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RDA Coffee Klatch
Sevim’s presentation from panel session, “Look before you leap: taking RDA for a test drive”: Bushman, Delsey, Espley
Margaret’s presentation from “Look before you leap” plus all-day pre-conference
Info and links at: https://intra.lms.kent.edu/page/15039

Testing RDA / Barbara Bushman
Assistant Head, Cataloging Section, National Library of Medicine

RDA Timeline Background
May 1, 2008 Joint Statement from LC, NAL, NLM
- Agreed to make joint decision on implementation of RDA based on a test of both the content and the online tool
- Since then, RDA Test Steering Committee formed
  - Representatives from LC, NAL, NLM,
- OCLC
  - ensure that changes required by RDA are implemented by OCLC prior to the test
- ILS Vendors
  - Meeting during ALA July 2009: discussion topics include changes needed in current ILS systems, future system development needed

Current Timeline (U.S.)
- January – March 2010
  - Preparatory period, preliminary use of RDA
- April – June 2010
  - Formal testing
- July – September 2010
  - Formal Assessment
- October 2010
  - Final report shared with U.S. library community

Current Timeline (US)
Widespread implementation begins after final report comes out
So (Sevim surmises) October 2010 – [2011]
International Timeline
Philosophy, "We already decided to go with RDA, so skip the testing, let's get going!"
Once RDA online tool ready to roll, international implementation will begin
So (Sevim surmises): Jan 2010 or soon after

Who’s testing?
• 23 selected
  • Diverse group of institutions – (but primarily National, Academic, and Special)
    • Size
    • Type of organization
    • OPAC and cataloging systems used
    • Areas of specialization in cataloging and collection development
    • System developers

Who’s testing? U.S. National Libraries (3)
• Library of Congress
• National Agricultural Library
• National Library of Medicine

Who’s testing? Academic Libraries (10)
• Brigham Young University
• University of North Dakota
• Columbia University
• Emory University
• North Carolina State University
• The Ohio State University
• Stanford University
• George Washington University

Who’s testing? Consortia/Groups (3)
• College Center for Library Automation (Florida)
• GSLIS Group
  • Dominican University, University of Milwaukee-Wisconsin, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
• Music Library Association/Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. (MLA/OLAC)

Testing on these OPACs
• Web Voyager
• Symphony
• Millennium
• Aleph
• Unicorn
• Oxygen
• Endeca
• Aquabrowser
• IBistro
• WorldCat Local
• Blacklight
• TLC ITS for Windows, BiblioFile
Testing Methodology

- Testing will last six months
  - First three months a training period
  - Records created in the second three months
- Core set of 25 resources
  - Will include textual monographs, AV materials, serials, and integrating resources
  - Each institution will create both an RDA record and a record using their current rules
  - Different staff members will create the RDA record and the record using the current rules

RDA, FRBR, and FRAD

- FRBR Terminology and Concepts
- Why we need FRBR
- FRAD Terminology and Concepts
- FRBR and FRAD as implemented in RDA

FRBR – Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
FRAD – Functional Requirements for Authority Data
RDA – Resource Description and Access

FRBR Terminology and Concepts

- What FRBR is not
- What FRBR is
- The entity-relationship model

What FRBR is not

- A data model
- A metadata scheme
- A systems model
- A content standard

What FRBR is

- Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)
- A conceptual model
- An abstract depiction of the universe of things being described
- An entity-relationship model
FRBR’s Entity-Relationship Model
- Entity = a general category of data
- Relationships = An association between two or more entities

One Entity  \(\rightarrow\) Relationship \(\rightarrow\) Another Entity

FRBR’s Entity-Relationship Model
- Person \(\rightarrow\) Work
  - Created by Shakespeare \(\rightarrow\) Work Hamlet

FRBR Entities
- Group 1 – Products of intellectual or artistic endeavor
  - Work
  - Expression
  - Manifestation
  - Item

FRBR Entities
- Group 2 – Responsible for content, production, or custodianship of Group 1 entities
  - Person
  - Corporate body
- Group 3 – May serve as subjects of Group 1 entities
  - Group 1 and 2 entities
  - Concept
  - Object
  - Place
  - Event

Group 1
- Work
  - Is realized through
  - Expression
    - Is embodied in
      - Manifestation
        - Is exemplified by
          - Item

Intellectual/ artistic content
- Manifestation
  - Is realized through
    - Expression
      - Is embodied in
        - Item
  - Is exemplified by
    - Item
Works

- Abstract concept
- "Distinct intellectual or artistic creation"
- Cannot point to a single concrete example

J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone:*
the book as it was in the author’s head!

