Minutes
Bibliographic Standards Committee
ALA Midwinter Conference 2011
Saturday, 8 January 2011, 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. (0800-1200)
Manchester Grand Hyatt - Gallery
San Diego, California

1. Introduction of members and visitors
2. Settlement of the agenda
3. Approval of Annual 2010 minutes
4. Consent agenda: DPC votes
5. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee
6. *Examples to Accompany DCRM(B)*
7. "Reconsidering DCRM in the Light of RDA: a Discussion Paper"
8. Revision of *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging*
9. DCRM(MSS): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)*
10. DCRM(G): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics)*
11. DCRM(M): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*
12. DCRM(C): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*
13. Application Manual for DCRM(S): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*
14. Preconference seminars
15. Preconference workshops
16. Reports (to be appended to the minutes): Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger; CC:DA Report
17. OCLC's duplicate detection algorithms and policies
18. MARBI Discussion paper no. 2011-DP01: Changes to Accommodate RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements
19. New business: Pre-1801 names in RDA
20. Announcements
21. Adjournment
Appendix A: Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) discussion points
Appendix B: Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger
Appendix C: CC:DA Report

1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Marcia Barrett, University of Alabama; Erin Blake, Folger Shakespeare Library; Jane Carpenter, University of California, Los Angeles; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; Eileen Heeran, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Ryan Hildebrand, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin (controlled vocabularies editor); Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art; Martha Lawler, Louisiana State University, Shreveport; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Ann Myers, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale (secretary); Jennifer Nelson, Robbins Collection, Law Library, University of California, Berkeley; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; Aislinn Sotelo, University of California, San Diego.

Members excused: Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (chair).

Liaisons: Randal Brandt, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (Web team liaison); Larry Creider, New Mexico State University (ACRL liaison to CC:DA); Elizabeth Robinson, Library of Congress (LC liaison).

Visitors: John Attig, Pennsylvania State University; Alison Bridger, Folger Shakespeare Library; Ellen Cordes, Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Diane Ducharme, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Emily Epstein, Health Sciences Library, University of Colorado, Denver; Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles; Elaine Franco, University of California, Davis; Christine Frodl, German National Library, Frankfurt; Jane Gillis, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Elizabeth L. Johnson, Lilly Library, Indiana University; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Nancy Lorimer, Stanford University; Michelle Mascaro, University of Akron; Bob Maxwell, Brigham Young University; Marilyn McClaskey, University of Minnesota; Christine Megowan, Loyola Marymount University; Jessica O'Pray, Huntington Library; Molly Poremski, Vanderbilt University; Nina Schneider, Clark Library, University of California, Los Angeles; Bruce Tabb, University of Oregon; Manon Théroux, U.S. Senate Library; Catherine Uecker, University of Chicago.

1a. Substitute Chair

Since committee chair Stephen Skuce was unable to travel, immediate past chair Randal Brandt filled in to run the meeting.

2. Settlement of the agenda

At the beginning of the meeting, agenda items were rearranged as follows: agenda item 7 was moved to follow item 2, followed by items 18, 6, and 5 in that order, then followed by item 3 and the remainder of the agenda in its original order.

7. "Reconsidering DCRM in the Light of RDA: a Discussion Paper" (Attig)

John Attig briefly introduced the discussion paper, explaining that there are different ways to define DCRM's relationship with the standard for general materials cataloging, and the discussion paper presents some of those options. There was some discussion of the implications of DCRM's historic relationship with ISBD(A) given that ISBD(A) is no longer supported but DCRM makes use of ISBD's structure and punctuation.

Erin Blake reported that the DCRM(G) editors discussed the paper and they favored Option 2 (make RDA the basis for particular instructions in DCRM, but apply RDA in an ISBD structure and continue to organize DCRM by ISBD areas and elements) with bits of Option 3 (redefine the relationship between DCRM and other standards). Margaret Nichols pointed out that with regard to Option 1 (make RDA the basis for all aspects of DCRM) there is little point in getting rid of

the bibliographic record as long as our records are MARC encoded, and wondered if we need to start thinking in terms of a content standard the way DACS is set up, perhaps keeping the structure of ISBD but starting to open the possibility that not everyone will use the same punctuation. There was some discussion about the merits of this, given that cataloging is still firmly in the world of MARC for the time being, but catalogers might have occasion to use other standards, for example, Dublin Core for digitized rare books, and it is possible to have the elements of an ISBD record without using MARC.

Elizabeth Robinson brought up Issue 6 in the discussion paper, which discusses LC's stated preference for DCRM(B) over RDA. Robinson reported that the LC policy division says BSC should make its own decisions about DCRM's relationship to RDA and not wait for them to change their policy. She also wondered if BSC would consider a two-step approach to RDA implementation, for example, starting with Option 3, but then migrating over time to Option 2. Attig pointed out that this relates to how we issue the standards – because they are currently issued as printed books, evolution is slow. He asked whether we should move to online products, which would make faster evolution of the standards more feasible. Larry Creider wondered whether we need to rethink our relationship with LC sponsorship of publication and access. Blake commented that incremental changes are already being made as the different modules are published and revised regularly, which means that incremental change across the DCRM board is inevitable. She sees DCRM(G) as a transitional manual as they are including both AACR2 and RDA options; by the second edition, RDA will be more established and she expects that the guidelines will reflect that.

