

OLAC NEWSLETTER

vol. 26, no. 2

June 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

TREASURER'S REPORT

2006 OLAC CONFERENCE

PREVIEW

CALL FOR POSTERS

CALL FOR REPORTERS

LIAISON REPORTS

NEWS FROM OCLC

 RLG TO COMBINE WITH OCLC

 CONNEXION CHANGES IN FEBRUARY

 CONNEXION CHANGES IN APRIL

OCLC MEMBERS COUNCIL REPORT

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

OCLC NUMBER EXPANSION PROJECT

OCLC SUPPORT FOR LARGER LENGTH RECORDS

IMPLEMENTATION OF ISBN-13 IN OCLC

CONNEXION CLIENT ENHANCEMENTS

CONNEXION BROWSER ENHANCEMENTS

LC ANNOUNCEMENT ON SERIES AUTHORITIES

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT

CODING FIELD 246 FOR TITLES NOT DERIVED FROM FIELD 245

POWERPOINT WITH NARRATION ON CD-ROM

INFINITE VARIETY OF LANGUAGE OPTIONS ON DVD_s

THE METAPHYSICS OF FIELDS 006 AND 007

BLANKS IN FIELD 007

TYPE CODE, GMD, AND SMD FOR A VIDEO ON CD-ROM

DOLBY DIGITAL, STRAIGHT, NO CHASER

ON-DEMAND PRINTOUT OF A PDF FILE
DESCRIBING A VIDEO AND ACCOMPANYING MANUAL IN CONTAINER
DATES FOR VIDEORECORDINGS VERSUS DATES FOR AUDIO
RECORDINGS
PLATES OR JUST UNNUMBERED LEAVES?

FROM THE EDITOR
Jain Fletcher

Much has happened in the "cataloging world" since the last *OLAC Newsletter* issue. There have been two momentous announcements in the last few months, both of which gave a glimpse into the future of cataloging--one for its prospects and the other for its challenges. The first was the announcement (included in this issue) that RLG and OCLC services will be combined. It is invigorating to consider the opportunities that the amalgamation of RLG's and OCLC's services will bring to catalogers. The other was the stunning announcement from the Library of Congress that told of the decision to change the way series authority work is done "in-house". Of course, most institutions can change their "in-house" operations without much effect on other institutions (except for, perhaps, the overall quality of their output with respect to cooperative use). On the other hand, the Library of Congress has been a central figure and a founder of cooperative ventures, having instituted services in the early 20th century that put it at the vanguard of the cooperative ideal. Its "series announcement" (the link to it is provided in this issue) may be the first harbinger of a 21st century change at LC to move away from providing a full array of cooperative services, with respect to the description and access of bibliographic materials.

Subsequent discussion over various listservs--especially those related to the latter announcement--show that catalogers are intelligent, thoughtful, articulate, ready for challenges and full of ideas. It has been stimulating to read all the commentary. Many good ideas have emerged from it, one of them being that perhaps there should be a shift in our thinking *away* from considering LC as the central point of cooperative ventures and *towards* the realization that the logical place is in cooperative systems. Indeed, OCLC has acted responsively and with gratifying concern throughout this period. With the changes coming to OCLC and RLG, perhaps the combined company

is well-positioned to emerge as the central point of cooperative services.

The most important thing OLAC members can do--in representing the most expert catalogers "out there"--is to stay abreast of developments, be actively involved and know how to apply standards to address user needs in meaningful ways. As usual, this issue provides developments in its "News & Announcements", "OCLC News" and our liaison report. As to applying standards to address user needs? Why, that is *exactly* what Jay Weitz's column is about!! And OLAC's bi-annual Conference is one of the best ways to stay involved. We all hope to see you there in October!

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Rebecca Lubas

Greetings, OLAC members! How time flies. At the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, it will already be time for the new OLAC President to take office.

I want to share with you an extraordinary opportunity I had this past April. I was invited to speak at National Library Week in Kosovo. Libraries in Kosovo, both academic and public, are preparing to make the leap from the card catalog to an integrated library system this year. In preparation for this huge step, librarians there have been updating their cataloging skills and learning the MARC format. As with all libraries, they have materials in multiple formats. They specifically asked me to come to teach audiovisual cataloging, since they want their new online system to include all materials. The librarians there are eager to learn and eager to advance information accessibility in their country.

I attempted to cram videos, electronic resources, maps, microforms and graphics into a very short time period. I would like to thank CAPC, and especially Jay Weitz, for encouraging me in this formidable task by letting me use much of their training materials. Many of the OLAC training materials have now been translated into Albanian and are being circulated amongst Kosovar librarians.

The experience was fantastic. The hospitality of the Kosovars was overwhelming, and their energy to move their country forward was inspirational. I encourage you to visit the Website of the National and University Library at <

ks.org/index.php>. Even if your Albanian is a bit rusty, check out the amazing architecture of the building and cover shots of their publications.

Remember to register for our 2006 Conference in Phoenix, Arizona, "Preparing for a Brave New World: Media Cataloging on the Threshold of RDA". Please see the OLAC Conference Website <<http://www.asu.edu/lib/olac/>> and get your hotel reservations and other arrangements ready!

It has been a pleasure serving as your OLAC President.

TREASURER'S REPORT
Third Quarter
Through March 31, 2006
Bobby Bothmann, Treasurer

	3rd Quarter Jan.-Mar.	Year-To-Date
OPENING BALANCE	\$4,579.84	
INCOME		
Memberships	\$5,209.40	\$8,733.40
Other		\$35.00
TOTAL	\$5,209.40	\$8,768.40
EXPENSES		
ALA	\$570.31	\$970.31
Membership Overpayment		\$5.00
OLAC Board Dinner	\$295.58	\$481.82
OLAC Award		\$227.00
Stipends	\$700.00	\$950.00
Postage & Printing		\$3,203.53
<i>Printing</i>		\$2,991.76

<i>Postage</i>		\$211.77
Web Domain		\$15.00
Miscellaneous	110.67	\$147.67
TOTAL	\$1,676.56	\$6,000.33
CLOSING BALANCE		\$10,035.54

**MEMBERSHIP as of April 13,
2006**

Personal:	365
Institutional:	189
Total:	554

**2006 OLAC CONFERENCE
-PREVIEW-**

**"Preparing for a Brave New World:
Media Cataloging on the Threshold of RDA"
Mesa, Arizona (Phoenix Metro Area)
October 26-29, 2006**

Pre-Conference Workshop

"Electronic Serials Cataloging"

Plenary Sessions

Opening Keynote Address

"Developing RDA (Resource Description and Access): Envisioning a Cataloging Standard for a Digital Future" - Jennifer Bowen

"OLAC Ambassador" Address

"Non-Print Cataloging, National Library of Kosovo" - Rebecca Lubas

Closing Keynote Address

"RDA: A Case Study in Developing Cataloging Standards" - Dr. Barbara Tillett

Workshops

"Basic Videorecordings Cataloging" - Presenter, Jay Weitz

"Advanced Videorecordings Cataloging" - Presenter, Jay Weitz

"Map Cataloging" - Presenter, Paige Andrew

"Sound Recordings Cataloging" - Presenter, Mary Huismann

"Electronic Resources Cataloging" - Presenter, Amy K. Weiss

"Introduction to Metadata for Educational Resources" - Presenter, Rob Wolfe

"VRA Core 4.0 and CCO" - Presenter, Trish Rose

The importance and application of two standards: Visual Resources Association Core 4.0 (a set of metadata elements and XML encoding structure) and the Cataloging Cultural Objects guidelines (a data content standard similar to AAC2 or DACS)

"Gathering Audio Metadata for the Monterey Jazz Festival Concerts" - Presenter, Nancy Hoebelheinrich

For a full description of the sessions, information about the presenters, registration and hotel information, please visit the OLAC 2006 Conference Website <<http://www.asu.edu/lib/olac/>>.

