

2021-04 VAOH Session

Presentation summary

Local data in WorldCat records

Hayley Moreno and Robin Six discussed how members can keep their local data out of the shared bibliographic record, by either using other types of locally maintained records or in fields not retained in the WorldCat record. Joining them during the Question & Answer section were Robert Bremer and Bryan Baldus.

Resources and URLs mentioned during the presentation:

[About local bibliographic data](#)

[BFAS 3.4 Local Information in Records](#)

[BFAS 5.2 Member Capabilities](#)

[Brief guidelines for editing and replacing WorldCat master records](#)

[LBD Fields](#)

[MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data](#)

[OCLC local holdings records](#)

[OCLC-MARC local holdings format and standards](#)

[Virtual AskQC Office Hours](#) oc.lc/askqc

- April 2018 URLs in a shared cataloging environment
- June 2018 What is the expert community?
- January 2019 When to input a new record
- February 2019 Provider neutral cataloging
- August 2019 OCLC cataloging policies: An overview of Bibliographic Formats and Standards
- January 2020 Best practices for editing WorldCat bibliographic records
- February 2020 Best practices for enriching WorldCat bibliographic records

[Work with local bibliographic data](#)

[WorldCat Discovery release notes, March 2021](#)

[WorldCat Holdings](#)

[WorldShare Record Manager training](#) – includes Local Holdings Records training

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/8xx/856.html> has an element about DOI

https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Collection_Manager/Understand_reports/MyFiles/My_Files_reports

https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Collection_Manager/Choose_your_Collection_Manager_workflow/Query_collections/About_query_collections_in_Collection_Manager/About_query_collections?sl=en

<https://www.oclc.org/community/discovery/modernization.en.html>

<https://www.oclc.org/community/discovery/events/item-details-configuration.en.html>

Member questions

April 13, 2021 session notes:

If we find a library's local information in an OCLC master record, should we report it and how?

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#requestingchangestorecords> shows all the different ways you can report issues with records to Metadata Quality staff.

If we encounter another institution's local data in a WorldCat master record that isn't for an archival or special collections resource, should we ignore it, or do we have permission to delete these fields? The presence of this information is often problematic for Discovery users because it appears to users as if it applies to our own holdings.

If you're unsure if a field is too local and should not belong in a WorldCat record, but you don't want to take it off feel free to send them to us. If you are able to edit the WorldCat record to remove what is clearly local data, by all means, feel free to do that, but we would appreciate if you could just send us a note about it in whatever way is convenient for you, whichever way you normally report errors. Because the odds are, if you're finding a local note on a record, it's going to be on multiple records and that will give us the opportunity to look at it and hunt down any additional records and correct them in bulk. There might be an opportunity for us to reach out to the institution that contributed those notes for educational purposes. So, by all means, feel free to edit the record if you're able to. But we would also appreciate being notified, so we could follow up if additional actions need to be taken.

What is the philosophy behind including local, copy-specific info in the OCLC record for rare/special collections materials? What is the value to the world to see in WorldCat that Library X's copy 2 is bound in purple leather, or that it was acquired as part of the Blah-Blah Collection? Or are these cases of "abuse of local info" that we shouldn't be seeing in OCLC records?

Certainly, you're going to find records that have local information. It may not be coded as local information, but when you look at it you know it's local information. Please do report those to us. It may be that you have something that is unique, for example an artist book. Something original, maybe that you're cataloging for your collection, you want to make it as descriptive as possible for your users. And you keep your records in WorldCat. I'm not sure of the philosophy behind it. I can see plenty of reasons why you would want to, but always keeping in mind that if you're sharing this information to WorldCat other institutions are going to see it. It's going to show up in their records as well or in in the main record in WorldCat. There are lots of different opinions about cataloging rare materials, what's important to somebody who deals with rare materials may not be the case for somebody who works in a more general way, and was just looking at the item as they were adding it to the collection and views it as just an old book, or may look at it and say this is really valuable it needs to be described in very specific detail. A lot of the details that you see in rare book cataloging are really interesting to others that are dealing with the same kinds of materials. They're trying to differentiate whether they have another copy of exactly the same thing or differences in printings of materials are going to be of interest to different users. We try to accommodate everybody, as much as we can, that means that we lean on the side of allowing more information in records that represent rare materials with the idea that if you don't need it - for somebody that is using that same record for copy cataloging - they can edit it out locally, perhaps, but it is very much a different philosophy for rare materials versus everything else.

How secure is LBD information, e.g., for donor names?

[WorldCat Discovery release notes, March 2021](#) If you don't want donor information in a particular field to be shown to your users, you can omit that from being shown.

