



RDA Update
RDA in Practice
Music Library Association Annual Meeting
Chicago, February 20, 2009

Mark Scharff, Washington University in St. Louis
MLA Liaison to ALA ALCTS CCS Committee on
Cataloging: Description and Access



RDA since MLA 2008

- ▶ **First ... what was out there?**
 - ▶ Draft of Sections 2-4, 9 (December 2007)
 - ▶ Chapter 6 on naming works
 - ▶ Generalizing all music rules proved too difficult in short time frame
 - ▶ Rules for constructing preferred access points for music largely carried over from AACR2,
 - ▶ Major exception: removal of the concept of “Selections”





LC/12

- ▶ Issued Feb. 6, 2008 (right before MLA)
- ▶ Not only a response to RDA draft, but proposals to introduce changes to cataloging practice.
- ▶ MLA response—support for many proposals; reservations about:
 - ▶ “Non-distinctive” and “distinctive” titles
 - ▶ Recording non-distinctive titles in original language except for a small list of instrumental forms
 - ▶ Naming cadenzas with the preferred access point for the “target” work, regardless of who composed them.
 - ▶ Using “found terms” to name large ensembles





The May Group

- ▶ JSC charges the North American constituencies with drafting of music portions of Chapter 6 to the North American constituencies and MLA
- ▶ Meeting at LC on May 16—participants
 - ▶ Judith Kuhagen (LC)—moderator
 - ▶ Geraldine Ostrove, David Sommerfield (LC)
 - ▶ Mark Scharff, Steve Henry (MLA)
 - ▶ John Attig, Kathy Glennan (ALA; Kathy also MLA)
 - ▶ Daniel Paradis (CCC)

Subsequent teleconference on May 28





Then ...

- ▶ Summer silence
- ▶ Why?
 - ▶ Areas of discussion and some proposals from May Group went beyond contents of LC/I2
 - ▶ Need for a document for non-participatory constituencies to review (BL, CILIP, ACOC)
 - ▶ Vacations, IFLA





Finally ... LC/12/followup (AKA “Son of LC/12”)

- ▶ Issued on Halloween 2008
- ▶ Resolved some issues
- ▶ Left others unresolved
- ▶ Created new issues
- ▶ MLA response





And ... LC/12/followup/2

- ▶ Issued Dec. 4, 2008
- ▶ Proposals that had not been discussed by JSC and were not areas of consensus among May Group
- ▶ MLA response





And ... LC/12/followup/LC response

- ▶ Mostly wordsmithing, but a few substantive points
- ▶ Issued Feb. 2, 2009
- ▶ No formal MLA response yet



Meanwhile ...

- ▶ **Draft of Full RDA appears**
 - ▶ Issued Nov. 17, 2008
 - ▶ 900+ pages
 - ▶ Instructions and Appendices
 - ▶ Workflows, Housekeeping documents separate
 - ▶ Reorganization of Chapter 6—instruction for choosing and recording preferred titles now precede instructions for constructing preferred access points.
 - ▶ Chapter 6 draft otherwise largely that of the earlier draft.
 - ▶ Comment deadline was Feb. 2
 - ▶ MLA feedback in CC:DA wiki



Full draft—highlights for music

- ▶ Data elements for content type, media type, carrier type—information previously found in GMD and elsewhere (Chp. 3, Chp. 6)
- ▶ Still some vagueness as to status of containers as sources for title proper of resources. (Chp. 2)
- ▶ Recordings contents of a compilation with a collective title removed from realm of transcription—now is expressing a relationship (Chp. 25)
- ▶ Relationship designators (Appendix I, J, K)





What's next?

- ▶ **JSC meeting in Chicago, March 12-20**
 - ▶ Review feedback on final draft
 - ▶ Make a decision on the LC/12 documents
 - ▶ As much as possible, finalize text
- ▶ **June 2009—JSC scheduled to deliver final text to ALA Publishing for entry into the online platform**
- ▶ **3rd quarter of 2009—RDA published**



And then what?

- ▶ Some constituencies may adopt RDA right away
- ▶ U.S.—testing period precedes decision on implementation
 - ▶ 3 national libraries + ca. 20 other libraries, museums, etc.
 - ▶ 3 months of orientation, 3 months of cataloging
 - ▶ Free RDA access
 - ▶ Core set of resources to be cataloged by all in both AACR2 and RDA—other materials as acquired by participants
 - ▶ LC will distribute its records in both AACR2 and RDA
 - ▶ Documents and methodology to be on public Web site
 - ▶ “Informal testing”





After the test ...

- ▶ Three-month assessment period
- ▶ Criteria
 - ▶ Cost-effectiveness
 - ▶ Ease of use
 - ▶ Compatibility with existing data
- ▶ Implementation decision
- ▶ Development of implementation scenarios





RDA the Product

- ▶ Online only
- ▶ 3 “tabs”
 - ▶ Instructions
 - ▶ Toolkit—schemas, workflows, annotation/bookmarking tools
 - ▶ Additional resources—links to external cataloging tools
- ▶ Sophisticated tools for navigation, customizing displays of instructions and examples
- ▶ Toolkit would allow creation of documents, records, etc. that could be shared
- ▶ Demo should be available in late February





RDA Issues

- ▶ Lack of a print product
- ▶ Pricing structure
- ▶ RDA and Cataloger's Desktop

