

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

The main focus of the 2007 CONSER operations meeting was implementation of the CONSER standard record (CSR). Highlights of some of the important decisions members made are presented below. More details of outstanding issues and proposed solutions from the meeting discussion and discussion afterward are documented at: <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Decisions-frequently-asked-questions.pdf>

CONSER representatives agreed to implement the CSR on June 1, 2007 with the understanding that institutions will probably need to consult locally before implementing. Representatives agreed to monitor how it is going locally at member institutions and suggest any changes needed in practices over the coming year.

Action: a group will be formed to monitor the CONSER standard record. Representatives will monitor issues related to the standard at their institutions, gather feedback from other staff and provide input for the monitoring group.

On Wednesday May 2, Melissa Beck (UCLA) and Valerie Bross (UCLA) provided a training session on the CSR. After the training, members worked on identifying outstanding issues and discussed solutions. The training material used for the session was updated after the meeting and is available from the CONSER web site: *CONSER Standard Record SCCTP Presentation* <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/>. Other documentation related to the CSR was also updated and is available from the CONSER web site including:

- *CONSER Standard Record Documentation* which includes a Metadata Application Profile (MAP), field by field guidelines for the CSR record
- *Cataloger's Cheat Sheet* a short guide to the CSR MAP
- Links to related Library of Congress Rule Interpretations that support CSR decisions.

In addition, several ideas for improving user displays through changes in MARC 21 were suggested by operations representatives throughout the meeting and afterwards.

Action: A CSR MARBI proposal group has been formed to pursue these for the January 2008 MARBI meeting.

Other highlights are summarized below, more detail on some of these topics can be found at: <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Decisions-frequently-asked-questions.pdf>

Working with existing copy. For the most part existing records do not need to be changed to fit the new standards (e.g. uniform titles should not be deleted from existing records), there were some questions about closing out records, making later modifications based on a later issue. In closing out records with existing formatted 362 0, catalogers have the option of closing out the 362 0 in the pre-CSR style for formatted 362s or simply add information about the last issue in an unformatted 362 1. Catalogers also have

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

the option of closing out the 260 \$c in pre-CSR records if the record includes a beginning publishing date.

CONSER representatives agreed to retain former frequencies in existing 321 fields in existing records and to continue the practice of moving former frequencies to the 321 when adding a new frequency in the 310 field. The practice of deleting 321 fields and adding a "frequency varies" note when there are more than three 321s in a record will be discontinued.

Working with the CSR guidelines for recording numbering in a 362 1 note instead of a formatted 362. The group agreed to try working with this new practice and continue to evaluate its impact. One impact may be on recording non-roman data for numbering. If there continues to be value in CONSER providing both vernacular and Romanized numbering information in paired fields, it is probably best to continue use of 362 0 for this purpose.

Uniform titles. There was confirmation that the "not required" option for uniform titles to distinguish identical titles also applies to online serials. CONSER will monitor this practice throughout the year to determine the impact.

Practices for special materials. The CSR guidelines mention categories of material for which the CSR approach may not be appropriate: "Specialized resources such as those in non-roman script, law serials, rare serials, newspapers, etc., have specialized requirements not included in this basic documentation." Current cataloging practices for these specialized resources may need to continue unchanged. Additional categories identified at the meeting include practices for preservation microform and area studies serials. Members discussed the need to document variances with the CSR (e.g. the need for distinguishing uniform titles for newspapers) or practices that could be adapted from the CSR in existing documentation such as the CCM newspaper, microform, and legal resources modules. It was suggested outreach is needed to these other cataloging communities to explain the CSR and determine if there are aspects of the CSR that can be incorporated into existing documentation for these resources.

Practices for translations and language editions. The group agreed to adapt the CSR guideline for these materials (i.e. instead of a uniform title, collocation is provided in a 730 with \$l language).

Series recommendation. The group agreed to implementation of the series proposal in the CSR (i.e. when series authority records exist or are being established, not required to transcribe it, just supply established form in 8XX), though if a series is not being traced, the series statement should still be transcribed in a 490 field.

**Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007
Library of Congress**

The Joint CONSER/BIBCO Operations Meeting Thursday May 3, 2007

Non-roman data in catalog records

Dave Reser (CPSO, LC) set the stage for the discussion by giving some background on developments in handling non-roman data in catalog records. Dave Reser's PowerPoint is available from: http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/nonroman_auth.ppt. The NACO nodes, LC, OCLC, RLG, British Library, have been working on issues related to non-roman data for many years. The current LC/NACO authority file model is based on having one authority record per entity and is the MARC 21 "Model B" for multi-script records, that is no 880s, the fields are linked with non-roman equivalents.

A proposed new vision of the NACO model is the addition of non-roman 4XX fields based on usage and 670 "source found citations" with non-roman data. Roman 1xx and 4xx would be established per current practices.

There are several implementation issues, one of which is the need to work with PCC libraries to formulate guidelines for all languages and scripts for choosing non-roman variant forms for use in authority records and bibliographic 880 fields. There is a need for policies regarding qualifiers, for example, should they be in the language of the catalog or the language of the heading? Policies are needed for dates, including visual or logical order conventions for bi-directional script headings. LC will work on a white paper for NACO node and PCC review and consider needs for LCRI revision.

But first...NACO exchange of records between nodes and master file must migrate from MARC-8 to UTF-8 system; LC will continue to distribute MARC-8 and UTF-8 records for the foreseeable future.

Timeline:

- Migration to UTF-8 for NACO exchange no earlier than Oct. 1, 2007
- Inclusion of non-roman data in authority records no earlier than Dec. 2007.

David Williamson (LC) and David Bucknum (LC) then demonstrated ways they have developed to work with non-roman data in Voyager records, using macros that probably could easily be adapted by other systems to transform records.

Integrating resources, distribution of bibliographic level "i" records.

Les reviewed recent developments in distributing records for integrating resources. An authentication code "pcc" has been agreed upon and will be the default 042 code for integrating resource records contributed by both CONSER and BIBCO members. A problem with the encoding levels and authorizations in OCLC will be fixed when OCLC is able to look at replacement rules and install a rewrite later this month. The fix will allow coding of both BIBCO and CONSER records as bibliographic level "i."

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

The harder part of the task of distributing integrating resource records in one file will be up to LC. CDS, CPSO, and LC's ILS office have identified the programming issues that need to be resolved. As of June 15, 2007 specific programming changes have been identified and there are LC staff available to work on them.

Question: Could the BLvl "i" be implemented separately from distribution through CDS, that is could authentication code "pcc" and LCCN be added to these records before all the technical details are ironed out on the CDS end?

Robert Bremer: LC would find it problematical to collect & de-dup records. But OCLC could batch the records and then release them to LC when LC is ready.

Agreement: if this is possible, the membership would like to pursue this approach.

LCCN would need to be issued to BIBCO members. Those institutions which are both BIBCO and CONSER could make use of the CONSER LCCN that were issued to the CONSER members.

Action: LC staff that distribute LCCN will survey CONSER and BIBCO members on their need for LCCN

Conversion of records

OCLC also needs to convert pcc records currently coded as BLvl "m" to "i." LC records that are coded according to the interim practice (BLvl "m" and 006) and older records coded only as monograph (loose-leaves, etc.) were issued in the CDS Books file, so to convert these, a delete for the monograph needs to be issued to and the record re-issued with a new LCCN. PCC members have been asked not to convert these records from m to i until LC can delete and reissue the records.

LC IR work

Question: In the past, LC catalogers have cataloged in Voyager for monographs; when BLvl "i" is implemented, will LC catalogers work in Voyager or in OCLC?

Answer: LC will do work related to integrating resources in OCLC

Aggregator-neutral record for integrating resources

Peter Fletcher (Tulane) is heading a group looking into the provider neutral approach for electronic integrating resources. Peter is analyzing rules as part of the charge to see what should be done. Guidelines for aggregator neutral records for serials float above AACR, etc. the goal is to develop similar guidelines that can be incorporated into the BIBCO manual chapter on integrating resources. This chapter would also be issued as part of the CONSER Cataloging Manual. Consolidation of existing multiple provider records would

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

be something that only OCLC could do, at this point its not certain what the extent or difficulty of this work will be.

