

A conversation about conversion

Panel

Sally McCallum, Nancy Lorimer, Kevin Ford, Jodi Williamschen

Major transition

From

- Unit record →
 - Card catalog heritage
 - Cataloging rules focused on Unit records
 - Long history - 100+ years
- MARC →
 - Followed the cataloging tradition of the Unit record
 - Developed 50 years ago
 - Innovative data structure at the time, ISO 2709

To

- FRBR/LRM
 - FRBR analysis in 1990s continuing to LRM
 - Deeper understanding of components of bibliographic control
 - Works, Instances, and links rather than a Unit record that links by locking together
- RDF/BIBFRAME
 - Data structure that facilitates linking, RDF
 - Identifiers that facilitate linking, URIs
 - Web that makes use of both to support a “web of data”

Difficulties for change

- Very large international infrastructure built on MARC
Exchange
Systems
Trained staff
- Gigantic trove of records in libraries
- Data conversion between MARC and BIBFRAME has challenges

Questions on conversion

- Is there a difference between conceptual analysis of bibliographic data (FRBR/LRM) and data exchange (BIBFRAME) requirements?
- As we enhance BIBFRAME for linked data do we need to change MARC also, and vice versa?
- How do we gradually ease MARC into better alignment with BIBFRAME, i.e., are there MARC data input policies or changes that would yield improved convertibility going forward?
- What are some of the sticky problem areas, e.g., like MARC/007, punctuation, parsing, transcription vs. access?
- How much of MARC is really implemented and used, by what types of libraries
- How much parity is needed between MARC and BIBFRAME data elements?
- Does BIBFRAME need to accommodate data elements tacked onto MARC for convenience but not really bibliographic description, e.g., acquisition data?
- If there are differences between MARC and BIBFRAME, how do we assure catalogers understand and agree on differences?

Thanks for participating