

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2002 Annual Conference in Atlanta, Ga.
June 15 and 17, 2002**

Members present:

Kristin Lindlan, Chair
Steven R. Arakawa
John C. Attig
Michael A. Chohey
Bradford L. Eden
Peter Vincent Fletcher
Kate Harcourt
Susan M. Hayes
Dorothy McGarry

Lynnette M. Fields, Intern
Cheri A. Folkner, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

Matthew Beacom, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group

ALA Liaisons present:

Shi Deng for Chalermsee Olson, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Gabriele I. Kupitz, ALCTS/CCS/CCM
Mark R. Watson, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Lowell Ashley, ALCTS/MRC
Ann Sandberg-Fox, ALCTS/NRMC (represented by Mary Woodley 6/15)
Cecilia Sercan, ALCTS/PARS
David Van Hoy, ALCTS/SS (absent 6/17)
Robert L. Maxwell, ALA/ACRL
Rebecca Culbertson, ALA/GODORT
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT
Shelby E. Harken, ALA/LITA
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
Kevin A. Furniss, ALA/NMRT (absent 6/17)
Margaret Shen, ALA/PLA
Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/RUSA (absent 6/15)

Non ALA Liaisons present:

William Benemann, AALL
 Anne E. Champagne, ARLIS/NA
 Laurel Jizba, ARSC
 Gertrude Koh, CLA
 Robert McDonald, MedLA
 Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA
 Ann Caldwell, PCC
 Sandra McIntyre, SLA

CC:DA Webmaster:

John Attig

Notes:

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have 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 interns 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. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” 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.
- V. Abbreviations used 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 of Library Collections and Technical Services
 - BL** = British Library
 - CC:AAM** = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
 - CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 - CCC** = Canadian Committee of Cataloguing
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service
 - CPSO** = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
 - FRANAR** = Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (IFLA Working Group)
 - FRBR** = IFLA’s *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
 - IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
 - IRRT** = ALA/International Relations Round Table
 - ISO** = International Organization for Standardization

JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
LC = Library of Congress
MAGERT = ALA/Map and Geography Round Table
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
NDMSO = LC, Network Development & MARC Standards Office
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

MINUTES

*Saturday, June 15, 2002 – 2:00-5:30 p.m.
Atlanta Marriott Marquis, Marquis Ballroom IV*

774. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Kristin Lindlan opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee and visitors.

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

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

776. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[CC:DA/A/46]

Brad Eden moved the revised agenda be adopted. Peter Fletcher seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

777. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2002 Midwinter Meeting, New Orleans, LA, January 19 and 21, 2002: Chair

[CC:DA/M/750-773]

After corrections received via e-mail were noted, Eden moved that the minutes as amended with the corrections be approved. Fletcher seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

778. Report from the Chair: Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2001-2002/2]

Lindlan reported that Charles Wilt, ALCTS executive director, has been working on replacing representatives to CC:DA and ensuring that CC:DA has representatives from organizations. During that process, the Association of Jewish Librarians and IASSIST have agreed to no longer have liaisons to CC:DA.

Lindlan requested the Committee reaffirm votes of CC:DA from January to June 2002. The Chair's report [CC:DA/Chair/2001-2002/2] summarized these actions. It was moved to reaffirm the votes. Eden seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

Lindlan reviewed the actions taken by CC:DA in the past six months. During that time CC:DA:

- Sent a letter to ALA Publishing addressing concerns on the publishing of the loose-leaf format of AACR. CC:DA also provided feedback on sample chapter 9 for AACR 2002 to ALA Publishing.
- Made plans for a joint meeting with MARBI at this annual conference. The meeting will take place Monday, June 17, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. during part of CC:DA's normally scheduled meeting time.
- Acted as a co-sponsor, along with the SS/Committee To Study Serials Cataloging, for a program on revised Chapter 12 which will be presented on Monday afternoon, 1:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m. Speakers will be Jean Hirons, Regina Reynolds, Rhonda Lawrence, and Adam Schiff. Lindlan encouraged everyone to attend.
- Formed two task forces. One is the CC:DA/MARBI Program Planning Committee for Annual 2003 in Toronto, with Susan Hayes as chair; the topic of the program will be FRBR. The other is the Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2, with John Attig as chair; an interim report was received.
- Discussed, via the electronic list, some issues that were to be covered at the May JSC meeting so Matthew Beacom could better represent ALA at that meeting. The issues discussed were GMDs, 4JSC/ALA/36/Rev (Special Characteristics of Electronic Resources), and the proposal from the Alpha Prototype TF report on reorganization of AACR in CC:DA/TF/Alpha/3.
- Agreed to volunteer for certain parts of the LC Bibliographical Control Action Plan for Electronic Resources (3.1 and 3.3-3.5). CC:DA is waiting for specific assignments. Lindlan will be attending a meeting Sunday and may have more to report on Monday.

Lindlan also reviewed the status of CC:DA's task forces:

- The Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes is in abeyance and is waiting for direction from the JSC. The task force will meet Sunday 2:00-3:30 p.m. at the OCLC Booth in the Exhibit Hall.
- The Task Force on ONIX International chaired by Eden submitted its report to CC:DA at the Midwinter Conference. Lindlan officially discharged the task force.
- The Task Force on the Rule of 3 chaired by Steven Arakawa made comments on 4JSC/ACOC/1 last fall. Those comments were sent to the JSC. Beacom will report on the results of the JSC discussion.
- The Task Force on Special Characteristics of Electronic Resources is waiting on the JSC constituency responses to 4/JSC/ALA/36/Rev. Beacom will report on the issues this afternoon. Task force chair, Laurel Jizba will report on Monday.
- The Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2, chaired by Shirley Lincicum, submitted its final report after Midwinter. CC:DA sent rule revision proposals to the JSC as 4/JSC/ALA/42 which will be considered at the fall meeting of the JSC.
- The Task Force on ISO Harmonization, chaired by Michael Chohey, submitted its final report identifying some rule revision proposals on metric unit symbols. CC:DA will discuss and vote on the rule revision proposals after this meeting.

Lindlan thanked the CC:DA voting members who are completing terms after this conference:

- Brad Eden has been involved with CC:DA for a long time. He has served as the LITA representative from 1995 to 1998 and as a voting member from 2000 to 2002. He chaired the Task Force on ONIX International and he has served on: the Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes, the

Task Force on Special Characteristics of Electronic Resources, the Task Force on the Review of ISBD (CR), AMREMM, Metadata, the 2000 Preconference on Metadata; recommendation 2 in 4JSC/ALA/30, and Metadata and Cataloging Rules.

- Susan Hayes has served on the Task Force on the Rule of Three and the Task Force on ONIX International. She will be continuing as the chair of the CC:DA/MARBI Program Planning Committee for Annual 2003. She served as CC:DA intern 1997-1999 and as a voting member on CC:DA from 1999-2002.

