



1. Introduction of members and visitors
 2. Settlement of the agenda
 3. Approval of Annual 2008 minutes
 4. Consent agenda
 5. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee
 6. Examples to accompany DCRM(B) and DCRM(S)
 7. Revision of *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging*
 8. MARBI
 9. Reports (appended to the minutes): Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger; CC:DA Report
 11. Preconference workshops
 10. Preconference seminars
 12. DCRM(C): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*
 13. DCRM(G): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics)*
 14. DCRM(MSS): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)*
 15. DCRM(M): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)*
 16. DCRM(S): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*
 17. DCRM editorial logistics and guidelines
 18. Assignments
 19. Announcements from the floor
 20. Acknowledgements
 21. Adjournment
- Appendix A. Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger
Appendix B. CC:DA Report

1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Marcia Barrett, University of Alabama; Erin Blake, Folger Shakespeare Library; Randal Brandt, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (chair); Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; David Faulds, Emory University; Ryan Hildebrand, University of California, Irvine; Windy Lundy, University of Colorado, Boulder (secretary); Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; Nina Schneider, Clark Library, University of California, Los Angeles (controlled vocabularies editor); Bruce Tabb, University of Oregon; Eduardo Tenenbaum, Princeton University; Alex Thurman, Columbia University; Seanna Tsung, Library of Congress.

Liaisons: Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles (rare music); Jane Gillis, Yale University (rare serials); Elizabeth Robinson, Library of Congress (LC liaison); Manon Th  roux, George Mason University (ACRL to CC:DA).

Visitors: Alison Bridger, Folger Shakespeare Library; Jane F. Carpenter, University of California, Los Angeles; Ellen R. Cordes, Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Jackie Dooley, OCLC Research; Ellen Elickson, Yale University; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado, Denver, Health Sciences Library; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; Martha Lawler, Louisiana State University, Shreveport; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Jennifer MacDonald, University of Delaware; Robert Maxwell, Brigham Young University; Christine Megowan, Loyola Marymount University; Ann Myers, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Jennifer Nelson, Robbins Collection, Law Library, University of California, Berkeley; Cory Nimer, Brigham Young University; Phyllis Payne, Boston University; Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ray Schmidt, Wellesley College.

2. Settlement of the agenda

Agenda items 10 and 11 were reversed at the beginning of the meeting.

3. Approval of Annual 2008 minutes

Several corrections to the Annual 2008 meeting minutes were submitted by email before the conference. The minutes, incorporating those corrections, were approved unanimously.

4. Consent agenda

There were no items for the consent agenda.

5. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee (Schneider)

Nina Schneider announced that 16 people attended the Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee meeting on the previous afternoon. She reported that since Annual, the Subcommittee has been resolving conflicts with the Genre Terms. She queried the Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) for thoughts on whether the seven thesauri can be combined and whether images can be included as examples, although the images would not be part of the term records. Discussion followed concerning the usefulness of \$2 and the qualifying terms, whether the qualifying terms are needed or can be eliminated unless conflict arises, how well the terms of the thesauri fit together, the conversations with Andy Houghton at OCLC Terminologies Service about inclusion of the RBMS controlled vocabularies, and the possibility of a moratorium on new term submission for several years while the merger is being done. The committee agreed in principle that the thesauri should be merged and that Schneider should report back if problems are encountered. The proposal

to use images also found favor. Randy Brandt said they should be cited fully. Schneider will consult with ACRL and the RBMS webmasters about hosting the images. Schneider reported that as of December 2008, OCLC Terminologies had record counts of the numbers of RBMS terms used in 655 fields in WorldCat: 70,000 Binding terms, 592,000 Genre terms, 7,000 Printing terms, 16,800 Publishing terms, 35,600 Provenance Evidence terms, 4,600 Type Evidence terms, and 4,000 Paper terms.

Thesaurus term proposals

The Subcommittee brought seven terms to BSC. Three were new terms and four were outstanding terms from Annual 2008. Following are the terms as they were presented and discussed. Four terms were approved unanimously; three were returned to the Subcommittee for further discussion. Full treatment of the terms can be found on the wiki (<http://rbmsthesauri.pbwiki.com/>).

New Terms

Art Deco bindings

The Subcommittee proposed adding this new Binding Term. Following discussion about whether the term is appropriate for modern bindings in the Art Deco style, the Subcommittee's preference for restricting to the 1920s and 1930s was accepted. A term for Art Nouveau bindings has not yet been proposed, but if it were proposed it would be treated the same as this proposed term. Images would be good to illustrate Art Deco bindings. Final version approved:

Thesaurus	Binding Terms
Term	Art Deco bindings
Hierarchy	[Styles]
SN	Use for bindings produced during the 1920s and 1930s, in Art Deco style, often characterized by sleek, geometric, or stylized forms.
UF	Bindings, Art Deco
BT	[Styles]
Comments	See wiki for full treatment.

