

2018-04-25 Virtual AskQC Office Hours

Topic presentation

URLs in a Shared Cataloging Environment, presented by Robin Six

Robin Six (Database Specialist II) presented on the topic: *URLs in a Shared Cataloging Environment*. The focus of this topic was on use of URLs in fields 856 and 956. Field 856 is retained in the master record and should be provider neutral, while field 956 is not retained in the master record and may be used for an institution specific URL. If field 856 is used in a Local Holdings Record (LHR), then an institution specific URL may be use. These fields contain the information required to locate and access electronic resources. The 2nd indicator in field 856 should never be coded 0 on a print resource. Properly coded indicators on print and online version records are very important and affect how records are displayed in a library's online display in their catalog.

OCLC works to maintain current URLs through partnerships with publishers and vendors, who often contact OCLC when URLs need updating. However, we also rely on member institutions to report issues with URLs to bibchange@oclc.org. In general non-working URLs are deleted from bibliographic records, except in the case where a bibliographic record representing an online resource would no longer have a URL. In those cases, the second indicator would be changed to "blank" and a note would be added stating that the URL no longer works as of a specific date. Another URI found in fields 856 and 956 is the PURL, or persistent uniform resource locator. Broken OCLC PURLs should be reported to bibchange@oclc.org as with any other change request.

We will be sending out a survey after the May session to OCLC-CAT to gather feedback from the Virtual AskQC Office Hour sessions. We are looking for feedback on how you thought these sessions went as well as suggested topics for future sessions. We are looking to send the survey to OCLC-CAT sometime in early June.

Member questions

URL Questions

There are 856 fields with URLs representing the table of contents that have a second indicator of 1 (856 41 \$3 TOC \$u [URL]), and there are 856 fields with URLs representing the cover art have a second indicator of 0 (856 40 \$3 Cover image \$u [URL]). What is the preferred method for coding the second indicator in fields 856 and 956 for URLs representing table of contents and URLs representing cover images? Most of the 856 fields with TOC in subfield \$3 are not coded with second indicator 0 in electronic records.

Answer: It depends what type of record that 856 field is on. If these URLs are on an electronic record, then both the 856 field representing the table of contents and the 856 field representing the cover image should have second indicators coded 0 because those URLs represent a part of the resource itself. Second indicator 0 should be used for URLs that represent the entire resources itself or a portion of the resource itself.

If we find institution specific URLs in the master record, should we delete them or report them?

Answer: It depends. If an institution specific URL represents the same link as another URL in the record, then you may delete that institution specific URL or report it to bibchange@oclc.org. For example, if the institution specific URL was a Wiley URL but a non-institution specific Wiley URL already existed in the master record, then you would retain delete the institution specific URL. If an institution specific URL was unique, then you would convert it to a

non-institution specific URL instead of deleting it. If you are unsure, please report the URL to bibchange@oclc.org and staff will decide whether to delete or convert the institution specific URL.

OCLC used to have a project called something like Econtent Synchronization where it created bibliographic records for HathiTrust and GoogleBooks titles which are not accessible to anyone due to copyright restrictions. Will those be retained since the 856 URL's do not point to an accessible resource?

Answer: Yes, they will be retained. Some of the links to HathiTrust and GoogleBooks records are freely accessible. Others are only searchable or not accessible yet due to copyright restrictions, but that could change at a later date. If we deleted the URLs that were not accessible, we would need to go back and repopulate those records with the appropriate URLs after they become accessible, so these HathiTrust and GoogleBooks URLs that are searchable only or not accessible are okay to leave on the master records.

How can a provider be considered materials specified?

Answer: Materials specified is a general caption for what [subfield \\$3](#) represents. It is used for both specifying the specific material as well as differentiating between different providers in a provider neutral record. OCLC discussed the issue of whether subfield \$3 covers the name of a provider many years ago at the outset of provider neutral cataloging. While it is a stretch of that definition, there was no other place to very conveniently indicate what URL belonged to what provider. After making use of subfield \$3 in that way, there are now millions of records with subfield \$3's with provider names in them, so usage has since dictated the change and shift in the definition.

