

SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records: Final Report Transmittal & Tracking Sheet

Date task group charged	September 5, 2023
Date task group discharged	July 11, 2024

This form is to be used to track progress on the review, approval, and implementation of the final reports of PCC task groups and committees. A link to this form can be found in the task group charge. Thereafter, the form should be updated each time the report is transmitted to a different body for review or action. Additional rows may be inserted as needed. The PCC Secretariat will insert the completed form as the cover sheet for the report when the process is complete.

Submission of report (completed by chair/leader of group):

Use the chart below to record the date the report was first submitted, the name of the PCC task group or committee submitting the report, and the title of the report.

Date	Name of Group	Title of Report
December 5, 2023	SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records	Preliminary Report of the SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records
April 5, 2024	SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records	Final Report of the SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records

Review of report (completed by PCC chair prior to passing report on for review):

Use the chart below to record the date the report was submitted for review, to which body, and its current status (e.g. in process, completed, etc.).

Date	Name of Body	Status of Review
December 18, 2023	SCS	Preliminary report reviewed, no comments
June 17, 2024	SCS	Final report and recommendations approved

July 11, 2024	PoCo	Final report and recommendations reviewed
---------------	------	---

Decisions regarding report:

Use the chart below to record decisions made regarding the report.

Date	Name of Body	Decisions Made
July 11, 2024	PoCo	Final report and recommendations approved; group discharged

Implementation of report:

Use the chart below to record actions taken regarding implementation of the decisions.

Date	Name of Body	Actions Taken



Final Report of the SCS Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records

April 5, 2024

Membership

Steve McDonald (steve.mcdonald@tufts.edu, Tufts University, Co-Chair, PCC Standing Committee on Standards Representative)

Christopher Carr (christopher.carr@concordia.ca, Concordia University, Co-Chair, Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange Representative)

Lindsay Conway (lisco@loc.gov, National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled) (started 11/21, replacing Ania Kazmierczak)

Hong Cui (hong.cui@bac-lac.gc.ca, Library and Archives Canada)

Michelle Hahn (MichelleKHahn@gmail.com, Ohio University)

Jeannette Ho (jaho@library.tamu.edu, Texas A&M University, OLAC representative)

Lilly Hoi Sze Ho (lilly.ho@nt.gov.au, lillyho@gmail.com, Library and Archives NT)

Teressa Keenan (teressa.keenan@mso.umt.edu, University of Montana)

Stephen Kharfen (skharfen@gpo.gov, U.S. Government Publishing Office)

Debbie Krahmer (dkrahmer@cornell.edu, Cornell University)

Morris Levy (levymo@oclc.org, OCLC)

Anita Kazmierczak (ahoffman@loc.gov, National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled) (ended 11/21, replaced by Lindsay Conway)

Introduction

The Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records was tasked in August 2023 with clarifying the relationship between the provider-neutral (P-N) record guidelines and accessibility features of online resources and considering whether the *Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide* should be modified to accommodate recording accessibility features. The Task Group was asked to take into account “*end user discovery, as well as the benefits offered by the provider-neutral standard for reducing duplication of work and streamlining long results sets for both catalogers and end users.*”

According to the PCC’s [Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide](#) (P-N/RDA version), “*The provider-neutral (P-N) model uses a single bibliographic record to describe multiple online manifestations of a resource, regardless of which publisher or aggregator is making the content available. The description should apply only to equivalent manifestations of the same expression; substantial (not just incidental) differences may indicate a different expression, which should be described in a separate record.*”

A change in accessibility content is sufficient to indicate a new expression. The Provider-Neutral Guidelines specifically mention several forms of accessibility content as features to watch for when deciding whether a manifestation can be included in a provider-neutral record. Different expressions cannot be recorded on the same provider-neutral record. For this reason, accessibility information is generally not included in provider-neutral records, significantly limiting community sharing of accessibility information in OCLC WorldCat.

There is a growing desire to record information about accessibility content in bibliographic records to assist users with disabilities. This information can also inform collection development and collection analysis. The Task Group was charged to consider whether it is possible to support these efforts while retaining the benefits of provider-neutral records.

The Task Group began by examining the nature of accessibility features. We shared knowledge about accessibility in electronic text formats, video and audio accessibility features, and provisions in the MARC21 standard for recording accessibility information. We collected some information on vocabularies available to describe accessibility features. We briefly examined legal liability issues for providing materials that are not accessible. Much of our discussion has circled around the great need for accessibility information in bibliographic records, and what kinds of information might be desired

Evaluation

The Provider-Neutral Guidelines specify that “Notes about access restrictions, file formats, file sizes, prices, subscription information, or system requirements specific to particular providers are not used.” However, accessibility features that might vary from provider to provider are specifically called out for streaming media: “...a streaming video with English captions and one without are considered different expressions and should not be brought together on the same provider-neutral record.” Though this guideline was originally written for AACR2, it is supported in both original RDA and in the LRM model which is the foundation for official RDA. Under LRM, accessibility content constitutes a work in itself, and a resource with accessibility content is an “augmentation aggregate”, an aggregate of a primary work plus a supplementary work to augment the primary with accessibility content. The same title with different accessibility content, or lacking accessibility content, is technically a separate work and expression, requiring a separate bibliographic record. The nature of aggregate expressions is contrary to the expectations of many librarians and can cause frustration for users.

