



RDA implementation issues

The following questions originate from the EURIG Annual Members' Meeting, held 25 April 2014 in Vienna. This is a document in development.

Date: 18 July 2014

- 1. Is the decision whether to implement RDA or not to be taken by your single institution or do you need to reach an agreement in order to a National / Regional implementation?
In such case, does the budget of each and every library/institution allow the subscription? What if not?**

OCLC/Netherlands

It is the responsibility of each institution.

We have guidelines for the shared cataloguing system, in which we now refer to both RDA and the Dutch RT, but we do not think that all cataloguers need access to the RDA toolkit.

Denmark

Implementation will be decided on a national level by the authorities. Current rules are free of charge published by the government. Whether the government will try to get a national license to RDA or not isn't decided.

Latvia

The national library is responsible for the implementation of RDA.

BnF

The decision as to whether France will adopt RDA and abandon the French cataloguing rules (AFNOR rules) will be made at the national level. However, the implementation in libraries will occur progressively and may take quite some time, so as to allow ILS to evolve in order to take these changes into account.

BnF, as a national bibliographic agency, will implement RDA once the decision is made, and will contribute to disseminate RDA at the national level through the records it will make available for reuse. But for the time being, adopting RDA is not a priority in France: we are currently focusing on the FRBRization of data and the publication of Linked Data. As long as the technical means for the production of FRBRized data is missing, there is no gain in adopting RDA.

The issue of the cost of subscribing all libraries to RDA Toolkit has not been addressed yet: it is too early, and, more importantly, we hope that small and midsize libraries will not need RDA Toolkit, as they will massively reuse data produced by BnF and ABES.

NUKAT

NUKAT Center as the administrative body of the union catalog has to take the opinion of member libraries into consideration. At this moment we are rather thinking about modifying our cataloging rules than adopting RDA, so the subscription of RDA Toolkit will not be necessary for most libraries.

Norway

National implementation, led by the National Library. The subscription costs will be subsidized in some way, but the details are not decided yet.

Sweden

Since the National Library of Sweden makes decisions about cataloguing rules for all libraries cataloguing in the Union Catalogue the decision is on a national level but the process will be gradual.

We haven't decided on how to deal with subscriptions to RDA Toolkit yet.

Finland

We need to reach an agreement on the national level.

Not all the libraries are required to implement RDA at once. We will have a transition period of several years when some libraries still use ISBD.

2. Has your institution any agreement regarding the RDA conversion with the company responsible for your current ILS? In which ways does this ILS plan to cover the cataloguing changes?

BL

There is no agreement with Ex Libris. We have control over the configuration, so there was no need to talk to Ex Libris about this.

Austrian Library Network

The same goes for the ALN, but there will be a workshop for the ILS vendors about the changes in RDA.

BnF

No. Our system (at BnF) was developed internally.

For French libraries using different ILS, see above.

NUKAT

The NUKAT database is using VTLS software. This company has been trying for some years to implement RDA in their products. Unfortunately NUKAT member libraries are using several different ILS. It is expected that some vendors will have trouble adapting their ILS to new cataloging rules. Libraries can rely on NUKAT Center help to some extent but in general they have to solve such problems on their own.

Sweden

The National Library of Sweden is developing a new infrastructure, based on linked data, and a web based cataloguing tool that will replace our current cataloguing client Voyager. The new system will support RDA.

Finland

We convert the data ourselves at the national library.

3. Has any institution considered a short-term change on the format due to the change on the instructions? Do the institutions see BIBFRAME as a real possibility for the near future?

Austrian Library Network

No, we think it is too early to decide on Bibframe.

BL

Bibframe is not ready yet, and as far as I can see it does not support RDA. Format changes are not easy, because they are tied to your system. As long as we have Aleph we will stick to MARC.

BnF

We are considering changes in our production format in order to prepare for the FRBRization of the catalogue (systematic use of uniform titles, content type/media type), but such changes will be punctual and limited.

BnF is developing a model for the publication of its data in fine-grained form on the basis of FRBR₀₀. BIBFRAME will be a model on which we will make alignments so as to ensure the interoperability of our data.

NUKAT

We will introduce some new fields in authority and bibliographic formats (for example 33X, 37X) to make our data more actionable. We are following the development of BIBFRAME but at this moment we are not considering this format as a real option.

Sweden

In developing our new system, we follow the BIBFRAME project.

Finland

No short-term changes. We have doubts on Bibframe.

4. What would your institution decide in the cases of single instructions from your current cataloguing rules that RDA doesn't cover (not the case of conflict between instructions, but the case where RDA keeps silent)?

There is general agreement that this can be handled by policy statements and by writing proposals for RDA.

BnF

We keep them whenever they do not conflict with RDA instructions. In some cases, we will produce requests for the evolution of RDA, if we consider that other countries or communities may be interested in our rules.

NUKAT

As we are not introducing RDA but modifying our cataloguing rules, we will keep our instructions.

Sweden

Not applicable. (We have just started our work with RDA.)

Finland

We will prepare the national policy statements of RDA.

5. How will you implement carrier, media and content type? Only as codes, only as text or both code and text?

OCLC/Netherlands

Both code and text. The text is coupled with the language of cataloguing (see examples in the [presentation](#) by Daniel van Spanje and Lian Wintermans, p. 9).

BL

Only as text, but we will accept codes in incoming records. The codes are not part of RDA, but of the implementation in MARC.

Austrian Library Network

We will record the codes, and use text when representing the information.

BnF

Only as codes. Textual labels will be automatically generated for public display (with possible variations, as needed, according to displaying format).

In records distributed by BnF in UNIMARC format, we will provide both code and text (in French).

NUKAT

It has not been decided yet but it seems that the implementation of both text and codes is the appropriate choice.

