2018-03-28 Virtual AskQC Office Hours

Topic presentation

Processing Change Requests, presented by Charlene Morrison and Shanna Griffith

Charlene Morrison (Database Specialist II) and Shanna Griffith (Database Specialist II) presented on the topic: *Processing change requests: how WorldCat Metadata Quality staff sort, analyze, handle error reports, and how they are categorized*. This topic was chosen from suggestions made by an attendee from February's presentation. We hope by sharing how WorldCat Metadata Quality staff process change requests, members will understand and appreciate the volume of requests processed and the care we take in processing each request.

Bibliographic change requests are routed to the BCR Inbox (bibchange@oclc.org) and are processed by WorldCat Metadata Quality staff daily. Duplicates are filed for evaluation and processing by format specialists, and change requests are processed on a first in, first out basis. The same process is followed for authority change requests sent to the Authfile Inbox (authfile@oclc.org). Staff do not have items in hand, and resolution time frames may vary based on the complexity of the request. OCLC cannot merge authority records and will forward them to the Library of Congress for member libraries who are not NACO participants. There are multiple ways change requests can be submitted, these are documented in Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) Chapter 5 (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html).

We currently average 2,500 merge requests each month and have a backlog of approximately 24,000 merge requests. Two-thirds are for book duplicates, followed by sound recordings, continuing resources, and scores.

Member questions
Processing Change Requests

If the change we are requesting is to reconcile a descriptive field with fixed fields - for example if fixed fields indicate illustrations and maps but the 300 field lacks this information, or vice versa - do we have to provide proof?

Answer: No, you do not need to provide proof for that. Whether or not to record illustrations can be considered cataloger's judgment. If the Fixed Field is coded for illustrations, we can add it to the 300 as needed.

Why wouldn't libraries just update things like the 300 fields themselves?

Answer: Sometimes this doesn't fit into their workflow, it may be easier for them to just report it. Or, it could be that the record is a PCC record and they are not able to make changes to a PCC record and therefore they need to report it.

If I have a number of merge requests for maps, is it better to submit a batch of them to you, or just submit them as I find them?

Answer: It is your preference based on what fits best in your workflow. You can send multiple requests periodically or individually as you come across them.

When reporting a duplicate in Record Manager, besides the record numbers it asks the user to provide a "description" (required field). What sort of information is wanted in this box? For us, we're not a PCC library

Answer: You can use this area to describe what the error might be if you wanted to elaborate on some details. Or, just writing the word duplicate would let us know what you are requesting.

Adding to that... why isn't there an "undo" button in Connexion?

Answer: We wish we had an answer to that, we would love to have an undo button as well.

For older items, dealing with the print version records, can "proof" be supplied by scans from HathiTrust, Internet Archive, or Google Books?

Answer: Yes. A lot of times we use Amazon, Google Books, HathiTrust, etc. as proof when processing change requests.

In the past, I have submitted change requests to bibchange@oclc.org via regular e-mail vs. Report Error in Connexion. Does one take priority over the other as far as "place in line"?

Answer: No, requests are processed first in, first out.

My correction of records in OCLC is sometimes blocked by anomalous coding in 007 fields, usually the wrong codes for space/blank. Could OCLC provide a way to delete the problem 007 coding (not the whole 007)?

Answer: We would need to see an example of that. You can always save these to your online save file and then send an email or report a change request. We can then go into your online save file and see the record and issue you are reporting.

Processing Authority Requests

Yesterday I made a change to an authority record and realized after I'd replaced it that I shouldn't have changed the record at all. Is it possible to intercept a record and revert it to the original form before it goes off for distribution?

Answer: No. Once the change is made, a NACO lock is placed on the record until it completes the distribution process. We would encourage institutions in this situation to wait until the record has completed the distribution cycle and make any corrections themselves. Optionally they could report this to us, but we cannot stop the distribution or make any changes to the record until the process completes either. One of the features being built for authorities in Record Manager, which will be released in the fall, will be the ability to make changes to an edited authority record before it is locked for distribution to LC.

If I am updating/creating a NACO record can I provide a search for OCLC records which will need to have headings changed? I recently created a NAR for a Pre-1955 entity. All publications using the heading prior to 1950 need to link to the new record.

Answer: Yes, you can report bib file maintenance to the Authfile inbox (authfile@oclc.org) and we'd be happy to run those through a macro.

