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

COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING: DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS

Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources

REPORT

Prepared by Laurel Jizba for the Task Force

CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION, CHARGE, METHODOLOGY

Action to date. This August report incorporates the May 2001 JSC recommendations, and is intended to be a comprehensive document of the various complex issues, correlated by numbering scheme to the numbering in our February 2001 report. Our February report was developed from our Monday, January 15, 2001 oral report and informed by discussion from the Saturday, January 13, Task Force meeting. In late May CC:DA forwarded comments from the JSC members, which the Task Force took into account when it met to revise its conclusions in its June Meeting on Saturday, June 16th.

Who we are. The Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources was appointed in July, 2000 by CC:DA. Active members are: Brad Eden, University of Nevada Las Vegas; Greta de Groat, Stanford; Laurel Jizba, Portland State University (Chair); Gene Kinnaly, Library

of Congress; Jimmie Lundgren, University of Florida; Nan Myers, Wichita State University; and Ann Sandberg-Fox, Cataloging Consultant & Trainer. Collectively, we are practicing electronic resources catalogers or supervisors/trainers in electronic resources cataloging. Almost all of us have given public presentations on electronic resources cataloging and/or published on the topic of electronic resources cataloging. Thanks go to John Attig for placing the report on the CC:DA Web site in HTML, and for editorial assistance with associated proposals for chapter 3.

The charge. *The Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources is charged with examining and if necessary, proposing changes to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules for expressing specific characteristics for electronic resources, including rules for type and extent of resource (area 3), physical description (area 5), and related notes (area 7). Particular attention shall be paid to remote resources. The Task Force shall consider areas 3, 5, and 7 of chapter 9, the roles of these areas in other chapters of AACR, and other areas of description if necessary. The Task Force shall consult with the broader cataloging community to:*

> a. *learn what is needed to identify and describe specific characteristics of electronic resources*

> b. *ascertain how areas 3, 5, and 7 are being applied and used by catalogers of electronic resources*

> c. *examine and test alternatives to current practices*

An interim report shall be presented to CC:DA at the 2001Midwinter Meeting in Washington, D.C. The final report of the Task Force shall be presented at the 2001 Annual Conference in San Francisco and shall be sent to the Chair of CC:DA no later than June 1, 2001.

Methodology: Task Force members made decisions about the issues before them based on extensive personal knowledge of mainstream electronic resources cataloging issues. This knowledge was additionally supplemented by the JSC constituency responses and three surveys were conducted of (a) the electronic resources cataloging community, (b) the Task Force itself (to evaluate the community response), and (c) of discussions with electronic resources cataloging librarians attending the Task Force's midwinter and summer meetings. The Task Force members were queried to evaluate the community survey responses (mid-December we completed a separate, internal Task Force survey). Email discussion and voting has continued to the present.

Midwinter and summer meeting/focus groups. The midwinter and Summer Task Force meetings in January and June focused on collecting another set of votes and comments from 19 or so electronic resources catalogers present at the January meeting and a smaller but similar number in June (focus groups). Those present in January were from academic libraries except for one public library cataloger and one corporate library cataloger. Only one participant had previously participated in our external survey. Academic and national librarians attended our June meeting.

External, international cataloging community survey. We began work in August, 2000. By devoting many hours over the fall season we developed, conducted and analyzed an external Web-based survey of the cataloging community. We thank John Attig for placing our survey instrument on the ALA/ALCTS/CC:DA Web site in a timely manner. The Web-based survey ran for two weeks: October 19th to November 3rd. All incoming survey responses were viewed by Task Force members via our reflector software (reflector arranged for by Nan Myers). Many thanks are due to everyone who responded to the survey. On November 9th, Jimmie Lundgren

provided preliminary numerical tallies and calculations on an Excel spreadsheet. We very much appreciate her detailed work. The rest of the members divided the large task of analyzing and summarizing hundreds of comments distributed by the Chair the 3rd week of November.

Demographics for participants in the external cataloging community survey. The cataloging community survey results consisted of 181 responses. 75% identified themselves as librarians cataloging "lots" or "some" electronic resources. 10% were administrators. The remainders were other staff members who catalog electronic resources. At least 158 responses, or 86%, came from the U.S., while at least 13% (23) were from outside the U.S. (The remaining 1% of URLS could not be placed geographically.) Of the 23 responses from outside the U.S., at least 6% (13) came from Canada. Other countries represented included the U.K., Australia, New Zealand, Germany, Czech Republic, Egypt, and Sweden. 72% were from academic libraries, 13% from special libraries and 11% from governmental libraries.

About the community survey statistical analysis. Measures of central tendency and standard deviation used in analyzing the numerical results from the external survey were: (a) average: a simple average (not strictly applicable in a scientific sense since fractional responses were not permitted, but still useful for understanding responses); (b) mode: the answer given more than any other answer; (c) median: the answer with half the other answers above and half below; (d) standard deviation: interesting as a reflection of the relative extent to which our respondents disagreed or agreed with one another on each question. Small numbers near zero indicate group agreement. Larger numbers as standard deviations mean that there is less uniformity of opinion.

B. "ACTIVE" RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR REVIEW WITH BRIEF EXPLANATIONS

Active change proposals for review are found in here in section "B". Brief explanations are given with each. The full rationales are found in Appendix I. These are also the initial "parent" recommendations from which these proposals stem, and the foundation for the proposals (ideally, the proposals illustrate the recommendations). **Although a brief explanation is given here with each rule change proposal, the Task Force strongly recommends consulting the corresponding rationale for each recommended rule change proposal, in order to determine if each change proposal is serving its purpose—and whether it is adequately reflecting and illustrating the parent recommendations or rationales.**

At the end of each header is a correlated number referring to the February 2001 Task Force report.

For the following rule changes proposals (a) deletions are struck-through, and (b) new material is double underscored. The JSC preferred formal editorial rendering of proposals: current rule (unadorned), proposed revision (adorned with struck-through deletions and double underscored additions) is not being following in the interest of providing a cleaner draft document for review.

<u>**Recommendation #1.**</u> **Eliminate Area 3 for Chapter 9 and associated rules in other chapters—area 3 is not useful [*was* B.1 in February]**

Brief explanation for recommendation #1. All Task Force members support the elimination of area 3 because it is not useful for library staff or patrons. Our survey responses support this, as do all JSC members.

Revised ALA Rule Proposal (per LC)—Delete Text In Introduction

INTRODUCTION

0.25. The ISBD (G) contains an area for details that are special to a particular class of material or type of publication. This third area is used in these rules for cartographic materials (chapter 3), music (chapter 5), ~~electronic resources (chapter 9)~~, serial publications (chapter 12), and, in some circumstances, microforms (chapter 11). Do not use this area for any other materials treated in these rules. Where it is applicable and appropriate, repeat this area. For example, in describing a serial cartographic item ~~or a serial electronic resource~~, give details relating to the cartographic material ~~or the electronic resource~~ and those relating to its seriality (in that order).

Revised ALA Rule Proposal—Delete Text In Chapter 1

CHAPTER 1
GENERAL RULES FOR DESCRIPTION

1.3. MATERIAL (OR TYPE OF PUBLICATION) SPECIFIC DETAILS AREA

1.3A. Precede this are by a full stop, space, dash, space.
This area is used in the description of cartographic materials (chapter 3), music (chapter 5), ~~electronic resources (chapter 9),~~ serial publications (chapter 12), and, in some circumstances, microforms (chapter 11). See those chapters for the contents of this area and its internal prescribed punctuation.

New ALA Rule Proposal—Delete Text In Chapter 3 Cartographic Materials. The changes are to the revisions (*4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/3*) and to the clean copy of the full chapter 3 (*4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/4*).

Delete 3.3E from the Area 3 table of contents and renumber 3.3F as 3.3E and 3.3G as 3.3F

       3A. Preliminary rule
       3B. Statement of scale
       3C. Statement of projection
       3D. Statement of coordinates and equinox
       ~~3E. File characteristics~~
       3~~F~~E. Digital graphic representation
       3~~G~~F. Numbering related to serials

Delete reference to file characteristics in 3.3A3 and remove 1st example:

3.3A3. If more than one material specific details area is required, give them in the following order: mathematical data; ~~file characteristics;~~ digital graphic representation; and numbering related to serials.

> ~~Scale not given (W 138°59′–W 93°47′/N 74°25′–N 69°16′). – Electronic data~~

> Scale 1:250,000 ; universal transverse Mercator proj. (E 138.00°–
> E 153.92°/S 9.00°–S 29.83°). – Raster : pixel. – 1996-

Delete 3.3E and renumber 3.3F as 3.3E and 3.3G as 3.3F:

~~3.3E. File characteristics~~

~~3.3E1.~~ ~~Give the file characteristics for the item as instructed in 9.3.~~

> ~~Scale not given (W 138°59′–W 93°47′/N 74°25′–N 69°16′). – Electronic data~~

3.3~~F~~E. **Digital graphic representation** [etc.]

