

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
2003 Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pa.
January 25 and 27, 2003**

Members present:

Kristin Lindlan, Chair
Steven R. Arakawa
John C. Attig
Michael A. Chohey
Peter Vincent Fletcher
Kate Harcourt
Dorothy McGarry
Jay Weitz
Matthew Wise

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:

Louise Sevold, ALCTS/AS
Shi Deng, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Kay E. Lowell, ALCTS/CCS/CCM
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Paul Weiss for Katha Massey, ALCTS/MRC
Mary Woodley, ALCTS/NRMC
David Van Hoy, ALCTS/SS
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

Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/RUSA
Cynthia Whitacre, ALA/SRRT

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, AALL
Sherman Clarke for Anne E. Champagne, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Gertrude Koh (represented by Shi Deng on 1/27), CLA
Robert McDonald, MedLA
Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA
Ann Caldwell, PCC
Cynthia Whitacre for 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 & Technical Services
 - ANSI/NISO** = American National Standards Institute/National Information Standards Organization
 - BL** = British Library
 - CC:AAM** = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
 - CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 - CCC** = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service
 - CILIP** = Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals
 - 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 and Institutions
IRRT = ALA/International Relations Round Table
ISBD(CM) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Cartographic Materials*
ISBD(CR) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and other Continuing Resources*
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*
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
ISSN = International Standard Serials Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
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
SCCTP = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
UBCIM = Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme (IFLA)
VRA = Visual Resources Association

Saturday, January 25, 2003 — 2:00–5:30 p.m.
Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel — Philadelphia Ballroom

799. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Kristin Lindlan opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

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

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

801. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[CC:DA/A/47]

It was moved the revised agenda be adopted; the motion was seconded by Michael Chohey and it was unanimously approved.

802. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2002 Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA, June 15 and 17, 2002: Chair

[\[CC:DA/M/774-798\]](#)

After corrections received were noted, John Attig moved that the minutes as amended be approved. Dorothy McGarry seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

803. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, June 2002–January 2003: [CC:DA/Chair/2002-2003/2]

Lindlan requested the Committee reaffirm its votes taken since the 2002 annual meeting. The Chair's written report summarized these actions. Jay Weitz moved to reaffirm the votes. Attig seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

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

- Formed a new task force. The Joint ALA/BL Task Force to Reconceptualize Chapter 9, chaired by Michael Chohey, is charged with redefining the scope of chapter 9 in AACR2 and proposing rules in other chapters to deal with electronic manifestations of materials covered in those chapters.
- Sent two letters to the ISBD Review Group: one on the use of multiple ISBDs, reviewed and written by Peter Fletcher (chair), Lowell Ashley, Ann Caldwell, Michael Chohey, Ellen Crosby, Brad Eden, Laurel Jizba, Nancy Lorimer, and Ann Sandberg-Fox; and one on the ISBD(ER) revisions, reviewed and initially responded to by the Task Force to Reconceptualize Chapter 9.

Lindlan officially discharged and thanked the following task forces:

- The Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources, chaired by Laurel Jizba with members Greta de Groat, Brad Eden, Gene Kinnaly, Jimmy Lundgren, Elizabeth Mangan, Nan Myers, and Ann Sandberg-Fox, was charged with examining and proposing changes to the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* for expressing specific characteristics for electronic resources. The task force focused on rules for type and extent of resource (area 3), physical description (area 5), and related notes (area 7). Its work resulted in *4JSC/ALA/36* Electronic resources.
- The Task Force on ISO Harmonization completed its work in July 2002. This task force, chaired by Michael Chohey with members Beth Guay, John Hostage, Gabriele Kupitz, Aimee Quinn, and John Sluk, was charged with identifying and examining ISO standards relevant to AACR2 resource description, focusing on standards for abbreviation, symbolization, and punctuation; identifying areas where ISO standards and AACR2 differ; and proposing rule revisions, if appropriate. Its work resulted in *4JSC/ALA/46* Metric unit symbols.
- The Task Force on the Rule of 3, chaired by Steven Arakawa with members Lowell Ashley, Sherman Clarke, Rebecca Culbertson, Kate Harcourt, Susan Hayes, Mary Larsgaard, Shirley Lincicum, Robert Maxwell, Jennifer Sweda, and Noelle Van Pulis, was charged with reviewing the rule revision proposals on making the "rule of three" optional. CC:DA sent comments to the JSC based on the work of the task force. A new task force on chapter 21 will be formed if necessary.

Lindlan also reviewed the ongoing work of CC:DA:

- The Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes, chaired by Cynthia Whitacre, has a revised charge to redraft the appendix document as a stand-alone document for publication.
- The Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 continued its charge to: review editorially Part I; identify inconsistencies across chapters and prepare revisions to resolve the inconsistencies

and determine how many specific rules exist for particular classes of content or carrier or publication patterns; and decide whether any of these specific rules should be given in general form in Chapter 1.

- The CC:DA/MARBI Program Planning Committee for Annual 2003 continued working on its charge to develop and publicize a program on the role of FRBR in cataloging. Besides the program for the 2003 ALA annual conference in Toronto, the task force has agreed to work on a preconference on FRBR for Annual 2004. Lindlan commented that the name of the task force was causing some confusion with ALCTS. Matthew Wise moved that the name of this task force be changed to incorporate the concept of the 2004 preconference. Chohey seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7 to 1.
- An unofficial task force on FRBR terminology (Steven Arakawa, John Attig, Kate Harcourt, Betsy Mangan, and Dorothy McGarry) was thanked by Lindlan for its work. Attig then moved that an official task force on FRBR terminology be formed. Arakawa seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.
- CC:DA continued to be ready to work on the LC Bibliographic Control Action Plan when called upon. The Committee has volunteered to help on parts 3.1 and 3.3-3.5.

Lindlan discussed the role of liaisons to CC:DA. The role of a liaison includes participation in the electronic discussion list, if the liaison has something to say. Lindlan proposed CC:DA procedures be amended to include the role of liaisons. Mary Woodley commented she would like to see that added. Nancy Lorimer said she felt that the role has been defined better in the past year and a half. Lindlan will work on amending the procedures and will be asking others to work with her.

Lindlan ended her report by thanking Attig and Matthew Beacom for all their help and support.

804. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Barbara Tillett distributed copies of her report (available at <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/lc0301.html>). Some of the items she highlighted are listed below:

- **Mail Delivery:** As a result of the anthrax incident everything received at LC is irradiated and arrives several weeks late. This now includes UPS and FedEx deliveries as well as USPS deliveries. The CIP division is encouraging the use of ECIP to reduce delays.
- **Recruitment:** The Cataloging Directorate was authorized to hire 44 new catalogers in the 2002 fiscal year. Nearly all vacancies have been announced and most have closed.
- **AACR2 2002 Revisions:** CPSO implemented the revisions on Dec. 1, 2002. Training materials used at LC are available to the public at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/train.html>.
- **LC Classification:** Subclass KBP, Islamic Law, was implemented on Jan. 20, 2003. The P schedules in Classification Web have been reconfigured so they work properly with the enhanced and hierarchy browsers.
- **CDS:** Classification Web will replace Classification Plus. A new edition of the CONSER Cataloging Manual (2002 edition) was published in Nov. 2002. Changes reflect the 2002 revisions of AACR2.
- **LC ILS:** An effort has been initiated to increase the number of external users of the online catalog. There are plans to implement a release supporting Unicode in Summer 2003; this will affect every character in every language. Access to authority records, no longer a pilot project, has been made a free service through LC's website.

- **MARC 21:** The harmonization with UKMARC was completed with agreement among MARC 21 users and UKMARC users to changes to MARC 21. There are proposals on the MARBI agenda for Midwinter 2003. For authority records, LC will not implement the new Leader/05 Status value of “obsolete” and will defer the implementation of 148, 448, and 548 until they can be indexed by the ILS. The implementation of 670 subfield u may be deferred depending on the UK’s ILS implementation.

805. Report on activities of the IFLA Cataloguing Section: Patton

Glenn Patton reported that the 2002 IFLA meeting marked the 75th anniversary of IFLA by returning to the country where IFLA was founded. The Working Group on FRBR, chaired by Patrick Le Boeuf, was formed. Patton believes this group will be very important in the future. The group has set up a listserv as a way to publicize FRBR experiments and implementations. A website including FAQs and a bibliography will be available on IFLANET. Attig stated he will make a link to this website from the CC:DA website. Patton added that papers from a Norwegian/Finnish project which attempted to FRBR-ize existing records and the AUSLIT project which is a reference or bibliography oriented implementation of FRBR are included on the website.

Other working groups that are continuing are: the Working Group on the Use of Metadata Schemes, the ISBD Review Group, the Working Group on Multilingual Cataloguing, and the FRANAR Working Group. The FRANAR Working Group expects to meet in Europe in May. It hopes to have a model developed that will be an extension of FRBR -- to define the functional requirements for authority records. Attig asked Patton about the FRANAR document. Patton responded that it will go through the worldwide review process. He doesn’t expect it to be out for comments until the fall of 2003.

Patton asked Tillett to review the regional meetings on cataloging principles that will be sponsored by IFLA. Tillett noted that it has been over 40 years since the conference that created the Paris Principles, and these meetings, which will be by invitation only, will revisit the issues from that conference. The first meeting is scheduled for July 2003 in Frankfurt. There will be a web-based discussion list with position papers to focus the discussion. The discussion list will be available Apr.-June. Another regional meeting is scheduled to take place before the 2004 IFLA meeting in Buenos Aires. A meeting in Asia is tentatively scheduled for 2006. Tillett is contacting representatives in the Middle East in hopes of a meeting there in 2005, but the prospects are small. Currently, there is nothing scheduled for Africa due to difficulties in creating interest. The results of these meetings will impact AACR and the JSC will be involved at IFLA. There probably won’t be a North American regional meeting since the JSC represents the Anglo-American interests and will be involved at the Frankfurt meeting. Some topics that will be covered are personal names and corporate bodies, seriality, multivolume publications, general material designators, and expression level citation.

Patton also reported that the UBCIM program office will split. International MARC will be hosted by the National Library of Portugal. The location of UBC is still under discussion. Deutsche Bibliothek is asking to retain it. Marie-France Plassard, the program director, is retiring at the end of Feb. 2003.

806. Report on activities of NISO: Weiss

Paul Weiss stated that ALCTS appoints the ALA representative to NISO, but as he represents all of ALA he would appreciate it if members of the Committee and the audience would let him know if there are others in ALA he needs to contact regarding NISO activities.

Weiss reported that NISO standards are reviewed every five years. The Z39.83, NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol, draft was approved. Steve Hearn was appointed to the revision committee for Z39.19, the monolingual thesauri standard. Weiss asked that those with comments on this standard

contact Hearn. There are two draft standards out for trial use: Z39.7 (Library statistics) and Z39.87 (Data dictionary of technical metadata for digital still images).

Weiss highlighted the Reference Ontology for the Interchange of Cultural Heritage Information. Like FRBR, this is a large conceptual model but it takes an object approach rather than a bibliographic identity approach. Weiss was disappointed that he didn't get any comments from ALA on this standard. Weiss hopes that CC:DA will comment on the model when it comes out in the draft international standard (DIS) stage.

Weiss also reported that the ISBN will be expanded to 13 digits. This ISO project will clarify that the ISBN system applies to any form of monographic publication, including e-books. The project also is exploring the linking of ISBNs to group editions of a work and will clarify that continuing resources should receive ISSNs not ISBNs. Implementation is targeted for Jan. 1, 2005.

NISO has recently published the *RFP Writer's Guide to Standards for Library Systems*; this is available free as a PDF download from the NISO website. If this document is useful, please let NISO know.

Weiss concluded by soliciting ways to get more ALA involvement in the NISO standards process. Woodley suggested that he contact the Networked Resources and Metadata Committee. She also asked about the status of Dublin Core within ISO. Weiss reported that this standard is not at the NISO level and he would notify Woodley if he is able to discover something about it on the ISO website.

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

[\[CC:DA/JSC Rep/MLB/2002/2\]](#)

[\[CC:DA/FRBR Terminology/3\]](#): Incorporating FRBR Terminology: Review of JSC Decisions

[\[CC:DA Program of Work\]](#)

Matthew Beacom reviewed actions taken since the 2002 annual meeting. Beacom noted that the time frames established by the JSC required a large amount of work from CC:DA throughout the fall. This forced CC:DA to do the work online and it seemed as if there was a CC:DA meeting everyday. Beacom expressed a concern that when CC:DA is forced to "meet online" the expertise and contributions of the audience is lost. A list of the actions taken since Annual follows:

- Responded to substituting the term "manifestation" for the term "item" in AACR2. "Manifestation" as a substitution was approved in Sept. and then withdrawn in Dec. This is an example of moving forward and then coming back to a different point. This process helped the JSC understand the challenges and impact of incorporating FRBR terminology into AACR2.
- Reached a place that required chapter 9 be revisited and decided that chapter 9 needs to be thought about as more than just a content chapter.
- Made some progress, on ALA's part, on the multipart proposals, but nothing made it into the 2003 amendments. There has been no response by BL or CILIP.
- Received comments on the terms of reference for chapter 21. Beacom will redraft the terms of reference based on the comments and send the document out shortly after this conference.
- Responded to and met the deadlines for *ALA/36*. This was a lot of work for CC:DA. Other constituents haven't responded yet. This will not be in the 2003 amendments.
- Responded in general to *4JSC/CILIP-BL/1* Revision of General Introductions and Introductions to Parts I and II. ALA hasn't responded to the suggestions in the LC response.