Jain Fletcher and Nancy Lorimer brought up their concerns for DCRM(M); on the one hand, they have a group of catalogers eager to make use of the guidelines for rare music, but on the other hand, they don't want to publish something that will immediately become obsolete because of the adoption of RDA. Attig expressed his concern that the DCRM standards should be edited collectively regarding RDA rather than individual decisions being made by each module, and he would be reluctant to pick one module to make the decisions for all the rest. Bob Maxwell pointed out that they could include RDA options in the existing text (as DCRM(G) is doing), and that way DCRM(M) would not be obsolete immediately.

Brandt asked how we feel about the RDA options presented in DCRM(G). It is currently set up so that one can use AACR2 or RDA and still code the record as dcrmg. The consensus was that this was a reasonable approach, allowing for the DCRM modules to move forward in publication while also accommodating what will surely be a gradual process of adjusting to RDA as not everyone will adopt it immediately.

Brandt mentioned the pagination controversy for books caused by RDA whereby if RDA is followed the traditional collation statement will be done away with, and wondered if there is room for compromise. Attig clarified that if there is a rare book reason to differ from RDA then it does not invalidate DCRM's relationship with RDA; the question is whether there is a legitimate reason to differ. Maxwell expressed his desire for a policy statement from BSC, since Brigham Young University is eager to be able to issue dcrmb coded records in RDA. There was some further discussion about the pagination statement issue in which it was pointed out that the RDA statement does describe accurately what is in the book just as well as a collation statement,

the issue is with the formatting. Brandt asked for a discussion paper on this particular issue, presenting compromise solutions to start a wider discussion.

Attig asked what our next steps should be, and suggested distributing this discussion paper to DCRM-L for further discussion and thinking before June, when LC will decide whether to adopt RDA or not. It was agreed that BSC needs to be thinking and making interim decisions in the meantime rather than waiting until RDA is officially adopted, and there was a suggestion that since converting DCRM to FRBR and RDA will be a massive undertaking, having a task group to explore these issues before June might also be a good idea.

18. MARBI Discussion paper no. 2011-DP01: Changes to Accommodate RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements (Creider)

This discussion paper addresses the need for MARC to change in concert with the changes RDA has made to ISBD Area 4, whereby unpublished materials are accounted for and recorded separately from published materials. There are three options for expanding MARC to include places to record separate publication, distribution and manufacture statements: 1) Add a second indicator to the 260 field which would create the labels distributor, publisher, manufacturer, etc. 2) Add separate subfields to the 260 field – instead of subfields a-g there would be subfields a-p 3) Add new 2xx fields altogether for each possible role. If there was ambiguity about which role to assign, the traditional 260 field format could still be used to record the information.

There was discussion about the possible merits of each option, the main points being that whatever solution is chosen needs to be extensible, and we need to consider the impact on OPAC displays. The consensus was that either Option 1 or 3 would be better suited to these concerns, since subfields are not labeled in most OPACs. Concerns were raised about these options breaking out transcription fields, and there was considerable discussion about the issue of ambiguity and the possibility of making false distinctions between printers and publishers. Attig clarified that in cases of ambiguity, the old way of recording the information would still be valid. There were some questions about what would happen if you had a printer but no clear publisher, and this was identified as an RDA issue, rather than one directly related to this proposal. It was agreed that this solution is geared toward contemporary materials, without allowing for the fuzziness that comes into play with rare materials.

The consensus of the group was that given that none of these options would undo the present coding for the 260 field, thus allowing rare materials catalogers to continue to record ambiguous information there, Option 2, adding subfields, is not a good option, but either Option 1 or 3 would work fine. There was some further discussion about the inaccuracy of the terminology used in the MARBI discussion paper to refer to date of copyright notice.

6. *Examples to Accompany DCRM(B)* (Schneider)

The talking points appended to the agenda have been revised since the agenda was first distributed. Schneider reported that Eduardo Tenenbaum has stepped down but Jane Carpenter has taken his place. They have been using the DigressIt blog and have received comments but not from many people. They have 40-50 examples from Leslie's workshops, and others have

volunteered to create their own examples which they will transfer to the blog soon, 5-6 per week for comment starting at the end of January or beginning of February. Their goal is to have a hearing or final decision on the examples at Annual 2011.

Schneider then presented questions for discussion as follows:

1. For review of the examples, is BSC happy with DigressIt or would we prefer a different platform?
   Annie Copeland asked how DigressIt was working for the examples team; Schneider responded that it was very helpful, since the comments are appended to the specific paragraph to which they refer. Consensus was that we should continue to use DigressIt, and Brandt encouraged everyone to participate in the comments. Copeland also suggested putting out a call for a close reading of the examples as we do for the DCRM modules for which everyone would have an assigned set of examples to review.

2. Should they make all comments visible, or only the substantive ones?
   Consensus was that all comments should be visible. There was some discussion about whether they should remove comments on items which have been fixed, with the conclusion that they should do whatever works best for their workflow.