The Task Group determined that provider-neutral records could be produced without violating the spirit of the P-N Guidelines as long as every instance of the resource linked to the record provided the same accessibility features. Thus a title might have a P-N record for platforms with feature A, another P-N record for platforms with feature B, a third P-N record for platforms with features A and B, etc. Since the P-N records would not indicate which vendors provide which named features, selecting the correct P-N record would require identifying the features available from the specific provider and checking the records, which would take even more work than simply selecting a provider-specific record. The extra work and the addition of multiple P-N records diminishes the usefulness of the Provider-Neutral Guidelines and would result in inefficient workflows.

The Task Group spent some time reviewing common workflows for importing bibliographic records into local library systems, especially in batches. For batch work, which sometimes imports thousands of records at a time, it is impractical to examine every bibliographic record individually. The purpose of batch work is to reduce or eliminate the need to work on individual records. Local libraries cannot afford to add and maintain accessibility information solely within their own catalogs. It is best if the information is added to the records by the provider or collectively by the community in a shared service such as OCLC.

OCLC's Collection Manager is an example of a distribution system for record sets for entire provider collections. Some vendors provide their own records directly to libraries, which may or may not include accessibility information and are usually not provider-neutral. OCLC, however, generally encourages the use of provider-neutral records. Providers send collection information to OCLC which uses an algorithm to find matching bibliographic records in the WorldCat database. The resulting sets of MARC records in Collection Manager can then be selected by subscribing libraries. This poses a problem regarding accessibility information. The information from the providers does not include details about the accessibility of titles. Automated record matches are based solely on the provided information. If there are multiple similar records, the algorithm could match the title to a record that does not match some of the missing details, such as accessibility information. With the vast numbers of records managed by Collection Manager, such mismatches will be discovered and corrected only if someone notices and specifically changes the match in Collection Manager, or if the data on which the match is based is improved in the bibliographic record or in the data file provided by the vendor. It is likely that many existing provider-neutral records in WorldCat are used to represent different expressions with different accessibility content.

When a library creates a separate bibliographic record in WorldCat for a work or expression that only differs in accessibility content, there are always concerns that the record with accessibility content might be matched and then merged to the record describing the work or expression without accessibility content. A library would need to "catalog defensively" by recording fields that mark the record as distinct from similar records to avoid automated merging. This is a serious problem faced by services that create accessible content to augment existing resources.

We also discussed the dilemma faced by libraries using a shared catalog, such as WorldCat Discovery or consortial catalogs. Member libraries often have little control over which record is used for common resources. Provider-neutral records are often preferred in such catalogs for the best use of shared resources. Members may or may not have the ability to augment the records with local information. Even when they can, the appeal of a consortial catalog is a catalog that requires less maintenance by individual libraries, and as was stated earlier most libraries do not have the resources to add information about accessibility content to individual bibliographic records within large sets.

The PCC requires its members to follow the Provider-Neutral Guidelines when creating records for online resources in OCLC that are coded as 'pcc' in the 042 field. OCLC's "When to Input a New Record" also states (regarding the 533 field), "Online resources, print-on-demand resources, and photocopy reproduction should be cataloged according to provider-

neutral guidelines.” But libraries are free to do whatever they want in their local catalog. Many libraries are probably using P-N records from OCLC without considering whether every instance of the resource linked to the record has the same features. If Library A and Library B use the same P-N record for different platforms with different features, it usually does not matter to those libraries. On the other hand, taking advantage of the convenience of provider-neutral records generally means that they do not get accessibility information in the records. If Library A adds accessibility content to its local bibliographic fields, the accessibility information can only benefit the users of Library A, and this effort does not support cooperative cataloging.

Changing the P-N Guidelines would mean consolidating multiple expressions, or even multiple augmentation aggregate works, into a single bibliographic record. This is a significant change from the current understanding that different expressions go on separate records. It would also have implications for conversion to a linked data environment adhering closely to official RDA. However, it would support the benefits of provider-neutral records and also enable libraries to provide accessibility information for users who require it.

The Task Group supports the idea that information in bibliographic records about accessibility features should be easily discoverable, including by those using assistive technologies such as screen readers, and 041, 341, and 532 accessibility fields and subfields are designed to be used this way. Additionally, these fields are repeatable and can be set up to indicate to which platform-specific accessibility features apply, permitting the use of a single bibliographic record to describe a resource as it is presented on different platforms with varying accessibility features.

The Task Group believes that these fields can be used to describe accessibility features present in the resource (the electronic file or files) itself, but not those that may be supplied on-the-fly by the platform through which the resource is accessed. As mentioned above, official RDA would describe a resource with accessibility content as an augmentation aggregate, with the accessibility content augmenting the main content. The aggregate is clear when the accessibility content has a continuing existence, in an augmenting file or embedded in the file with the main content. When accessibility content is generated temporarily at the point of content consumption and disappears afterward, it becomes hard to identify the expression realizing this ephemeral aggregate work. The feature is more a feature of the platform than of the resource itself. The Task Group does not recommend recording on-the-fly accessibility content in provider-neutral records.

Both born-digital and digitized resources can be described in provider-neutral records, and accessibility content works the same way regardless of how the resource was created. Accessibility metadata may be recorded in records for both born-digital and digitized resources; no separate policy is necessary.

