<div align="center">

BCC2009/SDC/1

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
ALA Midwinter Meeting
Denver, CO, Jan. 24, 26, 2009
Reported by Mark Scharff, MLA Liaison to CC:DA

</div>

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met in two sessions during the ALA Midwinter meeting in Denver; a third session was cancelled because the time was not needed to cover the agenda items. The Chair, John Myers (Union College) 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. Presentation is more topical than chronological.

Reports

CC:DA Chair. The full report is at http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair45.pdf . The Chair reviewed the votes taken by electronic mail since Annual 2008, and asked for and received confirmation of the results. Unlike recent years, *RDA (Resource Description and Access)* did not dominate the action list. The motion of most potential interest to music catalogers was the formation of a task force to formulate an ALA response to the IFLA proposal to add an Area 0 to the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) to contain data on media and content types that would be more precise than what is currently recorded in the General Material Designation (the draft of the Area 0 proposal is at http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/isbdrg/ISBD_Area_0_20081128.pdf). The Task Force worked on a tight schedule and produced a well-received response (see http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/tf-isbd03.pdf); more information is given below. CC:DA was asked by the ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Executive Committee to draft a list of ten Strategic Comments for ALCTS to use in preparing for the publication and possible implementation of *RDA*. The Chair drafted such a document, which received extensive review by CC:DA members by e-mail, and delivered it to the Executive Committee, which discussed it at its meeting on January 25. The CC:DA document was quite forthright about identifying problems with *RDA* and with the development process. The Executive Committee seemed to softpedal the concerns, and chose to focus instead on the implementation process and how *RDA*'s shortcomings will be overcome. At the Monday meeting, CCS Executive Committee chair Mary Woodley (CSU-Northridge) came to the CC:DA meeting to amplify the CCS response to the CC:DA report. She thanked CC:DA for its work, acknowledging the efforts and frustrations. To CCS, it is pragmatism—the *RDA* train is en route. Our concern must now be with implementation. CCS will be creating a task force to monitor the feedback that comes out of the testing process. She quoted Beacher Wiggins having said that the *RDA* implementation options for LC were "go" or "revise," not "no." Nonetheless, it's unknown what the American library community would do if LC did not implement *RDA*. Regarding concerns over the lack of a print product, Mary said that a market survey needed to precede print-product development; she emphasized a need for a "cost-effective" implementation. She also stressed that *RDA* information needed to get to library leaders, and not only catalogers, as the former need to understand the implications of *RDA* implementation. In sum, CCS is in a wait-and-see mode.

Library of Congress (Barbara Tillett, LC liaison to CC:DA). For a detailed report of LC initiatives, visit: http://www.loc.gov/ala/mw-2009-update.html

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

- The Music Cataloging teams (approximately 20 people) who were formerly part of the Special Materials Cataloging Division in the ABA Directorate were reassigned to the Music Division on October 1. The move thus far is only administrative, pending allotment and renovation of suitable space adjacent to the Music Division.
- The Section 108 Study Group, charged with developing recommendations for legislation to allow reasonable uses of copyrighted works by libraries and archives in the digital age, issued a final report on March 31, 2008. The Copyright Office is still reviewing the report as a prelude to proposing legislation. Web site: http://www.loc.gov/section108
- Legislation to provide a framework for fair use of "orphan works" (works under copyright for which the copyright owner is unknown or cannot be located) was introduced in the 110th Congress, but died in the House of Representatives. LC

expects that similar legislation will be introduced in the 111   Congress.