3. Once the examples are approved, should the review comments be published as well? It will be an online document, and could be useful for people to see comments along the lines of "I disagree with this application of this rule for these reasons."
   The consensus was that no, comments should be resolved before publication and not included in the final version, though there was some discussion about including areas of strong disagreement as an appendix. There was also some discussion about whether we could use the online publication to field questions about the rules, but there were objections based on not wanting to have to assign someone to monitor the site. It was concluded that DCRM-L is the place for questions, and perhaps the online publication could direct people there.

4. How should the examples be published? Cataloger's Desktop? The RBMS website? As an appendix to DCRM(B)?
   The consensus was that having the examples in more than one place would be ideal. Cataloger's Desktop has the advantage that the examples could be directly linked to the relevant rules in DCRM(B), but since it is a subscription service a copy should be made available on the RBMS website as well. Robinson indicated that LC should not have a problem with this arrangement.

5. Should they continue to accept comments post-publication?
   Discussion centered around how these comments would be monitored. It was agreed that this could be worth looking into later on but we will need to set up a mechanism for the comments to get to the right person, whether that is instructions on the page for who to email or an automatic routing system.

Schneider indicated that when they are transcribing a lengthy rule, they are using ellipses to shorten the amount of transcribed text and wondered if that was acceptable. The consensus was that as long as it is clear which rule is being transcribed, partial text should be acceptable.

Finally, Schneider reported that most examples are currently in MARC, though Tenenbaum did do a few example MODS records. Do they need to ask for volunteers to do examples for other standards such as Dublin Core? What about RDA? The group agreed that since they are providing examples for DCRM(B) as it is now written, they do not need to address RDA. A new group will be appointed in the future to create RDA examples. Brandt expressed thanks on behalf of the committee to Schneider, Carpenter, Tenenbaum and James Ascher for their work in putting together these examples and implementing the DigressIt site. He further encouraged everyone to look at the examples and comment on them.

5. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee (Hildebrand)

Hildebrand reported that there is now a MARC organization code for the RBMS vocabularies – IlChRBM – which was requested as part of Backstage's processing of the Folger Shakespeare Library's genre/form files. An XML export of the Multi-Tes database goes to Backstage, and they generate MARC authority records, including the parentheticals currently needed for some terms.

The subcommittee has been invited to collaborate with the Ligatus Research Centre on creating a binding structures terminology. Ligatus is building an XML database with terms in 16 different European languages. The subcommittee has also received an invitation to send a representative to a conference in Oxford.

The subcommittee believes that it is time to begin work on integrating the different thesauri. They are in the process of assessing a new database to replace Multi-Tes, called TemaTres. It is free, and has a great deal more functionality including exports in useful formats and it allows multiple editors. Jason Kovari and James Ascher have worked up a demo site which looks great. The subcommittee would like to begin building a unified thesaurus in TemaTres and clean up everything as they go (creating missing scope notes and bringing everything up to the current standard for thesauri). They realize that this will take years, but at the end of it, we would have a finished, unified thesaurus.

Schneider asked whether the moratorium on new terms would be extended. Hildebrand said that six months from now the moratorium is scheduled to be lifted. At that time he plans to establish a set number of terms to be considered at any one time so the subcommittee can continue other work. Blake pointed out that there are also now better tools for working between meetings, for example they could put term proposals on DigressIt, and a lot of work could be done so that they wouldn't be as overwhelmed as in the past. Leslie encouraged anyone with lexicography training to step forward to help with this effort. Hildebrand said that they will be issuing a call for interested parties to contact him and join in the discussion.

The subcommittee approved nine terms to be distributed later and discussed at Annual 2011. Bildungsromans was approved at Annual 2010, but there was a request to reevaluate the references, and as a result Bildungsroman (singular) is no longer a UF. The record now reads:

> Term: Bildungsromans
> Hierarchy: [Literary forms]
> SN: Use for novels in which the theme is the development of a character from youth to adulthood.
> UF: Apprenticeship novels
>   Bildungsromane
>   Coming-of-age novels
> BT: Novels

Leslie objected that there are hits in OCLC for the singular form, so there is user warrant to have it as a UF. Blake countered that no other controlled vocabulary has the singular form as the preferred term, and according to NISO, singular forms are not appropriate. Leslie argued that that rule has not been confirmed as it applies to UF. Hildebrand mentioned that in AAT the anglicized singular form was the preferred term at one time but is no longer and therefore should be removed from our record as well. A vote was called to approve striking the UF reference of Bildungsroman (anglicized singular form); it passed with one vote opposed. Hildebrand pointed out that users will still find the plural form even if they search for the singular because they have just dropped the final s. He concluded that BSC should be on the look-out for terms needing evaluation.

Maxwell brought up an issue with RDA and thesaurus terms: as the rules are currently written it is unclear whether the RDA list of thesaurus terms is closed or not. He has found that he has to defend the right to use our relator terms in RDA records rather than only those explicitly listed in RDA, Appendix I. Blake found that there is language in RDA which allows the use of other terms, but Maxwell pointed out that this allows you to use any term you want, which we don't want either. He asked that BSC make a statement to the effect that the language should be changed to allow for the use of other specialized lists.

