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1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Jane Carpenter, University of California, Los Angeles (chair); Lori Dekydspotter, Lilly Library, Indiana University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Emily Epstein, Health Sciences Library, University of Colorado, Denver; Ryan Hildebrand, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin (controlled vocabularies editor); Linda Isaac, California State University, Fullerton; Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art; Martha Lawler, Louisiana State University, Shreveport; Michelle Mascaro, University of Akron; Ann Myers, Stanford University (secretary); Jennifer Nelson, Robbins Collection, Law Library, University of California, Berkeley; Audrey Pearson, Massachusetts...
Institute of Technology; Aislinn Sotelo, University of California, San Diego; Catherine Uecker, University of Chicago.

Members excused: Todd Fell, Yale University.

Liaisons: William La Moy, Syracuse University (RBMS Executive Committee liaison).

Visitors: John Attig, Pennsylvania State University; Marcia Barrett, University of California, Santa Cruz; Matthew Beacom, Yale University; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; Diana Duncan, Field Museum; Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles; Jane Gillis, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Nancy Lorimer, Stanford University; Jennifer MacDonald, University of Delaware; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; Cory Nimer, Brigham Young University; Nina Schneider, Clark Library, University of California, Los Angeles; Elizabeth Sudduth, University of South Carolina; Bruce Tabb, University of Oregon.

2. Settlement of the agenda

No changes were made to the agenda.

3. Consent agenda

Four votes were conducted online between Annual 2012 and Midwinter 2013, and the following decisions passed: change in terminology for Relator Terms, approval of the BIBCO Standard Record for RDA, revised wording for DCRM 4A6.2, and acceptance of the RDA Task Force’s final report. The consent agenda was approved.

4. Approval of Annual 2012 minutes

The Annual 2012 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

5. Revision of Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging (Barrett)

The Standard Citation Forms (SCF) working group distributed a report prior to Midwinter which included a request for feedback on two subjects: presentation of information and indexing. Marcia Barrett reported that they have received permission from the Library of Congress to host the Standard Citation Forms on the RBMS website with a link from Cataloger’s Desktop. There is a sandbox site on the RBMS website now (http://www.rbms.info/scfsandbox/) with an example citation showing how the information could be formatted. They need to finalize this format before the group proceeds with more editing work. One small change was suggested, to precede the current citation form with the label “Cite as:” to eliminate any possible confusion. With this change the format was approved.
Barrett proceeded to explain the issue with the indexing. In the second edition, there are three indexes: citation forms, subjects, and names/titles. In addition to these, the new edition would include an index of former citation forms. The subject index is somewhat confusing as it includes authors and titles in addition to subjects; the working group is proposing to remove these entries from the new edition’s subject index. The names/title index is also confusing, as often the association between the name and the citation it is linked to is unclear. The group was encouraged to edit as needed for clarity, and to investigate the possibility of a mechanical means of creating the indexes.

Barrett reported that they are hoping to complete this project in 2013. The next step will be working with the Web Team to find a way to automate the data transfer onto the RBMS website, followed by checking their work for accuracy and creating the indexes. At some point BSC will be asked to do a close reading of the forms. Barrett asked that if anyone sees any problems in the instructions for creating citation forms to please contact the group as soon as possible. It was suggested that the instruction to put 2 spaces between author and title in the citation could be dropped since many systems will not even allow this. Anyone interested in seeing the full documentation of the group’s work can be added to the wiki.

6. Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) (Schneider)

Nina Schneider reported that as of January 11 the Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) are available on Cataloger’s Desktop listed under D for DCRM(B) Examples; you may need to refresh your table of contents page to find it. The MODS example currently does not display correctly in Chrome, but does display in other browsers; they are working to address this issue. Anyone with comments or corrections is asked to first look at Example 89, and then to contact Schneider.

