

**Addendum:
Minutes of CC:DA Discussion**

691. Agenda item 16. Report from the Task Force on an Appendix of Major/Minor Changes: Lindlan [Related document: CC:DA/TF/Major\Minor Changes/3]

Task Force Chair Kristin Lindlan said she would begin by making a few general comments, and would then go through the Appendix item by item. She asked other Task Force members present to participate in the discussion as she went along.

Lindlan thanked all of the Task Force members for their work, and said that the Task Force was grateful for the work of earlier CC:DA task forces and other groups (see Report, p. 1, para. 2).

The purpose of the Appendix, Lindlan said, is to provide catalogers with guidance on when to create a new record for a resource, and conversely, when to handle changes with notes in the existing record. She said that, for the most part, the Task Force had documented existing practice.

The Task Force's initial discussion focused on expression-level records and manifestation-level records. After some discussion, the Task Force agreed that it would draft its guidelines within the context of the existing cataloging code, which is based on manifestation-level records. Lindlan said that the Task Force supports the idea a future experiment comparing manifestation-level and expression-level cataloging for the purpose of adding further guidelines to the Appendix.

Lindlan said the Task Force had included in its report (p. 2) abbreviated *FRBR* definitions for the terms "manifestation," "expression," and "work," and borrowed definitions for "finite resource," "continuing resource," "integrating resource," and "serial" from Jean Hirons's report, *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality*. She said that there had been discussion about whether to use the term "finite resource" or "monograph" in the Appendix, and that the Task Force had decided to use "finite resource."

The report includes a section on reproductions, Lindlan reported, and the Task Force has identified some issues to be addressed by a future version of the Appendix on Major/Minor Changes.

Lindlan said that the Task Force had decided that differences between elements of the description for the parts of a multipart item or between the parts of multipart issues would not constitute major changes, and that the Appendix's basic guidelines would include the instruction "in any case of doubt, consider a change to be minor." She said that the latter instruction followed the recommendation of the Hirons *Seriality* report, and represented a change from the current code, which instructs catalogers to consider a change to be major in case of doubt.

John Attig said he wanted to congratulate the Task Force on having completed its task, and said that he had two general comments on the Appendix, though he recognized that it might not be possible to rework the Appendix to address his concerns.

The first comment, he said, was that “phrasing this in terms of changes implies that there is an order in which we do it, and what we’re really talking about is differences. There are two things you’re comparing and they are different. It’s a different way of looking at it, and I think there are some cases where it isn’t really a change.”

Attig said that his second comment was that there are couple of places within the Appendix that address changes in the cataloger’s description of an item, rather than true changes in the underlying facts of the item in hand. He cited the instructions in **E.3.1C General material designation** (p. 5) as an example where the phrasing in the Appendix suggests that a change in the description of an item, without changes to the item itself, could cause a new record to be created.

Adam Schiff asked for clarification of the sentence “Do not consider differences only between elements of the description for the parts of a multipart item or between the parts of multipart issues of a serial as major changes” in item number 3 under **E.2 BASIC GUIDELINES** (p. 4). He said that it was not clear to him how the phrase “or between the parts of multipart issues of a serial” in the second part of the instruction related to serials in which the title changes, but the numbering continues the numbering of the former title.

Elizabeth Mangan said that she thought the guideline had been included as an extension of the discussion about multipart monographs, during which it had been concluded that changes within the parts of a multipart monograph would not be considered major, and that perhaps the guideline had been included to cover that category if it exists in the serial world.

Lindlan said that she would go back and look at the Task Force’s discussions to see what had been intended by that phrase, and would reword the guideline as necessary to make it more clear.

Schiff said that he thought there might be a problem with the instructions for *Finite resource* under **E.3.1B Title proper** (p. 4). He pointed out that while the first sentence of these instructions says “Generally consider any change in title proper a MAJOR change,” the section directly above instructs the cataloger not to consider such a change major in multipart items. He said that a user of the Appendix reading this instruction would have to remember that a different instruction for multipart items had been given above, which might be a problem. He also suggested that this might be problematic in the case where a user of the Appendix goes directly to the rule, without having read the basic guidelines.

