

LC Editor: Describing Resources: Demonstration  
<http://login.icohere.com/PCC?pnum=VMX65008>

[Paul]

Hi everyone I'm Paul Frank from the PCC Secretariat at the Library of Congress and I am here with three of my colleagues: Les Hawkins – I'm starting with Les because he's my closest colleague, because he works here in the PCC Secretariat with the CONSER program, and so we work very closely; and we have a new staff member in our section, in the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division, Alicia Pike(?), and Alicia's going to learn about the BIBFRAME editor today, and of course last but not least, Jodi Williamschen, who's our lifeline in the Network Development and MARC Standards Office here at the LC and Jodi's done a lot of work in BIBFRAME and is a real go-to person for all of us.

So what we hope to do in this recording is demonstrate the cataloging of two resources in the BIBFRAME Editor. I'm going to start out with an easy one, it's a Monograph. And then Les is going to do a serial, and that will be an easy one for him, but a complicated one for me, so I'm looking forward to learning from Les.

Before we do this we need to talk about the background for doing this. I know that most of you watching this are probably going to be working in Sinopia, which has an entirely different cataloging interface. What you see on the screen here is the interface to our LC BIBFRAME Editor that our catalogers here are using in the Pilot. The interface that you see in Sinopia will be much different but the ultimate goal is the same, to be able to describe a resource, and in our case using RDA Resource Description and Access. I think for most of you as a PCC cohort you'll also be following RDA.

So we realize right at the start that what we show you, you won't be able to replicate exactly in Sinopia in terms of just following along, but we hope that we can share with you some sort of pre-cataloging analysis that needs to take place before a resource is described in the BIBFRAME Editor.

For most of our resources at the LC, the BIBFRAME description already exists in our BIBFRAME database, in fact, the example that I'm going to use is artificial because I could have just pulled it right out of the BIBFRAME database and shown you how it looks there, but I'm not sure how you'll be interacting with the Share-VDE file so just for the sake of the demonstration we'll assume that this resource has not been cataloged, so there's no Work description, there's no Instance description, or Item description. We're starting fresh. Les is going to take the same approach.

We're going to get into the nitty gritty in just a second. I guess that's it.

[03:40]

I always think that I'm a logical person and I scope out my work before I do it but actually I don't. I usually just plunge in and start working. Here's a resource that I'm going to show you. [video: Paul holds up the book]

This is a wonderful new resource called "American Libraries: 1730-1950." It's got a nice statement of responsibility here by Kenneth Breisch and a it's got a foreward by another important person to us, the Librarian of Congress.

Let's take a look at the title page, which is extremely important. Has title, the same title that I just mentioned, the same agents associated with the Work, called the author, and all sorts of publication information. Pretty straightforward monograph. And we're going to catalog that. Probably what you're thinking is that if you were going to catalog this in BIBFRAME and you've done cataloging in MARC, you're probably thinking about the MARC record and how that might appear for this resource. In anticipation of that I thought maybe this would be a helpful start to our work.

[05:07]

I took the bibliographic description from OCLC, and this actually describes our copy as well, you can tell from the 040 field. But what I like to do, and this is a real copy here but this is the type of thing that goes through my head every time I start to work in the BIBFRAME Editor. I have a lot of experience with MARC so I always think about the MARC tags and the MARC fields and how they might be expressed in BIBFRAME and the BIBFRAME Editor, and because MARC is so flat, when I look at this MARC record, I can find attributes that relate to different BIBFRAME entities, and I tried to do my best...you can probably point out areas where I've made a mistake here, but what I've tried to do is, if you can see the color on this slide, in the yellow highlighting, this is information that would relate to the BIBFRAME Work, the green highlighting would relate to the BIBFRAME Instance, and the blue is sort of a catchall, it could be admin metadata, it could be something that really can't be captured, it might be Item information, but I'm not really going to address that today. I really wanted you to see the breakdown between the Work information and the Instance information, so between the yellow and the green.

