NISO Election Results

John Regazzi, President of Engineering Information, Inc., New York City, was elected Vice Chair/Chair-Elect in NISO's annual election. Directors chosen to represent libraries, information services and publishing are, respectively, Lois Ann Colaianni, National Library of Medicine; James Rush, Executive Director, Palinet (Philadelphia, PA); and Peter Paulson, Executive Director, OCLC-Forest Press.

The new directors took office July 1, 1989, joining the directors currently serving on the NISO Board: Paul Peters, Chair (New York Public Library); Mary Ellen Jacob, Immediate Past Chair; Heike Kordish, Treasurer (New York Public Library); Susan Vita (Library of Congress); Toni Carbo Bearman (University of Pittsburgh); Charles Bourne (DIALOG); Bill Bartenbach (The Foundation Center) and Carol A. Risher (Association of American Publishers). Karen Runyan (Houghton-Mifflin) has since been appointed for a one year term to fill the seat vacated by Raymond J. Hender-long.

NISO Welcomes Two New Members

VTLS, Inc. has joined NISO as a voting member. The voting representative is Vinod Chachra; alternate is Carl Lee.

The Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) has also joined NISO as a voting member. Voting representative is Patricia J. Barnett; alternate is Pamela J. Parry.

In other membership news, the American Society of Indexers is now represented by Jessica Milstead; Nancy Mulvaney is the new Alternate Voting Representative.
Data Research Grant Launches NISO Endowment Fund

NISO has received a $25,000 grant from Data Research Associates, Inc., a leading provider of library automation services headquartered in St. Louis. NISO will use the grant as the nucleus of an endowment fund. The grant was formally presented in a ceremony on Monday, June 26, in the Data Research exhibit at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the American Library Association at the Dallas Convention Center.

In announcing the Data Research grant, James J. Michael, Data Research’s Vice President and Voting Representative to NISO, said: “The future success of libraries as information centers is crucially dependent on networking, which in turn will rely on adequate standards for the exchange of information.”

Data Research President Michael J. Mellinger observed that “With this donation Data Research reaffirms its commitment to the development of and adherence to standards. We are pleased that our contribution will be used to launch NISO’s endowment effort.”

For the last several years NISO has discussed the possibility of establishing an endowment fund to provide a stable base of funding to support its activities. Pat Harris, NISO Executive Director, praised Data Research for its leadership in the endowment effort: “This is a wonderful way to begin NISO’s second half century,” she said. “Data Research has actively supported NISO standards both as a developer and implementer, and has been a voting member of NISO since 1986. They have led the field in library automation compliance to emerging Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) Protocols, and have consistently supported compliance to the full MARC record in automated library systems. It is appropriate that Data Research is helping us launch a NISO endowment fund, and we are most appreciative.”

Message from the Chair

Paul Evan Peters
Chairperson, NISO

Take a New Look at NISO

This is my first opportunity to address you from my new vantage point as Chairperson of NISO. I want to use it to explain why I feel so fortunate to be in the position I now am, at this particular time in NISO’s history, and to outline three of the priorities I intend to focus on for the next two years. I hope this will convey some of the pride I take in NISO’s past, together with some of the excitement I feel for NISO’s future. I also hope to stimulate (provoke?) you to let me know what NISO means to you, and what you think NISO should be doing to advance the cause of standardization in librarianship, information services, and publishing.

NISO Past and Present

NISO was born fifty years ago, primarily as the result of the singularly farsighted vision of a very limited number of truly dedicated individuals, who understood the importance of standards for the development of cost-effective industry practices long before global technological and
economic interdependency rendered that fact obvious to the rest of us. Since that humble but distinguished beginning, NISO has grown to become a major actor on both the national and international standards stages, and to embrace more than sixty voting members, considerably more than one hundred committee members, and literally hundreds of informal participants and interested parties.

NISO is not only larger now than it was fifty years ago, it is also a different type of standards organization, and it works on a different type of standard than it did fifty years ago. For instance, the CD-ROM, linked systems, common command language, electronic manuscript, and preservation standards on which NISO now works are qualitatively different from the book spine, bibliographic reference, technical report, and book and serial numbering standards of NISO's initial program of work. Furthermore, a standards organization that publishes its own standards (as NISO now does in conjunction with Transaction Publishers) and its own periodical (as NISO now does in the form of Information Standards Quarterly) is qualitatively different from a standards organization that does not.

A Secure Foundation

I believe that these differences distinguish NISO in the community of standards organizations and constitute important new elements in the foundation for NISO's future. My first priority for the next two years is to insure the security of this foundation, programmatically and financially.

The standards program of NISO must continue to expand to address the needs of all three of its constituencies and to work in highly technological areas of tremendous contemporary interest, but it must also continue to maintain and develop its established excellence in bibliographic materials and systems. The publications program of NISO must continue to reach out to prospective users of standards (and other interested parties) in a timely and informative fashion, but it must also accomplish this outreach in a manner that generates, rather than depletes, resources available for the development of the standards themselves.

Increased Participation

My second priority is to increase participation in NISO. I plan to pursue this priority in at least three ways:

1. First and foremost, NISO needs to increase the participation (at all levels) of representatives of its publishing constituency. NISO currently benefits from more participation from this constituency than ever before. Nonetheless, NISO must seek still more participation from a widening cross-section of the publishing constituency; I intend to take every opportunity to get the NISO message out to publishers—and their message in to NISO.

2. Secondly, NISO needs to find new ways for individuals to take an active interest in—without actually becoming involved in—its Standards Committees. I am convinced that there are many more people who benefit from NISO's program, or take comfort from the knowledge that NISO exists, than NISO is currently reaching in any sort of organized, targeted fashion. I intend, first, to test this conviction in various ways; then, if these tests prove my conviction to be substantially correct, I will see to the formulation of a plan for increasing the participation of these interested (but uninvolved) individuals.

3. Thirdly, NISO needs to increase its knowledge of, and involvement with, other organizations. NISO is already very actively involved with other standards organization (e.g. ASC X3, Information Processing Systems) and will need to become actively involved with others (e.g. ASC X12, Business Data Interchange). I believe, however, that NISO's need for inter-organization liaison and cooperation is not limited to standards organizations. Rather, this need also includes at least the professional and trade associations in each of NISO's three constituencies. I intend to find ways for NISO's program to become better informed by the hopes, activities, and plans of these associations—and vice-versa.

Recognition

My third (and final) priority for the next two years is to make sure that the talented professionals who are involved in the governance, management, and program of work of NISO know that their insights, dedication, and hard work are recognized and appreciated. This priority is consistent with the leadership style to which I was acculturated many years ago: choose an impossible problem or an irresistible opportunity; find the best people; then turn the problem or opportunity over to
those people, and get out of the way. My position as to whether NISO represents an impossible problem or an irresistible opportunity is very complex and fluid; suffice it to say that NISO generates both impossible problems and irresistible opportunities at an impressive rate.

