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ABSTRACT
Between 2013 and 2015, the Library of Congress and experts from school, public, and academic library communities revised the 42-year-old Cataloging in Publication (CIP) data block (back-of-title-page cataloging data). This article describes the assessments, including development and analysis of two surveys, used in this data-driven process. The revised data block replaces the catalog card layout with a labeled layout that identifies components within the block, merges print and electronic information, and provides additional descriptive and subject access points. A 2017 follow-up assessment confirmed the project’s success in meeting the needs of its principal users, those in school and public libraries.
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Introduction
Changing the content and appearance of the iconic Library of Congress CIP data block, the text block of cataloging information that often appears on the back of book title pages, was not a project to be undertaken lightly. Headed by the legend, “Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data,” this symbol of work done at the Library of Congress had appeared virtually unchanged on almost two million books since the inception of the CIP program in 1971. The project called for careful assessment of the status quo, thoughtful deliberation about potential changes, and follow-up assessment of results. This article takes an historical and chronological approach to the story of how the CIP Data Block Committee, a group of LC and external librarians charged with the revision project, assessed and revised this library icon.

The CIP Program provides pre-publication metadata to the nation’s libraries for cataloging and other information purposes. The CIP cataloging process results in
two products, both based on prepublication submissions by the publisher usually consisting of a galley of the forthcoming book and prepublication metadata. Catalogers first create the prepublication electronic bibliographic record from which the CIP data block is then programmatically derived and provided to the publisher for display in the published book. The data block revision project focused only on determining which data elements from the MARC record should be displayed in the data block and the best layout for display of these elements.

Between 1971 and 2012, the CIP data block underwent only minor changes. By 2013, in response to rapid developments in the bibliographic environment, Library of Congress management determined that it was necessary to conduct a thorough review of the data elements and the layout of the CIP data block to determine whether it should be changed, and if so, how. In 2014, the CIP Data Block Committee surveyed librarians and other data block stakeholders to learn about their use of the existing data block and sought their input about potential new elements and layouts. After an exhaustive analysis of the results of the survey, the committee and Library of Congress staff developed and implemented a completely redesigned data block. The new data block was crafted to better meet the needs of its users, especially school and public libraries, a sector that the 2014 survey had confirmed as continuing to rely on the data block. The new CIP data block includes additional descriptive elements and data from additional subject thesauri and classifications; combines information about both the print and electronic versions of a title; and uses a labeled layout that no longer resembles a catalog card. In 2017, a follow-up survey confirmed the success of the revised data block.

This article presents a detailed overview of the assessment process, including development and analysis of two surveys and a follow-up assessment of the data-driven changes made to the data block. The article also includes a literature review, and sections on the history of the CIP data block, problems encountered and lessons learned, how this research might be valuable to others, and suggestions for future research.

**Literature review**

Robert R. Newlen provides a brief history of the CIP program in his 1991 article celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the program. After an initial year-long experiment in 1958 called Cataloging in Source, the CIP program officially began on July 1, 1971. Newlen states, “Twenty years later, and now part of LC’s operating budget, the CIP program has processed more than half a million titles.” In 2000, the LC CIP Program launched the ECIP (Electronic Cataloging in Publication) program to create CIP data more efficiently. This program uses an electronic workflow to streamline the cataloging process and additional non-LC cataloging partners now contribute. In the article, “The Electronic Cataloging in Publication Program: A Model for Cooperative Cataloging for the Twenty-First Century,” Karl E. Debus-López concludes that the ECIP program “represents a true partnership
between publishers, libraries of all types, and the Library of Congress.” He highlights the value of the program as “faster and better metadata processing to the benefit of the national and international library communities.”

The CIP data block itself has multiple uses and benefits. Joanna Fountain points out that “because the CIP data are printed in the book, anyone holding it can refer to them.” She adds, “Students, bookstore browsers, or parents at home can look at the CIP data and find useful information.... It is not necessary to consult a library catalog....” In a history of LC’s Cataloging Distribution Service, Paul Edlund surmises that the convenient location of the CIP data block perhaps evolved from publishers printing the LCCN (Library of Congress Card Number) on the verso of title pages.

Library science textbooks use examples of the CIP data block to introduce cataloging and classification concepts. In Introduction to Cataloging and Classification, authors Joudrey, Taylor, and Miller relate: “Some libraries use the CIP records for preliminary cataloging. Other libraries may use the brief CIP record instead of full cataloging.” Jean Weihs and Sheila Intner include instructions on using the CIP data block for copy cataloging in the textbook, Beginning Cataloging. The literature also presents concerns about the incompleteness and inaccuracy of CIP data. In Fundamentals of Technical Services, John Sandstron and Liz Miller recommend checking the accuracy of CIP data against the resource and advise that “you will probably need to add some information ... because typically this information wasn’t available when the CIP record was created.” Jean Weihs cautions that “a cataloguer should not assume LC or LAC [Library and Archives Canada] knows best.” Author Mary Mortimer in Learn Descriptive Cataloging adds, “However it [the CIP data] is still valuable, especially if no other records are readily available.” In spite of these concerns, which are the inevitable result of working with pre-publication data, the CIP data block remains an authoritative source for descriptive cataloging, subject analysis and classification. Kevin Cretsos from the University of Dayton Libraries blogs, “As you can see, the CIP data block gives you a quick and condensed version of the catalog record and this can be useful for libraries with limited cataloging expertise.” By 2013, the time seemed right for what Debus-López called “a radical transformation” in the article, “Introducing the New CIP Data Block,” which describes the new data block and summarizes its genesis and development.

**Development of the CIP data block, 1971–2013**

From the very beginning, the CIP Program created full-level pre-publication metadata, using the current descriptive cataloging code and subject analysis guidelines. Most of the bibliographic elements that appeared on a catalog card appeared in the CIP data block. CIP data blocks always included titles proper, other title information, statements of responsibility, edition statements, and series information. Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and/or LC juvenile subject headings,
Library of Congress Classification (LCC), and Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) also appeared in each CIP data block, as did the International Standard Book Number (ISBN). CIP data blocks have also always included LCCN (Library of Congress Control Number, formerly the Library of Congress Card Number used for ordering card sets). However, the place and name of the publisher, the date of publication, and the price were all omitted. The “p. cm.” found in the physical description area of the data block was a placeholder for the pagination and size that the Library of Congress would later add to the MARC record after receiving the published book.

