2021-03 VAOH Session

Presentation summary

PCC and OCLC

Cynthia Whitacre, Luanne Goodson, and Robert Bremer presented on the relationship between PCC and OCLC, the various PCC committees and the work that they do, and how to join.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC):

https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/

PCC Standing Committee on Applications:

https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sca/

Bibliographic Formats and Standards, Chapter 5, Enriching BIBCO Records:

https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#editpccrecords

Guidelines for Minimally Punctuated MARC Bibliographic Records (Training):

https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sct/documents/GuidelinesMinimallyPunctuatedMARC-SCT-2020-01.pptx

NACO Participants' Manual revision (Training):

https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/naco/documents/NACOParticipants'Manual-20200708.pdf

Member questions

March 9, 2021 session notes:

Closing records for serials that have ceased, for PCC CONSER records a need. Is there any movement for more serials to have ceased dates added?

Answer: Libraries do report that kind of thing to Metadata Quality and we will go ahead and closeout records. A lot of CONSER participants will spot these same kinds of needed changes in their own work. So, it really is a combination of both. We take the requests as they come, either a CONSER library will do it ahead of us, or we do it when it's reported.

Are PCC participants going to more regularly add $0 subfields?

Answer: There is currently a pilot going on about adding URIs in PCC records, both for NACO and BIBCO records. Once that pilot reaches its conclusions, they will publish their recommendations and open up entry of those subfields to the rest of the PCC. So, yes, you will start seeing more now, subfield $0 and subfield $1, in the appropriate places. Look for best practices to come.

Does CONSER still have a moratorium on new members? Is there any sense of when the moratorium might end?

Answer: The LC Secretariat said that they are willing to allow more members now. See the [PCC website](#) for information on how to apply.

Please confirm: MARC Organization Codes are used in 040 field for authority records and not our OCLC Symbol?

Answer: Yes, the MARC Organization Codes are used in the 040 for authority records.

For the PCC standing committees, who can participate, and how would one join if there is an opening?

Answer: There are membership slots that open up each year. Generally, it is the chair of the standing committees who recommends, or seeks out, new members. The PCC year starts in correspondence with the federal fiscal year, so the terms run from October through September. October 1st is when new members join. If you are interested in becoming a member of one of the standing committees, we would suggest getting in touch with one of the chairs of a standing committee and letting them know. Occasionally there are also calls for volunteers on the PCC List, and you are welcome to volunteer when there is a call.

Will you add the email link for sending cataloging questions to OCLC?

Answer: We have several different emails, depending on the purpose. Cataloging questions go to askqc@oclc.org. Requests to correct bibliographic records go to [bibchange@oclc.org.](mailto:bibchange@oclc.org) If you are not a NACO member, requests for correcting or creating NACO records can be sent to [authfile@oclc.org.](mailto:authfile@oclc.org)

What can we do about EZ proxy links to other university libraries in CONSER records? Example: We update our records in WorldShare, and some serials records has an EZ proxy link that goes to a different library and doesn't work for our users.

Answer: You can report those kinds of links to Metadata Quality and we will take them out. The intention is that the CONSER record would only contain general links to an online serial publication, and not institution specific links.

I often find mistakes in PCC records, why is this? And when reported to OCLC, why does hit take so long for them to be edited, and why don't they notify the reporting library when the edit has been made?

Answer: PCC catalogers make mistakes, just like everyone else. If you find mistakes in records, do feel free to report them. We suspect you may find mistakes in DLC records too, and those are also a part of PCC records. If you do find them and want us to correct them, we'll be glad to do that. It shouldn't be taking very long for them to be corrected. We usually turn around our requests to the BibChange inbox within several days to maybe a week. If you are not seeing that correction being made, perhaps we didn't receive your request, so you might send it again. Also due to the volume of requests we receive, we don't respond to each request. We want to take the time to address the request, and if we had to respond to every request that was sent in, you could see how that would cut into the time we can spend making correction. Don't forget that you can make many, many changes to PCC record, which are listed in [Bibliographic Formats and Standards chapter 5](#). There may

be changes you can make that you may not be aware of. If you would like for us to notify you because you are waiting on that record to be corrected before you can use it, please just add that to the email or the request and we'll try to do that.