3.3~~G~~F. **Numbering related to serials** [etc.]

Revised ALA Rule Proposal—Delete Text In Chapter 9

CHAPTER 9
ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

Contents

[... (skip to p. 25 in Amendments text)]

9.3. MATERIAL (OR TYPE OF PUBLICATION) SPECIFIC DETAILS AREA

9.3A. This area is not used for electronic resources.

~~9.3. TYPE AND EXTENT OF RESOURCE AREA~~

9.3A. Preliminary rule

9.3A1 Punctuation
For instructions on the use of spaces before and after prescribed punctuation, see 1.0C.
Precede this area by a full stop, space, dash, space.
Enclose each statement of extent inn parentheses.
Precede a statement of the number of records, statements, etc., by a colon when that statement follows a statement of the number of files.

9.3B. Type and extent of resource

9.3B1. Type of resource. Indicate the type of electronic resource being catalogued. Use one of the following terms:

> electronic data
> electronic program(s)
> electronic data and program(s)

9.3B2. Extent of resource. If the information is readily available, give the number or approximate number of files, records, etc. that make up the extent and/or these other details. If the resource is in a compressed fomr, omit the statement of extent.

a) *Data.* Give the number or approximate number of records (use *records*) and/or bytes (give the term in either abbreviated or full form).

> Electronic data (1 file : 350 records)

> Electronic data (550 records)

> Electronic data (1 file : 600 records, 240,000 bytes)

> Electronic data (1 file : 2.5 gb)

Electronic data (1 file : 1.2 megabytes)

b) *Programs.* Give the number or approximate number of statements (use *statements*) and/or bytes (give the term in either abbreviated or full form).

> Electronic program (1 file : 200 statements)

> Electronic program (2150 statements)

c) *Multipart files.* Give the number or approximate number of records and/or bytes, or statements and/or bytes, in each part according to a) or b) above.

> Electronic data (3 files : 100, 460, 550 records)

> Electronic programs (2 files : 4300, 1250 bytes)

> Electronic data (2 files : ca. 330 records each)

~~Electronic data (2 files : 800, 1250 records) and programs (3 files : 7260, 3490, 5076 bytes)~~

~~Electronic data (2 files : 3.5, 2 megabytes)~~

~~If such numbering cannot be given succinctly, omit the information from this area. If desired, give it in a note (see 9.7B8).~~

[...]

Recommendation #2. Where to place area 3 information.

Given under this recommendation are three separate options that are mutually exclusive, and given in ranked order.

Recommendation #2.a. Placing area 3 information: first option. LC Compromise: Use Areas 5 (And 7) for Area 3 Data (particularly in light of cartographic materials community needs) [*was* B.2 in February]

Brief explanation of recommendation #2.a. In its interim report (4JSC/ALA/36), the Task Force recommended that area 3 information be relocated to area 7 only, not to area 5. A majority of JSC reponses agreed. However, the Library of Congress proposed adding an option at 9.5B3 to describe "the actual content in addition to the specific material designation." In addition, CC:DA received responses to the Task Force's interim report from Mary Larsgaard and from Elizabeth Mangan, the MAGERT representative, arguing that the description of cartographic materials, in particular, require that the type and extent of content be given, even for remote access materials; these responses are included in Appendix III to this report.

A majority of the Task Force accepts with reservations that there is value in considering the views of the cartographic community, whether these concerns have been voiced by other segments of the cataloging community or not—as proposed in the "compromise" option provided by the Library of Congress. We note that this is a fairly liberal and radical approach, since it opens up area 5 for description of remote resources for any and all types of formats/chapters, merging content and carrier terms. As a result, it employs more extensive and creative conventional vocabulary than the prescribed, controlled vocabulary currently in use. Patrons might understand area 5 terms better. On the other hand, it represents a radical structural change to area 5 that can affect other chapters, and it moves past the traditional semi-controlled vocabulary. See Appendix I for more information.

ALA does not object to and accepts with reservations LC's proposal at 9.5 footnote and ALA withdraws earlier ALA proposal: please see discussion in Appendix I.

9.5. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA[2]
[...]
    2. Unless applying the option at 9.5B3, do not give a physical description for an electronic resource that is available only by remote access. See 9.7B1c and 9.7B10.

    9.5B3. *Optionally*, for direct and remote access electronic resources, record the actual content in addition to the specific material designation (where appropriate). Use terms found

in subrule .5B in the relevant chapter of part I; if none of these terms is appropriate, use conventional terminology.

184 remote-sensing images (ca. 19 mb) on 1 CD-ROM

maps on 3 CD-ROMs

1 digital photo (tiff)
(*Remote access resource*)

1 sound file (mp 3)
(*Remote access resource*)

Recommendation #2.b. Placing area 3 information: second option. Use area 7, Notes--Task Force original preference. [*was* B.4, B.8, B.11 in February] [*REINSTATED*]

Brief explanation for recommendation #2.b. The Task Force was polled on September 20, and as its second choice, the Task Force prefers to place all area 3 information into area 7, the Notes area, as discussed in the Task Force's midwinter (February) report. All JSC members except the Library of Congress agree with this. The advantage is that since there are no commonly understood standardized conventional or controlled terms for **remote** resource extent, it represents no radical structural change to area 5 and supports the status quo. As with all notes, it leaves much to cataloger's judgement. The disadvantage is that it does not accommodate the cartographic materials community's desire to use area 5, or enable merging of content and carrier in area 5.

9.5. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA[2]
[...]
    2. ~~Unless applying the option at 9.5B3, d~~ Do not give a physical description for an electronic resource that is available only by remote access. See 9.7B1c and 9.7B10.

Recommendation #2.c. Placing area 3 information: third option. Task Force Alternative Compromise: Phase-in the LC Compromise, delaying use of area 5 for all electronic resources but cartographic materials [*NEW*]

Brief explanation for recommendation #2.c. As its third choice, the Task Force supports this phase-in of the LC compromise, thereby supporting the immediate needs of the cartographic materials community (alone) in the short term. The advantages of a phase-in approach are that it enables gradual adjustment to the use of area 5 until there is a clear need for use of this area by other cataloging communities. The disadvantage is that if other cataloging communities wished to use this right away, they could not.

ALA Alternative Task Force Member Proposal to LC's Proposal at 9.5 footnote

9.5. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA[2]
[...]
    2. Unless applying the option at 9.5B3 for cartographic materials, do not give a physical description for an electronic resource that is available only by remote access. See 9.7B1c and 9.7B10.

ALA Alternative Task Force Member Proposal to LC's Proposal at 9.5B3

    9.5B3. *Optionally*, for direct and remote access cartographic electronic resources, record the terms in rule 3.5B1. in addition to the specific material designation (when appropriate).

        110 remote-sensing images
          (*Remote access resource*)

        250 maps on 2 CD-ROMs

Recommendation #3. Move Only Some Area 3 File Size Text to Area 7 [*was* B.5 in February]

Brief explanation for recommendation #3. The Task Force does not believe it is necessary to move all examples on file size from area 3 to area 7, only some of them. A majority of JSC members agree. We were not sure about how to specifically propose this in our first attempt at a rule proposal recommendation. Now, we withdraw our original proposal and agree to support LC's new rule proposal example at 9.7B8.

ALA's Original Proposal at Subrule d) 9.7B1 is withdrawn
Instead, ALA agrees with LC's New Rule Proposal that incorporates ALA's proposed example at 9.7B8

    9.7B8. **Type and extent of resource.** Give information relating to the type and extent of the resource if it is considered to be important and not found elsewhere in the description. When recording extent, specify the number or numbers or approximate number of files that make up the resource (use file or files preceded by an arabic number) and/or the number or approximate number of records (use records), statements (use statements), or bytes (give the term in either abbreviated or full form).

        Computer data (2 files: 800, 1250 records) and programs (3 files : 7260, 3490, 5076 bytes)

        Hierarchical file structure

        Number of variables: 960

        Number of routines: 102

        File size: 520, 300, 280, 320, 400, 500 records

        File size varies

File size unknown

ASCII character set

Blocked BCDs, 40 rccords per block, 90 characters per record

ALA's Original Proposal at 9.7B10 is withdrawn
Instead, ALA agrees with LC's New Rule Proposal that deletes "physical" in the second sentence

9.7B10 Physical description. Make notes on important physical details that are not included in the physical description area, especially if these affect the use of the item. If the resource is available only by remote access, give ~~physical~~ details (e.g., colour, sound) if they are readily available and considered important.

Stereo sd.

