PCC Core Records and How To Identify Them

Margaret Shen, Head, Catalog Department, Cleveland Public Library

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging is an international cooperative effort aimed at expanding access to library collections by providing useful, timely, and cost-effective cataloging that meets mutually-accepted standards.

The program was organized to cooperatively enhance the timely availability of bibliographic and authority records by cataloging more items, producing cataloging that is widely available for sharing and use by others, and performing cataloging in a more cost-effective manner. Through participation in the program, members develop and maintain mutually acceptable standards for records, promote the values of timely access and cost-effectiveness in cataloging, and expand the pool of catalogers who catalog using the mutually-accepted standards.

When our catalog database was first created without authority control, we had many unsuccessful retrievals. As members of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, we create our authority records online at the time of cataloging, and contribute them directly to the national authority file. Existing problems are resolved with information submitted by the public departments. Now our catalog users have very few unsuccessful retrievals.

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and its Core Record project was developed after the demise of the National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP). Begun as a cooperative program among eight university libraries and the Library of Congress, NCCP ended in November 1992 with a disappointing quantity in output (due to various stringent requirements from the Library of Congress) and discontinuation in funding.

The Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC) continued the work of the NCCP, with the Library of Congress acting as the coordinator. Six Task Groups were formed; they included personnel from all types of libraries. After vigorous communication via e-mail and listservs, the final reports from all of the Task Groups were completed at the end of October 1993, and were accepted by the CCC. The CCC officially changed its name to Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) in February 1994, and three permanent standing committees were established: Standards, Training, and Automation.

During 1994 and 1995, the Library of Congress staff aggressively trained new participants in the Name Authorities Cooperative Program (NACO), and BIBCO, a program for the creation of core bibliographic records. "Training the Trainers" institutes were also offered. By October 1995, PCC was ready for BIBCO to start, but most of the participating libraries waited until March 1996, because of the implementation of Format Integration.

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging was instituted based on the Core Bibliographic Record, authority control, and training. The core bibliographic record is one that falls between minimum-level cataloging and full-level cataloging. When using this standard catalogers record key elements in bibliographic records and omit non-essential fields. This model is an alternative or supplement to two other

approaches in getting library service materials to the public: depending solely on the Library of Congress, or outsourcing.

According to Sarah Thomas of the Library of Congress, "PCC advocates the exercise of judgment by catalogers in lieu of the information of complex policies and interpretations ... and specifies that all headings must be under authority control." (Sarah E. Thomas. "The Core Bibliographic Record and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 21:3/4, 1996.) Standards for a Core record simplify the notes area, but require the fixed field to be fully coded. A recognized classification system (Dewey or L.C.) and one or two appropriate subject headings are required.

With the project a little more than a year in operation, many libraries have begun to see the benefits of this cooperative cataloging. The program recruits participants in academic, public, and special libraries; therefore, a wide variety of materials are covered by core records.

There are two elements in PCC BIBCO records that identify them:

1. Field 042: pcc in every record
2. Encoding level: 4 for a core record (at present in OCLC, it is also field 039 core) 'blank' for full record)

The following is an example of an OCLC Core record:

Type: a   Bib I: m   Enc I: 4   Desc: a   Ctry: cau   Lang: eng   Mod: Srce: c   Ill:
Audience: Form: Cont: Gvt: Cnf:
0   Fst: 0   Ind: 0   Fic: 0   Bio:
Dat tp: s   Dates: 1956   Control:

	010	o	$a 36578331 $
	040		$a CLE $c CLE $
	042		$a pcc $
	090		$a KF5709.3.W56 $b R43 1956 $
	245	00	$a Recommended code provisions for windstorm resisting construction. $
	246	30	$a Windstorm resisting construction $
	260		$a San Francisco, Calif. :$b National Board of Fire Underwriters, $c [1956] $
	300		$a 10 p. ;$c 23 cm. $
	500		$a Cover title. $
OK	650	0	$a Building laws. $
OK	650	0	$a Construction industry $x Law and legislation. $
OK	650	0	$a Roofs $x Law and legislation. $
?S	650	0	$a Masonry $x Law and legislation. $
OK	710	2	$a National Board of Fire Underwriters. $

