



Bibliographic Standards Committee  
Midwinter Conference, January 2000  
San Antonio, Texas  
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Gillis, Larry Creider, Bruce Tabb, Melinda Hayes, Richard Noble, E.C. Schroeder, Bob Maxwell, Patrick Russell, Jerry Wager, Juliet McLaren, Patrick Russell, Jain Fletcher,

EXCUSED: Elizabeth Robinson, Sandra Sider

LIAISONS: John Attig, Deborah J. Leslie

VISITORS: Manon Théroux, Gregory Pass, Larry Heiman, Rutherford Witthus, Elaine Shiner, Jennifer O'Brien, Lisa Struthers, James Larrabee, Erin Davis, Susanne Nevin, Jeffery Makala, Henry Raine, Roberta Engleman, Margaret Nichols, Peter Hanff

## 1. SETTLEMENT OF AGENDA

After members and guests introduced themselves, the agenda was settled. The discussion of the DCRB revision format (7a) was moved from Saturday to Sunday.

## 2. APPROVAL OF 1999 ANNUAL MINUTES

Minutes from the 1999 Annual Conference were approved with the addition of "directly" after LCSH in 11a. The sentence now reads: Few people will be able to update LCSH directly.

## 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### a. BSC response 7 October 1999 to PCC series questionnaire

Following is the text of the BSC response to the survey, approved between the meetings:

Dear Andrea Stamm:

The ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) is the official voice of the RBMS on cataloging rules and procedures and as such wishes to respond to the BIBCO Working Group on Series Numbering's proposed change in BIBCO procedure with respect to recording series in PCC core records. (We assume that the proposal is only to apply to PCC core records [vs. PCC full records], although this is not entirely clear from the survey.)

All parts of the 440 and 490 fields in MARC records have, until now, always been a "transcribed" field, i.e., the cataloger has been expected to transcribe exactly what he/she sees

when putting information into a4XX field (following AACR2 abbreviation rules in the numbering portion of the field). Conversely, given this, the MARC record has been a reliable surrogate for how the series statement in the original item read. The BSC considers exactness in transcription (within the parameters of AACR2 rules) to be important, and does not feel that the series fields are somehow less important than other transcribed fields (e.g., 245), making them amenable to less exactness in transcription in the supposed pursuit of efficiency. Therefore the BSC opposes the proposals contained in questions 7a ("drop the 490 field and use only an 830 field with the series authority record(SAR) 642 field authorized volume number and caption/designation"), 7b("use the authorized form of numbering (from the SAR 642) in the 440 regardless of what is on the item"), and 7d ("drop the caption/designation entirely and use only the volume number or letter"). Implementation of one of these proposals would result in inaccurate transcriptions (or in the case of 7a, no transcription at all) of the series statement.

Proposal 7c, on the other hand, calls for exact transcription of the caption/designation ("use the volume number and the caption/designation of the item-in-hand in the 440, regardless of what is on the SAR 642 field"). We assume under this proposal catalogers would still use the 490/830 combination if the wording of the title itself on the item differed from the SAR 130. This proposal allows exactness of transcription, which the BSC would approve; however, the result of implementation of 7c would be the destruction of indexing in library databases that index series by the series number (as shown in the second set of examples under question 3 of the survey). This seems unacceptable, and therefore the BSC cannot support this proposal either.

The whole purpose of the PCC program in general, and the core portion of PCC in particular, is the production of catalog records that are reliable and trustworthy. This proposal cuts to the heart of that purpose. Libraries that wished to maintain standards would no longer be able to trust the series portion of PCC records, and catalogers would be required to verify the PCC record against the series authority record in every case to serif the original PCC cataloger had followed the SAR 642 field (under 7c); or potentially revise the record if the series was transcribed under 7a,b or d. The presumption of an improvement in efficiency in the cataloging of the original record behind these proposals is questionable at best. Given the capabilities of current systems, it is a simple matter to copy and paste authorized forms into 830 fields, and therefore the current procedure does not significantly slow down cataloging. And the pennies saved by the original cataloger would be more than offset by the dollars spent by libraries now having to check SARs for all PCC core records, and subsequently revising the records as needed. The proposed changes will significantly reduce the credibility of records produced under the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and may result in less, rather than more, participation in the program. The BSC strongly opposes this proposed change.