Displays in red, yellow, and blue

Not copy-protected

Recommendation # 4. At 9.5B1 and at 9.5D1, de-emphasize use of the direct extent term "computer optical disc": make it the option; emphasize "conventional terminology" instead [*was* B.6 in February]

Brief explanation for recommendation #4. There are three connected items here, and the first two are given in order of Task Force preference for 9.5B1 (only one can be chosen). The third stands separately, referring to 9.5D1. Considering these two rules for **direct** resources, a majority of the Task Force strongly prefers that **conventional terms** for **direct** resources take precedence over currently **prescribed terms** for **direct** resources. If the LC compromise at B.2.a. is chosen, this would make **direct** treatment parallel with the **remote** treatment given by the LC compromise in B.2.a. Even if the LC compromise is not chosen, the Task Force strongly prefers this, giving the older term "computer optical disc" a secondary role to conventional terminology like "CD-ROM", which patrons understand better. 3 JSC members agree (BL, ACOC, CC:DA) with the initial Task Force recommendation. We disagree with LC's reluctance to support this and believe that if this is not done it will be almost immediately perceived as an unfortunate oversight in need of equally immediate correction.

Recommendation #4.a for 9.5B1. Wording Option #1 for 9.5B1 — "A Newer Look" Option (first choice).

New ALA Rule Proposal — Deletions & Additions, prominently giving instruction and examples that catalogers actually see frequently.

9.5B. Extent of item (including specific material designation)

9.5B1. For direct access electronic resources, record the number of physical units of the carrier by giving the number of them in arabic numerals. Use conventional terminology to record the specific format of the physical carrier:

> 1 CD-ROM
>
> 2 Photo CDs
>
> 1 DVD

> *Optionally*, use one of the following terms as appropriate:

> > computer chip cartridge
> > computer disk
> > computer optical disc
> > computer tape cartridge
> > computer tape cassette
> > computer tape reel

[*Delete all text that would come after this to* "When new physical..."]

> When new physical carriers are developed for which none of these terms is appropriate or sufficient, give the specific name of the physical carrier as concisely as possible using conventional terminology ~~preferably qualified by *computer*~~.
> *Optionally*, qualify terms by *computer*, if appropriate, to meet the needs of the cataloguing agency.

> 1 computer card
>
> 1 computer optical card

Delete 2001 Amendments Optional Rule

> ~~*Optionally*, use conventional terminology to record the specific format of the physical carrier.~~

> ~~1 CD-ROM~~
>
> ~~1 Photo CD~~
>
> ~~1 DVD~~

> *Optionally*, specify the number or approximate number of files that make up the content (use file or files preceded by an arabic numeral) and/or the number or approximate number of records (use records), statements (use statements), or bytes (give the term in either abbreviated or full form). Enclose additions in parentheses.

<u>1 CD-ROM (1 file: 240,000 bytes)</u>

<u>1 computer disk (3 files : 100, 460, 550 records)</u>

<u>1 zip disk (96MB)</u>

Give a trade name or other similar specification in a note (see 9.7B1b).

Recommendation #4.b for 9.5B1. Wording Option #2—"A More Traditional" Wording Option (second choice)

Revised ALA Rule Proposal, (closer to MAY 2001 Amendments text)—Deletions & additions, more-or-less a reversal of text found in the May 2001 Amendments Package for Chapter 9 (but using an alphabetical approach) [*NEW*]

9.5B. Extent of item (including specific material designation)

9.5B1. <u>For direct access electronic resources,</u> record the number of physical units of the carrier by giving the number of them in arabic numerals and one of the following terms as appropriate:

> <u>CD-ROM</u>
> computer chip cartridge
> computer disk
> ~~computer optical disc~~
> computer tape cartridge
> computer tape cassette
> computer tape reel
> <u>DVD</u>
> <u>Photo CD</u>

<u>1 CD-ROM</u>

1 computer disk

2 computer cassettes

~~1 computer optical disc~~

1 computer reel

<u>1 DVD</u>

<u>1 Photo CD</u>

When new physical carriers are developed for which none of these terms is appropriate, or sufficient give the specific name of the physical carrier as concisely as possible <u>using conventional terminology</u> ~~preferably qualified by~~ *computer*.

<u>*Optionally*, qualify terms by *computer*, if appropriate, to meet the needs of the cataloguing agency.</u>

1 computer card

1 computer optical card

Delete 2001 Amendments Optional Rule

~~*Optionally*, use conventional terminology to record the specific format of the physical carrier.~~

~~1 CD-ROM~~

~~1 Photo CD~~

~~1 DVD~~

<u>*Optionally*, specify the number or approximate number of files that make up the content (use file or files preceded by an arabic numeral) and/or the number or approximate number of records (use records), statements (use statements), or bytes (give the term in either abbreviated or full form). Enclose use additions in parentheses.</u>

<u>1 computer disk (3 files : 100, 460, 550 records)</u>

<u>1 CD-ROM (1 file: 240,000 bytes)</u>

<u>1 zip disk (96MB)</u>

Give a trade name or other similar specification in a note (see 9.7B1b).

Recommendation #4.c for 9.5D1. Add example, delete example. (This proposal for rule 9.5D1 is independent of the two options for 9.5B1.)

ALA Proposal —New example at 9.5d & deletion of older term example (as a term to be avoided)

9.5D1. Give the dimensions of the physical carrier as instructed below.

<u>1 CD-ROM : col. ; 4 ¾ in.</u>

1 computer disk : col. ; 5 ¼ in.

~~1 computer optical disc : col. ; 4 ¾ in.~~

Recommendation #5. **Blend content and carrier in area 5.**

Given under this recommendation are two options that are mutually exclusive, and given in ranked order, according to the Task Force's preferences. The Task Force recommends that both options go forward to the JSC, even if CC:DA chooses to register its preference for one option and reject the other option. (Possibility: the words "Selected by CC:DA" and "Rejected by CC:DA" might be placed next to the rejected options as a simple way to edit this document.)

Recommendation #5.a. **Blend content and carrier in area 5: first option. Extend to all resources, including remote resources, the option to blend content and carrier (since it is being extended to direct resources).** [*was* **B.7 in February**]

Brief explanation for recommendation #5. The majority of the Task Force recommends parallel treatment that allows blending of content and carrier, for both **remote and direct resources,** since it is already being proposed for direct resources. A majority of JSC members has agreed to extend it to direct resources; LC would also extend it to remote. However, we note that there probably are implications for other chapters (such as music).
ALA agrees with LC's New Rule Proposal

Same as Recommendation #2.a. in this report, but repeated here for ease of reading comprehension in this context.

> **9.5B3.** *Optionally,* for direct or remote access electronic resources, record the actual content in addition to the specific material designation (where appropriate). Use terms found in subrule .5B in the relevant chapter of part I; if none of these terms is appropriate, use conventional terminology.

> > 184 remote sensing images (ca. 18 mb) on 1 CD-ROM

> > maps on 3 CD-ROMs

> > 1 digital photo (tiff)
> > (*Remote access resource*)

> > 1 sound file (mp3)
> > (*Remote access resource*)

Recommendation #5.b. **Blend content and carrier in area 5: first option. Alternative to recommendation #5.a., the Task Force offers an alternative compromise: Delay the phase-in by temporarily restricting blended content and carrier treatment to cartographic materials only.** [*NEW*]

Brief explanation for recommendation #5.b. If recommendation #5.a. is not chosen, then this is an alternative option supported by the Task Force that accommodates the cartographic materials community immediately in the short run—a phase in approach.

ALA Alternative Proposal

Same as Recommendation #2.c. in this report, but repeated here for ease of reading comprehension in this context.

> **9.5B3.** *Optionally*, for direct and remote access cartographic electronic resources, record the terms in rule 3.5B1 in addition to the specific material designation (when appropriate).
>
> > 110 remote-sensing images
> > > (*Remote access resource*)
> >
> > 250 maps on 2 CD-ROMs

Recommendation #6. Add new example for description of complex accompanying material for both direct and remote resources (but do not change text of instruction in area 5) [*was* B.10 in February]

Brief explanation for recommendation #6. Task Force opinion and survey results show that another notes example for describing complex accompanying materials would help in reducing the length of area 5 when there are complex accompanying materials, a good thing. A majority of JSC members agree to this.

ALA agrees with LC's revision of ALA's proposal at 9.7B11 to add the ALA proposed example only (ALA withdraws text changes)

> **9.7B11. Accompanying material**. Make notes on the location of accompanying material if appropriate. Give details of accompanying material neither mentioned in the physical description area nor given a separate description (see 1.5E).
>
> > Accompanied by a series of 5 programs in PL/, with assembler subroutines
> >
> > Accompanied by documentation: 1980 census user's guide. Pts. 1-2 Washington, D.C. Supt. of Docs., 1982
> >
> > Set accompanied by one teacher's and parent's guide, titled: Using sources / by James A. Peroco; and one user's guide. A teacher's guide accompanies each disc
> >
> > Accompanied by 1 tutorial, 1 installation and performance guide, 1 AutoLISP programmer's reference, 1 IGES interface specifications, 1 addendum, 1 plastic template

<u>**Recommendation #7**</u>. **Give better guidance in making summary notes.**
[*was* B.20 in February]

Brief explanation for recommendation #7. The Task Force strongly supports whatever additional guidance can be added to *AACR2* with respect to construction of summary notes, because it is long overdue. LC agreed with the sentence we are proposing. Several JSC members agree to addressing this issue (a) for chapter 1, (b) in new example for chapter 9 and (c) for the glossary.