Jane Carpenter thanked Schneider for persevering over the years to get this great resource onto Cataloger’s Desktop, and noted that the committee owes her a debt of gratitude both for the cataloging work she did in preparing the Examples as well as for her computer skills in getting them mounted online. Carpenter also thanked all the volunteer proofreaders and formatters; their names are listed in the Introduction. Bruce Johnson and Kate James of the Library of Congress also worked hard on this project. The Examples will eventually be available on the rbms.info website as well as on Cataloger’s Desktop.

7. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee (Hildebrand)

Ryan Hildebrand began with a summary of the subcommittee’s comments to PCC on the PCC Relationship Designator Guidelines Task Group Report. The main objection is that the current guidelines on relationship designators instruct catalogers to only use terms found in the RDA appendices, which eliminates the RBMS Controlled Vocabularies. While we could submit our terms to be added to the appendices, there is no guarantee that they would be included. For example, the term publisher is not currently included, and there is known reluctance to add it. The PCC Relationship Designator Guidelines Task Group is reportedly reconsidering their recommendations and may revise their report. The reasoning behind
the limitation is that if there is only one list from which catalogers can use terms, the source of the scope note for those terms will be clear. This seems overly restrictive.

Specialized communities can submit terms to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and they will be considered through a “fast track” process which would take six weeks or more. However, RDA is not supposed to be “one stop shopping” for specialist communities, and since the rare materials cataloging community has been managing controlled vocabularies for at least thirty years, we prefer to retain control of those terms. Hildebrand clarified that the limitation to the RDA appendices would only directly affect PCC catalogers, but it would also affect the contents of the shared catalog.

The following scope notes were approved:

**Mathematical recreations**

**SN**  Use for mathematical puzzles, games, or similar entertainments.

**Minstrel songs**

**SN**  Use for songs traditionally performed by blackface entertainers, primarily in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The following new terms were approved:

**pressman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesaurus</th>
<th>Relationship Designators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SN</strong></td>
<td>Use for a person who physically operates a printing press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BT</strong></td>
<td>printer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The SN for "printer" will be revised to better distinguish between printer and pressman.]

**Commencement addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesaurus</th>
<th>Genre Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SN</strong></td>
<td>Purpose of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
<td>Baccalaureate addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BT</strong></td>
<td>Academic addresses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occasional addresses

In the coming months, draft scope notes for the following terms will be posted to the subcommittee's digress.it blog for discussion: Libri amicorum, Literary hoaxes, Literary quarrels, Lyric poems, and Masques.
Deborah J. Leslie asked for an update on the transfer of the controlled vocabularies into TemaTres. Hildebrand reminded the committee that TemaTres is an open source thesaurus management software which they had been testing. However, he is concerned about doing the planned thesaurus integration in TemaTres, and thinks it might be better to merge them in the current Multi-Tes environment and then export to TemaTres. Continued support is needed from the Web Team to move forward on either of these possibilities.

8. Preconference sessions

a. Minneapolis 2013 (Mascaro/DeZelar-Tiedman, Dekydtspotter)

1. Michelle Mascaro reported that she and Christine DeZelar-Tiedman have submitted a discussion group proposal for “Directing without a Script: Strategies for Successful Technical Services Project Management”; it has not yet been approved, but the proposals are currently under review.

2. Lori Dekydtspotter reported that the short paper session “A New Cataloging Pas de Deux: RDA and DCRM” has been approved. Panelists Bob Maxwell, Nancy Lorimer, Catherine Uecker, and Morag Boyd will discuss their experiences with RDA and reconciling it to rare materials cataloging. Maxwell will specifically address RDA and the BIBCO Standard Record. Carpenter wondered whether this session might lead in to a workshop next year; Dekydtspotter said that she is pursuing that possibility.

b. Las Vegas 2014 (Carpenter)

Seminar proposals will be due before Annual 2013, so now is the time to start thinking of ideas. Schneider suggested that since the 2014 preconference will be 1960-themed, we could sponsor a seminar with a historian of information systems about the concerns people had in 1960 and whether they came true, what ideas were never implemented, etc., and then a second speaker could talk about the next 25 years. It was pointed out that seminars are supposed to be focused on learning outcomes, so this suggestion might work best as a paper presentation rather than a seminar.

