

Minutes of March 8, 2001 Catalogers Group Meeting, 2:30, West electronic classroom, YRL

Present: John R., Rita S. Joan L., Silvia M., Jean R., Caroline M., Renee M., Nancy N., Janice M., Ron W., Valerie B., Eli C., Louise R., Rebecca A., Luiz M., Gia A., Laura H., Beth F., Jeff M. (recorder)

Renee gave a report of her attendance at MLA (Music Library Association) recently in New York City. She had some handouts and everyone should've gotten a report entitled: Report to the Bibliographic Control Committee from CPSO, LC, by Lynn El-Hoshy and Geraldine Ostrove.

Renee mentioned a proposal concerning the possibility of creating separate subfields for multiple languages in the 041. Operas for example have many manifestations and translations. This was under discussion at MARBI, and the discussion paper can be read at this address: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2001/2001-dp02.html>.

The number of the document is 2001-DP02.

The Descriptive Cataloging MARC Format Subcommittee reported that there's a big amendment package concerning chapters 9 through 12 of AACR2 coming. Maps, too. Also whether a new work equals a new record, also multi-part items, and also that chapter 13 is to be merged and expanded into a "conceptual" chapter of the new AACR2. She also mentioned that JSC (Joint Steering Committee) had voted a change in Rule 21.30J1 to the effect that the exceptions to the rule are now optional.

Renee then reported on an Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) meeting held last October in conjunction with MOUG (Music OCLC Users Group). She had a very positive response to Adam Schiff's SACO workshop. Other materials are available for perusal at this URL: <http://www.lib.washington.edu/msd/olac/Confprog.html>. OLAC plans a DVD committee. The 007 defended by defenders from private companies as well as by LC indicating why it has utility. Some software uses it and LC uses it to make conservation decisions. A descriptive term, recon "legacy data," was noted. CPSO's Gerry Ostrove presented a paper concerning form/genre.

LC is currently concerned, among other things, that they will be unable to do the things they want to do because of time/staff limitations. If I heard right, there are now 2100 authorized floating subdivisions. Another speculation was raised at this meeting concerning a suggestion to reject the 240 in favor of a 100 \$t, which would more closely match or validate against an authority record.

John then gave his report, although he briefly raised some concerns about the proposed elimination of the 240. He gave us some handouts.

John is a member of the PCC E-Versions TF, officially known as the Task Force on Multiple Manifestations of Electronic Resources. He calls it the E-Versions TF and it'll

be called the EVTF in this document. The question for the wary cataloger venturing into this foggy bog of confusion is, Should I use the same record or should I make a new record? Or, Lumpers versus Split ters, terms he took from "sociology." (All other "minor changes" are to be "swept under the rug.")

That produced a laugh.

The EVTF has done a lot of thinking and produced a list of differences pertaining to e-versions. They've attempted to look at the issue from the perspective of the 4 basic functions of the library/archive, excluding the 5th, Management, which are ILL, Acquisitions, Reference and Cataloging. And they've created a list of possible criteria for making a decision. John discussed each element of the lists, raising both agreements and objections. His handout lists a lot of these issues. Difficulties such as finding the records, keeping track of the records, eventually unifying the records, ease of retrieval or lack thereof, the costs in both money or time, and in terms of cataloging and in terms of the user, to name a few.

However, due to pressure from various sources, Jean Hirons at LC issued an "interim decision": separate records are preferred across the board. The problem with any decision that is supposed to be "interim" that emanates from LC is that it tends to become the decision, which might mean that the EVTF no longer has an agenda.

John has some issues with this approach. Will separate records have fields on them that will allow the eventual amalgamation of disparate records in order to perform the bibliographic goal of pulling "bibliographic families" together? He mentioned the 780/785 fields and the 776 fields as useful for doing this in other contexts, e.g., returning to latest entry or implementing multiple versions, if a more unitary record approach is used.

Valerie raised the question concerning a perceived need to distinguish between records in OCLC versus the local OPAC. Rebecca noted that collection amassers want only 1 e-version of a title at the moment anyway because of questions of licensing and budget.

Another issue is the question of holdings. Valerie pointed out that particular libraries update their national records at different rates or periods of time. Louise asked whether a standard holdings format was available. Valerie mentioned that OCLC put one on the market, but that it has been seldom used.

John offered that someone not local has proposed a meta record which simply lists all e-versions like a genealogical tree.

Discussion ensued regarding the 773 vs. the 856. Louise asked if any thought had been given to creating a relational database. Rebecca mentioned the international electronic control number.

John then asked whether anyone had anything else to say about e-versions. The unitary record versus the separate record for every e-manifestation is an issue that is largely serial so far, but it will affect everyone as time goes by.

Then came the "grab bag" session. Net library problems were discussed. Concerns about the cost of Catalogers Desktop (Ron gave us the history concerning the advent of Desktop at UCLA and the decision of how to pay for it). It seems we've been accidentally paying somewhat less than we're supposed to pay, but it was partly LC's own fault.

John talked about the TAOS report writing capability. Various campus cataloging center libraries have expressed wish-lists. YRL would like to find and get rid of all 935's that begin with "ip". YRL also would like the authority files cleaned up, with a list of all names (and series?) lacking 010 fields to be displayed and printed out and updated. This raises an issue concerning local practice and idiosyncratic choices of entry that elicited questions and commentary from Gia, Silvia, and Jeff. Rita mentioned that Paul Priebe is maintaining a list of headings that might be candidates for global change if and when we obtain the capability.

Beth asked whether it would eventually be possible to do away with hash marks on tally sheets and simply have the machine report cataloging statistics in some automated manner.

Issues regarding local authority practice, John suggested, could be taken up in a future meeting, since the sands of today's hourglass had just run out.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30.

Submitted, March 13, 2001.

Respectfully, Jeff Morehead

