

Report of the Society of American Archivist's Liaison to the American Library Association
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

Susan Hamburger

August 2001

The major themes covered over the last year by the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access focus on new rules for electronic resources, old rules that are impacted by the need to catalog electronic resources, and harmonization of *AARC2* with international standards. One pertinent report, the review of the draft *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM)*, supports this new tool for archivists and manuscripts catalogers who deal with pre- and early-modern manuscripts. Also relevant to archivists is the use of Dublin Core to harvest metadata from websites; the more specific, descriptive information archivists provide in the EAD metadata, the more accurate the catalog record will be.

The CC:DA met in January 2001 in Washington, D.C. and June 2001 in San Francisco, CA. The committee dealt with several issues, had the following discussions, and made specific recommendations and decisions:

1. **The Task Force on the Review of Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals** was charged with reviewing proposed changes to Chapter 12 and also charged to look at the pending revisions to Chapter 9 and to comment on any possible inconsistencies between the application of the two chapters to the cataloging of continuing electronic resources.

General Issues and Recommendations:

 - a. They have noted the need to harmonize the various revision proposals currently in play: Chapter 9, Chapter 12, the Appendix on Major/Minor Changes, the Introduction.

Electronic Resources:

 - a. The Task Force examined the proposed rules for electronic serials or integrating resources in Chapters 9 and 12, and found most of the differences between the two chapters were just differences, not conflicts. Both chapters have to be applied to electronic integrating resources because there are distinct rules needed to deal with the electronic and the integrating aspects of the resources. They have recommended changes to the proposed revisions to Chapter 9.
 - b. Chapter 12 contains an explicit instruction to apply Chapter 9 to integrating electronic resources. Chapter 9 only contains general instruction to apply other chapters as needed. Rule 9.0A would benefit from explicit mention of integrating resources.
 - c. For the chief source of bibliographic information, the Task Force is prepared to accept both the general approach currently embodied in Chapter 9 and the specific needs for cataloging serials (and perhaps all continuing resources). Therefore, they will support the two different rules so long as they do not find them to be in conflict where they overlap. They support the rules in Chapter 12 for printed resources and for non-print resources other than electronic resources. For continuing electronic

- resources, the overlap in the rules is more problematic. There is a problem with the preference indicated for remote access resources. The rules in both chapters attempt to deal, each in its distinct way, with the fact that in both cases all of the relevant sources may not be available to the cataloger. When all of this uncertainty is combined and applied to continuing electronic resources, the resulting choice of available sources becomes increasingly arbitrary and inadequate when judged against the goal of consistent world-wide choice of chief source and of title proper.
- d. Recommendation: The rules for contents and summary notes in Chapter 12 should be separate. While noting the utility of parallel numbering of notes, they are not recommending any particular solution to the numbering of the rules at this point.

Comments on the Chapter 12 Proposals

- a. The Task Force made specific suggestions for wording changes to conform with terminology used to describe databases and integrating resources, grammatical corrections, typographical errors, and suggested ways to strengthen rule 12.1E1 concerning transcribing other title information for integrating resources.

Conclusion: The Task Force recommends general support for the concepts of continuing and integrating resources and the way in which they have been implemented in the revision proposals. The Task Force recommends general support for the proposals to revise the rules for cataloging serials. They see this as a significant step towards a truly international set of conventions for describing serials. They strongly endorse the concept of international agreement on such conventions.

2. Revised Report of the Task Force on an Appendix on Major/Minor Changes.

- a. The task force drafted an appendix F to AACR2 defining major and minor changes in a bibliographic resource. The purpose of the appendix would be to provide catalogers with guidance in determining when to create a new record for a resource and, conversely, when to handle changes with notes in the existing record for the resource. They settled on the current configuration of two parts: (1) Differences between manifestations, and (2) Changes within resources, with each of these parts further subdivided by the appropriate forms of issuance. They also made extensive revisions to the contents and wording of the appendix in this revision and included a chart of MAJOR differences and changes. They also included an addendum on wording for series authority records to be added in the future.

