost 96% of search advertising revenue in Australia goes to Google.

While the report is about market dominance in Australia, it includes some additional speculation about future changes in market dominance, including the possibility that Amazon might become a dominant digital platform in Australia but currently has low market penetration there. The report is a detailed examination of just how consolidated internet use has become in websites and services run by a few big companies. At 600 pages, and with significant efforts at large scale data collection, it is a uniquely detailed glimpse into usage patterns on the internet.

Findings from the report regarding news include: News websites rely on incoming traffic from Google and Facebook and benefit from this traffic. Meanwhile, Google and Facebook benefit from being able to provide news in search and the news feed. However, excluding any one publisher from search results or the news feed wouldn't have a significant impact on Google and Facebook, because news come from multiple publishers. So, there is a bargaining power imbalance. From 2006 to 2016, Australia had population and economic growth. Meanwhile, the number of people employed in print journalism fell by 26%. Social media can be used to spread disinformation. The report considers ways to fund news, including giving tax deductions for subscriptions to news, and concludes that these likely would not have a big impact.

Once again, while the report covers Australia, aspects of the report regarding news are parallel to the situation in the United States, where news has lost funding for decades and local news is often greatly reduced or unavailable. The need to fund news is a small part of the report and covered by an exploration of possible paths to providing funding for news creation, most of which are analyzed to be unviable and without enough impact to make a difference.

**The proposed law: News Media and Digital Platforms Mandatory Bargaining Code**

The News Media and Digital Platforms Mandatory Bargaining Code flows directly from recommendations in the ACCC's report. The proposed law would require Google and Facebook to pay news publishers a fee in exchange for being able to link to news content. The law initially would apply only to Google Search and Facebook News Feed, based on criteria regarding what digital platforms would be regulated. Other websites could be added if there is evidence to show a bargaining power imbalance.

The proposed law regarding payments by Google and Facebook for linking to news seems to be driven by a combination of financial woes in news, how dramatically search advertising revenue goes to Google, and the bargaining power imbalance between publishers and Google/Facebook, with news sites needing the traffic but the dominant digital platforms not being dependent on any one news source enough to need it.
The goal of the law is to provide a new revenue stream for news companies. News has taken huge financial hits with the internet. 30 years ago, subscription fees and advertising fees paid the bills at news companies. Now both are greatly reduced because the transition to the internet changed how people access news. People search and find news here and there, and advertising fees work differently.

The full text of the proposed law can be found at https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;page=0;query=BillId:r6652%20Reconstruct:billhome. The law has an administrative agency designate digital platforms to which it would apply. (Initially, it would apply only to Google Search and Facebook News Feed, based on the scale at which those services are used by the public.) The proposed law defines news broadly and would require news organizations to register with the government. All news sources must comply with a code of conduct in order to remain registered. It has a framework for setting up contracts for fees and sets up an arbitration process for contract disputes. Alternatively, a news organization could contract directly with a digital platform, and fees could flow outside of the fee splitting arrangement set up by the government. There are some minimum requirements listed that the contract would have to meet, and the offer would have to be available to all registered news publishers. The law doesn't specify fee structures or dollar amounts beyond requiring that payments be "fair." The law also requires advance notice from digital platforms about algorithm or interface changes anticipated to have a significant impact on traffic to the news publisher.

Misinformation is covered by provisions allowing a registration to be revoked based on misleading or false information provided as news.

A possible elephant in the room regarding misinformation is that the law adds procedures around the relationship of linking to news, while linking to other types of content is not regulated by the law. The purpose of the law is to fund high quality news rather than to address misinformation online.

At this time, the proposed law seems likely to pass.

As might be expected, both Google and Facebook oppose the law. It is both a financial cost and a precedent for regulation by governments globally.

**Google's response: Threatening to pull out of Australia, meanwhile contracting with major news organizations in anticipation of the law passing**

Google initially threatened to pull out of Australia but has now begun making contracts with news publishers in anticipation of the law passing.

**Facebook's response: Removing all links to news in Australia**

As of February 18, 2021, Facebook removed posts linking to news sites. Analysis of this change showed that traffic to news sites dropped, and people did not seek out alternative sources for news. That is in contrast to times when Facebook has been down entirely, when search traffic shows that people went elsewhere to research news and traffic remained constant. Because the proposed law defines news broadly, Facebook took a broad definition and removed a wide variety of content, including posts by government agencies, such as fire and health department information, emergency services information, and weather information. This emphasizes a possible danger in regulating high quality news without regulating the rest of internet content.

**Possible implications for the United States**

The Australian proposed law requiring mandatory payments from dominant digital platforms is a major step toward regulating search engines and news aggregators. What happens in Australia may set a global precedent and model for regulating search and the news feed. How to fund news is a small issue compared to the precedent for regulating
search engines and social media. At this time, Canada, France, and the European Union have shown interest in following Australia’s model. Even if the exact model of payment for content does not carry over to other countries, the idea of much stronger regulation over search content and presentation of news in social media may spread. Especially with recent Section 230 hearings, which weren’t about Section 230 but were heavily about how news and misinformation are treated on social media, the United States has the political will to begin stronger regulation of digital platforms.

Endnotes
ideas. After addressing these strong points, you can then move the discussion forward with something like “I understand your thinking here, but if you think further…” or “Let’s build on those excellent points…”

During the discussion, it’s important to maintain and demonstrate a curious attitude. Research shows that successful negotiators ask one question for every five statements, while average negotiators demonstrate little interest in learning about the other side, simply making pronouncements which they believe bolster their case while refuting all counter arguments. Asking questions such as, “What evidence would you need to believe in X?” or “I definitely agree with X value in your point…can you see any value in my point?” can break the downward spiral in which each side simply pushes back on the other’s points and doubles down on their own positions.