Electronic resources are not static. Providers may add accessibility features to existing resources or may replace them with accessible versions at any time. This is true of all electronic titles, whether they are represented in WorldCat by provider-specific records or provider-neutral records. Cooperative cataloging has been one of the only methods of maintaining metadata on accessibility content in the constantly changing world of electronic resources and would continue to be a primary method if accessibility content is added to provider-neutral records. Recommendations on better ways of obtaining and maintaining accessibility metadata are outside the scope of this Task Group but may be an important issue to consider in the future.

Recommendations

A revised version of the Provider-Neutral Guidelines is appended to this report, with recommendations from the Task Group. A summary of the recommendations follows here:

The Task Group on Accessibility Information in Provider Neutral Records recommends that the [Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide](#) be changed to permit a single provider-neutral record to include accessibility content that may be the same or vary across different provider platforms. This should be limited to describing expressions that differ only in accessibility information. The accessibility content must be pre-generated and thus a component part of the aggregate expression of the resource. Such expressions differing only in accessibility content may be represented by a single provider-neutral record. Any other significant differences between expressions would still require separate bibliographic records in OCLC WorldCat.

The Task Group recommends *against* recording accessibility content and accessibility features generated on-the-fly by the provider platform, such as automated speech-to-text transcription, automated text-to-speech translation, image zoom, font resizing, etc. Speech-to-sign-language translators have been released and other features may be developed in the future to allow on-demand generation of accessibility content or features at the point of content consumption. The Task

Group considers such platform features to not be part of the expression(s) being described by the provider-neutral record, but they may be recorded as local information in an individual institution's catalog.

Accessibility information may be recorded in 041 language codes \$p, \$q, \$r, and \$t; in controlled vocabularies in 341; and/or as free text notes in 532. In provider-neutral records, the latter fields should include \$3 to designate the provider that has the specified accessibility content. Accessibility information for different providers should be recorded in separate fields.

The attached revision of the Guidelines includes revised text to permit provider-specific accessibility information and new instructions for 041, 341, and 532 fields in the table of MARC fields. Text that limits a provider-neutral record to a single expression has been modified to allow an exception for expressions differing only in accessibility content. The Task Group has also drafted a new section in the Guidelines describing the use of accessibility information in provider-neutral records.

The Task Group recommends coordination with OCLC when implementing these revisions to ensure that their record processing will retain provider-specific accessibility information in provider-neutral records.



Provider-Neutral E-Resource

MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA version

June 4, 2024 revision (proposed)

Program for Cooperative Cataloging

Washington, D.C.

2024

BIBCOmail@loc.gov

Introduction

The provider-neutral (P-N) model uses a single bibliographic record to describe multiple online manifestations of a resource, regardless of which publisher or aggregator is making the content available. The description should apply only to equivalent manifestations of the same expression, **or to expressions which differ only in accessibility information**; substantial (not just incidental) differences may indicate a different expression which should be described in a separate record. The model is intended to encompass online resources that are simultaneously issued in physical format and online, online digital reproductions of physical format resources, and online born-digital resources.

The provider-neutral model was initially designed for use with AACR2, the descriptive standard approved for use by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging at the time, and was adopted for serials in 2003, for textual monographs in 2009, and for multiple formats in 2011. The original guidelines have been supplemented below with elements from RDA in order to assist in the creation of original RDA records and for deriving provider-neutral records from RDA-based physical format records. Note that only MARC fields specifically relevant to online resources are included in the guidelines.

RDA Provider-Neutral Metadata Application Profile (MAP) for Serials, Integrating Resources, and Monographs

Use these guidelines in conjunction with the [MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data](#), the [BIBCO Standard Record \(BSR\) RDA Metadata Application Profile](#), the [CONSER Standard Record \(CSR\) RDA Metadata Application Profile](#), and the appropriate modules of the [CONSER Cataloging Manual \(CCM\)](#), including Module 31 (Remote Access Electronic Serials), Module 33.18 (Electronic Newspapers), and Module 35 (Integrating Resources). The last document also serves as [BIBCO Participants' Manual](#) Appendix A. **Accessibility information may be recorded in a provider-neutral record in some circumstances; see details below.**

RDA Provider-Neutral Metadata Application Profile (MAP) for Streaming Media

This MAP may also be used for streaming media although extra caution should be exercised to ensure that different expressions are not **inappropriately** consolidated onto the same record. For example, a streaming video with **translated subtitles** ~~English captions~~ and one without are considered different expressions and should not be brought together on the same provider-neutral record. Other pitfalls to watch out for include (but are not limited to) ~~subtitling~~, dubbing, **colorizing**, and deleted or restored scenes.

However, expressions which differ only in accessibility information may be consolidated on a provider-neutral record. Accessibility information including (but not limited to) captions, audio description, transcriptions, and sign language insets may be recorded in a provider-neutral record in some circumstances; see details below.

It is recommended that use of this MAP be made in conjunction with the [OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs](#).

Accessibility Content in Online Resources

Catalogers may describe accessibility features of an online resource in a provider-neutral record regardless of whether they appear on all versions of the resource described by the record. However, catalogers must first determine whether the accessibility features are part of the resource itself. Font customization and accessibility content generated on the fly by a platform should not be recorded in a provider-neutral record. Examples of platform features which should not be recorded include font scaling, image zooming, and on-the-fly speech-to-text or translation services. For instance, captions for the hearing impaired can be recorded, but the language of on-the-fly translation of captions should not. Only accessibility features that are part of the resource itself may be described in provider-neutral records. Libraries are free to record other features they wish to highlight in their local records.