The work of this task force focused primarily on major and minor changes to manifestation-level records for monographs, multipart items, integrating resources and serials. The definition of manifestation is the physical embodiment of an expression of a work. The entity defined as manifestation encompasses a wide range of materials, including manuscripts, books, periodicals, maps, posters, sound recordings, films, video recordings, CD-ROMs, multimedia kits, etc. As an entity, a manifestation represents all the physical objects that bear the same characteristics. The boundaries between one manifestation and another are drawn on the basis of characteristics of both physical form (e.g., changes in the production process) and intellectual content (changes signaled in the product that are related to publication, marketing, etc. (e.g., a change in publisher, repackaging)).

b. **Proposal to change 24.1C, Changes of name.**

Proposed Rule

We recommend changing the numbering of the existing 24.1C1 to 24.1C2 and inserting the following text as 24.1C1 to provide information on what constitutes a MINOR change of corporate name.

24.1C. Changes of name

24.1C1. Minor changes. In the absence of explicit evidence that a name change has taken place, consider that different usages of a corporate name found in publications are either variants of one another (see 24.2-24.3) or constitute a minor name change. Consider the following differences to represent a minor change:

- a) the representation of a word or number (including, but not limited to, abbreviation, acronym, initialism, or symbol and the spelled out form; different spellings of the same word; arabic numeral and roman numeral; singular and plural spellings; presence vs. absence of an indication of the possessive case)
- b) the addition, deletion, or change in a preposition, article, or conjunction
- c) a change in punctuation
- d) the addition or deletion of a higher body's name or a variant form of that body's name in conjunction with the name
- e) the change of a higher body's name from one form to another (including an initialism), in conjunction with the name
- f) in the case of a conference name, the addition or deletion of the name (including an initialism) or names of a sponsoring body or bodies anywhere in the conference name
- g) in the case of a conference name, the change of a sponsoring body's name from one form to another (including an initialism) anywhere in the conference name.

3. The **Task Force on the Rule of Three** was charged with reviewing the rule revision proposals to make the “rule of three” [the concept of authorship] optional.

General Issues and Recommendations: The Task Force supports the general concept of an alternative to the “Rule of three” in AACR2.

a. Changes to transcription: The task force supports the ACOC proposal to revise 1.1F5 rather than use the notes field, i.e., as an option to transcribe statements of responsibility in the chief source of information in full, regardless of the number of persons or corporate bodies named, in order to justify more than three added entries. However, they also believe there may be situations where neither the default rule nor full transcription would be appropriate. For such cases they would propose a second option:

Optionally, transcribe the first name of each group and any of the remaining names in each group as deemed important for access or identification of the piece in hand. If applicable, indicate omission by the mark of omission (...) and add et al. (or its equivalent in a nonroman script) in square brackets.

b. Changes to access points:

21.6B1. Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading(s) for any other persons or bodies involved.

21.6C2. Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading(s) for any ~~or all~~ other persons or bodies named prominently in the item.

21.7B2. If such an item falling into one of the categories given in 21.7A and entered under a collective title includes two or three works, make analytical (name-title or title) added entries for each of them. If there are more than three works but only two or three persons or bodies responsible, make an added entry (~~or name title added entry when appropriate~~) under the heading for each person or body or make a combination of no more than three added entries for persons or bodies and analytical added entries.

Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading(s) for any of the other persons or bodies involved. If an item contains more than three works, make additional ~~name title~~ analytical added entries for any ~~or all of them~~ of the remaining works.

21.30G1. If there is more than one work to which a given work is related, optionally, make additional added entries under the heading(s) for any of the other works.

21.34B. Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading(s) for any other ~~or all~~ of the courts governed.

4. **Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR)** was charged with preparing a detailed review of the proposed International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and Other Continuing Resources (ISBD (CR)). Particular attention was given to areas, if any, in which AACR2R and ISBD (CR) are not in conformance and areas, if any, in which the proposed ISBD is not in conformance with the provisions of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. In addition to the review, the Task Force was invited to suggest examples to supplement the text in order to ensure a broad international perspective in the standard, including examples for the appendices. The final report includes point-by-point comparisons, discrepancies, additions, and suggestions. A detailed review of CR and comparison of it with AACR2R would be most effectively done with a crosswalk from CR to the matching rule in AACR2R, and another crosswalk vice versa. The press of time did not allow the compilation of such a document; instead, members of the task force worked with the most current draft of Chapter 12 and other parts of AACR2R as appropriate.

