

**Cataloging and Metadata Committee (CMC) Town Hall
MLA Annual Meeting 2017, Orlando, FL
Summary written by Bruce J. Evans, Baylor University**

Presenters: Tracey Snyder, CMC Chair (Cornell University), Damian Iseminger, RSC Music Working Group Chair (Library of Congress), Mary Huisman, Content Standards Subcommittee Chair (St. Olaf College), Casey Mullin, Vocabularies Subcommittee Chair (Western Washington University), Jim Soe Nyun, Encoding Standards Subcommittee Chair (University of California, San Diego), Chris Holden (Library of Congress), Kirk-Evan Billet (Peabody Conservatory).

The Cataloging and Metadata Town Hall was held on Friday, February 24th at the annual MLA Conference in Orlando, FL. The full session can be viewed at <https://vimeo.com/album/4456793>. CMC Chair Tracey Snyder began by welcoming everyone to the Town Hall, and by announcing that we will hear from three Subcommittee chairs and special guests. Tracey highlighted the CMC preconference and various co-sponsored program sessions, as well as the various Subcommittee meetings. She thanked all of the presenters and meeting leaders.

In other miscellaneous CMC-related news, Tracey announced that the CMC website continues to improve, and recently added a new FAQ section. Additionally, the CMC blog has moved to Word Press. CMC has also added screencasts via YouTube for various CMC-related events. With that, the meeting moved onto the reports.

Damian Iseminger (RSC Music Working Group Chair) began by giving reports on RDA developments. Damian reported that he presented four RDA Proposals for the October 2016 RSC Frankfurt meeting, the results of which will be reflected in the April 2017 Toolkit Update. The first (MusicWG/1) proposed a revision to 7.11, Place and Date of Capture. This instruction would now be known as the new element Note on Capture Information (7.11.4), with 7.11 re-titled as Capture Information. The second (MusicWG/2) made small changes to 2.15.3, Plate Number for Notated Music. The third (MusicWG/3) made changes to 6.15, Medium of Performance, with instructions simplified to allow for flexibility. It removed reliance on a closed list of terms, and that if possible, MOP should now be drawn from an external vocabulary instead, such as Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus, or UNIMARC Medium of Performance. The fourth and final Proposal (MusicWG/4) condensed the instructions to 6.28.1.9.1 and 6.28.10, Additions to Authorized Access Points Representing Works, into a single instruction. Lastly, if you are recording MOP in a 382, apply 6.15 and any

other relevant standards, and if recording MOP in an authorized access point, consult both 6.28.1.9.1 and 6.15.

Damian continued by noting that there will be no proposals during the 3RProject, which begins after the April 2017 Toolkit Update, and will end at the earliest April 2018. The 3RProject will make RDA data more modular and dynamic, as well as allow the RSC to track and manage metadata more effectively. This will also involve a redesign of the Toolkit, which will include improvements to navigation. In the interest of aligning RDA with IFLA-LRM, this effort will also see the addition of new RDA entities such as Collective Agent, Nomen, and Time-Span, will see implicit entities Agent and Place made explicit, and will involve subtyping of the existing entities Person, Family, and Corporate Body under Agent and Collective Agent.

Mary Huismann (Content Standards Subcommittee Chair) took over to report on LC-PCC PS and MLA Best Practices updates. With LC-PCC PS, Mary noted there will be changes to caption to reflect LRM terminology. Mary went through an extensive list of changes to PSs, which included PSs that were deleted because corresponding RDA instructions were deleted. Regarding MLA Best Practices, Mary noted that there would be changes to the BPs regarding type of corporate body, general guidelines on creating authority access points for corporate bodies, encoding format 3.19.3, and with the BP Supplement 1 document. Mary reminded everyone that you can find the MLA BPs on the Toolkit, whereas archived BPs, supplements to the BPs, and a place submit changes to BPs are all found all on the CMC Website.