My position on whether NISO has found the best people, however, never changes. I have the highest regard for Pat Harris, NISO's Executive Director, and her staff; I believe we are very fortunate to have them working on NISO's impossible problems and irresistible opportunities. I also find the professionals with whom I work on NISO’s Board, Board and Standing Committees, Standards Committees, and activities in general to be the most singularly talented, experienced, influential and (dare I say it?) entertaining group of people with whom I have ever had the privilege of being associated. It is very important to me that everyone who is involved in NISO know that her or his efforts are recognized and appreciated. This will be a particular priority of mine for the next two years, and it is one that I recommend to all of us.

Take a New Look

My summary message from my new vantage point as Chairperson of NISO is, simply, take a new look at NISO. When I look at NISO I see a vital and ambitious organization that is proud of its past and eager to achieve new standards of excellence (pun intended) in its future. I also see a NISO that is improving outreach to its clients and constituents, broadening its base of participation, and strengthening its ties with related organizations. Finally, I see a NISO that is made up of a remarkable array of professionals who need and deserve recognition and appreciation. So, please take a new look at NISO. After you do, I would love to know what you see.

From the NISO Executive Director

Pat Harris

I have had a good time preparing for NISO’s Fiftieth Anniversary meeting by reviewing NISO’s history and taking a good look at our roots. One point that had escaped me in the past was that NISO’s program, from its very beginning, was driven by the need to develop international standards. Indeed, it was ANSI’s interest in finding a constituency to review proposed international standards affecting the bibliographic community that led to the creation of Z39.

This same pressure continues to drive our domestic program today. Undoubtedly, with the European initiative to create a barrier-free Europe by the year 1992, this push will be felt even more strongly in the years ahead.

Certainly, the work that is now ongoing in ISO/TC 46 in the areas of standards for preservation, for OSI protocols, and for indexing, described in this issue of ISQ, will have an impact on the direction of the equivalent U.S. standards now in development or being revised. The importance of international standards development can be seen in two recent actions of the NISO Board of Directors:

- First, the Board voted that the standard for country codes, Z39.27, be withdrawn in favor of the ISO standard in this area, ISO 3166. The U.S. standard does not, in fact, include a list of the codes, but references the international standard, so it is appropriate that the international document be the standard of choice.

- In a second action, the Board of Directors has voted to recommend to the Voting Members of NISO that Z39.60-198x be withdrawn and that the operative international standard, ISO 9660 for CD-ROM Volume and File Structure, be advanced in its stead. Again, it is important—to avoid confusion and duplication of effort—that only one standard be referenced.

Because of this pressure, it is important that NISO’s operations, internal and external, be efficient and responsive to the needs of our user constituencies. The Standards Development Committee and the Board of Directors are looking at ways to make NISO operations more responsive. The Standards Development Committee is being reorganized around a series of information specialities, called portfolios, which will channel expert attention to particular areas of standardization and result in a proactive standards program. The Board of Directors is taking a careful look at a variety of ways to structure NISO’s balloting and review process, so that a wider net is cast when a proposed standard is reviewed, and Voting Members are allowed to direct their voting interests.

Meanwhile, the NISO Standards Committees are having a year of unprecedented
productivity. At least five committees are now putting the final touches on first or final drafts, so we can look forward to increased momentum in the pace of standards review. Now out for review are the revised standard for the technical report number; the first draft of a proposed standard for computer software description; and a proposed new standard for durable binding. On track to be balloted in the coming months are a revised Z39.1, Periodicals: Format & Arrangement; a final draft of Z39.62-198x, Eye Legible Information on Microfilm Leaders; the recently revised standard for paper permanence (Z39.48); and a proposed new standard for the exchange of circulation systems data. At age fifty, NISO is in high gear!

From a Thirteen Millimeter Wrench, to MARC, to the Data Research Vision

Jim Michael

Over the past two years, I have had the opportunity to speak at several seminars, workshops and conference programs about standards, NISO and Information Standards Quarterly, formerly the Voice of Z39. On several occasions, I took a “raise-your-hand” survey and found that fewer than ten percent of the folks attending knew what NISO was—and fewer than two percent had ever heard of Information Standards Quarterly or its predecessor.

That’s terrible! But not surprising. It was not very long ago that I was part of the uninformed majority; I did not know about NISO or the Voice of Z39. It is frustrating to be told about very important organizations and to admit “I didn’t know.” What’s even more frustrating is to have someone say “If you would have asked me, I would have told you.” That’s of no help whatsoever. I didn’t ask because I didn’t know that I didn’t know. I suspect that’s the case with many of the folks attending the sessions who did not know about NISO or ISQ.

My own introduction to standards came when I was a youngster. My father introduced me to the importance of standard sizes of nuts, bolts, sockets and wrenches. He said, “If you’re going to do a job, do it right. To do it right, you need the right tools.”

My first experience with multiple standards occurred when I bought an automobile that was assembled in Canada, with some Canadian parts and some American parts. As I was working on that automobile I discovered that I could not find a proper size wrench for one of the bolts. Some of the parts were American standards and some were metric—at which point I had to buy a set of metric wrenches and sockets. The precise wrench I needed was a thirteen millimeter.

You might ask, what does all this have to do with libraries, NISO and Data Research? I learned early on that you need the right tools to do the job correctly. These tools must meet certain standards. As I would also learn, using standards is also important for libraries and library automation.

Catalog Cards to MARC

My first awareness of a specific library standard occurred in 1970, when I implemented a process to use a copy machine to produce catalog cards for a library. That’s when I discovered that a three-by-five inch card is not a three-by-five inch card. A standard library card is actually 75mm by 125mm. This is slightly smaller than a 3x5 card. The 3x5 cards produced on the copy machine would not fit in the drawers.

Fortunately, it took only a slight adjustment to the placement and the cutting of the cards to correct the problem. (For a similar experience you might want to read an incident described by the editor of ISQ, Walt Crawford, on page one of his book Technical Standards: An Introduction for Librarians.)

In the early seventies, I began to look at some long range options for automation of a library. I attended workshops, seminars and conferences and listened and took notes. To this day, I am amazed at the foresight of some of the folks who conducted these seminars. I began to assemble a list of criteria that I referred to as a philosophy of computing. The list consisted of such things as standard programming languages, industry standard operating systems, a carefully defined growth path, and “off-the-shelf” hardware supported by the manufacturer.

The single most important criterion that was mentioned time and time again was the use of LC MARC records for building a bibliographic database. The library was already using OCLC so we knew of MARC. I did not learn until years later about the organization responsible for developing that standard. I only knew that standards were important, and that
for long range success one should start with a bibliographic database built around LC MARC records.

In the mid-seventies, I began to talk with specific vendors and consultants and to visit several sites that had library automation. A top priority for automation was a plan to build a bibliographic database and add circulation and acquisitions later.

To my surprise, none of the vendors I had contacted met the criteria I had listed. What was even more surprising was the lack of concern or interest in building an LC MARC bibliographic database. Not a single vendor would commit to providing a MARC database.

This was discouraging, but I continued to write specs for an RFP, and I insisted on a commitment from a vendor to provide a MARC bibliographic database.

Why this insistence on MARC? I could have had a circulation system in just a few months. But I knew of no other way to begin in order to guarantee success. The building and maintenance of a bibliographic database is the most time-consuming and expensive part of automating a library. I needed to load MARC tapes, create and edit MARC records, and write those records to tape in MARC format. As Dad said, "If you're going to do a job, do it right."

