



ISBD Punctuation and MARC

PCC Joint Operations Committee Meeting
May 8, 2014

Robert Bremer
Senior Consulting Database Specialist
OCLC
bremerr@oclc.org



Background



- Presentation at OpCo on eliminating ISBD and other punctuation in 2010
- Task group formed to examine requirements to accomplish that goal
- Task group finished its report in September 2011 (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sca/documents/isbdmarc.docx>)
- RDA implementation
- Disagreement within PCC management

Background



- Poll at OpCo 2013 indicated catalogers wanted to eliminate terminal field punctuation—but no action taken on that point
- Issue referred to ALCTS-LITA Metadata Standards Committee which after many months recommended waiting until the adoption of BIBFRAME (*I think overlooked key points in the report*)

Background



- Catalogers continue to obsess about punctuation, e.g., AUTOCAT digest Apr. 27-28 – 10 messages on when field 300 ends with a period
- Cataloger training is complicated by punctuation instructions rather than focusing on identifying, recording, and coding data
- Record creation is slowed by odd key strokes required for ISBD punctuation

Issues



- ISBD designates parts of the description where MARC 21 is ambiguous
- Granularity of coding continues to be a problem and comparison of MARC 21 to the UKMARC format or UNIMARC makes that very clear
- Terminal punctuation following elements will not be needed in the future

Issues



- MARC 21 is not dead yet—and it will be a very healthy zombie when the time comes, e.g., millions of additional MARC records yet to be created
- There will not be a *Day 1* where we all transition to BIBFRAME
- We will all have to deal with records created in MARC 21 mapped to BIBFRAME, records created in BIBFRAME mapped to MARC 21

Issues



- Mapping will be complex and unlikely to deal with all the minutia of adding and removing various styles of display punctuation
- Records mapped to BIBFRAME are likely to contain a lot of punctuation that we would prefer to have already removed
- MARC records that began life in BIBFRAME may lack punctuation per current standards

Example



- 245 02 A downland suite \$h [sound recording] ; \$b The holy boy ; Elegaic meditation / \$c John Ireland. Suite for string orchestra / Frank Bridge.
- How does a system know where the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th titles start and stop? And the same for the 2nd statement of responsibility?
- These elements are all specifically coded in UKMARC and UNIMARC and designated (poorly) in ISBD, but in MARC 21 it's only \$a, \$h, \$b, and \$c

Proposal #1 - Terminal Punctuation



Cease input of terminal periods for all fields effective ... except when the field ends with an abbreviation or contains two or more complete sentences, e.g., summary notes in field 520

- Requires changes to LC-PCC policy statement regarding punctuation
- MARC 21 would ideally have its input conventions revised for a number of fields
- Allows for utilities to begin removal of terminal periods
- OCLC could supply user macros to add and remove punctuation

Proposal #2 - Internal Punctuation



Prefer omission of ISBD and all other punctuation coinciding with subfield codes for all fields effective ... excluding access points; when the result would be ambiguous retain the punctuation, e.g., parallel titles in 245 \$b; do not add missing punctuation back into the shared record

- Allows libraries to still create records with punctuation if needed
- Follow the "German" model using code "c" in Leader/18
- Documentation changes needed over time to illustrate best practice
- Allows for utilities to begin removal of unnecessary punctuation
- OCLC could supply user macros to add and remove punctuation

Proposal #3 - MARC Changes



Request the MARC Advisory Committee review the report of the task group to assess which field changes would be most beneficial (i.e., those in the 2xx and 3xx ranges in particular) so that they could be approved as soon as possible