Thumb Bibles

The Subcommittee proposed adding this new Genre Term that falls into three hierarchies from two separate RBMS thesauri, Genre Terms and Printing & Publishing Evidence. They are included in the hierarchy for clarification. Final version approved:

Thesaurus	Genre Terms
Term	Thumb Bibles

Hierarchy	[Special shapes, sizes and kinds of books] : Printing & Publishing Evidence [Literary forms] : Genre Terms [Content of work] : Genre Terms
SN	Use for miniature volumes containing summaries or abridgments of biblical texts in verse or prose; typically illustrated and produced chiefly for use by children.
BT	Miniature books Juvenile literature [Religious works]
Comments	See wiki for full treatment.

Sammelbands

The Subcommittee proposed adding this new Provenance Evidence Term. The English form, rather than the German form, was proposed because the thesaurus is an English-language thesaurus. Schneider noted that the term is to be used for the specific time period in the scope note. Terms for later periods can be proposed. The term record was returned to the Subcommittee for further discussion for use-for and broader terms. The term and the scope note were approved:

Thesaurus	Provenance Evidence
Term	Sammelbands
Hierarchy	[Occasions of provenance]
SN	Use for separately published works bound together for the owner during the medieval or early modern period.
Comments	See wiki for full treatment.

Blind impressions

The Subcommittee proposed this new Printing & Publishing Evidence Term. Final version approved:

Thesaurus	Printing & Publishing Evidence
Term	Blind impressions
Hierarchy	[Pressman's work]
SN	Use for accidental impressions of uninked bearer type on a blank page or part of a page.
UF	Impressions, blind
BT	Accidental impressions
Comments	See wiki for full treatment.

Books in parts

Parts

These two new Printing & Publishing Terms were returned to the Subcommittee for further consideration of both the forms of the terms and their scope notes. BSC members felt that the distinction between the two terms was not clear and discussion during the meeting concerning completeness and the state of binding did not resolve the issues. The terms may benefit from being made related terms for each other.

Change to current term

Markings

The Subcommittee proposed changing the scope note for this Provenance Evidence Term to encompass not only intentional marks of ownership but also marks that may have been made unintentionally. Final version approved, with amendments to the SN:

Thesaurus	Provenance Evidence
Term	Markings
Hierarchy	[Physical amendments]
SN	Use for intentional or accidental marks applied manually in or on materials.
BT	[Physical amendments]
NT	Annotations Autographs Codes Devices Edge-marks Illegible markings Initials Inscriptions Monograms Mottoes Numbers Seals Shelf marks Stamps Stencils Watermarks
RT	Bindings Insertions Labels Papers
Comments	See wiki for full treatment.

Other discussion

With respect to *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, Robert Maxwell noted that the relator terms list appears to be a closed list and suggested that BSC should assert ownership of the RBMS Relator Terms. Manon Th eroux said the issue had been raised on the CC:DA wiki. Schneider will make inquiries.

6. Examples to accompany DCRM(B) and DCRM(S) (Tenenbaum, Schneider)

Eduardo Tenenbaum announced the members of the editorial team working on examples to accompany DCRM(B) and DCRM(S): Schneider and Tenenbaum (co-chairs), Jane Carpenter, Ryan Hildebrand, Silvana Notaromaso, and Sarah Yates. They have recataloged the examples accompanying DCRB and would like to use examples from the RBMS workshops. He brought two questions to the committee: 1) should the examples contain only the descriptive fields or should they be full records; and 2) should the examples be coded using different standards, e.g., MODS, DC, or MARC? BSC members expressed support of using a full record to be helpful to catalogers but encouraged using a distinguishing feature: annotation of the descriptive fields with the DCRM(B) rule numbers (Kate Moriarty); an explanatory statement with rationale for including the access fields (Seanna Tsung); using the 7XX and 655 fields but not the other 6XX fields (Erin Blake); and distinguishing by typography or color (Carpenter). Brandt summarized the committee's consensus to use at least some of the access points and to include relator terms. BSC also supported coding some examples in multiple standards, but not coding each example in all standards. Brandt suggested consulting AMREMM and DACS. On the question of locating copies of examples to confirm or revise the physical description, Maxwell suggested using the forms from existing DCRB examples. Catalogers will know if their copies are different. Brandt recommended that the editorial group request examples from the DCRM workshops.

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

Elizabeth Robinson, chair of the working group, announced the other members of the team working on the revision of *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging* (SCF): Marcia Barrett, Jane Carpenter, Jason Kovari, Ann Myers, and Phyllis Payne. Between the Annual and Midwinter meetings, the SCF Revision Working Group focused on current single name citations. Using the guidelines proposed at the 2006 meeting with Barbara Tillett, Deborah Leslie, and Robinson, the group created a table identifying existing citation forms, the full OCLC MARC forms for author and title, the descriptive rules used for the MARC record, and proposed full and truncated new citation forms based on AACR2 forms (http://rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/committee-docs/scfrevision20090114.pdf).