The integrity of a database was important for resource sharing. The data in all the fields, including the fixed fields, would be important for future searching. My database could become part of a large automation consortium and it needed to be compatible.

Data Research Associates

In the process of searching for a vendor, I happened upon a small St. Louis firm selling small business systems. I explained what I wanted and they responded that they were not only willing but able to write these programs. We issued an RFP and this firm, Data Research, was the only firm to respond. In 1977, we installed the first Data Research system—and one year later, I joined the company.

What I brought to Data Research, among other things, was an acute awareness of the importance of library standards. This concept was reinforced by the President and CEO of the company, Michael Mellinger, who insisted on the importance of technical standards for such items as programming languages and networking, as well as industry standards for hardware operating systems. Approaching the task of automation from two different view-points, we both agreed that adherence to standards would spell success for the customer and, therefore, for the company.

As I look back, I am embarrassed by my ignorance of the standards development process. I have come to appreciate and marvel at folks like Mary Ellen Jacob, Paul Peters, Henriette Avram, Sally McCallum, Pat Harris, Sandra Paul and Walt Crawford, to mention just a few. Not only do I appreciate and stand in awe of the contribution these people have made to the development of standards, but I appreciate the tolerance and help they gave to me and to Data Research.

It is because of Data Research's interest, as well as help from the people mentioned above, that today, as a company, we are making every effort to implement standards, become part of the development of standards, support NISO through contribution to its endowment fund and be an advocate for NISO and its work.

I do not intend for this to be autobiographical, but I think it is important to understand how Data Research became involved with standards. The how was not a bolt out of the blue. It emerged from the backgrounds of a librarian and a computer scientist and merged into a long-range commitment for the future. The commitment to adhere to standards is a guarantee for long-range success.

Why Adhere to Standards?

The why of Data Research involvement in standards is far more important than the how but is also more difficult to explain. How does anyone explain the passion or commitment one has for any issue without sounding altruistic, superior or just plain weird? I will try to explain the why as rationally as I am able, but there are times the commitment, passion and enthusiasm are not always rational.

The first reason that comes to mind is self-interest. Because I firmly believed that successful library automation would depend upon the bibliographic database, I wanted that database to be built on the LC MARC standard. This self-interest for future success was important to me as a librarian implementing a library automation system, and became important to me also as a vendor developing and selling library systems. Adherence to standards in library automation is in the best interest of librarians and vendors.

The decision to write a program to load, create, edit and write MARC records was visionary. It was visionary in the sense that circulation was what librarians wanted, but Data
Research believed the MARC standard was more important. Swimming against the tide was not and is not easy, but the MARC record has emerged as the single most important factor in library automation.

There are myriad reasons why adherence to standards continues to be important. To mention a few:

- Someone else has written the specifications and one does not have to reinvent the wheel;
- A standard becomes a universally accepted tool;
- There is consistency;
- One is prepared for advances in technology;
- Data is transportable.

But most important of all is the guarantee for success. Think of what the future will bring:

- Rapid advances in technology;
- Much greater demand for information;
- Local and global networks;
- Much greater library interdependency;
- Demands for multi-vendor connectivity;
- Seamless, invisible access to information on the part of folks from their office, home, conference room and classroom.

We will be prepared only if we have vision, and that vision will only become a reality with standards such as:

- OSI;
- ILL;
- Common Command Language;
- Search and Retrieval;
- Circulation Interface.

The support of standards is going to involve the support of NISO. As vendors and librarians, we are not nearly involved enough in the standards process. Not all the vendors are members of NISO—and they need to be. Not all libraries subscribe to Information Standards Quarterly—and they need to. More libraries need to become NISO Information Subscribers. American libraries are not nearly adequately represented on national and international standards bodies. In some cases, funding is not adequate to have U.S. representatives attend international meetings in foreign countries. This is not in our best interest.

There needs to be a day soon when all vendors are members of, and financial supporters of, NISO. The profession and the marketplace deserve the best we can give. There needs to be a day soon when the majority of hands go up when asked about NISO and ISQ. It's in your best interest.

Electronic Data Interchange

Ray Denenberg

Within the standards community, a subject of substantial recent attention is electronic data interchange, EDI, one of the most rapidly growing markets in the computer industry.

The aim of EDI is to automate business transactions. It replaces common business documents—purchase orders, invoices, etc.—with electronic transmission of the information they contain.

Electronic formats for business transactions are based on actual paper flow between businesses. However, EDI is more than just electronic exchange of messages or documents—it is not facsimile or electronic mail transmission. EDI transactions are exchanged between computer applications and are intended to automatically invoice a customer, debit an account, update inventory, etc. Benefits of EDI include improved customer service, control of inventory and cash flow, and faster and more accurate processing of sales and purchase orders.

EDI has been used for years in several industries, including grocery, transportation, and retail. Today, perhaps as many as 8,000 U.S. companies use some form of EDI, and it is predicted that by 1995 EDI will be implemented by 400,000 companies (worldwide).

The library and publishing community is interested in EDI for applications such as acquisitions. EDI concepts might also be used to model less obvious types of transactions, such as interlibrary loan.

In the federal government, EDI is gaining momentum, due in part to the emergence of EDI standards, which will be mandated for government use in the early 1990's.

Inter-discipline Interchange

EDI standardization has been motivated not only by the incentive to automate business transactions, but also to coordinate the representation of information exchanged across industries. Standards bodies and industries create data elements and message formats for interchange within their communities, often
without considering potential requirements for interchange across disciplines.

Application data elements are often created without benefit of generic data elements for reference. Different communities thus develop differently structured formats that address the same concept.

For example, ISO/TC 154 develops data elements for administration, commerce, and industry. TC 68 develops standards for banking transactions. TC 184 develops product definition data elements for industrial automation. TC 46 develops data elements for documentation and library applications such as interlibrary loan. EDI philosophy is that data elements and message formats would be more useful if their development were conceptually and structurally coordinated to support information interchange between communities of interest.

From TDI to EDI

EDI evolved from its predecessor, Trade Data Interchange (TDI), which addressed the "trade" aspects of business interchange—purchase, invoice, shipping, receiving, etc. In 1985, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe developed Guidelines for Trade Data Interchange, GTDI. ISO TC 154 used GTDI as the basis for the 1987 EDIFACT standard, Electronic data interchange for administration, commerce and transport.

EDIFACT is described as a set of principles that facilitates the electronic interchange of business data between manufacturers, exporters, wholesalers, distributors, retailers, brokers, shippers, banks, insurers, port authorities, government agencies, etc.

U.S. EDI Standards

In the U.S., Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) X12 on Electronic Business Data Interchange has been the U.S. representative for the development of EDIFACT standards. X12 has also developed national standards for EDI, published in 1984, including transactions for such industry groups as the Electrical Data Exchange, Telecommunications Industry Forum, and Chemical Industry Data Exchange. Transactions are being developed for the aerospace, hospital supply, electric utility, and electronics industries, as well as for the federal government for procurement, shipping, and customs.

There are also several EDI transaction sets in use which are not part of the X12 standard, including transactions for the health, insurance, gas, and hardware industries. In fact there are currently several incompatible versions of EDI in use.