NOTE: Registration materials will not be sent by mail; please print the registration form and send to the address provided.

Conference Organizers

OLAC 2006 Chair

Timothy Diel (Arizona State University Libraries)

Program Committee

Deborah Benrubi (University of San Francisco)
Elizabeth Icenhower (Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's)
Jeanne Piascik (University of Central Florida)
Jeannette Ho (Texas A&M University)
Julia Dunlap (Arkansas State University)
Katherine James (Illinois State University)
Robert Willingham (Southeast Missouri State University)

Local Arrangements Committee

Matthew Cordell (Arizona State University)
Rebecca Uhl (Arizona State University)

Webmaster

Debbie Flitner

2006 OLAC CONFERENCE - CALL FOR POSTERS -

Have you developed creative methods to deal with special format materials? Completed some research studies? Found an imaginative solution to a special format materials problem in your library? If so, why not consider sharing those ideas that worked? Think about doing a poster presentation at the OLAC Conference to be held October 26-29, 2006 in Mesa, Arizona.

All applicants should complete the "Poster Session Application" form (below), and submit the completed form via e-mail, FAX or postal mail to the Poster Session Coordinator. Applications will be reviewed by committee. Ten will be selected. Applicants will be notified by August 15, 2006 whether or not their posters have been selected.

OLAC provides the easels and tables; you provide the posters, graphics and handouts for your presentation. Presenters should plan to bring at least 50 copies of their handouts. Please make sure your contact information is on the handout. No network

applications will be available; however, you may bring a laptop computer for your presentation. Presenters should plan to be present for the entire time period.

The deadline for receipt of applications is July 15, 2006.

POSTER PRESENTATION APPLICATION

Application form must be completed and submitted via e-mail, fax, or postal mail to the Poster Session Coordinator listed below.

Poster Title:

Name(s) and Institutional Affiliation(s) of Presenter(s):

<<DEADLINE for receipt of application: July 15, 2006>>

Send abstract (150 words or less) with your application to:

Poster Session Coordinator:

Liz Icenhower
Memorial University of Newfoundland
QE II Library
St. John's, NL A1B 3Y1
Canada
FAX: (709) 737-2153
e-mail: <eicenhov@mun.ca>

CALL FOR CONFERENCE REPORTERS
Jan Mayo

It may seem early, but the OLAC Conference being held in October 2006 will be here before we know it. As Conference Reports Editor, I am in charge of ensuring that all of the sessions, workshops, and keynote addresses are summarized for publication in the December 2006 issue of the *OLAC Newsletter*. Since I cannot be everywhere at once during the Conference, I need your help!

If you plan to go to the OLAC Conference in Mesa, Arizona, please consider being a reporter for one or more of the sessions you attend. The Conference reports serve two primary purposes: to inform those who were unable to attend and to provide a record of what OLAC does to support and enrich the professional lives of its members.

As I mentioned earlier, your report will be published in the *OLAC Newsletter*, with your name and affiliation credited in the byline of the report. For those on the tenure-track or in other positions where publication is expected, this report can be used as a publication credit in a non-peer-reviewed library periodical.

If you have any interest in being a Conference reporter, please contact me at <mayoj@ecu.edu>. Also, if you have a preference for a session (or two) on which you would like to report, please let me know that as well. Many thanks for your consideration.

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled by Jay Weitz

RLG TO COMBINE WITH OCLC

Two of the world's largest membership-based information organizations have agreed to come together. The combined organization will offer an integrated product and service line, and will give libraries, archives and museums new leverage in developing services, standards and software that will help them support research and disseminate knowledge online. The RLG Board of Directors and OCLC Board of Trustees have recommended that the two service and research organizations be combined, effective July 1, 2006. If approved by RLG member institutions, RLG's online products and services will be integrated with OCLC products and services, and RLG's program initiatives will be brought forward as a new division of OCLC Programs and Research. A combined organization would provide an opportunity to leverage program strengths, services and innovative research initiatives, and to deliver more value to a greater number of libraries, museums, archives and other research organizations around the globe.

RLG is a nonprofit organization of over 150 research libraries, archives, museums, and other cultural memory institutions; it designs and delivers innovative information discovery services, organizes collaborative programs and takes an active role in creating and promoting relevant standards and practices. OCLC Online Computer Library Center is a nonprofit, membership, library service, and research organization whose public purposes of furthering access to the world's information and reducing library costs dominate its plans and activities. OCLC provides computer-based cataloging, reference, resource sharing, eContent, preservation services and research to 54,000 libraries in 109 countries.

RLG's program initiatives would be continued as RLG-Programs, a new division of OCLC Programs and Research that would provide programs to support architecture, standards development and best practices, to name a few. James Michalko, who currently leads RLG, would serve as Vice President of RLG-Programs Development, working under the leadership of Lorcan Dempsey, Vice President of Research and OCLC Chief Strategist. RLG-Programs would remain a membership-based organization. Its agenda would be shaped by the needs of its members and guided by a dedicated Program Council. RLG's online products and services would be integrated with OCLC service offerings as appropriate.

The potential for increased services and consolidation of costs would result in overall savings. For example, RLIN, the RLG Union Catalog, would be integrated into WorldCat, delivering economies of scale and reach that would benefit members of both RLG and OCLC. Both organizations are committed to providing seamless, high-quality services and service levels. Any change in RLG service offerings will be announced well in advance. Approval of the agreement requires the assent of two-

thirds of voting RLG member institutions. Voting will conclude in early June. RLG-Programs would maintain an office in Mountain View, California. Staffing decisions will be made in the weeks leading up to the proposed transition. For additional information, please see the FAQ "RLG Proposal to Combine with OCLC at <<http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/oclcrlgfaq.htm>>.

