TO: American Library Association,
             ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

FROM: John Attig [for the group listed below]

RE: Revisions to Chapter 9 of AACR2

Date: 28 June 2000

Next week CC:DA will have on its agenda the revisions to Chapter 9, as further revised by the Joint Steering Committee and with additional suggestions by the Library of Congress. Some of these suggestions are rather significant, and may require extensive discussion. In order to do some preliminary work, members of the old Task Force on the Harmonization of ISBD(ER) and AACR — and Adam Schiff, who was not a member of the Task Force, but whom we adopted — have been discussing some of these issues.

What follows is a discussion paper, with (in some cases) specific rule revision proposals.   The issues covered are:

    A. [Harmonization](#)
    B. [Area 3](#)
    C. [Area 5](#)
    D. [Resource identifiers](#)
    E. [Mode of access notes](#)

In some cases, there was consensus among those involved in the discussion; in other cases, there were different points of view — which are reflected below. We offer these ideas in the hope that they will prove useful in CC:DA's deliberations on Chapter 9 in Chicago.

     John Attig
     Matthew Beacom
     Laurel Jizba
     Mary Larsgaard
     Ann Sandberg-Fox
     Adam Schiff

A. Preliminary: "Harmonization"

This entire exercise was originally defined as the harmonization of ISBD(ER) and AACR2 and the term "harmonization" continues to be used. However, much of what has been proposed for AACR2 is at variance with ISBD(ER). Our group had strongly divergent reactions to this. Some expressed concern that we are moving farther and farther from the goal of harmonization with an international standard that was developed through considerable effort and which has achieved an international consensus. Others feel that time has moved on and that the revision of Chapter 9 of AACR2 represents an opportunity to move forward. These issues will need to be discussed by CC:DA, and this discussion paper is not the appropriate place to have that discussion. However, we do want to point out that the revisions suggested by the Library of Congress in 4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/4/LC response, do take us even farther from harmonization with ISBD(ER).

B. Area 3

The Library of Congress proposes to eliminate Area 3 from Chapter 9 and to move the various components to other areas of the rules. Their reasons are:

1. LC finds the list of "designations" which we proposed to add to Area 3 (and which JSC decided to move to an appendix) to be "genre terms" and argues that "no other chapter in AACR contains an area for such genre terms, although the concept would be equally applicable to other types of material."
2. Such genre terms can be recorded according to 9.7B1a (Notes on nature and scope) or 9.7B17 (Summary notes).
3. LC cites the difficulties of maintaining the appendix of genre terms and argues against undertaking it.
4. The extent portion of Area 3 can be accommodated in Area 5.
5. If Area 3 is retained in the rules, LC urges that it be made optional.

While most of us tend to support LC's conclusion, we did not reach a consensus that the LC suggestion has sufficiently explored the various alternatives for identifying the characteristics of electronic resources. Furthermore, since rule 9.3 is currently in use, we would like to see a wider discussion within the cataloging community before these rules are stricken.

With regard to the LC suggestion, we observe that the change in the scope of Chapter 9 from computer files to electronic resources and the change from computer programs and/or data to a networked multimedia publication environment calls into question the utility and value of the current language specified in rule 9.3. We also note that the attempt to replace that simple identification of programs and/or data was a difficult and not particularly successful effort.

LC did not propose any specific rules for either 9.3 or for the notes, although they did propose an addition to rule 9.5B1 which gives the option to record the extent of the resource *for direct access electronic resources*. There is no specific provision for recording either the type of resource (for either direct or remote resources) or the extent of a remote resource. We would like to suggest that these matters be dealt with explicitly.

During the discussions of our group, a variety of ideas have been put forward as possible alternatives to rule 9.3. These ideas have taken us into many parts of the bibliographic description — the physical description, notes on nature and scope, summary notes. That discussion could be continued and even expanded. In what follows, we present these ideas as contributions to an ongoing discussion, in order to give a sense of the complexity of the issues and the diversity of possible approaches.

