

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

2001 Midwinter Meeting — Washington, DC

Members present:

Adam L. Schiff, Chair
Steven R. Arakawa
Bradford L. Eden
Kate Harcourt
Susan M. Hayes
Carol Hixson
Daniel W. Kinney
Mary L. Larsgaard
Shirley J. Lincicum

Michael A. Chohey, Intern
Kristin Lindlan, Intern
John C. Attig, Consultant
Sherry Kelley, Consultant (absent 1/15)

Ex-officio representatives present:

Brian E. C. Schottlaender, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress (absent 1/15)
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group

ALA Liaisons present:

Roberta L. Dougherty, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Gabriele I. Kupitz, ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials (absent 1/13)
Sheryl Nichin-Keith, ALCTS/Collection Management and Development (absent 1/15)
Mark R. Watson, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Lowell Ashley, ALCTS/MRC
Ann Sandberg-Fox, ALCTS/NRMC
Cecilia Sercan, ALCTS/PARS
John Radencich, representing Mary C. Greci, ALCTS/SS
Robert L. Maxwell, ALA/ACRL (absent 1/15)
Aimée Piscitelli Quinn, ALA/GODORT
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT
David Williamson, ALA/LITA
Gene Kinnaly, ALA/NMRT
Margaret Shen, ALA/PLA (absent 1/15)
Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons present:

Judy Knop, ATLA (absent 1/15)
Anne E. Champagne, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Gertrude Koh, CLA
Robert McDonald, MedLA (absent 1/15)
Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA
Ann Caldwell, PCC
Susan Hamburger, SAA
Cynthia Marie Whitacre, SLA

Notes:

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material has been rearranged to increase comprehension and to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. Due to background noise, inconsistent use of microphones, etc., tapes of the meetings are of variable quality. The recording secretaries regret any loss of detail.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. Those votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes, except to break a tie. The term “straw poll” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, but a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “representatives” are used.

Abbreviations that may appear in these minutes include:

AACR = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules
AACR2 = *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 1998 rev.
ACOC = Australian Committee on Cataloguing
ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
ANSI/NISO = American National Standards Institute/National Information Standards Organization
BL = British Library
CC:DA = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
CDS = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service
CPSO = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
CSSC = ALCTS/Serials Section, Committee to Study Serials Cataloging
DCMES = Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
FRANAR = Functional Requirements and Numbering for Authority Records (IFLA Working Group)
FRBR = IFLA's “Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records”
Hallam = *Cataloging rules for the description of looseleaf publications: with special emphasis on legal materials*
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations
IRRT = ALA/International Relations Round Table
ISBD(CM) = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Cartographic Materials
ISBD(ER) = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Electronic Resources
ISBD(M) = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications
ISBD(NBM) = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Non-Book Materials
ISBD(S) = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials
ISO = International Standards Organization

ISSN = International Standard Serials Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
LA = The Library Association (England)
LC = Library of Congress
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
MAGERT = ALA/Map and Geography Round Table
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.A.)
NLC = National Library of Canada
NRMC = ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Committee
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
UBCIM = Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Core Programme (IFLA)
VRA = Visual Resources Association

*Saturday, January 13, 2001 – 1:00-4 p.m.
Four Points Sheraton, Franklin C/D*

698. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

CC:DA Chair Adam L. Schiff called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons and representatives, and audience members. He passed the CC:DA roster around the table and asked committee members, liaisons, and representatives to examine it for accuracy and make necessary changes. He also distributed attendance sheets to the audience.

699. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

[Related document: CC:DA/Roster/2000 November]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

700. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[Related document: CC:DA/A/43

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/101-agen.html#agenda>)]

Schiff asked if there was a motion to adopt the agenda CC:DA/A/43. Susan Hayes made a motion that the agenda be adopted. Mary Larsgaard seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the agenda was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

701. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2000 Annual Conference, Chicago, IL, July 8 and 10, 2000: Chair

[Related document: CC:DA/M/676-697

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/007-min.html>)]

Schiff said that a few comments had been made on the CC:DA discussion list about the Annual Meeting minutes. He said that the comments had already been addressed by the interns and the requested edits incorporated into the draft minutes. Schiff asked if there were any further comments on CC:DA/M/676-697. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt the minutes. Hayes made a motion to adopt. Brad Eden seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the minutes were adopted by a vote of 8-0.

702. Report from the Chair: Schiff

[Related document: CC:DA/Chair/2000-2001/1

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-ism3.html>)]

Schiff welcomed new CC:DA voting members Steven Arakawa, Brad Eden, and Kate Harcourt, and all of the new representatives and liaisons to CC:DA.

Schiff said he had worked during the fall with ALCTS and with CC:DA Webmaster John Attig to make sure that all of the CC:DA roster information was correct and up-to-date, and had also worked with ALCTS to make sure that the CC:DA electronic discussion list had all the right people subscribed to it. He asked any member, liaison, or representative who was not currently receiving messages on the CC:DA discussion list to contact him so he can rectify the situation.

Schiff announced that this meeting marked the 20th anniversary of continuous membership on CC:DA by Ex-officio representative Ed Glazier of the Research Libraries Group (RLG). Schiff thanked Glazier for his service and congratulated him on this extraordinary achievement. Schiff presented Glazier with a certificate of appreciation from ALCTS which read:

The Association for Library Collections and Technical Services,
a division of the American Library Association, recognizes Ed
Glazier for 20 years of distinguished service on the ALA/ALCTS/CCS/
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. He has
represented the Research Libraries Group and has served
catalogers and users of catalogs through his dedication.

The committee heartily applauded Glazier.

Schiff said that CC:DA had had a busy 6 months since Annual, conducting a lot of committee work over the Internet. Based on revisions made by CC:DA at Annual 2000 Schiff edited the CC:DA report on proposed revisions to the ISBD(M), and forwarded it to John Byrum, Chair of the ISBD Review Group. The revised ISBD(M) is supposed to come out soon, and in fact was supposed to have come out this past fall, according to a report by Glenn Patton. Schiff said that he had checked the IFLA home page right before he left for this meeting, and it had not yet been published, but he expected it to be available there soon.

Schiff reported that five task forces had been created after Annual 2000. Schiff drafted charges and appointed chairs and members for the following five new task forces:

- CC:DA Task Force on ISO Harmonization
- CC:DA Task Force the Review of ANSI/NISO Draft Standard Z39.85, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
- CC:DA Task Force on the Review of the Draft *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM)*
- CC:DA Task Force on the Review of *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals*
- CC:DA Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources

Schiff reported that three of these task forces had already completed their charges, submitted their reports, and had their reports approved by CC:DA via e-mail. These were the Dublin Core, *AMREMM*, and Seriality task forces.

Schiff said he had forwarded the Dublin Core task Force's report to Paul Weiss, ALA's NISO voting member, and Weiss had reported back to Schiff that he had voted "yes, with comments" as the CC:DA task force had recommended. The standard has not yet been approved by the NISO voting membership.

Schiff reported that the final report of the CC:DA Task Force on the Review of the Draft *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM)* had been forwarded to the author of *AMREMM*, Dr. Gregory Pass.

Schiff said that the original CC:DA Seriality Task Force had been reconstituted and charged with reviewing the rule revision proposals from 4JSC/Chair/68. This task force's work had been done very quickly, in time to forward comments to the JSC before their September meeting. After the September meeting of the JSC, Schiff decided to revise the charge of the Seriality Task Force, rather than create a new task force, and in the task force's revised charge, Schiff asked them to review the decisions on seriality made by the JSC in September, along with some other new seriality-related rule revision proposals. The task force has been working on its charge, and will be seeking input from the committee on some matters later in this meeting. The task force's final report (on its revised charge) will be due in March 2001, and CC:DA will deliberate on the report via e-mail at that time.

Schiff reported that in addition to those five new task forces, CC:DA also had two other task forces that were continuing their work. VRA Core Categories Task Force Chair Sherry Kelley will be delivering a report at this meeting, and a final printed report will be submitted shortly after this meeting, to be discussed and voted upon via e-mail. The Task Force on an Appendix of Major/Minor Changes has completed its original charge—which was to create a draft appendix to *AACR2*—and this was discussed by CC:DA at the Annual Meeting in Chicago. But this task force has also had its charge revised, and has been asked to keep working. Based on comments from the JSC at its September meeting, the task force was asked to change its focus, and create a draft appendix on “major changes,” rather than on “major/minor changes.” The task force has created a new draft, and will be presenting it at today's meeting.

Schiff said that he wanted to thank all of the task force chairs and members for their hard work and dedication, especially since many of these task forces had been required to work under very tight deadlines.

Schiff said that one of the things he had been trying to do as chair of CC:DA was to minimize the amount of paper documents that have to be sent out to everyone on the committee. He has been doing this by creating and disseminating electronic versions of as many documents as he can by scanning the documents to create .pdf files, and then posting these on an internal document distribution site where members can go to get the documents and read and/or print them. Schiff said he would like to get some feedback on how this system is working, and how committee members like it, and he has asked Attig to bring this up for comments on Monday when he gives his Webmaster report. Schiff said that he wanted to thank Attig for the tremendous amount of time and effort he puts into scanning documents and getting them on the Web so quickly.

Attig said that he wanted to apologize for the server problems some members had encountered, and said he was working to get these problems resolved.

Schiff said that one other thing he had been doing as chair was to compile periodic checklists of documents that had been distributed, and said he hoped that committee members were finding these checklists useful.

Schiff reported on the CCS Executive Committee meeting he had attended (both as a CCS Executive Committee member-at-large and as CC:DA chair) on January 12. A good deal of the time at that meeting was spent talking about the ALCTS Strategic Plan. All of the CCS committees will be asked to produce “tactical initiatives” for the Strategic Plan, and these will be due to CCS by March. CC:DA will have to document tasks that it is currently working on, along with specific tasks that it plans to accomplish in the next five years. These are being called “deliverables,” and an example would be the Appendix on Major Changes. CC:DA is being asked to try to fit these in with the goals and objectives in the Strategic Plan. Schiff will distribute a copy of the Strategic Plan via the CC:DA list, and the committee will discuss this further electronically.

Brian Schottlaender added that the ALCTS Planning Committee needed input from each of the ALCTS committees and sections no later than February 15 in order to deliver a preliminary draft of the tactical plan to the ALCTS Executive Committee by the end of March.

Schiff reported that CCS and its committees were planning three programs for ALA Annual this year in San Francisco. There will be a "30th anniversary of CIP" program; SAC is planning a program on subject access and classification in metadata for digital resources; and there will be a 3-hour map cataloging program, aimed at generalist catalogers, and at pin-pointing the differences between cataloging maps and cataloging books.

Schiff noted that CC:DA did not have any programs scheduled for 2001 Annual, and asked the committee if anyone had programming suggestions for 2002 Annual in Atlanta.

Laurel Jizba suggested that Chapter 9 was an issue that might merit a program. Other committee members noted that Chapters 3 and 12 might also merit programs.

Schiff said that in addition to the map cataloging program at 2001 Annual, a map cataloging preconference was also being planned for 2002 Annual.

Schiff asked if the committee supported organizing either a Chapter 9 or a Chapter 12 program, or both, for Annual 2002.

John Radencich said that the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging had been discussing organizing a program on Chapter 12.

Schiff suggested that perhaps CC:DA could work with them on that, perhaps co-sponsor a program with the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging.

Attig said that he thought that 2002 Annual would be too late for a Chapter 9 program, if the publication of Chapter 9 was going to be as soon as he thinks it is. He said CC:DA would have to look to other organizations to do programs on the subject of the new Chapter 9. He said that for the timing of a Chapter 12 program, 2002 Annual would be better.

Schiff said he would circulate a sign-up sheet for anyone who might be interested in volunteering to help put together a Chapter 12 program for Annual 2002, and would speak to the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging to find out what they had planned and whether they would be interested in having CC:DA involved with them.

703. Report of the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Library of Congress representative Barbara Tillett said that before giving her report, she wanted to introduce two colleagues of hers in the Cataloging Policy and Support Office who were in attendance at the meeting. She introduced Bob Ewald and Judy Kuhagen, and said that she wanted to recognize them for all of the hard work they had done over the past seven years, and all of the help they have given her with matters relating to rule revision and Library of Congress Rule Interpretations.

LC EXHIBIT BOOTH

There will be lots of demonstrations of LC products and services at the Library's exhibit booth, no. 1628.

PERSONNEL CHANGES

Information Technology Services. ITS Director Herbert S. Becker retired on December 30, 2000, with 43 years of federal service. Also the Deputy Director for ITS will be leaving the library in March. A job posting will be out very soon. We are looking for a customer-service oriented director, so please alert your friends and colleagues of this opportunity.

Cataloging Directorate. Norma Hendrickson, team leader of the Computer Files & Microforms Team, has retired as of January 2001. Elizabeth Robinson has become the new permanent team leader of the Rare Book Cataloging Team as of July 31, relocating from the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, where she was the principal rare book cataloger.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BICENTENNIAL SYMPOSIA

At the end of 2000, the Library of Congress hosted 3 Bicentennial Symposia each with a special focus: national libraries, preservation, and cataloging. On November 15-17, the Cataloging Directorate was host to the Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium, which invited 136 leaders in cataloging, publishing, and library system design to address the challenges of bibliographic control in the burgeoning Internet environment. A Web cast of the Conference is available on the Conference Web site at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol>, and the Conference Proceedings will be published in late spring. Ann Sandberg-Fox will edit the proceedings and you will be hearing more about this later in the CC:DA agenda.

LIBRARY SERVICES NEWS

CATALOGING DIRECTORATE (Please see <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/> for full information – the report was shortened to fit the time limit)

Arrearage Reduction Efforts

Machine-Derived Authority Records (MDARs): The final load of MDAR records was accomplished in early August. The process required identifying all music records verified on or after Nov. 23, 1998; the file was sent to OCLC. OCLC then compared the bibliographic records to the authority file followed by LC music catalogers making heading corrections. The file of corrected records was then sent again to OCLC for the creation of MDARs. Following several test loads of MDARs to assure the quality of records as well as the ability to flow through the NACO stream, early August realized the final loading of the 7,000 records.

Digital Tables of Contents (D-TOC) and Reviews. The Digital Tables of Contents project creates TOC data from surrogates of the actual TOC, and using scanning and optical character recognition (OCR) as well as original programming written by project staff, materials are subsequently HTML-encoded and placed on a server at the Library. In the process the underlying MARC records are also modified to include links to the TOC data. An additional project completed which modified and rewrote in the Visual Basic language, the original OS/2 VX-REXX program so that it was compatible with the Library's new Integrated System.

This project originally concentrated on printed monographic publications in the fields of business and economics (particularly, the areas of small business and entrepreneurship) with the expectation that techniques developed by the project could be extended to other materials, resources permitting. In its production mode prior to the installation of the ILS, the scope of materials was expanded to include wider areas of Economics, Computer Science, Technology and other areas in which BEAT sponsored projects or conducted investigations previously.

With the Library's installation of the ILS, the project was temporarily halted to redesign software for within the Voyager context. During this redesign stage, other elements of the project are being simplified to reduce the costs of production. In the current phase of the project, the subject scope is being broadened even further to include all areas of study. Currently about 2,200 records have been enhanced by the project.

Both the MARC records themselves and the linked TOC data may be viewed through a Web browser by accessing the Library's online catalog access options directly, available at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catalog>. In addition, various Web indexing software also makes catalog and TOC records available over the Web. The Z39.50 server and the browse search capability are recommended for direct searches and subsequent viewing.

