

ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE REPORT

New Orleans, LA, June 22-25, 2018

Reports from:

[OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee \(CAPC\)](#),

[OLAC Membership Meeting](#),

[RDA Pre-Conference](#), [RDA Update Forum](#) & [RDA Linked Data Forum](#)

[ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access \(CC:DA\)](#)

[ALCTS/LITA Authority Control Interest Group \(ACIG\)](#)

Reported by: Mary Huismann (St. Olaf College), Chair, Content Standards Subcommittee

OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC)

The OLAC CAPC meeting was held on Friday, June 22, 2018. The major part of the meeting was devoted to liaison and task force reports. Only selected highlights have been reported here—see the full CAPC meeting minutes normally published in the September *OLAC Newsletter*:

- Several changes to the CAPC membership were announced. Jessica Schomberg will become chair following this meeting.
- CC:DA liaison Kelley McGrath reported on the newly issued RDA Toolkit beta version. She anticipates much work for CAPC because of the great amount of options in the text. Kelley suggested that OLAC take an active role in preparing guidance on how to apply the new Toolkit text to moving images, since LC does not use RDA for this. Attendees expressed concern about the cost of the Toolkit, and asked that these concerns be brought to the RDA Steering Committee (RSC) and ALA Publishing. Everyone is invited to attend a meeting on Monday where CC:DA will discuss the MARC21 implication of changes made to RDA.
- The MAC report was given by Cate Gerhart. In the past year, OLAC has worked on discussion papers to address accessibility issues; two papers have turned into proposals.
- The LC report was given by Janis Young. LC's booth will feature Dr. Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress, at two different times during the conference. Janis reminded the group that the LC-PCC Policy Statements are currently frozen while the 3R Project continues. She also reported a policy change regarding "Multiple Subdivisions" (SHM H 1090) and a moratorium on *Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms* (LCDGT) term proposals. She hopes that a LCDGT progress report will be made by next Midwinter.
- OCLC representative Jay Weitz distributed a handout summarizing news and announcements from OCLC, and a brochure, *Breaking Through*, containing information about new products and reports. The 2018 OCLC-MARC Update will be published in an upcoming OCLC Technical Bulletin. The update will implement the MARC 21 changes announced in MARC 21 Updates No. 25 (December 2017) and No. 26 (April 2018). OCLC will also validate MARC codes announced in nine LC Technical Notices issued since November 2017. OCLC will implement this Update during the second half of calendar year 2018 and distribute announcements through the usual discussion lists and

Connexion logon greetings. Elements from the MARC21 Authority Format Updates No. 25 and 26 will not be implemented at this time, but at a future date. The OCLC Virtual AskQC Office Hours will continue to be held, though on hiatus for the summer.

- The RDA Standing Subgroup updated the RDA best practices documents; these documents have been posted to the OLAC website.
- The Unified Best Practices Task Force continues its work to compare and harmonize the best practices given in the three RDA best practices documents.
- The Objects Task Force will have a draft of their RDA best practices available soon.
- A new joint MLA/OLAC Task Force will be formed to address formats such as Playaways, GoChip, SlotMusic, USB Music Card, etc. The charge for this group will be expanded from the current Playaways Task Force. Members for the group are being sought.
- The group discussed the necessity for two resources, Authority Tools for AV Cataloging and Online Resources for AV Catalogers. Neither resource has been updated in recent history; the consensus of the group was to archive both resources.

OLAC Membership Meeting

The OLAC Membership meeting was held on Sunday, June 24. The 2018 OLAC Research Grant was presented to Michelle Urberg (Ex Libris/University of Washington) (co-investigators, Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon), Morag Stewart (University of Washington) to explore issues surrounding discovery and access of streaming video.

Rosemary Groenwald (Mount Prospect (IL) Public Library) gave a presentation about the video game genre vocabulary being developed by OLAC. In January 2015, OLAC CAPC formed a working group to write a white paper documenting the need for video game genre terms. LC Policy and Standards Division (PSD) acknowledged that video games have genres specific to the format that would be appropriate as LCGFT. In the summer of 2016, the CaMMS/SAC/GFIS Video Game Working Group was established with the charge of developing a vocabulary for video game genre terms and investigating options for publication if LC was unable to commit to the project. The OLAC Executive Board approved moving ahead with the project. The vocabulary has an initial list of approximately 80 terms. The vocabulary will be available in due course from the OLAC website (<https://olacinc.org/video-game-vocabulary>) as both a list of terms and as a downloadable file of authority records in MARC format.