EDI: The Traditional View

According to the traditional view, EDI refers to trade aspects of business interchange. X12 was chartered by ANSI in 1979 to develop standards for inter-industry electronic interchange of business transactions: order placement and processing, shipping and receiving, invoicing, and payment. The Electronic Data Interchange Association (EDIA) defines EDI as the "computer-to-computer exchange of intercompany business information". EDIA is the U.S. trade association for the development and implementation of EDI. They view EDI as the exchange of standardized electronic versions of common business documents, aimed at reducing overhead (such as time and human error) involved in business transactions done by paper.

Broadening the Scope: A Conceptual Model

Recently, however, there has been considerable interest in broadening the scope of EDI. ISO-IEC JTC1 (formerly TC 97) has now accepted responsibility for developing a model for EDI. JTC1 is responsible for standards for information technology and includes, for example, SC21 and SC6, which are responsible, collectively, for standards for Open Systems Interconnection.

JTC1 has formed a special working group on EDI, which first met in May, 1989. Its scope is the development of a conceptual model that identifies and coordinates existing and future standards and services for furthering global interoperability of electronic data interchange.

The committee will investigate EDI transaction types and information flow, data element modelling requirements, and EDI service requirements. The model is to be developed within 18 months.

Forming the U.S. Position

Within the U.S., ASC X3 has convened a committee to serve as technical advisory group to ANSI on EDI, to develop a U.S. position to the international group. X3 is responsible for standards for Information Processing Systems, and is the U.S. counterpart to ISO-IEC JTC1.
When the U.S. committee first met in July, there was lively discussion on various topics: the scope of EDI, its relationship to Open Systems Interconnection, taxonomy of transactions, semantics and syntax, and EDI services.

**From EDI to edi**

A new term, "edi" (lower case), is now used to refer to a generalization of EDI, to encompass inter-discipline interchange, not limited strictly to "business" transactions. Understandably, there is substantial debate on what this really means and how to describe it.

At the U.S. meeting, it was suggested that another term besides "edi" should be introduced, because of potential confusion between "EDI" and "edi." There was significant discussion and debate, several alternative terms were considered, such as "digital data exchange," "application information interchange," and "inter-discipline interchange." No consensus could be reached. Finally, it was decided to keep the term "edi." The discussion seemed to point out that there really was not a common understanding of what edi means.

**EDI and OSI**

Proposed edi concepts are not yet aligned with the ISO Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model. In the U.S., there is consensus that edi should utilize OSI services wherever possible and applicable, and that the model should identify any communication services required by edi which are not provided by OSI, for proposed inclusion into the OSI program of work.

**Taxonomy of Transactions**

Traditionally, EDI has applied only to computer-to-computer interchange. Apparently, edi is intended to cover person-to-application and even person-to-person transactions, as well. An example of the latter is the CCITT X.400 interpersonal messaging. A question of interest to libraries is where transactions such as interlibrary loan fit in the edi taxonomy.

**Semantics and Syntax**

Existing EDI standards such as EDIFACT and X12 are syntax oriented, with little attention to semantics. The U.S. holds that there must be a common understanding of the semantics of data elements, and a mechanism to preserve semantics when data elements are interchanged.

Thus, for example, in a transaction between an insurance company and a bank, a data element conveying "cause of death" must not be interpreted on receipt as meaning "deficit my account." Two cooperating systems must also be able to agree to the syntax that will be used to represent the semantics. Methods to preserve semantics and employ common syntax are the OSI mechanisms of application and presentation contexts.

The U.S. position is that semantics should be modeled before data formats and syntax. Semantics should include functions, services, terms, definitions, rules, and meanings.

**U.S. Definition of edi**

The U.S. committee has developed the following proposed definition for edi:

Edi is a set of services that send, receive, store, distribute, and perform needed transformations of electronic objects (including messages, documents, images, graphics, EDI, and voice). These services are both intra- and inter-enterprise, across heterogeneous environments, among people, among people and applications, and among applications.

Ray Denenberg is at the Library of Congress.

---

**Choice Supports Permanent Paper**

Indications that books are printed on acid-free paper will soon appear in Choice, a major book review periodical published by the Association of College and Research Libraries (a division of the American Library Association).

Choice is now working with its computer vendor to add an additional field to its bibliographic record for the acid-free paper indicator, and plans to begin publishing reviews with the indicator by the end of the year.

Choice will report whether a book sent out for review is printed on alkaline paper, based on information from the book itself or from LC MARC records. Choice will not physically test the paper for pH value, but will rely on information provided by the publishers.

Books that use paper meeting the standards for permanence established by NISO in standard Z39.48-1984 frequently carry the circled-infinity logo (shown here) on the copyright page. As discussed elsewhere in...
this issue, a new version of Z39.48 will be circulated for review this fall.

TC 46 in Washington: Working Groups and Subcommittee Meetings

Pat Harris

Following is the second report on the May 1989 meetings of ISO Technical Committee 46 in Washington, D.C. The first report appeared in the July 1989 Information Standards Quarterly. This review provides a capsule report on the deliberations of the various working groups and subcommittees that met during the Meeting Week. If you wish to monitor the work of a specific TC 46 unit, contact the NISO office for further information.

TC 46/WG 2: Country Codes

Working Group 2 maintains the international standard for country codes, ISO 3166, now in its third edition. Among the topics discussed were:

- General developments in the area of language codes, with particular attention to work in ISO/TC 37 on Terminology;
- Principles used in ISO 3166 that will be incorporated into the introduction of a fourth edition of the standard;
- A proposal advanced by the French to differentiate between the mainland and a country with its territories;
- The proposed withdrawal of three-letter alphabetic codes for countries;
- Plans to develop a list of country codes for historical entities.

The French proposal resulted in the most discussion and controversy. Discussion centered around the definition of a country, how to provide global coverage (and whether such complete coverage is desirable), and the dangers of becoming too political while trying to provide an objective, workable standard.

No major decisions were made at this meeting. Rather, delegates decided to review the distributed documents and discuss the issues with experts in their respective countries before the next meeting, which will be in Berlin, December 1989.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: William Kenworthy; Adele Hallam; Rebecca Guenther; Bruce K. Rosen; Sandra Shaw; Harry Coburn; L. Winneberger; Ted Dachtera; Judith Tokel.

SC 9/Ad Hoc Group to Develop an International Standard Technical Report Number (ISRN)

This second meeting resulted in approval of the principal elements of a second working draft. Discussion resulted in the following amendments and decisions:

- Expansion of the ISRN to 36 characters;
- Use of a double hyphen as the group separator, rather than a single hyphen;
- Use of the hyphen or slash as a subdivider, with no limit on the number of subdividers;
- Agreement that revisions and supplements to already-numbered documents do not require a new number, but can be identified by adding a new third segment to the sequential group;
- A mandatory alpha-two country code following the sequential group separator.

The second draft will be edited by the Canadian representative, then forwarded to the SC 9 secretariat for registration as a Draft Proposal and ballot. This working group has completed its work, and does not plan to meet again.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: John Elsbree; Mary C. Hall; Maureen Malone.