What is the appropriate use of \$y in 856?

Answer: The [subfield \\$y](#) is defined as "the text that is used for display in place of the URI in subfield \$u." It converts the text in the subfield \$y into a clickable link. For example, the phrase, "Click here", could be used in the subfield \$y so that the URI would no longer displays in the library's catalog but instead, the phrase, "Click here" would be displayed as a clickable link. The URI can also be masked using [subfield \\$3](#) and [subfield \\$z](#). So subfield \$y is not always necessary if the text from the subfield \$3 or subfield \$z is being used by the library's catalog. Years ago, subfield \$y was used with the phrase, "Click here", pretty frequently but later on it was not used as much. What works for one library doesn't necessarily work for another library that would prefer to use some different kind of phrasing. Because of this, subfield \$y is not used all that often anymore.

Currently the subfield \$y is used about 50 million times in WorldCat. The most common use is "View online". If you are interested in seeing how this field is used, click on this link: <http://experimental.worldcat.org/marcusage/2018-01-85>. Note that this list is a ".txt" file and its pretty large so it may take time to download.

So if the only URL we have is a local one, we don't add an 856. Will this still facet as an ebook or the like in WorldCat Local?

Answer: Currently, if a bibliographic record does not have an 856 field, the ebook icon will not appear in any of the OCLC's interfaces: WorldCat.org, WorldCat local, Discovery, or Record Manager. In order for the ebook icon to show, the record currently needs to have an 856 field. This is a known issue and OCLC staff are currently working to resolve it. In the next few months, we hope for a resolution that will change how the ebook icon is generated, removing the requirement for field 856. OCLC will send out announcements when this change takes place.

Should the 856 field be deleted from the local record if the electronic resource is not available in the local library?

Answer: This would depend on the local practice of your institution. You may delete it from the local copy of the record but it should remain on the master record.

Do we have any idea what percentage of PURLs are broken?

Answer: We do not know what percentage of PURLs are broken. We know that the way that OCLC PURLs were handled changed over time but we don't have any way of knowing the percentage of broken PURLs. Please report all broken OCLC PURLs to bibchange@oclc.org.

General Questions

Can you briefly explain the 776 field in a record? If someone copy catalogs, does this link go anywhere?

Answer: The 776 field is used to link between two different versions of a record. So for example, it would be used to link an electronic version record with a print version record. These two records have the same title, the same publisher, and everything is identical except for the version (i.e. print versus online). The 776 field on the print version record would point to the online version record and the 776 field on the online version record would point to the print version record. This links the records together in the library's online catalog.

Whether or not you choose to delete it from your local record would be up to your institution. However, the 776 fields should remain in the master record.

Does OCLC have a policy about local printouts of websites? For example, patrons here printout websites and donate them. I tend to want to create an electronic resource record in WorldCat for the online resource and just add the printouts in the local ILS. However, when the online resource goes away, should I do a new record for the printout?

Answer: Yes. You may catalog the electronic resource record in WorldCat for the online resource and mention the printouts in local fields. It is also okay to create a record representing the printout resource versus the online resource itself. That record would not be considered a duplicate record. How you handle what you attach your holdings symbol to, whether you are working with the record for the online resource itself and treating the printout as a copy or creating two records, is up to you locally but it is possible to have the two records.

I recently made a Name Authority Record that affects a whole lot of bib records. This calls for bibliographic file maintenance (BFM). Whom do I notify about that?

Answer: You may email any needed BFM to Metadata Quality staff at bibchange@oclc.org. Please include the authority record number (ARN) or Library of Congress control number (LCCN) representing the added or updated authority record and Metadata Quality staff will add your request to their workflow for processing.