**FAQ PCC CCT Feasibility Study**

The [**NACO Advisory Group**](https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/naco/NACOAdvisoryGroup.html) will be the primary contact for catalogers in the Feasibility Study. The NACO Advisory Group can be contacted at naco@loc.gov. Please include “**CCT Feasibility Study**” in the Subject line to assist in directing the message to the NACO Advisory Group.

# General

1. **What is the PCC CCT Feasibility Study?**

The **PCC Conventional Collective Title Feasibility Study**, or **PCC CCT Feasibility Study**, is an experiment to test a policy change for the cataloging of partial collections of literary forms by one agent. This includes partial collections of single literary forms by one agent, as well as partial collections of multiple literary forms by one agent.

1. **What is the scope of the Feasibility Study?**

The Feasibility Study will test partial collections of literary forms by one agent. Currently, resources in these categories would be assigned a conventional collective title

240 10 $a [Literary form]. $k Selections

 For partial collections of one literary form

*or*

240 10 $a Works. $k Selections

 For partial collections of more than one literary form

1. **How long will the Feasibility Study last?**

The Feasibility Study will last five months, August - December 2020.

1. **Who can participate in the Feasibility Study?**

All PCC catalogers who describe resources that are partial collections of literary forms by one agent may participate in the Feasibility Study.

1. **Is participation in the Feasibility Study mandatory?**

No, participation is optional. However, PCC participants are urged to follow the practice of the Feasibility Study and exercise cataloger’s judgment in **not** creating new conventional collective title authority records for partial collections of literary forms by one agent.

1. **How will the work in the Feasibility Study be tracked and analyzed?**

The NACO Advisory Group used a form that was completed for each resource cataloged in the Feasibility Study. The form asked for information about the resource itself -- the control number, the literary form, whether the resource was a translation, any related authority maintenance that was done, etc., and had an area to report any unusual issues.

1. **Is this a permanent policy change?**

No. This is a test only. At the end of the Feasibility Study, the Standing Committee on Standards will submit an assessment of the Feasibility Study to the PCC Policy Committee, with a recommendation on whether to make an official policy change.

1. **What will happen at the end of the Feasibility Study?**

At the end of the Feasibility Study, the SCS will make an assessment on:

* the impact of the policy change on legacy data, including existing authorized conventional collective titles for incomplete collections of literary forms by one agent
* the treatment of translations
* bibliographic file maintenance (BFM)
* any unexpected or unforeseen cataloging situations that arise during the Feasibility Study
* the number of resources cataloged in the Feasibility Study
* literary forms that are not listed in RDA 6.2.2.10.2
* other issues that arise in the Feasibility Study

# Process and Workflow

1. **How will the Feasibility Study work?**

When cataloging a resource that consists of a partial collection of literary forms by one agent, rather than applying the Alternative in RDA 6.2.2.10.3 to use a conventional collective title for the literary form followed by Selections as the preferred title of the resource, RDA 6.2.2.4 will be applied instead:

*For works created after 1500, choose as a preferred title for work the title or form of title in the original language by which the work is commonly identified either through use in manifestations embodying the work or in reference sources.*

The title under which the resource is published will be considered the “commonly identified” title.

1. **What about translations?**

Translations are within scope for the Feasibility Study.

1. **What about multipart monographs and series?**

8XX series tracings in bibliographic records for multipart monographs and analyzable monographs in a series may continue to use conventional collective titles; a two-volume collection of selected stories or selected poems may be a candidate for the Feasibility Study.

1. **What about works created before 1501?**

Works created before 1501 are within scope, taking RDA 6.2.2.5 into consideration.

1. **What if a resource within scope for the Feasibility Study has a manifestation title that is represented as a variant access point in an existing conventional collective title authority record?**

There are two options: 1) If the variant access point in the existing conventional collective title authority record represents the same resource being described (verify this by looking at the 670 field that justifies the variant access point), remove the variant access point and the 670 field from the authority record and describe the resource by applying RDA 6.2.2.4; 2) If the variant access point in the existing conventional collective title authority record does not represent the same resource being described (for example, it may represent an earlier or later edition of the work), make no change to the authority record.