9. Preconference workshops

a. Las Vegas 2014 (Carpenter)

Carpenter listed some suggestions that had been made in the past for preconference workshops, including DCRM and RDA, DCRM(G) or DCRM(M), computer programming for librarians, and rare book cataloging for non-catalogers. Both DCRM(G) and DCRM(M) will hopefully be published within the year, and Jain Fletcher expressed her willingness to hold a workshop assuming that the DCRM(M) module is published in time.
10. DCRM(M): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music) (Fletcher)

Fletcher reported that the editorial team expects to submit their text to the Library of Congress on March 1, although she has been reminded that they still need to conduct a close reading both in this community and in the Music Library Association (MLA), so that deadline may not be realistic. However, they do have a final text which can be made public immediately after Midwinter. Leslie recommended offering the text to other communities as well, such as the policy and support division of the Library of Congress, CC:DA, and the Society of American Archivists (SAA) if there is any manuscript treatment. Even if these communities don’t respond, it establishes a pattern of good behavior.

Fletcher then asked the group whether it would be acceptable for DCRM(M) to repurpose Appendix C. In DCRM(B), Appendix C was used to provide instructions for creating a PCC core record, but since it was based on books, every other DCRM format was supposed to say that no use was made of the core record. However, in the last half year progress has been made with RDA in providing a core record for all formats with the new BIBCO Standard Record (BSR). The BSR currently includes alternative RDA rules for rare books, and each format can add their core record instructions to the BSR. Fletcher sees this as an opportunity to advertise this availability in Appendix C with a link to the BSR, so the core record for rare music would be the BSR.

Aislinn Sotelo objected that the rest of DCRM(M) is based on AACR2, and this does not provide a core record in AACR2. Fletcher explained that there has never been a core record for rare music in AACR2. There is a separate appendix in DCRM(M) for minimal level records, and the new BSR has eliminated the concept of a core record. The BSR is the floor a record must meet in order to be considered a full record.

Fletcher mentioned that rather than including RDA options and alternatives in the text, they feel the BSR is sufficient for providing RDA instructions. Lorimer asked what, if anything, they should say about RDA in the introduction - that future guidelines will be available? It was pointed out that a number of these issues will also apply to the other DCRM modules, and that there should be some coordination about the introduction and appendix wording for consistency. There are also other areas which will need coordination, such as manuscript treatment and language.

BSC was asked to form a new editorial committee comprised of a convener, one representative from each DCRM module including those already published, and a representative from the RDA editorial team. It was also suggested that the convener of this group could be the main editor of the DCRM editorial guidelines. There is some question about whether this coordination will come in time for DCRM(G), who are determined to meet their February 15 deadline, but the group will be organized as quickly as possible and in the meantime Carpenter instructed the modules to keep working.

Francis Lapka reported on several potential revisions to RDA that affect rare materials cataloging. The first concerns the guidelines on how to count unnumbered leaves. The current revision instructs catalogers to count unnumbered leaves in terms of pages or leaves, but gives no instructions as to how, i.e. where to begin and end the count. DCRM(B) does include these instructions, but this is not solely a rare materials issue, so it seems that RDA would benefit from a revision here. Lapka wanted to gauge BSC’s interest in submitting a proposal, and the consensus was that we should submit something. Lapka would like some volunteers to draft a text for the revision to be submitted through the CC:DA channels.

The second issue concerns hand-coloring, and whether it is a content-level or item-specific characteristic. The current RDA guidelines were carried over from AACR2. The consensus was that we should submit a revision for this as well, so once again volunteers are requested.