Local Practice Questions

I've been noticing a significant number additions or changes to records that have to do with local practice and this is a change from what I've seen before. Is OCLC aware of this and what are you doing to address this?

Answer: An example was requested. Due to the amount of records in WorldCat, we may or may not have seen the issue before. When reported we will look at more than just that one record and we will look for patterns or any other changes, especially if they all came from one institution. We will look at their other records to see if we shouldn't be cleaning more up than just what was reported. So, we would ask if your workflow allows it, please report those.

Example of local practice: Book with 100/240 fields as well as 700 field with the same info.

Answer: Yes, we are aware of this, this was brought up via OCLC-CAT as well, so we are in the process of looking into that.

Continuing on with the "local practice" info in the master record, is it permitted for users to remove 856 fields that are based on a proxy linked URL?

Answer: We routinely will try to revise proxy URLs to a usable URL structure. We have a macro that can change these. If they are able users could also make this change, or report them so we can see if the change could be made to other such records.

General questions

Bracketed 250 in videos are appearing to create duplicates with language information which belongs in the 246 field. Lady Bird motion picture #1020547485 language English; Spanish subtitles; English sdh. 2 dups have a 250 [English dialogue only version/Spanish subtitled version] and 2 dups have [english dialogue only version].

Answer: Please report them and we'll take a look at them. We will merge as appropriate.

The Playayway bib records have two 007 fields – one for sound recording and one for electronic device; however, there is no consistency in the order these two fields are entered in the bib records. As a result in our discovery layer their format shows as sound recordings or as electronic resources, depending on which 007 field appears first in a given record. Are there any 'rules' about the order these fields should be entered in the bib records and is standardizing of these bib records something that can be done at OCLC level?

Answer: Standardizing the order of 007 fields is probably not a good idea. Sometimes the 007 relates to the main part of the resource and other times a 007 may relate to accompanying material. There is no way to programmatically determine which is which. There are certainly other built in problems regarding the 007 as far as MARC 21 is concerned and distinguishing between the main item and accompanying material is one of those things. There is no way to distinguish 007s in that respect. It probably wouldn't be possible or necessarily a good idea to standardize the order of 007 fields. It sounds like it is something you need to address in your discovery system, it should be determining the material type of your resource by some other means than by looking at the first 007.

OCLC used to provide training for basic and advanced cataloging for all formats. That's how I learned much of what I know about cataloging. The training I now see available seems to be focused on using WMS. Is OCLC no longer providing cataloging training that is not specific to WMS? Other training options I find tend to charge which limits access.

Answer: We do provide training for Connexion and Record Manager covering the interface functionality. We don't provide training on how to use RDA or how to use MARC. If you would like to email askqc@oclc.org we can put you in touch with our training team.

There are scores of records with the 100 New York Times, if one record is reported will staff fix all occurrences of such a mistake?

Answer: Yes, we do. As mentioned earlier, if you come across an error and send it to bibchange@oclc.org or authfile@oclc.org we will look to see if there are other records affected. Also, it's helpful if you notice a pattern to include that information in your request.

Is there a script or could a script be created that crawls the authority file and updates the name in name/title authority records to match the 1xx form of name? I frequently notice that someone has changed the personal name but hasn't bothered to update the rest of the file.

Answer: This is something which might need to be reported to LC or a NACO funnel. NACO institutions are supposed to update related name/title records when changing the 1xx form of the name. There may be lots of complications within this question because there will be situations where we have headings that were never controlled to the authority record but they don't match the form in the 1xx on the authority record nor do they match any of the 4xx references that are on the authority record. They are just a little bit different, so they will not get globally controlled on their own and will just sit out there in a different form than the established heading in the authority record unless it's called to our attention. We would do a manual and perhaps with the assistance with macros, the follow up to clean up the headings. In other cases, we may have situations where the authority record had changed and headings that were controlled didn't get completely changed. We need to be alerted to that situation so that we can do the follow-up and make sure that everything is in step with the authority file.

Update: Since the WorldCat authority file is a copy of the Library of Congress authority file, we would not run a script to crawl through and make changes. For non-NACO institutions, if you do see a situation where a name authority record (NAR) was updated but the corresponding name/title NARs were not updated, you may report these to authfile@oclc.org and staff will investigate further. For NACO institutions, please contact your NACO funnel or NACO directly for all NACO related issues.

Are there any restrictions on editing bib records in WorldCat with Encoding Level M (batch loaded)? It seems like I am not authorized to enhance those sometimes. I've been told those are "machine-loaded" and that is why they can't be edited. Is that correct?

