

## *Recommendations*

This section contains specific CRG recommendations. These recommendations are the result of CRG's deliberations which in turn were shaped by the factors noted in the Introduction—survey data, the CIP program mission, resource constraints, automation, staff experience, the ABA directorate reorganization, Library Services Strategic Plan FY2008-2013, CIP Advisory Group discussions, and other factors.

This section is divided into 10 subsections:

1. The Purpose. The CIP mission and printing CIP data in the book.
2. CIP Data Elements. The inclusion/exclusion of specific CIP data elements.
3. CIP Data Accuracy. The quality of CIP data.
4. CIP Verification. Some changes to the verification process.
5. Scope. Types of work in scope for the CIP program.
6. Eligibility. Types of publishers eligible for the CIP program.
7. Service to Publishers. Quality of service to publishers.
8. Future Service. Possible future service to libraries and publishers.
9. PCN Program. The PCN program.
10. Selection. The selection process as it relates to the CIP program.

### **1. The Purpose of the CIP Program.**

As noted in the Background section of this report, the purpose of the CIP program is to catalog in advance of publication those books most likely to be widely acquired by the nation's libraries. Instead of individual libraries cataloging the same work repeatedly, the work is cataloged once and literally thousands of libraries benefit and can redirect resources to other uses.

Does the library community still need the CIP program? Of all of the questions included in the surveys, this one received the most clear and unambiguous response. Over 92% of library respondents rated the overall CIP program as important or very important.

- 91% rated CIP important/very important for standardizing cataloging
- 90% rated CIP important/very important for improving the quality of cataloging
- 84% rated CIP important/very important for speeding book to users
- 54% rated CIP important/very important for speeding products and services to users
- 51% rated CIP important/very important for enhancing products and services for users
- 42% rated CIP important/very important for redirecting funds for purposes other than cataloging

MARC customers also value the CIP program highly: 79% of MARC customers rated CIP as important or very important. Nearly 50% of MARC customers rated CIP as very important for standardizing cataloging and for speeding products or services to users.

Publishers likewise value the CIP program highly.

76.4% cite increased sales to libraries  
46.7% cite benefits to marketing of their publications  
34.2% cite increased sales in general

When asked about the benefits of CIP data, many publishers mentioned that CIP gives legitimacy, credibility, and greater professionalism to their publications.

Many comments from the library community indicate the program is more important than ever because of the budgetary constraints and staff shortages which many libraries are experiencing. Respondents also expressed a desire to have more CIP cataloging. These responses clearly indicate that the fundamental purpose for the program remains sound and that the service it provides to the library community is beneficial and essential.

### Recommendation.

(1A.) The CIP Review Group recommends that the Library of Congress continue to administer the national Cataloging in Publication program in close consultation with libraries, publishers, and vendors of information products. The CIP program is central to the Library's mission to make its resources available and useful to the Congress and the American people and is a basic element of strategic objective 4.E of the Library Services Strategic Plan for 2008-2013, "Provide direct services to libraries and publishers." The CIP program at the Library of Congress is supported by a wealth of expertise in cataloging, standards development, innovative applications of information technology, and collaborative relationships with partner institutions. The Library should build on those advantages to improve the program while continuing to deliver the timely, high-quality bibliographic access that has served the U.S. information community so well for the past 35 years.

### ***Printing CIP data in the book.***

The CIP program is predicated on the understanding that participating publishers will print the CIP data on the verso of the title page. This is a principal means of making the data available to the library community.

Given the apparent prevalence of automation and internet connectivity in the library community, some question the need for printing the data in the book. The requirement to print the data in the book imposes a production constraint on publishers as it means submitting applications well in advance of publication and/or some items holding up their scheduled print date until the completed data arrives. To address these concerns the CIP program strives to complete the CIP process within a two week turn-around time. It achieves this goal for more than 80% percent of

titles processed, but 20% are delayed which may result in delays in printing or the absence of data in the printed book.

When publishers were asked to identify the principal reason for not printing the data in the book, 26% noted the data was not requested in time and 31% said it was not received in time.

Publishers, however, also fail to print the data in the book for other reasons. Some have adopted the practice of printing the legend “Library of Congress CIP data has been applied for” under the misapprehension that this practice meets CIP program policy requirements when in fact it does not. Or, alternately, some publishers print the legend “Library of Congress cataloging data is available”. This practice is also contrary to CIP policy.

In other instances (as in the case with some children’s books that lack separate title or Copyright pages) publishers do not print the data because there is insufficient space. Some publishers also chose not to print the data for aesthetic reasons, i.e., the CIP data compromises the design of the page.

Despite these practices and the prevalence of automation, the library community’s position is unambiguous. Ninety percent of library respondents said they used CIP data printed in the book; 86% said the data in the book was useful or very useful for cataloging; 39% said it was useful or very useful for public service; 32% said it was useful or very useful for routing books to appropriate staff; and 32% said it was useful or very useful for acquisitions.

### Recommendations.

- (1B.) Given the very large number of libraries that use CIP data printed in the book and the broad range of uses to which the data is put, CRG recommends that the program continue to require publishers to print the data in the book.

CRG recognizes that continuing to print the data in the book also means that the production of CIP data will remain a time-critical process characterized by urgency. The CIP program strives to produce CIP data within two weeks of receipt of the application. In FY06 the average throughput time was 9.4 days with 83% completed within 14 days. While all who contribute to the CIP process may appreciate the prospect of a less urgent pace that not printing the data in the book would likely engender, CRG believes that this would not, in the final analysis, serve the library community well.

Publishers would submit applications later in the process to ensure the accuracy of the data elements (most likely when the book is being printed and there is little chance that a data element will change) and because there would be no urgency to get the CIP data back

from LC before the print date. And Library staff processing applications would likewise no longer have the incentive of completing the cataloging prior to the anticipated print date. CRG fears that over time this would lead to CIP data being created and distributed after the book's publication with no mechanism built into the production system to prohibit this delay from extending over a period of weeks or months. This would depreciate a key characteristic of CIP data, namely, its currency.

- (1C.) CRG also recommends that the CIP program promote the importance of printing data in the book to publishers to obtain fuller compliance with this requirement.
- (1D.) CRG also recommends that publishers who routinely fail to print CIP data in the book or who routinely print the legend "CIP data is available at the Library of Congress" be suspended from the program.

### ***Printing the card image format.***

Since the inception of the CIP program, CIP policy has required publishers to print the data as provided without adding or deleting elements and without changing punctuation, capitalization, spacing, indention, and other matters of format. The format in which the CIP data is provided to the publisher is known as the card image format because it emulates the format of catalog card records originally printed for the Library's card catalog, a de facto standard for virtually all card catalogs.

Recognizing that the card image is an anachronism in an automated age, the CRG discussed optional formats for printing the data in the book, but were unable to identify a more efficient format. Aspects of the current card image format serve as shorthand that identifies basic parts of the records without descriptive labels or for that matter without the knowledge of the record's language. For example, when the first line extends over the body of the paragraph, that indicates that the extended line is the main entry. The ISBD punctuation identifies other parts of the record. The library community is familiar with these conventions. They help interpret the CIP data without the addition of cumbersome labels.

The maintenance and presentation of the card image format, however, is not without some cost. The computer application that generates CIP data is not able to generate CIP data that fully adheres to some of the requirements of the card format. Publishers likewise are unable to adhere to card image format specifications when the data is not sent to them properly formatted.

