To: ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Bibliographic Control Committee, Music Library Association

Subject: *4JSC/CCC/6/Rev* (Revision of 6.5B1 to parallel the use of conventional terminology at 9.5B1)

Related document: *CC:DA/MLA/2003/1*

The Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging of the Bibliographic Control Committee of the Music Library Association has reviewed the CCC document and offers the following comments. Please note that these comments should be read in conjunction with our own proposals regarding conventional terminology in Chapter 6 (*CC:DA/MLA/2003/1*).

The committee agrees with the addition of the following terms: compact disc, DAT tape, DVD-audio disc and minidisc. We feel these to be useful, stable terms that are in common usage, and also are the same SMDs that we suggested in our own proposal. It should be noted, however, that a sizeable portion of our constituency (and also members of ARSC) object strenuously to the redundancy in the term "DAT tape", in that the "T" in DAT already stands for "tape". In our own proposal, the committee decided to retain the redundancy for two reasons: 1) "DAT tape" is common usage, and 2) it fits well into the pattern of SMDs, in that each SMD ends with "tape", "cassette", "disc", etc. The objection to this term could be overcome by using "digital audio tape" instead of "DAT tape". The full name, however, is not as widely used as the acronym.

We do not, however, agree with the inclusion of "Super Audio CD". The MLA constituency is deeply worried that adding to the SMDs will initiate a never-ending proliferation of terms that in the end will work against our goal to make the catalog more accessible to users. The danger of endless proliferation is most clearly evident in the continuously expanding types of encodings available for compact discs, of which SACDs are one. If Super Audio CD becomes an SMD, what about CD-Rs, CD-RWs, etc.? These are generally available to the public, all are terms in common use and all require playback machines/drives that are specifically compatible with that specific encoding. If we go the route of making Super AudioCD an SMD, we would also have to make all other compact disc encodings SMDs, so that they could be described correctly in Chapter 6. Because of this, we feel it would be better to include SACDs and all other such encodings under "compact disc" and note the encoding in 6.5C2 (Type of Recording). By this method, SuperAudioCD would instead be stated as "1 compact disc : SACD" (See our proposal for the full text of this change). This would avoid the proliferation of SMDs due to the proliferation of encoding types, while at the same time providing a place for those encoding types (and not just SACDs) to be clearly stated within Area 5. It would also help avoid any problems due to terminology slippage in terms of common use. If the SACD were to become the standard encoding for compact discs, it is likely that the general public will stop calling them "super audio CDs" and revert to the generic term

"CD" or "compact disc", forgetting that the super audio term ever existed. If the encoding is not part of the actual SMD, but instead in 6.5C2, this type of slippage will not cause difficulties.

We also suggest that the CCC proposal as it currently stands does not sufficiently define the differences between overlapping SMDs — compact disc vs. sound disc, and DAT tape vs. sound cassette. The MLA proposal restricts the original SMDs (sound disc, sound cassette) to analog discs and cassettes, clearly differentiating what each SMD covers. We feel that an adequate proposal must address this within 6.5B1.

We have one other major disagreement with the CCC proposal. CCC has presented this proposal in isolation from the rest of Chapter 6. There is no discussion on how these changes might affect other rules within the chapter or whether added rules or changes to rules are necessary to support the new SMDs and new formats/encodings in general. MLA has specifically addressed this in its own proposal. We have noted that some sections of rules become redundant with the addition of more specific terms, that other rules need to be expanded to include new possibilities and that at least one new rule (Systems requirements) is necessary to allow catalogers to adequately describe sound recordings. We strongly feel that if the new SMDs are added to Chapter 6, changes to other rules in the chapter must also take place concurrently. Without these changes, the new SMDs will not be fully integrated into the chapter, but instead will remain as awkward add-ons that are not supported by other rules and terminology in Chapter 6. Again we feel that an adequate proposal should also address these issues.