1. **If I apply Option 1 in the FAQ above, and the existing conventional collective title authority record is not coded RDA, do I need to re-code the authority record to RDA?**

No. Since the existing conventional collective title authority record most likely is an “undifferentiated” work authority record (which would be considered a nomen for a “work group” in the Beta RDA), the record should not be recoded to RDA. This is an exception to the PCC policy that all non-RDA authority records must be recoded to RDA when a change is made to the record.

1. **May I provide access through a conventional collective title used as a variant access point in an authority record that I create to represent the manifestation title?**

Although this would provide access, it is not recommended. Authority records optionally may be created in the case of conflict as determined by LC-PCC PS 6.27.1.9 below, in order to break the conflict. However, do not create an authority record only to provide variant access from a conventional collective title construction. One of the goals of the Feasibility Study is to reduce the number of new authority records representing works.

1. **What about Library of Congress classification for resources cataloged in the Feasibility Study?**

Resources in scope for the Feasibility Study will be classed as separate works. This also includes translations, which will be classed following the Translation Table (Classification and Shelflisting Manual (CSM), instruction sheet G150, Translations/Tests in Parallel Languages), rather than applying a form Cutter (see the translation example below).

1. **Is the concept of “adequate” or “distinctive” title a consideration in the Feasibility Study?**

No. The determination of “adequate” or “distinctive” title, a judgment decision used under AACR2 in the cataloging of works in a single form, is not applied in the Feasibility Study. All manifestation titles are considered “adequate” or “distinctive” in the Feasibility Study.

1. **How do I track the work that I do in the Feasibility Study?**

For each resource cataloged in the Feasibility Study, complete and submit this [form](https://forms.gle/sVGrrNHfgpFFCu8M8). The form allows you to report any unusual circumstances you encountered in cataloging the resource.

1. **What if I have a question about a resource in scope for the Feasibility Study? Who can I ask?**

The NACO Advisory Group will be the primary contact for catalogers in the Feasibility Study. The NACO Advisory Group can be contacted at naco@loc.gov. Please include “**CCT Feasibility Study**” in the Subject line to assist in directing the message to the NACO Advisory Group.

1. **Is there a list of the literary forms that are within scope for the Feasibility Study?**

There is a partial list of literary forms in RDA 6.2.2.10.2:

correspondence

essays

librettos

lyrics

novels

plays

poems

prose works

short stories

speeches

 Any literary form that is not listed above (for example, Novellas; One-act plays) is in scope for the Feasibility Study. Comics are also a literary form and are in scope for the study. If you are not sure whether a form is considered literary, check with the NACO Advisory Group (naco@loc.gov, with the Subject Line: CCT Feasibility Study)

1. **What about non-literary forms?**

Non-literary forms are not a part of the Feasibility Study, although based on the assessment of the Feasibility Study, similar cataloging treatment of non-literary forms may be considered in the future.

1. **What if more than one literary form appears in a collection that is being described?**

As long as all of the forms are literary, the resource being cataloged is within scope for the Feasibility Study.

1. **How do I determine conflict when cataloging a resource in the Feasibility Study?**

For the purposes of the Feasibility Study, the General statement in LC-PCC PS 6.27.1.9, Additions to Access Point Representing Works, will be applied to determine conflict:

*The "catalog" when testing for conflict. Define the "catalog" as the file against which the searching and cataloging is being done. In addition, catalogers (including LC overseas offices’ catalogers) may take into account any resource with the same authorized access point of which they know, whether or not it is in the catalog. Do not take into account variant access points.*

1. **How will these partial collections of literary forms be collocated without the use of CCTs?**

Optionally, collocation can be achieved through the use of an LCGFT term in the 655 field, or an LCGFT term in the 380 field:

