Joint Task Group on International Participation In the PCC

Interim Report

Presented to the Standing Committees on Standards and Training
of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging

30 June 2003

John B. Wright, Brigham Young University (Chair)
Anthony Franks, Library of Congress
Philip Hider, SILAS, National Library Board, Singapore
Hester Marais, University of South Africa
Irene Münster, Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina
Heather Rosie, British Library
Paul Staincliffe, National Library of New Zealand

Contents

C.   Use of Standards and Documentation in Training
D.   Delivery of Training
E.   Recommendations for Training

VI.   Charge 4–Identify the required PCC standards that impede broader international participation in the PCC's programs and activities

    A.   PCC Programmes
    B.   NACO
    C.   SACO
    D.   BIBCO
    E.   CONSER

VII.   Charge 5–Consider the effects of recent IFLA activities (especially the reshaping of the concept of Universal Bibliographic Control) on international participation

    A.   FRBR and the PCC
    B.   FRANAR and the PCC
    C.   Implementation of 7XX Linking References

VIII. Charge 6–Explore options and recommend alternatives or changes in the use or application of standards and practices (as noted above) to facilitate broader international participation

    A.   Recommendations for Changes in Standards
    B.   Recommendations for Changes in Practices

I.   Background

I.A.   Charge

The Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) and the Standing Committee on Training (SCT) of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) appointed the Joint Task Group on International Participation in the PCC in late November 2002. The group was given a six-part charge, as follows:

•Outline benefits to both current and potential PCC participants of international cooperation in training and standards. Identify potential barriers to the provision of training to international participants

•Identify training and post-training needs of international participants

•Explore options and recommend strategies for the provision of training to potential PCC members outside of North America

•Identify the required PCC standards that impede broader international participation in the PCC's programs and activities

•Consider the effects of recent IFLA activities (especially the reshaping of the concept of Universal Bibliographic Control) on international participation

•Explore options and recommend alternatives or changes in the use or application of standards and practices (as noted above) to facilitate broader international participation

The group was instructed that its final report should outline "the group's findings and recommendations."

I.B.   Membership

The Joint Task Group on International Participation in the PCC was composed of the following individuals:

John B. Wright, Brigham Young University
Anthony Franks, Library of Congress

Philip Hider, SILAS, National Library Board, Singapore
Hester Marais, University of South Africa
Irene Münster, Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina
Heather Rosie, British Library
Paul Staincliffe, National Library of New Zealand & Auckland City Libraries

During our deliberations one member of the Task Group, Paul Staincliffe, changed positions, going to a Library system that is currently not a participant in the PCC. He graciously continued participating with us once he was established at his new location. His situation now—a former PCC participant without support from an institution—lends itself nicely to identifying one of the recommended changes in practice in section VIII of this report, namely, what to do with former PCC catalogers who are at non-PCC participating institutions.

I.C.   Process

Because the members of the Task Group are scattered across the globe, a listserv (TGIP-L) was created and all communication has occurred through the listserv and individual email correspondence. Task Group members began discussing the charge, covering the first part of the charge. That seemed to take too long. Task Group members volunteered or the Chair assigned various members to lead the discussion for an individual part of the charge (pts. 1-6). The designated member initiated discussion on the issues surrounding the assigned part of the charge and wrote a summary that was submitted to the Chair. The Chair compiled all summaries into a single draft report and edited them for continuity and style. The draft report was then sent to Task Group members who had two to three days to comment. The interim report was created from the draft report. In all cases, Task Group members are unanimous with regard to the proposed recommendations.

I.D.   Acknowledgements

The Task Group would like to thank the PCC for the opportunity of looking at these important issues. The group would also like to thank beforehand the members of the Standing Committee on Standards, chaired by Ann Caldwell of Brown University, and the members of the Standing Committee on Training, chaired by David Banush of Cornell University, for their comments and suggestions which helped us focus our report.

II.   Introduction

II.A. Organisation of the Report

The Task Group considered the charge received to consist of 6 parts. Each part is considered sequentially. Only parts 3 and 6 include recommendations. The recommendations can be found at the ends of their respective discussions. For continuity sake, the Task Group has chosen to write the report using UK English conventions to immediately demonstrate the spirit of international cooperation.

II.B. Scope of the Report

Every part of the charge, as it was discussed and recommendations were made, seemed to contain recurring themes. The report, however, attempts to place the relevant discussion and its accompanying conclusions and/or recommendations in the appropriate section without repeating in subsequent areas of the document.

The ability of the Task Group to evaluate all of the programmes offered through the PCC was somewhat limited as each member's level of PCC participation is varied. All members participate in NACO; three members participate in SACO; one member participates in BIBCO; and one member follows guidelines of CONSER, but is not a participant.

There is still quite a bit of work needed to tighten up the report and make substantive and clear recommendations. This will be our focus for the next three months and we welcome any direction you can provide.

