Background

In February, 2001, under the auspices of the Joint Standing Committee on Training and Standing Committee on Standards, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Policy Committee initiated the Task Group on Implementation of Integrating Resources. The Task Group was charged to:

1. Develop various scenarios whereby integrating resources are handled by CONSER and/or BIBCO
   1.1. Recommend whether certain types of integrating resources should be handled by CONSER and others by BIBCO libraries;
   1.2. Recommend mechanisms to allow for either BIBCO or CONSER libraries to update records for integrating resources prior to adoption of Leader/07, value "i"
   1.3. Recommend mechanisms to allow for either BIBCO or CONSER libraries to update records for integrating resources following the adoption of Leader/07, value "i"

2. Recommend appropriate types of and places for documentation relating to integrating resources;

3. Recommend ways in which to meet training needs associated with cataloging integrating resources;

4. Consider the maintenance and distribution issues associated with integrating resources (including loose-leafs) and recommend further action.

Members of the Task Group included: Robert Bremer, Valerie Bross (co-chair), Charlene Chou, Ana Cristan (ex-officio), Rebecca Culbertson, Ed Glazier, Jean Hirons (ex-officio), Dajin Sun, Iris Wolley, and John Wright (co-chair).

The Task Group submitted an Interim report April 23, 2001 (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgintegrpt.html), and a final report October 2001. In the Interim report, the Task Group discussed some issues related to the four charges and offered suggestions for discussion. However, most of the time was spent describing and comparing scenarios related to the question of who should create and maintain records for integrating resources.

This constitutes the final report of the Task Group. In preparing for this final report, the Task Group conducted an online survey between July 9-20, 2001 with questions related to the charge. Appendix B summarizes the survey results. After the survey results were distributed, the Task Group split into sub-groups to consider three critical issues: (1) training and documentation; (2) maintenance of records; and (3) distribution/redistribution of records. The subgroup members used as resource information the survey results. They also used Jean Hirons' "Current Distinctions between CONSER and BIBCO Program Records" (Appendix C); and the "PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation: Final Report" (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgdocnfinal.html).

Organization of Final Report

This final report is divided into four segments:
I.   Definitions
II.   Recommendations
III.   Discussion
         A.   Training and documentation for catalogers
         B.   Maintenance of integrating resources records
         C.   Distribution/Redistribution of integration resources records
IV.   Appendices
         A.   Complete List of Recommendations and Location in Report
         B.   Survey
         C.   "Current Distinctions between CONSER and BIBCO Program Records"

I.   **Definitions**

         An integrating resource is: A bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates
         that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. Examples of integrating resources
         include updating loose-leafs and updating Web sites.

         A CONSER authenticated integrating resource record is a record which contains an appropriate 042
         code and an 010 field (LCCN) and which is distributed.

         A BIBCO authenticated IR record is a record which contains an appropriate 042 code, but which may
         or may not contain an 010 field . A BIBCO integrating resource record which contains an 010 field is
         distributed.

II.   **Recommendations**

         Below is a general summary of Task Group recommendations. The Task Group recognizes the need
         for several task groups to address both short-term and long-term concerns related to records for
         integrating resources (IR). As described below, the Task Group has identified four such groups:
         1.   PCC SCT group to develop and maintain IR documentation;
         2.   PCC SCT group (in collaboration with other groups and organizations) to organize training for
              cataloging IRs;
         3.   PCC-sponsored individual or group to investigate better strategies for creation and sharing of
              records for web-based resources;
         4.   CDS individual or group to explore mechanisms for record redistribution outside LC's ILS.

         The summary is provided at this point in order to give an overview of the perspective of the Task
         Group; explicit and detailed recommendations follow in Section III. For a complete list of
         recommendations, please consult Appendix A.

     1. *Develop various scenarios whereby integrating resources are handled by CONSER and/or BIBCO.*
             1.1. Recommend whether certain types of integrating resources should be handled by CONSER
                  and others by BIBCO libraries;

             **The Task Group recommends that PCC encourage both CONSER and BIBCO libraries to
             catalog and maintain records for integrating resources regardless of the type of resource.**

             **[NOTE: For further discussion of this recommendation, please see the Task Group interim
             report,** http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgintegrpt.html **]**

1.2. Recommend mechanisms to allow for either BIBCO or CONSER libraries to update records for integrating resources prior to adoption of Leader/07, value "i";

Until such time as code "i" is implemented, records for integrating resources should continue to be coded as bibliographic level "m." Task Group recommends that PCC support early adoption of Leader/07 value "i" (rather than adopting some interim measure).

1.3. Recommend mechanisms to allow for either BIBCO or CONSER libraries to update records for integrating resources following the adoption of Leader/07, value "i"

[See point 4 below]

2. *Recommend appropriate types of and places for documentation relating to integrating resources*

The Task Group recommends that the PCC Policy Committee support dissemination of documentation by BIBCO & CONSER for cataloging integrating resources.

2.1. The Task Group recommends that PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation, in consultation with CPSO, delegate a person or group to write documentation or endorse existing documentation.

Detailed outlines are provided below to guide these efforts.

