Review the most recent member questions from AskQC office hours.

May 2022: The WorldCat registry and data quality
May 10, 2022

Regarding library location links and map: we catalog all materials for our countywide system under one symbol. The address associated with our institution is an administrative office, not open to the public; that is what displays if someone uses the map. We do have our catalog linked so users can click through to see which branch has an item available. Do you have any tips for our situation: best practice in the Registry when the cataloging institution's physical location isn't a place a patron would visit?

We recommend that the institution use their main address but use the "Also Called" name field to indicate that they are an "Administrative Office". Please contact registries@oclc.org for assistance regarding questions about addresses.

What does the search use if there is no ISBN in the record?

If there is no ISBN in the record, it will take you the base URL to the search box at your main library catalog. If there's an OCLC number in the record it will take the patron to that specific item. This may be a trial-and-error kind of process for resources not held by your library. If you use the test link in the service configuration and it goes to an item that is not in your library's collection, it will return a message stating "This search does not result in any entries" that the library patron would see. The library patron could then use the search box to locate the item.

How is Online Catalog Direct to OCLC Number (under Online Catalog) different from searching an OCLC number under "Accession Number" in a WorldCat Discovery catalog?

It is the same search, however it is the way that the search is performed and what the starting point is as to how the patron gets to the item. If you are searching WorldCat Discovery if the library has configured the direct to number link in the WorldCat Registry, then it is the number search that is being performed in the library's catalog.

If a library has chosen the OCLC # search option, does it search only the main OCLC # from a WorldCat record, or is it also searching for all the record numbers found in an 019 field? For example, a library has a record in their local catalog that has an OCLC # that has since been merged in WorldCat with other records.

The direct to OCLC number search will only use the primary number when searching the catalog.

Follow-up question 1: Would it not also depend if you've flagged the "Add ocn" to the number?

It will depend on how the number is indexed in your catalog. For example, some are indexed within prefixes such as leading zeros. We recommend gathering an understanding in how this works when setting up the Online Catalog Direct to OCLC Number feature.

Follow-up question 2: As to whether it would get a hit in the 001 (which may have the ocn) versus the 019 which will not?

Similar to above, it depends on how your local catalog is setup.

We keep our union listing for serials up to date, but still get ILL requests for articles from issues we don't own. Has there been a change in how this information is supposed to be entered? Seems like people are not looking at the range of issues we hold, just whether or not we have the title.

This is not related to the WorldCat Registry but relates to how patrons interact with catalog information while using InterLibraryLoan.

WorldCat Registry, can you provide a bit of background on the Authorized Users tab?

The authorized users tab shows the people who are authorized to manage a record. Those are the authorizations that were mentioned in the presentation about WorldCat service authorizations and WorldShare authorizations. Once
someone is authorized for the WorldCat Registry, they may add authorization to others. More information about authorization is available on the help page: https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/WorldCat_registry/OCLC_Service_Configuration_WorldCat_registry/130Authorized_Users?sl=en

Can you talk about the Relationships tab and the types of connections? Also, I see doing a search that our library is also listed in the registry under a previous identity. Is there a way to remove that?

Yes, we are always looking to identify and remedy duplicate records. Main and branch relation types, but recently added academics, department, consortia relation types. Keeping this information updated. If you are authorized to manage the record, you may update the information. Please send registries@oclc.org inquiries regarding duplicates or needing assistance updating a record.

Will the merge participant program ever expand to the registry?

Probably not, as the quantity is not the same as the bibliographic duplicates. If you identify duplicates, please send them to registries@oclc.org.

If we find duplicate bibliographic records in Connexion, should we report them? I’ve come across more than usual lately, that have the same OCLC#, so I assumed that they would be de-duped when the database is re-compiled at night.

If the OCLC numbers are the same on multiple records it is likely an indexing issue. Please send this to BibChange@oclc.org to remedy.

Can you point me instructions for diacritic entry into connexion? It’s been a while since I needed the information.

