RDA WORKING GROUP
NOVEMBER 21, 2011
MINUTES

Mary welcomed Chris Reimers who is joining the group in anticipation of Jean's retirement and due to Nastia's change in responsibilities.

1. **Policy/procedural questions that have come up from ND Cataloging staff regarding RDA records:**

a) No reference to "color" in 300 $$b when the illustrations are colored

Staff are coming across records for items with colored illustrations, but there is no mention of color in 300$$b. **According to RDA 7.17.1.3, color should be indicated if present in the content**. Examples found in DLC RDA records:

300 …. : $b color illustrations
300 …. : $b illustrations (some color)
300 …. : $b illustrations (chiefly color)

RDA permits the use of both spellings ("color" or "colour"), but the LCPS (Library of Congress Policy Statement) prescribes using "color".

The group agreed that an indication of color illustrative content should be added if it applies and is lacking from the record. We will follow the LCPS and use the American spelling, color. We will accept the spelling "colour" on incoming records.

See Adam Schiff's slides with notes,
http://alcts.ala.org/ce/02022011_Changes_AACR2_to_RDA_Part1_Notes.pdf slide 52.

b) No mention of the U.S. place/publisher in 260 when it is not the first mentioned

Under AACR2 it was practice to add the publishing information for a U.S. publisher even if it was not the first mentioned because we are a U.S. based cataloging agency. The question was raised if we should continue the practice. Under RDA, only the first named or most prominently named place of publication/publisher is required. All statements relating to publication info present on the piece can be recorded in the order they appear, but the country of cataloging is not a factor. It does not appear that one may be selective (i.e. either record the first or all of them, not a selection)

The group agreed we would accept the first or most prominently named place/publisher on incoming records and we would not add additional places/publishers for the sake of including a U.S. place/publisher if not the first named.

See RDA 2.8.2; 2.8.4; 2.8.2.4; 2.8.4.5
See Adam Schiff's slides with notes,
http://alcts.ala.org/ce/02022011_Changes_AACR2_to_RDA_Part1_Notes.pdf slides 28-30

c) $$i in 700 fields (ND system no. 3116054): changes needed in tab11_acc and edit_field

The record shows one of many relationship designators that can appear in an RDA record. The term used (**Contains (expression)** comes from RDA Appendix J in this case (J.3.4). When asked whether to keep this subfield or not, Mary discovered that because it's a new subfield and not accounted for in either tab11_acc or edit_field, it's causing a problem with both indexing and display. Because of the possible future use for this subfield, Mary directed staff to leave it in and she would pursue having the tables updated to account for it. Joe raised that a similar situation occurs with $$i in 246 fields which is handled appropriately. Joe will send Aaron some examples of records with 246 $$i present.

Mary suggested using these kinds of questions/decisions to form the basis of an FAQ on RDA which could be helpful in training. She encouraged everyone to share with the group any such questions as they come up in their units/departments or at the other institutions.

2. Systematic check of new RDA MARC coding in bib and authority records: how to proceed

The preceding problem with 700$$i raises the need for us to try to more systematically approach the MARC changes related to RDA. Mary distributed the summary of those changes as of September, 2011 **http://www.loc.gov/marc/RDAinMARC29-9-12-11.html**. We decided to divide up responsibility for evaluating these as follows:

Page 1: 336-338: These have been dealt with and necessary changes made in test and/or production.
Page 2: Bibliographic format fields 340 (new subfields only), 344, 345, 346, 347: Jen Matthews
Page 2-3: Authority format fields 046, 368, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 378: Nastia Guimaraes and Chris Reimers
Page 3: Authority/Bib 046 (new subfields only): Mary McKeown
Page 3: Authority 336: Nastia and Chris
Page 3: Authority/Bib 377, 380, 381: Joe Ross
Page 3: Authority/Bib 382, 383, 384: Jen Matthews
Page 3: Authority/Bib $$i in 4XX and 5XX/7XX and 76X-78X: Mary McKeown
Page 4: Subfield changes in 502, 490, 033, 518, 040: Mary McKeown
Page 4: 007 and 008 additional codes: Lisa Stienbarger and Mary Lehman
Page 4: Bibliographic format field: 264: Rachel Boyd and Sandy Sarber

