# 2019-02-13 VAOH session

## Presentation summary

Robert Bremer presented on the topic of Provider-Neutral Cataloging.  He gives a history of how Provider-Neutral cataloging has evolved and explains the single bibliographic record concept to describe all instances of the same manifestation of a resource, what information to include, and what information not to include.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

- https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PCC-PN-guidelines.html

Other references mentioned during the presentation:

- P-N Cataloging of Photocopies and POD Reproductions: see LC-PCC PS 1.11

## Member questions
## Topic specific questions

**Is the policy for photocopies and POD resources contrary to RDA?  I would expect to catalog the digital manifestation, and supply notes about the original publication.**

Answer: Yes, you are correct that is exactly what RDA would have you do. It does run contrary to what RDA says. It's a case of continuing that policy of cataloging a photocopy or Print on Demand publication using a reproduction note where you describe the original and that is completely opposite of what RDA would have you do.

**I often see records for electronic resources based on the information on the provider's web page, not the title page of the resource. Should these records be updated for conform with the title page or should a new record be created? Sometimes publication date differs.**

Answer: It really should be the case that the description is changed to match the title page, because that title page, presumably belonging to more than one instance of that resource, would really be the better choice of the description so that multiple sites could be added to the one Provider-Neutral record.

**For print reproduction/POD P-N records, what do you recommend for 300 $c in cases where there is no print original? Can we leave 300 $c out completely?**

Answer: Certainly if you don't know what it is and can't supply it, it doesn't need to be included. It is also worth pointing out that in the reproduction note where you might have included the size of the reproduction since it is going to cover all reproductions, that information is not there.  So if you think about how in the past you might have had a thesis that was 28 cm in it original form but you got a photo

copy of that same thing from UMI Proquest in the past and it was shorter it was only 22 cm and you used to see that in records where the 22 cm would have been listed in field 533 as part of the reproduction. That's not there any more. You can have really large reproductions or short reproductions; they are covered by the one record. If you know the size of the original include it, but if you don't know leave it out.

**With a digitization, by the owner-library, of a pre-1801 book, how would you code the dates in 008?**

Answer: I don't see that as being any different a situation if the book was published 1950, 1850, or 1750. You are going to record the date that is on that original publication that you are finding on that title page even though it makes it look, in theory, that this online version was issued in 1850, which we know is not true. That is just one of the quirks of Provider-Neutral cataloging.

**How do you handle if the only URL you have is a local one?**

Answer: A local URL is probably better than no URL at all. So, if that is all you have, that is what I would include. If you could figure out something that could be used by others to at least get you to the front door of the resource, I would include that. But if all you have is a local URL, go ahead and include it.

**I just cataloged a copy of a handwritten music manuscript that looked like it might be a photocopy, that was sent to binding. Does that qualify for P-N?**

Answer: If it is just a case that it is a photocopy of a manuscript, you would follow the photocopy and Print on Demand guidelines and describe the original manuscript and put that print reproduction note in a field 533. If something like that were put online, it changes the type code because everything that is online is considered published. So, if this was a manuscript score that would have been Type 'd' originally, once it is online it has to be Type 'c' because it is now a published score.

**Can P-N records be coded as PCC?**

Answer: Yes, because this is a PCC policy, but it is a PCC policy which OCLC has adopted for everything that falls in to the online category as well as photocopy and Print on Demand reproduction.

**Print on Demand books vary wildly in pagination and illustrative matter included (or not) and named publishers. Are we just supposed to modify a Provider-Neutral record locally? What happens with OCLC updates in this case?**

Answer: Well, you maybe have some interesting situation there. It is hard to make some statement "Yes, you would always put it on one record if the paging is much different". You would expect in the normal case you would have Print on Demand reproduction or a photocopy, and if you told someone to go to page 29 and look at the second paragraph you would all be looking at the same thing. But in some cases that is not going to be true because it may be the same content, but somehow laid out differently. In that case I would say it is not really the Print on Demand reproduction it's just another version of that same resource, probably you need more than one record in that case.

