OLAC NEWSLETTER
vol. 27, no. 2
June 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Jain Fletcher

This is the shortest *Newsletter* that I have produced thus far, coming in at only 24 pages. Even so, it is both a complete and an exemplary microcosm of a "between Conferences" issue. This is to say that all the expected features of a June issue are present; they are just shorter. Among these features are the usual elements (the President's and Editor's columns and the Treasurer's report) and the once-yearly announcement of OLAC election winners. All of our columnists have also submitted their timely offerings. Barbara Vaughan's "News and Announcements" column gives a few previews of ways that OLAC members can impart their knowledge and experience in responses to important initiatives (see the "genre/form" item and the "FRAD" entry), among other things. Amy Weiss' "Book Reviews" column presents a review of Cataloging Cultural Objects, a topic of interest in its own right, not to mention its special interest to those of us who took one of the workshops on the same topic at the last OLAC Conference. Last, but certainly not least, Jay Weitz bestows on all of us the benefit of his vast knowledge in his "Q&A" column. In all, I hope you will agree, this issue is a great read!

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Steven Miller

I am amazed that the past year has gone by so quickly and that I already find myself writing my final column as OLAC President. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to have served OLAC in this office.

First of all, I would like to extend my congratulations to OLAC's newly-elected officers: Bobby Bothmann as Vice President/President Elect and Kate James as Treasurer.

I would also like to express my special thanks and deep gratitude to John Attig for his many years of service as OLAC's Liaison to MARBI. Please join the Board and me in congratulating John on his recent appointment as ALA's Representative to the Joint

Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR. I would also like to extend my appreciation to Kelley McGrath, current CAPC Chair, for her willingness to fill in as temporary MARBI Liaison for the upcoming ALA meeting this summer.

The year ahead promises to be a full one for OLAC. Among many other activities, a small working group will explore updating the "look and feel" of the OLAC Website. Also, as usual, the Cataloging Policy Committee has several projects underway. And, OLAC members continue to contribute to the review of drafts of RDA, bringing the perspective of Internet and AV media catalogers to the development of the new cataloging rules.

I hope to see many of you in June at the CAPC and OLAC Membership meetings at the ALA Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.

TREASURER'S REPORT
Third Quarter, FY 2006/2007
January 1 through March 31, 2007
Bobby Bothmann, Treasurer

	3rd Quarter	Year-To-Date
	Jan.-Mar.	
OPENING BALANCE	$11,612.49	
INCOME		
Memberships	$3,917.00	$11,190.00
Gifts Received	$38.00	$38.00
Conference Income	$3,072.53	$3,072.53
TOTAL	$7,027.53	$14,300.53
EXPENSES		
ALA	$200.00	$400.00
OLAC Board Dinner	$321.00	$321.00
OLAC Award	$207.00	$207.00

Bank Charges	$3.00	$3.00
Checks	$20.00	$20.00
Stipends	$800.00	$1,400.00
Postage & Printing	$1,394.69	$4,003.20
Printing	*$1,246.50*	*$3,505.55*
Postage	*$148.19*	*$497.65*
Web Domain		$15.00
OLAC Scholarship		$436.42
Outreach		$473.45
Miscellaneous		$149.28
TOTAL	$2,945.69	$7,425.35
CLOSING BALANCE		$15,694.33

MEMBERSHIP as of April 5, 2007

Personal:	385
Institutional:	177
Total:	**561**

2007 OLAC ELECTION RESULTS

And the winners are:

Bobby Bothmann -- Vice President/President Elect

and...

Kate James -- Treasurer

Congratulations to both! Their terms will start at the end of the upcoming OLAC Membership Meeting in Washington, D.C.

