

**DCRM Working Conference Minutes**  
**Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut**  
**Monday, March 10, 2003 – Thursday, March 13, 2003**

*Conferees:* John Attig, Ann Copeland, Laurence Creider, Jackie M. Dooley, Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Jain Fletcher, Jane Gillis, Brian Hillyard, Elizabeth Johnson, Barbara M. Jones, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie, Robert Maxwell, Juliet McLaren, Gregory Pass, Elizabeth Robinson, Beth Russell, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Steven Skuce, Eileen Smith, Joe A. Springer, Laura Stalker, Bruce Tabb, Suzy Taraba, Manon Th  roux

**Opening Plenary Session**  
**Monday, March 10, 2003**

George Miles, Curator of Western Americana Collection welcomed all to the conference.

Leslie announced the general outline for the plenary sessions. The sessions will begin with general comments and housekeeping issues and then move on to reports from the different working groups.

Introduction of conferees.

When asked to explain the Bibliographic Standards Committee's overall plan for the publication of the DCRM suite, Leslie reported that the rules for manuscript cataloging, Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Early Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM), are currently being printed. They will not have the DCRM moniker for this edition. Rules for serials, maps and music are also currently being written.

One of the goals for this conference is to settle on a set of general principles to justify separate rules for rare materials. These principles can be used to guide the formulation of rules for different formats. Each format will also have more specific principles. Currently, the vision for this publication does not include a separate general DCRM being published, but rather a module for each format will be published in both print and electronic formats. When asked about the publisher and publishing timeline, Leslie responded that the expectation is that the Library of Congress will be the publisher, as they also published Bibliographic Description of Rare Books (BDRB) and Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books (DCRB). Additionally, the Library of Congress authored BDRB and collaborated with the BSC on DCRB. It has been suggested that since an ALA committee is initiating this document, the publishing issue needs to be cleared farther up the ALA chain. This has not yet been resolved. The timeline for publishing depends upon the results of this conference, and it is definitely a topic for discussion at the closing plenary session. Johnson asked if Library of Congress would publish the individual modules as well. Leslie noted that ACRL is publishing AMREMM, but that the publishing of future modules has not been decided. She noted that the advantage of

having Library of Congress as publishing is that the publication will be placed on Cataloger's Desktop.

Leslie asked that the moderators and drafters for each working group provide the background, status, main issues, and desired outcome for each group.

### ***Working Group 1 – General Principles (Springer, Dooley)***

Springer began by stating that by Wednesday he hopes that this group will have achieved consensus for the cataloging of rare materials. Specific tasks of the group include determining what the primary nature of this document is, determining the extent to which the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records can strengthen the document, adequately addressing cataloging materials other than monographic books, and considering the best presentation of this material. Springer also suggested that the group should look at what the archival community has done with the CUSTARD [asked Joe for clarification 4.16.2003] standard. The remaining time will be spent further distilling the principles for use with monographic book cataloging. He does not see the product of this group being a preface for DCRM or DCRM(B), but rather the preparation for such a preface to be written. He asked the other working groups to keep this draft in mind during their discussions, and also asked that the working groups let Working Group 1 know how this draft helps to guide their decisions and where it fails to guide.

Dooley added that the General Principles group is the place to keep in mind the history of the evolution of these rules, and use the past principles to stay grounded. The last time the rules were revised, Ben Tucker of the Library of Congress was a crucial player who consistently reminded the group of the broader community that these rules fit into. Leslie noted that she has the minutes from the BSC secretary during the last round of revisions, and Théroux added that the position papers from the last revision are available for the group to consult.

### ***Working Group 2 – Transcription (Hillyard)***

Hillyard outlined his plan for the groups' meeting this week. At the first meeting he hopes to come to consensus on the paragraphs etc. that need to be looked at for changes or additions. After this, he hopes the group can agree to the substance of those changes or additions, while making sure to record the arguments for the decisions. If this can be accomplished, then the group can possibly begin to draft rough text. Post-conference work will involve the exact wording, and perhaps tests of any tables that are created. The group will also need to consider the implications that any changes will have for the examples. So as to avoid spending time going around in circles on the i/j/u/v issue, this issue will be taken off of the table for the initial meeting in an attempt to reach agreement on other matters.

Leslie clarified that this group was looking at the transcription of pre-modern letter and other character forms, that is, how to transcribe, not what to transcribe. Hillyard added

that he is interested in picking up the references to “transcription” in the text to try and clarify the usage of this term.

### ***Working Group 3 – Machine Press Materials (Théroux, Russell)***

Théroux introduced her paper and the upcoming work of the group, which is to identify the areas where the rules are difficult to interpret for machine press materials. The thorniest issues are going to relate to the instructions that involve creating separate records for separate printings, as well as the question of printer, publisher, and the use of the 260 \$e and \$f. Leslie noted that this last issue overlaps with the work of Working Group 5. Théroux added that the Machine Press group would discuss the series area, which is not addressed in DCRB. Théroux’s paper consisted of text suggestions, and the work of this group will involve revisions to that text.

There was discussion as to whether this working group should address the issue of why a cataloger might choose to use DCRM for machine press books. While some felt that the reasons were the same as the reasons for using DCRB for hand-press books, others felt that this needed to be further delineated. Stalker noted that the general principles should be general enough to cover the reasons for using DCRM for any kind of materials, and Russell added that in some cases the decision to use or not use DCRB might be an institutional administrative decision. Leslie said that she hoped that while the group was thinking about the particular characteristics of machine press materials, they would be guided by a strong understanding of the general principles of why DCRM should be applicable to these materials. It was agreed that some explanation of why to use DCRM for these materials, as well as the advantages to be gained from such application, would be helpful to include.