Lindlan said that the Task Force had considered this problem, and had decided that they did not want to repeat the general instruction for multipart items in each section of the Appendix, but she said that perhaps they could reconsider that decision.

Lindlan said that in the instructions for serials in **E.3.1B Title proper** (p. 4-5), the Task Force had differed with the recommendations in the Hiron *Seriality* report in item b), where the Task Force added the word “substantially” before “different subject matter,” and in item f), where they added the condition “the only change is that words that link the title to the chronologic or

numeric designation are added, changed, or dropped.” The Task Force had also added two guidelines that were not in the *Seriality* report for when to consider a change in title proper minor, Lindlan reported. Both of these reflect existing practice, she said.

Ed Glazier said that he agreed with Attig’s point that what the Appendix was presenting as one situation was actually two separate situations: one in which the cataloger is faced with two different manifestations of a finite resource, and the other in which the cataloger is faced with two different pieces of the same continuing resource. So, one case is ‘changes within the resource,’ and the other is ‘differences between two different manifestations.’ He suggested that the Appendix as currently worded might be confusing to catalogers who do not understand this concept.

Schiff asked Glazier if he was suggesting that there be a separate section of the Appendix solely for finite resources, with guidelines on when to make a new record for a new manifestation of a given finite resource, and then another section addressing changes in continuing resources?

Glazier said that he was not sure whether that was the way to address the problem, but that he wanted to make sure the Committee recognized that there was a problem. He said that the title of the Appendix, “Major/Minor Changes,” implied that it only applied to cases where there were changes within the run of a continuing resource, since finite resources do not normally ‘change’ but rather appear later as different manifestations, editions, etc.

Schiff pointed out that there was also the third case, in which you have an integrating resource that has been replaced by a later version.

Lindlan said that perhaps the Task Force could add another guideline to address this confusion.

Barbara Tillett commented that another problem we might run into later on if we draft this appendix in terms of these three categories (finite resource, integrating resource, and serial) is that there are also integrating resources that are finite, so perhaps we should be stepping back and rethinking the structure of the Appendix, and considering perhaps rewriting it in terms of four categories of resources: single-part monographs, multipart items, integrating resources, and serials.

Tillett also suggested that perhaps the Appendix could be simplified by making it focus only on major changes, rather than attempting to describe all of the possible changes that could be considered minor.

Tillett noted that the Task Force’s Appendix was full of wonderful basic principles that could be pulled from here and added to the introduction of the code, which is where the JSC is planning to put some of these statements eventually. Then it could perhaps be reiterated here in the Appendix.

Task Force member Mary Woodley commented from the floor that the Task Force had been concerned that just having the instruction in the basic guidelines “when in doubt, consider a change to be minor” would be too vague for a lot of catalogers, and that a lot of catalogers would want examples of what kinds of changes could be considered minor.

Lindlan said that the Task Force had also been concerned about catalogers who do not have access to all of the LC documentation.

Carol Hixson said that she agreed with Woodley's comment from the floor that catalogers would find the elucidation of what changes to consider minor very helpful.

Attig said that comments here at this meeting were beginning to make it seem that what CC:DA was prepared to present to the JSC was only an interim report on the work that had been done so far on an Appendix of Major/Minor Changes, and asked Tillett to comment on how she thought the JSC would react to the suggestion that further work needs to be done on this.

Tillett replied that she thought that would be fine, but that it would be very helpful for the members of the JSC to have some sort of a document that they could share with their constituents to show them the direction that CC:DA is headed in with this.

CC:DA Chair Daniel Kinney pointed out that the impetus for this task force's charge was a request from the JSC to draft this kind of appendix. He said that the JSC had asked for this in the same spirit as they had asked for the report on 0.24, that is, just as a means of getting the process started. Kinney said the question before CC:DA now was whether or not to try to meet ALA Representative to the JSC Brian Schottlaender's deadline of August 7 for submitting something to the JSC to consider at their next meeting.

Tillett said that she would strongly encourage the Committee to do so.

Attig said that what CC:DA would be prepared to submit to the JSC would most likely be this document, along with some indication of what further work might be done on it. Would that be all right?