Casey Mullin (Vocabularies Subcommittee Chair) presented the LCGFT and LCMPT updates. Casey began by showing a complete list of LCGFT music terms added in 2016, many of which were dramatic terms. In 2017, Casey reports that the community will add LCGFTs for librettos, and additional terms for both sacred music texts and song texts. These terms have not yet been officially approved. Casey pointed out that proposals for new and revised LCGFT music terms will now be accepted through the SACO Music Funnel; more information to follow from the CMC. Casey illustrated LCGFT implementation by showing everyone the various CMC Best Practices guides.

Casey moved onto reporting on LCMPT developments, starting with showing a list of LCMPTs approved for 2016. In 2017, Casey reports that many new terms will be for electronic music. Proposals for new and revised LCMPTs also should go through SACO Music Funnel, watch for announcement from both LC and MLA.

CMC will be glad to assist you with submitting proposals for new LCMPTs. MLA released BPs for LCMPT during February, and featured changes to the 382.

To facilitate retrospective implementation of LCMPT, LCGFT (and beyond), the Vocabularies Subcommittee has instituted a project, in collaboration with Gary Strawn, to derive faceted data from LCSH music headings. Casey anticipates that he will be able to report on the results of this project next year. ALA ALCTS SAC has charged a Working Group (chaired by Casey) on full implementation of LC Faceted Vocabularies, with an expected release of a whitepaper in mid-2017. And finally, Casey encouraged everyone to read a new article in Notes that he, Beth Iseminger, Nancy Lorimer, and Hermine Vermeij wrote entitled Faceted Vocabularies for Music: A New Era in Resource Discovery.

Jim Soe Nyun (Encoding Standards Subcommittee Chair) then took the podium to report on recent music-related developments in MARC 21. After noting that while the death of MARC has been both predicted and encouraged for quite some time now – for example, Roy Tennant published a 2002 Library Journal article in which he stated "MARC must die" – the MARC format is still very much alive and growing. (He also noted that Sally McCallum of LC noted at the 2017 Midwinter OCLC Linked Data Roundtable that "If MARC dies, it will be through obesity.") With that, Jim highlighted music-related MARC format changes.

MARC Update 22 (April 2016) included clarifying that Code n (Not applicable) is now valid in SR 007/03 and 007/10, and that Code r and Code s are now valid in SR 007/01; in the 382, \$r and \$t were added, and \$e was redefined; code b (chip cartridge) was added to the 007/01, and code s for 007/00 was redefined. In Update 23 (November 2016; not yet implemented), 028 1st indicator 6 (Distributor number) was added; in the 382, the \$3 (Materials specified) was authorized for use; a new 008/20 Code p for piano score was authorized for use, and five other 008/20 codes were redefined. And finally, in Update 23 for the Authority Format (November 2016), the 382 field examples were revised.

Damian Iseminger and Chris Holden then came forward to give a report on the IFLA Library Reference Model. Damian started by reviewing that the LRM antecedents were FRBR (1997), FRAD (2009), FRSAD (2010). LRM replaces all of these conceptual models in a single framework. The LRM User Tasks, which Damian read and defined, resemble those of FRBR. They are: Find, Identify, Select, Obtain, and Explore. Damian went on to cover the change to Entities, Attributes, and Relationships in LRM.

LRM Entities are now class based. For example, the LRM Entity Person (LRM-E7) is Subclass of Agent. There are a total of 11 Entities in LRM, which Damian read and defined. They are as follows (in hierarchical order): Res (LRM-E1), the Superclass; Work (LRM-E2); Expression (LRM-E3); Manifestation (LRM-E4); Item (LRM-E5); Agent (LRM-E6); Person (LRM-E7); Collective Agent (LRM-E8); Nomen (LRM-E9); Place (LRM-E10); Time-Span (LRM-E11). Damian then covered the fact that LRM Attributes are properties of Entities, and that LRM Relationships are not exhaustive. Damian closed his part of the report with a series of PowerPoint slides to illustrate different types of Relationships, and how Entities relate to each other. Chris Holden then took over to illustrate work in LRM of interest to music catalogers.

