

Summary of IAML 2007 Cataloguing Commission Sessions

Session 1, 3rd July: RDA, DCMI and METS

Cataloguing Commission chair Antony Gordon introduced the session, and warned participants that time limits would have to be strictly observed, as the ABC was moving into the Music Workshop promptly at 3:30 to set up for the evening's concert.

Part 1. *Hitting the right note: composing and arranging RDA* (Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair of the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR, and National Library of Australia, Canberra; and Kay McIntyre, National Library of Australia, Canberra)

This paper outlined the progress towards publication of RDA. The main points:

Why a new standard?

A brief history of AACR was given, from 1967 to the 2005 updates, followed by mention of the JSC "Toronto Conference" in 1997 at which fundamental rule revisions were discussed and recommended. See <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/stratplan.html> for the Strategic Plan. The underlying purpose of the revisions was described as a need for stronger conceptual footings for the rules, namely FRBR (*Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*) for bibliographic records, and FRAD (*Functional Requirements for Authority Data*) for authority records: principles published under the auspices of IFLA.

Where does it fit?

A major difference from AACR is that the content of RDA will be purely resourcedata, not ISBD display or coding elements. (Mapping of RDA elements to ISBD, MARC 21, Dublin Core will be covered in appendices). It is designed for the digital world, and will itself be a web product. An early prototype is demonstrated at <http://www.rdaonline.org>

Outline of structure

"Part A—Description" is equivalent to AACR part 1, but differently organized. As an example, the GMD for music is to be replaced with elements for media and carrier types (Chapter 3) and content type (Chapter 4). The influence of FRBR can be seen in the way Chapter 6 instructs us to create access points associated with the "work" and "expression", while Chapter 7 (Related Resources) treats relationships.

The forthcoming "Part B—Access Point Control" is like AACR part 2, but based on FRAD. There may be a Part C, or an Appendix, to cover elements that are "data about data" such as notes specifying source used for description.

Who's developing RDA?

The Committee of Principals includes members from Australia, Canada, the UK and the US. An outline was given of the JSC structure and its constituencies.

RDA timeline

A revised timeline was presented: March 2007 to September 2008 (review of revised chapters 3, 6-7, then part B, then the complete draft of RDA); December 2008 should see the draft become the final document, ready for release in 2009.

Preparing for RDA

Decisions will have to be made about how much to implement, how much training to give, etc. Libraries should learn about RDA, FRBR and FRAD, and read the Frequently Asked Questions on the RDA website (<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rda.html>). The Australian Committee on Cataloguing also has a website with information about RDA (<http://www.nla.gov.au/lis/stdnrds/grps/acoc/>).

Part 2. DCMI: Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (Andrew Wilson, Dublin Core Usage Board)

Andrew Wilson gave a brief history of Dublin Core: how it started, what it is intended for, how it works, and how it is managed.

Short history

DC could be said to have “started in a corridor” in 1994 at a Chicago conference, when a group arranged a meeting in 1995 to tackle worries about the size of the web, and the consequent and growing difficulty of “discoverability” and searching. This was held in Dublin (Ohio), hence the name “Dublin Core”. There have been 14 meetings to date; the 15th is coming up in August 2007 in Singapore. DC is an ongoing activity, alive and well.

What it is

Initially DC had 15 “elements”—13 at the first conference plus two more added at the subsequent two meetings. These are terms for resource description (title, creator, publisher, language, etc.). To these have been added the so-called “Canberra qualifiers”: additional sub-elements. DC has a flat structure, with every element optional and repeatable, and with no prescribed order.

Standardization

DC is established as ANSI/NISO Z39.85-2001; ISO 15836:2003; and in Australia as AS5044, in an expanded version known as AGLS (Australian Government Locator Service).

Evolution

It has continued to evolve, to the point where there are now more than 50 defined “properties” (not just “elements” any more) referred to as DC metadata terms. As of late last year there is a single namespace within which these are defined. DC is not just about describing web resources, but rather *any* resource.

Abstract model

The DCMI “Abstract Model” was issued as a DCMI recommendation in 2005. This is a conceptual model of “description sets”; the key idea is, these are to be applied to one resource at a time. (A diagram showing the model summary was shown). A side effect of developing the model was that certain DC inconsistencies were revealed, which could be adjusted.

DCMI management

OCLC is an essential supporter. From other institutions the work is done mostly by volunteers. The work structure was described from the bottom level up: committees, Task Groups, Affiliates (who pay more and are represented on the board), the Advisory Board, Usage Board, Directorate (two people) and Board of Trustees.