Lapka then asked what our revision strategy should be. When should we submit revisions to the RDA text proper, and when should we focus on revising DCRM(B)? It was agreed that if the existing RDA guideline gives the cataloger no option but to misrepresent the item in hand, then RDA should be revised. If that is not the case, then the change should happen within the DCRM(B) revision.

The final issue regards what constitutes early printed resources. DCRM(B) does not define a chronological division for this term, but RDA defines early printed resources as those produced prior to 1825, which may be too limiting. Lapka is particularly concerned for the library or cataloger who does not use DCRM(B) but does use RDA; they would not be able to apply these guidelines to anything published after 1825. There was some discussion of other possible terms to use in place of “early printed resources”, but none were satisfactory – they tended to be too vague or open to interpretation. It was suggested that we could broaden the scope of the rule rather than trying to change the term, but the term is used as a label throughout RDA to identify sections of rules which apply to these materials. Lapka concluded that there is clear interest in changing the term to something less limiting, and will continue this discussion online to brainstorm more ideas.

12. DCRM(B) for RDA Editorial Team (Lapka)

The members of the RDA Editorial Team are Francis Lapka (chair), Morag Boyd, Lori Dekydtspotter, Bob Maxwell, Aislinn Sotelo, and Catherine Uecker. The charge for this group was sent out via email prior to Midwinter, and they received one suggestion to drop the sentence “Following RDA precedent, the revision will abandon the concept of an ordered description, and will not specify a standard for presentation.” They are willing to make this change especially since it broadens their possibilities. The charge as amended was unanimously accepted:
The editorial group is charged to:

1. Undertake a complete revision of DCRM(B) based on RDA, to include changes in terminology, structure, and examples.
2. Issue/promulgate the revision as appropriate (including via the RDA Toolkit).
3. Engage in dialogue with the rare materials community throughout the revision process through postings on a dedicated wiki, and discussion on DCRM-L, and at Midwinter and Annual meetings.
4. Insure consistency of DCRM(B) for RDA with RDA and with rare materials provisions in the BSR for RDA by recommending updates to the BSR and changes to RDA rules as necessary and appropriate.
5. Complete a first draft of revised DCRM(B) by Annual 2014.

The team’s initial plan is to conduct a rule by rule comparison between DCRM(B) and RDA between now and Annual 2013. They plan to provide frequent updates on their progress, and encourage participation on the wiki site they will be setting up.

13. Discussion of treatment of ms materials across DCRM modules (Nelson, Nichols)

A comparison chart showing the treatment of manuscript materials across the different DCRM modules was distributed prior to Midwinter. Margaret Nichols identified 9 areas where there are genuine differences between the modules:

1. Area 1: use 245 |k?
2. Area 1: use 245 |h?
3. Area 1: bracket cataloger-supplied titles and other data supplied in transcription fields?
4. Area 2: applicable to ms. materials? Nichols noted that there are philosophical differences between the modules here which might be fruitful to discuss together.
5. Area 5: use “ms.” in 300 field? If so, where?
6. Area 5: count pages/leaves?
7. Area 5: indicate color in 300 |b?
8. Area 5: indicate medium in 300 |b?
9. Area 7: any required notes specific to ms. materials? Nichols noted that here, the difference is not only in whether notes are required, but which notes are required. It is “kind of a big mess” if the goal is uniformity across modules.

Many of the differences are driven by differences in the nature of the material, in which case there may not be room for making changes, but there are some where the modules may be able to move closer together. The next step would seem to be to bring these issues to the new DCRM editorial group to be discussed by representatives of all the modules. Again, the timing is problematic since both DCRM(M) and DCRM(G) are so close to publication, but perhaps they could work quickly on the areas with the most potential for agreement. Even if it is not possible to align every facet of manuscript materials treatment, the discussion might be worth mentioning in the different modules, explaining the differences in the nature of the materials as well as the different cataloging traditions.
14. **DCRM(MSS): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts) (Nichols)**