### ***Working Group 4 – Collection-Level Cataloging (Jones, Fletcher)***

Jones began by noting that she is representing the ARL Task Force on Special Collections. She is the chair of the Access Working Group, which has compiled a document on hidden collections. This September there will be a conference to discuss this document and create an action plan. This conference will include players from the areas of technical services, administration, and special collections librarianship.

Fletcher introduced her paper and reminded the group that her approach at Midwinter had been more of guidelines for deciding to catalog at the collection level rather than codifying how to catalog at this level. She is looking for help with the terminology. She emphasized that preparation is the key to collection level cataloging, and noted that this issue of collection level cataloging has scarcely been discussed beyond the purview of APPM. She would also like to align the terminology with the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Fletcher does not have a clear idea of the goal of the group, as it will greatly depend upon the level of consensus at the beginning of its deliberations.

### ***Working Group 5 – Problems and Lacunae (Creider)***

Creider began by stating that his group is one that does not have a clearly defined mission, but rather it is dealing with the bits and pieces of the revision. The time will be spent working through these bits and pieces. There are other groups that the Problems and Lacunae group will need to work in close connection with, particularly the Machine Press Materials group. Some of the issues Working Group 5 will tackle are transposition, questions involving grammatical inseparability, roman numerals, and the relation between collation and extent. In area 4 there are a lot of questions regarding the recording addresses and there will be ties to Working Group 3's decisions regarding the 260 \$e and \$f.

Maxwell noted that there will never be an end to the bits and pieces, and that perhaps this group could formulate guidelines for the revision process to follow the publication of DCRM. Leslie felt that this might not be an issue for Working Group 5 so much as for BSC to discuss at its next business meeting, or for the larger group to discuss in the final plenary session.

### ***Working Group 6 – When to Create a New Record (Maxwell, Attig)***

Maxwell began by noting that when to create a new record is an issue for the larger community. Attig stated that this group is late in getting started, and they have identified a number of thorny issues. They are beginning with no proposals in the way of text, and the results of their work may not include much in the way of text, but will be substantive in decisions. Leslie reminded the larger group that Working Group 6 would be tackling the question of what level cataloging records should be created at. Currently, there is no explicit statement about the basic level of cataloging in DCRB at present, whether a new record should be created for a separate edition, issue, impression, etc. The group was asked to provide flexibility for advances in technology as well as options for libraries wishing to catalog at varying levels of granularity.

## **Second Plenary Session Monday, March 10, 2003**

### ***Working Group 1- General Principles (Dooley)***

The group followed Springer's outline introduced in the morning session. They began by talking about the broader context for DCRM. They looked at FRBR, particular the user tasks, the relationship of DCRM to ISBD(A) and AACR2, and the principles of revision in archival cataloging rules. They discussed the need to specifically identify the audiences, which would include rare materials catalogers and general materials catalogers cataloging rare materials. They also recognized that there are different kinds of users, of

both records and actual materials. They began a discussion of the nature of the content going into the statement of principles, which included a background and history of the context for rare material cataloging rules. The group hopes to create a definition of “rare”, so that DCRM identifies rare as meaning “special” and not just “old”. There was discussion of what formats would be included in DCRM. It was a productive session, yet no real decisions were made.

### ***Working Group 2 – Transcription (Hillyard)***

The group began by agreeing to pursue the strategy Hillyard outlined in the morning plenary session. The first issue they tackled was the punctuation issue. Leslie referred the group to the recommendations on p.14 of the position paper, the recommendation to modernize and normalize bits of punctuation that are integral to a word but different in character than punctuation that organizes words and paragraphs. The group agreed that there need to be cross references between 0E and 0J. While 0J deals mostly with contractions, it does discuss abbreviations, and a reference to 0E would be helpful. The group did not reach a consensus on whether or not to add punctuation when it was not in the original document being transcribed. While some felt that faithful transcription prohibited the addition of such punctuation, others noted that LCRI allows for following modern punctuation conventions. As there are two modern conventions, some felt this should be left to the cataloger’s judgment. This group did agree to add provisions for a required note when altering source punctuations, such as changing square brackets to parentheses or dots to hyphens.

### ***Working Group 3 – Machine Press Materials (Russell)***

This group was productive in its first meeting. They agreed to wording changes for 0A, scope and purpose. After discussing how to handle information that comes from the publishers binding or wrapper, the group agreed to adopt the suggested wording of the position paper. The discussion of 0D with regard to series information was deferred until the larger discussion on series. The recommendation to explicitly instruct catalogers to add illustration statements as other title information was referred to Working Group 5, as this issue is applicable beyond machine press materials. There was concern that the wording suggested in the position paper, if adopted by Working Group 5, would cause confusion in cases where the illustration statement succeeded the statement of responsibility on the title page. Creider agreed and noted that Working Group 5 will discuss the example in 1G14 to clarify the situation.

The Machine Press Group spent time discussing the issue of “justifying” the use of DCRM for machine press materials. It was decided that this issue was better resolved in Working Group 1. Leslie noted that this issue was part of a larger discussion of the use of core, collection, and full level cataloging. She had hoped that Working Group 6 could address this issue, but feels that it will most likely be left to the next BSC business meeting.

