

ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Resources Cataloging Interest Group report
ALA Midwinter Meeting, Seattle, WA
Sunday, January 27, 2013

Notes: Louise Ratliff and Marc McGee, Coordinator

Approximately sixteen people attended the joint ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Resources Cataloging Interest Group discussion.

Treatment of Globes in LCSH & LCGFT

This was a summary discussion of the revised treatment of Globes in LCSH and LCGFT. For details, please see the document: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsoc/genre_form_globes_final.pdf

In LCSH, the subject heading "Earth" will now be qualified by "Planet", e.g. Earth (Planet), because there are other topical meanings associated with the term "earth".

The heading "Earth (Planet)--Maps" will be established as a separate heading. When this heading is used to describe a globe of the earth, the LCGFT term "Globes" will be used with Earth (Planet)--Maps.

The genre subdivision "Globes" now applies to globes of all heavenly bodies.

The revisions will appear on Tentative List 02 (February 18, 2013) and the revised records will be distributed in March 2013. Catalogers can start using these headings.

Use of "World maps" in LCSH & LCGFT

Discussion on the use of "World maps" in LCSH was raised by Min Zhang and Tammy Wong of LC who wanted to hear from the map community. Catalogers in the Geography & Map Division would prefer to keep this term to describe maps of the world rather than using the newly established LCSH heading Earth (Planet)--Maps. A point was made that users ask for "world maps." Users search for globes in a different way, not under "World maps." Paige Andrew pointed out that it's useful to think about how discovery systems use the form/genre heading for faceting bibliographic records. The group agreed on the desirability of accepting "World maps" as a topical heading and as a genre heading. Min will advise Janis Young at the Policy and Standards Division (PSD) as to the preference of the community, and will forward policy proposals to Susan Moore for consideration by the MAGIRT Cartographic Cataloging Committee.

In cartographic resources cataloging what is a "Work" within the RDA/FRBR WEMI framework?

Mary Larsgaard said she would recommend to avoid creating "Work" records for cartographic resources since the community has never created "uniform titles" before. As an example, she cited a single 7.5 quad which is available in several paper editions, online, in microform, and scanned in different PPIs. The scanned ones are all different manifestations because of the different PPIs. There is no way we want to create a dozen work records. Discussion followed.

Mary cited some articles and a presentation that she and Kathy Rankin gave at WAML in October 2012. The presentation is available from WAML toolbox under RDA (<http://www.waml.org/maptools.html#rda>).

Citations:

Tami Morse (2012): Mapping Relationships: Examining Bibliographic Relationships in Sheet Maps from Tillett to RDA, *Cataloging Quarterly*, 50:4, 225-248. To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2012.657292>

Scott R. McEathron (2002): Cartographic Materials as Works, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 33:3-4, 181-191
To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J104v33n03_09

Ruth Kalf (2008): FRBR: an Opportunity for Map Collections and Map Users?, *LIBER Quarterly*, 18:2, 276-291
<http://liber.library.uu.nl/index.php/lq/article/view/7927/8184>
pdf <http://liber.library.uu.nl/index.php/lq/article/view/7927/8185>

Other discussion topics

Louise Ratliff reported on an explanation of BIBFRAME given by Sally McCallum at a presentation given by the MARC Formats Transition Interest Group at Midwinter.

A summary of the program: <http://alamw13.ala.org/node/9079>

Information about Bibframe will be available after the conference:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/>

See also: <http://bibframe.org/>

Tammy Wong spoke about RDA-related policies at LC. Before cataloging a map they do a name/title search to make sure that what they have is a separate entry. They assign a 1xx if at all possible so that their entry may be unique. There are too many non-unique name/title entries. A discussion followed about ways of further qualifying resources, including place of publication for older non-unique entries.

Min Zhang mentioned that Adam Schiff presented a discussion paper at CC:DA about relationship designators in RDA. It is to include information about geographic name relationship designators. It was recommended for review: <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TFappendixK201301.pdf>

The concept of “Core” and “Core if” elements in RDA was briefly discussed. There are no major changes in terms of expected bibliographic elements appearing in the “Core” and “Core if” elements for cartographic materials.

The Bounding Box Tool by Klokantech Technologies was discussed:

<http://boundingbox.klokantech.com/>

Many of those present use this tool to identify and add bounding coordinates for maps in their cataloging. Marc McGee will write up a brief description of how to use the Bounding Box Tool to be published in *Baseline*. The question was asked as to how many institutions always add coordinates to their map records as a matter of policy. Many institutions present always add coordinates to map records. For those institutions that do record bounding box coordinates, it was asked how many use degrees, minutes and seconds vs. decimal degree notation, since many non-library geospatial systems use decimal degree notation for spatial search. Both methods of notations were used among the group.

Discussion on the suitability of LCSH for describing geospatial data sets in the OpenGeoportal

(OGP) <http://opengeoportal.org/> Many institutions involved with OGP use LCSH to describe themes in the metadata for geospatial data layers. There is a problem of data layers needing more specific subject keywords than what are available in LCSH. The question was posed to the Interest Group as to whether the OGP metadata community should make an effort to address gaps in LCSH through the SACO program or whether they would be better served looking toward other thesauri (e.g. Getty, GNS, etc.) for more specific description of geospatial resources. The consensus of the group seemed to favor applying relatively broad LCSH terms and using also other thesauri for more specific terminology when appropriate. Marc McGee will report on our discussion to the OGP Metadata Working Group and report back on any further developments in the OGP Metadata Working Group.