

**Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Classification Section**

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions
January-May 2003**

The following is a record of motions made and votes taken between January 29 and May 23, 2003

1. 4JSC/LC/57 [Inaccuracies (1.0F1)]

Vote of 8-0 on the motion made by Mike and seconded by John that CC:DA approve 4JSC/LC/57, and that ALA recommend in its response that the last sentence be changed (for consistency) from:

“For inaccuracies in the title proper of a serial or an integrating resource, see 12.1B1”
to:

“For inaccuracies in the title proper of a continuing resource, see 12.1B1.”

2. 4JSC/LC/58 [Series title]

Vote of 7-0 on Mike's motion (seconded by Steven) that CC:DA approve 4JSC/LC/58 with the addition of the following example and explanatory text to the rule revision proposal for 1.6B1:

Let's dancce [sic]
(*series statement transcription*)

3. 4JSC/Sec/5 [AACR Glossary]

Vote of 7-0 on the motion made by Mike and seconded by Steven that CC:DA approve the move of the glossary from Appendix D to a Glossary section following the appendices, and that this move be delayed until the next edition. And that we point out what appears to be an omission. In the current AACR2, below the introductory paragraphs to the index, there is now the following:

“Abbreviations used in the index:

App. Appendix
n Footnote”

“Gloss.” should now be added here as well.

4. *4JSC/Sec/6* [“Considered to be important”]

We have a vote of 8-0 on the motion made by Dorothy (with slight revision suggested by Mike regarding 6.7B6) and seconded by Mike that CC:DA respond to *4JSC/Sec/6* with the following comments:

CC:DA agrees with the concepts expressed in relation to decisions made by the ISBD Review Group regarding when something is considered necessary.

The ISBD Review Group incorporated changes to mandatory and optional elements from section 7.3 of FRBR into the ISBDs, adding the concept that something could be mandatory when some condition applies, and optional when such a condition did not apply. To incorporate these changes, revisions were made to section 0.1.3 in both the ISBD(M) and ISBD(CR) and the Review Group decided to use consistent wording, throughout the text, using the phrase “if necessary for identification or otherwise considered important to users of the catalogue” when the conditional case applies.

This wording might seem wordy and cumbersome to some. However, we agree with the ISBD Review Group that it has at least two advantages: to serve as a consistent reminder of two of the reasons that catalogers include data in bibliographic records, and to provide the cataloger with a benchmark by which to make a decision about including or omitting information.

“Considered to be important” is a more compact phrase but we recommend the JSC consider it further and determine if it provides the right kind of guidance to users of the rules. At a minimum, something should be added to the “Omissions and Local Practices” section of the proposed new introduction (0.31–0.34) that explains what “considered to be important” is “shorthand” for.

In addition, we suggest that the following sentence, from 6.7B6, is also a candidate for treatment for consistency: “Give the names of performers and the medium in which they perform if they have not been named in the statements of responsibility and if they are judged necessary.” We suggest that “if they are judged necessary” be changed to “if the information is considered to be important.”

5. *4JSC/Sec/7* [Language examples]

Vote of 8-0 on Peter’s revised motion (seconded by Mike) for *4JSC/Sec/7*:

“I move that we approve *4JSC/Sec/7*, along with endorsing additional revisions requested in *4JSC/Sec/7/CCC response*, but that it is understood that all example revisions will be implemented during a review of examples for a new edition of AACR2. Additionally, some suggestions for the example from 4.7B2, “Some items in English, some in French”, are:

“Items in English and French.”
“Materials in English and French.”
“English and French” ”

6. *4JSC/CCC/9* [Definition of “Main entry”]

Vote of 7-0 on John’s motion (seconded by Mike and with a slight correction from Steven): I move that ALA not support the definition for “main entry” proposed in *4JSC/CCC/9*. ALA would rather see the AACR communities and the JSC re-think this cluster of terms and concepts and offer a more complete proposal to revise these basic terms and concepts, as part of the revision of Chapter 21. ALA also suggests that one of the constituent bodies begin the task of identifying the rules where “entry” is used to mean “description” or “record.”

7. *JSC/Chair/71/Rev/Chair follow-up/4* [Format Variation WG: Chapter 25 rule proposals]

Vote of 7-0 on the motion made by Dorothy and seconded by Steven that CC:DA thank the FVWG for the proposal and offer the following as our comments.