#### ***Working Group 4 – Collection Level Cataloging (Jones)***

This group reached a consensus to work from the document that Fletcher had prepared. The agenda for this group over the course of the conference will be to create the rationales for collection level access and guidance in decision making, determine the type of collection level records, determine the essential elements of a collection level record, reference to existing rules and standards, and discuss ways to raise awareness that collection level records are an option. Fletcher hopes that there will be an article written based on these discussions. Leslie asked the group to keep in mind that the idea of collection level records is not to transfer items from the status of uncataloged to under-cataloged. When asked if the importance of some kind of item level access had been addressed, Fletcher responded that it would be part of the discussion. The group has agreed that there should be a vast amount of flexibility in their document, that not too much should be legislated.

#### ***Working Group 5 – Problems and Lacunae (Creider)***

The group fine-tuned the wording regarding the option to keep original punctuation in addition to adding in prescribed punctuation, as discussed by Working Group 2. After an intense look at 1A2, regarding the transcription of dedications and statements of patronage as other title information, the group deleted these two types of information off of a list of information to be silently omitted. This deletion does not mean that catalogers who currently silently omit this information must start including this information (although omission will require the mark of omission), but it does allow those who wish to add this information into their records to do so. The discussion of transposition of initial statements of responsibility was tabled so that Hillyard can find examples of instances when the lack of transposition would be desirable. The proposal from Working Group 3 for wording changes to 1D (regarding illustration statements as other title information) was accepted. Finally, there was an initial discussion of the terms “separable”, “inseparable”, “grammatically linked” and “grammatically inseparable”. No decisions were made on this topic.

#### ***Working Group 6 – When to Create a New Record (Maxwell)***

This group agreed that model to follow would provide guidance and not prescription on when to create a new record. They discussed general cataloging models and where DCRM might depart from them, and they made the initial agreement that the default level for DCRM will be to create a new record for a new issue – using the definition of “issue” provided in DCRB. There will also be example of evidence of a new issue, and they still need to still discuss how this might affect formats other than books. Thérout noted that the text of DCRB that currently discusses cataloging of impressions would need to be scrutinized for possible changes. The group agrees that while the default is new record

for a new issue, catalogers will have the flexibility to catalog to a greater or lesser degree of granularity.

### **Third Plenary Session Tuesday, March 11, 2003**

Notes distributed from Monday's plenary session.

#### ***Working Group 6 – When to Create a New Record (Maxwell)***

Working Group 6 came up with preliminary text for the preface which is more explanatory than prescriptive. They also discussed factors that influence whether or not to make a new record. Such factors include existence and availability of useful copy, the state of bibliographic scholarship regarding a work, other copies already in a collection, the structure of the cataloging environment (i.e. OCLC or RLN), the nature of the local collection, and the nature of institutional policies. Previously, the group had agreed to the idea that the DCRM(B) rules were formulated with the expectation that books were being cataloged at the issue level, as defined in the glossary. Possible evidence of a new issue includes change in publication information, new title page, different edition statement, new publisher, supplied packaging, additional or changed content, and different kind of paper.

At the request of Working Group 3 this group looked at the definition of "issue" in DCRB. Upon review of this definition, Working Group 6 felt that there was an implication that an "issue" is a subunit of an "impression", and that in reality there is no such absolute hierarchical relationship. Therefore, Working Group 6 proposed changing the word "impression" in the DCRB definition of "issue" to read "edition". The altered text would thus read "A group of published copies of an *edition* which constitutes a consciously planned publishing unit, distinguishable from other group of published copies of that *edition* by one or more differences designed expressly to identify the group as a discrete unit". There was discussion as to whether or not this new definition fit in with AACR2's definition of an issue. Maxwell pointed out that Working Group 6 agreed that the broader level of cataloging is what they were looking for, regardless of terminology.

It was also determined that in cataloging to the "issue" DCRM will be looking at "issue" as a publishing definition, and not a printing definition. Therefore, with the examples of two items that are alike with the exception of one title page verso stating "nineteenth printing" and the other title page verso stating "eighteenth printing", the DCRM default will have these items cataloged on the same record. There will be the option for separate records, though, and Stalker pointed out that most catalogers will see important mitigating factors before deciding how to catalog the item and select a separate record approach. The group discussed the implications that this decision will have for the wording of the rules in general, as it will require a comprehensive review to align all rules and options accordingly.

### ***Working Group 1 – General Principles (Dooley)***

This group made significant progress, but has no product yet. They discussed the scope of the materials meant to be subsumed under DCRM, and also discussed the attributes of materials designated as “rare”. All of the attributes describe rare materials in general, they are not specific to books. The scope targets printed and early manuscript material, generally “readable” material. It will not include anything in the nature of early recordings, etc. or archival material. Some of the attributes defined by the group include provenance, binding, genre or form, chronology, printing processes, producer, physical artifacts, cancelled leaves and other publishing evidence, paper, type, format, collation, fingerprint, and structure of object. They also looked at FRBR to make sure that the list was inclusive of attributes that would arise from the user tasks, as they recognized that the statement of principles should be mindful of what users of rare materials require.

This group has thus defined their charge : “This groups’ work will provide explicit justification for the need for separate rules for rare materials by articulating the general objectives that underlie their different treatment.” They have briefly discussed the structure of their resultant document and know that it will start with a statement of purpose of DCRM, and then include background and historical context and user requirements for rare materials. In their next meeting they want to take the principles and make them concrete. They also wanted to convey their strong sense that statements they will come up with will not cause other groups serious issues or ties the rules in a certain direction.

