

CATALOGING DIRECTORATE STRATEGIC PLAN
Goal IV, Initiatives 1 and 3, relating to
Bibliographic Control of Digital Content
Work Group 4: Workflow Analysis

Contents:

Summary.....	2
Charge.....	3
Work Group members.....	3
Scope and assumptions.....	4
Basic recommendations.....	5
JACKPHY resources.....	7
Maintenance.....	9
Intrateam workflow and statistical reporting.....	14
TrackER.....	16
Implementation and interim workflow.....	20
Tools.....	21
Management and organizational recommendations.....	22
Action items.....	24
Concerns for future consideration.....	26
Appendices	
Workflow 1: New resources originating with Recommending Officers...	28
Workflow 2: New resources originating in Acquisitions.....	36
Workflow 3: Maintenance.....	42

SUMMARY

The report herewith lays out basic workflows for the processing of remote-access monographic and integrating electronic resources (ERs), and makes recommendations for underlying automation and management support to ensure an efficient process. The components of the process include the usual Library functions of recommending, selecting, acquiring, bibliographic control, and record maintenance, as understood within the special context of remote-access ERs. Requests for new cataloging emanate primarily from Recommending Officers (ROs) and from Selection Officers (SOs) in either public service or in acquisitions.

Also covered are digital counterparts (both digitized from print as well as simultaneous print and digital versions) and needed updates to ER bibliographic records as a result of discovered changed content, dead or changed URLs, or other error reports. ERs in JACKPHY languages also are addressed, primarily in terms of the feasibility of using RLIN for their cataloging.

TrackER is a program which provides for the electronic transfer of information about the resource being processed throughout the various work units that handle it and has been in production since April 2003. As such, it is necessarily key to efficient workflow and the Work Group spent considerable time in discussions of its potential enhancement to support our workflow concepts. Chief among the recommendations is that all requests for bibliographic work on ERs (new cataloging, maintenance) should be communicated through TrackER, other than the exceptions noted in the text. Another key recommendation calls for distribution of ERs directly to the appropriate cataloging teams, a function to be enabled by a detailed mapping of language, subject, and project.

Besides TrackER enhancements, Work Group 4 suggests other automated tools designed to make processing and workflow more efficient. The Group made no determination of their feasibility, but assumes that Work Group 3: Tools Analysis can investigate the potential for their development and implementation.

Finally, other recommendations pertain to the management and organizational oversight of the ER cataloging process. The Work Group suggests better efforts by management to communicate to staff its vision for the digital future and to state clearly how bibliographic control of digital materials can and will be incorporated into cataloging units' existing workloads. We endorse the Digital Life Cycle planning model, and repeat, by way of adding emphasis to the concept brought out by Work Group 2: Processing Rules Analysis, that the Cataloging Directorate should take steps to ensure its participation in planning for LC's digital projects. Lastly, the Group recommends that, with the appointment of the Digital Projects Coordinator within in the Cataloging Directorate, the existing organization of Cataloging be considered adequate to manage the bibliographic control of ERs at this time. This will enable a rapid implementation, and if deemed necessary because of developments in the digital environment, consideration of other potential organizational models can be incorporated into future strategic planning cycles.

CHARGE

Determine the best workflow and organizational model for processing electronic resources.

A. Propose a workflow that includes units upstream and downstream from the Cataloging Directorate, to ensure that the cataloging units know when content produced or acquired outside those units is ready for cataloging and that end-users know when cataloging is complete.

B. Develop and plan for maintaining bibliographic records to reflect changes in digital content and URLs, and for record enhancement to reflect digital counterparts.

C. Consider an organizational model for supporting remote-access electronic resource cataloging.

D. Consider a workflow for nonroman script electronic resources.

E. Consider mechanisms to test workflows and TrackER enhancements.

Task components/deliverables

A. Document the proposed workflow from recommendation or selection/acquisition through completion of cataloging.

B. Document a workflow for maintenance of catalog records for both born digital items and digital counterparts.

C. Provide recommendations for TrackER development.

D. Devise a distribution model for electronic resources.

E. Propose an overall organizational model which would ensure the efficient and effective management of ER cataloging.

WORK GROUP MEMBERS

Lenore Bell (CAT/RCCD)

Gary Bush (ACQ/SRD)

Michael Cantlon (CAT/Dewey)

Allene Hayes (CAT/SMCD)

Carolyn Larson (PSC/ST&B)

Everette Larson (AREA/HISP)

Valerie Mwalilino (ACQ/ELAD)

Nina Palmin (AFSCME 2910)

David Reser (CAT/CPSO)

Linda Stubbs (CAT/SMCD)

Sharon Tsai (CAT/ASCD), Chair

Phyllis Webster (AFSCME 2477)

SCOPE AND ASSUMPTIONS

The Work Group considered the following to be within the scope of its deliberations for workflow relating to ERs:

- > Remote-access only
- > Monographs and integrating resources only
- > All languages, including JACKPHY
- > Born digital
- > Digital counterparts
- > Bibliographic record maintenance/enhancement
- > Free access, purchase and/or licensing required
- > Archived and not-archived
- > Content in scope for the Cataloging Directorate; other types of content (e.g., cartographic) are not considered here

Assumptions:

1. That ultimately there will be a broad implementation to encompass resources in scope for all cataloging teams, and of sufficient numbers to engage staff in each of these teams, including the Computer Files and Microforms Team.
2. That all the usual sources for acquisition of Library materials will pertain also to remote-access electronic resources.
3. That the Collection Policy Statement criteria for selection of digital materials will be followed.
4. That certain of these workflow recommendations must be considered preliminary, pending approvals and detailed instructions from the work of Work Group 2: Processing Rules Analysis.
5. That ER cataloging and use of the TrackER system will be ongoing during development.
6. That TrackER enhancements, automated tool development, and developments in the digital environment have continued during this group's deliberations, such that some recommendations may already have been accomplished.
7. That workflow deliberations will need to continue, as developments in the digital environment progress, as recommendations from Work Group 2: Processing Rules Analysis are implemented, and as decisions regarding use rights for digital materials are made.

BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The information in this section is intended to present essential workflow and other recommendations for the purposes of enabling the Goal IV Management Group to make decisions and approve the approaches taken in this document and of providing a framework for the entirety of the report. Readers should consult the various subsequent sections (e.g., TrackER, Tools, Maintenance, Implementation and Interim Workflow, Management and Organizational Recommendations) for additional detailed recommendations on those topics. In addition, there are a few concepts in the list below which arose during discussions but which do not fit within any of the report sections, but need to be documented so as not to be lost.