Robinson noted several problems encountered in following the 2006 proposal: interpretation in truncation might vary; many original editions and supplements would be separated using the new forms; if the AACR2 form of entry is an institution name, it will be difficult for people in the field who know the works cited by surname. Discussion centered on the choice of form of entry to use, the unambiguous AACR2 form of the main entry (whether the personal or corporate name) or the personal name associated with the work. Following comments supporting either corporate or personal name entry, Brandt proposed using the personal name if it is present in 100 or 700 in the bibliographic record. Robinson noted that currently she establishes several new citation forms every year that must have approval by LC's Policy and Standards Office before CDS updates the text in Catalogers Desktop. Maxwell suggested creating a registry of every citation form, or an authority record for an established form that could be maintained on a wiki or central location, and sending to Catalogers Desktop only the more frequently used citation forms. Brandt and Robinson will discuss the direction the working group should take next.

8. MARBI (Brandt)

a. MARBI Proposal no. 2009-05: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-05.html>

The proposal is to add \$u to field 510 in the MARC Bibliographic Format to provide online access to a full description of the bibliography cited. Brandt reported that \$u is not intended for online resources that require subscription. Robinson noted the differences in the placement of \$c in the examples. Discussion clarified that the placement of \$c either before or after \$u should determine whether the link is to the work cited or to the specific entry in the work. Display of the order of \$c as well as how \$u itself displays is system dependent.

[Subsequent to the BSC meeting, MARBI approved Proposal no. 2009-05.]

b. MARBI Discussion Paper no. 2009-DP02: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp02.html>

The discussion paper proposes field 588 for the MARC Bibliographic Format for administrative metadata. Brandt reported that John Attig suggested BSC write our concerns in response to the discussion paper. Annie Copeland noted that the rationale for the proposal is that information such as the "Description based on" note is not needed by users and is often important only to catalogers. She further noted that DCRM(S) makes the note mandatory and it is important to users of rare serials. Barrett attended the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee meeting earlier and found overwhelming support for the proposal. Robinson suggested that no indicators are defined in the proposal and that they could be defined to display the field or to be used in indexing.

9. Reports (appended to the minutes)

a. Appendix A: Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger (Creider)

Brandt expressed the Committee's appreciation to Larry Creider for his continued work on maintaining the Web Resources page.

b. Appendix B: CC:DA Report (Théroux)

Manon Théroux (ACRL liaison to CC:DA) reported that the full draft of RDA was released in November, a month later than anticipated, and in PDF format only because the online tool was not ready; the review process was seriously hampered by the short review period, the limits of the PDF format, and the many inaccuracies introduced during the conversion of the text to XML and then PDF. She received a limited number of responses from the ACRL membership, but she received more comments from RBMS members than from other ACRL sections. She officially thanked RBMS members Eduardo Tenenbaum, Larry Creider, and Silvana Notaromaso for their comments on the RDA draft. She also noted that the special collections cataloging community had been asked to provide examples for a number of RDA rules as a result of Notaromaso's comments. Théroux's call for examples on DCRM-L netted responses from Notaromaso and William Hale; she will look for examples for the remaining rules herself.

Théroux made the following three additions to the preliminary report distributed with the BSC agenda: CC:DA has finished the "strategic comments" report on RDA requested by the Executive Committee of the ALCTS Cataloging & Classification Section (CCS). CC:DA has also finished its evaluation of the ISBD Area 0 proposals put forward by IFLA. The ALA representative to the JSC, John Attig, has started a blog on which he will report daily during the JSC spring meeting. In response to Maxwell's suggestion that she expand on the nature of the "strategic comments" document submitted to CCS, Théroux responded that the bulk of the report was critical of the RDA process (e.g., density of the RDA text, lack of clarity from ALA Publishing about pricing models and the availability of a print product, and unavailability of the online tool) but that some positive comments were included (e.g., forging of ties with metadata communities and the creation of online registries for the RDA vocabularies). She will submit a final report to BSC following the two Midwinter meetings of CC:DA (attached as Appendix B).

11. Preconference workshops

a. Charlottesville 2009 (ALA in Chicago) (Gillis)

Jane Gillis reported that BSC will be sponsoring a DCRM(S) workshop similar to the DCRM(B) workshop. The workshop will be aimed at rare book catalogers who are not

familiar with rare serials cataloging. Presenters will be Gillis, Copeland, Stephen Skuce, and Brandt.

b. Philadelphia 2010 (ALA in Washington, D.C.) (Brandt)

Brandt would welcome ideas for the 2010 workshop.

