OCLC Cataloging Community Meeting, Friday, June 24, 2022, ALA Annual

Cynthia began the session with noting that the turnout in the room is amazing. Jay prepared a News from OCLC handout (attached at the end of these notes). OCLC staff attending were introduced. : Cynthia Whitacre, Nathan Putnam, Jay Weitz, Bryan Baldus, Laura Ramsey, Shannon Stenberg, Gina Winkler, David Whitehair, and Chip Nilges.

Jay highlighted information from News from OCLC. He was shocked at how many showed up and thanked everyone for coming.

The bulk of the session was a Q&A session.

Q. WorldCat Entities: trying to visualize what it means. If we find issues, how do we report them so they get fixed?

A. As with bibliographic records, most members will be able to update entities. OCLC is working on creating OCLC Meridian with partner members, which will be used for editing the entities.

Q. Is this sort of a NACO Lite move?

A. Not exactly, but it will allow you to use the entities and you will be able to create them.

Q. Linked data: movement different from previous efforts--BIBFRAME is coming someday and OCLC is going in another direction, not adopting BIBFRAME

A. The goal is to support linked data serialization in whatever format users choose. Nathan Putnam will talk about it in a Zoom meeting for the BIBFRAME Update (which will be recorded) on Monday, June 27, 2022. WorldCat Entities is available on the website (<https://id.oclc.org/worldcat/entity>). OCLC is testing WorldCat Meridian with some libraries. Next will be a BIBFRAME editor; creating or editing entities; using other schema. Look at the WorldCat Entities website (<https://www.oclc.org/en/worldcat/oclc-and-linked-data/worldcat-entities.html>) to see what OCLC is doing. For reporting issues in entities, send a message to [bibchange@oclc.org](mailto:bibchange@oclc.org) or [linkeddata@oclc.org](mailto:linkeddata@oclc.org).

Q.: Linked data entities: Do you envision those as stable and supported going forward?

A. Yes. OCLC is working on updating and creation mechanisms.

Q. Updates on updating vernacular fields and replacing mnemonic encoding levels

A. On adding non-Latin scripts, colleague Jenny Toves has been doing more to add Cyrillic; Yale has been adding Laotian. On the encoding level project, OCLC is working on eliminating alphabetic codes. Level "K" has been eliminated except for incoming records. The September Validation installation is expected to invalidate entering "K" in ELvl. There are about 34 million “I” level records, expected to be completed in the next year. Then, for “M” level, OCLC plans to take a different approach using scripts.

Q. 34 million by hand?

A. No, OCLC uses multiple Connexion macro sessions.

Q. In the document outlining “I”-level records, how many values might they translate to?

A. blank, 7, or 3

Q. Has “3” been redefined? So some have been overly generous?

A. Laura Ramsey did an analysis in the use of “I”. 10% of the sample turned out as “3”, with both “I” and “K”. Most “I” ended up “blank”. Many “K” ended up “blank”.

Q. When “M” goes away, will there be an alternate mechanism to identify them?

A. We've had internal discussions, and plan to mark them somehow. The same will be true for incoming batchloaded records.

Q. Language codes: They have been asked to give feedback on codes. For Norwegian, there are 2 orthographies. What is the purpose of language codes?

A. The purpose of the language code is to identify the language of the item.

Q. Asked to give feedback on 2 orthographies which will then have merged codes?

A. It's best to direct that to LC’s Network Development and MARC Standards Office ([ndmso@loc.gov](mailto:ndmso@loc.gov)). MARC Language Code list provides information on how to report concerns about them. There are other language code lists (Language Code and Term Source Codes, <https://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/language.html>). Some are more detailed than the MARC list. Whenever the Norwegian language community determines what to do about combining them, the MARC code list could retrospectively take that into account and deprecate and convert to the official one if they are combined.

Q. Personally thinks we should stick with MARC codes.

Q. Brazilian Portuguese vs. Portuguese of Portugal

Q. On K-level, some libraries treat it as K if they don't have an authority for one of the headings or if they were unfamiliar with the language.

A. There are lots of reasons an institution would code as K rather than I. Plus, not everyone upgrading a record remembers to update ELvl before replacing it.

Q. Dari is supposed to be coded Farsi. Would there be a way to add something like a local note to encode the MARC language?

A. Field 546 language note to note the dialect as a normal text-based note.

Q. 2 sets of language codes. One in 008--MARC list only; and 041--lots of options--MARC and other lists. Cantonese and Chinese. Bantu. What constitutes a language vs. dialect is a political thing. It depends on the institution--as music cataloger vs. a cataloger in an East Asian library.