### ***Working Group 2 – Transcription (Hillyard)***

This group reviewed 0E on punctuation. Wording that was related to the typing of cataloging information on cards was abandoned and they want to restructure the remainder into three clear areas. These areas are to describe the punctuation, to introduce the normalizing of punctuation, and to discuss the option of additional punctuation. The precise details of this wording will likely be worked out post-conference. The group also discussed changes to 0F, including the introduction of information relating to dates and imprints, the addressing of space issues, instructions on deleting hyphens in cases where words are broken up over several lines in the title page, as well as how to handle apostrophic forms. This work has expanded the scope of 0F.

Additionally, the group has agreed to follow the ISBD(A) policy on capitalization, which is to not convert to uppercase something that is in lowercase in the source except for when the lowercase word is at the beginning of an element. They also discussed exceptions to ligatures, and on this topic Maxwell will seek additional advice.

The group did look at the i/j/u/v issue, and established quickly that they broadly agreed with the thrust of the position paper. There was an emphasis on the vision for access to different sorts of transcription, without relegating the instructions to an appendix. The

advice on how to proceed with transcription needs to be more clearly drafted, and there will be a table of last resort. Johnson pointed out that part of the reason this issue was relegated to an appendix was because it deals with additional access points, which have not traditionally been considered part of the descriptive cataloging. Leslie argued that the language for creating the title proper acknowledges the overlap between description and access.

### ***Working Group 3 – Machine Press Materials (Russell)***

This group began by discussing the DCRB definition of “issue” and decided to refer the matter of definition confusion to Working Group 6. While waiting for a response, they deferred the work of looking at 2B2. The group posed the question of whether or not their examples should be written in MARC encoding. There was disagreement on this issue, and the larger group will take it up in a later discussion.

There was general agreement in area 4 on the use of the \$e and \$f in the 260 field. In short, if there is information presenting itself as publishing information, that will go in the \$a and \$b, with other information about manufacture going in the \$e and \$f. When no publishing information can be discerned, this will imply that the printing information is the publishing information and therefore belongs in the \$a and \$b. Inseparable elements will remain as such. Working Group 3 asked the larger group for guidance in the intent behind the rule instructing catalogers to refer to copyright statements before 1870 in a note rather than in the publication area.

This seems to be a transcription issue, independent of legal and copyright history. The group discussed 5B5, regarding advertisements, and decided that it was not within the purview of this group to discuss what items belong in the statement of extent or in a note if the implications go beyond machine press materials. The group decided to adopt Leslie’s suggestion for 5B9, which would provide a default of counting illustrations as “pages or leaves of plates if unnumbered, or as pages or leaves of text if included in the pagination.” In discussing 5C, the group found the AACR2 definition of “colored illustration” to be confusing and requested guidance.

### ***Working Group 4 – Collection-Level Cataloging (Jones)***

This group continued to edit Fletcher’s document and the principles therein. The document is being rearranged so that it will be an appendix. They discovered that the Cataloging Service Bulletin (CSB) 78, from the fall of 1997, discusses in detail the issues raised in this group. They will mark up the language from this CSB and insert it into their document tonight, excising the Library of Congress-centric material. A rationale statement is being polished, and they will also draft a short introduction to the section. This group hopes to produce a draft of the entire document by Thursday.

### ***Working Group 5 – Problems and Lacunae (Creider)***

With only one meeting today, this group decided on a large number of easy issues. They are as follows:

1G9 – The recommendation to delete the rule was rejected. The group agreed to adopt the wording of the ISBD(A).

4A6 and 5B18 – The recommendation to delete the text and refer to the collection level appendix was approved.

4B3 – The recommendation to add the modern English form of the name for Latin place names was approved, and examples were added.

5B6 – The recommendation that the text of 5B6 c. be deleted was rejected. The group agreed to strengthen the language to make the method outlined in c. as method of last resort.

The group will add examples of notes regarding uncertain attribution.

7C18 0 The group agreed to indicate that notes regarding imperfections be prefaced with “imperfect: “ and that all copy specific notes need to indicate the institution either with 590 [Institution name] copy: or

500 \$5

For characters printed as ß, transcribe as “ss”. For characters printed separately as a long s and z, transcribe as “sz”. In cases of doubt, where it cannot be determined if they are separate characters or not, transcribe as “ss”.

Creider announced that all recommendations for the glossary would be determined post-conference in a general glossary review.

## **Fourth Plenary Session Wednesday, March 12, 2003**

Leslie reminded the group that there are two plenary sessions scheduled for the final day of the conference. There are a number of things that have been reported on that will require discussion by the larger group, and these last two sessions might be the time to address them. Additionally, some working groups require the full consultation of other working groups, so perhaps the one plenary session can break off into smaller discussions.

### ***Working Group 5 – Problems and Lacunae (Creider, Leslie)***

This group spent most of their time discussing edition statements and the various elements of the publication, etc. area. The definition of separability was again broached. The following areas were discussed:

4D6 – this group will need to consult Working Group 3 further regarding their decisions and perceptions of the 260 \$a, \$b, \$e, and \$f. Specifically the groups need to address and decide upon the differentiation of functions and the transcription of information from various sources.

