Rare Book Cataloging: Of RDA, FRBR, and DCRM(B)†

Sarah Yates
Foreign Law and Rare Book Cataloger
University of Minnesota Law Library

Early printed monographs have their own special cataloging rules in AACR2, under rules 2.12 through 2.18. However, many libraries, including the Library of Congress, that catalog a substantial number of rare books (rare generally being defined as published before 1801) choose to catalog them according to *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books* (DCRB). While DCRB is separate from AACR2, it is more a supplement to the general cataloging rules than a replacement for them. DCRB provides rules only for description, not headings or uniform titles, which are constructed according to AACR2 rules.

DCRB is similar to AACR2 in its structure and in many of the rules themselves, with the two cataloging standards also having a further similarity: they will both soon be outdated.

Just as AACR2 is currently undergoing revision, so too is DCRB. The zeta draft of the new rare book cataloging code is at: http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/dcrmbzeta20060108cleancopy.pdf. The draft is also available at: http://www.rbms.nd.edu/, the website of the ALCTS Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS), which is the organization responsible for the revision, but there is no direct URL to the draft.

If you look at this draft, you may notice that the rules are not just being revised; they are being renamed as well. This is yet another similarity with AACR2, which is becoming *Resource Description and Access* (RDA). A new name is certainly appropriate for what was originally planned as AACR3; while many of the actual rules are not changing much (at least in the publicly available draft of Part I), the organizational changes alone make RDA more a rewriting than a revision.

The DCRB name change, like the revision itself, is a less drastic one: from *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books* (DCRB) to *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* (DCRM(B)). The name change is intended to accommodate standards for other formats that are also in process: DCRM(S) for rare serials and DCRM(M) for rare music.

Another similarity between RDA and DCRM(B) is their FRBRization. The 1997 International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) report

2005-2006 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

OBS-SIS

Chair:
Richard Jost
University of Washington

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Susan Goldner
University of Arkansas at Little
Rock

Secretary/Treasurer:
Kathy Faust
Northwestern School of Law

Members-at-Large:
Caitlin Robinson (2004-2006)
University of Iowa
Stephanie Schmitt (2005-2007)
Yale University

Education Committee:
Susan Goldner
University of Arkansas at Little
Rock

Local System Committee:
Mary Jane Kelsey
Yale University

Nominating Committee:
Kevin Butterfield
College of William and Mary

OCLC Committee:
Pam Deemer
Emory University

RLIN Committee:
Ming Lu
Los Angeles County Law Library

Web Advisory Committee:
Shannnon Burchard
Univ. of San Francisco Law
Library

TS-SIS

Chair:
Karen Douglas
Duke Univ. School of Law
Library

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Rhonda K. Lawrence
UCLA School of Law

Secretary/Treasurer:
Chris Long
Indiana University, Indianapolis

Members-at-Large:
Brian Striman (2004-2006)
University of Nebraska
Janice Anderson (2005-2007)
Georgetown University Law
Center

Acquisitions Committee:
Lorna Tang
Univ. of Chicago Law Library

Awards Committee:
Pam Deemer
Emory University

Cataloging & Classification
Committee:
Karen Nuckolls
West Virginia University

Education Committee:
Rhonda K. Lawrence
UCLA School of Law

Nominating Committee:
Virginia Bryant
George Washington University

Preservation Committee:
Patricia K. Turpening
University of Cincinnati

Serials Committee:
Carol Avery Nicholson
University of North Carolina

OBS and TS-SIS Representatives

ALA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
George Prager, New York Univ. Law Library (2005-2007)
ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
Kathy Winzer, Stanford Univ. Law Library (2005-2006)
ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Yael Mandelstam, Fordham Univ. Law Library (2005-2008)
OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee
Caitlin Robinson, University of Iowa Law Library

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times…" Although the changes in the library world may not be as tumultuous as the French Revolution envisioned by Dickens, I am sure that for many of us, they are having an impact that feels just as revolutionary. For those of us who have been following recent events at the Library of Congress and at OCLC & RLG, the world in which we have been accustomed to working, has announced major changes that will impact all of us.

For librarians interested in online bibliographic systems, the OCLC & RLG merger is perhaps one of the most important changes since the development of bibliographic utilities. There have always been two schools of thought regarding the bibliographic utilities: either the single record concept of OCLC or the cluster approach of RLIN, with the primacy of the individual record. These two approaches have been widely debated in the library world over the years, with each library choosing the approach that worked best for its resources. Many libraries, including mine, used both of the bibliographic utilities, as each had unique records that gave us the best resources for our cataloging labors.

With the expected merger of OCLC & RLG, that choice will no longer be available. Although the details are still not entirely clear, it would appear that there will be one major database of all bibliographic records, built according to the OCLC model. Although some RLG services will survive under the OCLC umbrella, undoubtedly they will not completely replicate the RLG services that libraries have been using in the past.

All the reasons behind this merger may never be fully known, but certainly the economic market forces that impact the rest of the economy have not bypassed the library world. Although some of us, especially in academic libraries, may feel that we are immune from the messy marketplace in our tree-lined campus environs, I am sure that our colleagues in firm libraries can tell us that market forces have long been a factor in their ability to provide library services. Although we may not think of it as such, the library world is an economic market, subject to the same competitive demands and strains that we all learned in Economics 101. As with the rest of the economy, library vendors are increasingly global organizations, easily crossing national boundaries in the same way that information flows around the world.

Looking at the merger from an economic perspective, perhaps we can readily understand that having two major bibliographic databases does not make sense. Joining forces and combining records would seem to be the way to provide a more comprehensive database to all libraries, eliminating the need to be members of both utilities to reap the benefits. On this level, the merger does make sense and actually will make the workflow in my library less burdensome. No longer will we have to load records into both databases and make sure that we delete records from both databases when removing items from our collection.

However, another lesson that I dimly remember from my economics courses was that more players in the marketplace also brought benefits. Competition in many ways is beneficial for companies, goading them to innovate their existing products or to develop and offer new services. In addition, competition in the marketplace usually has a direct impact on the price of a service or product, a stimulus that will be missing in the new OCLC/RLG world. Will libraries continue to receive bibliographic utility services at a fair price? Will OCLC continue to develop new products and services that are needed by the library world? The answers, at least at this point, are not entirely clear.

What is clear, however, is that change is coming to our world. As I am fond of telling my library school students, change is neither good nor bad: it is neutral. What is good or bad is how we react to change. I know that many of us may not feel like embracing this particular change (or many of the other changes roiling the library world) but our choices are limited. We are not immune from the forces shaping the marketplace, nor are we immune from actions that other players in the library world undertake to strengthen their own organizations. When appropriate, we can voice our concerns, suggest alternatives, lobby for changes or transfer our business to other vendors (when available). What we cannot do, however, is to ignore the change and hope that it does not happen. My guess is that we will be seeing even more changes ahead in the online bibliographic world as companies consolidate, merge or disappear from the market. Our duty, as dedicated professionals, is to positively assimilate the changes for our staffs and patrons.

Although we may not know any more on this topic than we do today, the OBS SIS will be sponsoring an open program at AALL on Sunday evening at 6:30pm to discuss the OCLC/RLG merger. We hope to have representatives from both organizations in attendance to answer your questions and to listen to your concerns. Please add this date to your calendars and join us as we face this brave new world.

Richard Jost
University of Washington Gallagher Law Library

T echnical Services Special Interest Section

Congratulations to this year's officers, elected in our first ever electronic election! The new officers are as follows: Vice Chair/ Chair-Elect – Alan Keely (Wake Forest); Secretary/Treasurer – Sima Mirkin (American University); and Member-at-Large – Marie Whited (Law Library of Congress). I would like to extend my appreciation to those candidates who also ran: Paula Tejada (Charleston School of Law); Wendell Johnting (Indiana University); and William Benemann (UC Berkeley).

The Awards Committee awarded grants for attendance at CONELL for the first time this year. Recipients are: Annie Chen (Stanford) and Jill Ryder (NY State Office of the Attorney General). A grant was also awarded for attendance at the AALL Electronic Serials Cataloging Workshop. The recipient is Yan Yu (Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Nicholson Graham LLP). Congratulations to all of our grant recipients.

This year in St. Louis we will have another "first." TS-SIS will be sponsoring programs of our own in the same time slots as AMPC educational programs. These programs will be given a more prominent spot in the Annual Meeting program this year. You may also find more information about them on the TS-SIS Web page. http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/ annualmeeting/2006/. Be sure to look for the following programs: "Conversations Across the Cubicles," "21st Century Technical Services," and a discussion about changes in cataloging practices at LC. TS-SIS will also be offering a workshop on preservation, a program on transforming technical services librarians into digital librarians, and a preview of RDA. Don't forget to start off the conference with the "Alphabet Soup" reception which is once again graciously sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. Please attend the TS-SIS business meeting as well.

For those of you who can't attend the Annual Meeting, Christina Tarr has once again volunteered, with the help of our Webmaster, Martin Wisneski, to facilitate a blog from the St. Louis Annual Meeting. I encourage you to read and report on happenings at the annual meeting at: http://tssis.blogspot.com/.

If you want to make next year's meeting as exciting as this one, be sure to attend the Education Committee meeting on Thursday, July 11, 11:45 AM-1:00 PM, or send your program ideas to committee chair Rhonda Lawrence, Lawrence@ law.ucla.edu.

This has really been an exciting year for me, with never a dull moment. I can't believe it's almost over. So many momentous things have happened. We've had a major change in the Annual Meeting programming structure. As a result of the AALL Education Summit in which I participated, AALL now has a Speaker's Bureau and a Continuing Education Calendar. TS-SIS has created a new administrative committee and a new grant. OCLC and RLIN are about to merge. LC is about to make major changes in its cataloging policies. I will truly miss being at the forefront of all the excitement. I want to extend heartfelt gratitude to those who have "ridden the waves" with me this year: the best Executive Board a chair could ask for: Rhonda Lawrence, Cindy May, Chris Long, Brian Striman, Jan Anderson, Lorna Tang, Karen Nuckolls, Carol Avery Nicholson and Pat Turpening. Our Nominations Committee chair, Virginia Bryant, and Awards Committee chair, Pam Deemer, and their committees also did a superb job. Thanks especially to Mahnaz Mosfegh who took over as chair of the Centennial Committee when Janice Shull had to step down. I couldn't have managed without the most extraordinary list moderator, Betty Roeske, who will be stepping down after eleven years of dedicated service. Thanks also to the best Webmaster in the world, Martin Wisneski, who quickly, patiently and efficiently responded to my many demands for changes and updates to the TS-SIS Web page.

I never thought I'd say this, but it's actually been fun being chair of TS-SIS. See ya around.

Karen Douglas
Duke University

A TSLL Think Piece

Michael Maben
Cataloging Librarian
Indiana University School of Law
Library at Bloomington

As Cataloging Goes, So Goes the Library

I have been thinking a lot about what has transpired recently with Library of Congress announcement concerning series authorities and the Calhoun report. I went to my files to look at articles I have saved over the years that address these issues. I ended up re-reading two articles by Michael Gorman. The first was "The Treason of the Learned: The Real Agenda of Those Who Would Destroy Libraries and Books" which appeared in *Library Journal*, Feb. 15, 1994 (p. 130-131). The other one was "Human Values in a Technological Age" which appeared in *Information Technology and Libraries*, March 2001 (p. 4-11).