Question: How important is it to implement the aggregator neutral record before implementing BLvl “i”, is there a need to stop creating separate records for different providers of electronic integrating resources sooner rather than later?

Regina Reynolds: The ISSN Network assigns ISSN for electronic integrating resources on an aggregator neutral record approach, so only one ISSN is assigned to a title.

Agreed: if there is an existing record for a provider, don’t create another record in the national file. This should be added to the BIBCO/CONSER module on cataloging integrating resources.

CONSER Standard Record and IRs

Question: CONSER Standard Record: Should this be extended to IRs, at least not requiring the 538 Mode of Access note unless the access is something other than the World Wide Web?

Comment: This also is a topic and decision that should be made for the BIBCO/CONSER module on cataloging integrating resources.

LC Access Level Record

This was developed by LC, but applied by only a few institutions, e.g., University of Chicago. Can these records be authenticated as they were constructed under those guidelines when authentication is available?

Discussion: These probably could be authenticated when the details of authentication are worked out, it might be better however to wait until the CONSER/BIBCO documentation can be updated to document further decisions about cataloging integrating resources in the two programs.

[Comment from Les, post meeting: PCC practices for creating and modifying records for integrating resources is documented in a module of the BIBCO manual. This manual needs to be updated to include changes available since Connexion implemented code “i” and possibly some of the decisions made at this meeting: an aggregator neutral approach for electronic integrating resources, adapting at least some of the practices of the CONSER standard record, such as not requiring a mode of access note unless the access is something other than the world wide web, and a decision about records created under the LC access level for electronic resources. The module also needs to be incorporated into the CONSER Cataloging Manual.]

Report from Beacher Wiggins

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

RDA

Beacher gave a report from his trip as LC representative to the Committee of Principals (which includes representatives from American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals), and the Directors (or designates) of the Library of Congress, Library and Archives Canada, and the British Library. Concerns from ALA and CC:DA focused on the speed of progress toward implementation and keeping to the timeline. Other questions asked by the committee were: does it go far enough, is it worth it? The Committee of Principals reaffirmed its support of ongoing development of RDA.

RDA will be a web-based replacement of the code and hopefully not as difficult to use as AACR2. If June 1, 2009 is the rollout date we need to start planning now, working with OCLC to anticipate changes, as well as with vendors. Cataloger judgment needs to be encouraged and provide lots of options for different cataloging environments.

Role for PCC: The Committee of Principals wants to have PCC involved in training.

LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Division (ABA)

The question behind the reorganization was: how can LC continue to handle traditional print and move toward handling digital also? LC will meld acquisitions and cataloging functions, some 750 people, 200 in acquisitions and 450 to 500 in cataloging will be organized into 14 divisions in ABA, 8 cataloging, 4 acquisitions, training, and CDS. This provides for more flexibility and the opportunity to reduce redundancies in workflows and minimize re-handling of material by different staff (currently for 10,000 items per day, handled 10 to 30 different times along the way).

OCLC update

Parallel records

The policy of allowing records that represent the same manifestation, but cataloged in different languages in OCLC was a direct result of the 2003 OpCo meeting. The guidelines for working with these records is outlined in Technical Bulletin TB 250, available from <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/250/>. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) have incorporated instructions for working with these records. Of particular importance are instructions on how to identify records cataloged in a language other than English (the language is identified in 040 \$b) and when it is appropriate to create a new record (ok if there is not already an existing record for the resource in the institution's language of cataloging.)

PCC members need to be conscious of these "permissible duplicates." Some PCC libraries are upgrading and changing records that are non-English where as they should be left alone and an English language record created or used instead.

