

## 2019-01-09 VAOH session

### Presentation summary

Jay Weitz presented on the topic of When to Input a New Record. OCLC's When to Input a New Record, chapter 4 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) has long served to provide a common basis for decision making in the creation of the WorldCat bibliographic database by participants in the OCLC cooperative. When to Input has also been the public reflection of how OCLC's matching algorithms, including Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR), and automated loading of records are intended to work.

In October 2017, we made available a thoroughly revised and updated version of When to Input a New Record.

Cardinal Rule: "When in doubt, do not create a duplicate; use an existing record."

URL's mentioned during the presentation:

- OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards: <http://oc.lc/bfas>
- Differences Between, Changes Within: Guidelines on When to Create a New Record: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/sites/ala.org.alcts/files/content/resources/org/cat/differences07.pdf>
- OCLC's "Cataloging Defensively": <http://www.oclc.org/en/events/cataloging-defensively.html>

### Member questions

**If a separate record, an M record already exists, should we report the M record?**

Answer: Yes, please do report and we will take care of that. Please note that we do have a significant backlog of reported duplicates. So when you do report a duplicate to us, know that we put it in our queue, we will get to it eventually, but we can't guarantee that we will get to it right away. It might be a number of months before the duplicates are resolved, but we always appreciate reports of duplicate records.

**We've noticed over the last few years something that seems to be standard practice, but which we cannot find documented. It seems that LC is treating some publishers' statements of "paperback edition" not as edition statements, but as printing statements, thereby negating the need for a new record. Is this OCLC practice as well?**

Answer: Yes, and that is documented in When to Input a New Record as well as Differences Between, Changes Within. All other things being equal, that is the pagination, and the size, etc., paperback editions that are stated as paperback editions are generally not considered to be separate editions in this context.

**Does OCLC have guidance on advance review copies/uncorrected proofs? Should these be given separate records?**

Answer: Yes, we do have guidance in the 250 Edition Statements section of BFAS. Those should be separate records. If there isn't a statement that you can transcribe as an edition statement, that is a legitimate edition statement to supply by the cataloger.

**In the last example of the presentation for accompanying material, why would a new record be created, rather than updating the existing record? They appear to be the same item, to me, anyway?**

Answer: The upper record on that slide is the book all by itself without the audio cassette. The bottom record is the book accompanied by the audio cassette. Those are legitimately separate records.

**Why does a difference in country of publication require a new record if everything else is the same?**

Answer: A lot of this has to do with historic publication patterns. It used to be that there was a significant difference between things published in the U.S. and things published elsewhere, such as Great Britain. That difference and distinction is increasingly less in the more global situation in which we find ourselves today, but it used to be a big, big difference. It could be that the cover art was totally different or something about the design of the book was totally different, even if the context of the item was the same. That is something that we decided on historically and we've stuck with it. Maybe it's something we need to reconsider, but for now that is the way we are considering those legitimately separate.

**There are some new printings of music textbooks that list URLs for related audio contents. Should these have separate records?**

Answer: If these are online, you can catalog these separately if that is your policy. You would also want to make note of the presence of online accompanying material on the record for the score itself.

**If you have an item and the only record is in a different language, do you create another record in your language.**

Answer: Yes, these are called parallel records. BFAS chapter 3, section 3.10 Parallel Records for Language of Cataloging provides guidelines for how to handle these types of records. There was also an Office Hours presentation given in October 2018, for which the recording, questions, and notes are available.

**Following from the discussion of "edition statements" that are really printing statements: If the master record in WorldCat has what I'm quite sure is a printing statement in the 250 (e.g., "4a. ed."), should it be left as-is? If I have the "1a. ed." and everything else is identical, should I replace the 250 in the master record with "my" edition statement or leave it as-is?**

Answer: You could remove that 250 if you are absolutely certain that it is a printing statement and replace the record.

**In the past, I cataloged sets of curriculum materials which had extensive supplementary materials, which we usually did not have all of. When libraries appear to be able to pick and choose among supplementary materials, how many separate records for subsets are appropriate?**

Answer: One thing you are always free to do is to use the record that is in the database and edit it locally to describe what you have in hand, or add the local information to an LBD or LHR. If you need a record in WorldCat to describe what you have, and the accompanying material differs from what is in the WorldCat record, then you could create a new record.

**Does OCLC have an official document of publishers and their imprints so that records do not duplicate? If so, where can I find that document?**

Answer: Built into Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) are a relatively limited number of equivalents among publishers. The most obvious example would be what used to be called the Government Printing Office, now called the Government Publication Office, the GPO, the Superintendent of Documents, all of those are different ways that what is now the Government Publication Office have been designated for certain government publications from the United States over the years. So we have a whole set of equivalents for that particular entity. There are some other publishers for which we have tables of equivalents, as the example of John Wiley versus Wiley and various other variations of Wiley as a publisher. It is not a document and not available publicly, but we do have some of that built into DDR.