3. *Recommend ways in which to meet training needs associated with cataloging integrating resources;*

3.1. The Task Group further recommends that the PCC SCT Task Group assign a group to develop training modules for PCC participants.

4. *Consider the maintenance and distribution issues associated with integrating resources (including loose-leafs) and recommend further action.*

Authentication:
4.1. The Task Group recommends that CONSER libraries (and BIBCO libraries that wish to do so) be authorized to authenticate records for integrating resources via the 042 field.
4.2. **The Task Group recommends that two new 042 field codes for integrating resources be established for integrating resources, one for LC monograph catalogers; the other for all other catalogers with privileges to authenticate or maintain records for integrating resources. NOTE: BIBCO libraries may authenticate records that are not distributed. Only those integrating resource records that have an 010 in addition to the 042 will be authenticated and distributed.**

Maintenance:
4.3. The Task Group recommends that all OCLC and RLIN members be encouraged to maintain records for integrating resources.
4.4. OCLC: The Task Group recommends that CONSER, BIBCO, and OCLC Enhance members be authorized to maintain integrating resources records (i.e., records with 042 codes, including distributed records.

Distribution/Redistribution:
(1) Records created after implementation of AACR2R, Revised Chapter 12 and adoption of Leader/07 (Bibliographic Level) "i"
    4.5. Short-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC adopt Scenario II (see report below) to: "Adopt a system of distribution that would expand the CONSER database to include all authenticated records for integrating resources."

4.6. Long-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC commission a separate person or group to consider a better long-term strategy for creation and sharing of records for Web-based resources.

4.7. Long-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC discuss distribution of all BIBCO integrating resource records along with the broader topic of BIBCO record distribution and sharing

(2) Legacy records

4.8. The Task Group recommends that PCC support fast-track implementation of Leader/07 (Bibliographic Level) "i" to minimize the number of legacy records.

4.9. CDS should explore mechanisms for changing records from one distribution product to others that are separate from the record status in LC's ILS so that OCLC can make global changes and so that catalogers can make individual record changes of the bibliographic level code (Leader/07)

III. **Discussion**

As the Task Group discussed the charges, three areas of concern emerged. First, what documentation and training will be needed to support both PCC members and those looking to PCC for leadership? Second, recognizing that integrating resources, like serials, change over time, what strategies could be proposed to optimize the pool of catalogers able to modify IR records, while ensuring the quality of authenticated records? Third, what models for record distribution/redistribution would best serve the goals of the program?

Below is a discussion of each of these three areas.

Part 1, **Training and Documentation**
Subgroup:John Wright (coordinator), Iris Wolley, and Dajin Sun

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Group concurs with the Final Report of the PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation that "**for optimal functionality we need to be able to provide flexibility**." With that in mind, it is important to incorporate thoroughly the principles of the Final report and its Appendix into any program to provide documentation and training in support of cataloging integrated resources. The Task Group has, therefore, limited recommendations to specific documentation and training needs of integrated resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOCUMENTATION

The Task Group recommends that the PCC Policy Committee support dissemination of documentation by BIBCO & CONSER to support the cataloging of integrated resources. The Task Group further recommends that PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation delegate a person or group to write documentation. This documentation should include the following:

A. Format
    The Task Group recommends a single document, with separate sections for each type of integrated (print and non-print) resource.
    1. Each section would have modules addressing the material and corresponding descriptive rules.
    2. The modules would be numbered similar to the numbering layout in the CONSER Manual or BIBCO Manual.
    3. Each module in each section would have its own table of contents and glossary of terms; full record examples as well as brief examples that support individual topics; and references to AACR2, LCRIs and any other accepted source for description and access.

    An online version would mirror the print version with hot links to other resources.

B. Content
    Issues to be addressed in creating the content:
    1. Process of identifying the material
        a. Nature of the material
        b. What common aspects integrating resources share
        c. Descriptive aspects of integrating resources that differ from monographs
        d. Descriptive aspects of integrating resources that differ from serials

    2. Cataloging

        a. Levels of cataloging for CONSER and for BIBCO; and descriptive elements that are mandatory for each level.

        b. Creating a record for an integrating resource:
        Chief sources of information; Main and added entries (including the use of uniform title); Descriptive elements that may be given depending on the individual integrating resource (e.g., transcribing information about updates); Multi-volume publications/series; Accompanying material; Treatment of e-resources available through multiple suppliers; Component part cataloging; Use of 856 field.

        c. Record maintenance (in conjunction also with the new Appendix on Major/minor changes) Replacement title pages; Change of and variations of title; Edition and history notes; Contents notes; URI maintenance (for e-resources); When to close an existing record/create a new record.

        d. Differences in updates to integrating resources
- Partial updates
- Complete updates

C. Groups to consult in developing documentation
Groups that could be consulted in developing documentation might include:
1. BIBCO/CONSER members
2. Law librarians (many law materials are loose-leaf for updating)
3. Groups within ALA that discuss computer files and e-resources
4. Online Audio-Visual Catalogers (OLAC)

D. Methods of dissemination
While the majority of respondents to the survey (92.7%) prefer documentation to be made available free on the web, the Task Group believes PCC should support as many methods/types of documentation as possible (or as economically feasible). Multiple methods of dissemination would ensure that, regardless of size and budget, all libraries/institutions could have documentation available to them. Please consider strengths and weaknesses of each method of dissemination as outlined in the Final Report of the PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation, Appendix: Summary Functional Evaluation of Documentation Delivery Mechanisms (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgdocnappdx.html).

