To: Iman Dagher, CCAAM Chair

From: Charlene Chou, CEAL CTP Chair

RE: CEAL CTP's Preliminary Responses to CCAAM Statement in Support of Internationalization of BIBFRAME

CEAL CTP (Committee on Technical Processing) has discussed the CCAAM statement in support of internationalization of BIBFRAME. Because of the availability of BIBFRAME Comparison Tool, some members would like to have more testing on CJK examples in BIBFRAME 2.0 before making more comments in depth. According to one of our committee members from LC, the second pilot for BIBFRAME development is scheduled to begin at the Library of Congress in June and it will expand in the area of non-Roman scripts, which will address some of the concerns in the CCAAM statement on internationalization. We plan to do more testing and look into issues more thoroughly in the coming year; therefore, the following comments are simply preliminary responses to the CCAAM statement.

Generally speaking, CEAL CTP strongly supports internationalization of BIBFRAME to optimize the discovery of CJK resources in both original scripts and Romanized forms. Below is a list of our members' comments, which are diverse and in different perspectives for your reference.

1) Original script and Romanization
   a. The second LC pilot will expand in the area of non-Roman scripts. One of the big changes might be to have the original script be the primary data, and transliterations be limited to the access points and RDA Authorized Access Point (AAP). This will limit transliteration of MARC 245/250/264 data to the title proper only (245$a/n/p/k/s/v etc.)
   b. For Japanese resources, a concern was raised about limiting transliteration to the access points and RDA AAP. This may lose important reading information for Japanese kanji (e.g., publishers' names for rare materials) because the same character could have completely different readings.
   c. So far, MARC has paired the fields of original script and Romanized form in a correct and functional way. It is very important for BIBFRAME to link each instance of transliteration to its original script correctly. Incorrect linking, unlinked data or duplicate data creation would confuse users or cause incorrect search results. For legacy data, we don't want to see any data missing or incorrectly linked in the conversion process from MARC to BIBFRAME.
   d. BIBFRAME is a data model rather than a discovery layer for the features of display and indexing. On the other hand, we do want to see a well-designed interface to display bibliographic data and search results correctly and clearly.

2) Language tags
   a. Is BCP 47 the only standard recommended to use with BIBFRAME? How about other standards, e.g. NISO or W3.org?
   b. Does BCP 47 in its current form support coding of transliterated data well?
   c. Will BCP 47 be compatible with MARC legacy data well? It would be very challenging to deal with a lot of disagreement over what code is best.

d. Does BCP 47 correspond to any of the ISO standards? What is the role of ISO language tags in BIBFRAME?
e. This part is complex and more difficult to understand. It may need to be reworked with clarifications and explanations.