Update

Implementing RDA in The Netherlands

Lian Wintermans
Metadata specialist
Royal Library – The Netherlands

Daniel van Spanje Senior productmanager metadata services OCLC Leiden – The Netherlands



General strategy

Internationalization and standardization

No Dutch rules

Background

- GGC = Shared Cataloguing System in The Netherlands
 - used by national library, academic libraries, public libraries,
 special research libraries, schools for higher learning, etc.
 - 18 million bibrecords; 4,5 million authority records, 60 million holdings, 'synch-ed' with WorldCat
 - Linked record structures (bib tot bib; bib to authority, authority to authority)
 - Guidelines for the GGC were based on RT, but since april
 2013 RDA is also supported
 - Current environment is non-MARC21 and non-AACR2



RDA implementation: 2 tracks

- Track 1: investigate, describe and define what RDA means for the Dutch libraries currently using RT
 - Result: a "Dutch RDA profile", so that RDA can be the cataloguing guidelines for libraries in The Netherlands
- Track 2: implement RDA as the basis for the cataloguing guidelines in the Dutch shared cataloguing system
 - Result: implementation of RDA in phases, incl. Guidelines,
 communication, format extensions, database conversions

Track 1: project SLIM: results

- Document describing the general RDA instructions and rules
- Document describing what is in RDA and is not in or different from RT
- Document describing the "Dutch" profile with respect to alternatives, optional additions and omissions, and standard texts
- Translation of the RDA glossary

Track 1: project SLIM: results

- Translation of Thomas Brenndorfer's RDA workflow in ten easy steps ...
- Agreement on and how to implement RDA in the GGC
- A national RDA Helpdesk + website + FAQ
- A national RDA committee (under construction)

- Implementation decisions:
 - In phases. Note: track 2 started when track 1 was still under construction!
 - At 'manifestation" level
 - Not only RDA, but also changes related to "internationalization and standardization"
 - Language of cataloguing
 - Relator codes
 - Corporate body can have a primary responsibility for resource



- Package A april 2013:
 - Tag 0501 (336), 0502 (337) and 0503 (338) for content type,
 medium type, carrier type

Introducing relator codes

```
0500 Aax Novelle in boekvorm (hard copy)
0501 #tekst=txt_%%rdacontent/dut
0502 #zonder medium=n %%rdamedia/dut
0503 #band=nc_%%rdacarrier/dut
0500 Sax Novelle als e-book op cd-rom
0501 #tekst=txt %%rdacontent/dut
0502 #computer=c %%rdamedia/dut
0503 #computerdisc=cd_%%rdacarrier/dut
0500 Oax Novelle als e-book via internet
0501 #tekst=txt %%rdacontent/dut
0502 #computer=c_%%rdamedia/dut
0503 #online bron=cr %%rdacarrier/dut
0500 Aax Novelle in braille
0501 #tactiele tekst=tct_%%rdacontent/dut
0502 #zonder medium=n_%%rdamedia/dut
0503 #band=nc_%%rdacarrier/dut
```



- Package B november 2013:
 - policy for creating RDA records (RDA core elements plus further instructions; see e-mail to EURIG from January 2014 nrs. 1 - 12)
 - Policy for Language of Cataloguing + plus new tags in the
 Pica3-format
 - Instructions for upgrading legacy data to RDA
 - Recommendation to add relator codes

- Package B november 2013 plus:
 - Type of content, medium and carrier also in English, German and French

- adding tags 0501, 0502 and 0503 to the database

- Package C october 2014 ...
 - Name authorities
 - Workrecords
 - Additional RDA guidelines

RDA support and development

- National servicedesk + website + FAQ
 - Since november 2013
 - -> 200 emails on different subjects
 - 6 experienced cataloguers in 'shifts'

RDA support and development

National RDA Committee (under construction)

- Coordination by Royal Library
- Representatives from different libraries
- To guarantuee and secure knowledge of RDA will be firmly-rooted in the Dutch cataloguing community
- support the RDA servicedesk
- support RDA strategy and further implementation of RDA in The Netherlands
- to liaise to EURIG and IFLA,
- Integrate relevant documents into the RDA Toolkit



- In two tracks and in phases
- Doing more than just RDA
- Questions with updating legacy data
- Cataloguers raise all kinds of questions
- Digesting RDA

- In two tracks and in phases
 - not a big bang, so not everyting is ready!
 - This creates confusion, but a big bang also?
 - Strategy
 - Usermeetings
 - communication via GGC-listserv
 - in house training options

- Doing more than just RDA
 - Relator codes cause a number of questions, esp. the definitions (specific or general: author versus writer of introduction etc.)
 - Record per edition instead of recording editions in local holding records ("what is a edition, printing, ...")
 - Implementing RDA as successor of RT made clear many cataloguers didn't know RT

Questions with updating legacy data

- Encoding level has been coded in record. Not the Rules used for creating or managing records. `RT' has never been coded in bib or authority records. Many 'minimum level' and many 'hybrid' records
- Policy: add 'RDA' only with resource in hand
- 'Structure' of database changed as result of the new policy with respect to "record per edition"
- Multivolumes policy: title of volume can be in RDA, 'Parent' title can be in RT.

- Cataloguers raise all kinds of questions
 - start to change abbreviations in title statements
 - Transcribe information when creating notes
 - Koran translation in German by professor and twenty students: all students in statement of responsibility!
 - Confusion about recording statement of responsibility and creating access points

- Digesting RDA
 - RDA is in English. 'Legal' or 'biblical' language: one needs lawyers or priests to understand the language!
 - Interpretations and role of examples (space between copyright symbol and year?)
 - Year of publication versus copyright year
 - Relator codes: defintion and 'translation' issues (Issuing body versus publisher as corporate body)

- Digesting RDA
 - Abbreviatons
 - The simple solution: no abbreviations
 - The correct solution: do not abbreviate when transcribing. If there are abbrevations in transcription fields, take what you see!

 Recommendation: do not to abbreviate in annotations.
 - RDA transcription versus ISBD mixing in statement of responsibility / how many names in the statement of responsibility and how many access points / source of information



- Digesting RDA
 - RDA transcription versus ISBD mixing in statement of responsibility
 - RDA: identifying information is recorded as in resource. Policy [under construction] in The Netherlands: adding elements that are missing is okay. Adding data to existing elements is not okay
 - Example 1. On the title page is title and name of a person. If from the colophon it is clear that the person is [also] the editor, it is not possible to add like in ISBD [edited by]. No: the person is the author and in a note one can explain that the author is also the editor.

- Digesting RDA
 - RDA transcription versus ISBD mixing in statement of responsibility
 - Example 2. On the title page is title and name of a person. If from the
 colophon it is clear that the resource has been translated by another
 person from the English, one can add these data to the statement of
 responsibility not using square brackets. Reason: the translation
 element is missing on the title page.

Update

Implementing RDA in The Netherlands

Lian Wintermans Metadata specialist Royal Library – The Netherlands

Thanks!

Daniel van Spanje Senior productmanager metadata services OCLC Leiden – The Netherlands

