

2021-02 VAOH session

Topic	7xx linking fields
Date	Tuesday, 9 February - 9:00 AM Eastern Thursday, 18 February - 4:00 PM Eastern
Host	Shanna
Emcee	Hayley
Presenter	Charlene, Robin
Panelist(s)	Laura, Robert
Attendee/note taker	Megan
Number of participants	9 February: 240 18 February: 237
Recording link	9 February: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/lsr.php?RCID=95d297f0d3d34c209dbaa7eb5b3510ef 18 February: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/lsr.php?RCID=117d494f25e042348416feef7ff4bc5e
Registration link	9 February <ul style="list-style-type: none">Attendee: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=ec00cdd6be35194fe4292798c630251ecPanelist: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e9360ef5ec35391a2303a07303190fa0e 18 February <ul style="list-style-type: none">Attendee: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e235b1f57f53773e4ca8383f3a602068bPanelist: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e9cddb441b7a025f63f22b8e1d546b08e

File list

File 	Modified
Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet 2021-02-09 VAOH Attendee list.xlsx	Feb 18, 2021 by Griffith,Shanna
Text File 2021-02-09 VAOH chat.txt	Feb 09, 2021 by Griffith,Shanna
Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet 2021-02-18 VAOH Attendee list.xlsx	Feb 22, 2021 by Griffith,Shanna
Text File 2021-02-18 VAOH chat.txt	Feb 18, 2021 by Griffith,Shanna
Microsoft Powerpoint Presentation 2021-02 VAOH 7XX fields.pptx	Feb 09, 2021 by Griffith,Shanna

 [Download All](#)

Presentation summary

Topic presentation

7xx Linking Fields

Robin Six and Charlene Morrison presented on MARC 7xx linking fields. Fields covered were the general linking fields 765, 767, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 786, and 787; and the continuing resource specific fields 760, 762, 770, 772, 780, and 785. There was also a brief review of Connexion and Record Manager's ability to automatically generate linked entry fields from cited records.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/5xx.html>

https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Searching_WorldCat_Indexes/Bibliographic_records/Bibliographic_record_fields_and_subfields/7xx_fields

<https://www.oclc.org/en/events/2021/making-the-switch-to-record-manager.html>

<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/conser/word/Module14.doc>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#onlineresources>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#electronicresources>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/5xx/534.html>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/7xx/775.html>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#offprintsanddetachedcopies>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#inanalytics>

<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sct/documents/rel-desig-guide-bib.pdf>

<https://www.oclc.org/go/en/oclc-cataloging-application-comparison.html>

Member questions

Feb. 9, 2021, session notes:

Can you explain a bit more about what it means when fields do not transfer when merged?

What that means is there are different ways a record could be considered a duplicate and merged into a better record. This can happen through our duplicate detection and resolution software (DDR). It can happen if an institution reports the duplicate records and they would be manually reviewed and then merged. So when that transaction takes place, there is a hierarchical table that lists all the different fields and different indicators and sets in the record and makes decision then based on that criteria, does that field transfer or does it not? So certain fields during a merge transaction automatically transfer and some do not. I hope that answers the question.

Is the 773 field also used for offprints?

No, it is not. Actually, Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS), chapter 3, section 3.2.2 covers offprints and detached copies, and you do not use in analytic cataloging, extensions for offprints or detached copies.

Is field 777 the best choice for bound-with situations?

No, field 777 shouldn't be used for bound-with situations. Actually that's better recorded in field 501. Field 777 covers when items are issued together, when even though they're separate, they were actually issued published together.

Also regarding bound-withs: when some titles are bound together at one branch but separate in another, what is the best way to indicate that?

So that would be, it sounds like local practice. So the items weren't issued together or bound together at publication, it was done after the fact, so you probably wouldn't want to indicate that in the shared WorldCat bibliographic record but that would be considered local information.

Just to add, I agree that's purely local information that maybe would best be handled with notes rather than putting anything into the record in WorldCat.

Can field 777 be used for multivolume training materials, for instance? E.g. Module 1, Module 2, etc.?