Beacom then reviewed future actions:

- By Mar. 24, 2003 CC:DA will need to respond to: chapter 25 proposals from the Format Variation Working Group; multipart proposals; changes from the carry-over from the appendix of major changes; CCC proposals; and capitalization proposals.
- The JSC secretary noted a couple of areas regarding consistency in the 2003 amendments that need responses by Jan. 27, 2003. One is with respect to dates or names for heads of government. CCC's response was "our preference would be to have the rule 24.20B2 as it is and then repeat the text of that rule and add it as 24.20C3." LC agreed with the CCC recommendation. That new rule wasn't formally voted on by all the constituents. Beacom recommended that CC:DA agree with the CCC suggestion. The second issue is related to added entry under title, 21.30J, and some follow up revisions. Agreements were made, but CCC suggested some further changes. LC agreed with those changes as did BL, but BL asked whether 25.2E1 was still necessary. The secretary noted that 25.2E1 is in the rule revisions and she asks that constituents respond to BL's question. LC's response is that the rule is necessary as it addresses the need to provide, in chapter 25, for references for variant titles found in sources other than the title proper. Beacom recommended that CC:DA agree with LC. Attig moved that CC:DA follow Beacom's recommendations. Kate Harcourt seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Attig asked about the status of the index in the 2003 amendments. Beacom responded that Bob Ewald and an NLC representative will meet Sunday with the indexer and ALA. Beacom will report on that meeting on Monday. The timeline agreed to in the fall has slipped. For the 2002 version of the index, the national libraries had only 5 days to review it. This time ALA is trying to avoid such a short turn-around time.
- To aid the discussion by the Committee, Attig created a summary document regarding the JSC's decisions on incorporating FRBR terminology in AACR2. Tillett suggested that CC:DA wait to take a vote until Pat Riva's next iteration on incorporating FRBR terminology. The iteration should be ready soon. Attig wasn't sure when Riva would get the document out. Beacom agreed with Tillett that it would be best to wait since Riva responds quickly. Beacom suggested CC:DA review this on its own time schedule and wait to respond when Pat Riva's second draft is received.

In anticipation of the April JSC meeting, Beacom stated there have been discussions on the Introductions document by BL and CILIP. As LC started to work on a response, it found gaps with LCRI 1.0 just as ALA had. The JSC has stopped work on that and will discuss it face-to-face in April. It will discuss the notion of having an editor or consultant to assist in that work and perhaps work in a general editorship role. Beacom solicited comments on that idea.

Arakawa asked if having an editor would positively impact the continuous meeting problem. Beacom responded he thought it would be helpful, much like having Pat Riva's document has been helpful. Beacom continued that having a lead person helps coherency and is a better model for drafting a document than a committee model. Beacom felt it is easier to respond to a document as a committee rather than creating a document as a committee. Attig stated that the role of the editor needs to be clear at the outset since he has heard three different scopes discussed for this task: the introduction, chapter 21, or general editorship.

Ed Glazier voiced concern about using FRBR terms in the rules in any other way than they are used in FRBR. He stated it is a big mistake to make word substitutions only. Getting an editor just to change wording isn't the way to go; the cataloging code needs to be changed. Beacom responded that the JSC is talking about using an editor to help look at the rules as a whole rather than one chapter at a time; he envisions the editor as a project manager. Glazier countered that a writer is needed to write a cataloging code since the whole concept of how cataloging will be done is going to change and changing AACR2 in a piecemeal fashion won't do. Woodley added that what is needed is a cataloger who can write extremely well and won't be distracted by the CC:DA/JSC program; the need for the consistency task force is a result of a fragmented approach. Attig pointed out that Glazier's point may mean that the rules need to be

scrapped. Lindlan stated a concern about having task forces work on things that won't be used; she asked how the regional meetings revisiting the Paris Principles will impact this. Beacom responded the meetings will have an impact; the rest of the world is aware of our rules and we are becoming more and more aware of the rules in the rest of the world -- in libraries and outside of libraries. Attig said this discussion is making it sound like all past cataloging would be scrapped and the Committee and the JSC need to think long and hard if this is what is being considered. Woodley commented that an editor wouldn't scrap all the recent work that has been done; an editor would help everything hang together as a whole. She stated there won't ever be a new version of the rules if the cataloging community keeps waiting. Arakawa stated that if applying FRBR to the rules results in deconstructing the cataloging code, the implications need to be determined first. McGarry suggested Glazier provide some examples of what he thinks will be different and the resulting implications.

Everett Allgood asked for clarification of the exact charge from the JSC; is the charge to incorporate directly the FRBR conceptual model into AACR2? Allgood also commented that by speeding up the revision processes and making decisions via e-mail the Committee is losing deliberation in the process. Weiss stated the phrase "FRBR-ization of AACR2" means many different things and perhaps the phrase should not be used. Weiss felt Glazier brought up important points. One can decide to start using the definitions of four terms and concepts from FRBR in AACR2; that is very different from rewriting the code to say one needs to catalog the work and then expression and manifestation, etc.

Glazier reiterated those terms mean very particular things in FRBR; if the Committee and the JSC want people to understand FRBR and how it works, the cataloging code cannot use those terms to mean something different. A word for word substitution won't work because the concept of manifestation cataloging is different than work-based cataloging.

Sherry Vellucci stated that this is not going to change how cataloging is done but how cataloging will be approached. She suggested that someone outside of CC:DA write the document and then CC:DA can respond to the document. Lynne Howarth added that there are competing issues of the conceptualization of the code and the tweaking of the code to respond to immediacies. The piecemeal approach is pulling from the center and that may mean all the pieces need to be brought together in the conceptual framework to have a coherent and consistent code.

Attig suggested the JSC address how the code should be evolving and what the end result should be, including the issues Glazier raised. The JSC also should look at how the JSC works, whether that means bringing in outside people, and if there is a better way to set priorities and a better way for the constituencies to interact. The process has been stretched to the breaking point in the past four months. Beacom concluded that the discussion had many interesting directions and he would try to use the comments as he represents ALA at the JSC.

808. Report of the [Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes](#): Whitacre

[\[CC:DA/TF/Appendix on Major/Minor Changes/6\]](#)

[\[CC:DA/TF/Appendix on Major/Minor Changes/7\]](#)

Cynthia Whitacre began by saying that comments on the document can be given to her later if the discussion didn't allow time for those comments. The task force used the term "manifestation" throughout the document, but based on the rethinking of using this term by the JSC, this will have to be addressed by the task force. The task force posed questions to CC:DA in its report that accompanied the document.

The task force would like to hear how well it works for the document to combine, in the sections on multipart monographs and integrating resources, the concept of differences between items and the concept of changes within an item. For serials the document separates these concepts. Should the document

separate these concepts in the sections on multipart monographs and integrating resources? Whitacre reported the task force could not reach consensus on this issue.

