Presentation summary

Hayley Moreno and Cynthia Whitacre presented Best Practices for Enriching Worldcat Bibliographic Records.

- Hayley Moreno described in detail the difference between Editing, Enriching and Enhancing bibliographic records in WorldCat. She also provided an Overview of Levels of Cataloging
- Cynthia Whitacre talked about Enrichment. She explained adding fields that are not already present in existing records in WorldCat, which fields you can and cannot add and why.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

- AskQC: askqc@oclc.org
- Metadata Quality: bibchange@oclc.org
- Bibliographic Formats and Standards: http://oc.lc/bfas

Member questions (20200204)

Is adding a series access field considered a change to the earlier cataloger's local decision?

Answer: No, the cataloger may have decided not to add it or the vendor or publisher may not have had that information available at the time the record was created.

Could you please comment the best course of action for institution-specific URLs in Kanopy master records? Should they be deleted or something else?

Answer: Institution specific URL's should not be added to a master record. They should be entered in a local holdings record (LHR). We encourage removing these types URL's. When this problem is reported to Metadata Quality via bibchange, sometimes we are able to find a generic URL to replace it with, but not always.

Several of the enhance examples showed adding an additional 264 field for copyright date even though it was the same as the publication date. Is that something OCLC recormmends?

Answer: That is totally up to you, it is optional. LC practice is such that they do not do that if it is the same as the publication date. But you are free to add it. We have both, plenty of records that do and plenty of records that do not. They are both correct.

Looks like it's now okay to import diacritics to master records without having to overlay with Connexion diacritics, is this correct?

Answer: It sounds like this question has to deal with the case of the pre-composed letter diacritic versus decomposed where the letter and diacritic are entered separately. If picking up

stuff from a web source where you really don't know the nature of that character, it is probably pre-composed. Yes, that is no longer a problem as it was before the day of implementing all of Unicode. You can put them either into the Connexion client, Connexion browser and Record manager.

What is generally the turnaround time for issues submitted to bibchange?

Answer: Generally, we try to turnaround things in one week, but please note there are some requests that may take additional research, so the one week turnaround may not be possible.

If a record is in the database cataloged under AACR2, should you enrich the record to RDA or leave the master record as AACR2?

Answer: That is your choice. Both are acceptable. There is no requirement to do that.

Could you please clarify the difference between Replace and Update?

Answer: Update is when you are setting your holdings. Replace is the command that replaces the master record. The command Replace and update will do both.

Could you discuss making changes to AAPs when differentiating personal names previously on undifferentiated NARs?

Answer: If you want to differentiate names that were previously undifferentiated you are welcome to do so. To do this you could use as differentiation birth and or death dates, or something to describe the individual like a title or occupation. Unless you are creating a name authority record and work under PCC rules, you are not required to differentiate names. In addition, if you don't participate in NACO and you are aware of information that you could share with Metadata Quality to differentiate a name heading, you can send the information to authfile@oclc.org and share the information you have. We can probably create an authority record to represent that differentiated name.

Can anything be done on the automation end to stop people from converting a monograph record into a multi-volume record instead of creating a new multi-volume record?

Answer: That would be a great thing. We haven't come up with a way to do that. If you have ideas for us we would be happy to listen. You are correct it is not good practice to change a single volume into a multi-volume record. Also, you can always send these issues to bibchange@oclc.org. We would love to get any examples you have with seeing single volumes being changed into a multi-volume. We can look at the history of the record and change it back.

What is the policy on 336/337/338? Is that a valid reason to edit the record - and would that be an enhancement or enrichment?

Answer: To reemphasize what we went over in this presentation, enhancement is when you are changing the encoding level on the record from one to another. If you are adding 33x fields, that would be considered enrichment because you are adding fields to the record. If you do other changes to the record to make it fuller, then you would want to change the encoding

level, which would then be enhancement. In Metadata Quality when we run macros and add those 33x fields to the records, that's completely valid. It's okay that we have a hybridized database with elements such as those in AACR2 records. So yes, you could definitely add them if they are not present.

Occasionally when I try to replace a record after enhancing the contents note, the replace fails because of the presence of the last field, which says DAT; the error message says that the field is not valid (I forget its tag) What is that about?

Answer: To be honest, that is not ringing a bell to anyone in the room, so if you would please send an example of the record that introduced that error to you we could do further investigation, but that is not sounding familiar to anyone.

