

This document contains policies for the post-March 31, 2013 implementation of RDA by LC's Acquisitions & Bibliographic Access Directorate, confirmed by the ABAMT in March 2013.

Policy 1: RDA Acceptable Authority Records after March 31, 2013

Policy 2: Monographs Imported from OCLC

Policy 3: CIP Verification

Policy 4: Working with Existing Serial Records

Policy 5: Added volumes for multipart monographs

Policy 6: Manual Hybridization of AACR2 records with RDA elements

<p>Policy 1: RDA Acceptable Authority Records after March 31, 2013</p> <p><i>Note:</i> This policy represents a change to the existing PCC policy on access points in bibliographic and authority records</p> <p><i>Placement of this policy:</i> The PCC Post RDA Test Guidelines have been updated to reflect the new PCC policy; the LC-PCC PSs for creating authorized access points at 6.27 (Works and expressions), 9.19.1.1 (Personal names), and 11.13.1.1 (Corporate Bodies) all include a link to the PCC policy.</p>	
<p>LC Policy</p>	<p>LC will apply the PCC policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All <i>new</i> authority records must be established as and coded as RDA. 2) If a cataloger needs to adjust an existing RDA acceptable authority record for another reason (for example, to add a reference, or to add other <i>optional</i> identifying characteristics to enhance the record, such as 3XX fields), the cataloger must evaluate and recode it as RDA, even if the 1XX itself does not change. 3) Catalogers who need to use authority records marked with a 667 field indicating that evaluation is required should evaluate and recode to RDA before using the access point in PCC bibliographic records. 4) If an RDA acceptable access point is needed in a PCC bibliographic record (BIBCO, CONSER), catalogers are <i>strongly encouraged</i> to evaluate and recode the authority record to RDA, but are not <i>required</i> to recode the record. Remember that evaluating and recoding when first encountered will result in a savings for frequently used access points! A simple recoding to RDA involves 008/10 (change to z) and adding 040\$a rda; any other enhancements are optional.

<p>Policy 2: Monographs Imported from OCLC <i>Note: Depending on decisions made at the Section level, this may represent a change in practice.</i> <i>Future placement of this policy:</i> These changes will be incorporated into DCM B13, Appendix 10.</p>	
Pre-March 31 LC policy:	“Fuller-level” (encoding level #, 1, 2, 4, 8, I or L) AACR2 records should remain AACR2; less-full records, and pre-AACR2 records should be converted to RDA.
Post-March 31 LC policy:	“Fuller level” records <i>may be</i> converted to RDA or left as AACR2 <i>at the discretion of the individual section</i> . Less-than-full records, records where the language of cataloging is not English, and pre-AACR2 records should be converted to RDA when processing current receipts.
<p>Background: OCLC established a policy in June 2011 for its members governing RDA records in WorldCat during the US RDA Test (and later extended the policy), including the use of RDA and pre-RDA descriptive cataloging standards in OCLC. The policy included instructions on the types of records that could be converted to RDA, and those that could not. LC established its own policy (documented originally in Training Document R-4, now also in DCM B13, Appendix 10) which strove for the least possible conflict with the OCLC policy.</p> <p>In January 2013, OCLC posted a revision to its policy of June 2011, effective March 31, 2013. There are three hallmarks of both versions of the OCLC policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a single master record is allowed in OCLC—duplicate records that merely reflect a difference between RDA and non-RDA cataloging instructions are not allowed. • At no time can an RDA record be converted to a pre-RDA standard. • It is only possible to fully re-describe/convert to RDA with the item in hand. <p>The revised OCLC policy provides more flexibility for member libraries to convert records for monographs to RDA, so ABAMT was asked to reconsider the LC policy.</p>	

Policy 3: CIP Verification	
Note: This policy does not represent a change in practice	
LC Policy	LC staff are expected to retain the existing cataloging standard of the original CIP cataloging (AACR2 or RDA) at the time of CIP verification.
<i>Note:</i> LC may need to reconsider this decision in the future if LC resumes the practice of importing OCLC records for CIP verification.	

Policy 4: Working with Existing Serial Records	
Note: This policy does not represent a change in practice	
LC/CONSER policy	<p>CONSER authenticated records should not be converted to RDA, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepublication records (EL/8) • CONSER minimal level records (if being upgraded to encoding level blank) <p>Unauthenticated serial records that are being authenticated as CONSER/PCC records should be converted to RDA.</p>

Policy 5: Added volumes for multipart monographs	
Note: This policy may represent a change in practice for exceptional cases.	
LC policy	Generally do not convert bibliographic records for multipart monographs from AACR2 to RDA when adding volumes to an existing multipart monograph. Re-description to RDA is allowed under exceptional circumstances at the discretion of the cataloger (e.g., if problem solving requires major re-description anyway).

Policy 6: Manual Hybridization of AACR2 records with RDA elements	
Note: This policy does not represent a change in practice.	
LC policy	<p>Generally do not make manual changes to AACR2 records that will remain as AACR2 to enhance them with RDA practices or elements in non-access point fields.</p> <p>LC staff should not remove hybridizations already found (e.g., in an imported record).</p>
<p>Background: Following the recommendations from a PCC Task Group, OCLC will begin machine manipulation of existing WorldCat bibliographic records to incorporate various RDA practices that are useful to users <i>without</i> changing the coding for the original rules used. This will result in what is commonly referred to as “hybrid” records. An example of this hybridization would be the addition of 336-338 fields to AACR2 bibliographic records, spelling out of abbreviations, etc. Future hybridization could be considered as a programmatic option at LC, in consultation with other stakeholders and based on the demonstrated success of OCLC’s project.</p>	