The 'OK' in the left margin above was supplied by our local system vendor and indicates that all these access points were verified and supported by national authority records. In other words, libraries which do not have access to the national authority database can be sure that all the headings are correct when there is a field 042 in a bibliographic record, whether or not "DLC" appears in field 040. Because the quality of the record is guaranteed, staff can devote their time to editing for local practices when needed.

These records are currently available for you to use, and libraries are creating more every day across the country. Any size or type of library is welcome to participate in PCC's Core record program, provided they are willing to meet the standards of the program and participate in a thorough training program. For more information on the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, visit the Library of Congress's website at: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/pcc.html.

MLA-L: A LISTSERV for Music Librarianship

All of us can testify how difficult it can sometimes be to catalog and process music, whatever form it takes. For those questions that just don't have easy answers, turning to a listserv full of experts may be the best choice we can make.

The Music Library Association (MLA) is devoted to music librarianship and to all aspects of music materials in libraries. For people really interested in music in libraries, joining MLA may be the answer. But you don't have to join MLA to participate in their listserv, MLA-L. MLA-L is used to discuss MLA activities and deadlines, but it is not used for detailed committee business. It is used as a forum for topics of interest to the music library community.

To subscribe to MLA-L, send an email message to MLA-L@IUBVM.UCS.INDIANA.EDU. Leave the subscription line blank. In the body of the message type: subscribe MLA-L your name (where "your name" is of course your own name) then respond as directed.

Z39.50 Cataloging Clients: Are They Really the Yellow Brick Road?

By Margaret Maurer, Taylor Memorial Public Library

On the OPLIN listserv last year someone asked why some of us pay "big bucks" for MARC records when others use one of those new Z39.50 clients to download MARC records from other library catalogs for free. For those of you who are not familiar with them, Z39.50 clients enable not only the usual OPAC presentation of data from other libraries, but present the entire record in MARC communications format. They allow us to search each other's catalogs and download records without having to re-key them.

Of course library administrators would love to eliminate bibliographic utility payments. They envision a "duty-free" Oz: catalogers reaching into each other's catalogs and nimbly copying records, getting there via Z39.50 — Dorothy's yellow brick road.

To learn more about Z39.50 downloading I posted a set of questions to several listservs. Using Z39.50 software to download records raises complicated issues involving moral opinions, library traditions, economics, legal issues, database protection, current legislation, and a great deal of misinformation.

Who's Following the Yellow Brick Road?

I posted the questions to AUTOCAT, the OPLIN listserv, INLEX-L, and a listserv for participants in Library Leadership 2000. I asked for people's opinions on downloading records from other library catalogs. Thirty-six people responded to the questions, and many other people posted related messages expressing their opinions and providing information. Fifteen of the responding libraries contract with a bibliographic utility for the majority of their records and catalog the other items originally. Ten libraries contract with a

bibliographic utility for the majority of their records and then gather useful information (subject headings, classifications, etc.) from other libraries in order to catalog the remaining items originally. This includes printing screens and then re-keying the records into their own systems. Three libraries contract with a bibliographic utility for the majority of their records and then download the rest using a Z39.50 server. Two libraries use copy from book jobbers and then use the Internet and other libraries to get copy for other materials, but they didn't specify whether or not they were downloading the "help" they were getting. One library contracts with a bibliographic utility and then gets the rest in an unspecified way. One library only gets their records from their national database (outside the U.S.) One library goes first to the Internet and performs Z39.50 searches for cataloging copy, then contracts with a bibliographic utility for the rest. Finally, three libraries didn't detail where their records came from.

Ten respondents said they didn't approve of downloading, but nineteen of them said it was fine. Three respondents didn't address this issue directly.