We had an excellent slate of candidates, and I want to thank all the candidates (Bobby

Bothman, Kate James, Patricia Loghry and Scott Markham) for agreeing to run. There were 200 ballots returned by the required deadline.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Freeborn
OLAC Past Past President & Elections Committee Chair

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled by Jay Weitz

OCLC to Pilot WorldCat Local

OCLC is piloting a new service that will allow libraries to combine the cooperative power of OCLC member libraries worldwide with the ability to customize WorldCat.org as a solution for local discovery and delivery services. The WorldCat Local pilot builds on WorldCat.org, which allows Web access to the world's richest database for discovery of materials held in libraries. Through a locally-branded interface, the service will provide libraries the ability to search the entire WorldCat database and present results beginning with items most accessible to the patron. These might include collections from the home library, collections shared in a consortium, and open access collections. WorldCat Local will offer the same feature set as WorldCat.org, such as a single search box, relevancy ranking of search results, result sets that bring multiple versions of a work together under one record, faceted browse capability, citation formatting options, cover art, and additional evaluative content. The WorldCat Local service interoperates with locally maintained services like circulation, resource sharing and resolution to full text to create a seamless experience for the end user. WorldCat Local will also include future enhancements to WorldCat.org including more than 30 million article citations, and social networking services. The WorldCat Local pilot will test new functionality that allows users to place requests, gain online access, or request an interlibrary loan within WorldCat.org. OCLC will test interoperability with systems used by participating pilot libraries, including Innovative Interfaces, SirsiDynix, and ExLibris Voyager.

NetLibrary Launches Collection of eAudiobook Subject Sets

OCLC's NetLibrary has launched its first collection of eAudiobook Subject Sets for the United States library market. eAudiobook Subject Sets are bundled sets of high demand titles, each set offered at a fixed price. This new collection of Subject Sets is available to all library types through NetLibrary's eAudiobook purchase program. Developed by NetLibrary collection development librarians, eAudiobook Subject Sets provide a quick and easy way for libraries to offer the most popular downloadable eAudiobook titles to their users. NetLibrary is currently introducing nine eAudiobook Subject Sets: Biography, Business, Children's Fiction, Classics, Learning Guides, Mystery & Suspense, Popular Nonfiction, Self-Help, and Young Adult Fiction. NetLibrary's eAudiobook Subject Sets feature titles from the audiobook industry's leading publishers: Books on Tape, Listening Library, Living Language, and Blackstone Audio. Titles are never duplicated from set to set, allowing libraries to own more than one Subject Set without overlapping their collections. Delivery of OCLC MARC records is provided at no extra charge. … eAudiobooks can be downloaded or played on desktop, laptop, or portable devices that support Windows Media Player version 9 and above. Users can also transfer favorite titles to a wide range of portable devices, including portable music players, portable media centers, and more. To learn more about NetLibrary eAudiobook Subject Sets and to view titles, visit <http://www.oclc.org/audiobooks/purchase/default.htm>.

WorldCat.org Offers New Web Site and Search Box Features

WorldCat.org, the Website and search box that offers public access to the catalogs of libraries worldwide, has added new features and functionality that enhance the discovery experience and make it possible to customize the downloadable search box, search and find materials in Chinese, and link to libraries nearby via IP address location. New features and functionality on the WorldCat.org site will be added continuously as the service continues to progress. WorldCat.org allows Web users to search the catalogs of more than 10,000 libraries worldwide. The WorldCat.org site offers a downloadable search box to allow access to the world's largest resource for discovery of materials held in libraries. Among the most recent enhancements to WorldCat.org are:

- more visibility for evaluative content and Web resource links
- faceted browse to allow the user to expand search category options
- new options for downloading the WorldCat.org search box
- Chinese language added to the "Find" in a Library interface
- automatic geographic location code by IP address

Try WorldCat.org from the site: <http://www.worldcat.org/>. To find out more about the free downloadable search box, visit: <http://www.worldcat.org/wcpa/servlet/org.oclc.lac.affiliate.GetSearchBox>.

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OLAC MEETINGS FOR ALA ANNUAL 2007

OLAC President, Steven Miller, learned of the OLAC room assignments before this issue went to press. Here they are, along with dates and times.

- Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC)
  Friday, June 22, 7:30-9:30 p.m.
  Washington Convention Center - Room 302

- OLAC Membership Meeting
  Saturday, June 23, 8:00-10:00 p.m.
  JW Marriott - Russell Room

- OLAC Executive Board Meeting
  Saturday, June 23, 4:00-6:00 p.m.
  OCLC Suites (exact location and room number yet to be specified)

When the ALA event planner becomes available in late May, the "Meetings of Interest to OLAC" list will be assembled, then posted to the OLAC List and the OLAC Website.

Jain Fletcher
OLAC Editor-in-Chief

LC TO DISTRIBUTE GENRE/FORM AUTHORITY RECORDS

As a follow-up to the announcement made at ALA Midwinter 2006, the Library of Congress (via the Cataloging Distribution Service [CDS]) will begin to issue genre/form authority records (MARC 21 tag 155) no earlier than September 3, 2007 (see CDS announcement at: <http://www.loc.gov/cds/notices/genreform.pdf> for further details).

In working to define the guidelines for the creation and application of these headings, the Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) has drafted instruction sheet H 1913 for the *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings*. The draft is available in PDF format via the link below. Note that this instruction sheet covers only the development and use of genre/form headings for motion pictures, television programs, and videos; however, the plan is to create similar instruction sheets for other areas where genre/form headings can be created and applied, such as music, radio, law, etc. This instruction sheet will serve as the model for these other subject areas and therefore, CPSO invites you to send us your comments, suggestions for improvement, etc.

A representative from CPSO would be available to meet with OLAC at the ALA Annual meeting in Washington, D.C. this summer to listen/discuss/respond to any comments, suggestions, questions, etc. that members might have. [*Editor's update: Kelley McGrath, Chair of CAPC, has invited a CPSO representative to attend the Friday evening CAPC Meeting at ALA.*] CPSO expects that this draft instruction sheet will be finalized after the 2007 ALA Annual meeting so that the basic documentation will be in place to support the initial distribution of the genre/form headings. However, as with all documentation, improvements will be made over time as experience is gained in the development and application of the 155 genre/form headings. Note that the CDS announcement includes a few samples of proposed 155s, as others are input a list will be drawn up and sent to OLAC for consideration before the ALA Annual Meeting.

The draft of *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings* H1913 is at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genre.html>.

Please send comments to Janis Young (jayo@loc.gov)

Originally posted by:
David W. Reser, Senior Cataloging Policy Specialist
Cataloging Policy Support Office
L:ibrary of Congress

OCLC TECHNICAL BULLETIN 254 AVAILABLE

Technical Bulletin 254, "OCLC-MARC Format Update 2007 and Institution Records to Accommodate the RLG Union Catalog" is now available at this location: <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/254/default.htm> It covers these topics:

- The OCLC-MARC Format update (new and changed fields, subfields, and MARC codes).
- The implementation of institution records to accommodate the RLG Union Catalog (new and changed fields).

Originally posted by:
Peter Insabella
Manager, Product Documentation Content
OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.
phone: (614) 764-4330
e-mail: <insabelp@oclc.org>

WORLDWIDE REVIEW OF FRAD

The IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records is pleased to announce that a 2nd draft of "Functional Requirements for Authority Data" (=FRAD; previously titled, "Functional Requirements for Authority Records" [FRAR]) is now available for worldwide review. This draft, updated in response to comments received during the previous review, is on the IFLA Website at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/d4/wg-franar.htm>. Comments should be sent by July 15, 2007 to:
Glenn Patton
OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.
6565 Kilgour Place
Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395
phone: (800) 848-5878, ext. 6371 //or// (614) 764-6371
FAX: (614) 718-7187
e-mail: <pattong@oclc.org>
Originally posted by:
Glenn Patton

AWARD FOR BEST OF CCQ, VOLUME 39

Co-authors David Miller, Head of Technical Services, Curry College and Patrick Le Boeuf, Library Curator, Bibliothèque nationale de France, have received an award from *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* for the best article published in its volume 39. Their article, "'Such stuff as dreams are made on': How does FRBR fit performing arts?" appears in CCQ v.39(3/4): 151-178 and is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J104v39n03_10>.

