

## **ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Materials Cataloging Interest Group**

ALA Midwinter Meeting, Philadelphia, PA

Sunday, January 26, 2014

Notes: Marc McGee, Harvard Library, Cataloging Interest Group Coordinator

Approximately 28 people participated in the joint ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Materials Cataloging Interest Group.

### *Announcements and Updates:*

#### **MAGIRT-RDA Listserv**

A new listserv ([magirt-rda@ala.org](mailto:magirt-rda@ala.org)) was established in October 2013 as a dedicated forum for discussing the cataloging of cartographic materials using RDA. As of late January 2014 there were 72 subscribers to the list and 3 dozen posts. The list is hosted by the ALA Mail List Service and an archive of posts is maintained on the ALA lists web site. The list is open to ALA members and non-members alike. To sign-up:

<http://lists.ala.org/sympa/info/magirt-rda>

#### **OpenGeoportal Metadata Working Group**

The first OpenGeoportal National Summit was held Oct. 27-28, 2013 in Boston, Mass. Over 40 people participated in the Summit and one of the action items of the meeting was to form a Metadata Working Group (MWG) to coordinate metadata standards and best practices among participating institutions. More information is available on the OpenGeoportal MWG wiki: <http://opengeoportal.org/working-groups/metadata/> Participation in the MWG is voluntary and open. If you'd like to participate in the group please contact MWG co-coordinator, Marc McGee ([mmcgee@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:mmcgee@fas.harvard.edu)).

#### **RDA for Cartographic Resources**

A manuscript draft of "RDA for Cartographic Resources" by Paige Andrew, Mary Larsgaard, and Susan Moore has been completed and submitted to the publisher, ALA Editions, on time, in early January 2014. The authors are waiting to receive feedback from the publisher but are hopeful of a publication date in time for ALA Annual 2014.

#### **Cartographic Resources Manual, Library of Congress Geography & Map Division**

The Library of Congress Geography & Map Division has been working on a Cartographic Resources Manual which will replace the LC Map Cataloging Manual. When it is finished the manual will be published and made freely available on the Library of Congress web site. The tentative release date is sometime in 2014.

#### **Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)**

Nancy Kandoian, part of the Editorial Team for the DCRM(C), reported that the draft is still being worked on. DCRM(C) will be published as a free, online resource as a pdf and through Cataloger's Desktop. The publication date is still unknown but possibly sometime in 2014. A draft version is available for review: <http://dcrmc.pbworks.com/> Nancy also noted that the DCRM(Graphics) has been finished and published online: <http://rbms.info/dcrm/dcrmg/> and is also available through Cataloger's Desktop.

*Discussion topics included:*

- Applying the WEMI model to editions for cartographic materials

The question was posed to the group as to how the WEMI model is applied to cartographic materials specifically in the case of sheet maps issued in editions or as part of a series, and when it is appropriate to provide a “Preferred Title” in the MARC record for cartographic Works. It was pointed out that in the case of a large series where maps are issued in multiple editions it wouldn’t, as a practical matter, make sense to record a Preferred Title for every sheet in a series. The Library of Congress provides a Uniform Title for atlases where the title has changed, using the first known title for the Uniform Title. The question was asked as to whether a sheet map issued annually as an edition, with a slightly different title and covering the same geographic area would be considered the same Work and whether a “Preferred Title” would then be required. The general consensus was that in this case it might be appropriate to apply a “Preferred Title” for a Work but for most sheet maps that are part of a set, series, or issued in multiple editions it is not usually necessary.

- Digital gazetteers and Name Authority Records with linked open data

The question was asked of the group whether anyone is using linked open data from a digital gazetteer or from geographic Name Authority Records for digital humanities projects. No one mentioned any specific projects, but work is being done on various digital gazetteer projects.

New York Public Library currently has a grant to build a gazetteer for New York historical names. New Hampshire is also currently working on a historical gazetteer.

Colleen Cahill from the Library of Congress noted that anyone working on a digital gazetteer/name authority project where the data is being stored in MARC may get in touch with her ([cstu@loc.gov](mailto:cstu@loc.gov)) about adding data to the Authority File.

The Getty is currently in the process of making available all 4 of their vocabularies as linked open data through open APIs. The Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names could be a useful digital gazetteer for digital humanities projects requiring a linked data gazetteer.

<https://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/lod/index.html>

- The purpose and limits of geographic coordinates in authority records

It was noted that for geographic Name Authority Records the Library of Congress uses bounding box geographic coordinates for geographic features that are county size or larger, while point coordinates are supplied for smaller geographic features. It was questioned whether point coordinates are precise enough for evolving spatial discovery technologies. Coordinates in Authority Records are not intended to be authoritative coordinates and are intended to be used for rough discovery and identification. It was noted that coordinate precision can also be relative to scale. Coordinates in authorities are repeatable and can be updated, so if at a future point more authoritative coordinate data sources are available, authority records can be updated accordingly. It was also suggested that it would be useful to have a subfield and code for the authority 034 to describe the intention and level of authority of the geographic coordinate data.

- Using geographic coordinate data in MARC records for spatial search interfaces

The question was asked whether there are any projects that are using geographic coordinates from catalog records to enable spatial search.

Existing examples of systems that are leveraging geographic coordinate data from MARC records include:

OldMapsOnline <http://www.oldmapsonline.org> brings together multiple institutions' map digital image bibliographic information into a single, spatial search interface. A bounding box for each map image is displayed and map image thumbnails can be previewed in the search interface. Most of the bibliographic data in OldMapsOnline is based on library MARC records where selected MARC fields have been converted into a csv file for loading into the system.