Only two libraries had a formal policy regarding usage of their database by other libraries.

While most of the libraries questioned still purchased records from some type of bibliographic utility, many of them did not see anything wrong with searching other library catalogs as a secondary tactic. There are libraries downloading records from other libraries. There are also a lot of librarians out there who don't mind if you download records from their catalogs. The respondents also provided a lot of other related information and opinions.

"I Have a Feeling We're Not In Kansas Anymore!"

Libraries have a long-standing tradition of sharing bibliographic records. Typically richer libraries share with poorer ones in the hopes of improving universal bibliographic access. Libraries that can't afford to hire crack catalogers join a bibliographic utility and pay for dependable records. As one respondent put it: "Overall, I think the general process improves the quality of most libraries' databases so should be encouraged as much as possible."

What's different now is that it's so much easier to download records via Z39.50 than it was to re-key the record. One respondent argued that "this is just the next technological step in the ongoing process of reducing the duplication of the original cataloging effort." Another commented that it is easier to explain shared cataloging and an open catalog environment to their library administrators than it would be to explain why they spent staff time to catalog a record that already existed in the local university database.

But some respondents looked at these activities and pointed out that "sharing" records implies reciprocity. What does the "lender" get when the "borrower" dials in and downloads? As one cataloger put it "How long will the few remaining cataloging libraries do this work for the 'deadbeats' who would take them for nothing? Another felt it was "...parasitic behavior to load records from a bibliographic utility to which you don't belong, or from a library with which you do not have a contractual arrangement." Some software vendors offer software that keeps track of who is downloading records, but usually that only works if the other library is using the same software as you are. For the most part there is no way to track the activity.

The remaining comments dropped into that grey area in the middle. Some said that it's okay to download records from other library catalogs, so long as it's not the primary source of copy. Or that it's a matter of degree; that it's okay as long as it's not your primary source of records, or if you're really small, or if you're so broke that you'd never purchase records from an on-going source anyway. Some respondents were comfortable with downloading copy from the Library of Congress (its records are in the public domain), but not from anywhere else.

Somewhere Over the Rainbow; or, Is There Really a "Duty-Free" Oz?

While on the surface it might seem cheaper to ditch the cost of the bibliographic utility, many respondents pointed out the hidden costs of downloading records. *BookWhere?* was designed as a Z39.50 software add-on for citation management software like *ProCite*. It has no ability to edit a record, and it has limited export capabilities. Z39.50 itself is also not the powerful search engine that the bibliographic utilities supply, because the searches are limited to those supported on the host computer and vary from site to site. It is also generally less efficient to search multiple databases than it is to search in just one database. Respondents reported that it tended to be clunkier, requiring more mousing or tabbing about than the command driven interfaces offered by most utilities. They also felt it also didn't seem as fast.

Libraries should also be aware that their holdings would not appear as available for interlibrary loan via a bibliographic utility. Looking in more than one place for ILL requests is more cumbersome than utilizing a centralized utility.

The other thing that will be required will be a more sophisticated searcher, which will cost the library more money. The searcher has to know where to look on the Internet for records. They have to be very good at distinguishing between good copy and not-so-good copy, something that is very difficult to teach. They will have to be able to deal with authority records from a variety of sources, making it harder to maintain consistency. In the long run it might be more cost effective to use cataloging novices and pay for a utility with guaranteed levels of quality control than to ask them to evaluate and edit records from a wide variety of sources. In the words of one respondent, "Hunting for such records through a hunt-and-peck approach would not be cost-effective."

Are We Maybe Risking the Real Oz?

Inside the United States we tend to be very protective of our bibliographic utilities, and rightly so. Their existence makes cataloging an easier and more predictable process, and these resources are the envy of other countries. Some catalogers see the invention of Z39.50 downloading as a threat to these utilities. Indeed at least one utility has been forced to raise their prices to accommodate slower levels of traffic.