RDA Pre-Conference

James Hennelly (ALA Publishing) and members of the RDA Steering Committee (RSC) presented a full day pre-conference titled "A Practical Introduction to the new RDA Toolkit." Slides and recordings of the pre-conference are available from the RSC Presentations webpage (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/560>).

Gordon Dunsire (RSC) opened the pre-conference with the presentation "From Big Bang to beta: A Overview of the 3R Project." Three factors have driven the development of the new RDA Toolkit: adoption of the IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM), internationalization of the RDA audience, and a desire to expand to other communities. LRM introduces new entities and makes a shift from attribute to relationship elements. It also addresses aggregate manifestations and serial works that were not well-served in the current version of RDA based on *Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records* (FRBR). RDA needed change in order to accommodate an increasingly international user base with

different cataloging and authority files and vocabularies. Reaching out to other communities such as special libraries, museums, archives, and linked data communities is a strategic directive from the RDA Board.

Files for the new Toolkit were produced as a “big bang” – a one-time creation of all of the element files, generated using RDA Registry data and template for standard sections. In a nod to Scotland, the “big bang” was followed by a “wee bang” – a one-time overlay of standard instructions for relationship elements (formerly known as “relationship designators”). This process was not able to be completely done by machine and required hundreds of volunteer human hours to complete. A template was used to provide boiler-plate guidance and instructions. Both processes required refinements with multiple test runs.

There are thirteen entities and over 1700 elements in the new text. There is a marked shift towards work and expression elements and away from manifestation elements. Each element has its own “page” grouped by entity “chapter,” though all elements are to be considered equal with no implied hierarchy. Each element page has an element reference section and recording methods.

Navigation through RDA is accomplished through search (exact or keyword), entity page elements list (an alphabetic browse with active filters), or relationship matrix (still under development). The glossary can be searched through an alphabetic browse. The instructions are full of options, with nothing mandatory. One exception might be “nomen string” – one can’t have a “nomen” without a “nomen string” to describe it (but, use of “nomen” is not mandatory, either!). The core lists have been removed, as they are less useful at the global level; these should be defined in an application profile.

Application profiles will become very important with the new Toolkit. Typically, an application profile spells out what elements must or should be recorded, what elements are repeated, what vocabularies and recording methods are used. This can be accomplished through the use of notes/bookmarks, policy statements, workflows, or external documents linked into the Toolkit.

Dunsire used the term “shredding” to describe how the instructions were reformatted for the new Toolkit. As the organization of information is different, the instructions were literally shredded into pieces and reassembled. Instruction display is much cleaner in the new Toolkit. Nested options, exceptions and alternatives have been flattened into options, with a standardized layout of “for... do” and “if ... then” conditions. Transcription, recording and access point construction have also been separated. Some elements have had soft deprecation, for example, “Details of ...” would be an unstructured description under the root element.

There are still several tasks yet to accomplish: editing for clarity and consistency, distinguishing instructions for name/title and access point elements, and instructions for aggregates and serials. Users are encouraged to provide feedback through the link on the beta version site.

Next, James Hennelly demonstrated many of the features and functionality of the beta version. A handout “Where to find examples in the Beta Toolkit” was distributed and is also available from the RSC website:

[http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/Where%20to%20Find%20Examples%20in%20the%20Beta%20Toolkit\(1\).pdf](http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/Where%20to%20Find%20Examples%20in%20the%20Beta%20Toolkit(1).pdf) . A recorded demonstration is freely available from the RDA Toolkit website:

<https://www.rdatoolkit.org/index.php/node/158> .

Kate James (RDA Examples Editor) spoke about the basics of attributes and relationships. She provided a handout “Where Did It Go?” that contains a partial list of elements and instructions that have changed from the current to beta Toolkit; it is available from the RSC website:

<http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/Where%20did%20it%20go%20final.pdf> . She opened with a

review of the terminology used for attributes and relationships and a comparison of the organization of

these things in the original and beta versions. In the latter, relationship designators have become relationship elements. Relationship designators were previously in “no man’s land”—not regarded as attributes or elements (i.e., not present in chapters 19-20 but placed in an appendix). Strange, considering relationships are a principle that governs RDA!