1. The documentation should be created and maintained by a joint BIBCO/CONSER endeavor guided overall by PCC.
2. Print documentation in loose-leaf format for updating
3. Web-based documentation
- PDF files—they could be downloaded and printed
- HTML documents
- Powerpoint presentation to introduce catalogers to aspects of integrating resources cataloging
4. Traditional printed and published documentation
5. Via Cataloger's Desktop (this would make linking to other sources of description and access easier)

E. Copyright issues for both printed and online documentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRAINING

The Task Group recommends that the PCC Policy Committee support the development of training tools for the cataloging of integrated resources. The Task Group further recommends that PCC SCT Task Group

on PCC Participant and Training Documentation delegate a group to organize training efforts. Those developing training tools should consider the following:

A. Groups for funding training: The Task Group recommends that co-sponsors be sought to support training efforts:
   1. OCLC
   2. LC
   3. ALA
   4. Law Library Association
   5. OLAC

B. Methods for training
   The Task Group recommends that, just as with the types of documentation, the various training methods of training be available. This will ensure that libraries interested in the training are not put-off because they cannot attend national workshops or afford to have a trainer come to their library/institution.
   1. Local in-house workshops
      a. Provided by a "national trainer" (i.e., a trainer certified through an SCCTP-like program)
      b. Provided by a person in-house who has attended a regional workshop (similar to NACO)
   2. Regional workshops
      a. Attended by any interested library staff or by key staff in a library/institution
      b. Conducted by a "national trainer"
   3. On-line tutorials with training scripts
      a. Based on and linked to the documentation
      b. Must have FAQs and email addresses or an online list available for questions and answers
   4. Conference workshops
      a. Conducted by national trainers
      b. ALA conferences
      c. OLAC conferences
      d. According to the survey, this was the least desired (50.21%) because smaller libraries cannot send staff to the national conferences. While this position is understandable, conference workshops would be a good place to conduct continuing training for integrating resources. This would be similar to the SACO and NACO workshops held at ALA and the cataloging workshops given at OLAC. It might also be worthwhile to promote the workshop to local state library associations for inclusion as a program feature, or pre-conference addition to their annual conferences.

C. Training topics
   While there may be many levels of experience in the workshop, training should focus on topics unique to integrating resources. (This is not true for the documentation, however; the documentation should be all encompassing in its scope—very similar to the CONSER manual.)
   1. Method
      • Each format of integrating resource should be addressed separately. For example, first the print format and then the e-resource format.
   2. Topics
      a. Nature of integrating resources
      b. When to create a new record (e.g. for e-resources: multiple suppliers)
      c. What is the appropriate bibliographic level (item, component part, collection)
      d. Chief sources of information
      e. Main and added entries
      f. Sources of title
      g. Title issues
         • Replacement titles differ from earlier title(s)
         • Items without a collective title
      h. Extent
         • Transfer volumes

- Services published in sections
- Expanded/split volumes
i. Series
    - Multiple
    - Numbering
h. Linking fields
i. Notes relating to:
    - Variant titles
    - Editions
    - Choice of entry changes
    - Accompanying material
    - Currency of information

Part 2, **Maintenance**
Subgroup: Ana Cristan (coordinator), Becky Culbertson, Charlene Chou

Assumptions:
All OCLC members and all RLIN members will create and maintain as needed bibliographic records for integrating resources. A subset of these records will be cataloged within the CONSER and/or BIBCO program structure and would continue to be identified as such via the 042 field and, in certain cases, the the 010 field (all CONSER records, and possibly some BIBCO records).

Recommendations:
These recommendations will apply only to OCLC members. The Task Group recommends that PCC support a mechanism by which OCLC would:

1. Establish two new 042 field codes for integrating resources, one for LC monograph catalogers; the other for all other catalogers with privileges to authenticate or maintain records for integrating resources.
   NOTE: BIBCO libraries may authenticate records that are not distributed. Only those integrating resource records that have an 010 in addition to the 042 will be authenticated and distributed.

   For example,
   "042   pccLCIR" could be used by LC monograph catalogers and
   "042   pccIR" by all others.
   (These codes are just meant to be illustrative; PCC may prefer other codes to be used)

2. Authorize both CONSER and BIBCO members to catalog and maintain all integrating resources Bibliographic Level "i" records at the National Enhance level as per the current CONSER and BIBCO program structure.

3. Further, allow BIBCO members to maintain (i.e., enhance, update) integrating resources records without regard to whether or not the maintaining institution holds (i.e., "owns") the item.
   Comment: Currently, BIBCO libraries in OCLC may not update or enhance a bibliographic record not held (owned) by that library.

4. Authorize OCLC Enhance members (non CONSER/non BIBCO) to maintain all authenticated integrating resources records (i.e., records with 042 field codes, including distributed records).

