

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

Midwinter Meeting, New Orleans, LA
January 19, 2002, 8:30 a.m.

A. Timeline for recommendations

- ✓ **October 2001.** The Task Force report, revised as accepted 8-0 by CC:DA was reviewed at the JSC meeting.
- ✓ **January 19, 2001.** There is a “holding pattern” regarding pending JSC decisions in our report, 4JSC/ALA/36/Rev. The report covers type and extent of resource (area 3), physical description (area 5), and related notes (area 7); it makes progress in resolving the issues, but there remain options for JSC to decide.
- ✓ **January 30, 2002.** JSC members to conduct a *straw poll on options* preferred.
- ✓ **March 2002.** JSC members will respond to *rule change proposals*.
- ✓ **May 2002.** JSC retreats for strategic planning (time out from these issues).
- ✓ **September 2002.** JSC will discuss [final] decisions regarding change proposals.
- ✓ **February 2003.** Accepted changes put into revision package.

B. Key issues/recommendations

1. Eliminate area 3.
2. Where to place area 3 information.
 - a. **Use areas 5 and 7, to accommodate cartographic materials and everything else** – the “LC compromise” (LC prefers it). Revised rule 0.24 calls for equal treatment of content and carrier.
 - b. **Use only notes, area 7**, for remote resources (restrict area 5 to direct access), (originally favored by all JSC members except LC)
 - c. **Phase in area 5: start with maps**, but for all others use area 7 notes until issues, like remote terminology, are resolved.
4. De-emphasize use of “computer optical disc” and use “conventional terminology” instead. There is considerable agreement within CC:DA to use conventional terminology in .5B1 instead of the SMD “computer optical disc.” The question is how far to take this.
 - a. Drop term list for cataloger judgment on most useful term. Option #1 for 9.5B1 – Prominently give instruction and examples that catalogers actually see frequently.

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 [...]

1 DVD

etc.

So as an option to 9.5, we'll have a physical description for remote access electronic resources.

Question: how about getting the "1 DVD" example changed to "1 DVD-ROM"?

- b. Would add a few terms to a prescribed list in 9.5B1
- c. Makes a change to 9.5D1 (fully supported by CC:DA).

C. Other pending issues/recommendations

- 5. a. Blend content and carrier in area 5. Make option at 9.5B3:
 - 184 remote sensing images (ca. 18 mb) on 1 CD-ROM
 - 1 digital photo (tiff)
 - 1 sound file (mp3)
- 5. b. Restrict above only to cartographic materials (another phase-in for non-cartographic materials)
 - 110 remote sensing images
 - 250 maps on 2 CD-ROMs
- 6. Add a new (long) example for complex accompanying material at 9.7B11.
- 7. Give better guidance in making summary notes at 1.7 and 9.7.
- 8. Amend chapter 1 to show that notes should be specific, rather than general.

Task Force Members:

Brad Eden, Greta de Groat, Laurel Jizba (chair), Gene Kinnaly, Jimmie Lundgren, Nan Myers, Ann Sandberg-Fox

Task Force 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 of 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 AACR2, 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.*

Report to CC:DA, Monday, January 21, 2002, by Laurel Jizba, chair

The Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources met on Saturday from 8:30-10:30. About 20 to 30 people attended.

First, we reviewed the *timeline* for the Task Force report recommendations and then discussed *key issues and recommendations* in some detail.

Points of agreement:

- ✓ Everyone agrees that we want to accommodate the cartographic materials community.
- ✓ We also agree that we want to give the same option to the “generalist” electronic resources cataloging community. That is, the option to use conventional terminology in order to be flexible enough to accommodate rapidly changing technology and to accommodate future developments.

The problem for “mainstream” electronic resources catalogers is in the details. In executing the option we need clearer language in the *rule change proposal* that gives the “mainstream” generalist cataloger more direction regarding what are essentially two sub-options:

- a. to use area 5 judiciously when clearly applicable, but also
- b. clear permission to use area 7 as needed, leaving area 5 blank.

The necessity for enabling clarity of decision making exists because even experienced “mainstream” electronic resources catalogers are not experienced in this particular point of decision making and are asking for more guidance to avoid both (a) time-consuming decision making and (b) the setting aside of such titles, thus creating a backlog.

Solutions

One solution is to reword the rule change proposal at 9.5B3 so that the two verbs “record” and “use” are modified by “may”. This softens the instruction and avoids the imperative tonality.

New wording proposal for 9.5B3:

Optionally, for direct and remote access electronic resources, the actual content, in addition to the specific material designation (where appropriate) in subrule .5B in the relevant chapter of part I may be recorded; if none of these terms is appropriate, conventional terminology may be used.

Another solution is widespread cataloger training because this new point of decision making is so different that the problem, we believe, will be widespread in North America.

Another solution for “cleaning up” the proposal’s text at 9.5B1 (where the more modern look and feel of the text in option 1 continues to have greater support) is to add “1 DVD-ROM” as an example, deleting “1 DVD” for now.

Rationales:

- ✓ LC has chosen “1 DVD-ROM” in its training documents.
- ✓ GPO uses “DVD-ROM” in its records, including those for digital land use mapping resources.
- ✓ An OLAC CAPC Task Force has done research showing that (a) DVD-ROM appears widely on such titles and (b) it is widespread in the industry.

Outstanding issues:

1. Finding other solutions, most likely through cataloger training, that clearly enable “mainstream” electronic resource catalogers, or even catalogers working in chapters 7 or 6 to leave area 5 blank for remote resources.
2. Realizing that by adding a term for content in area 5, there may or may not have to be a term for carrier.
For example, using a term qualifier like the adjective “online” might be an option to qualify content [terms?] for remote resources. So at 9.5B3 we would have “1 digital photo (online)” or “1 sound file (online)” for remote resources, avoiding the necessity of dealing with a carrier that has no acceptable common name.
3. Starting a dialog with catalogers using chapters 7 and 6 regarding the use of and relationship to chapter 9 because historically (as in the case of laserdiscs) these communities have no tradition of “turning to chapter 9” on a routine basis for completing the descriptions.