<div align="center">CHAPTER 1
GENERAL RULES FOR DESCRIPTION</div>

Revised ALA Rule Proposal (LC agrees to the first sentence of the original proposal)

1.7. NOTE AREA

    1.7B17. Summary. <u>Give a brief, objective summary of the purpose and content of an item, unless another part of the description provides enough information. See 2.7B17, 4.7B17, 6.7B17, 7.7B17, 8.7B17, 9.7B17, 10.7B17, and 11.7B17.</u>

New Summary Note Example Proposal at 9.7B17. Summary

    9.7B17. Summary. Give a brief, objective summary of the purpose and content of an item unless another part of the description provides enough information.

[...] *add as the last example at 9.7B17. Summary.*

> <u>Summary: A digital collection of original photographs and documents on Northwest Coast and Plateau Indian cultures, complemented by essays by anthropologists, historians, and teachers about particular tribes and cross-cultural topics. Maps show traditional territories or reservation boundaries for parts of Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana. Digital databases include over 2,300 original photographs, over 3,800 pages from the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior from 1851 to 1908, and the six Indian treaties negotiated in 1855. Secondary sources include over 100 articles and books from several Northwest libraries and museums. Includes search engine.</u>
> (*Remote or Direct resource*)

New Glossary Term Proposal

<div align="center">**GLOSSARY**</div>

    <u>**Summary.** A brief, objective note describing the purpose and content of an item.</u>

Recommendation #8. **Amend (chapter 1) to show that notes should be both simple and specific.** [*was* **B.21 in February**]

The Task Force does not have a specific rule change proposal. However, the Task Force would simply point out that the cataloging community survey is in direct conflict with some current CCC proposals to make even more widespread use of general notes within chapter 12, and would therefore simply caution about preferring to add additional instructions that prefer general notes over simple, specific notes, especially for electronic resources. Chapter 1 would be the logical place for such instructions.

APPENDIX I.

"ACTIVE" RATIONALES / PARENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROPOSALS WITH BACKGROUND DATA, INCLUDING JSC RESPONSE TALLIES *(NEW)*

Currently active rationales/recommendations for the rule change proposals, with related background data appear here in Appendix I. These rationales— are also the initial "parent" recommendations from which the section B. proposals stem, and the foundation for the proposals (ideally, the proposals illustrate the recommendations). It would be very useful to consult the corresponding rationale/ recommendations in conjunction with each rule change proposal, to determine if each change proposal is serving its purpose and adequately reflecting and illustrating the parent recommendations or rationales.

At the end of each header is a correlated number referring to the February 2001 Task Force report.

This August 2001 (Revised in September 2001) set of recommendations includes the responses of multiple specialist groups:

- The JSC responses shared via CC:DA at the end of May, 2001
- CC:DA at midwinter and summer 2001 meetings
- The Task Force summer meeting of Saturday, June 16th (oral responses)
- The Task Force midwinter meeting of Saturday, January 13th (oral responses)
- The internal Task Force member surveys (written responses)
- The external cataloging international community survey (written responses)

Recommendation #1. Eliminate Area 3 for Chapter 9 and Associated Rules in Other Chapters—Area 3 Is Not Useful [*was* B.1 in February]

JSC. All JSC members **agree** with the Task Force and CC:DA that area 3 should be eliminated.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. The Task Force found in a unanimous vote of its members upon examination of community survey results, that existing rules for area 3 (data/programs/data & programs) "file characteristics" are **not** useful for library staff or for patrons. On this basis, the Task Force recommends that area 3 be eliminated altogether.
　　　The external survey of the cataloging community conducted by the Task Force indicated that 52% of the survey respondents did not find the existing area 3 useful for library staff or patrons. 19% were in strong disagreement with use of area 3. 16% had no opinion. We received 38 written responses, and 75% of those comments were negative with regard to the usefulness of area 3. Reasons for finding area 3 not useful are: lack of utility, redundancy with other parts of the description, the addition of delay to cataloging time without adding significant value. Fully 60% or 107 of those responding to this issue indicated that area 3 is not indexed in MARC catalogs.
　　　The midwinter focus group agreed to eliminate area 3; this was reconfirmed in June.

Recommendation #2.a. LC Compromise: Use Areas 5 (AND 7) for Area 3 Data (particularly in light of cartographic materials community needs) [*was* B.2 in February]

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** with the Task Force's, and CC:DA's original recommendation to relocate area 3 information ONLY into area 7.

JSC. 1 JSC member (LC), COMPROMISES to accommodate the Cartographic Materials community request—retaining the footnote at 9.5, and making it optional to place remote resources description in area 5 for **any** and **all** types of electronic resources. LC's compromise would (a) support the status quo of no area 5 description for remote resources while (b) simultaneously supporting the optional choice, to describe remote resources in area 5, per the footnote.

The Task Force and CC:DA DO NOT OBJECT to following the LC compromise in relocating area 3 information, to: (a) either area 7 for REMOTE resources, or (b) optionally, to area 5 for REMOTE resources for ANY and ALL types of materials NOW. However, we note that this is a fairly liberal opening up of area 5 for any type of wording to be used. As such, it is somewhat impractical when applied to routine, mainstream remote resources cataloging, since there are no readily available terms. (Catalogers may well choose not to apply the option for routine, remote resources cataloging.) Overwhelmingly, the Task Force does support use of conventional terminology for description in the record, and thus the notions that (a) at the present time, users and library staff do not understand prescribed terms as well as they understand commonly used conventional terms for direct or remote resources (when they exist), and that (b) perhaps more importantly, electronic resource terminology is changing faster than the rules process can keep up with this change. So why not take this large step forward and let catalogers use area 5 as an option for remote resources (whether terms exist or not)—since it will allow them to be flexible, current and creative?

The LC Compromise: advantages and disadvantages
>   **Advantages:**
>   ▪   Enables Cartographic Materials community's use of area 5 immediately
>   ▪   Enables other formats/chapters to develop their own terms for use in area 5 immediately
>   ▪   The "semi controlled" vocabulary historically stabilized in area 5 would disappear, enabling catalogers to be more flexible, current, and creative, at least in the short term
>   ▪   Patrons might understand area 5 better if conventional terms were used there for all electronic resource**s**
>   **Disadvantages:**
>   ▪   In reality, no terms (either prescribed or conventional) consistently exist for remote resources—(except perhaps for cartographic materials)—the terms will need to be developed in other chapters by specialized catalogers, and practicing catalogers will be confused in deciding what terms to use in area 5, for remote resources, at least for a while
>   ▪   Focal point of guidance and development would best be shifted to other chapters (where use would be more immediate and practical)
>   ▪   Very little actual use by other catalogers is anticipated at this time (music, text, moving image), although it is anticipated that in the future, use would become more common. (Hence original Task Force proposal to move area 3 to area 7)
>   ▪   SMD becomes at least one of the focal points for the content and carrier debate, since terms conveying embedded content would be present with carrier terms; terms conveying

embedded content and carrier (in a single word) would also be in use. Since the SMD serves multiple user communities, multiple tables of precedence (a type of case law) may potentially be invoked at some point in the future; alternatively, other options may become apparent in the future

▪ The "semi controlled" vocabulary historically stabilized in area 5 would disappear, at least in the short term

Recommendation #2.b. **Placing area 3 information: second option. Use area 7, Notes--Task Force original preference. [*was* B.4, B.8, B.11 in February]**
[REINSTATED]

Brief explanation for recommendation #2.b. As its second choice, the Task Force was polled on September 20, and it prefers to place all area 3 information into area 7, the Notes area, as discussed in the Task Force's midwinter report and as supported by the Task Force survey results. All JSC members except the Library of Congress agree with this. The advantage is that it represents no radical structural change to area 5 and supports the status quo, and as with all notes, leaving much to cataloger's judgement. The disadvantage is that it does not accommodate the cartographic materials community's desire to use area 5, or enable merging of content and carrier in area 5.

Recommendation #2.c. Task Force Alternative Compromise: phase-in the LC Compromise, delaying use of Area 5 for all electronic resources but cartographic materials [*NEW*]

The Task Force's Alternative Compromise proposal is to phase-in, by restricting and modifying the LC compromise in relocating area 3 information to area 5 at the present time, **by temporarily limiting it only to** application for cartographic materials—with the understanding that there will be a **future extension** of this treatment to other resources.