Arakawa stated he found the multipart section hard to follow. He saw three scenarios presented: an item in hand used as basis for description, an item in hand but not used as basis for description, and an item that doesn't match the description but hypothetically could be added, through an update, to the record. He felt the multipart section seemed to focus on the case where the item in hand basically matches the part that was used as the basis for description. In many ways this is the case easiest to handle and Arakawa asked why the document didn't refer the reader to the single part monograph section in that case. Then this section could focus on the really problematic areas of scenarios 2 and 3. He added that the problematic areas seemed to be handled in footnotes.

Beacom found the sections where the concepts were combined confusing; the section where the concepts are separated was less confusing. Attig found the document structurally complex and commented he hated to see the document become more complex. If separating the concepts means having to duplicate sections in their entirety, there may be a better way.

The task force's second question was whether the document should make specific references to AACR2, leave the references out, or quote the applicable parts of AACR2. Attig supported referring to AACR2 rather than quoting the text of the rules since the maintenance issues may outweigh the benefits. Beacom also supported referring to AACR2 particularly since the cataloger will be using the rules in any case. Arakawa asked if quoting the text of the rules would have copyright implications and make it less likely the document would be in Cataloger's Desktop. Whitacre replied she didn't know if this would have any implications on publication; that is a separate issue. Woodley added if it does get into Cataloger's Desktop, then one wouldn't want to quote the text since there would be links to the referenced rules.

Whitacre asked a third question of the Committee -- should the document mention URIs? URIs are not covered in AACR2, but are covered in the LCRI. Attig supported including URIs in the document to the extent the task force thinks they are significant criteria that should be included. Weiss added it was important to include any attribute that the task force thinks has an effect on whether something is a major or minor change, even if that attribute isn't covered in AACR2. Attig agreed with Weiss and stressed that since the document is no longer a part of the code, it allows for a broad approach. Arakawa then returned to the issue of multipart and stated that if the document isn't restricted to AACR2, the task force might consider going beyond the rules and mention things such as publisher intent.

Whitacre asked if the task force should go beyond the rules. Adam Schiff stated that best practices should go beyond the rules to help the cataloger make decisions, but best practices should not contradict the rules. Attig added that the document would be used in conjunction with the rules, but not limited to things referenced by the rules. Beacom said the document looked more like a checklist rather than explaining the underlying principles of the checklist.

Glazier pointed out that the words "change" and "difference" are defined in the introduction, but the words are not used consistently, even within the introduction. Whitacre replied that the task force tried to be consistent and asked that Glazier give the task force any instances of inconsistencies. Attig stated that at one point in the evolution of the document there was the distinction: "differences" applied to all resources while "changes" applied to continuing resources and multipart and their parts or iterations. He suggested that language may need to be added back to the document. Whitacre asked that specific instances of inconsistencies be forwarded to her.

Weiss asked about "difference" and "change." He stated that when a cataloger has a question about this, he or she doesn't know whether it is a difference or a change until reading the document. He asked about the thinking on the importance of keeping those terms distinct. If the document is describing the difference between major and minor, is it necessary to have a distinction between "difference" and

“change?” Whitacre responded that the task force extensively debated the need for the distinction and it concluded the distinction is needed. Attig said the case where there is a description of something and things are changing as pieces are added needs to be distinguished from the case where the cataloger is comparing an item with some other item and trying to decide if he or she has the same thing or something different.

Whitacre then asked if there are integrating resources in formats other than paper and electronic? The document includes examples for those formats in section C. Weiss said to leave the examples in, since the moment they are taken out the examples would be needed. Attig agreed. Ann Caldwell mentioned a slide set that is an integrating resource. Lorimer could foresee that, with the ease of downloading to a CD, a publisher might decide it didn't like how something turned out and ask the user to download a part onto the CD.

Attig said that when the JSC decided not to include this as an appendix, it expressed an interest in including the basic guidelines somewhere in the rules. He suggested sending a proposal to the JSC that would encompass p. 6 plus a bit more editorial work. Whitacre asked if another task force had been given that charge. Beacom responded that CILIP and BL were given that task and perhaps Attig's idea is coming from the stall on the introduction. Beacom suggested that CC:DA propose where to include the guidelines; he added that the problem may be with the language of the guidelines and the difficulty of integrating the language rather than location of the guidelines. Attig commented that the location of the guidelines would impact the language, in one case it would have to be in the imperative and in another it would need to be in the narrative. Whitacre asked who would do the proposal; Lindlan answered that the task force would do it. Beacom stated it might not be best for the task force do this because it might be distracted from its current charge. Attig volunteered to prepare a document for CC:DA to discuss before sending forward a proposal.

Robert Maxwell commented that there are some circular references in the document. For example, on p. 9 under A5.b which outlines the differences in other physical details that should be considered major differences, it reads “The following differences in other physical details are MAJOR: Books, pamphlets, and printed sheets: any significant difference.” It appears the guidelines are instructing that any major differences are major. The cataloger needs guidance as to what is major and what is significant.

Woodley stated that when the document was intended to be an appendix for AACR2, there were examples, but the JSC had asked the task force to take them out. She suggested that the examples be added back to the document.

Wise echoed some of the other comments and to illustrate his point he used the example of an item that differs from the description only in height. He elaborated that he would turn to this document to find out if the difference in height was a significant change. The document would only instruct that if it is a significant change, it is a major change. Woodley asked if it would be useful to have a general description of what major changes include and what minor changes include or would it be more useful to have them be distributed throughout the sections. Wise responded that the only way to define “significant” is through examples or concepts. He felt the document lacked a conceptual structure.

Whitacre concluded by reminding folks to forward any other comments to her as soon as possible after this conference.

Lindlan adjourned the meeting until Monday morning.

*Monday, January 27, 2003 — 9:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m.
Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel — Philadelphia Ballroom*

809. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

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

810. Report from the ALCTS 2003 Preconference Planning Committee: Harcourt

Kate Harcourt reported on the 2003 ALCTS preconference “Knowledge Without Boundaries” to be held June 19-20, 2003 in Toronto at the annual conference. This preconference will focus on metadata and will include international speakers. The speakers and their topics include: Dr. Thomas Baker speaking on Dublin Core, Dr. Howard Besser on preservation of electronic works, John Byrum on Library of Congress bibliographic enrichment projects, Robin Chandler on integrating access to collections and digital content, Michael Chohey on ONIX, Makx Dekkers on metadata interoperability, Tom Delsey on adapting AACR2R and MARC to accommodate electronic resources, Carl Lagoze on metadata harvesting, Ling Mah on metadata applications in Chinese libraries, Clifford Lynch on metadata at the crossroads, Eric Miller on the Semantic Web, Steven Jack Miller on metadata standards to organize online electronic resources, Barbara Tillett on library authority files as building blocks for the Semantic Web, and Beacher Wiggins speaking on bibliographic control in the new millennium. Wiggins will give the opening address and Lynch will give the keynote closing speech. There will be room for 400 people. Additional information will be available on the ALCTS website. The cost will be \$425.00.