1. Most requests for ER bibliographic work by units within the Cataloging Directorate should be communicated via the TrackER system. This will include new cataloging as well as requests for maintenance or update to existing records, and workflow loops for subject editorial procedures.
2. Besides catalogers, all Library units which recommend, select, purchase, develop LC subject headings and classification schedules, and perform maintenance on bibliographic records must have TrackER accounts. In addition to these basic workflow functions, representatives of such diverse groups as Online Resources for Cataloging Activities (ORCA) may have an interest in the use of TrackER for recommendations and requests for cataloging.
3. All new resources must undergo a selection process (selection, assignment of priority and level of cataloging) prior to being forwarded for cataloging. Recommendations of the Collections Policy Committee Task Force are pending and will need to be taken into account in the workflow.
4. The TrackER system should be developed and enhanced along the lines of the ECIP Traffic Manager, including an automatic distribution function and better functionality to support the unique needs of the digital environment. For example, ER workflow requires close communication between public service and cataloging.
5. The automatic distribution function in TrackER is to be enabled by mapping languages and subjects, and in some cases projects, to specific cataloging teams or pools. Submitters in public service areas and Acquisitions staff will designate these data in the submission form to cause this to occur. Initial distribution to teams will provide team leaders with oversight of receipts, work on hand, and completions.
6. Automatic distribution to appropriate teams means that the current workflow using a “resource person” (a cataloger within the Computer Files and Microforms Team) for distribution to another individual cataloger in the print monograph teams will no longer pertain.

7. Recommending Officers will be required to compose and supply summaries that can be used without editing in bibliographic records.

8. JACKPHY ERs should be cataloged in RLIN, in order to utilize RLIN script capabilities. Planning efforts have enabled implementation of JACKPHY ER cataloging in the current RLIN environment, although some issues remain for future consideration.

9. Cataloging Directorate management should clearly communicate to staff the importance attached to and its vision for the digital environment, within the context of existing cataloging workload.

10. The Cataloging Directorate has recently appointed a Digital Projects Coordinator. Given the number of digital projects and the extensive requirements in the position description, additional staff resources will likely be necessary. In support of these workflow recommendations, it is recommended that the incumbent, or designee, serve as TrackER system administrator, monitor all TrackER submissions, provide oversight of ER cataloging activities and workflow, and participate in planning for Directorate involvement in the Library's digital projects.

11. No organizational change is recommended at this time. With the Coordinator reporting to the Director for Cataloging, there will be adequate accountability and span of control. The Group recommends that future Directorate strategic planning continue to focus on the digital environment and address possible alternative organizational structures if it is deemed necessary.

12. The Cataloging Directorate should consider more involvement of Cataloging Technician staff in ER work.

13. Documentation for the cataloging and processing of ERs needs to be improved for better usability and applicability.

JACKPHY RESOURCES

Several catalogers of JACKPHY language materials have been trained in remote-access ER cataloging. To the present time, any JACKPHY language resources were cataloged in Voyager as roman-script-only records. It is anticipated that as the creation, discovery, and use of ERs continues to expand, Library officials will recommend resources for bibliographic control in an increasingly broad array of languages, to include JACKPHY.

It would be advantageous for LC staff to create records for JACKPHY ERs in RLIN in order to utilize that system's original script capability. Email correspondence between LC and RLG and consultation with APLO, CDS, CPSO, and ILS Program Office staff have made clear that technically there is no impediment to such a plan. Several issues are attendant upon it, however. These are detailed below.

Issue 1:

RLIN has already implemented bibliographic level "i" (for integrating resource). However, LC will not implement this for some time yet, and as a result, CDS currently would reject any Leader/07=i records. Thus, as they have been doing for print integrating resources (e.g., loose-leaf publications), and as other LC catalogers have been doing routinely in Voyager for all integrating resources, JACKPHY catalogers using RLIN will need to apply Leader/07=m (for monograph) along with an 006 to reflect integrating aspects of the resource.

Issue 2:

LC's currently distributed JACKPHY records are all coded as language material (Leader/06=a). With ERs, there may be several other appropriate Leader/06 values among items in scope for the Cataloging Directorate (e.g., music notation, musical sound recordings). Because of the complications for CDS, it is recommended that, in the pre-RLIN21 environment, catalogers do JACKPHY cataloging in RLIN only for those ERs which are legitimately Leader/06=a.

Issue 3:

Some ERs recommended for cataloging are represented in OCLC Connexion so that they can be added to Pathfinders prior to full cataloging. If a recommended ER is JACKPHY language, the cataloger would not import the OCLC record for use as the basis for cataloging (cf. Workflow #1 of this report), but rather would derive or create a record in RLIN. It is uncertain whether the resulting RLIN record, once loaded into OCLC, would merge with the original record used or created by the RO.

[Note: This situation would not only occur with JACKPHY resources cataloged in RLIN, but also may occur any time a cataloger uses a record other than the one to which the recommending officer has linked in his/her Pathfinder. See TrackerER recommendations for a suggested enhancement designed to ensure proper notification to ROs.]

Issue 4:

Voyager bibliographic records for ERs may contain a 985 field to specify the project or initiative with which the resource is identified. The current RLIN conversion software does not provide for this local field. It is therefore recommended that use of the 985 for JACKPHY ER cataloging be delayed until implementation of the new RLIN21 technical services client. Alternatively, a 985 field could be manually keyed into the Voyager record

As a test of the RLIN process, two records were created in RLIN, one for an Arabic ER (LCCN 2003618823 / RLIN DCLN03-B5754) and one for a Chinese ER (LCCN 2003618630 / RLIN DCLP03-B16169). Both records loaded properly to Voyager and were distributed by CDS without problem.

In light of the successful test results and the acceptance of the recommendations noted above, stakeholders have agreed that catalogers may proceed in cataloging JACKPHY ERs in RLIN. Documentation delineating specific RLIN ER procedures, covering both workflow elements and local field specifications, is in development.

MAINTENANCE, or, Record Enhancement/Update

This section covers the following

- Digital counterparts requiring bibliographic control
- Bibliographic records for ERs requiring updates due to changed URLs, dead URLs, or changed content
- Other maintenance issues related to ER records

[Note: Procedures for updates to certain TrackER submissions while still in process are included in Workflows 1 and 2 in the Appendix of this report]

General recommendations

1. A separate Maintenance Module in TrackER is needed to support communications and requests for maintenance. The submission screen in such a module should differ from that for new work submissions. (See also TrackER section for additional detail)
2. Directorate management needs to ensure that resources are committed to this work, as well as to prioritize it in relation to other tasks in the receiving unit. This will be particularly crucial if #5 below occurs and creates an increased workload.
3. In assuring adequate resources for bibliographic work engendered by digital conversion projects, it is essential that the Cataloging Directorate be included in the planning so that its resources can be taken into account in any cost estimates.
4. The Work Group recommends at this time that most of the bibliographic control work necessitated by LC-produced digital conversions continue to be centered in CPSO because of the difficulties with PreMARC records, the need to meet deadlines for new collection release dates, and to provide NDL/OSI staff a centralized liaison. As experience is gained, and if workload expands and specific documentation and training can be more widely dispersed, this recommendation could be revisited.
5. Work Group 4 endorses the several recommendations from Work Group 2 regarding potential changes to ILS records when there are changes to Web guides, a mechanism for routine link-checking, and studies to determine overall maintenance needs for changed content (Web guide maintenance recommendation 1, MARC/AACR maintenance recommendations 1 and 2). As these items are addressed, workflow and workload management will be affected.

