OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC)

The OLAC CAPC meeting was held on Friday, January 24, 2019. The majority 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 March OLAC Newsletter:

- **OLAC Research Grant** Application deadline is March 1, 2019. Contact Thomas Whittaker with questions.
- **CC:DA Liaison (Kelley McGrath)**
  - CC:DA has not been as active in the absence of RDA revision proposals due to the freezing of the RDA Toolkit.
  - There have been some changes to positions within the RSC and NARDAC: Kathy Glennan is the new RSC Chair; Gordon Dunsire has been appointed as Technical Team Liaison Officer; Dominique Bourassa serves as NARDAC chair and Stephen Hearn, who has been newly appointed as an ALA representative to NARDAC.
  - Progress continues on the 3R Toolkit project. The beta RDA Toolkit site has been updated; expect another update later this month with more detailed MARC mapping. The revised 3R timeline calls for an English language stable text by April 2019 with an expected date for Toolkit rollout in December 2019. After the stable text is released, work on policy statements and translations can begin. Communities of practice will need to develop application profiles to efficiently use the Toolkit. It is unlikely that any actual implementation of the new Toolkit will happen in December, since there is so much work to do! It is envisioned that RDA will be updated on a quarterly schedule rather than the current annual schedule.
- **MAC Liaison Report (Cate Gerhart)**
  - MAC has a somewhat lighter load this time around. OLAC has one discussion paper ([2019-DP02](#)) dealing with subfield coding for intertitles and transcripts in MARC 041. This will likely come back as a proposal at Annual. There was some discussion via e-mail as to whether the definition of intertitles would be extended to contemporary devices such as thought bubbles, scrolling prologues
or epilogues, chat, etc. Results of an audience poll was in favor of the definition not being extended to include such devices.

- **LC Report (Janis Young)**
  - LC-PCC Policy Statements continue to be frozen while the 3R Project continues.
  - A new section has been added to the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual*. DCM Z12 covers information about special projects for authority records in the LC/NACO Authority File and LC bibliographic records.
  - An appendix was added to the *LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data*. This appendix describes the process by which changes to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data are implemented in the LC/NACO name authority file (LC/NAF) as well as in the authority files for LCSH, LCGFT, LCMPT, and LCDGT.
  - Work on the “Multiple Subdivisions” (SMH H 1090) project continues.
  - Several genre/form terms with the construction “Filmed […]” and “Televised […]” have been cancelled now that the base terms have been established; however, some terms using this construction remain as high-level collocation points or because the base term is not a genre or form.
  - Changes have also been made to scope notes for the “Broadest Terms” in LCGFT. Scope notes limiting use of the term to collections have been removed. Note that some scope notes have been retained (e.g., scope note for “Pictures” [part of the Art Genre/Form project] has been retained).
  - The moratorium on LCDGT proposals continues.

- **OCLC Report (Jay Weitz)**
  - The *News from OCLC* was distributed. Highlights include the addition of records to WorldCat from the Cuban national library, new OCLC staff, and an announcement of new IFLA fellows.

- **Unified Best Practices Task Force (Marcia Barrett)**
  - The group has been working virtually and hope to have a draft for comment by Annual.

- **MLA/OLAC Task Force for Single-Title Audio Formats (Huismann for Bruce Evans)**
  - The group’s charge is to create best practices for cataloging Playaways, GoChip, SlotMusic, USB Music Card, etc.
  - Membership is being finalized and work will begin shortly. Bruce Evans will serve as chair.

- **Streaming Video presentation (Michelle Urberg, Kelley McGrath, Morag Stewart)**
  - The 2018 OLAC Research Grant awardees gave a brief presentation on their work so far and solicited input from the audience on several questions.
  - The goal is to come to consensus as a community as to what is required for vendor records, putting the results in toolkit format for the community to use.
RDA Pre-Conference

James Hennelly (ALA Publishing) and members of the RDA Steering Committee (RSC) hosted a hands-on RDA Toolkit Redesign workshop. Slides and recordings of the pre-conference will be made available from the RSC Presentations webpage (http://www.rda-rsc.org/rscpresentations) or the RDA Toolkit YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo).

