REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
PCC WORKING GROUP ON AUTHENTICATION CODES AND ENCODING LEVELS
FOR SERIALS AND INTEGRATING RESOURCES

SEPTEMBER 20, 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Working Group was formed to follow up on the recommendation of the Working Group on the Access Level Record for Serials that, "PCC/CONSER encoding levels and authentication codes should be re-examined and simplified in light of this record…" Although the Working Group included representatives from BIBCO and considered the impact of their work on the broader PCC environment, per their charge, the group focused on serials and integrating resources. The Working Group considered the uses and functions of encoding levels (MARC21 leader byte 17) and authentication codes (MARC21 field 042) in various contexts; sought input from group members' institutions or programs; consulted with OCLC, Library and Archives Canada (LAC), and LC's Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS); assessed the differences between the MARC 21 standard for national bibliographic record–full and the new CONSER record; deliberated the various issues raised, and made the recommendations in this report.

In order to assess the recommendations in this report appropriately, readers should be aware that one of the goals of the Working Group on the Access Level Record for Serials was to develop a record that would become the new standard CONSER record, not an additional, lesser level for CONSER records. The report of that Working Group includes a section, "What's in a Name," expressing concern that if the record were called the "access level record for serials," catalogers would still want to create "real" CONSER records.[1] Therefore the phrase, "the new CONSER record" will be used throughout this report. Since the new CONSER record includes all the fields deemed essential for discovery, identification, and access for serials, the potential encoding levels considered were primarily "blank" and "4."

The Working Group concluded that for serials, no clear distinctions were made either by catalogers, by libraries, by LC, by OCLC, or by consumers of serial records such as Serials Solutions between encoding level "blank" and encoding level "4." Many records are coded "4" by catalogers as a matter of policy, not because the records lack any elements. In order to resolve the current situation where serial records with essentially the same elements are coded in two different ways and to avoid the negative connotations that have surrounded encoding level "4" (i.e., core) records, the Working Group's recommendation is to use encoding level "blank" for the new CONSER record and to cease using encoding level "4" for serials.

Since speedy implementation of the new CONSER record is desired by LC, NLM, and other institutions, it is recommended that current authentication codes be used for the new CONSER record in the short term, but that current codes "lc" and "lcd" ultimately be

changed to "pcc." The capability of coding a record to indicate that not all headings are under authority control (currently indicated by the CONSER 042 code "msc,") is still needed for serials and integrating resources, especially to support distribution of minimal level ISSN records.[2] It is recommended that a new value, such as "pcc-msc" be considered for serials and integrating resources along with the other long-term recommendations in this report to achieve consistency and branding across PCC programs.

For integrating resources, current encoding level usage of "blank," "7," and "3" (used by LC for its access level records for remote electronic monographic and integrating resources) is recommended short-term. Encoding level "4" has never been a valid encoding level for integrating resources, since PCC has not defined a core level record for integrating resources. The authentication code "pcc" should be used for all integrating resource records whether created within BIBCO or CONSER.

For the longer term, the Working Group recommends further study on the use of encoding levels and authentication codes for monographs, with the goal of revising MARC 21 definitions so that coding practices can be aligned across PCC programs. However, since LC uses a more extensive list of authentication codes for monographs, and since encoding levels are heavily used in OCLC's algorithms for "overlaying" or "merging" of monograph records (no record overlay is done for serials), additional work across a broader group of stakeholders is needed.

To help readers of this report from different backgrounds (BIBCO, CONSER, RLIN) to better understand the environment in which the report's recommendations will be implemented, Appendix A includes information about the different processes that are used by OCLC to add various levels of bibliographic records and record data to WorldCat.

BACKGROUND AND CHARGE TO THE GROUP [FROM THE PCC WEB SITE]

Background: The Access Level Record for Serials Working Group has tested record requirements that it recommends become the new CONSER standard for serials. Implementation of such a new CONSER standard will require decisions on appropriate authentication codes in field 042 and in Leader/17.

