

Panel discussion:
Rules for cataloguing and interoperability

Osma Suominen

BIBFRAME Workshop in Europe 2020

23 September 2019

Rules that govern cataloguing

Format standards: MARC21, BIBFRAME ...

International cataloguing standards: ISBD, AACR2, RDA ...

Extensions and application profiles: bibliotek-o, Art & Rare Materials ...

National/regional standards

Local guidelines and practices for individual systems and institutions

Identifier services: id.loc.gov, ISNI, Wikidata, Finto ...

Panelists

Harriet Aagaard, National Library of Sweden

Christian Aliverti, Swiss National Library

Steven Folsom, Cornell University Library

Kevin Ford, Library of Congress

Nancy Lorimer, Stanford University Library

Chair **Osma Suominen**, National Library of Finland

Introductions

Does your institution produce BIBFRAME data, and how?

Is this a conversion process from legacy formats (MARC etc.) or are you creating "born BIBFRAME", for example using an editor tool?

What kind of identifiers are you using for entities such as persons, organizations, subjects, places and works?

Where do they come from and are they shared with other institutions or systems?

What kind of "house rules" that are more specific than the BIBFRAME standard are you applying when producing BIBFRAME data?

This could be for example custom conversion rules; application profiles; defaults and restrictions implemented in an editor user interface; international, national or institution-specific cataloguing rules or guidelines

Do you think it is appropriate to use RDA cataloguing rules for BIBFRAME data?

Are you doing it in practice and if so, what are your experiences?

Should the rules that go beyond BIBFRAME be shared, and on what level? For example as BIBFRAME extensions and/or application profiles that are specific to a particular material type; or system-specific profiles in collaboration projects such as Share-VDE or LD4P; or international communities such as RDA.

What does the panel think of instantiating current MARC 21 cataloguing practices such as the provider neutral model in Bibframe going forward? Would this create problems in terms of cardinality restrictions?

Where, and when, do the designers of web interfaces and end-user facing services come into the conversation? It seems to me that to realize the value of our linked data, the interfaces need to be able to handle different ways of showing data relationships - within a body of resource descriptions at an institution, and with data elsewhere - in a way that's easily "readable" and actionable by users.

Who makes "the catalog" or discovery layer? It used to be the Catalog Dept. but that's not really true anymore... Is the panel talking to the web and application designers - what is that conversation like?

Summing up

To find out how specific rules affect interoperability, we should exchange more BIBFRAME data.

Otherwise, MARC21 may become the lowest common denominator of data exchange!

Comments from the audience

There is little point in talking about the 'current' RDA - it will be replaced by the 'new' RDA by the end of the year, The 'new' RDA is much better aligned to BF than the 'old'. --Gordon Dunsire

I know you say it is early days but it is not. We started working in BF in 2011. We are moving too slowly. I agree with 2 of the panelists that we are in danger of moving into MARC 2.0. Can you tell me why it is too soon and why we cannot reach agreement? --Judith Cannan

Why not just use the RDA ontology to express RDA data? --Theodore Gerontakos

What restrictions on the possibility of sharing data in BF can be constituted by any Application profiles or extensions of BF? --Tiziana Possemato

Thank you!

osma.suominen@helsinki.fi - [@OsmaSuominen](https://twitter.com/OsmaSuominen)