[Subsequent to the BSC meeting, a plan was developed to do a Latin for Rare Book Catalogers workshop to be conducted by Jennifer Nelson and Kate Moriarty.]

10. Preconference seminars

a. Charlottesville 2009 (ALA in Chicago) (Brandt)

Brandt reported that David Faulds has agreed to take over and work on ideas for seminars. Time for approval of 2009 topics is short, but two ideas are: 1) focusing on the role of cataloging in security efforts of special collections; and 2) *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging* and the revision process. Suggestions of aspects of the cataloging and security topic included focusing on cataloging procedures (Leslie); how to make decisions on what to include in bibliographic records that is not now included and on what will not have a negative impact on production (Robinson); using DCRM(B) minimal level records for quick retrospective cataloging (Tsung); focusing on local notes for what distinguishes an item (Brandt) and for indicating value (Faulds); and developing a practice of connecting cataloging records and photographic representations of items, since verbal description could potentially tell a thief what to take (Blake). Ellen Elickson mentioned a similar program had been held at the Getty Research Institute. Bruce Tabb added that the Security Committee's manual has a section on cataloging.

Related to SCF and its revision is the use of citations in bibliographic records: whether we need to provide as much detail in the record when the citation is present in a 510 field and whether copy catalogers need to verify every 510; the implementation of 510 \$u (if it passes MARBI); and the benefit to public services colleagues, researchers, and booksellers.

Brandt suggested that if the second topic surrounding SCF and its revision were developed for a 2009 seminar, the cataloging and security topic would be appropriate for the 2010 preconference theme of collaboration. He further suggested that the seminar format does not have to be three speakers and a moderator. It can be fewer speakers with time for discussion.

b. Philadelphia 2010 (ALA in Washington, D.C.) (Brandt)

See above.

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

Seanna Tsung reported that DCRM(C) editorial team members (Carolyn Kadri, Nancy Kandoian, Th roux, and Tsung (chair)) met the previous afternoon, with Brandt and Attig attending. Two other members, Creider and Todd Fell, will meet with the team in Chicago at Annual 2009. She indicated that there will be appendixes for globes, maps in books, atlases, and manuscript maps. Kandoian is working on Area 3, mathematical data. The team is expanding on the provisions of DCRM(B) rather than eliminating them. They intend to have a rough draft ready by Annual, will establish a wiki, and will welcome examples.

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

Erin Blake reported that the DCRM(G) editorial team met at the Folger Shakespeare Library in November 2008 and will meet later during Midwinter, in two meetings to work on Area 4 and Appendix B. The text is currently in rough draft, but it is not ready for review on the wiki (<http://dcrmg.pbwiki.com/>). A full draft will be ready for BSC review by November 2009 and discussion at Midwinter 2010. By March 2010, DCRM(G) should be ready for comment from a broader audience. Blake noted that DCRM(G) will use "material" instead of "publication" and that the concepts of perfect copy and shared cataloging are new to the graphic materials community. The editorial team has discussed the relationship with DCRM(B) 0.G7.1, concerning misprints. In the draft of DCRM(G), the editors have used "inaccuracies" instead of "misprints." Members of the editorial team are Blake (chair), Ellen Cordes, James Eason, Mary Mundy, Lenore Rouse, Joe Springer, and Helena Zinkham, with Marcy Flynn as liaison from the DACS Working Group.

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

Margaret Nichols reported that the DCRM(MSS) editorial team has been working on Areas 0-4. Area 1 is long and complicated. Area 1 follows DACS in recording the date in \$f at the end of the 245 field, not in 260 \$c. At Midwinter the editorial team will work more on Areas 0-4, with Areas 5-7 to follow. They will meet two days at Annual, intend to have a three-day meeting in the spring, and plan to have a draft by the end of the year. Team members are Alison Bridger, Diane Ducharme, Kate Moriarty, Jennifer Nelson, Nichols (chair), Elizabeth O'Keefe, Heather Wolfe, and Bill Landis (ex-officio). Kate Bowers and Lynn Holdzkom are the DACS Working Group liaisons.

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

Jain Fletcher, chair of the DCRM(M) editorial team, noted the members of the Joint RBMS/MLA Task Group for Developing Rules for Rare Music Cataloging (JTG): Nancy Lorimer, Karen Spicher, and Charlotte Wolfe, representing the Music Library Association; and Fletcher, Maxwell, and Tabb, representing RBMS. Tabb has been working on terms for the Glossary. Fletcher announced that last-minute editorial changes and more examples will be added to the draft, so that, by end of February or beginning of March, the draft will be ready to be posted for wider review; from that point, it will remain static until at least June. Review will be solicited from MLA and BSC members. The text should be put on the BSC website and she will give an explanation and overview for the review. Fletcher also noted that she has been working with Hermine Vermeij, the music cataloger at UCLA, on "beta-cataloging" from the DCRM(M) draft; together they encountered some manuscript material bound in with print material and were pleased to discover that the DCRM(M) rules work well in this situation.