## Recommendations.

- (1E.) CRG recommends that the policy for printing CIP data in the book be maintained and that the basic card image format also be maintained.
- (1F.) CRG, however, also recommends that the specification for the card image format be reviewed. The software used by the Library of Congress to generate CIP data in card image format is obsolescent and will need revision fairly soon, at considerable expense to LC. The Library needs to have some leeway in the design of the card image. The CIP data in card image format should continue to conform to all requirements of the descriptive and subject cataloging standards, and any new card image format specifications should be made available to participating publishers and the library community.

## **2. CIP data elements.**

Library and MARC customer responses indicate that almost all of the data elements currently included in the CIP record are valued regardless of whether one considers the CIP record prior to the book's publication or after the book's publication and the CIP verification process is completed.

### Recommendation.

- (2A.) CRG recommends that the CIP program continue to include the current complement of data elements in the CIP record.

### ***The Dewey Decimal Classification Number.***

CRG notes that the decimal classification number, while not used by the Library, is nonetheless an important data element for a large segment of the library community. The useful/very useful rating for this data element is 48%. The useful/very useful rating for the LC call number is 43%.

### Recommendations.

- (2B.) CRG urges the continuation of Dewey Decimal Classification Numbers. CRG realizes that staffing resources currently assigned to decimal classification work are insufficient but notes that, although augmenting this staff through hiring may not be possible, the Decimal Classification Division has already begun training existing cataloging staff to assign DDC numbers.

Given these concerns and the importance of the decimal classification number for so many libraries, CRG recommends that Library management take the following steps:

1. Continue to train as many catalogers as reasonably possible to assign decimal classification numbers--at the same time that subject analysis is done--and thereby disperse decimal classification assignment work to staff throughout the various cataloging divisions.
2. Support efforts currently being tested in HLCD to automatically assign DDC numbers to works of fiction by single authors in English, French, Spanish, and Italian, and expand those efforts to include as wide a range of numbers as possible.

### ***The NLM Call Numbers & NLM Subject Headings.***

The NLM call number received a low useful/very useful rating, just 10% among library respondents and 34% among MARC customers. NLM subject headings received a low useful/very useful rating of 14% among library respondents and 41% among MARC customers. This, however, most likely reflects the fact that few public, academic, and school libraries use these call numbers and headings though they are valued highly by the small number of clinical medical libraries who do use them.

#### **Recommendation.**

- (2C.) CRG recommends that the CIP program continue to include the NLM call number and NLM headings

While the NLM call number and NLM headings are used by a relatively small number of libraries, they are valued highly by those libraries and, more importantly, they are created at no cost to LC. Clinical medical titles are cataloged almost entirely by the National Library of Medicine. LC staff add only LCSH headings and LC call numbers which are used by a large number of libraries.

### ***LC Subject Headings and NLM Subject Headings.***

Clinical medical works are cataloged by the National Library of Medicine. When a clinical medical title is submitted for CIP data, it is (after initial review by the CIP Division) redirected to NLM where it receives full descriptive and subject treatment. It is then returned to LC where catalogers in the medical team add appropriate LCSH headings. The surveys sought to obtain feedback regarding the value of both sets (MeSH and LCSH headings) and if, perhaps one set of headings would suffice.

For records with both NLM-assigned and LC-assigned subject headings:

18% of library respondents said MeSH headings were useful or very useful.  
41% of library respondents said LCSH headings were useful or very useful.

47% of MARC customers said MeSH headings were useful or very useful.  
70% of MARC customers said LCSH headings were useful or very useful.

These responses reflect the preponderance of public, school, and academic libraries responders. Users of these libraries are more apt to use an LCSH term like “cancer” rather than the MeSH term “oncology”. The relative low number of respondents who require MeSH headings are medical libraries or academic libraries where the MeSH are essential to their users.

The MeSH/LCSH issue was raised in the survey because there may not be sufficient LC resources to continue to add LCSH to otherwise complete records created by NLM staff. If the survey findings revealed that the MeSH would satisfy most libraries, LC could discontinue the current process of adding LCSH and simply distribute these medical titles with MeSH only. The survey response, however, does not support this.

### Recommendations.

- (2D.) Given the broad demand for LCSH, CRG recommends that LC make every effort to continue to add LCSH.
- (2E.) CRG also notes that the ABA Automation Specialist has developed a program for converting MeSH to LCSH equivalents and recommends that this application be employed routinely and, if possible, with little or no edits or additions by catalogers.

### ***LC juvenile subject headings.***

In addition to the Library of Congress subject headings that LC catalogers routinely assign to all works processed through the CIP program, catalogers also assign to juvenile works of fiction headings that are more appropriate for young readers. In the past, catalogers also assigned these additional juvenile subjects headings to non-fiction juvenile works. However, as a result of reduced staffing, the practice of adding juvenile headings to non-fiction works was terminated though standard LCSH headings continue to be assigned to these works.

The library community, nonetheless, values juvenile headings highly for both fiction and non-fiction.

65% of library respondents rate juvenile headings for juvenile works of *fiction* as useful or very useful.

68% of library respondents rate juvenile headings for juvenile works of *non-fiction* as useful or very useful.

50% of MARC customers rate juvenile headings for juvenile works of *fiction* as useful or very useful.

50% of MARC customers rate juvenile headings for juvenile works of *non-fiction* as useful or very useful.

## Recommendations.

- (2F.) Given the broad demand for juvenile headings, CRG recommends that LC continue to add juvenile headings to works of fiction.
- (2G.) CRG recommends that juvenile headings be added to nonfiction juvenile titles when adult headings are assigned.
- (2H.) CRG also recommends that LC explore the possibility of developing partnerships with select libraries that may be interested in adding juvenile headings to specific subject areas of nonfiction juvenile works. In terms of workflow, this option is very feasible as virtually all CIPs are processed electronically via the ECIP program effective January 2007. The LC-created record and its counterpart galley could be made accessible to a partner or partners interested in assigning these headings. LC staff have considerable expertise in this area and could provide initial training and orientation.

## ***Summary notes.***

The library community values summary notes of all kinds highly but prefers those created by LC catalogers for juvenile fiction and non-fiction.

83.5% of library respondents rate summary notes in general as useful or very useful.

75.3% of library respondents rate summary notes for juvenile *fiction* as useful or very useful.

74.8% of library respondents rate summary notes for juvenile *non-fiction* as useful or very useful.

62.7% of library respondents rate publisher-provided summary notes as useful or very useful.

The library community likely values the summary notes created by LC catalogers because they are always objective and are written by staff with considerable experience in this area. The library community also appreciates the summaries provided by publishers. The above numbers indicate, in fact, that the difference among the ratings for these various types of summaries is not dramatic.

MARC customers also value summary notes:

75% rate summary notes in general as useful or very useful.

50% rate summary notes for juvenile *fiction* as useful or very useful.

43% rate summary notes for juvenile *non-fiction* as useful or very useful.

63% rate publisher-provided summary notes as useful or very useful.

The difference in the amount of LC staffing resources required to provide these various types of summaries, however, is dramatic. The summaries provided by publishers absorb few LC resources. Catalogers read the summary and either accept it or reject it. Catalogers never edit or rewrite these summaries as the summaries are presented as the work of the publisher. Publishers are also not allowed to rewrite these summaries for to do so would require additional processing

by LC staff to accommodate the change.

Publishers for their part also appear to be satisfied with the publisher-provided summaries program. Sixty-eight percent of publisher respondents indicated that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with publisher-supplied summaries appearing in the CIP data.