Concurrent with this effort, OCLC implemented the new code, "i" for integrating resources in June 2006. Authentication and distribution of these records by CONSER and BIBCO members is dependent on defining an appropriate authentication code or codes to be used by members of both programs for integrating resources.

Charge: Recommend appropriate encoding levels and authentication codes to be used in records for serials and for integrating resources, with the aim of providing clear and simple coding for PCC records. The recommended coding structure should meet requirements for record distribution and take into consideration the needs of particular constituencies, such as the ISSN Network and Library and Archives of Canada. The

Group will also make recommendations on any changes needed to MARC 21 requirements for full level records. The work may also include making general recommendations on:

--guidelines for PCC members on how to apply the codes
--timing and coordination needed for implementing the new coding
--plans for reconciling codes in existing or "legacy" records
--changes needed in PCC documentation

MEMBERSHIP
Diane Boehr, National Library of Medicine, co-chair, and PCC Standing Committee on Standards representative
Regina Romano Reynolds, Library of Congress, co-chair
Mechael Charbonneau, PCC ex officio
Leslie Hawkins, Library of Congress, CONSER ex officio
Renette Davis, University of Chicago
Kate Harcourt, Columbia University
Greta de Groat, Stanford University
Melissa Beck, UCLA
Steve Shadle, University of Washington
Tina Shrader, National Agricultural Library
Mary Charles Lasater, Vanderbilt University
Robert Bremer, OCLC
John Levy, Library of Congress
Dave Reser, Library of Congress, CPSO
Rebecca Guenther, Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office

METHODOLOGY
The group worked via email and via a 6-hour web teleconference meeting on Monday, Sept. 11, 2006. In preparation for the meeting, Working Group members were asked to consult with their institution or program and prepare a statement indicating the program or institution's needs that had to be met by encoding levels and authentication codes used in the PCC. Input was also received from LC's Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), and Serials Solutions. Meeting preparation also included the assessment of the differences between the MARC 21 standard for the National Bibliographic Record–Full and the new CONSER record that can be found in Appendix B.

DISCUSSION
The Working Group's goals were twofold: 1.) to ensure that records created as part of BIBCO and CONSER will use the same encoding levels and authentication codes to indicate their status as PCC records; and: 2.) to disentangle and clarify current encoding levels and authentication codes used by Program participants. The current MARC 21 definitions for the various encoding levels mix the concept of record completeness and authoritativeness of headings. Some definitions consider only the completeness of a

record; other definitions include data about associated headings. The only reference made to the National Bibliographic Record occurs in the definition of encoding level 7 which refers to the National Bibliographic Record–Minimal. Although field 042 is currently defined as an authentication code, in fact, many of the approved values for this field indicate the origin of the record, rather than any authentication processes.

The Working Group identified the following needs for these elements:

- **The encoding level (Leader byte 17)** serves two primary purposes. It is intended to represent the "fullness" of the record, and whether or not the record is considered final by the library that created it. The group believes that the concept of "fullness" should be replaced by the concept of "sufficiency," taking into account whether or not a record meets FRBR requirements for resource access and discovery. the Working Group's proposal is to require the presence of necessary data or alternative choices of data elements, for example, transcription of either a statement of responsibility or provision of an authoritative access point for the responsible entity.

- **The authentication code (Field 042)** should indicate the authoritativeness of the access points in the record and signify that the descriptive elements have been reviewed according to the standards of the authenticating entity

"FULL IS BETTER"
The Working Group recognized that there are significant perceptual and even emotional issues involved in changing the way encoding levels and authentication codes are applied and defined in BIBCO and CONSER. Is a "fuller" record always a "better" record? By what standard should records be judged? If a cataloger adds an element to a record because that element is always added whether the particular resource requires that element or not, is that cataloger doing a better job than the cataloger who adds only those elements required for identification and access? To answer these questions, the Working Group on the Access Level Record for Serials did an extensive analysis of elements in serial records according to their ability to meet FRBR user tasks, developed a list of mandatory elements, and tested the results via 13 pilot projects. Since the access level record for serials was determined sufficient for meeting user needs–as the record has a full complement of identifying elements and access points–and since the record guidelines place no limitations on a cataloger's adding elements required by the resource or the cataloging institution, the Working Group strongly recommended that the new CONSER record be coded "blank" to ensure that this new record will not be regarded (as has been the fate of core records in many institutions) as an "inferior," or "dumbed-down" record.