Copyright date issue

Fletcher announced that, at the request of Bob Maxwell, Galen Fletcher of Brigham Young University conducted legal research on copyright and found that the copyright symbol's first official use was in 1909 and that other designations used at the time were "copr." and "copyright." G. Fletcher also determined that 1831 was the earliest date that music could be copyrighted in the United States. J. Fletcher passed around the document he had found for the JTG, then thanked the Ad Hoc Copyright Working Group members, Lorimer, Maxwell, and Wolfe. Following up on the JTG's copyright position paper discussed at Annual (http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/dcrm/dcrmm/dcrmm_copyright200806.pdf) Th  roux revisited the DCRM(B) editorial team discussion and difficult decision to exclude copyright dates from DCRM(B) in Area 4 [MARC field 260 \$c]. Th  roux created a background document, gathering information from the text of DCRB and from discussions about DCRM(B) Epsilon Draft and Zeta Draft. She noted that, for printed books and serials, LCRI 1.4F5 does not permit recording a copyright date following a publication date. She said there are multiple principles in conflict with each other and a number of issues not mentioned in the DCRM(M) position paper would need resolution should the transcription of copyright statements in Area 4 be required.

[Subsequent to the BSC meeting, on February 3, 2009, Th  roux posted her background document to DCRM-L, under the subject "Background on Treatment of Copyright Dates in DCRM(B)." The document has also be posted on the BSC website:

http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/dcrm/dcrmb_copyright200901.pdf

Discussion continued with comments and suggestions from other editorial teams. Blake noted that DCRM(B) does not say to use the copyright date as the inferred date unless it is the probable date. Because music often has dating problems and because other editorial teams may be faced with similar difficulties, Fletcher suggested that the rule needs to be

clearly stated. Blake proposed a standard note, applicable to all DCRMs, for situations where the publication date has been inferred from the copyright statement, with wording along the following lines: "Publication date suggested by copyright date." She said the DCRM(G) team will discuss this later in the conference, noting that graphics may have a reason for using both the publication and copyright dates as part of the transcription in field 260 and that users are looking for reproduction rights based on copyright. For graphics, she is grateful for any information that can be transcribed. Copeland suggested that DCRM(C), DCRM(G), and DCRM(M) teams should be able to make the decision for their own formats, but Leslie said 260 \$c should be transcription so that the instruction would be to omit, bracket, or transcribe. Tsung, noting that modern maps often lack dates, said that DCRM(C) can live with either point of view and that examples will help. Moriarty preferred the mark of omission; Brandt was okay with omission or bracketing, but against transcription of lengthy date of deposit statements. Blake brought up the issue of using "c" in the copyright date and the confusion with the meaning "circa."

DCRM(M) rule-specific discussion

5B14.3 and 5B15. Fletcher noted that discussions in the JTG have questioned whether both rules are needed. The draft DCRM(M) 5B14.3 instructs: "Record folded leaves as leaves or pages of plates. Make a note to indicate any folded leaves with printed music, if considered important." 5B15 instructs: "Describe folded leaves as such." Fletcher suggested that all could be used in 5B15 and that 5B14.3 could be removed.

*[Subsequent to the BSC meeting, in discussion by email, Leslie offered clarification concerning the distinction between the two rules: they apply to two separate sub-elements of the statement of extent (300 \$a), but "folded" may apply to both sub-elements. She suggested that changing the example to accompany 5B15 would make the distinction clearer and proposed the following for the second example: 60 **folded** p. of music, 5 leaves of plates (some folded)]*

Several other rules and small changes were discussed; for some of the small changes, the JTG was given the "go-ahead" to make them with the understanding that they would be discussed further in the open review period.

16. DCRM(S): *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)* (Brandt)

Brandt displayed a published copy of DCRM(S). He acknowledged all of the other DCRM(S) editors: Copeland, Gillis, Juliet McLaren, and Stephen Skuce; and the four DCRM(B) editors who provided assistance: Attig, Leslie, Springer, and Thérroux. Gillis, Copeland, and Skuce are working on an applications guide. DCRM(S) is available from CDS at the Library of Congress. Leslie reported that Barbara Tillett at LC was interested in receiving reports of CDS orders for DCRM manuals not being filled in a timely manner. To contact Tillett directly, send email to: btil@loc.gov.