ALA thanks the FVWG for its initial work on rule revisions to Chapter 25 to allow identification and collocation of expressions and a reasonable arrangement of expressions under the citation for a work and of manifestations under the citation for an expression. Although ALA regrets it has not had in-depth discussion of the proposals, we offer the following comments to the FVWG and to the other JSC constituencies. ALA would like the FVWG to revise the proposal for Chapter 25 along the lines of the following general and specific comments.

ALA is sympathetic with the views expressed by ACOC and LC that call on the FVWG to broaden and deepen the objectives set for the revision of Chapter 25 beyond merely allowing for expression level cataloging. Further work on the proposals should include, or include more explicitly, the philosophical basis for the proposed revisions. And in particular, further work should answer the question, “Is collocation sufficient to explain relationships to users?” (The other ACOC questions, such as “Is the concept of the citation heading appropriate for organizing expression level displays in the OPAC?”, are really subordinate to the sufficiency question.)

General comments

ALA notes that the current proposals for Chapter 25 take a minimalist approach to revision. Thus the proposal mostly uses the types of qualifiers that we already add to uniform titles, but distinguishes between those that identify expressions and those that identify works. This is useful, as far as it goes, but it has some severe limitations. ALA prefers that the FVWG use FRBR concepts more fully to explore the revision of Chapter 25.

For example, ALA would prefer to have a rule that tells how to create an expression citation for a translation, for a revised edition, for a performance, etc., rather than a rule that tells how to add language to the uniform title for a translation and then needing to look at a later rule for instructions on what to do when you have more than one translation of a work into a given language. The general point is that the FVWG organized the rule in terms of the type of qualifier being added, rather than by the type of relationship to be understood by the user.

This is particularly important for works intended for performance. The basic instruction in 25.5C2 to add the form of expression is indeed one way to deal with expressions of such works. However, it limits the extent to which collocation is possible. For example, 25.5C2 would have one adding either “sound” or “video” to the uniform title for a musical or dramatic work, and then 25.5C3 might lead one to add the name of a performer or performing group to further distinguish two performances. But this collocates all sound recordings of the work (or all video recordings), but does not collocate the sound and video versions of the *same performance* of the work. ALA knows that this is getting into a very old and very extended discussion about the rules for main entry of sound and video and whether they should even be considered the same work – but this is the kind of thing that FRBR ought to help us work out. ALA’s point is not that the proposal is wrong, but that it contains some assumptions that need to be questioned in further work on the proposal since by the way it organizes the rules it obscures some of the relationships that need to be considered by catalogers and understood by users.

ALA also points out that 25.5C2 uses language about an “original” mode of expression that ALA does not think is either valid or helpful. Is the text of a play somehow more “original” than its first performance? Can one always know which mode of expression was “original”? ALA prefers to think that we have different expressions of a work that need to be distinguished from each other and organized in a meaningful way under the heading for the work. This also assumes that ALL modes of expression may need to be qualified, not just those that are not “original”. Perhaps the FVWG should consider to adding “text” for textual expressions, as well as something identifying the performance and the way in which that performance is expressed (sound or video) for those expressions?

Optionality

ALA agrees with the FVWG proposal that uniform titles should not be mandatory. Since the large majority of works exist only in one expression and one manifestation, uniform titles to allow collocation by work or expression are needed for only a small percentage of works that exist in multiple expressions or manifestations. And even fewer of these require the application of uniform titles for efficient retrieval and display. ALA thinks that we need to leave it to cataloger judgment whether such uniform titles are warranted. However, that judgment needs to be exercised with some awareness of the larger contexts in which their records may need to function. It is wise to provide uniform titles that might not be needed in the local catalog, but might

be very important in shared-cataloging databases. ALA also wishes the FVWG to consider that there may be a third way between mandatory and optional – mandatory in certain situations.

Seriality

ALA notes that the proposals offered by the FVWG will affect serials cataloging uniquely because of the use to which the serials community has put the uniform title. This distinction may complicate acceptance of the proposal and implementation. ALA would like the FVWG to address this issue.

Specific comments

Each of the numbered sections in that document is covered.

3.1, 25.1A: In general, ALA likes the direction of this revision. Some minor quibbles:

- in the first indented item, “catalogue entries” is language that uses “entry” to mean “record”; “records” or “descriptions” would be better
- in the second item under “for identifying”, ALA would prefer “bibliographic relationships”; such relationships are rarely singular
- “for organizing the file”: this deserves to be expanded somewhat; there might be something about sorting or providing a meaningful sequence of descriptions in the catalogue
- bullet 7): this carries over from the current rule, but really isn’t helpful without some amplification. Perhaps the amplification could follow the LC suggestion that the rules offer guidance on when uniform titles might best be assigned?