Lindlan thanked Beacom and Attig for their assistance during the year.

Lindlan ended her report by presenting Glenn Patton a certificate for 20 years at the CC:DA table, noting that Patton has skillfully and intelligently represented both OCLC and the greater cataloging community, while still maintaining his sense of humor. She added that he has graciously agreed to speak during the joint meeting with MARBI on Monday.

779. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Barbara Tillett passed out copies of her report (available at <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/lc206.html>). Some of the items she highlighted are listed below.

- **Mail at LC:** LC resumed accepting USPS deliveries on March 4, 2002. USPS mail received from October 17 through March 3 is being sorted and handled by contractors. USPS mail received on March 4 and later is delivered to an off-site facility. Some of the mail has suffered damage from the irradiation process. LC cannot get an exemption from the irradiation process. UPS and FedEx mail is getting through to LC directly. Tillett suggested using one of those services to get mail to LC. She apologized if LC hasn't responded to inquiries mailed to it during the time of mail interruption.
- **LC implementation of AACR2 2002 amendments:** CPSO is targeting an implementation date of December 1, 2002. The delay is due to the publishing schedule and constituents' concerns regarding having enough time to schedule training. The LCRIs will be published in late summer. The decisions made regarding harmonization between PCC practice and LC practice will be shown in those LCRIs. Additional decisions will show up in the LCRIs update to be out in November still in time for the December 1 implementation date.
- **Catalogers' Desktop:** Issue no. 3 to be published in August will have the 2002 amendments and LCRIs included. LC considers the paper copy as the official version. Cataloger's Desktop will also include the updated version of the authorities format (the "blue pages") and the Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1: Name and Series Authority Records (the "yellow pages").
- **ALA/LC Romanization tables:** The scanned text of the 1997 edition is available on the CPSO Web site.
- **Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian languages:** CPSO is checking with language experts to help in the distinguishing between these languages. CPSO has sent its guidelines to the ALA Slavic and Eastern European Section for comments, but comments from others with expertise in these languages are welcomed.
- **LC Classification on the Web:** CDS is taking orders for this new fee-based service. CDS is contemplating discontinuing Classification Plus. Please give comments to LC.
- **Web authorities:** LC authority records will be available through the Web on a trial basis starting July 1, 2002. Authority records for names, subjects, and titles will be included. The records can be downloaded, but there are some bugs, including difficulties with diacritics.

- **LC integrated library system performance:** LC is limiting outside access to its ILS, including Web authorities, because of performance issues. LC is working with the vendor to improve performance so the number of outside users can increase.
- **MARC 21:** The *MARC Code List for Geographic Areas* should be released in July 2002. NDMSO has prepared Spanish language translations of several sections of the MARC 21 Web site. In 2001 NDMSO commissioned a study by Tom Delsey to examine MARC 21 from three perspectives: the FRBR model, the AACR cataloging code, and a set of user tasks the format might logically support. The report is available on the MARC Web site.

780. Presentation on *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*: Tillett

Presentation: [<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/frbr-intro.ppt>]

Background information: *FRBR* is available at

[<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.htm>], or

[<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf>]

Tillett gave a presentation on the FRBR model. During the presentation, she outlined the tasks done by users of bibliographic records and identified by the FRBR model: finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining. The model is an entity-relationship model where the entities are divided into three groups. Group 1 includes the products of intellectual and/or artistic endeavor: works, expressions, manifestations, and items. Group 2 are those persons or corporate bodies responsible for the intellectual and artistic content. Group 3 are the subjects of the works. Tillett proceeded to discuss the relationships within the groups and between the groups. She then reviewed the future of FRBR and extensions from it such as the IFLA working group FRANAR and opened up the floor for questions.

Ed Glazier asked how and when it is appropriate to integrate the needs of users into the model. Tillett responded that the model is based on and focused on user tasks. Glazier asked how those tasks are related to the user. He referred to the example of *Gone with the Wind*. A user looks at the movie and the book as the same thing in different physical formats, but in the model the book and the movie are different works. Tillett replied that they are related to the same work and there is a whole family of those works. She continued that in an implementation of FRBR it would become evident that the whole point is to collocate things, to make it easier to see what is related. In a large database, one can collocate at the work level such as *Gone with the Wind*. Then under that the display would show the expressions such as the novel in print form, the critical edition, the translations, etc. as well as showing the related work of the motion picture and its variations. Then one could select one of the expressions and see how it is manifested — CD, video, or some other form. She stated that it isn't of use in a small library where there aren't many manifestations of a particular work. OCLC has analyzed its data and about 80% of the records in WorldCat have only one manifestation, but the other 20% have many manifestations. It is for those 20% that FRBR is really useful because the user can see all the manifestations that are related to each other.

Kate Harcourt asked Tillett to comment on when one could practically get started applying FRBR. Harcourt continued that it is a lot of work for the 80% with single manifestations, but absolutely vital for the other 20%. Tillett responded that one may not have to do it at all for the 80% and one should not assume that FRBR results in new cataloging rules, but it does show what the foundation is for cataloging rules. Tillett continued that she hoped FRBR would be used in training new catalogers so they would understand what it is they are trying to organize and present in a catalog. FRBR is the underlying conceptual model for the universe of bibliographical information.

Attig commented that FRBR should be discussed in conjunction with MARBI. Its implementation will require a combination of cataloging rules to determine what data to put in a record and of system algorithms that will take the data and present the information in a more useful manner. Attig asked Patton

what documents will come out of FRANAR and when. Patton answered he envisions a document similar to the FRBR document which presents, in a visual form, real world entities, FRBR entities, and the names and identifiers that link those to the entities on the other side to the access points that are recorded in authority records. FRANAR also will develop definitions for the entities, a list of attributes for those entities, and a set of tables where it is shown which entities and attributes serve which user tasks. The group will expand the user tasks into tasks related to database management functions inherent in authority control. Tillett added that FRBR focused on the user tasks of finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining. When looking at authorities, one isn't only dealing with end users but with others such as acquisitions people and preservation people. Patton stated that the preliminary draft discussed by the working group in May has been re-done, with much work by Tom Delsey. The new draft is in review and will be reviewed at IFLA in August. Tillett asked if the draft could be sent to those who ask to see it with the caveat that it is very preliminary and very much a draft. Patton stated that the document would go through worldwide review before publication.

781. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Don Chatham reported on ALA publishing issues. He started by discussing the status of the 2002 amendments to AACR2. There are three completely revised chapters. The JSC met all the deadlines for the publication. The publishing and marketing objectives with this revision are more ambitious than in the past. ALA wanted to project a more contemporary and more current publication. The format will be 8 ½" by 11". It will be three hole punched for the US market and 4 hole punched for the international market. The publication will fit any standard binder although ALA will sell a professional binder with cover and tabs. The font will be larger and the spacing consistent throughout. Each chapter will be individually numbered and the base volume will carry the date of publication in the footer of every page. The amendments will be titled "updates" and will be complete pages allowing direct replacement into the base volume. The year of the update will be on the footer of the replacement pages. The base volume paging and update paging will be exactly alike. The text block of the base volume and the interleaved updates will be issued every year. There will be a completely revised index. The model for the new publication is from a Canadian publication, *Canadian Taxation of Charities and Donations*, which is described as a supplemented book in a loose-leaf format where the supplements are invoiced. The choices the purchaser will have are: the text block alone, the binder and tabs, or the text block and the binder together. The publication date will be August 16th at the earliest. The delay is due to typeface issues that were resolved through consensus.

Adam Schiff asked if purchasers would be able to subscribe and receive the updates annually. Chatham responded ALA wasn't sure how to price a model where one price would be paid for the subscription. Schiff suggested that ALA use a standing order model where the price of each update could be determined at the time of publication.

Attig asked about the plans for the index. Chatham elaborated that the index was being prepared by Janet Russell. Russell has an MLS and has worked as a cataloger. She has completed the first stage. The index will be reviewed for viability by catalogers in the Chicago area. The index will also be reviewed and proofed by the national libraries. This is scheduled for June 28. Beacom added the proofing schedule has a turn-around time that is worrisome.

Chatham reiterated that August 16th is the earliest publication date. ALA has overprinted the current edition to cover September to meet universities' needs. The cost of the new editions is not known. ALA is hopeful that the pricing will be \$59 for the text block, \$25 for the binder and tabs, and \$79 for the package. Arakawa commented that the price for the binder seemed high and wondered if anyone would buy it. Chatham responded that was unknown, but that the binder is high quality.

782. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Beacom

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/MLB/2002/1]

Beacom presented highlights from his written report. The JSC met in New Haven in executive session. There were no observers for the session. The meeting concentrated on strategic planning including reorganization of the rules, rule 0.24, and the introductory chapter. As a strategic plan is developed by the JSC, it will be reviewed by the Committee of Principals. The document will be drafted by the chair of the JSC. The Committee of Principals and constituencies will review the draft at the September meeting. The draft will be available on June 30. An initial response by CC:DA will be needed by August 9. CC:DA needs to develop a mechanism, whether formal or informal, to have a quick turn around time for comments. Beacom stated that he was comfortable with informal comments from an online discussion and then he would bring them to the JSC. He asked if that was a reasonable approach; there were no comments to the contrary.

Format Variation Working Group

This group is an outgrowth of the rule 0.24 work done by CC:DA and the position paper from the group that was discussed at MARBI this morning. Yesterday three working group members met with OCLC research and development staff, a VTLS representative, Tillett, and Sally McCallum. That group discussed what was available and how FRBR concepts might be realized in database displays and helped the Format Variation Working Group see how it could explore the options. The Format Variation Working Group has been charged with developing the evaluation criteria for user displays. In September, the UK members of the working group may meet with the Jennifer Bowen and Beacom. The JSC has given the working group guidance to go ahead and work on rule revision proposals for chapter 25. The working group will have a report to the JSC in time for discussion at the September meeting.

Incorporating FRBR terminology in AACR

Pat Riva submitted her report. The JSC has asked that she re-draft the report by June 30 with a handful of substantive changes. One chief change the JSC requested was to use another word besides "document" to replace the non-FRBR meanings of the word "item" in the rules. Currently the JSC is leaning toward using the word "resource" since that word is used in other parts of the rules — the phrase "continuing resource" being an example. Attig asked for clarification about the term that the JSC is trying to determine. Attig referred to Tom Delsey's data model where Delsey made a distinction between "document," which was a concrete real world entity, and "item," which is a cataloger construct of what the cataloger decides to catalog. Attig was unclear which of those two things the JSC is trying to name. Beacom answered that it is the real world entity. This terminology issue will be faced by CC:DA in reviewing the draft; and even though initial comments are due August 9, CC:DA will be able to make additional comments before the JSC meeting in the spring. Beacom stated he had discussed the mechanism for CC:DA comments with Lindlan; the mechanism could be a lead person from CC:DA plus one or 2 others who would create something for all the members to review. Lindlan stated she had already asked Arakawa to be the lead person on this. Lindlan sent around a sign-up sheet for others who might be interested. Beacom suggested the group focus on the introduction and the glossary. Lindlan gave the group a deadline of August 1 to get something to CC:DA and then CC:DA would have a week to discuss and comment. Attig suggested there be different deadlines for all the actions CC:DA must take. If the deadlines are staggered, it will be easier to meet them. Beacom reiterated that the JSC is asking for initial responses only. Beacom speculated that there will more work involved beyond the initial comments and that CC:DA may want to form a task force at Midwinter.

Elizabeth Mangan asked Beacom if the JSC had decided to use the phrase "multipart monograph" and he replied it had for now. She commented that to many catalogers "monograph" means "book." Beacom

responded that “monograph” does not imply “book.” Mangan restated that to many catalogers it does and she suggested using the phrase “multipart resource” instead.

Appendix of Major Changes

Although the JSC did not agree that the appendix “as is” should be a part of the rules, it did agree the basic guidelines should be included in the introductory chapter. BL is adding the basic guidelines to the draft of the introductory chapter. The JSC representatives encourage CC:DA to consider making the appendix, beyond the basic guidelines, a separate publication or training document. The JSC representatives all felt it was excellent work, but there were different philosophies about whether this level of instruction belonged in the rules. The task force and all the people who worked on the appendix deserve many thanks. The other constituencies will send formal responses to the concept of the appendix so it can be finalized at the September meeting of the JSC.

Chapter 21 revision proposal (rule of three)

The constituents agreed that work on the 4/JSC/ACOC/1 proposal would best be done as part of a larger revision of chapter 21. Such a revision would encompass not only the 4/JSC/ACOC/1 proposal, but also follow-up on other recommendations from Tom Delsey’s logical analysis of AACR and from Pat Riva’s report where she suggested an alternative ordering of the chapter. The JSC has asked Beacom to draft terms of reference (i.e., a charge) for someone or some group to revise chapter 21. The person or group has not been determined, though an individual might bring a level of coherency to the chapter that a group might not.

Authority records

This discussion covered the 4/JSC/LC/50 series and an authorities discussion paper. The JSC has asked LC to develop a conceptual draft for a third part of the AACR to address authority records and their construction. The draft is to be available for review by the JSC and the Committee of Principals at the September meeting. There is no action required from CC:DA at this time.

Specific characteristics of electronic resources

There is no consensus among the constituencies on recommendation 2. CC:DA needs to continue waiting for formal responses before further action on 4JSC/ALA/36/Rev. CC:DA does need to respond to the CCC proposals on using conventional terminology for area 5 in chapters 6 and 7 which are forthcoming. Beacom stated that there will be a tight turn-around time and there may be only a need for initial comments. The proposals will be issued by the end of June. Nancy Lorimer stated since a response would need to be made by August 9, that would give the affected communities only a week and a half to respond and that is an unreasonable expectation. Beacom summarized that the consultation process will take longer than the time allowed before the September meeting so there will not be a response made before the September meeting.