Whenever the CIP Program considered changes to the CIP data block, it turned to its customers, primarily libraries but also publishers and vendors, to provide feedback by means of surveys and discussions at CIP Advisory Group (CAG) meetings at American Library Association (ALA) conferences. For instance, addition of the Dewey edition number, beginning with DDC 19, and notation that designated cataloging according to Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2) resulted from a CAG proposal at ALA Midwinter 1981. At ALA Annual 1982, CAG proposed adding a qualifier to the ISBN for alkaline (acid-free) paper, based on concerns expressed by the Z39.Subcommittee S: Paper Audits for Library Books. The CIP data block has included the qualifier “(alk. paper)” in CIP MARC records and the CIP data block ever since. At ALA Annual 1984, CAG members gave a lukewarm response to adding publisher-supplied summaries for adult books because the text would take up extra space on the data block and catalog cards.

By 1985, LC’s CIP data block was well established and the CIP Program helped to shape the final report of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) Working Group on a Standardized Format for the CIP Record in the Book. The list agreed upon by the IFLA Working Group (see Appendix A) included mandatory elements (title proper, added entries) and elements required if available/applicable (parallel title, series, ISBN, main entry, subject headings, and classification numbers). The IFLA recommendations created a flexible policy that allowed each CIP agency to establish local practice appropriate to the situation and in accordance with publisher needs. CIP customers in the U.S. clearly agreed with the principles set out in the IFLA guidelines. The CIP data block included almost all of the optional elements, with the exception of the place and name of the publisher and/or distributor, the date of publication, the terms of availability and price, the key title of a series or subseries, and the government document number. The IFLA Working Group did not address the layout of the CIP data block.

From the earliest days of the CIP Program, LC believed the card image format was the appropriate way to provide the bibliographic data on the title page verso. This layout replicated the format of the catalog card originally printed for the Library of Congress card catalog, a de facto standard for all
card catalogs. See Figure 1 for an example of the original layout of the CIP data block.

The CIP Program provided very strict specifications for how publishers should print this information. Although these instructions were intended to ensure that the card image format was replicated, nothing has prevented publishers from altering this layout in their published books, because this information is sent via e-mail as pre-formatted text, not as an image. There are many examples of CIP data blocks with centered justification or displayed, for instance, as swirling images, depending on the design of the copyright page. Results of a 2006 survey by the CIP Review Group (CRG) indicated that although the card image format seemed outdated in the era of online catalogs, the card layout and International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) punctuation identified cataloging information and helped users correctly interpret the CIP data without the addition of “cumbersome labels.” Unable to identify a more “efficient” format, the CRG recommended that the card layout be reviewed in the future.

Requests for enhancements to the CIP data block in the ensuing years included some interest in broad genre headings (e.g., science fiction, western, detective/mystery) for works of American fiction, accurate display of diacritics, and a suggestion in 2003 to explore using ONIX data in the CIP process. Although BISAC headings, which were one of the added value elements in the ONIX data, could not be displayed at that time in the CIP data block, in 2009 the Library began using an “ONIX to MARC converter” to maximize use of descriptive metadata included within ONIX.

In 2012, the CIP E-books Program began to create metadata for e-books that are simultaneously published with print books. The program issued separate CIP data blocks for the print and e-book versions. The CIP data block for e-books had a few elements specific to the e-version: a “general materials designation” (GMD) [electronic resource], the note, “Description based on print version record and CIP data provided by publisher; resource not viewed,” and the physical description, “1 online resource.” When the Library of Congress decided to stop using the GMD in MARC records, this element was removed from the CIP data block.
By 2013, this venerable icon was showing signs of age, most notably in its use of a catalog card layout when generations of students had never even seen a catalog card; its inability to completely accommodate changes brought about by RDA; and the challenge of adapting to the simultaneous publication of books in print and e-formats. The stage was set for some potential rejuvenation.

2013–2015 CIP data block assessment

Formation and charge of the CIP Data Block Committee

The development of the new CIP data block had its roots in changes to the data block to accommodate the new cataloging standard, *Resource Description and Access* (RDA), that were proposed at the CAG meeting at ALA Annual 2013. The primary recommendations presented at CAG were to (1) add relationship designators to all name access points, (2) add the copyright date from the galley in brackets instead of including a separate copyright date, and (3) record all ISBNs available in the galley. CAG also proposed a change not related to the implementation of RDA: removal of the physical description field, (p. cm.) which occupied one full line of the data block. CAG members also suggested addition of a Quick Response Code (QR code) to allow for scanning and direct input of the MARC version of the data block into library systems. Based on the CAG discussion, LC CIP managers agreed that it was time to conduct a review of the data elements and layout of the CIP data block.

In August 2013, CIP program management sought volunteers to form a committee to review the CIP data block. The newly formed CIP Data Block Committee represented school, public, and academic library communities, and began meeting in September 2013. LC members included the division chief with managerial oversight of the CIP Program who served as the chair, the CIP Program Manager, the CIP Program Specialist, a computer automation specialist, and the head of the U.S. ISSN Center, which resides in the same division as the CIP Program. Since the committee believed that the assessment should focus on the needs and concerns of librarians, publishers were not represented. The committee developed its own charge: “…to possibly redesign the CIP data block. The committee will be looking at the CIP data block line by line to determine if lines should be added or removed, or the addition of other elements such as QR codes. At the end of this process, the committee will have two to three mock-ups of the CIP data block to share with various constituents.”

Assessment methodology

The committee first determined the scope of their assessment. A reasonable question, given the online availability of the LC online catalog where full MARC records for all CIP titles would be found, was whether the data block currently had
enough value to warrant its continued presence in books. Leaders of the school library community, the principal user community for the data block, affirmed unanimously that school librarians were still heavily reliant on the data block as a source of cataloging. The committee therefore agreed that the assessment would not be a referendum on the data block’s continued existence. Instead, the outcome would determine how to modify the data block to best serve its existing users.

Also out of the scope for further consideration, despite the committee charge of “line by line review,” were certain elements deemed “core” to the data block. Without the following elements, the data block would not include enough information to create a basic bibliographic record: Library of Congress Control Number (LCCN), International Standard Book Number (ISBN), Library of Congress Call Number, Dewey Decimal Classification Number, Authorized Access Point (formerly called Main Entry), Title Statement, Edition Statement, and Library of Congress Subject Headings. A summary (for juvenile and young adult literature) was also included to support the work of the Children’s and Young Adults’ Cataloging (CYAC) Program at the Library of Congress.

