

## CONSER Operations Meeting 2011 Outcomes

Agendas of the [PCC Operations Meeting](#) and the [CONSER Operations Meeting](#) contain links to discussion documents.

Outcomes from the joint PCC Operations Meeting are available from:  
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC-OpCo-Actions.html>

Outcomes of the discussion of CONSER standard record in the context of RDA begin on page 3 of this document.

1. **Multiple Linking:** OpCo attendees accepted the basic recommendations of the [report](#) [PDF; 186 KB; 17 p.] restricting use of 780-785 to title changes and using 776 for all other manifestation to manifestation links. The examples in part 2 presented some complex situations and require wider discussion to be included in documentation. The documentation updates listed in part 3 could possibly be used as is.

**Action:** After the meeting the CONSER email list was sent a proposal to update documentation based on part 3 of the report.

2. **ISSN:**
  - a. Contacts for US ISSN center are Regina Reynolds and Elmer Klebs. Please copy both Regina and Elmer on questions related to US ISSN until July 2011, Regina only after July 2011.
  - b. ISSN International Centre is partner to PEPRS pilot e-journal preservation registry project <http://peprs.org/peprs/peprs.asp>
  - c. The ISSN International Centre is considering a provisional change to policies on assigning ISSN to digital reproductions (changes to policy on microforms and print reproductions are not under consideration). The proposal is linked to the CONSER agenda, [Document 7](#) [PDF: 400KB; 10 p.].
  - d. Exploring repeatable 022 fields.

**Action:** An ISSN/CONSER working group will be formed to explore repeatable 022 field in CONSER records

**When:** July 2011

**Who:** Regina and Les will draft charge, ask for participants.

3. **Manager's perspective:** Preparation for working with RDA records

**Action:** Develop CONSER web site to share local RDA workflows, policies, training materials, macros, test records, tips for ILS changes to accommodate RDA records.

**When:** CONSER institutions may send any material to [conser@loc.gov](mailto:conser@loc.gov) beginning June 8, 2011.

## CONSER Operations Meeting 2011 Outcomes

4. **Shared experience working with RDA records:** CONSER catalogers want to share in creating records for a common set of 5 resources and work through serials related questions together.

**Action:** CONSER staff at LC will provide links to surrogates of the five records; send links and instructions to the CONSER email list

**When:** links and instructions sent by June 10, 2011; discuss preliminary results ALA annual 2011 (or earlier through web conference).

5. **Future of CONSER documentation, consensus:**

**CONSER Editing Guide:** Consensus that procedural material should be maintained on the web, overlap with MARC 21 documentation eliminated, remaining focus of CEG on fields where CONSER has made practice decisions or serial and integrating resource examples are needed.

**CONSER Cataloging Manual:** Many sections of the CCM serve to provide background for records created under AACR2 (and earlier rules) and are valuable for learning how to work with copy. Other sections such as Module 31 undergo frequent change.

**RDA environment:** The presence of RDA records now in our workflows demands a flexible dynamic format for presenting and testing CONSER practices. Need to allow CONSER catalogers to collaborate on developing practices and then make them available quickly.

6. **Open Access Journal Project:**

At ALA annual determine consensus on whether or not to continue the project. Details of how to manage the project on an ongoing basis need to be determined.

**Action:** Les will ask current pilot project leaders for advice on the type of structure needed to continue the project before ALA to have this information available for discussion.

## CONSER Operations Meeting 2011 Outcomes

**CONSER RDA Decisions Needed Discussion:** Fuller explanation of the decision needed and additional details of the outcomes are available from the [PCC RDA Policy and Practice Decisions Needed if RDA is Adopted](#) document. [Word; 175 KB; 37 p.]

### **Issue C-1: Entering a serial under the heading for a person (100)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

*LCRI 21.1A2 reflects the intention of the “creator” in RDA. In considering the entire run of a serial work in determining personal creatorship, current CSR practice is in conformity with RDA. There will still be instances when it would be appropriate to enter a serial under the heading of a person as in cataloging of personal zines, podcasts, or blogs.*

- 1) Reframe LCRI 21.1A2 within the context of RDA to specifically mentions application to serials and ongoing integrating resources.
- 2) Ask ALA representative to JSC to add this clarification to RDA for serials and ongoing integrating resources.
- 3) Reinstate provisions of LCRI 21.1A2 in a program statement as a CONSER/PCC best practice. Continue the practice in the mean time.

### **Issue C-2: Identification of language expressions (130 v. 730)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

- 1) Continue current CSR practice as an interim measure. This will keep CONSER cataloging in line with ISSN cataloging practice (i.e. new record created only when the language expression being cataloged or assigned an ISSN key title changes).
- 2) Form a “CONSER core elements” working group to revisit if RDA is implemented.

### **Issue C-3: Distinguishing Uniform Title (130/240)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

- 1) Continue CSR current practice in the interim.
- 2) There was no consensus within the context of RDA. Need to explore consequences of maintaining current practices if RDA is implemented and whether there are alternatives such as relying on ISSN key title to distinguish serial works with the same title.

### **Issues C-4: Other title information (245 \$b)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

- 1) Continue CSR current practice “*Generally, it is not required to transcribe other title information unless it provides clarification or support to the title proper...*”
- 2) Supplied subtitles such as “[report]” or “[proceedings]” are not sanctioned by RDA. If needed such information may be provided in a note.

## CONSER Operations Meeting 2011 Outcomes

### **Issue C-5: Parallel title proper (245 \$b)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

1) Continue CSR current practice. "Recording" parallel title is not core in RDA, but LC core during the test. CSR practice of recording the parallel title in field 246 is not out of line with RDA/LC practices.

### **Issue C-6: Statement of responsibility**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

1) Continue CSR practice in RDA; develop a "best practice" for serials or a proposal to ALA representative to JSC to make an exception/clarification for serials.

### **Issue C-7: Date of Publication (260)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

There was no consensus reached at OpCo. Issues: coverage dates are often more important for serials and often clearer in display (but systems vary on relying on 260 \$c for display); 260 \$c a bi-directional display problem for non-Roman script resources. "CONSER core elements" working group to revisit if RDA is implemented.

### **Issue C-8: Former publication frequency (321)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

Maintain CSR practice: prefer to keep former frequencies rather than replace all with a 321 "frequency varies" note, even if more than three former frequencies.

### **Issue C-9: Source of title proper note**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

Always give source of title proper note for simplicity of practice.

### **Issue C-10: Dates of publication/designation (362) and DBO note (588)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

- 1) Always provide DBO as best practice even if first issue in hand.
- 2) Wording in RDA: "Identification of the resource based on:..." is only an example. CONSER will continue to use "Description based on."

### **Issue C-11: Provider neutral records (PNR):**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

Consensus: PCC will continue PCC PNR practice if RDA is implemented.

## CONSER Operations Meeting 2011 Outcomes

### **Issue C-12: Physical description (300)**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

Continue with CSR practice if RDA is implemented: \$a extent required only for tangible non-print formats.

### **Issue C-13: Single record approach (SRA) for RDA records**

#### **Operations Committee Preferred Decision for this Issue:**

Consensus: PCC will continue PCC single record approach. Actions:

- Clarify that current guidelines apply to manifestations of textual materials
- Clarify that 33X fields contain elements only for the textual materials.
- Confirmed that 007 of other manifestations are not added to the single record.
- Ask PoCo to form a group to explore SRA for formats other than textual resources.