As less and less of us are participating in the utilities, the quantity and quality of the cataloging will drop. As one respondent put it, "Increasingly it seems that the only organizations that will be providing original cataloging are the Library of Congress and private vendors."

Some of the respondents were angry that other libraries would by-pass the bibliographic utilities and go directly to other library catalogs (which originally got their records from a utility). "We pay a handy sum of money for those records, and we would generally

frown upon those who would copy our cataloging."

We also may be putting at risk the closest thing we have to national union catalogs. Yes, the Library of Congress is still available. There are also projects currently evolving, like the National Library of Canada's Virtual Union Catalogue, which feature a series of decentralized files linked together. But the bibliographic utilities really function as our union catalogs

It's a Horse of a Different Color

While public opinion rages on these issues, the real revolution may come regarding database copyright law, and our first responsibility as database managers should be to define where rights exist and how they apply to our organizations.

The United States is one of the signatories on the Byrne Convention (which is the international law regarding copyright). By signing this the United States agreed that "...works originating in one of the contracting States must be given the same protection in each of the other contracting States as the latter grants to the works of its own nationals." This has had a major impact on the interpretation of U.S. copyright law because it requires us to recognize the moral rights of integrity and attribution, rights previously unavailable here. It has also extended the author's rights to last "life plus seventy-five" years, while U.S. copyright was only "life plus fifty years".

But MARC records are not automatically protected by copyright, because they consist primarily of information or facts, not knowledge, and facts can not be copyrighted. Compilations of facts can be copyrighted, but not the facts themselves. For example, an almanac can be copyrighted, but a list of the ten tallest buildings in the world cannot. Bibliographic utility databases are compilations, and their databases may therefore be copyrighted, regardless of the copyrightability of the underlying data. However, the individual records contained in them may not be. OCLC has copyrighted its database, and individual libraries have also done so. You really do own your own records, no matter where they came from originally.

Database producers want more copyright protection for their databases, and we in the library community should be aware of this trend. Current copyright protection for databases is seen as relatively thin, and database producers restrict access to licensees and control licensee conduct with contracts. New protection for facts would alter 200-year-old law in the United States, and just the idea of it makes many in the educational community very nervous.

New database copyright legislation is being considered nationally, and internationally. In September the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) convened an Information Meeting on Intellectual Property in Databases. Also in September the U.S. Copyright Office issued a comprehensive report to Congress on the subject of legal protections for databases. There are currently three bills working their way through Congress to implement the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty drawn up at a December 1996 WIPO Conference.

Proponents of new legislation believe that databases are increasingly important to the economy and to science. They want to protect these investments. Opponents of legislation believe that proponents have not produced sufficient evidence of a problem requiring a legislative solution. There was general agreement that databases are vulnerable to copying and that adequate incentives are needed to ensure their continued creation. They also agreed that "free-riding" or substantial copying for competitive commercial purposes should not be permitted

Finally, for the library community, we have the added wrinkle that many MARC records are produced by people who work for governments, and as such can be interpreted as being public records, therefore in the public domain. The Library of Congresses' MARC records are in the public domain, but what happens when those same records are purchased, entered into the database of a bibliographic utility, purchased again by a member library, and then downloaded via Z39.50 to yet another library? Managing copyright protection on the Internet will be a mind-boggling endeavor.

Looking for Your Own Heart's Desire

Each library is responsible for developing a policy regarding the use of its database. Decide how you will respond if contacted by other libraries about sharing your records. Decide what your policy is regarding using other libraries' records. Involve anyone who has an interest in your database in this process. This is something that should be decided locally, and have the support of the administration and the board.

Investigate whether or not you have entered into any contracts with vendors that would limit your own use of your records or the use of your records by others. In 1987 OCLC established the "Guidelines for the Use and Transfer of OCLC-Derived Records." According to Phyllis B. Spies, Vice President Sales and International, OCLC, "...these guidelines are designed to promote easy access to information, but they are also intended to protect OCLC from the re-sale of the

database to commercial vendors. OCLC is a nonprofit membership organization, and OCLC is seeking to protect the membership's principal asset. OCLC member libraries are free to transfer their own holdings to other libraries, member networks, state and multi-state agencies, and all other non-commercial firms. Transfers to state agencies, multi-state library agencies, national library agencies, or commercial firms require special agreement with OCLC."