MIT GeoWeb <http://arrowsmith.mit.edu/mitogp/> builds on the OpenGeoportal (OGP) platform to enable spatial searching of MIT Libraries' map bibliographic records. The map MARC records were crosswalked into the OGP metadata schema, leveraging the MARC geographic bounding box coordinate data to enable spatial search. In the GeoWeb Search you can limit your search to data types "library record" and map records will display in the search results table of contents with a link from GeoWeb to the MIT library catalog record.

University of Minnesota also plans to use the OpenGeoportal with MARC data to create a spatial search for their map records and noted that the MapHappy system has been discontinued.

Harvard has a Beta demo project called GeoHOLLIS (<http://sanger.hul.harvard.edu:8080/geohollis>) where 1.2 million MARC bibliographic records from the Harvard Library catalog were geotagged using MetaCarta's licensed, geotagger service and enabled for spatial search. The geotagger service uses Natural Language Parsing technologies with gazetteer data to find geographic keywords in the MARC record and associates geographic coordinates to those keywords thereby making it possible to spatially search records by various parts of the MARC record. In this project, the explicit coordinates recorded in the MARC records are not used for spatial search.

- Best practices for recording geographic coordinate data in MARC (DDMMSS vs. decimal degrees; and place-holding zeroes in 255s)

A question was asked about what the best format is for recording geographic coordinates in MARC records, DDMMSS vs. decimal degrees. In many cases map catalogers record geographic coordinates in the format that is present on the map piece. Geographic Information Systems that are able to leverage coordinate data primarily work with geographic coordinates in decimal degrees. There is not enough time for catalogers to convert the data from one format to the other. It was noted that coordinate data when being repurposed from MARC catalog records can also be programmatically converted to decimal degrees when needed.

The following online tools for converting DDMMSS to decimal degrees were recommended:

[http://www.onlineconversion.com/map\\_decimaldegrees.htm](http://www.onlineconversion.com/map_decimaldegrees.htm)

<http://transition.fcc.gov/mb/audio/bickel/DDMMSS-decimal.html>

It was also noted that there is a discrepancy between Cartographic Materials and MARC21 documentation as to how minutes and seconds are recorded in the 255 when the value of the minute or second is a single-digit value. In MARC21 the examples show place holding zeroes for single-digit values when there is also a double-digit value present in another part of the coordinate pairs (e.g. W 9°13'52"--W 9°04'47"), whereas in Cartographic Materials examples do not show place holding zeroes when a double-digit value is present (e.g. W 74°50'—W 74°40'/N 45°5'—N 45°0'). The question was asked as to how other catalogers were recording coordinates in the 255 for this situation. It was suggested to test the OCLC coordinate conversion macro to see how it translates the data to the 034 for each case. Most catalogers present were unaware of the discrepancy in documentation.

- Status of BIBFRAME

The question was asked whether anyone was following the progress of BIBFRAME. Many people were planning on attending the BIBFRAME Update Forum later in the day. No one had seen examples of BIBFRAME at the field level. It was noted that it was mentioned at the MARC Advisory Committee meeting that it was likely that MARC and BIBFRAME records will exist side-by-side for years.

- OCLC's Bibliographic Record Notification service & the utility of minimal-level records for cartographic material

The question was asked whether any institutions were currently taking advantage of OCLC's Bibliographic Record Notification Service for cartographic materials, a service that automatically updates local bibliographic records based on changes and upgrades made to bibliographic master records in WorldCat. No one indicated that they were currently using this service for cartographic materials. A related question was asked as to whether any institutions are currently using a minimal-level cataloging standard for cartographic materials. No one indicated that they were currently using a minimal record. The Library of Congress noted it has used minimal-level records for maps in the past and that the main difference in completeness of the record was found in the number of 500 notes in the record. It was noted that there is also a Canadian Core available that outlines a recommended set of bibliographic elements. The general consensus of the group was there wasn't much time to be saved in the cataloging of cartographic materials from the use of minimal level as opposed to using a BIBCO standard record.

- Use of collection level/finding aid records to address map collection backlogs

Some institutions address cataloging backlogs through the use of collection level records, both in MARC and EAD.

- Library of Congress Geography & Map Division interlibrary loan services:

For a black and white map – G&M will provide a paper reproduction of the map in black and white. For a color map – G&M will scan color maps and make a color print for Interlibrary loan purposes. In some cases, Library of Congress G&M can provide a digital image in place of the paper copy; there are possible Copyright issues that will need to be addressed.

- MarcEdit as a cataloging tool

The question was asked about catalogers' experiences using MarcEdit in their cataloging workflows. There was an enthusiastic response in favor of use of MarcEdit. Features of MarcEdit that users like include: support of batch processing of records, ability to crosswalk between metadata standards, and support for regular expressions queries. Jay Weitz from OCLC also noted that the current version of MarcEdit has increased interoperability with OCLC WorldCat making it possible to search and edit OCLC records directly in MarcEdit. The MarcEdit-I listserv was recommended as a good resource for asking questions and learning more about applications of MarcEdit: <https://listserv.gmu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=marcedit-l>. It was suggested that a possible future Cataloging Interest Group discussion topic might include a guided discussion featuring MarcEdit possibly with MarcEdit developer, Terry Reese, as a guest.