In assessing the appropriate encoding level to be used for CONSER records in the future, the Working Group on Encoding levels and Authentication Codes concurred with the former group's recommendation and concluded that for CONSER records, the appropriate encoding level is "blank" since the new CONSER record contains all

elements necessary for resource discovery, identification, and access. The group could not identify any clear distinctions that were made either by catalogers, by libraries, by LC, by OCLC, or by consumers of serial records such as Serials Solutions, between encoding level "blank" and "4" for serials. Therefore, as a matter of simplification and to eliminate the "distinction without a difference" between "blank" and "4," it is recommended that "4" should no longer be used for CONSER records and that existing records coded "4" in the CONSER database be converted to "blank." Many records are coded "4" by catalogers as a matter of policy, not because the records lack any elements. This finding is similar to the results of a survey done at Columbia regarding selector's perceptions of the adequacy of full vs. access level records for electronic resources:

> The Work Group asked if access level records were considered to be sufficient, both from the selector and public services points of view, or if any important information was missing. Seven respondents were completely satisfied. The other two selectors found the new model to be adequate, but also remarked that "full is better." No respondent noted any specific data element thought to be lacking in the records.[3]

FACTORS AFFECTING RECOMMENDATIONS

Although there is a proposed new CONSER record, i.e., the record that resulted from the work of the Access Level Record for Serials Working Group, no such record exists for monographs or integrating resources. LC has developed guidelines for an access level record for non-serial remote access e-resources, but this has not been submitted to the PCC, nor accepted as a formal standard. For this reason, final decisions about changes to MARC 21 could not be made at this point. Additionally, the process of loading records into OCLC differs for monographs and serials: OCLC uses matching algorithms that allow records deemed more desirable as master records in WorldCat (e.g., LC records) to "overlay" other records, based on a number of elements, including a heavy reliance on the encoding levels of the respective records. For serials, no "overlaying" is done. CONSER participants are required to work online in order to modify WorldCat master records. Further information on OCLC record processing is included in Appendix A.

Because of the potential complications to OCLC's record overlaying practices that might result from changing definitions of encoding levels, further deliberations with OCLC, the Network Development and MARC Standards Office, and other stakeholders are required before proposing a revised definition of encoding level "blank" to MARBI. Additionally, changes in authentication codes require lead time before implementation by institutions and OCLC. Therefore, even though the Working Group reached agreement on a single general authentication code to be used throughout the program, in order to give OCLC and others time to prepare for changes, it is recommended that all changes requiring MARC 21 changes or system changes be implemented at the same time.

Because work with monographs remains, the following recommendations are divided into short-term recommendations required to implement the new CONSER record as soon as possible, short-term recommendations pertaining to integrating resources, and long-term recommendations intended to align CONSER practice with MARC 21 and across PCC.

Short-term Recommendations for the New CONSER Record

1. *The new CONSER record should be coded as encoding level "blank."* Encoding level "4" should no longer be used for any CONSER records. Encoding levels "blank," "1," "2," "5," "7," and "8" will remain in use, as currently defined.

2. *All CONSER records with encoding level "4" should be machine-converted to "blank" by OCLC as soon as is feasible.* LC should be consulted before any re-distribution of these records to LC. It will not be necessary for this change to be made in local systems.

3. The new CONSER record should use the same authentication codes as those currently used on CONSER records: lc, lcd, msc, nsdp, isds/c, etc. (Cf. Long-term Recommendation #1 advocating future 042 code simplification changes.)