The workshop had four goals: create RDA data using the beta RDA Toolkit, test the use of simple application profiles, identify and explore RDA-related issues, and to have fun and get excited about RDA.

The workshop opened with a presentation on application profiles given by Gordon Dunsire. Dunsire traced the development of the application profile and how it is envisioned to be used with the Toolkit. An application profile will provide the most efficient method to use the Toolkit, whose design can accommodate an unlimited number of application profiles. A simple application profile (similar to RIMMF) was developed for illustration purposes for this workshop. Dunsire walked through the process of cataloging using this application profile to catalog a simple monograph. EURIG (the European RDA group) has been charged with developing a general international application profile. RIMMF 4 is in development and there will likely be a hands-on Toolkit workshop featuring it at ALA Annual. Dunsire wrapped up the presentation by reminding attendees that there is more than one right way to create an effective description, and there is no perfect catalog record.

The remainder of the workshop involved using an application profile to catalog a simple monograph and then moving on to cataloging a more complex resource (e.g., audiovisual, music, serials, aggregates, etc.).

RDA Update Forum

The RDA Update Forum, held on Saturday, January 26, included presentations by Dominique Bourassa (NARDAC Chair), Thomas Brenndorfer (NARDAC representative to the RSC), Kathy Glennan (RSC Chair), and James Hennelly (ALA Publishing).

Dominique Bourassa presented “News from NARDAC: The North American Region at Year One.” She gave an overview of the development of NARDAC (North American RDA Committee), who is the entity responsible for representing the North American region (Bermuda, Canada, Greenland, Saint Pierre and Miquelon, and the United States of America) on the RSC. NARDAC consists of 2 ALA representatives (Dominique Bourassa, Stephen Hearn), two representatives from the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (Thomas Brenndorfer, Nathalie Mainville), and two representatives from the Library of Congress (Damian Iseminger, Kate James). The ALA representatives are not members of the RSC; Thomas Brenndorfer serves as the NARDAC representative to the RSC. Content for the NARDAC website (http://www.rda-rsc.org/northamerica) is being developed and features NARDAC’s new logo! NARDAC will also be devising a new RDA revision proposal process.

The second presentation was by Thomas Brenndorfer. He recapped various RSC activities, including the fourth RSC meeting held in Montréal in October 2018. An outreach event preceded the meeting. Slides from the event are available on the RSC website (http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/560) and the RDA Toolkit YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo). Outcomes of the Montréal meeting are available at the RSC website (http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-Outcomes-2018.pdf). Two topics discussed include user tasks (removed from the beta Toolkit text) and data provenance (a statement or set of statements about an element). Thomas is working on a project
dealing with appellation elements that he will be speaking on at Monday’s “A Deeper Dive into RDA” session.

Kathy Glennan spoke about next steps for getting beyond the beta Toolkit. The goals is to have a stable English text in April 2019. After approval by the RSC, work on derivative products (e.g., policy statements, translations) can begin. The only content changes to RDA during this phase would be minor changes such as correcting typos, edits for consistency, creation of new elements, additions of options, conditions within existing elements. Any change requiring substantial change to the text will not be permitted. The RSC will continue to implement governance changes and more clearly identify the roles of RSC Working Groups, Regional Groups and the RSC itself. The RSC will also work on developing new procedures and timeframes for proposals and other changes. Current RSC Working Groups are based on format or subject expertise; it is expected that these groups will be discharged in favor of “task-and-finish” groups with an international membership. Only the Translations Working Group and Technical Working Group are expected to be ongoing groups. The RSC itself is becoming more of an executive body, making decisions based on input from the regional groups. Post 3R tasks include refinement of collective agent, review of extent of manifestation and extent of expression.

