Report of the PCC Access Points for Expressions Task Group
Submitted to the PCC Policy Committee on October 15, 2012

The Task Group's Report consists of the following sections:

I.   Task Group Charge
II.   Background of Charge
III.   Responses to the Charge
IV.   Policy Recommendations
V.   Rejected Recommendations

Appendix A: RDA Implementation Calendar/Dependencies
Appendix B: Revision of PCC RDA Frequently Asked Questions

I. Task Group Charge:

The primary goal of this Task Group is to provide clear guidelines for PCC catalogers to achieve insofar as possible a consistent bibliographic and authority database with respect to access points for expressions. In order to do so, the Task Group will:

> 1.   Prepare a policy recommendation and supporting PCC guidelines to describe when and how to create authorized access points for expressions, and when and how to create authority records supporting those authorized access points, including a recommendation on the use of Field 336 in expression-level authority records.
> 2.   Frame the guidelines within a definition and description of the problem so that both the concept and the implementation details will be understood by the PCC and broader professional community.
> 3.   Recommend an implementation strategy (including a rationale/explanation) and timetable for these guidelines.

Time Frame:

· Appointment of group: June 2012
· Deadline for guidelines and report to be submitted to PCC Policy Committee: Oct. 15, 2012
· Deadline for PCC Policy Committee comment and approval: November 5, 2012
· Announcement to PCCLIST and posting on PCC web site, requesting public comments: by Thanksgiving 2012
· Implementation date: The TG will recommend an implementation strategy and timetable

Chain of Reporting: PCC Policy Committee

Task Group Members:

Barbara Bushman, Assistant Head, Cataloging Section, National Library of Medicine
Thuy-Anh Dang, Media Resources Cataloger, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Paul Frank, Library of Congress (PCC Secretariat & Policy Committee Liaison)
Matthew Haugen, Rare Book Cataloger, Columbia University (Chair)
Kate James, Library of Congress
George Prager, Head of Cataloging, New York University Law School Library (NACO Law Funnel)
Mark Scharff, Music Cataloger, Washington University in St. Louis (NACO Music Funnel)
Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, Worldcat Quality Management Division, OCLC

II. Background of Charge:

RDA instructions on authorized access points for expressions give general instructions (6.27.3) as well as specialized instructions for access points for expressions of musical (6.28.3), legal (6.29.2), religious (6.30.3), and official (6.31.1) works. The access point is created by adding appropriate elements to the access point for the work, including content type, date, language, and/or another distinguishing characteristic of the expression, as applicable. Such elements are considered core when needed to differentiate, and may be recorded as separate elements in addition to or instead of as additions to the access point. The corresponding LCPS's for these RDA instructions instruct catalogers to construct an access point for an expression when cataloging that expression only for music resources, sacred scriptures, translations, and language editions. The LCPS also instructs LC catalogers not to add additional elements to differentiate between two translations into the same language, two versions of a scripture from the same year, or two arrangements of the same musical work, but to use such differentiated forms if they are found in the authority file.

RDA 6.0 (Purpose and Scope) describes many functions for access points for works and expressions, including:

- Bring together all resources embodying a work when they appear under different titles
- Identify a work when it is known by multiple titles
- Organize hierarchical and faceted displays when multiple resources embody the same work
- Differentiate unrelated works with the same title
- Referencing a related work or and expression (including subject relationships)

In addition to the above functions, expression-level authority records and access points can also:

- Reduce need to repeat expression-level data in each record for different manifestations
- Provide contextual information about the expression
- Record research and justify decisions made by catalogers

In 2011, the Decisions Needed Task Group identified a need to address the construction and use of authorized access points for expressions. The Task Force to Form or Recommend PCC/NACO RDA Policy on Authority Issues and the RDA Policy Statements Task Group reaffirmed this need, and identified several potential issues which led to the formation of the present task group.

