

PCC and RDA Discussion: Single Record Approach

Background:

PCC sanctioned the use of the “Single Record Approach” (SRA) recognizing it offered an efficient and practical approach to providing access to ever increasing numbers of online resources for which bibliographic records existed for their physical, mostly print, counterparts. Guidelines for the single record approach are found in the CONSER Cataloging Manual 31.2.3, in the Descriptive Cataloging Manual B19.4.6. Note, this practice is called “delineation” in LCRI 1.11A. If applicable, catalogers were to use the following MARC coding in the record for the physical item (the following is a “best” consolidation of CCM and DCM instructions):

- Code **008/22** (“form of original item”) and **008/23** (“form of item”) as correct for the original, not for the online version
- Note the availability of the online version in field **530**
- Add a **740** (2nd indicator blank) title added entry or (CCM) 7XX author/title added entry when the title of the online version differs
- Provide the location of the online version in field **856**
- Add a **776** field for the electronic version; (CCM) if a separate ISSN has been assigned to the online serial but a separate record doesn’t exist, add field **776** with subfields \$t and \$x (and/or subfields \$a and \$s if appropriate)
- Optionally, an electronic resource **007** field may be added for the online version
- Do not add an electronic resource **006** for the online version

Subsequent to the issuing of these guidelines:

- CONSER decided not to exercise the **007** option, though the LC Interim Guidelines indicate BIBCO libraries must exercise the option
- The **530** was also used to justify any 740 added entries
- CONSER decided to give preference to use of the **776 \$i** instead of the 530 note

RDA and the Single Record Approach

It appears that the single record approach would be workable under RDA as it has been under AACR2, since the fundamental function of the SRA is notation of a relationship between resources. Therefore, PCC discussion centers on deciding whether to continue the practice, and if so, whether the current MARC coding guidelines are appropriate. Additionally, some of the new MARC fields introduced for RDA may be of potential use.

MARC Field Review

006 – Current practice is not to add for the online version

007 – Current practice appears to be split between CONSER and BIBCO, with CONSER not using and BIBCO using per DCM draft interim guidelines (See page 27 of <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/dcmb19.pdf>)

008/22 and 008/23 – Current practice is to code for the original, not the online version

336/337/338 – These are RDA related fields replacing the GMD (245 \$h) and are repeatable. Given repeatability and the potential that these could be used to generate icons or limits, should they be added for the online?

530 – Current practice is to prefer use of the 776 \$i and to use only to describe complicated relationships and/or to justify added entries for the online.

776 – Current practice is to use

856 – Current practice is to use

\$3 and \$8 linking fields – These are defined for all the above MARC fields except the 006, 007, and 008. PCC has not recommend use of these currently. Might there be value in explicitly linking fields relating to the online, perhaps to facilitate future record generation?