2B4 – the group evaluated the recommendation to amend the section regarding appropriate abbreviations when an edition statement is expressed without language such

as “edition”, “printing”, etc. The current language allows for the cataloger to provide a qualification (edition, printing, etc..) for an edition statement consisting of one or more letters or numbers, if such a qualification can be supported by evidence from the publication or any other source, making a note to indicate the source of the evidence. 1B1 – the group considered “borderline” examples of transposition of author and title, such as example 36 from the *Examples to Accompany DCRB*. Hillyard argued that there should be no transposition in such a case, since the English title page was clearly trying to emulate a Latin title page. And if in Latin, the name would be in genitive form and so would not be transcribed. The group disagreed with this assessment, arguing that regardless of how it would have been in Latin, in English the name has no case endings and therefore is grammatically separable. However, they agreed to make explicit in Appendix A that an added entry in such borderline cases is recommended.

Working Group 5 acknowledged the need to go through the text and discuss the language regarding “grammatical inseparability” and “grammatically linked.” The definition of “grammatically inseparable” needs to be further clarified, and most likely the phrasing “grammatically linked” will be eliminated.

The group considered the suggestion to pull all of the rules regarding cataloging of single sheet publications in to one place, rather than having them dispersed throughout the text. This recommendation was rejected.

2B4 0- the group discussed a recommendation to tighten up text regarding transcription of edition statements, specifically, to disallow the provision of using standard abbreviations if transcribing an edition statement from a place other than the t.p. They created new wording that tried to clarify transcribed versus supplied. Any transcription taken from a place other than the title page will require a note, and any transcription taken from a place other than a prescribed area will be framed in square brackets. The wording suggested in Thérroux’s Machine Press position paper met with the group’s approval.

4D2 – The group considered the proposal to transcribe Roman numeral dates in Roman numerals, following the idea that accepting the importance of transcription elsewhere in the description extended to accepting the important of transcription in this element. Therefore, silent conversion of Roman numerals into Arabic numerals will no longer be allowed. Arabic dates will always be supplied in brackets. Per decisions made in Working Group 2 chronograms and representations in punctuation (i.e. (I)) will be represented as Roman numerals, with Arabic equivalents. Additionally, the use of “i.e.” will be restricted to correcting a genuinely incorrect date, not to assigning the current Gregorian date equivalent when confronted with different dating systems. An example will be included to show a common German printing practice that refers to years without reference to century.

4D7 – Will add an example of dates from a multi-volume set that are expressed in Roman numerals at the beginning and Arabic numerals at the end.

4C2 – Given that there are a number of compelling arguments for transcribing addresses, the group decided to be more neutral in the language of this rule. 4C1 will include “addresses” as a type of associated information. 4C2 will include wording to the effect “if addresses or qualifications such as printer to the King are omitted, indicate such

omissions by the mark of omission Maxwell pointed out the in the new wording 4C1 delineates out the types of information that may be included, but there is no mention that some information will be omitted. 4C6 – In providing guidance in omitting names in lengthy publisher’s statements, the rules will instruct the cataloger that it is permissible to omit all names of firms after the third (the rules previously allowed omission after the first name). When omitting subsequent names, catalogers must provide a total count (i.e. “[and 5 others]”). Taraba suggested wording to clarify whether or not names such as “J. & F. Johnson” would constitute one or two names. Leslie confirmed that firms are to be counted, and suggested that lack of punctuation between names be used as the primary guide to determine whether names appearing together are individual or firm names. Johnson noted that in the examples dealing with dates (in 4D2) with Old and New Style dating, the modern representation of the date (and the date represented in brackets) is always 1691. She asked if an example that had the modern representation of the date as 1690 could be added. The response from the group was that in this example when 1690 and 1691 are given, 1691 would always be the modern representation, unless the date is incorrect.

#### ***Working Group 6 – When to Create a New Record (Maxwell)***

This group has decided to try to eliminate the language of “issue’ and “impression”, but they have not changed their minds about the basic principle decided upon on Monday. Gillis asked if these would be redefined in the glossary, and this has not been decided.

The group looked to 2D3 as a rule to suggest the direction they were heading with wording. They identified 10 rules where the wording problem should arise. The key phrase involved in the rough wording decided upon was “However, if a decision has been made to catalog all impressions, record this information...” They agreed that it would be good to have an example showing the cataloging at each level following each rule affected by this decision. Maxwell clarified that this group has not proposed the removal of glossary terms as a result of this decision. Decisions regarding changes to the glossary will be dealt with later.

#### ***Working Group 1 – General Principles (Dooley)***

Springer worked to provide the group with text. This text will be available to all tomorrow. The basic concept comes out of the construct Springer outlined in the position paper. It contains four objectives of user requirements for rare materials, which include:

- Users shall be able to distinguish between different manifestations
- Users shall be able to investigate physical processes and post-production history
- Users shall be able to perform most identification and selection tasks prior to direct access to materials
- There will be two other user tasks relating to the principles of accuracy and sufficiency.

Additionally, the group has articulated that users need to be able to rely on records for rare materials to be accurate and sufficient while being brief. Springer will expand the opening paragraph to add the scope of the rules, i.e. tangible, readable material. Additional information that needs to be added is the relationship between DCRM and AACR2 and ISBD(A) and that the DCRM(B) rules should conform as much as possible to their co-genitors.

### ***Working Group 2 – Transcription (Hillyard)***

This Working Group drafted rough text to incorporate their concepts into the 0. rules. 0H has been renamed “Conversion of case” and borrows wording from ISBD(A), including the concept of not transcribing lower case letters into upper case. There will be references to Appendix B, historical background to explain the situation will be included. There are clear workflow recommendations, which instruct a cataloger how to proceed in examining printing practice, including that after a cataloger has spent an “acceptable length of time” trying to clarify the situation they should use the table of last resort. The new table is still in its rough draft form, but it intends to provide clearer guidance.

