

# **Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group Report**

## **July 30, 2009**

### **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 from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) was:

*To develop a provider-neutral cataloging model for a single bibliographic record that could be used for all the instances of an online monograph. This is to include records for resources, that, in the past, have been cataloged variously as reproductions or electronic editions.*

*To recommend best practices for flexible use of these records in libraries.*

*To recommend ways to promote the use of these records among cataloging agencies and publishers/providers who create and issue cataloging copy for online monographic records.*

*To explore the feasibility of collapsing multiple records for electronic monographic resources in OCLC into single, provider-neutral records, and to make recommendations for implementing the process.*

The group began work in the summer of 2008, and submitted its report to the PCC Standing Committee on Standards and the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) in October 2008. Final comments from the Standing Committee on Standards, PCC members, and cataloging email lists were received in June 2009, and a final decision by the PCC Policy Committee was made shortly thereafter. Implementation of the new policy has been scheduled for August 2009. Once implemented, this policy will apply to all PCC member libraries coding their records as PCC program records whenever they create or revise master records in OCLC.

It is recommended, though not required, that non-PCC member libraries follow these guidelines when they create or revise e-monograph records in OCLC. Of course, all libraries may follow whatever policies they wish in their local online public access catalogs (OPACs). If libraries upload local bibliographic records to OCLC, OCLC and the library will work together to "neutralize" the records for e-monographs. This process will consist in part of OCLC removing fields which were formerly used to distinguish multiple instances of an e-monograph, e.g., field 533. (See FAQ 10 for a more detailed explanation).

### **Scope of the Proposal**

It should be stressed that 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 records, otherwise known as the "single record approach". The Provider-Neutral E-Monograph proposal is intended to encompass records for monographic titles that 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 model from Day One, even if the resource is available from only one provider at the time of cataloging. E-monograph records created by either the eContent Synchronization Program (040 OCLCE), the DLF Registry of Digital Masters, or other digital preservation projects, should be combined with records from other providers onto the one provider-neutral e-monograph record. Separate records may be created in OCLC whenever the cataloger determines that the content of a new digital manifestation is significantly different from any existing record. 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 a particular online resource. Increasingly, monographs considered to be exactly the same edition are becoming 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 has followed similar provider-neutral policies that have been successfully enacted by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging 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—reproductions, simultaneously issued manifestations, or born digital resources—are to 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 used for descriptive data about a specific reproduction, is no longer to be used in the record except in the case of records for the DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. In exceptional cases, e.g., a reproduction of a rare book, essential local information may be given in the e-monograph record 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. Based on practical reasons, we advocated not adding the qualifier (Online) to any series access point to distinguish it from its original source format. This practice was approved by PCC and the Library of Congress Policy and Standards Division (LC PSD) in June 2009. LCRI 25.5B will be amended to appear in the August 2009 update to the Cataloger's Desktop. (See FAQ 8 for a detailed explanation of the new series policy).

**Metadata Application Profile (MAP) for the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record**  
**(Use in conjunction with MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data)**

<b>M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used</b>			
Leader		M	System-supplied except as below
	06 Type of record	M	Use the code appropriate to the type of material, according to the MARC 21 guidelines (e.g., language material and manuscripts published online should be coded type "a")
	07 Bibliographic level	M	(Default code currently = "m")
006	Fixed-length data elements – additional material characteristics	A/O	First byte is mandatory. Use code "m". Optionally, add an additional 006 field with the appropriate first byte value when the resource is an online reproduction of a manuscript. The code used will vary according to the type of reproduction (e.g., "t" for a reproduction of manuscript language material, "a" for notated music manuscript, etc.)
007	Physical description fixed field	A	First two bytes are mandatory. Use codes "c" and "r"
008	Fixed-length data elements – general information	M	Code as for any online monograph. Use code "s" for Form of item in byte 008/23 for Books and all other formats except for Cartographic and Visual materials which use byte 008/29
010	LC control number	A	Do not include print LCCN here but move it to the 776 field instead
020	ISBN	A	If there is an electronic ISBN (e-ISBN) as well as other ISBNs, record the e-ISBN in field 020 \$a as the first ISBN, record other ISBNs in 020 \$z, and copy the print ISBN (p-ISBN) to field 776 \$z. If it is unclear which format the ISBN represents—as often occurs with simultaneously issued versions—then use \$z for any ISBN in the e-version record
040	Cataloging source	M	Assign the MARC code for the original/transcribing cataloging agency creating the e-resource record in \$a. Do not assign the MARC code from the 040 \$a of the print/other format source record
050/060/082/086	Classification numbers	O	Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required. If using 050/060, set first indicator to blank and second indicator to 4
245	Title	M	Use subfield "h [electronic resource]" after subfields "a" "n" or "p"