I would like to quote Michael Gorman's first paragraph in "The Treason of the Learned":

> "Libraries are under attack as never before, and none more so than academic libraries. The enemies of academic libraries fall into three classes. The *bureaucrats* know little or nothing of education or libraries. They know only that they cost a lot of money; money that could be saved if libraries were to be dismantled behind a smokescreen of technology. The *technocrats*, or at least some of them, believe that technology can be used to provide something equal to, or better than, "traditional" library services. The *technovandals* want to use technology to break up the culture of learning and, in a weird mixture of Nineties cybervision and Sixties radicalism, to replace that world with a howling wilderness of unstructured, unrelated gobbets of "information" and random images in which the hapless individual wanders without direction or sense of value." [p. 130]

Gorman then quotes a report issued by a California State University committee that illustrates his last point. In subsequent paragraphs he discusses how the dispute usually comes down to money, power, learning, and culture; and that libraries are easy targets. Then comes what seems to me to be the key point in this move at LC to eliminate series authorities and ultimately eliminate LCSH in favor of a "Google" approach. Gorman says:

> "We would do well to do two things: First, to allow no promise or blandishment of those who would destroy libraries to go unquestioned. Second, to come up with a constructive program based on using technology to enhance library services, to preserve the best of what we have, and to rise to new levels of service… We should not permit this positive acceptance of technology to be used against us by our colleagues and by those who exploit them. It often seems, to put it bluntly, that we can never do enough to satisfy that crowd. Nothing short of permanently barred library doors and bonfires of books will placate them." [p.131]

Gorman goes on to discuss how for reading, nothing electronic can even begin to compare with the printed page; and that sustained reading is the power to "enlighten, teach, illuminate, and entertain." [p.131] The article concludes with this sentence, "If librarians, scholars, teachers acquiesce in this destruction, we shall, by our silence, be committing the ultimate treason to learning and to intellectual freedom." [p. 131]

Michael Gorman's words and thoughts challenge me. In a law library setting, I see many of the benefits of technology. No one sits down to read the *U.S. Code* from Title 1 to Title 50, or volume 844 of the *Atlantic Reporter*. A patron usually needs one case, or a few sections of the code (although I still prefer the printed versions of the codes). For these, the electronic versions work very well. If you want to cite-check a case, it is very easy and much faster to do it online than with the books. But I believe that there is much more to a legal education than that, and as Michael Gorman says, nothing beats the printed word on a page for sustained reading.

Our provision for series tracings, and a controlled vocabulary of subject headings gives our patrons and public services librarians the ability to collocate additional sources and items. I agree with Gorman that we should look to technology to enhance our services. In that respect, I believe that we should look at ways to improve the Library of Congress subject headings and cataloging, and I believe that technical services librarians are the best people to do that. I hope that the management at the Library of Congress will not make a pronouncement ending LCSH like they have done with series authorities, that they will recognize the enormous value of controlled subject headings, and that they will work with the library community to improve them and make them even more useful to library users.

I titled this essay "As cataloging goes, so goes the library," as a paraphrase of the old saying "As Maine goes, so goes the nation." This was a reference to Maine's vote in presidential elections when Maine used to vote before the rest of the nation and usually would predict the winner. As Gorman says, we are under attack and it will not end with catalogers or technical services. As we go, so goes the future of the library.

A Few Thoughts on Dealing with Procurement Offices

Despite all the nasty things I have said about umpires,
I think they're one-hundred percent honest, but I can't for the
life of me figure out how they arrive at some of their decisions. — Jimmy Dykes

The Commonwealth of Virginia recently directed the College of William and Mary to formally adopt its statewide electronic purchasing system, eVA. During the implementation period, eVA has become something of a synonym for e-Vil in Williamsburg (much to the chagrin of our cataloger, Eva Brooks, who, when hearing us complain about eVA, went through an unsettled period when she was unsure if we were really talking about her). Accommodating the new purchasing system was an adjustment for all. One of the major changes would be the introduction of a new player into our purchasing workflow: the campus procurement office.

Whether in an academic setting, firm, county or court library, some sort of procurement entity must exist. Often they are viewed as obstructionist, rule bound, inflexible entities with a mission to deny us what we want. They can be worked *with* rather than worked *around*, however. Here are a few things we've learned over the last year.

Documentation and guidelines, or; Learn their playbook better than they know it.
A procurement office runs on rules. Mastery of these rules is the hallmark of a great procurement officer. Find out what the procurement regulations are for your organization and, if applicable, its parent organization. If you are a state or government entity, what are the applicable local, state, or federal laws that apply? Who in your organization is charged with interpreting them? How do these rules and regulations apply to information resources, licenses for electronic products, and contracts with vendors for serial, monograph or bindery services? It is rare that government entities include guidelines for library-related purchases in their procurement codes. If yours do not, learn where library materials fall in the codes or regulations.

Specific local guidelines for procurement should be written and maintained as an authoritative reference for staff. These guidelines should include such items as:

- Definitions of each type of procurement (electronic, material, supplies, print, etc.). Explanation of what constitutes complete documentation for each type of procurement (copies of PO's, invoices, correspondence with vendors, etc.)
- Who can approve, process or transmit or charge various types and amounts of purchases, or in the absence of the "approver" who can sign off on requests.

In our case we have a set of campus procurement regulations as well as the Commonwealth of Virginia's Procurement Code. We maintain an extensive list of documentation not only as a mean of keeping staff current on procurement practices, but also to ensure adequate documentation in the case of an audit.

Education, or; Be a teacher as well as a student.
In addition to mastering the procurement office's playbook, teach them yours. Procurement offices are more comfortable working with what they know. Furniture, M&O (maintenance and operations), or contractor-related services are their day to day work, especially in an academic setting. Books, serials, etc. are a new thing that may not fit neatly into their regulations or list of purchasing codes. This can be especially true of licenses for electronic resources. It is a natural tendency to try to force the new thing to work like the old. But books are not chairs, and licenses are not contracts for dining services. Educate your contacts in the procurement office as to how a library works. We invited our procurement liaison over for a meeting, ran through sample licenses, and discussed what our needs were in addition to her office's requirements. You might also give them a copy of the AALL *Guide to Fair Business Practices for Legal Publishers*.

The library should provide training in purchasing as part of its learning curriculum. Periodic "orientation to purchasing" classes should be provided for everyone interested, along with specific modules on purchase card, travel card, foundation accounts, etc. Departmental supply representatives and purchase-card holders should be required to attend classes pertinent to their responsibilities. Staying up on the regulations is just as important for the library as it is for the procurement office.

Communication, or; I'm ok you're ok.
Staying in regular contact with your procurement office is a given. Keep them informed of directions in purchasing, changes

in license terms, mergers and acquisitions of vendors, etc. Communication builds trust. Once you have gained the trust of your procurement office, the more likely they will be to work with you rather than insist on blind conformance.

As our procurement officer told us, we want you to get what you want to buy, we just need to find a way to accomplish that within the rules we've been given. Education, documentation, and communication are three steps toward finding that common ground.

<div align="right">

CLASSIFICATION

</div>

Pondering the Future of Classification while Living in the Present

Elizabeth Geesey Holmes
Alexander Campbell King Law Library
University of Georgia

We have certainly been living in exciting times lately as catalogers: LC's announcement that it will no longer create series authority records, rumors that the Library of Congress Subject Headings would be eliminated next; RLG's merger with OCLC; Karen Calhoun's report for LC on the nature of the catalog; and OCLC finally implementing code i for integrating resources. It's been hard to keep up with all the e-mail discussions.

All of the above has led me to thinking about the practice of classification and its future. I assume all of us are assigning classification numbers to most physical materials that cross our desks for cataloging. We want these items to be placed on the shelf in a logical and browseable order so that our patrons can retrieve them easily. However, what about electronic/virtual materials which are not on a shelf and don't need a classification number to be retrieved? Do we assign classification numbers to them? When the majority of materials at LC are online and all their stacks are closed (in other words not browseable by patrons) will LC cease assigning LC classification numbers and maintaining the schedules?

All of which leads to the questions: "Why do we assign classification numbers?" and, "Should we continue to do so when we no longer need them for shelf parking?" I was influenced by Diane Hillman's (a former law cataloger) point of view on this question. I attended an AALL cataloging workshop in 1994 and heard her speak on cataloging CD-ROMs and remote files. She stressed the importance of assigning classification numbers as a subject access point even to virtual resources. The classification number is much more than a parking spot. Most of today's online catalogs allow patrons to browse by classification number to find like materials, in the same way (although admittedly less tactile) as researchers used to — and still do — locate one or two relevant materials in the stacks and then browse around that area to find other materials on the same subject. It is our policy at the University of Georgia to assign classification numbers, though not necessarily cutter numbers, to online resources whenever possible. [We purchased cataloging records for the Making of Modern Law online treatise collection and these did not have classification numbers and were too numerous for us to assign numbers to manually]. We use this information for more than just browsing in the cataloging. We generate special reports of our collection by subject breakdown based on classification number ranges, which our collection development team profiled in an Innovative Interfaces, Inc. feature called a "SCAT table." If materials in our catalog are not assigned a classification number they are not included in these reports that are used for collection analysis.

Classification numbers are also being used on the Internet to facilitate subject arrangement/browsing of online resources. *The Online Books Page* at*:* http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/aboutolbp.html facilitates access to books that are freely readable over the Internet. It is browseable by subject via both subject headings and LC classification numbers. It has quite a few sources listed in the K ranges and is interesting to check out. Another site using LC classification to organize online reference tools for undergraduate students is *E-Ref* at: http://icrc.bloomu.edu/icrc/lc.php. Again there are a few legal reference resources there to look at.

How are you using classification in your libraries? What is your opinion on the future of classification and its uses? I'd love to hear from other law librarians on this topic – especially in light of other happenings in the cataloging world.

Meanwhile – back to the present. We are all still assigning classification numbers to at least some of our materials and need tools and tips to do so. Here are a couple of things I've run across lately.

- *Notes on the Design of Subclasses KBM and KBP (CPSO)* by Jolande Goldberg is available on the CPSO website at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/KBIntro2.html. If you are interested in learning more about these sub-classes and their design this is well worth your time.

- While searching for a classification number for an Australian legal treatise I was reminded of the intricacies of searching Classification Web for law numbers housed in tables. I first tried to limit my search to the KU class, but mysteriously got no hits even when I broadened the search to include both the schedules and the tables. The trick was that the KU numbers are part of the KL-KWX6 table and to limit to this table I had to use the full table name and remember to check the search tables box. I didn't find this at all intuitive and had to get my paper schedules out to find the table number, and in this case, letters as well. So, don't forget to think about tables and where your class number resides when searching in Classification Web.

Lastly, if you have any classification questions that you want answered in a column or have comments please email me.

MARC Remarks

George A. Prager
New York University Law School Library

A. Implementation of Bibliographic Level "i" by OCLC and LC

AACR2 2002 revision formally altered the bibliographic division of the world from monograph/serials. Monographs remained one of the categories, but serials were subsumed as part of the new category, "continuing resources," which also included the new subcategory "integrating resources." Integrating resources include updating loose-leafs (long familiar to law catalogers), updating websites, and updating databases. To accommodate this new taxonomy, the Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI), defined a new bibliographic level (MARC leader/07) value in the MARC format: "i" (Proposal *No. 2001-05*). RLIN implemented the new value several years ago, but the Library of Congress (LC) and OCLC were waiting until OCLC finished converting to its new platform. OCLC's implementation should be announced sometime in June 2006 or thereabouts. Guidelines on how to apply value "i" are in OCLC *Technical Bulletin* 252, May 2006.

Both BIBCO and CONSER libraries are expected to share in the maintenance of records for integrating resources. Somewhat later this year (possibly by fall 2006), both BIBCO and CONSER libraries will be able to authenticate records for integrating resources by adding the LCCN [Library of Congress Control Number] and a new authentication code (MARC field 042), to be determined. BIBCO libraries will also be able to update and enhance these records on OCLC without authenticating them, but both the LCCN and the new authentication code will be necessary for the record to be selected for distribution through the Library of Congress' Cataloging Distribution Service. [Les Hawkins message posted to the BIBCO listserv, June 2, 2006 11:30:59 AM, "Bib level i CONSER and BIBCO records"]

B. New Place of Publication Codes (008/15-17) and New Geographic Codes (043)

More precise Australian country codes and geographic codes (043) for specific states and territories have been added to the MARC bibliographic format. They may be used immediately. The country of publication code "at" and the geographic country code: "u-at" remain valid for Australia as a whole.