1. *Eliminate Area 3 from Chapter 9 and add provisions to other rules to show how information regarding the type and extent of the resources should be included in the description.* Specifically, add language to rule 9.7B1a) Nature and scope, regarding identification of the type of resource; to rule 9.5B1, regarding the extent of a direct-access resource; and to rule 9.7B8, regarding the extent of a remote-access resource. [This idea has been spelled out in the greatest detail and proposed text is included below in an addendum.]

2. *Redefine Area 3 in Chapter 9 to identify whether the resource is made available by direct access or by remote access.* Specifically, use the terms "Remote access resource" or "Direct access resource." In this way, users are alerted early in the record whether the resource described is a physical item (in which case they need to look for the physical description and system requirements notes later in the record) or is a networked resource (in which case they need to look for the mode of access note and the resource identifier). One positive aspect of this idea is that the extended list of "genre terms" is eliminated from the rules, and at the same time, the user is given helpful information. It allows catalogers to use the note on nature and scope (9.7B1a) and other notes that provide additional descriptive information without needing to consult prescriptive lists of terms.

3. *Eliminate Area 3 from Chapter 9 and use the terms designating type of resource as SMDs in Area 5.* This would result in such physical descriptions as "1 computer system program" and "1 remote access resource." As noted below, the ISBD(ER) Review Group explored this option, but without reaching a consensus in its favor. [Note: This idea also implies that Area 5 would be applied to remote, as well as direct, resources; there is further discussion of that issue below.]

4. *Eliminate Area 3 from Chapter 9 and use summary notes to identify the type and extent of the resource.* By redefining and merging the Nature and scope note (9.7B1a) with the Summary note (9.7B17), controlled terms could be used in value-added construction of free text, terms that designate characteristics specified for Area 3 in ISBD(ER), but also applicable as genre headings (MARC field 655). Principled summary construction using free text coupled with controlled vocabularies could enhance user identification of electronic resources that are difficult to browse and would not take away from the author's vocabulary nor take away from the need for other controlled elements within the descriptive record. Instead these enhanced summary notes would add value and robustness to the user's interpretation of the item. Working such guidance into Chapter 9 rules for summary notes would ensure that more cataloging records provide the maximum assistance regarding the nature of the resource to users browsing the catalog. [See *Journal of Internet cataloging* 4(2), 1997, pp. 15-39 for additional discussion.]

5. *Retain Area 3 in Chapter 9 but with the designation as an optional area.* This was LC's fallback position. Some of our group found it attractive as an interim solution, at least. The question remains whether the rule retained would be the present text of 9.3 (updating only the terminology) or the revised version proposed by ALA, including the new appendix of designations.

This review of the variety of alternative approaches to this problem that have surfaced during about a month of discussion among half a dozen catalogers should give a sense of the difficulty of these issues and the many possible ways of addressing them. Clearly we had no consensus on any single approach. However, we seemed to favor narrowing the options. In other words, we were not satisfied with the suggestion that information now recorded in Area 3 should in the future be recorded under whatever rule seemed to fit; we would prefer that the rules themselves are explicit on this. We also came close to agreeing that there was a need to continue the discussion before coming to a final conclusion. In fact, the cataloging community needs more time to look at this issue that is available on the JSC's proposed schedule for revising Chapter 9. ***Therefore, we would like to suggest that we adopt an interim solution for this round of revisions and begin the process of working towards a long-term solution by appointing a CC:DA Task Force.*** This Task Force would (a) find out how catalogers are currently using Area 3 in Chapter 9, (b) find out what catalogers feel is needed in the way of identifying the type and extent of electronic resources, (c) explore and test alternative means for fulfilling these needs.

As an interim solution, we suggest that the options are limited to three:

1. *Retain rule 9.3 as revised by JSC.*

2. *Retain rule 9.3 but add the designation as an optional area.*

3. *Eliminate rule 9.3 and add language to other related rules.* Suggested text to implement this option is included at the end of this paper.

