

ALA Midwinter Conference Report
Report from the LITA/ALCTS-CaMMS Authority Control Interest Group (ACIG)
Seattle, Washington, January 27, 2013
Submitted by Damian Iseminger

Open Meeting

The theme of the opening meeting was *Best Practices for RDA Authorities*, and consisted of three presentations, followed by questions, plus a report from the Library of Congress.

1. Library of Congress Update to the Authority Control Interest Group – by Janis Young, Policy and Standards Division (PSD), Library of Congress (LC)

Barbara Tillett, chief of PSD, retired in November 2012. Tom Yee, the assistant chief of PSD, is now acting chief.

The new OPAC interface was taken down in September due to performance issues. However, it can still be accessed by going to <http://catalog2.loc.gov>. Until all issues are resolved with the new interface, the OPAC will remain as-is.

A paper detailing the new Bibliographic Framework Initiative was published in Nov. 2012 with the title of *Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services*. The new model, known as BIBFRAME, is being developed by Zepheira. LC has worked with the Early Experimenters group from October-December 2012, investigating how various types of materials interact with the model and in examining data content models. Two software code sets to convert MARCXML records to BIBFRAME are now available. Further information is available at www.loc.gov/marc/transition/.

In RDA developments, reworded chapters 6 and 9-11 were released in December 2012. The rest of the rewording will be completed by summer 2013. March 31, 2013 is still the implementation date for LC, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine. The PCC Day 1 for Authorities is also the same date, but there is no PCC Day 1 for bibliographic records. 400 LC staff have been trained to date, with training to be completed by March 31. Many NACO members have also been trained on RDA authorities. Over 150 types of training materials are available on the Cataloger's Learning Workshop, located at <http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/>.

The Library of Congress Policy Statements for RDA were renamed in October 2012 as the Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements, or LC-PCC PS, and are a collaborative set of statements for both LC and PCC. Since ALA Annual, over 250 LC-PCC Policy Statements have been released, changed, or deleted. Over 100 more Policy Statements are planned for release in February 2013. Both these and the results from the November Joint Steering Committee for Revision of RDA (JSC) meeting will be released in the *RDA Toolkit* in April 2013. As of April 1, 2013, those

who want to access AACR2 through Cataloger's Desktop will have to buy access to the *RDA Toolkit*.

For information concerning classification, subject access and genre/form projects at LC, please see the Subject Access Report by Hermine Vermeij, Subject Access Subcommittee Chair, BCC.

2. PCC Training Initiatives on Authority Records and Implementation at UCLA – by Chamya Kincy, University of California Los Angeles.

The PCC Standing Committee on Training Initiatives is responsible for the RDA NACO Training Task Group, which is intended to train those that are new to NACO; materials should be posted by March 31 on the Cataloger's Learning Workshop. It is also responsible for the RDA Series Training Task Group and is intended as bridge training for those who created series authority records using AACR2; materials for this training was posted to the Cataloger's Learning Workshop in the 2 weeks prior to ALA Midwinter. In recent developments from the PCC Trainers Meeting, the group felt that more NACO institutions should be encouraged to take the bridge training, perhaps through the use of various incentives.

The RDA NACO Review Process at UCLA was then detailed. UCLA has been under review for 4 months. This has included work with an external reviewer for 2 months and 2 months of internal review. Three units within UCLA were involved with the training: the Cataloging and Metadata Center, the Law Library, and the Film and Television Archive. There have been a mix of authority contributions, but mainly persons and corporate bodies, with a few conference and place records thrown in.

The training was self-paced. Catalogers were asked to view the RDA in NACO modules on the Cataloger's Learning Workshop Web site from August through September. Further RDA and NACO training webinars were also viewed in September. External review of records began in October, with the 1st batch submitted in mid-October. UCLA was made independent in December. 15 catalogers were involved in the process, with 6 internal reviewers. 12-15 records per week were reviewed, with 74 NARs reviewed externally. 71 NARs have been evaluated internally since independence.

Review of records consisted of a 2-stage process at the beginning: an internal review done by a RDA NACO Training Team consisting of 1 overall administrator and 5 reviewers and an external review. The internal review was done virtually over Google Docs, first through a primary reviewer and then through group review. The final determination for records to be submitted were made during a weekly in-person meeting.

The reviewers encouraged catalogers to use the new MARC authority fields generously and to use controlled vocabularies wherever possible, repeating subfields vs. fields. The reviewers were flexible with how fields were justified, leaving it up to the cataloger on whether to use a 670 field or a \$v subfield. Flexibility was also afforded to abbreviations in the 670 fields.

