General Comments

Those writing on the relation of the library catalogue to world wide web resources seem to take it as a given that the catalogue monitor will be used to actually read materials as well as to identify them. I wonder if that should be a given. There seems to me to be a distinction between identifying material (including the use of online indexes via the library catalogue), and actually *reading* those materials.

When I am waiting to get to a terminal to locate to book I wish to check out, it rather bothers me to have someone doing genealogical research, or reading an encyclopedia article or joke of the day. I wonder if it would not be better to allow the patron direct the identified resource to another terminal, perhaps one with a chair and room to write, either in the library, at home, or in the patron's office, before actually getting into the reading of textual materials.

The distinction between locating material, and consulting material, seems to me to be a valid one, and that the two are best done in different settings.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

Mac has a good point here.

[snip]

>>*The distinction between locating material, and consulting material, seems to me to be a valid one, and that the two are best done in different settings.*<<

Much material is, indeed, on the Web, and if I check a site and find that the item I want to read is a short one I may well read it at my desk rather than print it to take home. But there is much material in libraries which is *not* on the Web, and the PC is used only for location. Surely there is a case for some terminals/PCs being designated only for searching - or is that out of date now with webcats and links all over the place?

Helen Buhler, Classification Coordinator, The University of Kent at Canterbury

* * * *

Since Web sites are continuing resources, subcategory integrating resources, MARBI Discussion paper no. 119 - http://lcweb.gov/marc/marbi/dp/dp119.html - on areas of MARC21 which could be affected by the seriality related changes in AACR2 is relevant to the discussion of the cataloguing of Web resources to be undertaken at the DLC conference.

The creation of new fixed field code(s) for integrating resources is considered for LDR/07, i = integrating, in addition to the present m = monograph and s = serial. The OPAC label "Updating works" is suggested. Serials 008/17 (Frequency) might have "k" for Web sites but continue irregular for loose-leaf. 008/21 & 006/04 (Type of serial) would be renamed "Type of continuing resource" and would have at least a new code for loose-leaf services; the letter "l" has been proposed, but objected to as being too much like the number one; Web sites would be left blank, "other". A third different code "2" = integrating entry is suggested for 008/34 (Successive/Latest entry).

Whether 246 or 247 is to be used for earlier titles is still undecided. To avoid what many users want, current publisher for serials in 260, repeating 260s with indicators (# = Original, 3 = Current, 4 = Intervening) is proposed. (Integrating resources already have current imprint in 260 as opposed to first issue as for serials.)

AACR2 Chapter 12 will be revised for Continuing Resources, including both serials and integrating resources. Integrating resources (now coded LDR/7 m) will include both loose-leaf services and Web sites. Services which have replacement volumes rather than replacement leaves are still being considered.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

What are people's reactions to Barbara Baruth's article "Is Your Catalog Big Enough to Handle the Web?" (_American Libraries_ August 2000 p.56ff)?

She suggests that adding Web links to the local OPAC will overburden the system, needlessly duplicate the work of other libraries, never be as good as Amaxon.com, and never entice people away from the search engines.

She suggests instead a cooperative effort separate from individual catalogues analogous to the old _Union List of Serials_.

Anyone doing a letter to the editor in response? Making what points?

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

I've read the alternative architecture postings have some observations which may be useful.

Pauline C: We have the same vision, just a difference in the architecture necessary to accomplish that vision. To quote from my article: "The future of library systems architecture rests in the development of umbrella software that digests search results from rapid, coordinated searches of a variety of disparate databases -- OPACs of locally-held print and audiovisual materials, union catalogs, consortial catalogs of e-books and journals, and specialized digital library collections." [Unfortunately, Martin Dillon, in his posted paper, misrepresents my position as "discovery will be accomplished primarily through software directly acting on Web resources without benefit of human intervention, particularly of the cataloging sort." But more on Martin's piece in a later posting]

Under the architecture I envision, the user could perform a search that will extend across a variety of databases (human-created and machine-created) to provide a one-stop look for information. Do we still disagree?

Daniel C: I do disagree with your statement that the OPAC is more than able to handle the challenge of including Web based resources. As I noted in the AL article, considering the millions of Web sites created, revised, moved, or abandoned each year, identifying and cataloging all appropriate resources is simply too large a task for your local selectors & catalogers. Your catalog was probably scaled and sized to support print collections and their calculated growth and will not be able to handle a massive influx of records, even if your staff could manage that. In today's electronically connected world, you must able to provide a significant critical mass of information in a timely fashion to your users. If we do not act now to create the right architecture, your users will eventually discover the net and -- right or wrong -- rarely, if ever, come back to your catalog. Some college & university students are already on this road.

Also, you assume that portal technology is just for commercial enterprises. Not true! We librarians need to develop portal pages that will be the home base for the type of search I mentioned in my reply above to Pauline. North Carolina State University is already experimenting with this technology.

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

>> *Daniel C: I do disagree with your statement that the OPAC is more than able to handle the challenge of including Web based resources. As I noted in the AL article, considering the millions of Web sites created, revised, moved, or abandoned each year, identifying and cataloging all appropriate resources is simply too large a task for your local selectors & catalogers. Your catalog was probably scaled and sized to support print collections and their calculated growth and will not be able to handle a massive influx of records, even if your staff could manage that. In today's electronically connected world, you must able to provide a significant critical mass of information ... in a timely fashion to your users. If we do not act now ... your users will eventually discover the net and ... rarely, if ever, come back to your catalog. Some college & university students are already on this road.* <<

Yes, and it's frequently considered the road to information illiteracy. Poor research habits are not just a library issue.

We already provide a significant critical mass of information. We continue to improve on it. We do not have to act now; we've been acting on this issue for years and for issues similar to it for decades.

>> *Also, you assume that portal technology is just for commercial enterprises.* <<

I really don't, I just used that as an illustration.

>> *We librarians need to develop portal pages that will be the home base for the type of search I mentioned.*<<

It's already happened and is ongoing. That's a good thing, I agree.

Daniel CannCasciato, Head of Cataloging, Central Washington University Library

* * * *

Most of the respondents on public access to terminals and therefore the library catalog have come from public libraries, or libraries where the general public is admitted. At New York University which is only open to the NYU community plus various consortial guests and "friends" (a wide audience but not the greater public), we still have issues with use of the bank of terminals in the catalog area. Fortunately, there is an area of general-use PCs in the library that we can refer students to. Nonetheless, the terminals in the catalog area are often being used for email and we find increasingly that a student will respond "this is research email." Surfing too becomes indistinguishable from research, or at least they're on a continuum as reading other formats is.

We have cataloged a couple thousand electronic resources, we are trying to figure out how to get analytics for aggregators into the opac, we have a few web exhibits cataloged (but not analyzed). Generally, we are adherents of the opac as portal school of thinking, but I find these discussions of confusion in the opac interesting, especially now that Daniel CannCasciato has brought up visual surrogates. Most universities that are putting their slides into the opac have found they need to be able to distinguish searches for books and for slides. Putting the slides into the opac is rather like putting in analytics for periodical articles.