CONNEXION CHANGES IN FEBRUARY

OCLC installed the following changes to Connexion in February 2006:

- ***End of Connexion Browser Support for Internet Explorer Versions 5.0 and 5.01:*** OCLC ended Connexion Browser support for Internet Explorer versions 5.0 and 5.01 on February 19, 2006. Connexion Browser users, including CatExpress and WebDewey users, can no longer log on using IE 5.0 and IE 5.01. In preparation for the change, beginning after the November 13 Connexion Browser enhancement installation, users who accessed OCLC Connexion Browser with IE 5.0 or IE 5.01 received a message reminding them to upgrade their Browser.
- ***Changes in Controlling Functionality:*** There are changes in the controlling functionality in the handling of unqualified personal names tagged as 100 or 700. The changes facilitate less manipulation of headings tagged as 100 or 700 and followed by subfields \$e, \$u, and \$4. The changes in the controlling functionality treat all X00 fields in the same manner and use the multi-control page. The most significant impact of this change is the inability to "match all from the multi-control page. Users will need to search or browse the authority file as an independent step. One way to avoid this extra step is to mis-tag the personal name heading (e.g., 710 vs. 700). No changes are made to the handling of X10 or X11 headings.
- ***Problem Fixes:***
 - CatExpress export files now delivers records in the same order in which the cataloging or exporting was done.
 - *Database enrichment corrections.* Previously, if a user tried to add certain fields to a record, they were prevented from doing so if those fields were already present. Connexion now allows a user to add multiple occurrences of the following fields to existing records: 006, 007, 022, 027, 028, 030, 041, 043, 052, 088, 538.
 - *Records derived from a bibliographic Save File record in Connexion Browser pass validation.* If users choose to transfer the Fixed Field values when deriving a new record from a Save File record, the Fixed Field values are now retained. Previously, most of the Fixed Field values were dropped and the record failed validation.

- ***Connexion Statistics Enhancements:*** Enhancements to the Connexion Statistics on the OCLC Usage Statistics Website include:
 - Names now appear beside the authorization report titles, making it easier for users to know which authorization number to choose.
 - The Consolidated Report is a new report that combines the institution level report and all the authorization level reports on one page.
 - Chinese Name Authority File statistics will be added to the reports.

CONNEXION CHANGES IN APRIL

As part of the April 2006 installation, OCLC removed access to the separate PICA GGC database in the OCLC Connexion browser. The bibliographic records of the PICA Dutch Catalog are being loaded directly into WorldCat, thus removing the necessity of having a separate function to provide this access. Only a few users access the PICA GGC database via Connexion and very minimal searching is done. Users can now search directly for the records in WorldCat.

OCLC MEMBERS COUNCIL **Kevin Furniss**

The February 2006 OCLC Members Council meeting was called "Partnerships: Building and Expanding the Collaborative", carrying over the title from the October 2005 meeting. The following report includes topics discussed at the various meetings that should be of interest to OLAC members.

eSerials Holdings Service Update - Bill Carney

Bill Carney reviewed the features and benefits of the service, then provided an update/progress report on it. Twenty-one libraries are currently involved in the pilot, but that number will be growing to 36 libraries with the addition of a group of SUNY libraries. Over 270,000 holdings have been set in WorldCat and three of the pilot libraries are testing the MARC record updating option. The pilot libraries are showing that, on average, 16% of their ILL serials traffic is related to these holdings. The production service will enable libraries to deflect ILL requests automatically to the

next library in the lending string, based on settings in the OCLC Policies Directory. Libraries will be able to deflect all of the requests related to eSerials, or deflect all except those from existing groups. The Service will be available in June 2006, through the OCLC Online Service Center. The holdings portion of the service will be offered at no additional charge to OCLC member libraries. The optional MARC Record Service will be available in the future, for which there will be a first year subscription rate that includes the value of the initial record set, with a lower annual price for subsequent years taking into account the lower number of records sent as updates. The pricing model focuses the value on the updates. OCLC continues to recruit additional partners. Information on this service may be found at <<http://www.oclc.org/productworks/eserialspilot.htm>>.

Terminologies Service Update - Susan Westberg

Susan Westberg provided an update on the Terminologies pilot, which provides access to multiple controlled vocabularies for libraries, museums, and archives to create consistent metadata for their collections. The pilot is being conducted by phasing in different vocabularies at different points in the pilot. Libraries can use Connexion Client or Browser, or any other Web-based metadata editor. A survey has been completed with the initial participants, with another survey in process for non-Connexion users and MeSH and RVM users. Pilot participants indicated that they liked having access to multiple thesauri and the ease of adding the terms to a record in Connexion. Westberg shared the list of the eleven terminologies that will be included in the initial release of the service in June 2006. A question was raised about whether or not local authority files could also be used with this service. The answer was yes, that the Microsoft Research pane allows adding URLs for an institution's thesauri. [After the meeting, Susan clarified that some programming still needs to be done to add additional URLs, such as Web-based in-house thesauri.]

More information about the Terminologies pilot can be found at <<http://www.oclc.org/productworks/terminologiespilot.htm>>. For more information, see <<http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/assistance/HP010733831033.aspx>> and <<http://msdn1.microsoft.com/en-us/default.aspx>>.

Pricing for New Products under Cataloging Subscription - Chris Grabenstatter.

Chris Grabenstatter reviewed OCLC's three current types of cataloging pricing (transaction, fixed-fee, and subscription), and stated that all libraries will be moving to subscription pricing in July 2006. Once all libraries are under subscription pricing, OCLC will consider how to handle pricing for new cataloging products. Grabenstatter outlined the three options:

1. Include in Subscription package, no additional charge
 - o Need to continue to add value
 - o Examples include additional language interfaces, Terminologies Service, Content Cooperative (basic amount of storage)
2. An option to Subscription package, with an additional charge
 - o Linked to the subscription but at an additional cost
 - o Products that are not relevant to the majority of users
 - o Examples include 100% delivery via PromptCat and potential new Selection Service
3. Outside of the Subscription package
 - o Priced separately from annual Cataloging Subscription
 - o Currently includes: Dewey, WorldCat Collection Sets, and Local Database Creation; future would include eSerials record updating.

Discussion centered on support for avoiding complicated pricing levels. A Cataloging & Metadata Interest Group member indicated that it is frequently easier to get subscription pricing approved/paid, and that additional options may complicate this. Another member suggested that anything that adds value or contributes to the cooperative be included in the core subscription price.

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OCLC NUMBER EXPANSION PROJECT

The following message was distributed by OCLC to local system vendors in mid-April, 2006.

To accommodate the ongoing growth of the WorldCat database, a project has been launched that will expand the OCLC Control Number (e.g., the number assigned by OCLC and stored in the 001 field of the MARC Bibliographic Format in OCLC exported records). Currently, the highest number that can be assigned to incoming bibliographic records is 99999999.

For bibliographic records up to and including OCLC number 99999999, the correct

format of the OCLC number will remain as a three character prefix ("ocm"), followed by an eight digit number and a trailing space (e.g., ocm99999999). Starting with record number 100000000, the prefix will be "ocn", the number will be 9 digits in length and have no trailing space (e.g., ocn100000000).

All OCLC systems that output OCLC MARC21 Bibliographic records will be modified to output different OCLC number formats depending on the number itself (e.g., ocm99999999[blank] or ocn100000000).

The target date for all OCLC systems, products, and services to handle the new nine digit number format is November 1, 2006. OCLC expects to reach the 99999999 in number of total bibliographic records within WorldCat sometime shortly after November 1, 2006. OCLC programming should be in place by that date in order to be prepared on the day that number is reached. Systems will need to be ready to receive and process this new format of OCLC control number by that same date.

Please feel free to contact me with questions regarding this project.

Originally posted by:

Becky Dean

OCLC, Inc.

e-mail: <deanr@oclc.org>

phone: (800) 848-5878 x5144

OCLC SUPPORT FOR LARGER LENGTH RECORDS

The long-awaited enhancement planned for MARC Subscription to support larger length records has been installed. The new software was installed on April 26, 2006 and started creating files with the activity produced the day before.

