Description: This presentation will look at where we've come from and where we might be headed in AV cataloging. Along the way various best practices guides issued by the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) and Music Library Association (MLA) will be examined.
A snapshot of today’s topic – where we’ve been, where we are, where we’re going!
“The long and winding road...”

Paul McCartney (credited as Lennon-McCartney)

The quotes are mostly inspired by my field trip to the Rock Hall of Fame 😊
How did we get here? Or, for some of us, a trip down memory lane 😊
Milestones

- 1960s MARC developed
- 1967 AACR published
- 1967 OCLC founded
- 1977 ISBD (NBM) issued
- 1978 AACR2 published
- 1998 FRBR Final Report issued
- 1998 AACR2R published
- 1999 MARC 21 created
- 2010 RDA released

For our purposes today, these are the relevant milestones
Previous to AACR, the prevailing standard was the 1949 ALA code; however, there were no rules for descriptive cataloging, only for entry and headings. That was remedied by LC’s *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress*, also published in 1949. The only non-book materials included there were maps, music, and microfilms. Supplementary rules were issued for other non-book materials.

AACR was issued in 1967 in American and British versions. AV materials were covered separately in part 3, which contained rules for description and entry. The rules were based on the 1949 Library of Congress rules and supplementary rules. Non-book materials covered here include maps, motion pictures & filmstrips, music, phonorecords, and pictures, designs & other 2-dimensional representations. It’s important to note that the rules in the 3 parts didn’t necessarily agree, and an appendix listing the differences appeared in each part. Apparently, the rules were not too popular, and seem to have been heavily criticized.
A new edition of AACR was published in 1978. This edition unified the American and British versions and provided a single set of rules applicable to all types of materials. The rules were aligned with ISBD. In this edition, emphasis on the “item in hand” emerged.

"Machine-readable" means that one particular type of machine, a computer, can read and interpret the data in the cataloging record. MARC was developed in the 1960s by computer scientist Henriette Avram. By 1971 MARC was the national standard for communicating bibliographical record data and was adopted internationally, though there were several variations in play. In 1999, the US, Canadian, and UNIMARC (used in Europe) versions were harmonized into “MARC 21” or “MARC for the 21st century”

Along with bibliographic record data, MARC now encompasses standards for authority, classification, community, and holdings data.

The MARC standards indicate how the record is structured for transmission and how the data in the record is encoded. MARC is a communication standard, not a content standard!
OCLC defines itself today as “nonprofit, membership, computer library service and research organization dedicated to the public purposes of furthering access to the world's information and reducing information costs” (“About OCLC” oclc.org). OCLC began in 1967 as a cooperative, computerized network for Ohio libraries. The hope was to streamline operations, control costs, and increase efficiency for cataloging (sound familiar?!). In 1978, libraries from other states were allowed to participate, and in 2002 participation was opened to libraries worldwide. Just last fall, OCLC printed its last catalog cards.

Today, OCLC has expanded beyond cataloging, providing services, software, research and advocacy for the information community.
ISBD, or International Standard Bibliographic Description, was a set of rules created by IFLA to provide an eye-readable, standard presentation of bibliographic data. The ideas was that any user would be able to instantly figure out the title and other pertinent details on a catalog card or record just by “reading” the prescribed punctuation and presentation, regardless of any language or script. A version of ISBD for non-book materials was published in 1977. A consolidated edition of ISBD was formally published in 2011.

ISBD consists of 9 areas of description, numbered 0-8. Each area contains multiple elements presented in a structured order. Separation between elements and areas is accomplished through prescribed punctuation. If any area of description doesn’t fit the resource in hand, it is omitted.
FRBR’s aim: to provide a framework for a clear understanding of what the bib record provides info about and the expectations of the record meeting user needs

Requirements based around user needs: FISO
FRBR uses an entity-relationship model; entities ("things"), attributes ("characteristics"), relationships (between entities/things)
FRAD entities: Names, Identifiers, Controlled Access Points (Works, Expressions, Persons-Families-Corporate Bodies)
Attributes examples: person has dates, places, field of activity, etc.
Relationships example: relationships between personal name/pseudonym; between persons/corporate bodies (e.g., band members/band)
Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)

- IFLA, 2010
- Conceptual model of FRBR Group 3 entities as related to “aboutness”
- Authority data
  - Entities – Attributes – Relationships
- User tasks
  - Find – Identify – Select – Explore

Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data was issued by IFLA in 2010. It provides a conceptual model of the FRBR Group 3 entities as related to “aboutness.” FRSAD covers authority data, and uses the same entity-attribute-relationship framework. FRSAD has a slightly different list of user tasks – adding “explore” and shedding “obtain.”
We’ll pause here for questions ...
Now that we’ve looked at the milestones in our past, we’ll take a look at where we are today.
RDA is a cataloging standard designed for use in the digital environment, based on international principles and models. RDA is a content standard (as was AACR2). Most of us are still using MARC21 as the presentation format.
Making the vision a reality was a lengthy process, as we can see from the timeline.
RDA is based around the user needs articulated in FRBR: FISO. RDA is a content standard (as was AACR2). Most of us are still using MARC21 as the presentation format.
To set some context, let’s look back at the vision for RDA, adapted from a presentation by Barbara Tillett, circa 2009:

RDA would be a new standard for resource description and access.