III. Charge 1—Outline benefits to both current and potential PCC participants of international cooperation in training and standards. Identify potential barriers to the provision of training to international participants.

III.A. Benefits in Training

In our discussion the Task Group clearly saw as the greatest benefit of the training components of the PCC the professional development of individual cataloguers whose skills are honed through the implementation of consistent interpretation of rules and standards. The improved skills resulting from this common training program have allowed PCC participants to produce generally acceptable bibliographic and authorities records that can be used without further editing. The training has allowed PCC participants to help contribute to the success of the PCC mission (see Strategic Plan, 2002-2006 located at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stratplan_02.pdf). In addition, comments from the Task Group have identified the following benefits in PCC training that are worth mentioning:

- Personal training provided by knowledgeable and experienced cataloguers from outside institution.
- Support available in interpretation and application of the standards, which isa result of shared training and dialogue.
- Direct, personal contact with staff at LC helps to build a more constructive relationship with some real two-way communication.

III.B. Benefits in Standards

The primary benefit for PCC international participants in standards is the common use of and adherence to the principals represented in AACR2 along with the acceptance of common inputting standards associated with MARC21. The opportunity for participants to have input into the creation and revision of subject headings (LCSH), as well as the involvement with an international community that promotes an awareness of current trends, are seen as additional benefits.

III.C. Potential Barriers

Potential barriers for providing training to international participants can be grouped into six broad categories: 1) Geographic barriers and feelings of isolation, 2)

Language barriers, 3) Standards barriers and compliance to LCRIs, 4) Automation barriers, 5) Lack of experience in cooperative ventures, and 6) Lack of trainers. A discussion of each will now follow.

III.C.1.   Geographic Barriers and Feelings of Isolation

The obvious fact is that the majority of international participants share the common feature of being geographically distant from the PCC that is headquartered in the US. This geographic remoteness leads to feelings of isolation. In addition to the external isolation associated with geographic remoteness, international participants also share common feelings of internal isolation. Internal isolation occurs when the international participant adopts the standards and practices required for membership in the PCC and are then viewed as outsiders and anti-patriotic in their own nations or geographic regions. An interesting note is that four Task Group membersare the sole PCC members in their respective countries.

III.C.2.   Language Barriers

Although English is a universal language, not all PCC participants master it. For some international participants, it is their second language and thus they have difficulties in expressing themselves clearly enough. Trainers and trainees may not share the same mother tongue resulting in difficulties in understanding.

III.C.3.   Standards Barriers and Compliance with LCRIs

Potential international participants may be unfamiliar with AACR2 and inexperienced with its use. The same could be said for MARC21. The inexperience of international librarians using these mutually acceptable standards is a barrier to increasing the international participation in the PCC.

All current PCC members widely accept the use of standards (AACR2, MARC21 formats, etc.), but international participants find problematic the use of LCRIs which are not commonly used by non-US libraries. This will only be exacerbated by the recruitment of more international participants.

Compliance with LCRIs proves to be perhaps the greatest barrier to international participants. The cost/benefit of incorporating LCRIs could lead to the requirement for international participants to make changes in local cataloguing policy which prospective participants would be unwilling to undertake. Two broad categories of the LCRIs that will be problematic for international participants are

1.) US-centric LCRIs. AACR2 guidelines allow the cataloguing agency to give bias to the country in which they are based (e.g., 1.7A3). LCRIs, however, give that bias to the US. This would be unacceptable to most libraries outside the US and some concessions would be needed for an international cooperative to work.

2.) LC-centric LCRIs. This situation can lead to a duplication of effort by the international participants when submitting records, because of the obligation of following LC-centered practices and then having to adapt them to their own local needs (e.g., LC's use of abbreviation Dept. in headings rather than the spelled out form of Department).

III.C.4.   Automation Barriers

Currently, use of a bibliographic utility (OCLC or RLIN) is required for participation in the PCC. Many libraries or institutions do not join PCC because of the lack of capabilities, costs and administrative burden implied with being a member of a bibliographic utility. Also, OCLC access and training is controlled by regional providers that often require additional costs.

III.C.5.   Cost Barriers

Financial issues are a major factor with regard to international participation. In addition to the costs associated with being a member of a bibliographic utility, it is often difficult to obtain money for training. Institutions are not always capable to host a full week of training, plus the cost of bringing a trainer from LC. Money to attend conferences and meetings in the US are rarely available. The inability to attend conferences and meetings in the US adds to the feelings of isolation experienced by international participants.

III.C.6.   Lack of Experience in Cooperative Ventures

The benefits gained from cooperative cataloguing (sharing of economic burdens, consistency in application of standards, etc.) are perhaps not so well appreciated in certain areas outside US. Some persons see the idea of cooperatively sending records to an external file as a luxury unaffordable to their institution.

