

Minutes
of the
OCLC Enhance Sharing Session
with Jay Weitz
Friday, June 27, 2014
10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
Las Vegas Convention Center

“News From OCLC” and the official *What’s New at OCLC* were both distributed. The floor was opened for questions.

1. Macro for creating enhanced contents notes now available

The first was a comment from Becky Culbertson from UCSD. Jay explained that UCSD was one of the four participants in the pilot project to allow Enhance members to merge duplicate records in WorldCat. The University of Washington, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Chicago were the other participants. The pilot project ended May 31 and OCLC is now evaluating the results and surveying the participants to get their feedback on how the pilot went for them. Becky’s comment was that members should be reminded that OCLC has links from its web site to macros that can be used to convert an existing unenhanced contents note to an enhanced contents note. (See <http://www.oclc.org/support/services/connexion/macros.en.html>.) Jay commented that OCLC is in the process of updating *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* to conform to RDA and the accompanying changes to the MARC format. In the process they are adding OCLC suggested best practices, one of which is the use of enhanced contents notes.

2. Why no advance notice of MARC updates implemented this spring?

One library was caught off guard by some of the MARC changes implemented this spring. Jay explained that he was out of the office at the time of the implementation, so Technical Bulletin 263 (<http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/263.en.html>) announcing the changes was a few days late, and he apologizes. Phase Two of the 2014 OCLC-MARC update is tentatively planned for implementation in August, but this time Jay will be there for the installation, so the Technical Bulletin announcing it should be issued in a more timely fashion.

3. Duplicate call numbers

One member has been seeing many duplicate call numbers on OCLC records and asked if they should be deleted. Another pointed out that there are five cases where PCC allows for duplicate call numbers. (These are documented in BFAS 5.3 Database Enrichment, under Footnote 3 for the chart “Fields you can add or edit, at <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#databaseenrichment>.) For example, some libraries class bibliographies in class Z and some class with the subject. Some will class a monographic set as a set, others will catalog and classify the volumes individually. LC may assign a call number that is clearly

wrong, but since an LC call number is used as an identifier it seems unwise to delete it when a corrected number is added. The consensus seems to be that if the duplicate call numbers have the same class letters and numbers and only the Cutter number is different, it is okay to delete the duplicates. Otherwise it is probably okay to retain them.

4. Can brief vendor records be deleted when there is already a good record in OCLC?

These should be caught by the DDR process before or after they appear, but do report them if you find them.

5. How many libraries have staff members controlling headings when doing copy cataloging in OCLC?

Perhaps two or three or four libraries represented in the room have copy catalogers doing this work; most do not.

6. Invalid links

One member reported trouble with 500 U.S. Geophysical Union documents from which he deleted multiple URLs and kept just the Wiley links, only to find that the Wiley links were invalid, so that all the URLs had to be redone. Jay responded that there is a document on the OCLC web site on how to deal with links that are not valid. (See the “Field 856” section of the “Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines” document at <http://oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/cataloging/electronicresources.en.html>. Note that the document is in serious need of updating.) The PCC Standards Committee will discuss this on Sunday and there may be an LC/PCC policy statement later. Adolfo Tarango (UCSD) commented that the problem is a failure on Wiley’s part to update the DOIs. He also advised not deleting the URLs even if they are invalid, because we can still search by them.

7. Why are works on the same subject assigned different call numbers?

You’d have to ask LC.

8. What to do if Connexion gives you an error message that says some fields, usually vendor supplied, are invalid?

If the system won’t accept them, you have no choice but to delete them, or at least those parts that make them invalid. You can do this as a local edit, to assure the record will export. Or you can change your export settings in Connexion to not require validation of all fields before exporting. If you want to correct the master record, use your best judgment about whether the field or subfield can be deleted or whether you can correct the data. If you believe the data needs to be corrected but cannot figure out how to correct it yourself, feel free to report the problem with the record to bibchange@oclc.org.

9. FAST subject headings

A member asked what people are doing with FAST subject headings. One librarian would like to leave them in their local records but can't get permission. One library uses FAST subject headings for all their records.

10. What is happening with qualifiers in the 020 and 024 fields?

The newly-defined subfields \$q in fields 015, 020, 024, and 027 will be part of the upcoming OCLC-MARC Update 2014, Phase Two. We will convert existing data to the extent that is safely possible. It was noted that LC keeps using the wrong subfield for 020s for online versions that appear on the print record; they use subfield \$a rather than subfield \$z.

11. What is happening with BIBFRAME in OCLC?

OCLC has been an "early experimenter," which included the conversion of sets of existing MARC 21 records to BIBFRAME, but it is still very early in the BIBFRAME development process.

12. Medium of performance

There was a question on what progress is being made with the medium of performance fields. Jay replied that the X62 authority fields are being implemented, although the implementation needs to be coordinated with the Library of Congress and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging.

Respectfully submitted by
Doris Seely
University of Minnesota
July 3, 2014