I would be interested in a session on how to pull reports in WMS on LBD and LHR data. I'm talking about pulling reports in WMS. We have Report Designer.

[WorldShare Analytics Office Hours](#)

I'm going to pass this along to the analytics team and have them reach out to you, if you want to send us your email address or email ask, we'll make sure you get in contact with the right person.

Does anything need to be said about the use of \$5 with non-local MARC fields? Or when would it be appropriate to have in the WorldCat record a field that represents data specific to an institution is designated in the subfield 5.

That would be for a note or added entry where, say, somebody famous had donated an item to a specific institution. Say they was a noteworthy person, and this is a rare book or something, and they pass it onto your institution, you want to make note of that in the bibliographic record. It's rare, it's unlikely anybody's going to have this same item. You have the note, you have the subfield \$5. Say somebody looks at this record and they're looking for this item and they see your resource and it has a 500 note with the subfield \$5 that says it's signed by Abraham Lincoln, That's kind of noteworthy. It's probably a little bit of interest outside of your local institution and that's just information that's made available to everybody else, even though it is only specific to your resource.

\$5 with non-local MARC fields: this is part of the PCC Provider-neutral Guidelines for e-resources

Yes, in the case of provider-neutral cataloging, there was a need to indicate preservation information that would be specific to a single institution. So rather than have 2 records for an electronic resource, when a library has been involved in some digital preservation program, the decision was to go ahead and include that information in a single provider neutral record that would otherwise be used for cataloging of any instance of that resource online preservation information, though is not necessarily of interest to everybody, so those preservation fields that are used, one of them would be marked with subfield \$5, to say that it is really specific to the particular instance that is been used for digital preservation.

For eBooks, what dates should be put in MARC records, and in which fields? When creating an eBook MARC record: eBook has 2021 on t.p., c2014 on t.p. verso., No edition statement in eBook.

A print book was released in 2014.

Publisher in eBook matches publisher in the 2014 print record.

Pagination in eBook matches 2014 print record.

Option A: 264 _1 2014. Single date in Fixed fields, 2014, ---- (ignore the 2021 date)

Option B: 264 _4 \$c c2014 ; 264 _2 2021. Single date in Fixed field, 2014, ----

Option C: 264 _4 \$c 2014 ; 264 _2 2021. Reprint date in Fixed field, 2021, 2014

other options?

Recall 264 2nd indicators:

264 _0 Production.

264 _1 Publication.

264 _2 Distribution.

264 _3 Manufacture.

264 _4 Copyright notice date.

What dates do you use in a bibliographic record when it is an electronic resource, and it was originally issued or published in print form?

With that criteria, the description of the electronic resource should match the description of the print resource. And it's going to be the additional electronic fields that bring out the dates. Or any information that's electronic. And that doesn't necessarily include dates because different providers make that resource available online in different years. Say, 1 provider has a contractor or an agreement to provide this title for 5 years and then they drop it from their collection. Somebody else picks it up and makes it available in their collection. Then you'd have to go into the bibliographic record and change dates. The actual date is the date the item was originally published. And then the electronic information is added to make an electronic record. Under Provider-neutral cataloging guidelines, you're taking the publication date from the title page that

you see, that would normally correspond to the print. There isn't the same level of interest in when the item was digitized and placed online, partly because the 1 record is going to stand for all instances of that same resource as found online. They were probably put online by different providers at different points in time, so it's that original date of publication that is there on the title page. Part of it is does this conflict with what is in AACR2 or RDA and the answer is absolutely it is not in line with either those standards. But it's what is required for provider neutral. To make sure that this was accounted for some providers changed the title page date, but nothing else. How does that play into this? Providers can play all sorts of horrible tricks on us. It may be that you would end up looking at the print record realizing it's the same thing. And particularly if you're dealing with a provider that has a history of changing bibliographic information, or not necessarily presenting everything that you would expect to see. They digitize a book, but they don't give you that original title page. It depends on what is available to you as you are cataloging. A record that you might base on one instance, available from one provider might be altered when it's available from a 2nd provider and an original title page can be seen. You have to take that into account as a cataloger. It's not like you can do endless research on some item when you're cataloging it, you pretty much have to take what you see. If you suspect that you can't see the original title page, or that kind of thing, described from the title page that you have it's possible to include information in a 588 to say what you have based the description on and it's possible to base the description of the electronic version on the print item itself.

I discovered some subject headings that we had entered in a record as 655 _7 \$2 local had been programmatically changed by OCLC to 655 _4. Is that the preferred entry form to use 2nd indicator 4 instead of 2nd indicator 7 with subfield 2 local?