I do not know enough about that field. I would think it would be modules for all issued at the same time and were somehow together, issued together, then it would be appropriate to use a 777.

It sounds like it is possible. I have never seen a record where that kind of thing has happened, at least that I remember. We see so many different scenarios played out in records, but not something that I've got multiple volumes that is just a set and use of a linking field to kind of say all of these volumes go together. What you do see often in that case is somebody making a decision to catalog the set itself and then, if the individual volumes were scattered around the collection in different classification, make separate records for the individual parts, and that's potentially the situation that could be handled with a 773 field to link the individual parts up to the parent record for the individual set, but not so much a 777.

Would you use a 786 field with items that were listed in a bibliography?

I am not sure about that. It seems more that the field is used when there is data in an item that's being used to create a different item. I don't know.

I think that you're basically correct. It's not the kind of thing that you would typically use to cite sources that were in a bibliography in some item, to say this is where the information came from. It's not as if 786 cannot be repeated, it can, but the typical situation that I think was envisioned when this field was added to the format was that the resource that you're cataloging don't see that many 786 fields around.

Does the "Insert from cited record" function pull in data appropriate to the particular linking tag -- for example, the edition statements for linked editions?

That feature does pull in information from a cited record. I'm not sure how targeted that data is for each specific tag. I do know you do need to have a correct linking tag and correct indicators in order for the feature to work. It would also be recommended that if you were creating a linking field and you wanted the edition information present, then you would just double check the linking field and make sure it was pulled over or you could add it manually. I'm not sure if the feature was built to work on most fields or if there was actually any specific targeting for it, but I know when I use this field, I always double check and make sure everything was pulled in and there's nothing that has to be deleted.

The way that "insert from cited record" works is that for whatever record that you key in the number and pull in the data, it is exactly the same format in all of the fields from 760 to 787. The difference in the way something is cited is based on whether it is a serial or a monograph. It will pull in different information from the other record depending on what it is. You could look at what we do for monographs and say well, that isn't necessarily current for RDA, or it has more information than what you might put in a link in an RDA record, but that's based on "insert from cited record" having been implemented in the system back in the days of AACR2, where you could have monographic titles that were in conflict, so the only way you could identify that would be to include edition statements, the place, publisher, date, so that's why all of that is there when you're citing a monograph and it's not there when you're citing a serial, because serials had unique titles.

What would be an example of an edition in a vertical relationship?

The only example that I think of in something like that would be an edition statement that reflects the coverage of an item, so if you had something that was perhaps the United States edition, but you had another publication that was specifically the Ohio edition of that publication.

For 7xx, \$w is required or optional?

In the input standards, that is a required subfield. It's of course really helpful in making linking fields actually link if there's an identifying number that can be used to navigate to that other record.

For these 7xx fields where they cannot be added to and/or edited in PCC records, are PCC participants able to add or edit these 7xx fields?

Yes. So the statements that we made in the slides where it cannot be added to or edited in PCC records, that statement is only if you are not a PCC participant. But PCC participants can edit those in the records.

For editions of integrating resources (especially legal resources), is it better to use the 780/785 fields or 775 field?

I don't know that one way is better than the other. For legal loose-leaf publications I have seen both 780/785 fields used to link between the different editions and 775 fields with subfield \$i linking the editions. Normally you think of 780/785 being used to link between the different iterations of serial titles, those fields show the before/after. With loose-leaf IRs, the editions are a form of before/after so that is a valid reason to use 780/785. On the other hand, they are "editions" and that is what field 775 is used for. I think this is ultimately a matter of cataloger's judgement.

Is there a movement to add multiple 780/785 fields to reflect multiple title changes within a serial's history?

The purpose was to identify the immediate successor and predecessor so that you could go to Title A, see that it changed to Title B, go to Title B and see the link back to Title A but also the link forward to Title C, and then be able to follow the progression that way. Even though complex notes are allowed in serial titles records, they are more meant for those complexities involving the immediate title change. So like in that "absorbed by" example that we covered, that was more of an immediate title change complex note. These title changes can get very unwieldy and what is considered a major title change and minor title change has altered over the course of time, depending on the cataloging guidelines used, so there's a bit more complexity in the situation if we included all of the title changes before a particular serial in these linking fields.