It would be a web-based tool, optimized for use as an online product.

RDA was envisioned to be consistent, flexible, extensible; compatible with international standards, models and principles; and of use beyond the library community.

RDA would be “format-agnostic” – meaning the instructions would be independent of resource or record presentation formats. There would be a single set of instructions applicable to all resources, rather than the format-based chapters of AACR2.

Finally, RDA would have an emphasis on individual data elements rather than creating strings of data.
Now we’ll consider the reality (which has a few “buts”)

We do indeed have a new standard, but unfortunately it’s difficult to reap the benefits while we are still in the MARC environment

We have individual data elements, which is good for special formats! Individual data elements are useful for machine manipulation and moving forward, for use as linked data.

The single set of instructions idea, though, didn’t really work – it was necessary to add in format-specific instructions. RDA did remain “format-agnostic” in the sense that no instructions are given for MARC or any other presentation format. From a practical standpoint, though, many catalogers feel that having to reconcile RDA with MARC21 is a giant frustration!

Hybrid records, are problematic in the sense that they look like RDA records, but aren’t really
One huge problem everyone (well, at least AV folks) noticed with RDA is the lack of practical, specific guidance for many aspects of special format materials. (And I will note that through regular revision, RDA is much better than it used to be! And to be fair, some of the issues are really MARC-related issues, not RDA, so these will presumably go away in time)

These examples show some typical special formats issues that would benefit from additional guidance (and I realize that not all of these are really RDA problems, but they are representative of problems catalogers encounter):

1. What exactly constitutes a cover for notated music?
2. Where or how is aspect ratio recorded?
3. What is streaming media and how should specific technical details be recorded?
4. How do I record information about the specific video game platform?
A practical solution has been the development of community-based best practice guides. These best practices are designed to be used in conjunction with the RDA instructions, in some cases, providing clarification and explanation, and in others, tackling issues that are not addressed in RDA.

The three examples from the previous slide have been addressed though these guides:

1. The MLA BP for cataloging music provide a description of a cover
2. The OLAC DVD/Blu-ray BP provide guidance on where to record aspect ratio
3. The OLAC Streaming media BP defines streaming media and gives guidance on recording those technical details, depending on whether the provider-neutral or provider-specific approach is desired
4. The OLAC video games BP recommends recording platform info as an edition statement.
Some general comments about the all of the guides...

Each of the RDA guides is designed to be compatible with existing RDA documentation, the LC-PCC Policy statements and PCC guidelines.

The organization of the content varies, though – the music, streaming media, & video games guides are arranged by RDA instruction but the DVD guide is a hybrid RDA/MARC arrangement.

All of the guides are “works in progress” as RDA evolves, and have maintenance/revision plans, generally linked to the RDA update schedule. For example, the Music BP have transitioned from the purview of the initial task force to the MLA Cataloging and Metadata Committee Content Standards Subcommittee. Revisions are made following each major RDA update.
We’ll pause here for questions ...
In this next section we’ll look at the guides issued by the Music Library Association.
Three guides have been issued.

- RDA
- Genre/Form (LCGFT)
- Medium of Performance (LCMPT)
Best Practices for Cataloging Music Using RDA and MARC21, version 1.5, was issued in April 2016. (Version 1.0 was originally issued in 2014)

Although the document was initially issued as a pdf, it is no longer offered in that format. The document is now only available in the RDA Toolkit (Tab: Resources). Individual BP also appear within the text of RDA. The supplements (the attributes of audio recording carriers chart, the former appendix covering recording parallel data using ISBD in MARC, and the complete MARC record examples) are available at the MLA CMC webpage, though this URL will be changing with the next update in August.

The current version is 1.3, issued in October 2015.
A bit of background:

A task group was formed in 2011 with the listed charge.

Look for the white and blue button to view the BP directly from the Toolkit text!
The guide covers musical scores, audio recordings, musical works and expressions. General cataloging topics (i.e., topics that apply to all formats) are out of scope.