C. Character Set Changes (Basic Latin & Extended Latin)

Spacing characters may now be entered as characters on OCLC. Two of the most commonly used, the spacing underscore and spacing tilde, were approved as additions to the MARC bibliographic format in 1994, but since then, we have been directed to use the characters' hex values instead (%5F and %7E). Since uniform resource identifiers (URIs) frequently employ one or both of these characters, this has been a bit of a nuisance for most catalogers. OCLC cataloging interfaces are now accepting these characters, but they should not be used until revisions of the *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations [LCRIs]* 1.0E and 1.4F5 are posted on LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office's [CPSO's] website, which is expected to occur in early summer 2006. For more information, see: *Library of Congress Usage of New MARC 21 Characters Plus Processing Implications* on the web at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/newchar2.pdf (last revised 2006-04-04; last viewed, June 6, 2006) and: *Library of Congress Implementation of New MARC 21 Data Elements* at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/m21data.html (click on May 2006; rev. May 16, 2005; viewed June 7, 2006).

D. MARBI ALA Meeting in San Antonio, Jan. 2006

I attended my first MARBI meeting this past January 21-22, 2006. Attending the meeting were ten voting MARBI members representing different ALA constituencies, seventeen MARC Advisory Committee representatives and liaisons (including myself), three ex-officio members lending their vast experience, and about forty other attendees.

I will discuss in detail only a few of the papers, as the text of all the papers are available online via links on the MARC Development section of the MARC website at: http://www.loc.gov/marc/development.html. Minutes of the meeting are available directly at: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/mw-06.html.

MARC Discussion paper No. 2006-DP03 and *MARC Discussion paper No. 2006-DP08*

Of most general interest was *Discussion paper 2006-DP03: Incorporation of Former Headings into MARC 21 Authority Records*. In many cases, former headings are not allowed as cross references (MARC authority field 4xx's) in either the name or subject authority files, such as when a date or a qualifier is added to a former heading to resolve a conflict. Catalogers are supposed to delete this type of former heading from NACO authority records. However, it is useful for the information about the former heading to appear somewhere in the authority record. Two possible approaches were discussed: use of a 4XX field with control subfield $w coded to suppress the cross reference from public display, or defining a new field 683, which would appear as a note field. An advantage of the 4XX option is that it would assist in more accurate machine processing. But it would also be advantageous to have a special field dedicated to former headings.

A (made-up) example of the 683 approach:

    100 1# Prager, George, $d 1986-
    400 1# Prager, G. A. $q (George A.), $d 1986-
    683## Former heading: $a Prager, George [Date added to former heading to resolve conflict]

In the proposal, field 683 for former headings would be repeatable, and would include $a for the former heading, $i for explanatory text, $6 for linkage, and $8 for field link/sequence number.

No decision could be reached at the Jan. 2006 MARBI meeting, other than that a new discussion paper was needed. *MARC Discussion paper No. 2006-DP08* was issued on May 31, 2006, and will be discussed at the MARBI meetings held during the 2006 ALA Annual Meeting in New Orleans. It expands on the two options:

Defining new field 683: An additional $d (date of change) is suggested.

Using a 4xx field: The new DP (discussion paper) suggests using the first position in the $w control subfield ($w/0 = special relationship). Current values include: a (earlier heading), b (later heading), g (broader term), etc. It proposes adding value j for "invalid heading form." It also proposes revising the instructions for use of $i (reference instruction phrase) to indicate why the heading is invalid.

Example [from the discussion paper]:

    151## $a Venezuela $x Politics and government $y 1974-1999
    451## $w j $i Former heading (open date in period subdivision) $a Venezuela $x Politics and government $y 1974-

The new DP offers 2 additional options. The first option is to use new values in $w/1, /2, or /3. The second option is to define new authority format field 885, which would be similar to bibliographic field 886 (foreign MARC information). I don't see much difference between this approach and using the 683 field, but I'm not an expert on the use of field 886.

I like the 4xx field approach, with a new value j in subfield w/0, rather than the creation of either 683 or 885 fields. The only problem would be getting vendors to implement it properly.

For more background on this subject, see the 2003 PCC report: *The Final Report of the Task Group on the Function of the Authority File*, available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/scs/tgauthrpt_fin.pdf.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP-01 and *MARC Proposal No. 2006-06*

While these papers originated in the cartographic cataloging community, they have broader importance. Geospatial information systems (GIS) are becoming more important as tools for information retrieval in a variety of fields. Currently, MARC 21 bibliographic fields 034 and 255 are used in the cataloging of cartographic resources to clearly identify the location covered by using geographic coordinates. Searching by geographic coordinates can be a lot more precise than searching by other geographic information in the record, such as geographic subject headings (MARC fields 651 and 6xx $z) and MARC field 043. Additionally, coded language-neutral information such as geographic coordinates is advantageous for international bibliographic (and authority) record exchange. Some online catalogs have recently been able to use this data to assist patrons in information retrieval, but many (most?) do not. One reason is that items being cataloged, such as maps and other cartographic resources, sometimes do not give the coordinates, so that the cataloger would need to add the information from another source. Geographic coordinates for a particular place would be even more useful on an authority record, which could be linked to appropriate bibliographic records. For this reason, *Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP-01: Recording Geographic Coordinates in the MARC 21 Authority Format* (Dec. 16, 2005) proposes adding field 034 to the MARC authority format

to include this information on authority records for place names, geographic features, battles, buildings, etc. Adding this information to authority records would need to be a large cooperative project, involving both libraries and the geospatial community. At the ALA 2006 Midwinter MARBI Meeting, it was agreed that a proposal defining field 034 should be offered at the June meeting. *MARC Proposal No. 2006-06: Definition of Field 034 for Geographic Coordinates in the MARC 21 Authority Format* was issued in late May 2006, advocating the addition of field 034 to the MARC authority format. Field 034 should be repeatable, to allow for historical changes in coordinates, such as would apply for Sweden, Poland, etc. Two subfields ($x and $y) are also proposed, to specify the time period which applies to the coordinates.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP07: Recording Set Information for Multipart Cartographic Materials (June 1, 2006)
"Some map sets include thousands of sheets, each with unique sheet level data elements." Reading this line in the DP made me very relieved to be dealing with our mundane legal material, such as replacement volume sets!

MARC Proposal No. 2006-03: Standardized Terminology for Access Restrictions in Field 506 of the MARC21 Bibliographic Format
Field 506 is used to state that materials are unrestricted, or that they are restricted, or some variation thereof. To aid machine processing, it would be useful to have the basic distinction between restricted/unrestricted explicitly indicated by some kind of coding in the field. This paper proposes defining a first indicator as follows:

> \# No information provided
> 0 No restrictions
> 1 restrictions apply

It also adds a $f, which could be used whenever the note gives data about access restrictions from a standardized list, and a $2, giving the code for the name of the list. Because restrictions on access usually apply to local holdings or copies, field 506 is also proposed for the holdings format. No. 2006-03 was approved at the 2006 MARBI Midwinter meetings.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP04: Data Elements Needed to Ascertain Copyright Facts (June 1, 2006)
This paper suggests dedicating a single field to contain copyright information. It will be discussed at the June 2006 MARBI meetings, and I will go into greater detail about it in a future issue of *TSLL*.

MARC Proposal No. 2006-04 and MARC Proposal No. 2006-09
These papers dealt with the techniques of conversion of Unicode into MARC-8 in systems which can't handle Unicode records. No. 2006-04 approved a "lossy" technique (once in MARC-8, records cannot be re-converted to Unicode). This seems like a short-sighted approach, but was approved to serve the ostensible needs of a group of small libraries which have OPACs, but which don't typically send their records to other utilities or systems. MARC Proposal No. 2006-09 (May 31, 2006), to be discussed in the June 2006 meetings, offers the option of a "lossless" technique for conversion of Unicode to MARC-8.

MARC Proposal No. 2006-05, Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP05, and MARC Proposal No. 2006-08
These all deal with proposed changes in the MARC 21 Holdings Format to make it compatible with the ONIX (Online Information Exchange) for Serials standards. ONIX for Serials has been developed by EDItEUR, an international group for electronic commerce in the books and serials sectors, and NISO (National Information Standards Organization). Compatibility between the standards would allow for ONIX holdings, coverage, and other serials information to be loaded into MARC-based library OPACs. It is exciting to see this level of co-operation between these two metadata communities.

I have discussed most of the MARBI papers presented at the 2006 ALA Midwinter Meeting, and touched upon a few of the papers which are on the agenda of the June 2006 meetings. The Midwinter Meeting papers I haven't discussed include the following:

MARC Proposal No. 2006-01: Changes to Accommodate IAML Form/Genre Codes in Field 047 in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format (Dec. 16, 2005)
IAML [International Association of Music Libraries, Archives, and Documentation Centres] code list for form/genres contains more than 550 codes, compared to about seventy in MARC. For example, MARC has just the one code "rc" (Rock music), which has to represent not only rock music, but also reggae and many other types of world music. The IAML code list offers sixteen codes covering the same genres of music as covered by the one MARC code. Most IAML codes are three letters, but MARC codes are two letters. As the MARC bibliographic field 008/18-19 offers only two character positions, this proposal recommends the use of MARC field 047 rather than the 008 field, and some other related changes which would be necessary in coding of the 008/18-19 when only IAML codes are used. This proposal was approved as amended.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP02: Addition of Coded Value to 008 for Content Alerts (Dec. 16, 2005)
This paper discusses mechanisms to provide coded content alerts for visually impaired users of an OPAC or union catalog, similar to movie ratings. It was decided that it would be better to define a variable field, rather than an 008 field position for this purpose, so a new MARBI paper will need to be written presenting this option.

MARC Proposal No. 2006-02: Adding Subfields for Relator Terms to X11 Fields in the Bibliographic and Authority Formats (Dec. 16, 2005)
The $j (relator term) was approved.

Update No. 6 (Oct. 2005) to the MARC21 Formats
Update no. 6 (Oct. 2005) to the MARC21 formats was made available on May 25, 2006. These include changes made to the formats resulting from 2005 program proposals and meetings, most notable the addition of MARC bibliographic field 662:

Field 662 (Bibliographic Format: Subject Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name) examples:

    662## $b California $d Los Angeles $e Little Tokyo $2 gnis <thesaurus code>
    662## $g Mars $g Valles Marineris $2 Gazetteer of Planetary Nomenclature <thesaurus>

[Not yet implemented by the utilities, or even in Cataloger's Desktop, as of June 6, 2006; for further information, see *MARBI Proposal No. 2005-04/R*, dated May 27, 2005, and related papers.]

I think I've covered the basics. That's all for this issue.

Will There Be Magic in This Marriage? RLG to Merge With OCLC

OCLC

Pam Deemer
Emory University Law Library

Bullwinkle: "Watch me pull a rabbit out of my hat!"
Rocky: "That trick never works."
Bullwinkle: "This time for sure!"

How many people remember that little break scene in the old Rocky and Bullwinkle Show? The May 3 announcement that the RLG Board of Directors and the OCLC Board of Trustees recommended that RLG merge with OCLC, pending a positive vote by RLG members on June 7, brought that little dialog to my mind, because this isn't the first time such a merger was said to be in the works. When OCLC accomplished a merger in 1999 with WLN, which had 550 members and its own database, I seem to remember rumor had it that an RLG merger was also in the works around that time. The incompatibility of the databases that was a possible stumbling block then doesn't seem to be a deterrent this time around. It does seem like "This time for sure." [Just after this article was submitted, it was announced that the merger was officially approved by the RLG membership. Pam Deemer writes, "How OCLC will integrate the RLIN database is still being studied." Note the official announcement at the end of this column – *TSLL* editor]

In comparison to OCLC, RLG is a tiny organization. RLG has 150 research members, including libraries, museums, archives, and historical societies, while OCLC has a mix of all types and sizes of libraries numbering around 54,000. RLG has around 80 employees; OCLC, over 1,100.

RLG has been very innovative, despite its size, and for a long while had a more esoteric collection of titles. It implemented non-Roman script characters before OCLC did. Emory is an OCLC shop, but whenever I can't find a title in a non-English language on OCLC, I try RLIN. Nowadays, though, many libraries represented in RLIN also are in WorldCat. The RLG conspectus has been used by many OCLC libraries to evaluate and build their collections.