We view those as essentially equivalent. I know that a lot of libraries look at that and look at the MARC definition and say, well, they don't mean exactly the same thing. But in the context of WorldCat, they really do essentially mean the same thing. There isn't a particular preference, but we do change them to be a 2nd indicator "4" rather than a 2nd indicator "7" with a subfield 2 local, in part because we transfer data into records based on scheme, etc. identified by the 2nd indicator and the subfield \$2. To our system it looks like 655 with the 2nd indicator "4" in a different scheme than a 2nd indicator "7" with a subfield \$2 that says local when in fact they're actually the same. So, if we make them the same, then we don't have the same level of duplication that we would have otherwise. It's possible to call up a record and see the very same term in a 655 with a 2nd indicator "4" and also as a 655 with 2nd indicator "7" and a subfield \$2. We try to avoid that as much as possible.

Is it possible to export LBD records ? We only managed to export bib records which are merged with LBD fields (with query collection).

Yes, you are able to export the records through Record Manager. The help.oclc.org is a great resource on how to use query collections: [About query collections in Collection Manager](#)

Does OCLC have plans to deal with the presence in master records of 856 fields coded for specific institutions' authentication/proxy methods? There seem to be a small number of libraries responsible for adding these fields (perhaps through an automated process?), but they tend to clutter the master records and the time it takes to erase them really adds up

over time. Does OCLC routinely and systematically "comb through" master level electronic resource records to remove institution-specific 856s?

We do deal with removing 856 fields that are specific to an institution, particularly when there's a more general one that is available instead. It's much easier to do for commercial providers where we have a general URL available, and we'll try to transform the one that's local into the general one. and then, if it turns out it's a duplicate field, it will drop out of the record. And we do that using macros to clean these kinds of things up, but it only deals with a portion of the problem. There was a period of time where we had lots of 856 fields transferring more than is the case now. So that's where a lot of these things have come from the past. If you see any one specific institution where this happens a lot or a URL from a particular provider where this has happened a lot go ahead and contact us. Because then we can put some effort into dealing with that particular problem and get it out of the way as much as possible.

I see a lot of 710 fields with subfield 5 for the special collections of other institutions. We use WMS and Discovery, so there is no way for us to delete them. Is it proper to request that the fields be removed?

Absolutely shoot us a message and let us know, and we will definitely take a look at it. If you are concerned and want feedback, just say I found this, there's possibly more, could you let me know? We'll definitely take care of it, respond back to you, and say yes thanks for reporting this, there were 50 more we've taken care of. These often have subfield \$5s and we still want to know because not everybody uses the \$5 as it was intended. So, we would want to review that.

Can you add a MARC record in OCLC WorldShare under Record Manager in OCLC WorldShare can you create a MARC record for your library online for your library use only?

Not yet, but future functionality will include this. That's still not scheduled, but in the future, you'll be able to do that. It's planned work, we have the requirements for that, we just don't have a timeline when that will be released.

LAC uses 710 for the bilingual equivalents as part of our bilingual cataloguing as a national library. Would you be removing those? Our use of the 7XX for bilingual equivalents was discussed and implemented as part of our migration to WorldShare.

We're very careful about what we do with Library Archives Canada records because of their use of, and in particular the need to accommodate some elements that are needed for their unique catalog and the situation with accommodating records into language is French and English. We like to have these reported, we do remove things when it's appropriate to remove them and I'm speaking generally, but we do take care, we are rather conservative in our edits just like we're conservative with our merging. That may leave more data, or in this case, in an emerging case, duplicate records within WorldCat, but that's because we're erring on the side of caution and feel that the duplicate may be more acceptable in some cases than removing it and losing that information. And then Rich comments that most of the community has, he believes, has a hands-off approach to LAC data and WorldCat. So, we're definitely very, very respectful of that.

Situation: PN record, 500 field with no subfield 5 which says digitized from some specific library. Can that note be removed? It clearly doesn't apply all the digitized versions on the provider neutral record.

I would agree because the record is intended to stand for all instances of that same resource as available online, particularly when it's available from more than one provider that not is specific to one institution, perhaps it shouldn't be needed.

Is there more information about the 338 field and Spanish? \$2rdacarrier/spa

I do know with the tool kit having a translator version in Spanish, you can find more of the terminology, the cultural vocabulary for the RDA terms in Spanish. You can get more information in there. The macro and the work that we're doing adds Spanish 33X fields to the record when appropriate. We automatically add Spanish 33X fields

Hayley's example of course, was in the context of an LHR but in bibliographic records, the expectation is that the 33X fields would be in the same language of cataloging as the rest of the description. Occasionally, we'll come across a record that is marked as cataloging in Spanish, but the terms and 336, 337, 338 are in English. We'll go ahead and convert those whenever we can, and then mark the language code and the subfield \$2. So, you'll see something like RDA carrier to indicate Spanish.

