

Discussion of Non-Latin Task Group Final Documentation on PCCLIST

Whilst the Guidelines cover only the creation of *bibliographic* records, they raise a number of issues which relate equally to authority data. I was surprised not to have seen these raised - nowhere that I could find, at least (and apologies if they've been addressed in some forum I didn't think to check).

The Guidelines allow three options relating to headings (section 1.5.2). As such it's impossible, I believe, to consider them without having regard to the implications for NACO work.

1.5.2.1. Parallel fields for headings not established in standard Romanization. Should NACO participants follow this option or not? I would argue that, in most situations, it's actually closer to NACO conventions (based on LCRIs) than the "standard" found in 1.5.1. But it's not totally clear-cut, and that's just my personal interpretation.

1.5.2.2. Entering cataloger-created qualifiers in non-Latin script. Even before the Guidelines were finally accepted I had already noticed differences of practice in NACO contributions :-)

1.5.2.3. Omitting dates and cataloger-created qualifiers (right-to-left scripts only). For no other reason than my distaste for exceptional practice that's based around the state of (some) technology at a particular moment in time - or some users' ability to properly use/apply that technology... - I'd be more than happy to see this option banned for NACO purposes. But I doubt the decision is up to me...

I'm still trying to get my head around the implications of these options in other situations - e.g., for WorldCat Local customers. But that's not in scope for this list.

Right now I'm most interested in knowing where within PCC this discussion is taking place, or even whether it's taking place. And if it's not, whose job is it to bring this to the table (and to which table)?

If I've missed something I should have spotted I apologize in advance. But I'm holding off the sackcloth and ashes for a little while longer.

Thanks for this message. I am also very concerned about the lack of discussion. Perhaps it is because RDA is still a test, but it seems to remind me of all the trouble music and law catalogers had with AACR2. Will authorities people have a similar problem with RDA because we are not discussing?

The Draft-PCC guidelines for creating bibliographic records in multiple character sets was posted for comment on the PCCLIST, CONSERLST, and BIBCO discussion lists, Sept. 14, 2009. It was also sent to various stakeholder groups (i.e., specialist non-Latin cataloger communities) for comment. Extensive feedback was received and incorporated into the guidelines. Feedback was received also from the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, at the preliminary and final stages. Updates were given

Discussion of Non-Latin Task Group Final Documentation on PCCLIST

and it was discussed at PCC Operations meetings in DC, and updates were given at PCC at large meetings at ALA.

This was discussed in May at the BIBCO and CONSER Operations Committees meeting. I raised a number of concerns about all the options and the implications for authority records and particularly for those of us who are using network level catalogs like WorldCat Local. If we as an institution want to follow one option and another PCC library follows a different option, then we get into the position of having to change the form of the non-Latin access points on bibliographic records so that our catalog (OCLC) shows the forms the way we want. This is an untenable situation.

I also raised the issue that at some point we are supposed to have guidelines for the "correct" form of non-Latin references in authority records and perhaps even some day we will wish to designate preferred non-Latin forms. In order to have such guidelines, we need to come up with an agreed form for references that we all will follow. I was hoping that the guidelines for bibliographic records would help get us there, but they do not.

I am not persuaded by the problems some have in inputting dates and other qualifiers for right to left scripts. These additions can be made, there's no technical issue, at least in OCLC. Yes, it's a little complicated, and can look a bit odd, but it's doable and it's learnable.

I was on this task force. I can give you my impressions (but others may have different takes on it). We had difficulty dealing with parallel non-Latin fields for headings in bib records. Some members of the task force felt that non-Latin data for headings should reside only as references in authority records rather than as parallel fields in bibs.

However, as I understood it, revising NACO policy was not part of our charge. As part of our report we did recommend that the PCC address the issue of non-Latin references in authority records sooner rather than later. But I can't answer Hugh's question about who is going to do that or when.

One other note: one reason for the many options for bib headings was concern about efficiency. For example, if you have a macro that turns transliterated text into non-Latin script, why go back and have to retype (or copy-and-paste) a qualifier into Latin?

I can see where the pressures for efficiency would be greater in bib record creation. Removing non-Latin headings from the bib assembly line and putting the work into authority records (do it once and hopefully systems can provide the access from there) might overcome some obstacles to agreement.

Another issue is how parallel non-Roman fields will be maintained, by authority vendors or by ILS authority control systems. As Adam points

Discussion of Non-Latin Task Group Final Documentation on PCCList

out, we do not currently designate a "preferred" non-Roman form in authority records. So, automated changes to the authorized Romanized heading cannot be readily reflected in the parallel fields.

I think that the guidelines for bibliographic records are a great step forward, given that OCLC guidelines are very loose. This should at least lay the groundwork for sorting out the many questions about headings.
