<div align="center">

BCC2010/SDC/1

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
ALA Midwinter Meeting
Boston, MA, January 16, 18, 2010
Reported by Mark Scharff, MLA Liaison to CC:DA

</div>

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met twice during the ALA Annual Meeting in Chicago; the Friday session was cancelled because it was not needed. The Chair, John Myers (Union College) led the discussions.

This report focuses on items of interest to the music library community. For more information about the meeting and for reports about activities mentioned below, please see the CC:DA web page at http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/index.html. Presentation is more topical than chronological.

Reports

CC:DA Chair. The full report is at http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair50.pdf . The Chair noted that there were no electronically-conducted votes requiring confirmation since the Annual 2009 meeting. Myers also reported that the CC:DA Task Force for Review of *FRSAD* (*Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data*) had been reauthorized as a CCS (Cataloging and Classification Section) task force because of the overlap with SAC (Subject Access Committee). To a question about the status of the IFLA response to the document, Glenn Patton (OCLC) said that another draft is in preparation. Myers presented news from the CCS Executive Council about proposed changes to the CC:DA leadership structure. The current pattern is to appoint one member of CC:DA to be Chair, with an option for yearly renewal for the duration of a CC:DA membership (4 years). CCS Exec is proposing a 3-year commitment, with one year each of service as Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past Chair; this would align CC:DA with other committees within CCS. Among points made in the ensuing discussion:

      a.   One plus would be providing a gradual introduction to a difficult job.
      b.   The current system has a good track record in outgoing chairs being helpful in handing over the reins to the new chair.
      c.   In light of CCS Exec actions last year, is this more an attempt to provide a structure that would make it easier to get rid of a "troublemaker" Chair?
      d.   What role would the Past Chair play? Since that person would still be a voting member, the pool of candidates for Chair-Elect would be even smaller.
      e.   The three-year appointment doesn't correlate well with the two-year terms of CC:DA members.
      f.   The Chair would have to provide some direction for the Chair-Elect and Past Chair, simply adding to an already-heavy workload.
      g.   A Chair trainee could help.

A straw poll of the committee found unanimous opinion in favor of keeping the current structure. Myers will report this to CCS Exec.

Library of Congress (Barbara Tillett, LC liaison to CC:DA). For a detailed report of LC initiatives, visit:
http://www.loc.gov/ala/mw-2010-update.html

Barbara Tillett reviewed highlights from her report. Issues of particular interest to the music community include:

- Further improvements in reducing the number of denials into the LC online catalog.
- To help alleviate a large backlog of materials (130,000 items) in the Copyright Office, 38 ABA staff will be detailed to that office, with hopes to catch up by March.
- Ann Della Porta, formerly in the Policy and Standards Division, is now Chief of the Integrated Library Systems Office.
- A test project within the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) to harvest data from ONIX

records for CIP records has yielded useful information. The major problem has been inconsistencies in the level of data from different publishers; when data was good, the process was very fast; when it was not good, the process was longer than before. More publishers will be added to the pilot; if improvement continues, implementation could follow.

- Tillett highlighted a Spanish-language videoconference produced by LC with the cooperation of the State Department for Chilean librarians. In it, she reviewed historical cataloging practices and provided a preview of *RDA*. A recording of the videoconference may be found at http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=4736
- The *RDA* testing program continues to gear up. Tillett and Judy Kuhagen presented a full-day training workshop on Friday; a general session for testers and one for vendors are also scheduled, as well as the *RDA* Update Forum. Tillett was asked about when LC would make the option decisions that are part of *RDA*—before or after the test? She replied that some decisions have been made for LC, but that much would rest with cataloger's judgment. She hopes that the LC decisions will be in the initial release of *RDA* as an associated resource.
- As part of the preparation for testing, PSD staff have been reviewing the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRI) to identify which will be used in the *RDA* test. They will have a new name—Library of Congress Policy Statements (LCPS)
- The Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) is up and running, and NACO participants may now cite it as a reference source in authority records. See http://viaf.org/
- Cataloger's Desktop 3.0 has been released.
- Reorganization within ABA caused a drop in cataloging output, though numbers for authority records increased.
- The insertion of permalinks for bibliographic records has been judged a success, and may be extended to authority records.
- The Network Development and MARC Standards Office has worked with staff from the Motion Picture, Broadcast and Recorded Sound Division to digitize 10,000 78 rpm recordings and make them available through the Performing Arts Encyclopedia site (http://www.loc.gov/performingarts/)
- Tillett mentioned the XML Data Store Project, aimed at providing "seamless access" across all of the types of metadata that describe LC collections.
- IFLA is revising the document *Names of Persons: National Usages for Entry in Catalogues*; Judy Kuhagen has developed a draft for the United States portion and asked for feedback. It was pointed out that there were no examples for performers such as "Little Richard," nor for Native American or Hawaiian names or for symbols used as names (e.g. The Artist Formerly Known As Prince). She also called for suggestions for reference sources.
- LC will host an open house for all ALA attendees on Friday, June 25.