How many points to bring up during the discussion may depend on how much people care about the issue, how receptive they are to your argument, and how open minded they are in general. Grant believes that if they are not highly invested in the issue and they are receptive to our perspective, bringing up lots of supporting evidence can be seen as a sign of the strength of the argument. However, for generally stubborn people who are skeptical of our viewpoint and passionate about the issue, listing more reasons can actually backfire—debatable or weak arguments give them more opportunity to shoot down the entire message, and multiple points can feel more like an attack on their views.

Most middle managers (and human beings in general!) don’t enjoy difficult discussions in the workplace, but employing some of the strategies above may help lower the temperature and lead to workable solutions that actually leave both sides feeling heard and respected, if not happy.

Endnotes
1. Adam Grant, Think Again (New York: Viking, 2021), chap. 5, Kindle.
2. Ibid, chap. 4.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

Report of the AALL Liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), Midwinter Meetings, January 26-28, 2021

Introduction
The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened three meetings virtually using WebEx. Action was taken on ten proposals and six discussion papers during the meetings. Audio recordings of the MARC Advisory Committee meetings (audio only) can be accessed at: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/recordings.html. Timestamps are provided for each agenda item. The complete texts of all discussion papers and proposals considered at the 2021 virtual Midwinter Meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee are available at: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2021_age.html. To keep this brief, and since the meeting recordings are available online, this report will only summarize the most significant proposals and those of particular interest to the AALL community. Readers are encouraged to listen to the recordings for the papers not discussed here.

The papers brought to MAC at the Midwinter 2021 meetings advance the effort to transform BIBFRAME Linked Data elements into the MARC standard and implement changes proposed by the MARC/RDA Working Group (https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/MARC-RDA_Working_Group.html) to support compatibility with RDA. As we prepare for the transition to a Linked Data environment, parsing textual data and free-text note fields into distinct subfields in order to encode URI’s into the MARC standard again emerges as a trend. Notably at this set of meetings, there was no further
discussion related to the 856 field, which was a topic at the previous two meetings of MAC. I believe there will be additional changes to this field, possibly brought to MAC in the next meeting.

This report is organized with each discussion paper/proposal in bold with a summary of the related discussion. I encourage members of TS-SIS to provide feedback to the discussion papers. Please send your comments on the Metadata Management Committee listserv or to me directly.

Proposal No. 2021-03: Changes to Fields 008/21 and 006/04 for Type of Continuing Resource in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

Source: ISSN Review Group, ISSN International Centre, Paris

The current options for type of continuing resource in 008/21 (Type of continuing resource) and 006/04 (Type of continuing resource) do not provide enough granularity for faceting and statistical reporting in the ISSN Portal. They also argue that research and scholarship using continuing resources might also make use of these changes. This paper proposes revising the definitions for three existing codes:

- p - Periodical
- d - Updating database
- w - Updating Web site

The code p is intended as a “catch-all” and will include revised instructions to “use this code if less granularity is desired. Otherwise, prefer codes for the specific types of periodicals.” This paper also adds six new codes and definitions. The existing definitions for codes l (Updating loose-leaf), m (Monographic series), and n (Newspaper) remain unchanged. The ISSN Centre did not express any plans to retrospectively change ISSN registries to accommodate the new codes. Additionally, librarians recognized that there needs to be an option to leave these bytes blank if the resource doesn’t fit any of the categories. There were some editorial changes suggested to clarify the code definitions.

This proposal passed.

Proposal No. 2021-04: Adding Subfields $0 and $1 to Field 022 in the MARC Bibliographic and Authority Formats

This paper proposes adding subfields $0 and $1 to field 022 (ISSN) to provide a place for a URI. The addition of $0 and $1 has been brought to MAC for addition to several fields over the last year. The reason for adding subfields $0 and $1 is to enable a smooth conversion of BIBFRAME data to the MARC format that preserves the URIs that come from the BIBFRAME description.

There continues to be a debate about where subfield URIs belong. The MARC Appendix A (https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdcntv.html) states, “Subfield $1 contains a URI that identifies an entity, sometimes referred to as a Thing, a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual. When dereferenced, the URI points to a description of that entity. A URI that identifies a name or label for an entity is contained in $0.” However, whether a URI constitutes a Real World Object seems to be a question that is not universally agreed upon yet.

Lastly, there was discussion of the order of subfields. When MARC records are created from BIBFRAME, there will be many more URIs, and the Library of Congress will have to, in many cases, insert $0 other places in the data string. Imposing a requirement in MARC to have these codes at the end is not exactly possible since there is no order of elements in a Linked Data environment.

This proposal passed.
Proposal No. 2021-08: Defining a New Field for Encoded Supplementary Content Characteristics in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format

This proposal creates a new field 353 for “Supplementary Content Characteristics.” Fields 504 and 525 generate the BIBFRAME Work or Instance elements: bf:supplementaryContent (property) and bf:SupplementaryContent (class); however, they were identified by the Library of Congress as having terms that exist in controlled vocabulary but lack a place for a standard identifier or URI in the MARC standard.

As a result of 2020-DP02 (available at: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-dp02.html) , MAC agreed that fields 504 and 525 should be preserved for eye-readable notes, and a new field should be considered. The committee preferred that identifiers and controlled language for indexes, bibliographies, and other supplementary information be encoded in the 3XX block. Including subfield $0 and $1 in the new field 353 will enable a smooth conversion of BIBFRAME data to the MARC format that preserves the URIs that come from the BIBFRAME description.