0J – The group discussed abbreviations versus contractions and expanding upon them. Leslie expressed the concern that in providing for expansion, catalogers will see the example and begin expanding abbreviations throughout the record, whether or not they are advisable for clarification. The remainder of the working group preferred to leave this decision to cataloger’s judgment. No vote was taken of the group at large.

### ***Working Group 3 – Machine Press Materials (Russell)***

This group will attempt to draft a MARBI proposal to allow for the repeatability of the \$e and \$f in the 260 field. They will also pursue the ambiguities regarding the definition of “colored illustration” to clarify the rules not only for the rare cataloging rules, but for the greater cataloging community.

5C3 – The group generally decided to add the wording that in case of doubt, consider post-1801 publications with “hand coloring” to have been issued that way by the publisher. They will try to define a more specific date range for which this phrase would not be copy specific.

5D the group agreed that the current wording making it unnecessary to record format for post-1801 books should be kept.

The group spent a lot of time discussing the substantial additions to the series area. They reached a consensus on the idea of what they would like to convey regarding the chief source of information, if not the exact wording. They have agreed to a four pronged approach that can be summarized as follows: if the series information is taken from the series title page, no note is required; if the series information is taken from the series title page and the title page, and the information is the same, a note should indicate that the series statement also appears on the title page; if the series information appears on the series title page and the title page, and the information is different, a note should be created stating what the title page series information is; and if the series information is

derived from any prescribed source other than the series title page, a note should indicate where the information comes from. The text to concisely convey these ideas remains to be hashed out. In general, the group tried to remain faithful to AACR2, while providing guidance regarding series. They would like to add a footnote to the proposed 6A2, as well as 0D, to clarify that cover is meant to be defined as a cover that forms part of the publisher's binding or wrapper. The footnote is suggested in both places to prevent confusion.

6B – in discussion of the transcription of this rule a couple of issues for the larger group arose. First, is it permissible for the *descriptive* rules to address the fact that exact transcription of the series may be unlikely to be the way in which the series should be traced. Whether through examples in MARC format or through general wording, the larger group agreed that such guidance informing the cataloger to the difference between transcriptions and tracing in this field would be advisable. The remainder of the area 6 suggestions, 6E and 6F were accepted.

After a discussion of ISSN numbering in the 4xx field, the group deferred the decision until a discussion of area 8, the standard number area. The plenary group was of two minds regarding the transcription of the ISSN in the 4xx field, despite AACR2's directive to transcribe it there (there is no other option for transcription or tracing). There was concern for preserving transcription, when in many cases, the ISSN will not be on the same source as the series statement. Robinson noted that Working Group 3 struggled with the notion of optional or required notes when transposing elements in this area, given the direction that Working Group 5 had moved regarding mandatory notes for transcription of elements. Leslie announced that this topic appeared to be in need of plenary discussion.

#### ***Working Group 4 – Collection Level Cataloging (Jones)***

The group will have a draft to hand out tomorrow, an appendix called Collection Level Records. Today the group worked on a rationale and marked up the CSB as indicated in yesterday's report. There were two elements up for debate. The first regarded the recommendation that titles supplied by the cataloger be bracketed. The group decided to bracket the information because a collection has nothing from which to transcribe the title, and the cataloger always provides a title. As this record will be provided in a monographic cataloging context, the bracketing is appropriate. The second issue is whether or not to supply and bracket information in the 260. Ultimately, the group decided that information provided in the \$a and \$b should be bracketed (as, at best, it would be inferred from the collection as a whole and not transcribed from any one piece). The CSB does not mention the genre access, so this document will include that. Also, time period as a factor for collection level cataloging will be addressed. Guidance will be provided for the fixed field "type of record" generally advising the cataloger to use type "a" for monographic materials, but suggesting other options such as "mixed materials". Finally, the CSB instructs the cataloger to use angle brackets, and this instruction will be deleted from the DCRM(B) appendix version.

## **Fifth Plenary Session**

### **Thursday, March 13, 2003**

This plenary session was devoted to discussing issues before the entire group, final reports from the Working Groups were given at the last plenary session.

#### ***Editorial Committee and Draft Deadlines***

Leslie announced that there would be a small editorial committee that will be assigned the task of bringing together the entire product of the individual working groups into a cohesive draft. She was unsure about the timeline for production of such a draft, but did request that the Working Groups turn in their written results by April 1 . She has spoken to some people about being on the editorial team, but will not make any announcements until everyone agrees to work on the committee.

Working Groups 1, 4, and 6 felt that they had produced conference drafts that are ready for outside review. Working Group 5 came to many decisions, however, there was little to no proposed text produced by the group. Creider clarified that Leslie wanted to receive as much by April 1 as the working group could accomplish: finished text if possible, but just a list of decisions made would be acceptable

Jones asked if the original position papers had been saved and would be available. Leslie noted that they are currently available on the BSC home page, with no current plans to remove them.

#### ***Future Revision***

Maxwell asked again about the structure for future revision, noting that AACR2 is revised annually. Many felt that it would be premature to commit to annual revision at this point. This document is not the only agenda item for the BSC, so it is perhaps realistic to only look as far ahead as publication of this revision. In the past, the Library of Congress had expressed no interest in constant revision.

There was discussion of using Cataloger's Desktop to make changes without a new print publication. Attig responded that the Joint Steering Committee has discussed this issue, and ultimately decided that all versions of AACR2 should be kept in sync so that whatever format a cataloger uses, the rules are the same. Leslie said that she would like to say that the group acknowledges a need for eventual revision, without setting up any kind of timeline at this time.