The award panel stated, "This captivatingly crafted article brings a panoply of historiography and knowledge organization to bear on the problem of how to define and describe the records of evanescence: that is, performances. The dream metaphor, which is all mixed up with the show-biz metaphor, which reaches back to Shakespeare's Tempest is all too apt for the nature of performances, and especially for their treatment with FRBR. The paper is timely, original, innovative, extremely well-documented, and of enduring value. It has appeared at a critical juncture for the application of the FRBR model in the bibliographic control of performances. We applaud the authors. Bravo!"

The award panel consisted of Richard Smiraglia (Chair), Brad Young, and Dorothy McGarry.

Originally posted by:
Sandy Roe
Editor, Cataloging & Classification Quarterly
Bibliographic Services Librarian
Milner Library Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois, 61790-8900
phone: (309) 438-5039
e-mail: <skroe@ilstu.edu>

BOOK REVIEWS
Amy K. Weiss, Column Editor

Cataloging Cultural Objects:
A Guide to Describing Cultural Works and Their Images
by Murtha Baca, Patricia Harpring, Elisa Lanzi,
Linda McRae, and Ann Whiteside

This impressive guide to documenting and providing access to cultural objects and their images is the product of a huge collaborative effort by the cataloging and art and cultural heritage communities. The five authors are experts in the field, and the guide was reviewed by dozens of their colleagues, with project planning assistance provided by the Visual Resources Association (VRA) Data Standards Committee and major funding by the Getty Foundation and the Digital Library Federation.

The goal of *Cataloging Cultural Objects* (CCO) is to provide a content standard for describing and retrieving information about cultural objects (art, architecture, and material culture) and their images. As the "Introduction" states, "Standards that guide data structure, data values, and data content form the basis for a set of tools that can lead to good descriptive cataloging, consistent documentation, shared records, and increased end-user access" (p. xi). In the visual resources metadata community, data structure (element set) standards and data value (vocabulary) standards have been more developed than data content standards. CCO aims to fill the data content standard gap, providing rules and guidelines for the "…selection, organization, and formatting [order, syntax, and form]" of the values and information proliferating throughout the elements of the record. CCO works with structure standards such as *Categories for the Description of Works of Art* (CDWA) and VRA Core Categories and recommends use of various thesauri, such as the *Thesaurus for Graphic Materials* (TGM) and the *Art & Architecture Thesaurus* (AAT) and controlled name and subject vocabularies, such as LCNAF and LCSH. CCO also complements and extends AACR and *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS). In addition to placing CCO in the context of the art and cultural heritage metadata enterprise, the "Introduction" also discusses the audience and the scope and methodology of the manual.

The main body of the work is divided into three parts: "General Guidelines", "Elements" and "Authorities". The first part, "General Guidelines", delineates the principles of CCO, and includes extensive sections on levels of description, related works, database design and relationships, and authorities and controlled vocabularies. Although the work as a whole is meant to be a handbook and not read cover to cover, this section deserves at least one careful reading; the sections on related works and database design and relationships alone are worth the price of the book. The principles and guidelines discussed here are brought up again in the later chapters; indeed, one

of the strengths of the book is the referring back and forth among principles, guidelines, and discussions in the first section and their applications in the "Elements" and "Authorities" chapters.

Part Two, "Elements", contains a chapter for each element of description: object naming; creator information; physical characteristics; stylistic, cultural and chronological information; location and geography; subject; class (i.e., classification); description; and view information (for images). Each chapter opens with discussion of the element in question and issues related to its description and definition, such as specificity and depth and how to handle ambiguity and uncertainty, followed by a section on terminology, with a list of sources for standard vocabulary. Cataloging rules and recommendations follow, including dealing with capitalization and abbreviations, syntax, terminology, and applying the rules to various materials, as well as any other special aspects of the element. Recommendations are made regarding use of free-text and controlled vocabulary fields, as well as which fields are repeatable or not, referring back to discussions of principles of description, user access, and database design in Part One. Extensive examples of the specific rules and recommendations are provided. Each rules section is followed by a section on presentation of the data, discussing display and indexing (with references back to the "Database Design" section in the first part and forward to the "Authorities" part) and including sample records. The sample records are displayed along with their related work and authority records and arrows linking the various relationships.