"If you are an OCLC member library," said Spies, "you may use your records without restriction and may transfer records of your holdings without restriction to other libraries. If you are a non-OCLC library, and choose to regularly download records from an OCLC library, you should first check with that library to see if they have any restrictions on the use of their database." In May 1997 the OCLC Users Council and U.S. Regional Networks also adopted "WorldCat, the Online Union Catalog: Principles of Cooperation." By signing on to it member libraries agreed to limit use of OCLC records, systems, and services to OCLC authorized users.

Other bibliographic utilities have their own sets of rules and recommendations for member libraries. Find out exactly what you are contractually obligated to do by examining any documents signed with your bibliographic vendors, and include this in your policy discussion.

Once developed, publish your copyright policy and keep people informed of it. Some libraries post their actual policy on the library's web page. Posting your policy may be your only line of defense as there really is no way to block downloading, and no way to keep track of it (as some catalogers are quick to point out).

As you gain new information, or new legal developments occur, modify your policy, and keep everyone informed of the changes. Anyone interested in keeping current can visit the U.S. Copyright office's web page at http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright, or by subscribe to the U.S. Copyright Office's NewsNet listserv. Just send a message to listserv@rs8.loc.gov. In the body of the message type: subscribe uscopyright.

Remember that, unlike in Oz, everything on the Internet is not free. If you want to regularly download records from another library, contact that library and find out what their policy is. They may not mind sharing records. On the other hand they may be limited by contractual agreements they have entered into, or may wish to allow only certain types of libraries to download records. Records at the Library of Congress are, however, always in the public domain.

Most of all, use good common sense, and adhere to the advice that if your activity is illegal off-line, it's probably illegal on-line. Dorothy eventually found her heart's desire, and it was right back at home, in Kansas.

Bookmarks: DDC's Hot Topics Web Site

Got an impossibly new topic to classify in DDC and you're totally stumped? Help is only a browser click away at the DDC Hot Classification Topics web page.

Designed to help classifiers assign DDC numbers to topics of recent interest, this web page is updated weekly by OCLC Forest Press. It has lists of new and changed DDC numbers that the Library of Congress is currently applying to emerging subjects. You can download these lists, or browse them on-line. You can also search by key terms through new LCSH headings and be presented with their corresponding DDC number. For example, a recent search under "cookery" resulted in "Vegan cookery - 641.5636".

For those of us having difficulty cataloging topics related to automation there's a section on new computer related topics that has notes explaining how the numbers are constructed and examples. Other topics currently presented include assigning new base numbers for historical periods, animals and plants in aquatic environments, and sexual harassment in education.

Go to http://www.oclc.org/fp. Select DDC by clicking on it on the left side of the screen. Select "Hot Classification Topics" from the menu by clicking on it, and you're there. You can also get to it by directly keying in the web page: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/fp/ddc/hottopic/hottoc.htm.

Program Offerings from the Technical Services Division

By Amy Deuble, Portage Library Consortium

While summer quickly slipped into fall, the Technical Services Division Action Council worked to provide you with programs and workshops for the 1997 Annual Conference, and for the Spring Chapter Conferences for 1998.

The following programs were offered by the Technical Services Division at the 1997 OLC Annual Conference, held in October, in the heart of Rock and Roll, Cleveland, Ohio: "*Working on the chain gang*": *The nuts and bolts of workflow* presented by Jennifer Bull of the Ashland Public Library; "*...You get what you need*": *Maximizing fiction access*, presented by Georgianne Balcas Wiersch and Melanie Deutsch of the Cuyahoga County Public Library; "*Go where you want to go*": *Technical services and the Internet*, presented by Amey L. Park and Laura M. Bartolo of Kent State University; "*Stayin' alive*": *Hands on book repair*, a pre-conference organized by Ann Olszewski, Ann Kearney and Juan Davis of the Cleveland Public Library; and "*I will survive*": *Basic paper preservation tactics*, another pre-conferece presented by Ann Olszewski and Georgina Koh of the Cleveland Public Library.