The committee took multiple approaches to obtaining input. They obtained informal information from experts in the field and daily users of the CIP data block. The CIP Data Block Committee representative from the school library community sought input from time to time from a small subset of school library leaders. The ISSN Network was queried to learn how other national libraries presented CIP data. The committee asked Library of Congress catalogers in the foreign acquiring divisions to share examples of CIP data they used for cataloging non-U.S. books. Other expert groups such as the Library of Congress Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Management Team, the Library’s Policy and Standards Division, and The Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA (now the RDA Steering Committee) provided input. The CIP Data Block Committee also wanted input from front-line librarians, technicians, volunteers, and others who use the data block on a daily basis to create bibliographic records. Since the CIP Program had successfully used surveys in the past to assess the impact of services provided to libraries and publishers, the committee agreed that the principal tool for the assessment would be an online survey.

**Development of the 2014 CIP data block survey**

Since it was available at the Library of Congress, widely known, and had the ability to perform cross-sectional analyses, SurveyMonkey was chosen as the tool to create the survey. The survey was designed to provide data that could be analyzed from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives. For most questions asked, participants could add comments. The committee anticipated that comments would be just as important as the quantitative data. The main topics for revision of the data
block on which the survey sought input were: elements beyond the core that could be added, deleted, or changed, including author affiliations within the title statement; the addition of selective new classifications, genre/form terms, and subject thesauri; the catalog card layout vs. a labeled layout; and combining information about print and e-book versions into one data block.

The resulting survey included 11 questions on the type of library and systems environment in which the respondent worked; 11 questions on use of the data block for cataloging purposes; 21 questions on the removal or addition of data block elements; and 6 questions on the data block layout. The committee released an initial draft survey to a select group of testers at the Library of Congress and the ECIP cataloging partners. Once the committee believed that the survey instrument was sound, on May 1, 2014, it was sent to 13 electronic mailing lists that would reach the broadest range of libraries that use the data block for cataloging purposes. The participants were asked to complete the survey by June 1, 2014.

**Survey results**

A total of 420 individuals answered the survey. This constitutes a convenience sample, as the e-mail lists receiving the survey had a high percentage of catalogers and technicians who were likely to use the data block. While the response was not a true representative sample, the committee felt that the large number of responses could be considered indicative of the opinions about the data block held by the library community. Respondents could choose more than one type of library, resulting in 523 responses concerning the type of library represented. While most responses constituted the sole answer from a particular institution, in some cases several individuals answered from larger institutions. Accordingly, this summary of the survey results refers to “respondents” from a type of library as opposed to the library type itself, since there is not a one-to-one correspondence between a response and a library type.

As expected, the largest number of respondents, 235 (45%), came from school libraries, key users of CIP data. Along with public library respondents, 53 (10%), a group that was also identified as reliant on CIP data, the two groups represented 55% of all respondents. There were 117 (22%) college/university respondents. The rest of the responses came from the following groups: hospital/medical libraries, 27 (5%); corporate/military/prison/church/law libraries, 26 (5%); government libraries, 22 (4%); national libraries, 17 (3%); non-U.S. libraries, 15 (3%); and vendors, 11 (2%). Fifty-one percent of the participants came from libraries with collections of fewer than 25,000 volumes. Seventy percent worked in libraries with fewer than 100,000 volumes. Forty-three percent indicated that they cataloged fewer than 500 titles per year. Fifty-two percent of the survey participants worked in libraries where they were the only cataloger. Eighty-two percent worked in libraries with five or fewer cataloging staff. The survey also addressed the use of print vs. online catalogs: 91% of the respondents said that they used an integrated library
system. Only six said that they continued to use a print card catalog and only one said that they did not have access to the Internet. The survey results indicated that the library participants represented users of most interest to this assessment: librarians or other individuals who performed cataloging in smaller library settings, most likely with more limited resources than a larger research library and most likely heavily reliant on the CIP data block. A majority were from school or public libraries.

**CIP data block usage**

Fifty-six percent of CIP survey participants indicated that they do not use the CIP data block as a primary source of cataloging, and 54% said that they do not transcribe the complete CIP data block to create their bibliographic records. However, when asked whether they “referred” to the CIP data block, 96% of the respondents said that they did—either frequently (53%) or sometimes (43%). Similarly, when asked if they transcribe parts of the CIP data block, 81% said that they did. The most commonly transcribed parts of the CIP data block were: ISBN (61%); series statement (56%); Dewey classification number (56%); title and statements of responsibility (52%); Library of Congress Subject Headings (51%); and name headings (50%).

Responses from school library survey participants clearly demonstrate their continued strong reliance on the CIP data block. The majority indicated that they used the CIP data block as a primary source of cataloging (63%) and that they transcribed the complete CIP data block to create their bibliographic records (72%). Participants who worked in public libraries also clearly relied on the CIP data block; 58% used it as a primary cataloging source, and 55% “sometimes” manually transcribed the CIP data block. In contrast, college and university libraries overwhelmingly reported they did not use the CIP data block as a primary source of cataloging (83%) and that they did not manually transcribe the complete data block when creating bibliographic records (73%).

The responses to this section of the survey validated that the CIP data block remains an essential tool for most school librarians as they perform their cataloging, a fact which strongly influenced the changes in the CIP data block that the committee ultimately made. Other user groups indicated that they still valued and used the CIP data block, but were more likely to use it to verify cataloging data and as a source for additional information to include within bibliographic records, rather than as their primary cataloging source.

**CIP data block: Survey results and recommendations**

The bulk of the survey asked questions about potential changes to the data block in order to provide the CIP Data Block Committee with a broad sense of how changes under consideration would be viewed across the range of data block stakeholders. The committee subjected the survey results to in-depth
analysis, including assessing results by community, by element, and by topic. All free-text comments were taken into account. Additionally, over the course of the almost two years following the survey, the committee sought further input from various experts and communities, deliberated extensively about data block elements, investigated options for layouts, and experimented with various versions of a new data block. After careful consideration of the survey results and the comments from the various library communities, the committee recommended changes to the CIP data block that best met user needs and provided the greatest practicable enhancements.

Data block elements

In order to learn of additional data elements that could be included in the revised data block, the survey asked which “Non-CIP data block elements” respondents added to their bibliographic records. Results indicated: publishing information (53%); pagination and size (53%); summary (44%); form/genre terms (33%); additional LC subject headings (30%); local subject headings (29%); Sears subject headings (27%); audience level (25%); table of contents (18%); and BISAC headings (2%).