**Jay mentioned cleaning up print records with 006/007 for 'e'. When these are hybrid records, such as a score that has been digitized and the digital version represented only by the print fields 856, 5xx, 006, 007, are you splitting into two records or leaving these alone?**

Answer: This goes back to what the history of cataloging electronic resources has been, where you have long had an option to note the existence of an electronic version on the corresponding record for the print. So the way to think of these is not so much that they are hybrids of both, but that it really is still just the print record that is making a note of the existence of the electronic version. Of course, that means that print record will have an 856 field, it may have some kind of 5xx field referring to the electronic version, and this problematic 006/007 which is what causes the problem in terms of truly identifying what this record is and the way that they're displayed in systems. So when we clean these up, what we'll eventually do is take the 006 and 007 out of the record, but the 856 that notes the existence the location of the electronic version, that would stay in tact. Now in any of these cases you may have this record for the print, a separate record for the electronic version is certainly appropriate and may already be there. But if it's not there, we are not doing anything to remove the 856 fields in these cases.

**I have seen textbook records in which multi-volume sets and loose leaf volumes are on the same bibliographic record as a one volume hardbound edition. Shouldn't each of these have their own bibliographic record?**

Answer: Yes, they probably should have separate records. Something published as a one volume and the same thing published as multiple volumes and the same thing published as loose leaf would all have

separate bibliographic records, justifiably. If there is just a difference in binding, such as spiral bound versus hardbound, but the content is the same then those would not justify separate records. If you have loose leaf versus hardbound, it may be that it's just issued in two formats and is exactly the same situation as described with spiral bound versus hardbound. Loose leaf would have a separate record if, in fact, it was intended to be updated but if it's just loose leaf so that it lies flat on the table, that would not justify a new record.

**OCLC BFAS 4.2 says that variation in copyright dates does not justify a new record if the publication dates are the same. Assuming everything else is the same, no publication date, when do we need a bibliographic record for the later date [1963] in the following case: 1. "copyright 1937, renewed 1963"; 2. "c1937, copyright transferred 1963"; 3. "c1937, c1963"?**

Answer: Some years ago I had occasion to do some research on copyright, copyright transfers, copyright renewals, all of those copyright variations. The conclusion that I came to in all of that research and what AACR2 at the time and what RDA currently says, is that all of those copyright renewals, transfers, assignments, and so on are essentially to be disregarded. That is documented in AACR2 and fairly certain in RDA or related policy statement. Generally, ignore copyright renewals, copyright transfers, copyright assignment, and all of those other copyright variations. Only what we may call a straight copyright date would be paid attention to.

**When a self-publishing author switches companies does that justify a new record? Isn't it just a new printer?**

Answer: It would probably justify a new record, as is cataloger's judgement. If you have both in hand and can compare them, that would be a way to make the decision. All of the self-publishing and print-on-demand publications fall into this.

**Since you mentioned print-on-demand, I have a stack of reprints that we purchased through a print-on-demand publisher. I see some records that use the publisher and date of publication of the original work as well as records that use the print-on-demand publisher and date. Which is correct?**

Answer: This is really a case where you would want to follow the print-on-demand and photocopy cataloging guidelines, which you can find in the LC PCC Policy Statements for RDA instruction 1.11. So, if you go there it will tell you what to do with these print-on-demand type publications. You would end up retaining as the 260 or 264 the publisher of the original publication and pretty much ignore the publisher of that print-on-demand photocopy that you have in hand.

**What is the current policy/recommendation on institution-specific 856 fields in master records that do not work for users elsewhere because they require local authentication? For example, "Table of contents available to XXX-affiliated users at ... ". Should/can we delete these from the master record? These cause major problems when they come into our local catalog because they create confusing false links our users can't access, and our reference librarians complain about them.**

Answer: There are instruction in BFAS under field 856 about what should be done in those cases, and there might even be something mentioned in When to Input a New Record as well. Generally speaking,

if those institution specific URLs can be generalized, often by removing the proxy information, they should be generalized. The institution specific URLs should not be added to a master record and you are welcome to try to generalize them according to those instructions in BFAS or delete them. There is no need to keep them in the master record if they are truly local links. When we encounter them here, we also try to generalize them or delete them.