For electronic resource serial records, should the 780 and 785 fields reflect the electronic resource records? Or can they reflect the print version records? Or should both be included?

There are situations when you could point from a print to an electronic version as a later title. However, in a normal title change situation when you have a print and an electronic for title A, and a print and an electronic for title B, the 780 and 785 fields for the print would only point back and forth from the print title change, and then the same would occur in the electronic version, the 780 and 785 would only point back and forth between the electronic records for title A and title B. Then Title A, print, would be linked to Title A electronic with the 776 field that Robin covered. Title B in the same way would be linked between the print and the electronic using a 776 field, so you would have multiple 7xx fields in this situation. There is a situation when the print ends and is continued by an electronic version that has a title change; in this case, because it is a different version record, you would use the 776 field to link to that later title change instead of using the 785 field. Because it is another version record. And you would note that in the relationship area, so the subfield \$i would be "continues online," and then it would point back from the online to the print using the dates that the print spanned.

A number of slides state that some fields are required if applicable for full-level cataloging. However, the PCC BIBCO Standard Record doesn't consider most 7XX fields as required. Instead they are optional. So why are these fields "required if applicable"?

My guess is these are required if applicable when inputting full level cataloging in WorldCat, for purposes of WorldCat cataloging, and they do in general follow the guidelines put forth by the PCC. The idea is you would want a full level record to include as many of the pieces of information, especially with title changes within WorldCat database, so that it's easier to get from the different titles and see the relationship.

In some cases, we may have looked at a field in the past and said "okay, there are standards outside of WorldCat that treat them differently, and we may want to go above and beyond, in requiring something," but I think in other cases, some of these input standards have been around for many years and they just haven't been reevaluated in light of changes in cataloging. So I think that it would be useful if people sent any fields they were concerned about to askqc@oclc.org and we could reconsider the input standards or at least discuss them and say we decided to be different than the BIBCO standard record for a particular reason. It may be it's required if applicable just because that's the way it was implemented 30 years ago.

Are all the 7xx that are required in a full record needed only if the record is RDA, or are they equally necessary when the record is AACR2?

The input standards are required no matter what the cataloging rules used are. So basically it means if it's RDA or AACR2, you would still follow the input standards that are spelled out in Bibliographic Formats and Standards.

What is the best linking field to use if you have an antique map that has been extracted from an atlas and you want to link the map to the atlas title? 773 or 787?

Because the map has been extracted from the atlas, you no longer need the directions that are usually available in the 773 to actually go to the atlas to find the map, so it would be better to use the 787 field. If you wanted to create a record for the map and it's still inside the atlas, then you would use field 773, pointing to the exact location within the atlas, where the map is located.

When an eBook is a "reprint", what date(s) should be used in the fixed fields? And how should the publisher information and dates be expressed in 26x, 5xx, and 7xx fields?

I'm assuming in this case that you're talking about something that was a reprint in its print form and that that has been reproduced to be the digitized version that you see online. In that case, you would treat fields like the dates and 260 or 264 the same as you would have if you were cataloging its print counterpart.

No, I'm saying the publisher contributed MARC record for an ebook that has a different date than the print. Is an eBook which duplicates the title page except a change in date, a "reprint" or and edition or neither? What should the dates be in the fixed field, and how is the relation explained in notes, and 7xx fields?

In general, the date when an item is made available online is not a publication date. The date used in a record for an electronic resource which was originally published in print would be the same publication date as the print. As the electronic item is an electronic representation of a print item, the record description should describe the original print item but contain the appropriate electronic fields and coding. This relationship would use 776 fields to link the print and online versions to each other.

Sometimes a publisher will obtain a title then publish or republish it as an electronic resource, the original having been published in print and/or online by the original publisher. In this case, the new publisher will have "removed" the original title page and replaced it with a new title page. In this case, the electronic resource record description should reflect the new publication information and a note could be included in the record referencing the original item, such as a field 534, Original Version Note. A field 775 Other Edition Entry could also be used to link to the record for the original publication.