- Barbara highlighted three LC actions in response to recommendations of the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control: 1) LC has hired R2 consulting to produce a survey of the bibliographic landscape; 2) personnel are developing plans for identifying and enhancing access to LC "hidden collections;" 3) plans are being finalized for a testing process to follow the publication of *RDA* to help inform implementation decisions for the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library. LC is in the midst of identifying testing partners (libraries of various kinds as well as vendors) to participate. Three months of training and orientation for participants will begin upon publication of the *RDA* online product, expected to be no earlier than July 2009; all participants would then spend three months cataloging a core group of materials in both *AACR2* and *RDA*, and other materials that those libraries acquire. LC would distribute records it creates, and other institutions can choose to do so. Documentation and methodology will be posted on a yet-to-be-created Web site, which other institutions could choose to use to do their own informal testing. A three-month period for assessment would follow the testing phase, after which the national libraries will announce their implementation intentions. At this point, the best avenue to learn more about the details of the testing process is to contact Beacher Wiggins, Director of the Cataloging and Acquisitions Directorate (bwig@loc.gov).
- After creating and distributing over 29,000 subject authority records created for the sake of machine validation of headings in bibliographic records (they would normally not be made because they contain free-floating subdivisions and need no references), LC suspended creation in the summer because of a software glitch. They expect to resume production in the next few month, but would also appreciate any feedback on the utility of the project (such feedback could be sent to policy@loc.gov).
- The Virtual International Authority File is growing. An alpha version can be viewed at www.viaf.org.
- The Cataloging and Policy Support Office (CPSO) has been renamed the Policy and Standards Division. Barbara Tillett is still its head. It has assumed the product-development functions of the Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS).

ALA Publishing Services (Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director)

Chatham mentioned the online demonstration of *RDA* that was given in the *RDA* Forum by software developer Nanette Naught. The product has evolved into a tripartite structure—a "tab" providing access to the instructions themselves, a tab to a "toolkit" that would contain mappings between *RDA* and other standards, workflows, bookmarking/annotation tools, etc., and a tab that would provide access to other cataloging tools, including the text of *AACR2*. He outlined tentative pricing and marketing models, stressing how preliminary these were. The most basic model would be a one-time purchase of access to a static version of the *RDA* text (i.e. the 1st "tab" only). This would be in the $100-$125 range. Next would be an individual subscription, $100-$125 per year, that would offer access to dynamic versions of the 1st 2 tabs, and perhaps to the 3rd. A simultaneous-user pricing model would be used for institutional and consortial pricing, though there is still uncertainly as to where the break points might be. ALA is considering how to offer access to educators and disadvantaged users for free or reduced rates. In lively back-and-forth, major issues emerged: 1) the projected pricing structure. How much of a scaledown will accompany increase in number of licenses purchased? ALA's initial projections sounded too pricey to many; 2) ability to make on-the-fly adjustments to access needs for training, workshops, etc. Chatham offered few details; 3) *RDA*'s relationship to Cataloger's Desktop. LC has continued developing Cataloger's Desktop, and is interested in providing access to *RDA* in it. ALA Publishing, however, seems to regard the 3rd "tab" of the *RDA* product as promising to be a replacement for Cataloger's Desktop. Most, though not all, people at the table were skeptical of that notion, and did not relish paying for two products. They felt that ALA Publishing didn't grasp the amount of effort, time, and money needed to acquire licenses and permissions for Cataloger's Desktop resources; 4) the lack of time to review the online product. Chatham acknowledged the departure from the traditional pattern of thorough review, but cited the delays in delivering the text. He posited that *RDA* was in line with a "continuous beta" pattern of software development. Questions came up as to whether OCLC would be ready for *RDA* testing and implementation. The response was that other JSC constituencies will likely be adopting *RDA* without a testing period, and OCLC will have to be ready to process their catalog records. The JSC is scheduled to deliver a final text of *RDA* to ALA Publishing Services by June, and publication is projected at sometime in the 3rd quarter of 2009. Chatham reiterated that there will not be a print version of *RDA* available at the time the online product is released. Some thought has gone into what a print version might contain, but he pointed out that it would be a separate editorial process, and one that would benefit from the "shakedown cruise" of the online product.

Joint Steering Committee (John Attig, ALA Representative)

Due to press of time, John did not prepare a written report. The Joint Steering Committee has not met since April of 2008, but

will meet in Chicago from March 12-20, 2009, to make the decisions that will allow a final text of *RDA* to be drafted for submission to ALA Publications by June. A teleconference focused on the concept of "core elements" in *RDA*, which in the draft have replaced the designations of "Required" and "Optional." What purpose is served in designating a set of elements as "core?" A November paper by Alan Danskin (British Library) correlated proposed core elements with user tasks, and rejected the expectation that a set of core elements would be sufficient in most instances; they might be thought of more as a "base line" for identifying records created according to *RDA*. Terminology is an issue, since "core" is a loaded term and is used in several other senses in *RDA*. An extended discussion revealed a lack of consensus on these and other issues. A question as to whether more "core elements" needed to be defined for music led to a suggestion that a task force be created, charged with working with various cataloging "communities" (of which music has been cited as one) to guide them in asking the "right questions" in determining core elements for their materials.

