Program for Cooperative Cataloging
Advisory Committee on Initiatives

Name Authorities in Transition:
Implications for the PCC

June 24, 2014

Executive Summary

In late November of 2013, the PCC Steering Committee charged the Advisory Committee on Initiatives to examine the complex issues surrounding name authorities in a non-MARC environment in general and implications for the PCC specifically. The Advisory Committee began by considering the issues and "focus points" outlined in the *PCC Task Group Report on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment* (April 2013), as well as reviewing recent work undertaken by a wide variety of stakeholders. In this endeavor, we identified components of the emerging environment relevant for PCC review and articulated a set of assumptions about what functional requirements will be necessary to support the future environment. To frame recommendations for next steps to the PCC, we then assessed these requirements to determine:

1. What role should the PCC play in a transitional and future BIBFRAME authorities/identities environment?
2. What steps should the PCC take now to ensure that these requirements will be in place when they are needed?

We have made four recommendations for how the PCC might move forward in the rapidly evolving landscape of name authorities/identity management: (1) Develop guidelines for the use of VIAF vocabularies to authorize name entities; (2) Develop a process for evaluating, endorsing, and providing guidance for the use of name vocabularies beyond VIAF; (3) Significantly expand the ranks of those who can create identifiers/contribute authority data; and (4) Develop a testbed infrastructure to evaluate the intricacies of statement-based identity management.

As libraries transition into an environment where statements supplant records and where the web, at large, is recognizing the value of quality identity management, the PCC has an opportunity to play a critical role in moving a larger community forward at this critical moment.   It is our hope that further discussion of these issues and their implications will be helpful to the PCC in its strategic planning activities.

A. Introduction and Charge to Our Task Group

In late November of 2013, the PCC Steering Committee charged the Advisory Committee on Initiatives to examine the complex issues surrounding name authorities in a non-MARC environment in general and implications for the PCC specifically (see Appendix 1). After internal group discussions and follow-up conversations with the PCC Chair Emeritus, the Advisory Committee refined the issues laid out in the original request and has made recommendations for how the PCC might move forward in the rapidly evolving landscape of identity management. It is our hope that further discussion of these issues and their implications will be helpful to the PCC in its strategic planning activities.

The Advisory Committee began its work by considering the issues and "focus points" outlined in Part 2 of the *PCC Task Group Report on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment*:

- Develop policies and practices to express links between LC/NACO Authority File records and identity records in other systems following linked data principles.
- Consider developing policies, coding, and practices to enable the use of registered IDs outside the LC/NACO Authority File in bibliographic descriptions.
- Engage other sectors of the information environment–system developers, service providers, ID registries, cultural heritage institutions, etc.– in exploring use of URIs and linked data syntax for expressing and managing identity metadata.
- Model and promote the use of faceted searching and results display for entity metadata derived from authorities in library discovery and data management systems.
- Take a lead role in reconfiguring the relationship between library metadata and metadata drawn from other sources and in realigning expectations regarding cooperation and collaboration across sectors in the information community.

- Consider developing tools and techniques outside the LC/NACO Authority File for expressing relationships between identified entities and between relationship categories found in different systems.[1]

We have taken these important issues to heart as we have developed our more specific recommendations for actions for the PCC.

In our recommendations, we have also addressed the following specific questions for LC/PCC debate outlined in the 2013 report:

- Should a full record in the LC/NACO Authority File be required for authorized access points in BIBCO records or do IDs from other sources of a registered name identity (Wikipedia, VIAF, other library authority files, ORCID, ISNI, etc.) have a comparable place in BIBCO cataloging?

- What is PCC's role in asserting and revising relationships between LC/NACO Authority File records and identities in other registries?

- If an LC/NACO Authority File record references other identity records what metadata from these records (if any) should become part of the LC/NACO authority file record?

B. The Emerging Environment

With the development of VIAF, the existence of a large universe of names, and the increasing awareness that others outside the library sphere (e.g. rights management agencies) have similar needs for identifiers, it is becoming increasingly unlikely that libraries will continue to work within a single authority file. The emerging BIBFRAME approach to authorities does not seek to establish or recognize a single source within BIBFRAME for authority data, but instead assumes multiple existing sources for authorities and provides a mechanism for wrapping them in a common BIBFRAME Authority construct, currently called an "abstraction layer."

