

CONSER/BIBCO ALA At-Large Meeting Summary
Sunday, Jan. 13, 2008
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

CONSER standard record

When CONSER decided to implement the CONSER standard record last May we also wanted to set up a group to monitor this new standard to suggest revisions for the Metadata Application Profile and other CONSER documentation. In addition to posting a summary of unresolved issues, we have been making comments, suggestions, on the PCC wiki and CONSER email list. Now we are ready to form this group but wanted to touch base with the larger serials community for its thoughts and ideas before going ahead.

Adolfo Tarango provided the audience with some initial ideas about the formation of this group. The audience shared their experience in using CRS. In general, implementation has been going without problems. It was noted that catalogers are more comfortable applying CSR in original cataloging but have more trouble in doing maintenance and copy cataloging. It was suggested that we need to come up with best practices in dealing with these and additional issues such as uniform title, 362, etc. Regina Reynolds emphasized the need to incorporate in training that the CSR is more of an approach and philosophy than a standard. We are not talking about rigid right and wrong. The attitude should be emphasized over individual rules. CONSER members discussed the following functions for this group:

- The group is to be made up of people from CONSER institutions
- The group will review comments and issues that have surfaced to-date; proactively work to identify additional issues, draft revisions to the CSR guidelines; and present them to the membership at CONSER Ops.
- CONSER Ops. representatives will review, discuss, and provide comments and/or consensus for the revisions at their meeting in May. Their input will serve as the basis for any necessary further revision of the initial draft
- There will be an in-depth discussion at annual's CONSER-at-Large and possibly at the CRCC meeting to gather feedback from the wider serials community
- The membership will make decisions based on comments gathered at these discussions either at a special CONSER Ops meeting following the CONSER-at-Large and CRCC meeting or via e-mail

Les will be sending more information to CONSRLST.

Title presentation on e-resource web sites (Cindy Hepfer & Valerie Bross)

The display of e-journal titles on providers' web sites has been a recurring topic of discussion among serialists through the years. Many web sites display only the current title obscuring earlier titles associated with the journal. The practice hinders access and filters down to knowledgebases and other services further confusing users and librarians.

CONSER is interested in facilitating a discussion among publishers, vendors, and librarians to develop a common understanding of the problem.

Cindy started the discussion by sharing her experience and her effort in working with Taylor and Francis to provide better metadata for e-journals. She also mentioned that Steve Shadle has written a paper on the topic and will be presenting a workshop for publishers at UKSG. Valerie asked the audience to share their own experiences and to suggest names of publishers or vendors they would like CONSER to invite to join this conversation. The group identified several publishers and publication access management companies as examples of those who are doing something right

This discussion provided good information for the panel discussion that CONSER is planning for the NASIG conference.

PCC Series discussion paper (Renette Davis)

Renette presented the Discussion Paper on PCC Series Policies and Practices, which was issued by the PCC Series Group on Dec 14 (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/PCC-Series-DP.pdf>). At-large attendees only had time to discuss the three options for PCC policy on tracing series. Renette first gave a brief overview of current practice and then summarized the three options.

Option C was explored in detail. The reason this option was developed was that everybody wants the Library of Congress serial records to be in the CONSER database. CONSER records are used by vendors such as Serials Solutions and other services reliant on knowledge bases for a variety of services that deliver electronic content to many libraries.

LC serials catalogers aren't allowed to do series authority work, so if we go with option A, they would not be able to code their records CONSER. If we go with option B, they could, but there were strong feelings by some people in the task force that we should not make series tracing completely optional on PCC records, for all of the reasons listed in the discussion paper.

Most of the at-large comments strongly supported keeping the PCC standards as they are now. There were some comments related to minimal records for serials, but no comments related to core or minimal records for monographs.

A suggestion was made that perhaps a new indicator could be defined for 490 which means unevaluated. This same suggestion was made later at the MARBI meeting, so that might be something to explore.

A straw vote on the options was taken:

Option A, continuing current policy - 32

Option B, making series tracing completely optional - 4

Option C, current policy for full records, but optional on core and/or minimal records - 20

People were encouraged to send comments to the email lists, Les or Amy on the other recommendations.

Integrating resource cataloging manual issues (Robert Bremer, Peter Fletcher, Shana McDanold)

Should CONSER standard record guidelines be an option for CONSER and BIBCO members for cataloging integrating resources?