Sherman Clarke, New York University

* * * *

The notion that internet resources should not be represented in the catalog is one which I think is very wrong. From the cataloger's standpoint, I enjoy the challenges represented by these materials. The questions which have arisen as catalogers have attempted to grapple with the WWW have sparked more rethinking of what we catalogers are doing, both practically and theoretically, than any other issue since I went to library school in 1981. As I watch the impact of diminished monographic budgets and the gradual replacement of much in-house cataloging by shelf-ready books on the

amount of cataloging needed at the local institutional level, I am happy to see a source of material waiting to be cataloged.

However, my real reasons for wanting to catalog this material have to do with my needs as a user. The signal-to-noise ratio of the Internet is certainly less than .1 or even .01. I eagerly welcome the notion that selectors find materials which they think are of scholarly or reference importance and then have catalogers provide systematized access to those materials. A web search on a relatively obscure topic like the Picts yields hundreds of entries, only a few of which are scholarly. If I try to find materials by a known scholar of the early middle ages, I have to figure out what possible forms of the name might be used and then disentangle works by that individual from sites by others with the same name, from library new book lists mentioning the scholar's works, from archived e-mail messages by or mentioning the scholar, from announcements of conference presentations (without the papers), from publisher's advertisements, etc., etc. Finding a known item on the web may be a little easier than a few years ago, but not unless you know a very distinctive word from the title. I just tried to find Jim O'Donnell's article The Pragmatics of the New : Trithemius, McLuhan, Cassiodorus by searching on Google for O'Donnell and Trithemius and got 56 entries! Fortunately, the first was to the author's home page, which contains a link for the article. The remaining "hits" fit into one of the categories mentioned above. As a user, I would benefit from finding this item in an author display in a catalog. The selection function performed by collection developers combined with the predictable access provided by catalogers is a major service to users and will become a greater service as the web continues to grow. I'm not sure how any search engine will be able to sort the mass of internet materials to meet the needs of users without some sort of metadata tags and/or controlled access points. Once we have those, we are reinventing the catalog.

Gateways and library web pages don't really substitute for cataloging web resources. The main problems are 1) finding the web pages 2) keeping them up-to-date and 3) organizing them. By the time such sites are large enough to be of any use to a serious patron, they are unwieldy and need indexing of their own; indexing which would be better provided by catalog entries which then generate web pages, as some institutions are doing.

I certainly don't suggest that each institution should catalog the Internet as a whole. When selectors cooperatively choose which sources are genuinely useful to their particular patrons and libraries make use of other people's cataloging, the burdened is lessened. At the moment, catalog records for significant sites on OCLC and RLIN may be a small percentage of what is needed. But that was true of printed materials when I started doing retrospective conversion in the late 1970's. As we cooperate, more records will be available, and they in turn can be tools for other selector's collection development efforts. I am less worried about broken links and unstable URLs since I realized that these are analogous to a book not being on the shelf. One searches for such items when someone wants them and discovers them missing; few large libraries can do inventories and shelfread their stacks. This lessens the work as well.

Ms. Baruth has raised some excellent questions, but I believe that representing selected Internet materials in an institution's catalog is vital to the survival of libraries as well as catalogers.

Larry Creider, Head, General Cataloging Unit, New Mexico State University

* * * *

One argument put forward against cataloging Web sites is the unstable nature of URLs and the probability of broken links.

I find that the top level of sites of interest to researchers are fairly stable. www.nasa.gov is unlikely to change. The broken links become more prevalent as one moves down in a site or as one moves away from stable organizations. Middle school students personal pages may be very unstable, but who wants to link to them and use them.

A tool to use for lower down the hierarchy on worthwhile sites is a PURLs http://purl.org A joint effort to keep the URLs current and valid makes good sense.

David Bigwood, Lunar & Planetary Institute

* * * *

>>*The notion that internet resources should not be represented in the catalog is one which I think is very wrong.*<<

Whether they are represented or not is not so much the question for me, as whether or not (1) one should have live links and use the catalogue terminal to read the materials, or whether once found (the catalogue function) one should go to (linked?) terminals dedicated for the purpose, with a desk, and chair, and room to write (my 68 year old legs vote for the latter); and (2) whether it is not more important to include in the catalogue gateways and search engines which would give much more detailed access to individual sites than a few subject headings.

Your point about selection is an excellent one. Including sites for which the library has paid a license fee for access would also be a given, it seems to me.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

On Wed, 4 Oct 2000, Laurence Creider wrote:

>> *Gateways and library web pages don't really substitute for cataloging web resources. The main problems are 1) finding the web pages 2) keeping them up-to-date and 3) organizing them. By the time such sites are large enough to be of any use to a serious patron, they are unwieldy and need indexing of their own; indexing which would be better provided by catalog entries which then generate web pages, as some institutions are doing.*<<

Internet information gateways like those Web-based services that comprise the UK's Resource Discovery Network (RDN) do all of these functions. They find and select Internet resources (according to pre-defined selection criteria) and then describe them, including the addition of subject classification codes which can be used to create browse structures. These resource descriptions are then stored and checked periodically for broken links or other problems.

Resource Discovery Network user services:
http://www.rdn.ac.uk/services/

>>*I certainly don't suggest that each institution should catalog the Internet as a whole. When selectors cooperatively choose which sources are genuinely useful to their particular patrons and libraries make use of other people's cataloging, the burdened is lessened.*<<

The question remains whether, in the long-term, physically including resource descriptions of Internet resources in institutions' catalogues (OPACs) is the correct model to adopt. An alternative would be to develop what Ms. Baruth has described as "umbrella software that digests search results from rapid, coordinated searches of a variety of disparate databases." The development and implementation of such "broker" software offers an alternative way of unifying access to different types of resource.

This has several advantages. It means that all types of information resource could be described (and these descriptions managed) in appropriate ways, e.g.: library OPACS could describe locally held physical items, information gateways could describe (and link to) selected Internet resources, indexing and abstracting services could describe articles in journals, etc. The individual institution (e.g. a library) can then configure the broker to give access to all of the types of information resources suitable for their users.

The successful implementation of such services, however, will depend upon the adoption of common standards (e.g. in the area of metadata formats and search protocols) but also on the solving of non-technical (e.g. organisational, legal and business) issues.