The feature that will provide the ability to select the type(s) of transactions libraries wish to receive in their MARC Subscription file is scheduled to be implemented by mid-May 2006. Transaction types include update, produce & update, delete holdings and replace & update.

The "OCLC MARC Subscription Service Request" order form has been revised and re-named, "MARC Subscription Service Request". The form will be available in both "pdf" and "html" formats. Once the feature to select type(s) of transactions has been implemented, a library can complete the newly revised "MARC Subscription Service

Request" form to create a new setup, update an existing setup or cancel a setup. The "Product Status Change" form is no longer needed to cancel a subscription.

Thank you,
Cheryl Baugess

Originally posted on behalf of Cheryl Baugess by:
Chris Grabenstatter, OCLC
OCLC, Inc.
e-mail: <grabenst@oclc.org>
phone: (800) 848-5878

IMPLEMENTATION OF ISBN-13 IN OCLC

OCLC's plans for implementing 13-digit ISBN are being finalized. Once the implementation date is determined, details will be announced a few months in advance. Meanwhile, the following will be added to the announcement about OCLC's interim support for ISBN-13
<<http://www.oclc.org/news/announcements/announcement96.htm>>.

After OCLC completes the implementation of its new system/database platform, support for the ISBN-13 numbers will be added in the 020 field for Batchload, online input and searching.

In the future --

- all existing 10-digit ISBNs will be converted to 13-digit ISBNs and both forms stored and indexed in WorldCat records
- 13-digit ISBNs in field 024 (EAN) will be converted to field 020 and both forms (10-digit and 13-digit) will be stored and indexed in WorldCat records
- When a user inputs a valid 10- or 13-digit ISBN, the online system will automatically generate the other ISBN prior to adding the record to WorldCat unless the ISBN starts with "979"
- Reports and catalog card printing will be modified to display or print 13-digit ISBNs

Originally posted by:
Richard Greene
OCLC, Inc.
e-mail: <richard_greene@oclc.org>

phone: (800) 848-5878
(614) 764-6000 x6154

CONNEXION CLIENT ENHANCEMENTS

On Sunday, May 21, 2006, the following functionality was added to the Connexion Client.

OCLC-MARC Format Update 2006

With the May installation, OCLC begins implementation of changes in preparation for the OCLC-MARC Format Update 2006 that affect both the Connexion Browser and Client interfaces. Complete information regarding this update is found in *Technical Bulletin 252*: <<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/252/>>.

Except for specific changes detailed in Section 8 "Summary of Connexion Changes" in *Technical Bulletin 252*, OCLC strongly recommends that Connexion Browser and Client users *not* begin to use new capabilities, new fields and subfields, new indicators, new practices, new codes, and new characters until OCLC announces that they may be used. Note that, as OCLC converts data, users may encounter instances of these new data.

Error Fixes

Offline validation status changes to incorrect "failed" status. Immediately after validation completes, records that pass validation offline in Connexion Client 1.50 show Validate-C for "completed" in the status bar or save file list, as they should. When the local save file list or record is redisplayed, the validation status incorrectly shows Validate-F for "failed". This is an incorrect system response. The records actually have passed validation. Users can continue to update, replace and add records as usual. This problem will be resolved in this install.

Ability to Control Subdivisions Correctly (\$x/\$v)

Recently, the Library of Congress launched a project to modify values of bytes 008/15 (Subj use) in subdivision authority records. The new values in the records are 008/15 = b and replace the previously coded values of 008/15 = a. Changes have been made to ignore the value of the 008/15 value in all subdivision records that and allow users to control to the correct subdivision record.

Documentation

OCLC Connexion Client Help documentation will be updated as part of Client version

1.60, planned for release in June 2006.

Originally posted by:

Becky Dean

OCLC, Inc.

e-mail: <deanr@oclc.org>

phone: (800) 848-5878, x5144

CONNEXION BROWSER ENHANCEMENTS

On Sunday, May 21, 2006, the following functionality was added to the Connexion Browser. For more information, search Connexion News under the category "System Updates".

Metadata Extraction and Creation

Reimplementation of Metadata Extraction: The "Metadata Extraction" functionality in the Connexion Browser has been revised and expanded. In addition to creating records for Websites, users may now extract metadata and create records for locally stored files in the following formats: .htm, .html, pdf, and .doc. The creation dialogs for metadata extraction have been revised to place all extract functionality on the same screen rather than splitting between "Create/Single Record" and "Create/Multiple Records".

Note: "Metadata Extraction" functionality will also be included in the Connexion Client version 1.60, planned for release in June 2006.

OCLC-MARC Format Update 2006

With this May installation, OCLC begins implementation of changes in preparation for the OCLC-MARC Format Update 2006 that affect both the Connexion Browser and Client interfaces.

Except for specific changes detailed in Section 8 "Summary of Connexion Changes" in *Technical Bulletin 252*, OCLC strongly recommends that Connexion Browser and Client users not begin to use new capabilities, new fields and subfields, new indicators, new practices, new codes, and new characters until OCLC announces that they may be used. Note that, as OCLC converts data, users may encounter instances of this new data. Complete information regarding this update is found in *Technical Bulletin 252* <<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/252/>>.

WebDewey / Abridged WebDewey May Quarterly Release

This May release consists of updating the DDC 22 and Abridged 14 databases in WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey, respectively. These database updates contain the latest changes to the DDC, including new editorially mapped LCSH up to Weekly List no. 27 & 28 (2005) and monthly postings.

Material Types in Search Dialog

In the Connexion browser, the Material Type ("Mat. Type") list has been added to the Keyword/Numeric Search area in the Connexion Browser to join the existing limiters of Language, Source, Format, Years, Microform, Internet and Holdings.

Connexion Browser Logoff Warning Screen

The wording of the Active Records message on the Connexion Browser logoff warning screen and the format of the screen has been changed to clarify the meaning of the active records message and to provide libraries with the information to hide the logoff warning for those who prefer not to see the message.

Error Fixes - Ability to Control Subdivisions Correctly (\$x/\$v)

Recently, the Library of Congress launched a project to modify the value of byte 008/15 ("Subj use") in subdivision authority records. The new value in the records is 008/15 = b and replaces the previously coded value of 008/15 = a. Changes have been made to ignore the 008/15 value in all subdivision records and allow users to control to the correct subdivision record.

Documentation

OCLC Connexion Browser Help documentation has been updated to include information on the MARC Format Updates. OCLC Connexion Browser documentation has also been updated to include the user apparent changes related to "Metadata Extraction and Capture" for this installation.

Originally posted by:

Becky Dean

OCLC, Inc.

e-mail: <deanr@oclc.org>

phone: (800) 848-5878, x5144

LC ANNOUNCEMENT ON SERIES AUTHORITIES

Editor's note: *Although much has happened since the announcement of April 20,*

2006 from the Library of Congress on ceasing to maintain series authorities as of May 1, 2006, we are providing a link to it here <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/series.html>, because we believe that the future will prove this decision to have been a critical event for the practice of cataloging. Much of the subsequent discussion (mostly from the cataloger's perspective) can be found on OCLC-CAT; if OLAC members have missed it, consider subscribing to OCLC-CAT and taking a look at the archives of the discussion.