Based on the committee’s assessment of the survey data, plus the committee’s additional input and deliberations, the committee added the following elements to the data block: publication data; genre/form terms; all but one relationship designator; and BISAC headings. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents endorsed addition of publisher name and place, and 61% endorsed addition of the projected publication date. These elements assist catalogers by providing a nearly complete bibliographic record for their use. Participants supported the inclusion of genre/form terms by a solid 78%. As LC and other U.S. libraries are developing more genre/form terminology sets, inclusion of these terms complements the subject access already present in the data block. Seventy-six percent of the respondents indicated that they wanted relationship designators included within the CIP data block, with a preference for the following: editor (82%); illustrator (81%); author (79%); translator (73%); photographer (62%); compiler (52%); sponsoring body (37%); issuing body (36%); cartographer (33%); abridger (32%); enacting jurisdiction (14%); and honoree (14%). The committee approved including relationship designators, with the exception of “sponsoring body” because its use is generally limited to records for serials.

There was less agreement from respondents as to whether BISAC access points should be included, with 54% of school librarians indicating that the headings should be included but broad rejection (73% against) of including BISAC codes. After considerable discussion, the committee decided to include BISAC headings but not the codes, realizing that some school and public libraries organize their collections by BISAC headings, and because these headings are generally included with ONIX data supplied by some publishers. After the Government Publishing Office (GPO) joined the ECIP Cataloging Partnership Program in 2014, the
committee agreed to add the Superintendent of Documents (SUDOC) number to the data block.

Respondents endorsed the following existing elements for continued inclusion: series information (94%); language note (89%); audience note (84%); preferred (uniform) title—primary access point (80%); preferred (uniform) title–foreign title (80%); preferred (uniform) title–commonly known title (79%); bibliographical references note (76%); general note—“includes index” (75%); general note (67%); and preferred (uniform) title–collective title (67%). Following additional input and discussions, the data block committee agreed to keep all but one of these elements: preferred (uniform) title–collective title, and to remove the two elements that participants generally did not feel were helpful: the physical description field (p. cm.) which 77% did not feel was needed, and author affiliations which 61% wanted removed even though they had been included in accordance with RDA. These affiliations added little useful information, took up space, and interrupted the flow of author names.

The decision to not include the “preferred (uniform) title—collective title” is one of the cases where the committee decided to go against the preferences of the survey participants. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents wanted the “preferred (uniform) title—collective title” to remain in the data block. This came as a surprise, as committee members had heard complaints from librarians about this data element. Such titles are common, particularly for literary works (e.g. “Poems. Selections”), but do not provide much additional information, so the committee removed them from the data block.

The committee took survey results into account as they reviewed all note elements. Survey respondents preferred retaining the note, “Includes index,” but the committee decided to omit it to ensure a compact data block. However, they decided to retain notes indicating the presence of bibliographical references as important to researchers. The committee also decided that contents notes would be included only for multi-part sets and re-affirmed that summaries would be included only for juvenile and young adult literature. Moreover, the committee agreed that audience notes by age and grade would be included if provided by the publisher. These notes would include a legend indicating that the information came from the publisher.

**CIP data block layout**

Early in the assessment process, the committee agreed to explore possible new data block layouts. Responses from national libraries queried by their ISSN center generally indicated that CIP data was presented either in a catalog card layout or via a statement that bibliographic data was available in the national library catalog. Such statements sometimes included a unique identifier by which data could be found. The committee was intrigued by the labeled layout used by the National Library of Iran but wondered whether such a departure from the traditional catalog card
layout would be confusing for those libraries keying data into their local input system. Accordingly, the CIP Data Block Committee queried a small set of school librarians and the results indicated that input systems used most by school librarians had labeled input screens which could be at least somewhat aligned with a labeled data block layout. The committee therefore decided to include in the survey a proposed layout that used labels for broad areas further subdivided by vertical bars (the “pipe” character) to distinguish information contained within each area. The initial labels proposed were “Names,” “Description,” “Identifiers,” “Subjects,” and “Classification.”

To further determine whether a catalog card or labeled layout would be more suitable for users of the data block, several questions in the “Demographics” section of the survey asked about library systems used for cataloging. Fifty-eight percent of respondents worked with input systems that used both MARC and labeled input screens; 39% used MARC screens; and 10% percent used only labels. These answers indicated that the cataloging environment in most libraries would support a labeled layout. The survey presented two draft layout examples for the same title: one using the traditional layout and the other using a labeled layout. The survey participants were asked: “Considering how cataloging data may be created in the future with new cataloging rules and new data display and transmission formats, please provide comments about each of the 2 examples above.” A subsequent question asked “Do you have any other ideas for possible changes to the CIP data block layout?”

Of the 316 comments received, 54% preferred the labeled layout, 27% preferred the print card catalog layout, and 19% indicated no preference. Many of the positive comments indicated a need to move away from the card catalog layout and implement a new look. Others said the labeled layout was clearer and easier to read: “I like the labeled layout better because it looks more visually pleasing and easier to discern the information”; “Easier to read with the additional spaces”; “Has a modern look and the style may adapt to changing technology overall”; and “The labeled layout is more concise and organized thereby making it easier to locate the information I need faster.” Some comments were less positive, “Too spread out: readability studies will show that less will be read in this case. Too many labels and labels are too technical.” Others did not like the label “Description.” One person wrote, “Description is not going to mean ‘title’ to the general public. That’s confusing. Otherwise, okay.” Several of the participants who preferred the catalog card layout mentioned that they learned cataloging before online systems were in use and they considered themselves “old school.” One person noted: “I am old (ish) I started when I was actually typing up catalog cards so it makes sense to me. I can see how newer catalogers who have never had the privilege would not understand the reason for the old format. Do what is best for YOU! We can adapt.”

Since there was a preference for a labeled layout and since most input systems used by schools generally include a labeled input screen, the committee adopted a
labeled layout for the new CIP data block. Based on the comments from the survey participants, the number of labels was increased from five to seven, with “Titles” and “Other Titles” being separated from “Description.” Data elements would be categorized into seven over-arching areas in the data block: Names, Titles, Other Titles, Description, Identifiers, Subjects, and Classification.