It depends on which interface is being used. For Connexion the keyboard shortcut is ctrl+e. Information about this may be found on the following Help page: https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/Connexion/Connexion_client_3_0/Connexion_client_basics/Connexion_client_interface_windows/Enter_Diacritics_and_Special_Characters

For diacritic entry in Record Manager, please refer to this documentation: https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/Bibliographic_records/MARC_21_view/Insert_a_diacritic

We are using wms and fixing some LHR attached to wrong bib. When I move a LHR to another Bib. and change call no. at the same time, I can't find the new call no. using call no. browse. It happens more often lately. I think I need a reindex of call no. Anything I can do? or have to contact support for reindexing periodically?

Yes, please contact support@oclc.org regarding this question.
May 19, 2022

Where can I submit requests for registry changes/corrections?

registries@oclc.org

How does the WorldCat Registry tie in with Field 040 in WorldCat records?

The WorldCat registry record contains OCLC symbols and a numeric registry ID which is unique to an institution. The 040 field indicates that library that created the record, and $d indicates all the institutions that have modified it. The 040 ties into the registry in that if you wanted to get more information about the institution (for example, they put in a record and you have a similar item) then you could search the registry by ID to obtain more information.

I see a lot of picture books with 650s coded as LCSH but with $v Children's picture books. Shouldn't they be coded local or something?

Children's picture books is not a legitimate subdivision in LCSH. So children's picture books should be coded locally, corrected to a legitimate LCSH subdivision, or reported to bibchange@oclc.org.

Attendee noted in the chat: That subdivision is used consistently by New Zealand instead of Juvenile fiction/lit.

OCLC response: If you notice patterns of a particular incorrect subdivision being used consistently in certain libraries or in geographic areas. Please report it so that we can make corrections to multiple records.

I appears we have a registry account, but cannot get into OCLC Service Config; where do I obtain that number?

Check the documentation for account access, or contact registries@oclc.org for assistance.

When I'm using this site https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/3xx/300.html for cataloging help sometimes it will say things like see RDA 3.4.6.3. but it isn't a hyperlink and I'm not sure where to find what it is talking about.

We do not use hyperlinks to RDA because RDA requires a subscription that not everyone may have. If you do have an RDA account (to the original toolkit, in the case of these numbers), you can input that number in search on the RDA site, or use the left navigation to reach the resource.

A follow-up question, my login works in the new RDA Toolkit, but then it won't let me into the original one, does my institution need to pay for both or should my login work for both?

The understanding is that it works for both. There is a mechanism by which you can get access to both the original and the official or "new" toolkit. You have to re-enter your username and password after you click the link to the new toolkit. Link to the toolkit: https://original.rdatoolkit.org/ index.php/node/262 and to the original: https://www.rdatoolkit.org/index.php/node/262 and to the original: https://original.rdatoolkit.org/ . If you continue to experience issues with access, contact: rdatoolkit@ala.org.

Can I ask general questions about the RDA toolkit? If our institution is subscribed to a certain number of users, is that total users, or is it concurrent users?

Concurrent users. Note that OCLC is not the provider of the toolkit, so this answer is unofficial.

April 2022: Editions annotated, collected, corrected, and expanded: The varieties and roles of Edition Statements
April 12, 2022

You say that edition statements may in fact designate different printings of the same edition. Could you define "edition" as separate from edition statement? I don't see a definition in RDA.

There isn't necessarily a difference between an edition and an edition statement. The issue is that in some languages the word for "edition" (or words that are like the word for "edition") are ambiguous and sometimes say "edition" as we think of in RDA or AACR2, but are actually statements of printings. This often happens in European languages such as Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, and French. The statement may have a work that looks like "edition" or ambiguously refers to "edition" but actually refers to the printing rather than the publication itself. These statements may also include the name of the publisher and/or the number of books that have been printed.

RDA LCC-PCC practice: apply the option to transcribe ordinal numbers as numbers. Example: First becomes 1st.

This particular policy statement could not be located in RDA ToolKit. See instead: 1.8.1: "When recording numbers expressed as numerals or as words in a transcribed element, transcribe them in the form in which they appear on the source of information. Apply the general guidelines on transcription (see RDA 1.7), as applicable."

Will proper transcription of edition statement prevent bib records merging? With DDR, will the presence of a 250 field in a bib record prevent merging with a bib record without a 250 field or with a different 250 field?