5. Encourage duplicate record reporting, especially where multiple OCLC records have been entered for a title change within a manifestation.

This strategy would allow BIBCO and/or CONSER catalogers currently cataloging integrating resources to continue to do so, with no change to the current workflow and with the increased capability for providing maintenance for related items as well as allowing regular Enhance member to participate in the maintenance activity.

In cases where BIBCO integrating resources have related CONSER serial counterparts, serial bibliographic records may need maintenance at the same time as the records for the integrating resource. These complex arrangements are left to each individual institution to work out within it serials/monographic units.

For the long term: The Task Group recommends that PCC work with BIBCO/CONSER libraries for better monitoring of certain resources (e.g., high-profile resources) and other issues which would need to evolve as the number of integrating resources increase and the procedures and technologies for cataloging them

evolve. Revisit the procedures and initiate use of creative and cost effective mechanisms to aid in notification of need for maintenance.

Part 3, **Distribution of records for integrating resources**

Subgroup: Jean Hirons and task force members Robert Bremer and Ed Glazier.
Assistance from LC staff: Ana Cristan, Jim Kimball, John Levy, Dave Reser, and Regina Reynolds

1. **Assumptions**

- LC will distribute any integrating resource (IR) record that it creates or updates in its ILS
    The LC Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) distribution will continue to be based on record type (leader/06) and bibliographic level (leader/07) values for the separate distribution services, e.g., [note: MARC Distribution Service=MDS] MDS-Books, MDS-Maps, etc.)

- It will be necessary to distribute IR records to which ISSNs are assigned to the ISSN Center in Paris
    This will be true regardless of where the records originate; currently the ISSN Center receives a subset of the CONSER file

- LC does not currently distribute non-LC BIBCO records (except for BIBCO libraries that work within LC's system) and this practice will continue pending a policy change
    While distribution of IR records is just as important as distribution of other BIBCO records, this cannot be accomplished within the scope of IR records alone. The issue of BIBCO distribution must be reviewed as a separate but related issue. The scenarios and recommendations in this report do not include the larger issue of distribution of BIBCO records

- Record type and bibliographic level changes that would result in a resource being distributed in a different CDS product will continue to necessitate a delete/add transaction to accommodate the existing separate CDS distribution product streams.
    This is extremely problematic within Voyager.

- LC records for integrating resources in JACKPHY languages, created on RLIN, are not included in this proposal at present and need to be given further consideration.

2. **Background and challenges of distribution**

Current Distribution of LC and PCC records

The Library of Congress currently provides a separate MARC Distribution Service (MDS) for each of the following types of materials: books, computer files (limited to record type Am@ records), maps, mixed materials (manuscript collection records), music, serials (regardless of record type code), and visual materials. Monographic book records in JACKPHY languages are in a separate service. The serials file contains all LC and CONSER member serial records. Other files are, for the most part, limited to the cataloging of the Library of Congress or a few PCC libraries that work within LC's ILS.

It has long been a desire of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging to share records. This was always a central goal of CONSER, whose database is distributed by CDS. In the past, CONSER records were also made available in microfiche from the National Library of Canada, in CD-ROM and in book form (New Serial Titles) from CDS. Currently, CONSER records are distributed only via subscription to an ftp distribution service. One of the reasons that CONSER records can be distributed in this way is that they are all created and updated on the same database (OCLC), then sent to LC, from where they are distributed. The Library of Congress distributes its own monograph and collection level records (including the records of one BIBCO member working directly in LC=s ILS). Most BIBCO records, however, are not distributed by CDS unless LC imports the record for its own catalog, nor are the records shared directly between RLIN and OCLC. BIBCO records may be created in local catalogs and sent to RLIN and/or

OCLC, or they may be created directly on OCLC or RLIN. LC=s monograph records are created on the LC ILS, in RLIN (monographic JACKPHY records), or in other complementary LC systems (e.g., the Integrated Field Office System) and distributed to OCLC and RLIN as well as other CDS MDS subscribers.

Distribution of Records for Integrating Resources?

Records for integrating resources created by LC are currently coded as monographs and thus follow the same distribution patterns as all other monographs. With the revision of AACR2 Chapter 12, integrating resources will be defined as a subset of continuing resources; serials are another subset. Integrating resource records will no longer be considered monographs and once the approved MARC 21 changes have been implemented, they will be distinctly coded as integrating resources. The grouping together of serials and integrating resources in the cataloging rules recognizes that integrating resources, like serials, exhibit seriality, i.e, that changes in the resource will take place, necessitating changes to the records. It does not mean that different people (i.e., serials catalogers) will create the records, however, only that they will change over time. Ideally, records for integrating resources should be shared through some form of distribution.

If retained in the current distribution streams, records created by the Library of Congress for integrating resources will be distributed based on their record type value (e.g., books (textual materials), cartographic, etc.). If added to the current serials distribution, records for integrating resources will be distributed based on their bibliographic level value, which reflects their form of issuance. These two possibilities form the basis of the scenarios outlined below.