Thus, the opportunity to gather authoritative data concerning named entities from several sources under a common umbrella such as the BIBFRAME Authority wrapper opens the

---

[1] Report for PCC Task Group on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment, 2013: 15-16, http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20groups%20and%20charges/ReportPCCTGonNameAuthInA_NonMARC_Environ_FinalReport.pdf

door for the various subgroups within the cultural memory community to bring together data from the previously separate spheres of integrated library systems, digital repositories, and archives in a common setting where they can interconnect and be shared, discovered, and updated in a coordinated way.

The BIBFRAME environment will offer additional opportunities for decentralizing current library practices for registering name authority data when statements supplant records as the typical units of metadata creation and exchange. In a statement-based context, the various data elements that typically constitute today's authority record would not all need to be created at the same time or by the same person or institution.

The focus of authority work is shifting from creating name access points to describing and categorizing named entities. The linked data environment enables us to get a tremendous increase in benefit from authority work. With a reliable, unique identifier, we can go beyond merely providing a name for an entity to link to additional metadata about the entity, to coordinate with other representations of the entity.

Another driver for a less centralized, more opportunistic approach to managing named entities comes from the increasing need for institutions to recognize and, when needed, create identifiers for all their researchers in order to track their scholarly output in a variety of formats, including articles and presentations. In such comprehensive, institution-wide contexts, data creation needs to be as frictionless as possible, which will inevitably call for a lower bar for identifying named entities than is now seen in establishing library name authorities using current practices.

As we have long experience with multiple subject vocabularies (LCSH, MeSH) co-existing in a single discovery or editing tool, the emerging environment will require that our systems make sense of identities sourced from multiple files, and on a larger scale. This will have implications for legacy systems designed primarily to handle a limited range of name vocabularies. We believe, however, that the library community is better served by building tools based on standardized ways of referencing vocabularies and entities than by continuing to tailor its data to suit legacy systems.

C. Assumptions and Requirements

The Task Force believes that the PCC can and should continue to play a leadership role in the future environment surrounding management of name authorities/identities. To frame our recommendations for next steps for the PCC, we first articulated a set of assumptions

about what functional requirements will be necessary to support the future environment. Next, to develop our recommendations, we assessed these requirements to determine:

1. What role should the PCC play in a transitional and future BIBFRAME authorities/identities environment?
2. What steps should the PCC take now to ensure that these requirements will be in place when they are needed?

To support the transition between MARC and BIBFRAME, and from an insular authority environment to an open shared identity registration network, we have identified the following functional requirements:

- **Broader participation in identity creation and management.** We see value in encouraging broad participation in registering identities across the community of libraries, museums, and archives (LAMs). Opening up library bibliographic data will allow the open web to take advantage of the work of our community, while eliminating redundancies in library workflows by allowing us to use the work of others rather than re-establishing unique headings and re-creating authority data locally for a siloed library environment. All LAMs currently create headings for local entities and only a small percentage of them are able to contribute their work to the collective pool of authorized library data. Encouraging broader contribution to the collective pool will make more verified data available for wide use (both inside and outside of the LAM community), extend our expertise as a community that understands and values collocation and disambiguation, and bring that value to a larger playing field on the open web. In a transitional environment, either (a) more institutions need to be able to contribute authority data to the existing LCNAF, or (b) there needs to be a second authority pool to which any library, archive, or museum can contribute. In a BIBFRAME/linked data environment, we envision this need to be better addressed by an aggregation of stored statements to which anyone can contribute and that can readily welcome statements from local institutions.

- **Provenance.** Both in opening up authority data creation to LAMs beyond the PCC and in using registered authorities from non-library communities, libraries will more regularly interact with forms of names outside of our current rulesets. Rather than discouraging their use, we need easily-captured provenance information to identify the source of data elements and/or identify the rulesets that govern their creation. As we transition to a BIBFRAME environment, provenance data will be needed at the *statement* level in both BIBFRAME itself and also within MARC authority records, so that provenance data can be shared in a BIBFRAME environment. We will thus

need more granular ways of recording provenance even within the current MARC record environment.

- **Indication of level of authorization/verification.** We envision a process where initial registration of an entity should simply mint an identifier, which may be expressed initially (in the MARC environment) as a minimal-level authority record. Subsequent to this, libraries who have the expertise (especially PCC members) can provide much-needed verification functions for other communities. A scheme to identify provenance (as above) will enable identities that have this verification to become trusted. In the MARC environment, libraries should be encouraged to upgrade minimal-level authorities, as is currently common practice with the encoding level for bibliographic records. An equivalent process will be needed in a BIBFRAME environment to provide verification of the accuracy of statements surrounding identities. Again, in a BIBFRAME environment, indications of level of authorization/verification will be needed on a statement level rather than at the record level.