One impetus for the merger is both OCLC and RLG often explore the same technological and information delivery projects. RLG's non-redundant projects supposedly will be continued as divisions of OCLC.

OCLC did warn us of a large, rapid growth in the number of records in WorldCat before the merger proposal was announced. Other than the fact that they will have more records available for copy cataloging and perhaps more databases and products to purchase, what the ultimate merger impact on OCLC members will be is not yet clear. In mergers, all sides may have prices to pay, literally and figuratively.

According to the RLG Web page of FAQs on the merger, techies at OCLC are still studying the problem of how to incorporate RLIN's cluster records into OCLC's master record structure. I know catalogers who use RLIN will not be happy to be forced to edit incomplete OCLC master records and will think longingly about the clusters and the choices the clusters offered to fit their particular libraries' needs. Although the RLG members have yet to vote as of this writing, it does appear the merger will take place, whatever the catalogers' opinions. Like OCLC, RLG is much more than a provider of a union catalog. There may be too many advantages on the technology and research databases sides for a negative vote on the merger. We'll see if the expected rabbit comes out of the hat.

G's web page of FAQs regarding the merger: http://www.rlg.org/en/page.php?Page_ID=20944
OCLC's web page of FAQs: http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/oclcrlgfaq.htm
OCLC's press release on the merger: http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200618.htm

In other news: Yes! *OCLC Technical Bulletin 252* is available and does confirm that new practices for integrating resources, including our long awaited BLvl I, will be implemented in Connexion in June. What was the Serials workform is now the Continuing Resources workform. Data conversion will be gradual. This summer at AALL on Tuesday morning, Glenn Patton from OCLC will discuss this, other enhancements to Connexion, WorldCat Collection Analysis, and MARC holdings implementation in WorldCat. Sunday, after the TS-SIS business meeting, he will join an RLG representative to discuss the merger. We can further discuss these developments at our official OCLC Committee meeting Wednesday afternoon.

◇◇

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MERGER

To: RLG Member Representatives — Please Share With Your Staff
Subject: Vote Results on RLG-OCLC Combination

The RLG Board and I are pleased to report that the RLG membership voted in favor of the proposed merger with OCLC. As of July 1, we will begin to operate as RLG-Programs, a unit of the OCLC Programs and Research Division. Integration of RLG services into the OCLC service array will begin at that time.

Before we shift our focus and energies to the transition into the future I think it's important to reflect on our past, which we've been privileged to share with you.

RLG was founded in 1974 with the express goal of reducing institutional costs of acquisitions, shared cataloging, preservation, resource sharing, and communications. We met that goal over time in many ways and for many constituencies by blending managed collaboration and innovative service provision. This combination of an operational capacity with your willingness to work jointly has delivered a legacy of progress. Here are just a few of the many extraordinary things we achieved together:

- We built a catalog of remarkable breadth and depth that met the essential management needs of librarians and archivists which grew to the point where it also met the research information needs of students and scholars.
- We built a trusted global community of institutions who borrow and loan materials so that researchers could do their work better.
- We took on the brittle paper challenge and collectively managed the preservation of thousands of at-risk volumes and saved them for the future.
- We helped our community gain deeper understandings of research collections and how collecting patterns could influence collaborative collection development.
- We fundamentally redefined the description and discovery of primary resources and changed the way users of original source materials sought and made use of the rare, the special, and the unique.
- We created communities of interest, professional associations, and interactions that transformed careers and informed a generation of library leaders.

Everything that we've done took research and scholarship as its starting point. Expanding access to research resources is the bigger goal that has informed our agenda for these 32 years across huge shifts in technology, audiences, economics, expectations, and institutional roles. You judged the work important as evidenced by the continuing growth and globalization of the membership. And you supported the work with your funding, energy, engagement, and effort.

More than a generation of RLG and member institution staff have much to be proud of. By combining the RLG ethos and experience with OCLC's capacities and practices, current staff and members will have even more to look forward to.

At RLG's 25th Anniversary meeting I said that our job was to "see the future and make it work" for research and scholarship. Our reason for existence is to help research institutions face and manage the transformational challenges. With your support we've now chosen to transform the organization so that it can most effectively address those challenges. We look forward to working with your institution in our new form as a renewed collective for research institutions.

Honor the past accomplishments by taking a look at our timeline. Read our Prospectus at the RLG website and come to the Annual Meeting next week ready to start shaping our future.

Sincerely,

Jim Michalko
President

Take Me to Your LDRs!

<div align="right">

PRESERVATION

</div>

Teresa Parker-Bellamy
Regent University Law Library

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond Law Library

It might be difficult for anyone to respond affirmatively to this command. Most of the libraries in this small Virginia-based library survey, conducted by Teresa Parker-Bellamy and Sally Wambold, planned to recycle or otherwise dispose of their paper copies of local data records of serials. This preliminary survey was prompted by a question by Teresa about the disposition of paper LDRs. Conducting a limited survey was a way to begin investigating the topic of LDRs and also the new process on the OCLC CONNEXION Browser of Local Holdings Maintenance. Teresa and Sally hope to move on to investigate the procedures of the libraries in the Southeastern region of the country in order to increase the number of libraries in the study in order to transition to a second paper. Law school libraries in Virginia and the university libraries at the same institution were the population for this brief survey. The questions asked included the following:

1. What have you done or are you doing with your Local Data Records (LDRs) now that Local Holdings Maintenance has replaced the Union List of Serials in OCLC?
2. Do you keep paper records as well as electronic ones?
3. Have you adapted to Local Holdings Maintenance on the CONNEXION Browser? In other words, are you using it routinely and with ease, or are you learning Local Holdings Maintenance procedures at this time?
4. Have you uploaded your MARC holdings from your local system to OCLC or do you plan to do so? Does Local Holdings Maintenance on the CONNEXION Browser work well with your local system?

A query was also sent to OCLC to get a sense of the state of holdings on OCLC. This was the response:

"Actually, what I'm seeing is a renewed interest in keeping the data up on OCLC to take advantage of the automated deflection capabilities. We have had a lot of interest in the batch update capabilities so that the data in their local system can be used to update their local holdings in OCLC." (Myrtle Myers at OCLC)

Regarding question number 1, here are the answers about Local Data Records in response to the introduction of Local Holdings Maintenance:

- We continue to update information as needed. (Kevin Butterfield at the College of William and Mary School of Law Library)
- We have done nothing at this time. (Rekha Pandya at George Mason University School of Law)
- We have not started to use LHM at this point but have begun to review the tutorials for the LHM in OCLC. (Teresa Parker-Bellamy at Regent University Law Library)
- We have not started to use LHM yet, but we have looked at the tutorials. (Sally Wambold at the University of Richmond Law Library)
- We have begun updating our local holdings records, as needed, and adding new ones, including catching up from a period of several years when we did none. (John Bissett at Washington and Lee University Law School Library)
- We'll be getting our holdings info from our Voyager catalog, putting them in an Excel® file, and sending the file to OCLC, so they can bulk load our holdings. (Polly Khater at George Mason University Library)
- We will continue to maintain our LDRs now that LHM has replaced the OCLC Union List. (David Badertscher at Washington and Lee Leyburn Library)
- We have not yet done anything. (Allison Sleeman at Alderman Library of the University of Virginia)

Regarding question number 2, the responses discussing retention of paper records were as follows:

- No. (Kevin Butterfield at the College of William and Mary School of Law Library)
- No, we keep online only. (Rekha Pandya at George Mason University School of Law)
- We currently have the paper copies of all of our local data records, but as we add call numbers to our periodicals, we are discarding them. (Teresa Parker-Bellamy at Regent University Law Library)
- No, we do not keep paper copies of the local data records. (Sally Wambold at the University of Richmond Law Library)
- Only the periodically available lists from OCLC, as they are helpful in checking a title quickly. (John Bissett at Washington and Lee University Law School Library)
- Not anymore, we used to up to five or so years ago. (Polly Khater at George Mason University Library)
- No [we do not keep paper records anymore]. (David Badertscher at Washington and Lee Leyburn Library)
- No, we keep paper records only until we add the information electronically; we do not retain the paper ones after that. (Allison Sleeman at Alderman Library of the University of Virginia)

Question 3 addressed the status quo of libraries in working with the new OCLC process, Local Holdings Maintenance in the CONNEXION Browser. The responses included:

- Adapted with ease. (Kevin Butterfield at the College of William and Mary School of Law Library)
- No, we are waiting to take a workshop where we can get actual hands-on before doing anything. We are planning to eventually. (Rekha Pandya at George Mason University School of Law)
- We are learning LHM at this time. I have reviewed the tutorials available on OCLC but have not begun to input information. We will be using it routinely as we did with the ULS. (Teresa Parker-Bellamy at Regent University Law Library)
- We use the MARC holdings in our local system, Voyager/Endeavor. (Sally Wambold at the University of Richmond Law Library)
- It appears that our processing technician is using it routinely. (John Bissett at Washington and Lee University Law School Library)
- We are going to learn how to use LHM; Bridget will be attending a training class in June. But, we'll probably always bulk load once a year, rather than update a few titles at a time. (Polly Khater at George Mason University Library)
- I participated in a SOLINET online class on LHM. Our serials cataloger is doing the additions/changes for LHM. We have some questions about complex holdings that we would like to have clarified, but otherwise we are using LHM more or less routinely now! (David Badertscher at Washington and Lee Leyburn Library)
- We are just beginning to learn the Local Holdings Maintenance procedures; we started today [i.e., May 11, 2006]. (Allison Sleeman at Alderman Library of the University of Virginia)

Finally Question 4 asked about uploading MARC holdings from a local system and also asked how compatible the library local system is with OCLC's new Local Holdings Maintenance. Here are the answers to these crucial questions:

- No. (Kevin Butterfield at the College of William and Mary School of Law Library)
- No we have not, but I believe that the Associate Law Librarian plans to do so. (Rekha Pandya at George Mason University School of Law)
- No, we have not done so. At this point, we are not sure how it all works. (Teresa Parker-Bellamy at Regent University Law Library)
- No. We are not sure if it is compatible with our local system, Voyager/Endeavor. (Sally Wambold at the University of Richmond Law Library)
- We do not plan to, since we are only interested in it for regional union listing. (John Bissett at Washington and Lee University Law School Library)
- We last uploaded our MARC holdings in 2002, I think, with OCLC converting our holdings data. We haven't used LHM yet, in terms of how well it works/will work with Voyager. (Polly Khater at George Mason University Library)
- No [we have not uploaded MARC holdings and compatibility with our local system is not applicable]. (David Badertscher at Washington and Lee Leyburn Library)
- We have not yet done so; we are not sure that this capability exists. We might discuss this in the future. Many of our holdings records would need to be cleaned up to do it. (Allison Sleeman at Alderman Library of the University of Virginia)

Before concluding, a further word about the experience of Polly Khater at George Mason will add some interesting information. As noted in the responses above, George Mason batch loaded its local holdings with an Excel® spreadsheet.

Information about this procedure can be found on the OCLC website at: http://www.oclc.org/batchprocessing/options/holdings/localdatarecords/dataspecifications.htm

Polly Khater further noted that she contacted her regional network, SOLINET, for clarification. Requirements for processing holdings records are quite specific. If holdings records do not meet the requirements, patterned non-MARC holdings data is an option. Excel® spreadsheets, Access® databases and Word® documents are all ways to implement this patterned non-MARC holdings data option. If it is to be successful, "field descriptions and their content must be associated in a simple, consistent, discernible and predictable way across the entire file." More info at: http://www.oclc.org/batchprocessing/options/holdings/localdatarecords/dataspecifications.htm. Earlier in this survey, the response of Allison Sleeman at the University of Virginia indicated that Alderman Library holdings records would require substantial cleanup. The OCLC website section referenced here makes it quite clear that such cleanup could easily be a necessity.