Answer: No, you should be able to upgrade encoding level M records. You may run into an issue if another library has locked that record for editing, but otherwise, you should be able to edit these records depending on your authorization level. If you had a Search authorization you would not be able to make the edits, but with Full-level authorization or higher, you should be able to edit these records. If you came across a situation where you were not able to edit the record, send your request to bibchange@oclc.org and we will make the edits for you. This would also be a good opportunity to put the record in your online save file so we could take a look at it and see if there are reasons why that record is not editable for you.

My boss reported that she could not control access fields which contain a $0. What do you recommend in those cases - delete the $0 and control, or leave uncontrolled?

Answer: Subfield $0 by itself should not have an impact on your ability to control a heading. What I suspect in this case is that it's not the kind of record, in other words, it's not necessarily cataloged in English, and you're trying control a name to the LC/NACO authority file, in which case you wouldn't be able to do that. Typically, subfield $0s exist in records that are from outside the US, so it's not uncommon to see a record that is cataloged in German that has subfield $0s on every access point, or records that are created with language of cataloging Dutch that have subfield $0s. But typically for a record that's created in English you don't normally see a subfield $0. Even if the subfield $0 is there you should be able to control it, but the subfield $0 will disappear when you do that if you are successful in controlling. Another possibility with that though is if you are trying to control MeSH or some of the other subject vocabularies which you cannot control in Connexion. You can control them through Record Manager, and if you were in Record Manager you would see the typical blue link that you see with LCSH. Those controlled headings, like the medical subject headings, controlled in Record Manager will display a subfield $0 in there. You may also see a subfield $0 for FAST and those actually aren't controlled in Record Manager or in Connexion, but the subfield $0 is part of our processing when we enter that into the record.

So, if she encounters the issue with not being able to control with a $0 and it IS an English language record, should she report it?

Answer: Yes, that sort of thing should be reported so we can investigate and see what's going on. It may be that there is a disconnect between the text and the authority record that you're attempting to control to, so it's not finding it. It could be any number of issues. If it looks like it should fit into the category that should routinely control, by sending it to us as an example we can investigate and get back to you.

On records for Chinese materials, we have noticed that we frequently see redundant 600 14 paired fields. For example: OCLC no. 11114810. This is on the record:

600 14 [Chinese vernacular]

600 10 Romanization.

600 14 [Chinese vernacular]

600 14 Romanization.

Answer: If you come across something like this, report it and we'll look into it to see if there's a bigger issue at hand with other records. Also, if you were to notice a bigger issue or pattern, do let us know.

Are new OCLC 10-digit numbers replacing older numbers? The great war video #1023729399, record entered 20051201; replaced 20180307. The was a tape loaded record. Another record for this title has same scenario.

Answer: What you are probably seeing is this record probably came in through our data sync project and the date you actually seeing was probably the date from the local catalog of the institution that sent that record, so sometimes you'll see those entered dates don't make sense, but that's where they are originating from.

I'm extremely new at cataloging. I'm looking at a book entitled Ghosts of Greenglass House by Kate Milford; and in the fixed field after Ctry the letters mau appear. I was unable to determine why mau was typed for country? Also, what does the space stand for when typing a LCCN in the search dialog box?

Answer: mau is the code for Massachusetts. So if the city listed in the 260 or 264 subfield $a was a place in Massachusetts that was the reasoning for the country being coded mau for Massachusetts.

Chat comment: check out https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/ctry.html and scroll down to Codes. This explains how to code this field for items published in the U.S.

Chat comment: The LCCN structure is controlled by LC https://www.loc.gov/marc/lccn_structure.html - OCLC's search system takes that into consideration, so the space is part of the LCCN structure.

Are there any plans to be able to control Art & Architecture Thesaurus terms?

Answer: There aren't any plans to do that right now, we are working on creating a more robust authorities' infrastructure that will allow adding new authority files in the future much, much easier. Jody DeRitter, Director of Metadata Frameworks, she was hired last August to look into that and she's also working on moving FAST into production as well as moving VIAF out of Research and into production. So, there are no current plans for AAT at the moment, but stay tuned as all of the authorities' infrastructure beefs up.

I have found many 007 fields for DVDs with byte 4 displaying a "g" (laserdisc) instead of a "v" (DVD). I doubt in some cases the "g" is correct, but don't want to assume anything. Our ILS will display the laserdisc icon in our OPAC if that byte is a 'g'. It will display the DVD icon in our OPAC if it is a "v". I do not change the master record, but I do use the record for our local database and make the change to a "v" in the 007 field.