James Hennelly talked about the work to be done on the Toolkit in the next six months. The Toolkit is being continuously updated. Upcoming releases include one in February for the beta product, one in April for the stable English text, followed by a June release if needed. That release will mark the end of the functionality work for the Toolkit. After that point, policy statement and translation work will begin. Citation numbering will be available for use with print materials or other non-digital communications. These numbers will random, permanent, and searchable, available via a pop-up toolbar. Examples continue to be added to the Toolkit. Note that examples are considered to be “adjunct” material, and not part of RDA text. Toolkit training will be developed and envisioned to be delivered via live webinar, online courses, and the RDA YouTube channel. Hennelly is interested in hearing input on the training. Once the RDA Board has given its final approval on the Toolkit, the transition period will begin. The original site will be available for one year past the new Toolkit approval date. It is anticipated that this transition period would begin about a year from now.

A Deeper Dive into RDA

“A Deeper Dive into RDA,” held during the Monday portion of the CC:DA meeting, featured a series of presentations covering such topics as: the nomen entity; the RDA appellation elements; the RDA/ONIX Framework; the implementation of relationship elements; application profiles and policy statements; and future communication processes from cataloging communities to the RSC. The presenters include: Thomas Brenndorfer, NARDAC Representative to the RSC; Gordon Dunsire, RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer; Kathy Glennan, RSC Chair; Kate James, RDA Examples Editor; and James Hennelly, Director, ALA Digital Reference. Recordings of these presentations are available on the RDA Toolkit YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/c/RDAToolkitVideo).

The first presentation, “A Deeper Dive into Nomen and Appellations,” was delivered by Gordon Dunsire. Dunsire noted that “Nomen is a very strange thing”—the Latin “nomen” was chosen for this entity instead of “name” in order to avoid misunderstanding, because “name” could apply to other things such as titles. The main utility of nomen in RDA is for authority control. Nomen is also likely to be used for resource description and related entities.

The next two presentations were given by Thomas Brenndorfer. In “Appellation Elements” he shared his experience working on a project to review and reword the 96 appellation elements. His
second presentation was titled “RDA-ONIX Framework: New Content Types and New Carrier Types.” The content and carrier types in RDA are derived from the RDA-ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization (2006). Brenndorfer walked through the process of creating new content and carrier types.

Kate James spoke about relationship elements. In general, relationships connect two things, are inherently reciprocal, and help identify one thing by defining its relationship to another. Relationships can be expressed by a graph or an RDF triple. Relationships in RDA are now relationship elements. Relationship designators seem to be a refinement of a relationship element, yet are not discussed in the relationship element chapters of the current RDA (e.g., composer is a type of creator). In the new Toolkit, relationship designators have become relationship elements. These elements carry equal status with any other element. Some attributes have also become relationship elements due to new entities nomen and time-span; others changed due to development of the place entity. Many of these elements have been renamed to capture both entities (e.g., date associated with person).

Gordon Dunsire and James Hennelly presented “A Deeper Dive into Application Profiles and Policy Statements.” Dunsire spoke first about application profiles. Simply put, an application profile is a specification of metadata that is used in an application. An application profile may include entities, elements, and vocabulary encoding schemes that are used, plus the mandatory and repeatable status of elements. An application profile may also include the preferred recording method. In the context of the Toolkit, an application profile is useful as a front-end to the Toolkit (i.e., “tell me what elements to use”), as a data input form, data validation, and for data extraction. An application profile may be layered (“nested”). For example, the current “types of description” are replaced by “coherent description of an information resource.” There are three layers to this description: the first layer contains the primary relationship, the second layer contains the minimum description of the resource, and the third layer contains an “effective” description with a particular application in mind. The first two layers are required with the third layer optional. An equivalent visual representation would be that of LEGO bricks – a base layer is required, then bricks are built on the top. Application profiles can be built up from an existing profile (e.g., a music profile could be built on top of a basic application profile). Models of application profiles will be provided, but communities will need to construct profiles (to continue the LEGO theme, the bricks are what is bought, not the prebuilt project). Profiles can be developed by a region or internationally, published inside the Toolkit (easier to use in context, but behind the paywall), outside the Toolkit (freely available, but without context).

Hennelly continued the presentation, focusing on policy statements. A policy statement planning group has been formed with representatives from LC, the British Library, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, the RSC Secretary, the Technical Team Liaison Officer, and the Toolkit Director. This group will be setting requirements for both policy statement file and display, determine the proper markup and functionality of policy statements, and establish guidelines for policy statement placement and content. A “more bang” script will create shell documents for all policy statement sets with links for policy statement placed where the script thinks appropriate. (The “more bang” script follows the original “big bang” script that shreded the current RDA, and the “wee bang” script that provided an overlay of standard instructions to RDA.) It is hoped that the infrastructure will be in place before April, so work can begin as soon as the stable text is issued.

