

Catalogers Group
Minutes
May 18, 2007

Present: Melissa Beck (presenter), Valerie Bross (presenter), Claudia Horning, Laura Horowitz, Chamyia Kincy (recorder), Sara Layne (facilitator), Caroline Miller (presenter), John Riemer, Elaine Sakamoto, Hermine Vermeij, Kristen Wilson

Agenda: Reports from BIBCO and CONSER; Discussion of Issues

A. Report from BIBCO Operations Committee (presented by Caroline Miller with 2 handouts)

Caroline attended the 10th Annual Joint BIBCO/CONSER Meeting. Topics of discussion included:

1. Non-Roman scripts in authority records: Automated tools are being developed for adding non-Roman headings to authority records. Gary Strawn helped in the creation of these tools. Adding non-Roman scripts in authority will obviate the need for 880's in bibliographic records. Voyager is now capable of supporting this. At issue is the transfer from MARC8 to UTF-8 encoding. Also, at issue is the need for standards that govern how terms are entered into the fields. (Eg. In Hebrew, the form that is on the piece goes into the 4XX, whereas in CJK, the form that mimics the authorized form—including \$q—goes into the 4XX. These differences in practice will need to be resolved.) Catalogers can expect to see non-Roman data in authority records some time after December 2007.
2. Beacher Wiggins' report: "Update on JSC Committee of Principals/RDA and LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Division":
 - a. JSC and RDA: LC, the British Library, and the Library and Archives of Canada all reaffirm their support for RDA, in response to growing concerns surrounding the release date which keeps being delayed. This "reaffirmation" will be presented in a formal statement released sometime in June. A prototypical model of RDA will be available by April 2008 for the public to experiment with and test. LC hopes to not have a proliferation of documentation with RDA as with AACR2 (i.e. fewer LCRIs). LC is still interested in taking a role in RDA training. However, other groups, like ALCTS, plan on training, so coordination will be needed to prevent duplication of effort.
 - b. ABA reorganization: The newly re-organized Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) Directorate is still in the process of melding over 700 people from separate departments into one seamless operation. They have 14 acquisitions and 8 cataloging divisions. Illustrating the need for streamlining is the fact that it can sometimes take up to 30 people to process 1 piece! Their aim is to pair 14 of the divisions down to 10, while simultaneously

incorporating digital resources operations. They hope for this to happen by Oct. 2007. Other changes involve workflows, in which librarians will handle selection, acquisitions, and cataloging, while technicians will handle all descriptive and copy cataloging.

- c. OCLC Report: OCLC is working to have all RLG records migrated into their system by fall 2007. Among the benefits will be an enrichment of 1.2 million non-Roman records. NACO libraries that formerly used RLIN will need to acquire OCLC authorizations. A new feature in OCLC will allow catalogers to generate authority records from local systems onto OCLC. Other topics of discussion included the issue of parallel records after the migration process and RLG-style institutional record capabilities.
- d. Standing Committee on Automation: topics of discussion included aggregator-neutral records, vendor records, and Gary Strawn's work on normalization tables.
- e. Standing Committee on Standards: At issue was the Committee's lack of a Head position which affected the Committee's productivity.
- f. Standing Committee on Training: Our own Louise Ratliff is on the BIBCO Training Materials Group and will be working on the BIBCO Participants' Manual. An action plan has just been developed and 2 courses will be offered at ALA Annual 2007.
- g. PCC Input for the "Future of Bibliographic Control": There is a desire for PCC input to the LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. A PCC wiki will be set up for this purpose by ALA Annual 2007.
- h. Other issues:
 - i. Series Stats (Handout): BIBCO/CONSER libraries are picking up the slack on Series Authority creation and editing!
 - ii. Does BIBCO need a BIBCO standard record (paralleling the CONSER standard record?) Probably not, since we have Core.
 - iii. A course on basic cataloging: ALCTS is working on a "Fundamentals of Cataloging" course paralleling the acquisitions version.
 - iv. A "Cataloging Concepts" speaker was invited to speak. The hope was for the speaker to give insight into how PCC could adopt this format, but such talk will probably have to wait until RDA is ready.
 - v. BIBCO funnel? Can NACO funnel activities be expanded to address the entire bibliographic record? This would be particularly helpful for non-Roman language catalogers who already participate in NACO funnels for names and series.
 - vi. There is interest in filming Judy Kuhagen's "Train the Trainer" series.

3. Discussion: Vernacular variants in authority records and the issue of different philosophies. Policies need to be harmonized first. Currently, headings are paired in the bibliographic record (i.e. 1XX or 7XX for the authorized form and 880 for the vernacular form). If vernacular variants were allowed in the authority record, this practice of pairing the headings would be discontinued. The 880 field(s) would be eliminated from the bibliographic record and only the 1XX or 7XX would appear, even though the authorized heading would be in the Romanized form. Also, the form of the 1XX would depend on the country/language inputting it. A record input by a Brazilian institution may have different Romanization than an American institution, but either form would be valid.

B. CONSER Meeting (Valerie presented)

1. ISSN: The ISSN standard was approved; target implementation date is: 2008. The new standard continues to provide format-specific ISSNs; in addition, the standard introduces a format-neutral ISSN, termed the *linking* ISSN.
2. DLF Registry of Digital Masters: Libraries participating in the Registry share information through OCLC about digital preservation. Fields used for this information include: 007, 042 dlr, 506, 533, 583, 856. The DLF guidelines (<http://www.diglib.org/collections/reg/DigRegGuide.htm>) permit Registry participants to use *either* the single record approach or the separate record approach. At the meeting, CONSER participants agreed to prefer the separate record approach, at least for this year.
3. Revision of microform cataloging guidelines: Current CONSER practice instructs catalogers to create separate records based on differences in microform publisher and physical details. Many are dissatisfied with the results (e.g., proliferation of un-maintained records that are difficult to distinguish among in OCLC). A survey will be sent out to solicit comments on this topic.
4. National level cataloging for integrating resources: Many PCC catalogers would like to resume pcc cataloging of IRs. Issues to be resolved: (1) OCLC implementation of authentication code (042 -- pcc) for BLvl "i" records; (2) CDS distribution of CONSER-authenticated records; (3) consideration of the aggregator neutral IR; (4) reconsideration of guidelines (Access-Level Record for IRs v. CONSER Standard Record).

C. CONSER Standard Record Training (Melissa was invited to present)

1. Melissa and Valerie presented a CONSER Standard Record training session for the CONSER Operations Committee and representatives from LC. The discussion that followed was dynamic and synergistic—one in

which policy changes were made “right on the spot,” requiring Melissa to revise her own documentation to incorporate the new decisions. An announcement was made that the CONSER Standard Record will be implemented in June 2007. This doesn’t mean that institutions *must* start by then, but that they can expect to see these records in OCLC starting in June. For the most part, people agreed to try it, in spite of concerns. One of the concerns was how should a cataloger handle a record that is cataloged less “adequately” than desired, but that still conforms to standards. Should s/he just let it go or should s/he “enhance” the record, particularly if s/he needs to update the record anyway to address another issue? (The answer is: “Let it go!”).

2. Will the CONSER Standard Record include BLvl “i”? No. Just “s,” for now. Pro’s of including “i”: ISSN’s may eventually be applied to databases (see Valerie’s report, item B.1.) This has important implications for linking article citations through SFX directly to the bibliographic records in our local catalog!