



Bibliographic Standards Committee
Midwinter Conference, January 2002
New Orleans, Louisiana
Minutes

Bibliographic Standards Committee, Meeting I

New Orleans, LA, Saturday January 19, 2002

Members present: Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Jain Fletcher, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie (chair), Gregory Pass, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Beth Russell, Patrick Russell, E.C. Schroeder, Eileen Smith, Joe Springer

Members excused: Elizabeth Robinson, Robert C.W. Hall Jr.

Visitors: John Attig, Larry Creider, Mary L. Elder, Emily Epstein, David Faulds, Jane Gillis, Ellen Griffin, Elizabeth Johnson, Nancy Kandoian, Elizabeth Lilker, Windy Lundy, Bob Maxwell, Juliet McLaren, Michael North, John Overholt, Stephen Skuce, Bruce Tabb, Manon Thérroux, John B. Thomas III, Jerry Wager

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am

1. Introduction of Members and Visitors

Members and visitors introduced themselves.

2. Settlement of the Agenda

The agenda was settled.

3. Approval of Annual 2001 Minutes

<http://www.library.yale.edu/bibstand/2001annual.htm>

Changes were noted, and the minutes from the 2001 Annual conference were approved.

4. Announcements

Committee membership. Robinson, P. Russell, and Schroeder have entered their final year of service. Other continuing members are Fletcher, Larrabee, and Pass. Roper, the BSC intern last year, has been appointed to regular membership, and is the committee secretary. Springer is a new regular member--this represents his third appointment to the committee. Two new interns appointed to one-year terms are Smith and B. Russell. Bruce Tabb, Thesaurus Editor, is a special member of the committee, as are Jane Gillis and Juliet McLaren, the commissioned authors of the rare serials rules. Robert Maxwell, former BSC chair, is ACRL liaison to the ALCTS

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), and considers that RBMS Bibliographic Standards is the appropriate particular ACRL group with which to liaise.

5. Transition Issues

Leslie noted that the transition of chairmanship from Bob Maxwell to her was prompting a number of other transitions. The Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) website is moving from BYU to the Folger. The old main page at BYU contains a redirect to the new page at the Folger. Any problems with outdated documents should be brought to Leslie's attention. Leslie is planning a redesign of the BSC main site, and will consult with RBMS Webmaster Christian Dupont. She hopes to make it easier to link without having to scroll through the whole page.

6. BSC-RI on Printers' Names and Printers' Families

a. <http://www.folger.edu/bsc/printers.html>

Leslie announced that the BSC Rule Interpretation "Rules for Establishing Certain Names Associated with Printers" has been accepted by the Library of Congress Cataloging and Policy Support Office (CPSO), and will be written as a rule interpretation to chapter 24 (corporate bodies). Wager (an LC employee) informed the committee that Bob Hiatt at CPSO was given a February deadline for a draft of the RI, with final publishing/releasing in May. Leslie asked if the final version would be different from the proposal, and Wager said that there would be stylistic and editorial changes. Leslie noted that this RI will interpret several rules over different chapters in AACR2.

Leslie led a discussion of current practice for tracing printer entities. A few libraries have changed their practice to follow this RI. Leslie is interested in keeping track of questions or difficulties that arise from interpreting or applying the RI.

b. <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/bscrifam.htm>

P. Russell led a discussion of his previous proposal for dealing with families of printers. It was generally agreed that the newly-adopted BSC-RI on "Rules for Establishing Certain Names Associated with Printers" covered most of the issues.

One issue that does remain unaddressed is that of using family names as main and added entries. Leslie noted that the minutes from Annual 2001 mentioned that she and Robinson would discuss the possibility of requesting a new survey from LC regarding this. P. Russell noted that rather than review the whole question of using family names, he suggests using the same approach as printers' names – i.e. as a particular circumstance.

The discussion moved on to the issue of distinguishing between different branches of family names, e.g., distinguishing between the 19th-century Smith family of Baltimore, and the 17th-century Smith family of London. Wager noted that when LC looked at this issue, a balance was struck between the various interested communities with the decision to keep family names together. It is still controversial, and some libraries insist this makes archival material more difficult to find. The committee discussed the difference between the authority and subject use of such headings. There were suggestions of using a qualifier, such as "printer" or by city to distinguish between families. It was generally agreed that the primary benefit of pursuing authorization for treating family names as main and added entries would be for provenance rather than printers. Smith indicated her interest in working on a draft BSC-RI for family names as provenance added entries.

7. Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger

<http://www.library.upenn.edu/ipc/rarecat.html>

Leslie announced the website would eventually be moving to the Folger. McLaren asked Creider if the ESTC was listed as a cataloging source on the resources page. Creider responded that it is not on there, because it is not a free site. He had oriented the page towards freely available sites. Creider agreed to add a link to the ESTC page that explains the subscription process. Creider would like to do a conceptual overhaul for the site to improve navigation. Creider then reported on updates he had made to the site. He has been adding links for images of rare books, and will add a link to the British Library images of two Gutenberg bibles.

8. *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM) v14

Leslie announced that AMREMM is close to completion. Pass integrated CC:DA's recommendations on particular sections and how to dispose information in authority and bibliographic records. Hugh Thompson, Director of Publications for ACRL, has informed them that the turnaround time for publishing is 6 weeks once it is accepted. Leslie asked if the committee has access to version 14, and Pass responded that he could attach a copy to an email to the BSC list. There was discussion about the nature of the document's connection to the committee. Pass does want to acknowledge the Electronic Access to Medieval Manuscripts (EAMMS) group from which the idea for AMREMM generated. The committee felt that clearly naming the committee as a sponsor and authorizing body was important. This would lend authority to the rules, as well as acknowledge the continuing commitment of the committee for upkeep of the document. It was decided that the BSC would appear on the title page, while EAMMS and CC:DA would be thanked in the acknowledgements.

9. Draft Map Rules

Kandoian was present to report to BSC on the revision of map cataloging rules by the Anglo-American Committee for the Cataloging of Cartographic Materials (AACCCM). She announced that nothing has changed in terms of the subcommittee of map catalogers who worked on the rules distributed at the last meeting, which was part of the overall revision of the 1982 manual for map cataloging, an interpretation of AACR2. She did note that although major changes to chapter 3 of AACR2 would be published this summer, none of the chapter 3 changes apply specifically to early maps. She asked how the BSC had planned to incorporate the rules on rare cartographic materials into the *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials*. Leslie responded that the committee would be happy to simply point people to the maps document, unless, after publication, early map catalogers are not finding it sufficient. Kandoian reiterated that these rules were not created as a separate document, just created by a separate subcommittee and she did not know how difficult it would be to convert it to a stand-alone document. She also had the sense that it would be permissible to adapt the rules, as long as there was an official acknowledgement of their source. She can be reached at Nkandoian@nypl.org.

10. DCRB Revision

Leslie introduced the idea of scaling back on the committee's revision work. In looking over the comparisons, which she found helpful, she noted inconsistencies in assumptions and practice of the review. One of the revision tenets had been to remove redundancies between AACR2 and DCRB, but she questioned whether this would leave a stand-alone document. She added that the rules are pretty good as is, and the energies of the committee might be more profitably employed in pinpointing and revising problem areas. There was support for focusing on larger issues rather than editing the wording so that DCRM(B) conforms to AACR2. The group also agreed that it was important for the revised document to be self-sufficient even if it means there are redundancies between DCRB and AACR2. There was no objection among committee members to scaling back. Leslie proposed that the task force appointed to work on the general principles work out a strategy for how to best proceed with the revision as well as outline the general principles. Leslie added that she is not wedded to this approach, and welcomes other ideas. <The General Principles Task Force consists of Fletcher, Leslie, Smith, and Springer, with former BSC members Richard Noble and Creider as consultants>.

11. Early Music Cataloging Rules

Fletcher announced that she would be putting the draft music rules up on the web, between this meeting and the meeting of the Music Library Association in mid- to late February). The group is still exploring certain issues, such as formulating music-oriented examples. She thinks something substantive will be available in early spring. Karen Spicher from Yale has offered to lead a music manuscript rules effort. Fletcher mentioned that one issue they will be facing is who to name as the issuing body, this committee or the MLA Bibliographic Control Committee. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Bibliographic Standards Committee, Meeting II New Orleans, LA, Sunday January 20, 2002

Members present: Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Jain Fletcher, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie (chair), Gregory Pass, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Beth Russell, Patrick Russell, E.C. Schroeder, Eileen Smith, Joe Springer

Members absent: Elizabeth Robinson, Robert C.W. Hall Jr.