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

The language of cataloging in 040 \$b should not be removed by PCC members, unless the records were incorrectly coded for a particular language. For example, there are now a number of Dutch language records, coded 040 subfield b "dut" that were batch loaded in OCLC. Some *few* of these records are really English language records and inappropriately coded 040 \$b, these few could be converted by removing the \$b. However, if the coding looks correct i.e. the language of cataloging is in Dutch, don't change these record or remove the 040 \$b.

According to TB 250, other vendor records coded non-English are an exception to the converting restrictions.

RLG integration

Goals are on target and no disruption of service delivery to current member libraries is anticipated and expectations of users for services are being met or exceeded. Completion of the migration is expected by fall 2007. The following integration related projects are underway:

Tech Services/Cataloging Integration
Eureka to FirstSearch Integration
ILL/SHARES Service Integration
CAMIO/ArchiveGrid
Some other products will be discontinued

Implementing Institutional Records in Connexion Client & Browser:
Connexion updates are installed, archival fields enhancements have been made, access to the authority history, and Z39.50 enhancements have been made. With the next installation, May-June 2007 Institution Record support will be available, the final installation in August 2007 will support SCIPRO & Hand Press Book.

Statistics for Primary Cluster Member processing (Dec. 2006-Apr. 2007):
Records processed - 50.4 million
Records matched - 40.3 million
New master records added 7.8 million
Unresolved records 2.3 million
Records enriched 1.2 million

NACO transitioning: OCLC NACO authorizations will be required and there will be new functionality in Connexion client 2.0 to generate authority records from a local system record.

Important Note: RLG members were reminded to clean up any saved record in RLG.

There is a wealth of information on the RLG transitioning at:
<http://www.oclc.org/community/rlg/default.htm> including a master transitioning

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

schedule, a transitioning frequently asked questions document, specific information on various services, NACO and SACO authority related topics and other cataloging and metadata related topics.

Standing Committee on Automation (SCA)

Gary Charbonneau (Indiana) presented two follow-up reports:

The final version of the MARC Record guide for monographic vendors was issued in April and posted on the PCC website: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/sca/FinalVendorGuide.pdf>. Announcements were sent to NISO list, and to ALCTS Publisher Vendor Library Relations list. The SCA is seeking responses from vendors and looking at avenues for making the record guide known to them.

The Task Group on Normalization's final report "Authority File Comparison Rules" is available from http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/PCCNormalization_Final.pdf. Some further thought should be given on an implementation date, the executive summary and other details before the work is completed

Standing Committee on Training (SCT)

Caroline Miller (UCLA): One new task group has been established, the BIBCO Training Materials Revision Group. The SCT will be interested in the BIBCO operations meeting topic of a possible Standard Record for monographs—only in exploratory stages right now. Adam Schiff has completed SACO Participants Manual.

Electronic Resource Management Systems implementation issues and standards

Linda Miller (LC) gave an overview of several issues facing implementers of ERMS. LC purchased III's ERM system three years ago and was one of the first libraries to try it as a stand-alone ERMS component, where Millennium wasn't the primary ILS provider. LC bought the III user interface also. Trying to meld Voyager with Millennium has been a challenge, a work in progress to make it work seamlessly. Linda covered several areas of concern in implementing LC's ERMS:

License information not formerly available to users can now be made available to honor contracts and make good faith efforts to inform users of restrictions. However, reading licenses and sharing them is also a big job, still not fully realized. Solutions may be more automated in future. Aggregators and agents can negotiate license terms and save effort locally so that there isn't a need to display the entire license in reading rooms.

LC works with PAMS (Publication Access Management Services) TDNet, Serials Solutions, and the EZB consortium, these services provide date ranges, but not issue numbers for serials that are used in local holdings records. It is therefore hard to match with print holdings because the PAMS use chronology only for their holdings, rather than

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

both chronology and numeric data. Often though PAMS will say their data is MFHD compatible, often is not.

ISSNs for as many items as possible are needed to make ERM systems work smoothly.

