2020-06 VAOH Session

Presentation summary

Robert Bremer and Cynthia Whitacre presented on the Updates on OCLC encoding levels. Robin provided a breakdown of the fields along with examples showing how the fields are used in bibliographic records and Jay covered the vocabularies used within these fields along with the current best practices associated with these fields.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) Online cataloging, Encoding level
https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging.html#levels

VAOH past sessions:
https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/Metadata_Quality/AskQC/Previous_AskQC_office_hours

Quality Assurance Member capabilities:
https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#membercapabilities

VAOH slides for this presentation: https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/Metadata_Quality/AskQC

OCLC's "Cataloging Defensively" presentations are designed to give some background to how OCLC's Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software deals with bibliographic records, both generally and for specific bibliographic formats:
https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/Cataloging_documentation/Cataloging_defensively.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS), Contents page -
https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en.html

BFAS Encoding Levels: https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/elvl.html

Member questions

If we are upgrading a K , M or J level record with item in hand can we change the encoding level to blank?

Yes.

Could you talk about who is contributing most of the ELvl M records? Are they mostly vendors?

The majority of M level records come from member libraries. There is a certain percentage that come from vendors because the majority of vendor records that are contributed to WorldCat do come in through Data Sync and so are assigned Encoding Level M. But there are huge numbers, much more than the vendor records, that come in from member libraries and those are all assigned Encoding Level M when they go through the regular Data Sync process.

For the documentation, it may be useful to have a page somewhere that includes information on the alphabetic codes, for legacy purposes. Even if they're removed from OCLC, they may not be removed from local catalogs.

We've talked about the need to incorporate history into Bibliographic Formats and Standards for reasons just like this. When you find something on a record that you have in your database that is no longer current coding you kind of want to know the history behind that. We tend to look at MARC21 for some of that information but in the case of something like Encoding Levels I, M, K that were OCLC-specific that information is not going to be there. So yes, it makes a lot of sense that we should have some kind of history section for this information.

Have you also been consulting vendors of library systems who will need to incorporate this?

No, we haven't done that yet and the main reason we don't feel there is a big need to do this is because all these new Encoding Levels that members libraries will be using are all already valid as part of MARC21 and have been for years. If library system vendors have been loading records from the Library of Congress, or records from the Library of Congress that you've obtained from OCLC they're already familiar with loading these numeric Encoding Levels.

How will this be disseminated to cataloguers all over the OCLC world, who haven't attended this session?

We've discussed the need for additional training that we would like to put out there because we know not everybody necessarily tunes into these sessions. But yes, we will get the word out in advance, so people are used to using these new Encoding Levels long before we make them invalid.

We put these out in the Release Notes that came out for the April install, so there was information there. The recordings of these sessions will be available, as are all these Office Hour sessions, and we will start promoting recordings and the information in a big way as we get closer to making other changes. But for right now, we just want people to get a chance to take a look and think about using them. There isn't a requirement for people to switch right now unless they want to.

What codes should we use now if we are entering a full-level original record? We were recently instructed to use ELvl "I" for everything. What codes should we use now if we are entering a full-level original record? We were recently instructed to use ELvl "I" for everything.

You can continue using Encoding Level I, but at this point you can also enter a Full level record as Encoding Level "blank." They are essentially equivalent and "blank" will become preferred as we go forward.

Is there a coordination underway with local databases to assess the meaning of "M" in individual records?

M really has no meaning in terms of Encoding Level. It represents a status of the record in OCLC's system. If you've taken a record from OCLC and put it in your local database and retained Encoding Level M it really doesn't have too much meaning, there. It may be that locally you may want the Encoding Levels that we would eventually change these records to but it's kind of hard to say. We also are considering what the impact is in changing records in the database. Some libraries would subscribe to Collection Manager and receive all of those updates, some libraries, of course, wouldn't want the volume of updates coming through. But if you did incorporate changed records received through Collection Manager you could potentially update your own database to get rid of the OCLC-defined Encoding Levels.

What is the difference between code 3 and 7?

Code 3 is for abbreviated level, which means *less* than minimal and 7 is minimal level. So, 7 is equivalent to K. We do have, in one of the first chapters in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, some information in a chart there about abbreviated level records and what one would normally use when encoding a record as level 3.