Complications of changing type and bibliographic level codes

Because records are distributed according to their leader type and/or bibliographic level codes, changes in the coding are very problematic for LC and CDS. In order to avoid duplicate records and record rejection under existing CDS checks when the record type or bibliographic level is changed within a record, it is necessary to issue a delete for the former bib level/type via the original MDS and issue a new version via the new MDS. The problem in Voyager, and presumably most other integrated systems, is that you *can't* delete a record without dealing with other system dependencies (e.g., a charge history in circulation, a purchase order, a serial check-in component/history). Thus, the only method of generating a delete from outside LC (e.g., from OCLC) is to manually notify the responsible LC division (e.g., Serial Record Division) for them to issue a delete within LC's ILS. Even then, it will be very difficult at best to delete many of the records.

The recent change of computer file records from type code 'm' to code 'a' was an example of such a change from one MDS service to another and problems still exist at LC as a result of this change. With integrating resources there are two situations that will be problematic. One is the body of legacy records that are coded 'm' that ideally should be changed to 'i.' The second would be a resource that changed its issuance over time, say from a serial to an integrating resource.

BIBCO

The following scenarios and recommendations exclude the distribution of records from BIBCO OCLC members (but see below) and all BIBCO RLIN members. The issue of distribution of BIBCO records is a much larger issue that involves all BIBCO contributions, and the distribution of integrating resources should be included in that discussion. Two major differences between CONSER and BIBCO that impact on distribution are: 1) BIBCO members can contribute from local systems as well as contribute records directly via OCLC or RLIN, and 2) BIBCO members do not assign LCCNs in records (needed for LC distribution).

It would be possible, however, for an OCLC BIBCO library to create records for integrating resources on OCLC, add the appropriate authentication codes, and assign LCCNs in order to ensure distribution of records. This would be easiest for BIBCO institutions that are also CONSER members as the same block

of LCCNs could be used. A key factor to remember is that, regardless of whether it is a CONSER or a BIBCO cataloger who is creating the record, the same rules and coding will be applied.

RLIN

The problems associated with RLIN are different in that there is no master record concept and thus, the distribution in a CDS MDS product of a single record that would be updated over time would seem to be unfeasible.

3. **Scenarios for the distribution of integrating resource records**

    Scenario I: Distribution of integrating resource records in multiple MDS services

    Highlights

    - Expand the CONSER distribution service to include authenticated1 records for serials and integrating resources created by LC serial and CONSER/BIBCO catalogers and NSDP
       - CONSER/BIBCO catalogers would use a newly-defined authentication code that would be less restrictive2
       - LC monograph catalogers would use code 'pcc' or a variation of a newly-defined code
    - Continue to distribute IR records created by LC monograph catalogers with the books, maps, etc. distribution services
    - Do not include BIBCO records with 042 authentication codes but lacking an 010 field.

    Discussion

    This scenario assumes the closest thing to the status quo and would allow catalogers at LC to continue working in the database that they currently use. The only change would be to expand the CONSER database to be able to include records for integrating resources (leader/07=code i) and definition of a new authentication code.

    While this might be easiest on LC catalogers, it would not be very desirable for CDS subscribers or database managers. Duplicate records would be a problem as there would be no assurance that the same title hadn't been distributed in different services. If LC found a way to decide who cataloged what integrating resources, this would cut down on the duplication. However, NSDP will have to assign ISSN to a broad array of integrating resources if the publishers request them so there is no guarantee that any such breakdown of cataloging would work.

    Pros and Cons of Scenario I

    Pros

    - Easiest to implement
    - Least impact on catalogers
    - Maintains current distribution patterns
    - Allows for expanded 042 authentication codes and distribution of IR records (e.g., CONSER catalogers could create and update IR records)

    Cons

    - IR records would be distributed in multiple services
       - Customers would have to subscribe to multiple services to get all IR records

---

1 Authenticated records are those containing an LCCN and an appropriate 042 code.
2 A newly-defined code could enable updating by any PCC or OCLC Enhance library.

- No guarantee what service a particular IR record might be found in
- Duplicate records (with different LCCNs) would be likely in LC's ILS and MDS services
  - Would increase the number of records having to be deleted and re-added to different services
- Updates to LC records on OCLC wouldn't result in updates to the records in LC's database

Scenario II Expand the CONSER database to Include ALL Authenticated Records (with appropriate 042 fields and 010 fields) for Integrating Resources

Highlights
- Expand CONSER database to include all authenticated records with appropriate 042 fields and 010 fields for integrating resources (change MDS Serials to MDS Continuing Resources); distribute all IR records here
- The CDS distribution database would in effect become the master database through which all records would be processed
- Include records from CONSER libraries (including LC Serial Record Division and NSDP) and LC catalogers creating records on Voyager
  - CONSER and BIBCO catalogers would use a newly-defined 042 authentication code (potentially some OCLC BIBCO catalogers would assign 010s to allow distribution).
  - LC monograph catalogers would use code 'pcc' or a variation of the new code that identified the records as originating in the LC ILS.
    - Use of different 042 codes would be key to OCLC's ability to identify records to be loaded
- Do not include authenticated BIBCO records that ~~do not include~~ lack an 010 field.