Robert L. Maxwell  
Chair, ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Bibliographic Standards Committee

[note: None of the proposals was approved. The report is at:  
<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/seriesnumb.html>]

b. Absences

Maxwell announced that Sider and Robinson were excused.

c. Rare Serials Workshop at Beinecke Library

Schroeder announced that the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University is sponsoring a one day rare serials cataloging workshop on Apr. 8, 2000.

d. LC Voyager Implementation

Wager reported that Voyager has now been implemented at LC. There're still several problems: keyword indexing is not in real time but takes several hours; no keyword indexing in the authorities database; access to the authorities database in the web OPAC and unicode will not be available until this fall; JACKPHY will be later. People seem pleased.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE-RULE INTERPRETATION (BSC-RI):

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

Wager read the following message from Barbara Tillett in response this question to her about what to do with the BSC-RI:

Do you think it would be more useful to start a set of guidelines for rare book cataloging than incorporate it with all others in the DCM's? I know the JSC received a suggestion at the Toronto conference to have complementary guides to accompany AACR to address the specific applications of the rules for each type of material...is this the time to get started in that direction with LC taking the lead?

Wager also reported that Ann Della Porta offered the possibility of including it in the NACO Participants' Manual. Discussion focused on whether or not it would be advantageous for each group to make its own rules. Questions included: Where would the rules go? Who could access them? Could the rules become part of the Catalogers Desktop?

5. RESOURCES FOR THE RARE MATERIALS CATALOGER:

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

Creider reported that the Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger page has not moved and will not move from the University of Pennsylvania site for at least another year. Another member can take over the page and move it when Creider goes off the committee next year.

Some LC Cutter tables have been added. Refdesk.com has replace done of the general reference sites. There were also additions to Place Names, Calendars.

6. DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING OF ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL, RENAISSANCE, AND EARLY-MODERN MANUSCRIPTS v9 (AMREMM)

Pass reported that the [Friday night hearing on AMREMM](#) had been productive. Ed Glazier was there for RLG and pointed out that it should be presented to CC:DA. Rules were positively received. Discussion centered on levels (i.e., content) of description: what is summary and what

is full. Which of these is MARC full? There also appeared no way to create MARC core or minimal. Pass indicated that both summary and full are MARC full. The rules are very flexible. It depends on what the cataloger and the institution are interested in: textual or codicological aspects.

Deborah Leslie said that in language for levels, 'summary' is fine but that 'full' means something else in MARC. Another term for 'full' should be found. She also noted the difference in the 300 (98 l.) and in the collation note (100 l.). Pass explained that the 300 is bibliographical and extent in collation note is codicological. The extent in the 300 reflects the leaves of the manuscript, expressed in Arabic numerals in the collation statement. The Roman numerals in the collation statement represent flyleaves (usually modern). Roman numerals in the collation formula may also represent original raised flyleaves, in which case these are added into the total number of leaves of the manuscript as recorded in the 300. The 300 field represents the total number of leaves of a codex, whereas the collation statement expresses the structure.

Leslie also questioned the 752 (752 |a France. |b Northern), pointing out that this is not an authorized form. For many early manuscripts, there will be no authorized form to use in the 752 (e.g., Northern France, Southern Germany, etc.). She suggested using: 752 |a France, Northern. The committee agreed with her that this is a more acceptable way of using that field.

There was also discussion on the code to put in |e of the 040. The suggestion was: |e arum. This will not be used until it is disapproved. Maxwell will go to CC:DA today to make arrangements with the committee on the approval process. [note: Maxwell did ask and CC:DA agreed to review the rules as soon as we get them a copy.]

LC will not publish the code. Pass has talked to Hugh Thomson and ACRL is interested in publishing it. [note: ACRL has accepted publication of AMREMM.]

7. DCRB REVISION: <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~catalog/people/rlm/bsc/dcrb/dcrbrev.htm>

a. Discussion: Format of DCRM

Before starting the discussion on the forms of publication for the revised DCRB, Fletcher made the following motion:

"Move that we agree to a revision of the cataloging rules for rare materials, Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books (DCRB), and rename it Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM)."

McLaren seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The various chapters or books will be named:

DCRM(B) - for books

DCRM(PM) - for printed music

DCRM(S) - for serials

DCRM(C) - for cartographic materials, etc.