Subcommittee 10: Physical Keeping of Documents (Secretariat: Denmark)

SC 10 met for the first time in 1988 and is in the early stages of organizing its program of work. The principal work item is development of DP 9706/Part 2, Permanence of paper for Documents, the counterpart standard to NISO/ANSI Z39.48-1984. SC 10 discussions centered on progress in advancing DP 9706/Part 2, proposals for new work items, a review and revision of the SC's title and scope, and building liaisons with TC 171 (Micrographics), TC 42 (Photography), and TC 6 (Paper, board and pulp) in order to avoid work overlap.

As a result of the 1988 ballot on DP 9706/Part 2, that document has been referred to a working group (SC 10/WG 1) to prepare a third draft. It is hoped that this third draft will be completed before January 1990.
Two new work items were added to the SC 10 program of work: a standard for environmental controls and a standard for durable binding. The U.S. agreed to nominate a project editor for the durable binding effort. SC 10 members also approved a statement of future work interests. SC 10 is scheduled to meet in Paris in May 1990.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Carolyn Morrow; Betsy Humphreys; Merrily Smith; Robert Frase.

SC 9/Ad Hoc Group on ISO 7154, Bibliographic Filing Principles

This ad hoc working group was convened to review ISO 7154 and determine whether the standard should be revised for editorial reasons, expanded to include syllabic and ideographic scripts, or reaffirmed.

There was no clear support among attendees for inclusion of other scripts. The U.S. representatives argued that the need to interfile bibliographic records in different scripts is rare today. The working group recommended that ISO 7154 be reaffirmed; the issues raised will be examined again at the next five-year review.

U.S. Delegate: Susan Bieber.

Subcommittee 8: Statistics (Secretariat: United Kingdom)

Three revised standards, balloted in 1988/89 at the DIS level, were reviewed, with the following actions taken:

- **DIS 9230, Price indexes.** Comments were reviewed and resolved; the SC 8 secretariat will submit this to ISO for publication as an international standard.
- **DIS 2789, International library statistics; and DIS 9707, Statistics for the production and distribution of books, newspapers, periodicals and electronic publications.** Discussion centered on harmonizing the final drafts with UNESCO data-gathering methods and terminology. Final drafts were approved for publication as international standards.

The U.K. and Denmark advanced a joint proposal to develop standards on performance measures for libraries. This will be discussed further at SC 8's next meeting, May 1990 in Paris.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Lenore Coral; Sandra Paul; Fred Lynden; Ray L. Carpenter.

SC 9/Ad Hoc Group to Develop an International Standard for Establishment of Indexes (DP 999)

Two separate draft proposals have failed to achieve consensus. Consequently, this ad hoc group decided that the British standard BS 3700, *Preparing indexes to books, periodicals, and other documents*, should be used as the basis for a third Draft Proposal.

The ad hoc group reviewed BS 3700 and adopted the majority of the standard, with some additions, deletions and minor changes. Each member of the working group accepted responsibility for reviewing sections of BS 3700 and agreed to submit written comments to the group's chair. A revised draft will be circulated among the group before its next meeting, scheduled for November 1989 in Paris.

U.S. Delegate: Hans H. Wellisch

SC 4/Working Group 4: Application Protocols

DP 10162 and DP 10163 will be edited and circulated for second DP ballots; the revised documents will be titled *Search and Retrieve*. DPs 10160 and 10161 (*Interlibrary loan*) will also be circulated for a second DP ballot.

WG 4 intends to prepare a *Technical Report* to accompany the standards, describing the model within which parts of the standards will be used, and how they may interact and cooperate with other TC 46 protocol standards and external protocol standards. The *Update Service* will be continued as a separate document; the delegate from the Netherlands agreed to draft this document. This group will meet again in January 1990.

U.S. Delegates: Sally H. McCallum; Ray Denenberg; Wayne Davison; James Michael; Mary Jackson; Howard Turtle; Clifford Lynch.

SC 4/Working Group 6: Electronic Publishing

The Working Group recommended that the U.S. standard for electronic publications (ANSI/NISO Z39.59-1988) be advanced for approval as an international standard. The group further recommended that standards for the
publication of mathematical and tabular material be dealt with as separate new work items.

U.S. Delegates: Betsy Kiser; John Gale; Sperling Martin; Wayne Davison.

**Subcommittee 9: Presentation, Identification, and Description of Documents**
*(Secretariat: Canada)*

The proposed standard for *Preparation of manuscripts/computer scripts for publication* and the proposed *International standard technical report number* will be circulated for DP ballot.

SC 9 reviewed DIS 2108, *International Standard Book Number*, and agreed to register it as a DIS and circulate it for DIS ballot. ISO 1086, *Title leaves of books*, will be forwarded to the ISO Central Secretariat for publication as an International Standard. In addition, SC 9 members agreed to establish an ad hoc group to develop an international standard for music numbering.

U.S. Delegates: Judy Green; Sally McCallum; Margaret Morrison; Sandra Paul; Patricia Harris; John Elsbree; Karen Patrias; Sally Sinn.

**SC 4/Ad Hoc Group on DIS 8777, Common Command Language**

This ad hoc group met to review the results of balloting on DIS 8777. All proposed editorial changes were accepted; it was agreed that the definitions will be aligned with existing ISO definitions. The negative votes were tentatively resolved.

It was agreed that the revised text will be distributed to SC 4 Participating Members for review before final approval and advancement to ISO Central Secretariat for publication. The ad hoc group decided to add an Annex to the standard giving guidance to systems implementers on conformance. The U.S. will provide the text for the annex.

⇒ Note: as a result of the final review, this standard will be circulated for a second DIS ballot. The ad hoc group may be convened following the second ballot.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Margaret Morrison; Wayne Davison; Leah Houser; Marti Scheel; Bill Mooney.

**SC 4/Working Group 1: Character Sets**

The group recommended that proposed standards for Armenian character sets, Georgian character sets, and obsolete Latin character sets and Extended Cyrillic for Non-Slavic Languages be advanced for Draft Proposal ballot.

The Working Group discussed principles for encoding Chinese, Japanese and Korean character sets; this topic will continue to be a matter for discussion within WG 1. WG 1 also recommended that a formal liaison be established between TC 46/SC 4/WG 1 and IEC ISO JTC 1/SC 2. The group will meet in May 1990 in Paris.

U.S. Delegates: Karen Smith-Yoshimura; Sally McCallum.

**SC 4/Working Group 7: Data Elements**

Reviewing the results of balloting on DIS 8459 Part 2: *Acquisitions Applications*, the WG accommodated all comments and the negative vote. The DIS will be advanced for publication as an International Standard.

WG 7 also reviewed the status of 8459, Part 3: *Information Retrieval Applications*. The group reached agreement on a final draft and recommended that Part 3 be circulated as a Draft Proposal. In related discussions, WG 7 considered the need to update the data element directories to meet the operational requirements of users in the bibliographic community. WG 7 recommended that TC 46/SC 4 explore the best options for maintaining and publishing extensions and revisions to separate parts of ISO 8459.

WG 7 also discussed the new initiatives undertaken by ISO IEC JTC 1/SC 14 to coordinate representation of data elements. WG 7 will be exploring this matter further.

⇒ Note: DP 8459 Part 3, *Information Retrieval Applications*, has been circulated for Draft Proposal ballot.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Sally McCallum; Joe Santosuosso; Bill Mooney.