At our library we have recently found out that although records have links to authority records, when users use a heading from a 4XX field, in their searches, Discovery seems not to be able to find records using the authority heading. Why is this?

Answer: In Discovery, if Search Expansion is configured, a user should be able to enter 4XX terms and have that term as well as any authorized headings returned as part of their search results. Institutions who want to use Search Expansion will need to enable this functionality in Service Configuration as well as selecting the authority files they want to be used. Should an institution need any help, they can contact their Customer Service area.

Search https://worldcat.org/config/apps and navigate to WorldCat Discovery and WorldCat Local>Search Settings>Search Expansion Settings.

According to OCLC Bib Formats field 264: Optionally, add a terminal period at the end of the field unless the last subfield ends with an ellipsis, exclamation point, hyphen, period (following an abbreviation or initial), question mark, closing bracket, or closing parenthesis. The BIBCO example has a period after the bracket. Which is correct?

Answer: Long standing practice for that kind of information, whether in field 264 or 260, would be not to include a period after a closing bracket at the end of the field.

Can you briefly explain what Sinopia is?

Answer: Sinopia is a cataloging interface where you can catalog resources using linked data. There is a website you can go to read about Sinopia and the efforts that are involved with the Sinopia cataloging interface.

My library's holdings are currently attached to an incorrect WorldCat record and there is no corresponding attached holdings for us in Connexion. Who do I contact to sort this out?

Answer: Send a message to bibchange@oclc.org so that we can take a look and investigate to see why your holdings may have been attached to this incorrect record. If there is a problem with matching, we can address that. If you have a Data sync project, we can get you in touch with the Database Specialist for that project to see how we might be able to improve the matching, if it's matching incorrectly.

Will it ever become possible to identify the meaning of the MARC Organization Codes in field 040 of authority records by hovering over them in the authority record (in Connexion), as we can do with OCLC holding symbols in bibliographic records? Can this feature be added to Connexion for authority records 040 fields?

Answer: Hovering over those MARC institution codes in an authority record in Connexion and seeing what library it refers to is on our wish list for a future enhancement. It would be a nice feature. However, it is not something that is feasible in the near term. Also, at this time, there are currently no plans to add a hover-over feature for the institution symbol in Record Manager, neither for bibliographic records nor for authority records.

I always get the usage of OCLC symbol vs MARC organization code confused. Is there a simple rule for usage?

Answer: Your OCLC symbol is used in bibliographic records, your MARC organization code is used in the 040 field of authority records. In the past, OCLC sometimes did carry MARC organization codes in the 040 in bibliographic records, but currently we convert those to OCLC symbols.

Catalogers sometimes come across notes in WorldCat records that pertain to a specific organization's holdings, but that do not specify the organization. For example, see the note "Autographed copy" in OCN 27758517 or 2867234. In such cases, may a cataloger report the note to OCLC QC through the "Send change request" so that the note is either related to the pertinent organization through a $5 or deleted from the WorldCat record? Is there another suggested course of action?

Answer: If you are unsure if a note should be removed from a record, you are always welcome to send those to bibchange@oclc.org and we will look into it. Or, you can use the error reporting function through Connexion or Record Manager. Our April session for Virtual AskQC Office Hours is going to be Local Data in WorldCat Records on Tuesday, April 13 at 9 AM Eastern and Thursday, April 22 at 4 PM Eastern.

What is the relationship between WorldCat and OCLC?

Answer: WorldCat, as we refer to it, is the bibliographic database that you search. OCLC is the organization to which all five of us report and to which many of you listening have institutions that belong to OCLC. We've tried to limit references to the bibliographic database to WorldCat, that is to refer to the bibliographic database as WorldCat. Although for decades, people have been colloquially referring to all of OCLC databases as OCLC. Our preference is to refer to the bibliographic database as WorldCat. Some people think of WorldCat as the Discovery database or the WorldCat.org database, which is openly discoverable or searchable on the web. So they refer to WorldCat as something different than what is used in cataloging, but the database is the same database no matter what interface or service it is used as part of.

I updated a UKM record yesterday, they use "colour" in the 300 subfield $b. Do I change it to "color"?