III.C.7.　　　Lack of Trainers

International participants desire trainers who understand thoroughly the PCC documentation and its applications. Because of this desire, there are not many, if any, local PCC trainers available to train new international participants. Consequently, the training of international participants has fallen largely to LC's COOP team and a small number of other qualified PCC trainers. While the COOP team is sometimes frustrated by the inability to have local trainers in foreign countries, it recognizes the unique role it plays during the sometimes emotionally and politically heated arena of PCC training.

The LC trainer is viewed as being an outside authority. It is quite common that local trainers are not considered as authorities because they are not viewed as being from the PCC. Local PCC participants would be qualified to train if given the opportunity, but it is quite common that local trainers are not considered authorities because they are not viewed as being from the PCC. The absence of trainers in non-US settings is not because there are not qualified persons in the respective countries, but because the local trainers are not acceptable to the international trainees.

IV.   Charge 2—Identify training and post-training needs of international participants.

IV.A. Training needs of international participants

- Trainees need a trainer that shares or is competent in the use of their common language.

- Where possible, training should be provided in trainees' language.

- Training materials need to be in the languages needed by the international participants.

- Training materials need to be distributed to new participant in a format that is useable in the area (all PCC documentation is on paper size and binder reflecting US use and practice—8 1/2 x 11 inch, three-holed punch, three-ring binder). This format does not fit needs of many international participants.

- Module on importance of collaborative work—working in cooperatives

- Need instruction in LCRIs and AACR2—The PCC has always operated on the assumption that those receiving training already are experienced catalogers and know AACR2. There may need to be a training module or separate training modules created that deal with AACR2 and LCRIs.

IV.B. Post-Training Needs of International Participants

- Cost-effective way to contribute programme records.

- Because of geographic distance and changes in time zones the evaluation process and feedback of records submitted takes sometimes too much time and this causes problems to the participants.

- The reviewer or trainer should be contacted in an acceptable time after the course finished for feedback on the work submitted and to strengthen the relations with the participants.

- A formal follow up session as part of the training process, say after 4-6 months, to ascertain if hopes of both participant and the PCC are being realized.

- Way to interact with other new PCC participants.

V. Charge 3—Explore options and recommend strategies for the provision of training to potential PCC members outside of North America.

Before examining options and strategies for the provisionof training to potential PCC members, the Task Group identified the major impediments that currently exist in the provision of training. These were identified as:

1. Geographical distribution.
2. Language barriers.
3. Use of standards and documentation in training.
4. Delivery of training.

The Task Group then considered each impediment in turn.

V.A. Geographical distribution

It became apparent soon after beginning to explore the charge that the majority of international members share a common feature that the PCC has not to date acknowledged. When processing an application for membership, the PCC currently views the applicant in isolation, simply as an individual institution with no attempt to place the institution in any kind of context.

Before any training can take place, the PCC must recognise that international members perceive a real sense of isolation both geographically and in relation to their activities. This is exacerbated by the fact that they are more likely to be the sole PCC member in their country or region. This contrasts with the position in the United States where PCC members are geographically closer to each other, may be members of regional consortia for other programs and have regular contact with similar state-wide institutions.

The Task Group were of the opinion that the current approach of the PCC towards potential and existing members as being US centric, narrow in focus (following a single approach) and inflexible with respect to individualinstitutions. In short, it

ignores the reality of the individual domestic situation.

Although potential international members may be geographically isolated from other potential or existing PCC members, the frustration felt by the members of the Task Group at the PCC's viewing them in complete isolation has been a common theme throughout the discussions of this charge. Geographical isolation does not automatically equate to organisational isolation.

An often-overlooked facet of international membership is the economic and organisational situation of both the prospective member and of their country. When an institution applies for membership, the PCC does not enquire as to the motives, financial position, or organisational structure of either the prospective member, or of libraries in general in that country.

Whether this is because it assumes the organisation is fully able to participate in PCC activities, both financially and from a standards/support point of view or it regards these issues as not being relevant to PCC participation is unclear. The result is that often institutions become PCC members but are extremely limited in the role they can play in PCC activities.

In short, the provision of training does not currently take into account the:

- Size of the potential PCC market in each geographical region.
- Geographical distribution of potential members within each region.
- Relationship of the prospective member to other geographically close, similar institutions.
- Economic/organisational position of potential members, both individually and as a country and region.

Instead of this approach it would be more helpful to all, if the PCC viewed the applicant in their broader geographic region and relationship to other institutions. By adopting this approach, the PCC would identify whether there are any other institutions who may be interested or eligible to become PCC members. This identification and communication process will help to foster co-operation and collaboration, overcome isolation, share the burden of trainee and trainer and hopefully serve as an impetus for membership for others. In essence, a quasi-official regional funnel would be formed. These regional funnels would be an efficient method of widening participation, spreading knowledge and improving the ability both to give and receive training.