Some published descriptions of what broker services are designed to do and information on some exemplars can be found in:

Rusbridge, C., 1998, Towards the hybrid library. D-Lib Magazine, July/August.
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july98/rusbridge/07rusbridge.html

Dempsey, L., 1999, The library, the catalogue, the broker: brokering access to information in the hybrid library. In: Criddle, S., Dempsey, L. and Heseltine, R., (eds.), Information landscapes for a learning society: networking and the future of libraries 3. London: Library Association Publishing, 1999, pp. 3-24.
http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/dlis/models/publications/landscape/

A slightly more technical discussion of broker services can be found in:

Dempsey, L., Russell, R. and Murray, R., 1999, A utopian place of criticism? Brokering access to network information. Journal of Documentation, 55 (1), pp. 33-70.
http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/dlis/models/publications/utopia/

Michael Day, Research Officer, UKOLN The UK Office for Library and Information

* * * *

I'm happy to see the alternative architecture thread so lively. However, judging from the responses, I'm guessing that most of you haven't read my American Libraries article, in which, among other things, I include a large number of reasons for not including electronic resources in OPACs. In the article, (which was edited down by AL from a longer piece) I'm able to take the time to develop the arguments, which are more numerous than you may realize. Rather than try to rewrite the article piecemeal on this list, I urge you to read it in AL.

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

Greetings! I have read the _American Libraries_ article, relatively slowly in fact. Right now, all I can do is make a couple of brief observations and a request. I'm backlogged in work to the extent that I'll skip my usual lengthy ramble.

First, the request: is it possible to have access to your original paper? It's to be expected that a broadly-oriented professional magazine would edit a lengthier paper. But in a couple of your postings, there's a bit of a hint of, "what I originally wrote was even better." No doubt -- can we look at it?

The observations:
I feel that the article as published in _American Libraries_ is marked by a strong dualism: that we must either include or exclude electronic (meaning Web, I think) resources from OPACs. I get no sense of middle ground where the OPAC per se is concerned -- that there's no value in -selection-. Nobody but nobody, I am positive, is talking about "cataloging THE WEB." All of the papers I read and talk I hear points to different criteria or methods for selection -simultaneous with- the deployment of different architectures. It's not an all-or-nothing situation.

Second, I am really puzzled by the reiteration of phrases like "army of catalogers" or "army of selectors" (I'm paraphrasing) -- as if in the business of cataloging Web resources every library is trying to go it alone. Of course that would be implausible, and that situation doesn't exist. Cooperative effort directed precisely toward relieving that

impossible situation has been in place for electronic resources, on a large scale, for a number of years. I'm convinced that's simply a non-issue.

I'll be happy to keep going around on this, but may not be able to respond as promptly as I'd like.

David Miller, Levin Library, Curry College, Milton, MA

* * * *

Thanks for reading the article. AL has rights to the material for a while yet. I will be able to send you a copy of the original piece sometime in December, but it isn't packed with alot more info. I'm busy writing another article, which I hope to have published before next spring. I'll include some lines from it below. In my view, the local OPAC should be used to manage physically held materials -- and other vehicles should be used to manage electronic information. Architecture would make this dualism invisible to users. There is value in selection of electronic resources. The question is, who is going to do it -- your own acquisitions personnel, a cooperative group of librarians, a machine harvester, a combination of all?   Cooperative efforts like CORC are a definite hope. Perhaps the CORC catalog itself could be included in a library's resource array, routinely searched by the umbrella software as part of the response to a user's inquiry. An equally important question, though, is when is the selection going to take place. According to John L. King, Dean of the University of Michigan's School of Information, the amount of electronic information doubles each hour. I'm fearful that even efforts like CORC simply can't scale to that level. A next-generation Web search engine working on the fly could perhaps do a better job of locating, filtering, and delivering up free Web sites.

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

>>*In my view, the local OPAC should be used to manage physically held materials -- and other vehicles should be used to manage electronic information. Architecture would make this dualism invisible to users.*<<

I'm curious to know, still, why this separation seems so absolute in your view (even if linkage and interface design mitigate the distinction). Is it something about the technologies used by OPACs as compared with other kinds of electronic tools (and which technologies in particular)? Is this something about "the OPAC" as a concept? Please give me a little more help with this.

>>*According to John L. King, Dean of the University of Michigan's School of Information, the amount of electronic information doubles each hour. I'm fearful that even efforts like CORC simply can't scale to that level.*<<

Frankly, I'm extremely wary of all such statements, and there have been plenty of them. This kind of bare statistical remark tells us nothing about the nature of this "information," its context or its value. (I'd also like to know if this is based on empirical data and where that comes from, or if it's a rhetorical extrapolation.) It gives us no reason to assume that this actually matters. Seriously: if we could demonstrate that the number of printed advertising flyers doubled every hour, would we say we need to develop a new architecture for cataloging print-on-paper? No, because this is the kind of material we have historically ignored, and for good reasons. How about this speculation: if the number of Napster files being traded doubles every hour -- well, that's "information" too. So what?

David Miller, Levin Library, Curry College, Milton, MA

* * * *

Barbara Baruth [mailto:baruth@UWP.EDU] said:
>>*According to John L. King, Dean of the University of Michigan's School of Information, the amount of electronic information doubles each hour. I'm fearful that even efforts like CORC simply can't scale to that level.*<<

David Miller <dmiller@curry.edu> said:
>> *Frankly, I'm extremely wary of all such statements, and there have been plenty of them. This kind of bare statistical remark tells us nothing about the nature of this "information," its context or its value. (I'd also like to know if this is based on empirical data and where that comes from, or if it's a rhetorical extrapolation.<<*

It is clearly rhetorical exaggeration, unless John L. King is ignorant of the power of exponentiation. If we started this year with just one bit of information (and there was clearly more than that number), then now, about 6,000 hours later, there would be roughly 10 to the power of 1,800 bits of information. That's considerably more than the number of atoms in the universe, so there is not enough physical matter to store that amount of information.

Giles Martin, OCLC Forest Press

* * * *

My guess is that we have a semantic problem here. MARC advocates seem to think that the contents of an OPAC are equivalent to MARC records, indexes generated from these records, and objects linked to these records. MARC then (ideally, if MARC is well designed for this purpose, and cataloging is scrupulously done) provides a complete and consistent global means of supplying all materials to the user.

I think that you and others would like to envision an OPAC which includes all of this structure, but in addition could have other means of accessing material. For example, a well-organized web site containing information with research value need not be not dependent on MARC access, but could tailor its access to its own information and its own users. If the webmaster is a responsible curator of the material, the volatility of the contents of the website is offset by timeliness and relevance, and the website can become a permanent (or at least long-time) resource. Then the website attains a value greater than that of most websites. We could consider websites of research value to have a role something like that of reference works (for example, Chemical Abstracts). I can envision other non-MARClike structures for accessing research material. The major disadvantage is that complete and consistent global access to the entire OPAC in a single search would be difficult to maintain and this access seems to be a mandatory requirement for many.

The Library of Congress website already expands the functions of an OPAC: it includes the traditional MARC catalog, provides access to websites as well as research aids. As a user, I would welcome a means of organizing portals to websites and other electronic sources of research value on the Library of Congress website, much like a reference reading room presents reference works for easy access. Index entries based on analysis of the material and aAbstracts of the contents of these electronic sources would be an enormous help to the researcher. As I understand it, MARC advocates would like to expand MARC in this direction. If they are able to do so, they may be able to continue to provide global access.