**Subcommittee 4: Computer Applications**
*(Secretariat: USA [NISO])*

- Approved for circulation as Draft Proposals: DP 8459 Part 3, *Bibliographic Data Element*

• Approved for ballot as a New Work Item: Model for Information and Documentation OSI Protocol Development (Technical Report)-ISO/TR, Type 3.


In regard to DIS 8777, Common Command Language: SC 4 members tentatively approved the revised draft and directed that the SC 4 Secretariat distribute the revised text for final review.

Participants also approved two statements:

• In a liaison statement calling for stronger coordination between SC 4 and ISO IEC JTC 1/SC 21, SC 4 invited SC 21 to appoint a liaison rapporteur to follow the activities of SC 4.

• In light of the Plan of Action for Libraries recently adopted by the European Community, SC 4 called to the attention of the EC leadership the activities of SC 4/WG 4 in developing "standards for library oriented 7th layer applications for use inside the OSI reference model."

⇒ Note: The revised text of DIS 8777 was circulated for final review following the meeting. As a result of this review, it was decided that the document will be distributed for a second DIS ballot.

SC 4 will meet next in May 1991 in Berlin.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Paul Evan Peters, Head of Delegation; Sally McCallum; Patricia Harris; Mary Ellen Jacob; Sandra Paul; Margaret Morrison; Bob Dugan; Marti Scheel.

Plenary Meeting of TC 46

Mary Ellen Jacob chaired the Plenary Meeting of ISO Technical Committee 46. Among the actions taken, the TC 46 member bodies present:

• Approved a new title and scope for Subcommittee 10;

• Approved the assignment of GOST (USSR) as the maintenance agency for ISO 832, Abbreviation of typical words;

• Recommended that SC 4 consider accepting a new work item on bar code transcription of printed bibliographical identification elements;

• Reaffirmed ISO 7154, Bibliographical filing principles;

• Recommended that TC 46 leadership convene a meeting with appropriate UNESCO and IFLA staff to ensure effective cooperation in future standardization work in the area of statistics.

The next Plenary Meeting of TC 46 will be held in May 1991 in Berlin.

U.S. Delegates and Observers: Paul Evan Peters, Head of Delegation; Sally McCallum; Patricia Harris; Mary Ellen Jacob; Sandra Paul; Margaret Morrison; Bob Dugan; Marti Scheel.

NISO's Administrative Committees

Although NISO's main mission is standards development, as with any association, some of NISO's volunteer energy is channeled into running the organization. Five administrative committees assist the NISO Board of Directors in carrying out the NISO program.

The following are the NISO administrative committees and, in two cases, brief reports on committee plans and activities. Other administrative committee reports will appear in a future issue.

NISO is always looking for new talent to manage and shape NISO's program. If you would like to participate in an administrative committee, contact the NISO office.

Bylaws Committee

Chair: Ben H. Weil, Ben H. Weil, Inc., 4 Wells Lane, Warren, NJ 07060. Mr. Weil provided the following comments.

The NISO Bylaws Committee is up to date on its assignments. Following a general review and revision of the Bylaws a few years ago, the committee chiefly functions to keep the Bylaws clear, consistent, and in tune with the changes in NISO practices and policies that the
Board sees as needed, and wishes to have phrased in the Bylaws for Voting Member approval.

Most recently, the committee has drafted Bylaw provisions for nomination by petition, redefined participation categories and dues-setting responsibilities, and defined new provisions for the appointment of the chairperson of the Standards Development Committee.

**Education Committee**

Chair: Anita Anker Branin, MINITEX, S-33 Wilson Library, University of Minnesota, 309 19th Ave., South, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

**Finance Committee**

Chair: Heike Kordish, Deputy Director, Research Collections, New York Public Library, Fifth Ave. & 42nd Street, New York, NY 10018.

**International Committee**


**Standards Development Committee**

Chair: Kathleen Bales, The Research Libraries Group, Inc., 1200 Villa Street, Mountain View, CA 94041-1100. Ms. Bales provided the following comments.

The Standards Development Committee (SDC) is beginning the new fiscal year with a new structure and some new members. Three of the continuing members will represent the three NISO constituencies: Sally McCallum, Libraries; Ron Gardner, Information Services; and Connie Greaser, Publishing. The remaining members will be responsible for particular areas of standards development. Three of the areas (and members) are: Preservation, Carolyn Morrow; Telecommunication, Clifford Lynch; and Information Systems Services Providers, Jim Michael. Members for the remaining areas (Abstracting and Indexing, Electronic Publishing and Library Equipment and Supplies) have not yet been appointed. Kathleen Bales is the new Chair.

Continuing present practice, each member will be a liaison to active standards committees, with the responsibility for advising them and tracking their work. However, the major work of the SDC for the coming year will be the creation of a Master Technical Plan, which will outline NISO’s technical direction for the next few years. This plan, to be finished before the 1990 annual meeting, will be the basis of future goal-setting for NISO.

---

**Editor’s Notebook**

*Walt Crawford*

**Anniversaries**

A day or two after sending these pages off to NISO for printing and distribution, I’ll be following to attend NISO’s annual meeting and 50th anniversary celebration. I look forward to it; those of you who didn’t attend should look forward to a report in Volume 2, Number 1 of Information Standards Quarterly, issued in January 1990.

NISO is fifty; ISQ is a year old. If my chronology is correct, TESLA, the Technical Standards for Library Automation Committee of the American Library Association’s Library Information and Technology Association (LITA) is fifteen (or sixteen) years old. That committee’s “Standard Fare” column in the LITA Newsletter has now appeared for ten solid years, issue after issue, through four different column editors—a solid quarterly source of information and commentary on technical standards in NISO’s area.

All seem to be doing well, with healthy activity and occasional turbulence. (For some of the turbulence, note the status reports on Z39.63.) That’s good; without controversy, it would be hard to believe that library-related technical standards are of any real importance. Information Standards Quarterly tries to include some of the controversy alongside positive new developments—but that’s only possible to the extent that contributors make it possible.

ISQ does not have an editorial staff going out to find the news or create it. This is a very part-time volunteer operation—and, if you’re aware of the Research Libraries Group’s organization and activity within NISO, you’ll know that I’m not one of RLG’s key people on technical standards. My contribution is what it’s been through the fifteen years I’ve been vaguely involved with technical standards: as an observer, writer and editor.