Identification of other geographically close or related potential members should also be the responsibility of the applicant. Without goingso far as to insist on a formal regional funnel being established by each new participant, it should be stressed by the PCC at the application stage, that involvement of other geographically related institutions is highly desirable. The PCC could even goas far as to consider a system of "reward" for identifying potential members, for example credits or reduction in fees.

This involvement need not even be to the level of formal membership. Several Task Group members report a domestic situation where otherlarge institutions would welcome the chance to contribute but do not have the resources or ability to become participants in their own right. A funnel program would be the ideal opportunity for wider membership, especially bearing in mind that international members bring specialist, local knowledge that is not usually available elsewhere.

V.B. Language barriers

English is the universal language. The language of the PCC, Library of Congress (LC) and of international collaboration is essentially English.Whilst the use of a single, widely spoken language greatly simplifies PCC activities, the Task Group identified it as an impediment for institutions where the native language is not English.

With the exception of the translation of limited amounts of documentation into Spanish and Portuguese, the PCC has done little to accommodate non-English language speakers.

The administration of an international program requires administrators who either have themselves, or have access to a wide variety of languages.The PCC assumes that applicants automatically have the same grasp of English and can read and understand English as well as the PCC administrators. The Task Group identified that this is clearly not the case. In South Africa for example, where one might assume that English is widely spoken and understood it is in fact often a person's second or third language (there are 11 official languages). Although it is the language of instruction, trainer and trainees will often have another language as their native language. This can lead to problems in communicating and understanding. The PCC cannot hope to deliver effective training in such a situation when essentially the only language it uses is English.

Delivery of training and documentation in the native language would greatly increase the effectiveness of the training, its comprehension by the trainees and the kudos of the PCC for having undertaken the translation. Without such efforts, a question must be raised as to the quality of the delivery of training and whether the trainees have fully grasped the concepts involved. If the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs) is sometimes difficult to comprehend for an English language speaker, how much more difficult must they be for a person whose native language is not English?

A more desirable training environment would be for the trainer, the documentation and the trainees to all share a common language. A less desirable solution would be for thedocumentation to be in the language of the trainees and for training to be undertaken through an interpreter. Whilst creating numerous problems, this second approach would at least allow the trainees to be more relaxed and receptive to the training itself. There would be little to be gained from translating the documentation into (for example) Afrikaans, but then being unable to find an Afrikaans speaking trainer or translator and so have to deliver the training in English.

The PCC has undertaken some training in Spanish and Portuguese and shown a willingness to produce limited documentation in these languages. It must be congratulated on these endeavours but encouraged to do more and with a wider variety of languages.

V.C. Use of Standards and Documentation in Training

The use of standards is discussed in detail throughout this report. Suffice to say that many of the issues in the use of standards and documentation in training are similar to those of Language Barriers discussed above.

The Task Group spent a great deal of time discussing standards as a whole and how they fit into PCC programmes. Although not the only standards in use, discussions concentrated on AACR2 and the LCRIs as the most important and also most troublesome. Discussion focussed on several key issues:

- Their US and LC centric nature.
- Is one more relevant for PCC programs than the other?
- The limits they place on interpretation of bibliographical issues.

- Possible conflict in their incorporation in an international environment as opposed to a strictly local environment.
- The difficulty in comprehending the text and its meaning.

The standards themselves and their use represent perhaps the biggest hurdle to broadening international participation. For example, the standard for descriptive content is AACR2, not the LCRIs. AACR2 promotes flexibility through options and allowances for the needs of the cataloguing agency. LCRIs limit this flexibility in the name of consistency. In the case of AACR, the LCRIs extend the rules and these extensions sometimes diverge from AACR (as in the case of abbreviating "Dept.").

Thus consistency can be maintained in a local (and/or national) context, but may put unacceptable constraints on international participants. Further, it can lead to different interpretations of interpretations of a rule, especially by institutions operating outside of the North American context.

These standards are so widely accepted, widely used (at least in the US) publications, developed over a long period of time often through a complicated procedure of drafting, revision and approval that any attempt to radically alter their use or existence would be a major undertaking. However, the PCC should review their use in order to facilitate wider international membership.

The more standards that are requirements of PCC membership, the more detailed and extensive these standards are, the more likely they are to prove an obstacle to wider membership, whether in the area of bibliographic or authority work. Institutions contemplating membership are currently faced with a long list of standards, many of them new to the institution (for example, DCM, Blue pages, and the NACO participants' manual). If the LCRIs are also included here (which arenot as heavily used outside the US as inside), prospective members may be held back from membership if a large proportion of training would need to be undertaken in familiarisation and use of new or lengthy standards.

In light of the:

- Desirability of limiting the number of standards that are requirements of PCC programs.
- Interpretative complications introduced by the LCRIs.