3. Approval of Annual 2010 minutes

Two corrections to the list of attendees at Annual 2010 were noted. The minutes were approved as amended.

4. Consent agenda: DPC votes

There was a brief discussion of the use of DCRM-L for Discussion of Proposed Changes (DPC) and the votes that had taken place via ALA Connect. Changes were made to the wording of DCRM(B) and DCRM(S) 7A1.4, DCRM(B) 4D6.3 and DCRM(S) 4D5.3, and DCRM(B) 4D5. These votes need the committee's final approval stating that the votes took place and each of them passed. The consent agenda was approved.

Blake further clarified that the DPC votes could be used for minor wording changes in the currently edited DCRM modules that might affect other modules, and there will be links from the BSC website.

8. Revision of *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging* (Robinson)

Robinson had nothing to report. Blake asked whether DCRM(G) could change their examples to match what the new standard citation form is expected to be, and Robinson said that they could.

9. DCRM(MSS): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* (Nichols)

Nichols thanked everyone for their comments on Areas 1 and 4 and said that the editorial team has found them very helpful. They have not yet met to discuss the comments on Area 4, but so far their sense is that most of the comments address logic issues and items needing clarification, rather than any big-picture issues. They will be addressing Area 4 comments this spring. Area 1 is in good shape, though there are still some issues with how to structure some sections. They are currently focusing on Area 5. DCRM(MSS) will not have an Area 2 as it is rarely applicable, and when there is an edition statement it is usually not actually an edition statement in the book sense. In those cases such statements will be accommodated elsewhere in the guidelines.

The editorial team's meeting minutes will be available on their wiki. Jennifer Nelson encouraged everyone to continue to send in comments even though the formal comments period has closed. It was asked whether they were getting comments from the manuscripts community, and Nelson reported that she gets collected comments from SAA. There has apparently been some disappointment in the manuscripts community because Area 4 puts the date in field 260 $c rather than in field 245 $f where they are used to seeing it, but this was done for consistency's sake with the other DCRM modules. Bridger also mentioned that DACS is currently being revised and they have asked for our comments on it. Brandt commented that given the crossover with other forms of manuscript materials, the other DCRM modules currently under construction will be very interested in DCRM(MSS)'s progress. Nichols responded that they would post their progress on DCRM-L as appropriate.

10. DCRM(G): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics)* (Blake)

Blake reminded everyone of the DCRM(G) hearing/discussion to be held Saturday at the Hilton Bayfront at 7:30 p.m. She thanked everyone for their comments on version 6.0 on DigressIt, and reported that it is hugely helpful to have the comments entered alongside the text they refer to, as well as for people to be able to comment on others' comments.

The DCRM(G) editorial team is still undecided regarding the I/J and U/V transcription wording which they had originally submitted as a DPC. Théroux, Blake and Leslie plan to propose a more detailed solution on DCRM-L in the near future.

Topics of discussion for the hearing include: if supplying the date from elsewhere in the record, should the entire date or only the year be supplied; whether DCRM(G) should create its own core record; RDA; how to supply the date of manufacture; whether black & white is a valid

description; how best to provide instructions for the statement of responsibility given the differences in application between books and graphic materials.

11. DCRM(M): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)* (Fletcher)

Fletcher reported that she had finished compiling the BSC and MLA comments which resulted in 60 pages of comments in rule order. Given the magnitude of the document, she further subdivided the comments into topical areas: issues, wording, styles, typos, and examples since some, such as typos, can be dispensed with quickly, while others, such as issues and examples, will take longer, and there is too much to do via email. Five of the six editorial team members will meet at MLA in February, where they have scheduled a total of ten hours of working meetings to go through the major issues. They will start to put together delineated agendas for these meetings here at Midwinter. The worst issue is still the examples. Charlotte Wolfe has retired but is back at work part time and has agreed to stay on the editorial team and work on examples.

Regarding RDA, they are just beginning to consider providing optional RDA instructions as DCRM(G) is doing, and they will be discussing this further. They are also planning to make their own core record as DCRM(G) is doing. In the past they have received criticism for having too much explanation in the rules, but they are also aware that more background for the reasons behind some of the guidelines is wanted for the two different constituencies they serve. They are hoping that the examples and workshops will help with these questions. Leslie pointed out that the DCRM(S) Application Manual addresses these kinds of issues, so if they write their own application manual that should help.

There was lengthy discussion about whether core records are necessary. Fletcher said that the DCRM(M) editorial team feels it is important to have an accepted floor. Nichols suggested that BSC could either create our own core standard or simply establish the standard record as the floor. Blake objected that the DCRM standard record is the normative application of the rules, which is not necessarily what BIBCO looks like, and there would be no indication in the coding that one was using the core. Nichols wondered if we could eliminate the BIBCO core and either make a decision about rare materials core records across all the DCRM modules or individually, given that each module has different constituencies. Copeland said that since DCRM(S) works so closely with CONSER, it would not be possible for them to develop their own core and it would be better for the individual modules to make their own decisions. Leslie pointed out that DCRM(B) provides different possible levels of depth for a record that can still be considered a full-level record, so there is really no need for a core record if the standard record is considered the floor. Maxwell agreed and asked why we need a core. Blake mentioned that this issue would be discussed in more depth at the DCRM(G) hearing, since they have a constituency which needs some guidance in this matter. Creider pointed out that the original purpose of the core record was as a defensive measure against administrators who wanted minimal-level records; it might be appropriate to ask format by format whether this is still needed, especially since BIBCO requirements carry no weight for some.