Discussion

Scenario II would combine the records created by CONSER and those created by LC's monograph catalogers into a single distribution service, an expanded CONSER or "Continuing Resources" file. CDS would maintain the master file of CR records. Under this scenario, LC monograph catalogers would create original records in the LC ILS and their records would be distributed to OCLC and RLIN via the Continuing Resources distribution service. OCLC would need to subscribe to MDS-Continuing Resources and identify the records created by LC non-serial catalogers in order to load them to OCLC. CONSER and BIBCO catalogers would create and authenticate records on OCLC. All CONSER integrating resource records could include an 010 field and be distributed; potentially, some BIBCO catalogers could assign 010s to also allow distribution of their integrating resource records.

A complication with this scenario is that there would be no way for LC's records created on its ILS to be updated when the record on OCLC is updated3. One solution would be for the CONSER library to notify LC so that the appropriate LC ILS match points can be added to the CONSER record, thus allowing the updated record to replace the old record. This would create an added burden for LC's Serial Record Division. It should be noted that if the ability to maintain records is broadened to include any PCC or OCLC Enhance library (as is desirable), the likelihood of receiving all such notifications diminishes.

Pros and Cons of Scenario II

Pros

- All authenticated IR records (i.e., records with the appropriate 042 and 010 fields) would be distributed together
- IR and serial records would be distributed together as "continuing resources"
- Duplicate records and the necessity to add/delete records would be greatly minimized
  - Easier to identify duplicates within a single service

---

3 There is no mechanism currently for updating monograph records; however, the potential for major changes to the record (e.g., the title) for integrating resources would make such updating highly desirable.

- Serials changing to integrating resources (or vice versa) would not be as much of a problem because they would be distributed together
- Better model for subscribers; RLIN would receive records in a single distribution
- Potential beginning for a broader model that could eventually include more BIBCO contributions

Cons

- OCLC would need to subscribe to MDS-Continuing Resources and isolate certain records to load (i.e., LC non-CONSER records)
  - Use of a different 042 code by LC monograph catalogers would be one distinguishing feature from records created by serials catalogers, given that most other coding will be the same
- CDS would need to make minor changes to its distribution selection criteria
- In order to assure update of LC's ILS, CONSER (and potentially any PCC or OCLC Enhance) libraries would have to report to LC when they made modifications to a record that originated in LC's system.
- Serial Record Division would have to do increased maintenance (some could be caught up front)
- LC non-serial catalogers couldn't make changes to an LC record once it had CONSER authorization
- MDS products based on record type (e.g., cartographic) would no longer include all non-serial records of that type.

Two other scenarios were briefly discussed by LC staff but rejected. One would be to restrict distribution solely to NSDP records and LC records created in the LCILS. While this might be less restrictive for record maintenance, it seemed to have little advantage for the purpose of record sharing. The second scenario suggested was to fold the issue of IR record distribution into the issue of BIBCO record sharing and the possibility of a master file at LC. This has yet to be explored and it is not clear how this would enable the distribution of records for integrating resources.

4.   OCLC concerns

OCLC would not be able to control use of the 042 code since more than one code would be valid for code 'i' (i.e., if a CONSER library used the LC code by mistake there would be no way for OCLC to catch this).

A more important concern for OCLC will be the possibility of LC records duplicating authenticated records on OCLC. The question will be whether LC's records should replace the OCLC record, which could be more complete. Currently LC records replace existing records and OCLC users expect to see all LC records on OCLC. However, an authenticated record on OCLC could be more complete, including earlier titles, etc.

5.   Legacy records

As noted above, legacy IR records pose a serious problem. Most of these are currently coded with bibliographic level 'm and have been distributed via MDS books. Going back to change all of these records will be difficult and time-consuming and will not be possible if associated data, such as purchase orders, is not removed from the records. Not deleting the records, however, would result in duplicates in LC's ILS if OCLC or a cataloger subsequently changes the bibliographic level code on the record.

OCLC will, no doubt, want to change as many records as possible, or at least allow its users to change the records (as they can now do for computer file records). Otherwise, records for integrating resources, such as loose-leafs, would have to be maintained with out-dated coding for years to come. There is no advantage to the average user of OCLC to not changing such coding.

6.   Recommendations:

- Adopt Scenario II as a short term solution to the distribution of integrating resource records.

- Discuss the distribution of all BIBCO integrating resource records along with the broader topic of BIBCO record distribution and sharing
- Give careful consideration to the issue of legacy records. The recommendation to adopt scenario II does not apply to existing records. Implement code 'i' as soon as possible to minimize the growing number of records with code 'm'.
- PCC should commission a separate person or group to give further thought to the creation and sharing of records for Web-based resources.

7.   Diagrams

The following diagrams illustrate the current flow of records and the suggested flows for scenarios I and II. The principle difference is the single "continuing resources" distribution service in scenario II. The diagram of the current flow includes only serial records created by LC and CONSER members while the diagrams for scenarios I and II include records created by LC monograph catalogers.