#### ***Conference Report***

When asked if the BSC would be releasing a formal conference report, Leslie noted that there would be full minutes from the plenary sessions that can be edited into a report, along with the text and decisions from the various working groups. There was a request to have an official report that stands as a history of what was done, including what the process was, not just the product. Attig noted that he and Maxwell will be putting

together a report for CC:DA, and would be glad to share that report. Stalker agreed that a formal report should also be given to the RBMS Executive Committee, ACRL, and Yale.

Thérroux added that there would be an informal seminar at the Toronto Preconference discussing the work of this conference. Leslie emphasized that this will be an informal reporting session, noting that she hoped that the group leaders and position paper drafters would be available to participate.

### ***MARC coded examples***

Leslie stated that the group needed to address the issue of whether or not to present the examples in DCRM(B) in MARC format. This had been discussed at previous BSC meetings, and while some had assumed that a decision had been made in favor of such action, there has been strong dissent voiced at this conference. She asked for those who were not in favor of MARC coded examples to argue their case.

Arguments against MARC coding ranged from the fluid nature of MARC possibly resulting in a document that becomes obsolete more quickly, an acknowledgement that many libraries are investigating other metadata standards as methods of information organization, and a question of whether the document would be sufficiently enhanced to justify the extra work such coding would necessitate. Additionally, the current *Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books* already does provide MARC examples. Further, leaving out MARC coding also allows the opportunity to create standards that are internationally applicable, regardless of machine format. Those in favor of MARC coding maintained that for those who do not use DCRM(B) consistently it would be easier to understand the rules regarding transcription with such examples. Gillis noted that catalogers asked MARC formatted examples in the rare serials rules. , A suggestion was made that MARC coded examples would be appropriate in an index, citing AMREMM as a model. Others added that APPM has a similar index. Dooley warned that although encoding the examples might seem easy to do, it would not in fact be “the work of an afternoon.”

Attig called for an informal poll to be taken. The options were laid out as 1) encode all examples within the text in MARC, 2) do not encode examples within the text, but encode some examples in an appendix, and 3) do not encode examples anywhere in the DCRM(B) document, instead rely on the separate *Examples* publication to provide that information. The results of the poll were that zero (0) favored encoding examples within the text, ten (10) favored an appendix in DCRM(B), and fourteen (14) favored relying on the separate *Examples* publication. There was one abstention.

McLaren asked the group if they also wanted no MARC coded examples within the text of the rare serials rules, and the group agreed that this decision applied only to DCRM(B). This decision will be made for the individual iterations of DCRM as the issue arises.

## ***General Principles***

Attig noted that the group had not discussed to what extent DCRM exists as a general umbrella and how the work of Working Group 1 plays into this notion. He added that Working 1 had written the general principles document with the impression that it would be used as a preface for DCRM(B).

Leslie noted that Working Group 3, while they have not come up with exact wording for everything, had tended to eschew the language of “pre-1801” and “post-1801”. She asked the larger group how they felt about the mode and terminology of distinguishing the two major categories of materials. Leslie noted that 1801 was not the watershed year for the rise of machine press books, that book production shifted to machines in stages largely from 1820 to 1825; and others pointed out that there are hand press books created today. The group was hesitant to continue assigning specific time periods, and preferred the terminology of “hand press” and “machine press”.

Leslie announced to the group that she had learned that ISBD(A) is currently in revision. Hillyard noted that the changes are focused on keeping pace with changing technology, and that the revision team is looking to hear from anyone who has suggestions for revision. Leslie suggested that everyone keep an eye on this revision, because if the revision becomes substantive, the rare materials community should appoint a liaison. It was noted that with previous ISBD(A) revisions, the BSC participated via CC:DA.

## **Final Plenary Session Thursday, March 13, 2003**

### ***Working Group 1 – General Principles (Dooley)***

Dooley passed out the final conference draft devised by the group. As stated in previous reports, it includes the four objectives for users and five principles for rare materials cataloging rules.

### ***Working Group 3 – Machine Press Materials (Russell)***

The group does not have a completed document to share at this time. In their last meeting, the group discussed ISSN and ISBN issues. Specifically, the group discussed alternatives to recording the ISSN in the \$x of the 4xx field. The group was hoping to avoid an extra note stating “ISSN from cover”, since the 4xx field is a transcription field. Use of the 022 was discussed, but Attig urged the group to rethink this as an option since the 022 has a clear relationship to only serials records in MARC.

The bulk of the group’s meeting focused on notes. They decided that 7C9 should remain unchanged in terms of giving the cataloger the option of not recording signatures. They will also add examples of unusual ways in which physical structure does not correspond with the signing. They discussed use of 7C10 and 7C18 as related to publisher’s bindings.

Specifically, they were seeking to guide catalogers in what might bindings be copy specific and what bindings might be issue specific. Ultimately, they determined to add a sentence in 7C10 regarding description of publisher's binding if desired, with additional wording below the examples to flesh out this issue of determination of copy vs. issue specific bindings. They would like to see the BSC discuss addition of glossary terms for various terms for "cover".

In the afternoon, this group met with Working Group 5 to discuss some recommendations, such as how the shift toward preeminence of the publisher over other functions in the machine-press era would affect the transcription of the imprint. The groups were able to agree that in principle, the primary publication information should be in the \$a\$b\$c part of the 260, and the secondary and tertiary statements should be in the \$e\$f\$g (e.g., for hand-press books, colophon information if different from t.p. might go in the 260\$e\$f\$g, while the printer and stereotyper would for machine-press).

