



Bibliographic Standards Committee
Midwinter Conference, January 2003
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Minutes

Members Present: Ann Copeland, Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Jain Fletcher, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie (chair), Gregory Pass, Beth Russell, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Steven Skuce, Eileen Smith, Joe Springer, Manon Théroux

Liaisons: John Attig, Jane Gillis, Nancy Kandoian, Bob Maxwell, Elizabeth Robinson, Bruce Tabb

Visitors: Jeff Barton, Larry Creider, Charles Egleston, Ellen Ellickson, David Faulds, Elaine Franco, Laura Guelle, Billie Hackney, Ryan Hildebrand, Ruth Hughes, Elizabeth Johnson, Regan Kladstrup, Kenneth Lavender, Martha Lawler, Elizabeth Lilker, Windy Lundy, Elaine McConnell, Mary Faith Pankin, Nina Schneider, E.C. Schroeder, Elaine Shiner, Suzy Taraba, Alison Warner

Leslie called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

1. Settlement of the agenda

The discussion of Working Group 1 of the DCRM revision (agenda item 9.b.) was moved to Sunday, with the discussion of Working Group 5 (agenda item 9.f.) moving to the end of Saturday's agenda.

2. Approval of Annual 2002 minutes

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/2002.2.html>

Item 6 was amended to read 'Family Names as Added Entries'. The amended minutes were approved.

3. Introduction of members and visitors

4. Announcements (Leslie)

Leslie alerted the group to several recent advertisements for rare book cataloging.

5. Family names used for provenance added entries (Smith)

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/familynames20021205.doc>

This document will be submitted to the Library of Congress for consideration as a rule upon completion. Smith reminded the group that this issue was originally part of the document on tracing entities printers relating to printers (now an LCRI), but that family

names issue was separated out as distinct from printer issues. Currently, family names cannot be traced as name entries except in manuscript cataloging, and many institutions would like to have a way to trace family names for provenance. The group discussed the most apparent path, i.e., petitioning the Library of Congress to allow family names in the 700 field on bibliographic records for purposes of provenance tracing. The group discussed alternate possibilities as well, such as proposing to establish the families as corporate bodies, or using 79x instead of 700 fields, but without reaching consensus. The committee discussed the impact of this proposal on issues of authority control, since catalogers will need to use more specific family names than allowed in the current structure of establishing family name authorities. It was suggested that the wording of the proposal emphasize its optionality.

The committee agreed that there are many issues still unresolved with this proposal, and Smith will work on it further and report back at the 2004 midwinter meeting. Leslie suggested laying out and discussing thoroughly the possibilities that were mentioned in this meeting. Th eroux noted that the MARBI listserv has had recent discussion on a similar issue, and that this might be helpful to Smith as she reworks the document. Creider suggested that allies from organizations such as the Society of American Archivists might be helpful. Leslie will contact Jackie Dooley regarding this issue.

6. Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger (Creider)

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

Creider announced that Penn can no longer host this site, as he no longer has the necessary permissions to add updates. As a result there have been no updates since the last report. In discussing a more permanent home for the site, Leslie suggested using the ACRL server space that has been set aside for RBMS. She has spoken with Hugh Thompson regarding the turnaround time on updates, which are done by ACRL staff, and he reports that the work is done within a day or two of submission. Taraba informed the committee that ACRL and ALA are migrating to a new type of web site this spring, and as a result they will not be taking new data before this move is complete. April is an optimistic time frame for when ACRL will begin accepting new data. Leslie proposed leaving the Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger on the Penn website until the data can be moved to the ACRL server space, and the committee agreed.

7. AMREMM (Pass)

Pass reported that his last communication with Hugh Thompson indicated that AMREMM was ready for February publication. The corrected proofs were returned in December.

Leslie stated that Thompson had contacted her two days before this meeting and said that the original index was inadequate, and Thompson was in the process of finding another indexer, or perhaps asking the original indexer to revise his work. She is now hoping for it to be published by the 2003 annual meeting.

