MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Joint Authorities/Descriptive Subcommittee Business Meeting Report
San Jose, California – Friday, March 1, 2013, 11:00AM-12:30PM

Members present:
Authorities: Damian Iseminger (chair), Jean Harden, Stephen Mantz, Jacob Schaub, Raymond Schmidt, Tomoko Shibuya
Descriptive: Tracey Snyder (chair), Sonia Archer-Capuzzo, Sarah Cohen, Patty Falk, Kathy Glennan, Elizabeth McCraw, Chuck Peters, Amy Strickland

Authorities business

Chair Damian Iseminger announced that Thomas Pease and Tomoko Shibuya would be rotating off of the subcommittee, that Damian Iseminger would be completing his term as chair at the conclusion of the meeting, and that Raymond Schmidt has been appointed as the new chair.

Iseminger reported on the conversion of the LC/NACO Authority File to accommodate RDA. Phase 1 of the project identified and marked ca. 420,000 authority records as requiring human intervention to evaluate the authorized access point. Music authority records affected include those with 1xx fields that have "Libretto" or "Text" in $s, "Polyglot" or "&" in $l; "brasses," "plucked instruments," "keyboard instruments," or "instrumental ensemble" in $m; "winds," "woodwinds," or "strings" in $m if the $t of that heading does not contain "trio," "quartet," or "quintet." There will be changes in the handling of $c in some instances, and in the abbreviation "b."

Phase 2 of the project, slated to begin after March 4, will consist of changes that can be done mechanically to ca. 400,000 authority records at a rate of 30,000 records per day. Changes include spelled out forms of "acc.," "unacc.," and "arr."; conversion from "violoncello" to "cello," "Selections" to "Works. Selections"; and changes to $c. Iseminger noted that everyone should talk with their authority vendor or their authorities librarian at their institution to see what the plan is for bibliographic file maintenance in light of these changes to authority records.

Descriptive business

Chair Tracey Snyder announced that Jim Alberts and Candy Feldt resigned and that Sonia Archer-Capuzzo joined.

Snyder reported on three issues discussed by the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) at ALA Midwinter in Seattle, January 2013 of interest to the music community, which came from John Attig, ALA representative to JSC:

1. As a result of the ALA response to RDA revision proposal 6JSC/LC/21, an ALA task force will be formed to investigate whether further revisions to 3.4.5.2 and the Glossary are needed, and whether to revise RDA 3.4.5.3 to provide specific instructions on how to record unnumbered sequences of pages or leaves. Snyder pointed out that the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee should watch for developments and comment on a draft when it is available.

2. Last May, the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3 issued a discussion paper, and will now reconvene with different membership and continue its work, with Mark Scharff representing music interests. Proposals will be developed for adding Extent of Content to RDA, and for adding the Aspect–Unit–Quantity model to the RDA element set and to the instructions in Chapter 3. The Aspect–Unit–Quantity model uses data about a resource's physical properties, such as extent and dimensions, that can be parsed by a machine instead of human readable phrases. For example, the extent of a score made up of 72 pages would be described as follows:
Aspect: extent
Unit: score
Quantity: 1
Aspect: extent
Unit: pages
Quantity: 72

3. At the November 2011 JSC meeting, ALA was asked to investigate the inconsistency between the Statement of Responsibility element in Chapter 2 and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter and Artistic and/or Technical Credit elements in Chapter 7. Tracey Snyder (MLA) and Kelley McGrath (OLAC) will lead this effort, focusing on the question, "Should there be a principled distinction between what is recorded in the 245 $c and the 511/508 fields?" Snyder stated that the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee should be prepared to participate in wiki discussions about this issue.

Authorities-Descriptive business

Iseminger summarized the activities of subcommittee members during the past year. Most members of Descriptive and Authorities subcommittees were involved with several proposals for revisions to RDA. Ray Schmidt and Damian Iseminger are members of the RDA Music Implementation Task Force, which released its first draft of *Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21* in early February. Damian, Ray, Tracey Snyder, and Kathy Glennan

also helped plan the recently completed RDA Preconference, *Hit the Ground Running! RDA Training for Music Catalogers*.

In news from the ALA Annual Meeting, Iseminger reported that the LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual, Z1 has been and will continue to be updated with all the new MARC fields available for use and when to use them, along with relevant PCC Policy Decisions. It is available in Cataloger's Desktop. Also noted: March 31, 2013 continues to be the date for the switch to RDA.

In additional news from CC:DA:
1. Snyder reported that there is a Task Force for Recording Relationships in RDA. The problem is that there are no explicit instructions for contents notes in RDA; contents notes are subtly addressed in chapters 24-28. There is a mixture of work, expression, manifestation, and item (WEMI) level information in notes on contents and related works. Snyder is on this Task Force, which issued an interim report in December 2012 for CC:DA to read and comment on at ALA Midwinter. CC:DA approved of the general direction of this report, and has asked the TF to write another report for ALA Annual to clarify what level of WEMI is to be included in contents notes, and to draft instructions and examples for creating structured descriptions for related WEMIs.