The shifting content of electronic packages is a problem. It is difficult to track titles in packages when they are constantly being offered simultaneously in multiple packages. Because of the constant morphing of packages into different products it is hard to keep titles matched and updated. Often problems with electronic versions take longer to resolve and ultimately display in the OPAC than with the ink-print version and that is not the goal.

Gathering usage data is important for evaluating the value of a package and it is not always available or easily configured into usable results. SFX is LC's URL resolver, and they count usage in a different way from package providers. Provider promises to deliver cost per usage data, but then might add additional titles to a package, changing the cost calculation.

Unicode issues are not yet solved. Data are available MARC-8 or UTF-8, LC will take any format available. Strong search engines are needed for best discovery experience for users.

Linda talked about some of the factors involved with standards and software development that have the potential to help ease some of the work. Standards are aimed at making it easy for content providers transmit data to management systems and in turn present it in a user-friendly format. The ONIX for serials standards formats have potential for helping ERMS implementation. These include the SRN (serial release notice) a serials check-in function. And SOH (serials online holdings) aimed at helping load MARC21 holdings data from other systems into the ERMS. Talking with vendors about existing standards and the need to implement them is a possible role that the PCC could play.

LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control.

Michael lead a discussion on what PCC could do to have input for the next session and she wanted to get operations feedback. A suggestion was made that this would be a good topic for the PCC participants meeting at ALA Annual.

Series

Magda el-Sherbini (Ohio State) presented preliminary survey results of library, faculty, and students regarding series at Ohio State. The perception of value of series as an access point varies among these users.

Amy Turner (Duke) also presented some findings related to series processing by their vendor LCI since January 2007. The amount of series authority related maintenance

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

work during this period was low, though over 4,000 records (of 10,000 processed) contained series.

The PCC series group has still not been convened, but a charge has been written, the membership formed and the group is expected to begin its work soon.

Afternoon CONSER meeting:

ISSN report.

Regina Reynolds (NSDP) reported on the development of the linking ISSN. The new standard will be published very soon with a target implementation date of 2008. Records will contain both the linking ISSN and the medium specific ISSN. The ISSN Network will retrospectively populate the ISSN database with linking ISSN. A MARBI proposal for ALA Annual will probably define these subfields related to linking ISSN in the 022:

\$a medium specific ISSN (current definition)
\$l linking ISSN
\$m incorrect ISSN
\$n canceled ISSN

NSDP will begin to assign ISSN to integrating resources as soon as possible. Many of these will be resources that are serial in print and integrating in the online format e.g. law material. NSDP is receiving many ISSN requests for blogs, but mainly have been selective in assigning ISSN to these.

NSDP will need to work with CONSER staff to update C6 in the CEG, there are several new developments and instructions on the ISSN CONSER web form that need to be added to this.

Non-US titles, is it ok to add key title, abbreviated key title and ISSN found on ISSN Portal?

Decision: Yes but please make sure to add ISSN center code in 022 as a way to signal that the information was transcribed from ISSN Portal by a CONSER member. This is an important flag that the information is from the portal but may have changed since it was transcribed. This will be documented in the CEG.

There have been reports of a validation problem for some records where a CONSER member adds the center code 022 \$2. This has probably been resolved, but let Regina know when you come across this so she can monitor.

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

Registry of Digital Masters (RDM) and CONSER single record approach

The revised guidelines from the Digital Library Federation (DLF) include several mandatory fields: 007, 506, 533, 583, 856. These exceed the number of elements outlined in CONSER's single record approach guidelines. Recent discussions of contributing single record approach records to the RDM have debated the need to include series access for series titles appearing on the digital reproduction, but not on the print original. Some CONSER members have been concerned with moving too much toward a single record approach rather than focusing on separate records. Some have suggested that RDA and FRBR will encourage a separate record approach in the future. Historically, some CONSER file subscribers have been confused by some of the elements on the CONSER print single record 007 especially, and there is concern that additional elements will further confuse them.

On the other hand, several CONSER members make heavy use of the single record approach and have indicated that they will not be able to contribute to the RDM without making use of it. The information provided by RDM data elements is really prospective about plans for preserving the print and thus in some ways really does refer to the print.