C. Area 5

The Library of Congress "agrees in part" with a minority opinion in 4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/3 suggesting that the footnote to Area 5 ("Do not give a physical description for a computer file that is available only by remote access.") be eliminated, thus opening up the use of Area 5 for all electronic resources. LC's arguments relate specifically to the omission of sound and color characteristics for remote resources and cite the inconsistency of recording that information in Area 5 for direct access resources and in Area 7 for remote access resources.

Our group had a good general discussion without reaching a consensus on this subject. The following are some of the significant points:

✓ In addition to sound and color characteristics, accompanying material may also be applicable to remote resources, and it seems artificial to limit the expansion of Area 5 to sound and color only.

✓ In fact, once the footnote is removed, one can argue that Type and extent of item is also relevant to remote resources. What is not clear, however, is how the Specific Material Designation should be interpreted. Ann Sandberg-Fox describes the deliberations of the ISBD(ER) working group on this subject:

This was also a contentious area for the ISBD(ER) Review Group. In the end it took an international ballot to determine whether it should be kept. I think the main reason why we kept it was that we weren't able to develop Area 5 to everyone's liking. What would be the SMD? We tried such things as:

> 1 remote electronic resource
> 1 remote access resource
> 1 remote program
> 1 remote data file
> 1 remote access data and program

Which, as you can see, these involved either using the GMD or the generic terms of "program" and "data" already in Area 3. My notes also indicate that we considered using some of the expanded designations, such as:

> 1 remote electronic text
> 1 remote electronic map
> 1 remote access journal
> 100 remote access images

Despite prolonged discussion, we were not able to reach consensus on the terms nor on how to express extent.

✓ One of our group reminded us that Area 5 poses problems for electronic resources in that it can be meant to apply to either manifestations or expressions, as well as to original documents or reproductions. This particularly affects sound and color, but perhaps other aspects of the physical description as well. Because of those complications, Area 5 may need to be examined in the context of all the chapters in Part I of AACR.

✓ Another of our group reminded us that the revised wording of rule 0.24 would seem to be applicable here. Giving equal weight to all aspects of the item should allow the cataloger to record the type and extent of the content (e.g., 45 maps) and the type and extent of the carrier (1 CD-ROM disc) and would presumably allow such constructions as "1 map (29 mb) on 1 network server : col." There has not yet been time to examine the implications of the revision of 0.24 to various areas of the rules, but that might be fruitful in this context.

Again we feel that this issue deserves more extensive discussion than it can be given before the September JSC meeting. Therefore, ***we strongly urge that the footnote to 9.5 be retained at this time*** (i.e., in any revisions to Chapter 9 published as a result of the current revision proposals). ***We also suggest that a Task Force be appointed to look at the use of Area 5 in the rules.*** Such a Task Force could look (over the next 6 or 12 months) at all of the issues raised above. Because Area 3 and Area 5 issues are so closely related, it might be necessary to charge a single Task Force with both sets of issues.

D. Resource Identifiers

One of the most important developments regarding networked information has been the development by the Internet Engineering Task Force of a set of Uniform Resource Identification (URI) standards. These standards include the familiar Uniform Resource Locator (URL), which deals with addressing conventions across the Internet. A new standard, the Uniform Resource Name (URN) deals with naming conventions for networked resources. The URN is the name that identified a unit of information independent of its location. Unlike URLs, URNs are intended to provide a globally unique, location independent identifier that can be used for identification of a resource and thus to facilitate access to that resource. In discussions in MARBI, URLs are often compared to call numbers (the specific location of a copy of the resource) and the URNs to standard numbers.

The CC:DA Task Force on Metadata and the Cataloging Rules noted the need to record resource identifiers in the bibliographic description and suggested that these might be treated as standard numbers in rule 9.8.

The Task Force on the Harmonization of ISBD(ER) and AACR2 proposed adding Uniform Resource Locators to some examples in the Mode of access note (9.7B1c), thus proposing, by implication, that such resource identifiers belong in the bibliographic description and hinting that the Mode of access note might be the appropriate place for such information.