The Policy Statements Task Group's final report (April 2012) suggested many LC practices be adopted as PCC practice, but discussed at length several instances in which the PCC may wish to depart from LC Practice defined in the Library of Congress Policy Statements, and called for further resolution of these issues. In particular, with regard to LCPS 6.27.3 (Authorized Access Points for Expressions) and its analogs for special formats, the Task Group felt strongly that PCC catalogers should be allowed to further differentiate between different expressions when LC would not (as in the case of multiple translations into the same language, among others); the report contrasted this restriction on differentiation with the (since-removed) requirement for dates added to access points for expressions beginning with the conventional title "Works" even when not needed to differentiate.

The Task Force to Form or Recommend Policy on Authority Issues also discussed particular recommendations on practice for new special fields encoded in authority records, including those for expressions, namely the 046 and 3xx fields. As part of general recommendations to supply the new special fields whenever the data was readily available, the Task Force to Form or Recommend Policy on Authority Issues recommended that 336 (Content type) be encoded with an rda content term from RDA Table 6.1. However, the Low Priority Recommendation N-14 recommended against encoding this field in expression authority records because the record may represent more than one expression, and thus more than one content type. Furthermore, though content type could be used as an addition to the access point under RDA, and a MARC subfield $h exists for this purpose, current LC guidelines prevent its use in access points for expressions. Content Type remains a core element and is recorded in the $336 in the bibliographic record. The summary also pointed out that the decision should be revisited after the work of the present task group is completed. These recommendations were approved by the Policy Committee in September 2012.

Additionally, the Authority Issues Task Group discussed other issues which were potentially relevant or analogous to the specific issues charged to the present task group, such as the question of collective versus individual conference headings (High priority recommendation N-7a).

Among the potential issues raised in the charges and reports of these predecessor task groups, and ultimately in the charge for the present task group, were: whether differentiated or undifferentiated authority records for multiple expressions would be preferable, and whether the two could co-exist; the philosophical departure from past models to a FRBR/FRAD model; a possible shift from reliance on "uniform title" card-catalog style character strings and left-anchored alphabetical indexes to the model of separate elements within an identifier; issues of display, encoding, and indexing in current cataloging environments, and anticipated issues in future systems and encoding schema; machine versus user actionability; use and revision of legacy records in a hybrid environment; and access achieved by expression-level data contained in bibliographic records versus that contained in authority records.

III. Responses to the Charge:

Much like the predecessor task groups, the present task group initially saw situations when catalogers may wish to expand beyond the situations in which LC constructs access points for expressions and the level of differentiation allowed in those cases, but did not find easy consensus on when and how this should be done. Further complicating the matter, ongoing changes to related policies and documentation over the course of the task group's work presented us with a moving target. We encountered ambivalence about the work required to accomplish additional differentiation consistently, and the uncertain results of that differentiation across various encoding and display environments, both current and hypothetical, compared to the somewhat more certain benefits of consistency and predictability within shared authority and bibliographic files.

When multiple expressions of the same work exist, the level of potential differentiation possible in an access point under RDA is far greater than under AACR2. Taken to the extreme, recording every possible differentiating element in a single access point borders on the absurdity of duplicating a record within itself. Even differentiation that does not exceed what is sufficient to achieve user tasks could lead to confusion if not carried out in a consistent manner from expression to expression. Some of the potential benefits of this additional differentiation may not be realized until encoding and display systems are modified or developed to take advantage of it. Or, differentiation may be impossible when considered against existing expressions that have not been adequately differentiated in past cataloging practice, not to mention other expressions yet to be expressed. Alternatively, sufficient differentiation may be achieved through means other than authorized access points or authority records.

Some speculated that in a pure FRBR environment, total differentiation among each expression would be much more essential, and potentially more straightforward. Others

speculated that restricting additional differentiation in access points could hamper progress toward that goal. On the other hand, in this environment, cataloger-constructed access points may be less necessary, insofar as they facilitate collocation in left-anchored browse lists; possibly, systems could instead construct access point strings dynamically from the individual elements, or use individual elements as facets for collocation and differentiation. In the meantime, many communities still rely heavily on authorized access points for collocation, differentiation, and retrieval.