This alternative proposal by one member of the Task Force (supported as a secondary approach by the Task Force) addresses the concerns that (a) LC's compromise is potentially confusing for catalogers of electronic resources (the proposed "optionality" of the footnote and wording of 9.5B3—as these changes call for optionally recording the "actual content") and (b) how the cataloger goes about describing remote content—which is made up of different decisions regarding mixed media/formats such as text and photos or maps, charts, and tables that take in two or more chapters in part 1. From this viewpoint, it is not clear what constitutes "conventional terminology" which is proposed for use in the absence of appropriate terms in sub-rule .5B in the relevant chapters of part 1. The examples of "digital photo" and "sound file" are questionable. Since the intent of the compromise is for the purpose of accommodating cartographic materials, this member suggests that the footnote and the rule be worded to cover cartographic materials only for the time being, in the short term, until such time when content items relating to other formats and chapters are developed or become available. For example, in the case of the footnote at 9.5, this proposal suggests this wording:

> **9.5.** Unless applying the option at 9.5B3 for cartographic materials, do not give a physical description for an electronic resource that is available only by remote access. See 9.7B1c and 9.7B10.

In the case of 9.5B3, this proposal would use wording something like the following:

> **9.5B3.** *Optionally*, for direct and remote access cartographic electronic resources, record the terms in rule 3.5B1 in addition to the specific material designation (when appropriate).

> 110 remote-sensing images
>> (*Remote access resource*)

> 250 maps on 2 CD-ROMs

Initially, the Task Force supported only area 7. Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey: area 7. The cataloging community survey showed that 54% of respondents want area 7, notes, to be the desirable specific location, the one most preferred for file characteristics terms. 49% say the current "short list" of terms in area 3 is not needed anywhere in the description. A smaller plurality said that the ISBD (ER) list of terms has some slight value for use in notes.

Also, the Task Force queried the community about use of the subject genre field (MARC 655) as an alternative location; it was considered very acceptable by a large plurality (43%) of survey respondents (although this is not a majority).

The Task Force agreed with the community survey that the best alternative location for file characteristics details is in the notes area, area 7. Specifically, we suggest looking at rules 9.7B1 and 9.7B8, reworking/combining them (MARC 516 field of a bibliographic record). Task Force arguments for using area 7 are:

1. Mixed Opinion. The survey respondents were very divided on this issue. They indicated that we should stick to the practice of leaving out area 5 (MARC 300 field) for remote resources because it is now an established practice that seems to work.

2. Avoids Confusion. Area 7, notes, avoids confusion for users and catalogers. There is little to be gained by changing current practice but much to be lost by confusing those catalogers who only occasionally work with Internet resources. Any readily available physical details regarding remote files (sound, color, or other ill.) should be put in the note area if appropriate (including characteristics like "remote sensing").

3. Not Productive. It is not productive for catalogers to have to spend time consulting dictionaries and the like to include this information due to resources awaiting cataloging.

4. No Obvious Use For Physicality. Area 7 does not have an obvious use for recording information on direct access files as direct access files are distinguished by being stored on and contained in physical carriers that are inserted into the file drives of a computer. Thus they are "tangible" (unlike remote access files) and lend themselves naturally to a physical description.

5. MARC label conflict. Many integrated library systems have a label for the MARC 300 field that says: "Physical description", largely to accommodate tangible materials. Using it would be nonsense for remotely accessed resources. By contrast, tangible, direct electronic resources do have a physical carrier that we can describe. It seems best to use the physical description (MARC 300 field) to be consistent with other kinds of physical items whose extent is known.

Reconfirmaton of Area 7. At the midwinter Task Force meeting, the members and the audience present reconfirmed that relocating area 3 information to area 7, for **remote** resources, was fine. At the summer meeting the Task Force and audience did not object to use of area 5 per LC and the cartographic community, although problems are foreseen if this area is to be used for routine cataloging of remote resources.

Initially, the Task Force rejected the area 5 option. Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey: area 5. Although the community survey results could be construed to read that since the community was divided on the issue—a large percentage (but less than a majority) would agree to relocating area 3 information for **remote** resources into area 5—this option was initially rejected by the Task Force in its midwinter meeting as impractical and unnecessary. Regarding available terminology, because community survey respondents (a) rejected all but 3 proposed terms for "routine" description of extent, and (b) also rejected description of sound for "typical" remote resources, no use of the following generic type of description should ever be encouraged, implicitly or explicitly, in area 5 (MARC 300):

> 1 Internet resource : sd., col.

The historical use of area 5 for similar data was rejected by the Task Force and by its midwinter focus group—(i.e., that since the area 3 information was originally located in area 5, it should be put back into area 5).

For **remote** resources, merging of "intellectual content characteristics" and "content characteristics" was rejected, largely due to content instability, but also due to greater difficulty in examining a remote resource. However, this treatment might have some limited potential for **direct** resources. Further intellectual content description in area 7 is always possible for all electronic resources. Rejected draft example for **remote** resources:

> Area 5 (MARC 300)
>   10 satellite maps in 10 files : sd., col.
> Area 7—9.7B1 (MARC 516)
>   Visual and infrared satellite maps for North Dakota with colorized legends and audio description.

Survey comments also indicated that rejecting the area 5 option for REMOTE resources supports the concept of multiple version description.

Recommendation #3. Move only some Area 3 file size text to Area 7 [*was* B.5 in February]

The Task Force continues to recommend to move only some area 3 information on file size to area 7, and to make no changes that would eliminate file size, even though it is of lesser descriptive importance.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** with the Task Force that it is not necessary to move all examples on file size from area 3 to area 7, only some of the examples. ACOC and BL would prefer this be done at the discretion of the cataloguer.

JSC. 1 JSC member (LC) did **not agree**. "We believe that 9.7B1 already combines many diverse aspects in a single rule—adding an additional aspect (file characteristics) to this rule seems unnecessary when simple revisions to existing rules 97.B8 (Type and extent of resource) and 9.7B10 (Physical description) can adequately address the needs. We find the proposed subrule d) to be particularly troublesome given that it provides four criteria (available, important, ability to give succinctly, readily available) for a rule that is Optional to begin with."

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. There is a positive but lesser relevance for file size. Both the community survey results and the Task Force agreed that file size is not equally as relevant as other elements, although it has some value for library staff and patrons. It should remain in chapter 9. Both groups agreed that file size does not serve as a rough indicator of paging. Survey Count: 168, 117 (70%) No; 51 (30%) Yes.

Relationship of file size to types of resources. Both the community survey results and the Task Force agreed that file size relates to various kinds of files differently. The community said file size relates to:

84 (46%)   Any and all types of electronic resources
46 (25%)   Data files alone
23 (13%)   Multimedia files? (files with sound, graphics, etc.)
22 (12%)   Text files—electronic resources that may be read on screen like text
14 (8%)   None of the above
Count: 189 (Note: some said yes to more than one)

Percentage is in relation to total number of respondents (181) to this question.

Recommendation # 4. At 9.5B1 and at 9.5D1, De-emphasize use of the direct extent term "computer optical disc": Make it the option; Emphasize "conventional terminology" instead [*was* B.6 in February]

For direct resources (in line with remote treatment), the Task Force and CC:DA continue to recommend that for direct resources conventional terms would take precedence over currently prescribed terms, and so a reversal of the text and the option (i.e., CD-ROM would be preferred rather than "computer optical disc", which would be just an option), immediately. By giving "computer optical disc" a secondary, optional role in chapter 9, as soon as possible, we remove the emphasis on it, and on its older, underlying philosophy from area 5. (While the current, May 2001 Amendments version for this rule in chapter 9 provides the option of using the more conventional terminology, e.g. CD-ROM, it also continues to give emphasis to "computer optical disc" in the text—a reversal of necessary current and future emphasis.) See our response to LC's comments in the 4th paragraph of this section, below.

If the LC compromise at B.2.a. is chosen, this would make **direct** treatment parallel with the **remote** treatment given by the LC compromise in B.2.a. Even if the LC compromise is not chosen, the Task Force strongly prefers this, giving the older term "computer optical disc" a secondary role to conventional terminology like "CD-ROM", which patrons understand better. 3 of 3 JSC members agree (BL, ACOC, CC:DA) with the initial Task Force recommendation. We disagree with LC's reluctance to support this and believe that if this is not done it will be almost immediately perceived as an unfortunate oversight in need of equally immediate correction.

We offer three potential changes in text for accomplishing the above in this report in part B. "Active" Rule Change Proposals for Review. The first two proposals make a prominent change at 9.5B1 (only one can be chosen). The first gives examples catalogers will actually see frequently. The second proposed option is more-or-less a reversal of text found in the May 2001 Amendments package for chapter 9. The third stands separately, referring to 9.5D1.