811. Report from the [CC:DA/MARBI Program Planning Committee for Annual 2003](#) (and plans for the 2004 Preconference): Hayes

Susan Hayes reported on the FRBR program, jointly sponsored by CC:DA and MARBI, to be held in Toronto. It is scheduled for Sunday, June 22 at 8:30 a.m. The speakers will be Vinod Chachra of VTLS who will speak on the FRBR-ized OPAC, Barbara Tillett who will explain the basics of FRBR, Tom Delsey who will speak about FRBR and MARC, and Glenn Patton who will speak on the importance of FRBR.

Hayes stated that the preconference scheduled for Orlando in 2004 is in the preliminary planning stages and the program is not yet set. It is being planned as a day and a half preconference: Thursday afternoon and all day Friday. She is hopeful that the speakers from the Toronto FRBR program will want to repeat or revise their presentations for the preconference. The task force would like to aim the second day at an audience more knowledgeable about FRBR and cover some of the applications of FRBR that have been implemented. She asked that CC:DA members send her recommendations for speakers. The cost has not yet been determined, but may be \$275.

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

Chatham asked for reactions to the 2002 revision. He stated that so far the response has been positive. The same number of copies for the 2002 revision have been sold as were sold of the 1998 revision at this point after publication. Eighty five percent of the sales have been for the binder set. The first update is targeted for July 2003 and will include a checklist of changes instead of a summary of changes. The revision pages will have the year of the update in the footer. The revision package will include the

complete page of the change, both recto and verso. This will be the first year for the revised text block. The new packet will be called AACR2 2002 revision: 2003 update. Chatham added that there will be a subscription option; the entire text-block can be purchased with the updates included, or just the updates can be purchased.

Chatham reported that a meeting took place on Sunday between Marg Stewart, Bob Ewald, and the indexer at which time they reviewed prior indexes and reports on the JSC's concerns. The plan is to revise the index each time a new revision is issued. This revision will be different than just updating; the entire index will be reviewed each year.

Chatham asked if there were questions. Lorimer mentioned that the glue used to bind the endpapers to the binder was not very good. Chatham responded he had noticed yesterday that there was a problem with the glue. He will contact the vendor.

Beacom asked how long the national libraries would have to review the index given there was not enough time to review the index for the 2002 revisions. Chatham answered the plan is to have three weeks to do the review. ALA will publish a schedule for all parties so they will know the expectations. ALA plans to have the pages ready for the JSC meeting in April. That would make the return time May.

Attig inquired about the target for publishing the 2003 update. Chatham replied July 15. The plan is to have the updates or revisions published each July. This requires a change in the JCS schedule, which ALA appreciates. Sherman Clarke asked if the updates will be available in a PDF file. Some of the issues are the double-sided pages. Although the plan is to move in that direction, Chatham did not think the July 2003 update would be available as a PDF file.

Attig added that the tabs should be included with the next text block. He thought it would be desirable from a user's point of view to have the tabs available with the text block and not just with the binder. Chatham replied that part of the decision had to do with costs, but he will look into it.

Chatham thanked the national libraries for their understanding with the tight schedule for the index, and for the thoroughness of their contributions.

813. Rule change proposal from MAGERT: Mangan

3.1F1 Example Correction: [[CC:DA/MAGERT/2003/1](#)]

Mangan began by stating that this was a minor rule revision resulting from the editing of *Cartographic Materials*. The first example under 3.1F1 is missing some words. The rule revision proposal has the missing words inserted. Attig moved to approve the revision and Chohey seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

Mangan then presented the ALA follow-up that some members received on Saturday after the meeting. This was something that CC:DA approved last summer and it was sent to the JSC. LC had asked for additional information to be added to the rule. Mangan made the correction to 3.5D1. A sentence was added directing the cataloger to use a comma to separate statements of dimension and also how to deal with the word "on" used in the dimension statement as opposed to the statement of extent. LC requested a comma to separate dimension statements in 3.5D5. In its response CCC requested that 1.5D2, 1.10C2, 2.5D4, 4.5D1, 8.5D6, and 10.5D2 be reexamined. Mangan and Beacom reexamined those rules on Saturday and it appeared they were correct. Mangan will send Beacom a statement to that effect.

Mangan noted that the two examples following the second paragraph, which are not part of this proposal, include the sheet size, but are missing the map size. She would like to add the map size to examples in the rule proposal. Attig moved to support the proposal with the additions proposed by Mangan. Chohey seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Mangan ended by noting that the revised edition of *Cartographic Materials*, is complete and has gone to ALA for publication. It may be available in Toronto or very soon thereafter.

814. Rule change proposals from Schiff: Schiff

Additional example in 3.5B3: [[CC:DA/Schiff/2002/2](#)]

Revision and simplification of 12.1E1: [[CC:DA/Schiff/2002/3](#)]

Schiff stated that the proposal for 3.5B3 resulted from atlas cataloging he did over the summer. Many of the atlases either lacked pagination or had various pagings. After searching the University of Washington catalog and looking at LC records, he found the wording of the extent statements for these cases was not consistent. He thought there should be an example in the rules to show the correct way to format an extent statement with parentheses and double parentheses. He chose the example concerning various pagings because it is in the rules. Mangan stated that the proposal had been discussed at the MAGERT Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting on Sunday and that committee supported the proposal. She continued that there is an example like it in *Cartographic Materials*, but it is important to have it in the rules. Attig asked if there was a preferred way to format the extent statement. Mangan answered she thought most catalogers in the U.S. were formatting the extent statement in the manner proposed. McGarry moved that the Committee accept the proposal. The motion was seconded by Chohey and passed by the Committee.

Schiff stated that the proposal for the revision and simplification of 12.1E1 resulted from training he is giving on cataloging integrating resources. In 12.1E1 there are several situations where other title information is included for serial descriptions, but not necessarily included for integrating resource descriptions. At several programs he attended it appeared the first situation for serials in 12.1E1 is being applied to integrating resources also. Schiff believes that all the situations where other title information is included for serials should apply to integrating resources. His proposal is to make the treatment of integrating resources and serials more consistent and to make the situations applicable to all continuing resources.

Schiff reviewed the proposal in detail. The proposal begins by changing the text to read “transcribe or supply other title information” in place of the phrase “transcribe other title information” since in one situation other title information is supplied rather than transcribed.