Nichols reported that the DCRM(MSS) editorial team has finished going through Area 7 and the introduction. The introduction was especially challenging, as it is a place to clarify the relationship of this module with others – not just the other DCRM modules, but also others within the bibliographic and archival communities. The editorial team’s meetings here at Midwinter will focus on Area 0, and the main body of the text will be ready for general review and comment soon after Midwinter, with the possibility of a public hearing at Annual 2013. They still need to finish the appendices, fill in the examples, and apply the DCRM editorial guidelines. Nichols noted that the other DCRM modules have been meticulous about recording their deviations from the general editorial guidelines, but DCRM(MSS) has so many deviations they may need to make one blanket statement rather than individual notes.

15. **DCRM(G): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics) (Carpenter for Blake)**

Carpenter reported that that the DCRM(G) group have set themselves the deadline of February 15 for completing the text. They had originally planned to have an appendix with detailed examples, but they are now hoping to extract those examples and put them online only in Cataloger’s Desktop and on rbms.info, just as Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) has been published. Erin Blake has been in conversation with the Library of Congress about this possibility. It was clarified that the DCRM(G) module as a whole will be published both in print and on Cataloger’s Desktop.

16. **DCRM(C): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic) (Carpenter for Fell)**

Carpenter reported that the DCRM(C) editorial team has requested a public hearing for Annual 2013, to last 2 hours. They have finished Appendices A-F, and hope to finish the remainder by Annual. They plan to ask cartographic groups for comment as well.

There was considerable discussion about whether it will be possible to hold 2 public hearings at Annual, since DCRM(MSS) has also expressed interest. Scheduling the time may be an issue, not to mention that it would be asking a lot of this community to attend both hearings. The alternative would be to ask DCRM(MSS) to delay their hearing, since DCRM(C) has already requested the time. There was some concern that if their hearing were held at Midwinter fewer people would come. Further discussion is needed. The deadline for room requests for Annual is Jan. 31.

17. **Reports (appended to the minutes)**

a. **PCC Task Force for BSR for rare materials based on RDA (Lapka)**
   Lapka thanked everyone who offered input on the BSR. It is a revisable document and eventually all the DCRM modules will be included, but for now it is only compatible with DCRM(B).
18. New business

a. CSR for RDA working group – Rare Serials Guidelines for CONSER RDA Core Elements (Copeland, Gillis)

The CSR for RDA working group consists of Randal Brandt (chair), Ann Copeland, and Jane Gillis. PCC has asked this group to update the CONSER Standard Record (CSR) with rare serials elements, which has never been done before. They will be able to use many of the elements from the BSR, and expect to complete their work by April or May of this year.

b. BSC procedural manual (Carpenter, Leslie)

There is a need to have documentation of committee procedures, history, and precedent all in one place. This will facilitate greater transparency in our processes, as well as making things easier for chairs, members, listserv management, etc. Leslie likes the idea and has a lot of institutional memory but not a lot of energy, so she is willing to help if someone tech savvy can set up the structure for recording information. Everyone would be invited to contribute based on their experience and knowledge of the committee.

c. Reorganization of BSC webpage (Carpenter for Brandt)

Randal Brandt still wants to reorganize the committee webpage. Currently it is cluttered, hard to navigate, and contains a number of out of date documents. He has moved some things, but would like suggestions and comments about how we would like to navigate the page. Please contact Brandt with any ideas.

19. Acknowledgments

Carpenter thanked everyone who has been so helpful this year and who has worked so hard on all the committee’s projects, which are both time- and energy-consuming. In particular, she thanked Nina Schneider for her work on the Examples; Marcia Barrett for her work leading the SCF team; all of the editorial teams; Randal Brandt, Deborah J. Leslie, and Manon Théroux for their advice and recommendations; and Francis Lapka and Ryan Hildebrand for agreeing to work on difficult projects sometimes at the very last minute.