Visitors: John Attig, Larry Creider, Mary L. Elder, Emily Epstein, David Faulds, Jane Gillis, Ellen Griffin, Elizabeth Johnson, Elizabeth Lilker, Windy Lundy, Bob Maxwell, Juliet McLaren, John Overholt, Stephen Skuce, Bruce Tabb, John B. Thomas III

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

12. MARBI Report

a. Proposal 2002-07

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2002/2002-07.html>

Attig discussed Proposal 2002-07, which proposes to define indicator values for the 655 field.

The proposal argues that indicator values are defined for all other 6xx fields, but not this field, and proposes that the indicator identifying source be defined in field 655 as well. The problem, which is not confined to the 655, is that in a single indicator position, only 9 indicator values can be coded. There are 32 thesauri that are generally used, and the only field that would work for all thesauri is use of subfield 2. There was discussion of the implications of both approaches. <This proposal was approved by MARBI at its meeting on Monday January 21.>

b. Discussion Paper 2002-DP204

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2002/2002-dp04.html>

Attig next spoke about Discussion Paper 2002-DP204, the proposal to add fields 260 and 300 to the holdings format. The proposal is coming from the moving image archivists who are used to using one bibliographic record for all manifestations of a moving image. It makes things less complicated to move the publication and the physical description areas to the holdings format. It was reported that AACR2 cataloging is moving in the opposite direction, with the Joint Steering Committee of Revision of AACR (JSC) sponsoring a working group to look at “expression level” cataloging. There was discussion of the implications of these two approaches. Leslie suggested this as a possible topic for the MARC for Special Collections discussion group. MARBI may decide to support both techniques, but they would like to know the JSC direction before deciding.

c. Discussion Paper 2002-DP07

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2002/2002-dp07.html>

Attig began by stating that the British Library has decided to abandon UKMARC and adopt MARC21. As a result, they have made several requests for additions to MARC21 for fields and functions supported in UKMARC. One request is a separately-defined field to contain fingerprint information. The second request is a note field specifically for binding information. As defined in UKMARC, this binding note field contains a \$u for image links. These would not be a mandatory field, although there has long been an expectation that catalogers use specific rather than general tags where available. The BSC gives its support for these additional fields, with the understanding that most American libraries would not in fact use them.

d. Revision of the Marc 8 (ALA) Character Set

There has been a request to add Canadian aboriginal syllabics, which opens vast issues about character set support. Attig wanted to know where things currently stood, asking if the Greek character sets is supported. No one present has been able to input pi or chi in Greek characters. Leslie informed Attig that other special characters we need for signature statements are superscript pi, superscript chi, and superscript slash. Attig was not encouraging; he stated that there is a reluctance to add anything at this point the MARC 8 character set, because of how long it has taken to implement the last set of changes. Attig suggested looking into Unicode, and whether the characters of interest are represented there.

e. Proposal to Add \$2 to the Authority Format

Maxwell explained that the proposal is to add the \$2 to the authority format to the 155, 455, and 555 so that what is in the bibliographic record can match the authority record. This proposal hasn't been submitted yet, and he would like the BSC to be the point of origination. Attig noted that \$2 is not defined in any of the 6xx fields, and that the proposal might get more attention if it was proposed as an addition for all heading fields. He said that MARBI tends to think broaden narrow proposals. Instead of including in the proposal specific instruction for all heading fields in the authority format, Maxwell would like to work on proposing this for the 655 and mention

that it might work for other fields as well. Leslie proposed that Maxwell and Attig work on an updated version of the proposal and post it electronically.

f. CC:DA Report

Maxwell reported that the new version of AACR2 is coming out in June. It will now be loose-leaf, and will come out in an annual edition, with whole-page updates designed for easy insertion and removal. Updates will be issued through the web. The index is being completely rewritten for this latest edition. In the 2002 edition, chapters 3 and 12 will be substantially revised. A planned appendix of major changes, guiding catalogers on when to make a new record, is on hold. The JSC is deciding how much of this information should go in the rules. Maxwell mentioned that there are continuing discussions on the format of AACR2, with particular attention to electronic formats. If it is possible for the user to choose an AACR view organized by material format (as at present) or by area, it may not matter as much how the publication is organized. The initial enthusiasm for reorganizing the rules has dimmed, based on the work required and the response.