The Joint Steering Committee in considering 2JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/3 (the report of that Task Force) decided to remove the URLs from those examples. It was not clear where that decision leaves the question of how to include resource identifiers in a bibliographic description.

This proposal raises the issue again and offers several alternative approaches for CC:DA to consider.

This proposal rests upon a basic premise: ***Uniform Resource Identifiers play a vital role in the identification and retrieval of electronic resources. No bibliographic description can be complete or functional without including applicable resource identifiers. The Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules should therefore give an explicit instruction to record resource identifiers.***

If that premise is accepted, there seem to be four possible rules where the instruction to record resource identifiers could be placed:

- ✓ The rule for Mode of access notes (9.7B1c)
- ✓ The rule for standard numbers
- ✓ A new area of the description (Area 9?)
- ✓ The rule for notes on "important numbers borne by the item" (9.7B19)

Revision proposals for each of these options will be given below. In the following proposals, the "Current Rule" refers to the current state of the revision proposals for Chapter 9 (i.e., to 4JSC/ALA/27/ALA follow-up/3, as modified by JSC decisions). The strike-throughs and double-underlining are those in pending proposals; new additions and deletions proposed here are marked by HTML-style tags: <ADD>. . .</ADD> and <DELETE> . . . </DELETE>.

Option 1: Mode of access note (9.7B1c)

Current rule:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements<u>, and mode of access</u>

…

    c) *Mode of access.* If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> is available only by remote access, always specify the mode of access. <u>Begin the note with *Mode of access:*.</u>

        ~~Online access via~~ <u>Mode of access:</u> AUSINET

        Mode of access: Electronic mail using ARPA

        <u>Mode of access: World Wide Web</u>

        <u>Mode of access: Internet via ftp</u>

Proposed change:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements<u>, and mode of access</u>

…

    c) *Mode of access.* If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> is available only by remote access, always specify the mode of access. <u>Begin the note with *Mode of access:*.</u>

        ~~Online access via~~ <u>Mode of access:</u> AUSINET

        Mode of access: Electronic mail using ARPA

        <DELETE><u>Mode of access: World Wide Web</u>

        <u>Mode of access: Internet via ftp</u></DELETE>

    <ADD>Include a resource identifier (e.g., a URL) that has been assigned to a resource.

        Mode of access: World Wide Web. URL: http://www.un.org

        Mode of access: Internet via ftp. URL: ftp://ftp.nevada.edu</ADD>

Comments: The objection to this method is that it implies that resource identifiers, particularly URLs, should be included in general notes. This in turn raises the spectre of URLs being scattered throughout the notes area, which is a maintenance nightmare. Although there is no definitive relationship between the Mode of access note and any specific MARC field (i.e., the Mode of access note could be generated from MARC field 856), there are established conventions for recording URL only in field 856 which use of this rule might seem to contradict.

Option 2: Standard Number (Area 8)

Current rule:

9.8B. Standard number

9.8B1. Give the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or International Standard Book Number (ISBN) assigned to a ~~published file~~ resource as instructed in 1.8B.

> ISBN 0-89138-111-2 (codebook)

. . .

9.8E. Qualification

9.8E1. Add qualifications to the standard number and/or terms of availability as instructed in 1.8E.

> ISBN 0-87490-399-8 : $49.00 ($19.00 for students)

Proposed change:

9.8B. <DELETE>**Standard number**</DELETE> <ADD>**Resource identifier**</ADD>

9.8B1. Give the <DELETE>International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or International Standard Book Number (ISBN)</DELETE> <ADD>resource identifier (e.g., ISBN, URN, URL)</ADD> assigned to a ~~published file~~ resource as instructed in 1.8B.

> ISBN 0-89138-111-2 (codebook)
>
> <ADD>URN: hdl.loc.test/gotthome
>
> URL: http://www.un.org</ADD>

. . .