JSC. 3 JSC members **agreed** (BL, ACOC, CC:DA) with the INITIAL Task Force recommendation to emphasize conventional terminology for "**direct**" resources. (We again point

out the necessity of diminishing the importance of the dated term "computer optical disc" and its dated underlying philosophy given today's library catalogue users as soon as possible.) We only single out "computer optical disc" as a key example of the old way of thinking, and do not mean to restrict revisions to optical technology alone.

JSC. 3 JSC members **did not agree** (LC, LA, CCC) with the switch to diminish the philosophy behind the dated prescribed term by removal. (We note that making it an option would accomplish the objective similarly). Generally, LC would retain the dated "computer optical disc" in chapter 9, while also allowing use of optional conventional terminology. Further, LC does allow that it would be agreeable to add a new example at 9.5D1 "1 CD-ROM : col. 4 ¾ in.". Apropos the LC response, we do not think that catalogers will be confused about this "rapid" change in approach given the "May Amendments 2001 package"—in fact, we think it will almost immediately be perceived as an unfortunate oversight in need of an equally immediate correction by the JSC. It will be a comparatively minor change for direct resources, particularly given that for remote resources, area 5 is proposed to be "opened up", for any and all conventional terms, where there are no prescribed terms to fall back on. Further, catalogers should realize that *AACR* undergoes continual revision.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. For direct resources, "Computer optical disc" (and the philosophy underlying its use) is **not** popular among practicing electronic resources catalogers. A rule recommendation for AACR2R regarding "computer optical disc" is recommended. Community survey respondents and all voting Task Force members agreed that "Computer optical disc" is **not** liked—it is **not** a very popular term. Task Force agrees that we should recommend doing something different in the rules with respect to the use of the term "computer optical disc" and the underlying philosophy of its use. The underlying philosophy gives preference to a term for extent with long-term stability, rather than giving preference to a currently stable, commonly understood term. (However, it is the case that sometimes a commonly understood term may have different meanings among different user communities; changing the underlying philosophy will need to take into account such ambiguities in popular terminology.)

At the January 13th Task Force meeting, it was decided that "computer disc (CD-ROM)" would be an acceptable replacement term if CD-ROM cannot stand by itself.

Recommendation #5. a. Blend content and carrier in area 5: first option. Extend to all resources, including remote resources, the option to blend content and carrier (since it is being extended to direct resources). [*was* B.7 in February]

TF and CC:DA. At present, the Task Force and CC:DA agree to extend the option to both remote and direct resources, per the decision to allow optional use of area 5 for both remote and direct. Initially, the Task Force recommended blending of content with carrier **only** for **direct** resources in area 5 and only using established terms from other chapters.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** to blend content with carrier **only** for **direct** resources in area 5, and to continue to exclude remote access electronic resources from this area. They note with the Task Force the potential impact on other chapters. BL does not agree with "the example of "maps on computer optical discs" as a) we prefer the use of more specific conventional terminology and b) the extent should be specified."

JSC. 1 JSC member (LC) agrees, but would ALSO like to **extend the option** to **all** electronic resources (remote and direct access), given that "184 remote sensing images" is no less important

when mounted on a server than when residing on a CD-ROM (a particular concern for our non-print cataloging operations)".

Task Force Thought & Community Survey.   The community survey results show a preference for blending of content and carrier in two examples for **direct** resources:
    (a) "184 remote-sensing images (ca. 5 gb) on 10 computer optical discs" and
    (b) " maps on computer optical discs".
For example (a), above, the standard deviation was 0.98 (relatively close agreement) "agree   but leaning to no opinion". For example (b), the standard deviation was 1.11 (slightly lesser agreement) resulting in "no opinion, leaning slightly towards disagree".
        At the January 13th meeting, Task Force members agreed, only for **direct** resources (a) to add proposed language limiting use of this blended option to terms within other chapters and (b) to add an example illustrating the blending of content with carrier in area 5, primarily because **direct** resources have the stability necessary for this and because they are relatively easily examined. Only established terms from other chapters would be used. **This could potentially impact not only chapter 9, but also introductory statements in several other chapters.** Audience members at the meeting also accepted this approach.

Recommendation #5.b. Blend content and carrier in area 5: second option. Task Force alternative compromise: delay the phase-in to blend content and carrier by temporarily restricting it to cartographic materials only. [*NEW*]

One Task Force member (**supported as an alternative proposal by the Task Force**) would temporarily restrict blending of content and carrier to cartographic materials only at 9.5B3. For further discussion see B.2.b. above. In the case of 9.5B3, this proposal would use wording something like the following:

> **9.5B3.** *Optionally*, for direct and remote access cartographic electronic resources, record the terms in rule 3.5B1 in addition to the specific material designation (when appropriate).

>   110 remote-sensing images
>   (*Remote access resource*)

>   250 maps on 2 CD-ROMs

Recommendation #6. Add new example for description of complex accompanying material for both direct and remote resources (but do not change text of instruction in Area 5) [*was* B.10]

JSC. A majority of JSC members AGREE to this.

TF and CC:DA continue to support the concept. The Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey showed that complex accompanying materials are better described in the notes area. At the same time, existing rules that enable description of **simple**, **straightforward** accompanying materials for **direct** electronic resources in area 5 have strong numerical support in both the opinion of Task Force members and in the external community responses.

Recommendation #7. Give better guidance in making summary notes. [*was* B.20 in February]

JSC. Several JSC members **agree** to either addressing this issue in chapter 1 (or a conceptual chapter) and also to including another "summary" example in chapter 9.

On the whole, the Task Force and CC:DA continue to support whatever additional guidance can be added to AACR with respect to construction of summary notes and to place such an instruction in Chapter 1, as the Task Force initially proposed—but now using fewer words. We note that an Online Audiovisual Catalogers Task Force is doing a rather elaborate study of the issues. In spite of the potential importance of that effort, however, because this issue has been neglected and is long overdue, we encourage adoption of our simplified proposals now for (a) chapter 1, (b) the glossary and (a) the new example for chapter 9.

The Task Force emphasizes that the Task Force views summary notes as a kind of specialized, specific note—more than just any "general note" or "general nature of item note". (It may be viewed as a specialized type of "nature of item note". 9.7B17 would benefit from relocation to 9.7B1. b) with renumbering of such that b) becomes c) System ... , and c) becomes d) Mode ...). Further, the Task Force is providing a new summary note example for consideration (from an actual resource). It also supports the recent CC:DA chapter 9 summary note example proposed by A. Schiff. We encourage placement of examples that cover both static (monographic) and integrating electronic resources in chapter 9.

Task Force Thoughts & Focus Group.   Task Force and focus group agree. In its meetings in both January and June, the Task Force discussed and approved the recommendation to enhance summary note guidance in chapter 9 and also in chapter 1. The focus group of 19 practicing electronic resources catalogers agreed.

Summary notes are under-appreciated. All 6 active Task Force members agreed with community survey respondents that summary notes are under-appreciated, or unappreciated, in relation to other standards like Dublin Core, etc. There seems to be a lack of appreciation of the specific yet flexible nature of the summary note (MARC 520). One potential reason is that it is de-emphasized in AACR2R and there are no instructions for applying it. However, survey comments indicated that most catalogers working with audiovisual materials do create summary notes and understand their value to library staff and patrons alike.

Recommendation #8. Amend (Chapter 1) to show that notes should be both simple and specific. [*was* B.21 in February]

JSC. It may be inferred that a majority of JSC members **do not object** to this concept, (apparently), since they did not comment specifically on it.

TF. The Task Force does not have a specific rule change proposal. However, the Task Force would simply point out that this cataloging community survey finding is in direct conflict with some current CCC proposals to make even more widespread use of general notes within chapter 12, and would therefore simply caution about preferring to add additional instructions that prefer general notes over specific notes, especially for electronic resources. Chapter 1 would be the logical place for such instruction.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   The Task Force found this to be too difficult for recommending a change to chapter 9, because much judgement is involved in this type of consideration and it would be difficult, if not impossible to write. However, it can be construed that eliminating area 3 and emphasizing specificity in notes fulfills this desire for a simpler description with more specificity in area 7.

Community says notes should be simpler**.** Six (6) Task Force members unanimously agreed with community survey respondents that notes should be made simpler. Survey respondents indicated that notes should be made simpler and not redundant. Judging from the comments, simplicity and lack of redundancy is wanted in notes. 13 comments representing over a fourth to a third of the respondents asked for simpler, shorter records with fewer notes, avoiding duplication within the record. (This was 34% of 38 comments on notes in the notes section and 28% of all comments on the questionnaire whether the comments came from (a) the notes comments or (b) the general comments section).

Four (4) Task Force members said notes should be more specific. Specificity in notes is wanted. Fewer respondents, about ¼ of the total respondents say specific, unique note fields for "further explanation/ elaboration" and flexibility are wanted. This stated by 9 or 24% of 38 comments on notes in the notes section.   Two (2) disagreed.