13. Thesauri

Tabb reported that the thesauri group discussed further the online version of the thesauri, such as where a database such as this would be housed. Leslie suggested submitting an NEH grant proposal to create a database and outsourcing the work. Tabb will investigate the NEH grant suggestion. The day before, Saturday, January 19th, Tabb had attended the Fiction Guidelines Subcommittee of the ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Section, Subject Analysis Committee. Leslie mentioned that Tabb's interaction with the Fiction Guidelines Subcommittee would help in the process of creating an online thesaurus, and has encouraged him to attend even though their meetings conflict with the BSC I meeting.

Genre terms:

"Cast lists" was proposed by the thesaurus editorial team group for committee approval. This proposal was submitted by Leslie at the thesaurus group meeting on Friday afternoon, which means there has been no chance to solicit public comment. The BSC agreed that as long no substantive objections arise after a suitable public comment period, the term is considered approved by the committee and does not need to come up again for discussion. The term record as approved:

[Purpose of work]

. Record-keeping works

. . Cast lists

(Use for lists associating specific performers with their parts)

RT Playbills

The committee also approved, with the above caveat, a change request to add RT for Cast lists to Playbills.

[Conditions of Publication]

. Broadsides

. . Playbills

RT Cast lists

Relator terms:

The code "wdc" has been added to the MARC code list for "woodcutter."

14. DCRM (Serials)

Gillis started by saying that significant changes to the structure (but not the intention) of the rules have been made within the past month. She is trying to align the numbering as much as possible with AACR chapter 12. The group agreed that it is reasonable to try and keep the main numbers aligned, while asserting that it would be impossible for the subnumbers in different areas to align. Gillis noted one change was the approval of the principle of transcription of Roman dates when they appear that way in the source. Gillis and McLaren will be working on a CONSER rare serial module, and a lot of the explanatory text that doesn't have to do specifically with rules will eventually be moved to this. This text will be preserved in DCRM(S) for the time being, though. Leslie asked how much more work needed to be done with the DCRM(S) draft, wondering when it would be ready for a public hearing. Leslie suggested two possible approaches. The first would be to appoint 1 or 2 people to do a close reading, not necessarily committee members. The second approach would be a guided area by area discussion on DCRB-L to force a discussion. Schroeder suggested that perhaps a combination of both methods would be useful <Elizabeth Johnson, Robert Maxwell, Larry Creider, and Elizabeth Lilker have expressed interest and have been appointed the task of close reading>. Leslie will work with Gillis and McLaren to set up a schedule for the DCRB-L discussion. This schedule will include specific dates that committee members are required to respond by.

15. Preconference Seminar – Atlanta, 2002

Gillis is the moderator for the preconference seminar sponsored by this committee, “Changes Second-Generation Library Management Systems Have Made in Cataloging.” There will be a brief introduction to what second-generation library management systems are. Then everyone will break into four groups with a facilitator leading the discussion on one of the four major systems represented. The systems and facilitators are as follows: Robert Maxwell (Sirsi), Stephen Skuce (ExLibris), Elizabeth O'Keefe (Endeavor), and Beth Russell (Innovative Interfaces).

This seminar is expected to appeal both to those who already have a system in place, as well as to those in the market for a new system. After 40 minutes of smaller group discussion, the larger group will reconvene and hear summaries of the individual discussions. There are still spaces open for recorders for the breakout groups Anyone interested in fulfilling that function please let Gillis know.

16. Preconference Seminars (Toronto 2003, New Haven 2004, Boston 2005)

The 2003 Preconference will be in the ALA city, but 2004 and 2005 are not. The group discussed ideas for future seminars, in particular one on the organization and reporting structure for rare book catalogers. Fletcher will write a proposal to submit at Annual 2002 for a seminar to be held at the 2003 Preconference (Toronto). The theme of the Toronto Preconference is “Fakes, Facsimiles and Forgeries” and will deal with issues of authenticity and digitization. This will include discussion of surrogates and their use, and digital manipulation. Schroeder expressed an interest in the impact of digital initiatives on cataloging. Perhaps we might offer a seminar on cataloging digital copies of special collections materials – although this might be a workshop. Latin cataloging and map cataloging were mentioned as possible workshops. The group also discussed having a seminar discussing NACO problems and solutions in Toronto followed by a NACO implementation workshop at the following Preconference in New Haven. Thérout had suggested this, and Leslie will speak to her about putting together a proposal. Leslie added that

she feels committed to this committee offering one seminar at each Preconference. Schroeder will look into putting together a seminar proposal on digital initiatives in cataloging.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer O'Brien Roper