ALA Publishing Services (Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director; Troy Linker, Director, Publishing Technology)

Linker gave a demonstration of the *RDA* product, branded the *RDA Toolkit*. It is being co-published by ALA, the Canadian Library Association, and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP), and is available only from one of those entities. The pricing will be a subscription model, with no plans at this time for a one-time purchase. The base price for a single subscriber for a year is $325; additional licenses for 2-9 concurrent users are $55 each, $50 each for 10-19 users, and $45 each for each user beyond that. He emphasized that the single subscription can support multiple non-concurrent users; that is, an unlimited number of individual profiles can be established. He expects some discounting for library-school educators and for training situations where a short-term increase in concurrent users is needed. Linker foresaw that there would be "some interactivity" with LC's Cataloger's Desktop, but stressed that the two are separate products, with separate subscriptions. He said that there is a budget for regular updating and for tech support. Conversations are taking place for providing translations of the text, which would probably be incorporated into the toolkit itself. An entire chapter can be printed as a PDF. He expected a February Webinar to give a broader preview of the product, and invited people to write to rdatoolkit@ala.org or visit the Web site at www.rdaonline.org for more information.

Among the questions and comments from the committee and audience:

What happens if a user drops the subscription? One answer was that user annotations, which will reside on the publisher's server, will be retained for a certain period after a subscription has lapsed.

The base price seems high—what was the basis for it? Answer: the price is seen as comparable to other database products; the size of the market had to be a factor; queries suggested that the price seemed reasonable in the community. Will this affect cooperative cataloging?

What sorts of sharing arrangements are available? Answer: consortial deals are possible, but will be negotiated individually. Hesitant to extend such arrangements to networks—too many "$50 users" is not a viable arrangement.

Who gets billed? Answer: that can happen at any level desired (individual library, campus, consortium).

Will there be a print version available? The (perceived by questioner) similarity in format to *AACR2* would suggest this would be possible. Answer: Only by printing PDFs of individual chapters, i.e., by having a subscription. License agreements will include some restrictions on the dissemination of print text. ALA Publishing is still convinced of the superiority of the online product, and the Committee of Principals and the JSC have affirmed that decision. Derivative print products are not ruled out. (The response from the questioner was "Is *RDA* for users, or for the JSC and the Committee of Principals?" a comment that drew some applause from around the room).

<u>Joint Steering Committee</u> (John Attig, ALA Representative)

Attig expressed "cautious optimism" about the projected June publication date for *RDA*. He summarized JSC actions since Annual—the JSC waited until the rollout of the beta test version in November to review the *RDA* text. This task has been distributed among the representatives. Proofreading was against the marked-up PDF that was sent to ALA Publishing in June, and was a checking of changes, not of the entire text. Some errors can be fixed; others will be handled with a list of errata. Some things did not move from the PDF to the database correctly. Additional work with the *RDA* Registries, development of additional workflows, and creation of more full-record examples are also projected.

Attig described the revision process going beyond the initial release as a "black hole." There is currently no editorial structure in place—material all goes to the software developer, and this is not a sustainable pattern. He hoped that more information about a review process would come from the next meeting of the Committee of Principals.

Attig then led a discussion of a list of unresolved concerns from one or more constituencies that the JSC chose to leave that way for the initial release of *RDA*. The JSC constituencies had been asked to prioritize items, and some CC:DA constituencies, such as MLA, had submitted their priorities for consideration. This list is available at http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/5sec6rev.pdf

The ensuing discussion identified these items as high-priority for ALA in general: 1) merging the instructions for establishing the names of governmental bodies with those for corporate bodies in general; 2) providing more guidance for what terms name corporate subunits that fall in the categories in *RDA* 11.2.2.14 (*AACR2* 24.13A, Types 1 and 2), that is, names that would call for an indirect subheading; 3) clarifying and possibly merging the instructions for naming Heads of State and Heads of Government. Medium-priority issues include: 1) reconsidering omission of initial articles; 2) examining whether the same practice should be followed for persons who change their names as for corporate bodies (i.e. separate headings); 3) resolving inconsistent practices on how to structure names that consist of phrases or additions to a surname; 4) clarifying the choice between found and systematized romanizations for corporate bodies names. Some issues are important, but require the JSC to make some general decisions before moving ahead, particularly issues with elements that are "data about data." Other issues were seen as best pursued by specific communities (the American Theological Library Association, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Music Library Association, the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC).