- Fact that AACR2 already exists in numerous language editions and would be easier to review alone,

The Task Group was of the opinion that in order to broaden international membership, the PCC should re-evaluate its core requirements for standards. The aim of this would be to reduce the number of them required to undertake PCC participation, to streamline the two of most relevance and to accord priority to AACR2 as the primary standard with the LCRIs acting as a recommended but not mandatory option. The Task Group felt that this approach would be more likely to attract wider international interest in PCC programs.

V.D. Delivery of Training

Current training in PCC programs is limited to a single formal session (albeit lasting several days), delivered using a single approach with little tailoring to the specific participant and with virtually no preparatory work and no follow-up apart from contact with the trainer acting as reviewer. However, the Task Group was of the opinion that the training should actually start before the formal session and should not finish when the trainer departs from the institution and that there should be more emphasis placed on pre/post formal training activities and back up.

The Task Group felt that this would assist in countering the sense of isolation alluded to earlier in this report. PCC programs suffer from a general lack of contact and communication with and between members as a whole and between individual members and the PCC. New members are not well advertised to current PCC members. Doing so would foster communication between local members, other new members or between like-minded members such as those working with special collections in a particular subject area.

This single approach to the delivery of training is not particularly well suited to international members who require more flexibility. Whilst the PCC may have implicit knowledge of a US based prospective member, it does not have the same knowledge for prospective international members. Questions such as whom is the institution? where is it?, what role does it have?, what particular problems does it or the region have?, is there anything that the PCC can specifically offer it? Does it have unique needs? These are the kind of topics that would be examined in the pre-training membership survey alluded to above.

Given that a trainer is travelling from overseas (i.e. the US and at the members

expense) it would make sense for all to ensure that the maximum returns on the availability, cost and knowledge and experience of the trainer were realised. It may be that other institutions in the geographic region may benefit from the trainers' visit (either via the PCC or in a private arrangement). The PCC needs to give consideration to making full use of the limited time and availability of the trainer. This would help to reinforce the notion of quasi-official funnels mentioned earlier.

The Task Group was of the opinion that access to the trainer (when acting as reviewer) could be difficult due to the many demands on the trainer's time. Access or contact is generally only by e-mail and can often take several days, or not receive the timeand attention that it might otherwise, due to the reviewer having numerous demands on their time. Obviously many of these are outside the control of the PCC but trainers and reviewers are often working with numerous PCC members concurrently. If the trainers were undertaking fewer PCC activities simultaneously, s/he would have more time (allocated to PCC activities) to be able to increase the amount of time allocated to those members whom they had trained.

The delivery of the training in a single block (albeit spread over several days) with wide coverage was felt by the Task Group to inhibit wider participation. At times a gradual approach to training is more acceptable to trainees and seen as less fraught than a concentrated, single training session, particularly if the course subject is new, in a foreign language or introduces new written documentation and standards.

The introduction of a modular approach to training was seen as particularly more suitable to the needs of international members. Allied to this is the ability to deliver the training at locations other than the members' institution, for example at conferences or if a trainer was visiting a close regional institution.

Training need not necessarily be "face-to-face" or text based. Consideration should be given to the electronic delivery of training either via the World Wide Web or on CD-ROM. Trainees could then proceed at their own pace, with access to the trainer on an as required basis.

On completion of their formal training session, members are currently left with little support, feedback or backup. International members are particularly susceptible to this given their sense of isolation discussed earlier. To counter this the Task Group was of the opinion that there should be a formal follow up by the PCC, involving as a minimum some kind of face to face opportunity (presumably via video conference) by which trainee and trainer could discuss progress and issues etc.

V.E. Recommendations for Training

1. The PCC accepts that international members have a sense of geographical isolation, which extends to their PCC activities.

2. The PCC applies a non-US centric approach when processing applications for membership from prospective international members that identifies the applicant in the unique context of their geographical region and role within that region.

3. The PCC formulates a pre-training, pre-membership survey undertaken either at application stage, or shortly thereafter that:

    i. Identifies the motives for joining the PCC.
    ii. Confirms the financial/organisational ability of the applicant to take part in PCC activities.
    iii. Clarifies the domestic role and position of libraries in the applicants geographic region.
    iv. Identifies the feasibility of a (formal or informal) local funnel arrangement.

4. Throughout all its activities, PCC should strive tofoster a sense of support and belonging for international members.

5. The PCC should establish a policy that enables the provision of training and documentation in languages other than English.

6. The PCC should actively recruit trainers whose native language is not English.

7. The PCC should formulate a policy that provides for the provision of training documentation and standards in languages other than English.

8. The number of standards and documentation required in training should be minimised.

9. An abridged edition of AACR2 more suited to the needs of PCC participants should be created. [This recommendation is still under debate. We will have our position worked out for the final report.]

10. AACR2 should be emphasised as the standard for descriptive content, with the LCRIs as a recommended but not mandatory option.