Short-term Recommendations for Integrating Resources

1. *Integrating resources should be coded using the values currently in use for these resources: "blank," "7," "3."* Since there is no core standard for integrating resources, encoding level "4" should not be used. LC and the other libraries that are using the LC-developed access level record for e-resources should, for now, continue using encoding level "3." This practice will likely change in the future (Cf. Long-term Recommendation #3) but will facilitate potential conversion of these records to a different encoding level in the future.

2. *All integrating resources authenticated under the auspices of either BIBCO or CONSER should use the authentication code "pcc" in field 042.* Note: NSDP minimal level records will be exempt from this requirement in cases when authority records do not exist for all headings. In these cases NSDP will need to use "msc" or "pcc-msc" (Cf. Long-term Recommendation #2). NSDP will add the additional code, "nsdp" when adding or authenticating ISSN elements. Records for integrating resources will also require addition of LCCN in field 010 so the records can be distributed by CDS along with CONSER records. Although it is currently possible for BIBCO and CONSER authorizations to add "pcc" to field 042 on records coded as bibliographic level "i," system development work needs to be done at OCLC before other required changes are made, such as those needed to allow the use of codes "nsdp" or "msc"as 042 authentication codes, selection of records for daily distribution to LC, and retrospective addition of LCCN to existing records so they can be distributed by CDS.

3. *The historic discrepancy in the coding practice for the fixed-field element Cataloging Source (008/39) between BIBCO and CONSER records needs to be resolved* by proposing a change in the MARC 21 definition of the code and a retrospective conversion in OCLC of code "d" to "c" for CONSER serial records.

Currently, in BIBCO, an existing OCLC member input record that is authenticated by a BIBCO participant has its Source code changed from "d" to "c," while in CONSER an existing OCLC member input record which is authenticated by a CONSER member has its Source code left as "d". Consequently, in OCLC's validation process, an 042 coded "pcc" does not allow Source to be coded "d," while an 042 coded "lc" or "lcd" does allow Source to be coded "d." Current CONSER records are coded "c."

Long-Term Recommendations For All Resources

1. *All PCC records should use the same general authentication code "pcc" to indicate a Program record where the description meets PCC standards and for which authority records exist for all headings.* Achieving the goal of using "pcc" as the general authentication code for Program records would mean replacing "lc" and "lcd" in CONSER records with "pcc," so that a clear branding of PCC records could be achieved. OCLC should convert existing records with "lc" and "lcd" to "pcc," with the proviso that the records carry some indication of this fact in field 936 and the records not be re-distributed to LC.

2. *Investigate the means to meet the need for those CONSER records lacking authority records (chiefly, LC minimal level records and NSDP's ISSN records) to continue to be distributed via CDS.* The long-standing mechanism for this distribution is use of the 042 code "msc" within CONSER. The "msc" code (or an equivalent code) needs to be extended to integrating resources so that ISSN records for these resources can be distributed. One possible option discussed was to use "pcc-msc" in place of "msc" in order to achieve clear branding of PCC records. However, some group members objected to identifying any bibliographic records (including records for serials and integrating resources) lacking authority records as PCC records. Most members were opposed to considering monographic bibliographic records lacking authority records as BIBCO records.

3. *Re-define encoding levels "blank" and "7" in MARC 21 as follows:*

> **Encoding Level Blank: Sufficient (or "standard")**
> The record contains all the elements necessary for resource discovery and access, including subject headings. The information used in creating the record is derived from an inspection of the actual item (for serials, multipart works, and integrating resources at least one issue, volume, or iteration of the resource).

> **Encoding Level 7: Limited**
> The record contains essential descriptive elements, but does not contain a full complement of access points. It may be missing subject headings and/or classification numbers, or missing access points for related names and titles, or some linking fields. The record is considered a final record by the creating agency.

4.

A group should be formed to consider the status, applicability, and future development of the U.S. national bibliographic record standards in light of changing resources, standards, codes, and needs. This group should begin its work after new PCC standards for monographic and integrating resources are developed. At that time, requirements for RDA may also be available.