The revised DLF guidelines include a roadmap suggesting further development of the holdings record to contain RDM data, rather than the bibliographic record. Some members mentioned that one of the problems in using the holdings record is that an additional searching step is required, first the bibliographic records, then the holdings record. Also many institutions currently do not configure holdings records for OAI harvesting as they do bibliographic records, although encoding holdings records in XML for harvesting is certainly possible.

Decision: CONSER members agreed not to contribute single record approach records to the RDM for a year, we'll monitor developments in how holdings records might be used for this and take another look at it.

Non-US newspaper microform records: and aggregator neutral approach.

Bill Anderson (LC) described the problem of having multiple microform records for this category of material in contrast to the approach used by the USNP program, hanging holdings on the record for the print or the possibility of using a provider-neutral record where multiple micropublishers could be listed on a single record for the microform.

Does it matter to CONSER members that the name of a micro publisher changes over time? There is an impact on acquisitions staff where purchase data needs to be linked with a new provider, right now that is done by relying on a new bib record when the company changes.

Comment: The problem is really with preservation microforms where separate provider records are produced, where you have separate preservation projects going on in separate

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

institutions. This could be handled by putting data in 843 field of a local holdings record, if this visible now that OCLC has implemented the holdings record, it could work like the e-holdings data. Should this apply to all preservation microform, not just the non-US newspapers?

Will selectors have a problem with a change in our preservation microform policies? Probably it would be good to survey how the master record is used in relation to preservation microform, focus on how the master record is used by selectors, other staff, user.

If there were multiple 533 fields, 007 fields would need to be tied to these (they aren't now).

Action: Les will work with Bill Anderson and interested CONSER members to develop a survey to determine impact on other functions at libraries and consider the usefulness of the approach beyond non-US newspaper preservation microform.

National Digital Newspaper Project (NDNP)

One question for CONSER is how to work with new NDNP project members that will maintain CONSER newspaper records used as the basis of metadata for the project. We will want to assure that new NDNP project members maintaining and creating CONSER records are aware of CONSER guidelines for authentication and maintenance. There is a need to be sure that members properly use the CONSER authorizations and so we will need to develop some training and mechanism for mentorship. Two CONSER members are already part of NDNP, perhaps they'd be willing to offer mentorship. This could be handled as a funnel type project either for authentication or in terms of coordination, training and mentorship. NACO is still a requirement, so this will need to be considered also.

Individual membership.

Eugene Dickerson gave a presentation on his experience as a pilot "individual" member. Gene was a CONSER cataloger at NLM before he moved to the State Department. His new institution was enthusiastic about his continuing CONSER work if possible and this has been a major part of the pilot's success. One question is what the requirements are for individual membership? Production quotas have not been established. As far as PCC statistics go and as far as OCLC authorization goes, the membership is institutionally based, not really individually.

Suggestion: to expand this pilot we should develop an "individual consortium" approach. This would be a way to provide cooperative mentorship, training, etc. like the UC funnel. Quotas are funnel-wide, not institutionally based.

UC funnel update

Summary of the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting May 2-4, 2007 Library of Congress

A new member is interested UC Santa Barbara and will begin training soon. Benefits of the funnel include that we have more members available to participate on other CONSER task groups, more maintenance is being performed in the old enhance and when authentication for new records is required, it can be done by libraries in the funnel that have authorization.

GPO digital harvesting report.

Jennifer Davis gave an update on this project. GPO is using a new Ex Libris ILS for the Catalog of Government Publications (CGP). The CGP is the preferred source for holdings and authoritative data. Digital harvesting has not negatively impacted the CONSER database. GPO will continue to use OCLC, some few records from the digital harvesting project are fed back into the CONSER database.

CONSER documentation discussion

Some parts of the CEG are duplicative of the MARC manuals, the CCM offers broader principles for making decisions. RDA will probably lean more toward this approach rather than decisions on the “hard” cases. A layered approach was suggested [like the vision of RDA?]