- **Determination of equivalencies across vocabularies**. Because different communities will use (are already using) different naming schemes and different rulesets to represent the same identity, we need an infrastructure in both the MARC and the BIBFRAME environments to determine and record equivalencies across vocabularies. In a MARC environment, this could be accomplished by enabling the recording of other community identifiers in the LC/NACO Authority File and encouraging PCC members to do this. In a BIBFRAME environment, tools that facilitate the aggregation of statements would enable the sharing of these equivalences, thus increasing efficiencies and enabling broader linking. In addition to providing future opportunities for the PCC, we note that there may also be a potential opportunity for authority vendors to provide a service related to finding and tracking equivalencies across vocabularies.

- **Differentiation of entities.** It is important to ensure that a single identifier does not knowingly designate multiple entities and an infrastructure to support this differentiation is essential both now and in a BIBFRAME environment. In the MARC environment, the PCC has already begun to address problems created by undifferentiated personal name authority records. The BIBFRAME environment will also require an infrastructure to support appropriate differentiation between entities within BIBFRAME authorities. It will likely become accepted practice to rely upon a variety of attributes to differentiate between entities represented by the same text string. The provision in RDA for additional entity attributes (dates, affiliations, area

of activity, etc.) is a welcome move in this direction. The ability to show other known associations would be valuable for similar reasons. In a MARC environment, this is generally limited to linking to associated bibliographic records, but that principle could be extended.

- **Contextualization of entities in discovery systems.** A closely associated need is to make available to the public contextualizing information about each entity so that equivalencies (or distinctions) may more easily be determined by the researcher. Differentiating named entities in public displays can be achieved by reliance on an entity's attributes and its identifier, getting away from depending on manual construction of unique text strings. The development of this functionality needs to be encouraged, but its absence in most current discovery systems should not be a reason for delaying the use of multiple identity registries.

- **Publication and sharing of identities.** Identities are most impactful when they are shared and used widely. In order to achieve broad participation, there must be an adequate business case. Towards that end, the LAM community needs:
  1. community-developed technology to make contributing/linking/ identity-matching a feasible enterprise.
  2. technology to make it easy for contributors with various levels of authorization to record equivalencies or to state relationships between entities and published vocabularies.
  3. less training overhead than is currently required by the PCC for participation in its existing NACO program.

D. Recommendations

The PCC Task Group on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment called on the PCC to consider developing policies, coding, and practices to enable the use of registered IDs outside the LC/NACO Authority File (LCNAF) in bibliographic descriptions. In response both to that call and to the rapidly evolving development of BIBFRAME, we urgently make the following recommendations. We believe these recommendations will bring significant time savings to metadata workflows by no longer requiring that we replicate identities already established in other standard sources and they will encourage the creation of a larger pool of quality identity data.

Recommendation 1, *Develop guidelines for the use of VIAF vocabularies to authorize name entities*:

We recommend that PCC charge a group to develop guidelines for the use of VIAF (or some subset of its contributing vocabularies) to authorize name entries in the current MARC environment. As part of this recommendation, we propose that PCC adopt as a long-term goal the inclusion of an identifier in $0 for any bibliographic record access point supported by an approved authority.

We have included a draft charge for such a group in Appendix 2.

The availability of multiple identity registries is a given in a linked data environment, and library authority practices should reflect this fact. Indeed, the existing MARC environment already supports identity assertions from multiple sources through the use of the $0 identifier subfield. Further, it accommodates standard URIs when given in conjunction with a (uri) prefix in $0. The provision of a standard identifier in this subfield will serve to identify both the source vocabulary and the specific entity represented within it.

As a source of available authorities outside of the LCNAF, VIAF in particular is well suited to support the identity assertions made in bibliographic records. Therefore, we recommend its use as a ready source for an expanded list of authorities that could be approved by PCC.

Recommendation 2, *Develop a process for evaluating, endorsing, and providing guidance for the use of name vocabularies beyond VIAF*:

We further recommend that PCC use the work of the Task Group on PCC Use of non-LCNAF Authority Data Sources (proposed in our Recommendation 1) as a springboard to develop a process for evaluating, endorsing, and providing guidance for the use of name vocabularies not currently in VIAF. Considerations may include a vocabulary's coverage, maintenance, licensing conditions, compatibility with LCNAF, support for additional identifying data elements, and technical accessibility (e.g. through APIs).