9.8E. Qualification

9.8E1. Add qualifications to the standard number and/or terms of availability as instructed in 1.8E.

> ISBN 0-87490-399-8 : $49.00 ($19.00 for students)

<ADD>*Optionally*, specify the relationship of the identifier to the resource described.

> URL: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/toc/99060123.html (table of contents)
>
> URL: http://vlib.org
> URL: http://cui.unige.ch/vl/ (mirror site)</ADD>

Comments: The Uniform Resource Name (URN), can easily be considered a "standard number" under 1.8 (although that rule might require some modification). Although it is less clear that Universal Resource Locators are standard numbers, rather than the address of a particular copy (cf. rule 9.7B20, Copy being described, library's holdings, and restrictions on use), it is nonetheless true that URLs are indeed a part of the Uniform Resource Identifier schema and that all URIs are fundamentally significant elements in the bibliographic description of any electronic resource.

Option 3: New Area (Area 9) for Resource Identifiers

Proposed change:

<ADD>**9.9. Resource identifier Area**

9.9A. Preliminary rule [usual boilerplate for standard punctuation]

9.9B. Resource identifier

9.9B1. Give the resource identifier (e.g., URN, URL) assigned to a <u>resource</u> as instructed in 1.9B.

> URN: hdl.loc.test/gotthome

> URL: http://www.un.org

9.9C. Qualification

9.9C1. *Optionally*, specify the relationship of the identifier to the resource described as instructed in 1.9C.

> URL: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/toc/99060123.html (table of contents)

> URL: http://vlib.org
> URL: http://cui.unige.ch/vl/ (mirror site)</ADD>

Comments: This option is parallel to Option 2, but recognizes the unique significance of the Uniform Resource Identifier. The proposal, in fact, would be to add a parallel rule to Chapter 1 and to Chapters 2 to 12, renumbering rules X.9-X.11 as X.10-X.12.

Option 4: Numbers note (9.7B19)

Current rule:

9.7B19. Numbers. Give important numbers borne by the item other than ISBNs or ISSNs (see 9.8B).

> APX-10050

Proposed change:

9.7B19. Numbers. Give important numbers borne by the item other than ISBNs or ISSNs (see 9.8B). <ADD>Always give resource identifiers (e.g., URLs) that have been assigned to the resource.</ADD>

> APX-10050

> <ADD>URL: http://www.un.org</ADD>

Comments: This option is less elegant than the others, as it does not give any sense of the significance of the resource identifier. However, including a statement in this rule is preferable to the present silence of the rules on the subject of resource identifiers.

E. Mode of access notes

If resource identifiers are **not** given in the Mode of access note, a typical note formulated under 9.7B1c will be "Mode of access: World Wide Web". Members of our group disagreed about whether this information should be required. On the one hand, some argued that, if this is the only information that is included in this note, it can be argued that the instruction "always specify the mode of access" for remote access electronic resources is not justified.

On the other hand, others felt that the note "Mode of access: World Wide Web" is useful even when a URL is not included in the note, as this may be the only indication in the record that the item is a Web resource. Another point was that this note should not be something a cataloger should have to decide upon for each record created; better to make the note part of a default description — possibly with an option to omit when the information is apparent from the rest of the description.

We offer these various opinions for CC:DA to consider. We also offer two options for changing the rule. The first removes the requirement that a mode of access note be given; the second retains the requirement, but adds an option to omit the note.

Current rule:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements, and mode of access
…
c) *Mode of access.* If a ~~file~~ resource is available only by remote access, always specify the mode of access. Begin the note with *Mode of access:.*

> ~~Online access via~~ Mode of access: AUSINET

> Mode of access: Electronic mail using ARPA

> Mode of access: World Wide Web

> Mode of access: Internet via ftp

Proposed change, Option 1: Remove the requirement:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements<u>, and mode of access</u>

…

    c) *Mode of access.* If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> is available only by remote access, \<DELETE>always specify\</DELETE> \<ADD>give\</ADD> the mode of access \<ADD>unless it is apparent from the rest of the description\</ADD>. <u>Begin the note with *Mode of access:.*</u>