Digital counterparts requiring bibliographic control

This category could potentially comprise extensive workloads for Cataloging. Digital conversions of print material emanate from units within the Library such as PRD, CALM, LS and OSI staff building American Memory and Global Gateway collections, and exhibits. PRD has stated that it could digitize many times the number of items it now does, based on reports from CALM for brittle book replacement.

Much of this work involves upgrades to PreMARC records, with attendant heading work, to support redistribution. Therefore, it is recommended that the work be confined essentially to one unit, rather than distributing it widely to all cataloging teams.

Other sources of digital counterparts are from outside the Library. See the report of Work Group 2 for a discussion of the issues. The present report addresses only the simultaneous issuance of print and digitized versions. Awareness of this phenomenon may occur at the time of cataloging the print version, or may be discovered later by users or reference staff. Reference staff should be encouraged to communicate these cases to cataloging staff via TrackER for the appropriate links to be made. The recommendation herein is that such requests go to CPSO until such time as the volume of the workload and technical issues are better known.

The table below is drawn from the Group 2 report, which defined the categories of digital counterparts and proposed a method of bibliographic control for each category. (See that report for additional details about the categories, and citations for specific examples.) The categories listed here are solely those considered to be the responsibility of the Cataloging Directorate. Added to the table in the present report are recommendations for “who” should do the work and whether the request should be submitted in TrackER.

Category of digital counterpart	Method of bibliographic control/access¹	Which LC unit should handle	Submit via Tracker? Yes/No
LC digitizations of book material contained in LC digital collections (e.g., American Memory, Global Gateway, other cooperative endeavors)	Add details of electronic manifestations to ILS record for original book (DCM B19); may involve upgrade of PreMARC records	CPSO	No
LC digitizations of book material for digital delivery of ILL	Add details of electronic manifestations to ILS record for original book (DCM B19); may involve upgrade of PreMARC records	CPSO	Yes
LC digitizations of book material for preservation purposes	Add details of electronic manifestations to ILS record for original book (DCM B19); may involve upgrade of PreMARC records	CPSO	Yes

¹It is assumed that in cases where no bibliographic record exists for a print item in the collections that will be digitized, that item will be forwarded for original cataloging and addition of the digital manifestation to the appropriate cataloging team

LC digitizations of book material for research or reference needs (RBSCD, PRD), e.g., individual requests by researchers, exhibits, special requests by Library officials for donor relations, educational presentations, and media requests	Add details of electronic manifestations to ILS record for original book (DCM B19); may involve upgrade of PreMARC records	RBSCD (for their own needs) CPSO (others)	No (for work retained in RBSCD) Yes (any work forwarded to CPSO)
Simultaneous publication of publicly available digital counterpart to print manifestation collected by the Library	Add details of electronic manifestation to ILS record for book	Print monograph cataloging teams when noted at time of cataloging print version CPSO if noted later	N/A Yes

Bibliographic records requiring updates due to changed URLs, dead URLs, or changed content

This category assumes a completed record resides in the ILS which requires an update because of a change in the nature of or access to the resource. Such a record may be for an individual resource or for a collection or records (e.g., Web guides or a collection of MODS records). Discovery of such needed changes may occur serendipitously by users or reference staff. In other cases, an intentional change to the content of a resource (e.g., Web guide coverage) may occur. In still another instance of discovery, at least one public service webmaster is routinely reviewing sites prior to export to INFOMINE (cf. Group 2 report).

Group 4 endorses the recommendations of Group 2 that: 1) criteria be developed to define what changes to Web guides would necessitate changes to ILS bibliographic records; 2) a mechanism for the routine checking of links be developed; and, 3) that a study be made of existing records to determine the degree to which changed content is occurring. Cf. Group 2 report, Web guide and MARC/AACR maintenance recommendations.

Ad hoc or individual discovery of needed changes should be communicated to Cataloging via TrackER, and staff throughout the Library are encouraged to do so. Such requests can be submitted to CPSO, which should exercise the option of forwarding further to a particular cataloging team. Requests for maintenance should be submitted via TrackER using the Maintenance submission screen, providing all appropriate data elements, including a revised summary if the nature of the site has changed, and other information or instructions in the free text box.

Because the methodology for routine checking of content and links is unknown, as is the volume of record maintenance that will result, recommendations as to who should handle the work and TrackER implications are suggested as topics for future deliberations.

Other maintenance issues related to ER records

Records for ERs and for book manifestations with digital counterparts that reside in the ILS may be updated by any LC staff with appropriate Voyager security. Access point maintenance, as a byproduct of other cataloging, is an occurrence commonly dealt with by all cataloging staff.

Normal error reporting procedures from various sources inside and outside the Library will pertain to these records. Such reports normally are sent to CPSO, which may either make the change or forward to the appropriate cataloging team for action.

Group 4 recommends that none of these maintenance needs utilize the TrackER system.

INTRATEAM WORKFLOW AND STATISTICAL REPORTING

Parameters and points of discussion:

1. TrackER can supply reports of work on hand and throughput.
2. Cataloging teams rely on the Statistical Reporting System (STARS) for an easily-prepared monthly snapshot of most receipts, completions, and work on hand.
3. STARS is a stand-alone system residing on an unnetworked PC in each cataloging team.
4. Some divisions, because of the desire to manage all work on hand, also require manual counts of certain non-STARS categories (e.g., duplicates, awaiting shelflisting, awaiting subject cataloging)
5. Divisions utilize STARS reports and manual counts from teams to create a unified monthly and fiscal year division statistical report
6. STARS requires an LCCN for item input.
7. Are cataloging divisions (usually AOCs) willing to fold in an additional non-STARS count to their spreadsheets?
8. Group 4 recommends that divisions and teams manage this function as they see fit. Their consideration of the points above will inform their decisions.

Scenarios for intrateam workflow as it relates to statistical reporting of ERs:

1. Capturing in STARS for inclusion in monthly report of work on hand

- Upon initial “acceptance” for cataloging in the team

- ◆ If no existing IBCR with LCCN, make printout of dataview screen, paste LCCN barcode label on it, and log into STARS

- ◆ If IBCR with LCCN exists, make printout of dataview screen and log into STARS under the LCCN provided

- ◆ STARS sheets and printouts for each logged-in ER should be given to the cataloger to whom distributed in TrackER

Alternative: distribute to catalogers only by this manual process; cataloger then must retrieve the submission from the team’s New Work in TrackER and assign it to himself in TrackER

- Keep the dataview and STARS sheets together during processing within the team (use easily-recognizable green lucite folders?)