Streaming Media

Streaming media may be rendered accessible through accessibility content, such as open or closed captioning, open or closed subtitles for the hearing impaired (SDH), transcripts of the soundtrack, and signed language.

Electronic Books

Electronic books may be rendered accessible through both accessibility content (such as image descriptions) as well as accessibility features or formatting (such as structural navigation, page break markers, table of contents, index) that make it possible for the content of an electronic text file to be consumed using screen readers and other accessible technologies.

Recording accessibility features from various providers on a single provider-neutral record involves consolidating multiple expressions into a single bibliographic record. This is a significant difference from the way that other elements are treated, which are based on the idea that a provider-neutral record represents one and only one expression. However, an exception to the latter practice is being made for accessibility content.

The rationale for exceptional treatment for recording accessibility information is based on the recognition that such information is very valuable to library users with disabilities, and yet many record sets supplied by vendors or services such as OCLC's Collection Manager may lack such details. The latter situation may be partly due to vendors not supplying such information, resulting in the selection of the "wrong" record by a particular service that lacks accessibility information, or the absence of accessibility information being recorded in vendor-supplied records. At the same time, many libraries cannot afford to touch each individual record that they receive in order to fill in accessibility information that may be missing.

Permitting accessibility information from multiple providers in provider-neutral records promotes cooperative maintenance of accessibility information while retaining the benefits of provider-neutral records in a shared database.

Recommendations for Best Use of Provider-Neutral Records in Libraries

Libraries may make policy decisions on whether to use single or multiple records for their e-resources in their own catalogs. They may use a single provider-neutral record that incorporates all specific provider and other local information on one record – or use multiple records, each with one specific provider/URL on it. Whatever decisions PCC member libraries make for their local catalogs, they still need to follow the provider-neutral guidelines when coding WorldCat records in OCLC as PCC records. Any e-resource records added to OCLC may be ~~are~~ subject to being merged or having provider-specific information removed.

Characteristics of a Provider-Neutral E-Resource Record

The provider-neutral record is intended to be a base record in the shared bibliographic environment to which libraries can add provider-specific information locally. Only certain categories of provider-specific information are allowed in provider-neutral records. These include:

- Additional titles that are specific to the aggregator
- Field 588 “description based on” notes for born-digital resources
- Publisher and/or aggregator URLs that do not contain institution-specific components such as proxy server data (e.g., <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/by/year>, not <https://science-sciencemag-org.nuls.idm.oclc.org/content/by/year>). Multiple 856 fields may be added to each bibliographic record.
- For monographs, additional ISBNs or other identifiers.
- **Accessibility information, if that is the only difference between manifestations represented by the provider-neutral record.**

The following kinds of information should not be included in a provider-neutral record:

- Provider names are not given in edition statements, publication statements, distribution statements, manufacture statements, series statements, notes (**except as provided for below**), host item entries, or access points, nor are they added to authorized access points as qualifiers.
- Notes about access restrictions, file formats, file sizes, prices, subscription information, or system requirements specific to particular providers are not used, except as provided for below.
- Such information as individual database names, individual e-package names, or third party aggregators is omitted (**except as provided for below**).
- Field 533, which was used for descriptive data about a specific reproduction, is no longer included in the record except in the case of records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library, and other digital preservation projects.

These kinds of information are considered local information.

Some resources may have only a single provider at the time of cataloging, but may become available through other providers afterwards. Thus, it is important to keep the records as “neutral” as possible from the very outset of cataloging. The qualifier (Online) should not be added to any series access point to distinguish it from its original source format.

In exceptional cases, e.g., a reproduction of a rare book, essential local information may be given in the 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.

Explanation of Symbols Used in the Guidelines:

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

Note that the “A” category (Mandatory if applicable) is not synonymous with RDA “Core if.” RDA pre-defines some elements as core and requires them for resource description “when applicable and readily ascertainable” (RDA 0.6.4); others are core only under certain conditions, usually when one or more RDA elements cannot be ascertained. Just as in the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) RDA Metadata Application Profile, the provider-neutral MAP uses a combination of RDA Core, Core if, and PCC Core elements, applicable in different ways to different formats and types of issuance.

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

MARC Element	MARC Label	RDA Element	Serials & Integrating Resources (IRs)	Monographs	Notes
Leader/06	Type of record	[MARC control field equivalent of the predominant Content type (6.9)]	M	M	Code for the most significant material type of the resource being cataloged. Leader/06 should correspond with RDA content type (MARC 336). See Term and Code List for RDA Content Types .
Leader/07	Bibliographic level	Mode of issuance (2.13/PCC core)	M	M	
006/00	Form of material	[MARC control field equivalent of additional Content types (6.9)]	A/O	A/O	Libraries cataloging in OCLC or other shared bibliographic databases must use MARC 21 control field 006/00 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

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					“f” for manuscript cartographic materials).
007/00	Category of material	[some 007 positions equate to various RDA elements, such as media type and numerous carrier attributes found in chapter 3, e.g. 3.2]	M	M	Always supply Category of material “c” (Electronic resource) For material other than online books, textual serials, 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.). Code at least the first two bytes of each 007.
007/01	Specific material designation	[MARC control field equivalent of Carrier type (online resource)] 3.3	M	M	Use code “r” (this applies to the remote electronic 007 only)
008/23 008/29	Form of item	[MARC control field equivalent of Carrier type (online resource)] 3.3	M	M	Use code “o” in 008/23 for all formats except Cartographic and Visual materials. These two formats use byte 008/29 instead. All other bytes of the 008 should reflect the original manifestation.