APPENDIX II.

REJECTED RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM THE PRELIMINARY REPORT
WITH HISTORIC DATA THAT INFORMS
THE WHOLE OF THE REPORT,
INCLUDING JSC RESPONSE TALLLIES

FEBRUARY REPORT ITEM # B.4 Initially, the Task Force rejected recommending the "scrambled" option to use both areas 5 and 7, which would be accomplished by making the current footnote optional, and hence use of conventional terms optional, in area 5 (LC's compromise).

The Task Force initially did not want to relocate even some area 3 information to area 5 for **remote** resources (i.e., sound, color, other illustrations, intellectual descriptors), as an option to be used sparingly. We rejected this option for the same reasons given in 2.a above, namely that there is no acceptable term for **remote** resource extent—any term is difficult to ascertain—and also other illustrative characteristics are unwanted and unnecessary there. In helping to think about the simplicity and complexity inherent in this option, and its rejection, one (unnamed) expert on Electronic Archival Description discussed with the Task Force chair in early January the following information (paraphrasing)

For any standard, there is a concern that a descriptive field built around describing what is physically sitting in front of you will (gracefully) change into an apparatus describing the intellectual, changing the original purpose of the physical field—this is not a good thing.

In terms of digital preservation, electronic resources are physical. People should probably get over the idea that an electronic resource is not physical. It is. Anyone who has to worry about digital preservation knows that a digital file is a physical resource that needs care and feeding. An address, as in a URL, is in fact the address of a physical file.

- A physical description would logically describe "it" as a database with N number of files (perhaps also indicating notation of the files). And then in the appropriate area 7 note, describe the intellectual content of the files.
- Other the other hand, if what you are trying to do is describe an electronic database and descriptively analyze the contents in detail at the same time, then it would seem that you are trying to do both a collection-level description and item-level descriptions at the same time. If this is what is going on, then I think you have an impasse. AACR/MARC cannot do it in one record. In AACR/MARC you would need multiple records to accomplish this. EAD on the other hand would work just fine.
- Keep it simple. For any standard, if a distinction does not serve a useful purpose (even if it can be made), then there is no reason to make it. Making it, in fact, adds to the burden of the describer, without benefit.

Initially rejected draft examples for **remote** resources:

Area 5 (MARC 300)
    [no extent] : sd., col.
Area 7—9.7B1 (MARC 516)
        Visual and infrared satellite maps for North Dakota on 10 remote files

FEBRUARY REPORT # B.8 Initially, we considered amending rules in areas 5 and 7 to reflect that complex accompanying materials for both DIRECT and REMOTE resources are best described in area 7.
JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** to amend rules in areas 5 and 7 to reflect that complex accompanying materials for both **direct** and **remote** resources are best described in area 7. CCC questions why it would also not be made at 1.5E1c.

JSC. 1 JSC member (LC) does **not agree**. LC believes 9.5E1 "is adequate as written. Since rule 1.5E1 already supplies four options for accommodating accompanying material, this proposal would eliminate all but one (for a loosely-defined category of "complex" accompanying material). We would prefer that catalogers continue to use their judgement as to the most appropriate options found in 1.5E1." However, LC would agree to the new example at 9.7B11.

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, the Task Force and CC:DA are willing to go along with LC—if need be—and NOT support our initial recommendation.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. The community survey results showed that per numerical responses and comments, when the area 5 (MARC 300 $e) gets longer and more complicated, support for using area 5 (MARC 300) to describe complex accompanying materials drops. **We note that this has nothing to do with MARC per se—the MARC tagging is simply supplied as another familiar context**. Numerically, catalogers are split, although many voiced opinions that **complex accompanying materials** should be moved out of the 300 field and into the **notes** area 7 (500 fields) when practical.
        At the January 13th Task Force meeting, members agreed we should take this opportunity to suggest a rule modification to place complex, lengthy accompanying materials in **notes**—area 7—when appropriate to do so. Audience members at the meeting also accepted this approach.
        Tentative proposed draft example for **remote** resources:

> 9.5E1. [Revised to add new sentence.] *It is preferable to describe complex accompanying material for electronic resources in a note (see 9.7B11).*
>
> 9.7B11 [Add new example.]
> *Accompanied by 1 tutorial, 1 installation and performance guide, 1 AutoLISP programmer's reference, 1 IGES interface specifications, 1 addendum, 1 plastic template.*

FEBRUARY REPORT # B.9 Initially, we considered amending *AACR2* to show that if accompanying materials for DIRECT and REMOTE resources are also published separately, rules should reflect the making of added entries for them.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **do not agree** to this.

TF and CC:DA agree **not** to pursue this proposal.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. Both community survey results and the Task Force members agreed with survey respondents, that if accompanying materials are also published separately, then make added entries for accompanying materials (manuals were mentioned).

FEBRUARY REPORT # B.11 Initially we considered proposing retention of rules that eliminate extent for REMOTE resources; they are useful (or follow the alternative proposed by 1 Task Force member).

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** to this.

JSC. 1 member, LC does not support it.

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, a majority of Task Force members and CC:DA are willing to follow LC's compromise, (unless there is another compromise made to follow the alternative proposed by 1 Task Force member).

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   Cataloging rules that eliminate extent for remote resources are useful as they now read. Both the community survey results and the Task Force agreed that for remote electronic resources, the cataloging rules that eliminate extent for remote resources, are useful as they now read. AACR2R says: "Do not give a physical description for a computer file that is available only by remote access." [AACR2R 9.5, footnote 3]. The survey respondents found this rule, which omits a physical description for remote access electronic resources, is useful to patrons. Aggregate responses yielded a standard deviation of 1.19, with most saying "no opinion but leaning slightly towards agree" in regards to usefulness for staff members.]

FEBRUARY REPORT # B.12 Initially, we recommended not to add text or examples that blend both content and carrier concepts to area 5, for REMOTE resources only. (Even when there are no acceptable SMD terms for **remote** resources.)

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** to this.

JSC. 1 member, LC does not support it.

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, the Task Force and CC:DA are willing to follow LC and to ADD such examples, rejecting the initial proposal.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   A nearly acceptable term for remote extent was "l Internet resource", but the term was rejected by the community. Community survey respondents neither agreed with, nor disagreed with, "1 Internet resource" ("no opinion" was the statistical result). No rule change is proposed to create an SMD for remote resources.
         Five (5) Task Force members agreed **not** to interpret "The no opinion survey result on: 6.c.6   "1 Internet resource" as the most acceptable/least objectionable course of action. Survey standard deviation: 1.36. Five (5) Task Force members said "let's **not**" suggest a rule change to reflect using l Internet resource in area 5 for remote resources. On the other hand, one Task Force member thought this might be **indeed** be interpreted to mean this is the most acceptable/least objectionable of the examples offered.
         Other proposed terms for extent were also rejected. The community survey respondents did not like any of the other fourteen (14) proposed terms for extent for remote resources**.** Task Force members agreed with the negative results on this question. Namely, that these 14 terms are **not** good choices according to this survey. The terms are:

l remote resource:	Disagree, but leaning slightly towards No opinion
l remote resource (size unknown)	Disagree, but leaning slightly towards No opinion
l remote electronic resource	Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion
l electronic resource (remote)	Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion
l Web resource	Closest to No opinion, but leaning slightly towards Disagree
1 remote file	Closest to Disagree, but leaning towards No opinion
2 remote files (7 gb)	Disagree, but leaning hard towards No opinion
l remote text (file size unknown)	Closest to Disagree, but leaning towards No opinion
l text (remote electronic resource)	Closest to Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion
remote text resource (5 electronic files)	Closest to Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion
1 remote multimedia file	Closest to No Opinion, but leaning HARD towards Disagree.
remote multimedia file (size unknown)	Closest to Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion
1 remote multimedia e-resource (ca. 8 gb)	Closest to Disagree, but leaning HARD towards No opinion

The survey indicated **major disagreement** regarding this proposed term:

l remote e-resource: Disagree, but leaning slightly towards Strongly Disagree.

The Task Force agreed that three community survey examples blending both content and carrier concepts to area 5 for REMOTE resources are NOT potential examples to add to chapter 9.

The relative instability of remote resources in contrast to the stability of direct resources was a primary reason that led the Task Force to conclude not to blend content and carrier concepts for **remote** resources. 5 of 6 Task Force members disagreed with the community survey results, indicating **no**, we do not want to suggest rule changes in the direction of reflecting sanctioning of these terms within the rules for **remote** resources.