Given these complexities, access points and authority records for expressions did not invite easy comparison to access points and authority records for other entities. Unlike authority records for a person or corporate body, which are increasingly understood as discrete identifiers for the identity they represent, an authority record for an expression does not entirely function as a self-contained identifier for the expression. First, many expressions are represented synonymously with their works and manifestations, and never receive separate access points or authority records. In some cases, authority records are not required when no variants need to be traced or when the bibliographic record serves the purpose of representing the authorized access point in the database. Even when an expression does receive an access point and an authority record, it usually includes some work and manifestation level information in the record, while expression level data is also recorded in the bibliographic record. Also, unlike a subordinate corporate body, a record for an expression does not necessarily require its parent work to be similarly established.

One area for potential analogy which the Task Group explored in greater detail was that of access points for conferences as explored in the Task Group on Authority Issues Recommendation N-7a. Under RDA, both collective and individual conference headings are now established in the authority file, where previously, only the collective heading was established, while additional elements could be added to the access point in the bibliographic record for publications related to individual instances of the conference. Meanwhile, the current LCPS 6.27.3 instructs LC catalogers to construct access points for expressions in specific situations and not to further differentiate upon those situations. Thus, an access point for an expression such as "Name. Title. Language" may represent more than one expression. Other qualifying elements such as content type, date of expression, or other characteristic (e.g. translator, performer, publisher, date, version, etc.) would not be added to the access point or the NAR as they do not apply to all expressions represented by that access point. These elements would still be recorded elsewhere in the bibliographic record, and the LCPS indicates that this is sufficient for users who require that specificity.

As was the case under AACR2, LC acknowledges that further differentiation may still be encountered in the authority file. LCPS 6.27.3 instructs that such authority records should be used when found. Conceivably, then, if PCC catalogers create and use further differentiated NARs for expressions, LC would use those records. This would not necessarily require all other

previous or future expressions of the same work to be equally differentiated, potentially leading to the co-existence of undifferentiated and differentiated NARs.

In some ways, this could be seen to mirror the coexistence of a single collective and multiple individual conference headings, but in this situation the distinction between the two is not so clear. First, the two could potentially take the same form, and it may not be clear what the less qualified form (e.g. Name. Title. Language) represents as successive expressions appear, especially to the user who may not understand why search results are split and most likely can't see any separately encoded elements in the associated authority record which might clarify the situation. If a special category of "collective" expression access points without differentiation were employed and created simultaneously with individual access points with additional elements, as is done for ongoing conferences, this would require differentiation in all cases to prevent the undifferentiated form from being used to represent a single expression (most likely the first). This would result in requiring additional NARs with and without additions which anticipate conflict that may never occur. Or, it could require extensive file maintenance to add qualifiers to earlier records after the fact. In either case, it could also lead recursively to the need for additional intermediate sublevels of collectivity for groups of expressions as access points are further differentiated.

Such complications are not unique to expressions, but they do illustrate some of the problems created by collective and individual expression records potentially co-existing in the authority file. Perhaps it is more helpful to consider the collective form to be implicitly included in the differentiated access points without being defined separately as a collective record. A collective expression record as such may be more analogous to the parent work, in that it does not need to be established in the authority file but can still collocate along with differentiated expressions, as long as the base title is the same. With this in mind, a system could conceivably collocate all expressions with the undifferentiated form by truncating any additional differentiation if it is applied inconsistently across multiple translations, or allow for split browse lists and hierarchical displays to include the additional differentiation when called for. Or, similar to the manner in which subject headings are subdivided to various degrees, users may expect to find resources under both general and specific access points.

In grappling with these questions, the Task Group identified a need to seek out input from stakeholder groups both including those represented on the Task Group (namely music and law) and beyond. In return, an extensive report was received from the MLA BCC RDA Music Implementation Task Force, which will be attached with this report.