Video recordings are sort of in – mostly for issues related to music.
Some of the general music topics covered include:

--Title information: what to consider “title proper” vs “other title information” and how to handle parallel title information

--Identifiers: There are several different identifiers beyond the basic ISBN (which is not as common as for other types of materials)

--There are lots of details to record! Some are expressed as notes, others as individual RDA elements

--Access points for musical works/expressions can be tricky, so there is guidance for that!
Some topics relating to notated music:

--Copyright dates are usually important because often there isn’t a publication date.

--Edition statements for notated music may not look like “traditional” edition statements – things like voice ranges and musical presentation (e.g., full score, study score, parts, etc.) are recorded here.

--Identifiers for notated music include plate numbers, publisher numbers, or the International Standard Music Number

--Sometimes there are multiple carriers than can be recorded either in a single or multiple statements of extent (the BP has left this to cataloger judgment)

--The type of notation (e.g., staff notation (most common), graphic notation, tablature, etc.) is now recorded. (Previously, staff notation was “assumed” unless the note said otherwise)
Likewise, there are topics related to audio recordings:

--Sorting out what should be recorded in the Statement of Responsibility, and what needs to be recorded elsewhere

--Audio recordings may have both phonogram and copyright dates – the phonogram date refers to the capture of the sound, and is preferred. Copyright date can refer to almost anything else!

--Identifiers may include the label number, UPC or EAN

--The BP guide offers an exhaustive chart for coding the technical details of a recording (available in the “Supplement” document)

--Compilations require additional considerations, like providing contents notes (compilations have other issues, too, which will be discussed this afternoon)
The next two guides we’ll look at aren’t directly related to RDA, but it’s important as we move out of LCSH for music materials.

The best practices guide for using LC Genre/Form terms was issued in June 2015.

The first URL leads to the document, and the second URL leads to a hierarchy view of the thesaurus.

[Graphic: map of heavy metal music genres]
This project began back in 2009 as a collaboration between the Library of Congress Policy and Standards Division and the MLA Bibliographic Control Committee.

567 terms were approved in Feb. 2015 – with more to come, eventually.

This guide was intended for the interim period between the initial release of the terms and publication of LC’s LCGFT manual; it is still in effect until the final publication of the music pages.
The thesaurus has a true thesaurus structure. There’s one top term (“music”); all other terms have at least one BT. Terms may belong to more than one hierarchy (e.g., “Songs” belongs to both “Art music” and “Folk music”)

The terms came chiefly from LCSH. Terms contain no medium of performance, are generally plural, and have the first letter capitalized.
The guide provides general guidance for the choice of terms – choose the most specific term and assign multiple terms if needed.

Notated music has terms assigned for the musical presentation format – such as “Score” or “Parts”

There isn’t an analogous hierarchy, though, for recorded music. There are some terms available (from one of LC’s previous projects), though, that can be used. In general, don’t just assign “sound recordings” to individual recordings, but do assign any specific terms that apply.
Guidance is also given for specific terms –

In bib records, genre/form terms are tagged 655, second indicator “7” with $2 lcgft to give the source of the term.
There are several things on the list to finish –

Not all possible terms are included; some terms conflict with literary terms or needed more research. There were some hierarchy problems to resolve and there were terms that the TF and LC just couldn’t agree on!

While technically not an outstanding issue with LCGFT, how to handle the retrospective conversion of legacy headings needs to be dealt with. Hopefully some of it will be handled via programmatic means!
This set of best practices covers medium of performance of terms and how to encode this information in MARC field 382. (Medium of performance = performing forces required to perform a piece of music)

This guide was first issued in April 2014 and revised in February 2016.

This project was also a collaboration between MLA and LC.

Over 800 terms were approved in Feb. 2014. The principal goal for these terms is access, but the terms may also be used for the RDA medium of performance element.

Terms are available from id.loc.gov, ClassWeb – but not from the LC or OCLC authority files...yet.
LCMPT is also a true thesaurus – but in this case there are three top terms: ensemble, performer, & visuals. Terms are generally singular and NOT capitalized.
Guidance is given about choice of term – again, choosing the most specific term appropriate with the caveat that LCMPT is much more granular than LCSH!

When recording medium of performance for ensembles, you may either record the array of individual instruments or use a less granular term. You may also do both! The choice will depend on your needs and judgment.
The terms are recorded in field 382. Guidance is given for the order of subfields, since the order is important. Information about alternative instrumentation and doubling instruments may be provided, as well as the numbers of performers and ensembles.
Talking about these last two guides begs the question – so what about LCSH?

Continue to assign LCSH for music as usual, but in addition, also assign LCGFT and LCMPT

Watch for further developments on programmatic changes

At some point, LC will cancel headings not applicable as topical subject headings.
We’ll pause again briefly, for questions...
Now we will look at the individual guides, providing a “sneak peek” into the contents (if you haven’t already encountered these documents) or a reminder of the contents...