11. The number of applicable LCRIs should be reduced by separating procedural based interpretations from principle based interpretations, reviewing the latter and seeking opinions from participants as to how they should be implemented.

12. The PCC should initiate a full review of the delivery of training to international members that would examine:

    i. Delivering training using a modular approach as opposed to a single session.

    ii. Delivering training using a variety of on-line resources as training tools.

    iii. Introducing a formal follow up session to discuss progress, issues and other matters of mutual interest.

13. Improve access for trainees to the reviewer by ensuring that:

    i. The trainer is always the reviewer

    ii. The reviewer is limited in the amount of PCC activities they can be simultaneously involved in.

    iii. The reviewer is limited in the number of members they can be simultaneously reviewing.

14. The PCC should establish an electronic discussion list to facilitate communication between participants. LC should monitor this list.

15. International members should be encouraged to include staff from local institutions to attend their training.

VI.   Charge 4—Identify the required PCC standards that impede broader international participation in the PCC's programs and activities.

VI.A. PCC programs

Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRI) as a prerequisite standard for PCC membership impede broader international participation in NACO and BIBCO. Universal adoption of one specific interpretation of a descriptive standard cannot be achieved without international involvement in the production of that interpretation. The rules deliberately allow for differences in application between institutions with different needs. There is useful information in the rule interpretations and it helps with the understanding of the rules, but adherence to AACR2 should be sufficient for PCC participation.

VI.B. NACO

All members of the Task Group belong to institutions that participate in the NACO program.Some immediate complications associated with the standards required for NACO participation are listed below. A more complete report on this aspect of the PCC programs will be included in the Task Group's Final Report.

VI.B.1.   Non-roman script cataloguing is complicated and very important tolibraries with non-roman leadership. The issue of a choice of romanisation systems for a non-roman language (currently LC-ALA tables) and the technical inability to reproduce non-roman script in LC's bibliographic database have both contributed to the requirement of eliminating vernacular data from NARs.

VI.B.2.   Utilities-based participation was identified as a barrier to NACO participation. Bibliographic utilities are fee-based organisations and can add additional costs with regard to NACO participation.

VI.B.3.   NACO is presently tied to LC's authority file (in fact, it is LC's

authority file) and as such this seems something of a paradox.

VI.B.4.   Series authority work is currently too complicated and expensive for most international participants.

VI.C.   SACO

Currently, only three of the Task Group members belong to institutions that participate in SACO. The standards required for participating in this program have not been fully investigated. A complete response will be provided in the Task Group's Final Report.Immediate observations are as follows:

VI.C.1.   Web-based submission form is very useful.

VI.C.2.   Online tracking of submissions is useful, but the review process is still too long.

VI.C.3.   Local expertise of international participants in the PCC is often neglected or underutilized.

VI.D. BIBCO

No libraries outside the US are participating in BIBCO. It does not appear that the core standards impedeinternational BIBCO participation. Rather, the use of uniform titles and series in BIBCO records, along with the authority work involved with each seems to be the biggest impediment to international participation in BIBCO.

VI.E. CONSER

No members of the Task Group currently participate in CONSER. This will be further developed for our Final Report.

VII. Charge 5—Consider the effects of recent IFLA activities (especially the reshaping of the concept of Universal Bibliographic Control) on international participation.

Until recently, there has been little general attention paid to IFLA initiatives in the US and in AACR2 countries. For the most part, it seems that it is best for members of the PCC to monitor developments in cataloging codes under IFLA auspices and discuss the potential for PCC component cooperatives.

There are, at this time, three specific areas that invite comment in this report: 1) Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR); 2) Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR); and 3) Implementation of 7XX linking references between name authority records by the Library of Congress. This last has already had an actual impact upon NACO work and on foreign participation in that programme.

VII.A.   FRBR and the PCC

Any impact upon the PCC and international participation will be through FRBR's influence upon AACR. A CC:DA document, The Future of AACR (April 2003), at
http://www.libraries.psu.edu/iasweb/personal/jca/ccda/future1.html,
states that "the Joint Steering Committee for AACR is working with a volunteer consultant, Pat Riva of McGill University, to analyze the terminology in AACR2 in the light of some of the terms and concepts in the IFLA Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Specifically, the FRBR terms work, expression, manifestation, and item are to be used in AACR in a manner consistent with their definitions in FRBR. However, the changes in terminology need to be coordinated with other, related revisions and are unlikely to be published for a few more years."

A cross check with the IFLAnet web site indicates that the intention is for all cataloguing codes to adopt the same terminology and meanings.

Any negative impact upon the PCC, much less international participation, of a universal adoption of terminology with standard definitions is negligible. Indeed, it may aid in the mutual comprehension and exchange of bibliographic products.