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

010	Library of Congress Control Number	N/A	A LC or CONSER partners IRs: CONSER catalogers: assign Field 010 if authenticating record. BIBCO catalogers: May add Field 010 if arrangements have been made with LC for a supply of LCCNs	A LC or LC/CIP partners only	Do not transfer or use any 010 fields in the online version that apply to the print version of the resource.
020	International Standard Book Number	Identifier for the manifestation (2.15/Core)	N/A (Serials) A (IRs). If the resource has an ISBN it is likely that this applies to the print version. If so place the ISBN in Field 776 \$z	M Record each e-version ISBN in a separate 020 \$a; record other ISBNs in 020 \$z (preferably in separate fields); copy the physical format ISBN to Field 776 \$z. If it is unclear which format the ISBN represents—as often occurs with simultaneously issued versions—use \$z for any ISBN in the e-version record.	
022	International Standard Serial Number	Identifier for the manifestation (2.15/Core)	A Record the e-version ISSN in \$a; record ISSN of the physical format in \$y if it already exists in the record (and in Field 776 \$x). If available, also record the ISSN-L in \$l and the source of the ISSN in \$2.	N/A	Do not add \$l if the online record only has \$y.

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

024	Other Standard Identifier	Identifier for the manifestation (2.15/Core)	A For standard identifiers other than ISSN: Record the e-version identifier in 024 \$a; record identifiers for the physical format and cancelled/invalid identifiers in 024 \$z (preferably in separate fields). When identifiers are from different source vocabularies, use separate 024 fields for each vocabulary.	A For standard identifiers other than ISBN: Record the e-version identifier in 024 \$a; record identifiers for the physical format and cancelled/invalid identifiers in 024 \$z (preferably in separate fields). When identifiers are from different source vocabularies, use separate 024 fields for each vocabulary.	Examples: ISMN (International Standard Music Number) Universal Product Code (UPC) International Article Number EAN ISTC (International Standard Text Code) ISRC (International Standard Recording Code) DOI (Digital Object Identifier)
028	Publisher number	Identifier for the manifestation (2.15)	N/A	A	Use if other identifier is appropriate Example: Music publisher/plate number
040	Cataloging source	N/A			
040 \$a	Original cataloging agency	N/A	M	M	Assign the MARC code for the original cataloging agency creating the e-resource record in \$a. Do not retain the MARC code from Field 040 \$a of the print/physical format source record.
040 \$b	Language of	N/A	M	M	Always specify that the language of cataloging is

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

	cataloging				English. Use \$b eng
040 \$c	Transcribing agency	N/A	M	M	Assign the MARC code for the transcribing cataloging agency creating the e-resource record in \$c. Do not retain the MARC code from Field 040 \$c of the print/physical format source record.
040 \$e	Description conventions	N/A	M	M	Add two \$e codes: \$e rda and \$e pn. Placement of the \$e rda is directly after \$b, followed by \$e pn.
041 \$p	Language code of captions	N/A	O	O	Language code for accessibility content may be recorded even if the accessibility content is believed to pertain only to specific providers, if this is the only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 041 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record language-specific codes for accessibility content generated on-the-fly by the platform.
041 \$q	Language code of accessible audio	N/A	O	O	Language code for accessibility content may be recorded even if the accessibility content is believed to pertain only to

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					specific providers, if this is the only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 041 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record language-specific codes for accessibility content generated on-the-fly by the platform.
041 \$r	Language code of accessible visual language (non-textual)	N/A	O	O	Language code for accessibility content may be recorded even if the accessibility content is believed to pertain only to specific providers, if this is the only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 041 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record language-specific codes for accessibility content generated on-the-fly by the platform.
041 \$t	Language code of accompanying transcripts for audiovisual	N/A	O	O	Language code for accessibility content may be recorded even if the accessibility content is believed to pertain only to specific providers, if this is the

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

	materials				only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 041 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record language-specific codes for accessibility content generated on-the-fly by the platform.
042	Authentication code	N/A	A	A	Use “pcc” for records authenticated under PCC auspices (BIBCO/CONSER libraries only)
050 , etc.	Classification numbers	N/A	O Classification is strongly encouraged (especially for integrating resource (IRs)) If adding Field 050/060 to a PCC record, set first indicator to 1 and second indicator to 4. If adding Field 050/060 to a non-PCC record, set first indicator to blank and second indicator to 4. CONSER libraries are instructed to assume that the resource is not in LC.	M if BIBCO (except Graphic materials, Moving image materials, Sound recordings, and Rare materials) O if non-BIBCO If using Field 050/060 in a PCC record, set first indicator to blank and second indicator to 4 (except LC and NLM).	
1XX/7XX	Main entries	Creator (19.2/Core)	A	A	If more than one, only the