If the only difference is date, you need to determine if that date is indicating when the resource was made available online or if it is actually a publication date. If you need assistance with a specific resource, you are welcome to ask Metadata Quality staff at askqc@oclc.org, we would be happy to help.

OCLC's Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) addresses electronic resources in Chapter 3, Special Cataloging Guidelines at <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html>. Specifically sections 3.1.1, Provider-Neutral Cataloging: Online Resources at <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#onlineresources> and section 3.3.1, Special Types of Publications: Electronic Resources at <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#electronicresources>. For field 534, see <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/5xx/534.html>, and for field 775, see <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/7xx/775.html>.

If a title is issued simultaneously in different languages and you are not sure which is the original language, what tag would you suggest using to trace the relationship?

It seems like it would probably be 767. This field can be used when the item in the horizontal relationship is the original or another translation. So it might be safer to use this field because you're not pointing to what the original language was, you're just pointing to a different language edition.

You do see that in Canadian publications where the government will issue the same text in English and also in French simultaneously, so you can't say that one is necessarily a translation of the other, so if they are truly simultaneous and you don't know that there's any translation involved or what is the original language, you would use 775. You would use 765, 767 in cases where you actually have a translation that you know.

When a print title ceases and it continues as the same title in electronic version, do you use 780 to 785 to link the two?

When a print title ceases and it continues as the same title in electronic version, you would use field 776 to link the two, instead of fields 780 and 785.

776 08 \$i Continued online: ... [on print version record]

776 08 \$i Print version, -2019: ... [on online version record]

Only use fields 780 and 785 when both a title change and format change exist. For example, the print version ceases along with a title change to the online version. Both the print and online versions records representing the earlier titles would point to each other using field 776, and both records would also link to the later title, online version record using field 785.

Print version record:

776 08 \$i Online version: ... [link to other format with same title]

785 00 ... [link to later title]

Online version record:

776 08 \$i Print version: ... [link to other format with same title]

785 00 ... [link to later title]

Later title, online version record:

780 00 ... [link to earlier title, online version record]

780 00 ... [link to earlier title, print version record]

When a new item has a relationship with an older item, who is responsible for adding the reciprocal relationship to the older record?

In general, when a title changes and a member institution adds a new record representing that title change, the institution inputting the new record is encouraged to add the reciprocal linking field in the record representing the earlier title. If this does not fit with your workflow or you are unable to, you may email a request to bibchange@oclc.org.

In the past I asked how to link print and ebook for older materials when there are more than one print records and e-books. I was told we are allowed to add more than one 7xx fields in the record to point to the different records for the other format. Is this still the case?

Yes, you may use multiple 776 fields in a bibliographic record for point to other formats. You may also use multiple 7xx linking fields in a bibliographic record as appropriate.

7xx cannot link to the known version if it is not recorded in OCLC/LC system because there is no \$w record control number?

Subfield \$w is "Required if applicable" in 7xx linking fields in bibliographic record. So, if a control number is available, then you should add it to the bibliographic record. However, if there is no control number available, then you do not have to include one in the field. If a record is added at a later date, the control number may be added at that time.

773 not used for offprints and detached copies. How can we link digital articles, to the journal they belong to? True, there's no a physical relationship, but they're still associated with a specific journal issue, keep continuous pagination, etc.

Offprints or detached copies are issued separately but often alongside of the original for either the author or limited distribution. Information about offprints and detached copies along OCLC's policy can be found at BFAS 3.2.2, Offprints and Detached Copies (<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#offprintsanddetachedcopies>).

However, you may use field 773 to link digital articles to the journal they belong to. BFAS 3.2.1, "In" Analytics (<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging.html#inanalytics>) states that articles are considered part of this category and a 773 should be used. Note that some types of publications, such as a single issue of a serial may also use 773 but are not considered "In" Analytics in nature.

Feb. 18, 2021, session notes:

Do we only worry about coding the related resources in various 7xxs fields when the related bib records are also available in WorldCat?

