

TO: Cynthia M. Whitacre, OCLC

FROM: Charlene Chou, CEAL Committee on Technical Processing, Chair

SUBJECT: CEAL Responses to Field 260 in BIBCO & CONSER RDA Records

1) Convert East Asian terms under field 260s (esp. subfield b) to field 264s with appropriate 2nd indicators in field 264s

In the CEAL community, we are concerned how OCLC will convert East Asian terms under field 260s (esp. subfield b) to field 264s with appropriate 2nd indicators in field 264s, e.g. for 發行 (distribution), 배급/配給 (distribution), 發兌 (printing/issuing), 藏版 (keeper of the printing blocks; printer; publisher), 發賣/발매 (sale), 製作/제작 (produced), 製造 (manufacture), 印刷/인쇄 (printing), etc. Another major concern is for rare materials which may contain different and distinctive terms in the 260 field subfield b.

Examples for correct conversion:

260 東京 : †b 日外アソシエーツ : †b 発売元紀伊國屋書店, †c 2011.

This should be converted to:

264 _1 東京 : †b 日外アソシエーツ, †c 2011.

264 _1 Tōkyō : †b Nichigai Asoshiētsu, †c 2011.

264 _2 東京 : †b 発売元紀伊國屋書店

264 _2 Tōkyō : †b Hatsubaimoto Kinokuniya Shoten

260 重慶 : †b 重慶美卓实验印刷厂, †c 2010.

This should be converted to:

264 _1 [China] : †b [publisher not identified], †c 2010.

264 _3 重慶 : †b 重慶美卓实验印刷厂

264 _3 Chongqing : †b Chongqing mei zhuo shi yan yin shua chang

Other 260 examples for references:

260 江戸 : †b 岡田屋嘉七 : †b 大和屋喜兵衛發兌, †c 安政 5 [1858]

260 台北市 : †b 新銳文創出版策劃 : †b 秀威資訊科技股份有限公司製作發行, †c 2012.

2) Paired fields to be properly linked with each other

In addition to appropriate the 2nd indicators in 264 field, we are also concerned with the paired fields. When paired CJK and Romanized field 260s are converted into CJK field 264 and Romanized field 264, will field 264 pairs be properly linked with each other, even when multiple field 260 pairs are present (for publisher changes of multi-part monographs and serials) inside a single bibliographic record?

3) Recommendation:

We are not sure how OCLC experts are going to write the specifications for the conversion of paired 260 fields in CJK (and other non-Latin) records. Will OCLC test sample CJK records first to see how the specifications for conversion work? The CEAL CTP (Committee on Technical Processing) would like to help review these test results. If automatic conversion may not be working for these East Asian terms, a report may need to be generated for manual review and updates. Again, CEAL CTP would help review this report to provide our group comments.

4) Additional comment in the survey:

Rather than spending time and energy in such machine-conversion from field 260 into field 264 of questionable utility and potentially problematic results, OCLC should be handling more basic database management, including duplicate detection at the time of loading records from East Asia (duplicate records for the same manifestation in the same language of cataloguing) and merging of such duplicate records. Still, to this date, despite OCLC's earlier anticipation, multiple records for the same manifestation in the same Japanese language of cataloguing from a batch loading cataloguing agency in Japan still lingers inside WC. e.g., for ISSN 2187-6843: OCLC MR #986460726, #986029828, #985844578, #985685857, #985488494 ; for ISSN 1349-8630: OCLC MR #986391921, #986104627, #985806330, #985663252, #98550364