The summaries created by LC staff by contrast absorb considerable resources as the catalogers must familiarize themselves with each work sufficiently to write an accurate summary. This time-consuming task also affects cataloging throughput time and whether or not the completed CIP data will get to the publisher in time to be printed in the book. While the CIP program strives to complete CIP processing within two weeks, throughput time for juvenile titles is generally longer than two weeks. This is because the work is more time-consuming than most non-juvenile cataloging, staffing levels for this type of work are inadequate, and the number of juvenile titles published continues to grow year after year.

### Recommendations.

- (2I.) Given these circumstances, CRG recommends that publishers be urged to provide these summaries as they do today for adult titles; i.e., publishers should be urged to submit publisher provided summaries for all works for which CIP data is requested.
- (2J.) CRG also recommends that LC catalogers prepare summaries only for juvenile works of fiction for which there is no acceptable publisher-provided summary *and* only on those occasions when the work in question fully adheres to the scope of the Library's Annotated Card Program.
- (2K.) CRG also recommends that LC explore the possibility of developing partnerships with select libraries and/or juvenile literature experts that may be interested in creating summaries for specific subject areas and/or genres. In terms of workflow, this option is very feasible as virtually all CIPs are processed electronically via the ECIP program effective January 2007. The LC-created record and its counterpart galley could be made accessible to a partner interested in creating summaries for a specific category of juvenile works. LC staff have considerable expertise in this area and could provide initial training and orientation.

### ***Table of contents notes.***

Libraries value table of contents notes, especially when they appear as a note in the record.

71.3% of library respondents rate table of contents notes that appear in the record as useful or very useful.

45.2% of library respondents rate table of contents notes accessible via a hyperlink in the record as useful or very useful.

The immediacy of the table of contents appearing in the record very likely explains the higher rating for table of contents notes in the record over those linked to the record.

MARC customers value both the table of contents notes that appear within bibliographic records as well as the tables of contents that are hyperlinked in the bibliographic records.

73% of MARC customers rate table of contents notes that appear in the record as useful or very useful.

67% of MARC customers rate table of contents notes accessible via a hyperlink in the record as useful or very useful.

Table of content notes are added to or linked to CIP records in four ways:

(1) During the descriptive cataloging process, the cataloger adds the table of contents (TOC) to the 505 field provided that it is not overly long and contains valuable information. This pertains only to titles that publishers submit electronically via the ECIP system and for which the process is largely automated.

(2) Periodically the Automation Coordinator for ABA runs a program that retrospectively searches the ECIP data base of ECIP applications for all TOCs, stores them in a resource file, and adds a link to the appropriate record, assuming they have not been previously linked. These TOCs are not reviewed by staff nor are any special efforts made to adjust or enhance aspects of format, but they are indexed by Yahoo, Google, and the Library's website search engine. In this way, users searching the Internet can encounter the vocabulary originating from the TOCs and be led to the CIP record. Conversely, users who first encounter the CIP record, for example, by searching a library's online catalog can access the TOC by clicking on the link that appears in the record's 856 field.

(3) Periodically the Automation Coordinator for ABA runs a program that searches ONIX files provided to the Library by publishers. In this way TOCs, author information, publisher descriptions, etc., are linked to the catalog record to provide the reader additional information about the book or its author. The ONIX files include information that relates to both CIP and non-CIP records.

(4) The final source of TOCs is the Digital Table of Contents Project. The dTOC project works with the book in hand. Library staff identify and scan books that contain TOCs that are determined to be of value to the reader. The scanned image is then converted to a machine-readable file and linked to the appropriate record. As in the case of the ONIX process, the dTOC project is not solely concerned with books that have CIP catalog records.

### Recommendations.

(2L.) CRG recommends that LC staff continue to create TOCs in the manner noted above.

(2M.) CRG recommends that LC staff continue to include TOCs in the record when they are

brief, add value, and can be added to the record in a timely manner and without exceptional editing. CIP management and automation staff have from time to time discussed the possibility of terminating the inclusion of TOCs in the record (i.e., terminating the method described in paragraph (1) and instead providing TOCs as linked entities only). The rationale for this position is that it requires no cataloging resources. Given the clear preference for TOCs appearing in the record, and given the fact that while some cataloging resources are required to provide this service those resources are relatively modest, CRG recommends that LC staff continue to include TOCs in the record.

- (2N.) CRG also recommends that LC explore the possibility of developing partnerships with select libraries who may be interested in capturing TOCs and or other record enriching elements by emulating the dTOC Project. When libraries were asked if they would be interested in enhancing CIP records with additional elements, they were for the most part not interested or only somewhat interested. Thirty percent, however, said they were interested or very interested in helping with book reviews and 23% expressed the same interest in helping with indexes.

While only a relatively few libraries expressed interest in enhancing records, this is a low cost operation (requiring common and relatively inexpensive equipment such as a photocopier and/or scanner and Optical Character Recognition software) with a significant benefit for the library community. The Library's resource file of record enrichment elements (TOCs, publisher descriptions, etc ) is freely available to other libraries. Partner libraries could identify specific areas of interest and contribute the enrichment elements of that area of interest to the resource file while obtaining the collective benefits of the elements contributed by other participating libraries.

### ***Hyperlinked information.***

Library respondents generally rate hyperlinked information (i.e., information that is accessible by clicking a link appearing in the 856 field of the MARC version of the CIP record) highly:

- 49.1% rate reviews as useful or very useful.
- 45.2% rate table of contents notes as useful or very useful.
- 32.2% rate publisher descriptions (i.e., descriptions of the work provided by the publisher and obtained via ONIX records) as useful or very useful.
- 31% rate sample text (i.e., text of the work provided by the publisher and obtained via ONIX records) as useful or very useful.
- 29.9% rate contributor biographical information (i.e., information about the author provided by the publisher and obtained via ONIX records) information as useful or very useful.

Likewise, MARC customers generally rate hyperlinked information highly:

- 53% rate publisher descriptions as useful or very useful.
- 57% rate contributor biographical information as useful or very useful.

52% rate reviews as useful or very useful.  
45% rate sample text as useful or very useful.

### Recommendations.

- (2O.) CRG recommends that the Library continues to enhance CIP records with information elements obtained from ONIX files and, to the extent possible, that ONIX files be obtained from additional publishers.

Publisher survey responses, however, indicate that the availability of ONIX files is limited and that they appear to be created, maintained, and distributed mainly by the largest publishers. When publishers were asked if they currently create ONIX files, only 5.5% said they did and only 15.9% said they planned to create ONIX files within the next two years.

Nonetheless, libraries expressed considerable interest in having enrichment elements available to them.

48% said book reviews would have significant positive or extremely positive impact.  
39% said book indexes would have significant positive or extremely positive impact.  
38% said book jacket blurbs would have significant positive or extremely positive impact.  
37% said book jacket images would have significant positive or extremely positive impact.

- (2P.) CRG, therefore, recommends that CIP management explore the possibility of developing a low cost mechanism that would enable non-ONIX publishers to contribute elements such as indexes and book reviews to the Library's resource file. This might be accomplished with relatively few automation resources by modifying the ECIP publishers change request form. This change submission could be easily distinguished from the other routine CIP changes and processed in the same manner as ONIX file elements—automatically and without LC staff intervention.

### ***Genre headings.***

Library respondents value genre headings for works of American fiction very highly.

77% rate genre headings as useful or very useful.

MARC customers also value genre headings for works of American fiction very highly.

52% rate genre headings as useful or very useful.

### Recommendations.

- (2Q.) CRG recommends that the Library continue to add genre headings to CIP records but in an automated manner. CRG recommends that the list of genre headings prescribed by

*Guidelines on Subject Access to Individual Works of Fiction, Drama, Etc.* be included in a drop down box of the ECIP data application form in such a manner that the publisher can readily select the appropriate genre heading. This would be an optional field so the publisher could choose to have the heading appear in the CIP record or not.