We depend on you to tell us what’s happening, to contribute your thoughts and con-
### Standards Status: September 1, 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Standard or Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.1-1977 Periodicals: Format &amp; Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>To be revised</td>
<td>Z39.4-1984 Basic Criteria for Indexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.6-1983 Trade Catalogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.7-1983 Library Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.19-1980 Guidelines for Thesaurus Structure, Construction and Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.20-1983 Criteria for Price Indexes for Library Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Balloting</td>
<td>Z39.23-198x Standard Technical Report Number (STRN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.24-1976 Romanization of Slavic Cyrillic Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.25-1975 Romanization of Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Balloted</td>
<td>Z39.27-1984 Structure for the Representation of Names of Countries...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.29-1977 Bibliographic References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be revised</td>
<td>Z39.31-1976 (R1983) Format for Scientific and Technical Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.32-1981 Information on Microfiche Headings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.35-1979 Romanization of Lao, Khmer and Pali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.37-1979 Romanization of Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.41-1979 Book Spine Formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be revised</td>
<td>Z39.45-1983 Claims for Missing Issues of Serials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be revised</td>
<td>Z39.46-1983 Patent Documents—Identification of Bibliographic Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.48-1984 Permanence of Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.55-198x Computerized Serials Orders, Claims, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Z39.56-198x Serial Item Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Balloted</td>
<td>Z39.57-198x Non-Serials Holdings Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Z39.58-198x Common Command Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Z39.59-1988 Electronic Manuscript Preparation and Markup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Z39.60-198x Volume and File Structure of CD-ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z39.62-198x Eye-Legible Information on Microfilm Leaders, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>Z39.63-1989 Interlibrary Loan Data Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Z39.64-1989 East Asian Character Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Balloting</td>
<td>Z39.66-198x Durable Hard Cover Binding for Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Balloting</td>
<td>Z39.67-198x Computer Software Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Z38.5-1980 Permanent and Durable Library Catalog Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>SC R Environmental Conditions for Storage of Paper-based Library and Archival Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>SC LL Exchange of Circulation Systems Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation</td>
<td>SC MM Environmental Conditions for the Exhibition of Library and Archival Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation</td>
<td>SC QQ Physical Preparation of Theses and Dissertations in Printed Form for Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reb Storage by Libraries and Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation</td>
<td>SC RR Adhesives used to Affix Labels to Library Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation</td>
<td>SC SS Information to be Included in Ads [etc.] for Products Used for the Storage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Binding or Repair of Library Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>SC TT Related standards for CD-ROM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cerns, and to let us know what we're doing right, what's not working out and how we could do it better.

Member Profiles

This issue includes the second informal article from a NISO Voting Member, discussing their own interest in standards and how NISO affects them and their organization. My particular thanks to Connie Greaser of Rand Corporation and James Michael of Data Research Associates for starting this series out with such élan.

This is intended as a continuing series—and I would really appreciate self-nominations from voting members who would like to contribute future articles. Drop me a line, let me know who to contact, and I'll add you to the queue. At four per year, it may not be a fast process, but it will serve us all to see how we each deal with standards. My hope is to rotate articles among NISO's constituencies, to the extent that this is feasible. (As always, my address appears in the masthead on Page 2: Walt Crawford, The Research Libraries Group, Inc., 1200 Villa Street, Mountain View, CA 94041-1100; (415) 691-2227; Fax (415) 964-0943; Bitnet BR.WCC@RLG.BITNET.)

Graphics and Special Characters

Contributors should be aware that Information Standards Quarterly can usually show diacritics and special characters correctly, at least most of those in European languages. If your contribution includes something along these lines, please make sure it is clearly represented; we'll try to get it in. (ISQ body typefaces include the Ventura Publisher International character set, which is identical with the PostScript character set. We can also include characters in the Ventura/PostScript Symbol character set, which includes Greek letters and mathematical symbols.)

While you can't tell it from the published product, we've always had the ability to include machine-readable graphics that are appropriate to articles, using any graphics format that Ventura Publisher can import (which is very nearly any graphics format you can put on 5¼" MS-DOS diskettes, either density).

As of now, we can go one step further: we can accept illustrations that are not in machine-readable form. The rules:

- The image must be no more than one column wide—or, to be more precise, four inches. Larger images should be reduced to four inches or less.
- Ideally, the image should be the exact size that you would expect it to appear in an article; the absolute height limit is roughly six inches, but it would be unusual to use an image that tall.
- The image should be black on a white background, cleanly prepared with no extraneous material.
- The image should relate directly to the article.
- The image should not be so complex that minor alignment errors (that is, skewed printing) will make it useless.

Technophiles among the readers have probably already figured out what this all means. A Logitech ScanMan hand-held scanner has been added to the ISQ desktop publishing system. It works beautifully, but I have neither the time nor ability to carry out any significant post-scanning editing of images.

Serials Librarians Take Note!

This issue completes the first volume of Information Standards Quarterly. During this first volume, the phrase... formerly Voice of Z39 has appeared just below the banner, in accordance with Z39.1 requirements for change of title. (Yes, I know the title itself violates Z39.1 recommendations; that was done intentionally, for what I still regard as good reasons.)

Beginning with Volume 2, Number 1, that phrase will no longer appear—also in accordance with Z39.1 guidelines. By now, the transition should be clear within your local records; the record of transition does appear in USMARC bibliographic records.

Oh, and incidentally, my thanks to the Worst Serial Title Change committee for ignoring us; the “Snake-in-the-Grass” award is one we can do without.

Standards Activity

These notes summarize standards activity since Information Standards Quarterly 1, no. 3.

Standards Being Balloted

⇒ Z39.23-198x: Standard Technical Report Number (STRN). The balloting period for this revised standard is September 1-
Standards Recently Balloted


Standards Being Revised


- Z39.20-1983: Criteria for Price Indexes for Library Materials. Frederick Lynden has agreed to serve as technical editor and revise this standard, taking into consideration comments proposed during the balloting and the recently approved international standard for Library Price Indexes.

- Z39.32-1981: Information on Microfiche Headings. This standard is being revised by Charles Willard.

- Z39.41-1979: Book Spine Formats. A third revision has been prepared by Bob Tannehill and will be circulated for ballot and comment in late 1989.

- Z39.55-198x: Computerized Serials Orders, Claims, etc. A new draft should be released in September 1989, together with a summary of the changes from the previous draft.

- Z39.56-198x: Serial Item Identifier. SC CC has been disbanded. An ad hoc group will meet in the fall of 1989 to review comments received on Z39.56-198x and determine a future course of action for this proposed standard. The ad hoc meeting will be open to all interested parties. Contact the NISO office, (301) 975-2814, for further information.

Standard Under Appeal

- Z39.63-1989: Interlibrary Loan Data Elements. NISO responded to the arguments of the Association of American Publishers in July 1989, reaffirming the standard as approved by the NISO membership. AAP has asked ANSI BSR to continue the withdrawal petition. ANSI legal counsel is now reviewing AAP’s original request and the NISO response and will advise the BSR.
Standards To Be Revised

⇒ Z39.4-1984: Basic Criteria for Indexes. A standards committee is being formed to revise this standard.

Standards Development

⇒ SCR: Environmental Conditions for Storage of Paper-based Library and Archival Materials. A new revision should be available in mid-October, and the committee hopes to have a final draft in early 1990.

⇒ SC LL: Exchange of Circulation Systems Data. The chair of SC LL, Deborah Conrad, may now be reached at SEAL, Inc., 732 Dartmouth Street, South Dartmouth, MA 02748, (508) 996-8700. The SC will meet in November 1989, and hopes to have a completed draft in early 1990. The chair describes the approach as “minimalist—the least amount of information is to be exchanged between systems, with patron and bibliographic data to reside in their home system rather than be transferred between systems.”

⇒ SC TT: Related Standards for CD-ROM. SC TT met in July 1989. The new chair of SC TT is Ann Hudson, DePaul University, Chicago, IL.

Standard Withdrawn

⇒ Z39.60-198x: Volume and File Structure of CD-ROM. The NISO Board voted to withdraw this work item and advance ISO 9660 in its stead. NISO Voting Members will ballot this matter in the fall of 1989.