Those who have comments or questions about this project should contact Bruce Knarr, project manager at bkna@loc.gov.

Support for ECIP (Electronic Cataloging in Publication). During fiscal 2000, TOC data were included in the MARC records for approximately 21% of the titles processed as ECIPs, and the hope is that ultimately TOC data will be reflected in as many as 50% of ECIP titles.

New Projects for 2001: ONIX and E-Books. The Library has become interested in ONIX, an XML based communication standard for metadata about published works. ONIX contains a set of data elements describing various aspects of a publication and appears as a highly granular markup that defines and represents significant detail about book (and publishing) product information in electronic form. The Library is looking at possible projects to study the use of ONIX.

Cataloging in Publication (CIP)

The 30th anniversary of the CIP program will be celebrated at ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco.

Cataloging Policy

AACR2, 1998 Revision. LC implemented "Amendments 1999" to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 1998 Revision on September 15. As a result, six LCRIs have been canceled and nine have been revised to remove provisions that have been included in "Amendments 1999." The LCRIs reflecting these changes will be included in "LCRI 2000, Update Number 3-4," scheduled for February publication, as well as in the LC Cataloger's Desktop.

AMIM2 now available. For the motion picture folks, the 2nd edition of *Archival Moving Image Materials* is now available.

LCCN Restructuring to Four-Digit Year. On January 2, 2001, LC began the use of a restructured LCCN for both authority and bibliographic records. The restructured LCCN now contains a four-digit year (e.g., n#2001123456 (name authority record); sh2001123456 (subject authority record); ##2001123456 (bibliographic record)), and there is no longer a "trailing blank" at the end of the number. Note that LCCNs in the old structure (two-digit year; trailing blank) are not being changed and will exist simultaneously with numbers reflecting the new structure.

MARC Language Code List. The new 2000 edition of the MARC language code list was issued with substantial revisions to make it compatible with the ISO language code standard. Approximately 25 language codes were changed, and additional language codes were included.

New MARC 21 Characters. The Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) has previously announced (see <http://www.loc.gov/cds/mds-ils.html>) plans to distribute records containing the full MARC character set. This includes the 13 characters that were authorized as of 1994 but have been filtered or substituted in distribution by CDS. On January 1, 2001, CDS removed the character substitution step and could distribute records with these characters although some of the values will not be actively supplied by LC cataloging staff. For a detailed listing of the LC usage of these characters see the LC Cataloging Policy and Support Office homepage <<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cps/newchar.html>>

CORC

OCLC Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) is a Web-based, metadata creation system optimized for creating bibliographic records and pathfinders (subject bibliographies) for electronic resources, both local and Web-based. The databases and tools that comprise the CORC system are designed to assist in providing users with well-guided access to Web resources. CORC went into full production in July with LC as a founding member. CORC was featured at an LC Cataloging Forum and cybercast on "Using OCLC's CORC at the Library of Congress." LC's representative to the international OCLC CORC Users Group is Allene Hayes.

Music and Sound Recordings Teams (MSR I, MSR II, and MSR III)

IBC (Initial Bibliographic Control). In October, MSR1 produced its first IBCs (Initial Bibliographic Control records) for scores and sound recordings. The Special Materials Cataloging Division currently receives approximately 400-450 scores a month from the Music Division requiring IBC creation. All scores except the brief cataloging scores must have IBCs in Voyager. Likewise, book receipts lacking

IBC records are also created on the MSR teams. The MSR teams initiated the process of creating IBCs for sound recordings as part of a new workflow for compact discs.

Production-level cataloging (PLC) of music was discontinued in favor of core-level cataloging, which is supported by authority work. Guidelines have also been developed for brief cataloging of printed music. This level of cataloging does not include note fields, subject headings, or added entries, and requires only limited authority work. The Music Division has begun to designate the cataloging levels for items it selects and will likely select band arrangements, sheet music for popular songs, and other ephemeral music of limited research value.

The issue of contents notes for multiple-disc or multi-volume sound recordings surfaced several times during the course of the year as it affected specific projects. The revised Music Cataloging Decision 6.7B18 was issued in June 2000 and it will be reissued to provide for dividing a long contents note among multiple 505 fields (a decision prompted by the 78s project).

NUCMC (National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections)

NUCMC staff produced 2,832 RLIN bibliographic records describing collections held by 75 repositories. Cataloging production in FY00 represented an increase of 17.61% over FY99 (2,408 records).

In addition to local, regional, and state historical societies, NUCMC Team members also produced cataloging for a variety of special focus repositories. Special topics included African Americans (Dorothy Porter Wesley Research Center), fine arts (George Walker Vincent Smith Art Museum and Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum), folklife and oral history (Maine Folklife Center), Hispanic Americans (Henry B. Gonzalez Archives), Japanese Americans (Japanese Cultural Center of Hawaii), maritime history (Mystic Seaport Museum and Nantucket Historical Association), medicine (Armed Forces Institute of Pathology), military history (Battle of Lexington Historical Site and Fifth Maine Regiment Center), municipal archives (Manchester, N.H., Municipal Archives and Records Center and Seattle Municipal Archives), national parks (Gettysburg National Military Park, Lowell National Historical Park, Saratoga National Historical Park, and Shenandoah National Park), Native Americans (Pawnee Nation Archives), performing arts (Boston University Dept. of Special Collections), religious archives (Congregational, Episcopal, Jewish, and Lutheran), state archives (Montana, North Carolina, and Wyoming), and U.S. presidents (Rutherford B. Hayes Presidential Center).

In the Montana Union List Project (MULP), accessions were received from Butte-Silver Bow Public Archives, Montana Historical Society, Montana State University at Bozeman, and the University of Montana at Missoula. By the end of the year, 2,610 preliminary and full level records describing Montana collections had been input into RLIN. In addition, almost 100 of these records had links to Web-based finding aids. During the new fiscal year we hope to expand coverage to some of the state's smaller archival and manuscript repositories.

The NUCMC Web site continued to earn high marks from the public and the archival and manuscript community. The Web counter recorded 63,735 "hits" by the end of the fiscal year. NUCMC continued to receive praise for its provision of the gateway providing free searches in the RLIN-AMC file. Searches on the gateway during the fiscal year totaled 182,821.

At the end of the year, OCLC had given approval in principle to the idea of a similar pilot gateway to its manuscript materials. Once approval has been finalized, NUCMC hopes to have the gateway up fairly quickly.

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Activities

Marjorie Bloss (CRL), assumed the duties of the PCC Chair upon Michael Kaplan's resignation. With her departure from CRL to assume a position with Endeavor Infosystems, Larry Alford (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) has become the PCC Chair and Robert Wolven (Columbia University) serves as Chair-elect.

BIBCO (monograph cataloging component of the PCC). The BIBCO-at-large meeting will be at the Renaissance Mayflower Hotel, Senate Room (1127 Connecticut Avenue NW) 2:00-3:30 p.m. Sunday, Jan. 14.

CONSER (Cooperative Online Serials). The ALA Midwinter CONSER-At-Large meeting will be held January 14, 2001, in the Madison Hotel, Montpelier (15th & M St. NW) 8:00- 9:30 a.m.

NACO. NACO libraries contributed 128,074 new name authority records with 36,426 revisions to existing authority records and 8,914 new series authority records in FY2000. Several new members were

trained in late summer/early fall: at the St. Louis Law Library as part of a NACO law funnel; Oregon State University; Washington State Library; and Hoover Institute. In addition, a group of institutions joined the OLAC-AV funnel. Catalogers from the University of Michigan, the Donohue Group, and the law libraries of American University, Catholic University, Georgetown Law Center and the Maryland State Law Library received training. Other training included a Series Institute at University of California, Los Angeles and an authority workshop for PALINET libraries in Philadelphia.

In conjunction with the ALA Midwinter Meeting, a Training-the-NACO-Trainer session will be conducted for volunteers by Cooperative Team members on January 12, 2001, from 8:30 am-4:30 p. m. in the Library of Congress, Madison Building, West Dining Room (LM 621)

SACO (subject authority component of the PCC). As a positive result of the implementation of the new LC ILS, the Cooperative Team and LC staff have developed an online form for the submission of subject heading proposals to LCSH which delivers the proposed record to the LC ILS database with a minimum of processing, eliminating the need for re-keying. BIBCO libraries and the British Library, using this form, have reduced by an average of two weeks the approval time for SACO proposals. SACO contributions of 122 libraries totaled 2,681 new subject headings, with 621 revisions to existing headings. There were also 979 LC classification numbers produced, and 55 changes to classification numbers.

The PCC will sponsor two SACO workshops at ALA Mid-winter, in the Library of Congress, Madison Building, Dining Room A (LM620): Workshop A, 9:00 am-12 noon, on Economics and Social Science; Workshop B, 1:00-4:00 pm, on Christianity and General Religion.

International Cooperative Programs. Ongoing contacts with international institutions resulted training for several institutions in South Africa, Argentina, Mexico, and New Zealand. The NACO training in South Africa included 16 institutions in two different week-long sessions, one in Pretoria and one in Cape Town. The Universidad de San Andres, Argentina, received, and the Colegio de Mexico will receive, NACO training. The National Library of New Zealand was trained by Bill Garrison (University of Colorado, Boulder) in September. CONSER membership was augmented with the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and the National Library of Wales.

Statistically, in fiscal 2000, international PCC members produced 18,047 new name authority records (14.3% of PCC-NACO production); revised 7,425 existing NARs (10.1%); established 937 new subject authority records (33.6%); and revised 65 SARs (10.5%).

For further information regarding cooperative cataloging projects, activities, and developments, visit the Program for Cooperative Cataloging's Web site at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/>

Cataloging Statistics:

Cataloging (Books and Serials) Production

	FY00	FY99
LC Full/Core-Level Cataloging	159,091	148,628
Copy Cataloging	22,477	25,662
Minimal-Level Cataloging	16,080	19,256
Collection-level Cataloging	3,009	2,756
TOTAL records created	200,657	196,302
TOTAL volumes cataloged	224,544	205,893
Authority records		
Names	86,992	80,176
Series	6,772	7,272
Subjects	7,494	5,895
TOTAL	101,258	93,343

For more information contact: Beacher J. Wiggins, Director for Cataloging, Library of Congress, LM 642, Washington, DC 20540-4300 (telephone: 202-707-5333 or Internet: bwig@loc.gov).

NATIONAL SERVICES DIRECTORATE

Cataloging Distribution Service

Pilot Test of World Wide Web Access to Library of Congress Classification. From January 8 - March 30, 2001, the Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) is conducting a pilot test of World Wide Web access to LC Classification schedules. Libraries of all sizes and types are encouraged to try *Classification Web* during the 90-day test period. The Web address for the pilot is <<http://lccweb.net>>. Information about the pilot test is also available on the CDS home page at <<http://www.loc.gov/cds>>. Additionally, CDS will feature demonstrations of *Classification Web* at the LC exhibit booth. Should the pilot prove technically and economically feasible, CDS may offer *Classification Web* on a subscription basis.

Cataloger's Desktop and Classification Plus. CDS will conduct training sessions on *Cataloger's Desktop* and *Classification Plus* on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Tuesday, January 11th, 12th, 13th, and 16th. The training sessions are by reservation only, but continuous demonstrations of both products will be offered at the LC exhibit booth. Times and locations of the training sessions and special presentations in the exhibit booth theater may be found at <<http://www.loc.gov/ala>>.

MARC 21 and Other New Print Publications. The CDS exhibit booth display will feature the new MARC 21 publications. MARC 21 editions of all of the formats, as well as Update 1 (2000) and updated editions of the code lists, are now available. Other new CDS print publications include *Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual*, 2nd edition (2000) and new editions of several LC Classification schedules. Please see the CDS Web site at <<http://www.loc.gov/cds>>.for prices and order information.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INTEGRATED LIBRARY SYSTEM

In May 2000, the Library installed the "MARC Record Validator" software. This software checks for legal MARC 21 values in catalog records by identifying data errors and inconsistencies in records as the records are added to the database, so they may be immediately corrected by the cataloger, thus reducing the cost of quality control activities and improving the timeliness of data corrections. The Library added interfaces to the Electronic Cataloging In Publication (ECIP) to receive digitized publisher data and to the Federal Financial System (FFS) interface to automatically load LC ILS data to the Library's automated financial system. A new capability for geospatial searching, a welcome enhancement for accessing cartographic materials, was loaded on the test server at the end of the fiscal year, and is expected to be available on the production system by summer 2001.

The Library is working with Endeavor Information Systems, Inc. to prepare for implementation of the Voyager Release 2000 software targeted for May 2001. In preparation, the Library loaded the beta versions of Voyager Release 2000 on its test server. Staff began testing the software and reported found bugs to Endeavor for correction before their final software release. Library staff is also creating new training courses and updating operations procedure documentation, especially for the new features and capabilities in the acquisitions, serials check-in, and public catalog modules. Release 2000 also includes the capability to display Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Hebrew vernacular characters in the Web OPAC (from data stored in the 880 fields of MARC bibliographic records) and access to full MARC authority records via our Web OPAC. I know many of you have been eagerly awaiting the restoration of this capability.

Additional information can be found on the public ILS home page, <<http://lcweb.loc.gov/ils/>>.

Pinyin Romanization

On October 1, 2000, the American library community, including LC, OCLC, and RLG, began using pinyin as the standard romanization scheme for Chinese characters in bibliographic and authority records.

The Library coordinated conversion activities with RLG and OCLC throughout the year. Conference calls were held with the utilities at least monthly to discuss and agree on policy issues, and to work out aspects of the conversion and transfer of records. The Library received input on the project from many libraries and librarians, both in this country and abroad.

The year of intensive planning culminated in the conversion to pinyin of 158,368 name and series authority records by OCLC. Converted authority records have been loaded into the LC database and distributed to CDS subscribers. By the time of the conference, RLG will have converted 142,555 LC Chinese bibliographic records containing vernacular script, and some 30,000 in roman script only. OCLC is currently testing its bib record conversion program, and hopes to begin converting bib records in WorldCat

in early 2001. CPSO staff have converted hundreds of subject authority records, and made necessary changes to the classification schedule. Classification schemes for Chinese literary authors and Chinese local history have been revised, based on pinyin romanization.

A moratorium on creating and changing Chinese authority records was observed during August and September while OCLC performed its conversion. Similarly, a moratorium on the updating of Chinese bibliographic records created before August 1 has been observed during the RLG conversion of LC records. Since October 1, six catalogers, along with CPSO specialists, have been manually reviewing converted authorities and making corrections where necessary. In addition, 14 catalogers at 11 NACO libraries are reviewing and updating converted non-unique personal name authority records.

OCLC and RLIN through a cooperative partnership supplied Wade-Giles romanized authority records with their pinyin updates for load into the LC ILS and distribution through the MARC Distribution Service by the start date. These converted authority records will be available in the LC Online Catalog and via Z39.50 in May 2001. RLG began to convert LC's bibliographic records on November 20, 2000. OCLC will convert CONSER records after January 1, 2001, according to the same specifications. LC expects to load approximately 180,000 converted bibliographic records into the LC Database by the end of February 2001. The first 30,000 converted bibliographic records will be included in the MDS-CJK distribution for December 2000 (volume 14, issue 11). LC's converted bibliographic records will be available in the LC Online Catalog and via Z39.50 as soon as they are loaded into the LC Database.

The Library's pinyin home page (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pinyin>) has made available a coordinated timeline, romanization guidelines, explanations of various aspects of the conversion project, answers to frequently asked questions, and links to other related sources of information.