655 #7 $a Poetry. $2 lcgft

OR

380 ## $a Poetry $2 lcgft

# Examples

**Example 1**

**050 00 $a PS3552.R4174 $b W67 2020**

**100 1# $a Brewer, Gaylord, $d 1965- $e author.**

**245 10 $a Worship the pig : $b poems / $c Gaylord Brewer.**

**655 #7 $a Poetry. $2 lcgft**

*A collection of selected poems by Gaylord Brewer. RDA 6.2.2.4 is applied and the manifestation title is used instead of a conventional collective title Poems. Selections. The resource is classed as a separate work, and the LCGFT term Poetry is assigned for collocation purposes.*

**Example 2**

**050 00 $a PS3606.R445465 $b P37 2020**

**100 1# $a Freeman, John, $d 1974- $e author.**

**245 14 $a The park / $c John Freeman.**

**655 #7 $a Poetry. $2 lcgft**

*A collection of selected poems by John Freeman. RDA 6.2.2.4 is applied and the manifestation title is used instead of a conventional collective title Poems. Selections. The resource is classed as a separate work, and the LCGFT term Poetry is assigned for collocation purposes.*

**Example 3**

**050 00 $a PS3501.K5 $b H55 1937**

**100 1# $a Akins, Zoe, $d 1886-1958, $e author.**

**240 10 $a Hills grow smaller (Collection)**

**245 14 $a The hills grow smaller / $c by Zoë Akins.**

**655 #7 $a Poetry. $2 lcgft**

*A collection of selected poems by Zoe Akins. RDA 6.2.2.4 is applied and the manifestation title is used instead of a conventional collective title Poems. Selections. The individual poem The hills grow smaller is included in the collection, and the cataloger has identified this as a conflict according to LC-PCC PS 6.27.1.9. A uniform title is assigned in the 240 field to break the conflict, but an authority record does not need to be created. The resource is classed as a separate work, and the LCGFT term Poetry is assigned for collocation purposes.*

**Example 4**

**050 00 $a PS3501.K5 $b H56 1937**

**100 1# $a Akins, Zoe, $d 1886-1958, $e author.**

**240 10 $a Hills grow smaller (Poem)**

**245 14 $a The hills grow smaller / $c by Zoë Akins.**

**655 #7 $a Poetry. $2 lcgft**

*A single poem by Zoe Akins. The collection titled The hills grow smaller is in conflict with the title of the individual poem. A uniform title is assigned in the 240 field to break the conflict, but an authority record does not need to be created. The resource is classed as a separate work, and the LCGFT term Poetry is assigned for collocation purposes.*

**Example 5**

**050 00 $a PS3505.A87 $b L3817 1997**

**100 1# $a Cather, Willa, $d 1873-1947, $e author.**

**240 10 $a Later novels. $l Russian**

**245 14 $a Pozdnie romany / $c Uilla Kėtėr.**

**655 #7 $a Novels. $2 lcgft**

*A Russian translation of novels by Willa Cather, published originally in English under the title Later novels. The translation is treated as a separate work and the Translation Table is used (.x17 = Russian Translation), not the Form Cutter .A5-.A59 (TABLE P-PZ40).*

**Example 6**

**050 00 $a PS3545.E6 $b C65 2019**

**100 1# $a Welty, Eudora, $d 1909-2001, $e author.**

**245 14 $a The collected stories of Eudora Welty / $c Eudora Welty ; introduction by Ann Patchett.**

**655 #7 $a Short stories. $2 lcgft**

*A collection of short stories by Eudora Welty. The cataloger has determined that this manifestation does not contain all the short stories by Eudora Welty. RDA 6.2.2.4 is applied and the manifestation title is used instead of a conventional collective title Short stories. Selections. But the title Collected stories of Eudora Welty representing this work is recorded as a variant access point in the existing conventional collective title authority record LCCN no 98029448:*

**

*The authority record is already coded RDA. The cataloger can remove the variant access point*

*400 1\_ $a Welty, Eudora, $d 1909-2001. $t Collected stories of Eudora Welty*

*and the supporting 670*

*$a Welty, Eudora. Collected stories of Eudora Welty, 2019.*

*The resource is classed as a separate work, and the LCGFT term Short stories is assigned for collocation purposes.*