Not as many survey participants responded to the question asking for additional ideas for the data block, although several answers were quite useful. For example: “Perhaps using the labeled layout, but instead of using the label ‘Description,’ use the label ‘Title’ for the title, and have a separate section for ‘Description’ which would include notes, etc.”; “Add a barcode for access to the data, instead of (or in addition to) a camera-readable graphic. Librarians should not have to invest in new technology in order to see and/or download the data; most already have barcode readers.”; “For classification labels, use ‘Library of Congress’ and ‘Dewey.’”; “A publishing section that clearly states the publisher, place of publication, date of publication and copyright date.”; and, “If the labels (Names, Description, etc.) were bolded it certainly helps the cataloging content and information about the book to be easily discernable.”

Where possible, the committee made revisions to the layout based on survey comments. To address concerns that classifications and thesaurus terms were differentiated only by use of the vertical pipe bar, the committee agreed that the appropriate acronym and colon would appear before the classification number or subject heading. To further identify the inclusion of series information and summaries within the Description area, the committee included additional labels, “Series,” and “Summary,” to precede this critical information.

**Combined data block for print and online, QR codes**

A business need of the CIP Program was to eliminate the confusion and errors made by publishers who received separate data blocks for print and e-book versions. An example of a CIP data block that displayed information on both versions was included in the survey, and the participants were asked, “Do you think this is an acceptable method for providing CIP data for a title to the publisher in one block that can be printed in the book as well as included in the e-book?” Eighty-five percent of the responses were positive, with one writing, “Only one CIP data block should be acceptable for both formats. Combined CIP data blocks could emphasize/advertise the fact that there are two formats available for that title.” Another wrote, “Yes, one CIP with both forms of info is enough. We can figure it out.” An additional comment in support of the merger was: “I don’t see a reason to have separate records when most of the data is the same.” Others were not as supportive of the combined data block; “We are still figuring out how to display our e-book records, so not sure on this.” Nonetheless the committee became convinced that librarians and other users of the CIP data block would benefit from having complete information on all formats of the title in one data block that
included the LCCNs and the LC Classifications for both the print and electronic titles. Accordingly, after extensive experimentation with how to present all needed information, the committee adopted a combined layout.

To reduce the time data block users might spend manually keying CIP data into their catalogs, respondents were asked whether they were interested in a QR code that could access encoded CIP data or link to the Library of Congress bibliographic record. Sixty-seven percent preferred encoded CIP data. Seventy percent preferred a link to the LC record. The committee wanted to incorporate a QR code linked to the LC record and spent several months working to make this succeed. Unfortu-
nately, technical difficulties prevented the addition of a QR code. Coded data is still a goal as discussed below under “Areas for Future Research.” However, the committee decided to include an LCCN Permalink for each title to allow users to retrieve a complete bibliographic record in electronic format from the LC Perma-
link database. The database record can also be downloaded to a local library cata-
log, reducing keying and errors.

**Options not incorporated within the final CIP data block**

There were a number of suggestions that were not approved by the data block committee, mainly for practical reasons. Several survey participants and Gordon Dunsire on behalf of the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) on the Development of RDA noted that the information in the new data block was “dense.” They recommen-
ded highlighting the labels while others recommended making the vertical pipe bar thicker. Neither was possible because of technical limitations in the pro-
gram used to output information to the publisher. In addition to participant com-
ments about the label, “Description,” the JSC thought that publication information should have its own heading. The committee decided that adding another section would increase the length of the data block unacceptably.

The Committee agreed in principle with the chair of the ALA Subject Access Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation and the LC Policy and Standards Division that genre/form terms are not subject data. However, the com-
mittee felt that it could not justify including a separate label and line for these terms which are closely related to subject data. Many of the school librarians expressed an interest in adding Sears Subject Headings to the data block. The com-
mittee agreed that this was desirable but could not provide a programmatic way to generate Sears headings at this time. Currently, Sears Subject Headings are owned by EBSCO. OCLC Research is investigating a potential correlation tool that would map LC Subject Headings to Sears Subject Headings and make this addition poten-
tially more feasible in the future. A member of the CIP Advisory Group requested adding the controlled vocabulary of the Book Industry Study Group (BISG) Educational Taxonomy Working Group. It was determined that the terms were too spe-
cific and not used extensively enough by librarians to warrant addition to the data block.
**Release of the new CIP data block**

The CIP Data Block Committee agreed on final changes to the data elements and layout by July 2015. Between July and September, the CIP home page was updated with a detailed “Frequently Asked Questions” page on the new features of the CIP data block. The home page included several examples to emphasize different aspects of the new layout, and detailed diagrams that demonstrated how the various MARC fields for data elements mapped to the new labeled sections. The September 29, 2015 *LCCN* newsletter presented the reasons for the change and the process undertaken to create the new data block.

The Library of Congress CIP Program developed a plan to educate catalogers on how to use the new data block for cataloging through webinars and presentations at conferences. Finally, at the end of fiscal year 2015, the CIP Program implemented a single “print + e” CIP data block, suitable for inclusion in both formats.

On October 1, 2015, the Library of Congress formally implemented the new CIP data block. Publishers began receiving the CIP data in the new format. By early 2016, libraries, vendors, and bookstores were receiving newly published books with the new data block. While the CIP Data Block Committee did not have a predetermined vision of what the new layout would look like when they began the assessment process, the end result was a much richer display than initially anticipated. Additional descriptive information appears in the new layout. The layout has more subject, classification, and genre/form access than the previous data block. Complete information on the existence of both print and electronic versions of a title is available. Through the addition of clear labels and acronyms, catalogers

---

**Figure 2.** The new CIP data block. Implemented October 1, 2015.
who use the data block as they perform their work can easily determine where information should be entered on their input screens. The members of the CIP Data Block Committee believed that the new layout was a significant improvement from the previous version. Appendix B lists all of the decisions made by the Committee as to the MARC fields included or excluded within the new data block, relationship designators added, and layout changes. An example of the new CIP data block appears in Figure 2.

**Assessing the success of the new CIP data block**

In January 2017, in order to assess the new CIP data block, the CIP Data Block Committee again used SurveyMonkey to distribute a new short (15-question) survey to see whether the user communities did, indeed, support the changes that had been made in the data block, and whether they found the new version valuable to their work. For this second survey, the committee invited publishers and vendors to participate, since they were now providing the new LC CIP data in their books. The new survey was posted to the same electronic mailing lists as the 2014 survey. Two hundred and sixty responses were received, including 72 (28%) from academic libraries; 65 (25%) from school libraries; 48 (18%) from public libraries; 20 (8%) from publishers; and 9 (3%) from vendors. The remainder came from other types of libraries. To ensure that those answering the survey had some knowledge of the new data block before being asked to provide more specific input, the survey asked “Are you aware that the Cataloging in Publication Data Block was changed in October 2015 to the following labeled layout?” and included an image of the new data block. Somewhat surprisingly, between 30% and 36% of respondents in each of the major groups surveyed (school libraries, public libraries, academic libraries, publishers and vendors) were not aware that the data block had changed. Reasons given were more or less evenly divided among “do not use the data block,” “cataloging is done elsewhere,” and “no new books yet received” that included the new data block. The survey did not ask these respondents further questions.