**Jay mentioned the cardinal rule for determining duplicates when cataloging versus when batch loading. Is there a cardinal rule for provider neutral online serial publications? Are there cases where differences justify a separate record?**

Answer: It is the case with serials you sometimes tend to be a little more lenient and overlook differences when you're dealing with the same serial that has been digitized independently from issues from different sources. You may have a case where one provider has digitized the articles only, and the other provider has digitized the editorial preface, the advertisements, all of the illustrations, and the whole thing. And that, still within CONSER practice, has ended up on one record with the idea that it could change over time. One of these providers could go back and pick up the content that they were missing otherwise. It's probably something where you have to use some judgement, it may depend on whether the serial is rare or if it's just an ordinary run-of-the-mill serial. When you think about how serials are digitized on Google, where you've got all of these separate individual issues and who knows necessarily what they digitized versus another serial, same title, that has been very carefully digitized, where they did cover to cover and absolutely everything in between. You might think should those be put on separate records, and the approach is generally no, put it all on one record and overlook some of these little differences in where there's a difference in content.

**I have some government publications that have been reprinted and they use the original publication date (in the 1950s). These are clearly newer (2000+) but I think I have to use the original record. Is that true? Should I add a note in the record indicating our copy is a reprint?**

Answer: Generally speaking, if you have a simple reprint you should use the record for the original publication. If there are any differences such as a new bibliography or something new, some other kind of change, then you are encouraged to add a new record with a new date. If it's just a reprint use the original record. You may want to add locally a note to your record, or add the local information to an LBD or LHR, saying that the printing is a contemporary print rather than an older print.

**If we have a score with a cover title that matches the existing record, but it also has a title page that does NOT match but is very close, and the existing record has no note saying that the title comes from the cover, yet everything else matches exactly, does this require a new record? This seems to happen a lot in music publishing, where new printings appear with covers or title pages that weren't there before, but the music itself and the publication information is identical. I'm never sure what to do. I often find myself wondering whether someone simply didn't add a note about the title source, or is it actually a new publication?**

Answer: That is one of the great mysteries of music cataloging because there can be so many different sources for titles and other kinds of information - the cover, title, the caption, and so on. You kind of

have to use judgement. As time went on, cataloging instructions for cataloging scores were more explicit that you should indicate in the body of the record where a title came from, and of course in RDA you would do that more often. You really have to use judgement, if it's close enough and everything else being equal, I would probably use the existing record.

**Speaking of "print-on-demand", how should one deal with the Smithsonian Folkways CD reprints? It is common to find a record where only the reprint date is different. Can I just use the record and change the date to correspond to when it was reprinted for our order?**

Answer: CDs reproduced on-demand should probably be treated similarly to other on-demand reproductions; under RDA, that would be following the print-on-demand section of RDA LC-PCC Policy Statement 1.11. If there's an existing record for the standard publication in the same physical format (audio compact disc), you may use that record and either edit it locally for your own copy or document the local specifics in your own Local Data Record. If there's already a record for the on-demand reproduction, use that record for all on-demand reproductions of that manifestation, regardless of the dates of the reproduction. Adapt the instructions in PS 1.11 to the audio format as appropriate.

**The Center for Military History is always reprinting government docs published in the 1950x, but they give a new title page. They give a new title page with a new publication date. Would this be a new record? The content is identical, but the title page verso says "first printed 1951", for example.**

Answer: My suggestion would be to take the title page date as the date of publication and create a new record if one for that date of publication does not exist.

**Sometimes a paper edition comes out after 10 years of the hard copy. Is this considered a major change for a new record?**

Answer: If the stated date of publication or any other element differs from the original hardcover (including a size difference of more than two centimeters or a pagination difference of more than three pages), a new record is justified.

General questions:

**I've been noticing records for print books, based on 300 and 3xx fields with 006 and 007 fields indicating they are electronic, and I'm not sure what is happening here. We often have holdings set on them, so I'm assuming they were once clearly print, but now are displaying as 'e'. Any insight as to possible causes/solutions?**

Answer: We are aware of this problem and are in the process of cleaning those up. Some of that has to do with changes in policy regarding URLs and related records for online versions and print versions. A record for the print version should not have a 006 or 007 field to indicate the presence, or the existence, of an electronic version. It may have a 006 or 007 field for other reasons, for instance accompanying material, but not to indicate the existence of an electronic version.

**When I try to control name headings, I often get an error message about a script that can't run, so I can't see the actual NAF record. I end up either selecting insert name and then clicking on it to see the NAF record, or go to LC's authority file. Why does this error happen so frequently?**

Answer: This sounds like a software issue. We suggest that you send a query, with perhaps a screenshot of the error message you're getting, to our Customer Support staff and they may be able to help you.

**I'm trying to make more use of the NACO functionality in Record Manager, but I keep running into problems. I often get a system error when I try to add or replace an authority record. Also the "Copy Authority Data" feature sometimes works, sometimes doesn't. Is the NACO functionality still a work in progress?**

Answer: NACO functionality is brand new in Record Manager as of the last quarter of 2018, so yes, it is still a work in progress. There are a lot of enhancements that are needed. The basics are there, but there is still work ongoing to make it have the same functionality that you currently have in Connexion. You would want to contact Customer Support about this.