Relationships have also become relationship elements in the beta version. Here, the change is merely a change in wording because relationships were elements in the original Toolkit. In the original Toolkit, relationships are refined by designators; for example, “owner” is refined by “former owner.” A relationship element relates two entities (e.g., creator of work, related item of manifestation, etc.)

In the beta version, attributes become either attribute elements or relationship elements. Surprisingly, “attribute” was never defined in the original Toolkit, but was an element and not a relationship. In the beta Toolkit definition, “attribute element” appears to be limited to being described as an unstructured description; however, several of these can be recorded using all four recording methods. The new LRM entities “nomen” and “timespan” have turned several attributes into relationship elements (e.g., name of corporate body, title of work, etc.). Many of these elements have been renamed to include both entities, for example, “related timespan of person” (formerly, “date associated with person”).

There are several ways to locate relationships and elements in the beta Toolkit. The relationship matrix is a look-up tool for relationship elements, replacing appendices I-M. The matrix is located in the Resources drop-down list. Entries are listed in alphabetical order with no implied hierarchy. Entities may be searched using the Entity List of Elements. The search is predictive, so the entire term does not need to be entered. Keyword search filters may also be used to search elements. Former element names that have been added as alternative labels will be picked up with the elements search.

In closing, Kate raised several questions about the definitions for element, attribute element, and relationship element. Regarding the latter two, does it matter what kind of element it is?

In her presentation, Kathy Glennan (Chair-elect, RSC) walked participants through creation of a personal name authority record. She included caveats that the RSC anticipates changes to the instructions and that no policy statements are available in the beta Toolkit. The latter leads to some assumptions in the presentation: she is following her institution’s current practice for capturing authority data, and while trying to think outside of MARC21, she is still creating an authorized access point.

Gordon Dunsire returned to present “Dates, Approximately.” Dunsire used a recent query from RDA-L as a case study for recording date of publication in RDA. In this particular case the manifestation had no date, and the content had a “mid-sixties vibe.” Date of publication is recorded as a value of timespan, applying the general instructions for manifestation: date of manifestation. Under those instructions, when a date of manifestation is not identified, an approximate date is recorded. This is done using an unstructured description (e.g., “between 1962 and 1969?” or “approximately 1965”). Data in unstructured descriptions cannot be reliably processed to extract keywords; for example “1965” is a keyword for both “approximately 1965” and “1965 pieces” – requires context to make sense.

Clément Oury (ISSN International Centre) spoke about future development of diachronic works from the ISSN International Centre perspective. He began with background information on the ISSN (“a dedicated network for continuing resources”). There has been a protocol between the RSC and the ISSN International Centre since 2015 to support functional interoperability between data created using RDA and ISSN instruction and element sets. LRM alignment proved to be the driver for harmonization, as outlined in a RDA/ISSN IC discussion paper available at the RSC website:

<http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-Chair-20.pdf>. LRM section 5.8 is devoted to serials, but may be applicable to all continuing resources.

The notion of “diachronic work” has been introduced to RDA. A diachronic work is a work that is planned to be embodied over time and published over a limited (“finite”) or indefinite (“continuing”) time. This extension plan is an essential characteristic of the work. Because of this, several elements were re-located from manifestation to work (e.g., frequency, which is part of the publication plan). One problem is that there is a specific cardinality for diachronic work, tagged “1:1:1 WEM lock” – 1 work = 1 expression = 1 manifestation. This prevents any form of collocation based on commonality of content. Does this signal the end of collocation for serials? Not necessarily, as any RDA entity can be clustered, that is, grouped with other entities sharing common characteristics on any criterion or at the discretion of an implementing agency. An example of a clustering criterion would be “same title on different media versions.”

Deborah Fritz (Chair, RSC Aggregates Working Group) described the treatment of aggregates and serials in the new Toolkit. “Aggregate” is defined in the glossary as “a manifestation that embodies an aggregating work and one or more expressions of one or more works that realize the plan for aggregation.” Instructions are provided for three types of aggregates: collection aggregate, augmentation aggregate, and parallel aggregate. Similar to the “WEM lock” described in the previous presentation, aggregating works have a “WE lock” with cardinality restricting an aggregating work to be realized by one and only one expression. There are several work transformation relationships, such as transformation by audience (carrier version, language version, regional version) and transformation by genre. “Extension plan” is a new work entity; several manifestation elements were moved to the work level. At the manifestation level, the “mode of issuance” element has been collapsed into single unit/multiunit and a new element “contributor to aggregate” has been added. Next steps include further implementation of the recommendations from the Aggregates Working Group and the Serials Task Force and amending instructions relating to aggregates and diachronic works.