Brandt asked what our next step should be, and suggested putting together a group to look at the other DCRM modules. Nichols suggested that perhaps each editorial team could consider the

issue. Brandt asked all DCRM modules currently in process to discuss core records and address them in their reports at Annual 2011. Blake objected that DCRM(G) would like to move forward sooner than that, and there were further objections to our clinging to the core record idea. Nichols pointed out that it seems to be a matter of terminology. Brandt suggested that we table the issue for now with nothing resolved or a way forward.

12. DCRM(C): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)* (Théroux)

The DCRM(C) editorial team consists of Randal Brandt, Larry Creider, Nancy Kandoian, Todd Fell, and Manon Théroux. They have yet to come to any conclusions regarding RDA, but they have started the conversation and will be involving the general map cataloging community in the discussion. They have discussed Areas 3 and 4 with the following decisions of note: skeleton instructions regarding serials numbering have been eliminated from Area 3 since they were too confusing and they do not address serials anywhere else, and they are reevaluating unpublished materials in Area 4; currently they have only field 260 $c to be used for unpublished materials, but since both DCRM(MSS) and DCRM(G) are using field 260 $a as well they may reconsider so that there is no deviation among the modules regarding manuscripts. Théroux noted that their biggest challenge has been keeping track of the other modules to make sure they are on the same page.

The DCRM(C) editorial team intends to issue some DPCs on DCRM-L. Topics include: publication dates for multi-part monographs as the instructions do not currently address supplied dates; changing book-centric terminology such as booksellers, book trade data and book trade industry to something more generic that might work across DCRM modules such as publishing trade data and publishing industry; changing the definition of "optionally" and "if considered important" because DCRM(C) has one element which is entirely optional and there is no DCRM(B) equivalent. There are further options within this element, so they need to expand the application of "if considered important" since optionally is an inappropriate term in this case – it is not alternative treatment.

Théroux asked for further guidance about how to issue DPC messages – should she just send them, or will the chair be establishing a queue? Blake explained that Skuce had told her to just send them out, and we'll see if it works. Brandt cautioned that the individual editorial teams should agree amongst themselves before sending out a DPC so that the editorial team discussions are not happening on DCRM-L.

Théroux reported that their email discussion has been moved to their wiki, though they may move it to DigressIt instead. Finally, the DCRM(C) editorial team had had a rotating chair, changing every six months, but Todd Fell has now agreed to serve as the permanent chair from this point forward. Théroux is still the keeper of the text.

13. Application Manual for DCRM(S): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)* **(Copeland)**

Annie Copeland reported that they had a productive meeting last May and will be holding more meetings in San Diego. Copeland and Brandt will also be working on examples of manuscript serials at the Bancroft Library.

14. Preconference seminars (Brandt)

Nina Schneider's proposed seminar for the Baton Rouge preconference 2011 has been accepted. It will follow up on the 2010 conference program "To Catch a Thief," focusing specifically on the role cataloging can play in security. Presenters will be Ellen Cordes, Stephen Galbraith, and Randal Brandt.

There was no information on seminar ideas for the 2012 or 2013 preconferences.

15. Preconference workshops (Brandt)

There are no workshops currently scheduled for any upcoming preconferences. Anyone with ideas should let Skuce know as soon as possible.

16. Reports (to be appended to the minutes): Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger; CC:DA Report (Creider)

Creider briefly summarized the reports: on the Web Resources page he has added some paper resources as well as some new sections for manuscripts, and has changed the structure somewhat so things are easier to find.

CC:DA's major activity has been a report on the revision of ISBD. There are also some task forces looking into headings for heads of state and government and merging the instructions for government and non-government corporate bodies.

17. OCLC's duplicate detection algorithms and policies (Copeland)

Copeland reported that OCLC is running software to detect and merge duplicate records, but there is concern that this program is merging records that shouldn't be merged when edition information does not appear in the 250 field because it is not transcribed from the piece. However, OCLC is not automatically deduping anything dated pre-1801.

Elaine Franco reported that OCLC will merge pre-1801 records if you request it. She has been sending them hundreds of requests, though she is being conservative about what she sends and OCLC is being even more conservative in what they merge. Maxwell pointed out that there is still an issue with post-1801 records being merged. Bridger mentioned that she has had issues with OCLC merging manuscript records with the same title, when manuscripts are always unique. She wondered if any of the fixed fields could come into play in determining what OCLC does and does not merge. Creider pointed out that the large number of records from European

national libraries in different languages seem to be exempt from merging. Franco reported that OCLC prefers us to put one example of each language in the 936 field as a parallel record; so if there are five German records, pick the best one and report the rest as duplicates.