The PCC can provide an ongoing conceptual and institutional framework for evaluating vocabularies designed to support a variety of different communities, use cases, relationship assertions, and workflows. For example, such a framework might become the purview of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards.

Recommendation 3, *Significantly expand the ranks of those who can create identifiers/contribute authority data:*

As we proposed in the previous section on assumptions and requirements, we hold that the ability to contribute authority data needs to become more widespread across the LAM community. Although enlarging the pool of accepted identifier systems will greatly increase the available coverage of established identities, there will remain in the body of bibliographic data an ever-expanding number of named entities for which no ready registration process exists.

Current name authority practices have served the library community well, but the percentage of authorized names in the body of bibliographic data has remained low in spite of efforts to engage more agencies to contribute. NACO funnels have addressed the shortfall to a limited extent, but the training and procedural overhead is still high enough to preclude broader participation.

Much of the complexity of existing authority practices is due to the premium they place on heading construction. Such an emphasis on heading formation is less easily justified in a linked data environment, where the higher priority is on registering and establishing resolvable identifiers for named entities. Creating an expanded approach to NACO contribution with somewhat relaxed rules for heading and record construction would acknowledge this reality and would allow the LAM community to increase the coverage of registered identities. At the same time, participants in such an expanded program would continue to enjoy the advantage of the well-developed infrastructure and body of practice that NACO has built.

Therefore, given the need for greater LAM participation in registering named entities, we recommend that PCC liberalize the ability to contribute authorities for such entities in order to help meet that need. We have identified two possible models that the PCC should consider in making this possible and have listed them in order of preference:

1. Expand NACO participation to a larger pool of contributors, within the existing LCNAF file. Taking advantage of the two different encoding levels in the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data, PCC could institute a "NACO lite" level of participation that would enable contributions from new institutions that are skilled at careful differentiation among similarly named people and bodies and that are interested in creating new identifiers that others could use. The resulting new records could be easily distinguished in search

results and augmented with additional data by others.

2. Endorse the creation of a separate, parallel authority file to which non-NACO members could make contributions. Existing NACO members would also have the option to use it in certain situations, e.g. to create identifiers expeditiously for all of an institution's faculty members and researchers. This file would represent an additional dataset to search in performing authority work and would require coordination with the existing LCNAF; however, the existence of this shared file would be far better than a situation in which every institution creates its own local file for some of the identifiers it needs. The parallel authority file would represent an additional data stream that would feed into the VIAF.

Recommendation 4, *Develop a testbed infrastructure to evaluate the intricacies of statement-based identity management:*

The PCC would be able to undertake the three recommendations we have made thus far in the current authorities environment. Beyond those efforts, we see a remaining need for the program to do further developmental work to prepare for a transitional authorities environment. Many lessons will need to be learned as LAMs transition from record-based authorities management to statement-based identities management in the context of BIBFRAME and we believe that PCC is well positioned to lead in establishing best practices in the new environment.

In this regard, we anticipate a fundamental need for an infrastructure that supports the aggregation of statements to which a wide range of LAM stakeholders can contribute. The sooner a testbed for such an infrastructure is in place, the sooner the LAM community will be able to learn the intricacies of statement-based identity management. Lessons learned from this testbed will also enable the community (and PCC in particular) to make informed policy decisions to transition to a BIBFRAME environment.

To move the process of creating this kind of test bed forward, we recommend that the PCC actively engage stakeholder organizations such as LC, OCLC, and Zepheira to do the following:

- Create a shared environment for testing BIBFRAME authorities.
- Populate it initially with entities, for example, exclusively from the LCNAF or from all of VIAF.

- Create a simple user interface similar to the BIBFRAME Editor that would enable links out to various authority files and other identity sites (e.g. ISNI, ORCID).
- Enable anyone using the test environment to add a new identity or to establish a relationship between entities ("same as" relationships, etc.).
- Provide a mechanism for users to contribute local data in batches.

To reiterate, we see this as a test environment, a "sandbox" where LAMs can learn about statement-based identity management. Once such a BIBFRAME authorities test repository is in place, we recommend that the PCC appoint a group to evaluate what works and what doesn't work about the test site -- indeed to test the model of a BIBFRAME abstraction layer itself -- and to work with other stakeholders to develop a viable business case for creating and sustaining a BIBFRAME authorities production repository. Regarding the last effort, we feel it important to note that we see a clear role for the PCC in the process to develop the functional requirements for a shared BIBFRAME authorities infrastructure, but we do not believe that role carries over into a commitment to create and sustain the production repository infrastructure itself.

