

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
ALA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA, June 25, 27, 2011
Reported by Mark Scharff, MLA Liaison to CC:DA

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met twice during the ALA Annual Meeting in New Orleans; the Chair, Lori Robare (University of Oregon) 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>; the agenda contains links to many of the reports. Presentation is more topical than chronological.

Reports

CC:DA Chair. The full report is at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair57.pdf>. The Chair requested affirmation of the results of three electronically-conducted votes taken since the Midwinter 2011 meeting. One was approving an *RDA* revision proposal; the other two created task forces—one to evaluate the structure of data elements in *RDA* for recording machine-actionable data, the other to revise the written procedures for proposing revisions of *RDA* to CC:DA. All resolutions had passed in electronic voting, and those results were affirmed. Robare reminded committee members that with *RDA* now published, the revision process will require more frequent use of the CC:DA wiki. She also announced that in response to questions about the status of the books known as the Apochrypha, which have differing canonical status within the Christian world, work would begin with the CC:DA liaison from the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and other interested parties, with the goal of producing a proposal for CC:DA consideration at the 2012 Midwinter meeting.

Library of Congress (Barbara Tillett, LC liaison to CC:DA). For a detailed report of LC initiatives, visit: <http://www.loc.gov/ala/an-2011-update.html>

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

Items related to the *RDA* implementation decision for the three national libraries, which was announced shortly before ALA. In brief, implementation will not occur before January of 2013, and is contingent on nine conditions being met; those conditions are listed in the report. As part of the effort to fulfill those conditions, the LC catalogers who participated in the *RDA* test will resume using it in their daily work, probably in the late fall of this year. There will be a new Web site for *RDA* Implementation off the page for the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. LC has drafted a FAQ for the *RDA* transition period; it can currently be seen at CC:DA's Web site (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/rdafaq1106.pdf>) Information from the *RDA* test will be archived on the LC Documentation for the *RDA* Test page (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDAtest/rdatest.html>).

Personnel—a reminder that with the retirement of Paul G. Weiss, the lists of new LC Subject Headings will be issued monthly rather than weekly.

The Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative is an LC-based program to assess the present bibliographic landscape and identify a destination and means to get there, including a look at what might succeed MARC21 as a format for library data. LC intends for the Initiative to be fully collaborative, with worldwide input. A series of invitational meetings with various stakeholders will be held at LC during 2012-2013. A draft action plan is expected to be released for public feedback by the end of September. BIBFRAME, a discussion list, has been established for the Initiative; archives and links for subscribing are found at <http://listserv.loc.gov/listarch/bibframe.html>.

Library of Congress Policy Statements—they will be reviewed in consultation with the PCC to align practices to the extent possible.

Virtual International Authority File (VIAF)—there are now 18 participating national libraries and 4 more in the test phase. Headings for corporate bodies and jurisdictions are now included (but not name-title records yet).

ABA production statistics, as expected, lagged compared to the previous year because of *RDA* testing, but the shortfall was not as large as originally expected.

National Library Catalog XML Data Store project—XML-based software to allow searching across all LC metadata for its collections. It's in beta now, with over 60 different catalogs and databases being queried by searches. It was slated for public release in June (but as of this report, it doesn't appear).

Many other music-related items not mentioned here can be found in the report.

Joint Steering Committee (John Attig, ALA Representative)

The JSC has held almost-monthly conference calls since January. A “fast-track” procedure for decision-making regarding changes to *RDA* should be published soon; it has already been used in making corrections to the text where the editorial process introduced errors. These changes have been documented. The fast-track approach may be used for additions or changes to examples, or for changes or additions to the lists of relationship designators. In connection with examples, the JSC will create a new group to help with the creation and maintenance of *RDA* examples; there is an ongoing effort to replace parenthetical additions to instructions with examples. Work will soon begin to create an official set of complete examples.

Attig reported on progress in preparing the *RDA* element data sets and content vocabularies for publication in the Open Data Registry. All elements and subelements have been defined, as well as some types; but most of the lists of terms do not yet have definitions. Attig will post a list of missing definitions and changes needed to the CC:DA wiki, and solicit volunteers for help. He hopes that this work can be fast-tracked, and some definitions re-used. Copyright considerations require citation of sources and nature of borrowing to be given.

The JSC will next meet in person in Glasgow, Scotland during the first week of November. This establishes some deadlines. The JSC's deadline for receiving proposals is August 11; the deadline for constituent comments is September 28. For CC:DA, these translate into deadlines of Aug. 1 and sometime in mid-September for comments. Attig mentioned that he expects the JSC to receive a number

of music-related revision proposals from the Canadian Committee on Cataloging. Because the JSC has not discussed the *RDA* implementation announcement from the U.S. national libraries yet (and in particular its expectations for change in *RDA*), he declined any comment on that point.

