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How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 15 years → 1997

• Toronto conference: International Conference on the Principles & Future Development of AACR
• begins a massive revision process:
  2004 → AACR3
  2005 → RDA
• from revision into something quite different
• built on a theoretical foundation: FRBR and FRAD
How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 5 years  ➔  2007

• in the midst of work on developing RDA
• already thinking forward to implementation:
  ➔  statement about coordinated implementation
  “The British Library, Library and Archives Canada, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Australia have agreed on a coordinated implementation of RDA: Resource Description and Access.”
  – smooth transition – work together – coordinate decisions –

How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 4 years  ➔  2008

• working on the text of RDA
  o taking shape but still in the process of constituency reviews
  o reviews of chunks – nobody had seen “the whole RDA” yet
  o concept of “core elements” introduced
  o still defining RDA elements

• basic design for the Toolkit was completed – but still in the early stages of development

How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 3 years  ➔  2009

• text of RDA finalized
• RDA = a collection of static Word documents
• software for the Toolkit is designed
• work on putting RDA into software and completing the programming
How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 2 years → 2010

• RDA Toolkit is released on June 23rd, 2010

[Photo by American Library Association: Celebrating the launch of RDA and RDA Toolkit at ALA10]

How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 2 years → 2010

• open access to RDA Toolkit during summer of 2010
• US libraries begin a rigorous testing process:
  October to December 2010
  RDA records begin to appear in OCLC !!!
• the other author countries – Australia, Canada and Great Britain – delay implementation while the US completes its testing process

How far have we travelled?

Let’s go back 1 year → 2011

• results of the US testing are announced
  recommendation: US national libraries to implement if certain conditions are met
  implementation not before 2013
• some of the libraries who tested RDA decide to continue producing RDA records
**US test**

**2006-2007**
- Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control
  - final report: On the Record, January 9, 2008

**2008**
- the 3 U.S. national libraries – LC, NAL, and NLM – decide to test RDA and make a joint decision about implementation in the U.S
- 1st meeting of U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee

**2010-2011**
- testing from October to December, 2010
- analysis, report and recommendations, January to June, 2011

---

**U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee**

*Executive Summary, June 13, 2011*

- RDA should be part of the metadata infrastructure for the future
- before RDA is implemented, certain activities must be well underway
- to allow sufficient lead time for these actions to occur, implementation not prior to January 2013.

---

**U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee**

recommendations made in June 2011

- reword RDA
- define process for updating RDA
- improve Toolkit functionality
- add full record examples in MARC and other schema
- complete the registry of RDA element set + RDA vocabularies
- "credible progress towards a replacement for MARC"
- proper preparation for implementation
U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee

Recommendations made in June 2011

- Proper preparation for implementation
  - Training
  - Documentation
  - Ample notice of decisions about options, alternatives, etc.
  - Involvement of the expert communities of practitioners, for example, Program for Cooperative Cataloging
  - Involve and encourage vendors in thinking about a post-MARC environment, and designing databases that can take full advantage of RDA data

Progress

Program for Cooperative Cataloging
June 15, 2011
- PCC affirmed its support of the US national libraries’ decision to implement RDA, no sooner than January 2013

U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee
1st update, January 2012
- All recommendations either “on track” or “completed”

Progress

Library of Congress
Announcement on March 2nd, 2012
- Promising progress on Committee’s recommendations
- Target date for implementation: March 31, 2013
- Long-Range RDA Training Plan
Progress

Library of Congress
in the announcement on March 2nd, 2012:

- the other national libraries are also planning to target the 1st quarter of 2013 as their RDA implementation date:
  - National Library of Agriculture
  - National Library of Medicine
  - British Library
  - Library and Archives Canada
  - National Library of Australia
  - Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (mid 2013)

On the international scene

2005-2010
- comments on RDA drafts:
  - from libraries beyond Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States