<b>M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used</b>			
246	Varying forms of titles	A	Use if applicable Example: 246 1_ \$i Available from some providers with title: \$a <title>
250	Edition	A	Record only edition statements originating from the original publisher/society; ignore statements that pertain to specific provider versions
256	Computer file characteristics	X	Do not use
260	Publication, distribution, etc.	M	Record first named publication information that applies to all known instances of the online resource. If the e-resource being cataloged is an online reproduction of a print monograph, usually the publisher/distributor information will come from the original print/other format source record
300	“Physical” description	M	Use “1 online resource” in \$a. If available, include the pagination in parentheses followed by any illustrative matter, e.g., 1 online resource (25 p.) : \$b ill. Exclude the original subfield “c”. Examine any subfield “e” in the record, to make sure it is still applicable
490	Series statement	A	Record series as it applies to all known instances of the online resource. When the e-version is being used as the basis of the description and only one ISSN appears in the resource being described, record that ISSN in the 490 field. If both a print ISSN (p-ISSN) and an electronic ISSN (e-ISSN) appear in the resource being described, record the e-ISSN. When the print version is being used as the basis of the description, use whatever ISSN appears on that record. If no ISSN appears in the existing record, do not add any ISSN to the 490 field
500	Source of title	M	Use as first note; do not use if "Description based on print/other format version record" (DBO) note is present. Prefer field 588 for this information, once it has been implemented by OCLC
500	“Description based on print/other format version record”	A	Use when provider-neutral record is based on the print or other format version record; add a 776 field for that version. Example: 500 Description based on print version record. Prefer field 588 for this information, once it has been implemented by OCLC
500/550	Issued by [package provider]; Issued as part of [package provider]; Issued in [package provider]	X	Use package/provider names, if desired, in local record only

<b>M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used</b>			
506	Restrictions on access	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. For other resources – use restrictions information, if desired, in local record only
516	Type of computer file	A	Generally do not use unless e-resource has unusual properties
530	Additional physical form	X	Generally do not use; prefer subfield “i” in the 776 field
533	Electronic reproduction	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”
534	Original version	X	Do not use, unless the e-resource being described is a part of a larger original resource but is sufficiently different to warrant a separate record. (e.g., the e-resource is one poem scanned from a book of poems). In this case, record the provider information in the 260 and 008/7-10 fields, and record the information of the original resource in the 534 field
538	Systems requirements	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”
540	Terms of use	X	Do not use
583	Action	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”
700/710/ 711/730	Added entry	A	Use if applicable to all known instances of the online resource. Do not use for package/provider names (records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects excepted)
773	Host item entry	X	Do not use
776	Other format	A	Often used in conjunction with a 500 “Description based on print/other format version record” note. If cataloging in the OCLC environment, prefer OCLC’s “insert from cited record” technique. Use 776 subfield “i” rather than 530 field to describe the type of resource recorded in the 776 field, e.g., 776 08 \$i Print version: \$a

**M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if applicable O=Optional X=Not used**

800/810/ 811/830	Series added entry	A	Use the authorized print form of the heading when providing an added entry for a series that exists in print as well as online. For series that exist only online, use the authorized form of the online series. Do not use for package/provider series (records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects excepted). When OCLC implements 8XX \$x for series ISSN, use the print ISSN rather than the online ISSN for series that exist in print as well as online. The ISSN for the online version should be used for series that exist only online
856	Electronic location and access	A	Use subfield “u” for URLs that are general (not institution specific). Do not use subfield “z” for information that 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-resources. They can use a single provider-neutral record that incorporates all specific package and other local information on one record – or they can use multiple records, each with one specific package/URL on it. Whatever decisions PCC member libraries make for their local catalogs, they still need to follow the provider-neutral guidelines when coding master records in OCLC as PCC program records. Records from any library that are added to OCLC are subject to having package-specific information removed.