- (2R.) CRG recommends that the TCEC application that facilitates the cataloging process be modified so the selected genre heading could be automatically copied into the bibliographic record. The cataloger would then review the term during the cataloging process, accept it, or delete it, if it were judged to be inaccurate. No additional resources would be expended in this area.
- (2S.) CRG recommends that no subject headings be added to these works of fiction with the exception of juvenile works of fiction which would receive subject headings appropriate for young readers.

### ***Price.***

The price of the book is not currently included in CIP data. Thirty-two percent of library respondents said this would have a significant positive or extremely positive impact. Sixty-five percent of MARC respondents said this would have a significant positive or extremely positive impact.

### **Recommendation.**

- (2T.) CRG recommends that the price of the book be added to the MARC version of the CIP record assuming that it can be added automatically.

The cost for making this enhancement would be minimal as it would involve mainly changes to the CIP Data Application form and related files and the TCEC application. CRG notes that the price should not be included in the CIP data sent to the publisher to be printed in the book as it would be redundant to the occurrence of that information on the book jacket. CRG also notes that this should be an optional element for publishers and that the data element not be changed subsequent to submission by the publisher.

CRG recognizes that prices sometimes change but these changes are generally not substantial and that the intent of the price is to provide libraries a sense of the book's cost to assist in ordering and encumbering funds. The price actually paid by the library is influenced by a number of factors including, for example, vendor discounts. CRG also notes that only one price—the price for the U.S. market in U.S. dollars—be included as the principal constituency for the CIP program is the U.S. library community. Also any effort to include multiple prices would make this enhancement prohibitively costly and cumbersome.

### **3. CIP data accuracy.**

Library and MARC customer responses rate the accuracy of almost all CIP data elements highly. They also rate typographical accuracy highly.

Publishers also rate typographical accuracy as well as subject analysis accuracy highly.

Library respondents gave the highest poor rating (11%) to the physical description. CRG believes this rating is the result of a misplaced expectation that the physical description should include the size and pagination of the book. Because these data elements are not available at the time of CIP processing, these fields are always blank when the data is first issued. Also, when CIP data is sent to the publisher to be printed in the book, it is sent with the line “p. cm.,” with no pagination or size information included. Some libraries may perceive this omission as an error when it is only intended as signal indicating the location where these data elements appear in catalog card formatted data.

#### Recommendations.

(3A.) While library responses rate the accuracy of CIP records highly, CRG, nonetheless, recommends that Library management:

1. Require publisher liaisons to do a title proper search for all CIP applications prior to assigning the LCCN and forwarding for cataloging to minimize duplicate processing. Efforts should also be made to automate this search to the degree possible.
2. Remind all cataloging staff to do a title proper search before creating CIP records to ensure that a duplicate version of the record does not already exist.
3. Remind all cataloging staff to always run the validation application to ensure the accuracy of data elements.

(3B.) CRG also recommends that when the guidelines for printing the card image format in the book are reviewed and revised that the current convention of including “p. cm.” be deleted.

### **4. CIP verification process.**

CIP verification is the final stage of the CIP process. Immediately after the book is published, publishers are required to send a copy of the printed book to LC for each work for which CIP data was provided. When LC staff receive the book, they compare the book-in-hand with the CIP record and confirm the accuracy of the data elements in the record and/or correct erroneous elements. The MARC21 version of the record is then redistributed to libraries, book sellers, and bibliographic utilities and replaces the earlier version of the record.

The survey included several questions related to this process to determine if it is necessary for the Library to continue the CIP verification process.

Libraries were asked if they upgraded or completed the CIP record in their local catalog and 73.6% said they did. But when asked if they added their upgraded version of the record to their bibliographic utility, only 30.3% said they did. When asked if they downloaded LC's verified version of the record (regardless of whether they did or did not upgrade the CIP version earlier) 44.5% said they did. And when asked if it would be acceptable if LC discontinued the verification process, 75.6% said it would not be acceptable. Likewise, MARC customers were opposed to discontinuing the verification process.

This suggests that in many instances when libraries upgrade the CIP version of the record they likely do so as a stopgap measure, i.e., to get the record into their system and usable as quickly as possible, but in the final analysis they still depend on the verified redistributed record.

### Recommendations.

- (4A.) CRG recommends that Library staff continue to do CIP verification but to do so by using OCLC copy whenever possible. That is, CIP staff should search all CIP books on OCLC and whenever a verified version of the record is found, download it. CRG recommends that minimal review or revision be made to the downloaded OCLC record and that this process of downloading and minimal review be done by technician staff. While this may not ideally meet the needs of the library community, it represents efficiency and savings for the Library, expedites the verification process, and frees staff resources that can be redeployed to creating original cataloging.
- (4B.) CRG recommends that no verification be done on works (e.g., large print editions) not collected by the Library. When libraries were asked if this practice might be acceptable to the library community, 59.1% said it would be.
- (4C.) CRG recommends that the CIP office implement proactive claiming--additional to the monthly list of books currently posted on the front end of the ECIP system and accessible to publishers when they sign on. CRG recommends that the CIP staff (to the extent that staffing resources permit) email and/or call publishers who have especially large numbers of outstanding books.

## **5. Scope.**

“Scope” refers to the types of publications that the CIP program accepts for processing and is largely driven by the program’s determination to catalog works most likely to be widely acquired by the nation’s libraries. Availability of resources and the constraints of the automated systems that support the program are also important factors.

This has meant that in terms of format the program has been limited to ink-print monographs since its inception with two exceptions: original microform publications and direct access

electronic resources (“computer files”). Computer files were fraught with complexity from the outset. The pieces involved were numerous--the label, the box or package, the jewel case, the main menu--and the data elements appearing on each were seldom consistent. Printing the CIP data was likewise complicated and the number of publisher participants were very few in number. Production seldom exceeded 40 titles a year. As the cost of maintaining this separate work stream exceeded its overall value, it was eventually terminated.

While it is amply clear from the very high value that libraries place on the CIP program (as well as many of the comments) that libraries would like to have as much CIP data as possible, the severity of resource limits compels the Library to carefully assess those types of publications that libraries would like to have included in the CIP program as well as those currently included in the program.

### ***Audio discs/tapes.***

Audio discs/tapes are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including audio discs/tapes in the CIP program, 65% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive.

#### Recommendation.

(5A.) CRG recommends that the CIP program explore the possibility of providing audio CIP records in those instances when a previous catalog record exists for an ink print edition. Specifically, CRG recommends that CIP management explore the possibility of modifying the ECIP publishers main menu to include an application form for audio CIP data when ink print CIP data exists. The application form would include sufficient data elements to match the audio work with the previously created ink print CIP record. The application form would also include data elements unique to the audio version. Software development would be required to pull appropriate data elements from the ink print record and the application form and merge them into an audio format record. This recommendation is predicated on the assumption that the process would be sufficiently automated that it would be completed entirely within the Publisher Liaison Team by publisher liaisons who would only review the final product and send it to the publisher. No cataloging staff resources would be required.

### ***Video discs/tapes.***

Video discs/tapes are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including video discs/tapes in the CIP program, 74% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive. MARC customers indicated that 41% of them would find the inclusion of video discs/tapes to have a significant positive impact.

#### Recommendation.

(5B.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area. Significant resources would be

required to include these works in the CIP program. If, however, the recommendations noted for audio discs/tapes were confirmed and proved successful, a similar strategy might be applied to this format.