Part Three, "Authorities", covers controlled vocabulary types familiar to library catalogers--subjects and personal, corporate, and geographic names--while also adding the concept authority, which provides controlled vocabulary as well as hierarchical and cross-reference structure for generic terminology in the field. As with the "Elements" part of CCO, each chapter on an authority type has three parts. Following general discussion of the type of authority and its terminology (with resources), it moves on to editorial rules for constructing the heading. The rules include considerations of usage, language, word order, fullness, and earlier and later forms (compatible with heading construction rules in AACR), with additional considerations specific to the needs of documenting cultural objects, such as life roles, gender, and dates and locales of activity. Finally, the section on presenting the data discusses display and indexing and provides sample authority records.

CCO concludes with a selective bibliography, a glossary, and an index keyed to pages rather than sections or rules. One minor quibble with the layout and numbering is that the rules consist solely of numbers, rather than alternating numbers and letters, and subordination is indicated by finely-graded diminution of type size. For anyone who loses track between similar numbering sequences (for example, A.3.2.1.2.1 and

A.3.2.1.2.2), it is challenging to get back on track without clearer visual cues. In every other respect CCO is a model manual. Throughout, the authors stress principles and consistency of practice balanced against local collection and user needs, while providing detailed recommendations and guidance for each aspect of cultural object description. CCO will be an essential tool for catalogers of art and cultural heritage. Its delineation of principles of description and access and database design make it a model content standard and, as such, it belongs in every cataloging library.

Reviewed by:
Anna DeVore
Cataloging Department, University Library
University of California, Santa Barbara

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT
By Jay Weitz

Form/Genre Headings for Music

Question: Now that many catalogers have gotten used to the concept of tagging form/genre headings for print and visual material as 655, is it feasible (and if so, is it nationally allowed and accepted) to do the same when cataloging music, at least to some degree? With the rise in usage of form/genre headings, and increasing frequency with which those headings are indexed separately from topical headings (whether or not they are also indexed as "subjects"), patrons are being encouraged to search for "Mystery fiction" or "Comedy films" as genres. Therefore, is the next logical step to enable patrons to use that same index to search for "Rock music", "Jazz", "Opera", "Concertos", etc., by tagging those terms as 655 rather than 650 when cataloging music? After all, this *is* material that is that form or genre, not material *about* that form or genre.

Answer: The best informed answer was kindly provided by Harvard University's

Beth Flood, Chair of the Subcommittee on Subject Access of the Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee:

"To answer these questions, yes, it is definitely feasible to use 655 form/genre coding for music, and it is technically allowed. In practice, music is not widely being coded using the 655 field at this point. Use of the 655 field for music is currently one of the foremost topics of interest for MLA's Subject Access Subcommittee. You can probably expect more information from our group on practical application of the 655 field during the course of this year. The subcommittee, in cooperation with LC, is discussing the process for converting existing music form/genre headings from the 650 to 655 field, as well as creation of authority records coded 155 for these terms. It has been suggested that creation of 155 authority records should happen first and that part of this process might be automated, in conjunction with OCLC's FAST project. FAST is already creating authority records for music form/genre terms, and might provide a source to draw from for broader form/genre term conversion. There is informal consensus that the music cataloging community needs to agree to convert to 655 form/genre coding as a group, given the broad scope of music form/genre terms (the majority of terms for scores and recordings being form/genre terms). Before implementing 655 coding for music, we will need to make sure that library systems can function the same way with music form/genre headings coded as topical (650) and as form (655). Coordinating the conversion to form/genre coding is of vital importance to our cooperative cataloging efforts."