Beacom suggested CC:DA may want to consider that another approach may be needed. Not only was CC:DA unable to reach a consensus, but the other constituents are also divided. The ability to move forward might require the issues be thought about in a different way. Beacom stated that Chohey’s e-mail on this issue has made Beacom think it might be possible to move forward. The e-mail was well received by the JSC and it might provide an alternative model on how to deal with the characteristics of electronic resources and their relationship to the other chapters.

Attig stated that waiting for a decision on this means the fate of area 3 in chapter 9 is awaiting a solution. Attig asked if there really was no way to move forward with elimination of area 3. Beacom responded that everyone agrees that area 3 should be eliminated, but they do not agree where that information should go. This stymies the ability to move forward.

Chopey asked if other JSC members might go forward with other parts of the CC:DA recommendations in the way that CCC is going forward with conventional terminology. Beacom responded that none of the other parts are going forward. Beacom then corrected part of his written report where he stated that all the members agreed with recommendation 1; BL does not agree and would like to postpone action on that.

Introductory chapter

BL will produce a draft of an introductory chapter by the end of this month and CC:DA will need to provide an initial response by August 9. Tillett interjected that BL will be meeting an August 9 deadline for the draft. Beacom will verify the deadlines. The constituencies will probably respond after the September meeting. Beacom feels CC:DA should take time to review the draft due to its importance.

GMDs and the prototype of reorganized Part 1

There was an interesting discussion of the GMD. The representatives of the JSC seem to see the GMD differently than other members of the cataloging community. The action item from the discussion is that the chair of the JSC will draft a preliminary paper on the GMD, the class of materials, and the organization of part 1. After the September meeting, the JSC could have a document to share with the constituencies. No action is required of CC:DA at this time.

Internationalization

The JSC discussed internationalization issues both broadly and narrowly. Regarding the narrow issue of the Malay names and other issues like it, the JSC wants AACR to follow international standards and local expertise on usage. As a follow-up, ACOC will compare the AACR rules for Malay names with the IFLA *Names of Persons* and work with such interested groups as the Malay Committee on Cataloging to draft rule revision proposals for Malay names. ACOC may expand this work to include other names such as Indonesian names.

Next JSC meeting

The next JSC meeting will be in York, England, September 9-11, 2002. The JSC will meet with publishers on September 12, 2002.

4JSC/CCC/5: Dates or names to heads of governments

CCC proposed adding dates or names to heads of governments in rule 24.20C1 for Commonwealth heads of governments such as prime ministers. The LC response stated that it shouldn't be limited to Commonwealth states. Beacom suggested that CC:DA respond to this by August 9. Attig agreed with the LC response and suggested supporting the LC response. Arakawa voiced concern about whether adoption of the LC response would require additional research for heads of small jurisdictions. Beacom replied that it wouldn't require extra work unless the name was being established. Attig asked if it had been considered to make the addition optional. Bob Ewald stated making the rule optional seemed reasonable and the proposal needs constituent feedback. LC's response tried to explain in the covering rationale that these headings can only be used as main entry for a document from the incumbent individual and this a very, very small group of documents. Rebecca Culbertson stated she would take the issue to GODORT and report back to CC:DA on Monday.

Chopey moved to adjourn the meeting. Dorothy McGarry seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting adjourned.

***Monday, June 17, 2002 – 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Renaissance Hotel, Z Atlanta Ballroom***

783. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Lindlan welcomed the committee and audience and passed around the roster and visitor attendance sheet.

784. Proposed revision re: capitalization of Earth in AACR2: Mangan

[CC:DA/MAGERT/2002/1]

Mangan began by stating this proposal was requested by the JSC. During the revision of chapter 3, it was brought up that “Earth,” when referring to the planet, was not capitalized throughout AACR. Twelve occurrences of the word “earth” are found in AACR. Six occurrences are presented correctly, and six occurrences are submitted for revision. Mangan went through the six revisions in the proposal. McGarry moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Attig and approved 8-0.

785. Proposed revision re: punctuation in recording dimensions of cartographic materials: Mangan

[CC:DA/MAGERT/2002/2]

Mangan commented that this proposal dealt with complex physical descriptions. The multiple dimension measurements are easier to read if separated by commas. This is done for multiple dimensions although it is not expressly stated in the rules. Mangan remarked that most of proposed revisions of the examples just add commas, but there was one substantive change. When the number of sheets is included in the extent of the item, it has been the practice of the cartographic cataloging community not to repeat the word “on” in the dimensions. McGarry moved to approve the proposal. Attig seconded the motion.

Chohey asked Attig if the proposal would effect the ISO Harmonization proposal. Attig answered that any punctuation proposals would affect the proposal. Attig asked that Beacom include that information when he forwards the proposal to the JSC. The motion was approved 8-0.

786. Proposal to change rule 7.0B, Sources of information: McCafferty

[CC:DA/MRC/2001/1/Rev]

McCafferty presented a revised version of a proposal originally presented at ALA Midwinter 2002. The proposal originated with the PCC Core Bibliographic Record for Audiovisual Task Group and addresses the ambiguity of rule 7.0B1. Rule 7.0B1 as currently written does not prescribe a single chief source of information for motion pictures and videorecordings. The cataloger may choose the item itself or its container and container label, if the container is an integral part of the piece. Attig asked that everyone look at the proposed new rule at 7.7B2. Attig moved to approve MRC/2001 revision as amended by the comments. Fletcher seconded the motion.

Beacom stated that there were a number of concerns brought up at the last meeting that were not addressed in the revised proposal. He did not understand why the list of things that were outside the chief source of information (p. 3) was included. Beacom commented that is not done for books, and it appeared not to be an exhaustive list. He found this section confusing and suggested it be removed. He

felt other communities would agree. Lindlan agreed. Beacom added that if the glossary items were added, the definition for titles would need to be changed.

Jane Johnson remarked that she thought the things listed as outside the chief source were needed because these cause confusion and are necessary to clear up the ambiguity. Closed captions can be running at the same time as a main title. Intertitles can follow directly after the main title and can be very confusing. She added that often with a newsreel the series title also appears with the intertitle.

Eden asked if this was getting into cataloger's judgment. He stated that the British community has problems with getting that specific. He added that this type of information might be more appropriate in a manual instead of in AACR.

Johnson stated that if the section outlining the parts to be considered outside the chief source of information was removed, she would like the second part to remain. The second part lists a preferred order for what source to use if the title is not available from the chief source. Beacom thought that would be acceptable.