DIGITAL FUTURE

The Library will begin to acquire its first complete set of electronic journal archives this month through an agreement signed by Associate Librarian for Library Services Winston Tabb and the American Physical Society. APS will send the Library the complete archives of eight of its premier physics journals in electronic form. The electronic archives will be updated continuously, creating a permanent repository at the Library of both historic articles and the latest research in physics.

At a forum in the Mumford Room on Saturday, January 13, 3:00-5:00 p.m., the Library's Digital Futures Group will share with the library community its 5-year Digital Futures Plan, including plans for implementing various recommendations contained in *LC21: A Digital Strategy for the Library of Congress*, a study commissioned by the Library of Congress from the National Research Council and released to the public last summer. Comments and suggestions from the library community will be solicited at this forum.

NATIONAL DIGITAL LIBRARY

Since the last ALA meeting the National Digital Library met its goal of making available 5 million items available on the American Memory website. At present American Memory has over 90 collections available online.

As part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001 [P.L. 106-554], an appropriation of \$100,000,000 was included for a National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program. Of that amount, \$75 million is available as matching funds for private donations (including in-kind contributions) received before March 31, 2003. The program is to be administered under a plan developed by the Library and approved by the House and Senate authorizing and appropriations committees. The Library will develop the plan jointly with the Secretary of Commerce, the White House Office of Science and Technology policy, the National Archives, and other federal, research, and private libraries and institutions with expertise in the collection and maintenance of archives of digital materials, as well as private organizations involved in efforts to preserve, collect, and disseminate information in digital formats. There will be more information coming out soon as to how non-federal entities may apply for the matching funds.

704. Report from the OCLC Representative on the IFLA Section on Cataloguing: Patton

[Related document: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/you/ifla/cataloguing4.html>]

Glenn Patton said he would begin his report with a bit of OCLC news. He said that OCLC was launching at this conference what would be a year-long celebration of the 30th anniversary of online shared cataloging. He said to look for related events at the Annual Conference in San Francisco this summer. The actual anniversary is some time in August.

Patton said that the report [<http://www.ala.org/alcts/you/ifla/cataloguing4.html>] that he and Barbara Tillett put together after the IFLA conference in Jerusalem contained a lot of information about what is a very active Section on Cataloguing under Tillett's chairship. He said that Tillett has initiated a lot of interesting projects, and urged committee members to go to the section's Web page to read about these.

Patton said that he would highlight a few points from the report that have a bearing on the work of CC:DA and the JSC.

The ISBD Review Group, which is part of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing, is about to publicize changed procedures for the international review of ISBD revisions and changes. In the past, this has been a very paper-oriented process which involved sending lots of copies of documents out not only to section members, but also to a wide variety of other interested parties. Not surprisingly, this has become a great burden on the UBCIM office, which coordinates this activity, but it has always been a very slow process, as well. The Review Group is now moving to what will primarily be an electronic distribution system for documents. Paper documents will still be distributed to parties that face challenges dealing with electronic distribution.

The other thing that Patton said he wanted to call the committee's attention to was also related to the ISBD Review Group. There is some concern within the group about the amount of cataloging rule revision that is going on around the world these days, not only in the AACR2 community, but also in the German cataloging community, where they are undergoing far-reaching and fundamental changes to their cataloging code. Patton said that the group recognizes the need for change in cataloging codes as new materials emerge, and that the group supports the goal of achieving universal bibliographic control, an important aspect of which is the ability to exchange bibliographic data created using various sets of cataloging rules. One of the foundations of that goal has been the idea that national cataloging codes are founded in the ISBDs, and that kind of structure. So the Review Group has been working with the JSC, with the German cataloging rules revision group, and with the group that is revising ISBD(S) to see if there is way the Review Group could be alerted when a revision of a given cataloging code that represents a major departure from the ISBD standard is being considered. The idea is to set up a "cross-fertilization" process whereby revisions to the existing ISBDs could be considered at the same time that changes are made to national cataloging codes.

Patton said that those were the two main things he wanted to say. In response to Schiff's earlier comment about when the revised ISBD(M) would be available, Patton said he did not know either. He said that the Review Group was currently working with the IFLANET implementation staff to get the ISBD(G) and ISBD(A) up on the IFLANET Web site. IFLA has been very fortunate, Patton said, to get K.G. Saur's permission to make these publications, and the ISBD(ER), freely available on the Web.

Attig asked if Patton could confirm that when the revised ISBD(M) is finally issued, it would be available electronically.

Patton said that he believed that was the intent.

Tillett said that another very important point in the IFLA Section on Cataloguing report was the point about UBC [Universal Bibliographic Control] activity, and the new view of UBC that is coming out of the FRANAR working group. She asked Patton if he wanted to comment briefly on that.

Patton said that he had spoken once before to the committee about the IFLA group that had started out to revise the IFLA document "The Form and Structure of Corporate Headings." He said the old goal of that group was to devise ways to create a single form of name for corporate bodies that would be usable in the context of any catalog. That was a noble goal that had gotten started in the late 1970's or early 1980's, but the group quickly realized that it was not an achievable goal, and in fact if it were kept as a goal, it would actually be a disservice to library users. So that led them to give up that effort, and to move along and work on a task started by a group that was working on minimal-level requirements for authority records. That task involved the linking of authority files. The idea they started with was that, in the case of both personal and corporate names, you could have multiple authoritative forms of a name, each of which was valid in the context of a different cataloging code, and that the way to bring these together was to link the different authority files. That work is now going forward, Patton said, under the banner of the Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering for Authority Records, which you will increasingly hear referred to as FRANAR. That group is chaired by Françoise Bourdon of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and they are trying to get that moving along. In the next couple of weeks, Barbara [Tillett] is going to be coming to OCLC to see what can be done about setting up some kind of machine matching of authority files, and see if we can this started as a sort of a pilot project, Patton said.

705. Report from the ALCTS Publications Committee Ex-Officio Member: Eden

Bradford Eden, speaking as ALCTS Publications Committee ex-officio member of CC:DA, and as editor of the ALCTS Paper Series, said that CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff had asked him to give a report on the progress of the publication of the papers from the ALCTS 2-day metadata preconference at ALA Annual in Chicago in July 2000. Eden said that he wanted to make sure everyone realized what a Herculean task it was to put together this 26-chapter book for publication in the very short time frame of eight months. He said he wanted to thank Wayne Jones, who, as general editor, began more than a year ago to put together a team of associate editors and transcribers. Before the preconference, the editing team put together for publication all of the papers that speakers had submitted in advance. Those speakers who did not submit papers agreed to have transcribers transcribe their presentations. The editing team put these into their final form quickly—within two months. Eden said that he had then been able to submit these to ALCTS Executive Director Karen Muller by early October. According to ALA Editions, Eden said, the document is supposed to be published by March. The title of the book will be *Cataloging the Web: Metadata, AACR, and MARC21*.

706. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Schottlaender

[Related documents:

4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2/BL follow-up

4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2/BL follow-up/CCC response

4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2/BL follow-up/LC response

4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2/BL follow-up/ACOC response

Titles of nobility & British terms of honour in statements of responsibility

4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/CCC rep response/2

4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/CCC rep response/2/CCC rep response

4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/CCC rep response/2/LC response

4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/CCC rep response/2/BL rep response

Chapter 9: Electronic Resources and related rules

4JSC/LC/47/LC follow-up/2

Abbreviations (Appendix B.5)

4JSC/LC/50

Series authority records in AACR2]

ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee Brian Schottlaender that he first wanted to thank all of his CC:DA colleagues, especially those members who were chairing and serving on task forces, for the degree to which they have been able to work between conferences and expedite the work of the JSC, and for reviewing a large number of JSC documents under great press of time. Schottlaender said that this was very much appreciated by the JSC and by the international cataloging community—who are able to expedite their work to the degree that the JSC is able to expedite its work.

Schottlaender said that the reason he had asked CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff for only 30 minutes to speak at this meeting was thanks to John Attig, Laurel Jizba, Mary Larsgaard, and Kristin Lindlan, who would be reporting in their agenda items on some JSC actions and thereby sparing Schottlaender the need to do so. Schottlaender said that he thanked Attig, Jizba, Larsgaard, and Lindlan for that very much.

In conclusion to his opening remarks, Schottlaender said he particularly wanted to thank Attig, because everything Attig does for CC:DA in his capacity as CC:DA Webmaster, he is also doing for the JSC, and for AACR as a document. The JSC is extremely thankful and grateful to Attig for this, Schottlaender said.

Schottlaender said he would begin by briefly outlining some of what was in the document *CC:DA/JSC Rep./BECS/2000/10*, the report of the JSC London Meeting. He said the JSC had approved for inclusion in the next revision package revisions relating to:

- "Work" in music uniform titles [*3JSC/ALA/11*, etc.]
- AACR2 & ISBD (ER) Harmonization [*4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/LC follow-up* and *4JSC/ALA/33*, etc.], except rule revision proposals relating to Areas 3 & 5, respectively.
 - Schottlaender said he would be forwarding the CC:DA analysis being prepared by Laurel Jizba's Task Force to the JSC for their consideration at the April JSC meetings. He added that even if this is not a final report, the JSC was eager to have it—as a means of guiding their own thinking on how to proceed on the Area 3/Area 5 question.
 - Schottlaender added that Marg Stewart has been working hard at preparing another "clean" Chapter 9 (which, he noted, is an iterative process) to be reviewed by national libraries before inclusion in next review package.

Schottlaender explained that the agreement that the JSC had reached about 18 months ago was that when the JSC had gotten to the stage in Chapter 9 rule revision deliberations where they felt the question had more or less been called, and they were at the stage of editorial review—not substantive review—then editorial review would be carried out by the national libraries' representatives to the JSC, since those libraries were more likely to have support staff to facilitate that kind of review. Accordingly, the national libraries have been reviewing the clean Chapter 9 iterations.

Schottlaender noted that there were members of CC:DA who had also been interested in reviewing these, and that he had already forwarded to the JSC good comments from Schiff and Attig, with the request "How would you like us to proceed?". In his most recent exchange with JSC Chair Ann Huthwaite, Schottlaender said, Huthwaite had told him that the JSC did not want not to risk slowing down the revision process unnecessarily at this point, so she suggested that these questions be put into play when the Chapter 9 proposal comes to the JSC as a rule revision package. That would be the time to prepare an ALA response, which, if nothing else, could summarize Attig's and Schiff's comments apropos of Chapter 9.

Attig expressed the concern that this extra step would have the effect of slowing the publication schedule for a revised Chapter 9.

Schottlaender pointed out that the revised Chapter 9 would not go to the publishers before a national library review in any event, and said also that the JSC was motivated for a variety of reasons to get these revisions published quickly.

- Rule 21.1B2 regarding the collective activity of a conference [*4JSC/ALA/28*, etc.]
- Titles of nobility or terms of honour [*4JSC/BL/1/Rev/2*, etc.]
- Names of persons, See references [*4JSC/BL/5*, etc.]
- Terms of address of married women [*4JSC/BL/6*, etc.]
- Publishers statement ... [*4JSC/LA/1*, etc.]
 - Schottlaender noted that this one had been approved with the caveat that LA would do some follow up work in regard to additional rules and examples that will need revising. He said that LC had done a lot of indicative work in that area, on which the LA would now follow up.
- Initial articles [*4JSC/LC/29*, etc.]

Schottlaender said that there had been several other rule revision proposals discussed in London that did not make it to the point of being approved for the revision package, and said he would talk briefly about these.

- “Rule of Three” [*4JSC/ACOC/1*]. Schottlaender reminded the committee that the question of the “Rule of Three” had been raised some time ago within the JSC. The Australian Committee on Cataloguing had volunteered to take a look at that, and did so in the form of *4JSC/ACOC/1*.

Upon reading *4JSC/ACOC/1*, the JSC decided to ask ACOC to look further at pursuing option 2 in that document, and ACOC has done so in the very recently received *4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up*. Schottlaender said he would talk further about this in a few minutes [[see below](#)].

- [*4JSC/ALA/29*]. Schottlaender reported that the document series *4JSC/ALA/29* has been officially **withdrawn by ALA**.
- Cartographic materials [*4JSC/ALA/31*, etc.]. Schottlaender said that there had been an extensive review of the cartographic materials proposals [*4JSC/ALA/31*, etc.], and the JSC had the benefit of Mary Larsgaard’s presence in London to walk the JSC through them. These revision proposals were substantially approved, with the notable exception of Area 3.
 - ALA was asked to reissue those proposals in the form of *4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/2*, and incorporate all of the decisions that the JSC had reached up to that point.
 - Schottlaender said that Larsgaard would be discussing these proposals in her report on *CC:DA/MAGERT/2001/1* later in these CC:DA meetings. Whatever decisions CC:DA makes during this discussion will manifest themselves in the *4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/2* document.
- Nonroman access points [*4JSC/ALA/32*, etc.]. Schottlaender reported that the nonroman access points proposal had been deferred, pending input from constituencies other than LC (the only constituency to have responded by the London meetings).

- Appendix of Major/Minor Changes [4JSC/ALA/34]. Schottlaender reported that there had been a considerable review of the Appendix of Major/Minor Changes [4JSC/ALA/34]. The guidance that the JSC had asked him to carry back to Kristin Lindlan and her task force was they should circumscribe their efforts to major changes alone, not to minor changes, and should reissue a document (laid out in a certain suggested organization that has been proposed to them) as *4JSC/ALA/34/Rev.*
- Schottlaender noted that Lindlan would be discussing the latest version of the proposed Appendix in *CC:DA/TF/Appendix on Major/Minor Changes/3/Rev./2* later in this meeting, and the committee would be able to see how the document has been changed based on the JSC's recommendations.
- Members of royal houses . . . (22.5F1) [4JSC/BL/2, etc.]. Schottlaender reported that the members of royal houses . . . (22.5F1) proposals had all been withdrawn by BL, because they had been incorporated into *4JSC/BL/1/Rev/2*.
- Titles of nobility [4JSC/BL/3, etc.]. Schottlaender said that the BL had been asked to follow up to *4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2* incorporating ACOC and CCC comments in regard to 1.1F7 and correcting various of the examples (e.g., the "Baroness Orczy" example at Rule 2.1F1, as per the ALA response). Schottlaender said he would talk more about this in a couple of minutes [[see below](#)].
- Additions to names [4JSC/BL/4, etc.]. Schottlaender reported that the additions to names proposals had been withdrawn by the BL.
- Seriality/Chapter 12 [4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2, etc.]. These had been discussed at great length, Schottlaender reported, and substantially approved. LC volunteered to create a clean copy of Chapter 12, and has already done so. That document is now in play, along with a group of corollary proposals. John Attig's task force is now reviewing all of these.
- Abbreviations [4JSC/LC/47, etc.]. Schottlaender reported that these rule revision proposals, as manifested in *4JSC/LC/47/LC follow-up*, were approved, but LC was asked to resubmit the document formatted as B.5A, B.5B, & B.5C. LC did so, and the JSC conducted a review of this by e-mail. Schottlaender said he would say more about this later [[see below](#)].