What I couldn't do very well was highlight areas where actually you have both, so for example, the Title here, I highlighted this as a Work element, right, but it's also a Manifestation element because you have the Title Proper and you have the Preferred Work Title in RDA, and it just so happens that in this case those are identical. So our MARC shorthand is to just lump them together in a 245 subfield a, when really in a purely theoretical view you would expect to see a 240 here with the Preferred Work Title and the 245 would have the Title Proper that would relate to the Instance. So this is an area where there's really crossover and up in the Date as well the same thing happens.

This is the OCLC view of the record but now let's go to the BIBFRAME Editor and start describing this and I'm going to take the approach that we start with the Work description and then we go to the Instance description.

For ease of presentation and to keep things on track here I'm probably going to do a lot of copying and pasting of information that is just additional to the record, even if it's in the Work and the Instance area. I want to spend most of our time today looking at areas where there are some considerable thought processes in place about how things are done.

[08:45]

Now let's take a look back at our BIBFRAME Editor and we know we have a Monograph and we're going to start with the Work description, so we click on Work, and the first thing we're going to see is Primary Contribution. Now, did we have a Primary Contribution for this work? Yes, we definitely did. I know you couldn't see it when I showed it on the camera but we have an author, last name Breisch, first name Kenneth, so we know from RDA that this is the only person or only agent associated with this work so we know from RDA that we will construct an authorized access point for the Work using this author's name preceding the Preferred Title for the Work.

Now by clicking on Primary Contribution, you see the gray background? We know that this is going to take us to a submenu.

[09:29]

This is our submenu where we would be able to search for any Agent that might be the Primary Contributor to this work.

We know that we have a person, and we click on that and now we have behind the scenes in the BIBFRAME Profile Editor a lookup to the Name Authority File, to the LC NACO Authority File.

So I'm going to key in his last name, the sort of the entry element, followed by comma, his first name is Kenneth, and you see a possibility here. Now for a long time in our BIBFRAME Editor, this was all you could see. We've made a wonderful enhancement to the Editor that allows you to highlight the name or just hover over, mouse over, the label here and then a view of the authority record, a labeled view display of the authority record pops up so you can confirm that this is the agent that you want. Most of you do authority work so this is a routine thing you would do when working in MARC, and if the name that you wanted did not appear then you know you'd need to create a new heading but we're ok here. We've determined by consulting the resource in hand and looking at the information here that this Kenneth Breisch, Kenneth A. Breisch, is the correct Agent that's the author of our resource.

So we're going to click on that name, it populates his name in the person lookup, but we have to be sure to save that change. So we click on Save Changes. If we don't click Save here it's not going to Save, it's going to go away, so this is a required click.

But now we need to add his role because remember for...I can't think of the word—the opposite of Contributor, what is it? Well, Primary Contribution ...Creator! [laughter] It's going to be a game show! (I want the trip to Hawaii.) I get confused because in BIBFRAME we call it Contribution but you all know from RDA it's Creator and Contributor.

So we have a Creator here and we know from the PCC policy on relationship designators that all Creators need to be accompanied by a relationship designator to show their role, so we're not quite done here, we have his name but now we have to show his role, and we're going to click on the Role lookup ...

[12:52]

...another lookup, but this one's going to go to MARC relator terms. We want to search him as an author, and here we go, we have author, and again, we have that nice mouseover, if you're not sure, look at the narrower terms that are showing up on the lefthand side of the screen. But we know this is a correct relator for this person.

I know there's some smart people watching this asking, Paul, why didn't you do an RDA Relationship Designator? Well, it's because not all of the RDA Relationship Designators show up in the MARC list. So I'm going to select Author here and save that, but technically the more correct thing to do, especially if I were working in a MARC record, would be to use the RDA relationship term that appears there and that's why we have this extra box here because not all of the RDA Relationship Designators show up in the MARC list. But I picked Author from the MARC list, it's the same in RDA, so I'm going to accept that and save that change.

Now we have a nice package of data. We've literally reconstructed a 1xx field here by having a Primary Contribution and the Role that the person had in relation to the Work, and I'm going to save that. Don't worry, I'm not going to spend as much time on these other things but what I want you to think about now as we go through the rest of this Work Profile is:

[14:40]

What would you add? And you might want to think about that MARC record as we go through, you definitely have a Title, and when we looked at the [?] display from OCLC, this is an area where I said hey, that title actually is the Preferred Title but it also is the Title Proper. In this part of the BIBFRAME Editor you're going to put the Preferred Title so you would click on this box, and, maybe for this I will go ahead and copy it from the Library of Congress ILS. American libraries 1730-1950. Now this is not a lookup it's just a text entry box so I've got to be sure to click on the plus sign there. I don't have a Part Number, I don't have a Part Name.