Yes, that is the intention. DDR was built to recognize the difference between the presence and the absence of an edition statement and to recognize the differences between edition statements.

Would paperback vs. hardcover editions with different publication dates justify the creation of a new bib record?

Any differences between the paperback and hardcover editions, such as date of publication, number of pages, size, pagination, etc., would justify the creation of a new record.

Would you advise using the 251 field along with 250 for uncorrected proofs, ARCs, etc. now? Or wait until RBMS has combined their vocabs?

RBMS has just recently released a beta version of the combined vocabularies with a public forum scheduled for April 20, 2022.

In French, how should we transcribe the edition statement for legitimate editions (not printings)?

Where there is an explicit edition statement (not a printing statement), transcribe it as it appears.
Is it OK to report for merging records when one is reasonably confident that a paperback record equals the hardback, or if the records are for printings, and not editions?

Yes, either case can be reported.

Are very many libraries adding Galley copies or ARCs?

Not many, but some libraries are doing this. We do see these types of edition statements in the WorldCat.

There have been requests from libraries to retain paperback vs. hardback, because patrons want one or the other. Particularly novels; paperback is easier to carry.

An approach to this scenario is to create two item records in your local catalog indicating hardback or paperback. However, in the shared cataloging environment, if everything is the same and there is no explicit edition statement, the same record would be used.

What is a printing? Isn't it just a manifestation?

A printing is a manufacture of an edition, not a manifestation itself. It is a set of copies which were produced, that along with other copies of that same edition would be part of what is the manifestation of a work.

Another thing to keep in mind is that if a paperback edition is catalogued separately and has a different printing date than the hardback edition, then I think that the printing date would be treated as a publication date.

There is a hierarchy of dates, and it depends on the resource at hand. If you have a copyright date or publication date, and a printing date, you would disregard the printing date and use the copyright or publication date. So it is not always true that the printing date would be considered a publication date.

Refer to DtSt: Type of Date/Publication Status for more information.

Would local paperback/hardback be searchable, if library uses Discovery?

Answer (via email) from the Discovery Product Team: As Local Holdings Record (LHRs) do not have a standard way to indicate paperback or hardback information which can be used to display to users for searching/filtering, WorldCat Discovery cannot create a such a feature.
April 21, 2022

Doesn't an edition statement end with a terminal period? Slide 9 examples do not have periods.

Examples follow guidelines from OCLC Bibliographic Standards and Formats (BFAS), which makes terminal punctuation optional.

Wouldn't FOR low voice be considered grammatically linked?

That depends on the context. In the grammatically linked example (see presentation slide 20), low voice, or a medium of performance statement, would be part of the 245. In the non-grammatically linked example (see presentation slide 21), it says "version for low voice." Since it contains the word version (which is a kind of edition), it is linked to the version, but not anything else in the 245 fields.

What if a paperback edition and a hardcover edition are more than two years apart, would we create a new record for paperback edition?

Yes, since there is another difference besides the binding (in this case the year of publication), that would justify having two separate records.

If there are two books, one paperback and one hardcover, and only the size is different, are they the same edition?

A size difference of more than two centimeters would justify having separate edition records. Any difference at all besides the binding (paperback or hardcover) would justify separate records.

Is it ever appropriate to use a date in the 250 field?

Yes, when the date is significant and shows a difference in the content for two editions, the date should be in the 250 field (see presentation slide 17 for example). If it is on the resource, brackets are not needed. If the difference is known due to external sources, or by looking through the resources, then the date information should be in brackets to show that this is a supplied edition statement that is not on the piece, but is known to the cataloger. Further note that even the time of day may be a significant difference in editions. For example, a recital given twice in the same day. This information should be recorded in the 250 as well.

What does OCLC or RBMS suggest for different printing statements? In some cases (e.g., when there are many different printings) it would be useful to have separate records for them.

Under rare books cataloging guidelines, having a printing statement is justifiable. Make sure that the records are coded to indicate the rare books standard to prevent the record(s) from being merged. If cataloging a general publication, the printing statement could be added locally using a 590 field, LHR, or LBD.

If the edition statement reads "2nd edition, February 2019" do you include the date?

