**DACS Review outtakes**

p. 8 of review document, note after the Comment on “Purpose and Scope”:

**Question to DCRM(MSS) Group:** *Options and Alternatives: Does this follow the same pattern as the DCRM series? Not that it needs to but it would be nice if they were consistent with each other.*

[The phrase in red was taken out because the suggestion need not be just an aside to the DCRM(MSS) editorial team; DACS editors may want to consider the suggestion as well.]

p. 9 top of review document, first Comment on the page:

*The “minimum” “optimum” and “added value” seem to go with the BIBCO Core Standard records (minimum, which does not meet BIBCO, core and full, see DCRM(B) Appendix) which was superseded by BIBCO Standard Record, which is only one level (or two if you count those which do not meet this standard). Possibly need to rewrite to include only two levels? Of course these are mss and archival collections not books. And*

[Taken out because BIBCO is a “monographic bibliographic record program of the PCC” (Program for Cooperative Cataloging; see http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/bibcopara.html) where bibliographic records for published monographs are standardized and authority work is done on them to facilitate the use of the records by other institutions cataloging the same item. It has no relevance to manuscripts, which are unique, so their catalog records can’t be used by catalogers at other institutions. There’s no need to modify DACS because of BIBCO considerations.]

p. 9 of review document, under “Single-level descriptions,” last sentence of comment: *(No, I guess a straight inventory is still considered a multilevel description).*

[Taken out so as to leave the preceding question open and convey that it’s not clear whether a straight box list counts as a single-level or a multiple-level description.]

p. 216 of DACS, 2.3.21, just before “Another thing ...”: ***Question to DCRM(MSS) Group:* [Taken out because based on the example given, the suggestion applies to description of collections more than to description of single items; so it belongs in the DACS review, and need not be just an aside to the DCRM(MSS) editorial team.]**

p. 13 of review document:

*IGNORE?*

*2.3.4 “Record the name(s) … responsible for the creation, assembly ...” It is stated just above that if the repository is responsible for the assembling of the collection, one should not provide the repository’s name in the title, but consider including that information in this rule. The way people use rules is to go straight to the rule that applies to what they are doing, and they will not necessarily read the whole chapter/section. In this case, the information is more useful here and definitely applies here. “If the repository is responsible for the assembling of a collection, do not name the repository here; instead, record the nature/format of the materials and a topical subject, which can be a person, family or corporation.” OK, this is in 2.3.6 ...*

[Taken out because 2.3.6 of DACS does cover this.]

p. 17 top of review document, first Comment on the page: *it needs the : before the k, although maybe it does not as I could not find anything in MARC 21 Bibliographic that stated that this was required.*

[Taken out because the following sentence says the omission of the colon is actually OK.]

p. 26 of review document, comment re typo in Chapter 12 commentary: [middle sentences in quoted passage] *The purpose of this chapter is to provide rules for the standardized* [*form*](http://desktop.loc.gov/template.htm?view=document&doc_action=setdoc&doc_keytype=foliodestination&doc_key=dacsFormSLASHglossary&hash=FormSLASHglossary) *of the names of persons and families. Regularization of names is critical to the formulation of consistent citations to archival materials and, particularly in online environments, to the retrieval of all relevant records.*

[Taken out because this text didn’t seem necessary in identifying where the typo is]