Schottlaender reported that there were four active JSC document series that he wanted to mention briefly:

- Titles of nobility [4JSC/BL/3, etc.]. Schottlaender said that the ACOC and CCC comments in *4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2* called for the retention of British terms of honour in 1.1F7(d) as terms that will continue to be transcribed. LC, in its response to that document, proposed replacing the new example "by Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea" proposed by ALA because LC could not locate it in "real life." ALA—Adam Schiff, actually—did indeed locate it several times in the OCLC database, though it was lacking the word "by." ALA therefore suggested retaining the Finch example, minus the word "by," which suggestion LC accepted. *4JSC/BL/3/Rev/2* should now be complete.
- AACR/(ER) Harmonization [4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response/CCC rep response]. Schottlaender reported that this is the document that is now in play. This document was reviewed, as planned, by the national libraries prior to the Chapter 9, etc. proposals being included in the next revision package. ALA was not intended to review the document, but our intrepid souls Adam [Schiff] and John [Attig] did so, and found a few problems not caught by the national libraries. Schottlaender said he had forwarded their comments to Ann Huthwaite, who has suggested that when the package is issued for what would ordinarily be national library review, we go ahead and submit an ALA document summarizing Schiff's and Attig's comments.

- Abbreviations [*4JSC/LC/47/LC follow-up/2*]. Schottlaender said that this is the document that LC had been asked to produce, and it is now in play. It has been approved by the JSC electronically. ALA has also pretty much approved it, Schottlaender reminded the committee, except that we prefer the phrase “according to” to the word “following” at the end of both B.5A1 and B.5B1. Schottlaender said that he would be responding to the JSC accordingly.
- “Rule of Three” [*4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up*]. Schottlaender said that this document had arrived very recently, and it is possible that some members have not yet read it. Schottlaender noted that this is a 40-page document, and is substantial enough that a CC:DA task force might be formed to review and prepare a response to it. He said if that task force could prepare a response to it by March 1, so that he could have something to forward to the JSC before the April meetings in Washington, DC, that would be good. If a task force was not able to meet that deadline, he asked that it respond as soon thereafter as possible.

Schottlaender said that he would now talk briefly about several other JSC actions taken at the London meetings that did not relate directly to rule revision proposals.

- The JSC decided that it would ask its chair Ann Huthwaite to provide the Committee of Principals and the publishers with an explanation of what the ISBD “alpha prototype” is, how it came about, why we need constituent input, and how that input will affect our program of work. The impetus for this request was a sense that the Committee of Principals and the publishers were somewhat uneasy about the prototype, and it is hoped that some discussion and explanation will help assuage this. Schottlaender said that too much work had been done on this prototype to let it just sit on a shelf somewhere.
- Schottlaender said that the members of the JSC had agreed that both JSC and AACR Web sites are needed, and that the JSC Chair would provide the Committee of Principals with an explanation of the intended purpose of the AACR Web site and why it needs to be made public. Again, there is some unease on the part of the Committee of Principals and the publishers about making the AACR Web site public, because of the fear that this will adversely affect their market for the code. This is not at all the JSC’s intent or wish, so the JSC felt that it had to explain more clearly why it believes the site needs to be made public.

Schottlaender said that his own opinion on this was that the situation was slightly confounded at the moment because of the conflating of the JSC and AACR Web sites into a single site. There are some things the JSC needs to do as a committee, by way of tracking documents, keeping track of what is in play and who has reviewed what, etc., that the Internet is such a logical way of doing (as Schiff has proven by doing it for CC:DA), and to not take advantage of the available technology and Attig’s skills would be a great shame. Schottlaender said that he hoped a better explanation would help the right people feel better about the JSC’s use of the technology.

Attig suggested that, because the JSC was running into this kind of reaction to the combined site, which is what he prototyped first, they had decided that the way to go was with separate sites, so what he has now developed is a JSC Web site, and with a few finishing touches, that should be ready to go very soon. From there, Attig suggested, the way to proceed would be for someone other than the JSC to approach the Committee of Principals and the publishers, and try to convince them that there is a further need that has to be addressed.

- Schottlaender reminded the committee that one of the recommendations that had come out of Martha Yee’s Task Force on 0.24 had to do with what we used to call “multiple versions,” but now are calling “format variations.” He said that there had been a recommendation, endorsed by others also, that some sort of working group be put together and tasked with actually seeing whether the proposals that were put forward in that report worked in real life. In other words, they would be charged with actually creating a database of bibliographic records predicated on

the proposals made in Yee's report, and seeing whether—not in the abstract, but in concrete terms—the proposals alleviated the multiple versions problem or not.

The JSC has endorsed that proposal, and Schottlaender has drafted some Terms of Reference for an International Working Group on Format Variations. Those Terms of Reference were reviewed by the JSC at the London meetings, and Schottlaender revised them subsequent to that review. The JSC has been brainstorming electronically about the chairpersonship and membership of such a working group, and is basically finished with that process, so the appointment of that working group is now imminent. Unfortunately, Schottlaender said, since it was still imminent, he could not tell the committee anything about the makeup of that group.

- Schottlaender reported that Barbara Tillett had put together for the JSC a "Principles" document, which had been one of the big missing pieces following the Toronto Conference. He said that Tillett had done a beautiful job of pulling together a variety of substantive principles that the JSC thinks are usefully expressed explicitly in the code. The JSC discussed this document in some detail and offered some revisions, and Tillett is now in the process of revising the document. The JSC will take another look at that at the April meetings.
- Schottlaender said that he also wanted to touch briefly on something that Glenn Patton had mentioned in his report—the issue of harmonizing AACR revision with ISBD revision. He said that the JSC has been talking quite directly with the ISBD(S) review group, and two general ideas have come out of their discussions in this regard.

First, the JSC has agreed that constituent communities that bring rule revision proposals to the JSC should be alert to potential "disharmonies" with the ISBD that these could create. Furthermore, constituent communities should be alerted explicitly—that is, when submitting a proposal, they should say something like "we recognize that making these proposals will create disharmony with _____."

The reason that the JSC is eager for this to happen rather more explicitly than has been the case in the past, Schottlaender said, is to achieve what Patton described rather nicely as the "cross-fertilization" of AACR and the ISBDs as a result of this kind of action. Schottlaender said that he felt it was important that it be recognized that this is a two-way street—that AACR revision proposals could cause disharmony with the ISBDs, but also that ISBD revision can cause disharmony with AACR.

Schottlaender said that CC:DA now had two documents to consider besides *4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up*, and these are *4JSC/LC/50* (Series authority records in AACR2) and *4JSC/LC/51* (Multipart items in AACR2). He said he wanted to talk about the first of these two JSC documents (both which CC:DA has). The second, he said, would be discussed on Monday as a separate agenda item [see [717](#) below]

- Series authority records in AACR2 [*4JSC/LC/50*]. Schottlaender said that this discussion document, prepared by Judith Kuhagen, ought to serve to eliminate some of the confusion resulting from the guidance that was given by the JSC to the Appendix on Major/Minor Changes Task Force following the London meetings, that, in reiterating its report, it should take into account the fact that series authority records can represent works. Schottlaender said that the Task Force may have had some questions about what the JSC had had in mind with its suggestion, and that this document would shed some light on that.

In a nutshell, what Kuhagen's discussion paper makes clear, Schottlaender said, is that there are bibliographic entities—notably multipart items or monographic series—for which series authority records serve as surrogate bibliographic records. As a consequence of this, changes of sufficient substance to those bibliographic entities necessitate changes not in bibliographic records, but in series authority records. Therefore, the Major Changes Appendix ought to attend to that

possibility, as well. The problem faced by the Task Force, Schottlaender said, is that the code does not really talk about series authority records, which makes talking about them in the Appendix difficult. Kuhagen's paper ends with some very nice concrete recommendations for dealing with this problem.

Schottlaender said that he would suggest that CC:DA do one of two things. It could either review *4JSC/LC/50* as a stand-alone document, either with a task force or here, right now, or, it could ask Lindlan's task force to undertake that review in the context of its review of the Major/Minor Changes work. Schottlaender said that he did not feel strongly that one or the other solution was better, but pointed out that if a separate task force were to make recommendations and have them approved by CC:DA, the task of implementing the recommendations would fall to Lindlan's task force anyway.

Schiff asked Lindlan if she had a preference as to how this should be done.

Lindlan said that what Schottlaender had said made sense.

Schiff asked Kuhagen, who was in attendance at the meeting, if she would be willing to join Lindlan's task force to help with the revised charge.

Kuhagen said that she would.

Schiff said that he would revise the task force's charge accordingly.

Schiff asked the committee if it thought that a task force should be put in place now to review the whole revision package when it is issued. He said the committee would also have to decide whether this task force should be charged with reviewing the entire revision package, or just the Chapter 9 revisions.

Schottlaender said that he would like to remind the committee that it is under no obligation to review the revision package. The national libraries are very well equipped to perform the review. On the other hand, he said no one would refuse a report from CC:DA if it wished to carry out its own review.

Schiff said the committee take the course of action suggested by JSC Chair Huthwaite and make comments in the form of an ALA document after the review by national libraries has taken place and the revision package has been distributed. Schiff invited any interested committee members to look at the clean Chapter 9 at any time, and send comments to him by e-mail.

Schiff asked the committee if it wanted to form a task force to review *4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up*, the proposal to make the "rule of three" optional.

Larsgaard moved that a task force be formed. Carol Hixson seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion was approved by a vote of 8-0.

Schiff said that he would send around a sign-up sheet for the new task force. He asked if the committee felt it was reasonable to establish a March 1 deadline for the task force's report to be submitted.

Schottlaender asked Tillett and Marg Stewart (present in the audience) if they could shed some light on what the JSC's expectations were for this. Schottlaender said that he had not come away from London with the impression that ACOC would have finished its work in sufficient time for ALA to have reviewed it in time to call the question at the April meetings.

Tillett said she thought that the JSC would like to have it done in time for the April meetings.

Stewart said that she did not recall hearing any suggested deadline.

Schottlaender said that in that case, he felt that the committee would not want to give this proposal short shrift by trying to get it reviewed in an unreasonably short time frame.

Hixson suggested that such a short deadline as March 1 might restrict who can participate.

Larsgaard said she agreed with Hixson and thought that March 1 was an unreasonable deadline.

Schiff and the committee decided that the task force's report would be completed in time for discussion at the Annual 2001 CC:DA meetings in San Francisco.

Tillett said that there was still one matter to resolve before moving on to the next agenda item. She said that, regarding *4JSC/LC/47/LC follow-up/2*, LC had asked the JSC for consideration of an item on the very last page. Tillett said that LC had originally submitted this proposal on behalf of the PCC. She said that PCC participants were very interested in implementing the change in terms used in the numbering of series statements. LC proposes issuing the text of this revision after JSC approval as a Library of Congress Rule Interpretation before the revision is published in the next Amendments package, Tillett said, and she welcomed comments from the committee on this idea.

Steven Arakawa and Kate Harcourt both indicated that they would support such an LCRI. There were no objections from the other voting members.

Tillett said she would appreciate ALA's mentioning this in its response.

Schottlaender said he would do so.

707. Report of the Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes: Lindlan

[Related document: CC:DA/TF/Appendix on Major/Minor Changes/3/Rev./2
(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/TF-appx1.html#report3>)]

Task Force Chair Kristin Lindlan thanked the members of the CC:DA Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes for their active participation and hard work, and said that she appreciated the wide range of expertise that the members brought to the task force's work.

Lindlan reported that the task force had been asked by the JSC to rearrange the draft appendix in two ways. One was to make the appendix address only major changes, not minor changes, except in the area of title proper. The other was to rearrange the appendix into four parts: Monographs, Serials, Integrating Resources, and Multiparts. Lindlan said that the task force had completed this rearrangement, and commented that in the process, the task force had discovered several gaps in what they had already done, and were able to address several issues that they had missed the first time around.

Lindlan said that the task force had also decided on their own to remove the section of the first draft appendix that had dealt with reproductions, thinking that it was better covered in the general rules in the new arrangement.

Lindlan said that the task force was recommending, as they had in their first report, that changes to corporate body names be covered by rule 24.2, "Variant names. General Rules."

Lindlan said that the task force had been paying attention to some related discussions, including the harmonization discussions of the AACR, ISSN, and ISBD groups, and had made some revisions to their recommendations as to what constitutes a major or minor change in the area of title variants. She said that in the harmonization talks it had been decided that numbering that began again would not constitute a major change. The task force had also been paying close attention to the Chapter 12 rule revisions, Lindlan said.

Lindlan said that the task force had identified a topic that might need to be addressed in the future: what to do with changes in URNs and URLs. The task force did not discuss this question, she said, but was pointing it out as an area to be addressed in the future.

Lindlan said that she had included at the end of her report a list of questions that she wanted CC:DA to consider. The first question is whether or not the task force should have used “not applicable” in all the places it did in the appendix. She said that it had made the task force’s work easier to have the same numbering in each section as it looked across the rules for monographs, serials, integrating resources, and multipart. That was the reason for the parallel numbering in each section and the use of “not applicable,” she explained, but she said that the task force was not sure that that was the best solution for the final product, and was open to suggestions from the committee.

Another of the task force’s questions for CC:DA, Lindlan said, was whether the terms “significant” and “substantive” were acceptable as they are used in the draft appendix. She said that the task force wondered whether they were relying too much on cataloger’s judgment. She said that the task force had defined their use of these terms. They had used “significant” when the emphasis was on matters of degree, and “substantive” when referring to real, actual changes.

Lindlan said that the task force had noticed that there was overlap between rules 21.2 and 21.3 and some of the appendix’s basic guidelines on what constitutes a major change. At one point, the task force had had in its report instructions on what to do with a major change, Lindlan said, but they realized that this was not part of their charge, and took out those instructions. This leaves for CC:DA the question of where in the rules to address this, she said.

The task force’s last question for CC:DA, Lindlan said, was on the consideration of series authority records. She said that this question had already been answered now that the task force had been given a revised charge.

Lindlan said that she would go through the appendix point-by-point, and accept comments from the committee as she went along.

Subtitle The task force added the subtitle “when to create a new record.”

John Attig noted that the appendix’s title should not include the word “appendix.” If published, it will be “Appendix E. Major Changes.”

Basic Guidelines Lindlan asked if there were any comments on the basic guidelines in the appendix. She noted that the committee had gone over these at the last meeting, and said that Ed Glazier had commented at that time that the appendix was not always clear on what was a “change,” and what was a “difference.” Lindlan said that there were still places in the appendix where this was problematic.

Steven Arakawa commented that he had read the discussion in the minutes about the problem with “major changes” as opposed to significant differences between manifestations, and he did not feel that this had been resolved in the new draft of the appendix.

Arakawa also stated that since the point of the appendix was to help the cataloger determine when to create a new record, he was not at all opposed to the new subtitle, and in fact thought that perhaps the subtitle should become the title, and perhaps the subtitle could become “significant differences and major changes.” He said that as he read through the appendix, he could not help seeing it through the conceptual framework of continuing resources, where change takes place through time. As a monographs cataloger, he said, his problem with the draft appendix is that he is often dealing with significant differences between manifestations of a work where time is not really the issue. Since the purpose of the appendix is such an important one, Arakawa said, he would like to see the purpose statement at the very beginning of the appendix, rather than at the end of the first section, where it almost seems like an aside.

Arakawa said that one final comment he had on the basic structure of the appendix was that he felt that if one is dealing with finite and continuing resources, differences between manifestations of a finite resource are more fundamental than changes in a continuing resource. If this is indeed the case, instructions for dealing with significant differences between manifestations of a finite resource should precede instructions for dealing with changes in a continuing resource, at least in the introduction. Arakawa also pointed out that the order in which the rest of the appendix is presented suggests that the introduction should address the mainly monographic problem of differences in manifestations before addressing the problem of changes in continuing resources. He said that he had come up with the following suggested wording for the introductory paragraph of the appendix:

This appendix includes basic guidelines for determining when to create a new record for finite and continuing bibliographic resources, based on: 1) significant differences between manifestations; or, 2) a change within an existing bibliographic resource. What constitutes a significant difference or a major change for a resource is then described in some detail.