If explicitly stated in the edition statement, then the date information could be included in the 250 field. See BFAS chapter 4 for more information.
Is there anything being done to improve macro functionality in Connexion Client 3.0?

Connexion functionality is outside the scope of coverage for AskQC Virtual Office Hours. For information about Connexion, please see the OCLC Connexion documentation at or contact OCLC Support in your region.

When is it appropriate to use a detailed date in the fixed field?

This is typically seen in technical reports. See BFAS 3.3.5 for more information.

Earlier a PCC rulebook was mentioned, where can I find that?

https://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/lcps_access.html

So if you are cataloging an item in French or German where they use the term for edition, how do you tell if it is really a printing date or if it really IS an edition?

Generally, printing statements of this kind will include the publishers name or the number of copies that were printed. See BFAS chapter 4 for guidelines on using the 250 field.

The examples you showed illustrated two separate 250 fields. Is there ever an appropriate time to include at least two edition statements in one 250?

Previously, field 250 was not repeatable, so there are many WorldCat records with multiple edition statements in the 250. Currently, 250 is repeatable so if the statements are not directly related to each other, or could be thought of as intellectually distinct, it is preferable to include separate entries in the 250 field.

Are subfield i’s in 700 fields optional?

Yes, they are optional. See BFAS input standards for each subfield.

Are subfield b’s in 246 fields optional or required?

246 b is optional. See BFAS input standards.

How often is deduping run?

Under normal conditions, deduping runs continuously.

March 2022: Bibliographic Formats & Standards chapter 3: A deep dive

March 8, 2022

In provider neutral records, providers can be added in 856 $3. Can this subfield be added to the index in WorldCat?

This is currently not the situation, but may be something worth considering so that records can be retrieved that
come from a particular provider. What you can do instead is search the domain name that is in $u to retrieve items that come from one provider versus another.

**In BFAS 3.2.1, does "In Analytics" apply to accompanying material?**

Accompanying materials and "In Analytics" are treated separately. Accompanying material can be understood on its own, while "In Analytics" are an actual component of the resource and essential to use the resource itself.

I would like to see in the documentation an example of a special issue of a serial cataloged separately. I'm curious why 490/830 is used instead of a 77X-78X.

An example would be a special issue of a serial, which would often have its own special title.

**Regarding the Corduroy Bear example, is there an example showing the MARC fields needed to link the two records if two records are created for the book and the bear? I.e., what is necessary if not using the 300 $e?**

Typically we think of that particular link only going in one direction, from the separate record for the bear back to the parent record. But it could be the case that you have another link that goes in the other direction. It is recommended that one add the 300 $e as well, due to how accompanying material is treated in matching and deduping.

**For parts of multipart monographs/serials, if a parent record for the series as a whole exists, is it preferable to use that rather than create a specific record for the volume in hand?**

You have the option of either using the record for the entire multi-part or serial, or to create records for each individual part. Those aren't considered duplicates. There are a lot of reasons why libraries will take one approach versus the other. For example, if you have an item that is part of a serial, but you do not plan on subscribing to that serial. You may also choose to catalog all the issues of a multi-part individually to create more in-depth subject access.

**If an item has marginal comments by a person of historical interest, where does this get entered?**

This would be considered local copy-specific information (LBD or LHR fields), or in lieu of that, use the note fields which are not retained in the WorldCat record. If the person in question has interest beyond the local institution, use the $5 for special collections or rare material. Field 562 could be used as well.

**For technical reports, what is the difference between standard and non-standard report numbers?**

A standard number would be put in field 027. Those are the STRN and ISRN numbers which are defined by ANSI/NISO. Link to instruction: [https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/027.html](https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/027.html). Field 088 is for non-standard numbers.

**Would you recommend a library that has recently migrated to WMS to split their collection record that described together tangible and online resources of recordings of an event? Or could they stay as described now?**

If the record describes the tangible item and just notes the existence of an online resource (as the single-record approach outlined in the cataloging of electronic resources), it is possible to leave it as-is. However, the recent trend has been to catalog these resources separately, as it makes them easier to manage in the long-term, but either approach is acceptable.

**For detached copies and offprints, why use 580 instead of 787 $i?**

Historically, 787 has not displayed in a lot of online systems, so the use of 580 (and 500) is a carry-over from what has been done in the past. Using 787 $i is also acceptable.