#### ***Working Group 4 – Collection Level Cataloging (Jones)***

The group distributed a document for review. This document includes the rationale for collection level cataloging. As discussed at previous plenaries, the document borrows heavily from CSB 78, Fall 97. This appendix suggests that collection level cataloging *might* be appropriate for collections falling into one of three categories 1) those well organized by a previous owner 2) those that come from the same source or 3) those that are artificially arranged or organized. The document provides a lot of guidance on arrangement and description, emphasizing that preparation is important. It also provides the standard elements in a collection level record

#### ***Working Group 6 – When to Create a New Record (Maxwell)***

The group distributed a document for review. They still have before them the task of examining the language of the current rules to determine what changes need to be made as a result of their decisions. They also need to talk further about the glossary definitions of some terms. The detail work of wording may be sent on to other Working Groups. The distributed document seeks to answer the basic question of when to use copy and when to create a new record. It lists factors to keep in mind when making this decision. It also provides a list of factors that do not indicate a new publication unit. The group document emphasizes that the default will not work for every institution and every item, and provides alternatives.

#### ***Working Group 5 – Problems and Lacunae (Creider, Leslie)***

Creider reminded the conferees that while this Working Group was very productive in terms of decision-making, not much final text was determined. In their final meeting the group discussed the following issues:

5B9 the group evaluated the recommendation that when the item contains numbered plates with an unnumbered front, the representation "[1]" should be allowed for that

unnumbered plate. This recommendation was accepted. For volumes that are composed entirely of plates, the cataloger will be instructed to call the plates “leaves” (not “leaves of plates”) in the physical description area and make a note “Wholly engraved” or “chiefly engraved.” Such items may or may not be additionally illustrated. Smith agreed to send Leslie examples of such books.

The group discussed the current ambiguity in the rules regarding the physical descriptive treatment of engraved and letterpress insertions. They decided that until they have a clearer idea of why the current rules regarding tables printed on leaves and engraved title pages were adopted, they could not come to a conclusion. Leslie has agreed to research this issue and write up a proposal.

5B15 The group discussed the issue of the difficulty in understanding and representing “folders” in the catalog record. Leslie will work further on this issue.

5B17 The group evaluated the examples provided for this rule, which discusses bibliographic volumes in physical volumes. Currently, the cataloger is instructed to note a difference in bibliographic and physical volumes in a note. They decided to leave the rules and examples as is. Many in the plenary session took exception to this decision, noting that AACR2 does not treat this material in this manner. Since there is no rare book reason to deviate from AACR2, the rule will be changed.

7C9 The recommendation was that examples be provided to show catalogers how to represent non-roman characters not in the presently available character set (e.g. π). The group decided to provide examples of both transcription of the unavailable character, so that the rules remain relevant should such characters become available, as well as examples that illustrate the current transcription method. A statement such as “if typographical facilities are available...” will be added in.

7C18 Hillyard provided the Working Group with examples from the British rules for copy specific notes. The British rules provide clearer examples than the currently vague examples provided in DCRB. Larrabee and Roper will work on incorporating clearer examples in to the text.

7C19 The group discussed “with” notes. There was a universal dislike of the current rule, which instructs the cataloger to simply begin the note “With:”. There was a desire to differentiate between “bound with” and “issued with”. Robinson and Creider, will work to draft new wording for this rule.

Dooley noted the cataloging community in general is most likely focused on the work of this Working Group, noting that the group should be prepared to explain or provide commentary for their decisions.

### ***Working Group 2 – Transcription (Hillyard)***

Within the next week or so, this group will be able to draft new text 0E and 0J. They hope that the result will be better organized than the current iterations. The group proposed a new table of last resort in a previous plenary session. They are going to devise a worksheet based on this table to distribute to volunteers to ensure that the table reflects as accurately as possible the evidence of usage in the text.

This Working Group wanted to discuss a proposal on transcription of **W** that departs from the recommendation in the position paper of transcribing **VV** as **VV**, filed **V**'s as **W**, and **W** as **W**. Many in the Working Group were persuaded by the argument that since the 2 distinct **V**'s work together as **W**, as opposed to other **U**'s and **V**'s in the text, that any instance of **W** (whether formed from single or separate type pieces) should be transcribed as **W**. This is not a case conversion issue, but rather strictly a transcription issue. The conferees discussed the history of why **VV** was used to represent **W** by some printers, and the relative meaning of why sometimes the **V**'s are filed down and sometimes they are not. Some asked if this was a critical issue, since a cataloger can use the 246 field to transcribe the letter(s) alternately from that chosen for the 245. Leslie pointed out that if there are two distinct **V**'s transcribed as a **W**, the 246 will aid in indexing, but will not express to the user that the **W** was created with two **V**'s. Whoever is looking at the record should be able to easily determine what is going on. Creider mentioned that if the title page has **VV** and it is recorded in the 246 as **W**, with an additional 246 representing **VV**, it seemed that the cataloger was making the concession that the text reads **VV** and not **W**. He suggested recording **VV** in the 245 (i.e. transcription) area, and use the 246 to record the alternate **W**. The group jointly agreed that if a **VV** were transcribed as **W** in the 245, a note in addition to a 246 would have to be made to explain the situation, while the reverse was not true. A vote was taken and twenty-one (21) voted that **VV** be transcribed as **VV** in the title area, and one (1) voted for **VV** to be transcribed as **W** in the title area.