E. Conclusion

Our recommendations address how the PCC can go beyond what it can accomplish working within its own files. The nature of the work in the Program for Cooperative Cataloging could change from 600 institutions functioning as the sole creators and revisers of authority records, to PCC serving as leaders, trainers, coordinators and problem solvers for a larger group of participants in this activity. Keeping in mind the ethos of cooperation present at the founding of the PCC, we see opportunity for greater collaboration and avoidance of duplication of effort in the area of authorities. In making changes to its policies and programs, the PCC can provide leadership to a broader community new to contributing their names to a pool of shared identities. This will expand the availability of data we all need.

We believe that it is important for the PCC to begin to take action now, rather than waiting for BIBFRAME to fully develop. We have identified some specific actions that can be taken during the interim. This is also the perfect opportunity for the PCC to recast its purpose beyond specific programs. As noted in the first of its 2014 Strategic Directions (Expand the Leadership of the PCC in Shaping Standards within the Metadata Communities), the

"PCC welcomes interaction—both influencing and being influenced by other metadata communities."

As libraries transition into an environment where statements supplant records and where the web, at large, is recognizing the value of quality identity management, the PCC has an opportunity to play a critical role in moving a larger community forward at this critical moment.

Appendix 1, Charge to the PCC Advisory Committee on Initiatives

From: Philip Schreur [mailto:pschreur@stanford.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 1:33 PM
To: Riemer, John
Cc: Philip Schreur
Subject: Question for the Advisory Group

 Hi John,

Thanks so much for having the Advisory group take a look at the issues surrounding authorities in a non-MARC working environment, especially in regards to a cooperative cataloging program such as the PCC. I was asked to pull together the questions on behalf of the Steering Committee. As you consider the possibilities, please use the Report for PCC Task Group on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment as a starting point. In particular, keep in mind the challenges to libraries presented on page 11:

- How to relate external named entity identifiers and information to library authority data
- How to relate external named entity identifiers and information to library bibliographic data
- How to structure library authority data to optimize its utility in a linked data environment as well as in library systems.

Your white paper on these issues will help move the PCC forward and become one of the discussion papers for consideration during the PCC strategic directions meeting next November in DC. In particular, we'd like you to focus on these questions:

1. How can the PCC make use of non-LCNAF authority files for its BIBCO program? In particular, what are the implications for the use of non-unique text strings, the recording of authority file links in bibliographic records, and the use of multiple authority files for authority vendors?
2. If PCC members can create headings in and make use of non-LCNAF authority files, what implications does this have for the NACO program?
3. BIBFRAME recommends the creation of a lightweight abstraction layer at the local level to maintain the URIs for headings used locally. Part of the recommendation is that this layer could be the location for links to various authority files for these headings (LCNAF, ISNI, VIAF, ORCID, etc.). What are the trade-offs between these

links being recorded locally or in one central file (like the LCNAF)? If these links are recorded centrally in the LCNAF, what implications does it have for the NACO program and expectations from participants?

Please submit your report by June 1st, 2014 so that it can be incorporated into the required reading for the strategic directions meeting the following November. Thanks again for taking this on, we very much look forward to hearing what you have to say.

Philip

--
Philip E. Schreur
Head, Metadata Department
Stanford University
650-723-2454
650-725-1120 (fax)

2013-2014 Membership, PCC Advisory Committee on Initiatives
- John Riemer, Chair, University of California, Los Angeles
- Jennifer Bowen, University of Rochester
- Martin Kurth, New York University
- Chew Chiat Naun, Cornell University
- Erin Stalberg, Mount Holyoke College
- Glen Wiley, University of Miami

Appendix 2, Task Group on PCC Use of non-LCNAF Authority Data Sources

Draft, June 19, 2014

Context:

Following the work of the PCC Non-MARC Name Authority Task Group, the PCC Advisory Committee on Initiatives in its white paper on Authorities in a Transitioning Environment recommends the extension of authority source data usable to support authorized access points in bibliographic descriptions beyond the LCNAF to other sources, as well as the expansion of NACO to include a larger pool of contributors. This task group is charged to address the first of these recommendations.