Form Subdivisions for Juvenile Videos

Question: What is the proper use of some form subdivisions with juvenile videos? At issue, in particular, is the use of "$v Juvenile *drama*" versus "$v Juvenile *films*". Using the DVD of the recent *Charlotte's Web* movie as an example, would it be correct to assign headings of the type, "Piglets $v Juvenile drama", or should "Piglets $v Juvenile films" be used instead? Looking at the *Subject Cataloging Manual* H 1690, it appears that "$v Juvenile films" is better. Could you please advise when to use each subdivision? Another question is whether or not it would be all right to use the following LCSH headings as genre headings (coded appropriately, of course):

    655 _0 Animals in motion pictures.
    655 _0 Farm life in motion pictures.
What is your take on these issues?

Answer: No one will ever accuse LCSH of consistency. As I read both H 1690 and H 2230, the subdivision "Juvenile films" seems to be the more proper term for such videos. (As the note near the beginning of H 2230 says, "As used in this instruction sheet, the word 'film' is understood to refer to any type of visual material".)

Regarding what the SCM calls "fiction films", the instruction in H 2230, Section 4 reads, in part: "Assign the following headings, as appropriate, to individual fiction films: Topical headings with the subdivision '--Drama' (or, in the case of juvenile fiction films, the subdivision '--Juvenile films')".

The chief SCM reference for "Juvenile drama", H 1780 Section 3.a, is very clearly and firmly within the context of drama defined as stage plays. There must be some obscure historical reason for LCSH's inconsistency in the use of the term "drama" (and the corresponding absence of a subdivision such as "Films" or "Motion pictures" to be used for non-juvenile materials instead of the term "Drama"--and let's not even think about LCSH's complete chaos when it comes to the terms "films" and "motion pictures" or "drama" and "plays" themselves).

As to the related questions, as far as I have been able to determine, neither LCSH nor SCM addresses the "[topic] in motion pictures" construction except in the context of place names (H 910, Section 3, where it was made invalid in 1997). The subdivision "In motion pictures" gets mentioned in other places as well, but used with place names (H 1140), personal names (H 1110), family names (H 1120), corporate names (H 1105), and Christian denominations (H 1187); it is not valid generally under topical headings. Moreover, in all of those cases (see sh2002005441), it follows a subfield $x, not a subfield $v. It has also always been my understanding about the "[topic] in motion pictures" construction (which does not seem to be explained anywhere), that it is to be used for works that are about that topic, not applied to works that are examples of the topic. Therefore, "Animals in motion pictures" would be applied to a book such as "Great animals of the movies" or "Animal actors", but not to the video of *Charlotte's Web*. So I do not believe that such headings would be appropriate genre headings, at least not as things stand right now. We will know more once LC completes its project of creating authority file records for genre headings (655s).

The Changing Fashions in URLs

Question: It appears that Project Muse has, at some point, changed the URLs to its journal titles, even though the old and new Web addresses are both active and both link to the same information. As an example, for the journal, *American Jewish History*:

> **Old style**: <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ajh/>
> **New style**: <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_jewish_history/>

Would it be of value to OCLC if catalogers working with Muse titles replaced the old style URLs with the new ones? Another question arises from Project Muse's newer-style links, since the "underscore" is often found in them: where can information or documentation be found about whether or not the underscore character should be used or if it should be replaced it with its ASCII code (%5F)?

Answer: Instead of replacing the old URL with the new one, consider this idea: because both URLs actually work (and if there continues to be no indication that Project Muse intends to disable the old style URLs), it would be preferable for catalogers simply to add a second 856 field with the new style URL. The information about the spacing underscore character can now be found in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* in the subfield $u section of Field 856 <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/8xx/856.shtm>, as well as in the "Field 856" section of "Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines" <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/cataloging/electronicresources/default.htm>, and also in the "Character Set Changes" section of Technical Bulletin 252 <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/252/default.htm>. The essence of the guidance given in those places is this: "Because the 'Spacing Underscore' may cause problems with MARC output, users may prefer to continue entering it with the hexadecimal value %5F".