What is the best practices of recording $c in 520 field? When do we use $c and when don't we?

Answer: We are struggling to remember what the $c is. I think that is when you say where the source of the note is from. You would only use that when you are quoting that note or taking the note from another source rather than composing the note yourself. What is the best policy on that? It really is at your discretion whether you use that or not.

I sometimes see data in 490/830 series fields of master records that reflect local data such as "John Smith Alumni Collection". Should I only delete those locally?

Answer: I would say that maybe you should send those to bibchange@oclc.org so that we can do further investigation. If you have the item in hand and can see that it is not really a valid series statement, then it could be deleted from the master record.

What is the status of local subjects (6XX _4 or 6XX _7 $2 local) when adding subjects from standard vocabularies? Should the local subjects be preserved when they're identical to a standard subject heading on the record?

Answer: There is no reason you need to preserve a local subject heading that is an exact duplicate of a standard subject heading that is already in the record. Feel free to delete those.

When we create new NARs, what are your thoughts on how much/what kind of cleanup we do ourselves versus reporting BFM to OCLC and letting you all deal with it? Should BFM be reported to bibchange, authfile, or a different address?

Answer: If you have records in your local catalog that need to be updated then go ahead and do it because it is in your local system and you want them to be updated. If there are other records in Worldcat and you don't have these resources, go ahead and send them to Bibchange because we are dealing with bibliographic records. Also eventually Controlling should update these headings if they were previously controlled.

This is a follow up to the question about changing single volume records into set records. Sometimes a publisher decides to turn what was originally a single volume work into a set after the fact, i.e., the first piece gives no indication it is part of a set, but then another one comes out calling itself volume 2 and referring to the previous one as volume 1. In

that case shouldn't we change a record for a single volume into a set record, or should we create a new record for the thing as a set?

Answer: When the initial record is definitely cataloged as a single volume and doesn't indicate that there is an open date or open volume, create a new record for the multi-volume set. OCLC policy is that it is appropriate to have a record for a single volume in addition to a record for the entire set. So there could be a record for volume 1, volume 2, and a record for the multi-volume set.

Does OCLC pass BFM requests on to LC?

Answer: We report to LC anything that is in their catalog that needs to be corrected, but not normally bib file maintenance.

Going back to the BFM question: I've never reported BFM requests when an AAP in a 240 changes. Should we be doing this if we want them to get changed without our changing them manually?

Answer: Yes, since 240 fields are not subject to controlling, it would be great if you reported them. We would not know otherwise.

What's the policy of recording the price information of an item in 020 field?

Answer: Please don't. There is a place to do that in the MARC format but we routinely delete them because they are not generally valid over time.,They don't help to anybody to know the true price since prices change and data becomes out of date. Plus, there are currency issues. BFAS says to generally not enter terms of availability except for scores.

Is OCLC considering changing the types of encoding levels?

Answer: Yes. This is something we have been considering for quite awhile. Our long term goal is to eliminate the OCLC specific encoding levels which are the ones that are alphabetic characters and instead adopting the standard MARC encoding levels, these are the numeric codes. This is something we have been planning for quite awhile and we are still planning. We don't have a time frame yet. These encoding levels are embedded in so many systems within OCLC that it is taking a long to consider. We are taking time to considered every system and service that may be affected. When we are ready to implement that we will give lots of notice and information on what is going on.

What kind of information OCLC needs to be included in the BFM request?

Answer: It is up to you if you want to give us lots of information, but not necessary. We all tend to look at the authority file record to make sure we are changing the titles that should associated with that entity. We could always do follow up with you if we need more information. It is not necessary to supply all the record numbers because we do searching regardless, to be sure we are catching all headings that need to be changed.

Are encoding level values factors in doing bib file merges? Do changes to encoding level values prompt other kinds of automated attention?

Answer: Yes, when doing manual merges our automated DDR merging program does use encoding level as one of the factors. More important is the completeness of the record. As explained, Encoding level M could be very brief or very full and so a lot of factors get taken into consideration. Does that prompt other kinds of automated attention? Yes. When you are enhancing a record and replace the record, that makes it a candidate for DDR.

Member questions (20200213)

I was under the impression we couldn't edit 245 fields or other fields already in the record. Is this a difference between enhancement and enrichment?