Two New Standards, One Revision Out for Balloting

This fall, two completely new standards are out for initial ballot, as is a revision of Z39.23, the Standard Technical Report Number standard. Balloting and comments will be received from September 1 through November 30; interested parties may purchase copies of the drafts for $25 each from the NISO office.


This standard is intended to improve access to technical reports by specifying a format to uniformly identify technical publications. The proposed STRN consists of two groups of characters:

• The first group identifies the issuing organization and includes an optional subdivision or series;

• The second group is a sequential number, to which may be added an optional 2-character alphabetic country code.

The standard was originally developed in 1974 and last revised in 1983. It describes how and where the number should be assigned and used, and calls for a central authority to coordinate and monitor assignments.

The proposed revision allows for more characters, greater variability of separators, and coordination of volume and set numbers. Members of the SC that prepared this revision include John Elsbree (National Technical Information Service); Susan Feindt (NTIS); Mary Hall (U.S. Department of Energy); Barbara Lesser (Defense Technical Information Center); Maureen Malone (NTIS); and Michael Streeks (NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility).

Z39.66: Durable Hard-Cover Binding for Books

This proposed standard describes manufacturing methods and materials that contribute to a durable book binding. These factors include endpaper attachment and reinforcement; the method of binding leaves together; rounding and backing; case making; and casing-in. Materials specifications are provided for adhesives, boards, covering materials, endpapers, linings, and threads.

Compliance with this standard is recommended for important works of fiction and nonfiction, scholarly monographs, collected editions, books intended for the library market, and reference books. The standard does not apply to textbook binding or commercial library binding.

The proposed standard was developed by NISO SC GG: Carolyn Clark Morrow, Chair (Harvard University); Gerard S. Case (Oxford University Press); William Flavell (R.R. Donnelly and Sons, Company); Jerome Frank (Publisher’s Weekly); Douglas Horner (Book Manufacturer’s Institute, Inc.); Peter McCallion (New York Public Library); Jan Merrill-
Z39.67: Computer Software Description

This standard explains how to describe “off-the-shelf” computer software in advertising, on the packaging, on the title screen and in bibliographic references and accompanying materials.

The purpose of the standard is to allow software users to unambiguously identify the contents of the software package so as to determine readily whether the product meets the user’s needs and hardware capabilities.

Members of SC FF, which developed the standard, include Edward Swanson (Minnesota Historical Society); Jan DeSirey (Hennepin County Library); Ann M. Fox (Library of Congress); Sheila Intner (Simmons College); Brian Kahin; Judith Rowe (Princeton University); Ken Wasch (Software Publishers Association); and Philip Youngholm (MINITEX).

Permanence of Paper

In the last few months, SC II has received the final report from the second round of coated paper testing (carried out by the Institute of Paper Chemistry). After reviewing these and other tests and considering many issues (including artificial aging, recycled paper, and new developments in paper-making technology), SC II has prepared a draft revision of Z39.48 to be circulated in the fall of 1989.

The proposed revision:

- Expands the scope of the standard to cover writing papers used in original documents and records, as well as printing papers;
- Includes criteria for coated as well as uncoated paper;
- Modifies the paper stock requirement to specifically address lignin;
- Eliminates the folding endurance requirement;
- Expresses the tear resistance criterion as a “tear index” (as specified in an ISO standard);
- Shortens the compliance statement.

Introductory materials provide the rationale for these changes. Although additional research is needed on many questions related to permanence of paper, SC II believes that the proposed revision is based on a reasonable interpretation of currently available information, and will produce a valid, usable standard.

Thesaurus Construction

Standards Committee PP will hold a two-day retreat September 24-25, 1989, at the headquarters of the Art and Architecture Thesaurus in Williamstown, Massachusetts, in order to review the complete draft revision of Z39.19. Observers will be invited to attend.

If the committee completes the review at this meeting, the draft revision will be circulated for comment in early 1990. It is expected that a subsequent meeting will be held to discuss and incorporate comments; a second edition will then be circulated for ballot.

Dr. Bella Hass Weinberg, chair of SC PP, will present a paper entitled “Progress in the Revision of the NISO Thesaurus Standard” at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS) in Washington, D.C. She will report on the draft revision; like her presentation at last year’s ASIS conference, this one is expected to generate interest in the work of the subcommittee and input from many sectors of the information community. The presentation will be part of a session on “Thesaurus and Classification Projects to Improve Information Access” on Monday, October 30, 10:30-noon.

News and Events

Notes on meetings, non-NISO standards and other items that may be of interest to ISQ readers.

Standards for Archival Description

The Working Group on Standards for Archival Description, a project sponsored by Harvard University with funding from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, held its second meeting June 2-3 in College Park, Maryland, and is now preparing its final report.

The group is considering standards in the broadest sense: not only technical standards
but also guidelines and conventions. Topics include the viability of adopting standards for specific kinds of finding aids; potential archival uses for the USMARC formats for authorities and holdings information; approaches to reconciling differences among cataloging rules for various types of archival materials; the use of controlled vocabularies to provide access to archival and manuscript materials; and other related issues.

The final report will recommend that the Society of American Archivists (SAA) coordinate and monitor archival standards-related activities; will endorse the development of specific products and tools (such as a general handbook on standards for archivists); and will identify broad, long-term needs.

Anyone wishing to receive a copy of the group's final report should address a request to the project coordinator: Vicki Walch, 65 North Westminster Street, Iowa City, IA 52245.

Hypermedia Standards?

X3V1 (Text: Office and Publishing Systems) is investigating the potential need for standards related to hypermedia. X3V1 also seeks to identify interested parties who could participate in work on hypermedia standards. For further information, please contact Mr. Thomas F. Frost, Chair, X3V1.1-User Requirements, AT&T, Room 5A210, Bedminster, NJ 07921, (201) 234-8750. Written contributions can be sent directly to Dr. Richard Y. Flanagan, Rohm and Hass Research, 727 Norristown Road, Spring House, PA 19477; RS.RYF@ROHVM1.BITNET.

The Technical Standards for Library Automation Committee (TESLA), a committee within ALA's Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), has been working for some time to evaluate the need for hypermedia standards in the library community. That work has now culminated in a survey that will be carried out in cooperation with the Association for Research Libraries. The survey should help to determine the level of need for hypertext standards within ARL's membership; it will also serve as a pilot for a possible wider survey.

Computerized Interchange of Museum Information

The Museum Computer Network Board of Directors is establishing a Working Group on Computerized Interchange of Museum Information (CIMI), charged with defining protocols for interchange of data between museum computing systems, consistent with ISO 2709, which has been endorsed by the International Council on Museums CIDOC Committee as the appropriate framework for such interchanges. (ISO 2709 is the ISO equivalent to NISO/ANSI Z39.2, the underlying technical standard for MARC.)

Museum professional associations representing all areas of the museum community will be invited to join the working group. David Bearman, president of MCN and chair of the new working group, estimates that the project will take three years to adopt a protocol and framework for ongoing maintenance. For more information contact Deirdre Stam, Executive Director, Museum Computer Network, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244; (312) 443-5612; Bitnet: DCSTAM@SUVM.