Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group Report
December 19, 2008

Introduction

The Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group was formed shortly after the 2008 Annual Meeting of the American Library Association. The group's charge was to develop a monographic cataloging policy that would provide for a single electronic MARC bibliographic record to represent an online resource that is available from one or more providers. This proposal is only concerned with separate MARC records for the electronic resource-- it does not address the addition of electronic fields to the print record, otherwise known as the "Single Record Approach." The proposal is intended to encompass records for monographic titles which are simultaneously issued in print and online, digital reproductions of print resources, and born-digital resources. All e-monographic resources cataloged on OCLC should follow the Provider-Neutral (P-N) model from Day One, even if the resource is available from only one provider at the time of cataloging. E-monograph records created by the DLF Registry of Digital Masters should be combined with records from other providers onto the one P-N e-monograph record. Separate records may be created at the national level, whenever the cataloger determines that the content of a new digital manifestation is significantly different. Catalogers are also free to use the Single-Record Approach, at both the national and local levels.

Background

Current monographic cataloging practice requires the creation of a new record each time a new publisher, aggregator, or distributor provides access to an online resource. Increasingly, the same monograph has become available digitally from multiple providers, resulting in many duplicative MARC records for online resources in shared bibliographic utilities and in local catalogs. Catalog users often have difficulty understanding the rationale or the subtle differences between multiple records when searching through a cluster of very similar electronic resource records. Often the only difference in a long record is the presence of a different publisher/aggregator/digitizer/distributor in the Reproduction note (533 field).

In developing a provider-neutral e-monograph policy, the Task Group is following similar provider-neutral policies which have been successfully enacted for online serials and online integrating resources. According to this policy, no distinction is made between the cataloging of digital reproductions and digital resources issued simultaneously in another format. These distinctions are becoming less and less useful and increasingly difficult to make. All digital monographs, whether reproductions, simultaneously issued manifestations, or born digital resources, will be cataloged according to the same guidelines.

General Characteristics of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record

The provider-neutral e-monograph record emphasizes recording only information applicable to all manifestations with the same content. It does not contain information specific to any one particular provider (with the exception of citing the package and format upon which the record has been based in the Source of title note). Provider names are not given in notes or as added entries, or added to uniform titles as qualifiers. Notes about access restrictions, file formats, or system requirements specific to particular providers are also not used. Field 533, which is currently being used for descriptive data about a specific reproduction, will usually not be used in the record except in the case of DLF Registry of Digital Masters resources and some local digitization projects. In exceptional cases, e.g., the e-monograph record is for a reproduction of a rare book, essential local information may be given in 5XX fields, as long as each 5XX field contains a subfield $5, giving the institutional MARC 21 code for the institution adding the local information.

Metadata Application Profile (MAP) for the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record

M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used			
Leader		M	System-supplied except as below
	06 Type of record	M	
	07 Bibliographic level	M	(Default code currently = “m”)
	08 Type of control	M	(Default = “blank”)
	17 Encoding level	M	
	18 Descriptive cat form	M	
006	Fixed-length data elements - additional material characteristics	A	First byte is mandatory “m”
007	Physical description fixed field	A	First two bytes are mandatory “c” “r”
008	Fixed-length data elements – general information		
	06 Type of date/publication status	M	
	07-10 Date 1 11-14 Date 2	M M	
	15-17 Place of publication	M	
	23 Form of item	A	“s”
	28 Government publication	A	
	33 Literary form	O	(Default=”0”)
	34 Biography	O	(Default=”blank”)
010	LC control number	A	
020	ISBN	A	Include e-ISBN and p-ISBN; identify with qualifiers if available
040	Cataloging source	M	
041	Language code	A	
042	Authentication code	*	*For PCC records only
043	Geographic area code	O	
050/082/086/090	Call numbers	A/O	E-resource classification strongly encouraged but not required
1XX	Main entry	A	
240	Uniform title	A/O	
245	Title	M	Subfield “h [electronic resource]” entered after Subfields “a” “n” or “p”
246	Varying forms of titles	A	Example: 246 1 $i Available from some providers with title: $a <title> Example: 246 1 $i Print version has title $a <title on other format that does not appear on the e-resource>
M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used			
250	Edition	A	
256	Computer file characteristics	X	
260	Publication, distribution, etc.	M	Publication of first named publication information that applies to all instances of the work online
300	“Physical” description	M	Use: “1 online resource” If available include the pagination in parentheses followed by the illustrative matter. Exclude the