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

		Other agent associated with a work (19.3/Core if)			<p>creator having principal responsibility named first in resources embodying the work or in reference sources is required; if principal responsibility is not indicated, only the first-named creator is required. The appropriate relationship designator (\$e) is mandatory for the first named creator and optional for other named access points.</p> <p>See PCC Relationship Designator guidelines</p> <p>After satisfying the RDA core requirement, catalogers may record additional authorized access points for creators and other agents (in 7XX fields) according to cataloger’s judgment</p>
245 \$a	Title	Title proper (2.3.2/Core)	M	M	Reminder: do not use \$h “general material designation;” see 336-338 instead
245 \$n	Number of part/section	Title proper (2.3.2/Core)	A	A	
245 \$p	Name of part/section	Title proper (2.3.2/Core)	A	A	

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

<p>245 \$b</p>	<p>Remainder of title</p>	<p>Other title information (2.3.4/PCC core for monographs; not core for serials)</p>	<p>O (serials) Record other title information if it provides clarification or support to the title proper that might otherwise appear misleading without the other title information O (IRs) Monographic IR catalogers may wish to transcribe other title information on a consistent basis</p>	<p>A</p>	
<p>245 \$b</p>	<p>Remainder of title (Parallel titles)</p>	<p>Parallel title proper (2.3.3/PCC core)</p>	<p>A (serials) Recommend that all parallel titles for serials be recorded in Field(s) 246 O (IRs) If cataloging IRs from a monographic perspective, it is optional to transcribe the parallel titles in Field 245 \$b</p>	<p>A</p>	
<p>245 \$c</p>	<p>Statement of responsibility, etc.</p>	<p>Statement of responsibility relating to Title proper (2.4.2/Core for monographs; not core for serials)</p>	<p>O/A Transcription is required only if usage is not recorded in the Name Authority Record. Usage of variant names</p>	<p>A Only the first recorded statement is required by RDA, but catalogers are encouraged to transcribe as many statements of responsibility that are possible</p>	

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

			appearing in a statement of responsibility on later issues may be recorded in Field 550 notes or in the 4XX field of authority records. IRs: Same	and appropriate to aid in resource discovery, identification, and selection	
246	Varying form of title (Parallel titles)	Parallel title proper (2.3.3/PCC core)	A (Parallel titles) For parallel titles not recorded in Field 245 \$b, use indicators: 1 1 For parallel titles that have been recorded in Field 245 \$b, use indicators: 3 1	A (Parallel titles) Use indicators: 3 1	
246	Varying form of title (Variant titles)	Variant title (2.3.6)	O (cataloger's judgment for most)	O (cataloger's judgment for most)	Retain from source record, or record provider-specific title variants if deemed important, with or without an explanatory note, e.g., 246 1_ \$i Available from some providers with title: \$a <title> 246 1_ \$a <title>
246	Varying form of title (Later title proper)	Later title proper (2.3.8/PCC Core)	A (minor changes)	A (applies to multipart monographs)	Core element for LC/PCC unless applying the alternative when the changes are numerous.

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

247	Former title \$a, \$n, \$p	Earlier title proper (2.3.7.3/PCC Core)	A Use only for integrating resources and for serials for which all evidence of the earlier title is removed	N/A	Core element for LC/PCC unless applying the alternative when the changes are numerous.
250	Edition statement	Designation of edition (2.5.2/Core) Designation of a named revision of an edition (2.5.6/Core)	A	A	Record only edition statements originating from the original publisher/society; ignore statements that pertain to specific provider versions
256	Computer file characteristics	[see Extent, number of subunits at 300 field below]	X	X	
264	Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture and Copyright Notice				All online resources are considered published. The provider-neutral model (in contrast to RDA) specifies that if the e-resource being cataloged is an online reproduction of a tangible resource, usually the Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture and Copyright notice information will come from the original tangible source record. See Field 264 Guidelines for further information. Follow RDA and LC-PCC

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					Policy Statements for providing distribution and manufacturing information.
264 \$a Ind2=1	Place of publication	Place of publication (2.8.2/Core)	M	M	
264 \$b Ind2=1	Name of publisher	Publisher's name (2.8.4/Core)	M	M	
264 \$c Ind2=1	Date of publication	Date of publication (2.8.6/Core)	M	M	
264 \$c Ind2=4	Date of copyright notice	Copyright date (2.11)	O	O	
300 \$a	Extent	Extent (3.4/Core for monographs and ceased serials) Number of subunits (3.4.1.7) File type (3.19.2) File size (3.19.4) Duration (7.22)	O Use "1 online resource" in \$a Subunits (if known) are required for ceased serials, e.g., 300 \$a 1 online resource (5 volumes) See RDA 3.4.1.10 and the corresponding LC-PCC Policy Statement for more information.	M Use "1 online resource" in \$a (add subunits and duration, if applicable, in parentheses). Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (25 pages) Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (1 audio file (30 min.)) Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (1 score (32 pages) + 1 part (19 pages)) Example : 300 \$a 1 online resource (2 video files)	See LC-PCC PS 3.4 for more information.