**OCLC documentation for When to Input a New Record says that absence or presence of 040 $e does not require a new record. I have been working on streaming videos. Would best practice be to make an existing record PN, even if it requires a lot of major revisions and may have a lot of holdings?**

Answer: Yes, I don't see where that makes a difference. In the case of, for instance, the photocopy and Print on Demand, since that's a relatively new approach to cataloging that kind of material, we've got 30 years of records going back where we have 533 fields that say "Photocopy. Ann Arbor, Michigan : University Microfilms, etc. and 22 cm." Something like that, you would want to fix it up, make it Provider-Neutral so that it conforms to current standards. It really wouldn't matter how many holdings are on it.

**Could you say more about what differences in provider versions would justify separate descriptions rather than Provider-Neutral treatment, i.e. accessibility differences, content differences, etc.?**

Answer: Well, you do run into situations with online resources where of course there's going to be differences in accessibility and that kind of thing. Normally that is just to be over-looked. However, there are more complicated kinds of things where you can't tell for sure if the title that is available on this one website is really the same thing as available over on this other website. Thinking back, some of the stuff that ended up on that Project Gutenberg website, it would just have a title and it had no indication of any kind of bibliographic history. And because it was plain text you had a hard time being able to tell what had been used as the basis for making this digitized copy. So, if something is digitized and you have got the original title page, then you can say this is all based on the 1859 edition of this work. But over here there is the same title with no information at all as to where it came from, you are going to end up with two records in a case like that, because you cannot tell whether that second item really belongs on the first record. Other kind of things like file sizes, the file types, that kind of thing get over-looked. PDF, HTML, and plain text could all exist on the same record if it really is the same content.

**I am occasionally asked to catalog locally printed copies of electronic resources. Should I make a new record for these printouts with a 533 Print reproduction note?  Wouldn't this imply the publisher printed it even though it was only published in electronic form?**

Answer: It seems that a locally printed copy of an electronic resource should be Provider-Neutral with a print reproduction note. It is falling into that same category of photocopy or Print on Demand reproduction and still sounds like it would be provider neutral. If you plan to contribute a record to WorldCat, we would want it to be provider neutral. Another option would be to make a copy for local use only, in a local holdings record in you local system, and note that particular copy is photocopy.

**If you're creating a PN record for a digitization of a resource that was unpublished in its original format, do you create a 264 field for publication information?  RDA considers all online resources as published, which would seem to require 264, but PN guidelines say take the publisher information from the original.**

Answer: Yes. Provider-Neutral works really well for items that were previously published. Especially when you have a title page with the publisher listed on it so that you can transcribe it. But because rules in AACR2 and RDA both indicate that online resources are published, if you have something that is

manuscript that is put online it is now published and you should have a publisher. You see this a lot with dissertations that are put online that are cataloged Provider-Neutral where what happens is that you end up with a place and publisher that relate to the library that did the digitization and put the resource online. I suppose if you are digitizing a manuscript that is 300 years old, and you have some date like 1700, and you are now putting the library in as the publisher of this thing, that is kind of an unusual situation and maybe not so easily answered.

**For the unpublished digitized title, wouldn't there be a 264 anyway for the manuscript date? I'm assuming the unpublished item was a manuscript, letter, or diary.**

Answer: Yes, there would have been a 264 with second indicator of '0' with just the date of the manuscript and possibly the producer of the manuscript. The thing is that once it's online, now it's published. You have the problem that you really ought to come up with a place and publisher for this published online resource.

**Does the photocopy/POD apply to self-published works? Our library has donations from a local writer who donates one of her books quarterly.**

Answer: You might ask is photocopying really the production mechanism to produce copies of the book that is being distributed in which case, I wouldn't pay attention to it. I would take the person's name that is there as the self-publisher at the foot of the title page as the publisher and not put in a print reproduction note, in a case like that. You would only want to do that when something looks like it has a previous existence, because it really is about photocopies of something that already existed or Print on Demand reproductions. So it really is about reproductions, as opposed to photocopying was the initial mechanism to create copies to distribute.

**Would theses and dissertations be cataloged as P-N records?**

Answer: Yes, they would. It's online and the Provider-Neutral guidelines for online resources apply to everything. You may think that it won't be online anywhere else, but with anything electronic, it is hard to say never. If it does end up online somewhere else, the record should already be set up to be able to just add another URL.