[this would also facilitate any manual handling of these materials, e.g., for subject/name authority assistance, particularly during the implementation phase-in before everyone can use TrackER]

- Last person in the team who handles the item ensures STARS logout

2. Combined logging

- Team would interact with STARS to account for these items after completion or partial completion in the team
 - All intra- and interteam communications and forwarding/referrals would be via TrackER
 - A manual STARS sheet, or some record, will need to be kept for the purpose of tallying Auxiliary Statistics (authorities made, changed; bib maintenance performed, etc.) for later STARS input
 - Last person in team to handle the ER must ensure appropriate STARS logging
 - For monthly division reports, a team leader could derive a report of ERs on hand from TrackER for inclusion in the non-STARS count.

3. Paperless workflow

- Team distributor assigns resource to cataloger in TrackER
- Descriptive or whole item cataloger logs resource into STARS, discarding STARS sheet
- Cataloger who completes the ER for the team logs the item out of STARS
- Each team cataloger who handles the ER must keep track of Auxiliary Statistics for later input to STARS

TrackER

TrackER is central to the orderly management of ER workflow, from initial recommendation through cataloging and notification of completion. Put into production in April 2003, it has been in use by public service recommenders, some acquisitions staff, and by catalogers as a means of communication regarding these items with no physical presence. Modifications to the program are ongoing, and a few of the recommendations below have already been programmed. As with other portions of this report, the recommendations here represent full implementation of ER cataloging and workflow, i.e., full participation by all appropriate units within Cataloging, Acquisitions, and public service areas.

In TrackER's current manifestation, all recommended monographic and integrating resources are submitted through TrackER to the Computer Files and Microforms Team; staff members ("resource persons") in that team further distribute the resources for cataloging to staff trained to catalog ERs throughout the Cataloging Directorate. While public service submitters and catalogers utilize TrackER, certain processes endemic to workflow are not currently provided for, notably selection, requests for purchase/licensing, and the subject heading/classification editorial processes.

The recommendations herein are divided into two sections: those dealing with policies for use of TrackER and those relating to its functionality.

TrackER policy recommendations

1. Most requests for work related to bibliographic control of ERs should be entered into TrackER. These include:

- > new items from Acquisitions for cataloging
- > resources recommended for cataloging by public service librarians
- > sites recommended for new cataloging or counterpart data from ORCA
- > serials from Serial Record Division cataloging teams to monograph teams for subject cataloging
- > new subject heading or classification proposals for ER cataloging to SHED or CLED for the editorial process
- > referrals for cataloging assistance to other catalogers/teams/divisions
- > requests from catalogers to submitters for additional information or to report a problem with the submission (e.g., dead URL)
- > questions from catalogers regarding selection/level of cataloging
- > changes to URLs or site content
- > requests for bibliographic maintenance of records for print material with digital counterparts
- > requests for other bibliographic record maintenance (e.g., error reports)

[Note: Exceptions are collections of digitized items such as American Memory and certain other

projects. See Maintenance section for details]

2. In a change from the way Acquisitions forwards print monographs to Cataloging (i.e., to cataloging divisions as a whole), for ERs originating in Acquisitions, staff will be required to select subject and language to enable automatic distribution to the appropriate team or pool.

3. All staff involved in any stage of ER workflow should have access to a TrackER account. Exact configuration of accounts needs to be determined through discussion with users.

4. A TrackER system administrator should reside in the Cataloging Directorate to establish and change accounts and user profiles, monitor throughput, add new project identification strings, adjust distribution matrix, ensure that desired programming changes are communicated to ITS, and otherwise troubleshoot the system.

5. Ongoing meetings with TrackER users should be held so that its functionality can be fine-tuned.

Functionality and usability enhancement recommendations

These recommendations support this report’s workflow recommendations and also are designed to improve TrackER’s current usability. They have been prioritized into the following categories: M (mandatory, i.e., required to support the recommended workflows); HD (highly desirable); and D (desirable). The table below groups the priorities, and numbers the individual items sequentially within each group.

Priority/ Number	TrackER function
M1	Unique submission screens designed specific to the needs of individual ROs, SOs, Acquisition staff, and maintenance requests, with appropriate data entry boxes. E.g., SOs need spaces to assign priority and level of cataloging
M2	In submission screen, a separate box reserved solely for the Summary. This is in addition to a Comments box
M3	A system administration module to provide for individualized user profiles. User profiles should support various defaults in submission forms (e.g., designation of project), multiple automatic “complete” notifications, automatic routing from RO to either Acquisitions or Cataloging, etc.

M4	Mapping of languages, subjects, and projects to appropriate cataloging team, enabling automatic distribution to team accounts. Mapping will need to evolve as implementation broadens and system administrator should have the capability easily to adjust mapping as need arises
M5	Individual cataloger accounts to enable a paperless team distribution and efficient referrals
M6	Within a team account, a “Distribution” button which would bring up a menu listing individual catalogers in the team for distribution within the team
M7	Separate receipt menus in each team and individual accounts for: New Work, Referrals, and Requests for Maintenance
M8	Reformulated Update capability (for revising a submission prior to assignment to a cataloger). Ensure that the update merges with original submission and does not result in a separate new receipt
M9	Better “Refer” capability, back and forth among all parties
M10	Default automatic referral/forward back to submitter if this is the desired referee, to avoid having to choose from a lengthy menu
M11	“Complete” screen when email notification(s) have been requested to include LCCN, original OCLC record ID, Pathfinder information, and cataloger-added comments
M12	A check box in Acq Spec/SO submission screen to indicate the presence of Voyager record
HD1	Function for searching all worklists by control number, title, or URL
HD2	Automatic de-dup function to help avoid duplicate submissions
HD3	Function to sort all worklists by particular data element, e.g., title, URL
HD4	List of closed submissions viewable to all users, showing status (complete, withdrawn) with capability to sort by submitter, team, or cataloger to support tracking and reporting needs
HD5	List of referrals viewable by individual user showing date and to whom sent
HD6	“Forward” capability for use when not expecting submission to be returned; should arrive in recipient’s New Work menu
HD7	Comprehensive pulldown menu of project identifiers for use in MARC 985 field in the submission screen
HD8	Work Menu page as the default opening page upon signon by reference specialists
HD9	Viewable worklists: individual cataloger can view his own; team leader can access entire team; TrackER Sys Admin can view all

HD10	A standard format for data files that can be loaded into TrackER as an alternative to online data entry in submission forms. Such facility will enable “bulk import” of large batches of submissions for various projects, as well as a mechanism to transfer data from other forms or systems (e.g., Acquisition’s RFA form, Voyager IBCRs)
HD11	A link to catalogers’ codes page (in LS intranet) from every submission form and from the viewable list of active submissions
D1	Reduced size TrackER logo on each screen, to eliminate excessive scrolling

IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERIM WORKFLOW

It is assumed that full implementation of remote access ER cataloging within the Cataloging Directorate means that every team will have an adequate number of staff trained to complete both the descriptive and subject cataloging of resources within their areas of responsibility. The completion of training to attain such full implementation may take several years. It is recognized that the training to perform descriptive cataloging of ERs is more complex and time-consuming than that required to perform subject cataloging only. Therefore, to maximize the use of available staff resources, to acclimate staff to the use of TrackER, and to prepare for the influx of ERs in a broad range of subject areas, an interim phase in ER cataloging workflow is recommended. Conceptually based on the “Subject Activation Phase” of ECIP implementation, the plan would make use of the limited number of staff trained in descriptive ER cataloging, but utilize fully the subject cataloging expertise available throughout the Directorate.