[RDA Registry has such controlled terms in multiple languages.](#)

Irene is asking if we could recommend OCLC resources that describe in detail the information that has been presented today.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards: all of the fields are listed in there, also the online help pages. If you go to oclc.org, and look under support or help, you will find local Holdings information, local data information. The help site could help, do a keyword search - it's really nice and it has categorized listings of all the fields. Plus, you'll have the resources in this video to look back on as well.

Very off topic question: Would you ever consider making it possible to save a record without closing it? The process of saving and re-opening has been a big time-eater this past year of working from home with a less-than-totally-reliable connection. Closes when saving to online save file.

We'll look into this.

April 22, 2021 session notes:

At this library, they receive only the Cross-reference exception report after we upload our records to, and this is done weekly. Is it okay? To ignore other reports that come along with the cross reference and can we explain how to retrieve the impounded records?

Thank you very much question. We have limited expertise in this area. Metadata Quality team doesn't work quite a bit with this, but we had some internal chat as the session was going on. First to share, which I've now put into the chat to everybody is a link to my understanding my file reports. And if this ultimately doesn't help answer this particular question, then we suggest reaching out to Support@oclc.org. This is the support system, and they will absolutely be able to direct you into the right place or anyone who has questions regarding these cross ref, exception reports for this.

At the Lillian Goldman Law Library (Yale University), we review only the Cross.Ref exception report after we upload our records to OCLC weekly. Is it okay to ignore other reports that come along with the Cross.Ref? Also, can you explain as to how to “retrieve” the impounded records? Thank you.

[My Files reports](#) Please reach out to Support@oclc.org.

How can a consortium use the local notes field?

If the group has some sort of Discovery package, and they want to share that particular note, then an LBD seems to be the more appropriate place, rather than an LHR.

Should we decide to use our institution public interface, even if we are subscribing to WorldCat Discovery, would we be able to extract local data for our users?

Yes, in both Record Manager and Collection Manager. It's a little easier to do it in Collection Manager as a query collection. If you want to learn how to do that check out this link: https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Collection_Manager/Choose_your_Collection_Manager_workflow/Query_collections/About_query_collections_in_Collection_Manager/About_query_collections?sl=en

Then the other part of the question is, should we decide to use our institution public interface even if you're describing to Discovery? That's a great question and a lot of institutions do need to deal with that particular situation. I know that there's reasons, in some cases to use your public interface and then there's reason to use Discovery. Of course, us being on the call here, we would love for you to use WorldCat Discovery interface and there are quite a few benefits to doing that as well. But the first part of that question is a really good local question to have with not only the catalog within your institution but also with people who work with the public services and users, which may be one and the same. It's definitely a local decision for that.

You also have a comment about access music, libraries having local notes for the music records for these. There are providers around that do not have any kind of general URL that would take you to something about the item. If it's metadata or in the case of something like Ebooks that drop you at a title page that they might let you see. In those cases where that's entirely all local,

we would certainly like to reduce the number. The problem that we have when there's a general URL when there is one additional that is institution specific is really a problem of clutter in these records, where you have the same domain name over and over and over, and most of those are not going to work for anybody. If there was only one URL for Naxos on one of those records and it was local it's still not going to work for anybody. Our general approach to that in the past was, we're okay with perhaps removing the other times. We've looked at it and said, well, one is better than none at all. So it's something that we may need to discuss about what we want to do with these kinds of things across the board because if it's entirely something that is unavailable to everybody else in WorldCat, that sort of raises the question of why have it.

Should things like 856 with a link to a local book fund plates or a table of contents those kinds of things that are password protected, be in an 856 in the WorldCat record?

What is described in the question is a link to a local Book Fund Plate, or table contents, that's password protected. Those are local institution-specific type links, it sounds like. So, no, they should not be in the WorldCat bibliographic.

Is adding DOI ids to LHR 856s a norm? Is adding those kinds of identifiers to 856 a norm? Or, maybe to put a different way, good places to add.

I'm used to seeing them in the 024 field. To be honest, I have not yet come across it in an 856. But I would tend to see them more in an 024 field and we actually recently had an example in Bibliographic Format and Standards showing it in field 024, even though we don't see them a whole lot within the 856. It seems to me though, because of the nature of being the link, a potential link to an item itself, those would go on the WorldCat record.

