

DRAFT: Report: CCDA Task Force to review the Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables

June 4, 2020 draft

Questions regarding general, technical, and procedural detail from previous “Procedural guidelines” https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/romguid_2010.html

- Are any of the technical guidelines (both general and specific guidelines and principles) regarding character mapping, modifiers, rendering, reversibility, machine-transliteration, non-alphabetic languages, etc., being carried over or also revised?
- There are also specific procedural guidelines outlined in the previous guidelines, including timelines, contacts, public announcements (CSB), etc. Are these also to be included or revised?

Regarding a “review board”

- This Task Force agrees that a review board that would coordinate the process is a good idea.
- Who would serve on it? How would the membership be constituted?
- Would this be a permanent body?
- What would be the role of the ABA director?

Recommendations:

- The procedure should specify that LC will notify the chair of CC:DA, and, for Asian and African languages (excluding Asiatic Russia), simultaneously the chair of CC:AAM, at the same time that LC contacts the stakeholders in the communities". This will allow interested members of the ALA committees to become involved as soon as possible and should help ensure speedy ALA approval of the final table.
- The primary body to be contacted in connection with Slavic and East European romanization tables should be the ACRL European Studies Section Slavic Cataloging and Metadata Committee, as ASEES does not have any committees with a cataloging focus.
- For languages spoken by smaller populations (e.g., Georgian, Karakalpak, etc.), available and accessible library cataloging, and academic experts typically exist in extremely small numbers. For these languages, LC and the communities may have to go further afield to acquire the necessary expertise to produce or revise romanization tables that are accurate and useful. A mention of this in the guidelines would be helpful.
- Multiple experts are needed for languages that have varying regional and local expression (e.g., Arabic, Persian, etc.). At least three experts should be adequate.
- When or if specific technical procedures, regarding timeline, etc., are established or revised, we recommend at least a 30-day period for garnering feedback on a new or revised table, but we also support making the process as flexible and efficient as possible.

Role of CC:DA

- To achieve consensus and approve proposals jointly with LC, the role of CC:DA (consulting with CC:AAM for Asian and African languages (excluding Asiatic Russia) via its ALA Liaison), should be to verify as far as possible, that the revision and vetting process is complete according to established procedures. CC:DA would vote to approve a new or revised table on this basis.
 - Since CC:DA is not a language expertise group per se, it could coordinate language expertise from other cataloging communities or other library functions (public services, acquisitions, vendors, etc.) on an as-needed basis as part of the approval process. However, for the sake of efficiency, it should not acquire language expertise that has clearly, adequately been utilized earlier in the overall process.
- CC:DA membership on the review board that is being explored.

Respectfully submitted, June 12, 2020

CC:DA Task Force to review the Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables

Peter Fletcher, Chair

Renee Bu

Tatyana Chubaryan

Lori Lynn Dekydspotter

Jian Lee

Robert Maxwell

Keiko Suzuki

Jia Xu