AALL should consider advising the RDA Steering Committee on supplementary content terms for legal works in the RDA Registry. At present, there does not appear to be a Supplementary Content value vocabulary (https://www.rdaregistry.info/termList/) in the RDA Registry. The terms in the Library of Congress supplementary content (https://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/msupplcont.html) could likewise be expanded.

This proposal passed.

Proposal No. 2021-09: Recording the Mode of Issuance for Manifestations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

This proposal creates a new field 334 for the RDA element “mode of issuance.” The RDA 3R project changed the scope of mode of issuance and the values associated with it, which no longer correspond to the MARC 21 Leader codes. The RDA Toolkit removed values for multipart monograph, integrating resource, and serial from the controlled vocabulary used to express mode of issuance (these concepts are now covered by the controlled vocabulary for "extension plan," which is coded in field 335 following the acceptance by MAC of Proposal 2020-07, available at: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2020/2020-07.html).

The RDA mode of issuance values are now multiple unit or single unit, which are derived from the RDA Registry controlled vocabulary. This proposal defines a new field and subfields for the purpose of coding this new element. This, in combination with extension plan, would then be capable of reflecting the distinct attributes of diachronic resources as recognized by the RDA Steering Committee and the ISSN International Centre. It should be noted that this field is not required, and a community may choose not to record this element in circumstances where it does not correspond with a particular record model or community of practice.

The proposal passed.
Connexion Client 3.0 is coming.

- Administrative privileges will not be required for installation.
- Windows 10 (64 bit) will be required.
- Online documentation will be updated.
- Field testing is planned for May-June 2021. OCLC is looking for additional field testers who use network-shared local files, macros, label printing, or the CJK E-dictionary. If you are interested in participating, contact cnx-product@oclc.org
- General release is planned for July-August 2021.
- Support for older versions will be discontinued in 2022, with a minimum of 3 months advance notice.

New data sync reports available in the OCLC Usage Statistics portal.

- Bibliographic and Holdings Processing Summary.
- LBD Processing Summary.
- See documentation on the OCLC website for more information: https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Collection_Manager/Understand_reports/emailed/data_sync?sl=en.

WorldCat Validation will be updated in late February 2021.

- MARC 21 Bibliographic Update No. 31 (announced December 2020).
- MARC 21 Authority Update No. 31 (announced December 2020) to the Validation Rule Set that Includes All Valid Elements of MARC 21 Authority Format.
- MARC 21 Authority Update No. 31 (announced December 2020) to the Validation Rule Set for the Library of Congress Name Authority Cooperative (NACO).
- MARC 21 Holdings Update No. 31 (announced December 2020).
- Making Authority Field 050 Second Indicator "Blank" Obsolete.
- Validation of Authority 5XX Subfield $4.
- Implementation of Unicode in Local Holdings Records (LHRs).

Preservation in Turbulent Times

Last year was challenging across the board. The impacts of the last 12 months will be with us for a long time, and, for better or worse, will likely have a permanent change on the way we work. Likewise, library budgets took a hit, with cuts both in place and on the horizon, and I would bet preservation is likely one of the last things on your agenda. The stories we’ve read about the 1918 flu pandemic should be a reminder about just how important it is to preserve our tangible collections and the snapshot of history they will provide for the future – we wouldn’t have those pieces of history if it hadn’t been for someone’s foresight in saving the news as it was reported.
As I say this, I know that budgets are tight, even if they weren’t at the dawn of 2020. I’m not suggesting expensive practices here, though if you do have extra funds in your budget, this is probably a good time to stock up on some acid-free boxes and folders and maybe purchase the book press or CoLibri Book Cover System that you’ve been eyeballing.

There are many natural enemies to our collections, including water, moisture, mold and mildew, light, pests, temperature, and humidity. The impacts of these lead to expensive repairs or the complete destruction of our materials, so this is a good time to think about low or no cost practices to proactively protect our volumes. So, the next time you’re in your library, do a quick inventory and see if you can do some preservation work while you’re there as well:

- Turn the lights out and/or lower the blinds. If your building is closed, or only open on a limited basis, turn off the lights in areas people aren’t accessing. If you’re able to close blinds in rooms that receive a lot of direct sun, you can also reduce potential damage to your materials.
- The next time you’re in the building, give all those books on display a rest. Not only is light damaging, long-term display, especially when books are open, can damage spines, pages, and covers.
- As we move through winter and spring, check windows and other places prone to leaks to make sure they’re dry. Wet books can be a pain; moldy books may be unsalvageable!
- Dust the stacks – this is a great task for workers that have to be onsite, even when there’s not a lot of patron traffic. Make sure to brush dirt and dust away from the spines.
- Review the TS-SIS preservation resources (https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/resources-publications/technical-services-links/preservation-resources/), especially the tips included on the “Preservation on the Cheap” handout. While several years old, this is still a great resource for inexpensive preservation tools.

If you don’t have access to your building, or even if you do, it’s a great time to review your institutions’ preservation policy and disaster plan to ensure they are up-to-date, or to draft one if there’s not one in place. It’s also a great time to talk about these policies with all members of your library staff since these days it’s hard to know who might be in the building when a preservation emergency strikes!