Note that a film version of this title is a different (but related) work.

Expressions

- A realization of a work in some concrete form: alphanumeric, musical notation, sound, image, objects, etc.
- Examples of different expressions include revisions, abridgements, translations, and arrangements of musical works

A French translation of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone* is a new expression.

Manifestations

- A physical embodiment of an expression
- Manifestations are what we typically catalog
- Changes to physical form or format with no changes to intellectual or artistic content result in new manifestations: paper to microform, different publishers, etc.

Items

- A single example of a manifestation
- Examples of variations among items include damaged copies, bound copies, autographed copies, etc.

Why Do we Need FRBR?

- Improve the user experience in locating information
- Guide systems designs for the future
- Guide rule makers
- Cut costs for the description and access to resources in our libraries
- Position information providers to better operate in the Internet environment and beyond

FRBR Benefits

- Collocation
  - Better organization to catalog
  - More options to display
    - Identifying elements
    - Pathways
- Simplify cataloging
  - enabling links and re-use of identifying elements
What is FRAD?

- FRAD – Functional Requirements for Authority Data
- A product of the FRANAR Working Group
- IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records

FRAD – the Publication

- Published for IFLA by K.G. Saur
- June 2009
- IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control, vol. 34
- ISBN 978-3-598-24282-3
- Available later on IFLANET

FRAD Goals & Objectives

- Goal
  - To extend the FRBR model to authority data
- Objectives
  - To provide an understanding of how authority data functions currently
  - To clarify the underlying concepts to provide a basis for refining and improving on current practice in the future

FRAD – The Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRBR +</th>
<th>New in FRAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Body</td>
<td>Controlled Access Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept, Object, Event, Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRBR and FRAD as Implemented in RDA

- RDA Design Objectives
  - Consistent, flexible, and extensible framework for the description of all types of resources and all types of content
- Compatible with internationally established principles, models, and standards
- Adaptable to the needs of a wide range of resource description communities
Foundation of RDA
- Based on the FRBR and FRAD models
- Collaborators and consulted communities include:
  - Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA
  - Dublin Core and other semantic web communities
  - Library of Congress Network Development and MARC Standards Office
  - IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloging Code
  - The Publishing Community (ONIX)

RDA
- New cataloging standard to replace AACR2 in 2009.
- This new standard provides guidelines for cataloging digital resources
- This new standard has a stronger emphasis on helping users find, identify, select and obtain the information they want.
- RDA also supports the clustering of bibliographic records to show the relationships between the works and their creators.

RDA in MARC
- RDA is fully compatible with MARC21, which will continue to be used as a data transmission and storage standard.
- MARC21 has had fields added to accommodate new RDA data.
- Most libraries will begin by creating RDA records in MARC21.
- MARC is, however, changing.

New MARC Bibliographic Fields
- Field 336 – Stores RDA Content Types
- Field 337 – Stores RDA Media Types
- Field 338 – Stores RDA Carrier Types

(There will be more new fields in the authority format)

Coming in the Pipeline
- Three RDA Relationships:
  - Resource to Name
  - Resource to Resource
  - Name to Name

RDA and Workflow
- We are changing our content standards significantly.
- Workflow will also change based on new tools, and new emphasis on relationships.
- In the near term (MARC) environment will see changes. More change to come as databases change.
RDA – the tool

- It’s an XML Database, and therefore, never conceived of as a linear document.
- Biggest change is the way the rules are presented. They are no longer organized by format. (There will be an AACR2 rule number search in RDA.)
- Instructions are in order from most frequently used to least frequently used.
- You can create templates for workflow, but they only list tasks—don’t lead you through them as a true wizard would.