The question was raised as to whether these rules should be structured more like AACR2. Attig said that AACR2 is most likely going to be restructured. Rules pertaining to all formats will be rearranged by fields.

Fletcher led a discussion on two possible presentations for the printed version of DCRM. The first possibility is a single publication with many chapters, much the way AACR2 is currently formatted. The first chapter could be the "general" one, with each format (books, serials, maps, music, etc.) having its own chapter. In many cases, the rules for different formats would refer to the general chapter rules when there was no difference. The second possibility is to publish each manual separately, as self-contained entities. Fletcher summarized the differing needs of the two styles of presentation (without intending to get into the issue of print vs. electronic at this point

Chapters	Individual Manuals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One chapter on general rules and shorter chapters for each format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each manual could provide introductory information suited to each material and its specific historical issues.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive glossary, index, appendices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More room for material-specific appendices and examples.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might not need parenthetical extensions in \$e in 040</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need many extensions for \$e in 040</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Huge in a print edition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each manual would be small; all manuals together would be much larger than the one volume with chapters</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To use, would have to go back and forth from general chapter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rules for each format would be explicitly stated; each manual would self-contained</li> </ul>

Noble noted that publishing separate manuals is adapting the format of the ISBD publications. Noble suggested we could compare ISBD(G), ISBD(A), etc. Creider said we can't construct general until after constructing specifics. ISBD(G) came after ISBD(A), ISBD(M), etc.

"Move we go with ISBD-like style labeling, extensions to be decided later as drafts are being written. Current drafts in process are serials (S), music (PM), books (B)."

Seconded. Passed.

Fletcher noted, before stating the final resolution, that if it were passed, it would also have an effect on the way the 'books' format revisionism being undertaken for DCRM.

"Resolve to develop DCRM as a set of separate manuals to be reconciled and eventually edited separately or together as the committee will decide. AMREMM will be included."  
Seconded. Passed.

b. Reports: Comparisons

i. DCRB/AACR2 comparison

ii. OJ

Leslie has researched areas where transcription is required (OJ1). She will post document for discussion. Fletcher volunteered to find examples of abbreviations and their expansions (OJ2).

iii. DCRB/ISBD(A) comparison

Noble stated that a comparison between DCRB and ISBD(A) is not easy because there is not a one-to-one correspondence. In several places there are major differences. Area 4 is an example of this. Where DCRB uses only \$abc in the publication, etc. area, ISBD(A) also uses \$efg. It depends on whether the publisher and manufacturer are from same source in item. ISBD(A) has many examples of series for the 19th century. Fletcher noted that we will have to follow LCRI 1.6 on series since we have no series guidance in DCRB.

c. MARC21 and DCRB

Russell has incorporated responses into report.

d. Core/Minimal

Creider and Fletcher discussed their draft for the appendix on Core/Minimal level cataloging. It was drafted using much of the text of Appendix from DCRB, but adapted to include 2 kinds of less-than-full cataloging: the minimal level (as originally given in DCRB) and the core-level (from the PCC standard). The Committee was asked to suggest any edits or content changes when they have a chance for a closer reading after Lathe issues addressed at the meeting were:

1) Does the new heading for the appendix, "Less-Than-Full Cataloging" seem OK? (There seemed to be general agreement to this.)

2) Should this guidance apply to all formats covered in DCRM? (the text has been written as if the answer is "yes", even though the authors were aware that a decision would still need to be made on this issue)

3) Should the full text of the DCRB Core Standard be included in this appendix, or, considering that the standard is changeable, would it be "safer" simply to include the address where the current standard can be found?

e. 19<sup>th</sup> Century

Schroeder will write something up and get out to committee.

f. Serials: <http://www.library.yale.edu/conser/documents/dcrs.html>

Gillis reported she had sent to several listserves (exlibris, rbms, autocat, serialst) notice that the draft version of the rules for cataloging rare serials was on the web and invited comments. Several people responded.

McLaren and Gillis attended a CSSC (Committee to Study Serials Cataloging) meeting on Friday night at the request of the chair. Members had looked over rules and had several questions. Gillis and McLaren will appear on a CSSC program on Monday afternoon during the annual conference.