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT

By Jay Weitz

Coding Field 246 for Titles Not Derived from Field 245

Question: This question concerns the correct coding of the indicators in field 246 for the following video.

245 00 Pamela Crawford's Container gardens \$h [videorecording] /\$c producer, Bill Baxter ; director, Mark Thorn ; script, Pamela Crawford, Kaki Holt.

246 30 Container gardens

246 1 \$i Title on disc surface and container: \$a Pamela Crawford's Container gardens for Florida

246 30 Container gardens for Florida

The question is for the last 246: should a "0" or "blank" be used for the second indicator?

Answer: In field 246, the second indicator "0" is used for portions of the title that appears in field 245, as is the case with the first 246. Partial titles derived from titles other than those found in field 245 (such as the "disc surface and container" title of the second 246) would be coded with a second indicator of "blank". So the third 246 should properly have a "blank" second indicator.

<=====><><><O<><><<=====>

PowerPoint with Narration on CD-ROM

Question: What is the primary characteristic of a CD-ROM with slides (text, with a few illustrations) and the tutor's voiceover: language material or visual material? In

trying to catalog the CD-ROM as visual material, it did not work out--the GMD, 300 field, Type Code, and the 008, 007 and 006 fields became mixed up. Using "videorecording" as the GMD and "1 CD-ROM" in the 300 also did not seem to be correct. However, using the GMD "electronic resource" did not correlate with the 008 for visual materials, etc. Please advise.

Answer: If I understand the question correctly, this is a CD-ROM that contains a chiefly textual PowerPoint presentation with narration. If that is the case, I would suggest using the GMD "electronic resource," Type "a" for the textual aspect, field 006 for the computer file aspect, and field 007 for the CD-ROM. Following the first option in AACR2 9.5B1, describe it as "1 CD-ROM" and include "sd." and "col." (if that is appropriate) under 9.5C. In field 538, describe the software (PowerPoint?) and any other system requirements. If necessary, describe the language(s) of the text and the narration, if they differ from that of the title proper.



Infinite Variety of Language Options on DVDs

Question: It is very confusing to determine how to handle certain DVDs with Multilanguage options, with respect to the title and language information in fields 240, 245, 246, 740. For a DVD called El Bola, the film is in Spanish and English subtitles can be selected, if desired. On the title screen, only the Spanish title shows unless the English subtitles have been selected; in that case, the English title displays as a subtitle. For that situation, should this English title be included somewhere in the record, and if so where? Another example is a Baby Einstein DVD called Baby Neptune. For this one, the language choices are English, French, or Spanish. For each language chosen, the title and credit information, as well as the spoken language, is in that language; i.e., if French is chosen, the titles display in French on the screen and the spoken word is in French. Any guidance you can provide would be greatly appreciated. The online records are such a mishmash with everyone doing what they think best.

Answer: DVDs and their seemingly infinite variety of language options have vastly complicated that particular aspect of video cataloging. Because the possibilities are so vast, it is a bit difficult to generalize, but let us try to break it down. Always keep in mind a few caveats: that publishers may very well have issued varying versions of what otherwise appear to be the same video, that some catalogers are more or less thorough than others in delineating exactly what languages may be available, and that there can be contradictory information about language availability within the same DVD (on packaging and on a displayed menu, for instance). With these in mind, it

will usually be prudent to start by taking any information, both in a bibliographic record and within the resource itself, with some skepticism. Moreover, plan to err on the side of editing existing records that may be close, but not exact, matches to what is in hand. Because the title frames (and an integral label) are the chief sources of information for a DVD, it is what appears there that determines what titles/languages are transcribed in the 245. Here is what I would suggest. Transcribe in field 245 (and give access to) any parallel titles that appear in the title frames when the subtitling capabilities are turned off. If subtitling must be turned on in order to see any such parallel title(s), but the parallel title(s) appears on the integral label (that is, the DVD surface), include such parallel title(s) in the 245 (and give access to them). Any parallel title(s) that appears only on a (non-integral) container and/or in the subtitles when that language is selected, should be noted in a note and given access (though field 246 or through a 500/740 combination, whatever is appropriate in the circumstance). Exactly what languages are available and in what combinations should be outlined as clearly and succinctly as possible in a note (546, most likely). The Baby Neptune circumstance is one I have not previously encountered, but certainly is among that "seemingly infinite variety of language options" mentioned above. It sounds as though it would need to be treated as an item with three parallel titles/statements of responsibility, provide 246 fields for the additional parallel titles, and explain the language situation in a note, again as clearly and succinctly as possible.



The Metaphysics of Fields 006 and 007

Question: It is not quite clear what the "mandatoriness" of the 006 and 007 fields is. As to the 006: at one place in OCLC's Bibliographic Formats & Standards (BF&S) it says, "Use the same input standard for the fixed field and 006 elements". This seems to be saying that the 006 field is required if any of its associated fixed field elements are mandatory. But another place <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/006.shtm> says, "... you may use field 006 ...", which implies that only if a cataloger were to choose to give an 006 of a particular type would it be necessary to follow the input standards for associated fixed field elements. This last location also says, "If an element is in a 006 prompt, it has the same input standard as the fixed field element". Now, how is this interpreted? Does "prompt" translate to "edit/input window" in the Connexion Client context? It is worth mentioning that the MARC 21 full level National Level Record shows all 006s as optional.

For the 007, BF&S <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/default.shtm> says, "Use

field 007 to code for the physical characteristics of an item", which appears to be fairly definitive: it is mandatory for the primary carrier for all types of resources. Except for the fact that it says later, "Use an appropriate 007 field if you are cataloging microforms, motion pictures, nonprojected graphics, projected graphics, videorecordings, etc., that are published separately". This makes it seem as if it is mandatory only for these types of resources. (There are also specific requirements for accompanying material, kits, reproductions, etc.). However, the information found in <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/007comp.shtm> and <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/007sound.shtm> indicates that the electronic resource and sound recording 007s are required if applicable, even though they are not mentioned in the previously cited selection. (The MARC 21 full level National Level Record has only the electronic resource and microform 007s as required if applicable.)

Would it be possible to show this information in the same way as that for variable data fields, with a chart at the top?

Answer: Joel Hahn (Lead Cataloger, Niles Public Library District, Niles, Illinois) provided the following excellent response on OCLC-CAT, reproduced here with his permission:

"I do not have a concrete rule to point you to for 006s, but for 007s, OCLC's Input Standards Tables contains all of the "required, required if applicable, optional" decisions for every field and subfield at <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/tables/en/0xx.shtm>.

"Summary of what it has to say:

007 Physical Description Fixed Field (ELvl: I / ELvl: K)

- Electronic Resource: Required if applicable / Optional
- Globe: Optional / Optional
- Map: Optional / Optional
- Microform: Required if applicable / Optional
- Motion Picture: Required if applicable / Optional
- Nonprojected Graphic: Required if applicable / Optional
- Projected Graphic: Required if applicable / Optional
- Remote-sensing Image: Optional / Optional
- Sound Recording: Required if applicable / Optional
- Tactile Material: Optional / Optional
- Videorecording: Required if applicable / Optional

"So with four exceptions, if you are doing I-level cataloging, 007s are required when applicable, but when you are doing K-level cataloging, they are all optional. That said,

if I remember correctly, certain 007 positions are indexed in WorldCat (such as to enable searching for DVDs), so it is in everyone's best interest if they are always included when applicable. 006s are probably best handled the same way, for similar reasons (for forthcoming searching capabilities even if that's not a factor right this minute)."