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

<p>300 \$b (Also see 347)</p>	<p>Other physical details</p>	<p>A variety of carrier attributes (3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.11, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.19.3) and content attributes (7.15, 7.18)</p>	<p>O</p>	<p>O May be included if applicable to online version; most likely applicable to Illustrative content (7.15) and Sound content (7.18) Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (25 pages) : \$b illustrations Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (1 video file (30 min.)) : \$b sound, color, with black and white sequences Example: 300 \$a 1 online resource (6 maps) : \$b color</p>	
<p>300 \$c</p>	<p>Dimensions</p>	<p>Dimension (3.5)</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>X</p>	
<p>336</p>	<p>Content type</p>	<p>Content type (6.9/Core)</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>The predominant Content type will correspond to MARC 21 Leader/06 (Record type) and is core. Additional content types may be given</p>
<p>337</p>	<p>Media type</p>	<p>Media type (3.2/PCC core)</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>M</p>	
<p>338</p>	<p>Carrier type</p>	<p>Carrier type (3.3/Core)</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>Use “online resource”</p>

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

341	Accessibility Content	Accessibility content (7.14)	O	O	Accessibility information about a resource may be recorded even if the accessibility content is believed to pertain only to specific providers, if this is the only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 341 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record accessibility features or audio-visual customization generated on-the-fly by the platform.
347	Digital file characteristics	File type (3.19.2/Core) File size (3.19.4/Core)	O	O	Core for cartographic resources only. For other formats use RDA 3.19.1-3.19.8 as appropriate to the resource Caution: Catalogers following the Provider-Neutral model should exclude file size, as it may differ substantially from one iteration to another
362	Dates of Publication and/or Sequential Designation	(2.6.2/Core)	A If providers vary in the range of issues they offer online, give the beginning numbering or date of the print or other original format, if available. If using	N/A	

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

			the print version, use 362 1 Print version began with...		
490 \$a	Series statement	Title proper of series (2.12.2/Core*) Title proper of subseries (2.12.10/Core*)	A *A series statement is only core in a serial record if an authorized access point for the series is not being made	A	Transcribe the form of the series only if it applies to all known iterations of the online resource. Do not use for package/provider series
490 \$x	International Standard Serial Number	ISSN of series (2.12.8/PCC core) ISSN of subseries (2.12.16/PCC core)	A	A	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 physical format version record is being used as the basis of the description, use whatever ISSN appears on that record.
490 \$v	Volume/ sequential designation	Numbering within series (2.12.9/Core) Numbering within subseries (2.12.17/Core)	A	A	
500/550	General note/Issuing	Other agent associated with a	A	A	After satisfying the RDA core requirement, catalogers may

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

	body note	work (19.3/Core if) Related work (25.1)			provide additional authorized access points for entities according to cataloger's judgment. Do not use for online package/provider names.
506	Restrictions on access note	Restrictions on access (4.4)	O (for open access remote electronic resources)	O (for open access remote electronic resources)	Use for remote access electronic resources where the entire resource described by the record is available as open access. Use in addition to 856 field(s) with \$7 0 (zero) for the open access version(s). Use only a single, general 506 note in the format described below to indicate that open access versions of a resource are available. Use the following standardized text in \$3 and \$a and an appropriate term in \$f from the vocabulary specified in \$2 (See the Access Restriction Term Source Codes List). Example: 506 0# \$3 Some versions: \$a Open access versions available from some providers \$f open access \$2 coarar

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					Do not use 506 to indicate the access status of a specific provider version. This information may instead be indicated in the 856 field for that version using subfields \$7, \$1, and/or \$n.
506 with \$5	Restrictions on access note	Restrictions on access (4.4)	A	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects. Use with \$5
515	Numbering peculiarities	Complex or irregular numbering (2.17.5.4)	A Record as needed.	N/A	
516	Type of computer file or data note	File type (3.19.2) Nature of content (7.2)	O	O	Generally do not use
520	Summary, etc.	Summarization of content (7.10)	O	O PCC core for archival materials (see also DACS 3.1)	Recommended for other resource titles, when useful to support user tasks
530	Additional physical form available note	Related manifestation (27.1/unstructured description)	O	O	Generally do not use; prefer \$i in 776 field
532	Accessibility note	Accessibility content (7.14)	O	O	Accessibility information about a resource may be recorded even if the accessibility content

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					is believed to pertain only to specific providers, if this is the only difference between versions represented by the PN record. Use \$3 to specify which provider each 532 statement applies to. Record only accessibility content specific to the resource; do not record accessibility features or audio-visual customization generated on-the-fly by the platform.
533	Reproduction note	Related manifestation (27.1/structured description)	A	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library, and other digital preservation projects. Use with \$5
534	Original version note	Related expression (26.1/structured description) Related manifestation (27.1/structured description)	X	X	
538	System details note	Equipment or system requirement (3.20) [Note: there is no “mode of access” in RDA, it is covered by Carrier type]	A	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects. Use with \$5

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

540	Terms governing use and reproduction note	Restriction on use (4.5)	O	O	Use 540 to indicate use and reproduction rights status only if the status is known to apply to all provider versions represented on the record or to all potential provider versions. Example: 540 ## \$a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International \$f CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 \$2 cc \$u https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/ Do not use 540 to indicate the use and reproduction rights status of a specific provider version. This information may instead be indicated in the 856 field for that version using subfields \$r and/or \$t.
546	Language note	Language of content (7.12/PCC core)	A	A	
583	Action note	N/A	A	A	Use only for records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects. Use with \$5
588	Source of description note Latest issue	Note on issue, part, or iteration used as the basis for identification of the resource (2.17.13)	M Record “description based on” notes and the source of title proper notes as usual. Include the provider and the	M If the description is based on a single online resource, combine in one note the source of description, source of title, the	For both serials and monographs, if the description is based on a record for the physical format, use the following phrase without

