

BCC2006/SDC/1

COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING: DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS MEETINGS

ALA Midwinter Conference, San Antonio, TX

Jan. 20, 21 and 23, 2006

Reported by Kathy Glennan, Chair, Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met in three sessions during the ALA Midwinter meeting in San Antonio, Tex. The Chair, Mary Larsgaard (University of California, Santa Barbara), 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 bulk of the meetings focused on the draft of part I of *RDA* (Resource Description and Access), which is publicly available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftpt1.html>

The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) representative asked that CC:DA consider comments in two categories: short term – able to be incorporated into the rules prior to publication in 2008; long term – to be saved for a revision process once *RDA* is published. Changes to existing *AACR2* rules, not otherwise addressed in the *RDA* draft, fall into the latter category.

Observations and questions about *RDA* included:

- *RDA*, unlike *AACR2*, does not contain case-based rules; instead, it is principle based and should provide enough guidance to catalogers about how to handle unusual situations without requiring additional, more specific rules.
- *RDA* appears to retain a print and Western European bias.
- Many expressed frustrations with redundant rules in the print version; the yet-to-be developed electronic version may have fewer problems in this area.
- Several questioned the need for a concise version.
- CC:DA had a nearly even split between those who applauded moving ISBD to an appendix and those who felt the examples were confusing without those conventions.
- With the relegation of ISBD to an appendix, *RDA* has lost the ability to relate certain data elements to each other; this functionality needs to be reinstated in some fashion.
- Should ISBD terminology (such as “title proper” and “parallel title”) persist in the rules?
- How can *RDA* best balance the competing needs of transcription and accuracy, and where should corrections and clarifications appear in the record?
- How should the cataloging record present data elements, and should certain *AACR2* conventions continue, such as bracketing supplied information?
- Should *RDA* clarify the difference between formal statements and notes?
- Should *RDA* remove all abbreviations from a cataloging record?
- Some of the optional rules address “and” instructions, while others present alternative treatments.
- Organizing *RDA* in a “decision tree” fashion would facilitate training; currently some instructions appear in a “then/if” construction instead of “if/then”.
- Chapter 2 rules should somehow indicate whether or not a particular data element belongs to the list of mandatory elements (rule 1.4.).
- The music and audio-visual communities expressed strong dissatisfaction with the limitations in the definition of “resource” (rule 2.2.1., footnote).
- Should the concept of preferred source of information disappear, in favor of using the entire resource?
- Many questioned the decision to make recording the statement of responsibility optional (rule 2.4.0.3.), although the JSC strongly supports this change.
- Serials catalogers noted the inconsistency in use of the terms “serials” and “successively issued resources” throughout Part I.
- Should *RDA* contain high-level rules about topical access?

Reports

Library of Congress (Barbara Tillett, LC liaison to CC:DA)

(for a detailed report of LC initiatives, visit: <http://www.loc.gov/ala/ala-sanantonio-update.html>)

Barbara Tillett emphasized that although LCRIs will cease with the ending of AACR2, LC will create another tool/series for use with *RDA*. LC may decide to combine cataloging rule decisions with tagging decisions into a future single series.

The voluntary retirement program offered at the end of the year resulted in a loss of 212 LC employees; their salary savings will offset the cost of the retirement incentive. CPSO had 5 staff retire, and CDS had 10 retirements.

For details on the Thomas Hampson Tour, visit: <http://www.loc.gov/creativity/hampson/>

In December, LC took possession of Phase 1 of the new National AudioVisual Conservation Center in Culpeper, Va. LC expects full operation of this facility by the end of this year. At that time, LC's audiovisual preservation laboratories and the staff in the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division will relocate.

LC will make the following CDS publications available as free PDF files beginning with issues published after Jan. 1, 2006: *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, *Updates to Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, *Updates to Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings*, *Updates to CONSER Editing Guide*, *Updates to CONSER Cataloging Manual*, and *Updates to MARC 21 format* documentation.

With the next release of *Cataloger's Desktop* on Feb. 1, 2006, LC will publish the changes to LCRI 1.0G1 (accents on initial capital letters of words in manifestations published after 1801 in French, Spanish and Portuguese) and LCRI 22.17 (ability to add death dates to existing personal name headings). Catalogers may use the former immediately; however, LC requests that we wait for the publication of the latter, due to the expected impact and the need for an orderly implementation.

LC has updated the 670 section in the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual, Z1* to include guidelines for the use of subfield \$u for Uniform Resource Identifiers. They made a similar change to the *LC Guidelines supplement to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data*.

Implementation of new Unicode characters, including the musical sharp: CPSO will work on adjustments to cataloging policies related to bibliographic and authority records using non-roman scripts over the next year. Changes will be held until 2007 to allow time for testing and coordination with NACO nodes.

ALA Publishing Services (Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director)

This portion of the agenda focused on the development of *RDA* as an electronic resource, considered the preferred format by the JSC. Using an outline of functionalities provided by the JSC, ALA Publishing has begun to work with a database developer to create an electronic version *RDA* that will be easily navigable. During the Midwinter conference, two focus groups viewed the current prototype and provided feedback to the developers. ALA Publishing hopes to license *RDA* to ILS vendors and bibliographic utilities, with the goal of enabling catalogers to consult a particular rule while creating records. The prototype included three modes (full, concise, and customized) and three interfaces to the database (Search/Browse, SmartSheet, and Step-by-Step). The publishers will also consider developing a training module. The pricing for *RDA* remains uncertain at this point; the number of available features will influence the cost.

Joint Steering Committee (Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative)

The JSC achieved some significant milestones in the past few months:

- The publicly available draft of *RDA* Part I, with a mechanism for anyone to comment on specific rules
- The creation of RDA-L as a discussion forum about the rules
- The hiring of a project manager, Marjorie Bloss, to keep the project on track and work on its promotion
- The availability of the *RDA* Prospectus and *RDA* FAQ at the JSC website
- The establishment of *RDA* Forums as a regular feature at ALA meetings

When constituencies want changes from existing AACR2 rules, the JSC will continue to entertain separate proposals, following the old model of suggesting revisions; however, if accepted, each revision would also require evaluation for pre- or post-*RDA* implementation.

The JSC meets next in Ottawa in April. The agenda includes reviewing the constituency comments on *RDA* Part I and the draft of Part II.

Other

The Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media will go through the appendix from their September 2005 status report and compare that with the rules in *RDA*. This is one situation where the AACR2 rules will not be carried over as is.

Task Force to Maintain the CC:DA Publication “Differences Between, Changes Within” questioned the value of updating this document with the pending termination of AACR2. Suggested improvements include updating references to rule numbers and some formatting revisions. In lieu of a print product, ALCTS may consider a PDF-only version.

The Task Force to Review the Draft *Functional Requirements for Authority Records* (FRAR) completed their work; the appendix to their final report may serve as an assessment tool when parts II and III of *RDA* become available for review.

CC:DA will meet at ALA Annual on Friday afternoon, Saturday afternoon, and Monday morning. Those meetings will focus on *RDA* Part II.

Last updated Febraury 12, 2006