Copeland wondered if we would want to start using brackets in the 250 field to record non-transcribed edition information. Leslie said that it would be problematic to supply edition statements for items that don't have them. For example, if you have concealed editions, they are actually different settings of type, but you can't assign numeric edition statements because you don't know where they fall in sequence or how many other concealed editions might exist, so how would you format a supplied statement? Nichols commented that Cornell's general principle when OCLC pushes us to tweak MARC is that we shouldn't let the database contort how we construct the records, since future databases may work differently. Copeland suggested that BSC petition OCLC to leave dcrm records alone regardless of year and format – this would include records coded dcrb and bdrb as well. This was greeted with much acclaim, and Copeland offered to pursue this option. She will share a petition on DCRM-L for discussion, asking OCLC to omit all dcrm, dcrb and bdrb records from automatic deduping. Once the petition is approved, she will send it on to Glenn Patton.

There was some further discussion of the issues posed by concealed editions, which occasionally necessitate the creation of duplicate records when one cannot determine which concealed edition is described by the existing master records. Franco asked everyone to let her know if they have any problems with her manual merging of pre-1801 duplicate records.

19. New business: Pre-1801 names in RDA (Brandt)

In RDA testing it has been revealed that the guideline to prefer the form of a name found in modern reference sources rather than that found on the work itself has been dropped from RDA. Leslie reported that in the past, an LCRI was issued stating that if the two forms are different, prefer the modern one, since many authors were published with Latinized forms of their name but that is not how they are commonly known. She asserted that it would be a real problem to lose that flexibility in the rules. Maxwell said that the principle is to use the commonly known form and the same principle is in RDA, so one is not required to use the Latin form. He did agree that clarification is needed in RDA though, since the principle overrides the rule and the rule as written is unclear. Lorimer thought there was still a problem with multiple languages, and Franco said that one of the choices is to use a reference source in the language of the person. There was some disagreement about whether RDA really provides for this or not. Blake found the relevant section of RDA which revealed some contradiction within the guidelines and that some sections need reordering.

Brandt asked whether this needs a formal action by the BSC. There was general agreement that clarification within the rules or an LC policy statement might be needed. Leslie mentioned that in the past they had crafted BSC rule interpretations which were then accepted by LC as LCRIs and asked whether BSC would want to resurrect this mechanism. Lorimer pointed out that this issue does affect other cataloging communities as well so a BSC RI would be insufficient. Leslie suggested that the BSC RI could be the first step. Copeland thought it was probably too late to make changes to RDA, so an LCRI would probably be the best place for this clarification.

Maxwell asked if there was an agreed-upon interpretation of what "commonly known name" means, and suggested that BSC should have a say in the discussion. It was agreed that BSC should put together a group to draft a statement.

20. Announcements

Maxwell reported that Brigham Young University no longer has a hiring freeze, but it also has no open positions at this time.

Copeland encouraged attendance at the Technical Services Discussion Group meeting Sunday at 10:30 a.m. which will include an update on WorldCat Local and more.

21. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Myers

Appendix A: Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) Discussion Points

Examples to Accompany DCRM(B)
BSC – San Diego, CA, 2011
Nina Schneider
Jane Carpenter

1. **Developments since Annual**

    Eduardo Tenenbaum had to step down from the subcommittee shortly after Annual, but
    we were fortunate that Jane Carpenter was available to volunteer as co-chair.

    Since Annual, 48 of the original 50 Examples to Accompany DCRB, have been upgraded
    to DCRM(B), posted to the Digress.it blog, and have received comments. The committee
    purposefully omitted the manuscript and serial examples (nos. 18 and 44 in the 2nd edition
    of Examples) since there are (or will be) DCRM modules for these formats.

    The remaining examples are being entered into Digress.it, and will be posted to the
    DCRM-L discussion list on roughly the same schedule beginning at the end of January or
    early February.

2. **Review process**

    We have only received comments from a handful of individuals. Those that have
    contributed have pointed out both clerical and typographic errors, as well as provided
    substantive comments. We have not responded to these comments, except in the case of
    egregious errors, but are compiling an independent master document to be emended.

    Once the remaining examples have been posted, we will compile comments to present to
    BSC for discussion.

    We plan to post the Digress.it URL to other email lists (AUTOCAT, SHARP, etc.) for
    additional comments.

    We would like to have a public hearing at Annual 2011.

3. **Questions for the Committee**

    For the purpose of review:

    Will BSC members review examples and comments in Digress.it? If not, is there a better
    platform?

    Will BSC want to see all comments or only those that contribute to illuminating points
    about the Examples, and that catalogers would actually want to read (i.e., omitting clerical
    or typographical errors)?

For the purpose of publication:

Should comments be published in order to provide context for the cataloger? Or, should comments not be published?

Once the Examples are in their final approved form, will they be put on the RBMS website? Cataloger's Desktop? Would they be a sort of appendix to DCRM(B)?

Will we continue to accept comments? And if so, how will these comments be distributed?

