## PROPOSAL 1A.

Under "Characters That Cannot Be Reproduced by the Facilities Available", strike the following:

"In the context of machine-readable catalog records note that "facilities available" means the totality of characters that can be represented in machine-readable form and displayed/printed using the "MARC-8 character set"; referred to hereafter as the "character set"). These characters can also be represented in the UCS/Unicode UTF-8 character set, but these guidelines apply only to that subset of the Unicode UTF-8 set that has a counterpart in MARC-8, i.e., the MARC-8 repertoire of UTF-8.

Conventions appropriate to particular character set situations are given below."

Rationale: Technological barriers to the accurate representation of bibliographic data in electronic records have been reduced considerably since the introduction of the precursor to the above statement, LCRI 1.0E. The restrictions reflected in the above statement would impose an unnecessary impediment to the quality of cataloging that can be produced for researchers of a large number of languages other than English. Policies of NDMSO and MARBI from 2006 and 2007 adequately provide for techniques of lossless conversion of data between MARC-8 and UTF-8 environments.

PROPOSAL 1B.

Under "Special Letters, Diacritical Marks, and Punctuation Marks", insert the following:

"The literal character as represented in the source, if available from the UCS/Unicode UTF-8 character set, may be used. The following is provided as a guide to managing legacy data, or for input where facilities are not available to produce the literal character."

Rationale: The insertion of this text into the policy statement would enable the production of accurate bibliographic data for languages where this has not historically been possible, including many Native American languages, such as Lakota (see example provided below).

PROPOSAL 1C.

Under "FIRST ALTERNATIVE", change the following:

"All other languages/scripts must be fully romanized"

to:

"Access in other languages/scripts may optionally be supplied by the cataloger, but must include romanized access"

Rationale: The insertion of this text into the policy statement allows for an improved level of access to users of bibliographic information for works in scripts other than Latin. A large and

growing amount of bibliographic data is produced in non-Latin scripts, direct access to which is becoming a greater part of users' expectations.

PROPOSAL 1D.

In the example for Lakota, insert:

"Preferred Transcription

245 10 \$a Oie wowapi waŋ Lakota-Ieska"

Rationale: Past practice allowed only for a transcription as, in this case,

Oie wowapi wa<u>n</u> Lakota-Ieska

When technological barriers were in place that prevented the use of the literal character, y (Latin eng), it was understandable that rough approximation by applying a double underscore as a combining diacritic to a base letter was the closest that could be produced. This gave rise to a number of issues, however, that are exacerbated in an environment where content is increasingly digital. Over time it has produced a substantial divergence between bibliographic access points and the works they need to be able to link to, or be searched as from online citations. The recommendation we propose as a preferred best practice in this policy statement, if properly implemented, would allow for a greater level of access by users to more accurate data, and for more clarity in comparing between bibliographic citations and catalog data. It may be expected that there would be a concomitant impact on indexing and on search logic; these are impacts that are secondary to ensuring the accuracy of the data available to the user.