2. Kathy Glennan spoke about the Task Force on Sources of Information. Glennan is on this Task Force, and Mark Scharff is the chair. Earliest parts of RDA chapter 2 have been causing problems: 2.1 Basis for Identification of the Resource, and instructions in 2.2 Sources of Information. Notably, collective title is not in RDA for sound recordings, and there are questions about what is part of the resource, for resources issued in more than one part, etc. Two proposals [6JSC/ALA/20 and 6JSC/ALA/21] were submitted to JSC and were largely accepted as proposed, allowing catalogers to prefer a source that bears a collective title for a single work on more than one disc, and to use a formally presented collective title on a container issued with the resource. Scharff added that the revisions enable catalogers to favor the predominant work as a means of identifying resource, which is important for dealing with DVDs. Scharff asked everyone to continue to think about what it means to "identify the resource as a whole" in RDA terms, and how this is different from past practice.

A substantial portion of the joint business meeting was then devoted to reviewing the outcome of RDA revision proposals that were developed jointly by the Authorities and Descriptive subcommittees in the past year, and to reviewing proposals and discussion papers submitted by other groups, which MLA commented on.

The joint proposals were:

1. Revision of RDA instructions for arrangements and adaptations of musical works (6JSC/ALA/14), intended to clear up confusion surrounding possible adaptations of "traditional music." The proposal was accepted by the JSC in revised form.

2. Revision of RDA instructions relating to librettos and lyrics for musical works (RDA 6.2.2.10.2, 6.27.4.2, Appendix I.2.1, and Glossary) (6JSC/ALA/13), addressing the problem of when the composer and the librettist are the same person, and allowing for the use of *Lyrics* in variant access points. The proposal was accepted by the JSC.

3. Proposal on recording of medium of performance (6JSC/ALA/12), to allow for using a controlled vocabulary to record medium of performance, and to add an instruction to record details of a medium of performance in 7.21.1.3. The proposal was accepted by the JSC with revisions.

4. Proposal on recording copyright dates (6JSC/ALA/11). Included in this meeting as a joint proposal, it was actually a Descriptive proposal, seeking a change to the instruction in 2.11.1.3 to record only the latest copyright date. The proposal was accepted, so that if a resource has multiple copyright dates, catalogers may record any that are considered important for identification.

Concerning proposals and discussion papers from other groups, reviews of current status and summaries of MLA's comments were given for: Revision to re-instate Format of Notated Music Statement (Musical Presentation Statement) (6JSC/IAML/1); EURIG Discussion Paper on Musical Arrangements (6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/1); Additions of the type of arrangement, medium of arrangement, and arranger surname to expression access points representing an arrangement (6JSC/EURIG/4); Changes to Core definition for Language of Expression and to add Optional additions to Language of Expression (6JSC/EURIG/3); Change to scope of Date of Expression and to add Optional additions describing the type of Date of Expression (6JSC/EURIG/2); Addition of examples to 6.12.1.3 (Other distinguishing characteristic of the expression) and 6.27.3 (Authorized Access Point Representing an Expression) (6JSC/EURIG/1); Treating Selections as a Work attribute (6JSC/LC/20); Change in treatment of consecutively numbered works and consecutively numbered parts for musical works (6.14.2.7.2, 6.14.2.8, and 6.28.2.3) (6JSC/CCC/7); Additions to Access Points Representing a Compilations of Musical Works (6.28.1.11) (6JSC/CCC/8); Additions to Recording Numeric Designations (6.16.1.3) (6JSC/CCC/9); Compilations in RDA Discussion Paper (6JSC/ACOC/5); Recording transmission speed (3.19.7.3) (6JSC/ACOC/6).

Iseminger noted that the February update to the RDA Toolkit has been delayed, but there is a good chance that our approved revisions will appear in April.

Snyder then reported on the JSC's newly appointed RDA Music Joint Working Group. The group was re-formed in September 2012 with three members from LC, three from CAML, and three from MLA. This means there will be a new process for revision proposals. Descriptive-Authorities will develop proposals assigned by the Working Group. Proposals will be submitted directly to JSC between April and August, rather than going through CC:DA for discussion at ALA Annual. JSC constituencies (including CC:DA) will review proposals and provide comments before the JSC meeting in early November 2013 in Washington, D.C.

The next agenda item concerned the possibility of BCC providing input on LC PCC Policy Statements. Kathy Glennan serves on the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, which is gatekeeper/developer of the Policy Statements. She pointed out that development of LC PCC PSs is an ongoing iterative process, and if there are music-specific things we're not happy with, we should come to the committee with proposed changes to text. There is no proposal cycle; most communication is by email. Glennan suggested that even if the long-term solution is to change RDA, a short-term solution would be a change to a PS, and she is willing to be a conduit in this process. It was noted that the Best Practices document might be a good place to look to for changes needed to Policy Statements.

Iseminger called attention to the RDA Music Implementation Task Force's first draft of *Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21*, noting that there is a comment page on the wiki, or that feedback could be emailed to the Task Force chair Casey Mullin.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30PM.

Submitted by
Damian Iseminger, chair, Authorities Subcommittee
Ray Schmidt, incoming chair, Authorities Subcommittee
Tracey Snyder, chair, Descriptive Subcommittee