I think you could still create a linking field for the related resource even if there wasn't a functional number to link it to. So, for example, with the earlier and later titles, you might know the later title but just not know the individual numbers that go along with it. You could enter part of the information into a 785 for the later title, and that would be okay. The idea behind doing it that way would be that later when the control number comes along, you could easily fit it in at that point.

Are the slides for the series/subseries missing the subfield "i"? Slides 31 and 32, the examples that didn't include subfield "i."

With some of them, we included subfield \$i with second indicator 8 to show how you would set it up with second indicator 8. In other examples, I showed it using the default second indicator, to show it would generate that default constant display.

Does "may not be added to and/or edited in PCC records" mean that it can't be edited by non-PCC libraries, but can by PCC libraries?

Yes. We took those statements based on information in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, Chapter 5, and that has a title on what fields non-PCC libraries can add or edit in PCC records. So if you're interested in seeing the full list, I recommend BFAS, Chapter 5.

In PCC cataloging, wouldn't you ordinarily make a 7xx for a related work as a work--in a 700 name-title entry, for example--rather than using a linking field to specify a particular manifestation?

Yeah, that is correct. In monographic cataloging, you typically would make an access point for a related work, and as coding has developed in the MARC format in support of the implementation of RDA, it's far easier now to be explicit about what the relationship is, so that that information can be included directly in that access point field. So a lot of these linking fields would not necessarily be used in monographic cataloging.

Maybe I missed something in the beginning, but why can these fields NOT be added to PCC records?

Generally, the fields that can be added directly to PCC records by a non-PCC participants have been limited to the kinds of things like call numbers in additional schemes and subject headings in additional schemes and various kinds of note fields that are pretty unique, such as contents note or even a summary note. So the linking fields haven't really been in that category. Not that we couldn't reconsider that, in light of the question, but they just have never been considered to be quite in the same category for people to just add them to PCC records.

Why are these fields not transferred when records are merged? Does this mean that the linking data is lost?

So when records are merged, with DDR, we're unsure of what the quality is for some of the records. Some of them might be very good quality, both the retained and the duplicate, but with the duplicates, there's no real way to programmatically give this in a real and meaningful way for DDR purposes. So that's why some of these fields are not automatically transferred when those records are merged. Now, for manual transfers, if the person doing the merging just looks at the two records and says "oh, wow, this field really does need to be added to the other one; it would make the record more complete, it adds quality to it," then that cataloger can manually transfer it but it does require someone to manually look at the records when they are merging.

Does the fact that some 7XX fields are not transferrable factor in to whether a record gets merged? Do these fields get added to a record before a merge takes place?

The 7XX fields are not taken in consideration directly in terms of deciding what record to keep and merge. They would be considered in terms of records that we would look at and say, well, they're equal in rank. So let's say that we have two records that are both I-level and the software is looking at the number of fields that are present as well as the number of holdings. so in that sense, 7XX fields would be counted and be part of the equation of what record we're going to keep in a case like that. That is sort of a different situation than somebody who's manually looking at two records to merge and evaluating the content of the two records to say "this one looks better than the other one does." And certainly, you can think of cases in serials where you would look at the linking fields in particular to sort of figure out what is going on. If one record has coverage that's greater than the other record, it may be that somebody created a duplicate record, added a 785 for what should have been a minor title change, so that explains why this one only runs for a period of ten years where the other record is still open and ongoing, covering fifty years. So you look at 7XX fields, the linking fields, but in terms of automation, they don't really get considered in quite the same way.

What is the difference between 501 (with) and 777 (issued with)?

For field 501, that's a "with" note, so it's used primarily to describe resources as they were originally published, released, issued, or executed, and the 777 "issued with" entry is information about publications which are separately cataloged but that are issued with or included with the target item. And you specifically would not use this field for bound-with notes.

Does anyone ever use 760 or 762 fields anymore?

CONSER practice is to not use 760/762, instead relying on 830 to describe the relationship.