Arakawa commented that the OLAC list had concerns about the terms "leader," "end-titles," "video slates," and some other terms. He asked if glossary terms were needed for these. He added that these terms were in the rules and not just in examples, so they were appropriate for the glossary. Lorimer remarked all the terms could be found in a film reference book.

Lindlan asked if CC:DA was concerned about not having all the terms in the glossary. Johnson advised against taking the terms out of the proposal. She would like to see them added to the glossary. Beacom stated that usually terms were added to the glossary only if they were used in a different way, or could not be found in a regular dictionary. Schiff suggested that the document could be approved and when Beacom presented it to the JSC the terms could be supplied for the glossary if needed. Tillett stated that is not the way the JSC works; constituent bodies make suggestions to the JSC, not the other way around. Schiff suggested that the task force could add the terms for the glossary, and then the JSC could take them out if it thought they were not necessary. Beacom stated that if a body feels that a definition is necessary, they should put it in. Attig stated he wasn't clear on the standard. He felt the only term being used in a special way was "main title." Chohey stated the terms are being used in a special way. He cited "voice-over" as an example. Attig answered that the terms are not being used in a specific way, they are being used the way the film community thinks of them. Lindlan asked why filmstrip was in the glossary.

McGarry asked if the proposal was going to be amended by removing the chief source paragraph and the glossary definitions. Lorimer stated that "main title" was being used differently than it would be by other communities. She used the example of parts of music. Beacom replied that the parenthetical qualifier could be kept. It could be written as "Main titles (motion picture, videorecordings)." Attig stated that the special terms are included in special dictionaries. The context in which the terms are used gives as much information as the definition does. Fletcher stated the glossary terms are useful and other terms should be added.

Attig stated that concerning 7.0B2, there is a provision in chapter 9 that essentially says the same thing. He stated it is a fact that every item cannot be viewed. He questioned whether the rules should say what to do if the rules are not followed. Tillett commented that adding this step to the rules is unusual. She thought one would adjust the prescribed sources of information instead of adding this note. She also wondered why adding the additional prescribed sources should apply. She added that if the task force had strong justification for this, it would be helpful to explain the justification to the JSC.

Eden noted that audiovisual materials and electronic resources are often not viewed, even though that is not stated in the description. Johnson commented that with audiovisual materials one may wind up with a very different description if they aren't viewed. Matthew Wise stated that there are many cases in which an item is not viewed. Attig commented a source of title note would indicate if an item hadn't been

viewed. Glazier added that brackets would also indicate if an item hadn't been viewed. Johnson stated the rule proposal says not to use brackets when the item isn't viewed. She added that the intent is not to have brackets everywhere. Beacom stated that looking at the prescribed sources of information, most parts of the description can come from any source. The proposal opens up the chief source. Schiff stated that if the title can be taken from almost any source, then one cannot know if the item has been viewed or not. Beacom answered that the source of title note should take care of that. Attig stated that if the information is not available from the chief source, a substitute chief source is used which does not require that information be bracketed. Beacom answered that the proposal does not allow for a substitute chief source.

Johnson stated that if the part about what is not the chief source is removed then the rule should just stay as it is written, but the rule as it stands is not working. She added there would be too many cases of bracketed titles when the title frame was not viewed. Beacom stated he did not understand why people do not want to bracket the title if the item is not viewed.

Attig summarized his perception of where things stood in the discussion. He would support a proposal that included the revision to the first paragraph of 7.0B1, but not the paragraph beginning "Consider the following." He did not support 7.0B2. Attig asked CC:DA if it wanted a redefined motion or if it wanted the committee to take the proposal back and resubmit. Johnson replied they would like to take back the proposal and rework it. Attig withdrew his motion.

Beacom suggested that the task force reach out to the community and talk to CC:DA members as the proposal is revamped.

787. Report of the Task Force on Major and Minor Changes: Whitacre

Whitacre reported there was overwhelming support on the task force to develop a separate publication incorporating ideas from the appendix. The task force proposed this new charge:

The Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes is charged with re-drafting the appendix document to prepare a stand-alone document for publication. This document will provide catalogers with guidance in determining when to create a new record by defining what constitutes a major change. The document may also incorporate minor changes to illustrate when a new record is not required. The task force will investigate and recommend potential methods to publish and maintain the document, including both Web and print. A final draft of this document and report shall be submitted to the Chair of CC:DA by November 15, 2002.

Tillett stated this document would be hard to maintain. She suggested the task force work with LC on this and maybe this could be published as an LCRI. Attig supported that idea. Mangan wondered if this would be broad enough for the international community. Whitacre replied it might be premature to worry about who would publish it. Lorimer suggested the communities be given time to review the document.

Attig moved to amend the charge of the task force to its suggestion; Harcourt seconded the motion.

Chopey suggested the approach of the task force should focus on when to create a new record. Whitacre added the title could be "Guidelines on when to create a new record."

Wise suggested that CC:DA might want to discharge the original task force and form a new one. Schiff stated that past experience has shown it is easier to change the charge of the original task force.

The motion passed.

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

Jizba reported that 22 people participated in the informal discussion on Saturday morning. The task force is staying with the proposal that came from within MLA and is proposing to merge expression and manifestation and carrier and to use conventional terminology. There is a strong push for conventional terminology. Some terms being proposed are: 1 sound file (MP3), 1 CD, 1 data tape, 1 videofile, 1 image file (b&w). The task force also is proposing extending the number of files into subfield b.

Jizba stated catalogers will need explicit instructions for area 5. She suggested the task force or LC develop guidelines. This is the first time catalogers have had to combine content and carrier. Jizba suggested more cross-references between chapters. She added that most non-print catalogers are not accustomed to consulting chapters other than the one for the type of media they are cataloging.

Mangan stated the cartographic community is not necessarily optimistic but the community will work with Anglo-American Cataloguing Committee for Cartographic Materials (AACCCM) to work with the BL representative on the JSC and explain why area 5 is needed.

Chopey agreed with the terms "sound file" and "video file," but not the term "image file." He mentioned there had been a suggestion earlier to use the term "digital image." Chopey asked Beacom what would happen if a proposal were put forth for chapter 8 that added "digital image" in a physical description. This would contradict chapter 9 that states there can't be a physical description for a remote access resource. He wondered how the British Library would react to the proposal. Beacom answered he didn't know how other JSC members would react. He thought ALA should wait to see what CCC proposes for chapters 6 and 7 and that might lead to a way to handle these situations. It may be that there is a need to think about how to do a physical description for a remote access item; the initial problem may need to be re-visited.