Is there training documentation available yet?

Not specifically designed as training, but I would direct people to have a look at the Encoding Level page in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, it pretty well explains the situation, especially when you get to the OCLC-defined codes that are at the bottom of the page. It indicates what's happening with them and what code would be preferred in place of level I or level K.

Why is it important to know if a record was batch loaded? For example, couldn't encoding levels 1 and 2 be used based on the completeness of the record?

For the first part of the question, we received feedback that there was interest in knowing that a record had arrived in the database via Batchload; because it is something that we could just get rid of entirely. But a lot of libraries were interested in having that information at hand. It is useful, in some respects, especially when you are looking at records that look very similar and

you're considering are they duplicates or not. If somebody intentionally put it in, it may be that they have a different version of a record. If it only arrived by machine processing it could be that it wasn't detected as a duplicate. So, in those terms, knowing that it came in through Batchload is a useful kind of thing.

2nd part of question: In a sense, maybe they could, but it's not as if it's data that hasn't been examined, which is part of the definition of 1 & 2, in terms of the record that's in OCLC. A cataloger really did look at the original item and perhaps supplied Encoding Level "blank" and then sent it to us. Changing that "blank" then to be a 1 doesn't seem to be the right thing to do at this point. It would be better to keep the "blank" intact, because somebody did have the item in hand when they created the record, and then store the indication that the record arrived via Batchload in another field.

Does encoding level 8 become an M in a tape load? When doing a merge, is there any way to know this?

Encoding Level 8 becomes M depending on, in a Batchload situation, what library it comes from. From member libraries it does indeed become an M; from the Library of Congress, or other national libraries where we get CIP records those remain Encoding Level 8. It does depend on the source of the record right now. In the "future world" we will be retaining 8 from whatever source we get it from, but that's not implemented yet.

And "When doing a merge is there any way to know this?" Not really. If it's an M, right now, if we are doing a merge, or if one of the Member Merge participants is doing a merge, they need to just examine the fullness of the record to figure out when it came in, and what it was when it came to us. It's a little bit of guess work.

**Didn't "K" use to mean "less than full" rather than its present "minimal"?
https://web.archive.org/web/20050811235459/http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/elvl.shtm: "Less-than-full input by OCLC participants. A record that conforms to OCLC's level K input standard. The level K input standard represents less-than-full cataloging."**

I don't recall that it was ever defined as less-than-full, but I hesitate to disagree with Walter Nickeson. I think it's always been defined as minimal, as far as I can remember.

Will there be improvements to data sync so that incoming batch loaded level M records will match on existing ones and not create so many duplicates?

That's a general question about Data Sync and the matching that goes on in that process. We do look at that constantly to see what it should do that it's perhaps not doing at this point. Once a duplicate is added to the database it is subject to DDR processing which compares records in a somewhat different fashion than is the case with Data Sync. We have two chances to catch duplicates as they come in.

The problem with so many duplicates is that there is something in the record that prevented it from matching. And the very kinds of things that you could look at a record and say: Well, this difference doesn't really matter – in one case is the same kind of difference that in another case indicates that there really are two versions of some resource. It's a very fine line to get things to match correctly, but not necessarily match things that really are different. So, again, we are always looking for improvements to that process.

The question about M and local databases is meant to be the other way around: if the local databases have specific ELvl, but OCLC only has the M, could the OCLC level be changed to match what the local databases have.

In that case we probably still need to do an assessment based on the data that is in WorldCat because, let's say we have an Encoding Level M record and it's pretty skimpy but that same record exists in some local database and is in that local database upgraded to a level "blank" it could be that additional fields have been added locally as well, to make it a full and complete record. Well, in WorldCat we might still have something that really ought to be considered minimal level. It is all based on what we have in WorldCat in terms of making an assessment and figuring out what the Encoding Level should be

Why were full records, cataloged in OCLC, encoded 'I', changed to M? I have seen this with a large number of full records in OCLC.