This brief survey gives a microcosm of the responses of libraries to Local Holdings Maintenance. Yet it shows what some highly reputable libraries are doing and can help others of us to plan our response to this new procedure. The survey of the Southeastern libraries will be a much larger project and the comparison to the Virginia libraries will be very interesting to discover.

Print vs. Electronic: A Collection Development Dilemma

PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES

Mary Rose
Bryan Cave LLP

Law titles are increasingly available in both print and electronic formats. Collection development librarians are faced with the task of deciding whether to maintain both formats or to choose only one. This article explores some of the factors that enter into these decisions.

From the literature…
In her excellent article, "Electronic Resources or Print Resources: Some Observations on Where to Search" (*Perspectives: Teaching Legal Research and Writing* 14(1) (Fall 2005)), Barbara Bintliff compares the relative merits of print and electronic formats for different types of legal research.

Bintliff observes that electronic resources outperform print in terms of speed and efficiency for highly specific searches. She also notes that electronic formats are superior for delivering news since the time lags associated with print updates are eliminated.

Bintliff asserts that print resources are better for researching broad concepts because indexes and tables of contents place topics in context, allowing for an easier broadening and narrowing of the research focus. In addition to context, indexes provide a controlled vocabulary for searching, which is helpful when a search concept has many synonyms. Bintliff acknowledges that some electronic resources include indexes and tables of contents but notes that they are usually very awkward to use. She also observes that consulting and comparing multiple sources or sections at the same time is much easier using print resources.

From the trenches…
As the Collection Management Librarian for Bryan Cave Library and Research Services in St. Louis, Susan von Schrader wrestles with format choices on a regular basis. In the following interview, I asked her to share her thoughts about what she takes into consideration when evaluating the relative merits of print and electronic formats.

Q: Do you notice any demographic patterns in attorneys' preference for print or electronic formats? Do certain age groups prefer one or the other?

A: When I first came to the firm, the younger attorneys seemed to prefer the electronic format whereas the "seasoned" attorneys continued to use print materials. I don't think that distinction is as strong as it used to be. We put a great emphasis on training—both by library staff and by vendors—and the more comfortable attorneys feel with the electronic databases, the more they use them.

Q: Do you often decide to subscribe to a particular publication in both electronic and print formats? If so, why?

A: Sometimes we do subscribe to both electronic and print formats of a publication. Often the decision is based on how the electronic product is "packaged." For instance, a contract for an electronic subscription may prohibit the cancellation of current print subscriptions. But then the print subscriptions are discounted to a degree that having both formats is not cost prohibitive.

An advantage in having both formats of a newsletter or journal, for example, is that the attorneys who prefer a hard copy have that available to them. But once the periodical is no longer current we may choose to discard it (thus freeing up shelf space) while relying on the electronic archives for back issues.

Another advantage of having a title in two formats is that if the print copy is in use (or missing!) the material can still be accessed electronically. Conversely if a website or computer system goes down, the print copy is available for attorneys to use.

Q: Do you think that the Bryan Cave library will eventually become a "paperless" library, in which the library's "holdings" are all electronic?

A: As more titles become available electronically and assuming the cost is affordable, I can imagine purchasing fewer books and print subscriptions. The cost of real estate (read: library and shelf space) is, in part, causing the "shrinking library" that so many librarians are experiencing. Attorneys will have less need to come to a physical library as more products become available on their desktops and business can be conducted via Blackberrys, online, etc. I don't think the time is near that we'll be completely paperless. But I do see that trend continuing.

In summary…
It is clear that electronic resources are inherently better than their print counterparts for the delivery of time-sensitive information. When it comes to usability, electronic resources still need some improvements to match traditional print. Effective training can help users transfer from print to electronic formats. Relative cost is one of the biggest factors affecting the print versus electronic decision. Cost comparisons are complicated by publisher packaging and the "hidden" costs of processing, maintaining, and housing print resources.

We are in an uncomfortable transitional stage. But I predict that while the manipulation of electronic resources will never offer the sentimental pleasures of print, it will someday effectively mimic all of print's practical advantages. Attorneys will become uniformly technology-savvy in the foreseeable future. More and more publishers will abandon print production in favor of electronic replacements, a phenomenon that has already begun. And eventually the paperless law firm library will be born.

Drano for the Braino

Chris Long
Ruth Lilly Law Library
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis

There I was once again, staring at a cursor on the white space of a fresh Word document. The cursor blinked impatiently, as if it wanted to say, "Well, are you going to write something or not?" Heck yeah, I am going to write something. I just don't know *what*. Like every writer does occasionally, I was struggling with a major case of writer's block. With a deadline looming, I had to think of a topic, and fast. But the well was dry.

And then it struck me. Why not make my predicament the subject of my column? I mean, I'm not the only one who sometimes needs to run a plumber's snake through the old cranium. There are surely some tips out there on how to thaw out a frozen brain — and so a column is born. Here are some suggestions I have compiled on how to overcome writer's block.

Write every day
One thing that leads to writer's block is a tendency towards perfectionism. We often don't want to put anything down on paper until it's just right. One way to kick-start the writing process is to simply keep a notebook handy so you can jot down thoughts as they come to mind. They do not have to be profound, nor do they have to be complete sentences. But by making writing a habit, an everyday occurrence, even if it is just random, incomplete thoughts, the writing process becomes less intimidating.

Boost your confidence
Do not be discouraged because the words are not flowing freely; many authors have found writing hard. Remind yourself that you have written before. Even if you have not yet published anything, you could not have made it through college and graduate school without being able to write. Do not succumb to writer's amnesia and forget that you have already proven your ability to express yourself with words. As B.M. Peters put it, "Remind yourself that the fact you are blocked means you are a writer with ideas, even if they are not yet expressed in writing."

Listen to music
Ann Reeves points out that background music can ease our creative anxieties. Clinical psychologists suggest that certain types of music, like Baroque music in largo tempo, are more soothing than others. You want to achieve a state where your mind is freed up. That may mean that the music you use for this is not the same kind you listen to for fun. Find the style that works for you; even 15 minutes might help.

Get yourself out of a rut
Shake things up a little bit. If you are paralyzed at the keyboard, try actually writing with a pen in your hand. If you are stifled in your office, take a notepad outside, retreat to a computer lab, or commandeer a study room. If you normally write during the day, try writing at night. A little change in routine may break up the logjam in your head.

Do absolutely nothing
Peters suggests, "If words won't come, be stubborn. Sit at your desk with notebook and pens or at your typewriter or word processor. No stereo, magazine, or telephone calls allowed. Write something, anything. Don't move until you do."

Write a letter
Not a letter that you are actually going to send, but a letter that will jumpstart your brain. Bryon Cahill says that a letter is the most intimate form of writing, and that when we are writing to a friend or relative the words often flow so constantly that our hands get cramped. Try to get into that same groove by explaining the project that has been percolating in your brain to an imaginary friend.

Break it up
Maybe you are blocked because you are trying to tackle a big project all in one go. Break the task up into smaller pieces. A few incremental successes will start to build a momentum that will carry you over the rough spots.

Reward yourself
Building on the above suggestion, promise yourself a treat after you have completed a piece of your project. Go to a movie or do lunch with a friend after you have written a few pages. Think about how good it is going to feel when you are done, and promise yourself a big treat when the work is finished.

Exercise
Charles Dickens loved to roam the streets of London when he needed inspiration. Give your mind something different to do by jogging, taking a walk, going for a swim, hopping on a bike, or any other physical activity you like to do. A healthy body feeds a healthy mind.

Get help from colleagues
Writing tends to be a solitary experience for most of us, and most writers prefer it that way. But too much solitude can lead to isolation, which can make you feel that your project is a huge burden, sap your energy, and even lead to depression. So take a walk down the hallway and bounce a few ideas off your co-workers. Maybe they will have some ideas that will give you a different perspective. Or maybe just hearing yourself talk about your problem out loud will start an avalanche of ideas, or at least knock a few pebbles down the hillside.

Vary your reading
Writers tend to be readers and they get many of their ideas from what they have read. If nothing is flowing out of the pump anymore, maybe you need to prime it with new ideas. This may require a drastic change. Read more about non-technical services issues in librarianship. Go beyond librarianship and read some of the literature in related disciplines, or extend yourself even beyond that and read about what is happening in areas with which you have little or no familiarity. You never know from where your next big idea will come.

Give yourself time
All of these suggestions presuppose that you have given yourself enough time to do your best writing. While some people feel they work better under pressure, procrastination tends to have a paralyzing effect on our work. Plan a timeline for your project, set a deadline, and build enough time into your plan to allow for those creative dry spells.

None of these suggestions will work for everyone, and writers may have to try different solutions during different seasons in their lives. Hopefully, though, some of these tips will work for you the next time the blinking cursor gets impatient.

References

Cahill, Bryon. "Overcome Writer's Block … Write a Letter." *Writing* 27, no. 5 (Feb./Mar. 2005): 22-24.
Peters, B.M. "You Can Outwit Writer's Block." *Writer* 103, no. 12 (December 1990): 28-29.
Reeves, Ann. "Writer's Block? What Writer's Block?" *Communication World* 15, no. 5 (April/May 1998): 30-31.
Skinner, Jeffrey and Stephen Phillip Policoff. "Writer's Block—And What to Do About It." *Writer* 107, no. 11 (Nov. 1994): 21-24.

Research Roundtable at St. Louis

I hope you are able to come to the Research Roundtable in St. Louis. This year it will be held on Tuesday, July 11, from 9:00 to 10:00 AM. Paul Healey, editorial director of *AALL Spectrum,* will be there to share some insights, and as always there will be time to share your own project ideas and discuss research concerns.

Signing Off

This will be my last Research and Publications column and I would be remiss if I did not thank Brian Striman, Ellen McGrath, Galen Fletcher, and Joe Thomas for their constant support and encouragement over the last few years. Thanks also to the readers for bearing with me. Much of what I wrote was a sermon to myself, but I hope you found a few things that motivated you too.

[Editor's note: Chris Long has been a valuable contributor to our profession with his years as columnist, including all the other contributions he makes. Chris, we all applaud your commitment and energy to keep plugging away and beating the research and publication drum.]

Special Guest Author

NASIG IN THE "MILE HIGH" CITY
"MILE HIGH VIEWS: SURVEYING THE SERIALS VISTA"

SERIAL ISSUES

Karen Douglas
Duke University School of Law

I attended a NASIG (North Atlantic Serials Interest Group) conference for the first time this May. I probably would have attended sooner had I known what was in store for me, but I wasn't too happy about having to live in a college dorm room while attending the conference. Before 2004, the meeting was held on college campuses around the country. The meeting is now held at a hotel.

The mission of NASIG is "to promote communication, information and continuing education about serials and the broader issues of scholarly communication." In a manner vastly different than other conferences I have attended, this year's conference, held in Denver, proceeded to do just that.

The NASIG conference is very casual. There were no business suits there. Everyone was dressed in jeans, t-shirts and other casual attire. There were no formal exhibits. Vendors were in attendance, but you couldn't tell them from anyone else. It was much easier to talk to them about issues when you were both sitting in chairs, rather than having them in booths.

The conference was divided into several types of sessions. The description of the session types and the purpose of the organization are taken from the NASIG annual conference web page at: http://nasig.org/public/conferences.html. Pre-conferences cover similar content to those at an AALL meeting. This year's pre-conferences included SCCTP Basic and Advanced Serials Cataloging, with law librarian Joe Hinger presenting "Basic Serials Cataloging," and "How to Implement an Institutional Repository," by Carol Hixson, one of our speakers for this year's Annual Meeting.

There were three vision sessions, one to start each day. These are plenary sessions in no-conflict slots which "deal with the larger universe of ideas and issues that may influence the serials world." The first vision session, presented by Robin Sloan, dealt with the future of libraries and scholarly communication. He presented some amusing but scary scenarios, ending with the demise of the *NY Times* online and all information and news being provided solely by "Googlezon," a combination of Google and Amazon. The other vision sessions covered the digitization of Colorado's Historic Newspaper Collection and the morphing of monographs and serials into digital databases, and how that will affect our jobs.