Committee members discussed some areas in the rules that were troublesome: use of uniform title, the 260 field, 245 \$b, title page substitute, why there is no "ideal" copy, fixed field dates. Attig will send out what JSC has done.

h. Music

Fletcher reported that Elizabeth Johnson has dropped out of the group working on the rare music cataloging rules because of recon commitment sat library and asked if there was another person who could fill the position that Elizabeth did. [note: Bruce Tabb has become a member of this group]. The music group has a first draft. They used DCRB and deleted things that were specific to books. Now they will add music specifics. They will hand drafts out to people to use for six months to see what works and what does not.

i. Maps/Cartographic materials

Sider will report at Annual. There is a group similar to the one for music.

j. Examples

The Examples has been published. Noble will take responsibility for upkeep.

k. Future Revisions

l. Single sheet publications

McLaren reported that she is in the process of bringing together the rules for single-sheet publications that are dispersed over DCRB.

8. MARBI

Attig reported that the proposal from art librarians to deal with anonymous attribution information. Subfield J has been defined in X00 fields to take case of situations such as School of. Nothing in the description limits this to artists.

9. THESAURI: <http://libweb.uoregon.edu/catdept/home/genreterms/winter.00.html>

Tabb reported for the other committee members (Noble, Robinson, Russell, Leslie). One revised relator term (lithographer) and one new term (contributor) were proposed and discussed. The discussion on lithographer centered on approving the addition of the scope note that appears on the MARC21 list. Concerning contributor, Attig pointed out that contributor is used in Dublin Core for everything other than author. Members decided that this was not a hindrance. The following were approved:

*lithographer*: Use for the person who prepares the stoner plate for lithographic printing, including a graphic artist creating design directly on the surface from which printing will be done.

*contributor*: Use for one whose work has been contributed to aerial publication, anthology, or other compilation. Do not use for someone whose sole function in relation to a publication is as editor, author, compiler or translator.

The first genre term proposal was to change the term Juvenile literature to Children's literature, the LCSH form. Schroeder asked whether Children's literature would be limited to under 12 or would include Young Adult literature. A term is needed to include both children's and young adult literature. This we already have with Juvenile literature. The scope note for Juvenile literature should be rewritten to include young adults. This proposal was tabled until the Annual Meeting.

The next term was Merchant manuals. The term was accepted with the scope not rewritten (Use for manuals containing information on trade routes, market locations, business practices and merchant ethics, etc.). In the UF, Route books was deleted.

The next term was pilot guides. The scope note (Use for nautical guides that describe coast lines, harbors, dangers, and aids to navigation) was changed slightly. In the Use For, Navigation charts, Navigation maps, and Pilot charts were deleted. Pilot was changed to Pilots (Handbooks). In the BT, Manuals (Handbooks) was added and the term was approved.

Portola charts was the next term. It was approved.

The last genre term proposal was Session laws. The scope note (Use for publications of all enactments and resolutions of a legislative body passed at a particular session.) was changed slightly. A definition from Webster's will be added to the Term Record (which's used by the committee but does not appear in the public record). The term was approved.

The last term was Straw fibers from the Paper Terms thesaurus. It was approved.

The suggestion was made that the thesaurus editor be a separate appointment. The editor would be an ex-officio member of BSC.

[note: RBMS executive committee were favorably inclined and asked Maxwell to write up a proposal, to be presented at Annual, to change the manual.]

## 10. PRECONFERENCE REPORTS

### a) 2000, Chicago

Gregory Pass will give a 6 hour manuscript cataloging workshop on Wednesday. The price will be around \$100.

[note: Elaine Smyth asked Gillis and McLaren to repeat their rare serials cataloging workshop. This will also be a 6 hour workshop presented on Wednesday]

### b. 2001, San Francisco

Among the possibilities for workshops at the San Francisco Preconference were cataloging Latin materials and cataloging rare music.

[note: some non-workshop possibilities (seminars perhaps?) mentioned after the meeting are: processing 20th century literary archives and migration to new systems]

## 11. RARE RECON SURVEY

Schroeder volunteered to summarize results and publish them on the web. He will contact original respondees for updates and list respondees (23libraries).

## 12. RARE BOOK AND MANUSCRIPT CATALOGER'S RESOURCE PAGE : <http://www-lib.usc.edu/~melindah/rbmcrp.htm>

Melinda Hayes mounted the beginnings of a Rare Book and Manuscript Cataloger's resource page. Members decided it should be a BSC web site and that volunteers should go through the chair of the committee. The name was changed to The Rare Book and Manuscript Catalogers' Help Line. Schroeder will take over responsibility for it and add the names of people who volunteered at the meeting to the various categories.