TrackER functionality should be designed to enable automatic distribution to the appropriate cataloging team through the choice of language and subject, or in some cases project, as designated by submitters. The mapping of languages/subjects to teams for the interim will necessarily differ from that for full implementation, and is based on the following concepts:

1. Catalogers trained in ER descriptive cataloging within a given division will be designated to handle the descriptive cataloging for all ERs in scope for the division. Assuming that all divisions already have more than one trained descriptive cataloger, the particular configuration of the workload for a given division should be devised by division management to suit its unique resource availability, and altered as more catalogers are trained.
2. Staff performing descriptive cataloging would choose one of the following next steps, depending upon where the subject expertise resides:
 - Complete the subject cataloging, if trained in the subject area, **or**
 - Forward the ER to another cataloger within the same team trained in the subject area, **or**
 - Forward the ER to another team within one’s own division which is responsible for the subject area
3. Staff trained in ER procedures complete the subject analysis, end-stage processing, and mark TrackER submission “complete.”
4. All teams would utilize TrackER for distribution and forwarding of ER’s.

The concepts listed above presuppose that the particular catalogers with the expertise to complete any given ER will be trained in the ER cataloging procedures, including use of TrackER. However, because of the potential need for a unique mix of language and subject expertise to complete the cataloging of an individual ER, it may be necessary for catalogers personally to consult or refer items manually to staff who are not trained in ER procedures. This could be common prior to full implementation, and will continue to occur until and unless literally all catalogers are trained.

TOOLS

The tools listed below are requested in order to support the efficiency and effectiveness of electronic resource cataloging. They are in addition to TrackER enhancements, but some would require an interface with TrackER. Some might be easily accomplished (e.g., Z-Processor ER) while others may take some time to develop or be made effective. Work Group 4 recommends that Work Group #3: Tools Analysis undertake investigation and development of these tools.

z-Processor ER

- Additional search keys for OCLC number and URL

Incorporating TrackER reports into other statistical reports

- E.g., cataloging division's monthly spreadsheets
- Other units' reports, as requested (needs to be explored with stakeholders)

TCEC capability from TrackER

- To utilize data (summary, URL, project, etc.) from dataview to create or add to bibliographic record

Support for importing submissions into TrackER

- Create tools to massage supplied data into a standard format for batch loading submissions into TrackER (ad hoc)
- Create tools to extract data from known sources (e.g., Acquisitions' RFA form, Voyager IBCRs) into a standard format for the ongoing loading of submissions into TrackER without re-keying

MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Cataloging Directorate management should articulate and clearly communicate to staff:
 - > The importance of digital resources to the Library's mission, as expressed in its Digital Strategy
 - > Its vision for bibliographic control of remote ERs, particularly in relation to the existence of other methods of searching of and access to Web-based information, and the instability of content and URLs
 - > The role of Cataloging staff in support of ER bibliographic control and digital projects
 - > Priority of ER cataloging in relation to other team workloads
 - > What full implementation of ER cataloging will look like (i.e., is there sufficient volume for all teams, all catalogers, all subjects?)

2. Management also should take these steps to create the appropriate environment:
 - > Include objectives relating to ER cataloging and digital project support in performance plans
 - > Establish divisional production goals for ER cataloging
 - > Consider measures to close the "knowledge gap" about ERs and digital projects that is widespread among Directorate staff
 - > Acknowledge and publicize the duties and responsibilities of the Digital Projects Coordinator

3. The Cataloging Directorate must become a formal presence in any discussions of digital projects at the planning stage. The planning and costing-out process must take into account the cataloging resources which will be required for any project. (The Digital Life Cycle planning effort is germane here)

4. Cataloging Directorate staff resources should be dedicated to the coordination of ER cataloging sufficient to provide oversight of workflow and automated support, assist in planning, and react to changes in the digital environment. The Digital Projects Coordinator already in place can take on those functions, but will likely require assistance. Such assistance could be staff reporting directly to the Coordinator, or could function much like the network of Automated Operations Coordinators does. In either case, assistance could be fulfilled by details or long-term volunteers within each cataloging division. However organized, the following functions are recommended as tasks to be assigned to the Coordinator or designated assistants, in order to support the recommended workflows:
 - > Serve as system administrator for TrackER, performing such tasks as adding user accounts and profiles
 - > Monitor TrackER submissions for workload, throughput, and statistical data on ER cataloging
 - > Convene periodic meetings of a TrackER users group, for TrackER functionality feedback
 - > Work with the ITS programmer to accomplish TrackER improvements and continued development

- > Coordinate with digital project staff to devise project identification data strings for use in the 985 field of bibliographic records, and add them to the TrackER pulldown menu
- > Plan, coordinate, and ensure the completion of training and wider implementation of ER cataloging
 - > Coordinate the Directorate's involvement in digital projects
 - > Make recommendations to management regarding Directorate involvement in digital projects
 - > Convene periodic meetings with ER catalogers for the purposes of sharing information, briefings regarding developments, etc.

5. The Work Group does not recommend any overall reorganization to support the cataloging of ERs at this time. Having the Digital Projects Coordinator report to the Director for Cataloging should afford adequate accountability and span of control. That this position is already in place also will enable a rapid implementation of proposed workflows and procedures and allow expansion of ER cataloging without encumbrance.

6. Future Directorate strategic planning cycles most certainly will include a focus on the digital environment, and the Group recommends that if developments warrant, alternative organizational structures be addressed.

ACTION ITEMS

When the Work Group's charge was originally formulated, it was believed feasible that pilots could be mounted that would test various workflows. However, because systems need to be in place in order to test an entire workflow and those systems will need to be developed on a prioritized basis, the Work Group recommends that as development occurs, careful but intensive testing take place so that implementation of various pieces is as rapid as possible. Work Group 5: Implementation may wish to take note of developments and devise a plan for ongoing implementation as things change.

In planning for development, testing, and implementation, care needs to be taken to coordinate recommendations which impact on one another. For example, as distribution mapping in TrackER is completed and ready for programming, divisions should be working out their distribution schemes (assuming this would occur prior to full implementation). Another example is that when TrackER is programmed to enable a system administrator within the Cataloging Directorate, the Digital Projects Coordinator should be ready to take on that role.

The list below is an attempt to bring together items from this report that would require some action in the short term if all recommendations are approved. There has been no attempt to prioritize them here.

