

ALA Midwinter Meeting 2014
Report from the Online Audiovisual Catalogers
Cataloging Policy Committee (OLAC-CAPC)
and the LITA/ALCTS CaMMS Authority Control Interest Group Meeting (ACIG)
Submitted by Ray Schmidt, Chair, Authorities Subcommittee, MLA BCC

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS CATALOGING POLICY
COMMITTEE**

OLAC Movie & Video Credit Annotation Experiment

Kelley McGrath put out a call for contributors to the OLAC Movie & Video Credit Annotation Experiment (see <http://olac-annotator.org>). The ultimate goal is to teach a computer how to identify entities in statements of responsibility and credits notes and match them to authorized forms of names.

CC:DA and MAC Reports

For detailed reports from CC:DA and the MARC Advisory Committee, please see the reports from the MLA liaisons to those committees.

OCLC report (Jay Weitz)

The pilot project for merging duplicate records in WorldCat has begun. OCLC is working with the University of California-San Diego, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, and University of Washington, through May 2014, to explore the best ways of extending to the Enhance Program and the Expert Community the capability of merging duplicate bibliographic records. The focus of this project is currently on books.

A thorough, word-by-word updating of *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* continues. The bottom of the page has a “Last Revised” date for fields that have been changed. The revision process does not currently include chapters 1-5.

Connexion client 2.50 is available for download; upgrading to this version will be required by March 31, 2014. Enhancements include: support of Armenian, Ethiopian, and Syriac scripts; a new RDA authority workform for Name-Title; new authority indexes Cataloging Source, Descriptive Conventions, Keyword, and Notes available in dropdown lists; improvements to macros, including the GenerateAuthorityRecord macro.

Roy Tennant, OCLC Program Officer, has created a “MARC Usage in WorldCat” website, which has diagrams that present statistics about the use of MARC fields and subfields in WorldCat. See <http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/marcusage.html>.

Audiovisual Materials Glossary Update Task Force (Heidi Frank)

About 400 terms to be added to the glossary are under review. New terms should appear in the live version of the glossary at <http://olacinc.org/avglossary/> later in the year.

Additional reports

Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG). OLAC is in need of a new liaison to MOUG.

Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) Liaison (Thelma Ross). AMIA is working on a revised edition of *AMIA Compendium of Moving Image Cataloging Practice*. OLAC-CAPC will collaborate by serving as an information distribution point.

NACO-AV Funnel (Peter Lisius). Lisius, who is the new NACO-AV Funnel Coordinator as of July 1, 2013, is doing a lot of housecleaning, reconciling lists of contributors that appear on various websites, determining the status of previous contributors, tracking who needs training, etc. OLAC statistics appear on the PCC website. Short-term goals include increasing the number of reviewers; a long-term goal is to develop a Best Practices document for creating NACO-AV name authority records, following the work of the NACO Music Project.

RDA Revision Proposals Task Force (Stacie Traill). The Task Force has been inactive since ALA Annual 2013, as most issues are resolved. The OLAC Board will announce whether or not the Task Force should continue.

DVD/Blu-Ray Disc RDA Guide Task Force. The guide is being recast as a Best Practices document, rather than a “how to catalog a DVD” manual, with the recognition that RDA practice is evolving. New sections have been drafted, and the goal is to have a draft ready in the next few months, to be finalized in time for ALA Annual 2014.

Streaming Media/Video RDA Guide Task Force. Several sections of this guide have been drafted and discussed, but no consensus has been reached on a provider neutral policy. Completion of the guide is targeted for ALA Annual 2014.

New business

The chair solicited ideas for future RDA guides. Possibilities include: CD/DVD-ROMS, video games, batch-loading e-resource records, and playaways.

With two new CAPC guides coming out this year the question was raised whether these and other guides need to have a consistent approach in their presentation and style. The membership agreed that this is desirable, and that one way to do this is to format the guides along the lines of cataloging workflow.

The chair asked for opinions on what the meeting requirements should be for a full CAPC member. Options for “virtual “ attendance were considered.

LITA/ALCTS CaMMS AUTHORITY CONTROL INTEREST GROUP

Library of Congress Update (Janis Young, Library of Congress, Policy and Standards Division)

Young spoke about two significant vocabulary developments, the LC Medium of Performance Terms for Music (LCMPT) and LC Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT). For details on these vocabularies, please see the report from the MLA liaison to the ALA Subject Analysis Committee.

In addition to Young's presentation, her written report to ACIG included the following items: 1) A new phase of the BIBFRAME Initiative has begun, involving test implementation by organizations in the community, scheduled to last a year; 2) Guidelines for resolution of undifferentiated name authority records were issued in *Descriptive cataloging Manual Z1*, Update 1, 2014 in February. LC and PCC catalogers will no longer create new undifferentiated name authority records, nor will they add names to existing undifferentiated name records; 3) The July 2013 *RDA Toolkit* release contained 83 updates to LC-PCC PSs; and 4) New ALA-LC Romanization Tables have been approved for Tamashek, New Macedonian, Rusyn, and Serbian.

