Document 2

Aggregator Neutral Electronic Monographic Records
Prepared by Becky Culbertson (UCSD) and George Prager (NYU Law)

Background:

Currently, accepted cataloging practice specifies that monographic catalogers create a new record for each aggregator's version of a remote-access monograph. Some records are created deliberately as reproduction editions (through the application of LCRI 1.11A), others are created inadvertently as undetected duplicates through batchload processes, and a third category are created as perfectly correct records for distinct electronic editions. The resulting proliferation of these multiple, separate records for different versions frustrates both catalogers and users, increases the likelihood of duplication, and increases the workload for bringing together works.

Five years ago, the serial cataloging community initiated and implemented an aggregator-neutral cataloging practice record that uses one catalog record to describe "neutrally" the content of a journal. This has been very successful and, parallel records aside, has resulted in a manageable number of serial records for varying formats. In a similar vein, the PCC Policy Committee in November 2007, approved the introduction of provider neutral records for remote access electronic integrating resources.

Proposal:

We propose that the monographic cataloging community follow the serials model and provide an aggregator-neutral record for electronic monographs. This idea has been developed with the OCLC database and catalogers that use the OCLC database in mind. Further exploration is needed to see whether this proposal would be workable for the Library of Congress in their monographic workflows.

The goal is to provide one bibliographic record for all the iterations of an online version of a monograph, whether it has a print counterpart or not. This concept would apply to new electronic titles, as well as to those that have existing multiple records. By allowing the main description to be as "aggregator neutral" as possible we can eliminate the need for record creation and editing, and can simplify the national database.

The automated addition of package names using an aggregator series, a 710 or other 7xx field at the LOCAL level (rather than at the master record level) should be encouraged. It is also not necessary for the URLs for any or all aggregators/publishers to be maintained in the master record, especially if the URLs are institution specific.

Basic Strategy for Choosing Records:

Born digital: Use fullest record—those with contents notes, LC class numbers, and LCSH.
Reproductions: Use record that is closest to the most authoritative print version record for that resource. Every resource that is an electronic reproduction does not necessarily have a title page—this is why it is so important to select the best version record.

Document 2

As with serials, we will rely on OCLC to develop the appropriate techniques to consolidate the records, moving the OCLC numbers of merged records to the 019 field, so duplicates need not be reported.

Basic Strategy for Record Coding:

Only the most important MARC fields are mentioned below. Most of the instructions apply equally to both born digital and reproduction resources.   Only when the instructions are different, is the fact of whether it is born digital or a reproduction included.

1. Leader/07=s
2. 008/07-14 Born digital: use date of electronic edition. Reproductions: Use date as found on original source
3. 020 field. Use for electronic ISBN (with any appropriate qualifier).
4. 050/090 field. Use of the LC classification portion is encouraged.
5. 245 field. Use GMD of $h [electronic resource]
6. 246 field.
    a. Use for titles that appear on various manifestations. Example: 246 1 $i Some versions have title: $a …   It is considered helpful to use varying titles, even if you don't own the aggregator's resource that has that particular title
    b. Another option would be to consistently use 246 13 (Other titles) for titles appearing on other aggregator's versions.
7. 260 field. Born digital: the primary publisher of the content—not the aggregator, should be used in the 260. Reproduction: if the resource is either a scanned reproduction or an edition that is similar enough that it could serve as a surrogate for the original (e.g., HTML), then the publisher that appears on the source version record should be used.
8. 300 field. Born digital: Use " 1 electronic text" (pagination if easily available). Reproductions: Use field as it stands in the original. Another less generic option would be to use [pagination] : $b digital, PDF file
9. 4XX/8XX field. Born digital: Use as description/access point if appears on the piece. Reproductions: Use field(s) only if it is part of the original source edition. Aggregator series should not be recorded in the master record.
10. 500 field for source of description. Born digital: Use Title from … note. See Source of Title Note for Internet Resources at: http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/cts/olac/capc/stnir.html Reproductions: Use "Description based on print version record."
11. 506 field. Do not use unless restrictions apply to all versions and formats of the resource. If needed, notes on restricted access may be added LOCALLY. Many libraries prefer to use their own wording on restrictions in the 856 $z.
12. 516 field. Not used.
13. 530 field. Born digital: Not applicable; Reproduction: Use of subfield i in 776 field is preferred over the 530 field.
14. 533 field. Not used.
15. 538 field. Provide a mode of access note only for access methods than the World Wide Web.
16. 6XX fields. Use of LCSH and appropriate genre headings is encouraged.

Document 2

17. 7XX fields. Use only as related to content. Do not use a 710/730 for package names.
18. 776 field. Born digital: usually not applicable. Reproductions: Use to link to other formats. It is recommended to use the "Insert from cited record" command in OCLC Connexion to bring in the citation. This is lieu of $c Original.
19. 856 40 field. Use only the $u and only for URLs that are universal.