### ***Multimedia packages.***

Multimedia packages are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including multimedia packages in the CIP program, 54% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive.

#### Recommendation.

(5C.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area. Significant resources would be required to include these works in the CIP program. If, however, the recommendations noted for audio discs/tapes were confirmed and proved successful, a similar strategy might be applied to this format.

### ***E-books.***

E-books are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including E-books in the CIP program, 39% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive. When MARC customers rated the positive impact of including E-books in the CIP program, 46% said the impact would be significantly positive.

However, when participating publishers were asked if they published E-books, 78.9% said they did not and 73.3% of these negative respondents said they did not plan to publish E-books within the next two years. Of those publishers that said they did publish E-books last year, 53.1% said that their E-books constituted less than 5% of their production.

#### Recommendation.

(5D.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area. Significant resources would be required to include these works in the CIP program. If, however, the recommendations noted for audio discs/tapes were confirmed and proved successful, a similar strategy might be applied to this format.

### ***Microform publications.***

Microform publications not originally published in another format are within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including microform publications originally published in other formats, 40% said this would have no positive impact and 16% said it would have a slightly positive impact. Currently, very few records are created for microform publications not originally published in another format.

### Recommendation.

- (5E.) CRG recommends that microform publications of all kinds be excluded from the CIP program. Digital technology has replaced microform publications in many instances. Maintaining procedures and other system features to support CIP processing for microform publications is not cost effective.

### ***Non-English books.***

Technically the CIP program currently includes all languages, though non-English submissions are limited by CIP policy to works originally published in the non-English language. In practice more than 90% of CIP production is for English language titles while about 5% are Spanish. The CIP program accepts translations into English and translations into Spanish. The CIP program does not process any work translated from a non-English language to another language with the exception of works translated into Spanish. Translations from any language into Spanish are within scope.

### Recommendation.

- (5F.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Mass market paperbacks.***

Mass market paperbacks are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including mass market paperbacks in the CIP program, 42% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive. Exactly half of MARC customers, however, rated inclusion of mass market paperbacks as having no impact.

### Recommendation.

- (5G.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area. Significant resources would be required to include these works in the CIP program. If, however, the ECIP cataloging partnership efforts noted in other parts of this report prove successful or if recommendations to modify and more fully utilize the CIP program to create records for audio discs/tapes are successfully implemented, this recommendation should be reconsidered.

### ***Clinical medical books.***

As noted above in the section entitled "LC Subject Headings and NLM Subject Headings," the CIP program includes clinical medical titles. These works are cataloged by the National Library of Medicine with the exception of the LCSH headings which are added by LC cataloging staff.

Recommendation.

(5H.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

***Music scores.***

Music scores are currently not within scope. When libraries rated the positive impact of including music scores in the CIP program, 20% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive while 41% said there would be no positive impact.

Recommendation.

(5I.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

***Devotional /inspirational books.***

Devotional /inspirational books are currently within scope of the CIP program.

When libraries rated the negative impact of removing devotional /inspirational books from the CIP program, 24% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative while 32% said there would be no negative impact.

Recommendations.

(5J.) CRG recommends that CIP staff work closely with Selection Librarians who have expressed concern regarding the inclusion of some devotional/inspirational publications that may not be widely acquired by the nation's libraries. As such titles are identified by Selection Librarians, publisher liaisons will research them, and if the publishers of these works prove not to produce works widely acquired by the nation's libraries, suspend them from the CIP program.

(5K.) CRG also recommends that CIP staff pursue discussions with University of Dayton Roesch Library staff who have expressed an initial interest in cataloging the works of select publishers of devotional/inspirational works which the University of Dayton libraries collect.

***“How to” or do-it-yourself books.***

“How to” or do-it-yourself books are currently within scope of the CIP program. When libraries rated the negative impact of removing “how to” works from the CIP program, 33% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative.

Recommendation.

(5L.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Textbooks.***

Textbooks that are college level or higher are currently within scope. This applies to editions intended for students; teacher editions are out of scope. Also, when multiple versions of a given textbook are published, only the most comprehensive version is provided CIP data. When libraries rated the negative impact of removing college level or above textbooks from the CIP program, 18% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative.

When libraries rated the positive impact of including textbooks below the college level in the CIP program, 15% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive.

#### Recommendation.

(5M.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Consumable educational materials (workbooks, teachers manuals, etc.).***

Consumable publications of any kind are currently out of scope for the CIP program. This includes not only educational publications, work books, manuals, tests, etc., but also any publications that indicate that the user should write in, mark up, or in any way alter the work.

When libraries rated the positive impact of including consumable educational materials in the CIP program, 21% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive while 34% said there would be no positive impact.

#### Recommendation.

(5N.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Phonics books.***

Phonics books are currently within scope of the CIP program. Phonics books are curriculum books generally used in classrooms rather than libraries and they help in the learning of reading and spelling based on the use of phonics. These works impose an especially heavy burden on cataloging resources and in particular juvenile cataloging resources which can least afford the burden.

When libraries rated the negative impact of removing phonics books from the CIP program, 16% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative while 38% said there would be no negative impact.

#### Recommendation.

(5O.) CRG recommends that phonics books be excluded from the CIP program. CRG acknowledges some negative impact, but the ratio of work to available cataloging resources in the area of juvenile cataloging is critical. Cutting back in this area will better enable the

CIP program to provide data for other juvenile titles in a timely manner.

### ***Chapter books.***

Chapter books are currently within scope of the CIP program. Chapter books are transitional books, divided into chapters and often featuring contemporary themes and/or humorous stories, that help children move from early readers to full novels. When libraries rated the negative impact of removing chapter books from the CIP program, 46% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative while 26% said there would be no negative impact.

#### Recommendation.

(5P.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Repackaged editions.***

Repackaged editions are currently within scope of the CIP program. Repackaged editions are formerly published works that when republished are mainly distinguishable from the previous edition by packaging; e.g., a set of volumes previously published individually then republished as a box set. When libraries rated the negative impact of removing repackaged editions from the CIP program, 20% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative while 29% said there would be no negative impact.

#### Recommendation.

(5Q.) CRG recommends that repackaged editions be excluded from the CIP program. The content of the repackaged edition and the principal cataloging data elements of the earlier versions are usually sufficiently similar that libraries can use the record(s) created for the previous edition(s) with some edits. CRG acknowledges some negative impact, but the ratio of work to available cataloging resources in the area of juvenile cataloging is critical. Cutting back in this area will better enable the CIP program to provide data for other juvenile titles in a timely manner.

### ***“Tie-ins”***

“Tie-ins” are currently within scope of the CIP program. “Tie-ins” are generally (though not exclusively) children’s books, that are derived from movies, TV shows, comics, video games, toys, food, etc.

When libraries rated the negative impact of removing “tie-ins” from the CIP program, 32% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative while 28% said there would be no negative impact.

#### Recommendation.

- (5R.) CRG recommends that “tie-ins” be excluded from the CIP program. CRG acknowledges some negative impact, but the ratio of work to available cataloging resources in the area of juvenile cataloging is critical. Cutting back in this area will better enable the CIP program to provide data for other juvenile titles in a timely manner.

### ***Editions.***

Editions are currently within scope of the CIP program with some exceptions. Vest pocket editions, textbooks published in multiple volumes when a single volume edition exists, and teachers editions are out of scope. The number of editions published each year is considerable. Approximately 22% of CIP production is editions.

Many editions, however, are not substantially different from earlier editions.