**Should we add statements and data such as closed captioning in a PN record?**

Answer: That's one of the issues with trying to apply Provider-Neutral guidelines to videos. If there is that kind of difference between what is otherwise the same video on two different websites, maybe that does really require two different records to be able to handle that correctly. It's hard to say definitively whether something has not been mentioned in a bibliographic record, such as closed captioning because it is not there, that is it's not in the resource. Or, if it has been overlooked by a particular cataloger. It is hard to know. You have to use your judgment. If you know that there is a version with closed captioning and another without closed captioning, and there is a bibliographic record that corresponds to one of those, and you have access to the other version, then you would create a new record.

It may be worth pointing out that similar kinds of things happen for print publications as well, that end up being digitized after the fact. This came up in serials at an earlier point where if I have this Provider-Neutral record for cataloging a serial, and on this website they actually digitized everything cover to cover but over on this other website they only did the articles. They left out the letters to the editor and advertising, maybe they didn't even produce the photographs that were there. The approach there was to put in on the one record with the idea that this type of thing could change over time. For monograph catalogers, that is kind of a difficult thing to accept, because in terms of print records we would typically make two records if there were those kinds of differences. So, it really is a thing where you have to use your judgment about whether another record is necessary.

**Can you repeat the best practice for streaming video again?**

Answer: The problem, it's not merely streaming video, it has been a long-standing problem with even tangible video recordings such as discs and even before the advent of discs, video cassettes and so on. The thoroughness of cataloging varies a lot, and sometimes a cataloger will indicate all sorts of information including accessibility information, most commonly as subtitles or captioning or audio description and things like that and sometimes a cataloger will overlook that or not include that information. So the Provider-Neutral guidelines hasn't really changed how you would determine whether to input a new record or not input a new record. You have to make a judgement about how likely it is that the information that is in an existing bibliographic record is accurate. You also have to consider whether the publisher was accurate in indicating things like captioning and subtitling and all that as well. I've presented entire 8 hour workshops on this, and it is hard to sum it up in a few minutes. The problem hasn't changed. It's the same problems we have always had that as in it has been exacerbated by the advent of steaming media.

**If we add data about our digitized copy in a 506, 533, and 538 with our institution code in subfield $5 in our local bibliographic records (Voyager) and later send those records to OCLC, will those fields be stripped out of the OCLC records? Should we add these fields only after our records have been sent to OCLC?**

Answer: If the record was going to be added as a new record to WorldCat, all of those fields would remain intact and would be added. If it found a match in the database, we transfer those under certain circumstances. For some of those fields, if they have a subfield $5 that does not match a subfield $5 for the same field that is already in a record, yes, it will transfer. You do not have to add these fields only after the record has been sent, but that is an option.

**What about "pages" versus "leaves" or "volume" versus "sheet" for print reproductions for items that don't have a print original? Is there anything special or things to note about this?**

Answer: If there gets to be a difference in paging versus leaves as a result of the thing being photocopied or going though a Print on Demand process, that gets overlooked. As long as you are ending up with what is essentially the same resource. This kind of thing would happen in the past with the dissertations you used to get from UMI, where the photocopy was pages but the thing that had been photocopied originally was presented on leaves.

**If one is cataloging a physical item that might or might not be a reproduction, would it be acceptable to catalog it following P-N guidelines and instructions, but omit Form: r and "Print reproduction" in the 533 field?**

Answer: No, because if you were not able to conclude that what you had was a reproduction so that you didn't want to code Form: r, then the Provider-Neutral guidelines would not apply to that item. You would catalog the resource in hand as is.

**I'm finding records for resources that are published by university presses that have an 's' in the GPub character place. Bibliographic Formats and Standards indicates that publications from university presses are not considered government publications, so this character position should be 'blank'. Some examples are 32969382 (University Press of Kentucky) and 756594353 (University of North Carolina Press). These are DLC records. Does LC have a different practice of coding university press publications as government documents?**

Answer: No, they no longer have a different practice. There was a change in practice regarding the coding of government publications, such as state universities and colleges several years ago. The practice changed and Robert tried to identify as many of those as we could to correct them to 'blank' instead of the 's' that was already there. We are not able to catch all of them because not all state universities and colleges are identified as such. So, there are records that still have the old practice. The Bibliographic Formats and Standards page on government publications does have the current standard, which is that state university and colleges publications should not be considered government publications.