Decision: Including them as an option where anyone could apply them to an IR was generally accepted, but it was requested that both options are clearly indicated in the documentation such as including two examples, one for each option (for training purposes and so people know why something is or is not there); Regina indicated that NSDP will apply the CSR rules to IRs when they start assigning ISSNs.

008/39 Srce code

Discussion: the general feeling was to either have everyone do the same thing (presumably BIBCO's practice of coding this byte "c" when they authenticate an existing OCLC record, as it's tied to the 042 code "pcc" for validation purposes) or completely get rid of it as a code because it serves no purpose anymore; Robert indicated that converting the CONSER records to "c" wouldn't be a problem if we wanted to make it an universal PCC practice (simpler to convert CONSER records than it would be to retro-convert BIBCO records and it may not even be possible to retro-convert BIBCO records).

Differences in BIBCO and CONSER on guidelines for order of notes

Discussion: This is not really a big issue, although some statement that following either the BIBCO or CONSER practice (include what the two practices are) is acceptable would be nice (in IR9.1 Overview?); generally seen that tag order is simplest, but note to please leave them in whatever order they were originally input rather than re-ordering them when updating (prevent "editing wars"). It was also noted that since some notes are not actually 5XX fields, they generally aren't in strict ISDB prescribed order anyway so what does it matter?

042 codes, when to leave existing codes other than "pcc" in an existing record

Decision: The general consensus indicated that when the 042 code indicates level of cataloging (such as "dc" or "lccopycat"), REPLACE with the higher code when upgrading the record; however, when the 042 code indicates participation in a particular program (such as "NSDP" or "xlc") the code MUST remain and further codes (such as "pcc") should be added in additional \$a subfields. There was a request for including a list of 042 codes that must be kept in the manual; does anyone have a complete list or does one exist somewhere that we can copy?

Common/section title for remote access IRs

Request: Please include examples of each one plus an example where it could be both/either way; Anyone with examples is welcome to send them to Les Hawkins.

Series/websites

Request for "when in doubt, how to catalog" help. The series/website example given in the manual is an American Memory page which is cataloged many different ways (inconsistent application).

Web based resource available in multiple languages

Possibilities: Treat the resource as having multiple chief sources, if multiple chief sources exist. Often however, there is a "base" URL pointing to one portal page or one language that is the base URL and all other language pages are an extension of that URL. One option then would be to create one record based on the primary portal page for the resource. When choosing which language to make as the primary, one could determine which version is the fullest and use that as the basis for the description. If multiple chief sources exist, it was suggested that rules for cataloging books in multiple languages should be consulted. Regina Reynolds brought up the fact that for some resources the web pages clearly present separate language resources and each language version gets its own ISSN (ex. UN resources); each would then require their own record. In the case of Library and Archives Canada, separate web pages and separate records are created for each language because they have multiple audiences that use their data. Comment that sometimes the preferred language is chosen by the selector/bibliographer that made the request.

K versus I versus blank for ELv1: who in OCLC can edit what records for integrating resources?

Robert indicated that for integrating resources the rules will be the same as with any other format: anyone with a full (or higher) authorization can edit any record with 10 or fewer holdings; once it hits 10 holdings or is authenticated, editing is limited to those with specific authorizations to do so.

Other issues:

There was a request for examples illustrating interface versus content (such as same content with multiple interface options? AGRICOLA?)

The idea of putting together a list of PCC level actions that are applicable to both BIBCO and CONSER that are the really important things to be consistent on was brought up (such as 042 codes); first step towards harmonization for generally applicable guidelines/practices?

Reports from PCC standing committees

Standing committee on Automation (Adolfo Tarango)

The SCA has a new chair and some new members.

Standing Committee on Standards (Joan Schuitema)

The SCS will be looking at: non-English access PCC multiple guidelines; review its charge, and RDA draft

Standing Committee on Training (Caroline Miller)

The SCT PoCo rep. is Robert Ellett

BIBCO At-Large topics (Carolyn Sturtevant)

Non-Latin Characters in Name Authority Records (Dave Reser)

Status report on revision of BIBCO training materials (Iris Wolley)

ECIP membership among BIBCO libraries (Eugene Kinnaly)