Pass pointed out that there will be nothing in this printing to indicate the work as an official DCRM module. This led to the larger issue of how to incorporate other modules, such as the early map rule interpretations that Nancy Kandoian has reported on, into DCRM. Leslie asked if Pass had any objection to AMREMM becoming a part of DCRM, and he said that he

did not. Creider reminded the gathering that the original agreement had been that the first edition of AMREMM would be stand-alone and any subsequent editions would be incorporated into DCRM.

8. Early music cataloging rules (Fletcher)

http://www.bol.ucla.edu/~jfletcher/DCRM/DCRM_opener.htm

Fletcher clarified that these rules will be a component of DCRM. These will include rules for early or historical music, scores, and manuscripts. The group working on these rules is trying to stick with the text of DCRB, which is currently a moving target. The website for the committee's work shows a work in progress, not yet ready for serious review. The group has more recently discussed the issue of fictitious imprints, which they feel is not germane to music scores; scores are more likely to have fictitious composers or people, not imprints. They would like to get the opinion of the music library community before incorporating this idea. She also noted that the examples will be in MARC format. Leslie asked if there are any radical or questionable departures from DCRB, and Fletcher noted that the only differences are issues relating specifically to music, with the exception of the i/j/u/v problem. Since music is often printed from an engraving, music catalogers do not have the same reason to look at what the printer is done. The group working on the music rules is inclined to instruct the cataloger to transcribe what is on the piece and then add entries for normalized version. Fletcher asked if this would be a problem. Leslie noted this as an issue to keep in mind when discussing i/j/u/v with regard to DCRM(B).

9. DCRB revision (Leslie)

a. DCRM Conference

Leslie announced that the conference plans are on track. The DCRM Conference is an official BSC meeting; it is an invitational conference for the sole purpose of doing serious and productive work on the revision of DCRB. Key work will be the additions to the text, such as the addressing collection level cataloging and machine press books. The Beinecke Library, with support from Yale University Library, is supporting the conference. The number of invitees had to be limited to 25, with the intention of making the discussion papers points of public discussion as much as possible. Discussion on the papers is currently happening on DCRB-L, as people signed up to that list have expressed an interest in the revision. This public component has yielded some excellent thoughts.

The conference will be structured into plenary and working group sections. There are six working groups, and each conferee is assigned to 2 of the working groups. The intent is to bring DCRM(B) much closer to completion. The wording of DCRM text may not be exact at the end of the conference, but it is expected to be close to finished. As soon as a draft is ready, it will be distributed widely for public comment.

Fletcher asked if there would be a chance to talk about nitty-gritty details about DCRM text; Leslie responded that this was the province of the Problems and Lacunae Working Group (WG5). Maxwell asked if there was going to be discussion on the final format,

whether the document will be published in separate manuals, loose-leaf, etc. Leslie thought that would be appropriate for a plenary meeting discussions.

Shiner asked if the final product would be published in print or electronically, and Leslie responded that since the Library of Congress is the publisher, the ultimate word would be by that body. Maxwell questioned Leslie's assumption that LC was settled as the publisher; and explained that when he as chair of BSC and spoke to LC about revising DCRB when this revision work began, he thought that LC was probably assuming that it would retain publishing rights. The group discussed whether or not LC would still be the publisher, with some assuming that it would be and others thinking that it was a point for discussion. There was also concern about the BSC retaining control in the electronic publishing of the final document, to ensure the integrity of the rules as stand-alone document. Leslie announced that the question of publisher was still open based on the extra information from Maxwell.

c. Working Group 2: Transcription of Early Letter Forms (Leslie)

See thread on [DCRB-L archives](#) under subject "Transcription rules" and variants in [January 1999](#) and [June 1999](#);