I don't really have a note about the title, not going to worry about the admin metadata at this point. I just want to save my Preferred Work Title.

Now, from here on, once you've satisfied the core requirements in RDA, anything else is extra. So Form/Genre would be an optional value that we could associate with this Work, and if you

want to include that you would look it up. This is a lookup here to Library of Congress Genre/Form terms. I'm not going to do that, I'm going to cancel that. Date of Work is an RDA attribute for Works. Often the date of a Work is the date of the publication, so there's a substitution taking place between the Manifestation Date and the Work Date. I could put 2017 here if I wanted, that's the publication date, it's actually a copyright date, but I'm going to let it serve as the date of the Work

Place associated with the Work—remember this is not subject information about the resource. This is where was the Work created. We don't know. I guess we could call the author and say "Where did you do this? Did you do it at your desk in Illinois? Did you do it at the Library of Congress?" That's what the Place of Origin of the Work is, where the Work came from, but it's not a core element in RDA, we don't need to do that and it would actually be a lot of work to determine that so I'm going to leave that out.

[17:16]

Geographic coverage—now here's something that we might consider doing, because what was the title? "American libraries..." It's using "American" in that very chauvinistic way meaning United States, and there's a lot more to America than the United States, but often American is used when it's really the United States. I might decide I am going to put this here, keeping in mind that I'm probably going to want to bring out the United States as well in the subject area but for the geographic coverage of the content of the work, I'm going to put in United States. Now what's happening here? This is a lookup. This is going to the Name Authority File. Now some of you might think oh wow I used to put Geographic Coverage in an 043 field, that's a different list, right? The geographic areas.

But in the BIBFRAME Editor here we're actually looking up against the Name Authority File. So I'm going to click on United States and I don't really have a note to include with that, I'm just going to leave United States and save that. Now I've got a nice Geographic Coverage for the content of the work.

Time coverage, well, why not? That's actually right in the title. I could put 1730-1950...actually I'm going to ask Jodi a question: What would be the best way? To put 1730 and save it and then put 1950 or use the hyphen, what would you do?

[Jodi]

We haven't seen a lot of data in our Editor... I would almost think of it in terms of centuries.

[Paul]

That's a good point. Centuries. I will point out something that you might have noticed already. In these thinks, where there's a hyperlink, this is going right to the RDA Toolkit, but what you don't see explicitly is the RDA instruction number, so you've got to be sure you know your RDA instructions pretty well to know that place of origin of the work is going to take you into Chapter

6 of RDA, time coverage of content is going to take you into 7.3 where you have additional work elements in RDA.

I like Jodi's suggestion to do centuries...this is going to be a hard one to complete, so should we put 18th, 19th century? 20th century? Should we just abandon it? [laughter]

[Jodi]

It's a literal field, not tied to a vocabulary, so you can really put in whatever you want.

[Paul]

I don't even need to put a period there. Intended Audience, I'm not going to do that. I think this is a value probably you would think of in the 008 field, right? We had that pipe in the 008. In fact, I think the lookup goes...

[Jodi]

Yeah it goes to an audience dropdown.

[Paul]

This is the type of thing you would associate with the 008 field but I'm going to leave that blank...

[Jodi]

The only time it really seems to get used is when it's a children's book.

[Paul]

That's right. You're right. And then we come down to Contribution but other than that Primary Contribution, well I have the author of the foreword but we usually don't express that bibliographically, I mean that will be in the transcribed part of the record if it appears in a prominent source but we don't usually give an access point for the author of a foreword. So I don't have any other contribution other than Kenneth Bresich primary contributor.

Now I want to go to the Subjects because here's something really interesting. This is an area that we're working on very intensely right now with BIBFRAME because we recognize that LCSH policy does not always result in an authorized heading being created for a subject / subdivision combination. And that's exactly the case that we have here.