Among other things mentioned:

There is and will be no definition for "edition" in the *RDA* Glossary, which seems to stem from difficulties of fitting it in the FRBR model. Folks pointed out that this has major implementation implications.

The concept of "persons" now extends to non-human entities.

The definition of "volume" has been expanded to encompass unbound items.

Unhappiness with the proposal to name all parts of larger works "through" the name of the larger work (the norm for music, but not for other materials) caused the JSC to relent and revert to the *AACR2* "division of the world."

The JSC has rejected the *AACR2* practice of using the title of 1st work as title of a compilation that does not have a collective title. If such a resource has to be cited, the cataloger is directed to use a devised title. This could have significant implications for music.

The other portion of John's report time followed Don Chatham's presentation, and that time became an assessment of his news, particularly the notion of *RDA* replacing Cataloger's Desktop, and what would be an appropriate response. While not unanimous, the opinion of most around the table was that *RDA* was not likely to be able to assume all the functions of Cataloger's Desktop without a significant investment of time and money—and that ALA Publishing didn't seem to understand this at all. Members and liaisons also decried the lack of planning for a print product—a sore spot in particular for the public- and school-library communities. There were also concerns about how a fragmented implementation of *RDA* would affect WorldCat. While records created according to a multitude of standards co-exist, the specter of duplicate records for *AACR2* and *RDA* cataloging, and processes that produce records that are neither purely one nor the other, are unnerving. CC:DA resolved to continue talking about these issues via e-mail.

The JSC has made the vast majority of the *RDA* working documents publicly available at http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working1.html, to provide context for the changes being incorporated into *RDA*. The full draft of *RDA* that was issued in October is at http://www.rdaonline.org/constituencyreview/

CC:DA Task Force on ISBD Area 0 (Lori Robare, University of Oregon). Lori stressed the short time frame that the Task Force worked in; consensus was that the report was pretty good in that light. Some expressed a desire to see more forceful recommendations. Among concerns brought to the table: 1) the proposal uses a complex punctuation convention to allow strings of data; not only is this confusing in some cases, but some situations seem to fall outside what the punctuation can express; 2) there is a lack of alignment with FRBR elements; 3) there are discrepancies among Area 0, ONIX, and *RDA* in how some elements are defined. Lori indicated that she would do her best to incorporate these comments into the final response, due January 30. CC:DA adopted the report.

CC:DA Webmaster (Patricia Hatch, Harvard University). During the past semester, there has been some movement at ALA with implementing their website, including migration to the Collage content management system, but difficulties with this launch have had a domino effect. The good news is that delays have given ALCTS the time to form a group to seek a more unified approach to migrating content into the website. She thanked John Attig for continuing to maintain the CC:DA site at Penn State.

ALA Representative to NISO (Cindy Hepfer, University at Buffalo). No report given, but a number of ISO proposals have been offered for ALA comment via e-mail.

RDA Implementation Task Force (Shawne Miksa, University of North Texas). At Midwinter, activities included the *RDA* Update Forum (see above) and a meeting of the Task Force. There will be an ALA Annual preconference workshop focusing on the concepts of FRBR and FRAD; leaders will be Barbara Tillett (LC), Glenn Patton (OCLC), Robert Maxwell (Brigham Young University) and Tom Delsey (*RDA* Editor). There will also be a program session on Saturday, July 11, 1:30-5:30 —"Look before you leap: taking *RDA* for a test drive." Content will include an overview of *RDA*, comparisons with *AACR2*, workflows, an update on the testing preparations, *RDA* and ILS products, and *RDA* and educational efforts. This session conflicts with CC:DA, so it's likely that CC:DA will meet only on Friday and Monday. Outreach efforts have been a mixed bag; a proposal for a program on the Public Library Association meeting is in, but the American Association of Law Libraries has rejected the Task Force's proposal. The Task Force expects to mount a Web site to collect documents that will be public.

Last updated February 25, 2009