Finally, Kathy Glennan presented “New Ways of Working? The RSC in the Post-3R Era.” She contrasted current and future methods of internal and external communications. The RSC will also need to develop a more streamlined RDA revision proposal process. The current revision proposal process
takes at least one year from start to finish. Goals for a future process include a quarterly timeline, reliance on regional groups and working groups, and to make the process transparent.

Bibliographic Conceptual Models Interest Group

The Bibliographic Conceptual Models Interest Group (formerly the FRBR Interest Group) met on Sunday, January 27. Slides of the presentation are expected to be available on the RSC website (http://www.rda-rsc.org/rscpresentations). Gordon Dunsire presented “The LRM and its Impact on RDA and Related Standards.” The initial question posed in the presentation was “Is LRM suitable for RDA?” The RDA Board has expressed a desire to move beyond libraries to the museum, archive, publisher, and linked data communities, so it was determined that the LRM is suitable for RDA.

The LRM (Library Reference Model) has retained several entities from the old models, including WEMI (work, expression, manifestation, item) and person (though with changes). New entities include agent, collective agent, nomen, place, timespan, and res. Res, literally meaning “thing,” is a super-class that allows inheritance. The RSC decided not to explicitly implement Res, rather, “RDA entity” was created to limit the model to anything of interest to RDA. RDA also adds sub-classes of collective agent (corporate body, family). Most RDA elements can be fitted into the model, though a major difference is that attributes have become relationship elements.

“Manifestation statement” is new, and transcribes information as it appears on the source. This statement is designed to cover many types of manifestation layouts, not just Anglo-American title pages or print materials. It is similar to an ISBD record, but there is not an exact correspondence.

“Representative expression” is also new. Many works have multiple expressions, and it’s not always clear which expression is the earliest version. Thus, there isn’t a fixed idea of this element and it will likely be community-driven.

LRM restricts agents to human beings, so non-human personages need to be accommodated in a different way. Fictitious entities and legendary characters in a title or statement of responsibility are treated as pseudonyms, while animals and non-human performers are accommodated as non-RDA entities (which will require a new set of relationships).

The IFLA Working Group on Aggregates report recommended not implementing its report before consolidation of the older models. LRM defines an aggregate as “a manifestation embodying multiple expressions ... every aggregate manifestation also embodies an expression of the aggregating work.” An aggregating work, then, is a plan for the aggregation; an aggregating expression realizes the plan by packaging the expressions that are aggregated. There are no whole/part relationships. In RDA, this is expressed as “a manifestation that embodies an aggregating work and one or more expressions of one or more works that realize the plan for aggregation.” There are three types of aggregation: a collection of expressions, an augmentation, and parallel expressions of the same work (e.g., in multiple languages).

Next steps for the LRM include development of a final draft LRMoo (object-oriented LRM) and integrating the LRM with the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model. There isn’t any significant LRM impact on RDA since only the LRM (and not LRMoo) was used for RDA development.
ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

CC:DA met on Saturday, January 25, 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 Amanda Ros delivered the chair’s report of CC:DA motions and other actions since ALA Annual. The 3R Task Group has been reconstituted and charged with providing feedback on the 3R Project.

LC Representative Kate James provided highlights from her written report. The full report may be viewed at http://alcts.al.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/LC-2019-01.pdf. A document covering all LC activities is available at the “LC at ALA” website (https://www.loc.gov/librarians/american-library-association/midwinter/lc-update/). LC does not have a booth at Midwinter, but has a table in the Skybridge Lobby of the Convention Center staffed by LC staff. LC is operating normally during the government shutdown because their funding was approved before the start of the fiscal year.