There were problem areas common to all catalogers. These included typos, non-justification of information in the new MARC fields, the placement of 040 \$e, the formulating of place names in the 370 field, not adding \$2 when needed, and forgetting to add a date in \$v.

There were also several issues and challenges encountered along the way. Institutional review of records takes a significant amount of time, so turn-around was a problem. Sometimes catalogers revised submitted records beyond the internal reviewers' suggestions, which caused problems later on in the review pipeline. There were also questions of how "nitpicky" the internal review process should be. In the end, it was decided to err on the side of being nitpicky internally. There were also problems of limited expertise internally.

Moving forward, UCLA will be looking for ways to streamline the process for individual review and independence. One of the big issues coming up will be in coordinating NACO review with BIBCO review, starting in February.

3. RDA and CONSER: NACO RDA Training at Northwestern University and Some Thoughts from a CONSER Cataloger – by Kevin Randall, Serials Cataloger, Northwestern University.

Northwestern University is a PCC Member institution, and is involved with NACO, SACO, BIBCO, and CONSER. NACO RDA Training commenced in August 2012 with 25 staff involved and 5 core planners, using the LC Cataloger's Learning Workshop materials. The watching of videos was self-paced, with target dates for reaching specific modules. Weekly discussion meetings were held and the modules were finished by all staff by the end of September. Discussions among the trainees continued in October.

Northwestern follow the stated LC/PCC policies, but had additional local core elements for place of birth and death and fuller form of name. Cataloger's judgment was used for all other options and alternatives. A table of elements in MARC order was made for handy reference.

The reviewers were the initial core planners mentioned above, plus 2 additional reviewers. Two live webinars were held with LC staff in October. Each cataloger under review had to submit 3 records to the core planners. Each record was reviewed by 2 people: one of the 6 primary reviewers and a 7th reviewer who forwarded the records to NACO. Weekly meetings continued to be held through December.

The library became independent in mid-December, with local review continuing. The internal reviewers determine when individual catalogers will become independent. Independent catalogers may become reviewers. The weekly meetings have ended and have been replaced by BIBCO bridge training.

RDA does raise some issues for those who are involved with CONSER. RDA requires unique authorized access points for works. Therefore serial access points have to be compared against all resources, not just serials. In AACR2, the title only had to be compared against other serials. Other issues include bibliographic file maintenance for serials and recommended practices for using the new MARC fields and subfields in authority records.

4. RDA Best Practices and the NACO Music Project: Observations from a NACO Funnel Project – Mark Scharff, Washington University, St. Louis, NACO Music Project Coordinator.

A Funnel Project can be thought of as a group of institutions with a similar authorities “market.” This can be a subject area, language, geography, or format. The funnel is treated as one participant.

The NACO Music Project, or NMP, was founded in 1987, with the first records submitted in 1988 and is the first NACO Funnel. Governance of NMP is through the Music OCLC Users Group. Review of records was initially done by the coordinator. As other music catalogers become independent, they reviewed the records of non-independent members. As of now there are 84 members at 63 institutions. Review takes place in a one-on-one model, with independence granted through a minimum number of errors submitted in a pre-determined number of records. The emphasis has shifted from submitting records in all formats (personal names, corporate bodies, series, name/titles) to submitting name/title records.

When RDA was released, it was initially assumed that the NMP Coordinator would take RDA Training and go through the review process, with the NMP Coordinator eventually gaining independence. The coordinator would then do train the NMP reviewers, who would then repeat the process with their charges. The assumption was that the process would be fast. In reality, several NMP participants were already cataloging in RDA, and were therefore “independent.” The NMP coordinator, in an effort to catch up, underwent training, and began the review process, but because some NMP participants wanted to begin training right away, the review process also included the review of other NMP participants. This led to a situation where NMP participants were becoming independent, but the NMP Coordinator himself was still under personal review. Currently, the situation in NMP is that a small number of participants are independent and are currently reviewing the work of other NMP participants while other NMP participants have no interest in moving to RDA at this moment. The current situation becomes even blurrier due to the fact that one has to deal with the moving target that is RDA and the fact that no specialized guidelines yet exist for the challenges that music authority work faces.

Despite these challenges, Scharff is encouraging NMP participants to get started sooner rather than later with RDA training. He also hopes to get started on the creation of training materials that will help in the transition from AACR2 to RDA.

Business Meeting

Reactions to the meeting: for being up against the RDA Update Forum and the location of the meeting, the group was happy with the number of the attendees. There was some concern about the room being too big, but it is hard to tell how big of a room ACIG will need from year to year. The group liked the lineup of speakers and thought that presentations were well-conceived.

The business meeting ended with a discussion of possible topics for ALA Annual in Chicago.

The business meeting adjourned 4:55.