Wrapping up the day was a list of next steps and projects. The beta version will have ongoing tweaks, fixes and edits for clarity and may involve moving things around. Feedback from the community will inform this activity. Topics such as collective agent, authority control, and MARC mapping are to be considered. A Toolkit release with stable text is expected in September 2018. IFLA is planning a review of ISBD in the context of LRM over the next two years, likely with an opportunity for worldwide comment.

RDA Update Forum

The RDA Update Forum, held on Saturday, June 23, included presentations by Dominique Bourassa (Yale University), Clément Oury (ISSN International Centre), James Hennelly (ALA Publishing), and Gordon Dunsire (RSC).

The first presentation, “News from NARDAC: The North American Region Takes Shape,” described the ongoing development of the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC). NARDAC was formed in 2018 and consists of communities that have implemented RDA. The current representatives are Dominique Bourassa and Kathy Glennan (ALA), Thomas Brenndorfer and Nathalie Mainville (Canadian Committee on Cataloguing [CCC]), Damian Iseminger and Kate James (LC). The group meets virtually, using existing electronic lists for communication. NARDAC has a webpage on the RSC site (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/northamerica>).

NARDAC has been charged with formulating North American positions on RDA matters, keeping the region informed, responding to RSC initiatives, and identifying individuals for RSC Working Groups. Since NARDAC is an umbrella group, future RDA revision proposals will continue to be submitted

through existing committees (e.g., CC:DA, CCC, LC). Proposals are not yet being accepted, and will have to fit within the new Toolkit to be considered.

The second presentation examined common views on serials modeling by the ISSN International Centre and the RDA Steering Committee (RSC). The IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM) treatment of serials provided a driver for harmonization of RDA, ISBD and ISSN. Issues discussed at the 2017 IFLA conference were summarized in an RSC/ISSN International Centre discussion paper (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-Chair-20.pdf>).

James Hennelly provided a brief demonstration of the RDA Toolkit beta version, released on June 13, 2018. It is important to note that the product is not yet complete; for example, the visual browser will be added at a later date. Policy statements and translations are not incorporated into the beta version. Minor fixes and updates will be ongoing and not saved up for a formal release. The beta version of the Toolkit should not be used for current cataloging. Some sample examples are included but the vast majority of examples are yet to come.

Search filters have been added. It is possible to search the Toolkit by MARC field or old RDA instruction number, provided that these were mapped in the previous Toolkit. Other useful tools include the ability to set bookmarks and create notes, which could be used for local policy statements (and one can subscribe to these notes). A feature also creates URLs for linking or citation purposes.

The final speaker, Gordon Dunsire, presented a brief overview of the content of the beta RDA text. (This was summary version of his RDA pre-conference presentation.) IFLA LRM, internationalization, and communities are the primary drivers for changes to RDA. In the beta version, there are thirteen entities and more than 1700 elements. Implementation of RDA will be accomplished through application profiles, in which mandatory elements and option choices will be documented. Application profiles will vary by library, format, and community. Instructions appear in a standardized format with a structured display of options, using conditional statements. The RSC continues to work on the text; their next meeting will be in October 2018.

RDA Linked Data Forum

The RDA Linked Data Forum was held on Monday, June 25. Gordon Dunsire (RSC) presented “RDA Linked Data and the New RDA Toolkit” (slides available at the RSC website: <http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/Dunsire%20presentation%20Linked%20Data%20Forum.pdf>). Dunsire briefly recapped the RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project (3R), which aims to bring a new responsive design and structure, incorporate IFLA LRM (LRM) as the underlying framework, and extend RDA to international, cultural heritage and linked data communities. The beta version of the Toolkit was released in mid-June, but is not expected to be complete until December 2018.

Several new entities have been introduced in the beta version, including entities for agent, collective agent, nomen, place, and timespan. Many attributes have become relationships, for example, “date of birth” is “related timespan of person.” RDA vocabularies comprise RDF representations of entities (classes), elements (properties), and terms (concepts) with translations into more than twelve languages. The vocabularies are published via GitHub and RDA Registry. Four methods for recording data values (these methods were formerly known as the “four fold path”) are provided: unstructured description, structured description, identifier, and IRI. RDA will use semantic versioning (i.e., “break.bend.minor”). A change in the first number signifies a break from the previous version; a change in the second number is a “bend” away, while a change in the third number is considered a minor

change. For example, the last version of the current Toolkit is numbered 2.7.3 (April 2017) while the beta version is numbered 3.0.6.

ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

CC:DA met on Saturday, June 23, 2018. The CC:DA [blog](#) contains the full [agenda](#) and links to various documents and reports.

After introductions, the adoption of the agenda, and approval of the minutes of the meeting held at ALA Midwinter, chair Tina Shrader delivered the [report](#) of CC:DA motions and other actions January-June 2018. The new CC:DA chair will be Amanda Ros. Two task forces were convened: the Task Force to Review Chinese Rare Book Cataloging Guidelines and the Virtual Participation Task Force.

LC Representative Dave Reser provided highlights from his written report. A library-wide realignment to support its user-centered future direction is planned. The Library received increased funding for FY 2018. LC is conducting market research for a next generation library service platform with the hope of issuing an Request for Information (RFI) later in 2018. The BIBFRAME pilot project phase 2 is expected to continue well into 2018. The full report may be viewed at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3361>

Dominique Bourassa and Kathy Glennan provided a [report](#) on NARDAC and RDA-related activities from January-June 2018. The North American RDA Committee (NARDAC) is up and running. There are two representatives from ALA (Dominique Bourassa and Kathy Glennan) along with representatives from the Canadian Committee on Cataloging (Thomas Brenndorfer and Nathalie Mainville) and Library of Congress (Damian Iseminger and Kate James). Roles for the committee have been determined: chair, Dominique; NARDAC representative to the RSC, Thomas (back-up, Kate); coordinator of web content (Damian). The committee has begun to add content to their [webpage](#) on the RSC website. The committee has also agreed upon a basic protocol for future RDA revisions and additions. The full report may be viewed at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=3363>.

The RSC has expanded its core membership to include a Wider Community Engagement Officer (Ebe Kartus, University of New England, New South Wales) and representatives were added from the translators (Daniel Paradis, Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec) and policy statement writers (Dave Reser, Library of Congress). Work continues on the 3R project, including creation of draft guidance chapters, examples, creation of a new 3R Project FAQ on the RSC website, instructions for diachronic works and aggregates. The RSC will meet at McGill University in Montréal, Québec, Canada, from October 23-25, 2018.

The PCC report noted that their strategic plan approved, resulting in the formation of some new task groups. One is for broadening PCC to encourage participation; and others for communication, legal status, and linked data best practices development. A report on formulating URIs was released. A test of limited ISBD punctuation with vendors, etc. for display, usability aims to collect data by July 1 with analysis complete in time for the November Policy Committee meeting.

James Hennelly provided a report from ALA Publishing. LIS pricing for the RDA Toolkit was changed to a fixed price (previously at 50% cost or prorated) to alleviate administrative costs. The number of new subscriptions are down presumably customers are waiting for new Toolkit. However, the number of sessions, searches and document views have increased. Overall, revenue is close to budget projections, though a bit behind due to the revised LIS pricing. Print copies of RDA are still selling despite not being updated. ALA Publishing will provide free webinar training for navigating the new Toolkit. A suggestion was made to archive current Toolkit at the Library of Congress; at present ALA materials are

archived at University of Illinois. There are signed agreements for Arabic, Hungarian, and Danish translations of RDA.

James also gave a presentation on changes in the beta version of the RDA Toolkit. Profile login now requires a unique user name; contact James if problems are encountered with profile login. He is seeking feedback on types of content to be featured in the news blocks on front page. Hennelly wants to develop a mapping tool rather than recreating the MARC mapping table currently in the Toolkit. Navigation buttons at the bottom of the screen are based on DITA maps that place entities and elements in alphabetic order. When policy statements are incorporated, they will align on the page alongside the option/instruction/etc. to which they pertain. MARC subfields may be searched, but one must use quotation marks (e.g., "546 \$b"). Subscriptions can be set to be notified of changes to user-contributed documents, policy statements, and notes.

Jessica Hayden gave a report from the Virtual Participation Task Force. The group is charged with investigation of meeting options. ALCTS currently has a license for Go-to-Meeting with a limit of twenty-six attendees; they plan to test a variety of platforms for their task force meetings.