Schiff went through the proposed changes:

- Combined the sections for serials and integrating resources into one rule.
- Situation (i): Added an example of an integrating resource.
- Situation (ii): Added “(see 1.1E4)” to the end of the instructions. Removed the example of the serial that has both an acronym and a statement of responsibility because it belongs in a separate section. Added an example of a website with a statement of responsibility.
- Situation (iii): Added an example of a website with bracketed other title information. Added text instructing in what order to put an acronym and a statement of responsibility. Added an example for a homepage.
- Removed the section on integrating resources except for the text that instructs not to transcribe other title information that consists solely of words related to the currency. Added an example of an Internet resource that has words related to currency that would not be transcribed as other title information.

McGarry moved CC:DA approve the proposed revisions to 12.1E1. Attig seconded the motion.

Kathy Winzer raised issues regarding eliminating integrating resources as a separate section. She requested time to send the proposal to the law community for comments. Attig reminded the Committee that comments need to be to the JSC by February 10th to be considered for the next revision package. Allgood asked Winzer if she had a sense of the concern in the law community. Winzer replied that the law community deals with many loose-leaf publications where subtitles can be important. There might be eight or nine loose-leaf publications that can be distinguished only by the subtitle. Schiff stated the intent of the change was to make it clear that the subtitle should be transcribed. He added that two of the cases are already in 1.1. Winzer responded that other law catalogers indicated they would like more time to think about this. Lindlan asked for a motion to table this until the law community has had a chance to respond. Attig moved to table the motion until the law community can respond. Harcourt seconded the motion and the motion to table was carried.

815. Report of the [Task Force on the Reconceptualization of Chapter 9: Chohey](#)

Chohey reported that besides Chohey the task force includes Adam Schiff, Jay Weitz, Ann Sandberg-Fox, Nancy Lorimer, and four British Library catalogers. The task force met Saturday morning, but the British Library members were not present. The task force began by working on the scope statement and will then move on to examining .1 of chapters 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Chapter 4 will be put aside for the moment. The task force also discussed how chapters 10 and 11 fit. The intent is to make chapter 9 less of a carrier chapter and more of an intellectual content chapter. The plan is to have graphic materials, cartographic materials, and textual materials each be described by their respective chapters and to revise the scope note in chapter 9. The task force is using OCLC guidelines to distinguish between type "m" for electronic resources and type "a" for language materials. One of the guests at Saturday's meeting stated that CPSO has good guidelines on its website for distinguishing cartographic electronic resources from other electronic resources, i.e. when to use type "e" or "m."

Chohey reported that the task force will also look at the list for area 3. ISBD(ER) has a longer list of examples of types of electronic resources. If chapter 9 becomes a chapter to describe items like programs and games, the task force may give more guidance on what would be covered, i.e. online services. There seems to be confusion on what an online service is. Chohey was told that the Friday session of the Integrating resources train-the-trainer session gave a good way of distinguishing an online service; if one queries the service and gets a unique answer, such as making a plane reservation, then the website should be a type "m" and not a type "a." The task force will be looking at defining such things as online services, or at least including examples of them.

Responsibility for part I chapters have been divided up among ALA members with the understanding that their British colleagues would decide with which chapters they wanted to help. Chapters 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will each be given to a two-person team. Each team will develop a scope statement for its chapter while the task force as a whole will develop standardized wording to be used in all the chapters. The task force will also propose sources of information, and area 5. The decision on whether to remove the notes and other areas of the description from chapter 9 and add them to the relevant chapters is still under discussion. Since Chohey is also working on the consistency task force, he will be monitoring how the work of the reconceptualization task force fits with the work of the consistency task force.

There has been a suggestion to let chapter 9 operate the same as chapter 2 does for printed materials. Chohey stated that Lorimer and he have some objections to chapter 2 being used as a super chapter. Someone cataloging a score would also have to look at chapter 2 just because the score happens to be on paper.

Chohey and other members of the task force have the sense that catalogers want to give a physical description for remote access electronic resources, especially if they are cataloging a PDF document with

pagination. Chohey wondered if the community is still opposed to saying "1 Internet resource" or "1 website."

Chohey remarked that many institutions do not have a way to determine the number of online items in their catalogs other than using the fixed fields. There is an "r" in the 007 for remote access, but many catalogs can't limit by that value. The task force is discussing the use of a standard word in the extent statement such as "online."

The task force discussed whether the chief source of information for a remotely accessed electronic resource should be the same as the chief source of information for a directly accessed electronic resource. The task force is considering having chapter 9 instruct that the chief source of information for an item such as a program or game be the item itself and its labels. The rules may instruct that the chief source of information for an electronic textual or cartographic item be the title screen.

There is a problem cataloging textual documents available on the web in multiple formats; often pagination varies depending on whether the format is HTML or PDF or Word. Another problem is the issue of reproductions. The British Library does not follow the LCRI for 1.11A. BL describes the reproduction and not the original. The task force would like AACR to address electronic reproductions, and not the way 1.11A does. Many electronic texts are reproductions.

The task force also considered whether or not three-dimensional items could be electronic. Schiff will be investigating this issue and will report to the task force so it can consider whether chapters 10 and 11 should have rules for electronic resources. Matthew Wise pointed out that three-dimensional games might be interactive video recordings.

Chohey stated that the task force will have an interim written report by March 1, 2003 and a final report by May 15, 2003. Chohey asked for comments or questions.

Woodley stated the intellectual content should be cataloged rather than the carrier. She agreed with Lorimer and Chohey on the point about a score. She felt the extent should be in a note because pagination can vary depending on the type printer used to print a copy of an electronic document. She also stated that the electronic version of the game Monopoly is very different from the board game Monopoly. Chohey added that games are described by chapter 10.

Mangan pointed out that cartographic materials are an exception when describing reproductions and originals. For cartographic materials the reproduction is described in the body of the record, and the original is described in a note.

Attig asked the task force to cover, in the interim report, its plan for chapter 9 and what the plan is for other material that will no longer be in chapter 9. There needs to be a case made for putting those rules in the individual chapters. Attig stated that not everyone agrees this is the correct path to take. He hoped that the charge of the task force didn't mean that the decision had already been made to do it this way. At some point CC:DA needs to have that discussion. Attig would prefer an additional chapter of partial generalities like chapter 11 and 12 that could be used with the content chapters. The electronic aspects would be consistently dealt with in one place. Attig feels that the general issue has not yet been decided, and there needs to be a way to raise that issue for discussion and decision. He added he hoped that will be done before the task force presents its final report. Chohey agreed the task force would do that.

Allgood asked if it was the intent of the task force to put things in different chapters by rearranging the code by area of description. Chohey answered that it had not been thought of in that way.