Guidelines for what to look for when evaluating each field (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/):

a) **Identify what the field is for and give examples if needed to clarify its purpose. You may find it useful to use the MARC to RDA mappings in the RDA Toolkit (under the Tools tab). That will give you the link to the corresponding RDA rule(s) where you should find an explanation with examples.**
b) **List the possible indicator values with their meanings and possible subfields. Indicate the repeatability of the field and its subfields. Indicate any mandatory subfields.**
c) **Indicate whether the field is defined in ALEPH (Does it appear on the list of fields when you use F5? Does a label appear in the cataloging editor when you add the tag to a record?).**
d) **Validation: What happens when you try to save a record in ALEPH with the field with all possible subfields included? What error messages do you get?**
e) **Does this field contain prescribed vocabulary terms or values that should be set up in the CTRL F8 functionality? Should there be validation on those terms/values?**

f) **Does any help appear in the lower pane when your cursor is on the field? If so, does it match what's in the current MARC documentation http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/?**

g) **Does the field and any of its subfields currently display in the web OPAC? In the GUI? If so, in what display type? Is it currently indexed? Come up with suggestions for how the field and its subfields should be displayed and indexed, including where it should appear in the cataloging editor view in ALEPH. [Current ND production versions of tab11_acc (browse), tab11_word (keyword), tab11_ind (numeric) and edit_field (display) are attached to this message. I'll link to them once I have this posted on the wiki).**

You can use the "paul" server to play around but anything you create will be lost since the data is refreshed regularly. Use Barnabas if you want to keep your examples. You can find RDA records in OCLC by including "rda" in the Descriptive Conventions index in your search. Remember to change your OCLC export definitions if you want to export anything to ALEPH test, but you can also just add the fields to an existing ALEPH record to see what happens with them.

Lisa had seen something RDA/MARC related on Ex Libris' documentation portal. After the meeting it was identified. [I'll link to it once this is on the wiki] It contained a reference to version 20 rep_changes 3039 and 3040, but they aren't covered in the release notes. Aaron discovered references to other files which we do have in the USM directory on the A tree. Those files are codes.eng and marc_exp.dat. They also released new help files, which may already be in production.

3. **Developing local policy starting from: Core elements for recording attributes of manifestations and items: RDA 1.3**

The group started going through the RDA Core elements (1.3) to begin developing local policy.

Title: Only the title proper is core under RDA. The group agreed that recording other title information (what users would tend to think of as subtitle) is important. **There is an LCPS which states that other title information is core for LC. We agreed to follow the LCPS for RDA 2.3.4.** Mary asked Sandy to keep an eye out for vendor supplied RDA records to see if they are showing any tendency to omit other title information.

Statement of responsibility: Only the first statement of responsibility relating to the title proper is core under RDA. There are no LCPSs on statements of responsibility. This is going to be a difficult area to prescribe a regular practice since there is so much leeway under RDA. There is no more "rule of three" so lengthy lists of contributors can be listed in full or just the first can be recorded followed by [and X others] or you can be selective. Different circumstances will dictate the best option. Mary thinks this is an area where we'll have to "teach" judgment and common sense. Again, we'll want to keep an eye out for vendor records to see if they have a tendency to omit this kind of information.

Edition: The designation of an edition 2.5.2 (e.g. First American edition; New edition) or the named revision of an edition 2.5.6 (Example: edition designation: 4th edition. Named revision: reprinted with corrections) are core under RDA. There is no LCPS on edition. We'll need to discuss whether statements of responsibility related to an edition should be core for MALC at the next meeting.

4. **Next meeting:** we will not try to meet in December. Mary will schedule our next meeting for the 2nd week in January **(tentatively set for Friday, January 13, 10-11:30, 248).**