Answer: Except for PCC records, you are welcome to edit the 245 field in records. Hopefully, if you are editing the 245, it is to add something that is missing. For example, if it cut off after the $b and you wanted to add $c, or if you are correcting a typo. Those would be the type of edits that would be appropriate to make to a 245 field. The difference between enhancement and enrichment is, when we are enhancing we are changing the encoding level to a higher level, such as 3 to a K, or a K to an I. Enrichment is adding additional fields to the record. Editing is actually something that was covered in the January AskQC office hours.

Is enhancing from M to K permitted? I read BFAS 5.2 as M only to full.

Answer: It is permitted even though it is not shown on the table. There could be times, as the examples that I showcased in the presentation, that you might not have all the initial information at the time and are changing the a few datapoints that you have. You are only going to change from a M to a K rather to an I because you haven't fully described the resource at that point. So yes, you can change encoding level from a M to a K.

I see that editing typos comes after replacing the record, does that mean you cannot edit typos in PCC records?

Answer: You are welcome to do what we call local edits when fixing typos in PCC records prior to adding your holdings to the record. Unless it is one of the fields that you are allowed to edit as shown in the chart in BFAS, you probably won't be able to correct the typos in the master record. That is when it would be very good if you would report those errors to bibchange and we will make the changes for you.

If one's library is PCC, but only one cataloger has been BIBCO trained, is it still OK for all to change a PCC record?

Answer: If you are enriching the PCC record by, e.g., adding a contents note that was not there, anybody with a full level authorization is permitted to do that. If you are doing other changes that aren't permitted for everybody, it should be done by the person who has the BIBCO or National level enhance authorization.

May I change wrong formatted diacritics in non-English records?

Answer: If you have the language expertise that would be fine. If you do not it would be preferable to send a request to bibchange.

Can you talk about OCLC's project to do non-Latin enhancement of records?

Answer: So far, the only language we are tackling is Russian. These are records that are cataloged in English where the language of the item is Russian but lack Cyrillic characters. This is a project that is cooperative between OCLC Research area, Metadata Quality area and UCLA, who was doing a similar project, so we joined forces. We have started the work. We are supplying Cyrillic fields for those records. We are enhancing the records with those non-Latin fields. If this work goes well, we may expand this to other languages or scripts. We need to get this work done and evaluate what was done before we make any choices to move on.

How long will the Russian project take?

Answer: We just started the replacements to the records this month. We think we may be done as early as next month.

How can we tell if the Cyrillic was added by this automated project?

Answer: We are adding a specific note field to say that we have done this. I don't remember exactly what that note is.

It may be a 588 field, an administrative kind of note, that catalogers would be interested in, that will say that it was part of this project. That way if a cataloger was reviewing it in the future with the item in hand, they could review the Cyrillic that was supplied and decide if it looked okay or correct it. Then at that point, get rid of the administrative note. It was meant to be an alert to other catalogers that there may be a problem with the Cyrillic that was supplied. It was all dependent on what the transliteration looked like.

What will be in 040

Answer: I think it will be OCLCQ but I am not positive.

When I request an edit to a PCC record, what is the typical turnaround time before I'd see that change?

Answer: Usually we can process requests within one week.

I have seen adult level materials with juvenile subject headings (6XX _1). Should we delete those headings in the master record?

Answer: That is appropriate, if the juvenile subject headings are not correct for the resource.

Why it is taking so long to merge records? I've seen records that are the same for the same manifestation, and they haven't been merged!

Answer: We have different ways of merging records, one is DDR, our duplicate detections software. Jay Weitz has given presentations on that. We error on the side caution with that, because we don't want to inappropriately merge records. Manual merges are very labor intensive. If they are not reported to us we don't know they are there. We do come across many in our daily workflow. We also have a large backlog. We are doing different initiatives with the Member Merge Project to help with this big duplicate problem. Thankfully many libraries are helping with the issue we are having with duplicates. Please keep reporting duplicates and we will get to them as soon as we can.

We have two distinctly different backlogs in terms of reports, one is the Bibchange for changes to records, the other is duplicates. We try very hard to keep the backlog to a minimum for changes to

records, that is a turnaround time of a week or less. The duplicates take a lot longer. Sometimes we can do them fast, but it depends on the other work that is going on, or what other things have been reported. We do have a large backlog of duplicates. Some formats are caught up but books we have at least a years worth.