## **Recommendations for Changes to MARC 21**

We have recommended two changes to the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format in conjunction with the implementation of the provider-neutral model:

1. Currently the MARC format does not clearly distinguish bibliographic records for online resources from records for other types of electronic resources. Therefore, we have written a Discussion Paper to MARBI to add two new values in the fixed field byte for "Form of item" across all formats, for online access and for direct access. Currently 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. If our recommendations in the form of a proposal to MARBI are successful, then code "s" for electronic will be replaced by the two new values, and code "s" will be made obsolete.
2. A proposal to add a subfield "5" (information about the institution to which the field applies) for 800-830 fields will be put forward to MARBI, so that essential local series information on DLF Registry of Digital Masters records and records for other digital preservation projects 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 subfield "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. Multiple bibliographic records 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).
2. The 2nd edition of the PCC's MARC Record Guide for Monograph Aggregator Vendors is being written from the perspective of the provider-neutral model. The current version is available online at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/vendorguiderevised.pdf>.
3. 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 including these examples in our report as they may continue to be revised. Note the 936 field in the OCLC records. There is a 730 field in each record to be used as a collocating device: 730 0\_ Provider Neutral Task Force (PCC) example records. The initial group of ten records is below. More may be added later, using the same 730 field.

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 merged with an OCLC eContent Synchronization Program 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 Record Comparison Chart**

## 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 (OCLC, programs & research)  
Kate Harcourt (Columbia, education, PCC MARC Vendor Guide TF)  
Anne Harris (ebrary, vendor/publisher community)  
Ryan Hildebrand (UC Irvine, rare books)  
Claudia Horning (UCLA, repository copies of ebooks)  
Yael Mandelstam (Fordham Law, special libraries community)  
Shana McDanold (U. of Penn., serials community)  
Dave Reser (LC, PSD)  
Karen Sinkule (National Library of Medicine)  
Carolyn Sturtevant (LC, ex-officio)  
Larisa Walsh (U. of Chicago, digital registry community)  
Susan Westberg (OCLC, Googlebooks, mass digitization community, digital registry community)

## **Appendix A**

### **Frequently Asked Questions about the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record**

#### **1. What is a provider-neutral e-monograph record?**

A provider-neutral e-monograph record is a single bibliographic record that covers all equivalent manifestations of an online monograph. Manifestations are considered equivalent if their format and their content are essentially the same, based on clues from the author, title, edition, publishing information, and physical description. Another separate record is needed only if the cataloger determines that another online version, because of substantial differences (e.g., in content or subject), really represents a different manifestation. There will also be some cases where the resources are considered equivalent even though the titles that appear on each resource differ.

#### **2. What are the types of online monographs for which it will be used?**

The provider-neutral e-monograph record has been defined for monographs that have the same content available by one or more providers. The monographs may be issued as born-digital resources, current simultaneously-issued-with-print editions, or scanned reproductions of previous existing materials. A provider-neutral record should be created for online monographs even if no equivalent manifestations exist at the point of cataloging. Records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects will use the same criteria and may be combined both with other Registry records and records for equivalent manifestations.

#### **3. Why do we need it?**

Current monographic cataloging practice in the Anglo-American world requires the creation of a new record each time a new publisher, aggregator, or distributor provides online access to the same electronic resource. As a result, many duplicative MARC records for online resources are created in shared cataloging systems such as OCLC. 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. The creation of one record that can be used for as many aggregations as possible will improve search and retrieval in online catalogs. Moving to the provider-neutral model puts the emphasis on the content of the resource, and not the provider.