---

**SERIALS ISSUES**

*Paula Seeger*

*Fox Rothschild, LLP (Philadelphia, PA)*

**Introduction**

Because “social distance doesn't mean socially disconnected,” as Dr. Aiesha M. Johnson reminded us in the first annual Southeastern chapter of the American Association of Law Libraries (SEAALL) Diversity Lecture on February 11 (recording at: https://gsu.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=a8680336-577b-490b-a940-ac00000232a1), the call to remain connected is the guiding principle as I begin my tenure as the author of this column. You will find the invitation to connect sprinkled throughout my columns, and I humbly ask for your feedback and input as we connect and create together. I work for Fox Rothschild, LLP at their headquarters in Philadelphia, but I coordinate the updates of the print collections in the other 27 firm offices across the United States. This duty is shared among an operations team and has been drastically changed in the past year. I literally started my job the day before the Philadelphia office went into its first lockdown, so for the first several months, I did not see or touch any part of a print collection. Imagine what the training is like for the main part of your job without actually handling the materials you need to update! “Challenging” is an understatement. In addition to managing a months-long, near-total suspension of print deliveries, and then a reinstatement and overwhelming backlog of shipments, we also faced (and continue to face as of this writing) the difficulty of finding staff at each office to complete the updates we ship to them. The filing services staff, third-party contracted workers who usually visit the offices to update the libraries, are temporarily not allowed into the offices per firm guidelines, which creates a different sort of backlog. For offices with few attorneys coming
into the office, updating print collections was not nearly as urgent as for those offices with a higher capacity. A level of training (it could be called “quick and dirty”) was fashioned to get essential staff onboarded and started with learning how to update the collections. This process, and the lessons it yielded, will perhaps be described in future issues. Has COVID changed practices, policies, or even yielded systemic changes in your department of organization? Please connect with your stories and anecdotes so we can share what worked, what failed, and what we plan to do going forward.

The Big Picture
A former supervisor once told me that “It’s all customer service,” and she was right. In all our interactions with patrons, customers, clients, visitors, and especially colleagues, we strive to be helpful and have a good attitude. In a similar vein, so much of life mirrors the same character as serials work: the ebb and flow of our daily life or a serials run, the disruption of a missed opportunity or a gap in the issues, a change in job or living arrangement or a change in format that causes you to reset or rethink an entire system, and a feeling of satisfaction when life is content or a complete set returns from the bindery. As much as serials work is wedded to the many specific details, looking at the big picture helps reset your frame of mind from time to time.

Agenda
I have an ambitious agenda of future topics I would like to address in this column. My priority is to present current awareness of trends, news, and resources in the serials world (such as how COVID has changed policies, handling, or practices), but also to revisit the topics that were highlighted in last year’s survey (see v. 45, no. 3: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/wp-content/uploads/sites/17/2020/03/Technical-Services-Law-Librarian-45-3-March-2020.pdf). Then, alternating among these topics, I want to break down and explore more fully the basic elements of current serials work, as well as the continuous development of excellent serials librarianship, including professional development of skills and techniques that are becoming essential as the discipline continues to evolve. I also want to review the history of this column, to celebrate how we have changed, while examining what is being taught about serials in the current iSchool curriculum. Finally, at the end of each column, I aim to ask for your feedback and input in order to connect and create.

Selected Resource Recommendations
Note: As of this writing, Taylor and Francis, the publisher of Serials Review, is making any peer-reviewed research published in their journals related to COVID open and accessible to all.
Scott Vieira (2021): COVID-19 and Innovation, Serials Review, DOI: 10.1080/00987913.2021.1879712 Need to hear the positive outcomes of the pandemic? Take a look at this article as experiences are shared about a few innovative solutions and responses.

Also recommended in Serials Review from 2020 are (1) the entire issue of Volume 46, Number 3 from the 2020 North Carolina Serials Conference (including a timely article on remote work in technical services), (2) the entire issue of Volume 46, Number 2, the Special Issue on Accessibility (with multiple definitions of accessibility), and (3) Margaret Mering (Contributor) & Casey D. Hoeve (2020), A Brief History to the Future of Open Access, Serials Review, 46:4, 300-304, DOI: 10.1080/00987913.2020.1850041, which provides a nice bite-size summary of the evolution and history of open access (OA), why the concept is important, and the types of OA that are most used.

I am a decade or so late on discovering this podcast, but the latest episodes are really what drew me in: “T is for Training” at https://tisfortraining.wordpress.com/. It features discussion in a conversational format about relevant and timely topics on library management, leadership, and training, including the future of librarians in a time of pandemic, using social media to change the world, and the ever-popular topic of what should be taught in library school.

Call to Connect
If I have presented anything in this column that has piqued your interest, fired you up, or just made you wonder, please connect with me at pseeger@foxrothschild.com. I look forward to hearing from you.
The following is a list of serials title changes:

**I/S: A Journal of Law and Policy for the Information Society**
- **Changed to:**
- **Ohio State Technology Law Journal**
  - v. 16 (2020) (OCoLC 1107052580)

The following is a list of serials cessations:

**Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 35 (2020) (OCoLC 61146694)
- Continued online at [https://www.law.berkeley.edu/library/ir/bglj](https://www.law.berkeley.edu/library/ir/bglj) (OCoLC 62878395)

**Canadian Human Rights Reporter**
- **Ceased with:** v. 20 (OCoLC 7208097)

**Dalhousie Law Journal**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 43, no. 1 (2020) (OCoLC 60622264)
- Continued online at [https://www.dal.ca/faculty/law/research/publications/dalhousie-law-journal.html](https://www.dal.ca/faculty/law/research/publications/dalhousie-law-journal.html) (OCoLC 651616288)

**Deakin Law Review**
- **Ceased with:** v. 24 (2019) (OCoLC 30842851)

**Flinders Law Journal**
- **Ceased with:** v. 21 (2020) (OCoLC 651616288)

**Forum (Consumer Attorneys of California)**
- **Ceased in print with:** May/June (2020) (OCoLC 4974159)
- Continued online at [https://www.caoc.org/index.cfm?pg=forumarticles](https://www.caoc.org/index.cfm?pg=forumarticles)
  (No OCoLC online record)