### **Recommendations.**

- (5S.) CRG recommends that editions be cataloged by technicians when copy for an earlier edition is available and the complexity of changes do not warrant the attention of a professional cataloger.
- (5T.) CRG also recommends that LC explore the possibility of developing partnerships with select libraries that may be interested in cataloging editions in specific subject areas. In terms of workflow, this option is very feasible as virtually all CIPs are now processed electronically via the ECIP program and the CIP application could be made available to a partner.

### ***Large print editions.***

Large print editions are currently within scope of the CIP program though LC does not collect large print editions. Consequently, some LC staff have from time to time questioned the expenditure of limited staffing resources for both initial cataloging as well as the CIP verification on these works. The basic premise of the CIP program, however, is to serve the library community by cataloging those works most likely to be widely acquired by the nation’s libraries.

When libraries rated the negative impact of removing large print works from the CIP program, 25% said the impact would be significantly or severely negative.

### **Recommendation.**

- (5U.) CRG recommends that the CIP program no longer provide original cataloging for large print editions. Instead, CRG recommends that CIP management explore the possibility of modifying the ECIP publishers main menu to include an application form for large print editions when CIP data exists for the “regular” non-large print edition. The application form would include sufficient data elements to match the large print work with the record previously created for the “regular” non-large print edition. The application form would also include data elements unique to the large print edition. Software development would

be required to pull appropriate data elements from the record for the “regular” non-large print edition and the application form and merge them into a large print edition record. This recommendation is predicated on the assumption that the process would be sufficiently automated that it would be completed entirely within the Publisher Liaison Team by publisher liaisons who would only review the final product and send it to the publisher. No cataloging staff resource would be required.

### ***Serials.***

Serials are out of scope for the CIP program. Serials are periodicals, annuals, and other publications regularly issued under the same title. Normally, only the date or volume number changes from one issue to the next.

#### Recommendation.

(5V.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### **6. Eligibility.**

“Eligibility” refers to the types of publishers that the CIP program accepts for participation. As the purpose of the CIP program is to catalog in advance of publication those works most likely to be widely acquired by the nation’s libraries, participating publishers must publish works consistent with this purpose.

#### Recommendations.

- (6A.) CRG recommends that CIP management develop and conduct a seminar for publisher liaisons that focuses on procedures for reviewing and accepting applicants to the CIP program to ensure that all applicants are researched thoroughly and that accounts are provided to only those publishers that clearly qualify. CRG also recommends that the review process be standardized to ensure full review, including review of homepages and searching OCLC for holdings.
- (6B.) CRG also recommends that publisher liaisons review all current participants, as time and resources permit, to identify any publisher who may have been accepted into the program in error and/or whose works have subsequently proven not to be widely acquired.
- (6C.) CRG also recommends that the CIP office automatically terminate any ECIP account that has been inactive for 24 months. While 45% of publisher respondents indicated that such a policy would have a negative or significantly negative impact, this policy will facilitate the review process referenced above and thereby contribute to a tighter application of CIP eligibility policy. CRG acknowledges that this may be an inconvenience to some publishers but the application form that publishers complete when requesting participation to the program is neither extensive nor especially demanding.

## ***Self-publishers.***

Titles paid for or subsidized in any part by individual authors, creators, editors, illustrators, etc. are not eligible for the CIP program.

When libraries rated the positive impact of including self-publishers in the CIP program, 27% said the impact would be significantly or extremely positive, while 26% said there would be no positive impact. Forty-eight percent of MARC customers rated the possible inclusion of self-publishers in the CIP program as having no positive impact.

## **Recommendation.**

(6D.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area. Many self-publishers have expressed dissatisfaction with this policy for various reasons including the following:

1. Self-publishers perceive the policy is discriminatory and favors large publishers over small publishers. In fact, however, the largest majority of publishers that participate in the CIP program are small. Publisher responses indicate that 41% produce five or fewer new titles per year while 24% produce between six and fourteen new titles per year.
2. Self-publishers perceive that participating publishers obtain a marketing advantage and maintain that all publishers must be provided this same advantage. The CIP program, however, does have a right to make determinations regarding publisher eligibility. “The Supreme Court has held on numerous occasions that the government may set conditions upon eligibility for conferral of a government benefit.” (Overview Books, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. United States, Defendant.)
3. Self-publishers perceive that exclusion from the program diminishes the value of their publication. However, though the program might be viewed as a benefit to participating publishers, “the program does not burden non-participants’ ability to derive economic benefits from their work.” “The existence and nature of property rights in governmental benefits has been addressed extensively by the Supreme Court in the context of procedural due process protections of such rights. ‘To have a property interest in a benefit, a person... must have more than an abstract need or desire for it. He must have more than a unilateral expectation of it. He must, instead, have a legitimate claim of entitlements to it’.... ‘Property interests... are not created by the Constitution. Rather they are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules or understanding that stem from an independent source.’ ” (Overview Books, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. United States, Defendant.)
4. Self-publishers perceive that exclusion from the program limits freedom of speech. “Authors and publishers [however] are not required to adopt any position or viewpoint in their work to have such work processed through the CIP program, nor are they prevented from expressing themselves in any other way.” “The program is a benefit to authors whose books are placed in the program but not a burden to the expressive rights of those whose

books do not qualify. Nothing in the CIP program suggests that the Library is attempting to advance a certain viewpoint or idea.” (Overview Books, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. United States, Defendant.)

CRG notes that this policy of excluding self-publishers was developed in conjunction with the CIP Advisory Group that consists primarily of librarians. As self-published works are generally not widely acquired, they are more efficiently and cost-effectively cataloged by those individual libraries that do acquire them. If the CIP program were to include these works, it should be noted, the increase in workload would be devastating. At least two-thirds of the works currently processed by the PCN program would be directed to the CIP program. This means that CIP production would immediately increase by, at very least, 20,000 applications. Current resources could not support this demand, and the CIP process would stop.

CRG also notes that most self-published works are not vetted by an objective body. By contrast, works issued by publishing firms are reviewed by editorial staff and others who judge the viability of proposed publications. Most proposed works are rejected. Those judged acceptable are backed with a financial commitment from the firm. When self-publishers ask the Library to catalog their unvetted works, they are asking the Library to commit valuable cataloging resources to works that have not been reviewed and approved by any objective body and for which there is no assurance that there is any audience let alone a large audience of libraries.

For these reasons only publishers with an established history of producing works that are widely acquired by the nation’s libraries are eligible for the CIP program.

### ***Production houses & consortiums.***

Production houses and consortiums are not eligible for the CIP program. Production houses are companies that provide services to publishers and often act on behalf of a publisher when requesting CIP data. Often the services of a production house overlap with those of a conventional vanity press. Often production houses submit works on behalf of self-publishers or a publisher that publishes works not widely acquired by the nation’s libraries. Consortiums are associations of publishers and writers and/or self-publishers that provide support to publishers and/or writers but do not generally provide a financial investment or establish a contractual arrangement for the individual works produced by the members. The works of consortiums are generally not widely acquired by the nation’s libraries.

Production houses are also problematic, because as intermediaries they are often not positioned and/or not willing to ensure full compliance with CIP policy--such as the requirement to send to the Library a copy of the printed book immediately upon publication.

Because some production houses facilitate the production of mainstream publishers whose works are widely acquired by the nation’s libraries, a number of these firms have over the years been included in the CIP program.

### Recommendation.

- (6E.) CRG recommends that CIP service be suspended for all production houses and consortiums and that no future accounts be established for production houses or consortiums. If publishers eligible for the CIP program choose to have a production house obtain data on their behalf, that service must be obtained via the publisher's account, but the publishers will be responsible for all aspects of CIP policy compliance.