[22:13]

You might argue with me on the cataloging of this resource but in terms of the subjects I'm not going to disagree with what was assigned to this resource.

The three subject headings are:

Library architecture—United States—History...so we have a heading, geographic subdivision, and a topical subdivision... then we have Library buildings—United States—History, so same

structure, heading, geographic, topical, and again, same thing, Libraries—United States—History.

In a perfect world, when we get to this part of the input screen, our first subject heading Library architecture—United States—History, we would hope that we would find that full string but we don't, we do not see it. We get close with Library architecture—United States but we don't have history appended to this.

So even though we're close we're going to abandon this and we're going to go to the component part of this pop-up box and put the individual elements of the string in separately and I'm going to show you how they link up, so this is work that Jodi's done, really happy and proud of what's she's done, we'll achieve the result we'd get in MARC.

Our first heading was Library architecture, so I'm going to select that, Save Changes, here it is. Okay, now I want to give the geographic subdivision so I'm going to click on Geographic. And United States from the Name Authority File, which is correct, that's where we would go for the geographic subdivision. Save that change. So now what we've got, we're building at the bottom, Library architecture, United States. Now we want to get History so we go to topical subdivisions so we're going to click one last time, and pull up History from LCSH, save that, and we have our first subject string.

Now each of these elements is supported by an authority record, so we do have a linked-data-friendly construction here. So we now want to save the entire package and look what happens, it's added it just as you would expect to see it in a MARC field or a brief display of a MARC record.

Now maybe for the sake of the exercise I don't need to go in and do the other two but they would follow the very same pattern. For the next subject string we have Library buildings—United States—History. If we searched it in the lookup we would see that it does not exist as all three, so we'd follow the same workflow that we did in the previous one where we look them up individually, package them together, and save the changes. So that's how we get the subjects in the Work record. What else do we have here?

Notes about the Work, well, there could be a considerable number of Notes, in fact this one has, further down, it had a summary, it had a Contents Note. You would know how to do that. The only thing I will say short of actually inputting this, for a Contents Note, for example, generally you know from a 505 field you'd put one element, and then you'd have a hyphen hyphen, then the next element, and that's the way Contents Notes are constructed. You could follow that punctuation policy or not. I don't think BIBFRAME really cares does it?

And the Classification Number that was assigned to this resource is D679.2...very tricky about classification because there's a book number appended to this to complete the call number but the Classification Number itself is the Work element in BIBFRAME so we're not going to worry

about the book number or the Cutter for the author, that will go in the Item record. You might have noticed there was no lookup to Classification schedule, we just keyed it in [?]

[27:33]

Here's some default values, Content Type: Text, that's because this is a Monograph, so we're not going to change it. It's a nice thing to have it already in the record.

Language, the Resource is written in English. If I clicked on this it would go right to the MARC language list and I can pick that and save it. You might think of this as parallel to the language code in the 008 field.

Script, default, I don't need to do anything here, I'm not going to make a note about that.

Supplementary Content. This is where I would add bibliographical references and indexes. That's really getting to the end.

Related Work. Don't have one. You certainly could fill this out if you wanted but I'm going to say I'm done with this Work description and I'm going to preview it, getting used to looking at RDF here, I'll go through quickly, verify that I input all the information correctly, my colleagues didn't point out any typos, so I'm going to assume that I'm good. And then I'm going to save this description. Now I have saved it. What we would do...I shouldn't talk about what Library of Congress catalogers are doing in the BIBFRAME Pilot but what you would do now is go and add the Instance description to this Work record.

So we'll go back to the Editor, we go back to the Monograph Profile Instance, I would want to verify that I had the correct Work that would be associated with this Instance, so in our catalog I would look it up and pull it in so I could add the Instance but in Sinopia I think what you would probably do is create the Work and the Instance all together and Save it...

[Jodi]

That's what our catalogers do.

[Paul]

Yes that's what our catalogers do, just complete the entire description for Work and Instance before going on. But let's say we did that. General broad comment: in the Instance area there are going to be a lot more textual fields that you just fill in. This is transcription for the most part. This is not going to be as controlled by lookups as the Work area. So for instance, Title, you're going to give the Title Proper, for Statement of Responsibility, you transcribe what's on the Resource. For the Edition Statement, and there is one here, it said first edition, you're going to just transcribe that: first edition.