VII.B.   FRANAR and the PCC

This IFLA project, started in 1999, has as one of its goals the extension of the FRBR model to include authority data.   At this time, there is little publicly available documentation. At a recent International Conference on Authority Control, held in Florence, Italy, 10-12 February 2003, Mr. Glenn Patton made a presentation on FRANAR discussions to date:
http://www.unifi.it/biblioteche/ac/en/intro_eng.htm#P

Mr. Patton has since indicated in e-mail correspondence that the second entity-relationship model described in the paper has changed so significantly from the February presentation that this document cannot be regarded as being more than a work in process.

While there is little publicly available documentation about FRANAR, it appears that whatever potential impact this work will have on the PCC is on the programme as a whole, and not solely on international participants. It would be worthwhile for PCC members to stay abreast of FRANAR developments and discuss these as appropriate.

VII.C.   Implementation of 7XX Linking References

Throughout other portions of this report, members have reiterated, through both their comments and recommendations, the underlying goal of a single, uniform, AACR2-based authority file into which all members, regardless of national origin, may contribute the headings which they use on their own bibliographic records, for the use of all other members. That is, indeed, the understanding they and their recruiters to the PCC had upon their training and entry into participation. The implementation of 7XX linking references by the Library of Congress for NACO, while not itself creating or maintaining this field, strikes directly at the possible attainment of this ideal. (LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC21 Format forAuthority Data, generally called "Blue Pages", pages for 700, 710, 711, 730, 748, 751)

In the final report of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing Working Group on the Revision of FSCH: Structures of Corporate Name Headings (November 2000), online at http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/scatn/final2000.htm#2g, the working group stated in sections 1.6, The illusion of a world-wide uniform heading, and 1.7, Different approach, that, due to the lackof uniformity in cataloguing rules and practices in the formulations of headings from one country to another, one cannot have uniform results in headings. The working group embraced the

views as put forward in the 1998 report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN, available at http://www.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-2/mlar.htm. This group likewise suggested to allow National Bibliographic Agencies (NBAs) to preserve differences in authorised forms that best meet language and cultural needs in their countries, but also proposed to make the national name authority files available over the Internet.

The working group on the revision of FSCH further inferred the need for this kind of approach from the Final Report of the 'AUTHOR Project on European name authority files' (July 1998) that says that one of the main constraints that prevent adequate downloading of authority data in order to reload them in the national or a local systemof another country is "that cataloguing rules are different between existing authority files: it is impossible to translate automatically and exactly the content of headings and the order of elements from a file to another in order to preserve intellectual signification of information."

In the 1998 report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN, referenced above, the working group recognised "the importance of allowing the preservation of national or rule-based differences in authorized forms for headings to be used in national bibliographies and library catalogues that best meet the language and cultural needs of the particular institution's users." Following upon this recognition, they recommended that NBAs make available over the Internet their authority files for searching. Further thinking on this topic developed the resolution of 7XX linking references on name authority records to authorised headings in other databases—presumableythose of other codes, languages, or scripts.

When applied to the work of international PCC members working in English, in AACR2, and according to the LCRIs, this practice rapidly degenerates into an unsatisfactory arrangement based on the ties between theNACO authority file and the Library of Congress bibliographic database. In particular, rather than revise an existing heading and create bibliographic file maintenance (BFM) at the Library of Congress, what are preferable headings, based upon predominantusage and a current application of LCRIs, become 4XX references if the contributor is not an NBA, or a 7XX reference if the contributor is an NBA.

This arrangement leaves most members of the international community in the doubly expensive situation of performing duplicate authority work: one record to record their own AACR2 heading; and an "unused" heading in a NACO authority record, according to the LCRIs and LC database, simply in order to document their own heading as a 7XX link.

The introduction of the 7XX linking references by the Library of Congress as a response to the IFLA retreat to independent national authority files seems to be an unannounced reversal of previous policy on the part of the Library of Congress away from a unitary AACR2 authority file. Many international members have joined sufficiently recently to deal with this change by continuing to maintain their existing authority files (with or without links) and by opting out of full NACO participation-or even out of any participation. We do not think that this can have any good effect on furthering recruitment to PCC participation among international institutions.

The situation in the United Kingdom, however, is one that bears special consideration. The British Library has signed an agreement with the Library of Congress to create and maintain a single authority file. This is similar in many respects to an agreement between the National Library of Canada and the Library of Congress, but is much farther along the road to achievement on thepart of the British Library. The BL (and with it the members of the Shared Cataloguing Programme) as part of its system implementation in 2004, has announced plans to abandon its own national authority file and to rely upon the NACO authority file. The new policy of a national, LC-centred authority file, with a large proportion of mutually usable headings not susceptible to revision under LCRIs, may make for an uncomfortable, if not unsuccessful, working collaboration.

VIII. Charge 6—Explore options and recommend alternatives or changes in the use or application of standards and practices (as noted [in other charges]) to facilitate broader international participation.

