

# **Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide**

---

Includes revisions to **June 21**, 2011

Prepared by

**Becky Culbertson**

*University of California, San Diego*

**Yael Mandelstam**

*Fordham University School of Law*

**George Prager**

*New York University School of Law*

Program for Cooperative Cataloging

Washington, D.C.

2009

## Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

### 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 iterations 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, received final approval from the PCC Policy Committee in June 2009, and the Guidelines went into effect on August 1, 2009. The provider-neutral policy applies 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 this guide 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 **iterations** of an e-monograph, e.g., field 533. (See FAQ 11 for a more detailed explanation).

### Scope

It should be stressed that this guide 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

## Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

as the "single record approach". The provider-neutral e-monograph model is intended to encompass records for monographic titles **in all formats** that are simultaneously issued as print and online **versions**, 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 either the eContent Synchronization Program (040 OCLCE) or the DLF Registry of Digital Masters and 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

## Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

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 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 was amended 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)**

(Use in conjunction with [MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data](#))

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<b>Leader</b>		
<a href="#">06</a>	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," <b>notated music coded as type "c," moving images as "g", etc.</b> ).	M
<a href="#">07</a>	Bibliographic level Use <b>"m" for monographs and "c" for collections.</b>	M
<b>006 Fixed-Length Data Elements – Additional Material Characteristics</b>		
<a href="#">00</a>	Form of material Libraries cataloging in OCLC or other shared bibliographic databases must use MARC 21 control field 006 with the assigned value "m" when the MARC Leader/06 is set to any code other than "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 ("t" for a reproduction of manuscript language material, "a" for notated music manuscript, and "f" for manuscript cartographic materials).	A/O
<b>007 Variable Control Fields – Physical Description Fixed Field</b>		

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">00</a>	<p>Category of material “c”</p> <p>For material other than online books and notated music, use an additional 007 field for other characteristics not specified in the first 007 field (first byte “v” for videorecordings, “a” for maps, etc.). The codes used in this 007 will reflect the digital aspects to the degree possible, e.g., the dimensions byte would be “z.”</p>	M
<a href="#">01</a>	<p>Specific material designation “r”</p>	M
<b>008 Variable Control Fields – Fixed-Length Data Elements</b>		
<a href="#">23/29</a>	<p>Form of item “o”</p> <p>Use code “o” for Form of item in byte 008/23 for all formats except Cartographic and Visual materials. These formats use byte 008/29.</p>	M
<b>Variable Data Fields</b>		
<a href="#">010</a>	<p>Library of Congress Control Number</p> <p>Do not include <b>physical</b> format LCCN here; move it to the 776 field instead.</p>	A
<a href="#">020</a>	<p>International Standard Book Number</p> <p>If there are ISBNs for the resource in its electronic format as well as other ISBNs, record each e version ISBN in a separate 020 \$a; record other ISBNs in 020 \$z (preferably in separate fields); copy the print 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.</p>	

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">040</a>	<p>Cataloging Source</p> <p>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.</p>	M
<a href="#">050, etc.</a>	<p>Classification Numbers</p> <p>Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required for non-BIBCO records. If using 050/060, set first indicator to blank and second indicator to 4.</p>	O
<a href="#">245</a>	<p>Title Statement</p> <p>Use subfield “h [electronic resource] “ after subfields “a”, “n”, “p” (or “f” and “g” for archival collections).</p>	M
<a href="#">246</a>	<p>Varying Form of Title</p> <p>Retain from source record or record provider specific title variants if deemed important, with or without an explanatory note, e.g.,</p> <p>246 1_ \$i Available from some providers with title: \$a &lt;title&gt;</p> <p>246 1_ \$a &lt;title&gt;</p>	A
<a href="#">250</a>	<p>Edition Statement</p> <p>Record only edition statements originating from the original publisher/society; ignore statements that pertain to specific provider versions.</p>	A
<a href="#">256</a>	<p>Computer File Characteristics</p> <p>Do not use.</p>	X
<a href="#">260</a>	<p>Publication, Distribution, etc. (Imprint)</p> <p><b>All online resources are considered published.</b> Record first named publication information that applies to all known <b>iterations</b> of the online resource. If the e-resource being cataloged is an online reproduction of a <b>physical</b> format monograph, usually the publisher/distributor information will come from the original <b>physical format</b> source record.</p>	M