I'm sure that monograph practice is to do the same thing and rely on an 8xx series tracing instead. 760/762, within WorldCat nowadays is a pretty rare thing.

I assume we should link to English language titles if we are an English language cataloging institution and NOT link to records with other languages in 040 \$b.

That's correct. It should be links to records that are in the same language of cataloging rather than crossing from one language to another. So it may be the case that today there is only a German language of cataloging record available, don't put that bibliographic record number in a citation if you are cataloging in English. To cite a number, there really should be an English language record to cite.

If you were merging a CONSER record and an unreliable record, and the CONSER record has a linking field, does it get retained?

There's a hierarchy on which records get retained, and the CONSER record does get retained over any other record in that hierarchy. So the linking fields in the CONSER record will never go away, at least as far as a merge is concerned. So the CONSER record will always win out.

Many CDs consist (in part or as a whole) of re-issued content. Under what circumstances is it useful and correct to include a 775 field linking to the original issue?

This would be a local decision and, even then, may vary greatly depending upon the circumstances surrounding each individual audio recording. In general, a 500 note explaining that the material has been previously released in whole or in part is sufficient. In that note, you may include further identification about earlier releases, including the audio format (such as LP or 78), the recording label or publisher, any pertinent title information, dates, publisher number, and so on.

If you look at the PCC Standing Committee on Training (SCT) *Training Manual for Applying Relationship Designators in Bibliographic Records* (<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/sct/documents/rel-desig-guide-bib.pdf>), "Guideline 13: Relationship Designators for Resource-to-Resource Relationships" seems to be the only relevant guidance. It does state that "The use of relationship designators for resource-to-resource relationships is encouraged," but if you go through the still-official Original RDA Toolkit Appendix J (Relationship Designators: Relationships between Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items), none of the designators really apply to this situation. You are certainly allowed to "use another concise term to indicate the nature of the relationship" (J.1), but you may alternatively draw the inference that perhaps a linking field isn't necessary to account for these types of relationships.

My suggestion would be generally to not bother with a linking field in this circumstance. Use field 500 to include the previous manifestation data at the level of detail you believe to be useful and appropriate. If you want to give access to the publisher and publisher number of any earlier manifestations, use field 028. If there is any title information worth giving access to, use field 740.

How important is name/title data in a 7XX linking field when an OCLC record number or other record number is present? Does name/title metadata in 7XX need to be maintained to support linking functionality?

I'm sure that the theory is "no, it doesn't need to be there; you just need some kind of identifier." On the other hand, we're still at a point where people are dependent on that data in a linking field to actually display a name and title, to see what's going on. I expect that most local systems don't necessarily use the identifier to go grab the information from the related record and supply it in a display. Maybe some do, but I'm thinking probably most don't. So we still have this historical practice of including the name/title data in addition to identifiers that we would also put in the link. And it helps in certain situations. I think certainly in the work that we do in maintaining the quality of the data in WorldCat, we've seen instances where the subfield \$w had a typo in the number, and we have the name/title for the successor title in the case of a serial that had a major title change, and having that information helps in sort of figuring out what was intended when the identifier leads you to something that's clearly incorrect.

Is 7XX \$a included in browse indexes in OCLC? My concern is that a lot of older print items now appear in digital form with 7xx links. Maintaining a name in the older record becomes more onerous if we have to chase down 7XX occurrences.

I believe that it not. But I'm not 100% sure on that. It does not appear to be part of the phrase searching; only the keyword search. So for example, 780, subfield a, is only searchable by the au: search.

I can agree with that, it is a real nuisance to have to maintain the same information all over the place. Going back to what was mentioned earlier about just including an identifier in a link, it makes sense if we could then interactively just pull in the information from the related record and always have it display whatever is currently in that related record. That would be a good thing. And that's something some of us have been talking about for 20, 30 years. It just hasn't happened. The way I would look at it now is the numbers you would potentially include in subfield \$x, the ISSN, the ISBN in a subfield \$z, and of course the control numbers in subfield \$w, that those are the most important things to maintain, and if the citation gets a little bit out of date, out of step with the related record, that's something we might be able to resolve in the future using all of those identifiers. So you think of a future environment where we rely on identifiers more so than is the case today, then we could get information from the related resource and populate a display.