DVD Release Identical to Previous VHS

Question: In copy cataloging a DVD release of an earlier VHS tape, various dates are present. The date on the screen is c1993, the disc shows c1999 and the package is dated c2000. The only difference between the VHS and DVD seems to be that the DVD has the text and logo for "Dolby digital". There are no additional features on the DVD. Is it still a DtSt "p"? The first date on the existing copy is the package date. Is that correct or should it be changed to 1999?

Answer: Given that the DVD is an exact re-release of the existing VHS in the same medium (videorecording) but a different format (changed from VHS to DVD), consider the DVD to be DtSt "r" for an identical re-release in the same medium. If the "package" date explicitly pertains to the design of the container, it should be ignored. If not, consider it to be the date of publication, although the other dates associated with the resource should also be account for.

DVD-Rs and Dates

Question: This question concerns the date to use in the 260 field, as well as in the Fixed Field, for a DVD-R production. Usually it is possible to take dates from the screen at the end of an actual viewing. However, the date at the end of this DVD-R shows "MCMXCIII" (1993). Online records for the DVD (not DVD-R) versions give "2004" as the date. The container has "Package copyright 2004" and the disc is stamped with "2007". It is generally safe to use the screen date, although this may not be a hard and fast rule. The date on the cover often refers to the cover design (as it does in this case) and not the actual manufacturer or production of the DVD. The date stamped on the disc itself often refers to a new cut (like a monograph reprinting) of an earlier production. So, it is confusing to know how to assign dates for DVDs in general and, specifically, for the one in hand. Finally, is it correct to create original records for DVD-Rs? There does not seem to be any rule or guidance recommending that catalogers create a new record for DVD-Rs. The rationale for doing so seems correct, since DVD-Rs will not work on all players, but it is still not clear if this is the right thing to do.

Answer: The issue of dates for DVDs in general, and specifically for DVD-Rs and the many other varieties of recordable DVDs, is one that causes no end of consternation. An on-screen date at the end of the credits (or some other comparable place) is certainly important as a date of original production and should be duly noted as such, but cannot necessarily be taken as a date of publication. DVDs did not become commercially available until very late 1996/early 1997, so no date earlier than that can possibly be considered a date of publication for any DVD, whether a "traditional" DVD or a recordable DVD. Under ordinary circumstances, a container date that is specifically designated as "package design" or the like would usually be ignored, but in a circumstance such as the one you describe, in the absence of any other usable date of DVD publication, such a date may make sense as a probable date of publication (bracketed and with a question mark). From your description, it sounds as though the "2007" date stamped on the disc is likely the DVD-R equivalent of an on-demand reproduction date. Because these are the equivalent of on-demand reproductions, catalogers have **two options** for cataloging them. The **first option** is to adapt the existing rules for other "on demand" materials. This would involve following LCRI 1.11A and OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* Section 3.2, describing the original (that is, presumably, a published FFH DVD) in the body of the record and the reproduction (the on-demand DVD-R) in Field 533. This would include: "Videodisc" in Field 533, subfield $a; the date of the reproduction in 533, subfield $d; physical description of the DVD in subfield $e; any appropriate notes about the reproduction. As with other on-demand publications, future catalogers of this title on DVD-R should use the same record regardless of the date of the reproduction. In one 533, subfield $n, it would be a good idea to explain briefly what the situation is with these

DVDs, possibly a quoted note if the item says something useful. The **second option** is to follow the option noted in Footnote 1 of LCRI 1.11A, pretty much ignoring the RI and cataloging these as though they were not reproductions, although proper reference to any previous manifestation would be prudent. While this option is a much simpler way to deal with these things, it opens the door to cataloger confusion concerning the date of any later on-demand reproduction of the same DVD.

Video Durations with Extras on the Side

Question: What should be recorded in the 300 field for the duration of a videorecording when there is additional material and the timing of the extra material is also known? For example, the "Barney" DVDs are about 30 minutes and they have extras that range anywhere from 30-60 minutes. Should the time only for the actual program or motion picture be given or for the entire length of the content?