2011 (began in 2009)
- formal launch of European RDA Interest Group (EURIG)
  - members from: Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the Vatican

On the international scene

Translation projects:

- German
- French
- Spanish

licensing for:
- Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Uruguay, Venezuela

expressions of interest from others
Test Committee Recommendations

Results of the U.S. test

Report and Recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee - May 2011

Recommendations for:
- Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
- ALA Publishing
- The American cataloging community, including PCC vendors

Test Committee Recommendations

• RDA:
  - reword RDA
  - appoint copy editor
  - improve readability but do not change intent of instructions
  - reduce ambiguity
  - 5 chapters to be completed by June 1st: 6, 9, 10, 11, 17

Test Committee Recommendations

• Define process for updating RDA:
  - RDA tad includes: RDA Update History
  - Revision history for each instruction:
    - Icon will show date of last revision
    - Click on icon and see previous text or all revisions
  - Fast track changes (minor corrections)
    - If new release, 2nd Tuesday of the month
  - Software upgrades: if new release, 2nd Tuesday of the month
  - Revision of RDA instructions: twice a year
Test Committee Recommendations

- improve Toolkit functionality
  - a lot was already in development, for example,
    - improved response time – long chapters load more quickly
    - improved TOC – fewer clicks to open RDA TOC
    - improved searching (thesaurus added with variants, plurals, etc)
    - order of results – option to sort results by document order
    - mapping to other metadata scheme – mapping to MODS added
      ... more coming

Test Committee Recommendations

- add full record examples in MARC and other schema –
  new updated full examples at JSC website
  more to be added -- in process

- complete the registry of RDA element set + RDA vocabularies
  - 1st group of controlled vocabularies published on Open Metadata Registry
    http://rdvocab.info/
Test Committee Recommendations

• a credible replacement for MARC:

  Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative
  http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/
  
  - general plan and define requirements
  - search for funding
  - broad accommodation of content rules and data models
  - provide for data that logically accompany or support bibliographic description
  - accommodate both textual data and linked data
  - consider needs of all types and sizes of libraries
  - support MARC until no longer needed
  - use the data we have in MARC

Similar considerations

RDA
  - data that can be encoded in different schemas and used in different database structures
  - accommodate both textual data and linked data
  - consider needs of all types and sizes of libraries
  - continuity with legacy data

Bibliographic framework
  - broad accommodation of content rules and data models
  - accommodate both textual data and linked data
  - consider needs of all types and sizes of libraries
  - use the data we have in MARC
Test Committee Recommendations

• proper preparation for implementation
  o training
    ○ Library of Congress leading the way:
      • all training resources accessible on the web
      • generous policy about re-use of their training modules
    ○ other organizations and institutions also stepping up
      for example, in the US:
      • ALCTS webinars
      • Program for Cooperative Cataloging
      • regional and state library associations
      • RDA Toolkit

Test Committee Recommendations

o documentation
Library of Congress:
  http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/
Program for Cooperative Cataloging: RDA and PCC
  http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html
MARC 21: RDA in MARC
  http://www.loc.gov/marc/
OCLC: policy statement
  http://www.oclc.org/rda/policy.htm

individual libraries: good examples
  North Carolina State University
  https://staff.lib.ncsu.edu/confluence/display/MNC/RDA
  University of Chicago
  http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/staffweb/depts/cat/rda.html

Test Committee Recommendations

o ample notice of decisions about options, alternatives, etc.
  Library of Congress leading the way:
  o policy statements: include decisions about options, use of alternatives, elements to record in addition to RDA core
  o LC has updated their policy statements – published in the Toolkit
  >>> other national libraries will also issue policy statements
  >>> essential information before training can begin, before training documentation can be finalized
Test Committee Recommendations