What the RDA tool / rulebook looks like

Not a printed book, but a database

The closest we have to demo of RDA:

http://www.rdaonline.org/rda_samples/rda_samples.html

RDA Compared with AACR2

- Handout of MARC and public view of AACR2 & rda records
- Biggest ways that the records are different

RDA Compared with AACR2 / Tom Delsey
Editor of RDA

AACR2

- Description
  - ISBD elements
  - classes of material
  - mode of issuance
  - type of description
- Access
  - choice of access points
  - form of headings
  - references

RDA

- Description
  - attributes of FRBR entities
  - types of content and carrier
  - mode of issuance
  - type of description
- Access
  - FRBR relationships
  - attributes of FRAD entities
  - FRAD relationships
  - subject relationships*

AACR2 Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I – Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Rules for Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Books, Pamphlets, and Printed Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cartographic Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sound Recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Motion Pictures and Videorecordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Graphic Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Electronic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Three-Dimensional Artefacts and Realia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Microforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Continuing Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II – Headings, Uniform Titles, and References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Choice of Access Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Headings for Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Geographic Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Headings for Corporate Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Uniform Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RDA Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRBR/FRAD Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attributes of Manifestation and Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attributes of Work and Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attributes of Person, Family, and Corporate Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attributes of Concept*, Object*, Event*, and Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRBR/FRAD Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Primary Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationships to Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies Associated with a Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Subject Relationships*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relationships between Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relationships between Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Relationships between Concepts*, Objects*, Events*, and Places*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categorization of resources

General Material Designations
- electronic resource
- microform
- sound recording
- videorecording

Media type
- audio
- computer
- microform
- video

Carrier type
- filmstrip
- motion picture
- slide
- transparency

Content type
- cartographic
- music
- text

AACR2
- chief source of information specified for each class of material
  - books, pamphlets, and printed sheets
  - cartographic materials
  - manuscripts
  - music
  - sound recordings
  - motion pictures and videorecording
  - graphic materials
  - electronic resources
  - three-dimensional artefacts and media
  - microforms
  - continuing resources

RDA
- preferred source of information specified for three categories of resources:
  - one or more:
    - pages, leaves, sheets, or cards (or images of one or more)
    - moving images
    - other resources

Level of description

AACR2 first level of description
- title proper
- first statement of responsibility
- edition statement
- material specific details
- first publisher, etc.
- date of publication, etc.
- extent of item
- notes
- standard number

RDA core elements
- title proper
- first statement of responsibility
- designation of an edition
- date of publication
- scale of cartographic content
- first place of publication
- first publisher’s name
- identifier for the manifestation
- carrier type
- extent

Rule of three – GONE!

- Collaborative works
  - AACR2: entry under title if more than three persons or corporate bodies responsible
  - RDA: first named person, family, or corporate body with principal responsibility (or first named if principal responsibility not indicated)

- Compilations of works by different persons or bodies
  - AACR2: entry under heading for first work if no collective title (with added entries if no more than three works in the compilation)
  - RDA: separate access points for each work (and/or devised title for compilation)

- Treaties, etc.
  - AACR2: entry under title if more than three parties
  - RDA: party named first (exception for single party on one side); title if first named party cannot be determined

Using RDA in bibliographic and authority records

- Using RDA in bibliographic and authority records
- Mappings to ISBD and MARC
- Sample workflows
- Changes to AACR2 instructions
- Search by AACR2 rule number
Before we move on .... remember

WEMI=
Work
Expression
Manifestation = bib record
Item = item record, a copy

“Our bibliographic records today typically reflect particular manifestations” – Barbara Tillett

RDA and an ILS / John Espley, VTLS

How, mechanically, would you make records under RDA rules?
And,
What would a bib record look like when created under RDA rules?

New Acquisition

Work workform

Work record

Work record
This manifestation in AACR2 and MARC

Manifestation in AACR2 and Public View

Manifestation record in RDA

Work, Expression, Manifestation

New Expression
1. Work, 2 Expressions, 3 Manifestations

- AACR1 ➔ AACR2 ➔ RDA Transition
  - New types of records will begin to appear and be added.
  - What’s needed is a real national timeline, and a local one.
  - OCLC has implemented the new MARC fields
  - KentLINK adaptation is dependent on next III upgrade.
  - Local planning for transition must be set in place.
  - We must plan for lots of training.

2. Final Thoughts
   - Think of RDA as a different sandbox, same toys.
   - We’ll spend less time entering, and more time figuring out where in the hierarchy things fit.
   - Impact will be different for original catalogers than it will be for copy-catalogers.

   Thank You!