In contrast, to the Task Force finding, community survey respondents voted yes**,** agreeing with three examples for remote extent that used these terms: (1) remote-sensing images, (2) sound files (3) motion picture. All of these represent departures from the current rules and do some mixing of content with carrier. Survey respondents agreed with the following terms for conveying remote extent:

167 remote-sensing images (ca. 4 gb)
Closest to No opinion, but leaning towards Agree
2 sound files (45 min., 40 sec.; 5 min., 3 sec.)
Closest to No opinion, but leaning towards Agree
1 motion picture (16 min.)
Closest to No opinion, but leaning towards Agree

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. 13   Initially, we recommended retention of the absence of rules in area 5 about sound and colour, as acceptable, preferred practice for ROUTINE REMOTE resources, to be continued.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **agree** to this.

JSC. 1 member, LC does not support it.

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, the Task Force and CC:DA are willing to follow LC if need be, but warns that for routine description of remote resources, this is not a practical approach.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. Per the Task Force, all members agree that absence of rules about **sound and colour** and **illustrations** in area 5, as the rules currently read, is OK.

In contrast, the community survey responses showed weak support for using Area 5 for colour and sound (55% agree or agree strongly) and weak disapproval of relying on notes in Area 7 in lieu of Area 5 for remote resources (only 37% agree or agree strongly for sound, 28% for colour). Numbers were well spread among the possible answers. The comments, both taken alone and especially taken with individual answers showed much ambivalence about this issue. There was a great deal of anxiety about the mutability of internet materials and that detailed descriptions of sound and color would soon become inaccurate and need maintenance. Many questioned the advisability or importance of including this information at all, citing the above reason, as well as the near universality of colour, the difficulty of determining sound on workstations lacking sound cards, and that it is unnecessary when the patron can just click on the URL and see the resource. Survey numbers showed slightly higher support for colour than sound in Area 3, while the comments would tend to indicate the opposite. Those approving of Area 5 for sound and color cited consistency with other formats and visibility to patrons. Information about sound and colour should be recorded in the same place, regardless of format, otherwise it complicates cataloging

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. 14 Initially we considered proposing the retention of the absence of specific rules in area 7 about sound and colour, as acceptable practice for remote resources and that should be continued. No routine description of this information is desirable.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **do not agree** to this.

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, the Task Force and CC:DA are willing to reject this proposal.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. Five (5) Task Force members said **do not** recommend inclusion of **specifics** for sound and colour in **Notes/Area 7**, additionally to recording them in area 5. One (1) said yes.
     Use only area 7 notes (exclusively), for sound and color for remote resources. Six (6) Task Force members agree that the Task Force should recommend continuing only to make notes about **sound and colour** for remote resources.
     Most Survey respondents who disapproved of Area 5 did so while expressing support for Area 7. Currently 300 is not used for remote files, please let's keep it that way, one said. Sound and color should only be noted on the bibliographic record if significant, which would mean a descriptive phrase, and therefore a note. The abbreviations in the 300 are not understood by patrons, while notes are in plain English. One respondent said that 300 did not display in the online system for serial materials. Some respondents simply quoted the current rule on omitting Area 5, while expressing their satisfaction with the status quo in their survey answers. Approval of Area 7 was generally based on the idea that details of sound and color could not be rendered adequately in the cryptic abbreviations of Area 5, or that the respondent was happy with the current absence of Area 5 in records for remote resources.
     Community survey respondents and Task Force members agreed that rules for remote resources should be changed to reflect that it there is **no need to routinely record colour or sound**. A large number of comments questioned whether this information should be included in

the catalog record at all. Most web resources have colors, and computers have colour capacity so it is almost a moot point, and irrelevant in this day and age. It's also relative, since computers have the ability to alter the colour scheme on their monitors. Several respondents noted the lack of sound cards on their cataloger workstation or public computers, so they can't record if resource has sound.   It's difficult to determine if data files and databases have sound or color. It takes too much time to determine and code the type of sound or colour.

   In contrast, community survey respondents who approved of Area 5 for sound and colour also thought it advisable to include specifics about sound and colour in notes. While generally feeling Area 5 should be used, details of system requirements for sound and colour should be noted in the 538 field. It's not an either/or situation—If you want to search/retrieve on the data, 300 is better, but for resources that don't quite fit the usual definitions for the 300 or for complex cases, a note for human reading may be appropriate. For example, the presence of animation, /movies/videos/ or live-feed Webcam content should be noted. If a resource always contained sound/colour, use the 300 but if it was added later, use the 5xx. The 300 is useful in its standardization, which would map better to metadata schemes than the more nonspecific note tags, useful as they may be for information too specialized for the 300. Redundancy is good.

NOTES—REMOTE

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   Among Survey respondents there were pluralities of opinions regarding notes for remote electronic resources. There was ambivalence, and very few, if any, overwhelming majorities of thought. Nevertheless, some very general trends have nearly emerged when at least a plurality of about 1/3 of the responses are examined, and in some cases more than 1/3.

JSC. A majority of JSC members **do not agree** to recomendations B. 15 through B.19

TF and CC:DA. Subsequently, the Task Force and CC:DA are willing to reject recommendations B.15 through B.19.

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. **15 Initially, we considered amending the rules to emphasize the importance of notes. At many times in chapter 9 notes may be required, and not optional.**

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   Notes become even more important in chapter 9 than they already are with the elimination of area 3, the continued absence of an SMD for remote resources and the recommendation to move complex accompanying material description to the notes area.

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. 16 Initially, we recommended giving a preferred usage and order for notes—since a preferred order was discovered.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. Five (5) Task Force members agreed with community survey respondents regarding the following preferred note usage and order. Respondents collectively indicated an average preferred order (which is not necessarily the precise overall preferred order) as follows:

a. 538 system requirements notes (average placement 2.61)
b. 500 general notes for nature of item (average placement 3.2)
c. 516 type of computer file or data note (average placement 3.248). Also, this is the place most preferred for file characteristics terms (54%), although placement in the 655 subject genre field was also considered very acceptable by a large plurality (43%).
d. 520 summary note (average placement 3.81)
e. 500 general note for physical characteristics (average placement 3.86)
f. 500 general note for file characteristics (average placement 4.09)

One (1) Task Force member did not agree on grounds that the list is biased against the summary MARC 520 note because of the failure to provide adequate guidance and therefore insight on the potential for better use of the summary note in AACR2R.

As to notes preferences, Task Force members agreed unanimously that widespread institutionalized AACR2R practice may be swaying opinion. 79% of the respondents were doing lots (35%) of ER cataloging or some (54%), and administrators (10%) or others (3%) may be familiar enough with AACR2R to know that the "system requirements" comes first in chapter 2 and that the "nature of item" note comes first in chapter 1.

More than one Task Force member believes that widespread institutionalized CONSER practice may be swaying opinion towards use of the 516 note.

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. 17 Initially we considered adding a rule indicating that specificity in notes is necessary whenever possible.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey.   Specific is better. Community survey respondents indicated that specific notes are to be preferred over general notes. Specific notes (MARC tags: 538, 516,520—i.e., system requirements, type of file or data, summary) are preferred for the specific elements of "file, sound and color characteristics" over general notes (MARC tag 500) when it is the case that these elements are not covered earlier in the description. As well, four (4) of six (6) Task Force members agreed with respondents that general notes are less useful. Survey respondents indicated that general notes (MARC tag 500) are not deemed as useful for the specific elements of "file, sound and color characteristics", although they do allow for flexibility. Two (2) Task Force members did not agree.

FEBRUARY REPORT # B. 18 Initially, we considered adding a rule indicating that basic file, sound, and colour notes are unnecessary and unwanted for routine remote items.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. For "routine" remote resources**,** Task Force members are split evenly on whether notes for basic file, sound, colour characteristics are necessary in the description at all. Three (3) TASK FORCE members agree with respondents that notes for basic file, sound, colour characteristics for routine titles are NOT wanted. Since using general notes to describe "file, sound and color characteristics" (MARC 500) came in last (least preferable as far as notes go) one possible conclusion is that the notes area of the record is NOT the place for BASIC "file, sound and color characteristics". In contrast, three (3) Task Force members did not agree.

Example: Area 7 note (MARC 500): Sound, colour.

FEBRUARY REPORT # B.19 Initially, we considred amending the rules to show that the "nature of item note" should prevail over a general note.

Task Force Thoughts & Community Survey. Nature of item note should prevail. Five (5) Task Force members agreed with community survey respondents regarding nature of item: that either a general note (MARC 500) or a "type of computer file" note (MARC 516) should prevail**.** Regarding overall "nature of item", respondents said a general note (MARC 500) is only marginally (.008 more in scoring) preferred over the type of computer file or data note (MARC 516). **Further**, that the 516 should prevail. One (1) indicated it doesn't matter.

APPENDIX III.

COMMENTS FROM THE CARTOGRAPHIC COMMUNITY

Please see the following CC:DA documents:

- CC:DA/MAGERT/2001/2: MAGERT response to 4JSC/ALA/36 [May10, 2001]

- CC:DA/Larsgaard/2001/1: Response to 4JSC/ALA/36 [May 14, 2001]