• proper preparation for implementation
  o involvement of the expert communities of practitioners, for example, Program for Cooperative Cataloging
  o LC working with external communities to ensure that all are aware of decisions and documentation that will need to be prepared or changed
  o for example, cooperation with associations of music librarians to prepare RDA revision proposals: RDA Music Revisions Facilitation Task Force
  o PCC will play a significant role in RDA implementation
    ▪ training for RDA authorities
    ▪ investigation of key issues during the transition

Test Committee Recommendations

• involve vendors: encourage them to think about a post MARC environment, and design databases that can take full advantage of RDA data
  The MARC of Quality (Deborah and Richard Fritz)
  o RIMMF: RDA in Many Metadata Formats
  o visualization tool
  o training tool
  o prototype of input software using the RDA element sets and relationships
  o designed around the structure of the RDA instructions in the RDA Toolkit

RIMMF

• helps one “to get used to thinking RDA”
  http://www.marcofquality.com/rimmf/doku.php
RIMMF

as a data entry prototype:
- RDA elements
- mirrors RDA's structure
- organized by the 11 FRBR bibliographic entities
- for each element, link to RDA instructions
- if controlled vocabulary – drop down list of terms
- enter as RDA data and save as MARC
- customizable
- option to have different views

*in development --- shows the possibilities*

Transition

• how do we implement RDA?
  - nature of transition
    - what will implementation be like?
    - how do we go through the transition?
  - training
  - preparations

Initial implementation

*important factors:*
• volume and importance of legacy data
• implementation in current catalogues and databases
• implementation in a MARC 21 environment

implementation in our current environment
Initial implementation

- still using MARC 21
- still creating bibliographic and authority records
- still transcribing titles and recording pagination, etc.
- some new fields
- some new instructions

BUT thinking about bibliographic information *differently*

bibliographic information as *data* and as *machine actionable data*

RDA: for now and for the future

**Initial implementation**
- designed to work in current catalogues
- data can be encoded using MARC 21
- co-exist with AACR2 records in the same databases

**Future implementation**
- ready to take advantage of new database structures
- data is independent of encoding
- function in the linked data environment of the semantic web
- visible in the web alongside other types of metadata

For initial implementation

**emphasis on continuity**
- RDA data in MARC 21
- in current catalogues
- a lot of resources to help the AACR2 cataloguer make the transition
Limitations of RDA in MARC

Two examples of limitations when using MARC 21 to encode RDA data:

• ambiguity of MARC data versus precision of RDA data
• cannot do justice to relationships

RDA precision

**RDA:** precise data elements
Each element is distinct and defined for one particular type of data

different element for each type of data

- illustrative content
- encoding format
- production method
- sound content
- applied material
- base material
- reduction ratio

AACR2 and MARC

**AACR2:** information embedded in "other physical details" (or a non-specific note)

- other physical details
- MARC 300 $b

- illustrative content
- encoding format
- production method
- sound content
- applied material
- base material
- reduction ratio
RDA controlled vocabulary

• controlled vocabulary recommended for many elements

encoding format

 DAISY, MP3, Access, XML, JPEG, TIFF, CAD, PDF, Blu-Ray, VCD

production method

 blueline, blueprint, engraving, etching, lithograph, photocopy, photoengraving, woodcut

base material

 Bristol board, canvas, cardboard, ceramic, glass, leather, paper, parchment, vellum

RDA in MARC

all currently map to MARC 300 $b

(\textit{and more})

illustrative content encoding format production method sound content applied material base material reduction ratio

\textit{day 1 implementation in MARC 21 environment – data will still be ambiguous}

Note: a lot of work has been done to add precision to MARC 21 (\textit{for example, 502, 264})

Relationships: ACR2 + MARC 21

\textit{for example}

ame of a person \textendash\textendash title of book

AACR2 + MARC 21

• type of relationship may be embedded in text of bibliographic description and/or

• bibliographic record contains the title and the authorized access point for the person
MARC wrapper

100 1  $a Leacock, Stephen, $d 1869-1944.
245 10 $a Sunshine sketches of a little town.
260  $a Toronto : $b McClelland & Stewart, $c 1931.