Attig then led discussion of some proposals and white papers:

Attig's proposal on Affiliation (*RDA* 9:13) (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1105.pdf>). Attig drafted this proposal based on his experience as an instructor in the *RDA* preconference at the 2011 Music Library Association meeting in Philadelphia. There, a questioner confronted him with Leonard Bernstein as an example of a person who was affiliated with several different organizations in the same capacity (Music Director for the New York City Symphony and the New York Philharmonic) and in different capacities within the same organization (New York Philharmonic as Assistant Conductor and Music Director). *FRAD* and *RDA*'s definition of Affiliation limits it to being a group. The proposal redefines Affiliation as a relationship that is expressed by the subelements Name of the Affiliated Body, Position within the Affiliated Body, and Dates of the Affiliation. This is at odds with MARBI Proposal 2011-05 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-05.html>). Reaction around the table was generally positive, and a few suggestions for additional subelements were made (e.g. academic degrees under the name of a college or university). Attig expects to have this ready to submit for CC:DA approval in time for JSC consideration in November.

LC proposal on Appendix A (Capitalization) (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-LC-1.pdf>)-- Since LC had originally advocated doing away with this appendix entirely, this proposal represents a significant change. The general problem LC had with Appendix A was the needed effort put into maintenance and comprehensibility. For several reasons well-articulated in the document, LC now advocates retention of the appendix. Discussion centered around two of the revisions proposed—one to extend the notion of retaining unusual capitalization in formulating access points to personal and family names, and the other to add capitalization instructions that are currently part of Library of Congress Policy Statements. There was general agreement (with one loud dissent) to keeping Appendix A; Attig noted that consistency was a JSC value, even more than an ALA one, and one member warned against “dueling cataloger judgment” in the absence of the Appendix. The first revision brought out a mixed reaction—approval, as being akin to “letting Mark Twain be Mark Twain” to concerns about being able to discern a person's capitalization practice, given the caprices of publishers. The second proposal was controversial because of the possible ways to incorporate new languages into the list. Should alphabetical order trump the value of retaining rule numbers that are often cited elsewhere? But others pointed out that the underlying naming architecture can be independent of display order. Attig will look for comments in the wiki in drafting an ALA response.

LC proposal on Date of Manufacture (*RDA* 2.10.6)—Attig saw this as correcting an editorial problem that fell victim to lack of time. It would clarify that outside the realm of archival materials, “manufacture” pertains to published items.

LC proposals on “Selections” as used in *RDA* Chapter 6—Recommendation no. 1 addresses the conceptual inconsistencies in how “Selections” functions as both a work and an expression attribute in different parts of the code. It recommends that “Selections” be treated as a work attribute in all instances, which in part affects where it appears in access points. Recommendation no. 2 assumes that this realignment calls for “Selections” to be retired as a term, and something else used in its place. One comment warned that a change in the term will cause collocation problems in catalogs. Others expressed doubt that the concept of “Selections” as applied to, say, 2 arias from an opera had the same meaning as

when applied to 2 of a writer's 12 novels. Early drafts of *RDA* did away with "Selections" altogether, and some of that antipathy re-surfaced during discussion. Another suggestion was to substitute less-formal indications of incompleteness (e.g. Cummings, E.E. 5 poems; Steinbeck, John. 2 novels)

RDA Revision Proposals from the American Association of Law Libraries (John Hostage, Harvard U. Law) (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/aall3rev.pdf>)

The proposal deals with revising *RDA* to allow continuation of the current practice of omitting the name of the larger jurisdiction in access points for states, provinces, etc. of the four principal English-speaking jurisdictions (the U.S., British Isles, Canada, and Australia), moving practice for some exceptional jurisdictions (Malaysia, the former U.S.S.R., and the former Yugoslavia) to the general rules. It also proposes instructions for when to qualify names of islands or island groups that are under the jurisdiction of another country by the name of that country. It was first discussed at Midwinter, and now returned with revisions. Discussion centered on how one should define "near" when deciding whether or not to add the qualifier for the larger jurisdiction, and problems with the current and proposed instructions in the relationship between the United Kingdom and the British Isles vis-à-vis Ireland. The proposal will probably go forth with further revision and a new rationale statement.