Tillett said that it would.

Hixson said that she would not want to ask the Task Force to completely revamp this document without first hearing comments from the JSC on the work that had been done so far.

Mary Larsgaard said that she agreed with Hixson, and pointed out that the Task Force clearly had written this document as an information document, and had even stated in the introduction that they would not be able to produce a complete draft appendix without first hearing the results of several issues on the table at the next meeting of the JSC, and at the harmonization meetings, etc. She suggested that the Committee consider the document a discussion paper.

Glazier said that he agreed, and that the report should be forwarded to the JSC, perhaps along with an excerpt of the minutes from this meeting.

Schiff said that he agreed, but that the Committee should nevertheless complete its review of the rest of the document at this meeting.

The Committee agreed that this was a good idea.

E.3.1C General material designation.

Schiff said that he agreed with Attig's comment that perhaps this area should be rephrased to apply to the underlying characteristics of the item in hand, rather than to the catalog description of the item.

Lindlan said that the Task Force would rephrase or remove the area, and pointed out that the Task Force had debated whether to even include this area, and had finally decided to leave it just to refer catalogers who might look here to **E.3.5B**.

Glenn Patton pointed out the further problem that there are two lists of GMDs in AACR2, and that there are GMDs in existing records that have been superseded by GMDs with new wordings that in fact represent the same carrier.

E.3.1E Other title information

Schiff noted that the instruction under *Finite resource* was to consider a change in other title information a major change only in the presence of an indication of a change in content, and pointed out that there are many instances when a subtitle changes, and that in itself is enough indication for most catalogers to judge that a new edition was in hand. Do we want to change our current practice with regard to this?

Schiff also pointed out that the instruction to consider a change in content should be understood as a necessary step in each of the sections of the Appendix, so perhaps a more general rule at the beginning of the instructions should cover this.

E.3.1F Statements of responsibility

Attig noted that that a change in the statement of responsibility for a finite resource was to be considered a major change, and asked if that included a change in the order of names in the statement of responsibility.

Lindlan noted Attig's comment.

Larsgaard pointed out that if the definition of "integrating resource" is approved as is, some items that are now considered finite resources in certain areas, such as map series in cartographic materials, will become integrating resources. In map series, she said, a change in statement of responsibility should be considered major (not minor as the Appendix instructs for an integrating resource).

Schiff asked Larsgaard to comment on why a map series would constitute an integrating resource, not a multipart finite resource.

Larsgaard explained that map series are issued in sheets that are integrated into the series as they are received.

Mangan said that the thinking of the Task Force in constructing these rules was that no one rule would be taken in isolation. So while a rule for one area might say to consider a change to be minor, there may be changes elsewhere that will require the cataloger to create a new record.

Schiff said that a statement like Mangan had just made needed to be added above, in the basic guidelines.

Lindlan said that she would add such a statement.

Larsgaard commented that there was still a problem in **E.3.1F** because a change in the statement of responsibility in a map series, from, for example “by the Army Map Service” to “by the Defense Mapping Agency” should be considered a major change.

E.3.2 EDITION AREA

Attig said that in item a) under *finite resource*, the statement following the comma in “Numbered edition statements, provided there is also other wording indicating a change in content (e.g., corrected, enlarged, with a new introduction, etc.)” was a departure from current practice. (Current practice would have the cataloger consider a new, sequentially higher, numbered edition statement to constitute a major change, regardless of whether it included words like corrected, enlarged, with a new introduction, etc., or not.)

Attig said he was pointing this out not to argue against the practice prescribed in the Appendix, but rather to point out that if the Task Force was intending to codify existing practice, they were not doing so in this case.

Hixson said that whether the current rules reflect the practice prescribed by item a) here or not, she concurred with the instruction in item a), and would like to see it go forward.

Matthew Beacom said that he usually considered the presence of the phrase “second edition” on an item to be a clear indication that the content had changed in some way, regardless of whether words like revised, enlarged, with a new introduction, etc. were present or not, and that he would want to continue creating a new record for such an item. He suggested that item a) be removed from this section of the Appendix.

