

ALA Annual 2011 New Orleans
OCLC Enhance Sharing Session
Friday, June 24, 2011

Jay Weitz opened the session with a few housekeeping details and introductions. He reviewed key points from the News from OCLC handout. The key highlight is the new version of the Connexion Client, version 2.3, which was released in April. Users will be required to upgrade from any earlier version on Nov. 1, 2011. As in the past, users will get notices reminding them to upgrade starting a few weeks before when they log on to the Client. Connexion Client 2.30 supports 32-bit and 64-bit versions, and works with Windows XP, Vista, and 7. It does not work with Windows 2000. It requires .Net framework 4 extended.

Enhancements to the Client in this version include integrated links to RDA ToolKit, the display of 029 field has been moved to the end of the record, the language of cataloging (ll) limit has been separated out into its own box in the search dialog box. Additionally, the language of cataloging can be displayed in local save file search results, the number of batch searches that can be performed in one moment has increased from 100 to 150 and users can now export filled in workforms without having to add the completed record to WorldCat. There's also new export/import support for MARCXML. The Client upgrade also includes many changes from the OCLC MARC Update 2011, improvements to macros, authority control changes and improvements to Connexion digital import to attach digital content. The enhancements are detailed in Technical Bulletin 259.

Jay then outlined the OCLC MARC Update 2011 plans. The current schedule is to implement the Update in August 2011. After the release of the Update, a pop-up dialog box will appear asking users to download new files only once. The main item of note in the Update is the computer file fixed field FORM(008 pos 23 and 006 pos 06) is added to allow for differentiation between online and tangible electronic resources.

The next big news item is the planned expansion of bibliographic updating permissions for NACO authorized institutions. This change is being made in cooperation with the PCC and LC to allow NACO participants to update PCC records. This news announcement was followed by several questions. Things still to be determined include which authorization should NACO Enhance participants use, and if it will be institutional or dependent on individual authorization rights. Jay reminded the audience that there are certain instances where you can update a PCC record now such as controlling headings, minimal level upgrade capabilities, and actions that fall under database enrichment activities.

The discussion then moved into the announcement regarding the implementation of RDA no earlier than Jan. 2013. OCLC will release a statement declaring their intentions and is beginning the process to determine how to best proceed with the full integration of RDA into WorldCat. The current policy statement in effect since publication of RDA in June 2010 remains

in effect until further notice; it has been updated slightly to reflect end of test period and the decision. OCLC requests that libraries continue to abide by current RDA policy statement which includes creating no duplicate records, and do not edit master records to change from RDA to AACR2 or vice versa unless permitted under policies as currently set forth.

Additionally, OCLC will issue a discussion paper regarding working with records containing mixed practices, and work to determine best practices for cooperative cataloging. OCLC staff will be participating on the three PCC RDA-focused task forces, which will help to inform the decisions and discussions at OCLC. The discussion paper will be announced on OCLC-Cat when it is available. The timeline is to hopefully have it completed by the end of the summer.

Jay then addressed questions that had been submitted prior to the Session. The first question was from Paige Andrew regarding the retrospective conversion of old headings from LCSH form/genre to LCGFT headings. What is the plan to convert/flip headings in bib records? Paige is specifically interested in the plan for converting maps headings. Jay asked Robert Bremer about conversion/flip. Robert replied that a quality control macro will change various obsolete forms of \$v when appropriate and construct 655 genre heading with \$2 LCGFT if not already present. They have not made changes for non-cartographic materials at this point. He asked that users email suggestions for conversions to askqc@oclc.org. It was also pointed out that the flip is not that complicated and that the University of Minnesota has successfully flipped using the available conversion tables and MarcEdit.

Robert then asked his own question for the group attending the Session. Are LC Genre terms and LCGFT headings the same or different? Should they convert LC Genre to LCGFT? Or can they both remain? During discussion the attendees decided that they are both same and different. Additionally, since not all genre lists are complete, heading flips will have to occur over a long period of time. Most likely OCLC will only flip those headings that have a genre authority record. The main downside to leaving the records as they are and not flipping the headings is that everyone has to flip locally. Of course, what each institution does locally is up to them and this decision is really about master records.

The discussion continued with several questions from the attendees. Master records should be linked (via controlling headings function) to the appropriate authority records for maintenance purposes, but what about form/genre headings that come from other thesauri? Are genre/form headings distributed via OCLC's bibnotification service? Neither Robert nor Jay are certain, but they both believe would be treated same as other subject authority changes in bib record. Concern was expressed about the impact on vendors that use OCLC records and if they will provide updates to their subscribers. Previous changes, such as updates to ISSN and ISBNs have resulted in problems for some vendors. Robert believes the volume for genre headings changes would be lower than ISBN/ISSN and would be more of a trickle, thus preventing issues for vendors.

Jay then opened the floor to additional questions. Questions about credits and encoding level revisions were answered with unknowns. Additionally, when reviewing encoding level standards, there is a question about the usefulness of revision knowing that there is a timeline to move beyond MARC. The final question was about the expert community experiment. There are no new statistics on types of upgrades, but the project is no longer an experiment and is still going strong. Links to the Enhance program and Expert Community can be found here: <http://www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/quality/default.htm> . There is also a PDF available detailing the various authorization levels here: <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/catalogingauthorizationlevels.pdf> .