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

	consulted note	Title source (2.17.2.3/PCC core)	<p>date viewed (provider can be omitted from LIC if it is the same as in the DBO). If considered useful, add the file format of the resource viewed.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>588 ## \$a Description based on: Volume 1, Issue 1 (September 2012); title from journal home page (publisher’s Web site, viewed May 16, 2012)</p> <p>588 ## \$a Description based on: Volume 16, issue 1 (2012); title from PDF article running title (Tandfonline.com Web site, viewed May 19, 2012)</p> <p>Note on IR treatment: For online IRs we recommend using the form: “Description based on contents viewed on [date]”</p>	<p>provider, and the date viewed. If considered useful, add the file format of the resource viewed</p> <p>Example: 588 ## \$a Description based on online resource; title from PDF title page (ACM, viewed May 26, 2011)</p> <p>If the description is based on part of a multipart resource, combine in one note the part used, the source of description, source of title, the provider, and the date viewed. If considered useful add the file format of the resource viewed.</p> <p>Example: 588 ## \$a Description based on online resource; title from volume 2 PDF title page (ACM, viewed May 26, 2011).</p>	<p>additional information:</p> <p>Description based on [physical format] version record</p> <p>Indicator values (“0”) meaning “Source of description” and (“1”) meaning “latest issue consulted” can be used to generate a display constant.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>588 ## \$a Description based on print version record</p> <p>588 ## \$a Description based on CD-ROM version record</p> <p>588 0# \$a Print version record.</p> <p>588 1# \$a Vol. 1, issue 4 (May 2016).</p>
700-751	Added entry fields	<p>Creator (19.2; core requirement covered by 1XX)</p> <p>Other agent associated with a</p>	A	A	Core for Creator (see 1XX); PCC core for Contributors in certain situations. Use of appropriate relationship designators is strongly

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

		<p>work (19.3; core requirement covered by 1XX)</p> <p>Contributor (20.2/LC core for certain situations)</p> <p>Related work (25.1/authorized access point)</p> <p>Related expression (26.1/authorized access point)</p>			<p>encouraged. See PCC Relationship Designators in Bibliographic Records</p> <p>Use if applicable to all known iterations of the online resource. Do not use for package/provider names (records for DLF Registry of Digital Masters, HathiTrust Digital Library and other digital preservation projects excepted. (Use with \$5)</p>
773	Host item entry	<p>Related manifestation (27.1)</p> <p>Related item (28.1)</p>	X	X	
76X-78X	Linking entry fields	<p>Related work (25.1) PCC core</p>	<p>A</p> <p>Record as needed (fields other than 776)</p> <p>When making reciprocal links for serials, do not link latest entry cataloging records to successive entry records and vice versa.</p> <p>When linking from a RDA record to a pre-RDA (e.g., AACR2) record, generally use the pre-RDA form of entry and access point as</p>	A	

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

			<p>found in the related bibliographic record for constructing the linking entry field.</p> <p>Note: when OCLC creates online records for digital preservation projects (e.g. HathiTrust), they use the same entry convention (008/34) as the base print record.</p>		
776	Additional physical form entry	Related manifestation (27.1/structured description/PCC core for reproductions)	A	A	<p>Required if the description is based on the record for another format; otherwise provide if readily available. Use Field 776 \$i rather than Field 530 to describe the type of resource recorded in Field 776. This form applies to resources that are either reproductions or are simultaneously issued in more than one format. Reciprocal 776 fields are recommended but not required.</p> <p>Examples are:</p> <p>776 \$i Print version:</p> <p>776 \$i Online version:</p> <p>776 \$i <other format> version:</p>

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

80X-83X	Series added entries	Related work (25.1)	A (If institutional policy is to use series)	A (If institutional policy is to use series)	Use the authorized form of the heading for the physical format 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) 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 Example: 830 #0 \$a Proceedings of SPIE—the International Society for Optical Engineering; \$v v. 7719. \$x 0277-786X
856	Electronic location and access	Uniform Resource Locator (4.6/LC core)	A (under certain conditions)	A (under certain conditions)	If there is a general (not institution-specific) URL, add it to \$u. Do not use \$z for information that is institution specific. If the domain name is not specific enough, \$3 may be used to record package/provider

M (Mandatory); A (Mandatory if applicable); O (Optional); X (not used); N/A (not applicable)

					name.
856 \$7	Electronic location and access	Restrictions on access (4.4)	A (for open access remote electronic resources)	A (for open access remote electronic resources)	<p>Use \$7 code “0” (zero) to indicate that the electronic resource associated with the URL in \$u is open access if this information is known and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The URL leads to the complete full text of the resource described by the record. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The URL leads to the complete full text of a subpart of the resource that is clearly labeled in \$3. <p>Optionally, use subfields \$7, \$l, \$n, \$r, and/or \$t to record additional information on access restrictions or terms governing use and reproduction of the specific provider version associated with the URL in \$u.</p>