        ~~Online access via~~ <u>Mode of access:</u> AUSINET

        Mode of access: Electronic mail using ARPA

        \<DELETE><u>Mode of access: World Wide Web</u>

        <u>Mode of access: Internet via ftp</u>\</DELETE>

Proposed change, Option 2: Add an option:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements<u>, and mode of access</u>

…

    c) *Mode of access.* If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> is available only by remote access, always specify the mode of access. <u>Begin the note with *Mode of access:.*</u>

        ~~Online access via~~ <u>Mode of access:</u> AUSINET

        Mode of access: Electronic mail using ARPA

        <u>Mode of access: World Wide Web</u>

        <u>Mode of access: Internet via ftp</u>

    \<ADD>*Optionally*, omit the mode of access note for remote resources if this information is apparent from the rest of the description.\</ADD>

Addendum: Proposal for eliminating rule 9.3

As described above, this revision would delete rule 9.3 and change the text of rules 9.7B1a and 9.7B8. Also assumed in this proposal is the paragraph suggested in the LC response in rule 9.5B1 that would allow the extent of a direct-access file to be included. [Thanks to Matthew Beacom for suggesting the text for these revisions.]

Current rule:

**9.3. ~~FILE CHARACTERISTICS AREA~~
    TYPE AND EXTENT OF RESOURCE AREA**

[etc.]

Proposed change:

9.3. <DELETE>**~~FILE CHARACTERISTICS AREA~~
    TYPE AND EXTENT OF RESOURCE AREA**</DELETE>
    <ADD>**MATERIAL (OR TYPE OF PUBLICATION) SPECIFIC
    DETAILS AREA**</ADD>

9.3A. <REPLACE WITH:>This area is not used for electronic resources.<AND DELETE ALL SUBSEQUENT RULES UNDER 9.3>

Current rule:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements, and mode of access

   a) *Nature and scope.* Make notes on the nature and scope of the ~~file~~ resource unless it is apparent from the rest of the description.

         Game

         Word processor

         Combined time series analysis and graph plotting system

         ~~Spread sheet~~ Spreadsheet with word processing and graphic capabilities

Proposed change:

9.7B1. Nature and scope and system requirements, and mode of access

   a) *Nature and scope.* Make notes on the nature and scope of the ~~file~~ resource unless it is apparent from the rest of the description. <ADD>When the information is readily available, indicate the type of the resource.</ADD>

         <ADD>Electronic journal

         Electronic book (HTML and PDF)</ADD>

Game

Word processor

Combined time series analysis and graph plotting system

~~Spread sheet~~ <u>Spreadsheet</u> with word processing and graphic capabilities

Current rule:

9.7B8. ~~File characteristics~~ <u>Type and extent of resource</u>. Give important ~~file characteristics~~ <u>information relating to the type and extent of the resource that has not been</u> ~~that are not~~ included in the ~~file characteristics~~ <u>type and extent of resource</u> area.

. . .

If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> consists of numerous parts the numbering of which cannot be given succinctly in the file characteristics area, and if the information is considered to be important, give the number of approximate number of records, statements, etc., in each part.

. . .

Proposed change:

9.7B8. ~~File characteristics~~ <u>Type and extent of resource</u>. Give important ~~file characteristics~~ <u>information relating to the type and extent of the resource that has not been</u> <DELETE>~~that are not~~ included in the ~~file characteristics~~ <u>type and extent of resource</u> area</DELETE> <ADD>recorded elsewhere in the record</ADD>.

. . .<EXAMPLES UNCHANGED>

<DELETE, as suggested in the LC response>If a ~~file~~ <u>resource</u> consists of numerous parts the numbering of which cannot be given succinctly in the file characteristics area, and if the information is considered to be important, give the number of approximate number of records, statements, etc., in each part.</DELETE>

. . .<EXAMPLES UNCHANGED>