Questions for the remaining respondents assessed whether the changes made to the data block were successful, and where there might be a need for further improvement. Overall, the survey results were quite positive: around 85% of respondents found the new layout “useful” (34%), “rather useful” (30%), or “very useful” (21%). Even more positive were the responses from school libraries, primary users of the data block. Ninety-nine percent of school library respondents found the new layout useful (31%), rather useful (34%), or very useful (34%).

The most obvious change from the former data block consisted of replacing the catalog card layout with a labeled layout that identified groups of elements. Other key changes included providing the previously-omitted publisher name, place of publication, and publication date; including additional types of subject data such
as BISAC headings, SUDOC classifications, and genre/form headings; and combining information about the print version and e-book version into a single data block. While respondents generally regarded the changes as positive, responses were also somewhat dependent on the group to which the respondent belonged and the purpose(s) for which the respondent used the data block.

One of the challenges of the data block is that it is used by different communities, and for different purposes even within the same community. For example: 91% of school libraries use the data block for cataloging, subject headings (77%) or classification (68%) whereas only 77% of academic libraries use the data block for cataloging, 25% for subject headings and 35% for classification.

**Preference for the new data block**

A key question asked whether the respondent preferred the new layout over the old layout. Overall, 59% preferred the new layout, 15% preferred the old layout, and 26% did not have a preference. This result correlates with the 2014 survey where 54% of the overall comments about the proposed labeled layout were positive. In 2017, school librarians were the most positive about the new layout, with 74% preferring it, none preferring the old layout, and 26% having no preference. Even among academic librarians where 22% preferred the old layout, the majority (52%) still preferred the new layout, and 26% had no preference. The majority of public librarians as well as publishers and vendors all preferred the new layout. Some positive comments included: “I really like the new format, works great for cataloging”; “About time”; “Easier to find specific parts”; “Very easy to read: very clean organization to find useful information about the book.”

However, there were holdouts regarding the card format, such that overall, in a list of elements that respondents liked and did not like, 39 mentioned liking that the new data block was no longer the card format while 30 mentioned that they did not like the fact that it was no longer the card format. Negative comments included: “Quite ugly compared to the previous one”; “I do not like the way things are scrunched together”; “Sorry, old school librarian”; “Quit tinkering with things that work well and have worked well for decades!” Some of the concerns were: “small print”; “text in the block is much harder to read—it seems jumbled”; “seems more compact, harder to read (especially the ISBNs).” Multiple comments indicated that the ISBN was more difficult to locate (it was previously one of the first few elements). These comments were surprising, given how readily the ISBN can be found on most books.

Since academic libraries mainly base their cataloging on existing MARC records, it is not surprising that some comments from that community present a different perspective on the CIP data block. “All I care about is accessing a good MARC record. So, to me, the only worthwhile piece of data in the new CIP data block is the LC link,” or “Giving us a MARC record on the t.p. verso would be more helpful.” Several comments specifically mentioned liking the
“LCCN Permalink,” a feature of the new data block that was added subsequent to the original survey.

**Labels**

A key characteristic of the new data block layout is its use of labels. Responses indicated that 34% liked the labels; 7% disliked the labels; and 3% did not understand the labels. Respondents did not have to provide input on each of the items, resulting in responses that do not add up to 100%. Not surprisingly, some labels were more problematic than others. As with the 2014 survey, several of the concerned respondents indicated they expected the label “Description” to contain a summary of the book rather than elements such as publisher, place, date, catalogers’ notes, and other information considered “descriptive” in cataloging terms. Because the sample of the new data block did not include a summary, various comments mentioned summaries as missing and desired elements. Currently, LC catalogers include summaries for juvenile fiction titles only. Other comments objected to the label “Names”: “Names is an unhelpful label for the 1XXs and 7XXs, which are confusingly lumped together as if equals. The uniform title is also lumped in with ‘Names,’ which also becomes confusing.” The data block committee struggled to come up with labels that would be understood by both catalogers and non-catalogers. Similar comments had surfaced in the 2014 survey, but the committee felt they represented only minority opinions, which seemed to be the case in the 2017 survey as well. Nonetheless, the labels provoked some of the most critical comments and should be considered as an area for future improvement.

**Combined data block for print and e-book**

A significant innovation was combining information about both print and electronic versions of books available in both formats into one data block that would be displayed in both formats. Respondents to the 2014 survey did not foresee this combined data block as a problem. The combined data block was a very positive feature for school library respondents who answered the 2017 survey. In the lists of elements that respondents liked and did not like, 57% of school library respondents vs. 36% of respondents overall liked the combined data block. None of the school library respondents disliked the combined data block, while 22% of all other respondents disliked it. Twenty-six percent of public library respondents liked the combined data block, while 39% disliked it. One public librarian asked if the print information could be left out of the information for the electronic version, but only two respondents included the combination as an element they did not understand. Academic library respondents liked this change the least: only 18% liked the combined data block vs. 28% that disliked it. One possible reason might be that the RDA cataloging rules and Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) practice is to
create separate records for print and e-book versions. However, publisher and vendor respondents were quite positive about the combined data block, with 61% liking it and only 6% disliking it. One likely reason is that they would not have to display different data blocks in publications that were basically the same.

**Addition of place, publisher, and date**

Although the addition of this information seemed a possible risk to the data block committee because it can change before the book is published, its addition seems to have been well accepted. While 80 (53%) of the 151 respondents indicated this on a list of elements they liked, only three noted that they disliked this addition. Only one respondent expressed a concern: “The place and date of publication often change with publication.”

**Additional subject terms and classifications**

The new data block also included a variety of additional subject headings and classifications such as BISAC headings, SUDOC numbers, and genre terms. Overall, 60% liked the additional headings while only 1% disliked them. Among school librarians, 89% liked them and none disliked them. There were a few comments indicating that libraries do not use BISAC subject headings, and others were concerned that genre terms are being phased out. Somewhat surprisingly, only 45% of academic librarians indicated that they liked additional subject headings and classifications even though some specialized information, such as headings by the American Mathematical Society, National Library of Medicine, and others are included.