We’ll start with the three guides issued by OLAC.
Three guides have been issued.

- Video Games
- Streaming Media
- DVD/Blu-ray Discs
A joint MLA/OLAC task force is working to update the existing Playaways cataloging guide for RDA. This guide will cover the “standard” Playaways plus some of their new products.

OLAC is planning future guides for disc-based resources, realia, and non-musical audio recordings. There’s also a need for document covering “older” video formats.

Both organizations are interested in input on future guides, so if you have suggestions they’d be happy to hear them!
The newest RDA BP guide is for Video Games, issued in June 2015.
A task force was formed in 2014 with the charge to produce an RDA guide for cataloging video games.

As a happy coincidence, the TF chair and one of the members was already involved in a grant-funded video games initiative. As a result, members of the Game Metadata and Citation Project (GAMECIP) provided valuable feedback on the document.
The guide covers both physical and online game formats. The guide does not cover subject or name headings, or classification.

Note that work continues by another CAPC task force on video game genre headings and also by a joint ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee-OLAC TF on preferred titles for games. (This joint subcommittee is dealing with games in the broadest sense – not just video games)
There is an introductory section that explains video game characteristics such as:

Platforms & formats
Editions & expansions
Locating Credits and Title information
Legacy MARC data

plus a bit about legacy MARC data. A list of resources is included at the end of the guide as are several full MARC record examples.
Some of the issues dealt with include:

Title – source of information and how to deal with “franchise” titles (a franchise title is a “general title or concept used for creating or marketing a series of products, typically films or television shows” [www.oxforddictionaries.com])

SOR – how to determine what to record, e.g., when you just have a logo and not a “real” statement

Edition – BP recommendation for recording the platform

Publication – using the P-N guidelines for online games

Series – not confusing a franchise title with a legitimate series
Identifiers – e.g., including some platform’s proprietary numbers

Extent – the difficulties here with “terms in common usage” (i.e., there aren’t any)

Color content – offers guidance on color content, for example, monochrome or simulated monochrome monitors; sometimes this is complicated, and may require a note to explain

Equipment/system requirement note – making sure to include platform and peripherals required
Guidance is also given for:

AAPs – note that games are usually collaborative works

Form of work – since there is not a widely accepted vocabulary for games, the recommendation is to use free text terms or terms from gaming sources.

Relationship designators – notably, game developer is missing from RDA, so work continues here to get some of these terms proposed

URL – a reminder not to include institution-specific URLs in shared cataloging
Finally, there are recommendations for recording relationships, both for P/F/CB associated with a resource, and between resources. Note that there currently is no relationship designator for game developer.
The streaming media guide was also issued in 2015 and provides a set of best practices for cataloging streaming media.

Both of the task forces tried to harmonize BP that might apply to both DVD/B-R and streaming media, but some slight differences remain.
The group had a similar charge as the DVD/Blu-ray group – to update an existing document for RDA and to provide examples.
A look at the table of contents: there is a nice introductory section that explains what streaming media is, the best practices, arranged in RDA order, a section dealing with special situations, sample records, resources and three appendices.
This guide covers both streaming audio and video, resources that are born digital, or created from an existing resource in another format.

Resources downloaded to tangible media and genre/form are out of scope.
The guide covers both audio and/or video issues plus information specific to streaming media:

--When to use single or separate records

--Clarification of the source of information to include an accompanying website as “part of the resource itself”

--The BP guide contains a handy list of file types and software players

--Options for recording technical details – e.g., use of provider-neutral or provider-specific approach.

--And finally, resources converted to streaming from different formats
BP for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs using RDA and MARC21, version 1.0 was issued in early 2015. The URL for the guide is given – but it also comes up easily with a Google search.

Version 1.1 is in the works...
The task force was formed in 2012 and was charged with updating the existing DVD/Blu-ray disc guide for use with RDA and to provide examples for cataloging.

This guide differs from some of the other guides in that it mixes the “how-to” approach of the previous AACR2 guide with the addition of best practices for RDA.
Contents

- DVD and Blu-ray Discs
- Resource Description & Access (RDA)
- Describing the Resource
- Recording Relationships
- Appendix: Recommended Description and Encoding of DVD/Blu-ray Attributes
- List of Resources
- Full MARC Record Examples

For those who haven’t seen the guide, this is the Table of Contents
The guide covers (obviously) DVD-Video, Blu-ray Discs, plus both description and access (the previous version only covered description).

DVD-ROM, older video formats, and genre/form are out of scope.

