**CEAL questions on transcribing CJK numerals applying RDA 1.8.2**

1. PSD has asked for comments from several LC non-Latin cataloging groups, including Cyrillic, Perso-Arabic, and Hebrew (discussions with Greek catalogers not completed).  The intent is to find out from those non-CJK non-Latin groups if LC’s (latest) suggested responses that have the endorsement from CEAL survey results also apply to the other groups, and if not, what the other groups are doing.  The goal for PSD is to document the best practices, even if the approaches are different.  Discussions are not complete, but initial reactions are as follows:
	1. LC-PCC PS for the first alternative at 1.8.2: LC will draft a revision to provide an exception for certain non-Latin scripts, providing examples for recording both the non-Latin and Romanized forms using Western-style Arabic numbers. A reference from the LC-PCC PS for 1.4 will also be made to this PS since it might be expected that script issues are dealt with at 1.4. As of this writing, the proposed substitution of Western-style Arabic numerals seems to be acceptable to all but the Hebraica cataloging community.
	2. LC-PCC PS for the second alternative at 1.8.2: LC needs to have a broader discussion with the PCC community on the second alternative, but will at a minimum clarify the distinction between this alternative and the optional additions at 2.6.3.3, 2.7.6.3, 2.8.6.3, 2.9.6.3, 2.10.6.3, and 2.11.1.3 for adding corresponding dates of the Gregorian or Julian calendar (with a possible exception for Hebrew).
	3. LC-PCC PS for 1.8.5: LC will draft a new PS to make clear that for Chinese, Japanese, or Korean that the instruction on recording ordinal numbers applies whether the number is found as a Western-style Arabic number or a script number.
2. With regard to series numbering, the two series numbering related questions were forwarded to the PCC series policy working group.  PSD will take those comments into consideration to ensure the proposed policy statements at 1.8.2 applicable to recording series statements and 24.6 for recording series numbering in series access points are compatible.

In summary, PSD will continue to consult with other non-Latin communities, the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, and the PCC series policy task group. Because the instructions at 1.8 also apply to serial numbering (an issue not raised by CEAL), we need to consult more broadly with the PCC CONSER community on this issue. Ideally, if consultations prove productive, the revised policy statements will be included in the next RDA Toolkit update (October 2014).

**Undifferentiated Name Authority Records**

With regard to a former policy on authority records not coded as “undifferentiated” in 008/32, but have non-Latin script references that clearly represent multiple persons added by the initial pre-population of non-Latin references, PSD confirmed that NACO catalogers should adhere the PCC guideline on undifferentiated authority records: (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/PCC%20RDA%20guidelines/Z01%20008%2032%202014rapril.pdf> )If you encounter an authority record that is not coded as ‘undifferentiated’ but has references that clearly indicate they are for other persons, the irrelevant non-Latin script references should be removed.

**Non-Latin script references**

Regarding Ref Evaluation (008/29) coding “b (for reference not evaluated)” and 667 note.  The use of 008/28 coding “b” is to assure that systems with non-Latin bib headings wouldn’t flip to the Romanized authority 1XX based on a non-Latin authority reference.  The instruction to non-Latin catalogers is to continue with the current practice on supplying 008/29 coding “b” and 667 note “Non-Latin references not evaluated”.  PSD and PCC will continue to gather information from PCC members and library system vendors to look for solutions.  PSD is aware of the not-so-ideal situation (asking catalogers to continue to supply 667 and coding “b” in 008/29 for new NARs and updated NARs where references indeed have been evaluated).

The non-Latin script reference FAQ page (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/nonlatinfaq.html> ) is still valid for use though PSD is not intending to maintain it and will eventually take it down after the issues on 008/29 and 667 note are resolved.  It may be a good idea to look at what needs to be added in the current DCM Z1 in the area of 4XX and in the section on undifferentiated name authority records and possibly include some of the non-Latin script reference information there.