Publication, Distribution, Manufacture is an interesting area because we're experimenting with a quasi-controlled lookup here. For Place we have New York? That's going to be a pretty easy one to look up from the Name Authority File...

[Jodi]

No, this is looking up from the country [?]

[Paul]

Oh that's right, you're right, this is a perfect parallel to the 008, that's right. Ok thanks for pointing that out. Did you want to say something?

[Les]

My serial example starts from the Instance, when you're ready...[?]

[Paul]

I'm going to speed through this because I know I'm talking a little bit more than I should. This is the quasi-lookup type of information...the Publisher as you know would be transcribed in the 264 field, but it's W. W. Norton...

Okay so what's going on here is that publisher data from 260 and 264 fields has been mined and massaged in a way, I mean, it's not under perfect authority control, but we're experimenting with having a list of providers, so you know that this information would be transcribed in a bibliographic record, so what I'm showing you here is something you would not normally do, but we're experimenting in our Pilot with it. And you see all the raw data so you know right away this is probably a typo, right? So everything's there. No real cleanup has been done but I'm going to say, I don't know, this is probably close enough for what I have, it's W. W. Norton, and if it doesn't show up in this lookup you have the option to key it in, but I'm happy with that, I'm going to save that change. And we had actually a copyright date here that's substituting as the publication date, 2017, I'm going to save that. But don't be alarmed for those of you who are still relying on the transcription, we have a Transcribed Provider Statement so what you would put here is exactly what you would transcribe in a 264 field, so you'd get everything you would need in a MARC record.

[Jodi]

And this really just an experiment we're trying, we don't know if we're going to keep this set up in the future or not.

[Paul]

Yeah, totally experimental.

Okay let's look at ISBN and then I'm going to turn it over to Les to do the serials. ISBN is an interesting thing because the ISBNs are controlled in a way because they have an expected structure to them, but there's no database of ISBN lookups so you would need to key the ISBN

in here and save it just as if it's a literal piece of data even though in a sense it actually is controlled.

I will point out another programmed in value, a default value, for Monograph Media Type is unmediated.

Everything else here should look familiar to you, Dimensions would be the 300 field, Carrier type is programmed, we don't have a Related Manifestation, I'm not going to go into the Item here although this would be a part of the regular cataloging workflow, for you to describe the Item, I would want to put a note...

Admin metadata area is another area that's sort of a little bit out of scope for what we wanted to show you today.

[Jodi]

Actually Paul can you go up to ISBN and click on a fresh box? Usually the MARC record will have the ISBN for the e-book in subfield [?] and you can accommodate in the Editor so just type in the number and go down to the Incorrect, Invalid or Canceled and we have a dropdown vocabulary so, "canceled or invalid" is what is used for [?] in subfield [?]. So you can supply that status and still input all of your identifiers that you would normally put in a MARC record.

Incorrect only applies to ISSN.

[Les]

If you want to qualify these, a qualifier could be added at the end?

[Jodi]

Yes...

[Paul]

Qualify here?

[Jodi]

No, no, no, Save As...go down to Qualifier, and that's where you would put the data that would go in subfield q now which would normally be e-book or...

[Paul]

Hyphen in e-book?

[Jodi]

I don't know...

There's still an awful lot of 020 fields that you see in MARC records that still have the qualifiers as parens and not as subfield [?]s but we are, in the data conversion, trying to split the number and the qualifier apart from each other.

[Les]

Sounds like a data conversion issue.

[Paul]

Now I'm going to preview my Instance, looks good, Save. Ah hah, I did the wrong workflow, Jodi was right, I should have done the Work and then the Instance.

But I do have a complete Instance that's looking for a Work, I know the Work's there, we're going to have to link that one up, that's something that's done behind the scenes anyway so I don't think having that happen is a major problem.

Any comments on this? Should we close Monographs and go on to Serials?

[Jodi]

Single monographs like this where it's one Work and one Instance is by far the easiest type of material to describe in BIBFRAME, unfortunately it's not the only material to describe in BIBFRAME.