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/transsum.html>

Leslie announced that a position paper for this working group has not yet been released. She has provided links to earlier discussions on this issue. There is no clear-cut best solution to this problem; it will eventually be a matter of choosing the least painful option. The paper will discuss the pros and cons of the various options. Leslie acknowledged that each method will have its advocates and detractors, but that it would be useful to have another chance to make a case for each. Fletcher and Robinson agreed that this issue would impact other components of DCRM. Fletcher, referring to the possible recommendation for a different transcription system for DCRM(M), said that we should be aware of how the other formats might have to diverge from this rule if what applies to the printing of books does not apply to music, maps, or even serials. Maxwell requested that the reasoning for the decision, whichever way it goes, be clearly laid out. Thérourx asked if there was any documentation from the last time this issue was discussed and decided upon. Leslie pointed out that there might be no access to the real discussions from the writing of BDRB, but the group agreed that some sort of guidance would be helpful.

d. Working Group 3: Description of Machine-Press Materials (Thérourx)

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/DCRMmachinepress121502.doc>

Thérourx issued a position paper for Working Group 3 in December. The paper is organized following DCRB layout. In the paper she made suggestions for new rules and revisions to existing rules for issues affecting machine press materials. She also proposed additional examples that would reinforce DCRM's suitability for 19th and 20th century materials.

One of the major issues is how to treat printers and publishers, as these roles had settled, and by the 19th century the publisher was clearly the foremost entity, taking precedence over printers, booksellers, &c. DCRB currently instructs us transcribe publishers and printers interchangeably in the imprint area, but AACR2 and MARC provide for transcribing publisher information in one set of subfields and printer information in another group of subfields. The second major issue is of interest to the other working groups, and that is when to create a record. Leslie emphasized that DCRB has not made an explicit stand on this issue, although there is some evidence within the rules suggesting an assumption that new records are to be made for each different edition, impression, and issue. If we are going to include rules for machine-press materials, DCRM will have to make a decision, state it explicitly, and use that as guidance for revision. Th  roux noted that there has not been too much response thus far to the paper. She solicited more input, particularly from members of the working group.

Th  roux expanded on the issues of printers and publishers, noting that these functions became more defined in the 19th century. The heart of the question is whether to treat printers, stereotypers, etc. as manufacturers or transcribe them as equals to publishers. Fletcher opined that the wording should alert catalogers that the use of 'printer' and 'publisher' as equal terms only applies to pre-1801 materials. She also added that she has never felt that DCRB specifically prohibited the use of the \$e and \$f with that rule, especially when applying it for "post-1801" material where the roles of publisher and printer are more delineated.

Leslie pointed out that this group needs to agree to the use of these subfields as the way to present this information. There was discussion on this issue. Some felt that the principle of transcription only allows for the use of \$e and \$f when the information is found somewhere other than the title page. Others felt that transcribing all publishing and printing information into the \$b made for ease of cataloging and training. Gillis suggested that everyone look at ISBD(A), which is available online.

e. Working Group 4: Collection-level Cataloging (Fletcher)

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/wg4outline.doc>

Fletcher introduced the issue of collection-level cataloging by stating that institutions are looking for ways to reduce backlogs, and that collection level cataloging has been suggested as a viable method of cataloging a large collection. She defined this issue as relating to unique collections comprised mostly of items which had originally been published.

When asked to define 'unique,' she said that Library of Congress has already suggested guidelines for cataloging a publisher issued collection. 'Unique' refers to materials that were pulled together in some other way, meaning no one else holds these exact materials as a collection. She admits that her paper will repeat a lot of information that archivists who have traditionally dealt with these issues. She makes a point of stating in the paper that collection-level cataloging does not necessarily guarantee that less time and less money will be spent in processing a collection. She emphasized that the preparation

stage in collection level cataloging is important. The paper defers mostly, if not completely, to APPM for descriptive guidance; access issues will run along more familiar lines for rare and special materials catalogers. Rather than going field by field, which has already been done in APPM, this paper suggests how to prepare a collection for cataloging. Lack of preparation can lead to incorrect and incomplete records.