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/8xx/856.html> has an element about DOI

I find that 38x fields often won't validate because of an invalid value in the \$2. I end up having to delete them to validate the record.

If something doesn't validate please notify us. We see validation updates often and usually need to update both the validation rules and the User interface to account for the change.

If there are invalid values in subfield \$2 perhaps they are just codes, like from an earlier time period, as opposed to a more specific code based on some terminology that's coming from the registry because those codes have developed over time and our validation is a match to development as well. But I suppose that if a particular one has a subfield \$2 that just says when the expected term for that 38X field is from some specific list within the RDA registry that probably it would fail. Let us know about any one example, and that's one of those cases where we can go look for more of them and potentially get them changed to a valid code.

I enter holdings in summary field, 852 \$z and 599. Where does 852 \$z information show up in Discovery?

Our group does not work directly with Discovery but here is a link to documentation: https://help.oclc.org/Discovery_and_Reference/WorldCat_Discovery/Display_local_data We encourage you to write to Support@oclc.org and they will help you.

How is LBD data merged with WorldCat record data for export to a local ILS?

Record Manager inter-weaves it. Collection manager has the 2 options

https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/LBD/Work_with_local_bibliographic_data

Does those OCLC routinely and systematically comb through WorldCat level electronic record resource records to remove institution-specific 856s?

Cleaning up the records when errors or issues like this are reported to bibchange@oclc.org, we review that and if it looks like something that has been added to multiple records well, if it's something local, we'll go ahead and fix that record. Then we usually go on and search for additional records and target those that require a log in, and which anybody from an institution can log in with the log in credentials. Of course, we always want to be careful about any that we end up deleting or transforming in some other way. But, if we get a report, and it's a case where one record was reported, but we have another 5,000 that have the same kind of issue we'll try to add logic to macros that we use to possibly transform a URL to be a generic one for that provider, as opposed to an institution-specific one. Periodically we have gone back through Ebook records to deal with it. There was a time period where we did a lot of field transfer that wasn't really intended, and we picked up a lot of institution-specific URLs that we needed to get rid of. And we could probably do that over and over and over again to help clean them up. If you see a problem like that, where the same kind of URL that is institution-specific is across a whole set of records let us know and we'll try to get rid of it.

Should we decide to use our institution public interface, even if we are subscribing to WorldCat Discovery, would we be able to extract our local data for our users?

These local notes appear in the modernized view of Discovery in the item details. They can appear before or after the WorldCat notes. Libraries can use their WorldShare sign in information: <https://www.oclc.org/community/discovery/modernization.en.html> This is a link to a specific program that talks about this configuration option <https://www.oclc.org/community/discovery/events/item-details-configuration.en.html>

When you find an OCLC record with local information, should you report it? And if so to whom.

Yes, that can be reported to bibchange@oclc.org. And if it's more of a general question, it's not a specific record, but you have more of a general question about local information, then send to bibchange. We would ask, though, if it is local information from another institution and, you are confident, you can delete it and it makes the record better. But maybe shoot us an email anyway and let us know so we can look and make sure there aren't additional records with the same issue.

We use Collection Manager and keep getting ILL requests for articles which are published outside of the years we own. Is that because they are patron-initiated requests or the ILL staff at the borrowing institution may not have time to look up which years we own?

That's a very good question but outside of the expertise of this group so we need to have you contact Support@oclc.org and they will get the right group to assist you.

Do English and Spanish subject settings have to be listed in one group all in one group (all 650_0) and then another (650_7)

650 0

650 0

650 0

650 7

650 7

650 7

or can they alternate...?

650 0 English subject heading

650 7 Spanish equivalent

650 0 another English subject heading

650 7 corresponding Spanish equivalent

They will generally sort by the type of subject heading so that you can see the entire set of headings that were assigned according to a particular scheme grouped together and I realize that for some libraries this is a little more problematic, because it may be in a bilingual setting. You're trying to duplicate headings in English also in Spanish, and you want to see them, sort of paired up. But, eventually, when other processes get to those records, we'll sort them by indicator with just a regular reformat in Connexion. You may be able to input them, paired up, but they won't necessarily stay that way. If you are using a local system, and you're exporting the WorldCat record, the export will maintain the order that they're in. When the record first arrives, it's no doubt in the order that it was when it was sent to us, but once it's in the database and subject to other processing that we do, stuff can get sorted around. Discovery doesn't necessarily follow the MARC tags, the subjects may end up in a different order anyway, regardless of what order you see within Record Manager.