**Journal of Appellate Practice and Process**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 21 (2021) (OCoLC 41126396)
- Continued online at [https://law.arizona.edu/journal-appellate-practice-and-process](https://law.arizona.edu/journal-appellate-practice-and-process) (OCoLC 54401122)

**Journal of Eurasian Law**
- **Ceased with:** v. 11 (2018) (OCoLC 217269484)

**Law Library Journal**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 112 (2020) (OCoLC 1642568)
- Continued online at [https://www.aallnet.org/resources-publications/publications/law-library-journal/](https://www.aallnet.org/resources-publications/publications/law-library-journal/) (OCoLC 50636172)

**Legal Studies Forum**
- **Ceased with:** v. 44, no. 2 (2020) (OCoLC 12005788)

**Loyola Maritime Law Journal**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 18 (2019) (OCoLC 50855345)
- Continued online at [https://loyolamaritimelawjournal.scholasticahq.com/](https://loyolamaritimelawjournal.scholasticahq.com/) (OCoLC 60626770)

**National Lawyers Guild Review**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 78 (2021) (OCoLC 647995073)
- Continued online at [https://www.nlg.org/nlg-review/](https://www.nlg.org/nlg-review/) (OCoLC 664350202)

**Public Utilities Reports**
- **Ceased with:** v. 354 PUR 4th (2019) (OCoLC 1763113)

**Statement of Treaties and International Agreements**
- **Ceased in print with:** 2018 (OCoLC 2139268)

**UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs**
- **Ceased in print with:** v. 24 (2020) (OCoLC 35006739)
- Continued online at [https://escholarship.org/uc/uclalaw](https://escholarship.org/uc/uclalaw) (OCoLC 60624160)
The Library of Congress has announced the creation or revision of a number of subject headings of interest to law librarians. “Misconduct in office--Law and legislation” may be used, as may “HIV infections--Prevention--Law and legislation.” “People with disabilities (Roman law)” appeared, as did “Prison reform” and “Prison abolition movements.” “Drug traffic in motion pictures” and “Drug traffic on television” are available, as are “Police in motion pictures,” “Epidemics in motion pictures,” and “Populism in motion pictures.” Speaking of epidemics, the term “Epidemics” has been revised, with the term “Pandemics” added as a Used For term rather than established separately. Works on the current pandemic will go under the newly established “COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020-,” which does subdivide geographically. And what about literary hoaxes? May we use the term “Literary hoaxes?” Sadly, no, we may not, at least not in subject analysis. Instead, we must use “Literary forgeries and mystifications.” How dull!

In the areas of international affairs and international law, we have several new and revised terms. “Libya--Politics and government--1969-” is now “Libya--Politics and government--1969-2011,” and “Libya--Politics and government--2011-” may be used. “Multipolarity (International relations)” appeared and may explain the need for “Autonomous weapons systems” and “Autonomous weapons systems (International law).” Related to these last two is “Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Weapon System,” a type of ballistic missile defense system. The terms “Collective punishment” and “Collective punishment (International law)” are available. The term “Military observers” may be used. In some instances, they do more than observe, so read the source consulted notes for further information.

Those from India, but not living in it, are “East Indians,” and “Indians” continues to be used for Native Americans. Adjustments were made to the Used For notes in these and merit consultation. The new term for all indigenous peoples in the Western Hemisphere is “Indigenous people—America.” “Indians” is a narrower term for this new subject. Perhaps the newly approved “Critical race theory” will explain this for us. In use in academia since the 1980s, we may now use the term in our subject cataloging. “Mexican American civic leaders” may be used, as may “Sexual minority teachers” and “Sexual minorities in education.” “Women household employees, Black” may be used, as may “Vice-presidential candidates' spouses.” One status unites us, the new term “Taxpayers.” Much in vogue this time of year, the new term has finally been established.

In other new and changed matters, the “Wilmington Race Riot, Wilmington, N.C., 1898” has been revised to “Wilmington Massacre, Wilmington, N.C., 1898.” “Blackface in mass media” was established, as was “Chinese American theatrical producers and directors.” “Speeches, addresses, etc., Winnebago” is now “Speeches, addresses, etc., Ho-Chunk,” and “Winnebago language” is now “Ho-Chunk language.” “Texas Church Shooting, Sutherland Springs, Tex., 2017” may be used for the incident which left 26 innocent people dead. Of possible legal interest, the term “Lingering” was established, although we already have the term “Loitering.” It would be helpful if the two terms were distinguished.

A new genre/form term “Standards (Reference works)” and a new demographic/group term “Prisoners of war” conclude this column.
OCLC Extends GreenGlass Functionality to Serials

OCLC’s GreenGlass has for years been used by libraries that want extensive collection analysis metrics in one dashboard. GreenGlass offers a lot of useful data, such as subject coverage, age of collection, and rarity of titles, based on OCLC holdings data. As a user of GreenGlass at two very different institutions (a large university and a community college), one of the big benefits of GreenGlass is that it requires very little work on the part of the library to get access to a wealth of data. Generally, a library will assist with a holdings refresh with OCLC, and GreenGlass does the rest. However, one of the big drawbacks is that GreenGlass has only been able to analyze monograph collections.


At a time when many libraries are having to make decisions about the serials collections, to save both space and money, any tool that helps inform retention decisions is welcome. Hopefully, GreenGlass for serials can live up to its promise.