I've come across a lot of maps that have been removed from atlases. If I catalog them as detached copies,
should I still use their page number in the 300 $a, rather than "300 $a 1 map"? If so, if the page number isn't on the item, how should that be recorded?

In this case, catalog it as a single map, making mention of its previous atlas inclusion in a note.

When did the policy about being able to add 710/degree-granting institutions to thesis records change? I remember when this was not allowed and the 710's were removed from the existing master records. We have been using various local fields since then.

This was a change resulting from the adoption of RDA. AACR2 typically did not have any relationship terms in access points because if an institution was on every record for a thesis, when one was looking for publications of an institution, one would retrieve every thesis ever submitted for that institution. Under RDA the use of relationship terms is routine and "degree granting institution" is one of those terms, so we can clearly differentiate between the different relationships.

We have a collection of maps removed from National Geographic. Can I put them as a collection into one bibliographic record?

You can do that. Use bib level code C. If they have page numbers, record that in the 300 field and then add the 580 "detached from" and 787 for the National Geographic(s) that it came from.

Under what circumstances should we remove local information from OCLC records? Examples: copy numbering for a limited edition ("No. 45 of an edition of 100 copies"); "Signed by all contributors" (when that only applies to a local copy), etc. We're a WMS library and all of these local notes, added entries, etc. show up in our catalog and can be confusing to users. I find myself adding notes to our LBD (Local Bibliographic Data) records saying that, by the way, such-and-such doesn't apply to our copy.

OCLC attempts as best as possible to make distinctions between local information that has interest beyond the institution supplying it, and that which is only of interest to that institution. Some of this local information could possibly be removed, but if you have some fields marked $5, look at them closely and consider whether they have interest beyond the institution.

What are the best practices for cataloging mp3 files contained in tangible carriers, especially with reference to fixed fields: audio books on CD recorded as an mp3 file, for example. Has anyone established best practices for audio-enabled books?

Answered via email

To code the bibliographic record as Type (Leader/06) “i”, adding a textual 006 for the book aspect, a computer file 006 for the audio file aspect, and sound recording and computer file fields 007. Use field 020 for any associated ISBNs, field 024 for other standard numbers, field 028 for any publisher numbers.

RDA 3.4.1.3 and its Policy Statement allow the use of “a term in common usage (including a trade name, if applicable) to indicate the type of unit,” although the MLA Best Practices document frowns upon that, at least in the example cases of “CD” and “CD-ROM.” So using “VOX Book,” “Wonderbook,” or the trade name of your device in field 300 is permissible; a further explanation in field 500, possibly quoted from the resource, would be advisable. Include any appropriate fields 344 and/or 347.

The 33X fields would be as follows:

336  spoken word $b spw $2 rdacontent

336  text $b txt $2 rdacontent

337  audio $b s $2 rdamedia
For picture books, an additional 337 ($a still image $b sti $2 rdacontent) may be added.

Depending upon your device, you will want to include notes about the type of device (for instance, "Issued as a Wonderbook, a pre-loaded audiobook player permanently attached to a hardcover book"), any need for such accessories as a battery and/or USB charger, some details about the original print publication as needed. Generally, those are some of the main differences. In many other respects you will catalog such a device as you would many other standard sound recordings.

Although it is from 2010, is AACR2-based, and lacks many more recent MARC additions, you may find the OLAC/MLA Guide to Cataloging SlotMusic Based on AACR2 Chapters 6 and 9 useful. Much more recent (2020) and also possibly helpful is the OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging Objects Using RDA and MARC 21.

I'm creating records for some photomosaic maps from the Department of Agriculture. For similar items in WorldCat, most of them (for individual maps, usually on multiple sheets) have the CrTp coded as b (map series), but in the records there's no series information. Why are these maps considered a map series? I'm wary of using CrTp b if I don't understand it.

Thank you to Paige Andrew, Cartographic Resources Cataloging Librarian at Pennsylvania State University who provided the following answer via email.