Future work

More “application profiles” are to be developed. These profiles are a way of putting together metadata properties from DC and other metadata standards, to suit particular communities. For example, there was a meeting at the British Library earlier this year (April 30-May 1) to develop an application profile for RDA.

Further information is available at <http://dublincore.org/>.

Part 3. *Musical METS: an introduction and case study* (Scott Yeadon, Australian National University, Canberra)

Scott Yeadon covered a great deal of ground in a short space of time. He explained that METS stands for “Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard”. This is a schema: a self-describing way of packaging digital objects. METS is standard XML, and a brief description was given of XML followed by an actual example of MusicXML.

Next came a description of METS major structures: element and header, administrative metadata, descriptive metadata, file references, etc., with an illustrative example. “METS Profiles” were defined as “profiles intended to describe a class of METS documents”. An analogy was made with the rules for describing a musical form like a sonata. The APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories) and their recent and planned developments were mentioned in the context of METS profiles.

Why use METS? It is useful because it is based on open standards, and has international support. It can be used to describe and provide access to digital objects and collections. Like any XML document, software can interpret and render METS mark-up in various ways according to context and purpose. To illustrate, an example was demonstrated of a CD collection marked up in METS, showing the hierarchy of elements, structure, etc.

At the conclusion there were two questions from the floor. The first had to do with a particular detail of the METS mark-up just shown—whether the individual movements of a sonata ought to be subordinate in the hierarchy to the sonata itself—which he replied could have been done either way.

A more general question concerning the whole session was “Why is all this happening? [i.e. RDA, DC, METS] How will cataloguers get on top of it all?” There were several answers: first a reassurance that METS is not something most cataloguers would have to contend with, then an explanation that “Web 2.0” developments showed there was a movement in the world towards interchange and sharing of information. These new developments and standards are intended to make information more share-able and find-able.

Further questions and discussion had to be cut short in order that the session could finish promptly at 3:30.

Session 2, 6th July: New Catalogue, New Rules, But How Well Does Your System Perform? (Chair: Antony Gordon)

Part 1: *Conversion and addition of early printed music and autograph letters to BN-Opale Plus* (Sébastien Gaudelus, BnF Département de la Musique, Paris)

The PowerPoint accompanying M. Gaudelus’ paper was entitled “The new musical references in BN-Opale Plus: progress on data conversions: early printed music, handwritten letters, etc.” M. Gaudelus explained that BN-Opale Plus is the single online catalogue of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, which since January 2006 provides access to the entire online database. He summarized previous and recently completed data conversions from printed and/or paper records: French music bibliography 1946-1982, sheet music catalogue, early printed music in Parisian public libraries, and handwritten letters. Thanks to the

conversion, online access is now available by added entries, publishers, plate numbers, and thematic catalogue numbers for selected composers.

In converting from the printed catalogue, data has been “decoded” and expanded: e.g. abbreviations for journals are spelled out, and each single dashed-on record for multiple editions of the same title has been converted to individual electronic records for each edition. Information about copies held outside the BNF has been retained in notes. For the “Handwritten letters LA collection” the record conversion was not based on the printed catalogue but rather on the older handwritten catalogue which contains more detailed information. Each letter has its own record. Conversion of the “Handwritten letters NLA collection” records was based on the card catalogue, as it was for the “Letters to Nadia Boulanger.” Thus the whole MS letter collection held by the music department is now in the online catalogue.

Conversion of the music department’s *author* and *anonymous author* catalogue has just begun. There are 621 drawers containing 867,614 cards which, when converted, will represent about 600,000 records. There are difficulties: many of the cards are old and not always fully legible; over time different cataloguing rules and styles of handwriting have been employed; there are non-Latin characters on some (Cyrillic, Hebrew, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese will be retained, others will be romanized); and some records are very long, covering as many as 50 cards. The conversion is planned as a five year project, 2006-2011. Currently the supplier, Jouve, has digitized all the original cards. A new project will begin in 2008, for early printed and manuscript music held outside Paris, comprising 30 different catalogues. The records will be added to the CCFr (Le Catalogue collectif de France) in 2009. This is a national database at <http://www.ccf.fr/portailccfr/servlet/LoginServlet>

There were several questions from the floor:

Is Jouve using OCR or “human” means to convert the digitized cards to electronic records? The initial transcription is “human”, followed by an automated formatting process.

What is the cost? The whole process cost more than €1 million.