### ***Print on Demand.***

On-demand book publishers are not eligible for the CIP program. On-demand books are generally printed in small numbers. While some titles may, over a period of time, generate a total overall print number of some significance, the initial print runs are seldom widely acquired by the nation's libraries. In those instances when an on-demand title is widely acquired by libraries (over a period of time and a series of printings) a catalog record is generally available from other libraries or networks such as OCLC (the Online Computer Library Center).

Slightly more than 69% of responding publishers noted that they did not print on demand. Of the slightly more than 30% that do print on demand, most (slightly more than 58%) print very few print on demand titles (i.e., 5% percent or fewer of their total production are print-on-demand titles). Other responses, while few in number, indicate that there are publishers in the program that do mainly or only print-on-demand titles.

### Recommendation.

- (6F.) CRG recommends no change to CIP policy in this area.

### ***Non-U.S. publishers.***

A number of prominent non-U.S. publishers are currently included in the CIP program. These are multi-national publishers who were accepted into the program because they produce works that are routinely added to the Library's collections and are also widely acquired by the nation's libraries. These participate in the CIP program with the understanding that they maintain, in a U.S. city, production and editorial staff capable of responding to issues that may arise during the cataloging process and responsible for ensuring compliance with CIP policy.

These publishers, however, are often problematic as they frequently submit applications direct from a non-U.S. office without the knowledge of the U.S. office, which in turn are sometimes unwilling to take responsibility for them. Other issues that arise include inadequate communication, failure to print the CIP data in the book, and failure to send the printed book immediately upon publication.

These issues aside, 40% of library respondents said that the inclusion of additional prominent non-U.S. publishers in the CIP program would have a significant or extremely significant positive impact. Fifty-seven percent of MARC customers rated the inclusion of prominent non-U.S. publishers as having a significantly positive impact.

## Recommendations.

- (6G.) CRG recommends that the CIP office suspend those publishers who are not in full compliance.
- (6H.) CRG also recommends that the CIP program identify (with the input of the CIP Advisory Group and LC's selection and recommending officers) a small number of non-U.S. publishers not currently in the CIP program but whose works are collected by LC and widely acquired by the nation's libraries. If resources permit, CIP staff should invite these publishers to participate in the CIP program if they have the resources to ensure full compliance with CIP policy.

## **7. Service to Publishers.**

CIP staff provide support to publishers when they request CIP data. CIP staff provide initial review of incoming applications. They review requests for changes forwarding some to catalogers and processing others. They provide information regarding CIP policy and procedures. They resolve some technical and cataloging problems and refer others to automation specialists and catalogers. They monitor and research overdue or urgently requested CIP data. And they review and send completed CIP data to the publishers.

The Electronic CIP system is the principal means by which CIP data applications are submitted. Effective January 1, 2007, it became the sole mechanism for submitting applications with some exceptions for certain works consisting mainly of tables, charts and graphs and certain works with diacritics in the front matter.

### ***Publisher Liaison Service.***

When publishers rated their level of satisfaction with the courtesy of publisher liaisons, 68% said they were satisfied or very satisfied. Sixty-four percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the technical expertise of publisher liaisons while 58% were satisfied or very satisfied with their email communications, and 41% percent were satisfied or very satisfied with telephone availability of publisher liaisons.

## Recommendations.

- (7A.) CRG acknowledges the favorable comments that publishers have made about publisher liaison service and specific publisher liaisons as well as the generally favorable ratings. CRG also recognizes that the CIP Division Administrative Assistant position and several publisher liaison positions have been vacant for a number of years and that these positions are critical to providing support to publishers. CRG, however, also recognizes a theme of unhappiness regarding telephone and email communication and therefore recommends that every effort should be made to address these concerns within the limits of current available resources.

CRG recommends that CIP management periodically review the status of incoming email

communications to ensure that they are answered in a timely manner. CRG also recommends that publisher liaisons copy all outgoing publisher communications to a CIP office folder so the communications can be reviewed periodically for accuracy and completeness.

- (7B.) CRG also recommends that the publisher liaisons' performance evaluations always includes an appraisal of telephone service and email service.
- (7C.) CRG also notes CIP management's concerns with technical problems related to redirecting calls from the front office phone to the publisher liaisons' network. CRG recommends that ITS resources be made available to provide a complete review of the CIP Division telephone system to obtain improvements and fuller coverage to the extent possible as well as to implement any available technologies that would aid quality review.

### ***Electronic CIP System.***

When publishers rated their level of satisfaction with the Electronic CIP system, 66% said they were satisfied or very satisfied. Publisher comments indicate, however, that many would like the option of submitting their applications in PDF format.

When the ECIP system was being designed, the CIP Division surveyed publishers to determine if there was a prevailing format that the publishing community used for working with manuscripts and galleys in an electronic environment. Publishers, however, used a variety of applications. The only common denominator was ASCII. Consequently, ECIP was built as an ASCII-based system. This determination has served the CIP program well as the ASCII text provided by the publisher can be readily manipulated by the TCEC application which greatly facilitates the cataloging process and substantially reduces keying. It also enables catalogers to readily copy tables of contents into the note field and also means that this ASCII data can be indexed and searched by Internet users.

PDF poses some special challenges because the PDF text cannot be readily manipulated in the same manner as ASCII. Even if the PDF file were sent in a manner that could be converted to ASCII, conversion programs would be required and after conversion editing would likely be required to add codes that would determine the beginning and end of the physical title page, copyright page, series page, etc. The ECIP Traffic Manager would also require substantial change.

### **Recommendation.**

- (7D.) In an effort to acknowledge publisher desire to submit PDFs, CRG recommends that CIP management and automation staff explore the possibility of modifying the ECIP system to accommodate PDFs. Specifically, CRG recommends exploration of a "hybrid" system that would require the usual application form but with attached ASCII text limited to the title page, copyright page, series title page, and table of contents plus sample chapters in PDF. Some publishers who have expressed a keen interest in submitting PDF instead of ASCII have indicated that this compromise "hybrid" system would be acceptable. This would facilitate data request submission from their side as they could use the PDF files that are

immediately available to them while greatly minimizing the amount of text they would have to convert to ASCII. It should also be viable for the descriptive cataloging process as the essential elements that TCEC uses would be available in ASCII. The PDF files could also be attached via a link to the online record in those instances when the publisher indicated (via check box in the CIP data application form) that the text could be made available as sample.

### ***CIP data service to publishers.***

Currently publishers obtain CIP data in one way: publisher liaisons send the data via email to the publisher as soon as the record is complete. Publisher liaisons also resend data in the same manner if it is misplaced. CIP data is also sent by U.S. Postal Service though this occurs less frequently now that ECIP is the principal mechanism for publishers to obtain CIP data.

#### Recommendation.

- (7E.) CRG recommends that the CIP program explore the possibility of providing publishers other options for obtaining CIP data. Specifically, CRG recommends exploring the possibility of modifying the ECIP publishers main menu to enable publishers to readily obtain CIP data by LCCN and/or ISBN without the assistance of the publisher liaison. Publishers should also have the options of obtaining data in a variety of ways, e.g. MARC, PDF, or card image. (The MARC format because publishers market their titles via the Internet. PDF because it ensures accurate transmission of data that include diacritics.) CRG also recommends exploration of a data delivery service that is determined by frequency and that can be pulled ad hoc by the user or pushed periodically to the user via a predetermined user profile.