17. DCRM editorial logistics and guidelines (Brandt)

Brandt began the discussion concerning logistics and communication among the DCRM component editorial teams. Following Annual 2008, Blake had entered all of the existing editorial guidelines on the ALA wiki (http://wikis.ala.org/acrl/index.php/DCRM_Editorial_Guidelines) and Brandt encouraged editors to make updates to those guidelines. Anyone with an ALA login can make changes on the wiki.

[Subsequent to the meeting it was reported that an ALA login is not necessary and anyone can make changes on the wiki.]

Brandt said that all of the DCRM component editors should be subscribed to DCRM-L. Concerning the archiving of the components and drafts, Blake noted that unless a subscription fee is paid to pbwiki not everything is archived. For DCRM(G), the team is keeping Word backups. Leslie noted that RBMS will not archive drafts of published documents and queried whether institutional archiving is possible.

For future meetings of the editorial teams, Leslie noted that beginning in 2010 ALA is condensing the conference. Monday will be the last full day, with the conference ending at noon on Tuesday. Meetings for the teams on Thursday and Friday might be possible, but they would overlap with the RBMS preconference. The cost of reserving rooms, providing Internet access, and the limit to the number of meeting rooms the section has are variables to consider. Meeting in public or academic libraries in conference cities may be a possibility.

Brandt announced that, following a question Maxwell and Attig brought up about the relationship of RDA and DCRM, all agreed that the DCRM components will continue to be based on AACR2. When the next component is ready to be published, the question will be revisited.

18. Assignments

Currently there are no assignments.

19. Announcements from the floor

Brandt announced that Fernando Peña, the new RBMS Executive Committee Member-at-Large, is liaison to BSC. Following Annual 2009, BSC will need a new secretary; Windy Lundy's term is up at that time. Brandt also will rotate off the committee as chair. Stephen Skuce will become the new BSC chair.

21. Acknowledgments

No further acknowledgments were made.

22. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Windy Lundy

APPENDIX A: WEB RESOURCES FOR THE RARE MATERIALS CATALOGER

Report to the Bibliographic Standards Committee on the Directory of Internet Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger:

<http://lib.nmsu.edu/rarecat/>

ALA Midwinter Conference, Denver, Colorado

Submitted by Larry Creider, January 2009

New sites

Biography:

Michaud's Biographie Universelle

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/> [click on "Decouverte," then "Dictionnaires," then "Dictionnaires biographiques," then "Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne"]

ADB/NDB Deutsche Biographie

<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/>

Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon

<http://www.bbkl.de/>

Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz

<http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/index.php?lg=d>

IFLA Names of Persons: National Usages for Entry in Catalogues, 4th ed.

http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/pubs/NamesOfPersons_1996.pdf

Calendars and Computus:

Calendoscope -- Repertory of Medieval (and early modern) Liturgical Calendars to localize and date materials

<http://calendriers.irht.cnrs.fr/>

Special Topics for Rare Books:

Publishers' Bindings Online Research Links

<http://bindings.lib.ua.edu/research.html>

American Bookbinders Museum

<http://www.bookbindersmuseum.com/index.php> -- Note Bookbinders and Endpapers tabs

R.I.E.C.H, Repertoire des imprimeurs et editeurs suisses actifs avant 1800

<http://dbserv1-bcu.unil.ch/riech/riech.php>

Bibliopolis -- Persons, Biographical Information on the Dutch Book Trade

http://www.bibliopolis.nl/personen/zoekscherm_personen_en.html

Gallery of Book Trade Labels

<http://www.sevenroads.org/Bookish.html> (Greg Kindal)

Images of Rare Books:

Zentrales Verzeichnis Digitalisierter Drucke

<http://www.digitalisiertedrucke.de/>

Digitalisierung und Digitalisierte Bestände - Miscellanea und Register

<http://wiki.netbib.de/coma/DigiMisc>

Muenchener Digitalisierungszentrum Digitale Bibliothek

http://mdz10.bib-bvb.de/~db/ausgaben/uni_ausgabe.html?projekt=1157526886

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Digital Collections

<http://www.digital-collections.de/index.html?c=kurzsammlungen&l=en>

Cataloging of Medieval MSS:

British Library Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, Glossary— from Michelle P. Brown, *Understanding Illuminated Manuscripts: A Guide to Technical Terms* (J. Paul Getty Museum: Malibu and British Library: London, 1994)

<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/glossary.asp>

Images of Medieval MSS:

Large Digital Libraries of Western MSS

<http://wiki.netbib.de/coma/DigitaleHandschriften> (Klaus Graf)

The Parker Library on the Web

<http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home>

Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon. Manuscrits mérovingiens et carolingiens

<http://florus.bm-lyon.fr/index.php>

APPENDIX B: CC:DA REPORT

Report submitted by Manon Th  roux, ACRL Liaison to CC:DA

To: Randal Brandt, Chair, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee; Diana Brooking, Chair, SEES Automated Bibliographic Control Committee; Marcus Richter, Chair, WESS Catalogers' Discussion Group; Elaine Westbrooks, Chair, AFAS Cataloging Discussion Group