Leslie asked if Fletcher envisioned this section of DCRM(B) to be a separate chapter instead of an appendix, expressing concern that an appendix would not have the same force as a chapter. Larrabee asked how the issue of collection level cataloging fit into the confines of DCRM(B) at all, since these 'collections' contain published items, and provisions for the cataloging of published items are already contained in the rules. The group discussed the place of the collection level cataloging guidelines in the work. Maxwell pointed out that collection-level records do not necessarily always have to be created in lieu of item-level cataloging, but rather as an enhancement to the individual records by providing an overarching record; analytics in reverse. Théroux argued for adding this section in as an appendix. Leslie retracted her statement about appendices not bearing the authority of the code, noting that she had been thinking of how NISO standards are organized. This is not, however, a NISO standard, and the appendices can carry full authority.

- f. Working Group 5: Problems and Lacunae in DCRB (Leslie)
<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/problems20021218.doc>

A list of identified problems and lacunae has been posted (URL above), but most are without specific recommendations, much less argument or justification. Leslie said that the main issues for amendment have to do with articulating a basic principle of transcription, and re-working the current rules based on the principle. There are a number of inconsistencies in treatment of transcribed data. The other major change would be for increased guidance for the 300 field, (such as the minor but vexing problem of an unnumbered first page after a roman sequence followed by an Arabic sequence), and eliminating one of the options for non-self-correcting pagination in favor of increased precision. Leslie spoke of a movement for less silent omission and fuller transcription, and cautioned that Brian Hillyard of the NLS is arguing for not even transposing separable elements. Maxwell said that these questions would partly depend upon the work of the general principles group. Maxwell urged this working group to provide guidance while leaving room for cataloger judgment. Leslie confirmed that the next draft of the paper would consider the proposals in the context of discussion, argument, and justification.

The group discussed when revisions of the paper should be sent out prior to the conference. The authors were instructed to post a deadline for comments for inclusion in the pre-conference versions in their next draft. The final pre-conference draft should be finished and distributed 2 weeks prior to the conference.

Leslie adjourned the meeting at 11 a.m.

BSC II: Sunday, 16 June 2002, 9:00-11:00 am

Leslie called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

DCRB revision cont. (Leslie)

b. Working Group 1: General Principles (Springer)

http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/draft_principles_20021116.doc

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/generalprinciples.html>

Leslie began the discussion of the General Principles paper by stating that many of the issues in working Group 1 and Working Group 6 overlap, but that she would like to have distinct discussions on the papers, to make sure that things get covered. Springer began by stating that the contents of this paper are derivative of contributions by IFLA and others. He struggled to decide whether these were general principles to guide the specific work of the DCRM conference or a prototype of the forward for DCRM(B). It is still somewhat vague, but it is mostly a broad view of the principles to take into consideration while revising the rules. He provided a brief overview of the development of rare book cataloging in the last twenty years, which saw a shift from working alone, in-house in a card environment to the current realities of copy and shared cataloging. One thing for this group to consider is IFLA's requirements for the bibliographic record, and what of these is of interest to the rare book cataloging community. How relevant is the concept of manifestation, and how is it defined -- is it simply a typographical shift or is there something more intellectual involved. He suggests paying attention to the user task areas as the group works on this at the conference.

In defining the principles that guide the construction of a bibliographic record, there are some obvious tensions. One such tension is the principle of user convenience and the principle of standardization. For instance, harking back to the prospect of starting the transcription where the title page starts (with no regard for separable elements), this makes it standard, but is it convenient for the user? There is also a tension in the principle of integration, as integration can be seen either in terms of other cataloging codes or across formats. Attig suggested that the user tasks from the CC:DA Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) might also be helpful with this issue. Attig also noted that the terms of cataloging are evolving, as evidenced by the Joint Steering Committee's (JSC) current struggle with the term 'manifestation'. Currently a new manifestation is considered to be in existence when any attribute changes, and this is a much finer level of granularity than non-rare book cataloging uses. Leslie pointed out that Springer had used the FRBR as a model when writing his paper because the committee had understood that this was going to be the main defining vocabulary for bibliographic relationships within AACR. This committee would like to be clear to the cataloging community at large in the wording of DCRM(B), but we are not wedded to the use of these terms if the JSC is going in a different direction. Attig admitted that it is not clear what the end result of the FRBR terms vis-à-vis AACR will be. Maxwell stressed

that while DCRM may not be wedded to FRBR, they are wedded to AACR, and we therefore need to keep an eye on the direction of the JSC. Attig said that using the FRBR as a starting point is a good way to stay in line with current thinking.