Questions:

1. Would this aggregator-neutral approach be sustainable? What about the many records that are batch loaded into OCLC? Could merging ebook records be built into OCLC's duplicate detection process, and would that further slow that process down?
2. If this proposal is accepted, how would it be announced? Should there be an LCRI? An OCLC Technical Bulletin? How would the cataloging community at large be educated about this?
3. How would a retrospective cleanup project be planned and implemented? On what kind of a timetable? With what OCLC staffing?
4. Would aggregator-neutral records be sufficiently useable to technical services departments? Unless the URLs were removed, there might be the possibility of non-working URLs in the records (for resources licensed by their institution). Would this mandate too much "local tweaking" to remove those URLs?
5. Cataloging specific question 1: For reproductions, if the cornerstone note field: " 500 Description based on print version record" (up to now a serial concept) is accepted by monographic catalogers, could we dispense with the now required Source of title note?
6. Cataloging specific question 2: How to handle cataloging of editions that are simultaneously issued in print and online? Possible—1) if a usable print record does not exist, catalog the resource as an electronic edition; 2) if a usable print record does exist, either derive from that record and use the 500 DBO note OR catalog as an electronic text . This could be the cataloger's choice—but do we need a "If this, do this … if that, do that" mechanism?
7. Cataloging specific question 3: How to handle publications that are issued first electronically and then later issued in print? Catalog as electronic texts?
8. Is the aggregator-neutral approach workable for the library community? In an environment where libraries like to be able to move whole packages of records in (and out) of their catalogs, what effect would there be of having the same one record "house" the URLs for NetLibrary, Ebrary, National Academies Press, etc. Or, looking at it from another perspective, would the library prefer to have duplicate records—one record per URL/package used by the library?
9. Is the aggregator-neutral approach workable for the aggregator community? Would the consolidated aggregator-neutral records need to be "redistributed" to the aggregators, to use in their services? Would their maintenance activities be done in or contributed to OCLC?

Document 2

OCLC 83262296 No holdings in CUS - 3 other holdings
Save File 110   Expires in 14 days

Rec stat n		Entered 20031105		Replaced 20070213	
Type a	ELvl I	Srce d	Audn	Ctrl	Lang eng
BLvl m	Form s	Conf 0	Biog	MRec	Ctry vau
	Cont	GPub	LitF d	Indx 0	
Desc a	Ills	Fest 0	DtSt s	Dates 2003 ,	

006	m	d
007	c ǂb r	
040	REB ǂc REB	
050 1 4	PS3552.A7367	
090	ǂb	
049	CUSL	
100 1	Barroga, Jeannie.	
245 1 4	The deli incident ǂh [electronic resource] / ǂc Jeannie Barroga.	
260	Alexandria, Va. : ǂb Alexander Street Press, ǂc 2003.	
300	1 electronic text (38 p.)	
538	Mode of access: World Wide Web. OPTIONAL??	
500	Title from table of contents page (Publisher's web site, viewed April 15, 2008).	
655 0	American drama ǂx Women authors.	
655 0	American drama ǂx Filipino American authors.	
856 4 0	ǂu http://www.aspresolver.com/aspresolver.asp?WODR;PL007866	
856 4 0	ǂu http://www.aspresolver.com/aspresolver.asp?AADR;PL007866	

Delete Holdings- Export- Label- Produce- Submit- Replace- Report Error- Update Holdings- Validate-C
Source-OCLC   Workflow-In Process

LIBRARY HOME   NEW SEARCH   ILLIAD   FORDHAM CAT   WORLDCAT   HELP   *MY* FULLPAC

New Search | Faculty Request | Save Records | MARC Display

RECORD # ▼   b319789   Search

☐ *Limit search to available items*

Location	INTERNET
Call Number	TEST RECORD
Author	**Shelford, Leonard, 1795-1864**
Title	**A practical treatise on the law concerning lunatics, idiots, and persons of unsound mind [electronic resource] : with an appendix of the statutes of England, Ireland, and Scotland, relating to such persons and precedents and bills of costs / by Leonard Shelford**

Click to View:
HeinOnline
Making of Modern Law

Imprint	Philadelphia : J.S. Littell, 1833
Subject	**Insanity (Law) -- Great Britain**
	Forms (Law) -- Great Britain
	Costs (Law) -- Great Britain
Series	**The law library ; v. 2**
Description	lix, 632 p. ; 23 cm
Note	Description based on print version record
	Includes bibliographical references and index
Alternate Title	Law concerning lunatics, idiots, and persons of unsound mind

Fordham Law   140 W 62 St. New York, NY 10023   (212) 636-6900   **Fordham University**

Document 2

Fordham Law
Lincoln Center | New York City

The Leo T. Kissam Memorial Library
FULLPAC

LIBRARY HOME   NEW SEARCH   ILLIAD   FORDHAM CAT   WORLDCAT   HELP   *MY* FULLPAC

New Search   Save Records   Regular Display

```
LEADER 00000cam  2200337Ia 4500
006     m
007     cr
008     080421s1833    pau      sb    001 0 eng d
040     ZYF|cZYF
043     e-uk---
099     TEST RECORD
100 1   Shelford, Leonard,|d1795-1864
245 12  A practical treatise on the law concerning lunatics,
        idiots, and persons of unsound mind|h[electronic resource]
        :|bwith an appendix of the statutes of England, Ireland,
        and Scotland, relating to such persons and precedents and
        bills of costs /|cby Leonard Shelford
246 30  Law concerning lunatics, idiots, and persons of unsound
        mind
260     Philadelphia :|bJ.S. Littell,|c1833
300     lix, 632 p. ;|c23 cm
440  4  The law library ;|vv. 2
500     Description based on print version record
504     Includes bibliographical references and index
650  0  Insanity (Law)|zGreat Britain
650  0  Forms (Law)|zGreat Britain
650  0  Costs (Law)|zGreat Britain
776 1   Shelford, Leonard, 1795-1864.|tPractical treatise on the
        law concerning lunatics, idiots, and persons of unsound
        mind.|dPhiladelphia, J. S. Littell, 1833|w(DLC)   40020084
        |w(OCoLC)1909801
856 40  |zHeinOnline|uhttp://www.heinonline.org/HOL/
        Index?index=beal/lunaid&collection=beal
856 40  |zMaking of Modern Law|uhttp://0-
        galenet.galegroup.com.lawpac.lawnet.fordham.edu/servlet/
        MOML?af=RN&ae=F106089504&srchtp=a&ste=14&
        locID=nysl%5Fme%5Ffordham
```