When coding the Cartographic Type fixed field as "b" it covers true map series but also map sets. These do not technically meet the definition of a published series, however it is common in the map publishing world for a geographic area to have been mapped at a larger scale (more detail) on standard-sized sheets of paper so it may take many sheets of paper laid side-by-side to show the geographic area. Typically all of the sheets are at the same scale but not always the case. Map sets can also be based on the same area mapped but each sheet showing a different topic for that area, similar in nature to a general atlas of a country which has individual maps to show climate, soils, population, distribution of crop types and more; and the individual maps in this case are likely at different scales in order to show the topical information as clearly as possible.

So, in OCLC Bib Input Standards code "b" is defined as "A map series is a number of related but physically separate and bibliographically distinct cartographic units intended by the producers or issuing bodies to form a single group". I think many catalogers get stuck on the word "series" here, where they need to pay attention to the "related but physically separate..." aspect of the definition, which can occur either in the case of a true series or not, as explained above.

Another element that using code "b" effects is the date in the call number. Whenever this code is used there should NOT be a date of situation in the call number because in a map series or set most often the individual sheets are published over time and so using one date to represent all is misleading at best. The date is replaced by an abbreviated form of the scale of the group of maps, e.g., s100 represents the fact that all sheets in the series or set were created at a scale of 1:100,000. And if different sheets in the series/set are at different scales we use "svar" as a way to say "scales vary" across the group. Probably the best explanation, along with examples, of this phenomenon are provided in the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division Map Cataloging Manual; alternately in earlier editions of the LC G-schedule there is a table showing the layout of different kinds of map call numbers for the same place (New York City) depending on what the published situation is (map serial, map series at a definite scale, map series at differing/varying scales, individual map published in a given year, and so forth)...I have the 1976 edition (4th edition) open to page 207.
My only other thought to share -- besides the fact that this kind of stuff is unique to cartographic resources and therefore looks odd to a cataloger not familiar with the format -- is that maybe OCLC could adjust the code "b" label and definition to be explicit about map sets to be helpful, so maybe the label becomes "Map series/sets" and definition something like "A map series or set is a number of ..."

March 17, 2022

Detached Copy- is that when something is removed from your own library's copy?

That can be any kind of thing that was removed from any publication, whether that publication is in your library's collection or not. This could be an article or chapter that has been taken out of a serial or some other book. Sometimes it will not be clear what it has been removed from, and the cataloging rules account for that scenario.

Additional context added in chat:

Think of special collections where maybe a donated collection includes one article that was detached from the original journal (maybe the donor was the author and just wanted to keep a copy of the article). Not from the library's own copy of the journal but received and part of the collection.

What about two different books that are bound together?

This is not specifically addressed in chapter 3. Consider when cataloging an item like this: were the items bound together after the fact OR are they two works issued together by the publisher?

In the case of two works issued together by the publisher up front, this item should be cataloged as issued by the publisher and transcribe both of the titles into field 245. If it is the case that the items are bound together afterwards (as in a local binding), then create two records. Use field 501 to link those two records (particularly in cases of rare materials).

Does OCLC allow donor names in 700 fields as long as there is a subfield 5?

Yes, for rare and special materials as long as the donor is of interest beyond the local institution. This is not encouraged outside of rare and special collections.

How does one determine what is "beyond local interest" for donor names?

This is somewhat of a judgement call. Typically this would mean that the donor is an individual of historical significance and who is well-known beyond the local community.

We see many 7XX $e donors in WorldCat that should not be in the bib record because they are not beyond local interest. Can these be deleted?

If it is not beyond local interest, it can be deleted. If you are unsure, reach out to askqc@oclc.org.

Does OCLC offer a service that can automatically add LC or Dewey classification in a bib record, based on the first subject heading assigned by the cataloger?

No, OCLC does not offer any automated classification assignment. OCLC does have an experimental (non-production) classification service that is available for public use, but it is not automated (i.e., it must be activated outside of cataloging interfaces). http://classify.oclc.org/classify2/

Is OCLC working on an interface with the LC BIBFRAME Editor (Marva) or Sinopia, or both?

OCLC will support BIBFRAME and other standards going forward to meet the diverse needs of the library
It seems as though 856 notes that point to a Table of Contents should be coded as 856 42 and yet I see most of them as coded as 41, including records from the Library of Congress. Is there any way these can be fixed globally?