To which your humble columnist added: Joel's response is right on the mark, although I will make a few additional general points. Certain 006 and 007 elements do play an important part in indexing, but also in record matching, both for Batchloading of records and for de-duplication of the database. The presence and correct coding of appropriate 006 and 007 fields assist in accomplishing all of that. It is difficult to offer precise and consistent rules about fields 006 and 007 being required/mandatory/optional because those fields are used for several different purposes. Most commonly, the fields can represent different aspects of a resource (for instance, the seriality of a non-textual resource such as a sound recording or video, or the electronic aspect of a textual resource on the Web), or they can represent accompanying material (for instance, the presence of a CD-ROM accompanying a book), or they--the 007 field, at least--can simply be a coded extension/representation of the physical description of the main resource itself, or occasionally, even some combination of these different uses. OCLC users are encouraged to create and code these fields when appropriate, but given the various uses of the fields for different purposes, it is difficult to offer hard and fast rules about when they should be included in a record and when they are optional (even if the variant standards for different Encoding Levels are ignored). In the "Field 006" and "Integrating Resources" sections of the document "Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines"

<<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/cataloging/electronicresources/default.htm>> standards are recommended for the use of field 006 in those particular circumstances. Informally, I would say that OCLC strongly encourages the use of field 006 in the various other circumstances in which it is appropriate, as described in BF&S and elsewhere. To give just an example of the complexities, let me refer you to two sets of Q&A that appeared in the *OLAC Newsletter* 25/2 (June 2005), p. 32-34 <<http://www.olacinc.org/newsletters/june05/qanda.html>>, under the titles, "Enhanced CDs, 006s, and 007s" and "Coding 006 and 007 Fields for Accompanying Material". I am aware that this may not be a particularly satisfying answer to the question, but I hope it goes some distance in explaining why a satisfying answer may not be possible.

<=====><<<<<O<<<<<=====>

Blanks in Field 007

Question: For subfield \$f (sound) in the Electronic Resource 007, a "blank" indicates

that there is no sound. When input and then reformatted, the subfield goes away. Trying the "|BLANK|" solution mentioned at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/cataloging/constantdata/>, does not work in the Connexion Client (either for a bibliographic record or a constant data record). What can be done?

Answer: The "|BLANK|" solution does not work in field 007 in either a bibliographic record or a constant data record because that particular subfield (the Electronic Resource 007/05 position, in MARC 21 terms) allows only a single character. It has long (and possibly always) been an OCLC convention that upon a reformat command, all blank fields and subfields disappear. Of course, the subfielding of 007 fields (like the mnemonic structures of the OCLC fixed fields and 006 fields) are merely OCLC display conventions to help users accurately assign codes to the correct positions in what MARC 21 represents and exchanges as mere strings of characters (sometimes including blanks, fill characters, hyphens, etc.). The meaningful blank in the Electronic Resource 007/05 remains in the bibliographic record even though it disappears from the OCLC display. On the other hand, to protect fixed field elements in constant data records, the "asterisk" convention (mentioned a little further on in the same document cited above) does work.

Thanks to my OCLC colleague Linda Gabel for her contributions to answering this question.

<=====><><><O><><><=====>

Type Code, GMD, and SMD for a Video on CD-ROM

Question: The online record for a CD-ROM being cataloged here (The Mastery Dental Assisting Course), has Type Code "m" with a GMD "electronic resource". This does not seem correct, since the "most significant aspect" of this CD-ROM's contents is video material. Indeed, the set-up instruction insert refers to the contents as a "Video CD-ROM course". Also, our library already has the equivalent on a set of videocassettes. Therefore, it would seem that a decision to change the Type Code to "g" would be correct. However, does this change mean that the GMD should therefore be "videorecording", along the lines of DVD-videos? Sometimes it is rather befuddling what exactly determines "GMD-ness", especially considering that clever DVD-video players eliminate the PC/CD-ROM drive from the equation, thus rendering some items less "electronic" in a sense. One wonders why the online record was coded "m"; was it because the cataloger did not or could not establish the true nature of the contents (there is quite a fiddly setup involved) or was it was an "autopilot response" to being confronted by a CD-ROM rather than a DVD-video? On

this note, would "CD-ROM-video" be the acceptable "term in common usage" for the 300 field?

Answer: It appears as though the choice of Type Code "g" makes sense, given that the predominant aspect is video, so yes, it should be changed. However, in GMD terms, because the disk is a CD-ROM, it is considered an "electronic resource". Under the current rules, the "electronic resource" GMD trumps any other GMD (such as "videorecording") that might apply. Now, catalogers know that this does not make complete sense, seeing that videorecordings in DVD format are also "electronic" in many respects. But for the purposes of cataloging, the technologies are different and DVDs are considered primarily a video format and CD-ROMs primarily a computer file format. Regarding the SMD in the 300 field, in the decision to go the "term in common usage" route, it is perfectly acceptable to describe it simply as "1 CD-ROM". Any specific format details and/or system requirements should be outlined in a 538 field.



Dolby Digital, Straight, No Chaser

Question: How should the 007 for a DVD that has the Dolby Digital trademark with no other information (no Surround, etc.) be coded?

Answer: Under the assumption that the Dolby Website http://www.dolby.com/consumer/technology/tech_overview.html can be trusted in its explanation about each of its many logo configurations, here is what it says briefly about what might be called, "Dolby Digital" straight, no chaser: "Dolby Digital: Delivers mono, stereo, or up to 5.1 discrete channels of surround sound: Left, Center, Right, Left Surround, Right Surround, and low-frequency effects (LFE). Global standard for DVD-Audio and DVD-Video. Digital audio standard for North American HDTV, digital cable, and DBS systems. Optional audio format for most digital video broadcast (DVB) applications worldwide". Clicking on the logo leads to a more detailed explanation. Of course, Dolby does not assign its logos for the convenience of catalogers, so it is difficult to say exactly what that might mean for coding the Videorecording 007/08 (subfield \$i in OCLC terms). As I read Dolby's explanation, it sounds as though applying code "q" is appropriate. If this solution keeps catalogers awake at night, the "u" option for "Unknown" is an alternative code that can be applied. Or the whole issue could be avoided by remembering that the position is optional and can be left out altogether.

