

Summary of decisions reported at the CONSER At-Large Meeting ALA Annual 2008

Two MARBI proposals were approved during ALA in June. One is a PCC wide proposal described in <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2008/2008-07.html> making 440 obsolete. The other defines \$x and \$3 for the 8XX fields, a proposal that grew from CONSER standard record recommendations and described in <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2008/2008-06.html>. The papers and proposals for these changes were drafted and shepherded through the MARBI process by the PCC Ad Hoc Series Group, thanks to group members for their support of these efforts.

There was a question about when we can implement the changes; there are two different situations with implementing these proposals. Since the 440 is being made obsolete and doesn't involve definitions of any new coding, it may be ok for the PCC to begin using 490/8XX instead of 440 before the usual three month waiting period. The PCC Standing Committee on Standards is putting together a recommendation for PCC implementation of this and we should have that soon.

The other proposal involves implementing newly defined subfield codes, so the usual three month waiting period applies before implementation. The three month period begins after the changes are published in MARC documentation. OCLC and LC will also need to put the changes on their MARC update schedules.

Use of the 007 with the single record approach was on the agenda. CONSER members confirmed agreement that we will not add a 007 for the online version when we are using the record for the print version in providing single record approach access.

Another other topic at the meeting was an update from the CONSER Standard Record Monitoring Group. Several group members met during ALA to go over the tasks identified in action items from the May Operations Meeting <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/actions-decisions-CSR-2008.pdf>. The CSR guidelines (the MAP) were updated based on these action items and the group looked these over. There were not too many revisions to make and the group made some decisions about which action items overlapped and how to simplify things. The revisions the group agreed upon will be completed and the revised MAP posted.

There were MARC related action items from the Operations Meeting also and Tina Schrader has agreed to coordinate the earlier group that was convened to make recommendations for the CSR. A year ago or so when we began to pursue the MARC recommendations from the Access Level Working Group we were warned that MARBI would be prioritizing RDA related proposals over other proposals. The Ad Hoc series group shepherded one proposal related to the CONSER standard record through MARBI, defining subfield codes to add information associated with the 7XX and 8XX fields.

We agreed that the CSR MARC group should pursue the definition of the 588 field for use of LIC and DBO and this work can begin right now. We should be firm and clear on

our need for these fields and build a good case for it in our MARBI paper. We can begin to get feedback on the idea from the MARC community through the MARC listserv.

I will be contacting OCLC directly about our needs related to implementing the repeatable 260. The CSR MARC group will explore some of the other issues listed in the action items from the operations meeting.

Les Hawkins CONSER Coordinator