Answer: Leave it in tact as the spelling with the letter 'u'. We serve libraries in other countries outside of the U.S. that will spell "color" differently than we do in the United States. In our own work, we tend to leave the two spellings in tact as found on records. Unless you were adding that information and you were keying it in for the first time because it wasn't there, then I would use the spelling that you are familiar with. Otherwise, leave the spelling in tact, because it is not necessarily incorrect.

Is there a way, or can there be a way, to view previous versions of bibliographic records in Connexion? Would be very helpful to troubleshoot cases where a record doesn't quite match the item in hand, but has many holdings, and we want to find out if it's the correct record with a mistaken edit, or a new record is needed.

Answer: We have an internal database called Journal History where we can view previous versions of the bibliographic record. That is not something that we can, at this time, make available externally. If you have a question that you think can only be solved by viewing the history of the record, send that

query to either askqc@oclc.org or bibchange@oclc.org and we can help you with figuring out what's going on with a particular record.

Many of the PCC and BFAS guidelines are premised on libraries having a local system where they can edit the bibliographic record as needed. This can pose challenges for some libraries using WMS that no longer have a separate local system. Is there any chance that this will be considered for future updates to guidelines?

Answer: If WMS is your local system and there is something you want edited in a PCC record, please send it to bibchange@oclc.org. We will make the edit if it seems like that is the feasible thing to do, or discuss it with you further if there are questions.

I have come across a record for a digital resource linked in a 7XX to the record for the item I have in hand, but it's clear by following the link to the item that it's for a different (very close) resource. The e-resource record looks like it was derived from the physical record by OCLC, some kind of automated process. Should I report this to the Bibchange email or take some other action?

Answer: It turns out that our processing for Google resources and HathiTrust, occasionally an incorrect record is cloned to represent an item online. If you can tell that has happened, you can either report the record to bibchange@oclc.org and we can make adjustments to it to reflect what is there in that one link, as long as it looks like that record really just has that one link and is supposed to represent what is at that URL. If it has picked up additional links, then the record may be somewhat more confused (one of the links refers to one version of the resource, while the other links refer to a different version of the resource), that kind of thing should be reported to us in that case. Ordinarily, if it's just the one 856 field for a record that was derived, that has symbol OCLCE in the 040 field, you can make adjustments to that record yourself and also correct the link in that 776 field to point to the correct version of that same item in print.

March 18, 2021 session notes:

If a CONSER record has a 130, is the 130 "self-authorizing"? Would the CONSER record be the authorizing source for use of the 130 title in a subject access point on a PCC record?

Answer: For many years there had been a policy in the NACO file to not necessarily include every uniform/preferred title for works in field 130. Instead, it could just exist on the bibliographic record itself. That is why, when you look at the CONSER file, you'll see so many 130 fields that are there to differentiate similar titles, the same title, for two different publications. So, yes, the CONSER record itself would be the authoritative source for the 130 that you were going to use as a subject heading on another record.

Edits to PCC records to be done in a single transaction. Does that mean we should only use "replace record" once, and not make another edit/replace if you missed something?

Answer: Yes, essentially that is the case. Because of the limitations on editing PCC records - editing, adding, or otherwise changing a field in a PCC record, you may find that if you have made an error in a field, it cannot be edited or corrected because that field now already exists after the record has been replaced. So, it is much preferable to replace a PCC record in a single replace transaction.

Can individuals join PCC?

Answer: No, individuals may not join PCC, it must be institutions. If you are from a small library and only have one or two people that are interested in participating, your institution can still join PCC. There are lots of funnels within NACO that allow smaller institutions to join and not have to contribute large amounts of records.

I see a lot of foreign language DLC records with encoding level 7 and 'pcc' in field 042. I thought the record had to be full level to be coded PCC. Also, I occasionally still see level 4 PCC records and I thought level 4 was discontinued. What's up with these?

Answer: You may see older records that have encoding level 4 because when the PCC started, level 4 was the code that PCC libraries used for BIBCO records. That hasn't been true for quite a few years now, but older records do still have that code and you'll still see them within WorldCat. There are still some other libraries that use code 4. They may or may not be PCC records, but probably are not if they are using it currently. As for level 7, if the Library of Congress is using it, when they create new records they automatically add 'pcc' in the 042 field for almost all their cataloging. There is not a problem with encoding level 7, which is minimal level with PCC records, as long as that is what it is accurately representing in the record. Any PCC records with encoding level 'blank' ought to adhere to the BSR (BIBCO Standard Record) or CSR (CONSER Standard Record).