Appendix B: BSC Directory of Internet Resources

Additions & Changes—January 2011

ADDITIONS:

http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/tools.htm *Cataloging Tools and Resources*—Yale University

http://www.library.yale.edu/BeinCatM/notes/imperfect.htm *Notes for Describing Imperfect Copies*—Yale Rare Book Team

http://digital.ub.uni-duesseldorf.de/content/titleinfo/1389153 Digitized copy of *Surius, Vitae Sanctorum*, 1618

http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/cona/index.html *Cultural Objects Name Authority Online*

http://www.bayerische-landesbibliothek-online.de/orbis-latinus *Orbis Latinus*, 4th ed. 1972. PDF format, so it is unsearchable, but page by page lemmas

http://www.watermarkarchive.org/ *The Watermark Archive Initiative*

http://www.wm-portal.net/niki/index.php *Watermark Database*—Dutch Institute for Art History, Florence—For graphic images

http://www.paperhistory.org/ *International Association of Paper Historians*

http://www.paperhistory.org/standard.htm International standard for the registration of papers with or without watermarks from the International Association of Paper Historians—Amazing list

http://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/290/ *London Book Trades Database*

http://www.library.yale.edu/BeinCatM/number_line.htm *Number Line in Modern Trade Publications*—Yale Rare Book Team

http://ipi.cerl.org/cgi-bin/search.pl Paul Needham, *Index Possessorum Incunabulorum* (=IPI)

http://incunabula.cerl.org/cgi-bin/search.pl *Material Evidence In Incunabula* (=MEI)

http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Blockb%C3%BCcher *List of Digitized Block Books* with links

http://www.archive.org/details/medicalheritagelibrary *Medical Heritage Library* (Internet Archive)

http://www.medicalheritage.org/ *Medical Heritage Library*

http://archive.nlm.nih.gov/proj/ttp/books.htm *Turning the Pages Online*—National Library of Medicine

http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Renaissance/Ursicula.html *Ursicula: 16-18th Century Dutch Books, Poems, Pamphlets*

http://www.rihs.org/atlas/ *Atlas of the Rhode Island Book Trade in the Eighteenth Century*

http://fletcher.lib.udel.edu/collections/wab/index.htm *William Augustus Brewer Bookplate Collection*—University of Delaware. Search and browse capabilities

http://www.oxbibsoc.org.uk/ *The Library of Anthony Wood*. Go to Research; go to N.K. Kiessling: The library of Anthony Wood (PDF, catalogue only) http://users.bathspa.ac.uk/oxbibsoc/wood_library.pdf

http://www.maphistory.info/SEARCHING%20FOR%20EARLY%20MAPS.pdf *Searching for Early Maps* (PDF)—by Joel Kovarsky; add date 2010

http://archiv.twoday.net/stories/8419493/ Literature on individual manuscripts, by repository—from Klaus Graf

INSERTED "Incipits" section under Manuscript Cataloging

http://archiv.twoday.net/stories/6420201/ Incipit databases from Klaus Graf, including:
- http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl Stegmuller, *Repertorium biblicum*
- http://cctr1.umkc.edu/cgi-bin/search Thorndike and Kibre
- http://jordanus.org/ *Jordanus—An International Catalogue of Mediaeval Scientific Manuscripts*
- http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~jurarom/manuscr/dat/initican.htm *Initia Operum Iuris Canonici Medii Aevi*
- http://www.archive.org/details/initiapatrumali00migngoog or http://www.archive.org/details/initiapatrumali00vattgoog Vatasso: *Initia partum*
- http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924029597733 or http://books.google.com/books?id=K2LgAAAAMAAJ Little: *Initia operum latinorum quae saeculis XIII. XIV. XV. Attribuuntur*
- http://www.manuscripta.at/_scripts/php/mihoeb.php, *Austrian MS incipits*
- http://firstlines.folger.edu/ *Union First Line Index of Manuscript Poetry 13th-19th Century (bulk 1500-1800)*

http://www.manuscriptorium.com/index.php?q=gaijibank *Gaiji Bank: Database of non-standard Characters from Manuscriptorium*—Provides some names along with images that can be used for description

http://archiv.twoday.net/stories/11445658/ *Online Images of Islamic MSS*

http://www.arlima.net/mss/france/paris/bibliotheque_nationale_de_france/ MSS catalogs of the BN, incomplete

CHANGES:

SUNY Buffalo Cataloging Information DELETED—Address not found

Association of College and Research Libraries MOVED TO
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/index.cfm

International Standard Bibliographic Description for Older Monographic Publications (ISBD(A))—IFLA merged into ISBD. See http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/isbd/isbd-cons_2007-en.pdf and draft revision at: http://www.ifla.org/en/news/worldwide-review-of-isbd

Descriptive Cataloging of 19th Century Books DELETED

Getty Art & Architecture Thesaurus Online MOVED TO
http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/aat/index.html

"Biography Sites" CHANGED TO "Biography and Authority Sites"

Union List of Artist Names Online MOVED TO
http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/ulan/index.html —From the Getty Research Institute

Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names Online MOVED TO
http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/tgn/index.html

http://geonames.nrcan.gc.ca/info/sites_e.php *Geographical Names of Canada*—Links to other sources. REVERSED ORDER WITH GNC NAME SEARCH

ILAB list early printing MOVED TO: http://www.ilab.org/eng/documentation/110-bibliographies_-_early_printing.html

Il libro antico in Biblioteca ADDED " " to name.