Chris began by explaining that the Work entity has only two attributes--Category and Representative Expression Attribute, and defined both. Some music-related attributes that were previously associated with the work have been relegated to the expression level, such as Medium of performance and Key. For example, with a Schubert piano sonata in A major, the piano and key aspects would no longer be associated with the work. However, this could be mitigated through the use of the Representative Expression Attribute, which is the most commonly occurring (or canonical) expression of a work, thereby reconnecting all of these elements back together more concretely. A specific example of a Representative expression: with a Wagner opera in German, the original German version would be considered the canonical expression. LRM does not stipulate how to determine Representative Expression Attribute, which gives catalogers some flexibility; end-user needs should be a primary consideration with this decision. LRM gives catalogers several sources from which to draw Representative expressions.

Chris moved on to define Aggregates, which fall into three categories. The first is Collection of Expressions, such as selections, anthologies, and series (such as The Best of REM). The second is Augmentation, such as an introduction by the editor of score. The third and final is Parallel Expressions, such as an opera score with parallel text in English and German within the music. As with other aspects of LRM, this model is meant to be flexible.

A notable change from FRBR is that Fictional Entities are covered by Res (because they are objects of human contemplation), and cannot be considered person, time, or place entities in LRM. The change came about because of a FRBRoo concept in connection with the Museum World, which deals with real world objects. More specifically, museum objects are made by someone, and so therefore it is impossible for someone “not real” to produce an artifact. Compatibility between

FRBRoo and CIDOC-CRM (an information model for museums) required modification of FRAD definition, which LRM retains. To be clear, though, providing access to a resource through a name is not the same thing as saying that the fictional entity associated with that name is actually the author. For example, with a book “written” by Kermit the Frog, you can assign a name access point for Kermit, you just cannot say that he is the author. In effect, access methods for fictitious entities will remain the same.

Jim Soe Nyun and Kirk Evan Billet came to the podium to give the Linked Data Working Group Report. This group – LDWG/Ludwig for short – was formed in response to the Performed Music Ontology Project, which seeks to develop a BIBFRAME-based ontology for performed music in all formats. This will be accomplished through partnering with domain communities and the PCC. MLA and ARSC were asked to participate in the development of this ontology. Since there was no existing group in MLA to accomplish this, LDWG was formed. Jim showed the group’s full membership. Jim and Kirk-Evan Billet are the co-chairs.

Kirk-Evan took over to talk about LDWG’s work. LDWG’s first task involves developing use cases for the Performed Music Ontology Group, 89 use cases in all. The use case areas were medium of performance, aggregates, sequence, events, and performers; events and medium of performance were the most commonly occurring type. A sample use case: A conducting student would like to identify conductors of recordings of Mahler’s Symphony no. 6 in which the Scherzo is performed as the 2nd movement in order to assess preference and impact.

Jim then talked about other LDWG tasks, which include reviewing event models, and reviewing and commenting on work coming out of the Performed Music Ontology Project. Jim moved on to mention that LDWG is one model for ontology development, and that community input will also be needed for ontology maintenance.

Tracey then opened it up for questions from the audience. The first question was to Damian concerning LRM’s redefinition of fictitious entities: What do catalogers do when we cannot ascertain name, and when multiple entities feed into one fictitious name? Damian replied by noting that we already do that through making a judgment call with the information we have, and then revise the access point as more information is gathered or emerges. We assume that it's one thing, but then go back and change it if we find out new information. Moreover, LRM says there is a file of nomens from which to choose. After a question that came up later on

about fictitious names vis-à-vis PDQ Bach, Kathy Glennan clarified that LRM only requires controlling nomens, period.

The next set of questions concerned Representative Expression Attributes. One concerned further changes to this concept with the new version of LRM, to which Kathy Glennan replied that the new LRM is not that different in that regard. And when someone asked how many Representative Expression Attributes you can have, the answer was that you can have as many as you want. There can be multiple canonical expression, and they can be multi-valued.

Another person wondered that with the removal of closed-lists for MOP, will there be a replacement vocab in the chapter 3 area? The response was that replacing them would be hard to accomplish.

An attendee noted the fact that the LCMPTs of voice and singer are used inconsistently, and wondered if there were any developments to sort this out. Casey replied that language in the BPs exists to help navigate that. That said, they have this matter on their radar to look at further.