no relationships mentioned:
creator – work
work – expression – manifestation

infer relationships

Relationships: RDA + MARC 21

for example
name of a person ------- title of book

RDA + MARC 21
• type of relationship may be embedded in text of manifestation elements
and/or
• bibliographic record contains authorized access point for the person and title
• can use relationship designators to define relationship

RDA + MARC 21

bibliographic record

100 1  $a Leacock, Stephen, $d 1869-1944, $e author.
245 10 $a Sunshine sketches of a little town.
260  $a Toronto : $b McClelland & Stewart, $c 1931.

MARC record is for the manifestation
• no explicit statement of the relationship between the work “Sunshine sketches”, the original English expression and this manifestation of it
• relationships work manifested and expression manifested are implied
RDA + post MARC 21

for example

name of a person —— title of book

RDA + post MARC 21 record environment
• data about entities
• data about relationships
• no MARC record wrapper
• data about the resource holds together through the defined relationships

work — Sunshine sketches of a little town

realized by

Person — Stephen Leacock

autographer

date of birth — 1869
date of death — 1944
county — Canada
profession — author, professor
affiliation — McGill University

work — Afternoons in Utopia

editor

manifested by

manifestation — Sunshine sketches of a little town
Toronto : McClelland & Stewart, 1931

item — signed copy

manifested

spoken word

Full implementation in future

• RDA data accessible, visible and usable in the web environment
  — not tied to MARC encoding and MARC records
• encoding RDA data so that the granularity and precision of the data is preserved
  — to support machine actionable processing
• RDA data in databases that reflect the FRBR and FRAD conceptual models
  — better search, navigation and retrieval
  — better displays of data

Full implementation in future
How do we go through transition?

• is there a day 1?
• will there be a hybrid environment?
• preparing for transition
  o in your cataloging community
  o at your institution
  o different approaches to training
  o decisions required

Transition has already started

• proportion of RDA records is still small... but growing
• mixture of AACR and RDA records
  for example,
  OCLC
  Library of Congress catalogue
  individual library catalogues
• regardless of official dates, RDA has started to become part of our cataloguing environment

Is there a day 1?

Yes and No
1) day 1 is important for a sharing data environment:
   PCC: declares day 1 for contributing to NACO authorities
   LC: declares day 1 for its own cataloguing operations
2) some institutions never switched back after the test
3) each institution decides on day 1 for bibliographic data
March 31, 2013

- All new authority records contributed to LC/NACO authority file = RDA
- All records coded pcc = all RDA access points
- All records coded pcc whether:
  - RDA description
  - AACR2 description
- LC will have completed training all its cataloging staff
- All LC records will be RDA records

by March 31, 2013

- Rapid rise in number of RDA bibliographic records
- Changes in LC/NACO authority file
- Distinction between RDA acceptable and not acceptable
- Global changes in individual databases
  - Implications for authority work
  - Implications for copy cataloging

Hybrid environment

PCC identifies 3 possible hybrid environments:
1) Hybrid database or catalogue ✓
   - AACR and RDA records in one catalogue or database
2) Hybrid record ✓
   - AACR2 description and RDA access points
3) Hybrid access point ✗
   - XXX part of the access point according to AACR2 and part according to RDA
Hybrid environment

within one record — consistency of description

• do not mix transcription conventions  X
  * for example,
    » do not introduce abbreviations into RDA record
    » do not omit square brackets in AACR2 record if statement of responsibility not from chief source

• do not mix descriptive practices  X
  * for example, reproductions:
    • describe the original or describe the reproduction
    • do not mix LCRI 1.11 and RDA description

Hybrid environment

• global changes will add to hybrid environment
global change to access points
  * for example,
    remove O.T. from X30  $a Bible. $p O.T. $p Genesis
    $a Bible. $p Genesis

global change to replace gmds with 33X fields
  * for example, from $h [videorecording] to
    336  two dimensional moving image
    337  video
    338  videodisc