#### **4. What is the relationship to FRBR?**

Provider-neutral records cover multiple manifestations, but not all physical manifestations, so they are neither at the expression nor exactly at the manifestation level. What we have proposed is collapsing multiple manifestations for online monographic resources.

#### **5. What is the provider-neutral mindset?**

This mindset is a fundamental approach to cataloging online resources that emphasizes recording only fields that apply to all electronic manifestations of the resource. Other information such as individual database names, individual e-package names, publishers or third party aggregators that are currently entered into the bibliographic records to distinguish different versions would, in this mindset, be considered local information. Some resources may only have one provider at the time of cataloging, but may become available through other providers in various packages afterwards. Thus it is important to keep the records as “neutral” as possible from the very outset of cataloging.

#### **6. How will these new provider-neutral records be identified? How will they differ from other e-monograph records?**

Only fields applying to all online versions of the resource will be retained in the master OCLC record. Although there is no single byte, subfield, or field that specifically states that the record is provider-neutral, the records

will look different from current practices:

- There will not be notes or added entries for specific packages or aggregations. This information will now reside in local fields, which may be added as needed by aggregators and publishers using the same source record.
- Multiple URLs may be included in the record for packages that contain the complete text but only if the URL can be used by all licensed users.
- 533 fields will no longer be used except for materials of DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. When they are used they will always be followed by a subfield “5” for the institution represented.
- Variant provider-specific titles will be used, but the specific provider will not be named in the title field, e.g., 246 1\_ \$i Available from some providers with title: \$a
- The note phrase “Description based on print/other format version record” is used whenever the source of the description is not from the e-resource itself, but a MARC record that contains the same source as the resource. This will be a frequent occurrence when the e-resource lacks a title page (or when the description on the other format record is more complete than what the e-resource offers for description).
- The publisher and dates will be those of the original monograph, as found on the copy being described, as opposed to the digitizer and dates of digitization. This information is much more useful and is more readily available.
- There will be fewer notes. The version (and format, if there are multiple formats) upon which the description is based will be cited in a “Description based on” or “Title from” note. The 538 will be rarely used for system requirements. It will also not usually be used for “Mode of access” notes, except for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. These have special requirements for this field and will end with a subfield “5” for the institution represented.
- The 300 field will start with “1 online resource”.

### **7. Upon implementation of the provider-neutral model, will catalogers still apply LCRI 1.11A and the 533 field?**

LCRI 1.11A will no longer be applied to electronic reproductions available from multiple providers when creating a provider-neutral master record in OCLC. Similarly, with the exception of records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects, individual 533 fields to describe publishers/aggregators will not be used for electronic resource records. LCRI 1.11A will be modified to include a “PCC practice” statement to apply these provider-neutral guidelines when creating or revising master records in OCLC for electronic reproductions of monographs available from one or more providers

### **8. How will series access points in multiple formats be affected by the provider-neutral model?**

The following series statements should be included in the provider-neutral record:

1. Digitized version of print monograph. The series of the print version (original format) should be represented in the provider-neutral record.
2. Born-digital e-monograph with no known print counterpart. The digital series should be represented in the provider-neutral record.
3. Born-digital e-monograph issued simultaneously with a print version.
  - a. If the series is the same for both versions, that series should be represented in the provider-neutral record.
  - b. If the digital version is issued as part of a series different than the print version, the digital series should be represented in the provider-neutral record.

<p>Note: Provider series that are not applicable to all e-versions should NOT be included in the provider-neutral e-monograph record, except for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects.</p>
---

## **9. How will digital reproductions and editions of manuscript materials be treated?**

In accordance with current Anglo-American cataloging practice, all remote access electronic resources, including manuscript materials, are considered published. Therefore, bibliographic records for digital manuscripts will require the MARC 21 Leader 06 "Type of record" value which is appropriate for the type of material (e.g., "a" for language material and "e" for cartographic material). Optionally, include an additional 006 field to reflect (and in some cases, index) the resource as a manuscript as well as a published item. In addition, field 260 for a digital manuscript will generally contain: [S.l. : \$b s.n.], \$c [date]. If the resource contains a transcription of a manuscript, the record will be considered an edition, and the publishing information relating to the distributor/publisher will be given in the 260 field, with no need for an additional 006 field.