There are introductory sections on DVD/Blu-ray history and technology and RDA basics. Following the BP there is an appendix with recommended description and encoding of DVD/Blu-ray attributes, a list of resources, and full MARC record examples.
The next slides provide some examples of topics that are covered:

**Titles** – sorting out the various titles that may be present in the resource

**SOR** – deciding who is recorded in the SOR and who is recorded elsewhere in the record.

With the production/publication statement, one of the issues for moving images is that “production” means something totally different in RDA than it does for moving images. The guide points out that the publication statement should reflect the manifestation in hand, e.g., publication date is for disc in hand, not the original production or release date.

The BP also reminds of the distinction between publisher series and television series.
Recommendations are given for:

Technical details

Language and accessibility information

Recording information about the original production or release

Applying the collaborative works exception for moving images and the Policy Statement regarding preferred titles.
But first! Stay tuned for an update covering the April Toolkit release. There were several changes affecting moving image materials.

First of all, changes to the statement of responsibility:
• RDA elements 7.23 & 7.24 are deprecated, merged with 2.4
• Expanded RDA 2.17.3.5 allows continuation of current practice

Next, the end of the “Cascading Vortex of Horror” (also known as “Cascading Vortex of Doom”) since the “core if” status has been removed for Distributor, Manufacturer, and Copyright.
The instructions for Duration and Color content have been revised and some new relationship designators have been added to Appendix I.
We’ll pause again briefly, for questions...

(if time!)
Mini Break – Take 5!
Case Study: Applying the Best Practices
in honor of the upcoming release of Sharknado 4 (July 31, 2016), we’ll be using Sharknado 2 as our case study. Please note that this is not comprehensive, but just a look at selected elements and best practices!
RDA has an element called “mode of issuance” that describes how the resource is issued. This one happens to be a single unit.

The type of description refers to which part of the resource is being described. In this case, we want a comprehensive description, one that describes the resource as a whole.

These two play a part in determining the source of information to be used. For single unit resources using a comprehensive description, choose a source of information that describes the resource as a whole. If there are multiple works on the disc, and there’s a predominant work (e.g., a feature film vs special features), look for a source that identifies the predominant work. In this case, we have exactly that – a feature film and some special features.

(If there is no predominant work, look for a source that identifies any individual parts as a collective source of information (e.g., multiple disc labels))
For this resource we have four possible sources of information: the disc label, the title frames, a menu screen, and the container. All of them have a title – which one do we choose?
There is still a preferred source of information, just as there was a “chief source” in AACR2. Since moving image materials are generally identified by title, the preferred source is where we’re going to look first for the title describing the resource as a whole.

Note that RDA does offer the alternative to use the disc label as a preferred source (RDA 2.2.2.3). No BPR was made, though the text of this section implies use of the title frames as the preferred source.
The various types of titles are explained in the title introductory section of the BP.

The title proper should be given a conflict test to see if a preferred title is warranted.

- Is there a conflict with the title of another resource?
- Does the title differ from original release or issued with different titles?
- Are there dubbed versions?

A source of title note is given only if the title is taken from a source other than the preferred source (title frames).

(Title proper includes an alternative title, but does NOT include parallel title proper or other title information.)
One set of titles not covered in the BPs are franchise titles. A film franchise is a “film that is or has the potential to be part of a series and lends itself to merchandising.” (www.collinsdictionary.com)

Another thing to keep in mind: there is no longer a prohibition on using a colon within a title proper. For example, a franchise title followed by another title. I expect there to be more work on this issue as it has also come up with video games.
When it comes to determining responsibility, there are several possibilities, but one can’t just pick and choose. For example, a statement of responsibility relating to the title proper must be taken from the same source as the title proper, even if there is better information elsewhere.
The previous slide contained the credits that appeared at the very beginning of the movie. The rest of the opening credits do not appear until 11 minutes into the movie! Two of these representative credits are shown here with a list of the other credits given.
Part of the reason the closing credits are so lengthy – the great amount of cameo appearances 😊
The production credits are even longer!
Sometimes the credits are also printed on the container. I often use these as a “check” against the screened credits to make sure I’ve recorded things properly.
The prevailing practice for moving image materials is to include what we now describe as “work level” roles in the Statement of Responsibility. So, filmmaker (using the RDA definition), screenwriter, directors, producers, production company. Use cataloger’s judgment to determine the significance of their involvement. Contributors are recorded in a note; even though the elements for Performer and Artistic/Technical credits have been deprecated, they can be recorded in a note. The latest TK update codifies current practice which allows flexibility in what is recorded in the SOR and what is recorded elsewhere.
A list of the credits relating to the title proper. Note that SyFy is a presenter and broadcaster (expression, manifestation roles) – would fall under “catalogers judgment” where to include
Just a reminder that though these next two elements are now deprecated, their MARC note fields live on to provide information about contributors not given in the SOR.