It seems that in the case of BIBCO records, a combination of encoding level 7 and 'pcc' 042 would be a little more unusual and would not pass our validation. Encoding level 7 in combination with 'pcc' might be something that you see more often in a CONSER serial record. The thinking is that 'pcc' indicates that the access points are under authority control, and encoding level 7 is indicating how complete the description is, and those are two different things. So, it is possible to have this combination in CONSER. Although typically, if somebody is doing full authority work so that they could add code 'pcc', they usually do a more complete description. So, the combination of encoding level 'blank' and 'pcc' would be far more common.

The combination of encoding level 7 and 'pcc' in BIBCO records fails validation because in monograph records we are not supposed to see that combination. But, as mentioned, it has been seen on some records. A search in the database revealed that for monographs, we have more than 9,000 maybe closer to 10,000 records that fall into that category. They look like they are just errors that have come from the Library of Congress. There isn't a situation where we have converted any encoding level M to be encoding level 7. So, they were received by us, presumably, as encoding level 7. That being the case, we should probably take the pcc code out of those, or at least look at them to determine whether the encoding level is an error and they really should be full.

We will investigate further to see what is in the Library of Congress' catalog versus what we have, in case something did change on our side along the way, determine what the issue is and take care of it.

Would it be helpful to report encoding level 7 records with pcc as an error to OCLC as we come across them?

Answer: No. We have identified this issue and will be doing something about them in the coming weeks.

If a CONSER record has no 130, is the 245 subfields $a, $n, and $p considered the authorized title for the serial for use in other CONSER and BIBCO records?

Answer: Yes, just like the case with field 130, if a CONSER record has no 130 because the title was not in conflict, then that information from field 245, the title proper in subfields $a, $n, and $p, would be considered authorized to use for an access point for that serial in another record.

I know I've sometimes replaced a record twice in quick succession, not because of being cavalier about it but because I realized I made a typo or other mistake, or noticed only after I'd replaced it the first time that there was another error to fix. Is that creating some kind of problem?

Answer: No, it is not creating a problem. It's best practice to do a replace once, but if you do notice an error or a typo that you need to fix after you replace a record the first time and need to replace the record a second time, that's fine.

The training materials on the PCC website for basic serials cataloging are from 2014. Have there not been updates since then?

Answer: There is some work currently going on to update portions of the CONSER cataloging manual. We are not sure when those revised sections will be available.

Can you provide a quick overview of what Sinopia is?

Answer: Sinopia is a cataloging interface where you can catalog linked data and recommend going to the Sinopia website for more information. Sinopia website: https://sinopia.io/. Standing Committee on Training, Sinopia Training: https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/Sinopia-Training/index.html.

There is still a moratorium on NACO membership, correct? If so, does anyone know when it might be lifted?

Answer: The moratorium has been lifted as of March 1, 2021. If you are interested in applying for PCC membership, you may do so.

Are you aware of official online or in-person training sessions for NACO being offered through PCC for new participants?

Answer: We suggest contacting the Secretariat at the Library of Congress. Because of the moratorium that was mentioned earlier, there were not any training sessions for the last year that were given in person or via online. It is possible that some could be planned for the future now that the moratorium has been lifted. There is a lot of training that has been recorded and is on the website: https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/naco-RDA/index.html.

I have recently encountered some non-English language bibs (i.e., 040 $b NOT eng) that display as though they are DLC or PCC-authenticated bibs within Connexion search results. Any news on these?

Answer: This is the issue related to the coding of the Source (Srce) element in the fixed field, where records are either coded with Srce 'blank' or coded with Srce 'c', and they display as if they are LC when they are not. That is something that we are working to resolve. It is an outstanding issue that

has been reported and is in our backlog to work on, but we are unsure when we will be able to get to it.

Does anyone know why the 546 field always seems to display before any of the other 500/5XX fields? Just wondering, as I always have to reformat to put everything in numerical order.

Answer (from participants in chat): That is the correct order of 5XX notes and should not be reformatted. Information about note order can be found in Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) at https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/5xx.html.