The Task Group agreed that the phrase "mutually acceptable standards" as it appears in the PCC documentation should be interpreted as meaning that all participants will use the same standards (i.e., bibliographic, authority, and input standards). All participants of the PCC have the opportunity to give input to the creation/modification of the standards—this makes them mutually acceptable. It is neither feasible nor desirable for the PCC to adapt several different standards.

Standards are in essence agreements. It is all to the good that the PCC encourages—to the extent that it does—input on standards, and clarifications of standards, from across the world. LC seems very reluctant to *listen*. If LC wishes standards such as AACR2 to be applied internationally and thus PCC to become genuinely international, then it needs to recognise the expertise that other potential and current PCC members bring with them, particularly with regard to language and culture. If the PCC did indeed provide a platform for more dialogue about standards, this would be a benefit that would support its international cause.

The need to make participatory standards building a hallmark of PCC is intrinsic to the future well-being of this cooperative venture. Continued recruitment of participants (which will increasingly be international) and the continued growth of the shared databases will ensure the continued success of the PCC. It can be said that there are currently two levels of institutions: 1) one that takes the PCC cataloguing for copy, and 2) one that actually contributes to the PCC databases. To induce libraries to do the latter requires some sort of carrot. ThePCC has to be a win-win relationship for all involved.

VIII.A.   Recommendations for Changes in Application of Standards

1.   Rationalise the LCRIs (revise, reduce and rename as PCCRIs), or discontinue their use, to avoid:

- contravention of AACR2 rules
- national/institutional bias
- influence of other standards on descriptive cataloguing policy (e.g. MARC 21, LCSH)

- interpretation of interpretations

and to allow:

- flexibility in application of options

Work to be done by an international group with representatives from all PCC constituencies. Enable new LCRI proposals to be submitted by any PCC participant.

The PCC (Standing Committee on Standards) should evaluate LCRIs and determine which apply to the PCC community in order to arrive at common understandings. Such a review can highlight areas where it would be possible to insist on agreement. These PCC rule interpretations should form part of the training documentation.

2. Rename the National Authority File as the PCC Name Authority File.
3. Translate standards into appropriate languages to facilitate training and use.
4. Review series authority function and application; consider simplification of LC practice before inclusion in AACR2 Part III to allow greater participation.

VIII.B.   Recommendations for Changes in Practice

1. The PCC needs to determine its intentions: If the PCC is moving away from remaining an English-language based cooperative, then translations of training materials and standards must be pushed forward following its strategic and tactical plans.   If the PCC is to remain an English-language based cooperative then the motives for recruiting international participants that have English as a secondary language need to be reexamined.

2. Create a discretionary fund to provide financial assistance for prospective international participants to cover some of the costs associated with the trainer's visit or to allow a trained participant to travel within their local region to recruit/train others.

3. Establish formal follow-up sessions as part of the training process to allow both parties to discuss and progress problems/issues.

4. Increase use of non-LC trainers, i.e. staff from the local area to train as PCC trainers for their community.

5. Recommend that the same person or persons is/are both trainer and reviewer (although there may be issues of workload here).

6. More flexibility in the design of training, tailoring the content/format to the needs of the institution and allowing for a modular approach where considered appropriate.

7. Tailor supply of equipment to the standards of the participating country e.g. paper size. Distribute all documentation in electronic form.

8. Create a web-based, password-protected NACO submission programme (or some other non-utilities based method of contribution) for those international participants who do not have the capability or institutional support to join one of the bibliographic utilities. This might also facilitate contributions by individuals and/or networks of individuals. This would also facilitate the continued contribution of individual cataloguers who leave a PCC participating institution and gain employment at a non-PCC participating institution. Could be very resource intensive. The PCC should investigate additional avenues of submission of records (for example web-based participation) for those international partners who are not using a utility

9. The PCC should investigate why international libraries do not participate in BIBCO.

10. Give credits for contribution.

11. The PCC needs to investigate romanization practises with representatives in order to attract international participation.

12. New participants to involve other institutions in their region to increase take-up. Funnel programmes should be actively encouraged.

13. Streamline and clarify responsibilities between PCC and OCLC/RLG.

14. Review use of OCLC agents (e.g. the South African network, Sabinet) to reduce double handling and reduce costs.

15. Consider a category of member with straightforward access to the bibliographic utility, but with no fees to be paid.

16. Establish a new electronic discussion list to facilitate communication between new participants and to serve as a forum for ideas on how to actually use participation.

17. Need to emphasize the benefits of international record exchange and copy cataloging for all members.

18. The PCC should investigate ways to include international participants more in PCC activities (i.e., encourage more appointment of international participants on PCC policy/operations/standing committees and/or task groups, this might necessitate a larger commitment on part of OCLC/RLIN or PCC to help with travel monies and/or creation of other means of communication among all PCC participants).