Answer: As far as I am aware, there is nothing explicit in the rules limiting the recording of duration for film and/or video material to the main contents, although that has long been the tradition. (This, of course, goes back to the time before commonly available videorecordings when there were few if any added materials.) OLAC's DVD cataloging guide <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality/default.shtm#databaseenrichment> does, however, make this assertion explicit: "The time given in subfield 'a' of MARC 21 Field 300 should be the time of the title recorded in Field 245, and this is also the time recorded in the appropriate Fixed Field. Times of supplementary material and/or special features may be given in the notes relating to that material or those features, but Areas 1-6 of the bibliographic record refer to the title being cataloged, not to the special material". Nowadays it is the usual practice to note the duration of the main material in the 300 field and to list any substantial additional material in a contents or other note (where the durations of added materials could be included parenthetically), if this is considered to be important.

When a Video has Both Widescreen and Standard Versions

Question: Some cataloging records now seem to be including edition statements (MARC 250) that indicate "widescreen and standard" for DVDs having both formats. This was not the norm in the past; instead, a 500 note was used to specify the two types of versions on one DVD. Is this an indication that cataloging practice is changing, now that so many DVDs come in dual formats? If so, is it now OK to give

this type of information as an edition statement?

Answer: When a videorecording contains *both* the widescreen and standard versions, the information is usually more legitimately presented as some sort of note on the contents, rather than as an edition statement. On the other hand, when a videorecording includes an indication that it is *either* a widescreen/letterboxed version or a standard/full screen version (*but not both*), such a designation will often be appropriate as an edition statement to differentiate one version from the other. By this I mean to suggest that an edition statement will be appropriate when different versions actually need to be differentiated (that is, when both a widescreen version and a standard version of what is otherwise the same resource have been separately published). In those cases, I would say that even the simplest designation of "widescreen", or "full screen", or whatever, will always be an appropriate edition statement, even in the absence of a term such as "edition" or "version". (In fact, I would go so far as to say that, if the existence of both versions is known and the one being cataloged does not explicitly say which it is, adding a bracketed edition statement in the spirit of 7.2B3 would be most helpful. However, catalogers should not feel obligated to research the existence of other versions.) Of course in the real world, a cataloger will not necessarily know about the existence of different versions. That is why I would tend to err on the side of including an edition statement when the resource in hand indicates wide, or full, or whatever. If it is known that only one version exists (for instance, according to the known practices of certain directors, certain video publishers, certain types of films), then putting that version designation in a note, without an edition statement, is fine (because an edition statement would not then serve a differentiating function).

Cataloging Choreography on DVD

Question: For DVDs featuring performances of ballets, is it appropriate to provide access to the choreographic work itself, using its uniform title as the main entry? For instance:

    130 0   Giselle (Choreographic work : Coralli and Perrot)
    245 10   Giselle $h [videorecording] : $b a romantic ballet in two acts / $c music by Adolphe Adam ; etc.

All kinds of practices appear online, with the more common being to give the uniform title as a subject heading (630) or a related title entry (730). What is the best practice?

Answer: AACR2 proper does not really address choreographic works in any meaningful way. The 1996 Music Library Association publication, *Cataloging*

Musical Moving Image Material, addresses the question of choreographic works the same way as it does moving images of operas and musicals, declaring the intellectual responsibility to be "broad and diverse" and "thus entered under title". I would concur, although a 730 for the choreographic work would be strongly recommended. The "Choreographic Works" section of LCRI 25.5B provides a possible hint as to why practice has been so varied. It reads in part: "AACR2 does not include specific rules for the creation of uniform titles for choreographic works, and in the past LC has treated headings for individual choreographic dance works as subject headings, rather than name headings. However, because they do represent individual creative works and to meet the needs of the dance cataloging community, these headings should now be treated as name headings ...". If the video includes significant additional material beyond the dance itself (such as commentary, interviews, historical background, etc.), then providing a 630 for the choreographic work would also be appropriate.

Last updated: June 19, 2007