Answer: A little bit of history, the value v for DVDs was a later addition to the MARC format. After DVDs began being published it took months, or possibly even years before code v for DVDs was defined in MARC 21 and then validated. So, there are probably records that are incorrectly coded in the 007. If you have evidence in the record that it's a DVD and not an earlier laserdisc technology you should, and it's perfectly proper, to change it yourself and replace the master record. Otherwise, you can report it to us and we'll take care of it.

I've never quite understood the rationale for locking records. This keeps other libraries from editing and replacing the record and therefore having to update in their local ILS which is more difficult in a lot of cases. Is this function really necessary?

Answer: Yes, we do allow libraries to lock records if they are upgrading the records, also if they are doing the NACO work necessary for upgrading the records. Locking a record may also be used for staff training.

#879468616 is an example of several records in the database with 505s that have summary information duplicating the 520s. Many of them came from changes contributed by New Zealand libraries in the middle of last year which I reported to bibchange at the time. For the specified record, OCLCQ appears twice in the 040 after NZHSD so I'm wondering...does QC look over the whole record when making changes?

Answer: Yes, it but depends. The first OCLCQ could have been because it was in a group of records the macro ran on, and the second OCLCQ could have been to remove the incorrect field, but then a batch or ingest process has reintroduced the error back into the record. There is a variety of reasons a library would send us updates to a

record, so if we take it out once, it's possible that if the library resends us the record it will show up again. But you can report those, we do try to work with the specific institution to try and minimize errors that keep coming back. We do ask that you report these, so we do know it's happening.

Any progress on where duplicate 264 _4 fields with a bad Unicode character of some type (like question mark in diamond), alongside one with the proper copyright symbol, are coming from, or a fix?

Answer: We are continually trying to clean those records up as they are coming in. That is a known issue that is being looked at but no specific data on a fix for that, so we are just trying to stay on top of it until we do get a fix in. We recognize that is very frustrating to a cataloger, you are more than welcome to take them out as well, but it is a known issue we are working on.

I'm noticing a "bl" in the 010 field that sometimes proceeds the LCCN, but other times the number is NOT the LCCN. What does the "bl" represent? British Library? And why is the "bl" present in front of an actually LCCN?

Answer: That is another thing we continually clean up, those are coming in through batch load. We don't know what the bl stands for, but we are aware of that and we do try to stay on top of that and clean those up as they come in.

Who can establish the heading Indigenous peoples -- France --Colonies in OCLC for us to use? Who establishes headings needed to enable subject strings to control properly? Indigenous peoples--Great Britain--Colonies is a valid heading but when I try to control Indigenous peoples--France—Colonies it flips to Indigenous peoples--Colonies—France

Answer: This particular combination of place with colonies is an issue within the heading control software for subjects. There is a portion of that process that looks at subdivisions and whether they can be geographically subdivided and then moves the geographics to that spot. In the case of these headings with colonies where you can further subdivide by a continent like Africa or Asia, we have two geographics that are actually separated by a topical subdivision and the software doesn't get them into the correct order. We've known about this for awhile and have a ticket in place with our developers to try and get that fixed, but that has not happened yet. So, we've generally just have looked the other way on these, looking forward to the time period when once it's adjusted we'll be able to go back through and actually control them correctly. Otherwise, you ought to be able to add such a heading to a record, leave it uncontrolled and make use of it that way.

But if you leave a heading like this uncontrolled won't OCLC automated processes come through and (incorrectly) control it later on?

Answer: Absolutely, which is why we don't bother to correct them because they will be flipped back to the incorrect form. So, we're still really waiting on the software to be fixed before we go through and globally fix these.

Today I learned that I can ask OCLC QC Staff to look at records in our institution-specific online save file. In what types of situations would that be appropriate?

Answer: That would be appropriate when we are asked by that institution to look at a particular record. We don't go into institution specific online save files on a regular basis, we don't do that unless we are asked to. It's a tool that we have to help institutions and we use it for that purpose. An institution may have made changes to a record and they want us to look it over, they have a question about it, a specific situation with a record, we can help them

with that. We've also run into issues where someone has tried to replace the master record and are unable to do so, but they are able to save it to their online save file, and then we can go in and try to recreate the problem with that actual record with the edits that they made.