Contributor roles noted here include actors, narrators and/or performers (MARC 511). Other artistic/technical credits are recorded in MARC 508.
Contributors like these would be recorded in a note.
IMDb: Asylum is both production company and distributor (i.e., publisher). Cinedigm is a content distributor for retail and digital platforms. Figuring out publisher – distributor is like putting puzzle pieces together!
Previously, there were “core if” conditions for distributor, manufacture and copyright but the April TK update has ended these conditions (and the lines of meaningless [...] statements)!

The first publisher name recorded is core and should be transcribed as found on the source. Sometimes this is easier said than done 😊 It can be tricky to determine if a name is a production company, subsidiary, distributor, etc. If in doubt about the function, treat the name as a publisher. If there are multiple names, record them in order.

The BP follows LC practice and prefers a supplied place & date rather than the “not identified” phrase.

Finally, record the copyright date if no publication date appears on the resource.
Dates! There is no publication date on the resource; IMDb gives a 2014 release date. There is a copyright date on the resource.

Bonus:
Type of date is “t” and not “s” because there is new content added
Although there is an alternative to use a term in common usage, the BP is not to do that for shared cataloging. (“What happens in your catalog, stays in your catalog”) Dimensions are a core element for LC/PCC and is encoded in MARC 300 $c and optionally, 340 $b.

RDA instructs that the diameter of the disc is given in centimeters, using the metric symbol “cm” (no period). There is an alternative to choose a different system of measurement; LC practice is to use inches (and the abbreviation “in.” from App. B). The BP follows suit.

A future BP will deal with the TK changes to color content. The current terms are “monochrome” and “polychrome,” etc.
The BP attempts to straddle theory with practice, and allows any term from the RDA list, a term formulated or based on RDA examples, or in accordance with the “another concise term” instruction to be coded with $2 rda. Predictably, this did generate some feedback, so stay tuned... (applies to 344 – Sound characteristic, 347 – Digital file characteristic)
Carrier Description

- Extent
  1 videodisc
- Sound content
  sound
- Color content
  color
- Dimensions
  4 3/4 in.

English – color – Dolby Digital 5.1
DVD video logo
Region 1 – NTSC – CC logo
Not Rated

Fairly self-explanatory
Carrier Description

- Sound characteristics
  - digital – optical
  - surround – Dolby digital

- Video characteristics
  - NTSC

- Digital file characteristics
  - video file
  - DVD video
  - Region 1

English – color – Dolby Digital 5.1
DVD video logo
Region 1 – NTSC – CC logo
Not Rated
A list of notes that would apply to this resource
Notes

© Statement of responsibility: performers
- Tara Reid, Ian Zierling, Vivica A. Fox, Mark McGrath, Kari Wuhrer

© Statement of responsibility: technical
- Production designer, Stephanie Barkley; costume designer, Kama Royz; art director, Randy Lee Hartwig; director of photography, Ben Demaree; music, Chris Ridenhour, Chris Cano; editors, Ana Florl, Vashi Nedomsny.

© History of the work
- Originally broadcast on SyFy in 2014.
Intended audience – the “warning” appears on the disc label (our preferred source)

Sadly, no awards 😞
Generally, record information about the spoken/sung/signed language of the content, written language associated with the content (e.g., subtitles, captions, intertitles), and language of accompanying material.

Optionally, record the original language of the primary content and any accompanying material.

In MARC, accessibility is recorded here (captions, subtitles, etc.)
Supplementary content beyond standard DVD/Blu-ray features should be noted. Optionally include advertisements, previews, or trailers.
There are no limits to the length or breadth of contents notes, unless “burdensome” (noted in the PS).

Provide a summary or synopsis of the content in a concise, neutral tone. Consult the OLAC Summary Notes for Catalog Records for additional guidance.

When summaries are quoted from sources, enclose with quotation marks and credit the source.
The BP recommends recording the ISBN plus any other identifiers that are present.
And Sharknado has LOTS of relationships!
Record as many relationships as possible
BP: Provide AAPs for additional creators beyond the core requirement
BP: Use Relationship Designators whenever possible; follow the PCC guidelines
We’ll pause here for questions ...
Where are We Going?

FRBR-LRM – BIBFRAME – Linked Data
“Follow the yellow brick road”

Herbert Stothard, Harold Arlen, Wizard of Oz
A draft of the FRBR-Library Reference Model was released for public comment earlier this year. Approval of the model is anticipated later this year. Many of the relevant points that follow are based on a presentation by Kathy Glennan at the recent BIBCO OpCo meeting.

