



Help! I'm cataloging an e-book! What do I need to know from I-Share?





Recommendations Pertinent to E-Books, with Examples

The recommendations below are excerpts from the [Cataloging Electronic Resources/Electronic Resources Display in the OPAC \(2009\) Final Report](#).

R1

The Task Force recommends creating separate bibliographic records for monographs or monographic sets issued in electronic form (e.g., one for the print version, one for the electronic version).

The Task Force recognizes, however, that an institution may have reasons to use a single bibliographic record for multiple formats of the same monographic title, especially if records are imported from vendors like MARCIVE, and acknowledges that it may be difficult for some institutions to follow this recommendation. Libraries working with vendors should encourage them to supply records for electronic monographs separate from the print.

Level: 1

R3

When using separate bibliographic records for monographs or monographic sets, the Task Force recommends using the provider-neutral record concept (see Glossary) developed and implemented by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging for electronic monographs available from one or more providers.

The “Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide” is freely available online: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf>

Level: 1

R4

When using separate bibliographic records for monographs or monographic sets, catalogers may place the provider-specific collection title or vendor name in an appropriate local field.

The local field can be used for internal purposes to collocate all records for e-monographs that have access through a specific provider. This field should assist libraries in identifying a group of records if changes or deletes are necessary in the future. Bibliographic field 791 or 797 can be used to record vendor names or 793 for collection titles. Libraries using a MARC record service may want to use their default field for collection name (e.g., 949). These fields are repeatable; if a title belongs to more than one collection, use a separate field for each collection/vendor name.

Level: 3

R6

The Task Force recommends that, if a library chooses to use a single bibliographic record for the print and electronic versions of a monograph, the library follow interim guidelines developed by the Library of Congress.

Guidelines provided in sections B19.4-B19.5 of the Library of Congress “Draft Interim Guidelines for Cataloging Electronic Resources” are freely available online: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsoc/dcmb19.pdf>.

The Task Force recognizes that these guidelines are in draft form and not as current as we would like; however, we could find other more current guidelines for creating single records for monographs.

Level: 1

R8

The Task Force recommends that each holdings record (MFHD) representing an electronic resource be assigned a location specifically designated for electronic resources rather than for any other physical format. The Task Force recommends that each library make its own decision about how many such locations to create and what names to give them.

In choosing a location for electronic resources, select one that will be used only for electronic resources. Don't mix print and electronic resources within the same location. This can help end-users limit searches to electronic resources. Audio and video remote access electronic resources may be assigned separate locations or the same location as other electronic resources, depending on the needs of the library. If electronic resources have been purchased for several different physical locations, consider assigning them separate electronic resources locations if there is reason to distinguish between locations, such as for licensing purposes.

Level: 1

Example:

<u>Location Code</u>	<u>Display</u>
ER	Online
ER Aud	Online Audio
ER Vid	Online Video

R9

The Task Force recommends that, if a library chooses to use a single bibliographic record for the print and the electronic versions, the library create a separate holdings record (MFHD) for each format of a title. The holdings record (MFHD) for the electronic version should contain an 856 field with a link to the resource.

Level: 1

R10

The Task Force recommends that libraries always place the URL or URLs appropriate to their end-users in the 856 field, subfield u of the holdings record (MFHD).

The URL appropriate to end-users may be "shareable" or institution-specific. It does not matter whether or not the URL works for end-users outside of the specific library community; what matters is that the URL in the holdings record work for end-users of that particular institution.

Level: 1

Examples:

Institution-specific URL to restricted resource

<http://library.icc.edu/login?url=http://www.netLibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=103190>

Shareable URL to restricted resource

<http://www.netLibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=103190>

Shareable URL to freely available resource

<http://www.amsreview.org>

Institution-specific URL to freely available resource

R11

The Task Force recommends that each library make its own decision whether to keep, remove, display and/or hide the 856 field(s) in its bibliographic records. Any URLs in the 856 field(s), subfield u of the bibliographic record should be appropriate to the library's end-users.