Lorimer stated that the CCC proposal is only looking at conventional terminology, not SMDs. "Digital file" is an SMD, not conventional terminology. Beacom answered that in order to deal with conventional terminology CC:DA also might have to deal with SMDs. Lorimer answered conventional terminology is being introduced into chapters 6 and 7 and chapter 9 is not being addressed. Chopey stated there is not a rule that tells one how to apply chapter 9 in conjunction with other chapters. He thought it would be fine for a chapter to read "describe a remote access sound file as 1 sound file (MP3)." One should start in the chapter for the type of material being cataloged. Mangan commented that cartographic materials catalogers have always been able to include content and carrier in cases such as "1 map on 4 sheets" or "5 maps on CD-ROM." They do not think that they are restricted by chapter 9. Schiff stated that the issue goes beyond remote access, for example "1 sound file on 1 CD-ROM." Lorimer answered that unless the CCC proposal goes beyond conventional terminology, the community will not be addressing these issues.

789. Report from the Task Force on Consistency across Part 1 of AACR: Attig

[CC:DA/TF/Consistency/3]

Attig reported that the task force had begun working on area 2. The task force currently has a working document on areas 2 and 3 and will begin working on areas 5 and 6. The task force is confident it can present at least two areas at ALA Midwinter, and it hopes to have all four areas completed.

The task force will develop three documents for each area. The first document will be a "cut and paste" of all the changes. The second document will be a summary of the issues. The third document will be a report consisting of the revision proposal and a summary of what was found to lead to changes and was found not to lead to changes.

Attig reported that the numbering system might need to be redone to allow for consistency across all the chapters in Part 1. This would make relationships clearer. The task force wanted to make this

recommendation to CC:DA and then have it forwarded to the JSC. The task force would like to have approval before it starts renumbering. Attig asked for the reaction of the Committee.

Weiss stated it was a great idea; it would help people to think about the whole document and see how everything relates. Glazier was concerned about numbers that wouldn't have corresponding numbers in other chapters. He asked if this would lead to a lot of blank numbering. Attig responded that renumbering would be a challenge. Bruce Johnson agreed with Weiss and commented that catalogers need to start applying all the necessary rules when dealing with more than one chapter. He added that it would not be an easy task, and he didn't even know if it was possible.

Chopey commented that instead of empty spaces for numbering a chapter might jump from 14 to 22. Empty space would not be required. Mary Woodley suggested if there was not a specific rule it could just say refer to chapter 1. Lorimer commented that skipping a rule in a chapter implies that it is not needed.

Attig moved that a new numbering system be developed for AACR. Chopey seconded the motion.

Fletcher asked if this could be left to the task force to determine. Attig answered the task force didn't want to do that until the JSC supported the idea. Beacom suggested CC:DA give the JSC a heads-up about this issue. Attig stated that the task force would rather be stopped at the beginning before getting started if this is something the JSC does not want. Beacom asked if not having a decision on this would keep the task force from moving on. Attig answered that he saw this as a separate issue. Beacom agreed. Attig asked if this should be done informally and should the motion be withdrawn. Beacom thought it would be better handled informally.

Attig withdrew the motion.

Chopey stated that he didn't think the task force could come up with a numbering system until it had done more work. Attig commented that the hardest part is identifying what rules need to be investigated.

Attig stated there is also the issue of punctuation. Except for area 3 there is disagreement about how much inconsistency there is. The punctuation will all be based on ISBD and the task force will continue discussion on the list.

790. Report from ALCTS 2003 Preconference Planning Committee: Harcourt

Harcourt outlined progress to date. The preconference "Knowledge Without Boundaries" will be held June 19-20, 2003 at the ALA annual conference in Toronto. Some of the confirmed speakers are: John Byrum, Barbara Tillett, Beacher Wiggins, Michael Chopey and Tom Delsey. The international speakers have not been confirmed. The final plans will be ironed out in Philadelphia. Harcourt asked that this be an agenda item for the Midwinter 2003 meeting.

791. Report from the Joint CC:DA/MARBI 2003 Program Planning Committee: Hayes

Susan Hayes reported the committee met on Sunday morning. The first task was to get the program approved. The topic is "FRBR is a concept whose time has come." CCS gave enthusiastic approval. The committee asked for a relatively conflict free time, i.e., Sunday morning. The committee is looking for a catchy title; e-mail suggestions should be sent to Susan Hayes. Hayes stated that the next task is to procure speakers. This task has been delegated to Beacom. Tillett and Patton have already agreed to be presenters. Due to the fact that there is quite a bit of research being done on the FRBR principles, Beacom was confident that he would be able to find speakers. Beacom also suggested a preconference for 2004.

792. Report from CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

Attig reported that he did everything he said he would do at Midwinter. He suggested he add a page for FRBR and CC:DA agreed that was a good idea.

793. Dates or names to heads of governments: Culbertson

Continuing the discussion on Saturday concerning the JSC proposal for Rule 24.20C1, Culbertson reported that GODORT supported the idea to make LC's proposal optional.

Attig moved that CC:DA support the proposal, but ask that it be made optional. McGarry seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

794. Revisions to "How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA": Attig

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2002/1/Rev]

Attig reported that he made the changes that individuals had submitted and will incorporate some editorial changes that were submitted before the meeting.

Lindlan stated she wanted to add a statement about the role of the Webmaster. She suggested adding the Webmaster may contact the person proposing the rule change in case clarification is needed and that the person proposing the rule change could also review the document if any changes were made for clarification.

Mangan questioned the wording on "within the U.S." She stated that LC changes are within the U.S. Tillett suggested that it could say "other than LC." Attig answered he would play with the wording. Beacom suggested that all it really had to say was "other than LC." Glazier suggested eliminating the sentence because all it really does is state the make-up of the committee. Arakawa added that if the sentence was removed, it would be easier if the make-up of the committee was ever changed.

Lindlan stated that the document has to go to CCS. Attig moved that the document be approved with changes and forwarded to CCS. Harcourt seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

795. Revisions to CC:DA Procedures: Schiff

[CC:DA/Schiff/2001/2/Rev]

Schiff reported he had made revisions to the document based on the comments from Midwinter. Schiff went through the changes.

I. Membership

B. The phrase "The intern(s) shall serve as recording secretary/secretaries for the Committee." was added.

V. Agenda

The word "agenda" was made lowercase in part A.

Lindlan asked whether votes taken between meetings should be part of the agenda or a consent agenda in order to be reaffirmed. She suggested adding consent agenda to A.3.

Mangan stated that in B it says agenda items must be presented at least one month before a meeting. The rule change proposal document says six weeks in advance. Schiff answered that it could go back to six weeks in this document. Attig commented that it should be the same in both documents. It doesn't matter to him if it is six weeks or one month. The Committee decided that Schiff would leave B at one month and Attig would change the rule change proposal document to one month.

Mangan suggested that there should be a time frame for distribution of the preliminary agenda stated in C. She stated getting the agenda one week before the meeting is not soon enough. Attig stated that one of the differences between the preliminary agenda and the real agenda is that the preliminary agenda has no hyperlinks to the related documents. Attig suggested the phrase be changed to “or made available to members two weeks in advance of the meetings.” Schiff answered that he would also add the agenda may be revised.