Sweden

We haven't made any decisions yet. For the moment, in imported RDA records, we leave them as they are, just saving them for the future.

Finland

Not yet decided, probably both ways.

6. How will you deal with multi-parts? In Germany at the time being we have records for every volume linked to an own record for the multi-part title.

Austrian Library Network & Germany

We have hierarchical descriptions: a record for the higher level, and separate records for the volumes. In RDA sometimes rules for hierarchical description are missing.

OCLC/Netherlands

We have the same approach, though there are discussions about adopting WorldCat policies.

Norway

We are linking volumes to mother records according to multilevel description, but we are about to change system and we will probably not continue this kind of linking. We have experienced that our linking method is causing problems with migration and record exports.

Iceland

We have analytical items that are linked to parent records.

Denmark

We have mother records and create records for the volumes. That way it is easier to record information regarding specific volumes.

BL

Cataloguing of separate volumes depends on the materials.

BnF

It is the same at BnF, except in the case of simultaneous multi-part publications where the titles of each volume are not significant (e.g., a dictionary in three volumes).

However, the record for each volume is complete and independent so as to be exported without any loss of information. The record for the publication as a whole serves more as a means to collocate the different volumes for management purposes (e.g., in order to check that the library holds all the volumes that belong to a given publication, etc.) or to enable users to navigate the catalogue.

NUKAT

We are creating separate records for each volume, except for such publications as dictionaries or lexicons. If each volume has its own distinctive title we are creating records for the title of the whole publication, to collocate the different volumes.

Sweden

We have used different methods in our catalogue over the years. For the time being the main rule is to follow the method used by the library that catalogued the first part. This also applies to imported records. The only exception is if the publication has already been catalogued according to another method in the catalogue.

For new multi-part publications we use two main methods. When every single part has its own title we make records for every volume and give the common title in the series statement field. We don't do any record for the multi-part title.

In cases when the parts don't have their own titles we do one record.

Finland

We catalogue them as monographs including the multipart title.

7. How will you describe e-books in several file formats (the same content in several formats - PDF, ePUB)? Will you create one record for all file formats

or a separate record for each file format? If you create one record, how will you structure information which applies for each file format?

In the **National Library of Latvia** we are realizing the experiment to create one record for several file formats using subfield |8, but it looks very complicated for cataloguers.

Example from the NLL National bibliographic database:

```
FMT      BK
LDR      00720nam a2200241 i 4500
001NBA02-000247279
00520140411124702.0
007cr |n ||uuuuu
008000514s2006   lv   s   001 0 lav
020|8 1\a |a 998479458X |q PDF
020|8 2\a |a 9984794592 |q ePUB
040|a LV-RiVB
080|a 94(474.3) |x "19" |x (093.3)
1001      |a Cielēns, Fēlikss, |d 1888-1964 |4 aut
24510      |a Laikmetu maiņā : |b atmiņas un atziņas. |n 2. sējums, |p Latvijas neatkarīgās
demokrātiskās republikas lielais laiks / |c Fēlikss Cielēns.
250|a 3., elektroniskais izdevums.
264 4      |a Rīga : |b Eraksti, |c 2006.
300|8 1\a |a 1 PDF datne (248 lapas) |c 2,96 MB
300|8 2\a |a 1 ePUB datne |c 1,96 MB
336|a teksts |b txt
337|a datorvide |b c
338|a tiešsaistes resurss |b cr
347|8 1\a |a teksta datne |b PDF |c 2,96 MB
347|8 2\a |a teksta datne |b ePUB |c 1,96 MB
500|a Izdevējziņas precizētas ISBN aģentūrā.
50603      |a Tiesību īpašnieks nav devis LNB atļauju publiskai piekļuvei darbam.
538|8 1\a |a Sistēmas prasības: Adobe Acrobat Reader (PDF).
538|8 2\a |a Sistēmas prasības: Adobe Digital Editions (ePUB).
650 4      |a Elektroniskās grāmatas
60014      |a Cielēns, Fēlikss, |d 1888-1964
651 4      |a Latvija |x Vēsture.
74002      |a Latvijas neatkarīgās demokrātiskās republikas lielais laiks.
901|a Ebook |b NLL
```

Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Verbundsysteme, Germany

Rita Albrecht noticed that you can approach this from a theoretical point of view or from a more practical point of view. Are these examples different manifestations according to FRBR?

BnF

The rule is to create one record per format.

Normally only one record should be created in the case of 'publication packages,' but the practice does not really exist yet (and BnF does not use MARC21, but presumably we would use the \$8 technique).

NUKAT

We create one record.

Sweden

Today we do one record per format if there are different identifiers for each format.

Finland

We create record to each format.

**7b. How will you describe e-books with the same content that have been included in different platforms/portals from where they can be licensed in different packages, license models and DRM?
Will you create one (neutral?) record or separate records for each "version"?**

8. Describing Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture, and Copyright Notice information (field 264) for e-books there is one questionable case - in e-book there is given only copyright date. We create one 264 field with second indicator 4 if the publication year matches with copyright date:

4 - 264 #4|a Rīga : |b Eraksti, |c 2006.

(We don't use copyright sign in the subfield |c because of second indicator 4).

The second option about which we are not sure is - the usage of two 264 fields:

264 #1|a Rīga : |b Eraksti, |c [2006] (this year we assume as a year of publication)

264 #4|c 2006

May be this is more correctly:

264 #1|a Rīga : |b Eraksti

264 #4|c 2006

The first example does not conform to MARC, the 2nd and 3rd examples are fine.

The **BL** includes the copyright sign in the system.

BnF does not use MARC21.

NUKAT

We don't use field 264.

Sweden

Not applicable.

Finland

We use the field 260, not 264.

9. How will you deal with conference publications? Which will be treated as monographic material and which as serials?