CONCLUSION

> *"In times of change, learners inherit the Earth, while the learned find themselves beautifully equipped to deal with a world that no longer exists."*
>
> Eric Hoffer

The above quote introduced the conclusion of the report of the Working Group on the Access Level Record for Serials. These words are equally applicable to the work of this follow-on group. Today's digital and economic environment challenges every aspect of library work. Carefully considered change is essential to the future of bibliographic control since the world in which our cataloging rules and practices developed has, in fact, ceased to exist in several important ways.

We recognize that in many ways the underlying goals of the group that developed the new CONSER record are very close to the goals used when creating the core level record: providing guidance on elements essential for access, identification, and retrieval, and relying on cataloger expertise and judgment to know when additional elements are needed for a particular item. However, we are deliberately not recommending the use of encoding level "4," because we want the concept of the new CONSER record to be viewed with a fresh eye in this new environment, both by administrators and catalogers. The focus of the core record development was on "what can we omit from a record?" The focus of the new CONSER record group was on "what do we need in a record?"

Changes required by new environments can either be proposed from "below"–i.e., from practitioners and those who work closely with practitioners, or from "above," i.e. from administrators who may have only a general awareness of work issues and considerations. This report and the report of the Working Group on the Access Level Record for Serials that preceded it represent the work of group members who are deeply involved in the work of bibliographic control and who have a keen interest in adapting the best of traditional cataloging rules and practices to current and future environments.

Although some of the proposals in this report may, at first, seem to threaten the traditions of cataloging that have long characterized CONSER and BIBCO, we hope that readers of this report will focus on the facts presented more than on potentially broken traditions or ingrained perceptions. Cataloging continues to have much to offer, even in the age of "Googlezon." We hope the results of our work and the work on the new CONSER record that preceded our work will yield the same kind of positive outcome as that reported about access level records at Columbia,

"Librarians and managers are equally excited about opportunities to create quality records more easily. This new approach gives the cataloger more time to focus on subject analysis and authority control and gives patrons access to underserved areas of the collections."[4]

**OCLC RECORD CREATION, MERGING, BATCH LOADING AND UPDATING PRACTICES
FOR MONOGRAPHS, SERIALS, AND INTEGRATING RESOURCES**

Currently, BIBCO and CONSER records are usually added to WorldCat though different processes. CONSER libraries–with a few specific exceptions–are required to work directly in OCLC's database and thus issues related to overlaying records and losing data do not arise in CONSER. A CONSER cataloger does not remove data from an existing record unless it is inaccurate. All full-level CONSER participants can edit any serial record in OCLC.

The only CONSER records which go through a batchload process are those that are considered new, a process currently used by two CONSER institutions. Of those, only records that do not match another already in the database are loaded, so there is no overlay of existing serial records in the database. For serials, the problem with batchloading records is the difficulty of determining who was looking at the most recent and/or earliest issues, which record has the more complete description, etc., whether authenticated or not. It makes it nearly impossible to batchload maintenance transactions or overlay existing records with any certainty that other descriptive information is not going to be lost from the record. The result is that CONSER activity (with the one option of batchload of new serial records) takes place via editing directly in the OCLC database. In making manual changes, call numbers and subject headings in schemes not used by the CONSER participant are left in the record unless it was clear that they were inappropriate for the title.

 Some BIBCO participants may work directly in OCLC, but others export records from their local systems and/or send batch loads. With batchloaded records for monographs, a "merge" process takes place where many elements from the original record are retained, e.g., call numbers, contents notes, subjects in other schemes, and recently, series access points. Although this was not always the case, currently, BIBCO records are taken into account in the record replace hierarchy in OCLC batchload processing. BIBCO records that match full OCLC-member records will replace those records in the same way that full LC records replace OCLC-member records. A record with 042 pcc and encoding level 4 ranks higher than a record with no 042 and encoding level "I". Call numbers, contents notes, subjects in schemes, etc., not present in the incoming record are transferred to that incoming record that will be retained in the database.