GRAPHICS IN SEPARATE FILE:

1. CURRENT DISTRIBUTION

2. PROPOSAL: SCENARIO I

3. PROPOSAL: SCENARIO II

APPENDIX A: LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND LOCATION IN REPORT

Charge	Recommendations	Location in Report
#1	The Task Group recommends that PCC encourage both CONSER and BIBCO libraries to catalog and maintain records for integrating resources regardless of the type of resource.	II.R.1.1
#1	Task Group recommends that PCC support early adoption of Leader/07 value "i" (rather than adopting some interim measure). Until such time as code "i" is implemented, records for integrating resources should continue to be coded as bibliographic level "m." [See also 7th recommendation under: Charge #4]	II.R.1.2
#2-3	The TG recommends that documentation and training be accomplished with consultation and/or collaboration with other professional groups, e.g.: OLAC, Association of Law Librarians	III.1
#2	Documentation (General): The Task Group recommends that PCC SCT Task Group on PCC Participant and Training Documentation, in consultation with CPSO, delegate a person or group to write documentation or endorse existing documentation.	II.R.2.1
#2	Format of documentation: The Task Group recommends a single document be produced, with separate sections for each type of integrated (print and non-print) resource.	III.1
#2	Content of documentation: The Task Group recommends that the documentation cover: levels of cataloging; record creation issues; and record maintenance issues.	III.1
#2	Dissemination of documentation: The Task Group recommends a variety of formats be used for dissemination, including web-based documentation, print documentation, PowerPoint, and Cataloger's Desktop.	III.1
#3	Training (General): The Task Group further recommends that the PCC SCT Task Group assign a group to develop training modules for PCC participants.	II.R.3.1 III.1
#3	Funding for training: The Task Group recommends approaching professional groups for co-sponsorship of training efforts	III.1
#3	Types of training: The Task Group recommends that a variety of training methods be developed, including workshops and online tutorials.	III.1
#3	Training topics: The Task Group recommends that training focus on those issues unique to integrating resources.	III.1

#4	Maintenance: The Task Group recommends that all OCLC and RLIN members be encouraged to maintain records for integrating resources.	II.R.4.3
#4	Maintenance: The Task Group recommends that PCC establish two new 042 field codes for integrating resources, one for LC monograph catalogers; the other for all other catalogers with privileges to authenticate or maintain records for integrating resources.	II.R.4.2 III.2
#4	Maintenance in OCLC: The Task Group recommends that CONSER, BIBCO, and OCLC Enhance members be authorized to maintain integrating resources records (i.e., records with 042 codes, including distributed records)	II.R.4.4 III.2
#4	Maintenance: The Task Group recommends that PCC allow BIBCO members to maintain (i.e., enhance, update) integrating resources records without regard to whether or not the maintaining institution holds (i.e., "owns") the item.	III.2
#4	Maintenance: For the long term: The Task Group recommends that PCC work with BIBCO/CONSER libraries for better monitoring of certain resources (e.g., high-profile resources) and other issues which would need to evolve as the number of integrating resources increase and the procedures and technologies for cataloging them evolve.	III.2
#4	Distribution: Short-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC adopt Scenario II: "Adopt a system of distribution that would expand the CONSER database to include all authenticated records for integrating resources."	II.R.4.5 III.3
#4	Distribution: Short-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC support fast-track implementation of Leader/07 (Bibliographic Level) "i" to minimize the number of legacy records. [See also 1st recommendation under: Charge #1]	II.R.4.8 III.3
#4	Distribution: Long-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC commission a separate person or group to consider a better long-term strategy for creation and sharing of records for Web-based resources.	II.R.4.6 III.3
#4	Distribution: Long-term: The Task Group recommends that PCC discuss distribution of all BIBCO integrating resource records along with the broader topic of BIBCO record distribution and sharing	II.R.4.7 III.3
#4	Distribution: CDS should explore mechanisms for changing records from one distribution product to others that are separate from the record status in LC's ILS so that OCLC can make global changes and so that catalogers can make individual record changes of the bibliographic level code (Leader/07)	II.R.4.9 III.3

APPENDIX B: SURVEY

Between July 9th and July 20th 2000, the PCC Integrating Resources Task Group conducted a survey to elicit opinions related to integrating resource records. Topics includes: creation and maintenance responsibilities for bibliographic records; training needs for catalogers; and documentation needs.

The Task Group announced the survey through discussion groups such as: PCCLIST, CONSRLST, AUTOCAT, SERIALST, and CORC-L. The survey announcement was also sent to two special library groups-- law librarians, medical librarians--thanks to Rhonda Lawrence and Diane Bohr, respectively.

In all, 253 participants responded to the survey. Interestingly, the survey attracted responses from the international community, including British Columbia Courthouse Library Society, British Library, Cambridge University Library, NanYang University Library, National Library of South Africa. Responses were heavily skewed to OCLC libraries (71.4%); but local systems (38.49%) and RLIN libraries (2.78%) were also represented. About 25% of the respondents represented PCC libraries.