There were four sets of strategy sessions during the conference. Each session in a set was presented twice on two different days to allow participants to attend as many sessions as possible. Strategy sessions cover specific concepts and theories and their effects on multiple segments of the serials world including publishers, vendors, service providers and librarians. Strategy sessions covered such topics as "FRBR in the Real World," open access journals in the OPAC, "The UC JSTOR Repository: Progress Thus Far," open URLS, journal pricing, the status of scholarly communications, and the future of ERM (electronic resource management).

There were also four sets of tactics sessions during the conference. Each session in a set was presented twice on two different days to allow participants to attend as many sessions as possible. Tactics sessions are "how to do it" programs which "address day to day issues and generally deal with one or two practical aspects of the serials world." Topics covered included providing the best access for library patrons to electronic resources, using established workflows to handle electronic resources, tech services reorganization, best practices for serials record management, blogs, wikis and podcasts, and electronic resource management.

Conference attendees use every minute of the day to network and exchange information at the NASIG conference. There are even special sessions held during the lunch hour on the Saturday of the conference. Informal discussion groups "promoting interaction among NASIG attendees who have a shared interest in a topic, idea, workflow or problem" are held during the lunch hour, with a separate location for each topic. Topics of interest this year included : the decision to buy a link resolver, the value of digitized journal backfiles, disaster planning, non-academic libraries, and implementing a MARC record service.

User Group lunches were held at the same time. The purpose of these lunches is "to share product implementation or development experiences and ideas." This is an opportunity for users and vendors alike to exchange ideas without getting or giving a sales pitch. Link resolver companies, such as Serials Solutions and SFX, and ILS vendors, such as Innovative and Endeavor, and representatives from SCCTP participated in these lunch sessions.

In lieu of vendor exhibits, NASIG presents a "Focused Vendor Demo Session." Each year a different type of vendor is chosen. Vendors providing a specific serials-related service are invited to answer questions about how their products can handle certain needs of libraries. The demo session is set up like a program. Each vendor is given 15-20 minutes to describe its services. A question-and-answer session follows. This year several subscription vendors described their services for libraries, with emphasis on electronic subscriptions. Representatives from Basch Subscriptions, Ebsco, Harrassowitz and Swets made presentations. A handout was distributed to attendees describing the services of each vendor, including links to their websites for further information.

This conference was not all work. There were planned social events, such as a first-timer reception, tours, a trip to a Colorado Rockies baseball game, dinners and an art galleries walk. The opening dinner was held at Red Rocks Visitor Center in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. The views were breathtaking. The thing I enjoyed most about the tours and social events was that they didn't conflict with programs or meetings.

I was very impressed with this conference. It was well planned. There was not nearly the conflict problem that I usually experience at other conferences, since sessions were repeated. The grouping of the sessions was very helpful in determining what programs to attend. There were a number of law librarians in attendance at the conference. I believe I can speak for them in saying that this was a very useful conference. For technical services librarians that need in-depth presentations and discussions of all things serial, NASIG is a must. I'll be back next year. If you can't attend, proceedings of the conference are published annually in *Serials Librarian*. For members of NASIG, proceedings can be found on their web page.

Christina Tarr
University of California, Berkeley

Margaret McDonald
University of San Diego

The following serial title changes were recently identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library cataloging staff:

American Bar Association.
ABA awards and grants listing
-2005
(OCoLC 46636478)
Changed to:
American Bar Association.
ABA awards listing
2006-
(OCoLC 67767182)

Cardozo women's law journal
Vol. 1, no. 1 (1993)-v. 11, no. 3
(summer 2005)
(OCoLC 28823602)
Changed to:
Cardozo journal of law & gender
Vol. 12, no. 1 (fall 2005)-
(OCoLC 69671162)

Corporate legal times
Ceased in 2005
(OCoLC 24874596)

Changed to:
Inside counsel (Chicago, Ill.)
Jan. 2006-
(OCoLC 62771511)

Lawyer's weekly USA
-Apr. 10, 2006
(OCoLC 27930193)
Changed to:
Lawyers USA
Apr. 24, 2006-
(OCoLC 67836920)
Vanderbilt journal of entertainment law & practice
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1999)-v. 7, no. 3
(summer 2005)
(OCoLC 41601927)
Changed to:
Vanderbilt journal of entertainment and technology law
Vol. 8, no. 1 (winter 2005)-
(OCoLC 64714998)

World e-commerce & intellectual property report
Vol. 1, issue 1 (Oct. 2000)-v. 5, no. 12
(Dec. 2005)
(OCoLC 45295344)

Merged with:
World Internet law report
Vol. 1, issue 1 (Sept. 1999)-v. 6, issue 12 (Dec. 2005)
(OCoLC 42788219);
And:
World telecom law report
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Sept. 1997)-v. 8, no. 12
(Dec. 2005)
(OCoLC 38837873)
To form:
World communications regulation report
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 2006)-
(OCoLC 63204836)

The following serial cessations were identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library acquisitions staff:

None this issue. Sorry!

Is there a future for subject cataloging? We have nothing to lose but our bananas.

Aaron Wolfe Kuperman

The future of cataloging.
An item arrives in the library. It is sent for cataloging. A monkey (cute furry beast with a tail that works for bananas), perhaps assisted by a simple robot, scans the cover and the first few pages including the title page and the table of contents. Books are shelved by accession number, and a catalog record is machine generated from the scanned data. Users then can "google" (assume that by this time the word has become generic and therefore lost trademark protection) the record using keywords. At most, a few "catalogers" will be left to take care of the monkeys, but this will probably be outsourced to work-study students earning sub-minimal wages. **Is this our future?**

LC proposals.
In March, the Library of Congress released a report written for LC by Karen Calhoun (a senior manager at Cornell University libraries) which among other things discussed discontinuing LCSH (a.k.a. subject access through controlled vocabulary), and relying of keyword access to the text (the report seems to believe that full text will be available, something that is

very unlikely for commercially produced legal literature). While perhaps this could be considered a "trial balloon," past experience with large bureaucracies suggests that when management studies a hypothesis, it means that management has already decided on the wisdom of adopting the hypothetical policy, and any further discussion or research is solely for the purpose of ratifying management's decision.

Shortly thereafter the Library of Congress Professional Guild (technically a union but with very limited bargaining rights since LC is a federal agency, and in many ways more of a professional association) released an eloquent rebuttal by Dr. Thomas Mann, probably one of the leading advocates of quality cataloging, and a working reference librarian rather than a manager. Perhaps to illustrate its decision-making methodology, in late April LC announced on a few-days notice that it would stop making series authority records, and while the public outcry (including unprecedented resolutions from ALA and AALL) delayed the change, as of June 1st LC discontinued series authority records.

It is not for me, being primarily a subject cataloger, to discuss the changes to series authorities. I should point out that any skilled searcher using an OPAC which (like LC's OPAC) allows for searching all 4xx and 8xx fields simultaneously in keyword searches, phrase searching within keyword searches, and both keyword and phrase searching of the 260 field, can pretty much locate works of a series as long as the series doesn't change its name or have multiple names. If a series does change its name, or has multiple names not all of which appear on all items (not uncommon in multilingual countries), it will be impossible to retrieve all works in a series regardless of the cleverness of the searcher or the power of the OPAC.

In defense of LC management, it is under pressure to reduce cataloging costs, and it appears that the cost and delay of cataloging is a function of descriptive rather than subject cataloging (though perhaps it should try cutting costs by making descriptive authority records only when a conflict exists or a name changes). Also, LC's collection is almost exclusively closed stacks, and its "official" user population consists of the 500+ members of Congress, all of whom are served by skilled professional researchers. While most librarians "beyond the beltway" might disagree, LC is NOT the "national library," is not required to "catalog for the nation," and is not funded for servicing anyone's collections other than its own. When an institution buys an LC MARC record, it pays for distribution costs of that record, not the cost of the cataloging that went into the record.

The bottom line.
Will we switch to a system in which "cataloging" involves no authorities: not the late series authorities (RIP?), nor name, nor subject authorities, and no classification? The title page and other primary sources of information (e.g. table of contents) will be scanned by technicians (not librarians), and the user will be left to his/her own devices. Librarians will no longer be tasked with facilitating scholarship, but merely with keeping the dust off increasingly inaccessible books. Skilled users will be annoyed but will get used to it. Unskilled users will be unable to find what they are looking for, but won't realize what they are missing. Library managers will be happy not to have to bother with cataloging. In fact, research libraries will be moving towards becoming museum-like archives rather than working centers of research serving communities of scholars.

If an author doesn't use what the user considers standard keywords, the user will need to rely on bibliographies, references, or trying to guess which keywords appear on the title page. Users will need to understand that, for example, African American Gays were once Negro Homosexuals, and if you go far enough back, Colored Sodomites. Users will need to understand that scientists discussing birds observed in Palestine, and scientists discussing birds observed in Israel, are discussing the same birds (this being a key place for studying avian flu, due to migratory birds who are willfully oblivious to political realities on the ground). Users will have to know the "Crown" is the same as the "Administration" or the "Executive", and that "Torts" are really "Delicts." Anyone interested in works in languages other than English will have to know those languages (as if most Americans care what "furriners" think -- perhaps we can insist that other countries produce their legal literature in English rather than in their own obscure vernaculars).

Even within the United States, different groups use different terminology. A "red" American believes a major issue is the battle between the "pro-life" and the "pro-abortion" movements, whereas a "blue" believes the fight is between "pro-choice" and "anti-abortion" factions. What a "pro-family" policy is varies greatly depending on which side of the red/blue divide one inhabits. Even between states, "Cooperative" and "Condominium" have different definitions, and both have meanings outside the area of housing law. Currently, it falls on LCSH (i.e. catalogers) to bear the burden of dealing with terminology whose meaning varies according to circumstances, jurisdiction or time period. Of course, users who only want to find materials supporting their position will be content with a system that denies them access to materials reflecting different perspectives. Traditionally, law librarians were supposed to refer users to all materials on the subject, which the legal researcher manipulates to support the client's position.

There are some suggestions that classification could continue without subject headings. From an LC perspective, this would be silly, except for miniscule collections in the reading rooms, the collection is kept in closed stacks. While Classweb has

transformed the LC shelflist into a powerful tool for subject retrieval (e.g. combining a keyword search, but limiting it to a single range of class numbers), most public service librarians don't understand this, and I suspect the proponents of dumbing down cataloging don't fully appreciate how Classweb links subject headings including UF references with class numbers. At LC and perhaps elsewhere, assigning subject headings and LC class numbers is a single process including book analysis (perhaps 60%), assigning subject headings (20%), assigning a class number based on the first subject heading (10%), and the physical process of entering the subject data into the bibliographic record (10%). There won't be any substantial savings in dropping LCSH unless LCC is also dropped. If the references of LCSH need to be incorporated into LCC, there will probably be no savings at all.

There are ways to make subject cataloging better and cheaper. One might be to avoid setting up descriptive authorities (including 600 and 610 headings) unless needed to resolve a conflict. My favorite suggestions include more flexible rules on "Law and legislation," time periods, and perhaps use of foreign subject headings (though if LC abandons the concept of subject cataloging, most of the library world will probably be forced to as well).

Alternatives.
What are the alternatives? Convincing the "powers that be" to preserve traditional cataloging may be hopeless. If you limit your "universe" to English language works serving "mainstream" users (or at least users with a common perception of what is "politically correct"), much of subject cataloging isn't really needed. Most popular works, fiction and non-fiction, can be adequately served by keyword access to the primary sources of information. Serious scholars interested in material from diverse time periods, diverse cultures and countries, and diverse languages basically will be "screwed" by the changes that dumb down cataloging, but they generally lack the clout to do anything about it.