Hixson said that her experience cataloging Romance-language publications would lead her to disagree with Beacom’s opinion on the meaning of “second edition.”

Beacom said that the difference in meanings of “edition” in different languages was a perfect example of the problem with trying to create a list such as this one. That is, that we are trying to make a mechanical process out of one that is inherently a very intellectual process.

Jizba said that the Task Force was well aware of the problem of the different meanings of “edition” in different languages when they created this list, and that the problem, perhaps, was that they had not succeeded in wording this instruction the way they had intended.

Sherry Kelley said that it was clear that the result of this discussion was that item a) would have to be reworded, and suggested that the Committee move on to the next point.

Attig said that one final statement he wanted to make on this point was that there was a lot of virtue in having an instruction in the cataloging code that instructs the cataloger to determine whether a statement is a printing statement or an edition statement, and then proceeding from there.

Hixson said that the problem with that approach is that it assumes that any cataloger who picks up a book from any part of the world will implicitly understand publication patterns in that part of the world.

E.3.3 MATERIAL (OR TYPE OF PUBLICATION) SPECIFIC DETAILS AREA (WHERE APPLICABLE)

Matthew Wise said that he was obligated to say at this point that he had received by e-mail a number of passionate statements from music catalogers in opposition to the instruction under *Finite resources (applicable only for the following classes of materials)* that a difference in musical presentation statement be considered a minor change.

Wise went on to say that he thought the music catalogers who had responded to this instruction had fallen into the trap that Mangan pointed out of looking at this provision in isolation, and that they were not aware of all of the other instructions in the Appendix.

Wise said that certainly if a musical presentation statement changed from "Vocal score" to "Full score," that should constitute a major change, but that if such a change were to occur, it would also be reflected in the physical description or the edition statement. He said that he and some other MusLA members had held an ad hoc meeting on Saturday night to talk about this, and they had concluded that the only change in musical presentation statement that might occur without changes elsewhere would be a change in the language of the statement, e.g., from "Study score" to "Studium-Partitur," and that such a change could be considered minor if it occurred without other changes.

In conclusion, Wise said, the Music Library Association supported this section of the Appendix, but thought that there needed to be more education about how to apply the Appendix.

E.3.4 PUBLICATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC. AREA

Schiff noted that the guidelines under **E.3.4F Date of publication, distribution, etc.** were phrased in terms of differences in publication date, and asked if differences in inferred dates would also qualify for these provisions.

Lindlan said that they would.

Schiff also noted that his institution had a policy whereby they create new records for newly received sets of encyclopedias where the only change is a change in the copyright date (because these usually don't include edition statements, and it is impracticable to compare all of the articles in an encyclopedia against an earlier set). He said he didn't know whether other institutions had a similar policy, but that the rules for date of copyright here did not make it clear whether a change in copyright date constituted a major or minor change.

Martha Yee pointed out that AACR2, in its definition of “edition” for nonbook materials, says that a mere change in distributor should not be considered a change of edition. She said that if the Appendix is meant to reflect what the current rules say, it might be wise to at least mention that. Yee went on to say that, judging from the records in OCLC, the current provision in the glossary regarding a change in distributors of a videocassette was not being widely followed, and that it might be a healthy change to stop creating a new record for the same videocassette every time there is a change of distributor.

E.3.5 PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA (WHERE APPLICABLE)

Attig asked why, under **E.3.5C Other physical details**, the provision for cartographic materials regarding scale was placed here.

Mangan responded that this was a cut-and-paste error, and that instead of “any change in scale,” the phrase should be “any change in other physical details.”

With regard to **E.3.5B Extent of item**, Schiff noted that in integrating resources, there are sometimes changes in the extent of item that are not captured in the extent of item statement. For example, a loose-leaf publication may have a lot of pages added to it that substantially change the content of the publication, but the extent statement (1 v.) does not change.

Mangan said that this is the kind of change that would have to be discovered elsewhere in order for a new record to be created.

Schiff also pointed out that, in **E.3.5C Other physical details**, while good examples of changes in some material types were provided, others (e.g., “black & white vs. color in a microform original) were not, and that more complete guidance might be desirable here on what kinds of changes in the other physical details of various materials should be considered major changes.