Report from Task Force for *RDA* Instructions for Heads of State and Heads of Government (Kathy Winzer, Stanford U. Law)

The Task Force has issued its final report (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/tf-heads3.pdf>). A few typos were noted. After a brief discussion, members voted to approve the report, and the task force was discharged.

Report from Task Force for *RDA* Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies (Kevin Randall, Northwestern U.)

The Task Force's charge was to look at the instructions in *RDA* Chapter 11 to see if one set of instructions could be developed that would work for both kinds of bodies. Randall reported that the task force's work was harder than anticipated, with subordinate bodies proving a particular problem. The task force compiled a list of the different types of subordinate bodies for each (governmental and non-governmental) and then a combined list. The combined list does eliminate some redundancy, but Type 6 (name of larger body wholly contained within name of subordinate body) is nettlesome. Further discussion led to the conclusion that more discussion and work would be needed, and that having a proposal ready by August 11 wasn't feasible. The report and working papers will be posted on the CC:DA wiki for member comment.

Report from Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in *RDA* Chapter 3 (Peter Rolla, Harvard Medical)

The task force has been charged to consider proposals to make extent and measurement data more machine-actionable. There is a list of elements in Chapter 3 to examine. The group has been meeting via Google Documents, and will meet in person at this conference to divvy out responsibilities.

RDA Programming Task Force (June Abbas, University at Buffalo)

Abbas recounted the group's activities—the two-day “*RDA 201*” preconference at Annual, with 135 participants; a session “Looking Beyond MARC;” a vendors’ forum; the *RDA* Update Session; and a session for *RDA* trainers and LIS educators. Task force members have made presentations at state, regional, and local conferences and events. Books and articles on *RDA* have begun to appear. She mentioned that the preconference materials will eventually be in the task force’s space on ALA Connect, and may eventually become webinars. ALCTS CCS has extended the charge for the group to be a year beyond *RDA* implementation (presuming it happens); new members will be sought. Abbas said that the task force expects to hold an update session at 2012 Midwinter, and perhaps another preconference at Annual 2012. Among comments and suggestions from the group: farm out programs to state-level organizations; develop programs on authority work and FRAD; consult with PCC trainers; work toward a program for IFLA to highlight non-U.S. *RDA* developments.

RDA Training Task Force (Robare for Mary Woodley, U. of California-Northridge and Kate Harcourt, Columbia U.)

The task force has been developing a series of webinars on *RDA* Basics. Five have been presented since Midwinter 2011, with another round scheduled for the fall. A complete list may be found at <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webinar/index.cfm> This list includes two music-related sessions, both led by Kathy Glennan—scores on Oct. 19, and sound recordings on Oct. 26. The 5 webinars already presented drew 48,000 registrations, and certainly were seen by far more people than that. Live participation costs money, but archived webinars can be viewed free after a certain period.

RDA Revision Proposals from the Music Library Association (Mark Scharff, Washington University in St. Louis)

Scharff began with the proposal clarifying the status of a container as a preferred source of information (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/mla2011-1.pdf>) and noted the paucity of CC:DA response in the wiki. He expressed a willingness to accept some rewriting, proposed by Kevin Randall, to emphasize that this is not a common situation outside of A/V materials, and that it applies to resources embodying collections of works. Discussion revealed some concern about extending the preference for sources bearing a collective title to resources other than sound recordings and DVDs (for example, forcing use of a spine title such as “Short stories” in lieu of a title page that contained the titles of three stories). One proposal to get around this was to say that the source bearing the collective title had to “prominent,” but *RDA* does not offer a definition of “prominent” as *AACR2* did. Discussion will continue on the CC:DA wiki, with hopes of having an approved proposal to submit to the JSC for their November meeting.

Scharff continued by asking for discussion on the proposal to extend the recording of artistic/technical credits in *RDA* 7.24 to include sound recordings (the proposal is at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/mla2011-2.pdf>) Consensus was that the proposal was well-formulated; discussion centered around whether this instruction should be generalized to include all types of resources. There was interest around the table in doing so; Scharff cautioned that the current instruction details those sorts of entities that should not be recorded here because there are instructions

elsewhere for recording them, and that those categories are specific to resources containing recorded performances. What language would provide similar exclusions for other kinds of resources, or would it have to rely on cataloger judgment? The conclusion was that this, too, could be discussed in the wiki; liaisons and members were encouraged to provide examples from their areas of expertise of sorts of functions and roles that would be recorded here. This, too, could advance to the JSC in November.