Dominique Bourassa provided a report on NARDAC and RDA-related activities from June-December 2018. NARDAC, the North American RDA Committee, has completed its first year of existence. The 2018 roster and roles were reviewed. Since Kathy Glennan’s term ended in December (she now serves as RSC chair), Stephen Hearn (University of Minnesota) was appointed as an ALA representative for a three-year term. Several amendments have been proposed to NARDAC’s terms of reference, pending approval by the RDA Board. NARDAC continues to meet virtually on a regular schedule. NARDAC members have been involved in development of the new RDA Toolkit and various outreach events. Presentations from these events are available at the RSC website (http://www.rda-rsc.org/rscpresentations). The annual RSC meeting was held in Montréal in October. Major topics included stabilization of the English text, LRM update (LRMoo), RDA content, beta Toolkit and functions, and RSC communication and work process. The 2019 meeting will be held in Santiago, Chile. It is anticipated that only the NARDAC representative to the RSC (currently Thomas Brenndorfer) will attend the annual meeting. The ALA representatives will need to work closely with Thomas to see that our needs are met.

Julian Everett Allgood provided highlights from the PCC report. The full report may be viewed at this link: https://alcts.al.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/PCC-2019-01.pdf. The new PCC directory was made available this past summer. Passwords need to be changed every sixty days for security reasons (note that the PCC has no control over this, it is a standard federal requirement). PCC members will use the Directory to report statistics. Although the previous statistics reporting method appeared seamless, it required a great deal of effort behind the scenes. An outcomes document from the November PoCo meeting is available at the PCC website (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/PoCo-2018/PoCo-2018-Outcomes.pdf) as is the revised governance document (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/about/PCC-Gov-Doc.doc).

Chair Amanda Ros led a discussion focused on the work of the reconstituted 3R Task Group. Chair Glen Wiley has had to step down, and Bob Maxwell will serve as the new chair. The group is charged with providing feedback on RDA and the new Toolkit. This will be accomplished through independent and guided activities. Informal feedback is intended to be submitted by the end of March, with additional feedback to be provided as necessary.
MAC liaison John Myers recapped MAC activity so far, and will provide a full report after the conference (since the second MAC meeting occurs after the CC:DA meeting).

James Hennelly provided a report from ALA Publishing. He would welcome any type of feedback, formal or informal, regarding the beta Toolkit. There is a link for feedback on the beta site. Most subscription growth is coming from overseas; ALA Publishing took a big financial hit due to the change in LIS subscription pricing. During the next six months the beta site will be continuously updated. As the text is stabilized, it is being sent to translators to work with. A policy statement group has been convened and charged with developing guidelines for policy statements. The graphical browser will be the last piece to be finished, hopefully by April (or June at the latest). Help pages are targeted for the April release. Each citation will have permanent, system-generated numbering available from a pop-up toolbar. It will be necessary to rethink how to issue a print PDF version of RDA. The PDFs are currently generated by chapter; the beta organizes by element pages. Since there are so many more pages, it’s possible that content will be split into two volumes. Accompanying publications will be re-issued. As text stabilization occurs, work will shift to translators and policy statement writers. ALA Publishing will be providing a suite of learning opportunities for the new Toolkit to include webinars, e-learning courses, the new RDA YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCd5pa3AoQlr17wESE99YHcnw), etc. It is envisioned that it will be at least a year before all the moving parts are ready for the Toolkit to be approved by the RDA Board, meaning that there will be at least two years for transition. The current Toolkit will be available for one year after the RDA Board approves the new Toolkit.

Jessica Hayden gave a report from the Virtual Participation Task Force. The group’s report was submitted in November but is not yet available on the CC:DA blog. There are some outstanding questions yet, such as whether there could be an unlimited amount of virtual attendees for a meeting, and would ALA charge registration for attendees.

Chair Amanda Ros led a discussion on CC:DA communication after the 3R Project is completed. At present, much of the meeting time is devoted to reporting. The group discussed the merits of submitting reports in advance with the expectation that members and liaisons read reports before the meeting; the meeting time devoted to reports would be used for questions and answers. One issue with this method would be how to engage a first-time visitor to CC:DA. Action will be deferred until CC:DA returns to its normal two-meeting schedule.