IV. Policy Recommendations:

The Task Group generally agreed that conforming to the LC practice was desirable for a consistent shared database. LC's own practice leaves the window open for other catalogers to further differentiate among expressions and to create NARs when they would not. We perceived mixed consequences for allowing optional additional differentiation beyond this minimum requirement, and thus declined to require any additional differentiation. We also recognized that some expressions are distinctive, and the needs of some user communities, music catalogers in particular, extend beyond the basic requirements in LC's practice and may justify

some flexibility for PCC institutions. Well-known translations, performances, scripture versions, arrangements, editions and so on may be the subject of other works; they may be known by a title distinct from other expressions; they may be the specific basis of derivative or other related expressions; they may appear in compilation with other works and expressions; complex situations may benefit from additional clarification; and certain expressions may be particularly sought by users. In such cases, it may be necessary or useful to record additional differentiating elements for use in preferred, analytical, related, and subject access points referring to those specific expressions. Within the realm of possibility, attempts to define a specific best practice may seem arbitrary or overgeneralizing, but consistency. However, recommendations and best practices for specific situations may arise with more experience. We recommend continued attention to these issues and situations as remaining chapters of RDA are completed and as MARC-21 is replaced.

In the meantime, the Task Group recommends that PCC catalogers conform to the requirements of LC practice, as expressed in the applicable documentation, as a minimum base practice. We also recommend allowing PCC catalogers to exercise careful cataloger's judgment when opting to further differentiate expressions and/or create NARs for expressions when LC would not require such.

Further, we recommend that when authority records are created or updated, special fields (046 Date, 336 Content Type, 377 Language, 381 Other Distinguishing Characteristic, and so on) pertaining to expressions **not** be encoded unless it is certain they apply to all expressions potentially represented by that record at its level of differentiation. This information is usually in the bibliographic record, and its presence in authority records that are less differentiated may force conflict and differentiation later. Usually, then, these special fields would only apply when those same elements are also included as additions to the access point. Because an authority record for an expression does not represent more than one language (even when not given in the access point), encoding language does not pose this problem; but because an undifferentiated access point may represent more than one content type, date, translator, contributor, etc., they do pose this problem. Furthermore because it is currently impossible to include content type in $h for authorized access points, per DCM-Z1 and the OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards, this conflict cannot be resolved by differentiation.

If PCC catalogers do opt to record additional differentiating elements in the access point and/or in separate fields, they should conform to LCPS policies when doing so. The Task Group felt that consistent practice is preferable, and supported the general recommendations issued by the Authority Issues Task Group which have since been included in the LC-PCCPS and other documentation, which provide guidance on use of controlled vocabularies, standardized dates, and so on in these special fields and in the access point.

Music resources often have multiple expressions, including reductions, arrangements, libretto translations, and audio or video recordings of performances. Furthermore, the distinguishing characteristics which may be used to represent depend on the particular resource. The name of a contributor used as a distinguishing characteristic could be the arranger, performer, ensemble, conductor, translator, or editor, depending on the preceding characteristics. For this reason, it may be helpful to specify content type in the access point especially for music

resources.

      The following chart addresses our recommendations more specifically:

LC-PCC Policy Statement	Recommendation	Explanation/Rationale
6.27.3 Authorized access points for expressions	Follow the LC practice for situations when access points for expressions in bibliographic records are required, and creating and using authority records for such access points are required; use cataloger's judgment on exercising the optional use of additional elements to further differentiate upon the access point when considered useful for distinctive expressions. When doing so, follow LC-PCCPS practice in formulating these access point elements.	See above.
6.28.3 Authorized access points for musical expressions	For general guidelines, refer back to PCC Practice under 6.27.3	Per the DCM Z1 introduction, LC Practice for music cataloging under AACR2 was to create Authority records for all title and name/title headings for music. Whether or not this practice will continue and whether or not PCC catalogers of music will be expected to also create NARs in all cases, the potential for differentiation is far greater here. We recommend allowing $h for content type in access points for musical expressions, if not for other expressions. The PCC policy under 6.27.3 provides the option for greater differentiation for music expressions; more specific guidelines should be offered here.