This new model consolidates the FR family – FRBR, FRAD & FRSAD – into a single model for all aspects of bibliographic data. Work began on this model back in 2010. The model is heavily influenced by (and is compatible with) the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model (CIDOC = International Committee on Documentation, International Council of Museums) and FRBRoo (object-oriented FRBR).

FRBR-LRM is a very high-level model and it is focused on user tasks, not library operations (a point that provoked much comment in the public review period).
FRBR-LRM is a “high-level, conceptual model” that uses the entity-relationship framework. Only 11 entities are included. There are some new entities, like “res” – “any entity in the universe of discourse” and “nomen” – a designation by which an entity is known.

FRBR-LRM retains only 37 of the most significant attributes (attributes = description or characteristic of an entity)

The model identifies 34 general relationships, with various reciprocals, chains, and shortcuts (relationship = links two entities and provides context)

New concepts are introduced, such as “superclass” and “subclass” (the former includes the latter but not vice-versa)

Certain entities from the FR-family are deprecated: for example, in the FRBR Group 2 entities, family & corporate body are deprecated and now part of “collective agent”
The model uses generic terms and definitions applicable to all types of resources and all relevant entities.

FRBR-LRM excludes extremely specialized data elements, elements specific to certain types of resources, and administrative metadata that doesn’t support user tasks.

In the model, user tasks are really END-user tasks. The user tasks identified are familiar: F – I – S – O – E. The “contextualize” part of explore (FRSAD) has been deprecated, and of course “justify” no longer fits since the model is looking not considering *library staff* users!
It’s almost a given that FRBR-LRM (when adopted) will drive future RDA development. However, the current basic framework of entities – attributes – relationships will be retained. The “placeholder” chapters for FRBR Group 3 entities will be removed.

It’s likely that there will be expansion – to accommodate expansions of the model (as in a specialized application profile for a format) or at very least, for specialized attributes not in the model. Other structural changes to RDA may happen as well!
Shifting gears a bit, we’ll turn to RIMMF.

RIMMF, or “RDA in Many Metadata Formats” began development in 2011 by Deborah Fritz and Richard Fritz. At present it is only a visualization tool, not a production tool. It’s most important purpose is for experimentation – to see how RDA (and FRBR) concepts can be applied without restraint from MARC.

The developers suggest that RIMMF could be a prototype for a “future cataloging interface.” (RIMMF Help Guide – Intro)

This illustration, found in the RIMMF User Guide, shows how the various categories of attributes and relationships in the RDA Element Set View have been mapped to RIMMF.
The R-tree (or “relationship tree”) contains all relationship records – M/E/W/P-F-CB, etc. for a resource. WEM records are color-coded, which is nice! Clicking on any of the records brings up the record; the status bar contains buttons for other operations.
The Manifestation Record – RIMMF begins with the manifestation and then on to expression & work. Information that applies to other records is automatically populated.

The first column gives the RDA element label; the second the information pertaining to the resource, the third column provides the RDA rule number and the fourth column has a checkbox that applies the information to the AAP.

At the very bottom of the screen are buttons for the Work and Expression records (left) and the R-Tree (right)
And the remainder of the Manifestation Record
Here's a look at the Expression record, note the blue rim! There's a button to view the Work record; the Manifestation record can be opened from the “Manifestation of Expression” row or the R-Tree.
And finally, the Work record – note the green rim.
There are options to view the records in RDF and XML.
Before we move on, I wanted to very briefly view a related person record (again, note the color coding!). From the R-Tree, we know that this record is linked at the Work level.

RIMMF is a very cool tool, and it’s very easy to get distracted by it for long periods of time 😊
So RIMMF is great, but we need a production tool!

The Library of Congress announced the Bibliographic Framework Initiative in May 2011, and published a general plan in October of that year. LC contracted with Zepheira the following May and released a model document in November 2012. Development has continued since then, with the BIBFRAME 2.0 model and vocabulary released in April 2016.

The goal of BIBFRAME is to provide a foundation for the future of bibliographic description for the web and networked world, i.e., the “post-MARC” world

The initiative’s initial expectations were to be a replacement for MARC, be agnostic of content rules (e.g., RDA, DACS, CCO), and to provide description and management of all types of library resources (including digital resources). Another major anticipated outcome is to assist in preparation of a transition path away from MARC.

Cf Riley-Szeto MLA RDA & LD 2013 slides (in RDA fold(er) for LC BF background)
BIBFRAME 2.0 was released in April, 2016. This new version replaces the original model and vocabulary, now called BIBFRAME 1.0. The new model builds on the experiences of LC’s BIBFRAME Pilot project that we’ll look at in just a minute.