The discussion continued but focused on internal CC:DA communication. ALA has asked that all groups discontinue use of the sympa lists and to use ALA Connect instead. A careful reading of the message would seem to limit access to ALA Connect to committee member and would exclude liaison or regular participants. Chair Ros will follow up with ALA, and possibly form a task force to study communication for the group.

The meeting closed with a brief discussion of the future of CC:DA. Any change to the charge would require a task force and input from ALCTS. It is important to note that all ALA RDA revision proposals will need to come through CC:DA, so there will be plenty of work to do.

Final announcements included recognition of Diane Hillman, DCMI representative, who is retiring and will not be attending ALA on a regular basis. DCMI has elected not to name a new representative.

The next CC:DA meeting is scheduled to be held at ALA Annual in Washington, DC on June 22 and 26, 2019.
ACIG met on Sunday, January 27 and featured three presentations. As of this writing, slides are not yet available on ALA Connect.

Janis Young opened the meeting with the LC update, which largely mirrored her report to OLAC (see report above).

The next presentation, “The OLAC Video Game Genre Vocabulary,” was given by Rosemary Groenwald (Mount Prospect Public Library), Rachel Jaffe (University of California, Santa Cruz), and Netanel Ganin (Library of Congress). This project had its start as an outcome of an OLAC CAPC working group white paper outlining the need for video game genre terms. Although LC PSD acknowledged that video games do indeed have genres that would be appropriate for inclusion in LCGFT, PSD was unable to commit to a project given their other priorities. In the summer of 2016, a CaMMS/SAC/GFIS/Video Game Working Group was established with the charge of developing a vocabulary for video game genre terms. The charge also included investigation of publishing the vocabulary independently if LC was unable to commit to an LCGFT project. With LC PSD’s circumstances still unchanged, a proposal was made to the OLAC Executive Board to issue the vocabulary. The OLAC Board agreed, and the vocabulary has now been made available at the OLAC website (http://olacinc.org/olac-video-game-vocabulary).

The vocabulary was developed using the guidelines from the LCGFT manual. The group applied for and was granted a MARC source code (“olacvggt”) for the vocabulary. The records were converted from text files to MARC record files by MARCIVE. Both types of files are available from the OLAC site. The vocabulary is also available from the Open Metadata Registry. Scope notes for each term contain extensive documentation. The vocabulary utilizes a syntactic structure, with a top term of “Video games.” Each term references a broader term. Platform terms are not included as they are entered in MARC 753 rather than MARC 655. Although the vocabulary was designed to be a closed list, discussion is ongoing with the OLAC Board to make a formal plan for revision and maintenance.

Rosemary described a retrospective project being undertaken at her library to add genre terms to their collection of over 2,000 video game records. Their catalog makes heavy use of faceting so this is a great service for users. Facets can be combine with a subject search, for example, to find a game on a particular topic.

The final presentation featured a panel of five speakers on the topic of authority control for electronic resources. Panelists included John DeSantis (Dartmouth University), Miloche Kottman (University of Kansas), Lisa Robinson (Michigan State University), Casey Cheney (Backstage), and Candy Riley (Marcive). The panelists were given several questions to address. Each panelist gave an overview of their institution’s approach, and as can be expected, no two panelists had the same approach—some purchase authority records, another used a homegrown local system, etc. The second question asked what was working well for authority control. One panelist reported doing authority control at the point of loading, and another described a process of choosing records to send out, based on vendor quality. Another question addressed had to do with what is done to manage the data in order to do authority control. The vendors responded that they are able to work with customer-identified problems, or to perform test runs to analyze how data can be improved. One panelist related that they rely on user- or staff-reported errors which are prioritized and fixed (or not). Another panelist reported that they review system-supplied lists, decide on treatment based on the type of problem, time to be invested versus the length/importance of resource (e.g., do we spent a great deal of time for a two-minute video?). The panelists addressed their biggest challenges, which mostly revolved around vendor-
supplied metadata, such as names in direct or odd order, no dates associated with personal names, incorrect MARC coding, headings not matching sources, keywords coded as LCSH, etc. Most vendors do not view these issues as a priority; thus there is no incentive to improve. Perhaps selectors can assist in advocating for better vendor records.