As I understand it, a few, usually unstated ideas fuel the discussion:

-- OPAC access must be globally complete and consistent - the level of access seems to be open to debate.
-- MARC already provides this access for materials traditionally stored in libraries.
-- WEB access tools are more useful than MARC access techniques for electronically stored information.
-- Electronically stored information has research value.
-- It is not clear whether WEB access tools could replace proven, well-established MARC access techniques for materials traditionally stored in libraries.
-- Materials which may not be easily accessible (or accessible in a cost-effective manner) through WEB access tools have research value.

imho, if we can clarify these ideas and ground them in real-life situations, the solutions may not be as difficult as they seem at present.

Judith Fiehler

* * * *

Such an exciting time we live in! I've been wanting to "jump in" to get my feet wet (I'm relatively new to the world of cataloging/librarianship so please forgive any naivete) and now seems as good a time as any. I pose more questions, I think, than I have ideas/solutions and am looking forward to all responses.

I'm inclined to agree with Barbara that the way many of us are dealing with the proliferation of electronic resources by trying to catalog them and put them into our OPACs for our users is probably not the best method. We can't keep up. (I can't keep up!)

Our library is part of the OhioLINK consortium and we are struggling with some of the problems Barbara describes in her article, namely multiple records describing what appear to the user to be the same thing. The way our system is set up, records from member libraries are contributed to a central catalog. Because of the varying (i.e., inconsistent) practices among the different libraries as far as cataloging electronic resources is concerned, we have a real mess. Some libraries choose to use one record to reflect all formats, while others use separate records. Our library has run into the unfortunate situation of using a combination of these two approaches, which has not helped the situation. The system does not have the capability of collapsing holdings from multiple formats into one record; hence the confusion for the user.

We have been trying to figure out how to solve this problem, but one obstacle we are faced with is the fact that OhioLINK can only "recommend" cataloging policy; the local libraries can do what they want.

One idea I had thought of before I read Barbara's article was the creation of some sort of interface that would "rest" on top of our current systems and would have the ability to search the central OPAC, web sites our selectors have created, our electronic journal collections, and the several collections of electronic books the consortium has made available to its members, and present to the user with a listing of library materials, websites, and electronic journals and books relevant to his/her search on a single web page with links to the bib records, websites, etc. There could be a separate option for the user to search "The Web," too, should he/she feel the need to.

This interface could even be modeled after some we see in the consumer arena, with the ability for users to create profiles, save searches, request assistance from a librarian through use of an email link to reference staff, etc.

With this sort of interface in place, the need to have records for electronic resources would be eliminated. Or, am I missing something? Should this model distinguish between websites and, say, electronic journals and books that have print counterparts or are continuations of print materials? Perhaps these sorts of materials should continue to be cataloged and a distinction made between what is suitable for cataloging and what is better placed on a webpage or portal.

Here's where my lack of technological expertise becomes apparent: is such a thing even possible (the interface to "rest" on top of our existing systems)? What would creating it require? How could we retain the subject access that catalog records provide if we chose to NOT catalog electronic resources? Could we catalogers work with the producers of electronic resources to create metadata using controlled vocabulary terms? If this sort of thing being done now? Perhaps this could be a business venture for some enterprising person...

Well, that's all I have for now; I apologize for not being able to present more convincing arguments with more specific examples; my "real" work beckons, but I wanted to "lay something on the table" now rather than wait until I could devote a significant amount of time to this topic (i.e., never!).

Jennifer W. Lang, Electronic Resources/Serials Cataloger, University of Cincinnati

* * * *

The John L. King reference is from an article appearing in an issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education a while back. Unfortunately, it didn't explain how he arrived at his conclusion. But the point to focus on is that there's far too much information out there for each local acquisitions/catalog staff to sift through and organize. Martin Dillon picks up on this in his paper (posted on the Bicentennial Conference site) when he writes:

"The library has to be reconceived as a unified cooperative, and cataloging has to be redefined as a function within that cooperative."

Issues arising from managing Web resources from the collective viewpoint are not receiving the attention they deserve. Regrettably, most library activities directed towards providing Web access do so in isolation, acting to control an ocean tide with a teaspoon. In other words, where the bibliographic task in the paper world was defined primarily as the need to fit records into a local catalog, the new task we are designing our systems for is fitting surrogate descriptive records into a universal catalog for Web knowledge resources, with the added need, at least for the foreseeable future of having this catalog work congruently and seamlessly with the bibliography of the paper world. The Web now has over a billion pages, whatever that means. The task of culling from this huge morass the population of stuff that we want to search is almost overwhelming. It can only be accomplished by an equally huge, ongoing effort of thousands of people, effectively coordinated by well-designed online systems.

Unless I misunderstand him, Martin Dillon is saying the same thing I did in the AL article, except: 1) I see multiple disparate databases, not one universal catalog for all e-resources, and 2) I'm not as optimistic that even a unified approach by an army of librarians and others will suffice to control the Web. Understandably, the OCLC position is different. OCLC has already pinned its hopes and assigned much of its resources to the CORC initiative.

While on the topic of Mr. Dillon's article, I'd like to correct a glaring misstatement he made about my position. He summarized my vision as: "The job of resource discovery will be accomplished primarily through software acting on Web resources without benefit of human intervention, particularly of the catalog sort."

In my article I state: "The future of library systems architecture rests in the development of umbrella software that digests search results from rapid, coordinated searches of a variety of disparate databases OPACs of locally-held print and audiovisual materials, union catalogs, consortial catalogs of e-books and journals, and specialized digital library collections." There indeed is a place in resource discovery for the local OPAC with its physical resources; we need library consortiums working together to create catalogs of jointly purchased electronic resources; we need to develop good organizational and access methods for the special collections we are beginning to digitize. There's plenty of work for catalogers and info organizers to do, and it might not get done if we are constantly trying to sift through the Web morass.

Martin Dillon notes: "Even if we agree with Barbara Baruth's assessment that search technology will improve sufficiently to eliminate the need of human resource description, how long will this take? I am always suspicious, and I recommend this scepticism to all, when delivery is promised of technologies that are not yet in beta test. Experience tells us that the promised date almost invariably stretches into the future."

Well, it won't eliminate it (see above) but... how long did it take to come up with Google? It is not a promised technology -- it is here. We could even think of it as a beta test for more advanced software. Martin Dillon also seems to think that I would agree that the library role can be encapsulated by search engines. I would ask him to re-read my article, in which, I thought I made a strong pitch for the future of libraries. I would particularly point out to him two sentences from the AL article: "When we succeed, we will have an information system that will be much more powerful than any Internet search engine. And when that time comes, your library and its Web site will move from being the last resort to the prime portal for your user community."

