

REPORT OF THE CATALOGUING COMMISSION  
TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
VIENNA, APRIL 4-5, 1984

---

The following points consist of additional questions and comments, above and beyond those presented to the general membership, which our Commission wished to present for your consideration:

1. The manuscripts which we are preparing for publication will contain approximately the following numbers of pages:
  - a. The Bibliography 125 p.
  - b. The Glossary 125 p.
  - c. The Computer Survey 150 p.
2. There are several archives who have not yet replied to the computer survey. They include: Amsterdam, Beijing, Beograd, Bois d'Arcy, Bruxelles, Bucuresti, Lisboa, Madrid, Mexico-FU, Moskva, Poona, Pyongyang, Rochester, Roma, Tirana, Torino, Toulouse, Warszawa, and Wien-OFM. We are asking for your help in "button-holing" these members and urging them to respond before the end of June 1984. The more complete the membership response to the survey is, the more accurate will be Mr. Smither's statistical analyses and evaluation.
3. Responses to survey questions indicated a seeming lack of commonly understood standards for recording the size of archival collections. Do FIAF standards for this purpose exist; if not, should we create them?

4. Roger Holman (BFI) felt confused by the directives which he received for the union list from the EC. There seemed to be two schools of thought in Lausanne: one which opted for the project as outlined in Stockholm (presently represented in our Annual Congress report) and the other which preferred data collecting to center around a single director or actor, e.g., Charles Chaplin. This latter alternative would have to include more detailed holdings information in order to be useful. We decided on the former approach because it (1) lent itself more readily to future expansions in union list coverage, (2) could successfully utilize a more minimal or limited record, and (3) owing to record simplicity, would more economically allow for experimentation with optical scanning, record merging, and other adp techniques. If there is strong feeling for the "Chaplin-type" alternative, we will reconsider our decision.

5. The Cataloguing Commission suggested the use of 2 to 3 letter codes for the recording of country and archive names on the union list forms. Such codes would be designed to facilitate computerization efforts. Disagreements arose over our proposals for creating 3 letter archive name codes. In order to anticipate the possibility of statistical comparisons and sorts between country of archive and country of production, our Commission preferred codes beginning with the country code (2 letters) and ending with a nemonic for the archive (1 letter). Documentation Commission members pointed out that such codes would run counter to the policy of identifying archives by the name of the city

in which they are located. We decided to table the matter in order to ask the EC for your preferences. Roger Holman and Frances Thorpe will work out codes following the EC-preferred alternative.