VI. Task forces of CC:DA

Lindlan stated that she was not following the proposal in A that reads “In consultation with the full Committee, the Chair shall write a charge for each task force and shall set the time period and deadlines for each task force to conduct its work.” She suggested that since this is not being followed, the proposal should be changed. Schiff answered that CC:DA should be consulted before a charge is written. Glazier stated that it doesn’t say that CC:DA votes on establishing a task force. Lindlan answered that it says the Chair may appoint a task force. Attig commented that the distinction is between setting up a task force and who appoints the members. Schiff stated that he thinks the current practice can continue and that it not be specified here.

VII. Discussions

Schiff rewrote section E. There were no comments by the Committee on the changes.

IX. Documentation

Schiff pointed out an error in the proposal. At Midwinter the Committee decided to change secretary/secretaries to interns. He will make that change.

X. Communication of Decisions, etc.

Schiff reported he had rephrased C which discusses how the JSC representative works with the Chair of CC:DA.

XI. Parliamentary Authority

Schiff pointed out an error in the proposal. He did not double underscore Sturgis’ *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*. There were no other comments on the rest of the document.

Attig moved to approve the document as amended and forward it to CCS. Chohey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

796. Report from the MARBI Representative: Watson

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2002/2]

Mark Watson distributed the CC:DA MARBI representative’s report. At the last meeting MARBI dealt with eight proposals and one discussion paper. All the proposals were discussed and decisions made.

797. Review of ISBD Review Group task force document on the use of multiple ISBDs: McGarry

McGarry moved that CC:DA form a task force to review issues related to the use of multiple ISBDs. Arakawa seconded the motion. The charge of the task force should be to look at the use of multiple ISBDs in area 4 and 5 for electronic maps and electronic serials.

There will be a two-month worldwide review period. This is not enough time for the task force to respond if CC:DA does not form the task force in advance of the review period. Attig stated it is important that CC:DA participate and the task force should be formed in advance.

Patton stated the general issue is that within the families of ISBD there has never been anything like 0.24 and 0.25 in AACR for using multiple chapters when needed. This is part of what this set of provisions is designed to do. It addresses combining ISBDs or parts of area 3 and 5, and in what order to do it: content followed by carrier, followed by form of issuance. He added that part of this proposal is catch up.

The motion was seconded and approved. Lindlan passed around a sign-up sheet for the task force.

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

Paul Weiss, the ALA representative to NISO thanked CC:DA for being so responsive. He also thanked Attig for maintaining the best ALA Web site.

Lindlan reported she is still unclear about the role of CC:DA concerning the LC Bibliographic Control Action Plan. She will pursue this and report back.

Lindlan stated that there would be two new members on the Committee, Matthew Wise and Jay Weitz. Lindlan will continue as Chair.

Attig moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Eden and passed.

Joint meeting with MARBI on FRBR and MARC 21

Lindlan began the joint CC:DA and MARBI meeting by passing around an attendance sheet. She introduced William Jones, the MARBI chair. Lindlan welcomed everyone to the joint meeting and announced that Sally McCallum, Tom Delsey and Glenn Patton would speak on different aspects of Fundamental Requirements of Bibliographic Records.

Sally McCallum

McCallum began her presentation by stating that MARBI was looking at FRBR from the MARC point of view. Tom Delsey had done a study for NDMSO where he took all the data elements in MARC and mapped them to FRBR for attributes. She stated that MARC has grown by need and so far AACR has been the basis of MARC. FRBR can be used as a guide for changes in MARC because it logically groups data elements. McCallum added that a piece of Delsey's study was to look at FRBR displays. The paper shows how retrieval sets can be "FRBRized." There are plans to keep the document up-to-date as MARC changes.

McCallum then spoke about downloadable transformation programs. LC wants people to experiment with this and to make FRBR distinctions. McCallum asked if this should be done on the MARC discussion list, the CC:DA list, or if there should be a FRBR list.

McCallum went on to speak about the goals of FRBR. There are different types of goals: end user goals and technical processing and staff goals. She then spoke about the history of FRBR. RLG has had record clustering for 10 years. WLN had a quadraplanar structure. OCLC has had matching and merging experience, which is what FRBR is doing. Individual libraries have had experience with local item records. The National Library of Canada has had experience with bringing things together at the work level.

An essential question is whether there will be cataloging consistency in the future. McCallum stated that costs, type of materials, budgets, and staff all affect what the bibliographic record looks like. MARC needs to have independence from AACR. It should be broader than AACR because it is used around the world. MARC needs to be able to support various attempts to "FRBRize." McCallum concluded by saying that there is a large MARC and AACR investment and, though FRBR is very young, it has huge implications for cataloging.

Glenn Patton

Patton stated there were four areas he wanted to talk about relative to cataloging rules and practice and FRBR. He added that the FRBR model is revolutionary.

The first area that Patton discussed was the importance of relationships in FRBR. Traditional card catalogs did some of the things that FRBR does. In card catalogs relationships were very important: earlier and later titles for serials; earlier and later names; earlier and later editions. This was done in a variety of ways from linking notes to linking fields (7XX fields). He is not sure that these relationships have been made an integral part of the online catalog.

For example, at OCLC they tried to bring together all the Harry Potter works. This was fairly easy to do for those works because the works were recently and consistently cataloged. When OCLC tried to bring together all the Hamlet works, it was much more difficult. All the necessary data isn't there and what data is there isn't consistent. It is also hard to bring together works where uniform titles aren't used, such as revised editions. Patton added that many catalogers do not understand what uniform titles are and when they should be used. The report of the Norwegian/Finnish project "Data mining MARC to find FRBR" brings these issues to light.

The second area Patton discussed was the importance of the relationship between roles of corporate bodies and persons. AACR allows some indication of roles for corporate bodies and persons, but most catalogers follow Library of Congress practice and only use role characteristics selectively, e.g., illustrators of children's materials. This role information may be crucial for establishing these relationships. The Norwegian/Finnish project report brings these issues out as well.

The third area Patton mentioned was the attribute 'form of expression.' It is closely related to discussions about the GMD and its role. The GMD is an unprincipled mixture of content and carrier.

The fourth area Patton spoke about was the process of creating a cataloging record — where the manifestation and the work are cataloged at the same time. The process requires creation of the bibliographic description and then the addition of the access points. Before the adoption of AACR2, the process was the reverse. This change of process was a significant change. For cataloging in a shared database, the decision about whether something is a new manifestation may require that one know the work and expression first. This may require the cataloging community to think about the organization of the process and the rules yet again.

Tom Delsey

[<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc-functional-analysis/home.html>]

Tom Delsey began by asking why undertake this exercise in semantics. On one level it is an attempt to understand the data in format. Because the MARC format has evolved over the last 30 years, what was understood 30 years ago might not be understood in the same way today. The format evolved around the print catalog. The objects described now are much more complicated than they were 30 years ago. Libraries have moved from a card environment to the online use of the bibliographic record. Catalog databases have turned into integrated library systems. Interoperability is a big issue. Catalogs are not interfacing with publishers, archivists, etc., but they need to be able to do so.

