

Summary of Chat Session for Elluminate CONSER Webinar on Multiple 260 Field

November 19, 2009

(last revised Nov. 23, 2009)

Comments/Questions:

Q: In the MARC format guidelines, 260 \$c examples don't end with colons while in the LC/PCC guidelines, colons are used. I think this is really minor, but just wondering?

A: We're hoping people will adopt the colon as a PCC "best practice."

Q: We have a question about how the user will interpret the record for an integrating resource (IR) if the \$3 is 2010- but the \$c is 2009-.

A: Good question – this is a concern and unfortunately we have no real “answer” for that.

Q: What happened to \$c in the 260 3_ example? (Slide 18)

A: This is a record for an online IR and since the cataloger did not have access to the first iteration, there should be no \$c but instead a 362 1_ unformatted note giving the approximate (best guess) date when the IR began.

Responses to cataloging exercise for IR on Slides 19-21:

Q: I would use the “date viewed on” in the subfield \$3 angle-bracketed date.

A: I am assuming you would add this to the 260 3_? (there is no angle-bracketed date except for the 260 ___ and I think that one is correct ...?) [response: yes]

Q: Was the original record based on 2005 or 2007? Is "<2005>" actually correct in both the 247 and 260 ___?

A: The original record was based on the 2007 (latest) iteration; however, the cataloger had access to earlier iterations back to 2005 so included information about them in both 247 and 260 ___.

Q: I wouldn't bother to use the Internet Archive (from several participants).

A: OK (depends on institution policies for cataloging, etc.).

Q: Why use angle brackets if the Internet Archive says the info?

A: The Internet Archive does not necessarily include every iteration, and when in doubt, question marks and angle brackets give the "best guess."

Q: We would leave the \$3 date span in the last 260 (260 3_) open/I would not close out a 260 3_ unless the publication ceased.

A: We agree (some of us) – there were differences of opinion here!

Q: I'd put the 2007 dates [in 260 __] in <> because that was true at that date, but not guaranteed for 2008.

A: OK, except that the cataloger looked at iterations ending in 2007 and beginning in 2008; the title and place of publication both changed at the end of the year (how convenient!); however, point taken.

More Comments/Questions:

Q: I think after we have some experience with this, we might ask for MARBI to change the requirement to have \$c in only one 260 [i.e., to allow for it in other 260s].

A: A good point! It may be that we need to see how things work out (especially in light of RDA).

Q: (in response to above) I would prefer the \$c isn't in any of the 260 fields; however, it's not that big of a problem because I can adjust it to display in a different constant by tinkering with the display file.

A: (from participant; in response to above): We don't use 260 \$c in serials anymore.

Q: I've been mulling over if the publishing date span should be put in separate field from publisher. Does anyone think a separate MARC field for publishing span is now useful/less confusing?

A: Yes, another good point (some participants also agreed here).

Q: One suggestion that has been made about date of publication is that it be a totally different field instead of a 260 \$c (rewording of above comment).

A: (from participant): Which is essentially what we've done by using fixed fields.

Q: (in response to above): Fixed fields for serials are coverage dates; FF go with 362 not 260.

A: Sorry, I was thinking IRs and multi-parts.

Q: Is there any preference as to which 260 field the subfield \$c should be on? I assumed it'd be the first 260. Slide 25 gives \$c on the current/last 260 3_ , which could be confusing.

A: The \$c should be in the 260 field which reflect the issue/iteration actually being cataloged. For serials this is the earlier issue; for IRs it is the latest iteration. And yes, we agree, it could be confusing!

Q: This is not so much a question of rules but of practice: seems to me that at some point the returns on recording every intermediate change in publisher diminish ... we have to balance a complete record with a record that is actually readable by users. My question is at what point should we just resort to a 260 x, a 260 \$3 and a 500 "Publisher [or: Place of publication] varies" note?

A: (from various participants): It's all about how we display it; also depends on how it's indexed. We already have lots of notes that are really "cataloger" oriented notes, so adding additional 260s, much like 310/321, aren't much different. [General discussion]

Q: Does this also go back to 1st discussion question above? "When is it necessary ... ?"

A: Yes, it does indeed. [Additional comments from participants: I guess I was hoping for a rule of 3 or something :); I think it's judgment.]

Additional comment from participant: I agree that date of publication should relate to the entire resource, not to any specific place of publication or publisher. That's pretty much how RDA sees it, I think.

Q: How important are specific 260 \$b's?

A: Sorry, this got lost in the shuffle! (not addressed in the live session) – we are not sure how to interpret this question. The choice of adding multiple 260s is based on the criterion that the new information is "necessary for identification or access." So in some sense the cataloger has already decided that a specific 260 \$b was needed. (Or: did

you mean that the publisher's name might be important but the place not so much? In some cases, place is important to identification and in other cases publisher is more important. Unlike pre-A2, rules, AACR2 always requires both \$a and \$b.)

Q: Are we allowed/supposed to use 260 \$3 for current publisher on a pre-A2 serial record, where description is based on latest issue?

A: We only had a few responses to this when we put it out on CONSERList. This is an issue of creating "hybrid" records and whether we need to rethink our current CONSER policy.

Q: (from participant): Slightly OT: I was under the impression that the major reason we (non LC CONSER members) are supposed to be very conservative with respect to updating pre-A2 records is because the change in Main Entry rules messes up LC's files. Is this still the case?

A: (from LC): Not so much anymore, but we still like to be informed.

Comment: There are a lot of topics for threads on CONSRLST ...

A: Yes, indeed!

Comment: Suggest telephone interface for better mic access.

A: Thanks, duly noted!