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

On Thu, 12 Oct 2000, Miller, David wrote:

>>*In my view, the local OPAC should be used to manage physically held materials -- and other vehicles should be used to manage electronic information. Architecture would make this dualism invisible to users.*<<

>>*According to John L. King, Dean of the University of Michigan's School of Information, the amount of electronic information doubles each hour. I'm fearful that even efforts like CORC simply can't scale to that level.*<<

1. I am mathematically challenged, but wouldn't anything whose size doubles every hour tend to blot out the sun and bring on nuclear winter and another ice age? :-)
2. I think part of the issue is the need to distinguish between 'bibliographic control' and 'catalog control'. A catalog controls a collection (grows and shrinks with it, and has call numbers that point to items in the collection) while a bibliography need not be tied to any assembly of physical objects (nor have any call numbers). If this be so catalogers would catalog physical objects in their library's collection (and, I guess physical objects for which their library has a temporary license) and bibliographers could compile lists of useful digital resources not in the collection.

Jim Agenbroad, Library of Congress

* * * *

On Thu, 12 Oct 2000 13:50:02 -0400, Jim Agenbroad wrote:

>>*I think part of the issue is the need to distinguish between 'bibliographic control' and 'catalog control'. A catalog controls a collection (grows and shrinks with it, and has call numbers that point to items in the collection) while a bibliography need not be tied to any assembly of physical objects (nor have any call numbers). If this be so catalogers would catalog physical objects in their library's collection (and, I guess physical objects for which their library has a temporary license) and bibliographers could compile lists of useful digital resources not in the collection.*<<

    Actually, this makes complete sense to me. Those in-house bibliographers could select and review for accuracy, authority, etc., web sites just as they now do for any print materials the library purchases. The web sites need not even be pay-for web sites, but could be civilian web sites with geocities or Fortunecity addresses. All the sites would need to be re-evaluated on a regular basis, just like every time a new edition of something comes out. It's the bibliographer, or collection development employee, that evaluates it and decides if it is a worthy addition to the collection.

    A lot of what has been said on this list, and in the few papers on the Conference website that I've managed to read, seems to assume that it is the cataloger's job to find appropriate and useful websites. But our job is to describe a resource, any resource, after it has been chosen by someone else. Keeping this distinction in mind may be very important in the coming years.

    Perhaps each department, Collection Development and Cataloging, may need to bring in extra people just to choose and catalog websites and electronic resources, or delegate those jobs to current employees exclusively, but the distinction between choosing a resource and describing a resource is still very important.

Gwendolyn Horton

* * * *

Discussing the Bibcontrol papers, Hal Cain said in a private message (quoted by permission):

>>In what I've read I don't seem to have spotted any mention of *national* bibliographic considerations; the US attitude (I mean this kindly ...) seems to take it for granted that US and international interests coincide, so no special provision has to be made for US national considerations.<<

Actually Hal, I think it is the other way around, although we probably both mean the same thing. No special provision is made for the international use of records, even though that was a stated aim of ISBD. DLC blithely assumes (to cite yet again a pet peeve) that a city jurisdiction known by cataloguers in the Beltway will be known on the west coast of the U.S., not to mention in Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia. (We have customers all those places except Australia.)

I, like Hal, found Barbara Tillett's concept of linked variant forms of names to be a great breath of fresh air. SLC is experimenting with Canadian spellings of topical subject headings for Canadian libraries, making the change as part of disk or ftp file creation as opposed to changing the master record (e.g., sending "Labour unions" as opposes to "Labor unions").

The recent question on Autocat concerning the use of alternate subject headings was an interesting one. So far as I know, Sandy Berman never automated that at Hennepin County. Our solution has been to program to accept 6XX 0 and 4, and label as 4 anything in addition to LCSH a customer wanted. Had we been a bit more sophisticated, we would have used 6XX 7, and programmed to look at $2. Joanna Fountain has done an excellent unified list of genre terms for 655 7, with codes for use in $2, although she did not include all LCSH genre terms such as "Symphonies".

We need more than a one-size-fits-all approach, without abandoning the basic structure. I see the ISBD as coded in MARC as that basic structure. That structure should be created once for each work in the country of origin, and used internationally.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

Library Journal Oct. 1st has "Cataloging the Net: Two Years Later" by Norman Oder, a two page summary of writing on the subject since addressed in Lj two years ago. He advances little personal opinion, but quotes those who range of optimistic to pessimistic about library efforts to catalogue the Web.

The standard question of selectivity vs. inclusion is raised, with those who wish the added value of selectivity seen by one writer as a "niche market". The question of whether the major search engines will remain free of charge raised, with the thought that some library indexing should exist in case that free access is changed. The discussion of integration into the OPAC and/or special subject listings vs. all Web resources being in a general library gateway is reported. CORC, and its integration with WorldCat, is seen as the major development of the past two years.

There is a helpful list of relevant urls.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

More than one paper for the upcoming Bibcontrol Conference has proposed using alternate sources of data for bibliographic records. At least one has recognized that this will require a relaxation in rules, e.g., capitalization in titles.

Perhaps some of you recall UK MARC for a period of time in which I believe they were experimenting with commercially created records. Some of us found that they required so much editing, it was easier just to rekey. Subject analysis was also erratic. Perhaps that experience should be investigated before we consider going down the same road.

To see how a database looks which contains records contributed from a variety of sources, using a variety of standards, you might visit http://abebooks.com . This excellent source of out of print books, located as we are on Vancouver Island near Victoria, lists the holdings of a large number of used book stores. Abebooks.com has written the large number of mapping programs it took to translate records received in a great variety of formats into that used by their database. As a finding tool it is impressive. But I'm not sure it is what we want as a library catalogue. Perhaps as a few have suggested, bridges to gateways rather than total integration would be a better solution for nonstandard records.

Just as all individual print periodical articles, all short stories, and all essays, are not individually listed in our catalogues, perhaps all individual electronic resource sites need not be listed. Perhaps rather than individual bibliographic records in our catalogues, access could be given (even electronic bridges created) to the appropriate indexes.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

I'm happy to continue this debate. I put this posting under the Alternative architecture thread, probably where it belongs, and those that have had enough of it can use the delete key. :)

We both agree that libraries should play a major role in providing access to information resources of all sorts. But I completely disagree with you that the only way to insure that libraries will not be left out is by individually selecting and adding records for Web resources to each local catalog. I think that is probably the best way to insure that libraries WILL be left out.

We should not focus our efforts on pumping up the local catalog, trying to force it to do a job it was not designed for. We will waste our time putting a relatively minute number of records in each local system and our users will rightly perceive that that pond is indeed very small and out of date. We need to have users associate the library with an ocean of quality resources or they will not come to our portals. Information seekers don't want us to tell them which is the good stuff...they just want to get the good stuff, and right now. We must quickly find ways to do that or we will be "disintermediated," a trend that's occurring in many fields, not just librarianship.

A change in architecture is essential. The local OPAC should be only one of many resources we use when providing quality information. In my opinion, Martin Dillon read and supported the position I took in my American Libraries article concerning OPAC integration of electronic resources. Perhaps I should have pasted in his entire sentence:

"In other words, where the bibliographic task in the paper world was defined primarily as the need to fit records into a local catalog, the new task we are designing our systems for is fitting surrogate descriptive records into a universal catalog for Web knowledge resources, with the added need, at least for the foreseeable future of having this catalog work congruently and seamlessly with the bibliography of the paper world."