Program for Cooperative Cataloging Liaison (Kathy Glennan, University of Maryland-College Park)

Glennan's report can be found at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/pcc2011-01.pdf> Of particular interest were the release of draft standards for the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) for archival collections, with comments accepted through July 12; the compilation of a table comparing the BSR requirements for all standards currently adopted; proposing moving the source-of-title note to the MARC 588 field for online monographs; and revision of the Provider-Neutral Guidelines to apply to all bibliographic formats, pending a decision on the 588 field. She mentioned that the Standing Committee on Training had formed two groups to start revisions of the BIBCO Participants Manual and the CONSER Cataloging Manual, in particular sections related to integrating resources and e-serials.

Glennan also mentioned the three *RDA* task groups formed by the PCC to sort out issues related to *RDA* implementation. The *RDA*-Decisions-Needed Task Group will look at a previously-drafted list of decisions needed (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC-RDA-Decisions.doc>) to decide if it is complete, to prioritize them, and to recommend courses of action. (MLA member Glennan is on this group). The Task Group on AACR2 & *RDA* Acceptable Heading Categories will assess the extent to which AACR2 headings can be declared acceptable for use in *RDA* catalog records, and whether there are categories of existing records that need to (and can) be changed to *RDA* forms. (Former MLA member Phil Schreur (Stanford U.) chairs this group). The Task Group on Hybrid Bibliographic Records will look at the implications of the decision to use existing access points from the LCNAF in newly-created records, whether the code used for description matches that of the access point.

CC:DA Webmaster (Melanie Polutta, Library of Congress)

Polutta's report is at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/webmaster10.pdf> CC:DA's Web presence continues to be centered both within the ALCTS portion of the ALA Web site and at Penn State University. The ALCTS site is currently a mirror of the Penn State site, and John Attig deserves thanks for that. Polutta has been seeking to improve the navigational structure of the site, and several mockups can be seen by following links in her report. She would welcome feedback.

ALA Publishing (Troy Linker, Publisher, ALA Digital Reference)

In the wake of the implementation announcement from the national libraries, Linker shared information about marketing decisions for *RDA*. The double-user offer has been extended to August 31, 2013 for both new and renewing subscriptions; after that date, only one renewal will be allowed. There is still a free trial period, and provisions for large-group access for a limited period after training sessions. No change in price is expected for this year.

Linker mentioned a July 12 webinar that would feature a discussion of the 9 conditions set down in the national-libraries implementation decision. He mentioned that some of these were known issues, and work has begun to meet the conditions.

New features in the *RDA* Toolkit include a full table of contents, as a printable PDF file, and a “back-of-the-book”-style index in the Toolkit (particularly helpful for concepts such as “GMD” or abbreviations where spaces might influence search results). On the docket: “rewriting the chapter,” whatever that means, and which is a JSC task in any case; editing the *RDA* Editing Guide; linking into OCLC Connexion; cleaning up the table of contents; engineering different options for sorting search results; allowing users to set the timeout period; and changing the navigation so that clicking on an instruction would not load an entire *RDA* chapter, but instead a section delineated by intellectual division points.

Another goal is to make the metadata structure behind *RDA* more visible, which would help conversations like those about implications of re-numbering rules (q.v.). Linker characterized the *RDA* testers as a large “focus group,” giving entirely different sorts of feedback than had the beta testers. He proposed “virtual users group meetings” via webinar to allow feedback and to demonstrate upcoming features.

In response to questions, Linker pointed out that while the *RDA* text does not offer explicit links to equivalent portions of *AACR2*, there are *RDA/AACR2* crosswalk capabilities—if you know an *AACR2* rule number, you can enter it in the Advanced Search. You can also go into the *RDA* copy of *AACR2* and follow a link back to the *RDA* text. He mentioned that translations of *RDA* into French and German are underway, and Spanish is in negotiation. Interest has also come from Finland.

CCS Executive Committee and Wrap-up (Lori Robare)

Robare had no announcements at this time. The discussions about the future of Appendix A will require the formation and charge of a Task Force in the future. Robare noted the departure of members Penny Welbourne (Yale U.) and Martha Yee (UCLA), and intern John Ilardo (University at Buffalo). Names of the new members and intern will be posted to the Rules discussion list [a subsequent posting identified them as John DeSantis (Dartmouth College) and Robert Rendall (Columbia University), and intern Jennifer Miller (Rice University)].

CC:DA will next meet at ALA Midwinter 2102 in Dallas, Texas, on Jan. 21 and 23. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m., and a joint meeting of CC:DA and the Subject Access Committee began at 10:30. An account of that meeting may be found in the report of the MLA Liaison to the Subject Access Committee.