

## **Amy's Summary Notes from trip to ALA, Washington D.C., June 2007**

### **1) ALCTS/CCS Update Forum on Bibliographic Control**

This presentation was an update on the activities of the LC Future of Bibliographic Control Working Group, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> in a series of public forums on this topic. Panelists: Jose Marie Griffiths, Sally Smith, Diane Casey, Greta de Groat, Michael Norman. Griffiths explained that the LC Future... Working Group was formed in large part to address the bibliographic control problem since many LC catalogers were retiring, because cataloging and acquisitions units were combined in a large restructuring of LC staff in 2004, and because of the series authority decision. The Working Group is made up of representatives from 9 libraries, 3 information service organizations, and 3 at-large members and will provide a report to LC so it can make further decisions. The committee's final report is due in November, and a draft for public comment will be available in late September/early October. Written testimony can be submitted to the committee and will be considered as a part of the process until July 15. The 3 meetings of the committee were 1) Users and Uses; 2) Structures and Standards; 3) Economics. The final meeting (dealing with economics) will be webcast. The final report will be available at <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future>

### **3) ALCTS Informing the Future of MARC: An Empirical Approach**

This was a presentation of the project I was involved with at UNT. Findings were presented of the research done on 56 million MARC records from OCLC WorldCat. Sally McCallum, Chief of LC's MARC Dev. Office, also presented and stated that the future of MARC is likely in MARCXML, and will most likely be viewed more as a carrier of information (communications format) rather than as a content standard. Some streamlining will occur, maybe as a result of this project or other projects like it.

### **4) ALCTS Technical Services "Small-Medium Heads" of Cataloging [Heads of Tech Services of Small-Medium sized research libraries]: Towards RDA Online in 2009**

Marjorie Bloss, chair of the JSC for the revision of RDA, began this forum by giving an overview of the environment in which RDA is being released, why RDA is being developed ("as a means of creating more efficient and more universally-compatible data, more efficient workflows, and more harvestable data" and also because we have more schemas, communities, and it could be possible to incorporate all of this into one content standard). RDA is an international venture (involving others countries). It will have 2 parts, Description and Relationships. RDA chapters will be organized by data element (title, edition, etc.) rather than by format of material. RDA separates the issues of content, encoding, and display, and focuses on content. It makes ISBD optional. It will indicate mandatory, mandatory if applicable, and optional data elements. It will emphasize cataloger's judgement. RDA will provide a mapping to MARC. It will probably 1<sup>st</sup> be issued as an online product (committee is still evaluating vendors) with the capability of customized views of the document and the capability to set up different workflow-type environments (it will still also be searchable and viewable in a sequential fashion); print version will also be offered. Timeframe for release of RDA: early 2009.

How to prepare for RDA: 1) Get familiar with FRBR, since it is the basis of Pt. 2 of RDA. 2) Review RDA drafts. 3) Keep up with comments on RDA-L. 4) Get familiar with possible modes of implementation at [www.rdaonline.org](http://www.rdaonline.org) 5) Compare RDA drafts with AACR2. 6) Come up with a plan for transition and share it on RDA-L. 7) Let ILS vendors know about

RDA and ask them what they are planning for implementation. 8) Talk to RDA Implementation Task Force (being formed, will also evaluate training methods, etc.) about ideas for implementation. Bottom line: RDA is coming, whether we like it or not. VTLS and OCLC are 2 vendors which have been doing mock-ups of what records will look like with FRBR hierarchies. BL, NLC, LC, and NLA are all embracing RDA and are planning to adopt. LC will have RDA “orientation” rather than “training”, and will not re-create LCRI’s – they will be “adapted” for RDA. RDA records should be compatible with AACR2 records.

#### **6) ALCTS/CCS RDA Update Forum**

More in-depth information on RDA. Speakers: Beecher Wiggins, LC, Dianne Hillmann, John Attig (ALA Rep. to the JSC), Marjorie Bloss (Chair of JSC).

Beecher Wiggins: LC will be implementing RDA when it comes out in 2009, though not immediately. They will be training folks as soon as they can.

Marjorie Bloss (see earlier RDA session – basically said same thing)

John Attig: Emphasized that RDA is designed for the digital environment which includes digital objects, with resulting records in digital environment. RDA is a “metadata scheme, an application profile, and a content standard”. It is a set of data elements based on FRBR and FRAD, designed primarily for use in libraries. Highlighted several main differences between AACR2 and RDA: 1) Changes in ways languages, scripts, numbers, and dates are represented 2) Use of persistent identifiers in records 3) Mode of issuance as a concept 4) Provenance is made more important 5) Alternative title no longer part of title proper 6) Publisher, etc. “not identified” 7) Relationships among works (FRBR) will be emphasized 8) Greater emphasis on access point control 9) Title will be main access point for treaties 10) New chapter for family names 11) Removing Christian bias in access point for Bible: name of book will directly follow Bible rather than subdividing by O.T. or N.T. 12) Rule of 3 abandoned – primary access point will be first-named creator rather than title 13) Compiler will be primary access point for an aggregate work 14) Changes to RDA may come about from recent decisions of IFLA on uniform titles, that access point for a work should be an indispensable element (uniform title?), and that the uniform title should be based first on the title “commonly known in the language and script of the catalog” 15) Basis for preferred titles 16) Use of abbreviations is limited

Diane Hillmann – talked about Data Model meeting at British Library in Apr./May 2007, which examined the fit between RDA and models used in other metadata communities.