That happens in a specific instance of batchloading when a library who has entered the records in WorldCat with their OCLC Symbol as the creator then also sends us those same records via Batch (Data Sync). One of the options in the Batchload profile (the Data Sync profile) is to check whether they want their own records replaced. If they have that checked, that means if no one else has modified the record the records from that library will replace their own records in WorldCat and change the Encoding Level as a result because all of the Data Sync loaded records are Encoding Level M. So that's why that happens.

And will the BFAS Quality Assurance instructions be updated as well?

Correct, there are some changes that need to be made to Chapter 5 that discusses quality assurance to bring them into step with what the current situation is.

Will you share the parameters you use to convert the level Ms so that we may use them in our local databases?

We'd be happy to share them. They aren't ready yet. They have been drafted but we still need to test them and make sure they are complete and cover what we need them to cover. Once we have them ready, and perhaps tested them a little bit, we would be happy to share them. I don't know when that will be. I suspect it might be next year some time.

So, is the idea to eventually get rid of all of the OCLC Marc Encoding Levels of I, K, M, and J?

You got it. That's the major point to take away today.

Do you want us to start using "blank" when we lock and replace a level "3" record instead of an I?

You are most welcome to do that. It really is up to you now, whether you want to use I or "blank," those two levels are equivalent, so why don't you start experimenting with "blank" because you are able to do that now when you are working online.

Will you receive a validation error if you accidently use blank and d vs. blank and c, and there isn't an 042 field in the record?

I do not believe that there is any relationship in Validation between those elements and it kind of makes sense that there isn't because you could have input copy in the past that would have required use of Source (008/39) "c" in combination with an Encoding Level like "blank." In other words, we have combinations of Source "c" with Encoding Level I as it is now. So, Source "c" is not tied to Field 042 at all. And, of course, Source "c" does get misused and it does cause things to get incorrectly indexed. So, we're aware that there's an issue there.

Looking through BFAS, I realize I'd forgotten than ELvl 5 even exists. Is that the ELvl some of LC's overseas offices use for their brief bibs before they come back and finish them later? Do you see other libraries using 5 often?

Other libraries will have most likely not need to use 5. We will not have anything in place that says you cannot use Encoding Level 5. But if you were to use Encoding Level 5 the expectation is that you're going to come back at some point and finish that record off and upgrade it to something like "blank" or even 7. Other libraries, of course, could come in on that record in the meantime and change Encoding Level 5 to be something else. But, for the most part, as it is now, libraries generally complete the record input it into the database.

I have tried to edit a level blank record and was not able to replace. the record. Will there still be level blank records OCLC members cannot update? Are there still fields in level blank records we cannot change?

You should be able to edit a level "blank" record in the same way that you would have edited an I level record in the past. PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) records are still exempt if you are not a PCC member, just as they have always been.

In terms of elements you cannot touch, system-supplied kinds of elements in the record that you cannot change (etc.). None of that has changed.

One of the presentations that we did a few months ago in these Office Hours included a large section about what you can and cannot edit in PCC records. That was the February session [Best practices for enriching WorldCat bibliographic records]. You may want to take a look back at that to get instructions and then see the references as to where in Bibliographic Formats and Standards we outline what may and may not be edited in PCC records.

L has already gone away.

That's true, we eliminated Encoding Level L a few years ago. That was considered Full level from a Batchload and it just seemed simpler to have one level from Batchload which is M.

Does that status as growing, for 'M,' mean that records have been downgrade, or that records are being added as 'M?'

It means that records are continually being added as Encoding Level M.

How soon do you expect to have additional training about using the numeric values?

We don't have a timeline in place, but we will start working on that in the second half of this calendar year. We'll release it and let you have it as soon we have something. We'll certainly have new training in place before we make any massive changes within the current WorldCat database.

Does it mean, when we create original cataloging records now, we will start to code blank in ELvl? For I level?

Yes, that would be a good thing to go ahead and start doing. "Blank" is the equivalent of I so you can switch from using an Encoding Level I for a Full level record that is brand new and use "blank" instead.

When enhancing or adjusting an I-level master record, is it acceptable to recode ELvl I as blank?

Yes, that would be a great thing to do. When you are upgrading, or otherwise editing a master record and it's coded either I or K and you want to change it, or if it's coded M and you want to change it to "blank" or 7, please feel free to go ahead and do so.

Do we think the continual growth of M is caused in some way by vendor created records?