**What’s missing?**

One question asked if there were any data elements or features the respondent would like added to the data block. Several requested book summaries, and others asked for series information. Unfortunately, the sample data block presented in the survey did not include a series or a summary (provided only for juvenile fiction). Both kinds of information are still included. Some respondents requested Sears subject headings, data that was not possible to provide, as discussed above. Other respondents requested information about the book’s size, pagination, and illustrations—information deemed not stable enough or available enough to provide until after publication. It seemed as if not all survey respondents realized that CIP information is provided by the publisher before the book is published. This is an area that the CIP Program can focus on for future educational outreach, particularly to school librarians.
Survey outcome

All in all, the 2017 survey indicated that the new data block succeeded in its goals of being more user-friendly, providing a more current layout, and containing more information, especially for its primary user group, school libraries. In addition to providing the most positive answers to specific questions in the survey, school librarians also made some of the most positive free-text comments: “I like the organization and format. It is much easier to find information I need to catalog books for my high school library”; “It would be awesome if all publishers were using the new data block”; “Thank you for listening to the needs of school librarians who lack the resources of larger libraries.” Happily, the data block seems most successful for its primary users.

Problems encountered and lessons learned

The CIP Program encountered a few problems when trying to implement the new CIP data block. Most of the new additional fields for the CIP data block were completed in time for the rollout; however, the element “target audience” had to be slated for a future rollout. Both the ECIP Traffic Manager, the database that manages the flow of CIP applications, and On-the-MARC, in-house software that translates publisher data into the draft MARC record, need programming changes that have not yet been possible. Manual keying of this data by catalogers was not deemed practicable.

Once the new CIP data block was implemented, the CIP Program received requests for explicit formatting instructions from a few publishers in the Preassigned Control Number (PCN) Program, which assigns the LCCNs to forthcoming titles. PCN publishers often rely on vendor-created CIP data, also known as “P-CIP,” in lieu of official Library of Congress CIP data. In order for P-CIP data to appear “legitimate,” P-CIP providers mimic the formatting of the LC CIP block data as much as possible. For example, the CIP Program received this very specific request for CIP data block formatting instructions:

Could you send me the layout of one title? Since it has a writer, artist, colorist, and letterer, I’m not sure about the layout for the CIP to be printed in the book. Many of these types of Fiction books (741.5) just say Graphic novels for a subject heading. That seems to be inadequate. Do you have any suggestions for other subject headings?

The CIP Program also received questions about how to display bibliographic information for multi-parts, how to include a pseudonym, and how to treat a translation.

The 2015 CIP data block survey results showed that there was confusion about the relationship between the MARC record and the CIP data block for use in bibliographic data creation and enhancement. As a way to assist all users of the CIP data block on how to use it to create a MARC record, the CIP Program created color-coded mappings. These mappings showed a CIP data block and its associated MARC bibliographic record. A mapping from the CIP data block to a labeled view was also created to assist those users who work in a cataloging environment with a
labeled display. These mappings and detailed information about the new CIP data block now appear on the CIP website.

An ongoing issue with the CIP data block is limitations in the mailer program used by LC staff to send the CIP data block to publishers. The mailer uses plain text format and often displays diacritics in the data block as a blank space or an inverted question mark. The new CIP data block has not resolved this problem.

**Areas for future research**

Despite the time and energy that went into the 2014 assessment, revision, and 2017 assessment of the data block, exciting areas for future research remain. Some ideas that surfaced either through current and previous surveys, presentations at conferences, or through committee discussions include: providing CIP data as an image rather than as text; encoding CIP data or the LC permalink into a QR or other code as part of the data block; and providing a mobile device application that could upload a MARC record from the data block or LC catalog into the user’s integrated library system.

Since the CIP data block is based on RDA catalog records as represented in MARC 21, another important area for future research will be the effect of the changing bibliographic environment on LC catalog records and therefore on the data block. As of this writing (March 2017), RDA is being re-cast to accommodate the new IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM), while LC and others are exploring BIBFRAME and additional possible approaches for formatting bibliographic data as linked data. How will the CIP data block have to be modified to accommodate these likely future changes to LC catalog records?

Of particular interest to the CIP Program is providing publishers with an image of the data block to insert into the book. An image could solve some of the issues that surfaced in committee discussions about designing the new data block and in survey comments. For example, the technology now used to produce the data block and send it to publishers cannot accommodate different fonts or formatting that could distinguish labels from content, or add helpful spacing to make the block easier to read and interpret. Also, as already noted, currently, publishers can all too easily change the text block by centering lines, changing the information, or embellishing the block in artistic ways they deem more compatible with the design of the book. One 2014 survey respondent noted, “The typography by the publishers make[s] it all the more difficult.” An image would lock down the data block text and layout and also provide the ability to include CIP data encoded in a QR or other code, something the data block committee explored but was not able to develop for a variety of reasons, including the inability to provide an image.

The idea to include CIP data in encoded form in the data block surfaced in 1998 during a meeting of the CIP Advisory Group. The 1998 presentation was delivered by Symbol Technologies, developer of the PDF417 code, a symbology now used by organizations such as the USPS for encoding postage and by airlines on boarding passes. As noted above, 2014 discussions resurrected the idea of using QR codes.
Future research is needed to determine the optimum code, how to produce and send the code to publishers in the distributed production environment of the CIP program, and how the code should operate. One intriguing possibility that would provide a service to those libraries most interested in the MARC record would be an application available on mobile devices that could read the code and enter the bibliographic data straight into the library’s catalog.

Before further changes are made to the data block, it would be useful to explore the methods, tools, and training of those who create records for school libraries by transcribing all or parts of the CIP data block. Although the 2014 survey provided some data that indicated manual transcription is a common way that school librarians use CIP data, a clearer understanding of the specifics of this process would provide information that could better inform the difficult decisions that LC might make about any changes. Further into the future, the CIP Program would benefit from an investigation into how much longer it might be necessary to provide bibliographic data within the book itself (whether in print or online) as opposed to simply providing a national bibliography number or permalink by which cataloging data can be accessed in the national library catalog. National libraries such as in Germany and other countries have moved away from providing CIP data in the book in favor of providing the national bibliography number for 100% of their titles.