Record matching even for monographs presents many challenges because the program must make some allowances for routine variations in data, minor typos, etc. when determining that two similar records do really represent the same resource. In other cases, the program must conclude that even though two records are so similarly described as to only have a one character difference in the title (e.g., Part A vs. Part B),the records do legitimately represent two different resources and thus require the two records. The

distinctions are sometimes difficult to determine especially when the incoming and database records can vary greatly as to their quality and completeness.

BIBCO participants who have National Enhance authorizations can edit any monographic record in the database, but not all BIBCO participants work directly online or have Enhance authorization in all bibliographic formats. Therefore, it should be noted that some BIBCO libraries will not be able to directly update records for integrating resources, just as they cannot now update records for monographs.

When all provisions for work by BIBCO and CONSER on integrating resources are in place, CONSER participants will be able to edit and replace records for serials and integrating resources (bibliographic levels "s" and "i"), and BIBCO participants will be able to edit and replace records for monographs and integrating resources (bibliographic levels "m" and "i"). However, BIBCO participants will not be able to edit and replace serial records, and CONSER participants will not be able to edit and replace monograph records. The one exception will be that CONSER participants can replace monograph records to change the bibliographic level from "m" to "i". BIBCO participants already have the ability to make that change.

The authentication codes in field 042 basically block non-BIBCO and non-CONSER users from making replaces aside from certain defined database enrichment replaces to add various fields in BIBCO records. The bibliographic level of the record and editing restrictions on changing bibliographic levels are the mechanisms that determine whether BIBCO or CONSER participants can replace particular records with their special authorizations. In the case of BIBCO, the record's type code is also taken into consideration since libraries are approved for enhance by category of material: books, maps, scores, sound recordings, etc. OCLC profiling staff in consultation with OCLC's WorldCat Quality Management Division control which institutions receive Enhance National (BIBCO) and CONSER authorizations as well as the issuance of regular Enhance and NACO authorizations. It can be assumed that once BLvl "i" is implemented for CONSER, any batch-loading of those records would have to meet the same criteria that OCLC now uses for Serials (i.e, at a minimum, they would have to be "new" records). In general, LC, CONSER, and BIBCO participants who want their records distributed via the MARC Distribution Service will need to do their work online in OCLC.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACCESS LEVEL RECORD FOR SERIALS
AND
MARC 21 NATIONAL LEVEL RECORD BIBLIOGRAPHIC—FULL

Element or Area	Access	Full
Leader/Directory	None	None
008/18-19 (freq, regularity)	NR	M
008/28 (government pub)	NR	M
008/38 (modified record)	NR	M
030 (Coden)	A	O
043 (Geog area code)	NR	A
130	Limited use	A
210	A	O
222	NR	A
240	Limited use	A
245 $b	NR	A
245 $c	NR	A
256 (computer file characteristics)	NR	A
260 $a place of publication	some omitted	A
300 $a-g	NR for paper	M or A
440, 490 (series statement)	NR for some	A
515 (numbering peculiarities note)	NR	A
525 (supplement note)	NR	A
538 (system details note)	A (limited use)	O
546 (language note)	A (limited use)	O
550 (issuing body note)	NR	A
6XX (subject access)	None	None
730, 740 (added entry uniform title)	Limited	A
767 (translation entry)	A	O
770 (supplement/special issue entry)	A	O
776 (additional physical form entry)	A	O
8XX (series)	A (with guidelines)	A
856 (electronic location & access)	A	O

KEY

Highlight = situations where element is required for access record and optional for full
NR = not required; this terminology is used here deliberately to conform to the
terminology used in the access level record for serials
M = mandatory
A = mandatory if applicable
O = optional