			original subfield “c” and (usually) the “e” subfield
490	Series statement	A	Use if on original resource. Series used only if available on all manifestations. (DLF Registry of Digital Masters records excepted)
500	Source of title	M	First note; not used if “Description based on print version” (DBO) note is present
500	Issued by…	X	Issued by [package provider] NOT used
500	“Description based on <print> version record”	A	Use if source record is better than the title page source on the e-resource. If source is DBO, than the source record should be indicated in a 776 link
506	Restrictions on access	X	Not used except for DLF Registry of Digital Masters records. Encourage use of local restrictions notes or in 856 public note (subfield z)
516	Type of computer file	X	
530	Additional physical form note	X*	*Generally not used; prefer use of 776 $i
533	Electronic reproduction	A*	*Use only for DLF Registry of Digital Masters records and with use of $5
534	Original version note	X	
538	Systems requirements	A*	*Use only for DLF Registry of Digital Masters records and with use of $5
583	Action note	A*	*Use only for DLF Registry of Digital Masters records and with use of $5
6XX	Subject headings	A	Use of subject headings if applicable, strongly encouraged, but not required depending on encoding level
655	Genre heading	O	Use if term is established as a 155 authority record (or terms from other identified thesauri)
700/710/730	Added entry	A	Use if applicable to all resources identified as having the same content. Do not use for package/provider names (DLF Registry of Digital Masters records excepted)
773	Host item entry	X	
776	Other format	A *	*Use, often in conjunction with a 500 “Description based on print version record” note. If 776 field is used, prefer the “insert from cited record” technique. Prefer this field instead of 530 field to describe the other format.
8XX	Series added entry	A	Use if applicable to all resources identified as having the same content; DLF Registry of Digital Masters records also included here
856	URL access	A*	*Use if URL is not institution specific. Do not use subfield “z” information if it is institution specific

Recommendations for Best Use of Provider-Neutral Records in Libraries

Libraries will need to make policy decisions as to the use of single or multiple records for their e-resource. They can use a single provider-neutral record that incorporates all specific package and other local information on that one record--or they can use multiple records, each with one specific package/URL on it. If the latter policy is chosen, it is important to remember that the OCLC number will remain the same on each one of the multiple records. In the future, libraries subscribing to WorldCat Local may want to record this kind of local information on holdings records.

Recommendations for Changes to MARC 21

We are recommending two changes to the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format in conjunction with the implementation of the Provider-Neutral Model:

1.The MARC format currently does not clearly distinguish bibliographic records for online resources from records for other types of electronic resources. Therefore, we are going to propose to MARBI that a new value be added to the 008 byte for "Form of item", to clearly mark when a record is for an Internet resource. Byte 008/23 “s” is used for records in the “Books” format and in most of the other formats as well; byte 008/29 “s” is used for records in the “Maps” and “Visual materials” formats. The “Computer files” format does not contain this byte.

2. We will also put forward a proposal to MARBI to add a subfield $5 for 800-830 fields, so that essential local series information on DLF Registry of Digital Masters records may be clearly distinguished from series information pertaining to all records with the same content. This subfield $5 for fields 800-830 would frequently be used in conjunction with other fields where $5 has already been authorized, such as fields 500, 538, 583, and several 7XX fields.