5. The **Task Force on Alpha Prototype of Reorganized Part One** is charged with: examining the prototype of part I of AACR2 created by Bruce Johnson and Bob Ewald (Library of Congress), using Cataloger's Desktop to rearrange the existing text of Part I into a text that groups rules according to ISBD areas determining whether this rearrangement is what was suggested in Delsey's *The Logical Structure of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* determining whether such a reorganization would be practical and user friendly for cataloguers identifying areas where the reorganization does not work as well as the existing arrangement

if deemed appropriate, suggest alternative possible reorganization(s) of the rules. Their report is due August 15, 2001.

6. The **Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2** is charged with but not limited to preparing a report for CC:DA that includes:

a. General background information about resource identifiers in the broadest sense, including what is meant by the terms resource identifier (RI) and uniform resource identifier (URI). This information should include, but is not limited to, what constitutes an RI and URI, what their purpose is, history of their development, the kinds of RIs and URIs already developed and in development, how they are used by various communities, etc.

b. Consideration of the rules as applied in a digital and networked environment. Description and analysis of how other standards (MARC, XML, Dublin Core, EPICS/ONIX, etc.) incorporate resource identifiers in the representation and communication of bibliographic and related information in machine-readable form. Inventory relevant standards, distinguish between structure and content standards, and relate these practices to what AACR2 might do.

c. The importance or value of RIs in bibliographic description and access. Should AACR2 have rules for including information about URIs in AACR2 bibliographic descriptions and/or access points? The Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records and The Logical Structure of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules should inform this discussion. The Task Force should discuss if and how related bibliographic standards (e.g., ISBD; PCC core records) handle URIs. The Task Force should consider the current and potential role of URIs in both bibliographic and authority records. In considering access, the Task Force should take into account the use of URIs to access both a resource being described as well as related resources. The issues involved in providing multiple URIs for the same resource available at different sites or through different providers, and for different parts or aspects of a resource should also be included.

d. An examination of ways in which AACR2 could include rules for URIs. Specific areas of description that should be considered include, but are not limited to, notes, standard numbers, and the creation of a new ISBD-like area for resource identifiers. For each area, the Task Force should articulate arguments for and against the use of that area. Areas of access that should be considered include, but are not limited to, rules for added entries, related works, and the possible need for special rules or other rules in part II. The Task Force should comment on the issue of change in URIs over time and whether AACR2 might provide instructions for dealing with this.

e. Any rule revision proposals to AACR2 that the Task Force believes should be made by CC:DA and sent to the JSC for incorporation in the rules.

The final report of the Task Force shall be presented to CC:DA at the Midwinter Meeting in 2002.

7. The **Task Force on ONIX International** has been charged with but not limited to:

a. Evaluating the relationship between library metadata (AACR2, MARC 21) and the ONIX International standard for representing and communicating book industry product information in electronic form to determine how well ONIX International maps into AACR2 and MARC.

- b. Identifying the issues surrounding the use of ONIX International metadata in AACR2 cataloging records.
- c. Assessing the consequences and impact of integrating records containing the ONIX International metadata into library databases, evaluating mechanisms for integration, and recommending appropriate measures for libraries.
- d. Preparing rule revision proposals and discussion papers as needed.
- e. Monitoring of projects and activities that use ONIX International.
- f. Investigating the feasibility of informing others of library perspectives through a designated liaison to the developers of ONIX International.
- g. Informing CC:DA about the development of ONIX International, including the preparation of a summary of the standard which shall include some background or history and community served, description of metadata element set, sample records if possible, citations for more information, implementation projects, etc., including Web sites.

The interim report states ONIX stands for ONline Information eXchange. It is a metadata standard developed by the publishing community as a standard means to exchange information about “book” product information electronically to wholesalers, e-tail and retail booksellers, other publishers, and anyone else involved in the supply chain. They conclude that “a devil’s advocate may argue that it is often easier to start from scratch than to convert a publisher record into a standard UNIMARC record with AACR2 serving as the guide to formulate the content, NAF for names, and LCSH to provide the subject headings. Granularity as well as content may reduce the usability of these records. However, we may be gaining information about the publication that would be useful for a patron to evaluate the title: increased information concerning the reception of the book, more information about the author, more detailed information about its currency.”