Of course, at the conference Mr. Dillon can speak for himself. (And not for me...or else please get it right.)

As I noted, I am skeptical of Dillon's position in that I'm not convinced that even the CORC effort --as universal Web catalog -- can scale.

You may be interested that at least a few others hold positions similar to mine, researchers as well as vendors. A couple of brief quotes: * Igor Jurisica (from his paper in Oct/Nov 2000 Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science): "Although many approaches to knowledge organization are available, it is a challenge to organize evolving domains, since relying only on humans to create relationships among individual knowledge sources is not sufficient. It is not scalable, and it may be subjective. In order to support systematic knowledge management we need to complement traditional knowledge management techniques with approaches that automate parts of the process." He later briefly discusses Web mining.

*From Endeavor's Announcement of Encompass: "First Endeavor's Voyager gave you integrated management capabilities for your library's PRINT collection. Now Endeavor Information Systems Inc. introduces ENCompass -- the next step in software for the electronic world. Created for today's digital library, ENCompass takes advantage of new technology and standards (like XML, EAD and Dublin Core) to describe, index and search a variety of ELECTRONIC resources." (I'm not advocating Endeavor's architecture...just using it as an example.)

I want librarians to break out of the mold of trying to dump everything in the OPAC. We have already lost far too many users to Internet search engines. Let's use a different architecture to get them back.

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

>> *Information seekers don't want us to tell them which is the good stuff...they just want to get the good stuff.*<<

That seems contradictory. If they want the good stuff, then having someone (or an agency such as the library) point them in the appropriate direction is, in fact, us telling them what is the good stuff. I think the method suggested by Debra (robust OPAC integration) is a direct and efficient means to this end. In the long run, I think it will better serve our patrons.

>>*A change in architecture is essential. The local OPAC should be only one of many resources we use when providing quality information.*<<

No argument there. That's the current status in most libraries, if not all, at this point. It happens to be the past status as well, as I understand it, what with reference indexes, bibliographies, bibliographies of bibliographies, encyclopedias, journals, etc.

In quoting Martin Dillon:

>> *... the new task we are designing our systems for is fitting surrogate descriptive records into a universal catalog for Web knowledge resources ...* <<

I still need to read the paper (!), but this emphasis on Web resources driving the catalog is one I dislike. As others have pointed out, there are many useful media formats which are not disappearing nationally or world wide.

Daniel CannCasciato, Head of Cataloging, Central Washington University Library

* * * *

>>*We should not focus our efforts on pumping up the local catalog, trying to force it to do a job it was not designed for.*<<

I never said "local" I just said library catalog. I think many of us (and possibly OCLC as well) are thinking about building earth's largest library catalog, as proposed two years ago by Steve Coffman. http://www.infotoday.com/searcher/mar99/coffman.htm

Although, since I was trained as an art historian and an archivist, used to finding out about individual institutions and their collections, I also can imagine a highly selected, local catalog, that includes all types of materials, but not all subjects.

Mainly I think the important thing is that web resources be integrated with print and other types of materials that libraries hold. That is certainly what Beacom is advocating, by trying to update AACR to deal with networked resources. He

explains the need to change our cataloging rules, rules that have been geared to describing publisher packages, information carriers, so that we can describe the information content regardless of its carrier, but still also provide enough of the carrier information to help users get the version of the content that they can use -- ie. the print copy on the shelf right over there, the digital version that my library licensed, the free digital version that anyone can get but you need this plugin to read.

The only way people are going to continue to use print and other analog resources is if they find out about print resources in the same search that retrieves networked resources, and the print. etc. is described well enough so that they realize it is worth going to get it!

And who says it is a job the library catalog was not designed for? There was another response to this list, from Pauline Cochrane, pointing out late 19th century analytic records in card catalogs, pointing to individual journal articles -- "true one stop look for information needs some transparent movement from one medium (journal articles) to another (books, maps, etc.) This was Poole's dream at Chicago Public in the 19th century where I found journal article references in the old card catalog!"

Another interesting point is the current size estimates; OCLC's Web Characterization Project says there are probably 7 million unique *sites* (see http://www.oclc.org/oclc/press/20001016a.htm) and also Web growth appears to be slowing. while commercial outfit Complete Planet talks about one billion *pages* on the "surface web" with perhaps 550 billion more in the "deep web" http://www.completeplanet.com/Tutorials/DeepWeb/index.asp

And yes sites to pages is apples to oranges, but if you think about 7 million sites the other number to remember is 45 million records made by humans in WorldCat right now.

Debra Shapiro, Continuing Education Services, UW-Madison SLIS

* * * *

My impression is that we should get used to the idea that all the libraries in the world (and all the memory institutions for that matter) are (or will soon be) "special" branches of the Big Library: the web. As a consequence, the very idea of "local catalogue" seems obsolete to me (the same goes for 'special catalogue'). So, in the Big Catalogue we should find all the materials (analogue or digital). Of course, if the user wants to browse only that segment of the Big Catalogue which reflects the "special" collection in his/her local library, (s)he should be able to set suitable filters.

Now, can we afford to catalogue all the material out there ? Of course not. No real need for that. We should select, i.e. to make value judgments. Is that new ? At least in my country, usually the selection (i.e. the value judgment) is made at acquisition time (my public library does not buy all the porno material available, only some -:) , and usually they do not buy "Mein Kampf"). In the new context, when we have to "select" free (or "free") material, the cataloguer will have to make that selection. The Gorman proposal (the 4 level resources) is not based on the same idea ? Who will decide the level of a resource ?

Another thing: FRBR is also based on the assumption that we have all the expressions of a work recorded in the same catalogue. Why to discriminate the networked expressions ?

Dan Matei, Director, CIMEC, Bucuresti, Romania

* * * *

Debra Shapiro's e-mail was illuminating. I had not seen OCLC's press release with the estimate that the Web contain 7 million "useful" sites. Putting forth a figure like that seems almost scandalous. "Useful" might as well be a code word for "since we are so far behind and can't catalog everything, we'll ignore the majority of the Web as not worthy to look at, saving our collective face." Of course, accepting figures of 1 billion or upwards of 550 billion Web pages is

mind-boggling, but labeling a small portion of the Web as "useful" seems to go against our belief in intellectual freedom and against filtering (following ALA's line).

Carla Stoffle of the University of Arizona has written that one of the biggest obstacles in the evolution of librarianship in the 21st century is our "fear of mistakes." So it goes, if we can't catalog the Web with full bibliographic description, let's relieve our collective anxiety by downplaying its size. Does the Web need full bibliographic description? Probably not. Coupled with this anxiety is prejudice towards MARC, with no doubt has served print resources well. But, the Web presents numerous other opportunities with XML and SGML that it is unwise not to see cataloging entering a different phase of its own intellectual development.

