

SCS Pilot Group on CONSER Policies

Date task group charged	November 15, 2022
Date task group discharged	January 11, 2024

This form is to be used to track progress on the review, approval, and implementation of the final reports of PCC task groups and committees. A link to this form can be found in the task group charge. Thereafter, the form should be updated each time the report is transmitted to a different body for review or action. Additional rows may be inserted as needed. The PCC Secretariat will insert the completed form as the cover sheet for the report when the process is complete.

Submission of report (completed by chair/leader of group):

Use the chart below to record the date the report was first submitted, the name of the PCC task group or committee submitting the report, and the title of the report.

Date	Name of Group	Title of Report
April 14, 2023	SCS Pilot Group on CONSER Policies	Preliminary Assessment of Deliverables

Review of report (completed by PCC chair prior to passing report on for review):

Use the chart below to record the date the report was submitted for review, to which body, and its current status (e.g. in process, completed, etc.).

Date	Name of Body	Status of Review
May 24, 2023	SCS	Reviewed and returned comments to pilot group
July 13, 2023	PoCo	Reviewed

Decisions regarding report:

Use the chart below to record decisions made regarding the report.

Date	Name of Body	Decisions Made
November 16, 2023	SCS, PoCo	Chairs review and assessment of pilot to determine next steps

Implementation of report:

Use the chart below to record actions taken regarding implementation of the decisions.

Date	Name of Body	Actions Taken
January 15, 2023	SCS, PoCo	Charge new SCS Task Group on CONSER Policies for Official RDA in MARC
February 26, 2024	SCS	Appoint new SCS-CONSER Liaison

**Program for Cooperative Cataloging
Standing Committee on Standards
Pilot Group on CONSER Policies
Preliminary Assessment of Deliverables
April 14, 2023**

Some of the issues discussed and recommendations that the Pilot Group expects to make are listed below beneath the appropriate tasks quoted from our charge. We invite SCS and PoCo's feedback on these issues and recommendations.

1. Determine when/how to apply the WEM lock to serials (including monographic series) especially with regard to translations and different formats, in MARC and BIBFRAME

The Pilot Group expects to recommend that the WEM lock should, in general, be applied to serials (including monographic series), but in a way that will produce results similar to current cataloging for versions in different formats (see 2. below).

The Pilot Group expects to recommend that the WEM lock should be applied to translations and language editions of serials in a way that will change the cataloging results. Each version will be treated as a separate work, with a unique AAP based on its preferred title. This will be a change from our current FRBR-based practice of using the AAP of the original language edition as the basis for the AAP of the translation.

In the context of serials cataloging, the Pilot Group expects to recommend that we continue our current practice of creating provider-neutral descriptions for electronic resources, Print on Demand (POD) reproductions and photocopies.

In the context of serials cataloging, the Pilot Group expects to recommend that we continue our current practice of cataloging microform reproductions of print resources by recording descriptive elements for the print version and giving details of the microform reproduction in a note.

The Pilot Group expects to recommend that we continue to allow the CONSER single record option (*CONSER Cataloging Manual* 31.2.3).

We note that we will need to develop guidance for appropriate recording of the ISSN-L in the context of Official RDA.

2. Determine whether serial authorized access points must be unique in bibliographic descriptions in MARC and BIBFRAME, and in the LC/NACO Authority File (NAF)

The Pilot Group considered and will not recommend using unique serial authorized access points for each separate serial work under the WEM lock in Official RDA; for example, we will not recommend returning to our earlier practice of using different, unique AAPs for the print and online versions of a serial.

The Pilot Group considered and will not at this point recommend using a unique value of **Work: *appellation of work group*** to group versions of a serial (for example print and online, or even larger groups across editions and title changes). In the longer run, this could be a more satisfactory way of modeling serial relationships than our current 1-to-1 linking fields and the AAP practice proposed immediately below. But at the moment there are no corresponding MARC 21 or BIBFRAME elements available, so this option might be better explored and developed after the adoption of Official RDA.

The Pilot Group expects to recommend using an identical AAP but unique IRIs for all serial works (under Official RDA), other than translations, that have up to now been treated as expressions of a single work (under Original RDA). We believe this will satisfy the requirements of Official RDA. In our current environment, creation of a separate CONSER record will constitute assigning a unique IRI to that serial work. Initial conversion of our data to BIBFRAME will result in the creation of an actual IRI for each work, which could then be preserved using appropriate new coding to ensure successful future conversion between MARC and BIBFRAME as needed. The identical AAPs for these works would allow us to continue indexing them in our catalogs with the same sort of grouping that has up to now been found satisfactory and appropriate for users' needs.

Treating print and online versions of the same serial as separate works with identical AAPs will mean that our current SARs would now represent two different actual or potential works. The [LC-PCC Metadata Guidance Document for Vocabulary Encoding Schemes \(VESs\)](#) indicates that SARs will continue to be created and maintained in MARC. The Pilot Group will need to learn more about how controlled series access is represented in BIBFRAME before it will be able to recommend any change in practice for SARs.

3. Identify and write policy and practice documentation to be updated (LC-PCC Policy Statements, Metadata Guidance Documentation, Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1, CONSER Cataloging Manual, Provider-Neutral Guidelines, etc.), and make recommendations on consolidating documentation into the LC-PCC PSs or the MGDs where possible, to reduce the multiple sources of serials documentation.

The Pilot Group is ready to begin this work, but would like SCS to review our expected recommendations above (1. and 2.) before we start.

4. Collaborate with other PCC committees and task groups to review and confirm mapping specifications between BIBFRAME and MARC for serials, and to identify areas where further development or best practices are required; collaborate with the OCLC CONSER group for tasks such as reviewing test data, etc.

The Pilot Group has identified the groups below (both within and outside PCC) as stakeholders in the description of serial resources in BIBFRAME and MARC in the new context of Official RDA. We will continue to develop this list and look forward to collaborating with them.

In particular, groups that have already implemented description of serials in BIBFRAME will need to be made aware of the implications of PCC's decisions regarding the WEM lock.

Continuing Resource BIBFRAME cataloging in practice:

- Share-VDE: Anna Lionetti, anna.lionetti@casalini.it or Tiziana Possemato, tiziana.possemato@atcult.it
- Library of Congress: Jodi Williamschen, jowill@loc.gov or Jacquelin Brellenthin, jbrel@loc.gov (contact to be confirmed)
- PCC Working Group on Metadata Application Profiles (Sinopia): Nancy Lorimer, nlorimer@stanford.edu or TJ Kao, tjkao@ucdavis.edu

BIBFRAME/MARC conversion and data interoperability:

- BIBFRAME Interoperability Group: Ian Bigelow, ian.bigelow@ualberta.ca
- PCC Task Group on BIBFRAME-to-MARC Conversion: Liz Miraglia, emiraglia@ucsd.edu
- PCC Linked Data Advisory Committee: Paloma Graciani Picardo, paloma.graciani@austin.utexas.edu
- Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO): Sally McCallum, smcc@loc.gov
- U.S. ISSN Center: Regina Reynolds, rrey@loc.gov

SCS Pilot Group on CONSER Policies

Everett Allgood, New York University

Kevin Balster, UCLA

Steven Folsom (LC representative)

Ed Jones, National University (Co-Chair)

Laura Ramsey (OCLC liaison)

Robert Rendall, Columbia University (Co-Chair)

Tina Shrader (NLM representative)

Abigail Sparling, University of Alberta (SCS liaison)

Kay Teel, Stanford University