1. Work with the ITS programmer to further prioritize the TrackER recommendations and determine their feasibility.
2. Devise a fast-track but robust testing plan for TrackER enhancements.
3. Complete language, subject, and project mapping scheme to enable automatic distribution through TrackER.
[Note: A Group 4 subcommittee is currently developing this mapping]
4. Ensure involvement of public service and Acquisitions staff in testing the mapping function. (Training/orientation needed-- implication for Group 5: Implementation)
5. Devise a distribution plan in each division for a phased-in implementation as staff are trained in ER cataloging; should be done in collaboration with the mapping subcommittee.
6. Reconsider issues related to JACKPHY resources when RLIN21 is implemented.
7. Take steps at the management level to communicate with staff about the digital environment, its bibliographic control, etc. (see Management section for specifics)
8. Assure that there are adequate resources in the Cataloging Directorate in support of its Digital

Projects Coordinator.

9. Work out project data strings for MARC field 985 for implementation in TrackER.
10. Monitor CPC's development of MARC field 925 retention values.
11. Establish a schedule for ongoing meetings of TrackER users.
12. Update the documentation for ER cataloging.
13. Develop automated tools to support ER cataloging (see Tools section)
14. Document in the Acquisitions Workflow and Documentation Committee the appropriate workflow steps and the specifications for IBCRs, in consultation with Cataloging.
15. Establish an eMail list for sharing among ER catalogers/Digital Projects Coordinator, others as needed.
16. Take steps to think through the ramifications for Cataloging of archiving activity at the Library.
17. Define criteria for when Web guide changes affect ILS records and need to be reported to Cataloging.
18. Ensure the commitment of ITS resources for TrackER development.
19. Maintain close coordination with and involvement of Acquisitions and public service staff in ER bibliographic control workflow implementation.

CONCERNS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

The digital environment is a volatile one. New developments will continually arise and will need to be analyzed to establish their impact on workflow. The Digital Projects Coordinator and other stakeholders should be charged with oversight and ensuring related updates to workflow processes, TrackER support, and documentation.

Many of the recommendations from Work Group 2 also have workflow implications. Because it is understood that the implementation of those recommendations will include analysis and establishment of workflow elements, those items are not repeated here in this report. The following list identifies some additional issues that are likely to face us in the future and will have an impact on workflow.

1. Implementation of the new bibliographic level (code “i” for integrating in MARC 21 Leader/07), and issues related to possible distribution of LC and PCC records.
2. Eventual deposit of Copyright materials in digital form and the bibliographic control needs for such a repository.
3. Development of digital archiving programs at LC and adjustments to workflow to incorporate archiving steps, e.g., the MINERVA Web Archiving Program, the OCLC Digital Archives Project.
4. Possible expansion of cataloging responsibilities to include other LC processing units or staff, e.g., the Decimal Classification Division (if resources are available and constituency demands are clear), bibliographic control of ERs in the field offices, and expansion of responsibilities for cataloging technicians.
5. An electronically-enabled Request for Acquisition (RFA) form and the potential for its data imported to TrackER submissions.

APPENDICES

Workflow 1: New resources originating with Recommending Officers

Workflow 2: New resources originating in Acquisitions

Workflow 3: Maintenance

**WORKFLOW 1:
NEW RESOURCES RECOMMENDED BY PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF**

Recommending Officer (RO)

1. Consider current selection criteria and policies as well as the appropriate mode of bibliographic control. If a MARC/AACR record is appropriate, continue.

2. Search for the resource in Voyager to ensure no duplication.

- If Voyager record found, do not submit
- If the Voyager record needs update or correction, see Workflow 3: Maintenance.

3. If using Connexion to create a record for inclusion in a Pathfinder, search OCLC Connexion Resource Catalog²

- If record found, note the OCLC number for use in TrackER submission
- If no record found, RO may create a Connexion record, noting the OCLC number for use in TrackER submission

4. Submit for selection and cataloging via TrackER

- Sign on to TrackER system
- Search for possible duplicate submission:

◆ Select the Work Menu link and search Total Active Submissions list by title and/or URL

◆ If resource is already in the system, do not submit

◆ If submission already in the system requires a change or update, see section below: Updates to certain TrackER submissions while still in process

• After ascertaining that the resource is not already in the system, select the Selector's New Submission form link, and enter the following data as prompted, depending on whether a Connexion resource record exists (starred elements are mandatory):

Data element	Resource record in OCLC	No resource record
Title*	✓	✓
URL*	✓	✓

²See Connexion workflow procedures at <http://www.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/corcrefg.html>

OCLC number*	✓	
Summary*	✓ (or state presence in resource record)	✓
Primary language*	✓	✓
Primary subject*	✓	✓
Collection title³	✓	✓
Keywords	✓	✓
Comments	✓	✓
Project name	✓	✓

- Also check the following boxes if appropriate:

- ◆ License or payment required
- ◆ Archived at LC⁴
- ◆ Notice of completion wanted

(List of recipients should be automated through submitter's profile; if notice to persons other than these defaults, Groupwise addresses must be supplied)

5. Automatic forwarding to Acquisitions in these cases

- If selection required because RO is not also a Selection Officer
- If purchase or license is required

6. Automatic distribution directly to Cataloging if neither condition in Step 5 applies

³Pathfinder, Web guide, aggregation title, or other collection

⁴Ramifications for cataloging workflow need to be considered before widespread use of this box

Acquisition Specialist/Selection Officer (AcqSpec/SO)

1. Sign on to Tracker to check resources submitted by ROs

2. Consider current selection criteria and policies

- If not selected (for LC or for cataloging) forward back to RO with message
- If selected:
 - ◆ Check Selection box in Tracker submission form
 - ◆ If purchase is required go to Step 3; if license is required, go to Step 4; if both are required follow first step in both 3 and 4, then one of the lists
 - ◆ If resource is free and does not require a license, skip to Step 5

3. Purchase steps

- Assure that the appropriate fiscal approvals have been obtained and that the Digital Life Cycle Planning checklist has been applied (if necessary)
- If OCLC number has been supplied by RO, import record as IBCR
- If no OCLC record cited in Tracker, and if appropriate as per Acquisitions policies, search for and import any other record for use as IBCR
- If no record to import, create IBCR⁵
- Create purchase order in Voyager Acquisitions Module
- Pay invoice

4. Licensing steps

- Negotiate license agreement with vendor
- If OCLC number has been supplied by RO, import record as IBCR
- If no OCLC record cited in Tracker, and if appropriate as per Acquisitions policies, search for and import any other record for use as IBCR
- If no record to import, create IBCR⁵
- Create purchase order in Voyager Acquisitions Module
- Pay invoice

⁵Record indicia and required fields TBD by AWDC in consultation with Cataloging

5. When access to resource is granted

- Notify webmaster for Electronic Database website, which will display the resource

6. Submit to cataloging through TrackER

- Check box to indicate presence of Voyager record if applicable
- Assign priority and level of cataloging in submission form
- Forward to Cataloging
- Primary language and subject or project entered into Submission form by RO are mapped for distribution to the appropriate cataloging team or pool

Cataloging Team Distributor

[Note: Each team should devise its own methodology for handling distribution, but these generally are the steps to be taken. In particular, where distribution pools are used, these steps will need to be augmented to account for the additional level of distribution. See also Intrateam Workflow]

1. Sign on to TrackER

- Check team account daily or as appropriate for team workload
- Open work menu, then open team New Work list

2. Review new resources received

- Assess whether resources are in scope for the team based on the TrackER submission information
- Forward resources not in scope to a different team, choosing from the pulldown menu
- Distribute in-scope resources to the appropriate cataloger based on team criteria such as regular assignments, areas of expertise, equitable distribution, etc.