## 13. NEW BUSINESS

Susanne Nevin was introduced as the ACRL representative to CC:DA.

---

## APPENDIX

### I. Hearing for DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING OF ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL, RENAISSANCE, AND EARLY-MODERN MANUSCRIPTS v9 (AMREMM)

Present: Larry Creider, Jim Larrabee, Patrick Russell, Bruce Tabb, William Crowe, Joan Aliprand, Ed Glazier, Jennifer O'Brien, Erin Davis, Louie Elder, Deborah J. Leslie, Peter E. Hanff, Bob Maxwell, Jain Fletcher, E.C. Schroeder, Barbara Paulson, Kathleen Bales.

Began at 8:00 pm.

Bob Maxwell briefly introduced AMREMM and Gregory Pass.

Gregory Pass outlined AMREMM, its purpose and its details. He then described the differences in the two levels of description available in AMREMM: full level and summary level.

The summary level primarily described the work bibliographically, it mentions potential points of physical description with research interest, e.g. illumination present. The full level is primarily aimed at the scholarly community that is interested in both the intellectual content and the physical object. It is possible to combine the summary level with certain aspects of full level description. The major difference between the levels are the number and types of notes that each require.

Bob Maxwell asked where does one draw the line between full and summary levels of description? How many notes does one need to add before making it full level? Does the full level record need everything. Gregory replied that if the record includes contents, provenance, and collation, he would call it full level since these notes require significant time.

Gregory then described analytics and how one relates the various titles within one physical vol.

Jim Larrabee asked if the 773 adequate? Does it distinguished enough? The host record has a linking uniform title (240 to 773). Larry Creider stated that some titles might not have a uniform title to link with. E.g. of the cataloging of a fragment. It is noted by the physical description.

Bob Maxwell asked why is the 541 required in the full level since some libraries don't want to include such information? GP said that maybe they would make this an option in the final version. Larry Creider suggested that the rules include instructions noting that it is not required if local practice is not to include this data.

Question and answer session.

Patrick Russell asked whether it is possible to use the rules if the collection is also cataloged using a finding aid? For e.g.: 10 letters of Henry VIII using appm.; but also catalog single items using aarem. GP replied that there was no reason you couldn't if the situation warranted.

Ed Glazier of RLG noted that the rules made sense, but that he had some minor quibbles about coding. E.g. Use of 006 instead of 008 seems redundant. He liked the contents of Appendix G, tabular instead of descriptive. In general the rules are very dense. He also noted that Full and Summary level records are coded the same. Should thebe? A user would only know if the record is a full vs. a summary when they look at the notes. This is especially a problem when additional notes are added to the summary level.

Larry Creider noted that nothing is gained by split for access, but it helps in workflow or cataloging the items. He also noted that the concept of full/summary is similar to AACR2. Patrick Russell suggested that they code as full MARC when using a summary level. Deborah Leslie suggested that perhaps the summary level could be considered the base amount of information to be included in the record, with additional notes added as desired. Ed Glazier noted that if it was called minimum, it would be a very full "minimum." Bob Maxwell suggested describing as minimum for these rules; but coded as full level MARC record? Glazier said that is possible. GP described the background for the creation of the rules and how he came up with the contents for each level. The full level contains the 40 odd items that scholars considered essential. Creider suggested calling the levels standard and full. GP said he was not committed to the names of the levels. Deborah Leslie asked whether we could use another name for "full"?

Glazier said that the idea of summary/full matches the PCC concept of cataloging. The summary is the essential plus additional notes and access points as needed. Maybe closer to a core/full concept. Bob Maxwell said he had thought of using core/full as well. He also asked Jain Fletcher if the language but not the word core could be used. Glazier said that USMARC has a "core" code that does not necessarily mean. Could also be an AMREMM core code? Bob Maxwell opposed the use of the word core because of the way people perceive core. Jain Fletcher said that the language works, core implies one subject etc.

Deborah Leslie and Bob Maxwell had a number of minor comments and questions they wanted to pass on. GP said to mail them to him at [passga@slu.edu](mailto:passga@slu.edu). He reminded the audience of the existence of the listserv for AMMREM.