New Version of OCLC Connexion Client Announced

In a recent email to users of Connexion, OCLC announced that a new version of the Connexion client, version 3.0, is scheduled for release in May/June 2021. Support for 2.xx versions of Connexion will be discontinued in 2022, with at least three months advance notice. The web-based version of Connexion will remain unchanged.

Continued from page 1

So, under RDA 2.2.2.3, Preferred Source of Information—Moving Images, the preferred source of information is the title frame or frames (or title screen or screens). If the title frames or title screens have no title that covers the resource as a whole, look for the first applicable source that is part of the resource for a formally-presented collective title. So, choose the preferred source from this list, in the following order:

- Label that is permanently printed on or affixed to the resource (e.g., a label on the surface of a videodisc). This choice does not include labels found on any accompanying materials.
- Container or accompanying material issued with the resource.
- Internal source forming part of a tangible digital resource (for example, a disc menu).

Sometimes, though fortunately rarely with most commercially available video resources, the information needed to identify the resource does not appear on any source in the resource itself. RDA 2.2.4 recommends that information is then taken from one of the following sources (in order of preference):

- accompanying material (if using a comprehensive description)
- other published descriptions of the resource
- a container that is not issued with the resource itself (e.g., a box or case made by the owner)
- any other available source (e.g., a reference source)
Best Practice Recommendation: Follow LC-PCC PS 2.2.4 and use square brackets to indicate where information was taken from when using a source outside the resource itself.

And, of course, when looking for the title proper, (i.e., the title that appears on the manifestation (i.e., the piece in hand that is being cataloged) and is the “title normally used when citing the resource” (RDA 2.3.2.1)), use these sources in the order in which they are given above, per RDA 2.3.2.2. The source of title information must be recorded in a note when the title is not taken from the title frame or title screen (RDA 2.17.2). The title should be transcribed as it appears on the source of information. Thus, when transcribing a title, inaccuracies and misspellings are also transcribed. Corrections can be given in a note (RDA 2.17.2.4) or as a variant title (RDA 1.7.9).

Any variant title considered important for identification or access can be recorded. LC-PCC PS 2.3.6.3 provides guidance for encoding variant titles with MARC21. Variant titles are generally recorded in MARC field 246. Individual titles in a compilation are recorded in MARC field 730, rather than MARC 740. MARC field 740 may be used for titles of accompanying materials where an authorized access point may not be necessary but an access point is desired (e.g., titles of accompanying booklets, discs, etc.) Initial articles are dropped from both MARC fields 246 and 740 unless the intent is to file on those articles.

We now come to the statement of responsibility. This, of course, refers to the “identification and/or function of persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for the creation of, or contributing to the realization of, the intellectual or artistic content of a resource” (RDA 2.4.1.1). A statement of responsibility may include words or phrases that are neither names nor linking words. The statement of responsibility relating to the title proper is transcribed as it appears on the source of information. Roles relating to direction, production, writing, and presentation are generally recorded in the statement of responsibility. If no statement of responsibility is given in the same source as the title proper, then take the information from another source within the resource or from a source specified at RDA 2.2.4. Only the first statement of responsibility is considered core and, therefore, required to record. The statement of responsibility is recorded in MARC field 245, subfield c.

245 00 $c a Frontline production with Yellow Truck Productions in partnership with Propublica ; writer, producer, director Thomas Jennings.

245 00 $c written, produced and directed by Greg Barker.

245 00 $c $c a Sandpaper Films production ; directed by Henry Singer, Rob Miller ; produced by Henry Singer, Rob Miller and Ida Ven Bruusgaard.

Yet not every person or corporate body which contributes to the realization of the content of a resource is recorded under RDA. Performers, narrators, and persons who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a resource are recorded as separate RDA elements (see the sections Performer, Narrator and/or Presenter (RDA 7.23) and Artistic and/or Technical Credit (RDA 7.24)).

508__ Edited by Lillian E. Benson, A.C.E. ; director of photography, Charles A. Schner ; music by Camara Kambon ; executive producer, Charles Floyd Johnson.

511 _0 Correspondent, Lowell Bergman.

511_0 Narrator, Will Lyman ; reporter, Jim Gilmore.

And, of course, all of the persons and corporate bodies involved in the realization of the video resource receive a 7XX added entry with the relevant relator term, as can be found in Relator Code and Term List -- Term Sequence: MARC 21 Source Codes (Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress) (https://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/relaterm.html).
Publication statements (RDA 2.8) are, of course, core elements. They can be found, in order of preference, in the same source as the title proper, another source within the resource, or in one of the sources listed in RDA 2.2.4. In practice, there is little difference between recording publication statements of videorecordings and those of print material. Those few differences that exist will be illustrated. Dates of publication (RDA 2.8.6) can be problematic when cataloging video resources. Take the date of publication from (in order of preference): the same source as the title proper, another source within the resource, or a source specified in RDA 2.2.4. Despite the many dates often found on a resource, the date of publication can be elusive.

Copyright dates may be present but are usually associated with container art or accompanying text. A copyright date may no longer be used as a substitute for a publication date; in RDA, it is recorded as a separate element (see the section Copyright Date (RDA 2.11)). Do not confuse the date of production of the original film or television production with the date of publication of the resource.

If a date of publication is not given in the resource, supply a date of publication. Use brackets to show that the information has been taken from outside the resource.

LC-PCC PS 2.8.6.6 provides practical guidelines for use of copyright and distribution dates when the date of publication cannot be identified in the resource. If there is no date of publication but a copyright date is present, supply a date of publication that corresponds to the copyright date if it seems reasonable to assume that the date could also be a publication date. Estimate the publication date from the copyright date associated with the program content or bonus features, not a packaging date (which is likely the latest copyright date present). In many cases, the packaging copyright date refers only to an updated container and has nothing to do with date of the content. Enclose the estimated date in square brackets.