Although WebVoyáge provides libraries with the option to display or hide the content of the bibliographic record 856 field, at the time of the writing of this report VuFind local catalogs will display the bibliographic record 856 field. Future systems may or may not allow customization of display. Libraries should assume that any URLs in the 856 field may display to the public at any time. Any URLs available in the bibliographic 856 field should either be constructed in a form that can be used by the institution's end-users, whether shareable or institution-specific, or else removed from the record. When copy cataloging, existing shareable URLs do not need to be retained in the bibliographic record.

There are reasons a library may wish to retain URLs in the bibliographic record. Libraries that batch load records will need to have an 856 field in the bibliographic record in order for it to be copied to the holdings record (MFHD). At the time of the writing of this report, bibliographic record 856 fields with the proper indicators display in the results list in VuFind (see Appendix A). Having an 856 field in the bibliographic record may also allow for easier migration and re-use of catalog data in other applications, such as third party discovery systems.

On the other hand, if present, a URL in the bibliographic record will be visually separate in an online catalog display from any corresponding local holdings information (e.g., years of coverage) that resides in its corresponding holdings record (MFHD), require maintenance, and possibly additional steps in a cataloging workflow.

Level: 1

Example:

The OCLC record for the e-journal "Academic Leadership" contains the two 856 fields, each with a URL:

<http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/6012>

<http://www.academicleadership.org/>

UIUC removes these two existing URLs and adds a single URL directing end-users to its e-journals database for access:

<http://www.library.uiuc.edu/orr/results.php?resid=31640>

See **R10** for additional examples of URLs.

R12

The Task Force recommends that libraries select stable and/or persistent URLs, when available, for placement in the 856 field of the holdings record (MFHD) and, if present, in the bibliographic record.

Persistent URLs describe an intermediate location rather than the direct location of the resource to be retrieved, and can greatly reduce the amount of maintenance required to correct URLs that, over time, no longer take the user to the expected resource. The work of identifying location changes is managed at the intermediate site, as opposed to each library having to update URLs with every location change.

Examples of Persistent URL systems:

PURLS: <http://purl.org>

OpenURLs: <http://niso.org/standards/z39-88-2004/>

Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs): <http://www.doi.org/>

Handles: <http://www.handle.net>

Publishers or aggregators frequently provide a recommended URL structure that is more stable than what is displayed in the browser window. Seek out a publisher's or aggregator's recommended URL structure by checking their "Librarians" page for instructions. When MARC records are acquired—whether from the provider or through a third party, such as Serials Solutions or as an OCLC Collection Set—the preferred form of URL should be already present in the 856 field. When in doubt, contact the provider for clarification as to what form of URL will be the most stable. Libraries working with vendors should encourage them to supply persistent URLs for electronic resources.

Examples of publisher's systems:

Informaworld links are constructed by combining the domain and the standard number, e.g.,
<http://www.informaworld.com/978-0-8247-2071-1>

Project Muse provides a list of title-level URLs available for download:
<http://muse.jhu.edu/holdings/>

Level: 1

R13

The Task Force recommends that all URLs be verified at the time they are added to the catalog.

The Voyager Cataloging Client provides a mechanism to verify hyperlinks for records being individually cataloged in Voyager. The Task Force realizes that not all URLs may be reviewed in batch records loads but recommends spot-checking URLs for access and proper construction.

Level: 1

R14

The Task Force recommends that any URLs in the holdings record (MFHD) and, if present, in the bibliographic record, be kept current.

Libraries may choose to do this manually or may choose to use an automated tool to verify links.