Preparing for transition

1. immediate
2. during 2012/2013
3. after March 31, 2013
Preparing for transition

1. Immediate need to train staff and develop policies:
   a) how to recognize RDA records
   b) how to handle RDA records

Recognizing RDA records

MARC 21 environment

Leader: position 18

descriptive cataloguing form

\[ a = \text{AACR2} \]

\[ i = \text{ISBD punctuation included} \]

\[ c = \text{ISBD punctuation omitted} \]

040: subfield e

description conventions

\$e \text{ rda}
Recognizing RDA records

MARC 21 environment

- presence of new fields, for example,
  - 336 content type $2 rdacontent
  - 337 media type $2 rdamedia
  - 338 carrier type $2 rdacarrier
  - 346 video characteristics $2 rda
  - 382 medium of performance

- use of relationship designators, for example,
  - subfield e or 4 in 1XX, 6XX, 7XX, 8XX

How to handle RDA records

1. Content issues
2. Technical issues

How to handle --- according to your environment:

- shared environment: union catalogues, etc
  for example, OCLC policy
  http://www.oclc.org/rda/policy.htm
- local catalogue only

How to handle RDA records: content

accept or reject?
- in a shared environment, may not have a choice
  for example, OCLC policy;
  - don’t change a record from RDA back to AACR2
  - don’t create duplicate records
- in local catalogue
  - are there technical limitations?
  - implications for export?
  - workflow implications
  - is anyone trained?
How to handle RDA records: content

• if add data, is it according to RDA?
  300 $a 84 unnumbered pages not [84] p.
  300 $b illustrations not ill.
  490 $v volume 5 as it appears on source

• not change what may look odd to an AACR2 eye:
  245 $a Milton and the Ends of Time
  250 $a Revised edition

• not remove data that is a core element in RDA:
  336 $a text $2 rdacontent

How to handle RDA records: content

• don’t move data
  for example, noun phrase
  245 $c dramatised adaptations by Barry Campbell.
  not back to AACR2
  245 $b dramatised adaptations / $c by Barry Campbell.

• accept relationship designators?
  100 $a Levy, David, $d 1954- $e author.
  700 $a Barth, Karl, $d 1886-1968, $e honouree.
  700 $i Parody of (work) $a Carroll, Lewis, $d 1832-1898.
  $t Alice's adventures in Wonderland.

How to handle RDA records: content

and knowing what to do with them

• need training and policies for copy cataloguing well before implementation
• train all for recognition
• if accept RDA records, train all or a few to make changes correctly:
  • consistency with the rest of the record
  • requires familiarity with core elements, transcription and some basic common differences
How to handle RDA records: technical

• latest MARC updates?
  - handled locally or by vendor?
    new fields
    new subfields
    new values in fixed fields

• new data
  - display now or later?
  - index now or later?

• import and export of records

Preparing for transition

2. 2012/2013
  a) become familiar with the decisions happening in your community
  b) who will guide implementation at your institution?
  c) plan for training
  d) develop a checklist of decisions that need to be made

a) your community

RDA “not just for libraries”
• elements used regularly in addition to RDA core
  options, alternatives

coordinated implementation
• libraries share records
• national libraries: aim to follow similar decisions about core “plus”, options, alternatives
• “library profile” – following the same policies
a) your community

**LC**
- policy statements
- training material and documentation
- primarily for the resources for which it is responsible

Other communities of experts step forward and prepare for RDA implementation

*For example*
- Program for Cooperative Cataloging task groups
- Music Library Association: RDA Music Implementation Task Force

---

**Program for Cooperative Cataloging**

[http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html)

- excellent documentation
- PCC interim guidelines before implementation
- task groups to prepare for implementation:
  1. Task Group on Decisions Needed
  2. Task Group on Hybrid Bibliographic Records
  3. Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Heading Categories