Lindlan asked Arakawa to give her a copy of the suggested new paragraph.

Lindlan said that she may have taken the instructions she received from the JSC too literally. She said that she thought she had been told to consider “change” to mean “difference,” or, in other words, to use “change” to mean both. Lindlan asked ALA Representative to the JSC Brian Schottlaender and LC Representative Barbara Tillett if she had misinterpreted the JSC’s instructions on this. Schottlaender and Tillett indicated that she had.

Monographs

E.3B EDITION AREA Lindlan said that the task force had added a sentence about Romance-language edition statements. She asked if that sentence solved the problem that committee members had had with that area in the first draft.

Arakawa said that he thought that the word “may” or “generally” or “often” could be inserted before the word “reflect” in the parenthetical sentence “e.g., Romance language ‘edition’ statements reflect printing information.” He said that it reads now as if it means “always,” which he does not think is the case.

E.3C Carol Hixson asked what exactly “substantive changes” would be in an electronic resource. She said that the wording here was “Consider a change in file characteristics that indicates a substantive change in the nature of the resource a major change.” Hixson noted that in other sections of the appendix, an “e.g.” had been given following an instruction like this one. Would an “e.g.” be useful here, too, or would people who deal with these resources find it unnecessary?

Lindlan said she could not recall whether or not the task force had discussed this.

Attig said that the original proposals from the Harmonization Task Force proposed some changes to the rules at 9.2, but it was felt that these would be more appropriate for an appendix. Attig suggested that Lindlan look at these for suggested examples that she could use.

E.3D PUBLICATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC. AREA Carol Hixson said that she had a problem with E.3D1 and E.3D3a, which instruct the cataloger to consider a change in place of publication a major change. She said that, in the absence of other factors, she had never considered a change in place of publication alone to be grounds for making a new record.

Laurel Jizba said that the original line that the task force had used came from the OCLC guidelines. She noted that those guidelines say right up front that the cataloger should consider this decision in conjunction with other factors.

Hixson said that that was what she would like the instruction in the appendix to say, also.

Jean Hirons (audience) said she thought that the task force might want to reconsider its instruction that a change in distributors not be considered a major change, at least in the case of electronic serials or e-books. She noted that for serials, they had just recently made a decision that multiple electronic distributors of the same work would be put on separate records.

Mary Woodley (audience) said that one more thing that needs to be considered is that NetLibrary e-books are being cataloged as reproductions, so there are two things going on in the world of electronic distributors of e-books: electronic originals and electronic reproductions. There needs to be some reconciliation between the rules for cataloging these two different types of thing.

She said she would also like to go back to E.3A5, and suggest that the task force consider the fact that a change in the order of names in a statement of responsibility sometimes only occurs in a printing, so this might also be something that should be considered in conjunction with other information.

Schottlaender asked if he could make two general comments at this point, which were not specific to any one rule. He said that he wanted to strongly encourage the task force to avoid what, in the absence of examples, could be construed as tautological statements. He said that a phrase like “if a resource changes substantively, it is a major change” is not useful unless “substantively” is defined by the use of an “e.g.” In some cases, he noted, the appendix provides these, but in other, it does not.

Schottlaender’s second comment was that he saw cases, such as one under E.3D, where the appendix uses loaded or soft words like “genuine” (“if there has been a ‘genuine’ change ...”), which should be avoided.

Hixson commented that this is case where perhaps alternative wording needs to be found, but said that this concept is valid, and should remain in the appendix.

Schottlaender said that he agreed, and would favor a statement of the concept somewhere in the introduction to the appendix.

Arakawa said that he wanted to clarify whether it was the case that we are talking about two different scenarios here: one where the cataloger has both manifestations in hand, and is trying to decide whether these are the same or different; the other where the cataloger has one manifestation in hand, and there is a surrogate of it in the bibliographic utility, and he is trying to decide whether that record represents what he has in hand. In the latter case, he said, he wondered whether E.3D1 could create problems depending on what cataloging agency had cataloged the book. One might exclude a place that would not have been excluded by another agency, for example, in a different country. For instance, an agency in Canada and one in the United States might transcribe the same imprint as “London ; Toronto : ... ,” and “London ; New York : ... ,” respectively.

Lindlan said that the appendix did not aim to address situations like this one that are covered by the rules in the numbered chapters of the code.

Hixson suggested that the introduction might include a statement to the effect that the appendix should be consulted after the rules in the numbered chapters have already been consulted.

E.3I Schiff said that he wondered whether “language of text” was more restrictive than it had to be. He cited the example of a sound recording that might not include a “text.” He suggested that “language of resource” might be better.

Attig noted that in other sections of the appendix, the task force had simply used “language.”

E.3J Hixson asked whether the language in E.3J1 should not more closely parallel the language in E.4J1? Should the same principle in E.4J1 for serials not also be applied to monographs?

Serials

Title Changes/E.4A Lindlan said that the task force was open to suggestions about whether rules for title changes in serials should be in Chapter 12 or in the appendix.

Hirons commented that she would rather see rules and guidelines related to serial title changes in Chapter 12 than in the appendix, since title changes are such a fundamental part of serials cataloging.

Lindlan it was not clear to her where a monographs cataloger looks for guidance on title changes.

Judith Kuhagen (audience) said that at present rule 21.2 deals with title changes for both serials and monographs.

Lindlan asked whether, if rules for title changes were moved to Chapter 12, Chapter 1 would be the appropriate place for rules on monographic title changes. The committee indicated that it would not.

Woodley asked whether it had been decided that E.4A would not appear in the appendix, but rather in Chapter 12?

Lindlan said that the text would probably appear in Chapter 12, but there would be a cross-reference in the appendix.

Schiff asked Lindlan if the task force would like guidance from the committee on whether this rule should appear in Chapter 12 or in the appendix. Lindlan said the task force was prepared to make a recommendation, but that she would not mind hearing what the committee thought.

Schiff said that maybe it would be a good idea to get a sense of how the people present at this meeting (committee members and audience included) felt about the question of whether serial title changes should be dealt with in an appendix or in Chapter 12.

Hixson commented that she thought it was a good idea to have the rule appear in Chapter 12, but that the reference to the rule in Chapter 12 should be left in the appendix. She said she liked the idea that all the points to be considered in deciding whether a new record should be created could be collected in one place in the rules. Mary Larsgaard, Kate Harcourt, and Susan Hayes all said that they agreed.

Attig commented that if this were the way that the task force was going to go with this, the implication was that something in Chapter 21 would be changed. He suggested that the task force investigate what the effect on Chapter 21 would be before proceeding with this.

John Radencich commented that, as a serials cataloger, he could not envision a rule about serial title changes not appearing in Chapter 12.

Lindlan asked for further comments on this by e-mail.

Arakawa said that he liked the style of this paragraph, where it says “in general, consider as a major change ... in a title proper,” and then it lists what those are. However, he said, he thought it was sort of strange that this pattern was not followed in the paragraphs that follow. He said he would prefer the wording “consider as a major change ... ” and then a list of things that would be considered major changes.

Schottlaender said that he agreed. He said that the draft appendix was variable in its construction of paragraphs like this, and cited examples. Sometimes it said “consider the following changes to be major: ...,” but sometimes it described a situation first, and then said “consider this a major change.”

E.4A3 Arakawa asked if the task force meant to say “does not appear in” instead of “disappears from” in the sentence “ ... only if the original title proper disappears from subsequent issues.”

Lindlan said that she would change the wording to the one Arakawa had suggested.

E.4G STANDARD NUMBER AND TERMS OF AVAILABILITY AREA Regina Reynolds (audience) said that she would like to suggest that a change in ISSN be considered a major change. She said that this was one of the key points of the harmonization efforts—all three groups had agreed that when it was decided that a new record would be created, a new ISSN would be assigned, so conversely, a new ISSN should signal that a new record should be created.

Lindlan said that this had not been the case up to now, so there would still be all of the older pre-harmonization records to deal with.

Reynolds said that, nevertheless, since the future is longer than the past, and since this was a key point in the harmonization efforts, she would still recommend that a change in ISSN be considered a major change.

Integrating Resources

An audience member pointed out that in legal publications, there are multipart sets whose volumes may be replaced, and they are actually integrating resources and multipart sets at the same time. She suggested that wording be added to the section in integrating resources to mention this other category of materials. She said a phenomenon that is not uncommon in law libraries is that a large multipart set is published, and, for example the original 1960 volume 1 is replaced by a new 1999 volume 1A and 1B, and yet this not like a looseleaf publication because entire volumes are replaced instead of sheets of paper.

E.5A1 Schiff commented that in this rule, “iteration” might be a better word to use than “manifestation.”

Attig concurred.

E.5A4 Schiff said that he wondered whether saying “not applicable” here was the same as saying that it was a minor change.

Lindlan agreed that this was correct, and said she would change this.

E.5A5 Rhonda Lawrence (audience) said that she wanted to ask Lindlan whether the task force had consulted Hallam’s [*Cataloging rules for the description of looseleaf publications*¹].

Lindlan said that the task force had, and asked if they had missed something.

Lawrence said that the instructions here for statements of responsibility were in direct contrast to Hallam’s guidelines, wherein a change in statement of responsibility is not considered a major change. She said that according to *Hallam*, a change in statement of responsibility may or may not call for a new record, depending on other factors, such as the edition statement. She said that she was not here to defend the practices prescribed by Hallam, that these practices might need to be rethought, but she just wanted to know whether the task force had consciously considered and rejected the *Hallam* guidelines.

Lindlan said that they had consulted *Hallam*, but that this may have been an oversight on the task force’s part. She said that the task force would look at this again.

E.5D2 Schiff that here once again, it was unclear to him how this would apply to Web resources.

¹ Hallam, Adele. *Cataloging rules for the description of looseleaf publications: with special emphasis on legal materials*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Office for Descriptive Cataloging [Policy], Library of Congress, 1989.

E.5J1 Lawrence said that the statement here *was* an accurate statement of the principle in *Hallam* (i.e., that a change in statement of responsibility should *not* be considered a major change even if it affects the main entry), as opposed to E.5A5, which was not in line with *Hallam*. She suggested that E.5A5 be changed accordingly.

Multipart items

E.6A TITLE AND STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY AREA Schiff noted that there was a reference in the serials section to Chapter 21, and said that, though the task force did not know what it was going to do with this yet, there should nevertheless at this point be a reference here to 21.2B2 for title changes within a multipart item. This is not a case, he said, of title changes between manifestations, but of a title change within one set.

E.6B EDITION AREA Lawrence asked if the task force had considered mentioning “mixed editions” of multipart items here.

Attig said that this is something that is done not because of rules in AACR2, but despite them, and at this point it might be better left that way.

E.6D2, E.6D3, E.6D4 Lawrence noted that these rules deal with changes between manifestations, and asked what should be done about changes within a manifestation.

Lindlan responded that if it were not mentioned in the appendix that meant that it was a minor change, and that would be the case here.

Wording Hixson pointed out that the phrase “between manifestations” was used in some of the rules in the appendix, but not in others where perhaps it should be used.

Schottlaender concurred.

E.6I. LANGUAGE OF TEXT The committee reminded Lindlan that this should be “language of resource.”

Arakawa said that the wording here was confusing, and suggested “Consider a difference in the language of a resource to be a different manifestation.”

E.6J. ACCESS POINTS Rhonda Lawrence (audience) said that following these two rules (i.e., creating a new record whenever there is a change in statement of responsibility) would mean that as many as 50 to 100 records could be created in the bibliographic utilities for one single manifestation of the kind of resource that is typical in law libraries.

Schiff said that perhaps one way to rectify this would be to change “between bibliographic resources” to “between manifestations” in E.6J1.

Ed Glazier pointed out that there is a difference between integrating resources, where a record changes over time as changes in the resource occur, and other resources, where a new record is created while an old one still exists.

Lawrence said that a good record for an integrating resource is one with lots of history notes.

Mary Larsgaard said map catalogers have always had integrating resources, and they, too, have dealt with these by making lots of history notes.

Schottlaender said that he wanted to stress to the task force that there was a real problem in this document with the words “significant,” “substantive,” and “genuine.” He said the problem was not that the words

were not specific enough, but that they were not different enough from each other. He said that the task force will have to settle upon one of these words, and define it.

Attig said that he would like to make the general observation that even though these are very discrete sets of instructions, one could not take any one of these in isolation and apply it without considering other factors in the piece in hand.

Schottlaender suggested that the introduction to the Appendix more explicitly state that “no single change condition is necessary nor sufficient to meet the test of ‘major change’.”

Hixson said that an appendix like this has long been needed, and she wanted to thank the task force for its perseverance in this task. She said that she felt they were very close to getting it right, and she appreciated their hard work.

Lindlan asked if anyone had an opinion on whether “not applicable” should remain in the appendix or be taken out.

Arakawa said he thought it should be taken out. He said that it seems to be the case in AACR2 that it is all right to omit the rules for a given area without mentioning explicitly that you are omitting the area.

*Monday January 15, 2001 – 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Four Points Sheraton, Franklin A/B*

708. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m. He announced that the committee had not made it through the last three agenda items at Saturday’s meeting, so we would be doing those quickly today. He said he had asked all of the task force chairs and others making reports this morning to be as brief as possible in the interest of being able to cover all of today’s agenda items.

709. Report on the LC Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium: Williamson

Schiff introduced ALA/LITA Liaison to CC:DA David Williamson to give a report on LC's "Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium: Confronting the Challenges of Networked Resources and the Web.”

Williamson said that the Library of Congress had celebrated its 200th Anniversary in the year 2000, and in commemoration of that, had held a series of symposia, one of which was this conference, held at the Library of Congress November 15-17, 2001.

Williamson reported that LC had invited approximately 90 guests from around the world to participate, and had approximately 30 library staff in attendance serving as note-takers and facilitators. The event lasted for two and a half days, and the aim was to bring together authorities in the library community—including those in the areas of cataloging and reference, the metadata community, and the systems vendor and Web-producing communities, to discuss outstanding issues and provide recommendations and actions for the Library of Congress, the library community, and other collaborators beyond libraries to develop and implement an effective response to the challenge of proliferating networked and Web resources.

The conference yielded eleven sets of recommendations from the eleven topical discussion groups. All 130 participants were divided into these eleven groups. The groups met for about a day, and came up with ideas, suggestions, and recommendations. By the end of November, the recommendations were distributed to the participants, who looked them over and made comments, and last week the recommendations were posted on the LC Web site at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/>.

The Cataloging Directorate hosted this conference, Williamson said, because LC, like the rest of the library community, is faced, if not overwhelmed, with dealing with digital resources. The Library's sense of urgency was heightened this past summer when the National Academy of Sciences released its report "LC 21: A Digital Strategy for the Library of Congress." In planning for the conference, planners linked to the report from the Conference home page, so conference attendees would understand the report's relevance to the conference's deliberations and to the Library's strategic planning and budget preparations. The report told the Library that some of what it was doing was fine and on target, but more needed to be done, and faster, of course. The Cataloging Directorate's managers were happy to note the report's positive acknowledgment of the conference, and its goal of bringing together experts from the various communities and stakeholders in the digital world.