6.29.2 Authorized access points for expression of legal work No LCPS	Refer back to PCC Practice under 6.27.3 as needed.	The task force agreed that RDA as written, and the more general policies under 6.27 and 6.27.3 suffice.
6.30.3 Authorized access points for expression of a religious work Previous LCPS was removed October 9, 2012	Refer back to PCC Practice under 6.27.3 as needed.	The task force agreed that RDA as written, and the more general policies under 6.27 and 6.27.3 suffice.
6.31.2 Authorized access points representing an expression of an official communication No LCPS	Refer back to PCC Practice under 6.27.3 as needed.	The task force agreed that RDA as written, and the more general policies under 6.27 and 6.27.3 suffice.

RDA 6.9.1.3 Content Type No LCPS	Add PCC-PS: Do not record content type in authority records for expressions. Content type remains a core element recorded in bibliographic records.	Because an authority record for an expression may represent more than one expression and thus more than one content type, and because the element cannot currently be used as an addition to an access point for the expression to differentiate between two expressions of different content types. Even in those situations when the access point can be deemed to represent only one content type, it would not be necessary to record it in the authority record as it is already recorded in bibliographic records. If restrictions on the use of content type in access points are altered, then this recommendation may be revised to allow content type to be encoded separately in the record when found in the access point.
6.10.1.3 Date of Expression LC Practice: Record date in terms of Gregorian calendar	Label as PCC practice.	The Task Group agreed that insofar as dates can serve as elements in an authorized access point for an expression, a consistent date format should be used in shared cataloging. However, the Task Group felt that a separately coded date in a NAR 046 for an expression should not be recorded if the record is to represent more than one expression, with more than one date.

6.11.1.3 Language of Expression LC Practice for Greek and Norwegian dialects.	Label as PCC practice	The Task Force agreed that insofar as languages can serve as elements in an authorized access point for an expression, a consistent language terminology should be used in shared cataloging. The Task Group also felt that because access points for expressions never represent more than one language, there was no reason not to encode it when applicable.
17.0, 17.8, 17.10 on Recording Primary Relationships LC Practice for Chapter 17: Do not apply chapter 17 in the current implementation scenario.	Label as PCC practice.	The Task Group agreed that this chapter is not easily applied under MARC 21.
20.2 Contributor **20.2.1.3 Recording Contributors** LC Practice : Record Illustrators for resources for children.	Recommend recording translators, performers, editors, or other contributors as applicable to the expression when considered important or necessary for differentiation of expressions.	Insofar as contributor names may serve as "other distinguishing characteristics" in additions to access points for expressions, we recommend recording them as applicable to the expression. Furthermore, the LC Practice described in 6.27.3 and 6.28.3 emphasizes that the availability of contributors, etc. in the bibliographic record are justification for not differentiating in the access point. They may be recorded in a statement of responsibility (245 $c, 250 $b, etc.) a participant/ performer note (511), or an added access point (7xx) as appropriate to the expression.

24.4.1 Identifier for Related Work, Expression, Manifestation or Item LC Practice: Do not give the identifier alone.	Label as PCC practice.	The task group agreed that the current state of technology is not to the point where identifiers can stand alone, though future systems may be better equipped to do so. However we felt that further experience in cataloging with RDA would be necessary before specific recommendations or best practices could be developed.
DCMZ1, MARC Authority LC Guidelines	**Recommendation**	**Rationale**
046 Special Coded Dates $k Single or beginning date of expression $l Ending Date	We recommend not encoding this field in authority records that can cover more than one expression with different dates. If this field is also a part of the AAP, then it may be encoded separately as well.	The Task Group felt the date in an expression NAR has the same problem as the 336 content type. If an authority record potentially represents more than one expression, then there could be more than one date associated with those expressions. It would be acceptable to encode it for records that include the date as an addition to the access point ($f).