[Note: This action will remove the submission from the team's New Work list and place it in an individual's New Work list]

[Note: See Intrateam Workflow section for distribution alternative]

3. Regularly check the Referral list and forward those items to the appropriate cataloger for processing.

Descriptive Cataloger

1. Sign on to TrackER, view submissions in individual New Work list
2. Make initial assessments prior to cataloging
 - Search Voyager for possible duplication
 - Access the URL provided to ensure that it is still live and that content matches submission
 - Consider whether there are any questions about selection or level of cataloging assigned
3. If there are any questions or problems as determined in previous step
 - Refer selection or level of cataloging questions to SO
 - Refer problems with URL, content, or duplication to RO; RO may supply appropriate information and return, or withdraw the submission
4. If there is no IBCR or if cataloger desires to search for copy and merge with existing IBCR:⁶
 - Open Z-Processor ER
 - Search by appropriate key: title, ISBN, URL, or OCLC number supplied by RO⁷
 - Choose record to import
 - If the record to be imported is incomplete cataloging, import under the “origres” stream
 - If the record to be imported is completed cataloging appropriate for copy cataloging, import under either the “copycat” or “pccadapt” stream
5. If there is no record to import, create a new IBCR using the appropriate Voyager template, or edit the IBCR supplied by Acquisitions

⁶Cataloger may opt to import the Connexion record created or cited by RO, or may import any other more useful record found.

⁷See Tools section for recommended support

6. Complete descriptive cataloging

- Ensure accuracy of Leader positions 06 (record type), 07 (bibliographic level), and 17 (encoding level)
 - Add/update/ensure accuracy of local fields 906, 925, 955, and 985
 - Ensure in particular that appropriate 006 and 007 values are used
 - If integrating resource use 006 Serial Control
 - 006/04 w o r d
 - 006/06 s
 - 006/17 2
 - 007 Computer File
 - 007/01 r
- If there is no summary in an imported record, copy and paste summary from TrackerER into a 520 note
 - Review comments provided in TrackerER by the submitter and incorporate significant information in the bibliographic record (e.g., information related to print format)
 - Consult any existing cataloging guidelines for specific projects at <http://www.loc.gov/staff/catdir/ERM/erdoc.html>
 - Continue to Subject Cataloger section below; if a different staff member/team will handle the subject aspect, forward in TrackerER
 - When forwarding in TrackerER to next stage, include notes to submitter such as use of an imported record different from that originally cited by RO
[See also Intrateam Workflow]

Subject Cataloger

1. Provide subject treatment

- Update 955 to reflect subject work (\$d, or \$i if whole resource)
- Assign subject headings
- Assign classification (050 \$a only) and other appropriate fields

2. To propose new subject heading or classification

- Refer via TrackerER to CPSO (SHED or CLED)
- Upon completion of approval and editorial work, SHED or CLED forwards back to cataloger via TrackerER

3. End-stage processing

[Note: Macros are available to facilitate end-stage processing]

- Update 955 to add \$e [code date]
- Update 906

906 \$a 7 \$b cbc ... [etc.]

- Ensure encoding level (Leader/17) is set as appropriate to the level/type of bibliographic control

Blank = full level

4 = core level (used for monographs only)

3 = access level

- Create or update holdings record

852 8 # \$b c-GenColl [or other custodial or reference assignment as appropriate]

\$h Electronic Resource \$z [Public note as appropriate]

Note: \$i and \$t are not used for ERs

Note: See additional details for \$b and \$z at

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/holdings.html>

- Create or update item record

Copy number = 0

Pieces = 1

Perm. Loc. = s-Online

Item type = Computer File

Item status: remove "In Process" from Status line

- Mark submission complete in TrackerER

- ◆ If RO has requested notification of completion provide LCCN and notes to RO, such as use of an imported record other than that originally cited by RO

- ◆ Automatic Email(s) will be sent to submitter and others as specified in original submission

ROs and webmaster

1. Upon receipt of emails noting completion of cataloging, update LC web guides as needed, using assigned subject headings and keywords, and link the citations to the catalog, as applicable.

2. Take note of any comments from cataloger, such as use of an imported record other than that originally cited, and adjust Pathfinder as needed.

Updates to certain TrackER submissions while still in process

The most common scenario is expected to be a case in which the original submitter of a resource desires to change the submission because of new information (e.g., URL or content changes). This should be possible until such time as the submission resides in the TrackER account of an individual cataloger. Once assigned to a cataloger, the submitter may contact that cataloger outside of TrackER to convey the information. Once the submitter has received a “completion” message, there should be a completed Voyager record, and Workflow 3: Maintenance would be appropriate.

RO (submitter)

1. Sign on to TrackER
2. Search
 - Individual Active Submissions if operator is updating his/her own original submission **Or**
 - Total Active Submissions if operator is updating a submission originating from a different submitter
3. Retrieve the appropriate submission from the list
 - If it has been assigned go to Step 4
 - If it has not been assigned go to Step 5
4. Note the cataloger’s code in the dataview
 - Consult the list of cataloging staff codes at <http://www.loc.gov/staff/catdir/codes/organization.html> to find the cataloger’s name
 - Contact that person via eMail or telephone to convey the changed information
 - Cataloger will incorporate the new information
5. Click the Update button
 - In the update screen fill in appropriate information and submit
 - The updated submission will replace the original submission in a team’s New Work list

WORKFLOW 2: RESOURCES ORIGINATING IN ACQUISITIONS

Acquisition Specialist/Selection Officer (AcqSpec/SO)

1. Consider current selection criteria and policies, and search Voyager for duplication
2. Consider current selection criteria and policies
3. If selected
 - If purchase is required go to Step 4
 - If license is required go to Step 5
 - If both purchase and license are required follow the first step in both 4 and 5, then the remainder of the steps in one of the lists
 - If resource is free and does not require a license, skip to Step 7
4. Purchase steps
 - Assure that the appropriate fiscal approvals have been obtained and that the Digital Life Cycle Planning checklist has been applied (if necessary)
 - If appropriate as per Acquisitions policies, search for and import a record for use as IBCR
 - If no record to import, create IBCR⁸
 - Create purchase order in Voyager Acquisitions Module
 - Pay invoice
5. Licensing steps
 - Negotiate license agreement with vendor
 - If appropriate as per Acquisitions policies, search for and import any other record for use as IBCR
 - If no record to import, create IBCR⁸
 - Create purchase order in Voyager Acquisitions Module
 - Pay invoice