---

**Program for Cooperative Cataloging**

1. Task Group on Decisions Needed
   - decisions for BIBCO, CONSER and NACO
   - policy and practice decisions
     *For example:*
     - how will PCC record its policy decisions?
       - generally follow LCPS
       - develop its own policy statements
     - training requirements for PCC contributors
     - use of relationship designators

Task Group to Formulate or Recommend PCC/NACO RDA Policy on Authority Issues
Program for Cooperative Cataloging

2. Task Group on Hybrid Bibliographic Records
   • guides for enhancing and editing RDA records
   • premise: for both RDA and non-RDA bibliographic records
     • do not remove valid elements
     • do not engage in editing wars
     • do no harm
     • when in doubt, ask before editing
   RDA Post-Implementation Guidelines Task Group
   Hybrid Integrating Resources Task Group

3. Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Heading Categories
   • LC/NACO authority file
     • AACR2 1XX that are usable as-is “RDA acceptable”
       95.1% of AACR2 authority records
     • AACR2 1XX that need to be changed
       • change can be done as a “global change”
         2.1% of AACR2 authority records
       • authority record must be reviewed and upgraded
         2.8% of AACR2 authority records
   • for AACR2 1XX that need to be changed
     • flag so they are not used for a RDA access point:
       667 $a THIS HEADING CANNOT BE USED UNDER RDA UNTIL IT HAS BEEN UPDATED
       667 $a THIS HEADING CANNOT BE USED UNDER RDA UNTIL IT HAS BEEN REVIEWED INDIVIDUALLY
     • also generate 046 and 378 (when appropriate)
     • no more 7XX for RDA access points added to existing AACR2 authority records
Program for Cooperative Cataloging

3. Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Heading Categories
   • methodology for identifying and processing authority records
   • need for “day 1” for authority records
   • re-code AACR2 authority records that are acceptable under RDA as RDA authority records
     008 byte 10 from “c” to “z”
     040 $e rda
   • also add code for unacceptable authority records

Acceptable Headings Implementation Task Group

Program for Cooperative Cataloging

3. Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Heading Categories
   Acceptable Headings Implementation Task Group
   • respond to concerns in 3 phase approach re: re-issue of all authority records multiple re-issue of some authority records
   • propose alternative
     end result = same as original recommendation interim = less immediate clarity

Program for Cooperative Cataloging

• concrete steps towards implementation
• easier for all:
  - creating the conditions that make it easier for the rest of the cataloguing community to implement RDA
  - consistency for the community
  - prepared for:
    pre-transition (between test and day 1)
    transition at day 1
    post implementation guidelines
b) implementation at your library

basic mechanics:
  ○ determine day 1 for bibliographic records
  ○ who needs to be trained?
    those who create or edit data
    those who use the data
  ○ separate training streams
    or same training for all?
  ○ who will train?
  ○ when will training take place?

>>> decisions for each institution

b) implementation at your library

• resources:
  ○ access to RDA
  ○ time for training
  ○ training budget

• keep decision-makers informed

c) different approaches to training

different learning styles

• US RDA Test Committee recommends offering at least 3 different ways to offer training
  ○ webinars
  ○ self-guided study using prepared documentation
  ○ self-guided learning using the Toolkit
  ○ classroom
  ○ train the trainer
  ○ online course
c) different approaches to training

different ways to approach the content of RDA:
• RDA Toolkit
  RDA: the text
  RDA element set view
  RDA mappings
  RDA entity-relationship diagrams (ERD)
  shared workflows
• RDA in print (text or element set)

Training

• narrow focus is easier
  - checklist of changes in MARC field order
  - ok for quick start but ignores the bigger picture
  - as a library community, we have to get beyond limitations of “AACR” and “MARC” thinking
  - some people will never want to know more:
    “Teach me just what I need to do my job!”
• broader focus ➔ deeper understanding ➔ motivation to change