Here is my reasoning, such as it is, for suggesting "q", again based on the (possibly

faulty) assumption that the Dolby Website is being accurate and truthful. When I read the "Dolby Digital" blurb, I thought to myself, "Well, that sounds a lot like 'Dolby Surround' to me". But when I read the "Dolby Surround" longer explanation <<http://www.dolby.com/consumer/technology/surround.html>>, it shed further light on both logos. Officially (if I am reading this correctly), Dolby apparently limits "Dolby Surround" to videotape products and TV broadcast, and goes on to say: "With the introduction of the Dolby Digital multichannel film sound format, Dolby Digital has replaced Dolby Surround as the preferred technology to deliver multichannel audio to consumers via DVD-Video, digital television, and games. However, every Dolby Digital decoder also provides a Dolby Pro Logic-compatible stereo signal on its analog outputs". To me, that says "Dolby Digital" is in essence the name of the "Dolby Surround" videotape standard applied to DVDs and so implies surround or multichannel in spite of the absence of the word "surround" in the logo. Perhaps I am being too trusting (it would hardly be the first time) but as I read all that stuff on the Dolby site, I think of an analogy to stereo LPs, which were equally playable on mono equipment. Once again if I am reading Dolby's information correctly, they seem to be saying that full multichannel is made available as a matter of course, but that, for less sophisticated equipment, the technology allows one to listen (more or less) equally well in stereo or even mono, through those respective mixdowns without the loss of anything substantial. It would hardly be surprising to find that some publishers are simply being inconsistent in presenting the information, sometimes following Dolby's official simplicity and sometimes elaborating.

Now if I were a betting man (which I am not), I would wager that Dolby has probably also been less than consistent in its application of these logos over the years, and especially through the transition from VHS to DVD and beyond. On the other hand, it is not unreasonable in a cataloging context to take their word about how they indicate to users what their own technology does. After all, they enable us to believe much less reasonable things when we sit in a theater and listen to movie magic.

<=====><><><O><><><=====>

On-Demand Printout of a PDF File

Question: In researching a stack of DTIC (Defense Technical Information Center) reproductions of publications from the Library of Congress Federal Research Division on the FRD Website <<http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/terrorism.html>>, it became clear that these are available as PDF files online, for which "copies" can be ordered from the Photoduplication Service. So, it appears that the reproductions originated in PDF format rather than in print. It would therefore seem less than ideal to catalog these according to the LCRI 1.11 for Facsimiles, Photocopies, and Other Reproductions, but

it is now unclear just how to handle these. There are many examples of records for electronic reproductions, but these just do not fit this situation, since the reproduction is in print format. If our institution had simply printed this out locally, our policy would have been to catalog the Website and make a local note (590) indicating that a paper copy had been printed in-house. However, these are "formal" DTIC reproductions that could be considered similar to a UMI reproduction (they have assigned numbers, are printed on demand, etc.), so they seem to require a different approach. For these, the best approach would be to catalog the Website and make reference to the reproduction in the 008, Form "r" and a 533. Still, there is a question as to the preferred inclusion/formatting of some of the fields, in particular, the 245 subfield \$h GMD. The LCRI seems to provide the choice of including it or not. Is that correct? To make it less confusing for users, it would seem helpful to exclude "[electronic resource]". It is also not clear how many of the notes typically applied to a Website (538's, 500 for date viewed, 516, etc.) would need to be recorded (or left in a derived record). How are other libraries handling these?

Answer: Policies for dealing with reproductions of all sorts have their origins in simpler times when it was often still possible to differentiate an "original" from a "reproduction". But as has been noted elsewhere many times, in the digital age, what were once relatively concrete lines are now nearly impossible to draw. In eras past, when people sat at a typewriter, they produced a typescript that could more or less accurately be thought of as an "original". Photocopies and microform copies could typically be identified as "reproductions". Today, when people sit at a keyboard, it is now more difficult to determine what is an "original": is it the word processed electronic document they have created, the printout made from the "print" command, the file converted to PDF format, or what? Furthermore, when one orders a "reproduction" from LC, UMI, or some other entity, it is far less possible to determine what generation of reproduction is received: is it a printout of an electronic file, a photocopy of a printout, a photocopy of a photocopy, or what? At best, one will be guessing.

All that being said, it seems that the situation described is roughly analogous to earlier sorts of "on demand" reproductions, and that it is not unreasonable to consider the PDF file to be the "original" for purposes of description in the body of the record. In field 533, describe the reproduction as "Printout," with the appropriate publication information for the entity responsible for the reproduction, the date of the reproduction, physical description of the reproduction, etc. If the assigned number is associated with the name of a series, present it as such, but otherwise, it should at least be included in a subfield \$n in field 533. Unless it can be identified as some other sort of specialized number (STRN or the like) with its own 0XX field, include that number in a field 028 with first indicator "5" or in field 037, whichever seems more

fitting to the situation. The PDF "original" would be described in the Fixed Field, except that "Form" (Books 008/23) would be coded "r" for "Regular print reproduction". Because the record represents the printout, there would be no GMD in field 245, there would be no field 006, and Computer File field 007 would be optional. In the body of the record, the 300 field could either be included or omitted for the remotely-accessible PDF original, depending upon which AACR2 9.5 option preferred for local application.

Regarding other 5XX fields, if an existing record for the PDF file is being used as the basis of the record for the reproduction, many of the notes (538 Mode of access, 500 Source of title with Description based on, 530 Additional formats available, etc.) could be left as they are, or edited, as appropriate. If creating a record from scratch, it would be appropriate to include any of those notes that would normally be included in a record for the PDF original. Include field 856 for the URL of the PDF original, with a second indicator of "1" because the record represents the printout, not the electronic original.

In addition to the ambiguities of provenance described earlier, the confusion is often further compounded by the constantly evolving nature of both technologies and cataloging rules. For now, catalogers can only hope against hope that RDA might clarify some of this and rationalize the treatment of such resources in the future.

Follow-up Question: When cataloging the reproduction, why is the 006 and 007 optional? Our institution codes the 007 for any record that has a link to a Website, which is also the plan for these DTIC reproductions. Is this not correct? Since they are reproductions of PDF files posted on the Web, would not the Computer File 006 be considered one of the required fields? The rationale is unclear for why some tags related to the e-version are left off and not others, so it is difficult to explain locally. One further question: our catalogers will most likely be following these guidelines, but there is some discussion locally as to whether it might be preferable to follow AACR2 and to ignore the LCRI on this particular question. If choosing this route, would it be a problem when cataloging for OCLC? Is it officially discouraged? Certainly there are records in OCLC from some who do not pay close attention to the OCLC guidelines, but it was somewhat surprising that some of those who replied to the initial question claimed that their libraries simply elected to ignore the LCRIs. Your response would definitely sway local decision making.

Follow-up Answer: Field 006 is used when the resource being cataloged has multiple aspects. Here, the electronic aspect belongs to the PDF original rather than to the printout being cataloged, so field 006 would not be necessary. Remember also that it is OCLC that has mandated the use of field 006 for resources that have an electronic

aspect, mainly for its own indexing purposes. In MARC 21, use of field 006 is entirely optional (see <<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/nlr00x.html>>). In the case of field 007, it may be included if desired, because one use of the field is to provide a coded "physical" description of the original PDF file. Including field 007 is a local decision.

I did not mention LCRI 1.11A in my answer because I inferred from the way you asked your questions that you had already decided to apply it and were mostly interested in details of doing so. The LCRI clearly allows catalogers a fair amount of leeway in deciding whether to apply it at all. As I have noted in the *OLAC Newsletter* 25:2 (June 2005), p. 38-39 ("Interpreting LCRI 1.11A" at <<http://www.olacinc.org/newsletters/june05/qanda.html>>), when in doubt (especially in cases of simultaneous publication of analog and digital forms and when there is "inadequate information about the original on which to base a description"), the LCRI leans in the direction of not following it and simply applying AACR2 1.11 proper. Again, that is a local decision this needs to be carefully considered and documented.