Law libraries serve legal scholars, who have all the same needs as scholars in the humanities, but unlike our benighted brethren, have the influence to do something about it. The key point is to convince the managers of our law libraries ("our bosses") why they need "real" cataloging, and to insist that it survive regardless of what is done by LC to the bulk of its cataloging. As it is, the rules governing subject and descriptive cataloging of legal materials are full of exceptions from generally accepted practices, so there is a precedent for law cataloging following a different path. The law cataloging community can insist on maintaining standards of subject cataloging (and classification and descriptive cataloging) independent of what the rest of the profession does. We must act now. We have nothing to lose but our bananas.

TECHSCANS

Corinne Jacox, column editor

Contributing Authors: Marlene Bubrick, Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Yumin Jiang, Ellen McGrath, Andrea Rabbia, Patricia Turpening

Acquisitions/Collection Development

Suggestions to E-Journal Publishers
Cook, Eleanor. "It's Never Too Late: 10 New Year's Resolutions to Suggest to Publishers of E-Journals." *Against the Grain* 18, no. 2 (April 2006): 70-73.
A light-hearted list of common complaints librarians have about licensing and managing electronic resources. Entries include "Put your licenses on a diet" and "Send/post/display lists of titles in true alphabetical order." If only all publishers would heed her advice!

E-Textbooks
Wyatt, Edward. "The Bottom Line on E-Textbooks." *The New York Times* (23 April 2006). http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/23/education/edlife/innovate.html/partner/rssnyt?_r=1&oref=slogin

Why have e-textbooks not "taken off" as an alternative to dead.tree volumes? Certainly, they are more portable. They are easily browseable, searchable, and now-- highlightable. And e-book publishers apparently have eliminated the most egregious complaints, e.g. that digital books "expire" after the academic year. Most publishers have done away with expiration dates. Granted, there are still limitations. An e-textbook can only be transferred to another computer registered to the same user ... and students like to share. Also, there is usually a limit of 100 pages that can be printed out in a week. But there may be a simple economic reason behind the lagging popularity of e-textbooks. Although they are usually 40% cheaper to purchase than a new dead.tree version (and 20% cheaper than a used copy), e-textbooks cannot be resold. The article points out that roughly half of dead.tree textbooks are sold back to bookstores or to other students; typically, the seller can thus recoup half of the original purchase price.
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 4 (April 2006)

Cataloging

Changing the Nature of the Catalog (The Calhoun Report)

Calhoun, Karen. *The Changing Nature of the Catalog and Its Integration with Other Discovery Tools.* Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 2006.

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/calhoun-report-final.pdf

In this report commissioned by the Library of Congress, Calhoun reviews the library catalog and its changing role amidst a new mix of finding tools and technologies. In preparing the report, Calhoun performed a literature review (largely focusing on the last five years) that informed the crafting of six questions that were used in interviews with selected individuals (full disclosure: I was one). The report identifies a number of options that Calhoun classifies in one of three categories of activities: lead, expand, and extend. A two-year phased approach to "revitalizing the research library catalog" is described. This report has caused some controversy -- particularly from the cataloging community which finds the de-emphasis on traditional library practice to be objectionable. But whatever position you may care to take, you would do well to read and consider the possibilities and implications of this report and other recent reports like it, such as the University of California Bibliographic Services Task Force Report and the White Paper on the Future of Cataloging at Indiana University.

—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 4 (April 2006)

http://www.guild2910.org/AFSCMECalhounReviewREV.pdf

"A Critical Review" response to the Calhoun paper, by Thomas Mann. (Catalogablog)

Library of Congress' Decision to Cease Creating Series Authority Records

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/series.html

The Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access announces the Library of Congress' decision to cease creating series authority records as part of Library of Congress cataloging. A controversial announcement that generated a great deal of debate and resulted in the implementation being delayed one month to June 1, 2006. (Catalogablog)

Indiana University Report on Future of Cataloging

Byrd, Jackie, et al. A White Paper on the Future of Cataloging at Indiana University. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Libraries, 2006. http://www.iub.edu/~libtserv/pub/Future_of_Cataloging_White_Paper.pdf

This is a report by a group "charged to identify current trends that will have a direct impact on cataloging operations and to define possible new roles for the online catalog and cataloging staff at Indiana University." Their one general conclusion after nine months of work is that "The need for cataloging expertise within the I.U. Libraries will not be diminished in the coming years. Rather, catalogers of the future will work in the evolving environment of publishing, scholarly communication, and information technology in new expanded roles. Catalogers will need to be key players in addressing the many challenges facing the libraries and the overall management and organization of information at Indiana University." The report also identifies five strategic directions. The report is an interesting read, and taken with the explosion of related reports (e.g., Calhoun's report to the Library of Congress cited in this issue, the UC Bibliographic Services TF Report), adds yet another perspective to the kinds of changes we must foster to create better library services in a vastly changed environment.

—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 4 (April 2006)

RLG/OCLC Merger

http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200618.htm

RLG to combine with OCLC. A blockbuster announcement. (Library Link of the Day)

http://acrlblog.org/2006/05/09/the-rlg-oclc-merger-research-library-perspective/

"The RLG-OCLC Merger: Research Library Perspective." (ACRLog)

Controlled Vocabularies for Use in Rare Books and Special Collections Cataloging

http://library.osu.edu/sites/users/russell.363/RBMS%20Thesauri/index.htm

The Bibliographic Standards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (ALA/ACRL) announces the availability of electronic versions of their controlled vocabularies for use in rare books and special collections cataloging. (Catalogablog)

Open WorldCat

Ferguson, Cris. "What in the WorldCat is OCLC Up To?" *Against the Grain* 18, no. 1 (February 2006): 82-83.

Open WorldCat is OCLC's effort to make records of library materials available to Web users via popular search engines and bookselling sites. This article describes how this program works and recent developments in enhancing its services. Such developments include reference services, user-contributed content, and online purchasing. OCLC's recent acquisition of Openly Informatics may enable Open WorldCat to incorporate records for libraries' licensed electronic collections.

Government Documents

Catalog of U.S. Government Publications

http://catalog.gpo.gov/F

There is a new version of the Catalog of United States Government Publications (CGP). This version of the CGP is the online public access catalog (OPAC) module of the Government Printing Office's (GPO) new integrated library system. (Catalogablog)

GPO's Future Digital System
http://www.gpo.gov/news/2006/06news08.pdf
The GPO has issued a request for proposal (RFP) for a Master Integrator of the Future Digital System, also referred to as FDsys. The launch of the RFP marks a major step in GPO's timetable for creating a new content management system that will provide permanent public access to all federal government information. (ResourceShelf)

Information Technology

Ask.com
http://www.irconnect.com/ask/pages/news_releases.html?d=94894
In late February, the Ask Jeeves search engine underwent an overhaul and changed its name to Ask.com. (Smart Libraries)

TechEssence.Info
http://www.techessence.info/
A new website/blog has been started by Roy Tennant and colleagues: TechEssence.Info, the essence of technology for library decision-makers. (SUNYLA-L e-list)

Public-Private Intersections in New Media
http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/2006/04/a-new-media-information-literacy-tool.html
Northeastern University, with the help of the University of Pittsburgh School of Information Sciences, has launched Public-Private Intersections in New Media, a new online learning tool with a supplemental discussion blog. (ALA TechSource)

Credibility Commons
http://credibilitycommons.org/
The Credibility Commons is an experimental environment offering individuals the opportunity to try various approaches for improving their ability to identify credible information on the World Wide Web. (ACRLog)

PennTags
http://tags.library.upenn.edu/
Penn Tags, a social bookmarking community created by the librarians at the University of Pennsylvania. (ACRLog)

Windows Live Academic Search
http://www.infotoday.com/newsbreaks/nb060417-2.shtml
"Windows Live Academic Search: The Details," by Barbara Quint. (Library Link of the Day)

Technology Conversations
http://www.palinet.org/rss/tech-conversations/default.htm
PALINET's Technology Conversations podcast series features interviews with leaders in library technology. (ResourceShelf)

ACRL's Virtual Conference
http://acrlblog.org/2006/04/24/reflecting-on-acrls-virtual-conference/
"Reflecting on ACRL's Virtual Conference." (ACRLog)

Google Scholar
Neuhaus, Chris, et al. "The Depth and Breadth of Google Scholar: An Empirical Study." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, no. 2 (April 2006): 127-141. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v006/6.2neuhaus.html
The introduction of Google Scholar in November 2004 was accompanied by fanfare, skepticism, and numerous questions about the scope and coverage of this database. Over a year after its inception, many of these questions remain unanswered. This study compares the contents of 47 different databases with that of Google Scholar. Included in this investigation are tests for Google Scholar publication date and publication language bias, as well as a study of upload frequency. Tests show Google Scholar's current strengths to be coverage of science and medical databases, open access databases, and single publisher databases. Current weaknesses include lack of coverage of social science and humanities databases and an English language bias.

Data Mining Digital Collections
Cohen, Daniel J. "From Babel to Knowledge: Data Mining Large Digital Collections." *D-Lib Magazine* 12, no. 3 (March 2006).
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march06/cohen/03cohen.html
This is a fascinating account of how you can construct a search engine optimized for specific tasks such as finding course syllabi through the use of simple technologies, access to resources like Google's Application Program Interface (API), and intelligent post-processing. A few conclusions from the author's research include: 1) More emphasis needs to be placed on creating APIs for digital collections, 2) Resources that are free to use in any way, even if they are imperfect, are more valuable than those that are gated or use-restricted, even if those resources are qualitatively better, and 3) Quantity may make up for a lack of quality. For explanations and justifications of these points see the article, which anyone building search systems should definitely do.
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 3 (March 2006)

NSA Eavesdropping
Dean, John W. "Why Should Anyone Worry about Whose Communications Bush and Cheney are Intercepting, if it Helps to Find Terrorists?" *FindLaw* (24 February 2006).
http://writ.news.findlaw.com/dean/20060224.html
According to a statistic quoted in this column, "The NSA is now eavesdropping on as many as five hundred people in the United States at any given time." That is one heck of a lot of data; experts assume the NSA is indulging in data mining, which the author defines as "the use of computer algorithms

to search automatically through massive amounts of data." A huge problem with data mining, of course, is the number of false positives, which ups the potential for innocent people to get caught in the net. Maybe you're one of those folks who isn't worried about things like this because you "have nothing to hide." But the very idea of the government amassing huge amounts of personal data on its citizens is troubling. Says the author, "Many people trust the government not to abuse or misuse this information. Based on experience, I don't." He knows from whence he speaks. If you're old enough to remember Watergate, you likely remember John Dean as counsel to President Nixon.
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 2 (February 2006)

Keyword Searching
Garrett, Jeffrey. "KWIC and Dirty? Human Cognition and the Claims of Full-Text Searching." *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 9, no. 1 (February 2006).
http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3336451.0009.106
This is a diatribe against the evils of keyword searching. Complaints include not allowing for context or metaphor. Works are like "organisms" and plucking out KWICs is to deracinate them and to "carry them away from their native settings with some additional word material still clinging to them, like dirt to roots." Keyword results produce a lack of coherence "fundamentally at odds with natural patterns of knowledge acquisition." The facts are disassociated and resemble "garbage heaps" of knowledge. You may not agree with the proposition but you'll be swept off your feet by the literary allusions, and that ought to count for something. One of several articles in the newly resuscitated *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. The journal is now published by UMich's "Scholarly Publishing Office" and the article by Maria Bonn on their model of scholarly publishing is also worth a read.
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17(2) (February 2006)

NISO Metasearch Initiative
Hodgson, Cynthia, et al. "NISO Metasearch Initiative Targets Next Generation of Standards and Best Practices." *Against the Grain* 18, no. 1 (February 2006): 79-82.
The first of a two-part article on the NISO Metasearch Initiative, this part introduces metasearch issues that impact software providers, content providers, implementing libraries and their end users. These issues prompted the creation of this initiative, which has drawn participants from various information sectors and countries. The initial findings and recommendations of its three task groups were presented at NISO's 2005 fall workshop, and will be covered in the second part of the article.