The final report of the Task Force shall be presented to CC:DA at the Midwinter Meeting in 2002.

8. The **Task Force on ISO Harmonization** is charged with identifying and examining ISO (International Organization for Standardization) standards relevant to AACR2 resource description, focusing in particular on standards for abbreviation, symbolization, and punctuation; consulting, as needed, with the ALA representative to the National Information Standards Organization (NISO); identifying areas where ISO standards and AACR2 differ; discussing whether harmonization of ISO and AACR2 is desirable or necessary; and, if deemed appropriate, proposing rule revisions to AACR2.

A final report shall be sent to the Chair of CC:DA no later than December 16, 2001.

9. The **Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources** was 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 considered 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.

Interim Report:

- a. Eliminate area 3—area 3 is NOT useful. 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.
- b. Relocate area 3 information to area 7 for REMOTE resources. In its analysis of community survey results, the Task Force agreed with the combined responses to several questions that best alternative location for file characteristics details for remote resources, and for other elements like sound, color, is in the notes area, area 7. Specifically, they suggest looking at rules 9.7B1 and 9.7B8, reworking by editing and combining them (MARC 516 field of a bibliographic record).
- c. Reject the option of relocating area 3 information to area 5 for REMOTE resources (the area 5 option).
- d. Reject “scrambled” option (a) to relocate some area 3 information to area 5 for REMOTE resources (i.e., sound, color, other illustrations), even as an option to be used sparingly, and (b) to relocate other area 3 information to area 7 (i.e., no. of remote files, exceptional intellectual content characteristics).
- e. Move only some full and unique examples on file size from area 3 to area 7, notes, and eliminate all existing textual instruction regarding file size. Do not eliminate file size altogether, even though it is of lesser descriptive importance.

EXTENT for DIRECT RESOURCES:

- f. Make specific optical terms like “1 CD-ROM” the normative rule. Change “computer optical disc” to be the optional rule. For optical technology, reject the current underlying philosophy in area 5 in favor of a more modern philosophy.
- g. Blend content with carrier ONLY for DIRECT resources in area 5 and only using established terms from other chapters.
- h. 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.
- i. Amend AACR 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.
- j. Do not change rules in area 5 for description of simple, straight forward accompanying materials for both DIRECT and REMOTE resources.

EXTENT for REMOTE RESOURCES:

- k. Retain rules that eliminate extent for REMOTE resources; they are useful.
- l. Do not add text or examples blending both content and carrier concepts to area 5, for REMOTE resources only. There is no acceptable SMD for REMOTE resources.

SOUND, COLOR, OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS for REMOTE RESOURCES:

- m. Retain the absence of rules in area 5 about sound and color. This is acceptable, preferred practice for REMOTE resources, and should continue.

- n. Retain the absence of specific rules in area 7 about sound and color for REMOTE resources. This is acceptable practice for remote resources and should continue. Further, add a rule indicating that routine description of basic file, sound, and color in area 7, notes, is unnecessary and unwanted for REMOTE resources.

NOTES — REMOTE:

- o. Amend the rules to emphasize the importance of notes. At many times in chapter 9 notes may be required for significantly useful information, and not optional.
- p. Do not recommend a preferred usage and order for notes, even though one was discovered.
- q. Add a rule indicating that specificity in notes is necessary whenever possible.
- r. Amend the rules to show that the “nature of item note” should prevail over a general note.
- s. Amend the rules to give better guidance in construction of summary notes.
- t. Indirectly amend the rules to show that notes should be both simpler and more specific by: (a) eliminating area 3, (b) reducing instruction on file characteristics elements in the notes from the lengthy discussion currently found in area 3, and (c) making some notes more specific.