How is it possible to turn single dashed-on records representing many editions into separate records? The same title information from the original single record is simply repeated for each new record.

Did you consider using existing electronic records from other libraries? No—the BNF cards contain much bibliographic and copy information not to be found in other records.

What are you doing about authority control? Elementary authorities are created along with the new electronic records; authority clean-up will follow.

Part 2: New cataloguing rules in Italy: music is the prima donna! (Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Ufficio Ricerca Fondi Musicali, Milan)

Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi began by describing the updating of cataloguing rules as a work in progress, and provided a “framework”: a brief history of various Italian rules and MARC formats from 1975-2004. The “RICA Commission” began working in 1997 to revise the cataloguing rules, supplemented in 2004 by a working group for music. At the same time a new central catalogue was set up along with a new MARC format, SBNMARC, based on UNIMARC. The central database has something like 8 million titles, 50,000 items, with

contributions representing books and special materials including music from 800 participating libraries.

The RICA Commission is basing the new rules on FRBR, more or less (emphasis on entities and relationships) but also pays attention to tradition (e.g. the old “rule of three” principles for added entries). It considers the practical application of the rules in relation to special materials. In particular, uniform titles are constantly used. The Working Group on Music has reformulated uniform titles for music based on an analysis of AACR2, AFNOR, RAK (Musik) [i.e. English, French and German rules]. A pre-publication draft is already online [see link at <http://www.iccu.sbn.it/genera.jsp?id=344>]. Some examples were shown to illustrate the principles (e.g. very few abbreviations, hierarchy of parts of works), the punctuation, etc.

Another innovation concerning music: rewritten rules for music manuscripts. The general principles were summarized (models, punctuation etc. based on an ISBD-like scheme) followed by an outline of the Description Framework.

In conclusion, we were told there were issues connected with the new rules arising from FRBR, and from the various responsibilities of the RICA Commission. These have been mentioned in a recent article in *Fontes Artis Musicae*. A parting thought: could an official ISBD for music manuscripts be possible—i.e. ISBD (MM)?

Questions: *Will much training be required for these new rules?* No, because libraries are already using them, more or less. *Doesn't the idea of a new ISBD (MM) go against the principle of the consolidated ISBD?* New rules for music manuscripts could be added to the consolidated ISBD. *Are you [i.e. the RICA Commission and the Working Group on Music] watching RDA, and considering how the rules compare?* We are in contact with RDA through IFLA, so yes, we are aware of RDA.

Part 3: System “swap shop”.

Antony Gordon introduced this as a self-steering event, to allow those present to compare their local systems, discuss what works and what doesn't, compare notes, and so on. Before the meeting he had heard from several Cataloguing Commission members, and noted that there several users of Endeavour Voyager, plus a couple using Ex LibrisAleph. One other ILS mentioned was Evergreen, an open-source system.

Libraries Australia had something purpose built, and in fact the National Library of Australia, which uses Voyager, is considering adopting the LibrariesAustralia system for the NLA online catalogue because of its greater flexibility. This trend is echoed in Sweden, where the [National Library?] system is Voyager, but where they built their own public interface. In Finland, libraries use Voyager but are not happy with it; they find it too American in some ways, and have problems displaying the Scandinavian character set properly. However, it was pointed out that the Library of Congress Voyager system *does* display these characters, so it should be possible to do the same in Finland.

Antony Gordon suggested the Commission should compile a list of questions we should ask vendors, in the hope of improving systems. Sample questions should be sent to him by e-mail. A member suggested there was an article [*N.B. so far unidentified—possibly connected with MLA's “Automation Requirements for Music Materials”?*] by Lenore Coral that would be a good point of departure.

There was a suggestion that we submit presentations for a future occasion about how our various systems handle different things, for example uniform titles.

It was mentioned that in Italy the central institute catalogue is based on open source programs, and uses things like simple Java applications to exchange and upload information, so there was no need for local libraries to buy large commercial applications.

The discussion turned to authority records:

- a member expressed gratitude to the BNF for making authorities available right away
- it was observed that our work would be easier if local systems were better designed so that exchanging authority records was simpler
- the Deutsche Bibliothek name authorities can be obtained via the library website
- in Switzerland, which has many Aleph libraries, they all refer to the LC authority file
- at the National Library of Australia, the problem is in actually importing the authority records; the result is the authorized headings are searched for and used in bib records, but authorities are not created or locally loaded

(notes by Alastair Boyd, for Joseph Haffner, Cataloguing Commission Secretary)