From: Manon Th  roux, ACRL Liaison to ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

Re: Final Report, ALA Midwinter Meeting 2009

Date: February 16, 2009

I. Activities at ALA Annual Conference 2008

Minutes from the CC:DA meetings held at ALA Annual Conference 2008:
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/min0806.pdf>

II. Activities Between ALA Annual Conference 2008 and ALA Midwinter Meeting 2009

The JSC secretary notified CC:DA of the availability of numerous RDA-related documents; a chronological list of these documents is provided on the JSC Web site:
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/workingnew.html>

The ALA representative to NISO notified CC:DA of the availability of numerous draft NISO documents for comment (too many to list here).

July 2008: The CC:DA "Task Force on the Review of Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)" issued its report, which formed the basis for the CC:DA response sent to the chair of the ACRL/RBMS/Bibliographic Standards Committee:
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair44.pdf>

Aug. 2008: A "satellite meeting" on RDA was held in conjunction with the 2008 IFLA Conference. The presentations were made available the following month on the JSC website. Of particular interest was a demonstration of the RDA Online product:
<http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rda.html#presentations>

Oct. 2008: The release of the full draft of RDA, due in October, was postponed.

Nov. 2008: The ALA response to "5JSC/Chair/13 [Consideration of proposals from the ISBD Review Group]" was drafted after CC:DA discussion. The response supported retention of an

exceptional rule (ISBD consolidated edition 1.1.4.1.1) for choosing the full form of title for continuing resources, rather than deleting it or extending the exceptional practice to all types of resources.

Nov. 2008: The JSC released the full draft of RDA in PDF format for worldwide review. The release of the RDA Online product was postponed due to software development complications. The deadline for public comment was given as Dec. 15, leaving approximately one month to review over 1,000 pages. New content included the introduction, glossary, and several appendices; revisions of previously released sections constituted the remaining content: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdafulldraft.html>

Dec. 2008: The JSC set up a wiki to record typographical errors, errors in cross-references, etc., identified in the Nov. 2008 draft of RDA. The JSC did not request proof-reading, but recognized that typographical errors may have been found during the review. The wiki allows reviewers to check if errors have already been identified. Only the JSC representatives and their nominees are able to edit the pages: <https://wiki.nla.gov.au/x/MQBS>

Dec. 2008: The JSC issued: 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2 [Musical works and expressions]. This follow-up to their November 2008 follow-up contained proposed revisions to RDA chapter 6 and was given a separate response deadline of Jan. 12.

Jan. 2009: The JSC announced that Margaret Stewart, representative from the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, will serve as chair from January to June 2009.

Jan. 2009: John Attig set up a blog for posting informal reports relating to his activities as ALA representative to the JSC. Initially, he will be using it to communicate decisions made in the process of compiling the ALA response to the RDA full draft. Later he will post updates during the JSC spring meeting. The blog has a built-in RSS capability. http://www.personal.psu.edu/jxa16/blogs/resource_description_and_access_ala_rep_notes/

Jan. 2009: CC:DA drafted a "Report of Strategic Comments on RDA" for the ALCTS/CCS Executive Committee, at their request, summarizing concerns, challenges, and issues with implementing RDA. The CCS Executive Committee will use the report as a basis for making recommendations to the ALCTS Board of Directors about how to proceed with RDA: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair46.pdf>

Negative issues identified in the report include: an overly technical writing style, no clear plans for a print product, online interface not yet revealed, no information on pricing, training challenges, and an overall "nimbus of disappointment" regarding the drafts and development process. Positive mention was made of: RDA's greater adaptability for emerging formats, the acknowledgment of new relational database structures, and collaboration with the wider metadata community.

Jan. 2009: CC:DA charged a “Task Force on the Review of the Proposed ISBD Area 0” with reviewing IFLA’s draft of a new Area 0 (Content Form and Media Type) for the consolidated ISBD; the draft proposes structure and terminology for an independent ISBD component for content/carrier as a replacement for the current GMD:

http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/isbdrg/ISBD_Area_0_WWR.htm

The Task Force’s report found the proposal to be successful overall:

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/tf-isbd03.pdf>

It expressed some concern about the amount of detail that would be recorded when following the recommendation to “record as many terms as are applicable to the resource being described,” suggested an alternative of recording only the category that applies to the predominant part of the resource, suggested that the “Multiform : Multimedia” option might not be very helpful to users, and had questions relating to the MARC coding.