### ***ONIX service to publishers.***

Most publishers (94.5%) currently participating in the CIP program do not currently create ONIX records. The ONIX format, however, is growing in popularity as it provides publishers a standard format for managing and communicating publishing data to booksellers and others who facilitate access to bibliographic information. To date, mainly large publishers have undertaken the effort to create ONIX data. Most small publishers lack the knowledge and/or resources.

#### Recommendation.

- (7F.) CRG recommends that the CIP program explore the possibility of providing publishers the option of obtaining an ONIX record when applying for and obtaining CIP data. Specifically, CRG recommends exploring the possibility of modifying the ECIP publishers CIP Data application form to include an additional and optional page. By invoking the option, the publisher would access the ONIX data element page. This page would enable the publisher to enter ONIX data elements unique to the title. Other recurring data elements unique to the publisher or imprint could recur as default elements after they were initially filled in. Some software development would be required to convert the data elements to the ONIX structure. Once developed and implemented the ONIX records would be created and

transmitted automatically and transparently with only publisher liaison review.

## **8. Future Services.**

### ***Online CIP service to libraries.***

Currently libraries obtain CIP data in four basic ways: by copying it from the printed book; by subscribing to the Library's Cataloging Distribution Service's MARC record distribution service (though these libraries are few in number); by obtaining the data from the LC catalog; or by obtaining the data from an intermediary such as OCLC or a book seller (who receives the data from the Library's Cataloging Distribution Service's MARC record distribution service).

When libraries were asked if they would like to receive CIP data in machine-readable form directly from LC, 38% said yes. When they were asked if they would like to have sets of CIP records sent to them according to a specific profile (e.g., CIP records for a specific classification number or number range), 33.6% said yes. Some comments indicate that these numbers may have been even higher had some respondents not been concerned about a possible cost factor.

Representatives of the school library community have also often expressed the need for a easy and direct mechanism for small libraries to readily access Library of Congress records.

### **Recommendation.**

- (8A.) CRG recommends that the CIP program explore the possibility of developing a free and user-friendly mechanism for libraries to readily obtain CIP records in a variety of ways including: (1) the mode of selection, e.g., by LCCN and/or ISBN for individual or sets of records; (2) the format, e.g., MARC, PDF or card image; and (3) the frequency, e.g., pulled ad hoc by the user or pushed periodically to the user via predetermined user profile.

Preliminary discussions of such a service suggest that the cost for setting it up would be modest while the benefit to the library community would be significant.

## **9. PCN Program.**

The PCN program is a well-defined and extremely cost-effective component of the CIP operation. The program is maintained by a small group of technicians—the staff of the CIP Publisher Liaison Team who support the program as an adjunct to their CIP program duties. Because all PCN functions are performed within the EPCN system, they are mainly automated. The information elements provided by publishers are automatically converted into a MARC-formatted IBC record by the liaison with a click of the mouse. Given this high degree of automation and efficiency and given the role that the EPCN system serves as an interface between publishers and the Library of Congress, CRG believes that the PCN program is a fertile area for greater innovation and a possible source of a rich array of data elements about forthcoming titles that are potentially valuable to the Library of Congress, book sellers, readers, and especially the library community. CRG also believes that these enhancements could be obtained at a relatively modest cost.

CRG also recognizes other important aspects of the PCN program including the following: the important role that the PCN program plays as an option for publishers not willing or able to participate in the CIP program; the value of the LCCN (when printed in the book) as an access point for libraries and book sellers; the assistance that EPCN IBC records provide during cataloging (for those works selected for addition to LC's collections); the monetary value of PCN books selected for the Library's collections—books, estimated to be more than 50% of the total number of PCN titles, that otherwise might not be obtained and/or would have to be purchased; and the value of those PCN books not selected for the Library's collection but which do support the Library's exchange programs.

### Recommendations.

- (9A.) CRG recommends that the EPCN application form be modified to include more detailed instructions and examples regarding key data elements (such as the title, subtitle, author, etc.) to improve the quality of that data as it subsequently appears in the IBC record. This would improve the efficiency of the cataloging that occurs in those many instances when the published work is selected for addition to the Library's collections.
- (9B.) CRG recommends that the EPCN application form be modified to obtain a wider range of data elements from the publisher including, for example, sample text, summaries, author information, title page, table of contents, etc.
- (9C.) CRG recommends that EPCN IBC records and associated enrichment elements be distributed to the library community, vendors, and others.
- (9D.) CRG recommends that the EPCN application form be modified to include a basic subject list. This information could support a selection service.
- (9E.) CRG recommends that CIP and ITS staff explore the possibility of making the EPCN process entirely automated so the submission of the EPCN application form by the publisher would invoke the LCCN assignment and IBC record creation. Presumably this would have validation routines to ensure inclusion of mandated fields, spell checker, etc.

## **10. Selection.**

While the principal purpose of this report is to evaluate the CIP program and, to a lesser extent, the PCN program, CRG was also tasked with reviewing the selection process as it relates to CIP activities. To this end, CRG met with the Selection Librarians to discuss options that might improve that process. Some CRG members also had the opportunity to meet with Barbara Morland, Head, Main Reading Room I, whose staff include a large number of Recommending Officers. As Recommending Officers and Selection Librarians have duties that share some common features, CRG also discussed options that might facilitate their work.

Specifically, CRG suggested that the ECIP Traffic Manager system might be modified to display a menu listing ten or twelve broad subject categories of recently cataloged ECIPs. Selecting a given

category would display a list of more specific subjects (within that broad category) and selecting a specific subject would display a list of all titles in the ECIP system relevant to that subject and cataloged within the past 30 or 60 days. Selecting a specific title would display the application form and galley--complete with the title page, table of contents, summary, author information, sample text, etc.--as well as a link to the catalog record. Review of this information would presumably provide sufficient insight of forthcoming titles to enable the selector/recommender to make a determination and then record that determination with an appropriate code in the catalog record. When the book is published and sent to the Library, technician staff that first search the work could process the work in accordance with the information provided during the earlier selection process. The work would in effect be pre-selected.

Selection Librarians did not think that this functionality would significantly improve the selection process as the published book in hand contained evidence necessary to determine the quality of the work and its suitability for LC collections. Barbara Morland, however, thought that the possibility of reviewing forthcoming works via the ECIP Traffic Manager might be a useful tool, additional to their current manner of reviewing books, to facilitate the recommending process as there are a large number of Recommending Officers and it is not always possible for them to come to the CIP Division to review the book in hand. The concept of reviewing forthcoming works within a specific subject area might also be helpful to Recommending Officers as their focus is subject specific. Works not pertinent to their specific subject of interest serve only to obfuscate the recommending process.

In the course of these conversations, the Selection Librarians also suggested that the selection process could be improved for clinical medical titles if the catalog records for all works cataloged by the National Library of Medicine had a default setting of "keep 2" instead of "keep 1" as is the case now. Current procedures enable Selection Librarians to change the default from 2 to 1 (in those instances when two copies are not required), but make it cumbersome to change from "1" to "2". Selection Librarians, therefore, would increase the likelihood of obtaining the required copies of works in this subject area for the Library's collections if the default was set to "2".

### Recommendations.

- (10A.) CRG recommends that the default settings for the cataloging templates of all NLM staff who catalog ECIP works be changed to "keep 2".
- (10B) CRG recommends that CIP staff, ITS staff, and staff responsible for recommending and selection duties examine further the feasibility of modifying the ECIP Traffic Manager system to facilitate the recommendation and selection process (as described above) and that the ECIP system be modified accordingly assuming the changes are not unduly complex and time consuming and assuming the changes would likely improve the efficiency of the recommending and/or selection process.