336 Content Type in Authority Record for an Expression $a content type term $b content type code $2 source of term (rdacontent)	PCC Practice: Do not encode.	PCC Task Group on Authority Issues Recommended not to encode because the NAR can represent more than one expression and thus more than one content type. This is especially true so long as this element cannot also be included as a differentiating addition to an authorized access point for an expression ($h) allowing for differentiation when content type differs.
		As discussed above, however, especially in the case of music resources, the use of content type in access points may be useful in some situations; if this is allowed, then content type could be recorded separately as well.
		DCM-Z1 previously said LC Practice is not to use $b. If catalogers use the OCLC Macro to supply the 336 field then the $b will be included. The Task Group also agreed that if this field is to be recorded, the use of codes should be encouraged, or at least not discouraged.

377 Language (of Expression) $a language code $l language term $2 source of code	Recommend encoding in expression level authority records.	A NAR that represents more than one expression cannot represent more than one language at the same time so this doesn't have the problem the other special fields do, so thee Task Group saw no reason not to encode language. LCPS 6.11.1.3 instructs to record language of expression using the language term from Marc Code list. DCMZ1 indicates the source code is unnecessary if the MARC code is used. Since a language term may also be used in the AAP for an expression, the Task Group felt that terms would be useful in addition to codes in the 377, considering that it may assist in supplying the form for the $l or vice versa.
381 Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression $a	We recommend not encoding this field in authority records that can cover more than one expression. If this field is also a part of the AAP, then it may be encoded separately as well.	The Task Group agreed that this field runs into the same problem identified for content type. Generally these characteristics are recorded in bibliographic records. If the record represents more than one expression, then a distinguishing characteristic for one (such as translator, scripture version, editor, performer, etc.) would almost certainly not apply to all.

130 Uniform Title and 1xx name/title Additions to AAP for Expression		(MARC LC Guidelines say do not use $h for content type; this also applies in title and name/title access points in bibliographic records)

Rejected Recommendations and Remaining Questions:

The Task Group declined to make specific requirements or guidelines on optional variant access points, but felt the general recommendations recently given in the DCM-Z1 4xx section are advisable.

A potential question remains as to what will be done after "day one" after interim hybrid record policies expire. If a cataloger needs to build an RDA expression access point based on a work that was cataloged under AACR2 and no RDA authority record was needed or created at that time, and the bibliographic record would result in an RDA incompatible access point (e.g. if the main entry or the conventional title of the work would be different under RDA). Will the original work that serves as the basis of the access point for the expression need to be recataloged according to RDA? Must older BIBCO records containing access points for that expression (or lacking them) be updated? (As per LCRI 25.1?) What will catalogers do if encountering records with access points which reflect older practice or otherwise depart from PCC practice? Are there differing requirements for NACO and BIBCO participants?

Must BIBCO catalogers use these established differentiated NACO access points for expressions in all PCC records going forward, or can undifferentiated access points continue to be used? Are catalogers responsible for updating the headings in records for other manifestations of that expression as well?

Appendix A: RDA Implementation Calendar/Dependencies

Approved recommendations will require revision of supporting documentation, including LC/ PCC PS, DCM-Z1 and LC Guidelines for the MARC 21 Authority Format, RDA FAQ (see appendix B)," MARC 21 Encoding to Accommodate New RDA elements 046 and 3xx in NARs and SARs," OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards, the "MARC 21 Encoding to accommodate new elements 046 and 3xx in NARs and SARs" documents.

We recommend that catalogers producing RDA bibliographic and authority records may begin using these guidelines as soon as they are published, except where interim guidelines preclude it prior to "Day One."

Appendix B: Revision of PCC RDA Frequently Asked Questions

RDA FAQ 4.7 reflects an interim policy to avoid hybrid records. It may need to be revised after Day One as AACR2 authority records are revised, and RDA NARs will be required, but the bibliographic records on which they are based may still be AACR2.