Best Practice Recommendation: Record the copyright date when a publication date is not present on a resource.

264 _1 $a Arlington, VA : $b PBS, $c [2019]

264 _4 $c ©2019

008/06 (DtSt): t

008/07-10 (Date1): 2019

008/11-14 (Date2): 2019

(©2019 is the only date present)

If a date cannot be determined or inferred from outside sources, record the standard phrase “[date of publication not identified].” However, LC/PCC practice is to prefer to supply a probable date of publication, if possible, rather than “[date of publication not identified]” (LCPCC PS 2.8.6.6).

Best Practice Recommendation: Follow LC/PCC practice and supply a probable date of publication, if possible, rather than “[date of publication not identified].”

264 _1 $c [not before 2010]

rather than

264 _1 $c [date not identified]
Regarding description of the resource, the first element is extent (RDA 3.4). The source is the resource itself, plus any accompanying material or container. Extent is recorded in MARC field 300 $a. Unit terms are taken from the list of carrier types given at RDA 3.3.1.3. Use the unit term “videodisc” for both DVD and Blu-ray Discs. RDA 3.4.1.3, however, does provide an alternative to use a term in common usage, if the term is not present in the list of carrier types or if it is preferred by the cataloging agency. Both LC and PCC practice allow the use of a term in common usage for extent (LC-PCC PS 3.4.1.3).

Best Practice Recommendation: Do not apply the alternative at RDA 3.4.1.3; use the carrier type “videodisc” for DVD or Blu-ray Discs rather than a term in common usage (e.g., DVD) for shared cataloging. Use the carrier type “videocassette” if you are cataloging a VHS tape, for example.

300 __ $a 1 videodisc

If a resource has multiple carrier types, all of the carrier types can be recorded. Record the primary carrier type in MARC field 300 subfield a, and record the secondary carrier type(s) in subfield e. Give the running time if stated on the item or is readily available (7.22, LC-PCC-PS core element.), and abbreviate minutes to min., hours to hr., and seconds to sec. (RDA B.5.3, B7).

$a1 videodisc (59 min.) :$bsound, color ;$c4 3/4 in. +$e1 volume (23 pages ; 28 cm)

$a2 videodiscs (250 min.) :$bsound, color ;$c4 3/4 in. +$e1 volume (45 pages : illustrated ; 19 cm) + 1 sound disc (4 3/4 in.)

In $b, indicate whether it has sound or is silent (RDA 7.18). Silent is used only for a film with no sound or music track, not for a silent film with musical accompaniment. Record whether it is color or black and white (RDA 7.17.3), using the terms "color" or "black and white" and their variants (LC-PCC-PS 7.17.1.3).

In $c, give the diameter of a disc in inches and fractions of inches: DVDs, Blu-rays and VCDs are 4 3/4 in. (LC-PCC-PS 3.5.1.3). For videocassettes, record the size of the tape in inches (i.e. 1/2 in. for a standard VHS tape), UNLESS the tape is 8mm (LC-PCC-PS 3.5.1.4.3). Do not use a period except for the abbreviation “in.” (RDA B.7).

$a 1 videocassette (59 min.) :$bsound, color ;$c1/2 in.

$a 1 videodisc (125 min.) :$b sound, color ;$c4 3/4 in.

The Content Type, Media Type, and Carrier Type elements replace the General Material Designation (GMD) used in AACR2 cataloging. Content Type, Media Type, and Carrier Type are recorded in subfield a of MARC 336, 337, and 338, respectively. When terms are taken from the specified RDA lists, add subfield 2 to the field to indicate the source of the term. The term may be also entered in coded form in subfield b using codes from the lists given in Value Lists for Codes and Controlled Vocabularies, “Other Value Lists – Term and Code Lists for RDA Content (Carrier, Media) Types” (http://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/index.html). If multiple types apply to a resource, a subfield 3 may be added to a field to indicate the part of the resource the type refers to.

Best Practice Recommendation: Always record Content, Media, and Carrier Type terms in coded form in $b.

Best Practice Recommendation: Do not record a content type, media type, or carrier type for most DVD or Blu-ray booklets, unless substantial in nature.

Best Practice Recommendation: Do not enter any General Material Designation (GMD) in MARC field 245 subfield h (i.e., [videorecording]) when creating a full-RDA catalog record.
Regarding content type (336, RDA 6.9), for most videos, it will be sufficient to record:

336__$a two-dimensional moving image $b tdi $2 rdacontent

Media Type (MARC field 337, RDA 3.2):

This field indicates the “General type of intermediation device required to view, play, run, etc.” (RDA 3.2,LC-PCC-PS 3.2). Use “video” when the item is a DVD, Blu-ray, VCD (video cd), videocassette, or laser disc. Use Computer if it is a computer-based video file encoding (such as QuickTime, mpeg, flash, etc.) and is encoded on a CD-ROM, DVD-ROM, Blu-ray, or is online. Be sure to add the $2 as indicated in the example. Also add $b (OLAC best practices). Almost invariably, a 337 field will be recorded for videos as:

337__ $a video $b v $2 rdamedia

Carrier type (MARC field 338, RDA 3.3):

This refers to the format of the storage medium and housing of a carrier in combination with the type of intermediation device required for viewing the content of a resource (RDA 3.3.1.1). Record the carrier type in MARC field 338 subfield a using a term from the list given at RDA 3.3.1.3. If the resource consists of more than one carrier type, either record only the carrier type of the predominant part of the resource (if there is one) or carrier types that pertain to the most substantial parts of the resource. Record each carrier type in a separate MARC 338 field.