## **10. How will existing records in OCLC be affected?**

Elimination of provider-specific fields is unlikely to become a part of duplicate detection itself, but the ongoing conversion of records into "neutral" ones will substantially improve record matching. Once the 533, provider 710 and provider 8XX fields are deleted, subsequent actual merges of the now duplicate records will automatically transfer URLs, unique call numbers, subject headings, etc. But it will be a lengthy two-step process in most cases; a record may be neutralized in 2009, but not merged with its duplicate(s) until 2010 when it is reported, or when OCLC staff initiates a manual merge, or when it is caught by the global Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) process. Other duplicate records will remain if they contain preservation data predating the use of subfield "5". In these records, provider-specific fields will need to be specifically identified and removed set-by-set. Since this will be difficult to accomplish in cases where the contents of specific record sets are unknown, duplicates will decline over the years, but are unlikely to disappear completely. All records batch loaded into OCLC will go through the same DDR process. In the place of the 533 field, one can expect to start seeing "Description based on print version record" (or equivalent statements for other formats) appear in records that exist in multiple formats.

## **11. As a cataloger, how do I decide which records to use for a provider-neutral record?**

Choose the best record; if they are all alike, select the record with the most holdings. At this time, it is not necessary to report duplicates, as we expect the DDR process to catch many, if not most of them.

## **12. How will records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects in OCLC be affected?**

MARC bibliographic records for materials of DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects will contain the same fields that they currently have – 533, 538, 583, 856, but if they are cataloged using the separate record approach, they will follow the same provider-neutral record criteria which may result in the use of one separate record. In the rare instances where there are multiple institutions providing Digital Masters, the same provider-neutral record will be used. Each institution will provide its specific information in the 533, 538, 583, and 856 fields followed by a specific subfield "5" to indicate the institution providing the information.

## **13. How will we maintain provider-neutral records in our local catalogs?**

Libraries will have the choice of relying on their own de-duplicating processes to add package information on a single merged record or keep separate records, each with their own individual package names, etc. Libraries subscribing to WorldCat Local in the future may want to use the provider-neutral bibliographic record without modification and use separate OCLC local holdings records (LHRs) to record provider-specific information (e.g., 856 links, package names, restriction notes, etc.). For newly purchased electronic record packages, it is very likely that libraries, vendors, and OCLC will work together to provide the URLs, OCLC numbers, and vendor specific information on MARC records using the provider-neutral OCLC record as the base record.

## **14. Where can I learn more?**

A summary of the presentation on this topic at the Joint CONSER/BIBCO Operations Meeting held on May 1-2, 2008, is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/BIBCOOpCo2008Summary.html>

A PowerPoint presentation by Becky Culbertson for the ALCTS Copy Cataloging Interest Group July 11, 2009 and Elluminate session July 23, 2009 is available at: <http://tpot.ucsd.edu/FrequentlyUsedLinks/PN090711.pptx>

The complete charge of the task group is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Mono-charge.pdf>

The latest version of the report has been posted on the PCC Website at:  
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf>

Please contact either Becky Culbertson ([rculbertson@ucsd.edu](mailto:rculbertson@ucsd.edu)) or George Prager ([pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu](mailto:pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu)), the group's co-chairs, for further information.

### **15. Can I see an example of a provider-neutral e-monograph record?**

There are ten examples in OCLC that can be retrieved in Connexion or WorldCat with this title search: 730 0 Provider Neutral Task Force (PCC) example records. More may be added in the future, using the same 730 field.