http://www.astropa.unipa.it/biblioteca/Rare%20books/general.htm *Rare Books in Astronomy: Free Online Resources* ADDED ":" before "Free online sources"

http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/rarebookteam/sigtable.htm *Signature-Pagination Table*—Yale Rare Book Team

http://my.netdirect.net/~charta/QuireCalc/about.html *Quire Calculator*—by Christopher Handy, for Macintosh GIVEN THEIR OWN HEADING, NOT INCUNABLES

Watermarks from the Biblioteca Ajuda DELETED—The Ajuda was merged into the National Library of Portugal and the websites are not findable

SHARP Listing of Publisher's Records sites MOVED TO http://www.sharpweb.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5&Itemid=57&lang=en

Scottish Book Trade Index MOVED TO: http://www.hss.ed.ac.uk/chb/sbtai.htm

Historical Directories MOVED TO http://www.historicaldirectories.org/hd/

The printer/publisher database at the Herzog August Bibliothek DELETED—This has been incorporated as a search possibility into the HAB OPAC

Printers' Marks from the Biblioteca da Ajuda DELETED—The Ajuda was merged into the National Library of Portugal and the websites are not findable

Bibliopolis—Persons, Biographical Information on the Dutch Book Trade PROBLEM LOADING PAGE—DISABLE COOKIES?

Mark Godburn's Nineteenth Century Dust Jackets MOVED TO "Bindings" section

Paul Dijstelberger's Collection on Type and Typography NOT FOUND—I will write him at PDijstelberge@planet.nl

Deutsche und oesterreichische Bibliothekszeichen, Exlibris : ein Handbuch fuer Sammler, Buecher- und Kunstfreunde / von K.E. Graf zu Leiningen-Westerburg—From University of Duesseldorf—DELETED, only one example

Cours de Paleographie: Archive de course d'Arisitum MOVED TO http://eric-camille.voirin.pagesperso-orange.fr/paleo/

Muenchener Digitalisierungszentrum Digitale Bibliothek—Incunables MOVED TO http://inkunabeln.digitale-sammlungen.de/start.html

University of Pennsylvania Library's Schoenberg Center for Electronic Text & Image—Digital facsimiles of books, manuscripts and visual materials—MOVED ABOVE EMBLEM BOOKS

European Illustrated Book and Manuscripts, ca. 1400-1700—From Takami Matsuda, Keio University—TIMED OUT 12/10/2010

Il libro antico—Catalogazione e cataloghi di libri antichi—A large and growing list POLITICAL MESSAGE REDIRECTS, WAIT A WHILE

Flemish Short Title Catalogue 1601-1700 MOVED TO http://www.vlaamse-erfgoedbibliotheek.be/dossier/short-title-catalogus-vlaanderen/stcv

John Johnson Collection of Printed Ephemera at the Bodleian Library ADDED "Click on 'Catalogue'"

"General" CHANGED TO "General Sites and Useful Articles"

Rare Map Cataloging: A Case of Special Considerations ADDED "2006" to description

Map Curator's Toolbox from the British Cartographic Society CODING MESSED UP—FIXED

MASTER Project Cataloguing Home Page DELETED—Link for Rules does not lead to a document, leads to a private company

Schoenberg Database of Manuscripts at the University of Pennsylvania MOVED TO http://dla.library.upenn.edu/cocoon/dla/schoenberg/index.html

The Parker Library on the Web DELETED—Not free

Beinecke Library Medieval and Renaissance Mss. MOVED TO http://brbl-net.library.yale.edu/pre1600ms/

Handschriftendatenbank for Manuscripta Mediaevalia URL HAS CHANGED BUT REDIRECTS INSTANTLY $^&@$ COLD FUSION!

Bolded **subheadings** so that they would be a little more visible.

Submitted by
Laurence S. Creider

Appendix C: Pre-Midwinter 2011 Report on CC:DA

This report covers CC:DA activities between the time of my report on July 23, 2010 and December, 2010.

The Task Force on the Revision of the International Standard Bibliographic Description completed its work in July, and the report submitted to IFLA may be found at: http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair55.pdf

A Task Force was created to examine the impact of the 16th edition of the Chicago Manual of Style on RDA or the editor's guide. The report is supposed to be completed by Annual 2011.

There is no meeting of the Joint Steering Committee currently scheduled. The practical effect is that proposals to revise RDA and to deal with the issues deferred until RDA was published will almost certainly not appear until after ALA Midwinter.

The schedule for the Committee at Midwinter in San Diego is fairly light. The agenda is available at: http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/agen1101.html, although not all the reports are up yet. Aside from reports by the LC representative (Barbara Tillett) and the ALA representative to the JSC (John Attig), there will be a report on revision proposals from the AALL on reports of one court (RDA 16.21.1.21 http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/aall4.pdf) and on places in certain federations (RDA 16.2.2.9 http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/aall3.pdf). There will also be reports from CC:DA task forces on RDA instructions for heads of state and heads of government (http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-heads1.html) and RDA instructions for governmental and non-governmental corporate bodies (http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-gov1.html). There will also be the now traditional reports from the RDA Training and Programming task forces, from ALA Publishing, MARBI, LITA, etc. More reports will be available closer to the meeting dates.

There will be some interesting discussion papers and one proposal at MARBI. See http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2011_age.html

Submitted by
Laurence S. Creider