Baruth's recent article in AMERICAN LIBRARIES was the "going out on a limb" that our profession needs to survive in the 21st century. I put it in the same category of Steve Coffman's piece one year ago. A mass dumping of Web records into local OPACs with the entire Internet offered at another click of the mouse presumes that our user base will count our selectivity as more worthy than Yahoo! or Altavista. It just will not happen. The incredibly rapid growth of the Web will prevent it. And, how much time would we really be saving our users, versus OPAC records that users value in saving them time from physically trudging up and down library staircases and rows of stacks?

The subtitle of the upcoming conference is "confronting the challenges of networked resources and the Web." Reducing the size of the Web to lessen the challenge does not promote innovative proposals, but rather placates the status quo.

CHAD P. ABEL-KOPS, School of Library and Information Science, Catholic University of America

* * * *

Where the word 'useful' came from I don't know, but it isn't in the OCLC press release. What OCLC estimated was that the Web contains about 7 million 'unique' sites. There is no value judgment there. For those who wish to read the press release themselves, the URL is http://www.oclc.org/oclc/press/20001016a.htm

Judith Hopkins, University at Buffalo

* * * *

Oops! My first posting to the listserv, in which I mention the "fear of mistakes," and then I go ahead and make one. I stand corrected. The OCLC press release used the term "unique."

Still, I am hard pressed to say all is wonderful, because there are only 7 million "unique" sites out there. If users like seeing journal databases in libraries that display indexes to each article, would they really appreciate an approach to Web cataloging that just identified the main site?

Ronald Hagler of the University of British Columbia has written that it took over 200 years to identify the title page and t.p. verso as the "chief source of information." Will we be debating Web control this long???

CHAD P. ABEL-KOPS, School of Library and Information Science, Catholic University of America

* * * *

>>*Smith Ayala, Emilie sorts several screens before Smith, A.*<<

MARBI has removed the 1XX indicator (1st indicator 2) which allowed us to do this correctly. WHAT were they thinking? Now what do you suggest? Using commas to influence filing order (the only solution we saw but rejected), we feared would create other problems.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

>>*Smith Ayala, Emilie sorts several screens before Smith, A.*

MARBI has removed the 1XX indicator (1st indicator 2) which allowed us to do this correctly. WHAT were they thinking? Now what do you suggest? Using commas to influence filing order (the only solution we saw but rejected), we feared would create other problems.<<

I always did think the removal of this indicator was a mistake. The only suggestion I have would be to reinstate the indicator, but trying to correct old records would be a real headache. But this and the problem of correctly filing (and using!) uniform titles suggest the problems computers still have after all these years.

Michael S. Borries, Cataloger, City University of New York

* * * *

>>*Ronald Hagler of the University of British Columbia has written that it took over 200 years to identify the title page and t.p. verso as the "chief source of information." Will we be debating Web control this long???*<<

It took some time to create the title page, too.

The Web hasn't gotten that far yet.

Dublin Core might be most useful for making Web things more accessible (and more catalogable) if _publishers_ (not authors, not librarians) began to use DC (or something like it) as a Web resource version of the title page. Once Web things have some feature that serves more or less the same purposes as a title page, then librarians or other folks can recognize its value as a distillation of core bibliographic attributes.

Matthew Beacom, Yale University Library

* * * *

IFLA has just released a new document: Guidelines for Legal Deposit Legislation / by Jules Larivi.

It may be found at: http://www.ifla.org/VII/s1/gnl/legaldep1.htm

Chapter 6, "Legal Deposit of Electronic Publications" addresses many issues germane to this conference: definition of eligible material ("as inclusive as possible to ensure that electronic publications are covered regardless of the type of carrier" both "off-line" and "on-line"); the question of retaining "dynamic" documents; and the role of copyright law and statutory licence in securing "last-resort" access as part of the national bibliographic resource.

With regard to dynamic electronic materials, Larivi makes practical distinctions: "What should be deposited are the separate and complete 'intellectual' units that are stored either separately or as part of a database. Whenever a database is made up of separate and complete units - such as a legal database that includes cases, journal articles, etc. - it should be an object of deposit. But when a database is made up of raw data (i.e. unorganized data that could be selected and gathered on order by an individual to create a separate and complete "intellectual" unit for his/her own private use), it should not be subject to legal deposit." He also addresses the question of what "published" means in the electronic media.

Finally he makes a plea for reasonable access to such deposited resources: "Whereas including a provision for unlimited free access for the users of a national legal deposit institution would be abusive, not providing at least one access to the registered users of such an institution would be as unreasonable."

If principles of this kind are accepted and brought into force, the matter of recording their availability becomes crucial -- resources unknown may as well not be gathered. In other words, finding lists or catalogues.

Questions of national bibliographic record aside, surely the matter of what to record (and, if appropriate, archive against the producer's possible withdrawal) is really a question of *selection*. At one extreme, many web documents are the electronic equivalent of handbills or similar ephemera. Some libraries have useful collections of such items, but I know none that makes a comprehensive attempt to give them full cataloguing; they may well be entered in catalogues as collections, but not individually. So with electronic items: some are worth keeping, some are not.

Hal Cain, Joint Theological Library, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

* * * *

Thanks to Martin Dillon for responding in part to my concerns via this list. I ask that he revise his paper to quote my entire sentence, not a selected portion, and to clearly indicate that I question the scalability of human resource description of WEB resources. I again ask that he remove his offensive implication that I think "the library role can be encapsulated by such search engines, we can dispense with libraries forthwith: this functionality can be provided by software firms and distributed directly to patrons either as clients or by glitzy Web portals."

My apologies are offered for attributing the context of some of his comments to his association with OCLC. Naturally, after a distinguished career with that organization, he might be expected to remain interested in OCLC and supportive of its programs and projects. Beyond that, no other such motivation for his position is imputed.

Yes, evolution of the quality of search engines is speculative. I have no crystal ball and would agree that the path Internet search engines will follow is unclear, but I would guess that a third generation is on the horizon. Meanwhile, second generation search engines are heavily used and are pulling users away from libraries and library Web sites. I consider the search engine a possible tool to incorporate into the new architecture I continue to harp on.

 Estimates of the number of original catalogers worldwide that might be diverted into working on Web materials, the number of Web resources deserving full level 1 treatment or level 2 treatment, and other such arithmetic is itself highly speculative. The biggest "If", though, is the "If we had begun this 5 years ago, we would have a database of 13 million records (2.6 million yearly.)" Omitted from the estimates are the number of selectors needed and the related costs necessary to build and maintain such a huge project.

Rather than divert resources to sift through and catalog the Web, should we not consider using those resources to digitize, catalog (provide metadata for), and make accessible our own special collections? Certainly there is concern over where the expertise and funds will spring from for those projects.

Barbara Baruth

* * * *

AACR2 1.4C5 provides that one is to give first place, plus a place given typographical prominence, plus one in the country of the library. When SLC has catalogued an item with more than three places, and the record is shared by libraries in more than three countries, do we keep adding places? What do non U.S. users of OCLC and MARCit records do? Add their own city to their internal record only?