Charge:

The PCC **Task Group on PCC Use of non-LC NAF Authority Data Sources** is charged to make recommendations on the following issues:

1. Which additional files represented in VIAF may be utilized to support access points for names in PCC cataloging records? Should any additional vocabularies outside VIAF be considered at this point as well? If so, which ones, and why? Please explain the rationale for this recommendation.
2. For what type of name headings (e.g.personal names) should non-LCNAF vocabularies be used? Should names from these vocabularies also be used for subjects?
3. If a vocabulary or file does not indicate a preferred form of heading, how should the text string be formulated? What implications are there for future coding practices and BIBCO best practices if vocabularies are used that do not indicate a preferred form of heading?
4. Provide guidelines on the inclusion of an identifier in $0 in bibliographic and authority records, including choice of identifier if more than one is applicable (e.g. VIAF or DNB) and syntax (e.g. use of URI vs. MARC source code prefix). Consider issues of practical feasibility in the current editing environment as well as longer-term needs.
5. Outline any issues that may need to be addressed for NACO practice if non-LCNAF sources are used (e.g. construction of access points for works and expressions, subordinate bodies, provision of references).
6. Identify other issues needing to be addressed as part of implementation, with preliminary recommendations if possible.

If the group has any questions about scope, process, or any other issues, please address them to the PCC Chair, who will consult PoCo as needed.

Time Frame:

- Appointment of group
- Deadline for report to be submitted to PCC Policy Committee:
- PCC Policy Committee will review by and post for OpCo review
- OpCo will discuss at meetings
- PCC Steering Committee will discuss OpCo outcomes and prepare an announcement for distribution on PCCLIST and posting on PCC web site, requesting public comments by
- Implementation date: The TG will recommend an implementation strategy and timetable

Chain of Reporting: PCC Policy Committee

Task Group Members:

Stakeholder	Name	Email Address
Chair		
PoCo Liaison		
OCLC/VIAF		
NACO		

Appendix 3, Resources Consulted

1. Cornell University Library, Harvard Library Innovation Lab, and Stanford University Libraries. "Linked Data for Libraries (LD4L)" web site, 2014-
   https://wiki.duraspace.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=41354028
2. Godby, Carol Jean. "The Relationship between BIBFRAME and OCLC's Linked-Data Model of Bibliographic Description: A Working Paper" (June 2013) 39 pages http://oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2013/2013-05.pdf
3. Library of Congress. "BIBFRAME Authorities: Draft Specification" (28 April 2014)
   http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/bibframe-authorities.html
4. Library of Congress. "On BIBFRAME Authority." (15 August 2013) section 2. The "Lightweight Abstraction Layer"
   http://bibframe.org/documentation/bibframe-authority/20130815.html#layer
5. OCLC Research. "Registering Researchers in Authority Files." (draft report 2014-03-28) 17 pages
   http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/activities/registering-researchers/oclcresearch-registering-researchers-draft-2014-03.docx
6. Program for Cooperative Cataloging. "Report for PCC Task Group on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment" (April 5, 2013) 23 pages
   http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20groups%20and%20charges/ReportPCCTGonNameAuthInA_NonMARC_Environ_FinalReport.pdf (The Advisory Committee also had access to unpublished proposals received by the PCC Policy Committee in November 2013 from Indiana and Harvard in response to this paper; those institutions's ideas are part of the agenda for the June 29, 2014 PCC Participants' meeting at ALA Annual in Las Vegas.)
7. Program for Cooperative Cataloging. Policy Committee. Agenda topic "ISNIs, NACO, VIAF, and ORCID," for November 7-8, 2013 meeting.
   http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/PoCo-Agenda-2013.doc
   a. ISNI discussion paper for PoCo (Word, 23 KB, 4 pages)
   b. About ISNIs: background for discussion (Word, 467 KB, 12 pages)
   c. Copy of identity links: background for discussion (Excel, 401 KB)
   d. Copy of database statistics: background for discussion (Excel, 405 KB)
8. Schreur, Philip E. Conference call meeting with the PCC Advisory Committee on Initiatives to clarify charge, get feedback on a preliminary report outline, and to exchange ideas, March 4, 2014, 2:00-3:00pm Eastern Time.
9. Society of American Archivists. Technical Subcommittee on EAC-CPF. "Encoded Archival Context - Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF)" (January

2011)
http://www2.archivists.org/groups/technical-subcommittee-on-eac-cpf/encoded-archival-context-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-eac-cpf

10. University of Virginia. Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities. "SNAC: The Social Networks and Archival Context Project" 2010-
http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/index.html