Creider stated that thus far in the discussion there is a continuing assumption that the users of these rules are interested in identification of manifestation, but there are many researchers who use these materials for their intellectual content. A 16th century copy of Ovid that contains notes of certain scholars may be of interest to a researcher because of those notes, and the general principles need to discuss this aspect. Many pointed out that DCRB concentrates on Areas 1-8 and assumes that AACR will take care of the other aspects of the record. Springer asked if the provision of intellectual access would require different mechanics from AACR, or is it more a matter of how those mechanics are employed. Creider responded that it requires both, since transcription will be necessary to justify added entries. Attig agreed that the general principles are the perfect place to discuss the concept that there are unique physical and intellectual aspects to rare book cataloging. Springer will attempt to incorporate this idea into the paper. Larrabee proposed taking 'descriptive' out of the title, but Leslie argued that no one is prepared to discuss the whole range of access points in the document. Th  roux agreed that authority issues allow for less room to deviate from the norm with access points. Robinson suggested that the committee take a methodical approach to identify access point deviations for rare book cataloging and create rule interpretations for these deviations.

Leslie noted to Springer that this paper also needed to include more specific principles for writing new rules or revising the rules that are specific to books, as it will be used DCRM(B). She would like to see the paper address issues like what is the principle behind transcription and to what levels should transcription be taken. These are the issues that will affect the work of other groups.

Leslie asked for the group's thoughts on the idea of no longer requiring silent omission of dedications. Fletcher asked if there would be provision to continue omitting dedications, just no longer silently. The group discussed the two sides of the argument, that of providing researchers with a greater level of descriptive detail about a book versus the problems that such faithful transcription might cause catalogers working in a shared catalog. Fletcher pointed out that a line must be drawn somewhere, there will always be more information that will help researchers than can be realistically provided in a record. Attig questioned whether or not silently omitting information misrepresents an item. He added that user convenience is not always served by transcription. Smith argued that a greater level of transcription would also help catalogers determine when an item in hand matches a record or not. Maxwell suggested watching the groups working on AACR2, as they are dealing with similar issues of what to provide access for and where to draw the line.

- g. Working Group 6: Editions, Issues, and States (Attig)
<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/wg6.doc>

Attig acknowledged that he is not an active rare book cataloger, but noted that there is a convergence between rare and standard cataloging on the issue of when to create a new record. There is currently a disconnect between the rules and the real world. The rules assume a cataloger is always creating an original record, when the reality is that a cataloger is working in a shared cataloging environment. The rules should recognize this shared environment, and Attig's paper therefore concentrates on the concept of edition in evaluating when to create a new record. It was difficult, though, to examine the FRBR and restate the principles in these terms, because 'expression' is not a concrete term, and 'manifestation' is a little too detailed, particularly for non-book materials.

Leslie asked Attig to summarize the guidelines for creating a new record -- is it done for a new edition, a new issue? Where does impression fall in this hierarchy? Many in the group saw this issue as one area where rare book cataloging deviates from general material cataloging; some institutions may even want to create separate records for each item. There are rare book catalogers, though, who are inputting records into a system that provides holdings for multiple locations, so this idea of a separate record for each copy does not serve their users who are simply looking for a copy that can be checked out from a circulating collection. Leslie noted that while the lowest common denominator reader might be frustrated by an extreme level of detail, the buyers of rare materials may find this information useful in determining whether or not to purchase a particular item. The group also discussed the impact of creating new records based on use of the bibliographic utilities and their requirements.

Leslie noted that the BSC would need to make a decision on this issue of specifying when to create a new record. She suggested writing the rules as if the cataloger were creating a record for each edition, impression and issue, and then providing an appendix with guidelines for creating a new record. Springer asked if this would be helpful for cataloging machine-press books, and Thérout replied that this was the approach she had used in her position paper, largely because it seemed to be what DCRB already implies, but that other options could also work. The group agreed that the rules should be flexible enough to allow for catalogers to take into account their limitations and needs based on institution and bibliographic utility. Leslie added that DCRM should include guidance on when to use different levels of cataloging, and when the use of the DCRM rules is appropriate at all.

10. Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) report (Maxwell)

The proposal to add \$2 to genre heading in authority records did not make it on to the agenda for this meeting, but it will be on the agenda for ALA Annual.

There is word that the JSC might be thinking of the new AACR in terms of a "new edition" -- AACR3. Attig is heading a task force on consistency, and they are currently going through part 1 and checking the chapters to ensure that any differences in the rules are legitimate. CC:DA is also struggling with the idea of when to create a new record, defining terms such as "difference" and "change". They are also struggling with the concept of making a new record based on differing dimensions. The current document says to make a

change if there is a significant difference in the size, and the committee is looking for suggestions on what catalogers determine to be “significant”.

Maxwell had several announcements from CC:DA . The Library of Congress is seeking to fill several cataloging vacancies. The new version of Voyager includes Unicode. The harmonization of UKMARC and MARC21 is now complete. An international group will be taking a second look at the Paris Principles. Europe would like to include the Anglo-American community in this process, and there will be announcement on discussion lists when meetings are set. The Bibliothèque Nationale de France has made its authority files available on the Internet. For more information go to <http://www.bnf.fr/pages/zNavigat/frame/infopro.htm>. The two authority files can be found at <http://noticesautorites.bnf.fr:8095/> <http://noticesrameau.bnf.fr:8096/>

NISO is revising the z39.19 standards. The ISBN is being revised to 13 digits.

11. CC:DA Subject Access Committee (SAC) Subcommittee on Fiction Guidelines (Tabb)

The SAC Subcommittee is going to write a report recommending that there not be one set of guidelines, and requesting discharge.

12. Thesauri (Tabb)

The Thesaurus committee met on Friday, and there were no new proposals. Russell has drafted a proposal to seek funding for online version of thesauri. Fisher will go through the Exhibit Hall and seek out vendors and get quotes for working on this project. The committee hopes to have this project underway by Toronto.

The three relator terms approved in Atlanta are on the MARC office website, but they might not be on Catalogers Desktop

13. Preconference seminars

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/preconference.html>

- Toronto 2003 (Théroux)

Théroux will lead a seminar on authority headings for special collections. The description of the seminar has not changed since Atlanta. 'NACO' has been removed from the title so as not to imply that this is an official PCC training course. This seminar is geared towards catalogers who understand authority records.

Leslie asked if the BSC should try to find out if there is a space for an extra seminar to discuss the DCRM Conference. Johnson informed the group that there is no free seminar space, and the group decided that Théroux's authority seminar was too important to delay further. Johnson suggested that an informal discussion time can be set aside at the preconference and the committee agreed to using this less structured time for discussion of the DCRM conference.

- New Haven 2004 (Fletcher, Thérroux)

Leslie will submit a proposal for a seminar on the Yale DCRM conference. Fletcher's proposal on "The Role of Biblio-Analysis and -Description for Rare and Special Materials" is in the process of being refined. Thérroux's workshop for name authority work is still planned, but has not yet been written up. Karen Spicher is proposing a day-long workshop for the 2004 Preconference on manuscript music cataloging. It was otherwise agreed that a workshop on DCRM(M) would be premature for the 2004 preconference.

- St. Louis 2005 (Leslie)

Leslie read out a list of possible topics for preconference seminars discussed at previous meetings for the committee to consider. Among these ideas are issues of digital reproductions, their cataloging, authenticity, and the impact of digital initiatives on cataloging departments; a repeat of the Latin cataloging workshop, and cataloging artists' books. Leslie wondered if the BSC might sponsor the Latin cataloging workshop at periodic intervals. Sarah Fisher indicated that she has experience cataloging artists' books, and so might be willing to work up a proposal. Leslie would like to see the BSC maintain its commitment to sponsoring at least one seminar per preconference.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer O'Brien Roper