[Paul]

And Les gets the hard one. Come on over, Les.

[38:09]

[Les]

I won't cover the fields you covered, but I have a couple of things to point out in the Work, mainly the Instance for the serial that I have. What I have here, the scenario is that in LC's public database, we have the earlier title for this publication. The earlier title is called Interface, and the preferred form of the title was qualified by Providence, Rhode Island. And we discovered that the title has changed and when the title changes in a serial we create a new description of it, and we don't have the new description in our database right now. This is a made up example because it was easier for me to find a surrogate that was online. I could find the first issue of this new title online so I could show you this actual issue, it's got an editorial, an introduction, articles by different people, this work is kind of the cumulation of many authors writing articles, and the publisher organization INFORMS: Institute for Operations Research and Management Sciences, really is responsible for issuing the body, they're not really responsible for the creation, they're not really a Creator, I wanted to show you that. We can also see publication information down here, at the bottom of this screen that has the first issue, so this is my source of information for this description.

So this is kind of a made up example we're going to start from scratch with this description, and a lot of the serials catalogers here I notice do start with the Instance. Though they start with the Instance Profile here they can add the Work elements here. So we're looking for the Work, we've already said that the organization INFORMS is not the Creator of this, so the authorized access point of this Work is going to be based on the Title [?]. So we can look it up, and see if we have that Title in our database, and so we see we have a couple of the organization's journals but we don't have the Journal on Applied Analytics, so we're going to have to add the Work Title. We're not going to use that organization as the primary creator because we've already said they're not the Creator. We'll go ahead and determine that the Preferred Title should be INFORMS journal... you'll notice a spell check which is kind of nice.

So I don't have a Part Title. I don't want to make a Note yet about this Work Title so I'll save that. So we've got that as part of the Work information.

Paul showed you about adding the Subjects and so forth, I won't do that. But what I do want to get to is the Contribution area. We know that INFORMS, the Institute for Operations Research and Management Science, is the issuing body for this publication. That's often the way it is with serials, you look at RDA and the LC/PCC Policy statement, a lot of times you find that there is no one single creator for a serial work, serial has the work of many authors, combined together, so we're very often adding an access point for a body such as Issuing Body.

So we didn't find it, I know that this is in the Name Authority File. We're actually using the public version of the Editor...I don't know if that's different...

[Paul]

Is it case sensitive? Would it have to be capitalized?

[Jodi]

It is punctuation sensitive...If there's any like hyphens... or ampersand...

[Les]

There it is, it's not Institution for not Institute of. We catch all the mistakes! So I think that's the only few things I wanted to show you...Preferred Title...We're going to add Contributor Name because that's appropriate for cataloging serials instead of specifying that body in the Primary Contribution...that's one thing I wanted to show you.

I think that we're done with the Work information now, I've done that, I go back to the Instance Profile here and [?] enter the Title Proper here, and then I have a couple of Variant Titles, I would enter those each, I would enter one, then save it, then enter another one...[?]Variant Title shows up here. Statement of Responsibility, Paul showed you this, this is published in Catesville, Maryland, so I look for Catesville but it's not there, so Maryland.

[Paul]

I forgot the 008...

[Les]

Then again I could search for INFORMS, INFORMS Pubs Online...

[Jodi]

Go down to look at the...

[Les]

That's really close, yes.

Frequency. Looking at the issue that I have here I see that the designation is bimonthly, type of designation, I find somewhere...dropdown menu and then this based on the MARC list...

So I'm creating a description of the online serial so we have Volume as Carrier Type, that's what we use for a print publication or print serial. I'm going to change that, dropdown menu.

I could make a Note about the Instance and for serials we typically make several Notes. We would give a description based on Notes even though we do have the first issue in hand, we'd cite the designation that was on its first issue, volume 49 issue 1, we'd say where the Title came from, it came from the publisher's website[?]. The other thing we do with serials is create that Note, save it, create a separate Note that said began with volume 49 issue 1, chronological designation, those correspond to two different fields within the MARC record where we give the description based on and we have 3xx. Those are two Notes that I would add. The other thing I think I would want to point out. I have the online version here, I know there's a print version, I just happen to be creating the description for the online version first. So I can give information about the Related Instance, for the print version, the Title is the same, I could give the Relationship Designator, these are just free text. I could give the Relationship Designator, Related Instance, Print version.