New RDA FAQ analogous to the NACO FAQ on Uniform Titles may be useful additions to the RDA FAQ section 5 on RDA and Authority Records. However, they may need to be revised as supporting documentation continues to transition away from AACR2-based documentation, and as interim policies transition after "Day One."

1. Is it true that LC does not make a name authority record (NAR) for all authorized access points (AAPs) for Works and Expressions?

Yes, that's correct. LC's policy is to make NARs for works and expressions only in the three basic situations stated in *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* Z1 (DCM) *Supplement to the MARC 21 Authority Format*, Introduction, p. 2:
(1) to refer from a variant access point for the work or expression (cf. RDA rules 6.27.4 and DCM Z1 4xx section);
(2) to document the research that was undertaken to establish the correct form of the AAP;
(3) to provide a "place holder" for a work or expression in its RDA form that is not in the LC database when the work is needed in a secondary access point on another bibliographic record.

In all other cases, the bibliographic record serves the function of representing the authorized access point in the LC database. LC's policy was determined as a means of controlling the cost of cataloging. However, LC recognizes that PCC libraries have other priorities and specialized user needs which are best served by creating NARs for AAPs in cases where LC would not.
Note that while the DCM Z1 and the LCPS permit NACO libraries to create more NARs for AAPs than LC requires, when choosing to do so, after "Day One" the NACO headings must be in accord with LC's RDA policies on access points for works and expressions which are stated in the LC-PCCPS for RDA 6.27-6.27.4.

2. Is it necessary to search the LC database to determine if LC has a bibliographic record for the item before creating a NAR for a work or expression when one is used as a secondary access point? (no. 3 in the DCM Z1 introduction p. 2)

First let's be clear that it is understood that this guideline in the DCM only applies to the cataloging of LC and PCC-designated bibliographic records. This means that a NACO-only participant may ignore this guideline. BIBCO and CONSER libraries on the other hand, must consider this guideline when creating PCC designated records. (cf. LCRI 21.30G)
The answer to this question is no, PCC libraries are not required to search the LC database for bibliographic records when determining whether or not to create a NAR in order to comply with the aforementioned DCM Z1 guideline. The LC database is distributed to OCLC and RLG on a weekly basis and it is accepted that searching these utilities to ascertain whether or not LC holds the bibliographic item is sufficient.

3. If the bibliographic item (for which I'm making a 6xx or 7xx secondary access point) is found in the utilities, but not on a LC record (040 $a DLC), is it still necessary to make the NAR for the AAP used on my PCC-designated bibliographic record? Why?

Yes, the goal is to have the authorized RDA form of the AAP represented identically in the LC database and the utilities where all PCC catalogers can view it. All NARs contributed by NACO participants are distributed by LC to both OCLC and RLG. LC's bibliographic records are also routinely distributed to both utilities thus, LC is considered the database of record for deciding whether or not it is necessary to create the NAR for the work or expression.
Reminder: PCC participants need only consider making this NAR if the bibliographic record being created is designated a PCC (042= pcc) bibliographic record.

4. Are all PCC libraries required to follow LC policy in assigning an AAP for a work or expression to bibliographic records?

No, only the participants in the BIBCO or CONSER components of the PCC are required to follow LC's policy with regard to the assignment of an access point to a bibliographic record and then **only if** it is a PCC-designated (042= pcc) bibliographic record.

5. Are PCC libraries required to follow LC policy in deciding when to make a NAR for a work or expression?

The answer differs according to the situation:
A. Generally, all PCC libraries may create work or expression NARs (even when LC does not) and contribute these NARs (formulated according to RDA and the LC-PCCPSs) to the NAF at their own discretion.
B. BIBCO/CONSER libraries must create and contribute a NAR for the work or expression AAP assigned to a PCC designated bibliographic record if it falls into the categories listed in the DCM-Z1 Introduction (Question 1 above).

6. When is an AAP for a work or expression needed on the bibliographic record without requiring a NAR?

A. Generally, when the main entry for an item is the AAP for the work or expression itself (130), a NAR is not made. This is because the bibliographic record provides all the access necessary via the 130 and the 245.
Example 1:
130 0# $a Chicken soup for the teenage soul. $l Spanish
245 10 $a Sopa de pollo para el alma adolecente / $c .....
In this example the creation of a NAR would be redundant.