The carrier type for DVD and Blu-ray Discs is videodisc.

338__ $a videodisc $b vd $2 rdacarrier

Form of work (MARC field 380, RDA 6.3) is core. Best Practice Recommendation is to provide the form of work if readily ascertainable. Take terms from a controlled vocabulary (e.g., LCGFT, LCSH, etc.) and capitalize the first word to provide consistency.

380__ $a Motion picture.

380__ $a Television program.

Some notes about notes (5XX fields). Title source notes (RDA 2.17.2.3) are core if the title has been taken from a source other than the title screen as instructed in RDA 2.20.2.3.

500__ $a Title from disc label.

500__ $a Title from container.

518 fields (date and place of capture, RDA 7.11) are not core but are useful nonetheless, especially with recordings of television programs. Information about broadcast history is recorded in the History of the Work element (RDA 6.7). An unformatted 518 field is sufficient.

518__ $a Originally broadcast by PBS Mar. 19, 2019 as part of Frontline.

And now a word about the 538 (systems detail note) field. In a MARC record for a videorecording, you may have seen 538 notes much like the following:
538__Sa DVD; Widescreen presentation.

538__Sa DVD, NTSC ; Stereo.

It does not hurt to add them. But RDA now recommends the use of 34X fields for sound, video, and digital characteristics of the resource.

MARC field 344 is for sound characteristics (RDA 3.16).

$g Configuration of playback channels

$h Special playback characteristics

Here is an example of four 344 fields in one record:

344 digital $2 rdatr

344 $b optical $2 rdarm

344 $g surround $2 rdacpc

344 $h DTS-HD Master Audio

Do not add a $2 following $h unless it is in the RDA list of terms for this field at RDA 3.16.9.3.

MARC field 346 is for video characteristics (RDA 3.18). For a videocassette, in $a, give video format VHS or other term from the list in RDA 3.18.2.3. Do not input anything in $a for a DVD, Blu-Ray, or other digital video. Using a separate 346 field and $b, for a tape or a disc, give the broadcast standard NTSC, PAL, or HDTV if applicable (3.18.3.3). Follow with $2 rdabs. In North America, the broadcast standard is NTSC; most DVD or Blu Ray players in North America will only play that standard. Examples:

346__VHS $2 rdafv

346__ $b NTSC $2 rdabs (for a DVD or Blu Ray)

MARC field 347 is for digital file characteristics (RDA 3.19). This field is not applicable for analog videocassettes (e.g. VHS, Beta, U-matic) or laser discs. Use separate 347 fields for each piece of information which would not have the same $2 (or no $2). In subfield $a, give the file type, in singular, from the list in RDA 3.19.2.

347__$a video file $2 rdaft

347__$a video file $b 4K Ultra HD Blu-ray $2 rda

347__$a video file $b Blu-ray $2 rda
All bibliographic records for video resources should have a 007 field. The 007 field is a coded field that describes the physical characteristics of an item. It is fairly standardized, but there are a few fields to which attention needs to be paid. Typical 007 fields are given in the table below with their corresponding 300 fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Physical Description (these are not formatted as in 2000s; they are spelled out to explain what to include in 007)</th>
<th>007 Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VHS</td>
<td>black and white, sound (mono)</td>
<td>vd b h o m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (stereo)</td>
<td>vd ch h a s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (unknown)</td>
<td>vd r h a t o u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>black and white, silent (i.e. no sound or music track)</td>
<td>vd r h b o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>black and white, sound</td>
<td>vd b r a n z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (stereo)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (unknown)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (quadraphonic, multichannel, surround)</td>
<td>vd c v a n q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (multiple soundtracks with different playback configurations)</td>
<td>vd c v a n k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu-ray</td>
<td>black and white, sound</td>
<td>vd b r a n z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>black and white, sound (stereo)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (unknown)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (quadraphonic, multichannel, surround)</td>
<td>vd c v a n q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color, sound (multiple soundtracks with different playback configurations)</td>
<td>vd c v a n k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video CD (VCD)</td>
<td>color, sound (unknown)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM with video files</td>
<td>color, sound (unknown)</td>
<td>vd c v a n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online (is streaming different?)</td>
<td>vz c a z a u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1: \( v \$b d \$d c \$e v \$f a \$g i \$h z \$i q \)

(Item is a videorecording; carrier type is a videodisc; the videorecording is in multicolor; the recording medium is DVD; sound is on the medium; sound medium is a videodisc; standard code dimensions for videodisc do not yet exist so z; sound is configured as quadraphonic, multichannel, or surround.)

Example 2: \( v \$b d \$d c \$e s \$f a \$g i \$h z \$i q \)

(Item is a videorecording; carrier type is a videodisc; the videorecording is in multicolor; the recording medium is Blu Ray; sound is on the medium; sound medium is a videodisc; standard code dimensions for videodisc do not yet exist so z; sound is configured as quadraphonic, multichannel, or surround.)

As mentioned at the beginning, this article is intended as an introduction to cataloging videorecordings on optical media. VHS is barely touched upon as it is an obsolescent if not obsolete format. Streaming video is a subject for another time. For further, in depth information, please see the following:

Appendix: Recommended Description and Encoding of DVD/Blu-ray Attributes (http://olacinc.org/sites/capc_files/DVD_RDA_Guide.pdf#page=189)

List of resources. (http://olacinc.org/sites/capc_files/DVD_RDA_Guide.pdf#page=191)
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