It doesn't have a new ISSN yet, the ISSN Publication Center hasn't gotten it into their hands yet... if I knew the ISSN of the print version I could save that. There's another related version though I mean there's another Related Instance, because I said this is a title change so the Work Title has changed and there's also the Related Instance of the earlier title so there is really another description out there the related instance the earlier online version so that's another relationship...

The other thing in the Admin Metadata I thought I'd look at. You see that it's got some defaults here, the Assigning agency DLC corresponds to the 040 information that you add for the institution. We have the authentication code here PCC corresponds to the 042 Authentication Code. Descriptive conventions often correspond to codes that we enter in the 040 field for serial records and for online serials we enter more than one. For an online serial we will also add provider neutral codes.

[Jodi]

Here you set up...[?]

[Les]

I noticed that some serials catalogers here just add the Admin Metadata twice... if I want to add this provider neutral ...they'll want multiple codes here so they'll add one here, save that, provider neutral guidelines, they'll come back and add a separate one for RDA, save that.

[Jodi]

You can just change the Editor to make that [?]

[Les]

Another possibility is to add ISBD which corresponds to suffix field element [?]

The other thing I wanted to show you, the encoding levels are available here in the administrative metadata area, and I think that that is all I wanted to show you about the Instance.

[Paul]

Save it. Les did it in the right order.

[Les]

I provided the, I was going to say I didn't provide the Relationship Designator for the Contributor...

[Paul]

That's not required right?

[Les]

We commonly do that for serials...issuing body...

[Paul]

Well, I got slapped on the wrist when I saved mine...

[Jodi]

You don't need to save it if you don't want to since this is the demonstration Editor.

[Les]

The demonstration Editor doesn't end up building a database of saved resources.

[Paul]

This is open to anyone, right? If you're anxious to get started in Sinopia but you don't want to make a mistake in Sinopia why not play around with this one? The data doesn't really go anywhere so maybe you could practice here.

[Jodi]

I just want to point out one thing. There's a lot of navigating going between Work and Instance so I'm going to get a fresh Monograph out, and one of the traps you can fall into is not like saving your work and going back. So pretend that we've input a bunch of Work details here and now we're going to add the Instance details, and you're going down, and then you're like "oh, I forgot something that belongs on the Work". And so you go up here and see well I'll just go here. This is a new Work, and you can create some very tangled bits of data where you end up having multiple Works that are really describing a single Work because you can keep going back and forth and back and forth and the background gets darker so you're getting more and more [?]

We've talked about trying to switch the navigation so that you really have to be at this page when you're like "Oh, I put some Instance data in and I need to go back to the Work" where you have to Save and then go back but I will cancel.

I considered switching the navigation so that you always start with the Work and you can't keep jumping back and forth but then we're really imposing a workflow on our catalogers that they would have to start in a certain way and so we have...I keep thinking about it though.

So between Work and Instance it's very bi-directional you can go back and forth, back and forth.

Instance to Item is different. So on the Instance page you can go back to the Work, you can go to the Item. When you're on the Item page you don't have the ability to go to the Instance. You have to save or cancel and then go back to the Instance so I guess my word of advice is when in doubt save instead of just clicking a button and building a layered menu.

I think the Sinopia design might alleviate this. Maybe someday we'll change our interface as well to be a little more constrained.

[Paul]

That's a really good point. We discovered in our pilot that developing a workflow and sticking to that really pays off because consistency builds upon itself. You saw two different approaches today with Les, and I got the red light, but anyway, you all decide for yourself if you can come up with a consistent workflow that's the way to go.

[Jodi]

Yes, very much so.

[Paul]

All right, I guess we're done. I hope this was helpful. Give it a try, if you don't want to wait for Sinopia go to the free version of the BIBFRAME Editor that we used today and try it out there.

[Jodi]

The URL is [www.bibframe.org](http://www.bibframe.org)

[Paul]

Yes, it couldn't be easier to remember that. Okay everyone thanks a lot.