Implementation of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record: Next Steps

1. The provider-neutral model will need to be approved by PCC, OCLC, and the Library of Congress.

2. The task force should work in concert with the DLF Registry of Digital Masters constituency to harmonize the two sets of guidelines to the greatest extent possible.

3. Once the model is approved, multiple bibliographic records will need to be merged in OCLC. This merger will be accomplished in two ways: 1). An automated process handled by OCLC; 2). Mergers done individually by libraries and reported as "duplicates" when encountered. (More details in FAQ #5).

4. This group, or another task group, should be asked to re-write PCC's MARC Record Guide for Monograph Aggregator Vendors from the perspective of the provider-neutral model. (Current version available online at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/vendorguiderevised.pdf). In addition, the audience for these guidelines should be enlarged to include catalogers, vendors, representatives from mass digitization programs, and national cataloging agencies.

5. OCLC's: When to Input a New Record (Chapter 4 of its *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*) will need to be revised. The current version is available online at:
http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/input/default.shtm

6. ALCTS': *Differences Between, Changes Within: Guidelines on When to Create a New Record*, will need to be revised. The current version is available online at:
http://tpot.ucsd.edu/msd/catpolicies/cattoolsresources/docs/Differences07.pdf

7. The provider-neutral record model we recommend will be a hybrid between reproduction cataloging using LCRI 1.11A and electronic resource cataloging using AACR2 Chapter 9 (and also RDA). To accommodate this model, Library of Congress Rule Interpretation 1.11A and others relating to online resources will need to be modified concerning this new position on provider-neutral records for online reproductions.

8. The model will need to be publicized to catalogers, publishers, vendors, and other interested parties, both in the U.S. and abroad. Libraries receiving records from vendors are in a particularly good position to ascertain if anything in those records is out-of-step with current practice, and to get the records corrected.

Examples of provider-neutral records. These examples are intended to be real life examples in OCLC of P-N records created from real records; in many cases, machines or human beings will be creating future P-N records by merging or revising pre-existing pre-AACR or AACR imperfect copy (just as we do with other copy cataloging). We are not subsuming these examples in our report as they may continue to be revised. Note the 936 field in the OCLC records.
Example 1. #244642311. Simultaneous print/electronic editions (with two electronic sources)
Example 2. #244745677. Merged born digital records—same publisher with two different databases
Example 3. #244745683. Record showing merge of publisher and 3rd party reproductions
Example 4. #244745687. Example showing merger of Google and other digitization project record
Example 5. #244745689. Merge of publisher reproduction and 3rd party records; institution specific URL dropped
Example 6. #244745694. Non-current reproduction record by same publisher.
Example 7. #244790830. DLF Registry of Digital Masters record.
Example 8. #244792421. Rare book example of e-resource based on microfilm version record
Example 9. #256043385. Example merging 2 electronic AACR2 Chapter 9 records, but basing record on the print source
Example 10.#246800938. Oxford HTML example with varying print version title.

Appendices

1. **Appendix A: Frequently Asked Questions about the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record**.

2. Appendix B: Provider-Neutral Guidelines

Task Group Members:
Becky Culbertson (UC San Diego, Co-Chair)
George Prager (NYU Law, Co-Chair, special libraries community)
Robert Bremer (OCLC, technical)
Jackie Dooley (Head, Special Collections and Archives, U. of Calif. Irvine)
Kate Harcourt (Columbia, education, PCC MARC Vendor Guide TF chair)
Anne Harris (ebrary, vendor/publisher community)
Ryan Hildebrand (University of California Irvine, rare books)
Claudia Horning (UCLA, repository copies of ebooks, nonmetadata/cataloger)
Yael Mandelstam (Fordham Law)
Shana McDanold (UPenn, advisor from Serials community)
Dave Reser (LC, CPSO)
Karen Sinkule (National Library of Medicine)
Carolyn Sturtevant (LC, ex-officio)
Larissa Walsh (UChicago, digital registry community)
Susan Westberg (OCLC, Googlebooks, mass digitization community, digital registry community)