

PCC Linked Data Best Practices Task Group

Interim report to PoCo, November 2018

The Linked Data Best Practices group has been meeting twice a month since late July. Initial discussions have revolved around the scope of the charge and the relationship of MARC and BIBFRAME issues, but the group has now started working on substantive best practices recommendations.

Scope of recommendations

MARC best practices

- Recommendations are provisional and will need to be reviewed in the light of further experience and policy development, especially on application profiles
- Need to reflect current tooling and shared environment
- Recommendations apply prospectively, not retrospectively

BIBFRAME best practices

- Until now there has been no immediate target audience for best practice recommendations, since outside of LC no PCC libraries have been cataloging at scale in BIBFRAME. This changes with LD4P, so as Steering has suggested, that cohort may be the right group to involve in this work.
- There are no established venues for making or promulgating policies for BIBFRAME cataloging; again, LD4P may

Some discussions have been deferred for the following reasons:

- It is desirable that MARC practice be consistent with natively produced PCC linked data, but for this to happen PCC profiles will need further development and evaluation. This may be pursued (to some extent) under LD4P.
- Modelling issues have surfaced during early discussions. For example, the BIBFRAME contribution model does not appear to accommodate the RDA properties.
- Technical issues have been raised about RDA support for APIs.

Progress report on MARC recommendations

- Subfield order - recommendation drafted
- \$4 - recommendations agreed in principle, draft to follow
- Pending
 - Fields with multiple objects - this discussion will be informed by an analysis that an NLM group recently completed
 - Repeating \$0/\$1 - discussion will resume shortly following the PCC URI group's discussions with OCLC about \$1 implementation
 - 758
 - 33X

Issues likely to be deferred/TBD

- Preferred vocabularies
- FRBR/LRM issues, e.g. how LRM entities can be implemented in BIBFRAME

Out of scope

These issues are not in the Task Group's charge, and the group does not propose to consider them unless otherwise determined by PoCo:

- 024 in authorities. This issue is under consideration by PoCo.
- Subject of MARC record. It is a known issue with MARC bibliographic records that they do not unambiguously indicate the subject of an assertion. There are groups working on this in the context of conversion specs.

Question for PoCo

- How should we roll out the recommendations - singly or as a group?