

**Date:** September 25, 2007

**To:** Stephanie Schmidt, Chair, MARBI

**From:** The Steering Committee to Oversee the Implementation of the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access Recommendations

**Subject:** Task Force for Investigating the Use of Romanization in Library Computer Applications

The ALCTS president, Pamela Bluh appointed a Steering Committee to Oversee the Implementation of the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access Recommendations (see appointed [www.ala.org/ala/pressreleases2007/august2007/alctsn07.htm](http://www.ala.org/ala/pressreleases2007/august2007/alctsn07.htm)) The Task Force prepare a report that included several recommendations (see the TF Report Recommendation 10 at: <http://www.ala.org/ala/alcts/newslinks/currentissues/nonenglishaccess/Non-EnglishReport07.pdf>).

Recommendation number 10 of the Task Force report asked to:

Examine the use of romanized data in bibliographic and authority records. Explore the following issues (including costs and benefits)

- Alternative model (Model A and Model B) for multi-script records are specific in the MARC 21 formats. The continuing use of 880 fields (that is, Model A records) has been questioned, but some libraries may need to continue to use Model A records. What issues does using both Model A and B cause for LC, utilities and vendors
- Requirements for access using non-Roman scripts (in general terms—defining requirements for specific scripts falls under Recommendation 2) Requirements for access using Romanization

MARBI was identified as the appropriate group to address this issue. Therefore; we are asking you to appoint a Task Force to examine the use of Romanized data in bibliographic and authority records, including the exploration of end-user demand versus the costs of their creation, against the background that the continued use of Romanization has been questioned.

The Task Force is expected to consider the following questions:

- Determine under what circumstances Romanization is required.
- If Romanization is required for some access points but not for others, what are those access points? Is there a need to define new standards beyond the current ones?
- What aspects for Romanization could be met with technology?

- What are current and future implications for access/retrieval in a situation where Romanized-only records co-exist with original-script-only, and Romanized-with-original script records? How can full accessibility be maintained?
- Currently, there are two models for multi-script records (see <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdmulti.html>), with each possibly having a combination of original script and Romanized data.
  - To what extent do these two models relate to the issues of Romanization raised by this Task Force?
  - What issues does using both Model A and model B cause for users, utilities and vendors?
- Assuming that Romanization is still considered necessary, what are the cost implications and how can they be met?
- The Task Force should consider all this issues from the point of view of a wide variety of users.
- For other suggested factors to be considers see attached document.

The Steering Committee for Overseeing the Implementation of this Recommendation is expecting periodic progress reports. The first report should be submitted to the Steering Committee soon after the ALA Mid-winter Conference. The next progress report should be submitted after the 2008 ALA Annual Conference. **John Espley, a Member of the Steering Committee, is designated to follow up with MARBI regarding the implementation of Recommendation number 10. Please let him know if you have any question or comments.**

CC: Sally McCallum

The ALCTS Reps. To MARBI: Renette Davis, Jacqueline Samples, and Adam L. Schiff  
 Steering Committee member: Magda EL-Sherbini, Chair; Glenn Patton; John Espley,  
 Martin J. Heijdra; Michelle Roberston; and Beth Picknally Camden, Liaison