**To verify, local proxy 856s of provider links already present in the record seem inappropriate for the master record. Is this correct? We are seeing edit wars with deletes of some of these being detected and reinserted very quickly, sometimes in just a few hours.**

Answer: Yes, they are inappropriate for the master record. We have seen those reappearing very quickly too. In most cases, we don't think they are edit wars. We think that they are coming in through our data sync service. We are working very hard to change the coding and the programming for our data sync service so that we won't import, or transfer, those local URLs into existing master records. We don't have an exact time frame on that, but we hope very soon to be able to prevent that from happening, in most cases. The thing to keep in mind with that is to do what makes sense for your local practice. If you take them out then replace the master record that is fine, just know that they may show up again a couple days later. That is not because someone else has put it in there, it is most likely because it was a batch process matching thing. We are working on that because we are just as frustrated about it as you are.

**I often find DLC records that have 653 _0 fields that duplicate 6xx _0 fields. Since this is an uncontrolled index term, I don't understand why it contains an LCSH subject heading string. Was there some program run that created these fields? Can we delete them from the master records?**

Answer: In looking at one of the records, it does seem like they duplicate the LC subject headings exactly, so I would recommend removing those. Without taking a look at the history of this record, I

can't tell for sure how they ended up on this record, but most likely it transferred from ingest activity. Since the tag would be unique, different from the LC subject headings, they would be eligible to transfer. The transfer of field 653 is one of the transfers that we are trying to limit. If you are unable to remove those fields, you can report them to bibchange@oclc.org and we will take care of it.

**How does P-N guidelines relate, or not relate, to microfilm reproductions?**

Answer: They do not. There is no Provider-Neutral guidelines for cataloging microform reproductions. You still do those even if you are applying RDA rules, the same way that we did contrary to AACR2 rules, where you would describe the original, then give all of the publication details in a microfilm reproduction note. Including the fact that it is reels of microfilm, or that it is microfiche, or microopaque, or whatever.

**For Create Space publications, should the publisher be the author or Create Space?**

Answer: This is a case for Create Space, it's not so much Print on Demand reproduction as it is you just get a copy. An author goes to Create Space as the mechanism for publishing their work.  I am thinking that the Print on Demand model fits really well for something like Higginson Book Company that is in Salem Massachusetts, that reprints all sorts of old history books. Whenever you want one, they will produce one that is probably manufactured better than the original one was. They should be treated just like other Print on Demand publications, thinking of Create Space as the "publisher" because it is the author who sends their manuscript to Create Space and they do the work, not a lot of work, but of making it available.

**For POD publications that are a re-setting of the type, and therefore have very different pagination, does that count as a new manifestation and requires a new record?**

Answer: Yes, it ought to have a new record in that case because it is not just solely the reproduction of what was there, it's basically a new manifestation.

## General questions:

**I am fairly new to cataloging and I have a series of 16 books published from 1985-2018 that have different series names in field 830. Therefore, currently they are not all traceable (to one series name). Is there a way to edit the ARN record to include the additional series names so when a particular book is searched, it will list all other books in the series?  There are 4 different series names and only two have the ARN number.**

Answer: You could send an email to the authfile@oclc.org email address. It would be great if you could send photocopies from the items that you are working with. We can create the series authority records that are lacking from the authority file for non-NACO libraries. It is hard to generalize a question without taking a look at what you actually have, whether or not it could be included on the existing series record or, if we need to create new series records.

**Why do you often see two records from a vendor (batch loaded), which are duplicates?**

Answer: It would be great if you could send examples, when you come across these, so that we could examine why. If they are from the same vendor, it's probably a timing issue as to when they came in and they somehow didn't match up because of the timing in which they were being loaded. If they are from two vendors, perhaps there is something different about the records that caused them not to match. This is obviously a problem, and we want to know about them so that we can get them merged.