## Appendix B

<b>Provider-Neutral Record Comparison Chart</b>		
<b>AACR2r Chapter 9</b>	<b>LCRI 1.11A</b>	<b>Provider-Neutral Model</b>
06 Type of record. Code appropriate to the type of material used according to the MARC 21 guidelines (e.g., language material and manuscripts published online should be coded type "a")	06 Type of record. Code appropriate to the type of material used according to the MARC 21 guidelines (e.g., language material and manuscripts published online should be coded type "a")	06 Type of record. Use the code appropriate to the type of material, according to the MARC 21 guidelines (e.g., language material and manuscripts published online should be coded type "a")
07 Bibliographic level. (Default code currently = "m")	07 Bibliographic level. (Default code currently = "m")	07 Bibliographic level. (Default code currently = "m")
006 Fixed-length data elements – additional material characteristics. First byte is mandatory "m"	006 Fixed-length data elements – additional material characteristics. First byte is mandatory "m"	006 Fixed-length data elements – additional material characteristics. First byte is mandatory "m". Optionally, add an additional 006 field with the appropriate first byte value when the resource is an online reproduction of a manuscript. The code used will vary according to the type of reproduction (e.g., "t" for a reproduction of manuscript language material, "a" for notated music manuscript, etc.)
007 Physical description fixed field. First two bytes are mandatory "c" "r"	007 Physical description fixed field. First two bytes are mandatory "c" "r"	007 Physical description fixed field. First two bytes are mandatory "c" "r"
008 Coded as for any online monograph	008 Coded as for any online monograph	008 Code as for any online monograph. Use code "s" for Form of item in byte 008/23* for Books and all other formats except for Cartographic and Visual materials which use byte 008/29
010 print LCCN not included here but moved to the 776 field instead	010 print LCCN not included here but moved to the 776 field instead	010 Do not include print LCCN here but move it to the 776 field instead
020 all retained	020 all retained	020 If there is an electronic ISBN (e-ISBN) as well as other ISBNs, record the e-ISBN in field 020 \$a as the first ISBN, record other ISBNs in 020 \$z, and copy the print ISBN (p-ISBN) to field 776 \$z. If it is unclear which format the ISBN represents—as often occurs with simultaneously issued versions—then use \$z for any ISBN in the e-version record

AACR2r Chapter 9	LCRI 1.11A	Provider-Neutral Model
040 MARC code for the original/transcribing cataloging agency creating the e-resource cataloging record. MARC code from the 040 \$a of the print/other format source record: not assigned	040 MARC code for the original/transcribing cataloging agency creating the e-resource cataloging record. MARC code from the 040 \$a of the print/other format source record: not assigned	040 Assign the MARC code for the original/transcribing cataloging agency creating the e-resource record in \$a. Do not assign the MARC code from the 040 \$a of the print/other format source record
050/060/082/086 Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required. If using 050/060, second indicator is set to 4	050/060/082/086 Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required. If using 050/060, second indicator is set to 4	050/060/082/086 Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required. If using 050/060, set first indicator to blank and second indicator to 4
245 \$h [electronic resource]	245 \$h [electronic resource]	245 \$h [electronic resource]. Use after subfields "a" "n" or "p"
246 Variant titles of resource: used	246 Variant titles of original source: used	246 Use if applicable Example: 246 1_ \$i Available from some providers with title: \$a <title>
250 Used if applicable	250 Used if applicable	250 Record only edition statements originating from the original publisher/society; ignore statements that pertain to specific provider versions
256 (Seen on older records)	256 (Seen on older records)	256 Do not use
260 Publication information of the reproduction/digitizer/ e-resource publisher. Includes date of new edition	260 Publication information of the original source version. Includes date of original	260 Record first named publication information that applies to all known instances of the online resource. If the e-resource being cataloged is an online reproduction of a print monograph, usually the publisher/distributor information will come from the original print/other version source record
300 (earlier) nothing 300 (later) 100 p. : \$b digital, PDF file 300 (2b) 100 p. : \$b digital, HTML file 300 (3) 1 electronic text	300 pagination of the original	300 Use "1 online resource" in \$a. If available, include the pagination in parentheses followed by any illustrative matter, e.g., 1 online resource (25 p.) : \$b ill. Exclude the original subfield "c". Examine any subfield "e" in the record, to make sure it is still applicable