Bob Maxwell said that the goal is to issue these rules during the next six months. Ed Glazier asked if CC:DA will look the rules over. BM said they would and that LC needed to sign off on them. Larry Creider asked how CC:DA would be looking at these rules? Glazier said to make certain that they fit in with existing cataloging rules, esp. AACR2.

---

## II. LESS-THAN-FULL RECORDS

The elements of description provided in DCRM constitute a full set of information for describing rare material. This section sets out a few options for providing less-than-full levels of cataloging. In any of these options, the elements recommended represent the base requirements for providing effective description of early printed books.

Libraries base their choice of a level of description on the purpose of the catalog or catalogs for which an entry is constructed. In selecting DCRM for describing rare materials, libraries make the decision that a more detailed, transcription-oriented description is warranted.

Libraries most often turn to less-than-full cataloging for rare materialism response to a need to create machine-readable records for large backlogs of uncataloged or manually cataloged materials with the least amount of time and effort possible. The following less-than-full options

are provided in response to such needs and are intended to be seen as usable standards for those institutions wishing to adopt them.

A less-than-full cataloging policy is best kept simple. Complex rules for omitting or shortening a variety of record elements would require catalogers to devote time to learning these new rules, thereby eliminating a portion of the intended gains in time and expense. In addition, tampering with the full description provided by CRM areas 0-6 and 8 would negate the very purpose of using DCRM for description of rare materials. The conclusion then is that eliminating notes accomplishes much of the purpose of less-than-full cataloging because it saves considerable time while not unduly limiting access.

Bibliographic records following such an approach will, in most cases, still identify the books being described and distinguish them from similar editions or issues.

The basic sets of options given below, one called *Minimal-Level Records* and the other called the *DCRB Core Standard*, are essentially similar in their recommendations concerning the descriptive rules. In this aspect, they differ mostly in the way they are presented (i.e., layout). The *DCRB Core Standard*, in alignment with other Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) standards, goes further than the *Minimal-Level Records* guideline by recommending base requirements for the whole cataloging record, including access points. One difference, then, lies in the amount of prescription between the two guidelines. One other important difference to note is that the *Minimal-Level Records* guideline can be applied to all materials covered in DCRM, where the *DCRB Core Standard* has thus far been developed and approved only for books. Therefore, the *Minimal-Level Records* guideline might be chosen because it provides more latitude in options concerning amount of access points. Furthermore, it must be chosen for any material other than books. The *DCRB Core Standard* might be chosen when an institution wishes to align itself with the PCC standards with respect to amount and nature of access points. It is also worth noting that the *DCRB Core Standard* may be followed even if an institution is not a part of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. In that case, the record would still be coded as "core" so that it would be clear that this guideline was followed, but it would not include the "authentication" code in the 042.

#### *Minimal-Level Records*

1. Follow the rules in DCRM areas 0-6 and 8. In general, abridge the description wherever possible as allowed by the rules. Do not make the mandatory notes found in areas 0-6. For notes called for in area 7, do not make them routinely, but only when especially necessary.

2. Optionally, institutions may add additional elements in accordance with local policy and may wish in particular to consider adding one or more of the following, each of which would significantly enhance the value of minimal-level DCRM records for identifying rare materials.

-- references to published descriptions in standard bibliographies, particularly when the source cited provides more detailed information than the minimal-level catalog record;

-- the mandatory notes called for in DCRM;

-- one or more copy-specific notes describing provenance, copy numbering, imperfections, binding, or any other information that will allow the bibliographic record to describe the particular copying hand with sufficient precision to indicate the institution's ownership of that particular copy;

-- optional note regarding transcription of elements in areas 1-4 of the description;  
-- optional notes based on reliable dealers' description accompanying the item being described.

3. Minimal-level cataloging policies often eliminate or simplify additional areas of the catalog record such as subject headings, classification, or other access points. Users of DCRM may also wish to streamline these areas according to local needs taking into consideration the effect that such policies will have on special files for printers, binders, bindings, genres, provenance, and the like.

#### *DCRB Core Standard*

For this standard, click on the link at the PCC BIBCO site (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html>), "Core Standard for Rare Books (DCRB Core)" and follow guidance found there.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Gillis  
Secretary