AACR2 1.4C3 would have us transcribe or supply the jurisdiction "if it is considered necessary for identification". While DLC will transcribe, it will often not supply jurisdiction. (NLC is better about this, like Australia having a list of cities not needing jurisdiction.) We find that cities known to DLC cataloguers in the Beltway are not known to our customers in the western U.S., Canada, or Asia. Both these rules it seems to me are counterproductive in terms of the ISBD principle of one record being shared internationally, and are thus examples of what Michael Gorman refers to in his paper for the Bibcontrol Conference as rules which fail to relate to principle.

Since most of us are no longer trying to get information on a 3 x 5 in. card (the reason for limiting information to the absolutely minimum required), it seems to me transcribing all places, and always supplying jurisdiction if lacking, would help to create a more internationally usable record, whether for text or electronic resources, as well as being simpler rules to apply.

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

Unfortunately the conference agenda is largely confined to cataloging of electronic resources. It seems to me that nonroman access points are another topic as deserving of attention. If the desirability of equal access includes equal ease of access, nonroman access points ("vernacular headings") which free those seeking materials in other writing systems from the burden of expressing their searches via romanization would seem to merit a mention in AACR. Since the mid-1980's many Anglo-American catalogers of Japanese, Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, Hebrew and Yiddish (JACKPHY) materials have used modern technology to assign vernacular headings but AACR has yet to take note of this change which sets the convienence of the public before the ease of the cataloger. (Cf. the preface to Cutter's 1904 rules.) JSC has a proposal that could remedy this. The conference agenda cannot change at this late date; but a note in the proceedings could remind us all that there are other topics to resolve.

Jim Agenbroad, Library of Congress

* * * *

You have struck an issue which I think needs some acceleration. Barbara Tillett in her paper "Authority Control on the Web" makes passing mention of an experiment in Hong Kong to make vernacular script available in authority records.

It is an issue that should have been discussed and sorted out well before now.

We are busily in the middle of worrying about Wade Giles to Pin Yin transliteration, and we carry vernacular script in special tags in the bibliographic record. But there is seems to be no discussion that I have managed to pick up that indicates that we will be seeing vernacular script in LCNA, despite the the provision of 880 tags in the MARC authority format.

The situation is particularly bad for Chinese as in some cases different characters transliterate to the same Pin Yin (or Wade Giles I believe). By not carrying this data it will be difficult to sort out conflicts at a glance.

Perhaps I have not been reading widely enough {I admit that there is often just too few hours in the day], or am being to simplistic in what must be a very complex issue. However it is an issue that I would like to see addressed centrally, as we, like many others around the world are required to use LCNA as our standard.

It seems shortsighted to provide vernacular in our bibliographic description and not allow for its provision in headings and cross references derived from authorities.

Patricia Scott, Bibliographic Services Librarian, University of Adelaide, South Australia

* * * *

For your information, Jack Cain of (the now defunct) Utlas had created authority records with CJK in them as well as distinguishing between the different meanings of the same Chinese character for the Chinese and Korean languages. One of the sadnesses of North American automation was that Jack Cain never received the recognition for his accomplishments.

Maurice J. Freedman, Director, Westchester Library System

* * * *

I'm finding it very helpful to have the conference papers online, in order to refer people to them in answering questions about Web cataloguing. What is the future of this site, the conference papers, the summarized discussion from the list, and any statements the conference may produce?

Michael Gorman's call for preservation as well as organization being the role of libraries in relation to the Web seems particularly appropriate in relation to this resource in particular. Will this conference be the shoeless shoemakers child? Does it have metadata? Will it be preserved?

J. McRee (Mac) Elrod, Special Libraries Cataloguing

* * * *

I dare to suggest to keep the list going. I guess I detect a community around it. And I'm afraid we still have a lot of (world's) problems to solve.

Dan Matei, director, CIMEC, Bucuresti, Romania

* * * *

I have a few points to make (despite the fact that I still haven't finished reading all the papers and other material -- work, some professional engagements, and the rest of my life demand most of my time and energy). Nearly forty years involved with books and libraries, much of it in cataloguing, gives me some background.

There are times when we may need reminding that there is seldom only one right way of doing things. Impressed as I am with Barbara Baruth's passionate advocacy of a separate database of electronic resource descriptions, I have to think that the elaborate indexing, searching and management facilities of the modern ILMS, based on the MARC formats, is too valuable a tool to be set aside. If a system doesn't offer the kinds of management tools appropriate for remote electronic resources, talk to your vendor; of course, most of are not yet too clear about just what details we require, so we need to talk to each other first. The arguments for excluding these resources from the catalogue seem to me to bear some resemblance to the 1970s arguments about non-print resources in the library.

The apparent problem of different styles of record in the MARC database is hardly new. My own experience of using the Australian service, Kinetica (and ABN before it), and now OCLC, RLIN and the LC catalog itself, has made it blindly clear to me that MARC systems can carry any sort of record, from the bare shelflist-type skeleton to the most elaborate (and many of them are not correctly flagged even with the inadequate codes MARC21 provides for showing the level of description -- and yet, we manage). Where MARC 21 falls down is in its techniques for multipart works (UKMARC does it far better, and Ausmarc used to too). If multilevel provision were incorporated into MARC 21, then it would also be able to handle the "multiple version" problem intelligently and coherently; that entails also the fundamental principles of AACR2, and I'm becoming disillusioned about the progress in revision of that code -- the weight of the past seems to be in control.

If we're to see a flood of MARC records which began life as Dublin Core -- and that seems inevitable -- then it's high time that we stopped pretending there can be one-to-one equivalence at the subfield level. In many fields, especially Title (245), MARC21 needs to be able to show that the data is not differentiated into appropriate subfields, as in AACR2-MARC records; whether this is done by different subfield values, or by indicators, is immaterial, but I need to know whether the record editor (if any) has considered the distinction between the title proper and other elements of title data.

In authority control (a preoccupation of mine), whether of not our systems controlled terms are taken up by non-cataloguers creating metadata, we need to move from a single preferred term with cross-references to embrace the concept of equivalence. That will entail both adjusting the MARC 21 authority framework and changing the way our systems work. Once this is under way, the tools are at hand to deal with different forms of a name, different names for the same person, and different national usages. As an Australian, I rather think that US thinking in this area is less developed than ours, but since the code (MARC 21) and the systems respond chiefly to US interests, the single established form dominates. This artificial approach is inadequate.

Finally, a brief repetition of what I said a while ago: the problem of what resources to catalogue, and how extensively, is a new form of *selection* and we have a long history of good practice in that field of librarianship. For libraries with responsibilities in copyright deposit and the national bibliographic record, the problem is somewhat different: how to retain the resources and make them accessible after the hardware and software no longer work reliably, if at all; and how to ensure that creators of databases offered by licence or other restricted access understand that they form part of the national information organism.

Hal Cain, Joint Theological Library, Parkville, Victoria, Australia