**How the research is helpful to other libraries**

The revisions, additions, and redesign incorporated in the new CIP data block expand traditional functionality to support the needs of a changing library world. With every new CIP block, catalogers can review a model of current cataloging practice either to transcribe directly, or to use as a learning tool. The act of reading, interpreting, and transcribing the information within the data block affirms the cataloger’s understanding of RDA. This authoritative cataloging record available in a resource provides a perfect example of transcription of bibliographic description and application of RDA elements, including relator terms. The new labels added to the CIP data block define the content clearly and support consistent interpretation of these elements.

Librarians have always used the CIP data block for classification recommendations. The addition of BISAC headings in the new CIP data block supports the activities of libraries using these headings to organize their collections. The addition of genre terms provides classifiers an authoritative recommendation for fiction collections. The opportunities for paraprofessional library workers to confidently classify materials have been expanded with the addition of these CIP data block elements.

With the addition of a LCCN Permalink in the new CIP data block, libraries with limited resources now have direct access to an individual bibliographic record from the Library of Congress. After activating the link, a user is taken to the LC
catalog, where they can view the record in the MARC format to further aid in transcription. Once in the LC catalog, a user can also download the MARC record for use in a local ILS.

The CIP data block continues to be the source of convenient, authoritative bibliographic data. Whether it is used to build better library catalogs or to simply know more about the book in hand, the new CIP data block supports a more robust and a more successful discovery experience.

**Conclusion**

How do you update an icon? Carefully and deliberately, retaining the essence but taking well-considered risks with the appearance. The CIP data block on the title page verso had provided catalogers with an almost-complete catalog record in the form of a catalog card for more than 40 years. For libraries that could not afford to join OCLC or other bibliographic utility, the CIP data block was an essential source of cataloging data, its card layout unchanged over the years—perhaps unchangeable?

In Fall 2015, after gathering a variety of input from stakeholders and a two-year effort from the CIP Data Block Committee, LC successfully changed the iconic look of the data block, replacing the card layout with a more easily interpreted labeled layout. RDA elements as well as subject terms from additional thesauri and classifications were added; print and e-book information was included in a single data block. The results of a 2017 assessment survey strongly indicated that the new CIP data block was very well received, especially by its primary user group, school libraries. The new layout was deemed more user-friendly and contained additional useful cataloging data. The survey also provided suggestions to consider for the future, such as including QR codes in the data block that would lead to the MARC record, and sending publishers an image file that would preclude their making layout and text changes. The survey also indicated that some additional training in using the new CIP data block would be valuable, such as LC hosting online webinars and sessions presented at conferences.

The CIP user surveys and positive reception of the new data block have affirmed the value of the LC CIP data block in newly published books and have demonstrated that librarians are quite willing to provide input into decisions that affect their daily work.
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24. CIP Data Block Committee Meeting Summary, September 23, 2013.

25. The survey was sent to the following electronic mailing lists: AASL Forum, ALCTS Central, ASCLA-L, CAG, Community College Listserv, FAFLRT, FEDLIB, ISSN Directors, LM_NET, MEDLIB-L, OCLC-CAT, PCC, and PUBLIB.

26. Regina Reynolds, Overview of CIP responses from 12 ISSN centers.


29. Shortly after the release of the new data block, webinars were hosted by ALCTS, AASL, and the Western New York Library Resources Council. A presentation on the data block was also given at the New England Library Association/New Hampshire Library Association meeting in October 2015. Additional training was considered, but was not followed through on as it seemed that users of the data block easily adapted to the new format.

Appendix A


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title proper</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel title</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other title information</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of responsibility</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition statement</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of responsibility relating to the edition</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication and/or distribution</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of publisher and/or distributor</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of publication and/or distributor</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical description</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title proper of series or subseries</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel title of series or subseries</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key title of the series or subseries</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Standard Serial Number of series or subseries</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbering within series or subseries</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation and dissertation notes</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary statement</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Standard Book Number</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of availability and/or price</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main entry (author or title)</td>
<td>Required if applicable [in effect, mandatory]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added entries</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government document number</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National bibliography number</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject headings</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject classification number</td>
<td>Required if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book number</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Table B1. New CIP data block: data element and layout changes, implemented October 1, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARC field</th>
<th>MARC field name</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Library of Congress Control Number</td>
<td>Include (print + electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>Include all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Library of Congress Classification Number</td>
<td>Include (print + electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>National Library of Medicine Classification Number</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>Dewey Decimal Classification Number</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>BISAC Codes</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>Primary Authorized Access Point (Main Entry)</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Preferred (Uniform) Title – Primary Access Point</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Preferred (Uniform) Title – Foreign Title</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Preferred (Uniform) Title – Commonly Known Title</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Preferred (Uniform) Title – Collective Title</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Title Statement</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Author Affiliations</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Edition Statement</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Publisher Name, Place and Publication Date</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Physical description (pages cm)</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Series Statement</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>General Note</td>
<td>Include, except when it only has “Includes Index”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Note</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Exclude unless the record is a multi-part set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Include for juvenile and young adult literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Audience Note</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Language Note</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6XX</td>
<td>Library of Congress Subject Headings</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6XX</td>
<td>Medical Subject Headings (MESH)</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650_7</td>
<td>American Mathematical Society subject headings</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650_7</td>
<td>BISAC Headings</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655_7</td>
<td>Genre/Form terms</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7XX</td>
<td>Relationship Designators</td>
<td>Include*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8XX</td>
<td>Authorized Access Point for Series</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Relationship Designators included within the CIP data block

Abridger
Author
Cartographer
Compiler
Editor
Enacting jurisdiction
Honoree
Illustrator
Issuing body
Photographer
Translator
Layout changes

Labels Used

Names
Title
Other titles
Description
Summary (included within Description)
Series (included within Description)
Identifiers
Subjects
Classification

Acronyms Used

Classifications

LCC    Library of Congress Classification
DDC    Dewey Decimal Classification
NLM    NLM Classification
SUDOC  Superintendent of Documents Classification

Subject Headings

LCSH   Library of Congress Subject Headings
AMS    American Mathematical Society Subject Headings
BISAC  BISAC Subject Headings
CYAC   Children’s and Young Adults’ Cataloging Subject Headings
GSAFD  SGenre/Form terms
MESH   Medical Subject Headings

Library of Congress Control Number
Add – links to record in LC Catalog
Permalink

Combined Layout
Use if title has both print and electronic