

- 9) MLA Task Force on Committee Structure
 - a) Several recommendations impact BCC:
 - i) Disband the Administration Committee.
 - ii) Rename the Integrated Systems Subcommittee and move it under the purview of the BCC with a new charge.
 - 1) General BCC agreement with both the rationale for this move and the need for the charge to be clarified.
 - 2) Creation of the best practices document, currently in ILS Subcommittee's charge, could be a task force activity.
 - 3) An emerging technologies group might provide an appropriate scope for the Subcommittee.
 - 4) Proposal to remove "integrated" from the name, expanding the focus beyond the library catalog.
 - 5) BCC subcommittees likely to evolve as RDA is implemented; a provisional relationship could be revisited as that process unfolds.
 - iii) Possibility of folding Authorities and Descriptive together after publication of RDA.
 - iv) Need for a metadata group of some type, broached in discussion of the Metadata Working Group report, was reiterated.
- 10) Music Genre Headings (Geraldine Ostrove)
 - a) Form/genre terms for moving images have been implemented; implementation for radio terms now underway. MLA willing to help with music headings.
 - b) "Syndetic structure creep" occurs when headings wander into other disciplines:
 - i) Project is not perceived as a music issue per se.
 - ii) Not solely a Subject Access issue, but a BCC issue.
 - c) Two components:
 - i) Retrospective conversion of all 150 and 650 headings.
 - ii) New cataloging using 155 field instead of 150.
 - d) Proposals for a possible framework for the project have been sent in a letter to BCC.
 - i) Decisions need to be made for the following:
 - 1) Deciding what belongs in a cloned 155 authority record.
 - 2) Deciding what can be done outside LC and what must be handled inside by CPSO.
 - 3) Planning and implementing an instructional component.
 - 4) Effect on libraries that opt out of x55 adoption.
 - 5) Identifying costs to libraries.
 - 6) Possible timeframe for implementation.
 - ii) Agreement between LC and MLA on workflow issues and permissions from institutions would be needed.
 - iii) BCC should draft a document specifying goals for the project, decide on convening of appropriate group.
- 11) RDA issues including the new document from LC (LC12)
 - a) MLA response to CC:DA on LC/12 due by Feb. 29.
 - b) BCC response might focus on two broad areas:
 - i) Large departures from AACR2.
 - ii) The effect on legacy records and interoperability of newer records.
 - c) BCC in agreement that some proposals are not supported by FRBR:
 - i) LC/12 provides two versions of "Chorus score," with one denoted as an expression and the other a new work.
 - ii) The cadenza proposal gives the composer of the work, not the cadenza, as the preferred access point.
 - d) Other issues of concern:
 - i) Instructions to use terminology assigned by the composer as the initial title element and to use the language of cataloging agency will result in conflicts.
 - ii) Compared to Types of Composition document with hundreds of terms, LC/12 give a closed list of only five types to be used in English, plus anything denoting number of performers (duet, trio, etc.).
 - iii) Abandonment of the concept of score order is lacking a strong rationale. Consistency with AACR2 to cope with legacy data is at issue here.
 - e) BCC discussion will continue post-meeting, with responses due to Mark Scharff by Feb. 28.

At 3:40 the Committee went into executive session.

Submitted March 18, 2008

Rya Martin, Recording Secretary/Webmaster

Last updated February 25, 2009