Chohey asked Attig if he wants the rules duplicated rather than removing the rules from chapter 9. Chohey wondered if the rules should be in chapter 1. He added that catalogers need guidance in area 5. Rule 0.24 does not give guidance on what takes precedence; it is from chapter 9 that catalogers know not to give a description for electronic resources. He would like to see an area 5 in each of the intellectual

content chapters for the electronic manifestations of that content. He asked if it would be better to move rules to chapter 1 instead of leaving them in the separate content chapters. Chohey wondered if a new chapter was really necessary. Attig answered the intent was to promote the concept that more than one chapter is needed to describe electronic resources. Attig added it was important to include things only once, whether that be in chapter 1 or in a new chapter and this decision needs to be made. Chohey answered that he will not assume that this idea has already been approved by CC:DA.

Beacom stated he would like the task force to show the options and the pros and cons for each option in its interim report. The result might be that there is not much left in chapter 9. He is intrigued by the idea of a chapter of partial generalities to bring out the digital aspect of a resource. Beacom added that he thought CC:DA was looking to the task force for options and rationales for the options.

816. Report of the [Task Force on Consistency Across Part I of AACR2](#): Attig

Area 2 Rule Revision Proposals: [\[CC:DA/Consistency/Area 2/3\]](#)

Area 3 Rule Revision Proposals: [\[CC:DA/Consistency/Area 3/3\]](#)

Attig reported that the task force met Friday afternoon and in addition to areas 2 and 3 which will be considered now, the task force has almost finished area 6, and will start area 5 soon. The analysis of area 5 has been completed by Chohey and Lorimer. The task force hopes to have those for consideration by the annual meeting at Toronto, as well as beginning on areas 8 and 4. Two areas are particularly involved with other areas: area 0 and area 7. By the meeting in Toronto the task force will at least have the comparison text prepared. He is not sure what else will be ready by then.

The task force discussed numbering, and decided to wait until the members could see how things were breaking down. Areas 2 and 3 did not require restructuring of the numbering but area 5 may.

The basic charge of the task force is to examine rules across chapters in part I looking for comparable rules and to determine whether they are consistently stated, and if they are not, is there justification for the differences. The task force is looking at consistency, and whether a rule needs to be in a separate chapter or moved to chapter 1.

There are three documents: the rearranged text; the analysis of consistencies, inconsistencies, and differences; and the revision proposals. At the beginning of each document is a summary and an annotated list of things the task force decided not to address.

Attig asked what kind of a discussion the Committee wanted. Schiff stated the changes were substantive enough that it would be beneficial to go rule by rule.

There were many editorial and style change suggestions made during the discussion. These are not reflected in the minutes. The minutes reflect discussion involving substantive changes.

Attig commented on the basic rule for edition statements. Because there are several revision projects and he was attempting to take account of the tentative JSC decisions regarding FRBR terminology that reversed "item" and "manifestation" in the proposals, he will revert to the current text and will note that if changes are made in terminology, the changes should be made in these proposals as well.

Attig commented that all the punctuation rules had been consolidated, with each chapter referring back to 1.0C.

Attig noted the "In case of doubt" rule on p. 15 included a substantial revision that was proposed in the CCC response to another proposal.

Schiff thought that the word "number" should be deleted from the footnote on p. 16. Attig agreed that it would be easier to remove it. He thought the suggestion came from the Canadian constituents. John

Hostage thought it should be retained. Attig stated that he would remove it, and if it was thought to be necessary, it could be added back later in the process.

Schiff pointed out that in 8.2 the examples included full citations, while none of the examples in the other chapters' area 2 include full citations. Attig stated the examples that are currently in the chapter were simply carried through. Schiff also stated the first example in 9.2 would be better as "Rev. version" instead of "Version 7;" the intent of the example is to show a different edition. Attig agreed that since the cataloger is supplying the statement, the statement wouldn't be as precise as "Version 7." Weiss disagreed, stating that the previous version may have been "Version 6." Schiff reiterated that the point of the example was to show that it was a revised version. Beacom suggested leaving the example alone. Attig added that "Rev. version" is an illustration of 1.2D, a subsequent statement. Schiff added that "[Rev. version]" is more in line with what is already there. Lindlan suggested that it be split into three examples, because they are all helpful examples. Attig agreed.

Attig then moved to p. 20, parallel statements. McGarry asked if this would be the same as with the title being transcribed. Beacom disagreed. He said the title is needed to show the language of the script.

Attig moved on to the statement of responsibility relating to the edition. Lorimer questioned using the word "work." She stated that it was easiest for her to talk about 6.2C1. A sound recording may have 25 to 30 works on it but in this case the proposal is using "work" to refer not only a single work but to a collection of works. She added that this has caused many problems in the music community and once the cataloging code starts to use FRBR terms there may be questions and problems on the use of the term "work" versus a collection of works. Attig replied that they are both works, and the concept of a collected work is supported in FRBR, which leaves a situation where the term "work" might be ambiguous. Attig felt Lorimer's concern should be given further attention, but not as part of this exercise. Lorimer replied that a sound recording may not be a work. Attig countered it could be a work composed of works. The Committee concluded that a work could have many works.

Laurel Jizba stated that this gets to the problem of striving for consistency across all chapters. There are concepts on top of each other. It also points to the disconnect between FRBR and the rules as employed right now. Weiss agreed with Lorimer and suggested the wording "all editions of the work being cataloged." That would indicate not all the tracks of a sound recording, but at the level the cataloger decided to catalog. Schiff stated all the things being cataloged are bibliographic resources so he suggested the phrase "of a given resource." Clarke added that this issue applies to contents notes, which might be works and have statements of responsibility and may include editions, etc. Attig said Schiff's suggestion about using "bibliographic resource" would be workable, but he wasn't sure if it was conceptually correct. This is another example of a case where he wished "edition" didn't have to be used; it does not fit well with the model.

Before sending this forward, Attig will expand the explanatory section focusing on what the task force did and the areas of disagreement. Attig asked if CC:DA would like to use "bibliographic resource" instead of "work." McGarry responded that she disliked introducing another new term when the direction the rules will take is unclear. Attig then asked if the phrase "work being cataloged" would be acceptable. Schiff answered that the word "resource" is being used in chapter 9 already. Attig stated that he wasn't hearing consensus and suggested leaving it in the proposal as is with an indication that there was significant disagreement and the characterization of the disagreement. The problem is CC:DA is not speaking clearly and that will make it difficult for the JSC. Beacom answered that Attig's suggestion was acceptable and the term would be brought out in the cover letter.

The discussion then moved to p. 26, statements relating to named revisions of an edition. Attig asked if all the examples that have the title proper should be removed or left as a group. The consensus was to leave the examples as a group.

Hostage stated that on p. 27 the original rule used the term “reissue” and not “revision” as is used in the proposal. Attig answered that the term “revision” was probably not appropriate, and he wasn’t sure why the task force made that suggestion. Clarke replied the point was that it was a named reissue that was revised. After some discussion Clarke suggested the term “named reissue.” Attig answered that the term occurs in all the chapters, and he asked if the Committee was in favor of the suggestion. It was and Attig said he would make the change.

