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Approach of This Presentation

- Describe how the standards developed by both communities have their strengths and weaknesses
- Review what each community can bring to the table
- Provide suggestions concerning the focus and directions the RDA process is taking
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ROT

R  Redundancy
O  Obsolete
T  Trivial
Strengths of Library Community Experience and Practice

- Authority work
- Rigorous content standards
- End user focus?
- Over 100 years of practice*

*or millennia if go back to clay tablets and scrolls
Weaknesses of RDA

- Book/print bias
- Rule driven not principle driven
- Overly complex rules that require intensive training
- Too expensive
- Too much ROT
- Structure based on a linear card catalog model
- User studies needed
- Not clear how RDA will implement FRBR
User Expectations?

LucasArts Monkey Island 2
Expectations of Users

- Simple keyword searching
- See cover, title page, table of contents, index, select pages
- Ranked reviews by others
- Listen to snippets of music
- “Spell check” Did mean ….
- Limit by format before searching
- Participant not just passive user
- Suggested other reading
Online Card Catalog

Screenshot: Oh my, how am I ever gonna find the right book in this library.

LucasArts Monkey Island 2
Opportunities

• Work closely with other metadata communities
• Transform the structure of information
• Increase integration with other information services
• Adopt “application profile” approach to support special library needs

Threats

• Library community will lose credibility by not exploiting technology and reuse of content already created
• Becoming less viable for finding information -- not the first choice for information discovery
“... if we in the library field do not develop cataloging rules that can be used for this digital reality, we will find once again that non-librarians will take the lead in an area that we have assumed is ours. We need to apply the principle of least effort, since we know that cataloging as it has been done is increasingly un-affordable. And we need to create cataloging rules that take into account the reality of machine-to-machine communication and the derivation of data elements by algorithms.”

-- Karen Coyle, email to the MARC list

Thanks to Diane Hillmann
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively simple metadata set with straightforward rules</td>
<td>• Inconsistent implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application Profiles to meet community needs</td>
<td>• Use of authorized access points not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively easy to train and implement</td>
<td>• Mere 12 years of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based (now) on a conceptual model</td>
<td>• Digital bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities

- Develop an ongoing dialogue between the DC and Library communities
- Encourage sufficient guidance without creating a rule to cover possible situation

Threats

- Lack of acceptance as a viable alternative in the Library community
- Lack of understanding of the basic principles
What other Metadata Communities Bring to the Table

• Advocate the development of a coherent conceptual model BEFORE developing the principles upon which rules are written
• Support the approach to use principles to determine the mechanisms of cataloging
• Stress the necessity of:
  ✷ Simplicity
  ✷ Consistency
  ✷ Elegance
• Build consensus about the “big picture” before arguing minutiae
The Real Questions

1. Legacy cataloging:
   How much pain and expense are we willing to tolerate?

2. Radical changes:
   How far can we push the envelope without breaking the systems?

3. Process
   Are we able to discuss the big picture before fighting over the details?
Recommendations

- Top down process of development
- Devise a realistic development timeline
- Do not use AACR2 as sole source of ideas
- Clarify decision-making authority and responsibility
- Provide more access to work in progress for feedback -- people do understand they are works in progress
URL to presentation

http://library.csun.edu/mwoodley/DCRDAatERIG2.ppt