Certain CC:DA constituencies then identified priorities for their communities. Mark Scharff presented a list from the Music Library Association. He identified the highest priorities for MLA as being 1) reconsideration of the workflow between *RDA* 6.14 and 6.27-28, which currently places seemingly artificial strictures on recording data elements for the sake of producing "access-point-ready" data; 2) resolving ambiguities surrounding the status of containers, with the hope that a container can be considered a preferred source of information for a resource when it offers a collective title and other sources do not; 3) revisiting the concepts of "arrangement" and "adaptation" to seek better outcomes for non-

Western and folk musics; 4) determining the least disruptive solution to problems surrounding access points for operas and librettos where the composer and librettist are the same person. Scharff identified other priorities; the complete list may be found at http://bcc.musiclibraryassoc.org/PositionPapers/RDA_Revision_Priority_List_2009.pdf

John Hostage, speaking for AALL, identified instructions for treaties and court reports as of most concern. CONSER (Peter Fletcher) sees allowing changes over time for resources to be identified with a data element rather than a note as being most important. The Society of American Archivists cited the JSC's stated intent to parlay with SAA and others to reconcile *RDA* with archive and museum practice in areas where they greatly differ.

Application Profiles—Three Presentations

The committee heard from three presenters. Jon Phipps (Cornell University) defined an application profile as "a set of documents that defines an agreement among developers on a model of how we describe things in the world in the context of the global world of data." He gave a thickly-layered presentation of the terms and concepts underlying the development of application profiles. Karen Coyle (independent consultant) followed with a description of how an application profile is created. In brief, the task is to define the parameters of what the application profile will describe; determine what elements will be present; identify and codify the vocabulary to be used, being sure that it is consistent, precise, and "portable" (will carry its meaning outside the realm of the application profile); and then find what sorts of allowances and constraints are to be placed on the elements (repeatability, mandatory vs. optional). Diane Hillmann (Metadata Management Associates) then spoke on application profiles within the context of *RDA* development. She put forth the rationale for doing this work—the need for libraries to emerge from the MARC/*AACR2* "cocoon," to pursue interoperability within the larger data community, and to allow our data to be created and coded such that it can be used in both very general ways and with high levels of specificity (i.e. without having to "dumb down" the data itself). She stressed the need for specialized communities to determine what needs *RDA* does not satisfy for them, and exploit *RDA*'s extensibility to provide for their needs.

This is a very sketchy summary. Those interested in the presentations (of which I would say Hillmann's is the most useful) can go to www.slideshare.net ; this is a site where people can share their presentations. A search on "Hillmann" will bring up the desired show (called "An Introduction to Application Profiles.")

PCC Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets (Peter Fletcher)

Fletcher reported on the work of this task force, emanating from the PCC Committee on Standards. The goal is to move past work with serials and to encourage standardization through creation of a document similar to the CONSER appendices. The entire report may be seen at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/scs/Non-Latin-TF-Prelim-Report-Guidelines.pdf . Among questions and comments:

It was suggested that an example of a contents note would be helpful.
There needs to be a "best-practices" statement for encoding dates in Hebrew personal names.
It should be clarified that "systematic Romanization" is at issue here.
The practice of treating all non-Latin access points as variants will be problematic going forward; one solution might be to create separate authority records for the Roman and non-Roman forms of an authorized name.

CC:DA Webmaster (Patricia Hatch). Things are still in a holding pattern vis-à-vis moving the CC:DA site from Penn State to ALA Connect. Myers commented that this is a problem section- and division-wide. Hatch indicated that she will not be seeking re-appointment as Webmaster when her term expires in June 2010. Her report is at http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/webmaster7.pdf

RDA Implementation Task Force

Several events happened at Annual 2009--a preconference on FRBR/FRAD from a conceptual point of view; the *RDA* Update Forum on Saturday afternoon The American Association of School Librarians and various state library associations were approached and in some cases agreed to presentations. At this Midwinter, there was a well-attended *RDA* Update Forum, and a meeting for *RDA* testers; a planned meeting with vendors was cancelled for lack of interest. Annual 2010 will feature a preconference on applying *RDA*, starting with a review of FRBR concepts, identifying

similarities and differences between *RDA* and *AACR2* and offering hands-on experience with using *RDA* to catalog. Outreach efforts outside ALA will continue. A more extensive forum for *RDA* testers is expected for Midwinter 2011.

CCS Executive Committee

Myers reported that ALA Council has declared 2010 the Year of Cataloging Research. He was asked the committee's meeting at Midwinter had involved any discussion of the process for leadership succession (see "CC:DA Chair" above). Myers responded that he had delivered CC:DA's feedback to the group; though no vote was taken during the meeting, he surmised that something might happen in executive session, i.e. wait and see. Myers noted that his term as Chair is over; those interested in taking on the position should contact him, use the ALCTS volunteer form, and/or contact Shelby Harkin, the incoming chair of CCS.

The next meetings of CC:DA are scheduled for June 26 and June 28, 2010, in Washington, D.C.

Submitted by Mark Scharff, MLA Liaison to CC:DA

Last updated February 19, 2010