E.3.6 SERIES AREA

No comments from the Committee.

Attig asked why the guidelines end after area 6. Why are there no guidelines for areas 7 and 8?

Mangan said that there was no area 7 in the Appendix because the point of the Appendix was to describe changes that might occur in an item, not in the catalog record for an item, and a note was not something that occurred in or on the item itself.

With regard to area 8, Attig suggested that for completeness, something should be said about how to treat a change in standard number.

E.4 CATALOGING OF REPRODUCTIONS

Lindlan said that this section had been added by the Task Force, just to show how this topic might be treated in an Appendix on Major/Minor Changes, and also to put into writing the practice that is now being followed by catalogers of reproductions.

Schiff pointed out that the list of candidates for cataloging as reproductions included “tape dubs,” but that there were various other kinds of dubs, so perhaps a broader term than “tape dubs” might be called for here.

Beacom said that he read the instruction in **E.4.b.1** that the cataloger consider the absence or presence of a reproduction note to mean the absence or presence of a reproduction note in the catalog record for an item. Was this indeed the intent here? Or was the Task Force referring to the absence or presence of such a note on the item itself?

Woodley said that this section of the Appendix was adapted from OCLC’s guidelines on when to create a new record, and she believed that OCLC was referring to the absence or presence of a reproduction note in the catalog record.

Cynthia Whitacre confirmed that OCLC was indeed referring to reproduction notes in the catalog record in this section of their documentation.

Beacom said that, in that case, he disagreed with the inclusion of this provision in the Appendix. He said that he agreed with Attig’s earlier point that the Appendix should address underlying changes in the characteristics of the item being cataloged, and not changes from the way the item was described in an earlier catalog record for it.

Lindlan said that she agreed with Beacom’s point, and would strike this section from the Appendix.

E.5.2 CHANGE OF LANGUAGE, INCLUDING TRANSLATIONS

Attig asked whether, in the *Serial* paragraph, the Task Force might want to consider changing the phrase “among issues or volumes” to “among issues or parts,” since “volume” tends to be construed more narrowly than “part.”

Lindlan noted the comment.

E.5.3 CHOICE OF ACCESS POINTS

Schiff pointed out that in **E.5.3.1**, item c) under *Serial* could be eliminated if the phrase “or such that a corporate body used as a qualifier in the uniform title main entry” were added to item a).

Attig said that his problem with this whole section was that it was hard to imagine a case where changes like the ones described here would not have been captured by one of the guidelines in the descriptive section.

Beacom said that he thought this section on access points was once again referring to cataloger-supplied facts about an item, rather than inherent characteristics of the item, and said that he would like to see this section eliminated, or rewritten in terms that focus on the characteristics of the item itself.

Kinney asked the Committee to decide at this point how proceed with the Task Force's report.

Beacom moved that CC:DA forward the report to the JSC by the August 7 deadline, along with notes of the Committee's discussion of it.

Larsgaard seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

**Addendum 2:
Comment from Ed Glazier, 8/1/2000**

Date: Tue, 1 Aug 2000 11:52:45 -0700

From: Ed_Glazier@notes.rlg.org

To: aschiff@u.washington.edu

Subject: Re: [ALA-CCDA:729] Appendix and Major/Minor and Minutes: Discussion

I still note in the appendix a lack of consistency in the use of the words "change/changed" and "difference/differs". During the meeting I commented on the fact that the appendix was discussing both differences between two manifestations for a finite resource and changes within a resource for continuing and some integrating resources. I don't think this has been completely resolved, nor is it adequately addressed in the Basic Guidelines, E.2. The wording in the revised draft sometimes reflects this (see E.3F, Series area) but doesn't in others (see E.3G, Standard number and terms of availability area).

This becomes particularly confusing in sections E.3D2, Place of publication, distribution, etc. and E.3D4, Place of manufacture, name of manufacturer, etc. where you need to consider whether the difference in name between two manifestations or two pieces of a continuing resource represents a significant change in the name of the body.