No, it's every record that comes in via Batchload (Data Sync) or via the WCIRU process – we have a lot of these batch processes – that is added to WorldCat is made into Encoding Level M. I shouldn't say *every*, I should say *most* records, the vast majority of records coming in that way. So that's why. Many, many libraries send us their records via those batch processes, particularly

via Data Sync. So, it's not just vendors. Vendors are only a small percentage of that, maybe between 5 and 10 percent of the records that we add through batch processes.

Those of us that send records for batch processing, these records will be set to BLANK if they come that way?

Yes, in the future we would retain the Encoding Levels as they come in. If we received a record that was Encoding Level "blank" it would end up added to the database that way if it didn't match another record. That's the significant difference between where we would like to be in the future vs where everything is arbitrarily set to Encoding Level M.

Is blank the pipe key?

No, "blank" is the space bar when you are typing on a keyboard.

M may also be from data sync ingests?

That's correct that's what M is from.

Could you explain some of the differences between MARC21 and OCLC-MARC?

We have been trying, quite purposefully, over the past few years, to eliminate many of the differences between MARC21 itself and OCLC-MARC which is OCLC's implementation of MARC. There are some things that we have not yet eliminated, including the Encoding levels. If you go to Bibliographic Formats and Standards, the contents page of BFAS, there's a document linked from there that spells out most of the remaining differences between MARC21 and OCLC-MARC. One of the big ones is the use of the local field 538 which OCLC defined as, for various reasons, mostly having to do with display in previous platforms for the database, the use of 539 instead of subfield $7 in Field 533. That's one that always sticks out in my mind, but there are a few others as well.

Are there requirements for particular fields at a given encoding level?

If we want to back up a few slides to the display of the Input Standards, the one that has the 3 red boxes on it, the Input Standards for the field as a whole is given at the top of that display. [Slide 18, BFAS Documentation Changes]. Right where it says Input Standards below that is the field level input standards Full vs Minimal, so in this case, which is actually Field 300 it's Required if applicable for Full level records <u>and</u> for Minimal level records. That's the Input Standard at the field level, then, of course, we also have the Input standards at the subfield level. So, the expectation is, if you are going to use "blank" for Full then you would be following the Input Standards on each of these pages. If the field is Required if applicable, and it does apply to what you are cataloging, or it's mandatory for Full level, you would need to input that.

Is core level 4 obsolete? What will happen to level 4?

Encoding Level 4 really is obsolete; it was tied to the previous Core level record standards and those standards are now obsolete. There isn't a scenario where you would use Encoding Level 4 on current cataloging. It's still valid in the system, because records do exist in WorldCat with Encoding Level 4, but it's not as if that number should be growing.

So, when M is going to disappear?

I would say Encoding Level M would disappear at the point that we have changed Batchload processing so that we're no longer creating new Encoding Level M records and we have converted the last one. We really can't take anything out of our Validation rules until all instances of that particular code have been removed from the database, otherwise if you go to use that record for copy cataloging and you decide to validate the record you will get an error message that says Encoding level isn't valid. So, of course, we should fix that for you upfront so that that doesn't happen.

Encoding Level M, because it is the largest group will probably take the longest to eliminate from the database. It's probably several years out.

What is the best encoding level for analytic records?

It all comes back to how much detail you are including in these records. If it's an analytic record that is fairly brief, then maybe you would end up with Encoding Level of 7. But an in-analytic, an article that appears in a journal, doesn't have a whole lot of detail anyhow so it may qualify to meet the full level record standard anyway. In that case it would be Encoding Level "blank."

Will LOC records continue to be clearly identified, as I think they, national libraries and PCC were the only ones that had previously been able to use BLANK.

Yes, Library of Congress records of course indicate that they have come from the Library of Congress in Field 040, and the same is true of other national libraries. But the authentication code in Field 042 is usually pretty important in identifying that a record is PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) and meets certain other standards in terms of authority control.

Is there any way to have the encoding level assigned automatically applied based on an examination of the record against a set of criteria?

We're sort of hoping that's the case, because the approach to dealing with eliminating Encoding Level M is to examine the record and see if it looks fairly complete. Of course, in doing that you have to take into consideration a lot of different factors. The way a manuscript letter may be cataloged ends up with a description that's fairly brief even though it would be considered Full vs a published book for example. You have to consider the coding in the record, what kind of material it is, in order to assess whether it appears to be complete.