Ann Copeland announced two upcoming job openings at Penn State, and noted that she and Ellen Ellickson are wrapping up their term as co-conveners of the Technical Services Discussion Group and are looking for volunteers to take over.
20. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Myers
Appendix A: PCC Task Force for BSR for rare materials based on RDA

The PCC RDA BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application Profile is now available: http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf

BSR instructions for rare materials were compiled by a task force comprised of Robert Maxwell (chair), Jain Fletcher, and Francis Lapka. The introduction to the BSR notes several important points:

“Timeframe for RDA BSR Implementation: This RDA BSR can be used by the PCC community for BIBCO-coded records, effective January 01, 2013. As the PCC evaluates the effectiveness of the RDA BSRs there are modifications to Resource Description & Access, and as other RDA-related policies are developed within the PCC (e.g., the use of RDA relationship designators in BIBCO records) and other communities (e.g., development of various DCRM standards for rare materials), the guidelines and requirements within the BSR itself will evolve. Any comments or suggestions for improving the BSR should be submitted to BIBCOmail@loc.gov.”

“Instructions for rare materials: The rare materials provisions in the BSR are closely aligned with the provisions of Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM) and may be used with any resources deemed rare by the cataloging agency. This includes resources that may require additional details of description to permit the ready identification of copies (e.g., as editions, impressions, or issues) and provide more exact descriptions of them as artifacts. Typically, early resources (e.g., resources produced before the advent of mechanized printing and papermaking processes in the early 19th century) are most likely to require these additional details, but the BSR rare materials provisions may be used if necessary with resources from any period.

As is the case with the general provisions of the BSR, the rare materials provisions represent a floor on which other elements can be built. They are not intended to reproduce or replace DCRM, and elements in DCRM not in the BSR can certainly be included in the record. The BSR rare materials provisions generally call for expanded treatment of elements within the BSR or deem certain RDA elements to be core that are not considered core for other types of materials. Two cases call for different treatment rather than simply expansion of the description. These are: 1.7.1 alternative 1, which invokes the option of using DCRM as the designated published style manual in place of RDA 1.7.2-.9 for transcribing; and 3.4, which calls for applying DCRM conventions when recording extent rather than RDA’s. These were singled out by the rare community as areas where there were valid rare materials reasons for departing from the general guidelines.

It is intended that the rare materials provisions be usable with any format. However, one of the stipulations of applying the rare materials provisions is the recording of the appropriate “dcrm” code in 040 in addition to “rda” in order to label the record as following the BSR rare materials provisions. Since there is currently only one monograph code available, “dcrmb” for rare books, for the moment the rare materials provisions, especially 1.7.1 alternative 1 and 3.4, should only be used with printed books. As other DCRM
modules (e.g. printed music, cartographic materials, graphic materials) are published and additional “dcrm” codes are approved the rare provisions of the BSR will become available to other formats and may be expanded. In the meantime rare non-book materials can certainly be cataloged using the BSR, including rare provisions that call for going beyond the floor of the general BSR, but they should be coded “rda” only in 040 and should follow the general RDA guidelines for 1.7.1 and 3.4.

Note: Earlier iterations of the rare books BSR excluded resources produced before 1500. The rare materials provisions of the current BSR do not contain this exclusion and may be used with resources from any period.”

Submitted by
Francis Lapka
**Appendix B: Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger**

BSC Directory of Internet Resources—Additions and Changes—January 2013

**ADDITIONS:**


Edgar Franco, Dictionary of Terms and Expressions Commonly Used in the Antiquarian Book Trade  

British Armorial Bindings Database  
[http://armorial.library.utoronto.ca/](http://armorial.library.utoronto.ca/)

Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada  

CERL Portal, Early Printed Materials, 1450-1830  
[http://cerl.epc.ub.uu.se/sporal/](http://cerl.epc.ub.uu.se/sporal/)