Describing a Video and Accompanying Manual in Container

Question: What is the best/correct way to describe a video and an accompanying book in a container?

(1) 300 1 videocassette (62 min.) : \$b sd., col. ; \$c 1/2 in. + \$e 1 manual, in container 30 x 24 cm.

(2) 300 1 videocassette (62 min.) : \$b sd., col. ; \$c 1/2 in., in container 30 x 24 cm. + \$e 1 manual.

(3) 300 1 videocassette (62 min.) : \$b sd., col. ; \$c 1/2 in. + \$e 1 manual \$f container \$g 30 x 24 cm.

(4) 300 1 videocassette (62 min.) : \$b sd., col. ; \$c 1/2 in. + \$e 1 manual.
500 In container 30 x 24 cm.

How open are the rules to interpretation?

Answer: Examples 2 and 4 are two of the most common means of expressing this situation, but there is also the possibility of describing the accompanying material in a note rather than in the physical description (following the guidelines in LCRI 1.5E1 regarding the character of that accompanying material). Also, remember that AACR2 1.5D2 stipulates the description of a container in the physical description is optional.

As I read the rules for the physical description area, the description of a container would have to precede the description of any accompanying material (as in example 2). In extrapolating from other chapters, there is even an example to that effect in Rule 10.5E1 (first example). Less common, but still valid, would be the use of example 4, particularly if there were something important to say about the container in addition to its dimensions. As to example 3, in my experience, subfields \$f and \$g are usually used only for describing the units of archival materials.



Dates for Videorecordings Versus Dates for Audio Recordings

Question: This is a question about dates for sound recordings and videos. Is it the case that for sound recordings, the latest date is used to infer the publication date, even if it is taken from the container and not the disc label? On the other hand, this is not typically what is done for videos, since a copyright date from the screen or disc label--rather than the container--is preferred, even if it is not the latest date. For instance, in your book *Cataloger's Judgment* (p. 26-27), one person had a CD with "p1995" on its label, and the dates "c1995, 1997" on the back of its container. She had found two records online with the date 1995 in them. Your advice was that she was justified in creating a new record with the date "[1997]" in it instead of using one of those records. Meanwhile, many current sources for cataloging videos emphasize how the chief source (the screen or disc label) takes precedence over other prescribed sources of information (e.g., the container), unless there are special circumstances. The *OLAC Guide to Cataloging DVDs* says to record the copyright date on the disc surface in the 260 and only to use the latest date on the container to infer date of publication if there is no date on the disc surface. In another of your articles, you also said that the chief source would generally be considered more important unless the date preceded the existence of the DVD technology, and in those cases, to use the date on the container to infer the date of publication. It seems that the chief source (disc label) generally takes precedence for videos, but this is not being applied the same way for sound recordings, where the latest date from any source is taken. Is this impression is correct and, if so, why this is the case? Is it because the container dates are used more often for packaging and artwork for videos? Again, this reading of the guidance may be a misinterpretation, but it seems that practice ought to be consistent for all resources, regardless of format.

Answer: At least two major differences between the publishing traditions of videorecordings and those of sound recordings come to mind to suggest why dates may appear to be regarded differently, but in the end, the practices coincide. For videos, the dates that are usually ignored are those identified specifically as related to

package design and container art. Video publishers redesign packaging frequently without changing the video itself. (Think of it as analogous to a paperback book publisher changing the cover art of a bestseller every few months without changing the contents themselves.) For sound recordings, cover art tends to be relatively stable, so there is not a redesigned container every time the publisher produces another batch of the same audio CD. Hence, there is also not a different copyright date for cover art each time. Another difference is that for sound recordings, collections of previously released material tend to be more common ("best of", "greatest hits", and other sorts of compilations). Such compilations of video material are much less common, although especially in the DVD era, supplementary material ("making of" documentaries, interviews, and so on) published along with the main video contents, do make the situations more similar. In reality, though, the principles behind the practices are not all that different. When there is a later date on a container that is not associated with such ephemera as package or cover design, it can at least be used to infer a date of publication for a video or a sound recording under many circumstances. As usual, it is hard to generalize. For instance, if the date on the surface of a DVD is that of the feature film alone, but a later container date reflects the presence of supplementary video material, the latter could make sense as an inferred date of publication. Likewise, if the date on an audio CD surface is the phonogram copyright ("p") date of the sound, but a later container date more accurately reflects the date the recording was actually released (because program notes have a later copyright ["c"] date, for instance), the later date makes sense as an inferred date publication. The practices are essentially similar.



Plates or Just Unnumbered Leaves?

Question: In some local oral history books at our institution, the pagination (or foliation--it is all on leaves) is quite variable from book to book. In most cases, the leaves are numbered only for the transcript portion. Following the transcript are leaves (without numbering) of photographs, copies of newspaper articles, short stories, letters, etc. Sometimes there is an index, which is also not numbered. My training is that plates need to fill two criteria: (1) they must be illustrative in matter; (2) they must break a sequence of numbering in the book. Since these books do not continue a pagination sequence into, or past the photographs, to the other printed matter, my contention is that they should not be recorded as plates in the 300. My co-worker disagrees, stating that the definition of plates just says that it does not form a part of either the preliminary or the main sequence of pages or leaves. What do you think?

Answer: The AACR2 definition of "Plate" reads as follows: "A leaf containing

illustrative matter, with or without explanatory text, that does not form part of either the preliminary or the main sequence of pages or leaves". AACR2 2.5B9 reads as follows:

"Give the number of leaves or pages of plates (see Glossary, appendix D) at the end of the sequence(s) of pagination, whether the plates are found together or distributed throughout the publication, or even if there is only one plate. If the numbering of the leaves or pages of plates is complex or irregular, follow the instructions in 2.5B8.

246 p., 32 p. of plates
xvi, 249 p., [12] leaves of plates
x, 32, 73 p., [1] leaf of plates
xii, 24 p., 212, [43] leaves of plates

If the volume contains both leaves and pages of plates, give the number in terms of whichever is predominant.

323 p., [19] p. of plates
(Contains 16 pages and 3 leaves of plates)"

The corresponding LCRI 2.5B9, labeled "LC practice" however, reads: "Give the number of leaves or pages of plates after the paging if the leaves or pages of plates are numbered. If the leaves or pages of plates are unnumbered, give the number only when the plates clearly represent an important feature of the book. Otherwise, generally do not count unnumbered leaves or pages of plates".

With all of that as background, the answer may depend upon the extent, the character, and the importance of these unnumbered leaves. I should also note that, if these happen to be unpublished or manuscript resources (from your description, I could not really be sure), other rules besides AACR2 could be applied, and that goes beyond my realm of expertise. Following the LCRI, these unnumbered leaves would have to be "an important feature" of the resource, at the very least, in order to describe them in the 300 field; if they are incidental either in importance or in quantity, they might better be described in a note or even be ignored. If they cannot be construed as "illustrative matter," they should not be described in the 300, but may again be described in a note or be ignored.