Is 775 added to a record for the original title when what I have is an intermediate translation... I have a Spanish translation from the English version of a French work... the 775 will be for the original French?

I would typically use field 775 for these situations where you have the same resource in two languages, when they're issued at the same time so that it would be difficult to say that the English is the translation from the French, or the French is the translation from the English, thinking more that 765/767 would be used, but that is another case where, in monographic cataloging, you would more likely do an access point.

We have started to see uncapitalized 655 AAT headings in records, which seem to be related to a linking project adding subfield 0. Is this the final version of these headings?

Yes, that is the final version.

If cataloging say an online version of something using title main entry, and using a 776 field with the insert from cited record function for the print version which is incorrectly using author/title main entry, if the print version record is corrected at some point to title main entry, does the 776 field in the online version get updated somehow?

Unfortunately, no, that is not an automated process. That wouldn't happen. Ideally, whoever was working on the record would see that and hop over and manually fix the record or report it to BibChange so we can fix the record, and I know myself and others in Metadata Quality, if we're working on, say, a print record and we see that 776, we will pop over to the electronic record and make sure the links are correct going back and forth between the records.

What is the Member Merge Program? How is the merge program going? Who do I contact if I'm interesting in the participating in the merge program?

The Member Merge Project is a program where we train our member institutions to merge duplicate records. It is going very well. We have 53 institutions that are participating and we are starting up another round right now, we just actually reached out to four more institutions that are going to be joining the program, but if you're interested and you are a participant of PCC, please send a message to askqc@oclc.org.

Are there major functionality differences between Record Manager and Connexion Browser? Is one more limited than the other?

There is a webinar coming up on Record Manager in a few days, and then I located a comparison chart that shows the differences between our cataloging applications that might be useful: <https://www.oclc.org/go/en/oclc-cataloging-application-comparison.html>.

I've noticed some German language records in OCLC that say DLC. For example, OCLC no. 1179117272. What is the story behind that? Why would they say DLC if they are not cataloged by the Library of Congress?

A longstanding practice from years ago would be for our indexing to look at the coding of source at the tail end of the 008 field, and based on that, if it was coded as blank or even coded as c, we assumed that it was either the Library of Congress or a Library Congress Cooperative Cataloging Program. But definitions in MARC are broader than that nowadays, where blank would be used by any national library, and c could be used for any cooperative program, so source isn't coded in quite the same way across WorldCat as you would have seen in the past. But we haven't updated our indexing to reflect the kind of changes that you see, so records that come from the German National Library, they have source blank, and consequently we're marking things as LC, and particularly in the case of source c, we're marking things as Library of Congress cataloging that are not. We do have a JIRA ticket open so we can take care of that, it's not implemented yet.

I was trying to reach WorldCat Discovery Team to ask a question about its Release Notes. What is their email address?

I would recommend going to OCLC Support and they will direct you to the OCLC staff that could answer your question. And that's support@oclc.org.

I work mostly with technical and scientific materials, for which there are numerous records in WorldCat in Dublin Core or other non-"regular" MARC records. I get overwhelmed by them. But I am interested only in regular MARC records. Can OCLC create a search limiter in Connexion and Record Manager to limit searches by "regular" MARC and non-MARC (or Dublin Core/non-DC). That would really help.

I don't know if this will help, but in a lot of the searching that I do where I want to weed out of the results Digital Gateway records, I would put in "not AC=DC," and that would cause them to fall out of the search results.

In linking fields, subfield \$t contains "title information from subfields a, f, g, k, n, and p of field 130 or field 245 of the related record." If you have a 130, where does info from 245 go? In the same \$t subfield?

Only one field (either field 130 or 245) is chosen as the title used in subfield \$t in the linking field. So if a record has a 130 field that field would be used because it has the differentiating information needed to distinguish the title in the 245 field from others with the same main title. Therefore the thinking is that there would be no need to include the title in field 245.