If all the differences between OCLC coding and MARC 21 are removed, will BFAS go away?

BFAS is the most used document on the OCLC website, so we know it's really popular, people use it all the time. We have put a lot of work into the documentation. Many of you are aware that we've been revising BFAS for several years, incorporating RDA, adding lots of great examples, going through the entire document. BFAS documents the particular uses of MARC21 that are specific to the cooperative environment of WorldCat. MARC21 itself doesn't take that into consideration, but Bibliographic Formats and Standards absolutely does.

So, no, we won't be getting rid of it.

And if ELvl code 4 is obsolete should the master record be updated/enhanced?

We did change some instances of Encoding Level 4 to "blank" in the case of CONSER records, but we did not do the same thing for BIBCO records, the monograph records that carry the designation PCC. It's something that probably needs to be discussed again. If, essentially, what was Encoding Level 4 meets most of, all the requirements perhaps, of current Encoding Level "blank" then maybe we should change them. We really don't know at this point.

What field will be used to record the data that the record came in via batch process?

We don't know yet. In his slides, Robert said that is one of the things we have yet to determine. When we make a decision and start implementing that, we certainly will announce it widely. It'll be a future year when that happens.

Will the BFAS be extended to cover the numeric encoding levels?

The numeric and "blank" Encoding Levels are already described on the Encoding Level page in BFAS, and we recently revised that to change the text under Encoding Levels I and K, in particular, to explain that they will eventually go away, and that you ought to prefer use of Encoding Level "blank" and Encoding Level 7.

Are you giving any thought to running some kind of validation process over encoding levels other than M? Anecdotally the existing values are often wrong.

Yes, that certainly crossed our minds. If we develop criteria for assessing an M level record to decide whether it should be "blank,"or 7, or 3 it makes sense that we may want to do the same kind of thing on Encoding Level I. I'm sure all of us, at one point or another, have seen an I level record that was pretty deficient on detail. It makes sense to, perhaps, reassess some of those and end up with Encoding Level 7 or 3, rather than just mapping Encoding Level I to "blank"

Have OCLC started chancing I levels records to blank levels

Not yet.

Is encoding level important to the duplicate detection and merge process?

Not in and of itself. What happens in DDR is that records are retrieved that look like candidates as duplicates, the data elements are compared in the records and then if it's determined that the records do represent the same bibliographic resource they're handed off to another process that we call Resolution. And what that process does is it takes a look at the coding in those records. It also considers the number of descriptive fields present and the number of holdings on a record, because that's often an indicator of which record is better. So, you could have, for instance, an M level record that has 50 holdings on it and has 40 fields versus an I level record that has 5 holdings and half as many fields. So between those two, even though on the surface it looks like Encoding Level I outranks Encoding Level M, where all the holdings ended up and the number of fields are more important a consideration in terms of retaining the record that appears to be most complete. So, in terms of hierarchy that we have, we give special consideration to PCC records, CONSER records, records from certain national libraries, but then for most of WorldCat they are as essentially viewed as being the same and uses this other criteria in terms of completeness: the number of fields and the number of holdings

Can you explain why "M" is considered so important? Yes, it tells me that the record came in as batch, but why is this important to me (or you), especially since as a cataloger I can manually change the "M" to blank or 7, thus "losing" that information even now?

This is buried in the history of OCLC, and when the OCLC Encoding Levels were first put together, and someone at that time considered it to be important. As we look at it now, when we do work with records in WorldCat and are resolving problems with records it's a huge clue to us as to why something may or may not have matched because if it came in via Batch it's using our Batch matching as opposed to a human being doing the matching. It may explain why there's a duplicate record.

And in the focus groups we got the same feedback several times that it was important to know that a record had arrived via Batchload process. it's not so much that M is considered important, it's the information that the record arrived a certain way at least initially. We've finally come around to realizing the way we have been doing it for several decades is really kind of a bad idea, so let's fix it.