OCLC has the ability to perform a scan to look for table of contents as the text and the 856 field in combination with a second indicator value and change them from one thing to another as appropriate.

Additional answer provided after initial answer:

The second indicator should be 1 for a table of contents based on MARC documentation, so these are coded correctly. It should be 41 when it's a table of contents and $3 will indicate because it is a unit of a resource.

Are the $5 issues perhaps a result of the data ingest from sync projects?

Yes, this is probably correct. People have used $5 and their own local database records get sent to us. If they don't match, they are added. So if data of purely local interest is put into $5, then it will be added to WorldCat. This is a case where one may want to remove that access point if it is clearly local. If unsure, contact askqc@oclc.org.

Some self published books are occasionally reprinted with minor edits, sometimes a dozen times. Should we create a new record for each of these reprints?

Information present in the title page can be useful in these cases. If it is clear that some changes have been made, particularly if there is a new publication date, then separate records should be created. Language such as "revised printing" is a clear indicator that sufficient changes have been made to warrant creating a new record.

Why is a Book Club edition considered to be something that can be merged with other editions? In some instances it may be the same version, but I'm not so sure if that is always 100% the case.

If the fact that it is a book club edition is the only difference, then they are probably the same. If there is some other feature (such as paging) that is different, then that would indicate that the editions are different.

February 2022: Getting a fix on fixed field elements, part 2

February 8, 2022

Is code "a" in CrTp used for a single sheet that contains more than one map on it (one on each side of the sheet, for instance)?

It's for a single map on a single sheet. If there is more than one map on a sheet, that is typically recorded in the 300, like you would see "five maps on one sheet." However, if you didn't have that situation, of a single map on a sheet, you would still have to pick a code. It doesn't fall into any of the other types, so you end up with type "a" sort of by default, when you have that situation of multiple maps on one sheet.

CONSER guidelines say that 008/33 "should be" blank if there is no authenticated Key title. OCLC guidelines say that the code may be based on language of title proper (245) if there is no Key title. When authenticating a record for CONSER, are we supposed to remove a code from 008/33 if there is no Key title?

That instruction that we have in documentation has been there since the 1980s. I personally have always considered that an ISSN element that I would typically not bother with in ordinary cataloging. For CONSER, since there is a guideline that says that it should be blank, if you are authenticating an existing record where that is coded and you end up with an authenticated CONSER record where there is no Key title, follow the CONSER instruction and...
change the element to be blank so it's in step with CONSER practice.

When using a code like "k" (vocal score) or "c" (accompaniment reduced for piano) for Format of Music, should "b" (arrangement) also be used for Transposition and arrangement?

Both of those elements are optional. You're welcome to leave both of them as they are or code either or both. It's entirely up to you.

If illustrative content (008/18-21; 006/01-04) has a lot of importance to a library that will be starting to use WMS soon, would you recommend them to continue to enhance illustrative content in this shared environment?

Yes, the illustrative content is important to everybody using the records. So if your library is in the process of making sure you thoroughly code those elements, that is a great idea. Everybody who uses WorldCat will benefit from that coding.

Electronic version of a loose-leaf (updating) monograph: the SrTp for the print is coded "l", but the electronic version normally presents the resource with the pages interfiled and updated, so it is an updated resource as a single resource. Should we retain the "l" in the SrTp? Or, because the vendors only provide the "current" and fully updated resource, should these electronic resources be coded "w" instead? This is a common situation with updating law materials.

It seems to me that "l" is really intended for the print situation where you're receiving updates and you're filing those in. The situation where you have that same publication presented as an online resource, where basically they replace it with the updated version, seems like it's much more the situation where you would want to code it as "w," to say it's more like an updating website in that case. But that's just my take on it at this point. There must be other records out there that people have coded that tend toward a certain practice. There may be documentation that addresses this. But that's what comes to mind.

The definition for "loose-leaf" in this position, the code "l," is defined as a tangible resource. It's a base volume updated by separate pages, which are inserted or removed and substituted and that's very print-oriented. Generally, you wouldn't use the code "l" for an electronic resource. Unless there's another code in this position that's more appropriate, I would generally use "w" as website, because that's the remote resource equivalent of an updating loose-leaf.