A. PCC is coming out with best practices later this year for the ISO code list.

Q. Not just ISO, but also other lists for 041--you can code more finely.

A. Index 041 in local catalog to find them. There is a Discussion Paper MAC will deal with for adding $3 to 041. That is not entirely related, directly but indirectly.

Q. Connexion client: Why can't we edit LHRs? Why only in Connexion browser?

A. That is a decision that was made a long time ago. Libraries were doing it in the browser, then OCLC added it in Record Manager. Many are doing LHRs in their local catalog and then sending them by DataSync. So, OCLC focused on other things. Connexion 3.1 is expected in July. OCLC can look at adding LHR in some future version, but it was easier to deal with in DataSync. Plug for Record Manager: Anyone with a cataloging subscription can access it.

Q. Searching in WorldCat, when someone reports a broken link and it gets sent to the wrong person at the local institution, how does the institution update the contact information?

A. Report it to [support@oclc.org](mailto:support@oclc.org) and they will get it to the right place to help with that.

Q. Connexion: With the death of Internet Explorer, what is the plan for the update? Will it be expanded to older versions and not require a Microsoft browser? And what other things will be included in the 3.1 update?

A. Can't remember the tie to Internet Explorer with 3.1. 3.1 has minor changes from 3.0--not new functionality. There were a few places that had "master" record that have been updated. Next, they will be looking at background things, including macros.

Q. Can you fix temp files issues--not everyone has Administrator write capabilities, and with Windows 11, things are even tighter.

A. Not in 3.1, but continuing to look at that--macros, local files, and now temp files.

Q. FAST is based on LCSH. When an LCSH changes, such as Problem youth to At-risk youth, how long does it take?

A. A maximum of 6 weeks. OCLC gets the update from LC, then changes the records through a [monthly] process.

Q: Can you tell us more about the progress of the retrospective?

A: Retrospective numbers: OCLC has processed about 450 million records, all but about 10%; about 140 million records have been updated. The process is adding RVM, MeSH, AAT, and LC headings.

Q. Flipping headings: when it's a straight flip, it's easy. When 2 terms split, it's harder. Does OCLC have a plan for dealing with them?

A. It's a case-by-case basis, depending on visibility, and the number involved. OCLC tries to use automated processes, but sometimes that's not possible. We try to catch the big ones.

Q. If we hear about a change, how do we share that information with OCLC?

A. Send a message to [askqc@oclc.org](mailto:askqc@oclc.org) to alert us and/or ask about a plan. At the OCLC Cataloging Community in January 2022 (<https://www.oclc.org/en/events/2022/cataloging-community-meeting-Jan2022.html>), Robert Bremer talked about what we did for the change to “Illegal immigrants.”

Q. Enrichment: When updating headings in Connexion, with FAST, the recommendation is to delete all of the FAST headings so that they can be regenerated from the LC headings in the record. Is the same true for RVM, MeSH, and AAT?

A. It's complicated. While headings might be added back to the record during offline processing, some of the headings may have been added manually, and for various reasons, may not be added back through the enrichment process. So, if you know French and can determine which headings match up with the LC, then please feel free to selectively delete any headings that are not appropriate for the resource.

A. Barbara Bushman from NLM requested that people not delete MeSH in case they were added by NLM or another medical library.

Q. When attempting to delete headings in Connexion, it gave an error message and didn't allow the record to be replaced.

A. That appears to be related to the way the system detects changes to the record. If you delete a RVM heading that behind-the-scenes is controlled, and add an LCSH, the system thinks the counts are the same and you changed the RVM into the LCSH. One workaround would be to use a two-step process: Add all the headings first you need to add, replace the record, and then delete the headings you need to delete, and then replace the record. Or delete, replace, add, and then replace. The other alternative would be to use Record Manager, where the non-LC controllable thesauri are fully supported.

Q. On MARC changes for data provenance, is there anything in the plans for dealing with that?

A. No plans yet, but we'll consider it. Data provenance is tracked better in WorldCat Entities.

Q. A record on Keynesian philosophy has a completely unrelated 520 for a children's book. They have been reporting them. Should they continue bothering OCLC or just fix them?

A. Please bother us so that we can look for patterns in other records.

Q. Creating a record, they try to create an authority record with the OCLC GenerateAuthorityRecord macro, but when trying to replace the record, it gives an error message.

A. That sounds like a workflow issue. If it works for you to replace the bibliographic record first, then do the authority. You may want to lock the record first so no one else can edit it.

Q. Some process thinks it has been updated.

A. Try replacing it again--the error message sometimes lies.
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