Chair Tina Shrader led a follow-up discussion on future task forces, based on the original discussion at the Midwinter meeting. There were several suggestions: exploration of vocabulary management in a linked data context, providing training within ALA for linked data (geared toward decision-makers), and developing application profiles or community standards (which will be very important with the new Toolkit). A task force will be required to change the website to add NARDAC information. Continuing task groups include the Virtual Participation Task Force and a refreshed version of the 3R Task Force. A straw poll indicated a preference for application profiles, followed by vocabulary work, and training.

The chair discharged the Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA and the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3.

The next CC:DA meeting is scheduled to be held at ALA Midwinter in Seattle on January 26, 2019 (1-5:30 p.m.), and on January 29 (8-11:30 a.m.).

[ALCTS/LITA Authority Control Interest Group \(ACIG\)](#)

ACIG met on Sunday, June 24 and featured three presentations. As of this writing, slides are not yet available on ALA Connect.

The first presentation, "PCC ISNI Pilot: Experiments in Identity Management," consisted of a panel of four speakers (Peter Fletcher, UCLA Library (for Michelle Durocher, UCLA), Iman Dagher, UCLA Library, Chris Long, University of Colorado Boulder, Lucas Mak, Michigan State University Libraries). The introduction provided context for the pilot project – a need for consistent, transparent identifiers and a need to collaborate with expert metadata communities outside libraries. ISNI was selected for its adherence to the ISO standard. Pilot participants hailed from thirteen volunteer institutions. The pilot project had several activities and deliverables, including examining functionality and gaps of existing tools, improving batch processes for library use, documenting "pain points" to inform ISNI technology and policy roadmaps, identify PCC training, documentation, and policy needs, and to envision a PCC collaborative model in ISNI.

Two panel speakers (Iman Dagher, Chris Long) related their experiences as part of the PCC ISNI pilot. UCLA became involved because of their commitment as a PCC institution to support PCC experiments and interest in linked data and semantic web applications. Some of the challenges faced included a culture shift from "authoritativeness" (as in NACO), functionality issues in searching and

creating ISNI records, lack of user-friendly documentation, and absence of local policy or best practices to integrate this workflow with other workflows. UCLA found this experience to be a valuable way to explore the concept of identity management in a working system.

The University of Colorado Boulder's ISNI experience featured a project to create or modify ISNI records for faculty and academic units of the College of Engineering and Applied Science. Project staff featured a mix of NACO and non-NACO catalogers. The project was completed in three months, with half of the work involving ISNI maintenance activities such as adding University information, merging duplicate records, and resolving mixed identities. Future plans include creating or modifying ISNI records for all faculty and academic staff units, using batchloading processes to achieve this. A concurrent NACO/ISNI workflow is not anticipated because it is not a sustainable workload.

The final panelist (Lucas Mak) spoke about the activities of the PCC ISNI pilot API review/testing subgroup. Four institutions are part of the subgroup. Each institution dealt with different use cases: Columbia University with department names, Harvard with Harvard University Press authors, Michigan State with electronic thesis/dissertation authors, and Stanford with game developer names.

Janis Young reported news from the Library of Congress. A policy change regarding "Multiple Subdivisions" (SHM H 1090) is coming soon. These headings were originally designed to save time for catalogers and to constrain the number of pages in print LCSH volumes but present drawbacks for linked data use. A project to remove existing headings is expected to take at least one year to complete. Occasionally what appear to be duplicate records in the authority file are reported. For example, when a heading appears in both the name authority file and LCSH, these are not true duplicate records – in most cases an LCSH record is created when it is needed to support a reference not appropriate for a name authority record or to add subject information. PSD has examined these "duplicates" and are confident that only the pairs that are truly needed exist. LC is also cancelling a program for NACO members to propose author numbers within the NACO workflow. The new policy will use the 053 second indicator to differentiate LC-assigned author numbers from those assigned by others. The limit on the number of 053s in a name authority record has been removed from DCM Z1. See instruction sheet F 632 in the *Subject Headings Manual* for more information.

The final presentation, "RightsStatements.org and Beyond: Authority Control for Rights Metadata," was given by Linda Ballinger (Penn State University). (Slides from this presentation are available at <https://goo.gl/WpPd16>). RightsStatements.org provides twelve standardized right statements for online cultural heritage that are meant to be user friendly, consistent, and machine operable. Standardized rights statements combat the problems of uncontrolled, free-text metadata about copyright. Tools such as the PA Digital's RightsStatement.org Selection Tool or the Durationator can assist with assigning a rights statement or determining copyright status. Ballinger also explored the relationship between authority control and rights metadata.