Local Systems

Problems with OPACs
"How OPACs Suck," an interesting multi-part series by Karen G. Schneider. (ALA TechSource Blog)
http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/2006/03/how-opacs-suck-part-1-relevance-rank-or-the-lack-of-it.html
Part 1: Relevance Rank (Or the Lack of It)
http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/2006/04/how-opacs-suck-part-2-the-checklist-of-shame.html
Part 2: The Checklist of Shame
http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/2006/05/how-opacs-suck-part-3-the-big-picture.html
Part 3: The Big Picture

TOCRoSS
http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=tocross_pals
TOCRoSS: New JISC project will feed tables of contents into library catalogues. (ResourceShelf)

VCAT Video Catalog
http://www.library.upenn.edu/catalogs/vcat/
VCat catalog for videos and DVDs at University of Pennsylvania. (OCLC-Cataloging e-list)

eXtensible Catalog
http://www.rochester.edu/news/show.php?id=2518
University of Rochester receives Mellon grant for eXtensible Catalog (XC). (AUTOCAT)

XC
http://acrlblog.org/2006/05/17/more-on-xc-from-david-lindahl/
"More on XC," interview with David Lindahl. (ACRLog)

Name Authority Service
http://catalogablog.blogspot.com/2006_05_14_catalogablog_archive.html#114787801513519609
OCLC has a name authority service using the Library of Congress name authority file. (Catalogablog)

SFX in Academic Libraries
Wakimotoa, Jina Choi; David S. Walker; and Katherine S. Dabboura. "The Myths and Realities of SFX in Academic Libraries." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 2 (March 2006): 127-136.
The report of a three-fold study ("end-user survey, librarian focus group interviews, and sample SFX statistics and tests") to answer these questions regarding the use and effectiveness of an OpenURL resolver (SFX from ExLibris) in an academic setting: "How successful is the system in actually meeting the research needs of librarians and library users? Do undergraduate students, who have increasingly high expectations of online resources, think that SFX lives up to their expectations? Do librarians feel comfortable relying on SFX for accurate and consistent linking? Do the perceptions of librarians and library end-users reflect the reality of SFX usage?" Their conclusions? "Ultimately, this study showed

that end-user expectations were slightly higher than their actual experiences of obtaining full text. The majority of the librarians were positive, however, reporting that SFX worked most of the time. Both groups had complaints about SFX and saw areas for improvement, but they still rely heavily on it for their research."
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 3 (March 2006)

Management

Organizing for Digitization
Boock, Michael and Ruth Vondracek. "Organizing for Digitization: A Survey." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, no. 2 (April 2006): 197-217. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v006/6.2boock.html
How are academic libraries organizing themselves in order to engage in the content selection and digitization of local collections? Are libraries creating new positions or units, assigning responsibilities to existing departments, setting up cross-functional collaboration among existing departments, or using a combination of these strategies? Who holds responsibility for the various activities related to digitization? The authors surveyed the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) to answer these questions.

Library Services at Network Level
Dempsey, Lorcan. "Libraries and the Long Tail: Some Thoughts about Libraries in a Network Age." *D-Lib Magazine* 12, no. 4 (April 2006).
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april06/dempsey/04dempsey.html
You would probably have to live under a rock not to have heard about "the long tail," but if your back is holding up a stone I will leave it to Dempsey's piece to explain it to you. After discussing the general concept of the long tail, Dempsey looks closely at libraries and the implications of this concept for what we do every day. There is a great deal to ponder here, and those of us involved with getting users to stuff would do well to ponder it carefully. Dempsey makes some specific recommendations, but perhaps the most significant assertion is that "We need new services that operate at the network level, above the level of individual libraries." Although one could point to Dempsey's place of employment as a prime example of this, what he is suggesting would go far beyond our present sharing of cataloging records and ILL infrastructure and get at the heart of aggregating supply and demand. Apologies for an outworn cliche, but this is just the kind of "out of the box" thinking we need right now.
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 4 (April 2006)

Art of ERM
Duranceau, Ellen Finnie. "Zen and the Art of ERM." *Against the Grain* 18, no. 22 (April 2006): 60-62.
This article really applies to all information professionals, not just the ones working with e-resources management.

Duranceau points out that we need new practices to cope with an increasingly hi-tech and demanding environment. She suggests that mindfulness or related contemplative practices could help us find peace of mind, focus, clarity and a sense of cohesion in our work.

Preservation

Digital Preservation Fallacies
Rusbridge, Chris. "Excuse Me... Some Digital Preservation Fallacies?" *Ariadne* 46 (February 2006).
http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue46/rusbridge/
In this tenth-anniversary issue, Rusbridge takes on some digital preservation assertions or assumptions that he believes underlies many of the preservation discussions happening today. They are: 1) digital preservation is very expensive, 2) file formats become obsolete very rapidly, 3) interventions must occur frequently, 4) digital preservation repositories should have very long timescale aspirations, 5) 'Internet-age' expectations are such that the preserved object must be easily and instantly accessible in the format du jour, and 6) the preserved object must be faithful to the original in all respects. After arguing with these assumptions, he restates them at the end of the piece as: 1) digital preservation is comparatively inexpensive, compared to preservation in the print world, 2) file formats become obsolete rather more slowly than we thought, 3) interventions can occur rather infrequently, ensuring that continuing costs remain containable, 4) digital preservation repositories should have timescale aspirations adjusted to their funding and business case, but should be prepared for their succession, 5) "Internet-age" expectations cannot be met by most digital repositories; and, 6) only desiccated versions of the preserved object need be easily and instantly accessible in the format du jour, although the original bit-stream and good preservation metadata or documentation should be available for those who wish to invest in extracting extra information or capability."
—Reprinted by permission from *Current Cites* 17, no. 2 (February 2006)

LOCKSS & Portico
Tananbaum, Greg. "LOCKSS and Portico." *Against the Grain* 18, no. 2 (April 2006): 84-85.
Both LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) and Portico offer methods for preserving licensed digital materials. This article outlines the history and basic principles of the two models.

CLOCKSS
http://www.lockss.org/clockss/Home
CLOCKSS is a controlled use of LOCKSS for the purpose of ensuring long-term access to scholarly content published in digital format. It provides additional functionality to that of the LOCKSS system. (D-Lib)

Archiving of Academic Online Journals
http://www.niso.org/news/newsline/NISONewsline-Apr2006.html#255353
Library leaders press colleges to archive online journals. (NISO Newsline)
E-Journal Preservation
http://www.arl.org/newsltr/245/preserv.html
"Surveying the E-Journal Preservation Landscape," prepared by Anne R. Kenney as an ARL bimonthly report. (ResourceShelf)

Serials

OACIS
http://www.library.yale.edu/oacis/
Yale's OACIS Project (Online Access to Consolidated Information on Serials) offers a union list of serials from or about the Middle East. (OCLC-Cataloging e-list)

Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) is available at: http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf. It is definitely worth looking at for anyone who hasn't yet.

One FRBR concept that will have special implications for rare book catalogers is the distinction between *works, expressions, manifestations,* and *items.* Of these four, the differences among various *manifestations* of an expression of a single work may indicate the greatest need for special cataloging standards for rare books. The IFLA report defines a manifestation as representing "all the physical objects that bear the same characteristics, in respect to both intellectual content and physical form" (p. 20). The document further explains that "changes that occur deliberately or even inadvertently in the production process that affect the copies result, strictly speaking, in a new *manifestation*. A *manifestation* resulting from such a change may be identified as a particular 'state' or 'issue' of the publication" (p. 22). The "strictly speaking" may let general catalogers off the hook when it comes to making distinctions in the catalog between certain different manifestations. However, this is the type of hook that rare book catalogers have always been on and will remain on.

In fact, one of the factors necessitating a supplementary cataloging code for rare books in the first place was the inadequacy of AACR in distinguishing among different states and issues. Indeed, there was no reason for AACR to provide for this level of detail for most general cataloging. For one thing, there is much greater uniformity among books published in the machine-press era. For another thing, even when slight differences do exist among mass-produced books, these differences are less likely to be of particular interest to patrons.

So while descriptive cataloging rules for rare books have always placed added emphasis on enabling users to distinguish among different manifestations, this goal is detailed much more explicitly in DCRM(B)—using FRBR terminology—than it was in DCRB. For example, a keyword search of the latest draft of DCRM(B) yields eighteen hits for the word *manifestation*; the same keyword search in DCRB on Catalogers' Desktop yields zero hits. (Similarly, the December 2005 draft of Part I of RDA contains twenty-four instances of the word, compared with five in the entire text of AACR2.)

Besides a new emphasis on FRBR concepts and terminology, how will DCRM(B) be different from DCRB? As someone who was not involved in the revision process, I hesitate to give anything that may sound like a definitive answer to this question. However, based on a more-than-cursory yet less-than-thorough glance at the zeta draft, I will share a couple of my general impressions.

First, DCRM(B) is much more explicit in its instructions. For example, rule 0F (Language and script of the description) in DCRB is one short-length page. In DCRM(B), it is three full pages and includes subrules 0F1 (Romanization), 0F2 (Letters, diacritics, and symbols), 0F3 (Punctuation), and 0F4 (Spacing). None of these subrules exists in DCRB.

Second, DCRM(B) seems to be moving even further in the direction of faithfulness to the way information is presented in the book. To this end, certain optional provisions of DCRB, such as using Roman numerals to transcribe dates that appear in that form, are being made mandatory in DCRM(B). Rare book catalogers who already follow these optional provisions may notice little change in the way they catalog. (I was lucky enough to be trained in rare book cataloging by Deborah J. Leslie, chair of the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee; she tipped off the class as to which provisions would become mandatory so we would be prepared for DCRM(B).)

Aside from the actual changes in the rare book cataloging rules, perhaps the most interesting thing about them is that the revision is taking place at the same time as the revision of the general cataloging rules. This fact would not be remarkable in itself, were it not for DCRM(B)'s intended compatibility with AACR2 in matters where the rules do not differ for a specific rare-book reason. In fact, the fifth stated principle of DCRM(B) (zeta version) is: "Rules shall conform to the structure and language of the latest revision of AACR2 to the extent possible…"

This raises an obvious question: Will DCRM(B) need to be rewritten again in order to provide for compatibility with RDA?

It is probably too early to answer this question. RDA is essentially still in its first draft, not counting AACR3, to which it reportedly bears little resemblance. Therefore, it is difficult to predict how much the rules will differ from those in AACR2, much less how compatible they will be with DCRM(B).

Structurally, however, RDA is very different from AACR2—and therefore from DCRM(B). One thing that makes DCRB easy to learn for catalogers already familiar with AACR2 is that the organization is so similar. In both, the rules for description are organized by International Standard Bibliographic Description "areas," and, to the extent possible, corresponding rules have corresponding numbers. For example, the general rules on statements of responsibility relating to an edition are under 1.2C1-5 in AACR2 and 2C1-3 in DCRB. While DCRM(B) retains the same numbering system, RDA not only has a different system (all numbers, no letters), but it is no longer organized by "areas." Assuming that the final versions of both documents resemble the current drafts, the question arises; will these organizational differences in themselves necessitate a rewriting of DCRM(B)?

Given that another revision in the near future is a real possibility, why did RBMS go ahead with the revision of DCRM(B) at a time when changes to AACR2 were imminent? The generally cited reason is the length of time required for the revision of AACR2. Rare book catalogers, it was felt, simply could not wait for much-needed new and newly explicit instructions. Since RDA is not now expected until 2008, that would have been a long time indeed to wait, particularly if RBMS had decided to wait for the final version of RDA before even *beginning* its revision process. It is also possible that RBMS was anticipating much less drastic structural changes to AACR2 than now seem likely.

How all this will eventually affect the daily work of rare book catalogers is hard to guess. What does seem certain is that catalogers of all specialties are in for some interesting changes in the coming years.

[†]This article is a slightly revised version of a column that originally appeared in v. 12, no. 1 of *LH&RB* http://www.aallnet.org/sis/lhrb/Lhrb-12-1.pdf, the newsletter of the Legal History and Rare Books SIS. *LH&RB* has published a rare book cataloging column in every issue since v. 11, no. 1, all of which are available at: http://www.aallnet.org/sis/lhrb/archive.html.