Topical Discussion Group 4A: Multiple Versions (*formerly* "How Can AACR2 Become More Responsive to Cataloging Networked Resources on the Web in the Near-Term?")

Facilitator: Sherry Kelley, Head, Cataloging Services, Smithsonian Libraries
Recorder: Judith Kuhagen, Library of Congress
Members: Matthew Beacom, Howard Besser, Jean Hirons, Ann Huthwaite, Jennifer Lang**,** Mary Page, Lucia Rather, Adam Schiff, Paul J.Weiss

The Assignment

The assignment was originally to develop a prioritized list of four to six near-term measures that could be accomplished over the next twelve to eighteen months to address some of the problems associated with the cataloging of networked resources. The assignment specifically included near-term measures to ameliorate the "multiple-versions problem," which has been discussed for many years but has been exacerbated by the proliferation of digital resources. At the start of the breakout sessions during the Conference, Topical Discussion Groups (**TDG**) 4a and 4b recognized that the multiple versions problem had long- and near-term aspects and was of sufficient scope to command the full attention of a discussion group. They therefore agreed to modify their assignments, with TDG 4a considering all short-term and long-term aspects of the "multiple versions problem," and TDG 4b considering all other aspects of how AACR2 could be made more responsive to cataloging networked resources on the Web.   TDG 4a considered the perspectives presented by Michael Kaplan in his Conference paper, "Exploring Partnerships: What Can Producers and Vendors Provide?" and by Carolyn Larson and Linda Arret in their Conference paper, "Descriptive Resource Needs From the Reference Perspective."

Recommendations

Sherry Kelley reported to the Conference plenary session that the TDG on multiple versions "didn't solve it ... but we pointed out ways to reach resolution." The TDG presented two long-term recommendations and six recommendations that could be accomplished in the near term.   These recommendations are intended to address problems of display (the "great need to consolidate access to different versions or formats" reported by Larson and Arret), the efficient use of aggregator services (the need for "hands-off computer to computer data interchange," especially for records provided for major microform sets and electronic aggregations reported by Kaplan) and the requirements for national/international record sharing.

Long-term recommendations

4A.1.   Restructure AACR2 & MARC 21 to support display of hierarchical relationships between records for a work, its expressions and its manifestations.
Base this restructuring on the IFLA *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
Who: JSC, MARBI, utilities, and system vendors

4A.2. Explore work/expression identifier on international scale.
Base this on other proposals for universal numbering systems such as that proposed for authority records (e.g., ISADN) or the International Standard Text Code (ISTC)

Short-term recommendations

4A.3. Investigate if AACR2 should codify practice to point/hyperlink to a manifestation from a record for another manifestation.

4A.4. Prepare guidelines for when to create separate bibliographic records and when to create single records for manifestations of an expression. This could be similar to *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions* (1995).

4A.5. Investigate if AACR2 should change its procedure so that one record covers multiple versions e.g., if the only difference between items is in physical carrier or extent, use multiple area 5's (with access points for only one version)

4A.6. Investigate if AACR2 should make linking explicit
e.g., hyperlinks from record to resource, from record to record for related resource (bibliographic relationships)

4A.7. "Separate records at global level -- Lump display at local level." [Or, "Merge records for the public view that are kept separate in the technical services components of our catalogs." (Kaplan)]

4A.8. PCC and JSC task forces work with public service staff and system vendors <u>early</u> on displays of multiple manifestations using:
already-existing data in bibliographic records
        (e.g., uniform title with qualifiers)
already-existing MARC 21 content
        (e.g., $8; 7XX fields)

Discussion

In comments from the audience at the plenary session, Mary Page, a member of the TDG, said that ultimately, the number of records shouldn't matter to the user; users shouldn't have to face record after record for the same content. Duane Arenales suggested that abstracting and indexing services should be involved in both the short-term and long-term solutions to the multiple versions problem. Dan Chudnov said that the TDG recommendations were equivalent to component records (for titles in aggregator databases). Judith Nadler expressed support for the TDG's short-term recommendation

no. 5, and strongly suggested that public services staff be involved in the multiple versions discussions. Wendy Riedel said that acquisitions librarians also ought to be included, since they have a large stake in control of multiple versions of the same content.

Post Conference Comments from Participants

None

12/29/00