Step 1: familiarization

• implement more than a check list of changes
• implement a new way of thinking about data
  • grasp a bit of the underlying framework so changes will make sense
  • understand why it’s worth the extra effort

“it’s not just what we see at day 1 of implementation”
Step 1: familiarization

before training

• getting comfortable with RDA vocabulary
• knowing of FRBR and FRAD’s existence
• getting used to RDA as a content standard
• based on principles
• seeing the user tasks as our frame of reference
• awareness that there’s a long-range view with long-range benefits

Why worry about RDA vocabulary ...

• user tasks
• entities – attributes – relationships
• meaning and scope of the 11 bibliographic entities

work
expression
manifestation
item

person
family
concept
body
object
event
place

• preferred title for the work, authorized access points, description of carriers

Using documentation

• vocabulary in the training modules
• vocabulary in cheat sheets and workflows
• vocabulary that is in the RDA instructions

  identifying manifestations
  describing carriers
  choosing a preferred name
  constructing authorized access points to represent works and expressions
User friendly: less abbreviations

AACR2
Description: [37] p. : col. ill. ; 28 cm.

RDA
Description: 37 unnumbered pages : color illustrations ; 28 cm


Instructions linked to principles

Common misunderstanding:
“no abbreviations in RDA”

RDA record $??$
250 $a 1st American ed.

transcription $\leftrightarrow$ principle of representation

“data describing a resource should reflect the resource’s representation of itself”

take what you see

transcribe the data: do not introduce abbreviations

if abbreviation on source – ok

How to remember?

AACR2
245 00 $a Cross-cultural psychology : $b research and applications / $c John W. Berry ... [et al.].
250 $a 3rd ed.
300 $a xxii, 626 p. ; $c 25 cm.
700 1 $a Berry, John W.
How to remember?

**RDA:** no more: ... [et al.]

statement of responsibility names more than one person,

*>>> record all*

*optional omission:* record first named and summarize the omission

access points for first named *core* or all or cataloger judgment or institutional policy

---

**Sample record (abbreviated)**

RDA: record all authors; access points for all authors; define relationships with designators

100 1 $a Berry, John W., $e author.

245 10 $a Cross-cultural psychology : $b research and applications / $c John W. Berry, Ype H. Poortinga, Seger M. Breugelmans, Athanasios Chasiotiis, David L. Sam.

250 $a Third edition.


300 $a xxii, 626 pages ; $c 25 cm

700 1 $a Poortinga, Ype H., $d 1939- $e author.

700 1 $a Breugelmans, Seger M., $e author.

700 1 $a Chasiotiis, Athanasios, $e author.

700 1 $a Sam, David L., $e author.

---

**Sample record (abbreviated)**

RDA: optional omission (2.4.1.5): more than three, omit and summarize

*core relationship = access point for first-named*

100 1 $a Berry, John W.

245 10 $a Cross-cultural psychology : $b research and applications / $c John W. Berry [and four others].

250 $a Third edition.


300 $a xxii, 626 pages ; $c 25 cm
Basic concepts, basic decisions

1. principle of representation: “take what you see”
2. more information for the user so the user can identify the resource
3. optional omission — continuity with past practice but more precision than in the past

yes, there are many options but institutions will make decisions and will follow them consistently

How to remember?

AAA R2
- Aesop’s fables. Polyglot.