Williamson went on to list the eleven working groups, and suggested that anyone interested in the charge of a particular group could go to the Web site to read that group's recommendation. The eleven groups were named and organized around these questions:

1. Choosing Electronic Resources: What Is a Valuable Web Resource?
2. What Are the Continuing Education Needs of Professional Catalogers?
- 3a. What Near-Term Cooperative Partnerships Should Libraries Explore in the Digital World?
- 3b. What Long-Term Cooperative Partnerships Should Libraries Explore in the Digital World?
- 4a. Multiple Versions (Originally titled How Can AACR2 Become More Responsive to Cataloging Networked Resources on the Web in the Near-Term?)
- 4b. How Can AACR2 Become More Responsive to Cataloging Networked Resources on the Web?
5. What Can the Library Community Offer in Support of Semantic Interoperability?
6. What Automated Tools Could Assist Libraries to Meet the Information Needs of Their Users?
7. What Steps Can The Library Take to Achieve Integrated Access to the Catalog and Other Discovery Tools?
8. How Can Libraries Participate More Actively in the Development of Metadata Standards?
9. How Can Catalogers and Metadata Providers Ensure that Resource Descriptions Meet Reference Needs?

Williamson invited anyone interested to send comments to John Byrum, whose e-mail address is listed on the site, or to make comments on the listserv dedicated to discussion of conference topics. The listserv is called BIBCONTROL, and you can subscribe by sending the message SUBSCRIBE BIBCONTROL [your name] to listserv@loc.gov.

Williamson reported that the Cataloging Directorate and other LC staff are now trying to determine which of the recommendations can be accomplished in the near term (6-18 months) and which can be accomplished in the longer term (2-5 years). They are also trying to determine which recommendations the Cataloging Directorate or LC alone can deal with, and which need to be worked on in collaboration with partners in and beyond the library community.

Williamson invited CC:DA members to visit the Web site to read the papers, almost all of which are now in their final form, the form in which they will appear in the published proceedings. The conference organizers will continue to use the Web site to keep us apprised of progress in implementing the recommendations, Williamson said. The proceedings are now being edited by Conference consultant Ann Sandberg-Fox, and will hopefully be published before ALA Annual 2001.

710. Report of the Task Force on the Review of ANSI/NISO Draft Standard Z39.85, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set: Chopey

[Related document: CC:DA/TF/Z39.85 Review/3
(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-dc1.html#report>)]

Task Force Chair Michael Chopey reported that the Task Force was set up after ALA Annual 2000 and charged with reviewing ANSI/NISO Draft Standard Z39.85, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set. The draft standard was balloted by NISO voting members from July 1 to August 15, 2000, and the task force was charged with reviewing the document in the very short time of frame of two weeks, and submitting a report to ALA's NISO voting member, Paul Weiss.

The task force recommended that Weiss vote "yes, with comments" and included these comments in the final report. Mr. Weiss subsequently reported that he had voted "Yes" as the task force had recommended. The voting during the balloting period was: 39 Yes; 2 No (National Library of Medicine, Special Libraries Association); 0 Abstain. The official ANSI public review was held August 11-October 10, 2000. NISO Standards Committee AS, chaired by John Kunze, appointed to process the adoption of the Dublin Core as a NISO American National Standard, responded to the negative voters and all commenters in November 2000. The negative voters were invited to change their votes to an approval or abstention based on the information presented by the Standards Committee, but they declined. Therefore, a reconsideration ballot will be put out during the period February 2 – March 5, 2001. All of the pertinent documents on this can be found at <http://www.niso.org/DC-recon.html>

Chopey thanked task force members Laurel Jizba, Sherry Kelley, Gabriele Kupitz, Noelle Van Pulis, and Mary Woodley for their participation and their willingness to serve on the task force under such a short deadline.

Schiff thanked and discharged the task force.

[Recording Secretary's note: CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff subsequently reconvened the task force in February, and charged it with reconsidering the Draft Standard in light of the SLA and NLM comments, and the NISO Standards Committee AS responses to those comments. The task force did so, and reaffirmed its original recommendation of a "Yes" vote. CC:DA approved the reconvened task force's recommendation by a vote of 8-0, and Schiff forwarded the recommendation to Weiss on February 12, 2001.]

711. Report of the Task Force on the Review of the Draft *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM): Kinney

[Related document: CC:DA/TF/AMREMM/3
(<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/iasweb/personal/jca/ccda/tf-amrm1.html#report>)]

Task Force Chair Daniel Kinney reported that the task force had been charged with reviewing *AMREMM* for consistency with *AACR2*. Kinney thanked the members of the task force: Thomas L. Amos, Western Michigan University; Matthew Beacom, Yale University; Melissa Conway, Uncatalogued Manuscript Control Center/DeRicci Census Project Update; Brad Eden, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Gertrude Koh, Dominican University; and Maria Oldal, Pierpont Morgan Library.

Kinney said that since CC:DA had already approved the task force's report, he would not go through the whole document in detail, but would just mention three issues that would probably need some follow-up, not necessarily from CC:DA.

The task force felt, Kinney reported, that there needed to be a review of the MARC examples, of which there are about 30 pages. He said the task force had noticed errors in these, but it was not within the scope

of the task force's charge or within the purview of CC:DA to report on these. This suggestion was being passed on to the editors of *AMREMM*.

Another issue that needs some sort of resolution, Kinney said, was the relationship of *AMREMM* to Steven L. Henson's *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts*². *AMREMM* also deals with those types of materials, and the task force noted that we now had two sets of rules, sometimes conflicting, for dealing with the same materials.

A final issue, Kinney said, was one that *is* within the purview of CC:DA, but may not require any action. Kinney said that he was reporting on it because he thought the CC:DA membership might be interested in hearing the opinion of a manuscripts cataloging specialist on the task force with regard to formulating uniform titles for manuscripts. Kinney said that a member of the task force had suggested that the general rule for formulating a uniform title for a manuscript could be improved by preferring the shelfmark over the name. Kinney pointed out that this is the opposite of the instructions in Rule 25.13B1 and the corresponding LCRI, which say to prefer the name. This manuscripts cataloging specialist stated that this is one of the most problematic AACR2 rules to follow in manuscripts cataloging, and that this rule might be one of the reasons why institutions with large manuscripts holdings do not consider AACR/MARC cataloging appropriate for their bibliographic records. This rule may not pose a problem for manuscripts of works like the *Book of Kells* or the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, but it does for many lesser-known works in manuscripts. This rule has resulted in titles made up by the publisher in the language of the publisher that appear on the title pages of commercial publications being used as uniform titles, when it is actually the shelfmark that is the unique identifier from the repository's standpoint, and is the name that scholars and curators use to identify the work. Another problem with popular names is that they vary from source to source and change over time.

Kinney said that the task force was unanimous in its praise of *AMREMM*, and felt that Gregory Pass is to be commended for solving many of the most complex and complicated problems in manuscripts cataloging.

John Attig said that he had been asked by ACRL liaison to CC:DA Robert L. Maxwell to make a comment. He said that this had been referred to CC:DA by the Bibliographic Standards Committee of Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ACRL. That Committee appreciated the review of *AMREMM* undertaken by the CC:DA, and indicated that the recommendations of the task force would be acted upon, especially the recommendation that the MARC examples be reexamined.

Schiff said that he invited the archives and manuscripts cataloging community to make rule revision proposals to address any of the concerns that the task force had raised.

Schiff thanked and discharged the task force.

712. Report of the Task Force on the VRA Core Categories: Kelley

[Related Documents: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-vra1.html>]

Task Force Chair Sherry Kelley reminded the committee that this was a task force that had been formed after ALA Annual 1998. Kelley said that the task force was now down to four members after some changes in the membership, and after some changes in the Core Categories themselves. Kelley thanked the other three members of the task force: Ann Champagne, Robin Wendler, and Sherman Clarke. She said that she wanted to apologize for the fact that the task force did not have a final report to submit yet, but that she had spoken to CC:DA Chair Schiff about this, and the task force fully intends to submit a final report by the end of January, which can then be deliberated upon and voted upon electronically.

² Hensen, Steven L., 1944- *Archives, personal papers, and manuscripts: a cataloging manual for archival repositories, historical societies, and manuscript libraries* / compiled by Steven L. Hensen. 2nd ed. Chicago : Society of American Archivists, 1989.

The VRA Core Categories is a qualified metadata element set, Kelley said, consisting of 17 categories. It is a data structure standard, not a content value standard or a data communication standard. It grew out of the needs of the visual resources community, particularly the slide libraries community, who felt that MARC and AACR2 are overly complex and elaborate in ways that provide no benefit to their resource description needs.

Kelley referred the committee to a sheet that she had distributed prior to the meeting. The sheet contains the task force's charge, originally written in 1998, and then revised at a later time. She noted that one of the things that had slowed the task force down was the fact that about a year ago, Version 3.0 of the Core Categories replaced Version 2.0, and at that point, the task force had had to start over again in some ways.

Kelley reminded the committee that this task force had grown out of the original CC:DA Metadata Task Force, and the interest on the part of the cataloging community in keeping track of metadata standards that might have implications for cataloging and the catalog, and in pursuing how those metadata standards might inform catalogers and CC:DA in its rule revision work, and conversely, how CC:DA and the cataloging community might inform those who are developing metadata standards.

Kelley said that one of the most important goals of this and other CC:DA task forces studying metadata standards was to determine if and how library data structures and non-library data structure could achieve interoperability and data sharing. That goal is reflected in the various charges of this task force.

Kelley reported that the mapping from VRA Core Categories to MARC21 was part of the standard. She said that this mapping could be done fairly faithfully and successfully, with little data loss, if the mapping were done by the standards developers themselves.

Kelley said that the task force's final report would address all of the charges, as outlined on the sheet she had distributed, and would contain a section on an analysis of the user tasks identified in the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*. She said it would also contain a very careful analysis of the mapping from VRA Core to MARC21 (field-by-field), and to AACR2 (area-by-area), along with a general overview of the issues involved in mapping non-library data structures to library data structures, and vice-versa.

Kelley noted that the task force was not recommending that there be a formal designation of a liaison between CC:DA and the VRA Data Standards Committee, as the task force felt that sufficient mechanisms were already in place to ensure a meaningful exchange of information between the two communities. She said that Sherman Clarke was already serving as the de facto liaison from VRA to CC:DA and to the MARC Advisory Committee, and at his request the task force's final report would be forwarded to members of the VRA Data Standards Committee prior to their February 2001 meeting.

Finally, Kelley said, the final report will contain a section with a fairly close comparison of the standard to the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, and appendixes on background, history, communities served, sample records, and citations.

Schiff thanked Kelley for her report, and said that the committee would look forward to reading the final report and discussing it electronically.

Kelley said that one final comment she would like to make is that it is very useful and valuable to the cataloging community for CC:DA to continue to appoint task forces to review metadata element sets as they emerge, in order to keep the committee and the cataloging community informed about new issues and new metadata standards, even if these task forces do not end up making any rule revision proposals. She said that one emerging metadata element set that merits a review by CC:DA would be the ONIX metadata standard. She said that the ONIX standard could be valuable to catalogers in that it would allow us to make use of metadata already supplied by publishers.

Carol Hixson moved that CC:DA establish a task force to review the ONIX metadata standard. Eden seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion was passed by a vote of 8-0.

713. Report of the Task Force on ISO Harmonization: Chopey

[Related Documents: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-iso1.html>]

Task Force Chair Michael Chopey reported that the Task Force on ISO Harmonization had been set up after ALA Annual 2001, and charged with:

- identifying and examining ISO (International Organization for Standardization) standards relevant to AACR2 resource description, focusing in particular on standards for abbreviation, symbolization, and punctuation;
- consulting, as needed, with the ALA representative to the National Information Standards Organization (NISO);
- identifying areas where ISO standards and AACR2 differ;
- discussing whether harmonization of ISO and AACR2 is desirable or necessary; and,
- if deemed appropriate, proposing rule revisions to AACR2.

Chopey said that the originally appointed chair of the task force had resigned in December, and that he had been asked to take over as chair shortly before this meeting. In addition to the chair, the task force has also lost 2 more of its originally appointed members, Chopey said, and he would welcome participation by any other CC:DA members who might be interested in serving on the task force. He noted that CC:DA Chair Schiff had already approved his asking for additional members at this meeting.

The impetus for the setting up of this task force was the rule revision proposal document presented to CC:DA by John Hostage of Harvard Law School Library at ALA Annual 2001. This document, CC:DA/Hostage/1, proposed removing the full stop after metric units of measurement in AACR2, and treating them as symbols rather than abbreviations in bibliographic description.

Chopey said that the Task Force, which now consisted of himself, John Hostage, Kristin Lindlan, and Aimée Quinn, had had a meeting this morning to begin to decide how they would be addressing their task force's charge. The first challenge will be identifying all of the ISO standards relevant to bibliographic description. He said that the task force would welcome comments from any member of the committee or audience, and these should be sent to him at chopey@hawaii.edu. The task force's final report is due to the CC:DA chair by May 15, 2001.

Schiff thanked Chopey for his report and announced that anyone interested in serving on this task force could contact either Chopey or himself to volunteer.

714. Report of the Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources: Jizba

[Related Documents: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-scer1.html>]

Laurel Jizba distributed an interim report from Friday that she said was out-of-date at this meeting because the task force had met Saturday and changed it substantially. She thanked the active task force members (Brad Eden; Greta de Groat; Gene Kinnaly; Jimmie Lundgren; Nan Myers; Ann Sandberg-Fox).

She said that her verbal report would summarize the recommendations and how they arrived at them. In their work, they had looked at the big issues and then broken them down into smaller ones. The charge for the task force had been to look at areas 3, 5 and 7 of chapter 9 on electronic characteristics. Jizba reported that they had conducted three focus groups to provide feedback for the task force: a questionnaire to electronic resources catalogers; an internal task force questionnaire; and feedback from 20 additional catalogers (mostly academic) on Saturday. The methodology they used is described in the written report.

Jizba said the task force recommended eliminating area 3 and relocating the data to area 7 for remote resources. There was no clear majority on what to do with area 5. File size was not seen as useful as other data.

In the extent for direct access resources, Jizba reported that they wanted to replace "computer optical disc" with "computer disc (CR-ROM)." Optionally, they suggested adding only established terms from other appropriate chapters related to content. For this same question, #4, they do not want to provide for remote resources, but use a note instead. For complex accompanying material, LC provided an example, but users don't like it. They recommend an LCRI be created regarding accompanying materials.

In B.4. Extent for remote resources, Jizba said the task force would prefer a specific and useful note. They rejected 17 different terms as possibilities.

In B.6 of the report, the task force agreed there was no need to routinely record sound and color characteristics, though the cataloger may provide them.

Jizba reported that electronic resources catalogers prefer specific notes to general notes for remote electronic resources. They also thought guidance in the construction of summary notes is necessary.

Jizba said that their final report is due at ALA annual 2001, with an interim report due March 1, 2001, for the JSC meeting in April.

Attig said it was a solid interim report, but added he was concerned about a couple of details where reversing decisions that were being published for the first time, e.g. in area 3, the use of computer disk vs. CR-ROM. Attig said the rule says can use "1 CR-ROM."

Jizba replied that was fine with the task force.

Attig said that chapter 9 contains a parenthetical extent of file for direct access resources.

Jizba said they were not concerned with direct access resources, only remote.

Schottlaender complimented Jizba for the great report.

Schiff thanked the task force for its work.

715. Report from ALA Editions Representative: Chatham

Don Chatham, Head of Publishing Dept. at ALA, reported that there would be an amendments package out in early spring. He said that the idea of publishing in loose-leaf format had been raised again to accommodate the substantial changes currently pending. He added that the former problems with the binder would need to be addressed. The amendments available on the web in pdf format had been a popular option. The publishers are considering the idea of a new revision and it would take 18 months to put together. He reported there would be a meeting scheduled with the Committee of Principals in April after the JSC meeting.