The Task Group has posted the survey and a summary of survey results to:

http://wwwtest.library.ucla.edu/libraries/cataloging/sercat/integres/integres_survey.htm
http://wwwtest.library.ucla.edu/libraries/cataloging/sercat/integres/pccsurvey.htm

APPENDIX C:

CURRENT DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN CONSER AND BIBCO PROGRAM RECORDS

by Jean Hirons

CONSER Records

CONSER records are distinguished from non-CONSER serial records by the following fields:

Leader/17	Encoding level: MARC 21 codes are used (blank, 4, 7, 8)
008/39	Cataloging source code: 'blank' is used by national bibliographic agencies; 'c' is used by other participants.
010	An unprefixed LCCN is assigned to all CONSER records; the LCCN is not replaced when the record is subsequently updated. At the end of each years participants are assigned a block of numbers for the coming year. The use of the LCCN is one of the primary differences between CONSER and BIBCO and is required because CONSER records form a discrete database.
042	Code lc and nlc are used by the Library of Congress and National Library of Canada, respectively; codes lcd, and msc are used by CONSER participants; codes nsdp and issn/c are used by the ISSN centers of the US and Canada, respectively.
	Code lcd means that all headings are authoritative; code msc means that one or more headings may not be authoritative (i.e., the record is coded in the encoding level as a minimal level record)

Fields 010 and 042 are required for the record to become a CONSER "authenticated" record. The authentication, in addition to assuring the quality of the content, also assures that the record will be distributed to LC and out to subscribers of the CONSER database.

CONSER defines three allowable levels: full, core, and minimal. The understanding is that the majority of an institution's records will be created at the core or full level. Separate statistics are not kept for core and full; only for full/core and minimal. CONSER does not require classification at any level because so many serials are not classified in various libraries (e.g., newspapers, periodicals, microforms, etc.).

As noted above, CONSER records are distributed as a distinct database. They are created in OCLC only and updated there as well. This is required in order to assure that updates are always being made to the most up-to-date version of the record. The records are then sent to the Library of Congress's Cataloging Distribution Service where they are sold as part of the MARC Distribution Service. In this way CONSER records are routinely added and updated on RLIN and other large databases. This is the only form in which CONSER records are currently distributed. The publication *New Serial Titles*, which was produced from the CONSER tapes, ceased publication. The current scope of the CONSER database is serials in any format.

A major focus of CONSER is on maintaining records since the program deals with serials. As a matter of fact, maintenance is perhaps the chief raison d'etre for CONSER as only CONSER members can update the records. Separate statistics are kept for maintenance and maintenance earns the same credit in OCLC as new record input.

CONSER produces two major publications: the *CONSER Editing Guide (CEG)* and the *CONSER Cataloging Manual (CCM)*. The CEG includes the policies and procedures of the program and a field-by-field guide to online cataloging of serials. The CCM is an instruction and reference tool that focuses on the rules and

practices that are used for cataloging. Separate chapters are included in part III that cover electronic serials, microforms, newspapers, and legal serials. If it was considered desirable, integrating resources could be accommodated in the CCM with addition of instructions for loose-leafs to the Legal serials module (and renaming it) and a new module on integrating electronic resources.

BIBCO Records

BIBCO records are distinguished from non-BIBCO monograph records by the following fields:

Leader/17   Encoding level: MARC 21 codes are used (blank or 4)

008/39   Cataloging source code: 'blank' is used by national bibliographic agencies; 'c' is used by other participants.

042   BIBCO records have the code "pcc" for Program for Cooperative Cataloging

BIBCO records are authenticated using only field 042, which validates that access points are under authority control at the time of creation or enhancement. BIBCO records are not assigned 010s and there is no distribution aspect to authentication for BIBCO.

BIBCO defines two allowable levels: full and core. Separate statistics are kept for full and core. There are not currently any standards for full BIBCO cataloging; the understanding is that full records will meet the full-level input standards of the bibliographic utility through which a library is contributing records. There are distinct core standards for different types of material, all of which are defined on the BIBCO Web site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html).

BIBCO records are not distributed as a distinct database. Member libraries may contribute their records via OCLC or RLIN, or both. There is no mechanism currently in place for formally sharing BIBCO records among the utilities.

Due to utility constraints (OCLC policy, structure of RLG database) and the sheer volume of non-serial bibliographic records, there is no maintenance requirements for BIBCO participants to parallel the CONSER model. When another BIBCO library has a question or problem with an existing BIBCO record, they may ignore it, report it to the originating library via the BIBCO liaison, or modify the record.

BIBCO documentation has been restricted to Web-based (e.g., the core standards) and training manuals; however, a new BIBCO Participants' Manual is under development. This manual will include policies and practices, but not the field-by-field guidelines of the CEG nor the cataloging instructions of the CCM. BIBCO relies on LCRIs, DCMs, SCMs, AACR2 and existing NACO and SACO documentation for key elements.

In addition, BIBCO participants must rely on the input standards of their bibliographic utility for supplemental or foundational information. OCLC members must also apply OCLC Enhance Training Outline guidelines (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm) and National Enhance guidelines (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm).

Key differences between BIBCO and CONSER

CONSER	BIBCO
one database for input and maintenance; formal redistribution of records	multiple databases for input and maintenance; no formal redistribution
core, full, and minimal standards	core and full standards only

use of pre-assigned 010 by all participants	no 010's for non-national libraries
multiple 042 codes	single 042 code
classification not required	classification (subfield $a only) required for most formats
emphasis on maintenance of bib records	no special emphasis on maintenance of bibs