III. Activities at ALA Midwinter Meeting 2009

CC:DA met twice at ALA Midwinter Meeting 2009; the agenda:

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/agen0901.html#agenda>

Other RDA-related meetings at the conference included:

- FRBR/RDA Forum (Friday Jan. 23)
- RDA Update Forum (Sunday, Jan. 25)
- MARBI (Sunday, Jan. 25; agenda included RDA proposals and discussion papers)
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2009_age.html
- RDA Implementation Task Force (Sunday, Jan. 25)

Some highlights of the CC:DA meeting included:

Status of the ALA response on RDA: John Attig, the ALA representative to the JSC, reported that he had completed approximately one third of a rough draft of his response to the RDA draft, based on the comments in the CC:DA wiki.

RDA core element set: The RDA core element set is tied to the FRBR user needs and tasks and is intended to represent the minimum requirements for an RDA record, not necessarily an ideal record. The core elements should allow for identification of a manifestation, of works and expressions embodied in the manifestation, and of entities responsible for creation of the manifestation. The FRBR attributes and relationship values have been mapped to the RDA core elements; FRBR assigns a high value to place of publication (unlike RDA), so there might be further discussion of this issue. CC:DA members noted potential problems associated with the word “core” (confusion with PCC core, core competencies, the “essential” elements in IFLA’s Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, etc.), problems with machine validation routines that might assume core means mandatory, uncertainty about whether a

record lacking a core element could still be considered an RDA record, the inevitability that what is considered core will vary with each format, whether core elements for specific formats should be left to application profiles for individual cataloging communities, and whether a core element set is needed at all. Also mentioned was the problem that access points are not themselves elements, although they are composed of elements and might include core elements.

RDA Appendix J: The numerous errors identified in Appendix J will be fixed; will have a clearer idea of the extent of the revisions after the JSC March meeting.

LC Reorganization: LC's Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate reorganized in Oct. 2008. Cataloging and acquisitions functions have been merged to create 6 production divisions and 3 support divisions; the former Cataloging Policy & Support Office (CPSO) is now called the Policy and Standards Division (PSD).

LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control follow-up: LC has contracted with R2 Consulting to develop a survey of the bibliographic landscape, as recommended in the Working Group's report. LC has also formed an internal group to analyze the report's other recommendations and identify projects that LC could undertake.

RDA Testing by LC and partners: Together with NLM, NAL, and various partner institutions, LC will begin testing RDA once the online product becomes available. Participants will include various types of libraries and different levels of cataloger experience. After undergoing training, the participants will conduct testing for 6 months. The test records will be distributed to the utilities, to other communities, and to CDS customers. Assessment of the test results will take 3 months and will be shared publicly.

LC Genre/Form: LC has established a plan for five new genre/form projects (cartography, law, literature, music, and religion) and is in the initial stages of creating genre/form authority records for cartographic materials: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genreformgeneral.html>

ALCTS RDA Implementation Task Force: Chair Shawne Miksa announced that the Task Force will sponsor the following at ALA Annual Conference 2009: a Friday preconference called "RDA, FRBR, and FRAD: Making the Connection" and a Saturday afternoon program called "Taking RDA for a Test Drive".

RDA and ALA Publishing: Don Chatham provided tentative information on pricing models for RDA: a one-time cost of approximately \$100-\$125 for access to the basic text for a single user (it wasn't clear how updates would be handled) vs. ongoing annual subscription prices for a single user or multiple concurrent users, with additional access to "toolkit" functions and added content. There was a long discussion on the relationship between RDA Online and LC's Cataloger's Desktop, with no clear resolution; it seems ALA Publishing needs to be better informed about the Desktop, what it contains, and how catalogers use it. The Desktop will soon be migrated to a new platform that will be technologically superior to the RDA Online platform.

Tentative timeline: A demo version of the RDA Online product should be available in Feb. 2009. The JSC will turn over the final text in June 2009. Release of RDA Online will probably happen sometime in the 3rd quarter of 2009. Training and testing would follow; in the U.S., implementation is expected for sometime in 2010. It is not yet clear how other countries are planning their RDA implementations or how OCLC will handle its implementation. However, OCLC is part of the ALCTS RDA Implementation Task Force and will be participating with LC in RDA testing.

Renewal/Revision of CC:DA Charge: The name of the JSC needs to be updated; questions about the appropriateness of the phrase “cataloging code” will be resolved on the discussion list; CC:DA might need a liaison from the ALCTS Subject Access Committee (unlike AACR2, RDA has subject access chapters; the CC:DA charge currently excludes subject access concerns, but the SAC charge does not include a formal relationship with the ALA representative to the JSC; John Attig would prefer not to have to report to both groups); the ACRL liaison has asked whether CC:DA should be relying on a single person to represent the very different cataloging constituencies within this large ALA division (traditionally the liaison has come from the special collections cataloging community, which has its own unique descriptive practices and needs, in RBMS; however, other ACRL sections, such as the nonroman script cataloging community in SEES, have their own particular issues and concerns).