Schiff had some general comments on area 3, especially referring from 9.3 to 12.3. He thought there should be a rule on change and extent of resource. Attig replied the task force had tried not to meddle with area 3 of chapter 9. He added that the problem would be solved when area 3 was taken out of chapter 9. Schiff asked when that was going to happen, and he just wanted to raise the issue. Attig stated that by the time these rule revision proposals were implemented, area 3 in chapter 9 would be gone, but he didn’t feel it could be removed yet.

Schiff stated that area 3 for chapter 3 and chapter 12 for geospatial cartographic materials when a scale statement changes could be significant. He added that there were no rules in chapter 12 for the other area 3. Attig replied that this was too big of an issue for this time. Attig felt that if it turned out to be a need, it should come forward separately. Mangan stated that as far as scale is concerned, she didn’t think it would be an issue because general instructions are included already.

Attig explained the proposed changes in numbering for area 3. Attig pointed out the general rule 0.25 about how to apply area 3. David Van Hoy stated that in 3.3G1, the last example is the only example that reads “Scales differ” and he would hate to lose that example. Schiff suggested that it could be moved to chapter 1. Attig asked if there were any other examples that stated “Scales differ.” Mangan stated that it was in the rules and not in the examples. After a discussion on moving the examples to 3.3A1, the Committee decided to move them to 1.3A1.

Schiff pointed out an error in the revision package 1.3A1. Mangan agreed “1966” was a typo and it should be “1996.”

Attig then asked how the Committee would like to proceed with the document. Lindlan responded she would like to see a revised copy. Attig reminded the Committee how little time it had. Beacom stated that because there were not significant changes, he would like to have it approved at today’s meeting.

Attig moved to approve the revisions to areas 2 and 3 as amended in the discussion. The motion was seconded by Chohey and approved.

817. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

Attig reported that he will be setting up a section for FRBR with a link to the IFLA site. He also reported the ALA website redesign has resulted in a complete redesign of the ALCTS webpage. Also ALA has implemented a new management system that will impact how the website is maintained. At the moment Attig does not have time to retool the entire CC:DA website. The official site is now on the Pennsylvania State University server. Attig will notify the Committee when the CC:DA website is again on the ALA server.

Beacom asked if someone needed to let ALCTS know that CC:DA cannot do its work on the ALA website and will have to establish its own website. Attig replied that once ALCTS catches up it will be okay. He will keep the Committee posted.

818. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[\[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2003/1\]](#)

Allgood distributed his report and reported that MARBI had a light agenda for this conference. He will include discussion from CC:DA in his final report. At the last meeting MARBI dealt with two proposals and three discussion papers. All the proposals were discussed and decisions made. Allgood will submit a more detailed report to CC:DA after this conference.

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

Attig stated that as CC:DA continues to work on the implications of FRBR, there will be an increased emphasis on relationships. For persons and corporate bodies catalogers have relied on the entire description to indicate the relationship, instead of indicating the relationship in the heading. He thought it would be worthwhile to explore 21.0D, designation of function, which is an optional rule. It lists four types of functions: compiler, editor, translator, and illustrator. There is an LCRI instructing not to apply this option, except for illustrators in certain types of records. Attig suggested that the LCRI could be changed. Attig has spoken to Tillett about this, and she indicated that LC would like to hear from catalogers on this issue. Attig added that the rule might not be sufficient for what is really needed. CC:DA might want to propose different relator terms or a different use of relator terms. If CC:DA wants to investigate this subject, he suggested a task force would be the best way to proceed.

Peter Fletcher asked what the benefit of having relator terms in headings would be. Weiss stated that at a meeting he attended on Friday, there was a discussion on the work being done on FRBR by OCLC and VTLS; it was mentioned that those added entries that had relator terms helped with the grouping of expressions. Attig added that relator terms help with retrieval. The terms distinguish people in different roles. Having the terms in the heading means the vocabulary can be controlled.

Allgood commented that CONSER does not use relator terms. He wondered if maybe CONSER should rethink that decision, because relator terms are critical for retrieval. Clarke stated that this is an example of descriptive needs clashing with retrieval and access needs. Weiss added that often the relationships are not one-to-one; for example, Bernstein could be the composer and the conductor and even a performer all in the same record. Sound recordings with multiple pieces also present a problem. Weiss wondered how the relationship would be indicated between some of the performers to one work or one performer to multiple works.

Beacom added that with the creation of a new edition of AACR, there is a movement toward creating a catalog instead of creating a catalog record. Being more explicit with using relator terms will help catalogers make better relationships within the catalog. Martha Yee stated that catalogers already add relator terms, but are not always consistent in their use. She added that in the UCLA Film and Television Archive's catalog about 15 entries for Charlie Chaplin are displayed, because he was a director, actor, etc. and different relator terms have been used. Woodley said catalogers should be looking at being able to show clusters, and the relator terms would help the clustering aspect so different kinds of groupings could be displayed.

Arakawa asked Attig how he thought the rule could be improved. Attig answered that he wanted to have more categories for which relator terms are appropriate. There are performers of various types that are not covered very well. He stated that this really is a chapter 21 issue. He asked if this should be part of the charge of the chapter 21 revision or if it should be pursued separately by ALA.

Beacom answered that this specific element has not been noted in the charge and investigating it would not preclude anything that has already been done. This task could be added to the charge of the chapter

21 revision task force, or it could be pursued independently. Beacom thought either approach would work. Attig asked if CC:DA was interested.

Tillett thought it would be helpful to have a strong stance from CC:DA, one way or the other. LC stopped using relator terms because of budget cuts. This was a decision made by managers, and they would need very strong justification to bring it back again. LC would also be interested in hearing from PCC. In light of what Tillett stated, Beacom encouraged CC:DA to pursue this issue independently from the larger revision of chapter 21. This could be folded into the chapter 21 revision later. It would help the JSC and the other constituencies to see where ALA is headed. This may be a way of changing the opinion of managers and showing there is value in the extra work.

Schiff commented that there are two ways to indicate relationships in MARC, by relator terms and by relator codes. The task force could look at the ways to indicate the relationships in MARC and it may not require a change in the rules. Attig moved to establish a task force to look at the question of relator information. The motion was seconded by Chohey. Jay Weitz asked if the task force should be formed jointly with MARBI since the relationships can be indicated within MARC. Attig answered that he thought MARBI would be interested only if it required new codes. Attig preferred to start by looking at the cataloging rules or at least catalog display considerations. Weitz stated that he wanted to make sure that this involves coding. An audience member said that catalogers should think of other ways to accomplish the goal, not just using relator terms, but by sorting in clusters. The motion was approved unanimously.

Lindlan asked people who were interested in working on this new task force to contact her by e-mail.

Lindlan stated that the next meeting will be in Toronto, and the Monday meeting will probably have the usual 8:00 a.m. starting time.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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