BF 2.0 is described as an “initiative to evolve bibliographic description standards to a linked data model, in order to make bibliographic information more useful both within and outside the library community.” BF 2.0 uses a LD model and RDF modeling practice, uniquely identifying entities, attributes and relationships between entities as web resources.

There are 3 core levels: Work, Instance, and Item. Note that this conflates Work and Expression. Some concepts related to these levels are identified, such as agents, subjects, and events (the latter, a nod to the AV world
The practical aspect of LC’s involvement in BF can be viewed through their BF Pilot project. Phase 1 of the project spanned Oct-Mar 2015-16 and involved 40 staff members working with all types of resources. Staff created data in both BF and MARC using the BF 1.0 editor. Phase 2 of the project won’t begin before October 2016. In the interim, the data from Phase 1 will be analyzed and documentation and training will be updated for the new BF 2.0 model, vocabulary, and editor.
LD can be thought of a part of the semantic web, also known as a “web of data” – data that is published and linked.

Linked Data is defined as a “set of best practices for publishing and connecting structured data on the web” (linkeddata.org)
LD uses URIs which identify entities or concepts, HTTP – which provides a way to retrieve resources or information, and RDF, which is a graph-based data model for description, which also includes relationships

Image credit: “A skim-read introduction to linked data”
http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/radiolabs/s5/linked-data/s5.html - cf slide 56,
RDF is a standard model for exchange of data on the web.

RDF structures relationships between resources, people, “things” on the web.

RDF uses a graph model to represent relationships.
The RDF data model has several components:

- **Triple statements** – think of this as “subject – predicate – object” (example: The slide title (subject) has the color (predicate) blue (object))
- **URIs** – character strings that provide identification of a resource
- **Ontologies & vocabularies** – these are ways to define concepts within a particular field of knowledge or study or to identify relationships between resources.
The RDF Generator is a nifty tool that will spit out triple statements from XML data. This table is a snippet that shows what the XML data from the Sharknado 2 record looks like as RDF triples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>892492305</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://schema.org/contributor">http://schema.org/contributor</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://schema.org/contributor">http://schema.org/contributor</a></td>
<td><a href="http://schema.org/work/data/20134390688/Perso">http://schema.org/work/data/20134390688/Perso</a> n/fernando_anthony_c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"When a category seven hurricane pummels New York, the surging flood waters bring thousands of sharks. To make matters worse, tornadoes soon dot the horizon. As Sharknadoes tear through the city, no vehicle, building, or national monument is safe." -Container:"
Before we wrap up, just a pointer to some LD projects (and this is very selective):

LD4L: Linked Data for Libraries; a project to “create a model that works both within individual institutions and through a coordinated, extensible network of Linked Open Data.” This was a grant-funded collaborative project between Cornell, Harvard, and Stanford. This project resulted in two more projects: LD4L Labs (helping libraries use linked data to improve the exchange and understanding of information about scholarly resources”) and LD4P. (The first URL points to the original project website; the second to a new gateway page for all the LD4 projects)

LD4P: Linked Data for Production; “LD4P is a collaboration between six institutions (Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Library of Congress, Princeton, and Stanford University) to begin the transition of technical services production workflows to ones based in Linked Open Data (LOD).” LD4P
BIBFLOW: a 2-year project at UC-Davis to investigate the future of academic library technical services operations in light of the semantic web and other emerging data exchange models such as BIBFRAME. One desired outcome of this project is a roadmap that other academic libraries can use for their own transitions.

Lest you think academic libraries are having all the fun, several public libraries are active in the Libhub initiative. This initiative hopes to use BIBFRAME and linked data to make library data more visible. Zepheira is a founding sponsor of the initiative.

Linked Jazz is a project at the Pratt Institute School of Library Information Science. The project mines the oral histories of jazz musicians for connections in their personal and professional networks. Subsequent phases of the project include crowdsourcing granular descriptions of the relationships and passing the data through visualization tools.
So, why *do* we want to get there, wherever that may be?

The biggest reason is to share our awesome library data! Using semantic web constructs and standards will help get our library data exposed and discoverable. The Denver PL has launched a linked data project to do just that.
Behind the scenes is the raw BIBFRAME data; a Google search yields results including library data!
Another reason: so we don’t have to re-invent the wheel – why not take advantage of the great work done by others?

I have no idea if there’s linked data behind this, but yesterday at the Rock and Roll HOF yesterday, I happened upon this kiosk where you could track influences on a particular artist. Lots of possibilities here!
And finally, make our own individual work more efficient by using batch processing and manipulation with services and apps. That way we can focus less on process and more on product!
What a long, strange trip it’s been ... and I’m looking forward to what is to come!!
Questions?

Thank you!
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