10. The **Task Force on VRA Core Categories** was charged with evaluating the relationship between library metadata (AACR2, USMARC) and the Visual Resources Association/Data Standards Committee Core Categories for describing visual resources collections to determine how well the VRA Core Categories map into AACR2 and MARC. In their summary report, January 2001, the task force notes the VRA Data Standards Committee has mapped the Core Categories to MARC as well as to other metadata standards.

11. The **Task Force on the Review of the Draft *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM)** was charged with preparing a detailed review of version 12 of the draft *AMREMM*. In particular, the task force was charged with identifying instances in which *AMREMM* is not consistent with the general rules in *AACR2* as well as the specific rules for manuscripts and suggesting ways in which consistence with *AACR2* could be achieved. The task force concluded that *AMREMM* is an excellent document which fills a specialized but real need for an extension to our cataloging rules and it will be a welcome tool for libraries with manuscript collections and collections of reproductions of manuscripts. Not only is *AMREMM* flexible enough to be adapted in most cases for records at varying levels of detail and complexity, but it is also clear enough to be understood by catalogers unfamiliar with medieval or Renaissance manuscripts. Gregory Pass is to be commended for having considered and solved many of the most complicated issues in manuscripts cataloging. He has also provided an ample bibliography—conveniently subdivided by category—and a glossary of technical terms. At the Winter 2001 meeting, the CC:DA recommended that the task force needs to review *AMREMM* for errors in MARC examples, note the sometime conflict with *APPM*, and commented on the problem with using the manuscript title versus the shelf mark for a main entry uniform title.

12. The **Task Force on the Review of ANSI/NISO Draft Standard Z39.85, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set** was charged with reviewing the draft standard and preparing comments to be sent to NISO's ALA Voting Member, who will formulate the official ALA position. Comments should include whether the proposed standard should be approved, as well as any suggestions for changes or improvement in it. The task force has reviewed all of the NLM and SLA comments and the responses from NISO Standards Committee AS. The Task Force reaffirms its support of a "Yes" vote by the ALA NISO voting member, and recommends that he not change his vote during the reconsideration ballot period. While they were in sympathy with some of the concerns expressed by NLM and SLA (and indeed had expressed some of these same concerns amongst themselves during their original discussions last summer), they did not find the negative comments of the "No" voters persuasive enough to recommend that the ALA voting member change his "Yes" vote. They also believe that the Standards Committee AS's responses have adequately addressed the NLM and SLA concerns and given satisfactory justification for the way the draft standard is written. NISO approved Standard Z39.85, the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, advanced it to the American National Standards Institute in July.

13. **PROPOSED RULE** changes in AACR2 Chapter 3 Cartographic Materials

3.5B4. If the description is of a separately titled part of a cartographic item lacking a collective title (see 3.1G4) ~~and the part is physically separate from the rest of the item,~~ give the statement of extent as instructed in 3.5B1-3.5B3.

1 globe

3.3B7. In describing a relief model, other three-dimensional item, or a two-dimensional representation of a three-dimensional item (e.g., block diagram, profile), give the vertical scale (specified as such) after the horizontal scale if the vertical scale can be ascertained.

While "relief model" is no longer appropriate as an SMD, such models do very frequently appear in map libraries, and the following phrase concerning three-dimensional items covers all other models.

14. **PROPOSED RULE** changes in AACR2 Chapter 25

Revise AACR2 rule 25.2E1 to be consistent with revisions to rule 21.30J1, as approved by the JSC.

25.2E1. Works entered under title. If a work is entered under a uniform title, make an added entry under the title proper of the item being catalogued ~~unless the title proper is essentially the same as the main entry heading (see 21.30J).~~

Optionally, do not make an added entry for the title proper if the title proper is essentially the same as the main entry heading (see 21.30J)

Refer from any other variants of the title, including variant romanizations found in the item (see 26.41)

Astronomy encyclopaedia

The international encyclopedia of astronomy

(*Issued in the United Kingdom as: The astronomy encyclopaedia. Later*

issued in the United States as: The international encyclopedia of astronomy)

Added entry under: The international encyclopedia of astronomy

but **Christian educator** (Nairobi, Kenya)

The Christian educator

(Several serials have the title: The Christian educator)

~~*No added entry under title proper*~~

Optionally, do not make an added entry for the title proper.