#### **5) ALCTS/CCS – New Developments in Form/Genre Access: Where we are, where we are heading, and where we want to be**

Three presenters, all members of SAC Subcommittee on Form/Genre Headings: Robert Maxwell (BYU), Adam Schiff (Univ. of Wash.), and Geraldine Strove (LC CPSO chief)

Maxwell: talked about the relationship of form/genre to FRBR. Identified problems of converting 150 authorities to 155 authorities. BYU has created entirely separate authority records for its 655 terms.

Schiff: What Univ. of Washington does in their Innovative Interfaces OPAC with form/genre headings (not the WorldCat Local Beta test catalog). They have a 655 index separate from the 650 and then also a combined 650/655 index. They have separate labels 650 is “LC Subject” and 655 is “Genre”. Also, they indexed all \$v terms in the 655 index as Genres. They do allow terms from other thesauri in their 655 index, and get authority records for GSAFD and AAT from Backstage Library works. They had to modify authority records (LCSH and others) to

make the cross-references work in the catalog. For copy with genre headings, the higher-level cataloging staff handle the records (e.g. they go to the problem shelf).

Ostrove: Talked about LC's "X55 Initiative", e.g. the implementation of the creation of authority records for Form/Genre headings. Updates are being posted on the CPSO website (click on Subject Headings link). So far they have only been tagging some 150 headings with a 952 field stating "consider for future genre/form". At some point they will begin the process of adding these new authority records. In my opinion, it sounds like they will be more selective about which 650s will actually get 655 authority records than I had previously thought. I hope this doesn't adversely affect all the libraries who, like us, have been tagging anything that "is" rather than "about" something as a 655, and for those libraries who have created 655 records locally.

### **9) ALCTS/CCS – Authority Control Meets Faceted Browse**

Basically this session discussed the problems and challenges associated with implementing a faceted browsing system (e.g. the categories that you drill down through, like in Amazon, Yahoo, etc.) in a library environment with authority control. Several libraries have implemented this, primarily those using the Endeca engine with their ILS. The subject headings have to be split (subdivisions removed and separately indexed) to accomplish this, which causes confusion sometimes. If USG ever implemented Primo (which Vanderbilt University has done), we would have this capability here in our catalog and it would be a project to get it to work.

### **7) OCLC Update Breakfast**

OCLC was ranked 86/100 Best Places to Work in IT (ComputerWorld)  
50 million records from RLG were added/merged in WorldCat (40 matched, 7.8 added)  
85 million records in WorldCat  
42% of WorldCat records are non-English materials  
Acquisitions: Blackwell is joining WorldCat Selection Service  
Connexion Client: OCLC Terminologies Service is new, Automatic metadata generation for MP3 files (2.0)  
Serials: eSerials Holdings service is new; no additional charge to OCLC member libraries  
Resource Sharing: 95% of ILL requests filled by 3<sup>rd</sup> lender in list  
WC Collection Analysis will soon include comparison to FRBR model for collections  
ContentDM collections will soon be integrated into WorldCat.org and WorldCat through First Search  
379 libraries are using WorldCat Local as their OPAC (pilot program)  
Reclamation project – Send in your library's database and OCLC will make sure your holdings are correct – your record comes back with the OCLC number in it (free service to OCLC member libraries – call SOLINET rep)

### **8) Connexion Users Group Meeting –**

Differences between RLG model (with institution records) and OCLC master record model was explained. Progress process of loading these records was explained. With Client 2.0, we will be able to search and view Institution Records. These are linked to the master records. Unless we pay for an IR subscription, we will not be able to edit or add IRs. We will not notice them at all if we set up the new Client not to search the IR indexes (I have screenshots on what this will look like).

Client 2.00 new features: IRs, compatible with XP and Vista, Icons on one or two rows, Menus are different: there will be more sub-menus (the menus were getting to long, so they re-organized them), Z39.50 access to ILS, Export records in Dublin Core qualified (XML), Non-Latin scripts enhancement, new OCLC-supplied macros including one for *Guided entry of 007 field*, and macro to generate 034 based on data in the 255 field, update of MARC tags (nothing we would use I don't think).

WorldCat Selection service (Acquisitions) was discussed. Right now they have partnered with several vendors including Harrassowitz and Blackwells.

eSerials Holdings – Free service for all OCLC cataloging members

OCLC Terminologies Service – something we could use – I have instructions on how we can do this using the Client (we'd only use it for GSAFD headings, but it might save some time).

### **11) Making Mass Digitization Work for Libraries Through WorldCat –**

OCLC staff member described the eSerials program and the eContent program and how they worked. The eContent program is working to synchronize WorldCat with mass digitization programs in libraries. The University of Michigan and Microsoft Live Search Books are each participating in a Pilot of this program. The service will be free to libraries that are doing mass digitization (really digitization on any scale) – anything being digitized will automatically get a master record in WorldCat (one for the digital item, and another for the print item if it does not already exist in WorldCat).

**2) Hollywood Librarian premiere** – a documentary film about librarians and the future of the library. Contained clips of stereotypical librarians from the movies interspersed with “real life” librarians and issues in libraries. Very good film. Only downside was that the filmmaker asked the audience (of about 2,000 librarians) to show the film in their libraries and charge \$8.00 admission for adults, which I thought was contradictory to the message of the film (libraries as places where folks can get access to resources for free as a basic service) and not the best method of getting people to view the film.

**10) I heard Robert F. Kennedy Jr. speak about his views on the environment and his political views.**