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">300</a>	<p>Physical Description</p> <p>Use “1 online resource” in \$a (add other indications of the extent if desired in a parenthetical qualifier)* Exclude the original subfield “c”. Examine any subfield “e” in the record, to make sure it is still applicable.</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (25 p.) : \$b ill.</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (36 charts on 18 leaves)</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (1 sound file (30 min.)) : \$b stereo</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (1 score (32 p.) + 1 part (19 p.))</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (1 video file (30 min.)) : \$b sd., col. with b&amp;w sequences</p> <p>Example: 300 1 online resource (6 maps) : \$b col.</p>	M
<a href="#">490</a>	<p>Series Statement</p> <p>Transcribe the form of the series as it applies to all known iterations 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, transcribe 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 in the record, do not add any ISSN to the 490 field.</p>	A
<a href="#">500</a>	Source of Title Note – See 588 field	
<a href="#">500/550</a>	<p>Issuing Body Note</p> <p>Issued by [package provider]; Issued as part of &lt;or Issued in...&gt; [package...]</p> <p>Use package/provider names, if desired, in local record only.</p>	X

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">506</a>	Restrictions on Access Note Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, <b>HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”</b> . For other resources, use restrictions information, if desired in local record only.	A
<a href="#">516</a>	Type of Computer File or Data Note Generally do not use unless e-resource has unusual properties.	O
<a href="#">530</a>	Additional Physical Form Available Note Generally do not use; prefer subfield “i” in the 776 field.	X
<a href="#">533</a>	Reproduction Note Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, <b>HathiTrust Digital Library</b> , and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”.	A
<a href="#">534</a>	Original Version Note Do not use, unless the e-resource being described is a part of a larger original resource <b>that</b> is sufficiently different to warrant a separate record (e.g., the e-resource is one poem scanned from a book). If so, record the provider information in the 260 and 008/7-10 fields, and record the information about the original resource in the 534 field.	X
<a href="#">538</a>	System Details Note Use for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects.* Use with subfield "5". For all other records, make a Mode of access note only if the resource is accessed by means other than the World Wide Web.	A
<a href="#">540</a>	Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note Do not use <b>except for digitized archival collections</b> .	X
<a href="#">583</a>	Action Note Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, <b>HathiTrust Digital Library</b> and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”.	A

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">588</a>	<p>Source of Description Note /Source of Title note</p> <p>If the description is based on the online resource, use the Description based on note and Source of title note. Record where and when the resource was viewed.</p> <p>Example: 588 Description based on online resource; title from PDF title page (Ebrary, viewed June 21, 2011).</p> <p>If the description is based on another record, use “Description based on print/other format version record” note. Do not use Source of title note.</p> <p>Example: 588 Description based on CD-ROM version record.</p>	<p>M (change from A)</p>
<a href="#">700-751</a>	<p>Added Entry Fields</p> <p>Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects. Use with subfield “5”.</p>	<p>A</p>
<a href="#">773</a>	<p>Host Item Entry</p> <p>Do not use</p>	<p>X</p>
<a href="#">776</a>	<p>Additional Physical Form Entry</p> <p>Required if the description is based on the record for another format; otherwise provide if readily available. Use 776 \$i rather than 530 field to describe the type of resource recorded in the 776 file.</p> <p>Example: 776 08 \$i Print version: \$a ...</p>	<p>A</p>

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

Element	Labels and Notes	Use
<a href="#">80X-83X</a>	<p>Series Added Entry Fields</p> <p>Use the authorized print (or physical) form of the heading when providing an added entry for a series that exists in physical format 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, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects excepted).</p> <p>Use the print ISSN rather than the online ISSN for series that exist in print as well as online. Append the \$x to the end of the field as the final subfield.</p> <p>Example: 830 #0 \$a Proceedings of SPIE—the International Society for Optical Engineering ; \$v v. 7719. \$x 0277 786X</p>	A
<a href="#">856</a>	<p>Electronic Location and Access</p> <p>Use subfield “u” for URLs that are general (not institution specific). Do not use subfield “z” for information that is institution specific. If there is a need to include information about the package name because the domain name is not specific enough, this may be given in a subfield “3”.</p>	A

### **Recommendations for Best Use of Provider-Neutral Records in Libraries**

Libraries 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.