716. Report of the Task Force on the *Review of Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals: Attig*

[Related documents: CC:DA/TF/Seriality Rules Review/4
(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-serr3.html>)
4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response
4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/LC response
4JSC/LC/49
4JSC/LC/51
Minutes of AACR/ISBD(S)/ISSN Meeting of Experts, Nov. 2000]

John Attig reported that the task force had been discharged, but had continued working and would have a final report soon. The task force still needed to consider recent documents and welcomed comments. At this meeting he wanted to discuss the broader issues.

Jean Hirons said that ISBD(S) had agreed on a definition of continuing resources and that the ISBD(S) was to be changed in scope to become ISBD(CR) for serials and other continuing resources. The focus included more than bibliographic description, e.g., serials control.

Regina Reynolds summarized recent ISSN activities, including agreements by the three groups (AACR, ISBD, ISSN) on rules for major/minor title changes, broader, lead to fewer title changes, fewer new record for trivial changes. She expressed concern that the concept of continuing resources was not being accepted by AACR, when the ISSN community had accepted it.

Attig said that continuing resources would not appear in the code until it appeared in the introduction, at which point it could then appear elsewhere in the code. He had unofficial minutes from the meeting of experts, at which there had been a discussion of scope of the common universe of the 3 groups (AACR, ISBD, ISSN). He reported that this would be in the final version of the minutes and that a formal definition of continuing resources was forthcoming. He added that the extent of harmonization that had been reached was great.

Hirons read the definition from the report for continuing resources, including the “lack of predetermined conclusion.”

Attig said there was some consensus in dealing with continuing resources: a lack of predetermined conclusion. The words “determinate” and “indeterminate” are from the original Graham/Hirons paper.³ If one goes back to the original discussion in the Toronto paper, “seriality” equaled anything that moves. He said he wanted to concentrate now on issues having to do with the model of bibliographic resources and the scope of chapter 12. He said that this model takes the concept apart and looks at: single vs. multipart; complete vs. incomplete; successive vs. integrating; determinate vs. indeterminate. These aren’t hierarchical, but independent axes. He added that what is needed is a 5-dimensional model, which makes it complicated when it is reduced to a two-dimensional page. The emerging consensus was to simplify by flattening the model, with the concept of “finite” to include concept of determinate and “continuing resources” to include the concept of indeterminate. This makes the concept of finite include determinate and then makes secondary distinctions about complete vs. incomplete, successive and integrating, etc., though he realized they cross the lines. If this model were accepted, it clarifies where to place multipart items since they are determinate and therefore finite. If that’s where we want to proceed, it is legitimate to suggest adding continuing resources to the scope statement of Chapter 12, although the chapter also covers some things that aren’t continuing resources.

³ Hirons, Jean, and Crystal Graham. “Issues Related to Seriality,” *The Principles and Future of AACR : Proceedings of the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, October 23-25, 1997*, Jean Wiehs, editor (Chicago : American Library Association, 1998), p. 180-212.

Schottlaender said that that was the JSC's intention once "seriality" was on the table, but questioned whether Attig was saying to include now before the introductory chapter is written. He added that it was not definite that multiparts would be included in Chapter 12.

Attig replied that it was not a definite decision that multiparts aren't continuing resources and therefore they were not ready to put in the rules. If we are ready to put them in the rules, then this is just a limited introduction of the concept and the introduction can provide that.

Tillett said that the JSC thinks the introduction should come first to get the concepts out and then the use of "continuing resources" in chapter 12 would follow.

Carol Hixson said she would support having "continuing resources" in chapter 12 now, because she thought it was important to get the concept out now, rather than waiting on the introduction. She doesn't want a new chapter 12 now and then another chapter 12 later. She added that we know the concepts and harmonization is more important than getting them all in the right order.

Susan Hayes said the terms are being used now. She asked what the timeframe was for the introduction that LA/BL is writing.

Schottlaender replied that a draft or outline was due by the JSC meeting in April.

Schiff said that the term "integrating resources" was also going into chapter 12 and he questioned the need to wait on the term "continuing resources."

Jizba said the two terms have practical value and people need them now. Waiting is a theoretical exercise.

Tillett point out that integrating resources are both continuing and not continuing and chapter 12 is a little unclear as a result. JSC wanted to be clear what was in chapter 12. She said including finite would add to the confusion.

Hirons said there were two issues: 1) what is the chapter title, and 2) getting the words into the scope statement.

Attig added that putting it in the scope statement allows us to define the term in glossary.

Schottlaender said chapter 12 includes determinate and indeterminate, as well as non-continuing integrating resources. We can call the chapter "Continuing resources." If multiparts are included, Chapter 12 would include all continuing plus some non-continuing resources.

Attig said that what is in the chapter cannot be described with single term. The question is whether continuing plus or integrating plus is included in chapter 12 before the introduction is revised. He said the scope statement could be written either way.

Attig asked for a straw poll on whether or not CC:DA wants to include "continuing resources" in scope note of chapter 12? There was unanimous support for it by everyone present.

Attig mentioned the many subrules for serials and integrating resources and asked whether it is better to have them in separate chapters. He added that the clean draft of chapter 12 made it clearer what happening, but that the task force hadn't had a chance to discuss it yet.

Hixson said she thought it was clear as written.

Lindlan said she would like to have serials and integrating resources in separate chapters, even if that means repeating parts of rules, because the rules for the two categories tend to have opposite instructions.

Tillett said the JSC had thought about all of the options and at this point, wanted to keep the two together, but having them separate is something they could consider. She reminded CC:DA of the Delsey report's recommendation of reorganizing the first part by ISBD areas.

Schottlaender said that if we are going to make that recommendation this is the time, even if it is late in the game.

Hirons questioned splitting up continuing resources, because if they are split up, the concept of continuing resources is lost.

Larsgaard said that there are pros and cons both ways and suggested that we could have chapter 12 in two parts: serials, and integrating resources.

Jizba said that it would be easier to have non-serial stuff together.

Attig said the task force needed to think about it more before asking CC:DA to make that recommendation. He added that he had a procedural question. There are many documents that discuss 21.2 and he wanted to know which task force should be discussing it and in which report the comments should be.

Schottlaender replied he preferred them in chapter 12 recommendations.

Attig said he and Lindlan would coordinate to get them in one place.

Schiff reminded CC:DA to send specific editorial comments on the chapter 12 text to John Attig.

717. Multipart items in AACR2: Schottlaender

[Related document: 4JSC/LC/51]

Schottlaender thanked Judy Kuhagen and commended her work on analyzing multipart items. The two-three paragraphs preceding how to address provisions not in AACR2 for handling changes to parts of multipart items depend on decisions JSC and this group need to make.

Schottlaender said that Recommendation #1 had a question to answer, i.e., the number of bibliographic records to describe. Two possibilities had been identified by Kuhagen: (1) reaffirm the principle for a single record to describe a multipart item, irrespective of the number of title changes on later parts, or (2) create a new principle, i.e., create a series of bibliographic records to describe each part of a set.

He said the JSC and CC:DA also needed to decide on which part to base the description: 1) earliest; 2) latest; or, 3) as in the current AACR2 principle, base the description on the part with the predominant title. He added that the word 'predominant' is undefined in the code.

Schottlaender asked Schiff how to proceed. Should we see if there is consensus or continue discussion electronically? The rationale for basing description on earliest means that it avoids having to go back and change earlier record(s) when new items issued.

Steven Arakawa said he would like to keep the principle of a single record approach, but was willing to be devil's advocate on the description by latest or earliest or predominant issue. He asked what was the user perspective in looking for that book. He also brought up the rationale for description from the earliest part, i.e., less work if analyzed.

Larsgaard said she supported the principle for a single record approach, but added that description based on the earliest part does not work for cartographic multipart items. In a classic situation, e.g., a 9-sheet map in

which the bibliographic information is spread across the tops of the first three sheets, a cataloger needs to catalog from all or as many sheets as are in hand because the first sheet may not have the title.

Schottlaender asked whether cartographic materials were the only exception and that, if they were an exception, how are they to be handled.

Attig voiced support for description from the earliest issue, because it is similar to workflow. He said that staff notice little about changes to multipart and added that they're lucky if a title change is noticed.

John Hostage said there are a lot of cases for multipart where incomplete and replacement volumes may have new title. Many legal titles may be both integrating and multipart.

Hirons asked what the distinctions are for these materials if they were successively issued, each part with own title, or integrating, with only one presentation of title at any one time. She said a cataloger may have to make a decision about which category a particular title falls into.

Schottlaender said that he was hearing a reaffirmation of the single record approach by CC:DA, but added that description on the earliest part seems problematic and he's not hearing a proposed alternative.

Hixson said that what may be describe is not later information, but bits of information across sheets for cartographic materials in a situation where a title can only be cataloged when all sheets are available. It's not a situation of have slightly differently information. Perhaps we need wording added that a series of parts constitute enough to catalog by when complete bibliographic information comes out on top of the sheets over time.

Jizba said there was an analogous philosophical situation in chapter 9, with most complete title appearing on source. She summarized that what she was hearing from the law and map catalogers was using the most comprehensive title.

Hixson expressed disagreement, because volume 2 may have a subtitle that is most comprehensive. She wouldn't advocate using that principle.

Schiff said he wouldn't have a problem retaining the concept of predominance. He has seen sets where the first part had one title and later parts another and it's a 20-volume set likely to be known by later title. He added that Arakawa had good point, i.e., if Analyzable parts, the cataloger would have to go back and change it. If we retain predominance, it needs to be defined. He added that variant forms of names have 80/20% rule and we may need something similar for titles in the rules.

Schottlaender said that he was still not hearing consensus.

Jizba said that access is necessary for the other title and it's not expressed in the rules. Chapter 21 needs some provisions for it. She said CC:DA should endorse description based on earliest part. She added that when the first issue is the latest, the next time it comes in it's still the latest and it's always going to be latest, even if it's the earliest.

Glazier asked at what point did the Appendix enter here.

Schottlaender replied that at this point, the Appendix is where those instructions are and will be.

Kuhagen added if it's one record, it should be in the first part of the code. The Appendix is only for major changes.

A straw poll was taken with the result that basing description on the "earliest" has it, but Schottlaender added that CC:DA needs to talk to law and maps catalogers because the response should have their needs in mind.

Schottlaender reported that in the discussion leading up to Recommendation #2, Kuhagen wrote that there were at least three general configurations possible if reorganize part 1 of AACR2: (1) areas of description; (2) a variation of the current AACR2 organization; (3) categories of publications. He referred to Appendix B in Kuhagen's report for a variety of other possibilities and explanations of why they were rejected.

Schottlaender said that Recommendation #2 describes the creation of a conceptual chapter expanding on the content of chapter 13, the analysis chapter. It merges it with future provisions, including the major change appendix and the LC 50 recommendations on series authority records and covers topics related to how many bibliographic records are created under which circumstances and the relationships of bibliographic records to each other. Kuhagen's recommendation is that such a chapter be in the code either as the first chapter or as a general chapter preceding part 1. He asked Kuhagen what she thought the relationship was between the conceptual chapter and the new introductory chapter being written by LA/BL.

Kuhagen said this was not a new idea on her part. In the Hirons/Graham paper, there were recommendations to include information on why creating a new record and a chapter on mechanics. She added that concepts integral to the code should be in the code, not in the introduction. The introduction should be limited to introducing the document.

Schottlaender said that if CC:DA endorsed this recommendation, it would constitute additional information being added to the code. He said he thought the British were working on an introduction that does extend to some of these concepts that are in the conceptual chapter that Kuhagen is recommending. It may be an undesirable 'mixing together' of introduction and cataloging.

Attig said he agreed. He also made the suggestion to not limit number (5) under Recommendation #2 to the concept of serials control. He said it was applicable to other types of local information as well. Also, in bibliographic records, he said there is copy specific data which is now covered throughout the rules and could belong in the conceptual chapter.

Glazier added that anything in the conceptual chapter on the topic of serials control would mostly be ignored.

Vote: unanimous endorsement of Recommendation #2.

Schottlaender said that it was unstated in the document how recommendations in this document would be implemented if the JSC endorses. If JSC endorses Recommendation #2, it clarifies that the conceptual chapter is different from the introductory chapter that LA/BL is preparing. He asked whether the Library of Congress was volunteering to draft the conceptual chapter, if the JSC decides that a chapter separate from the introduction is needed.

Tillett said she stopped short of saying that, but it was not impossible.

Kuhagen added that her paper laid out topics, e.g. multipart, that were not addressed in AACR2, but did not say where the information should go.

Schottlaender summarized Recommendation #3 on ways to organize part 1 of AACR2. #3 or 3a suggests that part 1 be arranged by areas of the description. Seriality would be included in the conceptual chapter and in chapter on notes area. Information in chapter 13 would be added to the conceptual chapter. He said that the Alternate recommendation #3 is to retain the current organization of part 1, but make the following changes: merge current chapter 1 with conceptual chapter; add multipart items; a revised chapter 12; new chapter 13 dealing with changes in data elements. He asked Kuhagen about the recommendation merging chapter 13 into conceptual chapter.

Kuhagen replied she was concerned about renumbering all of the other chapters. If add multipart to chapter 12, chapter 12 could be bibliographic description and new 13 changes. She added that not all serials or integrating resources have changes.

Schottlaender asked to clarify if new 13 would comprehend what is current being drafted as the Appendix on Major changes.

Kuhagen said it would include the notes for dealing with changes, which would be taken out of chapter 12.

Jizba said that this recommendation seemed to be print and textual-oriented and she said she hoped that a new conceptual chapter would not be overly written for print interests. This was seconded by Larsgard and Lorimer in the interests of map and music catalogers.

Kuhagen said she had taken special formats into account. She added that if the JSC does not want to reorganize part 1 of AACR2, we still need to think about how to get all of the parts into the code. The easiest way is her alternate recommendation. She said she had thought of as many possibilities as she could and had provided rationale for two of them.

Attig said that in the general part under Recommendation #3, he was not convinced you could limit the rules for changes to area 7, especially not for integrating resources where the cataloger changes the description. He added that he did not think CC:DA was at a point to recommend on the reorganization of part 1 of AACR2 until we've dealt with question of whether benefits outweigh the costs. A decision is needed on the alpha prototype of AACR2.

Vote: Neither recommendation endorsed.

Schottlaender said he would distribute a draft ALA response for member review prior to sending it on to JSC.

718. Report from the MARBI Representative: Watson

[Related document: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/marbi101.html>]

Mark Watson distributed his CC:DA/ MARBI rep. report and summarized the report:

Proposal No. 2001-02. Proposal allows for non-MARC country codes in fields 043 and 044 and proposed \$c in field 043 be defined for use of an ISO 3166 code for representations of names of countries and subdivisions, which is used in several metadata schemes. This was unanimously approved by MARBI.

Discussion paper 2001-DP02. Non-MARC language codes in field 041 of bibliographic and community information formats. The discussion document explored a number of approaches to provide for other standard types of language codes in MARC records. Watson reported that the issue will come back to MARBI at annual as a proposal that features the following characteristics: use of a repeating 041; use of repeating subfields a-h; second indicator "7" for non-standard codes used in 041; use of subfield 2 to specify language code scheme. The proposal will also suggest that stacking of language codes, e.g., 'engfreger,' be eliminated in favor of the use of separate subfields for language used in each item. The repeating 041s and un-stacking would apply to both MARC and non-MARC language codes. He added that this is a major change and he would keep CC:DA informed on this issue.