⁸Record indicia and required fields TBD by AWDC in consultation with Cataloging

6. When access to resource is granted

- Notify webmaster for Electronic Database website, which will display the resource

7. Submit to cataloging through TrackER

- Sign on to TrackER
- Search for possible duplicate submission
 - ◆ On Work Menu link, search Total Active Submissions by title and/or URL
- Supply title and URL in submission form
- Ensure selection decision is recorded
- Check box to indicate presence of Voyager record if applicable
- Assign priority and level of cataloging
- Select primary language and subject
- Submit to Cataloging

[Note: Primary language and subject are mapped to the appropriate cataloging team, for automatic distribution]

Cataloging Team Distributor

[Note: Each team should devise its own methodology for handling distribution, but these generally are the steps to be taken. In particular, where distribution pools are used, these steps will need to be augmented to account for the additional level of distribution. See also Intrateam Workflow]

1. Sign on to TrackER

- Check team account daily or as appropriate for team workload
- Open work menu, then open team New Work list

2. Review new resources received

- Assess whether resources are in scope for the team based on the TrackER submission information
 - Forward resources not in scope to a different team, choosing from the pulldown menu
 - Distribute in-scope resources to the appropriate cataloger based on team criteria such as regular assignments, areas of expertise, equitable distribution, etc.

[Note: This action will remove the submission from the team's New Work list and place it in an individual's New Work list]

[Note: See Intrateam Workflow section for distribution alternative]

3. Regularly check the Referral list and forward those items to the appropriate cataloger for processing.

Descriptive Cataloger

1. Sign on to TrackER, view submissions in individual New Work list
2. Make initial assessments prior to cataloging
 - Search Voyager for possible duplication
 - Access the URL provided to ensure that it is still live and that content matches submission
 - Consider whether there are any questions about selection or level of cataloging assigned
3. If there are any questions or problems as determined in previous step
 - Refer back to Acq Spec/SO for resolution
 - SO may supply appropriate information and return, or withdraw the submission
4. If there is no IBCR or if cataloger desires to search for copy and merge with existing IBCR
 - Open Z-Processor ER
 - Search by appropriate key: title, ISBN, or URL
 - Choose record to import
 - If the record to be imported is incomplete cataloging, import under the “origres” stream
 - If the record to be imported is completed cataloging appropriate for copy cataloging, import under either the “Copycat” or “Pccadapt” stream
5. If there is no record to import, create a new IBCR using the appropriate Voyager template, or edit the IBCR supplied by Acquisitions

6. Complete descriptive cataloging

- Ensure accuracy of Leader positions 06 (record type), 07 (bibliographic level), and 17 (encoding level)
- Add/update/ensure accuracy of local fields 906, 925, 955, and 985
- Ensure in particular that appropriate 006 and 007 values are used
 - If integrating resource use 006 Serial Control
 - 006/04 w or d
 - 006/06 s
 - 006/17 2
 - 007 Computer File
 - 007/01 r
 - Review any comments provided in TrackER by the submitter and incorporate significant information in the bibliographic record (e.g., information related to print format)
- Consult any existing cataloging guidelines for specific projects at <http://www.loc.gov/staff/catdir/ERM/erdoc.html>
- Continue to Subject Cataloger section below; if a different staff member/team will handle the subject aspect, forward in TrackER

[See also Inrateam Workflow]

Subject cataloger

1. Provide subject treatment

- Update 955 to reflect subject work (\$d, or \$i if whole resource)
- Assign subject headings
- Assign classification (050 \$a only) and other appropriate fields
- Provide summary as a 520 note (or accept in an imported record)

2. To propose new subject heading or classification

- Refer via TrackER to CPSO (SHED or CLED)
- Upon completion of approval and editorial work, SHED or CLED forwards back to cataloger via TrackER

3. End-stage processing

[Note: Macros are available to facilitate end-stage processing]

- Update 955 to add \$e [code date]
- Update 906
 - 906 \$a 7 \$b cbc ... [etc.]
- Ensure encoding level (Leader/17) is set as appropriate to the level/type of bibliographic control

Blank = full level

4 = core level (used for monographs only)

3 = access level

- Create or update holdings record

852 8 # \$b c-GenColl [or other custodial or reference assignment as appropriate]

\$h Electronic Resource \$z [Public note as appropriate]

Note: \$i and \$t are not used for ERs

Note: See additional details for \$b and \$z at

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/holdings.html>

- Create or update item record

Copy number = 0

Pieces = 1

Perm. Loc. = s-Online

Item type = Computer File

Item status: remove “In Process” from Status line

- Mark submission complete in TrackerER

Updates to certain TrackerER submissions while still in process

The most common scenario is expected to be a case in which the original submitter of a resource desires to change the submission because of new information (e.g., URL or content changes). This should be possible until such time as the submission resides in the TrackerER account of an individual cataloger. Once assigned to a cataloger, the submitter may contact that cataloger outside of TrackerER to convey the information. If the item is found in the Completions list, there should be a completed Voyager record, and Workflow 3: Maintenance would be appropriate.

Acq Spec/SO (submitter)

1. Sign on to TrackerER

2. Search

- Individual Active Submissions if operator is updating his/her own original submission **Or**
- Total Active Submissions if operator is updating a submission originating from a different submitter

3. Retrieve the appropriate submission from the list

- If it has been assigned go to Step 4

- If it has not been assigned go to Step 5

4. Note the cataloger's code in the dataview

- Consult the list of cataloging staff codes at <http://www.loc.gov/staff/catdir/codes/organization.html> to find the cataloger's name
- Contact that person via eMail or telephone to convey the changed information
- Cataloger will incorporate the new information

5. Click the Update button

- In the update screen fill in appropriate information and submit
- The updated submission will replace the original submission in a team's New Work list

WORKFLOW 3: MAINTENANCE

Digital counterparts entered in Tracker⁹

- Sign on to TrackerER and choose Maintenance submission screen
- Supply the following data elements, as prompted:
 - ◆ LCCN
 - ◆ Title
 - ◆ URL
 - ◆ Source of digitization
 - ◆ Project
 - ◆ Request for notification of completion
- Request will be routed at this time to CPSO
- CPSO staff or detailee updates existing bibliographic record according to established policies
- CPSO staff or detailee marks submission complete, which sends an email to originator of request (and others, based on the requestor's profile) if submission is so marked

TrackerER submissions for Voyager ER record updates

- Sign on to TrackerER and choose Maintenance submission screen
- Supply the following data elements, as prompted:
 - ◆ LCCN
 - ◆ Title
 - ◆ URL
 - ◆ Free text describing change desired (e.g., changed URL)
 - ◆ Summary (if changed content so necessitates)
 - ◆ Request for notification of completion
- Request will be routed at this time to CPSO
- CPSO staff or detailee updates existing bibliographic record according to established policies
- CPSO staff or detailee marks submission complete, which sends an email to originator of request (and others, based on the requestor's profile) if submission is so marked

⁹Consult Maintenance section for recommended categories