And to address the last part of the question, about that information that something has been Batchloaded into WorldCat can be lost now by an upgrade to "blank" or 7 or any other Encoding Level, and that's true, that's been true all along. But we're trying to, in defining whatever it is that we end up defining as the new place within a MARC record, to record the fact that something has been Batchloaded into WorldCat that that information will be retained, and will be saved from then on.

Is this why M has been considered "Min" even though that's not really what the code means?

Originally we had Encoding Level L which was Full level added through a batch process versus Encoding Level M that was Minimal level added through a batch process, and of course decisions were made as to how to code those on the basis of a file of records, not the individual records, their differences within a file. We arbitrarily took a file and said, these look pretty good they're going to be Encoding Level L and these other records they're Encoding Level M. Of course, that doesn't really work out well when you receive a library's file and it's a mix of complete records and less-than-complete records. So, we ended up getting rid of Encoding Level L, there weren't all that many of them, in favor of Encoding Level M because M had been used repeatedly over the years for the vast majority of files.

So, would you prefer we not change M to blank when enhancing at this time?

If you're doing an upgrade, you should change it to "blank." It would be useful to do that. The question may be asked in terms of, well we're losing the fact that it was Batchloaded, but that is the case on millions of records anyway. It seems to me that once a record is upgraded the fact that it came in through Batch initially may not be as important. The way that we use Encoding Level M now is often to diagnose problems, how did this record come to be this way, and it got added to the database without any human intervention. Once a record is upgraded, that means the cataloger has looked at it and made specific changes. I don't think that's a problem. You should go ahead and change Encoding Level M to "blank" if you are enhancing a record.

I see authority linked headings that don't get updated. Why does that happen?

We do have an issue with some headings not getting updated. It is on a list for investigation and a fix.

Is there a webpage that explains criteria for dupe detection?

There isn't a specific page in Bibliographic Standards or anywhere else that explains Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR). There are documents however, and presentations that give you some additional information about DDR. Probably the most detailed account of, what I guess you could call the criteria for DDR is When to Input a New Record in Bib Formats and Standards, because DDR is based on When to Input a New Record and When to Input a New Record is largely based on what we do in DDR. So that would give you the best idea of what the criteria for Duplicate Detection are.

When controlled headings don't update (I've seen it too) is there any more we should do than just wait longer?

The only options are to manually recontrol them or report them to authfile@oclc.org.

Why do field errors that prevent exporting records into a local ILS get through the validation/production process? Thinking particularly of invalid $2 codes and duplicate fields

That happens because those records that have those kind of validation errors did come in through our Data Sync process and we have some looser criteria. They still counted as validation errors when they came in through Data Sync but we have three levels of errors and the least egregious level of errors, Level 1, we do allow those to be added to WorldCat, and then, of course, somebody has to fix them manually. But that's why if we said, "no validation errors could get into WorldCat", the vast majority of records probably wouldn't get added to WorldCat through Batchload.

In the case of the invalid subfield $2 codes this has come up several times this year and we are looking forward to making a change where those would no longer automatically get added or potentially transfer from an incoming record to an existing record in the database; because they are so problematic and often the solution for us is to simply get rid of the subfield $2, change that 6XX heading to a second indicator 4 and then often that means that the heading ends up getting deleted anyway. Then what was the whole point of adding it? So, we are trying to fix this problem because we realize it does affect copy cataloging in a significant way.

We think that fix will go in later this year, we don't have a date for it yet. It'll be announced through the Validation Release Notes when it is ready.

Can you submit corrections to QC without 'item in hand'?

Yes you can, depending on what the error or the correction is, though, and where it is, if it's a descriptive element such as the title correction or publication information, paging, that kind of thing, we require that you submit proof of the item so that we can make the change appropriately. Because we, obviously, don't have the items in hand so we're not able to make those types of corrections without the item.

Sometimes we are able to verify information through open source information on the internet, so I wouldn't say that if you don't have the item don't necessarily report it, because we may be able to figure it out through other means.

We are doing some authority work and I am finding many eBook records which do not have the established form of heading for the author entries. And many others that have the wrong form. Is there a anything that can be done to fix these?

Yes, you can report those to us. You can report the access point that was established. You don't necessarily have to report individual records, but you can tell us that there are records with this certain form on them and we will make the corrections to the form of the name.