Proposal No. 2001-01. Designating taxonomic hierarchies in field 754. This proposal came back approved but slightly modified. Subfield a was redefined to contain taxonomic name only, \$c taxonomic category, with both subfields a and c repeatable and \$c containing a non-repeatable public note. Another subfield, maybe x, is to be worked on for a non-public note. Another subfield (to be determined) will be defined to contain a common or alternative name.

Discussion Paper 2001-DP01. Recording narrators in fields 508 and 511. MARC 21 documentation instructs catalogers to record on-screen narrators in field 511 and voice-over narrators in field 508. Watson reported that in actual practice, this is an impractical distinction and results in inconsistencies. The discussion paper recommended putting all narrators in field 511. Watson reported that there would be no follow-up proposal, but the documentation will be changed to implement this.

Discussion Paper 2001-DP03. Types of dates for electronic resources. The purpose of the discussion paper was to help the MARC community consider whether the format has sufficient data elements to distinguish types of dates important for electronic resources that have not been needed for other types of material, e.g., date modified and date valid, both of which are qualifiers in Dublin core elements. Watson reported there would be another discussion paper focusing on the use of field 046 special coded dates for a variety of dates, not just those for electronic resources.

Proposal No. 2001-03. Identification of \$2 (source) in field 015 was approved with no changes.

Attig said that mapping of dates might be useful, e.g., to distinguish date of creation from date of issuance or date of validity. The content standards of AACR do not always use these same dates, but they may be of interest for AACR2. Watson agreed to keep CC:DA informed on this topic also.

Watson said that MARBI would like to have a joint meeting with CC:DA on Monday afternoon at ALA Annual Conference 2001, with possible topics: (1) recommendations from Bicentennial Conference; (2) seriality.

Hirons suggested the proposed bibliographic level "i" as a possible topic. She added that if seriality were to be discussed, it would be a good idea to invite the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging to the meeting, since Monday afternoon is also their meeting time. Attig suggested a repeatable 260 field as another possible topic.

Hixson supported the idea of a joint meeting if there are substantive topics to discuss.

Schiff agreed to talk to Watson and Bill Jones, Chair of MARBI, about a possible topic.

719. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

John Attig reported that for the dissemination of documents electronically it was easiest for him if he received the original word processing copy of documents and created a PDF file, rather than scanning paper documents. He asked if use of electronic transmittal was acceptable for JSC documents. Schottlaender said he would forward any electronic copies that he received, but added that the document of record is a hard copy.

Schiff thanked Attig for his work on the CC:DA website.

720. Rule change proposals from MAGERT: Larsgaard

[Related document: CC:DA/MAGERT/2001/1

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/magert1.html#add2001>)]

Mary Larsgaard distributed a photocopy of a view of the UC San Diego campus with a perspective map on the verso that illustrates the note "Scale varies," because she said she often found it difficult to describe graphic items with words alone.

She reported that we would be discussing the 3.3 proposals, as the JSC had not had time for the 3.7 proposals at its September meeting. The area 7 note proposals were left in the package sent to CC:DA.

3.3

Larsgaard directed CC:DA to the MAGERT response for 3.3 and said that the JSC had agreed to renaming 3.3. The most important proposal is the new 3.3G for geospatial reference data dealing with horizontal and vertical data, grids, and state coordinate systems. She said that MAGERT had rethought this after a year of cataloging of geospatial items and has realized that detailed note information is not appropriate for area 3 and belongs in area 7. They wanted to propose three possibilities to the JSC: (1) write a revised 3.7B8 which includes notes on area 3 and example; (2) write a revised 3.7B8 including new text and examples; (3) handle this in the interpretative manual, *Cartographic materials*, 2nd ed., which would be out in late 2002. In response to a question from Schottlaender, Larsgaard said she preferred the additional text in 3.7B8 (all notes on mathematical and other cartographic data).

CC:DA concurred with her preference.

3.3A1

Larsgaard reported that this proposal was the result of JSC responses to ALA proposal for 3.3A3. MAGERT agreed with the JSC response on repeatability of the area and said that punctuation should appear in 3.3A1 and not in 3.3A3. MAGERT accepted CCC suggestions and LC wording, but found one incorrect phrasing in the LC proposal. In the last paragraph of the response, if 3.3G becomes a note — which it has — the last three instructions would need to be deleted.

3.3A3

Larsgaard reported that in the MAGERT response, MAGERT agreed that the first statement (“This area is repeatable”) is now covered by the addition to 3.3A1 and is no longer necessary. MAGERT would like to have this rule because they have deleted geospatial reference data in 3.3G. The example needs to be changed. She added that MAGERT accepted the LC idea of using the note “Scale not given” in this situation.

Schiff made a correction of the term “Computer data” to “Electronic data” in the example.

Jizba said that if area 3 were eliminated, this rule would need to change. Larsgaard agreed that they would take out file characteristics when changes were implemented in chapter 9, but said that MAGERT had worked with what was in the rules at the present.

Larsgaard read the text of 3.3A3, with correction of “and/or” noted.

3.3B1

Larsgaard said that there had been differences of opinion on 3.3B1 among the JSC constituencies. MAGERT agreed with the ACOC and LC responses and, in particular with ALA’s original proposal, but agreed with the language from the LC response and added as a true final paragraph: “For electronic resources, give the scale if the source has a scale statement or if the scale is already recorded as part of the title proper or other title information. Otherwise, give *Scale not given*.”

CC:DA agreed with this proposal.

3.3B3

Larsgaard reported there had not been an ALA proposal for 3.3B3, but there had been an LC response. She said that MAGERT disagrees with this response and wanted to keep the note “Scale varies” because map catalogers saw a qualitative difference between “Scale varies” and “Scale not given.” This is important information for users and MAGERT requested that the rule remain as is.

CC:DA agreed with MAGERT on this proposal.

3.3B4-3.3B6

Larsgaard said that she had left out a key point in these proposals and would rewrite them as one rule applying to all cartographic material. As a result, she was withdrawing 3.3B4, 5, and 6 and would resubmit them as 3.3B4. She agreed to get this revision to Schiff and Attig by Feb. 7 for CC:DA approval in order to be sent to Schottlaender by March 1, 2001 for forwarding in time for April JSC meeting.

3.3B7

Larsgaard reported that the MAGERT version had not been approved. MAGERT agreed that the word 'maps' should not be substituted for 'charts' in this rule because there are celestial maps that aren't charts. They also took birds-eye views out of this rule. They had discovered that views and perspective maps are constructed by a cartographer to a linear scale and therefore are not a situation of non-linear scale, as this rule covers.

3.3B8

Larsgaard reported that 3.3B8 had already been approved by the JSC.

3.3B9

Larsgaard said that MAGERT agreed with LC that "Scale not applicable" is not appropriate here and that LC's proposed final paragraph be added to 3.3B1. 3.3B9 is withdrawn.

3.3C2

Larsgaard reported that MAGERT agreed to the LC revision of this rule.

CC:DA agreed.

3.3D1

Larsgaard said that MAGERT wanted to simplify this rule by putting longitude and latitude letters for direction in the same location in front of the coordinates, whether given in degrees, minutes and seconds, or in degrees. Also, MAGERT agreed to change 'Optional addition' to 'Optionally,' as suggested by the Canadians. Larsgaard also agreed to rephrase this sentence in the imperative as suggested by Attig, i.e., "Record coordinates as"

3.3E

Larsgaard reported that MAGERT agreed with ACOC that this rule needed more examples and ACOC and/or CCC would provide the examples.

3.3F & 3.3F1

Larsgaard thanked the Canadian contingent of AAACM for their response. She said the second sentence should have the words "mechanism and storage technique." [IS THIS CORRECT?] MAGERT is also taking out note about lack of mention of typology level in the example in 3.3F1.

3.3G & 3.3G1

Larsgaard reported this was being moved to area 7 and the proposal was being withdrawn.

3.3H

Larsgaard reported that the MAGERT response was approved. She said that it is useful for users to have this information in area 3. She added that this is in flux because it has to do with serials and may need to be changed.

Schiff suggested the need for another document proposing changes to 5.3, 9.3, 11.3.

Schottlaender agreed to write it in consultation with Larsgaard.

3.5C2

Larsgaard reported that MAGERT agreed with CCC response on original proposal. She thanked Bob Ewald for noticing its omission. 3.5C2 has to do with the order of information for other physical details (e.g., layout, color). She said she would insert this into the final document prior to sending to the JSC.

721. Rule change proposal for 21.30J1 (Title added entries): Harcourt

[Related document: CC:DA/Harcourt/1

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/harcourt1.html>)]

Kate Harcourt said that Larsgaard had given her some suggestions that would inform discussion, even though she had not been able to incorporate them into the document. She read the existing text for 21.30J1 and outlined the benefits of changing it. She said that there were some additional decisions from the music community on that option. In her proposal, she suggested making the four exceptions in the rule optional or changing 21.30J1 so that title added entries are made routinely for all author/title combinations. She added that indicator changes may be more in MARBI's purview. Harcourt said that changing 21.30J1 would improve access for users. A rule change would codify what we've told the vendors for cleanup programs setting indicators one way or the other. Catalogers are also using macros and templates and it is difficult to remember to change the indicator values based on the exceptions.

Harcourt said that in the LCRI, LC generally makes an added entry except for exception b. She expressed concern that, especially for a and c, the title proper is identical to corporate body. Although this was a practical solution in the card environment, it does not work in online environment. We also see more and more titles composed by catalogers, particularly for web sites, and they are valid access points and are listed in finding aids. As a result, they are a valid search option. For option d) musical works, LC practice is to make a title added entry unless it's not sufficiently distinctive by itself to be an access point. She said this is subjective and that it is easier to err more on the side of more title access. In the interests of simplification, Harcourt would like greater consistency and ease of application. With processing and reprocessing records by vendors, keeping exception categories is increasingly difficult.

The three options in Harcourt's document are: 1) leave as is; 2) amend and simplify 21.30J to make an added entry under title proper of every item entered under a personal, corporate or uniform title heading, etc.; or 3) an alternative proposal to have an optional provision to not make added entries for the four exception categories found in 21.30J.

Larsgaard agreed that it seemed appropriate to change this rule, but make it optional for those libraries that want to use the exceptions, especially if they are still in a card environment.

Hixson moved to accept the alternative proposal, making exceptions optional. Hayes seconded.

Nancy Lorimer said that the optional clause would allow the music community to use the world as currently written and added that they have a list of what "distinctive" titles are.

Motion passed unanimously.

The proposal will go to Schottlaender by March.

Schiff noted that many of the chapter 12 and 21 proposals in the Chair/68 series of documents and LC/49 documents do affect this rule, but they affect only the last paragraph of this rule and not what was being discussed here.

722. Continuation of discussion on resource identifiers in AACR2 bibliographic descriptions: Attig

[Related documents: CC:DA/Attig/2000/1
(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/attig1.html>)
CC:DA/M/684
(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/007-min.html#M:684>)]

Schiff said this topic was a holdover from annual meeting because CC:DA had not resolved whether uniform resource identifiers should be in AACR or not.

Attig said that, in his discussion paper, possible solutions without major change to the code not particularly attractive because the places we could put things use the word "number." Resource identifiers are not perceived as being numbers. If that's the issue, a longer term project would be to consider broadening scope of area 8 to include standard identifiers, not just numbers. He asked if this was an approach worth exploring.

Glazier: One of issues about URIs is that they are not necessarily part of the universal bibliographic description. They may only refer to individual copies/versions that people have access to. He has a problem with rewriting rules unless one can determine that they are part of a universal bibliographic description.

Tillett: Impacts ISBD also. Would require ISBD review.

Schiff noted that in ISBD (ER) there is a URL in a mode of access note.

Schiff asked for straw poll: how many people think there should be provision in AACR2? Half the room agreed. There was then some consensus that AACR2 should deal with it.

Schiff asked if it is a number or something else.

Attig replied that it was clearly not a number.

Jizba said that it's a note about resource that can't be expressed in any other way, but it is a note and not a standard identifier.

Glazier said that mode of access note sounds closer than anything we've got now.

Jizba reminded CC:DA of two previous discussions. In the first discussion, CC:DA did not want it in AACR2, but in the second one did.

Sandberg-Fox said that the harmonization group agreed we needed it and wanted it proposed, but no consensus on where to put it. URLs and URNs had not been understood by people at the table, but now there has been a change in opinion.

Larsgaard said she remembered old discussions and that URLs were seen to be similar to call numbers.

Jizba said that it is an address where located. They describe access and belong in notes. The mode of access note is a good place for it

Sandberg-Fox said that another reason for leaving them out of AACR2 had been that URLs change too often and are not reliable.

Steve Shadle (audience) said that a PURL is not describing the location and in that sense, it's more like an identifier.

Glazier said that URLs are also being added to other notes by MARBI on a regular basis.

Attig said he was hearing that there may not be a single place in the notes area where all identifiers could be recorded.

Schiff asked whether we needed a task force.

Bruce Johnson (audience) said that many MARC elements are not addressed in AACR2 and that, given the breadth and number of problems currently with resource identifiers, they should be left out of AACR2.

Attig said that's where we started: MARC record would adequately deal with resource identifiers, whether AACR2 does or not. But the question is should we deal with them in AACR2?

Jizba mentioned they had been in earlier drafts of chapter 9, mostly in examples and at least one was taken out by JSC.

Attig: But in part that was because there is no rule that calls for inclusion of identifiers.

Schiff: Half the group thought should be in the rules

Larsgaard: We don't have critical mass yet. Would need to know more about URIs and Bruce's comments that a URI can refer to many things.

Schiff said that a task force could provide information about URIs.

Attig said, rephrasing Johnson's point, that resource identifier are used as linking devices, as well as information about the item.

Cecilia Preston (audience) asked to clarify whether CC:DA is talking about URIs, DOIs or other identifying schemes.

Sandberg-Fox replied that talking about a broader approach, not just URIs.

Schottlaender said that Preston's comments about emerging metadata schemes and Sherry Kelley's earlier comments were helpful and that we should begin to discuss the issues.

Hayes moved to form a task force to investigate resource identifiers in AACR. Lincicum seconded.

Schiff said he would draft a proposal and consult CC:DA on the wording of the charge.

Bruce Johnson said that URNs are a MARBI-approved concept. The subfield basis as need expressed??

Motion passed unanimously.

723. Other new business, reports from the floor, announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

Larsgaard asked whether CC:DA should consider having a deadline for submission for documents for consideration at CC:DA meetings. There had been a timeline of 6 weeks before documents were being submitted electronically. Glazier said that people also needed time to consult with their constituencies.

Schottlaender said that documents were to be submitted 30 days in advance for the JSC if there were to be discussed at the JSC meeting. A document might or might not be discussed, if it were late.

Sheryl Nichin-Keith asked if CC:DA needed to discuss everything at meetings. Schottlaender said that if discussions are done via email and decisions made, should be noted in chair report, for the record, that had been discussed.

Larsgaard agreed to examine and suggest revisions to procedural documents in order to establish better guidelines for the timeliness of submission of proposals.

Hixson said that she had had problems getting e-mail the week of ALA. CC:DA will rely on the internal distribution page.

Schottlaender announced that Matthew Beacom would be the new ALA representative to the JSC.

Schiff announced that the next meeting would be in San Francisco in June 2001.

The motion was made to adjourn the meeting and it was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael A. Chohey, CC:DA Intern
Kristin Lindlan, CC:DA Intern