B. In a name/title situation, if the title proper of the item is the same as the subfield $a of the AAP, a name/title NAR would also not be made.
Example 2:
100 1# $a Utrecht, Luuk
240 10 $a Rudi van Dantzig. $l English
245 10 $a Rudi van Dantzig : $b a controversial idealist in ballet / $c Luuk Utrecht.

In this example the variant access point would normalize to the same string as the name/title, thus, a NAR is not needed.

Note, that in either case if research had been performed and needed to be recorded to help sort out a complex situation, a NAR may be created and added to the NAF (in example 2 without a cross reference).

7. When creating a NAR for a work or expression, is it necessary to make additional NARs for all elements of the uniform title NAR (e.g., when creating a NAR for a translation is a NAR for the title also made without the language subelement?)

No. Unlike corporate body names, where each element of the hierarchy must be represented by its own name authority record it is not necessary to make NARs for each element of a uniform title NAR.

Example of a situation where a NAR is needed for the English translation of an original French language item:

1. Assure that a NAR for the author exists; if not, one must be created:
   100 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, $d 1903-1978
   670 ## $a Blue flowers, 1996: $b t.p. (Raymond Queneau) pref. (b. 1903; d. 1978)
2. Create a name/title NAR for the English language translation and make a cross reference to the original language title:
   100 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, 1903-1978. $t Fleurs bleues. $l English
   400 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, 1903-1978. $t Blue flowers
   670 ## $a Blue flowers, 1996.
3. **DO NOT** create a name/title NAR for the French language title:
   100 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, 1903-1978. $t Fleurs bleues
4. A name/title NAR for the original French language title is necessary only if another edition of the work in the same language with a variant title is being cataloged:
5. 100 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, 1903-1978. $t Fleurs bleues
6. 400 1# $a Queneau, Raymond, 1903-1978. $t Fleurs de Queneau
7. 670 ## $a Fleurs de Queneau, 1996.

Note that different criteria apply to NARs for musical works.

8. Do NARs for analytic and related work or expression access points need to be established as well?

The requirement to create a NAR for a work or expression used as a secondary access point is necessary only when there is no manifestation within the LC catalog. In the example cited below the manifestations of the works are contained within the item being cataloged, thus the title(s) can be ascertained without further investigation. However, it must be noted that if any one these titles had been previously published with different titles, etc. a NAR would be made to record the variant title(s). Remember that PCC catalogers need to worry about this only if the bibliographic record is coded PCC (042=pcc).

Example of an item with analytic 7xxs per AACR2 21.7B for which NARs are not made*:

245 00 Australia's biodiversity--responses to fire :$b plants, birds, and invertebrates /$c A. Malcolm Gill, J.C.Z. Woinarski, Alan York.

505 0 Biodiversity and bushfires : an Australia-wide perspective on plant-species changes after a fire event / A. Malcolm Gill -- Fire and Australian birds : a review ; Fire and Australian birds : an annotated bibliography / J.C.Z. Woinarski -- Long-term effects of repeated prescribed burning on forest invertebrates : management implications for the conservation of biodiversity / Alan York.
700 12 Gill, A. M. $t Biodiversity and bushfires.
700 12 Woinarski, John, $d 1955- $t Fire and Australian birds.
700 12 York, Alan. $t Long-term effects of repeated prescribed burning on forest invertebrates.

9. Are PCC catalogers responsible for updating name/title authority records that use the subfield $k according to the pre-AACR2 rules?

1) After "Day One," PCC catalogers are responsible for upgrading a Pre-RDA NAR when making a change to the NAR for any reason.
2) After "Day One," PCC catalogers are responsible for upgrading a Pre-RDA NAR when creating a PCC bibliographic record and the work or expression represented by the extant NAR is needed as an access point.