AACR2r Chapter 9	LCRI 1.11A	Provider-Neutral Model
490 Used if on resource	490 Used if on original resource	490 Record series as it applies to all known instances of the online resource. When the e-version is being used as the basis of the description and only one ISSN appears in the resource being described, record that ISSN in the 490 field. If both a print ISSN (p-ISSN) and an electronic ISSN (e-ISSN) appear in the resource being described, record the e-ISSN. When the print version is being used as the basis of the description, use whatever ISSN appears on that record. If no ISSN appears in the existing record, do not add any ISSN to the 490 field
500 Source of title: used	500 Source of title: not used	500 Use as first note; do not use if "Description based on print/other format version record" (DBO) note is present. Prefer field 588 for this information, once it has been implemented by OCLC
500 "Description based on print/other format version record": phrase not used	500 "Description based on print/other format version record": phrase not used	500/588 Use when provider-neutral record is based on the print or other format version record; add a 776 field for that version. Example: 500 Description based on print version record. Prefer field 588 for this information, once it has been implemented by OCLC
500/550 Issued by... Used to justify package name added entry	500/550 Issued by ... Appears in 533 instead	500/550 Issued by [package provider]... Use, if desired, in local record only
506 Often used	506 Often used	506 Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects** For other resources – use restrictions information, if desired, in local record only
516 Used early on; rarely used currently	516 Not used	516 Generally do not use unless e-resource has unusual properties
530 Generally not applicable	530 Used early on; now many catalogers use the 776 \$i Print version: \$a...	530 Generally do not use; prefer subfield "i" in the 776 field
533 Electronic reproduction: not used	533 Electronic reproduction: used	533 Electronic reproduction. Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects** Use with subfield "5"
534 Used by some catalogers to indicate original source information (this is in lieu of the 1.11A model)	534 Not used	534 Do not use, unless the e-resource being described is a part of a larger original resource but is sufficiently different to warrant a separate record. (e.g., the e-resource is one poem scanned from a book of poems). In this case, record the provider information in the 260 and 008/7-10 fields, and record the information of the original resource in the 534 field

<b>AACR2r Chapter 9</b>	<b>LCRI 1.11A</b>	<b>Provider-Neutral Model</b>
538 Used for Mode of access; Systems requirement generally not used unless unusual	538 Not used	538 Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects** Use with subfield “5”
540 Used—apt to be provider specific	540 Used—apt to be provider specific	540 Do not use
583 Used in digital registry records	583 Used in digital registry records	583 Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects** Use with subfield “5”
700/710/711/730 Used for package names	700/710/711/730 Used for package names	700/710/711/730 Use if applicable to all known instances of the online resource. Do not use for package/provider names (records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects excepted)**
773 Used for collocation purposes similarly to 700/710/711/730 package names	773 Used for collocation purposes similarly to 700/710/711/730 package names	773 Do not use
776 Used	776 Used	776 Use. Often used in conjunction with a 500 “Description based on print/other format version record” note. Prefer OCLC’s “insert from cited record” technique. Use 776 subfield “i” rather than 530 field to describe the type of resource recorded in the 776 field, e.g., 776 08 \$i Print version: \$a
800/810/811/830 Used if applicable	800/810/811/830 Used if applicable	800/810/811/830 Use the authorized print form of the heading when providing an added entry for a series that exists in print as well as online. For series that exist only online, use the authorized form of the online series. Do not use for package/provider series (records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects excepted)** When OCLC implements 8XX \$x for series ISSN, use the print ISSN rather than the online ISSN for series that exist in print as well as online. The ISSN for the online version should be used for series that exist only online
856 Used. Often includes subfield “z” information	856 Used. Often includes subfield “z” information	856 Use subfield “u” for URLs that are general (not institution specific). Do not use subfield “z” for information that is institution specific

\* We have proposed two new values in 008/23 and 008/29 for online access and for direct access.

\*\* Records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects will use all the fields that they need—including 533 and 583 fields—as long as they use a subfield “5” at the end of the fields to indicate the institution to which the field applies. We suggest a proposal to MARBI be made to implement a subfield “5” for the 800-830 fields.