When you say a code is not indexed, I assume you mean not indexed in the OCLC database. How are these codes used in our ILS or LSP systems? Does this usually correlate with the Mandatory codes?

Yes, we are discussing indexing in the WorldCat database, and our information is coming from the document Searching WorldCat Indexes, which is available on the OCLC website. Indexing is unique to each system, so if you want to know what is indexed in your own integrated library system or local system, you'll want to check with your system documentation.

Could you comment on fixed fields for Galleys, Advance Reader Copies, Uncorrected Proofs?

There really isn't anything different in the fixed fields for galleys, advanced reader copies, or uncorrected proofs from the published version. The differentiation for those would be in the variable fields, in the fields where you record the bibliographic information. You would want to put an edition statement in. It's really important to include an edition statement, either from the resource itself or to bring out that characteristic in a supplied edition statement in the 250.

I asked about Galleys, etc. because I have noticed that records our institution has previously cataloged with the supplied edition statements have been later merged with the final published edition of the book. Shouldn't these be on separate records, since there may be variances from the final published edition?

Pre-publication versions of a resource are definitely separate and should be separate. Make sure that information is presented as an edition statement in field 250. We try to look for certain words and phrases in quoted notes, which
has been a past practice for these sorts of materials, but we would urge you to start using field 250 for that information, regardless of whether it's on a cover, stamped somewhere, or just the information that you happen to know, that the item you have in hand is some kind of pre-publication version. Use the information that's on the resource as a field 250, or provide a cataloger-supplied edition statement for these pre-publication items. Even if it's in brackets, that should keep DDR from incorrectly merging a version with a field 250 with one without a field 250. If you have specific examples of incorrect merges, please let us know, give us the OCLC numbers and we can pull them apart and try to make sure that doesn't happen again. And we apologize for the extra work.

**Is there a way to search WorldCat for items labeled as open access in the 856 $7? I do not think this subfield is indexed at this time.**

In Connexion, this element is not yet indexed. It is something we would like to index in the future; it's on our list. I think it is accessible in some other WorldCat interfaces. The element itself is not indexed, but it is being used to show open access items in our discovery systems.

**If anyone knows, how quickly do FAST headings get updated when the LCSH term changes?**

FAST headings are not controlled in the same way that LCSH headings are controlled, so that they change pretty quickly when the related authority record changes. Instead, FAST headings, they're all backed up by authority records, but the FAST authority records have to be updated first. A number of those are tied to the corresponding authority record in LCSH and will get updated. There's also additional FAST authority records that are created out of combinations of headings and subdivisions that have been used in WorldCat. That will lag behind by about a month, in the monthly processing of FAST authority records, and it's only after the FAST authority records are updated that we would then proceed to change all of the headings. It could be spread out over a number of weeks. Certainly within two months, they would presumably all be updated, presumably. But it's not a really quick process. We're working toward the ability to control FAST headings, and in that situation, updating should be quicker than it is now.

**February 17, 2022**

**What if frequency has been changed over time, how to code it in fixed code, single one single code is allowed?**

In that case, you update the fixed field to be the current frequency. Or if the serial is dead, the last frequency that it had, and this corresponds with what you would also do down in the body of the record, where you would update field 310 to reflect the latest frequency and move the former frequency to field 321. So you can have multiple former frequencies, multiple 321s, but only one 310 and that corresponds to what's recorded in the fixed field.

**Why does the fixed field get condensed into one field in our ILS?**

It's very hard for us to say what's going on with your ILS. The fixed field is the 008 field, most generally. There are also elements from the Leader, which we discussed in part 1. So OCLC displays these all as separate elements, but behind the scenes in the MARC format, these are all part of the Leader or the 008 field. Your ILS is probably displaying something closer to what the original MARC looks like. You can see this in the OCLC cataloging interfaces in Connexion or Record Manager, you can see the field as one field rather than displayed as we had it on the slides.

**I am having trouble with the spacing on the 006, do you have any suggestions.**

In the Connexion Client interface, you can opt for something called "guided entry" to help with entering elements in the 006 field. I have no idea what you might be doing in your local system with that, but I know guided entry is how I make sense of the 006 field.