### **Examples of Provider-Neutral Records**

The title phrase: “Provider Neutral Task Force (PCC) example records” in OCLC browse retrieves examples of P-N records in multiple formats. 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). 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 record. #244642311.

Simultaneous print/electronic editions (with two electronic sources)

The title search in OCLC Connexion for records in other formats is: Provider Neutral Task Force (PCC) example records.

### **Appendices**

1. Appendix A: Frequently Asked Questions about the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record
2. Appendix B: Provider-Neutral Record Comparison Chart

## **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 is 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. The provider-neutral model collapses multiple manifestations for online monographic resources into one record.

#### **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 were previously entered into the bibliographic records to distinguish different versions, is considered, in this mindset, to be 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 can provider-neutral records be identified? How do they differ from other e-monograph records?**

Only fields applying to all online versions of the resource are retained in the master provider-neutral OCLC record. Although there is no single byte, subfield, or field that specifically states that the record is provider-neutral, the records look different from previous practices:

- There are no notes or added entries for specific packages or aggregations. This information now resides 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 is no longer used except for materials of DLF Registry of Digital Masters and other digital preservation projects. When used, they are always followed by a subfield “5” for the institution represented.
- Variant provider-specific titles can 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 are 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 are fewer notes. The version (and format, if there are multiple formats) upon which the description is based is cited in a “Description based on” or “Title from” note. The 538 is rarely used for system requirements. It is also not usually 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 starts with “1 online resource”.

#### **7. Can catalogers still apply LCRI 1.11A and the 533 field?**

LCRI 1.11A is no longer 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 are not 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 are series access points in multiple formats 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.

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, HathiTrust, and other digital preservation projects.

## **9. How are digital reproductions and editions of manuscript materials 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 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 generally contains: [S.l. : \$b s.n.], \$c [date]. If the resource contains a transcription of a manuscript, the record is considered an edition, and the publishing information relating to the distributor/publisher is given in the 260 field, with no need for an additional 006 field.

## **10. How are titles bound/scanned together treated? (added Feb. 2010)**

Although “bound together” titles may also be scanned together, they should not be cataloged as a unit since such treatment would necessarily be copy-specific and/or vendor-specific and would cease to be provider-neutral. Therefore, each title should be cataloged as a separate provider-neutral record and, if possible, should include an 856 URL link to the specific title covered by the record rather than a link to the “bound/scanned together” unit as a whole. If the only available link is to the unit, use an 856 \$3 to indicate the position of the title within the scanned image (If created through the DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust, or other digital preservation projects, records may use field 501 as long as it includes subfield “5”).

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

Elimination of provider-specific fields is unlikely to become a part of 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.

**12. 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.

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

MARC bibliographic records for materials of DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust and other digital preservation projects will contain the same fields that they previously had – 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.

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

Libraries have the choice of relying on their own de-duplicating processes to add package

## Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

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.

### **15. Should the provider-neutral record be used for resources that must be downloaded and accessed via e-readers or other electronic devices? (added Sep. 2010)**

Since the provider-neutral record focuses on the content of a resource rather than on its specific digital format, it should be used to describe any e-monograph that is either accessed directly online or is available online for downloading. URLs linking to free downloads of the resource from non-commercial sites (e.g., [gutenberg.org](http://gutenberg.org) or [manybooks.net](http://manybooks.net)) may be included in the master record, but do not provide URLs for downloads via commercial sites (e.g., [amazon.com](http://amazon.com) or [ebookstore.sony.com](http://ebookstore.sony.com)). Vendor-specific information about access restrictions, transmitting technologies, reading devices, etc. should be kept out of the OCLC master record but may be recorded locally in holdings or bibliographic records.

### **16. 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>

[Rules and Tools for Cataloging for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Session 2 on Online Monographs \(p. 83-144\)](#)

[http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/cataloginginternet/pdf/ceig1\\_IM-FINAL.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/cataloginginternet/pdf/ceig1_IM-FINAL.pdf)

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:

## Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf>

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

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

There are examples in OCLC of provider-neutral records in different formats, that can be retrieved in Connexion or WorldCat browse file with this title search: Provider Neutral Task Force (PCC) example records.