BIBFRAME Authorities: A High-Level Overview (Kevin Ford, Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office)

Ford gave a basic introduction to the Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME), the point of which is to reimagine and implement a post-MARC bibliographic environment. There are four core classes in BIBFRAME: Work, Instance, Annotation, and Authority. Authority is a resource reflecting key authority concepts that have defined relationships in Works and Instances. Specific Authority types have been defined in the BIBFRAME model: person, organization, family, meeting, jurisdiction, place, topic, and temporal concept.

BIBFRAME Authorities are not designed to replace name or subject authority records, but rather to function as an intermediary (a "light-weight abstraction layer") between a Work or Instance and a defined or authorized library authority. An example is:

```
<http://example.org/authorities/1>a bf:Person; bf:authorizedAccessPoint"Schulz, Charles M. (Charles Monroe), 1922-2000."; bf:has Authority  
<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79021850>.
```

BIBFRAME Authorities are locally extensible—and "locally" can be defined as a single institution, a consortium, etc. So, for example, name variants can be added, as well as links to kinds of information not traditionally stored in a name authority record, such as an abstract of a work or an image of an author.

The pre-coordination aspect of LCSH poses a challenge for BIBFRAME Authority because ordering is inherently difficult in RDF, so the decision has been made to link to or generate a MADS/RDF resource for a concept.

Current work includes development of editor, i.e. an interface for creating a BIBFRAME Authority.

Authority Control in a Non-MARC Environment (Philip Scheuer, Stanford University)

Scheuer began with a statement of the problem: in the current environment, authority control is done through MARC records in an integrated library system (ILS); at the same time, metadata records for digital repositories are created that are non-MARC (e.g. MODS) and not represented in the ILS; records for the digital repository don't go through same authority verification process as MARC records in the ILS; thus, even if a MODS record for a digitized book is originally drawn from the MARC record for its print counterpart, it is not maintained in the same way, and there can be a disconnect over time between the ILS and digital repository records.

Rather than continuing to maintain two databases of record, one for print and one for digital assets, Scheuer raises the question of whether the digital repository can replace the ILS as a single database of record?

Scheuer then spoke about the work of a PCC task group, chaired by Stephen Hearn, on the creation and function of name authorities in a non-MARC environment. The charge was to “think broadly and practically about identities (personal, corporate and family) in both an RDA and a linked data environment and how they function within it“ and to “identify the key changes that are needed to current authority record systems, structures, and guidelines to support the new environment.”

The task group report was issued in April 2013, and concluded with six challenges primarily relating to identity metadata outside the LC/NACO Authority File. PCC is seeking community input on how deal with these challenges.

Scheuer described three non-MARC authority projects at Stanford:

For the McLaughlin Map Collection of digitized 16th- to 18th-century maps, metadata records were created in MODS for the digital repository, and name headings in these records were linked to id.loc.gov, which enables updates to the headings.

The Stanford Authority File is being used to support a program called Community Action Profiles. These profiles are being developed for all faculty, staff, and graduate students, and are a record of their personas and publications. The planned focus will be on creating separate identities for linked data purposes rather than using text strings and creating name authority records for these individuals, most of whom are journal authors that tend not to be established in large national authority hubs. To share these identities with a broader community, one approach might be to develop a system of data exchange between local records and VIAF. Another possibility would be to register the Stanford names with ISNI through an institutional subscription, so that each name would have an international identifier.

In the context of the BIBFRAME Authorities light-weight abstraction layer, Stanford is using a new service provided by Backstage Library Works. As part of their regular authorities processing, links are added to id.loc.gov, VIAF, ISNI, and ORCID in 9xx fields in authority records, and these links are then loaded into Stanford's triple store.

Concerning the future of authorities, Scheuer listed four themes: 1) the move toward linked data will enable authority work to be done in a single unified environment; 2) the "database of record" problem will need to be resolved; 3) authority work will utilize linked identities, not text strings; and 4) the focus will no longer be on a single monolithic name authority file, but rather on a linked system of authority files with more dynamic interaction.

Enhancing Authority Records to Aid Copyright Review (Judith Ahronheim, University of Michigan)

HathiTrust is a collaborative repository of nearly 11 million digital files contributed by 77 institutions, including the University of Michigan. Many of the materials scanned and stored in the repository are still protected by copyright, and it is a challenge to sort out which may be viewed and which have to be kept in dark archives. Since 2008, the University of Michigan and several partners have been identifying works that were published in the U.S. that are in the public domain. As a result, 142,614 U.S. books published between 1923-1963 have been made freely available online.

Copyright review is done using a combination of bibliographic data and examination of the scanned works for publication date and location. U.S. monographs with a pre-1923 date in the fixed field of the bibliographic record are made available programmatically; those with dates 1923-1963 are reviewed by copyright evaluators in the Copyright Management System (CRMS). The nationality of the author is also relevant, because foreign authors writing in the U.S. retain the rights of their native country. For works published in most English-language speaking countries, the longest period of copyright protection is up to 70 years past the author's death.

Many European libraries have already been adding nationality information in authority records, and it can now be added to NACO records in MARC field 370 \$c. Ahronheim explained how this information is used in the CRMS, greatly increasing the efficiency and accuracy of the copyright review process. Death dates in the MARC field 1xx \$d also aid the determination of copyright status for non-U.S. authors. With RDA, death date may now be recorded in MARC 046 \$g as well, whether or not it is given in the 1xx \$d. Ahronheim urged catalogers to add death dates and nationality to authority records.