RDA
- Aesop’s fables. Greek
- Aesop’s fables. Latin
- Aesop’s fables. English
- Aesop’s fables. German

AAA R2
- Aesop’s fables. English & German

RDA
- Aesop’s fables. English
- Aesop’s fables. German

Example of basic RDA concepts

- precise data elements
- data elements for an automated environment
  bibliographic information as data
  also
- RDA core element:
  identify and record this primary relationship –
  >>> identify works and expressions embodied in the manifestation
  “Polyglot”
  use of “&” in an access point
donot support identification of content
A little bit of theory can’t hurt

cataloger judgment
conceptual framework = basis for cataloger judgment

RDA 0.4 Objectives and Principles Governing Resource Description and Access
• first objective = responsiveness to user needs
• record data that is important
• it is important because of how it is used
• use is operationalized as “user tasks”

Resource discovery = user tasks

Bibliographic data
• find
• identify
• select
• obtain

Authority data
• find
• identify
• clarify
• understand

Why record the data? To help user achieve these tasks.

Definition of importance

• record data if it is considered important for ...
for example, from 3.7 Applied material

Record the applied material used in the resource if it is considered important for identification or selection ...

cataloger judgment – based on fundamental FRBR concepts
LC Training plan

LC Core curriculum:

1. FRBR must be the first training component
2. Module 1: Background and Structure of RDA

Start with concepts and background

then move to specific instructions

then practice

LC curriculum (March 2012)

FRBR
Using the RDA Toolkit

RDA Instructions:

Module 1: Background and structure of RDA
Module 2: Attributes of Manifestations, Items, Works and Expressions
Module 3: Persons, Families and Corporate Bodies
Module 4: Relationships
Module 5: Preparing for Day 1


LC curriculum (March 2012)

FRBR ✓
Using the RDA Toolkit

RDA Instructions:

Module 1: Background and structure of RDA ✓
Module 2: Attributes of Manifestations, Items, Works and Expressions ✓
Module 3: Persons, Families and Corporate Bodies
Module 4: Relationships
Module 5: Preparing for Day 1 ✓

Georga Public Library Cataloging Summit (August 2011)

• 2 day workshop organized by LC
http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/Georgia_training_aug_2011.html
FRBR
Looking to the Future with RDA

RDA Instructions:
Module 1: Background and structure of RDA
Module 2-5: Manifestations, Items, Works and Expressions
Persons, Families and Corporate Bodies
Relationships
Module 6: Preparing for RDA
Module 7: Top twelve things to remember

As a trainer ...

LC's Top twelve things to remember
1. user needs – user tasks
2. “Take what you see”
3. element-based description
4. work, expression, manifestation, item
5. core and core if
6. alternatives, optional additions, optional omissions
7. fewer abbreviations
8. relationships, relationships, relationships
As a trainer ...

LC’s Top twelve things to remember
9. content, media and carrier types
10. no more “rule of three”
11. expanded sources of information
12. identifying elements (attributes and relationships) as building blocks for future systems

module 7 at http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/Georgia_training_aug_2011.html

A little bit of theory can’t hurt
checklist = good working document ... but
explain background
link changes to RDA principles and concepts
initial implementation is not the destination
new way of thinking about our bibliographic data
groundwork for the future
start thinking post March 31st, 2013

d) decisions

• RDA defines as a core element set = base
  ◦ national libraries -- “core plus” set
    for example,
    LCPS 3.2 media type is core for LC
  ◦ communities of practice
    PCC – OLAC – MLA – RBMS
  ◦ individual libraries may develop their own “core plus”
    for example,
    extensive collection of prints and paintings:
    make applied material part of library’s “core plus”
d) decisions

• RDA has many options and alternatives
  » follow LCPS (LC policy statements)
  » make different local decisions
    - library resources
    - digital repository
    - archives

• RDA records in the local catalogue
  » display new data fields
  » index new data fields
  » content, media and carrier types

• will RDA implementation have an impact on –
  • local policies and procedures
    for example, description of microform reproductions
  • local workflows
    for example, copy cataloging of RDA records?
  • authority control in the library's catalogue

Are we ready?

less than a year away ...

time to get ready!

• understand the major differences
• get familiar with the new vocabulary
• don’t forget the big picture
• stay informed
• start planning locally: training
decisions impact
Ready to implement?

questions and comments?

contact info: chris.oliver@mcgill.ca