Delsey asked if we still understand the data in the bibliographic records. The community is looking to import and export data such as author biographies, book covers, etc. There is interest in being able to import and export MARC records. Delsey wondered if the current format could support this traffic.

Another reason to undergo the exercise is to look at the ability to migrate to new data structures such as a new database or a new conceptual structure like FRBR. He added that it is not a pre-judged end result, and the exercise still has value.

Delsey then went through some of the conclusions drawn from the mapping. There was a substantial degree of correspondence between MARC data elements and FRBR that was not surprising since bibliographic records were used to develop FRBR. They looked at information from MARC and then tried to establish a model. Of the 23,000 data elements in the MARC format, not including tags or directory elements, 12,000 mapped directly into FRBR. There were 200 data elements that could be mapped from MARC to FRBR if the FRBR attributes were extended. Another 150 data elements acted as wildcards that are too loosely defined to map with algorithms, although a person could probably map them. In total, about two thirds of the data elements mapped to FRBR and this is a substantial degree of correspondence.

There were some significant anomalies that are included in the report. Some subfields didn't map because the subfields are defined by the content. Some subfields have a bunch of information jammed into them. With some of the data it was clear that the data was relevant to an attribute, but it was not clear how it was relevant. There is another group of data elements that doesn't seem to be controlled. There is still another third of the data that is outside the scope of FRBR and new entities related to work had to be added, but the entities don't show up in FRBR. The list could go on endlessly about from where works evolve.

Delsey concluded that:

- It is clear that the bibliographic entities in AACR have a significant impact on the structure of MARC. The class of materials has impacted the 006 and 008. This creates problems since that is used to structure the fixed fields.
- Headings in the MARC record make AACR embedded in the MARC structure. This won't transfer across communities.
- Formal structures in AACR have taken precedence over a structural foundation. Fields designed to reflect display of data do not do a good job reflecting relationships. This impacts how data can transfer to new data structures and across communities.

Discussion

Lindlan opened the meeting for comments.

Attig added to Patton's list of issues the concept of authority records. A lot of the relationships dealt with in cataloging are shown in the authority records as cross-references rather than as added entries in bibliographic records. He would like to see the mapping of the model extended to authority records.

John Espley stated that VTLS has an implementation of FRBR. More clear-cut rules are needed for determining things, such as when is something a new expression. Is a new edition a new expression? For a literary work, is the first American edition a new expression? The way he interprets the FRBR guidelines it is not. He gave another example of where he would like more clear-cut rules. The book, *The English Patient*, and the movie, *The English Patient*, are two different works. But is the screenplay for *The English Patient* a new work or is it an expression of the movie? When working with serials does a title change mean it is a new work? Or do different regions mean it is a new work?

Attig asked Espley whether the VTLS FRBR implementation uses algorithms or if it is a mock-up of the display. Espley answered that it is a little of both: some things are manually manipulated, but they can also take a MARC record and it can be "FRBRized" by the computer.

Lindlan stated there is a serials task force looking at some of the serials and FRBR issues that Espley brought up. Everett Allgood is chairing a CONSER task force on what is a serial work.

Delsey stated that work and expression are defined in relative terms. In the cataloging culture we tend to think we know what a work is unless it is a literary work. There must be some delving to know what the work really is. Some things become two works because two authors flip their names on titles pages. Delsey added that FRBR makes a distinction between version designations. For example, if something is a 2nd draft that sometimes gets carried over as an edition statement and sometimes it doesn't. It will never be a simple matter that can be accomplished by machine algorithms. By adding a language edition to a uniform title, all the French translations are brought together, but the translations are not all the same and ultimately a person must examine the text. None of this is really mechanical.

Attig stated he found that useful but disturbing. It is moving from the more concrete to the more abstract. He added that it will require a lot of research to establish relationships correctly.

Patton stated the Italians within the IFLA committee have found deficiencies in the expression level definition. The Italians have written a paper that concludes there are too many things squeezed together at the expression level. For example, they do not consider different performances of a work by the same performers to be the same expression. They propose as many as 3 or 4 levels of expression. Patton will send the citation for the paper to the CC:DA and MARC lists.

Glazier asked how to cope with the millions of legacy records that were developed without these relationships noted. Delsey answered that many of those legacy records reflect attributes that may not be

in a heading, but may be in a note. FRBR does not say everything has to be there. There are only about 10 elements that are identified as being necessary for identifying different expressions. The form of expression is largely reflected in type of record or the 008. If expression is to be used as an organizing tool, then the form of the expression is very important. Delsey added that language might be in the fixed fields or in the uniform title field. FRBR brings back some of the important functionalities of card and book catalogs. The cataloging community will need to look at the most important attributes for organizing expressions, including what the order of precedence will be during the organizing process.

Mitch Turitz commented that for serials, uniform titles are used in the opposite way than the way they are used in monographic cataloging. Uniform titles are used to distinguish between separate titles, not to bring titles together. In serials cataloging, sometimes even if the title doesn't change a new record might be created because a qualifier used in the uniform title has changed. Allgood answered that the CONSER task force will be considering this in its investigation.

Delsey stated that there are elements in uniform titles that pertain to the work, the expression, and, sometimes, the manifestation. In context, a uniform title is a heading for the work. Serials aren't the only things that use uniform titles to distinguish two separate works. Delsey commented that this is not an "either/or" situation and all those problems will have to be investigated.

Weiss stated that other uses of the catalog should be considered. FRBR might provide benefits to other areas such as interlibrary loan, collection development, acquisitions, or preservation. If a patron is requesting a copy of a book, the request might get attached to a rare book record when the patron really just wants any copy of the book.

Jane Johnson made a comment on uniform titles. FRBR may address system issues around sub-arranging hit lists by main entry.

Delsey commented that in the analysis of the AACR rules, deficiencies were discovered in how AACR handles a work. Those deficiencies go back to how it handles relationships. There need to be better ways to draw out the relationships between the manifestation and the work. This model is moving from prescriptive grammar to descriptive grammar. Beacom stated that the Format Variation Working Group is looking at using citation headings that would be like a uniform title or an author/title entry.

Beacom stated that the work and expression concepts are relative terms. The different cataloging communities can use the FRBR model as a conceptual model. The communities can attempt to apply these concepts that would lead to a common understanding of what these terms mean. He stated that he needed to read the model several times before he was able to look at things through a FRBR lens. Our OPAC displays are comparable to the displays of book catalogs.

Lindlan ended the meeting by informing the group that a joint CC:DA/MARBI program on FRBR is being planned for ALA Toronto next year.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheri Folkner, CC:DA Intern
Lynnette Fields, CC:DA Intern