Level: 1

R15

The Task Force recommends that catalogers structure data in the 856 field of the holdings record (MFHD), and, if present, the 856 field of the bibliographic record, in the following way:

- **Subfield 3: Provider or package name, if appropriate, and/or coverage/part information, if appropriate**
- **Subfield z: Note of restriction and institutional identification, if appropriate**
- **Subfield u: URL appropriate to the institution**
- **Subfield y: Link text (optional, see notes below)**

While formulating this recommendation, the Task Force considered current use of the 856 subfields by I-Share libraries, recommendations for use in national guidelines, and display of 856 subfields in WebVoyage and VuFind. Using the subfields in the recommended ways will result in the most consistent display of URLs in the online catalog. These notes need not be extensive to contain these three parts. The Task Force does not recommend any specific wording but does recommend that the notes be consistent. As of the time of the writing of this report, Ex Libris acknowledged that WebVoyage exhibits some bugs in the display of the subfield y as detailed in Appendix A.

Level: 2

Examples:

Shareable URL to a journal in JStor (access is restricted, but URL is not institution-specific)

856 40 \$u <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublication?journalCode=afriamerrevi> \$3
JSTOR \$z Access is available only to authorized users. \$y African American Review

Institution-specific URL to a volume of a book on SpringerLink

856 40 \$u
<http://proxy.library.eiu.edu:2048/login?url=http://www.springerlink.com/openurl.asp?genre=issue&issn=0302-9743&volume=4491> \$3 SpringerLink (v. 1) \$z Access restricted to EIU patrons

Institution-specific link to intermediate page that leads to access from multiple providers

856 40 \$u
<http://HZ9PJ6FE4T.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=HZ9PJ6FE4T&S=JCs&C=ACADLEAMUT&T=marc> \$z Available only to UIC users

Shareable URL to freely available resource (no notes needed)

856 40 \$u <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS110750>

R16

If there are multiple active URLs for an e-resource title, the Task Force recommends that catalogers record one URL per 856 field and provide notes in the appropriate subfields as specified by R15. This applies to 856 fields in the holdings record (MFHD) and, if present, in bibliographic record.

Each URL should be placed in its own 856 field within a holdings record (MFHD), but libraries may choose to place each 856 field in its own holdings record (MFHD) or have multiple 856 fields in a single holdings record (MFHD).

Libraries batch loading records will need to work within the parameters of the batch loading process, which can result in a single holdings record (MFHD) with multiple URLs, or multiple holdings records (MFHDs), one for each URL, depending on how the records are loaded. If multiple URLs are copied from the bibliographic record and placed into a holdings record (MFHD) at the time of loading, there will be one holdings record with multiple URLs. If an existing bibliographic record is overlaid with a new URL during an update, and the Bulk Import Rule is set to "Create MFHDs for Existing Bibs", a new holdings record (MFHD) will be created with the new URL at the time of the update and any previous holdings records (MFHD) will also remain.

Although serial holdings data are not addressed in the context of this report, the decision to create multiple MFHDs (one for each URL) or a single MFHD (with multiple 856 fields) has implications for libraries who use OCLC's Local Holdings Record (LHR) service to batch load their serial holdings data from Voyager to WorldCat. If you are using or considering this OCLC service, contact CARLI for additional information.

Level: 1

R17

The Task Forces recommends that libraries assign a topical call number or class number to each electronic resource using an appropriate classification scheme.

The call/class number should be placed in the 852 field of the holdings record (MFHD) as well as in the appropriate field of bibliographic record, if possible, for all types of resources that are usually assigned topical class numbers by your library. When performing batch loads, the call number can be transferred

from the bibliographic record to the holdings record (MFHD). As libraries' collections become increasingly electronic, assigning a specific call number will allow the electronic resources to be integrated with other library materials. This serves two useful purposes. First, it enables library end-users to take advantage of call number browses, searches, and facets, which have gained prominence and are easier to use in next generation catalogs. Second, this means that any class number-based collection analysis that a library performs will include its electronic resources, and not just their print resources.

Level: 3

R18

The Task Force recommends that libraries not create item records for electronic resources. (The single exception to this recommendation is the e-item record used in Voyager reserves.)

Item records are not needed for electronic resources since electronic resources do not circulate in the traditional sense of the word. Furthermore, the presence of item records prevents the use of some kinds of batch/bulk processing of bibliographic and holdings records (MFHDs).

Level: 1