ELEMENTS OMITTED FROM ACCESS LEVEL RECORD FOR SERIALS
COMPARED TO
MARC 21 NATIONAL LEVEL RECORD BIBLIOGRAPHIC—FULL

Element or Area	Access	Full
008/18-19 (freq, regularity)	NR	M
008/28 (government pub)	NR	M
008/38 (modified record)	NR	M
043 (Geog area code)	NR	A
130	Limited use	A
240	Limited use	A
245 $b	NR	A
245 $c	NR	A
256 (computer file characteristics; CONSER has omitted for some time)	NR	A
260 $a place of publication	some omitted	A
300 $a-g	NR for paper	M or A
440, 490 (series statement)	NR if 8XX used	A
515 (numbering peculiarities note)	NR	A
525 (supplement note)	NR	A
550 (issuing body note)	NR	A
730, 740 (added entry uniform title)	Limited	A
8XX (series)	A if no 4XX	A

Elements present in Access Level Record for Serials
Not Required in
MARC 21 National Level Record Bibliographic—Full

Element or Area	Access	Full
030 (Coden)	A	O
210 (Abbreviated key title)	A	O
538 (system details note)	A (limited use)	O
546 (language note)	A (limited use)	O
767 (translation entry)	A	O
770 (supplement/special issue entry)	A	O
776 (additional physical form entry)	A	O
856 (electronic location & access)	A	O

ISSUES OUT OF SCOPE FOR WORKING GROUP BUT REQUIRING FURTHER WORK

1) 042 reliability over time: Headings in records authenticated by either PCC or CONSER are correct at the time of record creation. However, the presence of an authentication code is no assurance that the headings in a record conform to the current authority record since when headings are changed in OCLC the corresponding changes are not made in all database records.

2) LC authentication codes for monographs: LC should re-examine the authentication codes used for monographs, confirm or refine their descriptions, and simplify the codes if possible.

3) "x" codes in field 042: These codes, used by LC and LAC, are also confusing and at least some may be unnecessary. Further study is needed to determine which, if any, of these codes are still needed and if field 042 is the appropriate field for the information.

4) Updating of authenticated PCC records: Which elements can be added to OCLC records that have 042 authentication codes? By whom can those elements be added? Does authentication of monographs and serials block OCLC members from updating or upgrading these records in useful ways? Will authentication of records for integrating resources block OCLC members from updating or upgrading another significant category of records?

5) What does "authentication" mean for integrating resources? Do similar maintenance obligations such as those for serials specified in the CONSER Editing Guide, B 1.9, "Record Maintenance," apply to integrating resources? Is distribution appropriate for all integrating resources, e.g., those that are ephemeral or of interest to a limited user population?

6) 042 code for Registry of Digital Masters: Since non-CONSER libraries cannot modify CONSER records, if a non-CONSER library digitizes issues of a serial which is represented by a CONSER record, they cannot add 583, 533, 042, 007, etc. to the record. There are many related issues, such as use of 533 and what information it should contain.

7) 042 codes used by U.S. and Canadian ISSN centers: Is there a need for separate codes for the two programs, or could the codes be collapsed into "issn," for example? Should CONSER members be able to add an 042 code to indicate they have verified ISSN elements for non-U.S. titles against the ISSN Register? Note, however, that this kind of authentication suffers from the same possibility of getting out of synch when changes are made in the ISSN Register record as the issue of 042 reliability for authoritativeness of name headings noted in 1) above.

8) **Impact on individual institution records if OCLC maintains some format of the RLG cluster model**. This report was developed with assumptions based on the current

structure of OCLC, which has always been the repository of CONSER records. With the merger of RLG and OCLC it is possible that the master record model will not be the only option available in OCLC.

9) Ensuring congruence between the proposed standard and RDA.

NOTES

[1] Access Level Record for Serials Working Group Final Report, p. 13
http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/pdf/alr/printer-version.pdf

[2] When cataloging a title not held by LC, NSDP catalogers check the authority file and use the authoritative form of any headings found. If no authority is present, the cataloger formulates the heading according to applicable rules and rule interpretations but does not create an authority record.

[3] Kate Harcourt, Melanie Wacker, Iris Wolley. "Automated Access Level Cataloging for Internet Resources at Columbia University Libraries." Unpublished manuscript, p. 23 Accepted for publication in a future issue of *Library Resources and Technical Services*.

[4] Harcourt et al. p. 24