3.2, 25.2B: ALA agrees that revised editions should not be an exception and that deleting the rule is the best way to deal with this. LC suggests that we have always taken the change of title in a revised edition to signal a new work. ALA is not sure that it is the best procedure within the FRBR context.

3.3, 25.5A-B: ALA agrees with the proposed revisions.

3.4, 25.5C: ALA has commented in general on this above. ALA adds that the captions proposed by CCC probably help. However, “distinguishing” may not be the only function involved here.

3.5, 25.5D: This rule *may* be too limiting in its characterization of when a manifestation-level qualifier may be needed. ALA is not clear whether recommending that the qualifier be taken from a prescribed source (found

terminology) is better than trying to be consistent in using the same terms to identify the same characteristics.

4.1-2: ALA agrees that this overlaps with the work of the Major Change Task Force's draft guidelines. The introduction, perhaps it should be the Introduction to Part I rather than the General Introduction, is the appropriate place for guidance on handling changes. Such guidance should be kept together if possible. ALA finds the proposed text interesting and suggests that JSC use it as a first draft for that section of the introduction.

4.3: ALA finds some of these "rules" too specific and detailed for the introduction.

4.4: This was also one of Tom Delsey's recommendations, and is likely to be part of the revision of Chapter 21.

4.5: ALA agrees with this clarification of 25.3C; in spite of LC's comments, "first" and "simultaneous" are not incompatible concepts. In this case, something is needed to indicate which instances of simultaneous publication raise this question of selecting the uniform title. ALA also agrees that the lack of an objective default rule for selecting the uniform title is a defect, as it does not promote consistency of work identifiers across catalogs. LC's suggestion of the first received is also subjective; ACOC's suggestion of the first publisher alphabetically is at least objective – if brutally arbitrary. Probably some procedural issues need to be brought into this discussion; at what point would a cataloger realize that a uniform title was needed and what information about different manifestations would be available?

4.6: The full definition of uniform title is the revised 25.1A, which makes it much too long for the glossary. This proposed definition may be too short. ALA thinks the definition should capture (a) its normalizing function, using one title for works etc. that have appeared under more than one title; (b) its synthetic nature, that it is constructed by the cataloger to perform specific functions within the catalog; and (c) [maybe] its hierarchical structure, adding elements/qualifiers to make increasingly fine distinctions. Even this might be too much for a definition, but it's where ALA would start. Although ALA does not see any references in the glossary to specific rules, a reference to 25.1A in this case would be invaluable.

4.7: No comment on the MARC issues.

8. Draft revision of ISO/CD 2108 [ISBN]

Vote of 5-0 on the motion made by Dorothy and seconded by Kate that CC:DA approve the response that has been prepared on the draft ISBN.

9. Comments on ISO 3297 [ISSN]

Vote of 5-0 on the motion made by Mike and seconded by Steven that CC:DA endorse these comments and send them to ALA's NISO representative, Paul Weiss.

10. ALA responses to JSC

Vote of 8-0 in favor of the motion to approve the 4 pro forma responses described below:

a. *4JSC/CILIP-BL/1Rev/LC Response [Introduction]*

We agree with the plan to delay work on the introductions and not have interim text in the 2004 revision package. This action rescinds our earlier view, creates a consensus among the JSC constituents, and allows work to go forward on the Introduction.

b. *4JSC/ACOC/2 [Malay Names]*

ACOC is withdrawing the proposal. We recognize that JSC has reached an impasse on this issue and say that we defer to the experts at LC, BL, and ACOC. Two small changes will be made: correcting the spelling of a name and extending a footnote.

c. *4JSC/Sec/4/LC Response [Changes to chapter 9 and 12 related to the work on the appendix of major and minor changes]*

CC:DA agrees with LC that this work should be placed on hold.

d. *4JSC/LC/57 [Inaccuracies (1.0F1)]*

We retract our comment about changing "serials and integrating" to "continuing." We agree with LC that we were mistaken.

11. *CC:DA/TF/FRBR Terminology/5 [FRBR terminology]*

Vote of 7-0 on the motion made by John and seconded by Peter that CC:DA approve the report of the Task Force on FRBR Terminology and forward its recommendations and comments as an ALA response to *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response*.