Believe it or not, it is not too early to begin thinking about the 1998 Chapter Conferences! The Technical Services Division is offering nine programs to the Chapters: Basic reference materials for Technical Services; Vendor Overview : a comparison of book jobbers; The 780s for the musically-challenged; Using volunteers in Technical Services; Processing audio-visual and non-book material roundtable discussion; Be smart about MARC; "All by myself" - cataloging without OCLC; Working with periodicals; Quick and dirty book repair.

If one of these appeals to you, let your Chapter's representatives know ASAP. They make many of the decisions on what is offered at spring chapter conferences in mid-November at OLCs Leadership Conference. Don't see something listed you would like? Contact me or anyone on the Action Council with your ideas. IT'S NOT TOO LATE! I can be reached by phone at 330-296-6144, by fax at 330-296-3780, or via email at deubleam@oplin.lib.oh.us. I would really like to hear from you!

Technical Services Division Election Results

This summer's elections packed the division with energetic council members. Here's how to contact your duly elected representatives:

Coordinator: **Gary Branson**, London Public Library, 20 E. First Street, London, OH 43140. (614-852-9543) (gbranson@kent.edu -or- lordon@oplin.lib.oh.us)

Assistant Coordinator: **Georgianne Balcas Wiersch**, Cuyahoga County Public Library, 2111 Snow Road, Parma, OH 44134. (440-794-9374) (gwiersch@cuyahoga.lib.oh.us)

Outgoing Coordinator: **Amy Deuble**, Portage Library Consortium, 167 East Main St., Ravenna, OH 44266 (330-296-6144) (deubleam@oplin.lib.oh.us)

Secretary: **Margaret Maurer**, Taylor Memorial Public Library, 2015 Third Street, Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44221 (330-928-2117) (maurerma@oplin.lib.oh.us)

Action Council: **Rhonda Marr**, Portage County District Library, 10482 South St., Garrettsville, OH 44231 (330-527-5082 Ext. 216) (marrrh@oplin.lib.oh.us)

Action Council: **Marian Benjamin**, Mansfield-Richland County Public Library, 43 W. Third St., Mansfield, OH 44902-1295 (419-521-3134) (marian_benjamin@freenet.richland.oh.us)

Action Council: **Jolene Bates**, Way Public Library, 101 E. Indiana Ave., Perrysburg, OH 43551 (419-874-3135)

Action Council: **Jo Ann Heyman**, Wood County District Public Library, 251 North Main Street, Bowling Green, OH 43402 (419-352-5014)

Many thanks go out to everyone who ran for office this year. Choosing who to vote for was very difficult because of how qualified all of the candidates were!

AKRON, OHIO 443 12-17-97 OCR3

Margaret B Maurer   3843
1365 Martin Road
Mogadore OH 44260-1572

44260-1572 03

OVAL Offers Internet Resources Workshop

Does your Library think of the Internet as a tool for reference service, not recognizing its value in technical services? There is a lot of useful information available for technical services staff on the Internet. To help technical services staff connect the net to their work the Ohio Valley Area Libraries (OVAL) has invited Georgiana Van Syckle from the State Library of Ohio to present a workshop next spring.

Internet Resources for Technical Services will provide an introduction to the many resources available to technical services departments on the Internet. It will also address time saving and cost saving alternatives to make the Internet work for technical services.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, 1998 at the Wellston OVAL office. For more information, or to register, contact Gail Zachariah at OVAL by calling 800-759-1537, or via the Internet at zacharga@oplin.lib.oh.us.