I understand the natural fear of merging the wrong records. Is there is a documentation on what fields the merges are based on?

Answer: We have internal documentation that we have shared with our Member Merge library partners. It talks specifically about what fields to compare. It is very similar to the documentation that is in BFAS Chapter 4, *When to input a new record*. So, if you look at that, you will see what we pretty much use as the same criteria.

A previous webinar said an OCLC member could apply to merge records, is that still possible? Would love to do that for all those level M's.

Answer: We would love for you to do that as well! You have to be a member of PCC in order to participate in the Member Merge Program. We will be starting a new round of institutions for training in August or this fall sometime. If you are interested send a message to AskQC@oclc.org to express your interest.

Can we change the 050 field call number when it is doesn't represent the work well, maybe only partially? I see records with two 050 fields.

Answer: On non-PCC records, anyone can add a 050 second indicator 4 which indicates the call number is locally assigned. It is not a good idea to change 050 with second indicator 0 on the LC contributed records, but any with second indicator 4 are fair game. If you do see an error on a PCC record and it is 050 with second indicator 0 from LC, you can report those to bibchange@oclc.org. We can look in to it, make the change and then follow up with LC.

Is there any financial credit for either enhancement, or enrichment?

Answer: No. There used to be but OCLC eliminated charges and credits years ago.

In the example of the audiobook being enhanced from K to I that had the 347 audio file and CD audio in the same field. I thought terms in the 34X field were supposed to be recorded in separate fields, especially if they come from separate lists, i.e. audio file is from the file type list and CD audio is encoding format.

Answer: Yes, that is correct they should be in separate 33x fields if they are from separate vocabularies.

To whom I send an email to check for a merged suggested last year and it hasn't happened?

Answer: You can resend that to bibchange and we will look into it.

If we think a record has been merged incorrectly can you tell, and how long after a merge before an 'unmerge' can happen?

Answer: It depends how far back it was merged. We may be able to see what a record looked like before it was merged as far back as 2012, anything before that we cannot. If we can't see its history in our system we may be lucky enough to be able see it another library's catalog. They may have a

copy of the original record. Any record that you think was merged incorrectly please send to bibchange. If we notice a pattern of things not being merged correctly, we can pass it on to the folks that work with the DDR software and can fix it. We merge a lot, so please do report problems.

Any development regarding the compound characters with their decompound form in OCLC like the dot below with certain languages?

Answer: This is an issue that has come up for us over and over. Particularly the way that these characters in their pre-composed form can be a problem for some catalogers only because some of our tools are a little bit older and are not completely Unicode compliant. Several years ago we implemented all of Unicode and suddenly you had the possibility of representing a letter with a diacritic in two different ways. That's the issue that plagues us at this point. We started a discussion of how we could deal with these in the longer term. We are going to move forward in taking that issue to our developers and see what kind of solution they can possibly suggest.

Why doesn't BFAS 2.4 link to the RDA and AACR2 full level standards?

Answer: RDA is subscription based. So unless you are a subscriber a link would not work. The online version of AACR2 is part of LC's *Catalogers Desktop* which is also subscription based. We don't because not everyone has access.

When we add additional LC subject headings to a record, how long does it take to have the FAST headings generated? If a cataloger adds the FAST headings, will the same FAST headings be generated by the system?

Answer: It is normally within a few weeks. I think there is a monthly cycle generating records that are new that do not already have FAST headings on them. It depends when a record comes in, whether it was entered manually or by batchload, so possibly 4 to 6 weeks.

When we see new materials cataloged in AACR2 is it always correct to replace it with RDA standards?

Answer: You are welcome to do that, but there is no requirement.

If we derive a new record from one with fast headings, should we remove the fast headings in the new record and let them be generated again?

Answer: If the headings are applicable, e.g. you clone the record for the second edition to add the third edition for the very same title, and you are going to leave the same Library of Congress subject headings, then the same FAST headings are going to be generated. You can leave the fast headings there in that case. If you are going to change the Library of Congress subjects, then you should delete the FAST headings and let them be regenerated.

Is it wrong to derive from existing records instead of starting with a workform? I tend to find something close and derive to save typing.

Answer: It is an easy way to do that you but you need to be careful that you did not miss something. It depends on the cataloger, some like to start with a fresh copy also.