Universal Short Title Catalogue  indicates whether a digital copy is available “collective database of all books published in Europe between the invention of printing and the end of the sixteenth century”

Annotated Books Online  Requires guest registration  very much in progress  

*English Folk Song and Dance Society Gallery of Historic Dance and Tune Books*  
[http://library.efdss.org/cgi-bin/dancebooks.cgi](http://library.efdss.org/cgi-bin/dancebooks.cgi)

Codices Palatini Latini—from the University of Heidelberg--includes reproductions from several sources  
[http://digi ub.uni-heidelberg.de/de/bpd/virtuelle_bibliothek/codpallat/index.html](http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/de/bpd/virtuelle_bibliothek/codpallat/index.html)

Bibliotheque de Verdun Digitized Manuscripts  

Univ. of Texas Ransom Center Manuscript waste survey  

Seymour de Ricci Bibliotheca Britannica Manuscripta Digitized Archive  
[http://sceti.library.upenn.edu/dericci/index.html](http://sceti.library.upenn.edu/dericci/index.html)
CHANGES:

RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee Latin Place Names to
http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/latin/index.html

Submitted by
Laurence S. Creider
Appendix C: CC:DA Report

In the wake of JSC (Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA) acceptance of an amended version of 6JSC/LC/21 ("Clarification of leaves and pages"), the ALA rep. to JSC (John Attig) has asked for a proposal to provide specific instructions in RDA 3.4.5.3 about how to record unnumbered sequences of pages or leaves. In our BSC 2013 Midwinter meeting, attendees indicated that the RBMS community should offer to submit such a proposal. This plan of action was accepted in the ensuing Midwinter CC:DA meeting. A proposal will soon be drafted.

With encouragement from JSC, CC:DA has agreed to continue its work on machine-actionable data elements in Chapter 3 (for extent and dimensions). There are two tasks, which might be separated: (a) developing a proposal for adding Extent of Content to RDA, and (b) developing specific proposals for adding the Aspect–Unit–Quantity model to the RDA element set and to the instructions in Chapter 3. I suggested that a representative from the rare materials community should be included in the ongoing work of this task force, given the importance of these elements in rare materials cataloging. More information on the work of this TF is available on the CC:DA website:

http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=111

The final versions of the proposals approved by the JSC during and after its November 2012 meeting have been posted on the JSC website:

http://www.rda-jsc.org/workingnew.html

A new “RDA Music Joint Working Group” has been created to submit music-related proposals to the JSC. The group comprises members from the Canadian Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres; the Library of Congress; and, the Music Library Association. Proposals developed by the working group will be submitted to the JSC chair, without direct involvement of CC:DA. Some in attendance at the Midwinter CC:DA meeting were concerned about the precedent of creating a group for a specialized community with direct representation to JSC (i.e. why music, and not others?).

The next release of the RDA Toolkit, scheduled for April 2013, will include revisions of chapters 2 (Identifying Manifestations and Items) and 3 (Describing Carriers). The revision is intended to clarify the language of the rules, without changing their substance. Unfortunately, there is unlikely to be any mechanism by which to compare the revision to the current text. Those hoping to make such a comparison are encouraged to commit the current text to memory, while time permits.

Deborah Fritz gave a demonstration of RIMMF ("RDA in many metadata formats"), a free software tool developed by “The Marc of Quality” (TMQ). Fritz describes RIMMF as:

- a visualization tool for catalogers, to help them to get used to thinking of RDA, instead of thinking AACR/MARC
- a cataloging training tool, to help educators teach RDA thinking (which is an implementation of FRBR thinking)
As John Attig noted during the CC:DA meeting, the tool forces a cataloger to make decisions (e.g. whether an attribute is characteristic of the Work, Expression, Manifestation, or Item) that MARC doesn't. More information is available on the Marc of Quality website: http://www.marcofquality.com/rimmf/doku.php

The full Midwinter agenda for CC:DA, with related documents, is available on the CC:DA website: http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=198
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