

## Enhance Sharing Session at ALA

Compiled by Verna Urbanski  
San Francisco, California, 2001 June 18

A meeting of participating OCLC Enhance librarians was held during the 2001 American Library Association Monday, June 18. The meeting was organized and moderated by Jay Weitz, with OCLC staffers Ellen Caplan, Robert Bremer, Rich Greene, Linda Gabel and others in attendance. There was a good turn out with 42 librarians representing 31 participating institutions. Jay distributed the flyer "News from OCLC" (attached) and described some of the quality control measures that have been accomplished at OCLC during the past fiscal year. A total of **4.1 million** bibliographic records have been edited and replaced with some of the major efforts concentrating on the conversion of subfield "x" to "v"; the updating of the subject heading Afro-American to African American; genre heading conversion; correction of indicators; updating of 043 fields; work with uniform titles; and, correcting spacing errors between words which affect retrieval of a record.

Jay asked us to not report duplicates for ordinary books as OCLC does not have staff available to review and act upon all the duplicate record reports it gets. Many reported bib record duplicates are discovered and resolved when the DDR (Duplicate Detection and Resolution) programs are run. DDR has been run thirteen times since 1991. OCLC staff would like to do it more frequently, but other projects (like pinyin conversion) take priority. The last time that DDR was run was November 2000.

OCLC has merged 1.2 million bibliographic records since 1991. These conversions are identified and completed following a very conservative set of algorithms. OCLC staff reviews about 1% of all conversions and has found them to be remarkably accurate.

OCLC **DOES** want duplicate reports for all formats except books. Exceptions to the 'no book duplicates' include records for CJK, Arabic, microforms, and electronic resources. Jay also asked that reporting libraries keep formats separate when reports are filed. Duplicate record reports for computer files, visual materials and electronic resources are usually done within a few days. Other categories may take a lot longer.

A question was asked regarding how credit was awarded for various upgrades to records. Jay encouraged us to upgrade level K, M, 2, 3, 5, 7, and level 4 when there is not an 042 with 'pcc'. Also PLEASE update vendor records. Database Enrichment for which credit is given include: the addition of a call number; the addition of subject-headings schemes associated with your authorization number that are not already represented in a record; and, adding a 505 or an 856 OR updating a 505 or an 856. Credit is not given for the addition of field 006, field 007 or the addition of a 300 on a CIP record. (Note from OCLC: You can use Database Enrichment capabilities on all records except serial records authenticated by CONSER. See Cataloging User Guide (<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/guide/index.htm>) and the Enhance Training Outline (<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm>) for information on replacing records.)

There was further discussion regarding the credit structure and whether the credits awarded for National Enhance and Regular Enhance should be different. Currently the programs receive the same credit. Jay commented that there would probably be a rethinking of the credit mechanism during the next 4-5 years as OCLC moves to the Oracle platform. WorldCat is moving to the Oracle platform and it is not yet known whether or not that will affect the current Enhance program.

One attendee mentioned that she was moving from a position at a non-Enhance library to a library with an active Enhance program. Her current institution has mentioned that they would like to send her notice of records they discovered that they would like to have enhanced. The general flavor of the discussion following this comment was: "YIKES!!! Don't do that." It was agreed that bibliographic maintenance of others' holdings is not a good idea. Many of us overworked catalogers wondered aloud how, when we can't even keep up with our own work, we would ever consider taking on other people's maintenance just as a friendly gesture. Amazement all around!! (Note from OCLC: The intent of all the upgrade programs is to upgrade records for items a library is processing while the items are in hand. The upgrade programs are not meant to disrupt a library's workflow or for general bibliographic maintenance on WorldCat.)

A librarian said that her library had begun adding microfilm records to OCLC for uniquely held items only to have second thoughts and decide not to continue the project. She was wondering how to delete these unwanted records from the OCLC database. Jay suggested that she provide OCLC with a list of the records to be deleted. There ensued a general discussion of the advisability of allowing Enhance libraries to delete records from the system. Currently no one but OCLC has the power to delete records from the database. It was in general agreed that it was probably best to leave the deletion of bibliographic records to OCLC.

A participant asked if the implementation of the Enhance program had caused a slackening off of the number of error reports sent to OCLC for correction. Jay indicated that there had not been a reduction in errors reported, but that since the implementation of the online system of reporting errors the number of paper reports had decreased. Errors requiring proof of the change being made still require paper submissions with supporting photocopies.

Someone inquired about the possibility of having a web page related to the Enhance program activities and quality control issues. That is in the works according to Rich Greene.

A questioner asked whether the majority of Enhance program participants were enhancing only in one format and whether application for additional formats could be streamlined for those who had already earned participation rights in one format. Jay indicated that most Enhance participants are authorized for only one format. He noted that each format had special requirements which preclude changing the application process, that is, expertise in one material does not necessarily indicate expertise in all material types. And, he also noted that, to be fair, OCLC had to treat all institutions similarly, in spite of differences in the size of cataloging staff, etc. (Note from OCLC: Jay checked the list of Enhance participants after ALA and found that 75% of the libraries are authorized for only one format.)

On a practical note, it was mentioned that sometimes Enhance participants get caught up in the process of replacing a record and forget to set their holdings after the record has been replaced. This creates the somewhat odd situation of having your institution's initials in the 040 but not attached as a holding library. (Note from OCLC: This situation will also occur, correctly, if an institution removes its holdings because it has withdrawn an item from its collection.)

Jay announced that OCLC is working on a new edition of Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) and asked whether the assembled librarians were interested in the BFAS being available as a print document or whether a web mounted version was all that was needed. The consensus was that as well as the web version might be, it could not replace the print version. Portability, duplication ease, ease of locating information were all cited as reasons that most in the room would prefer to have access to a print copy of this important document. Jay also asked if BFAS was used in conjunction with MARC 21. Most indicated that they did sometimes use these together, but preferred BFAS for standard workday information since the language was easier to understand and more explanations and examples were available in the OCLC document. It was pointed out that some of OCLC BFAS was actually contributed by OCLC users so the explanations grew out of real life situations and were therefore more accessible. Jay was greeted with a resounding "DON'T DO THAT" when he asked about discontinuing the BFAS in favor of using MARC 21 documentation.

Linda Gabel reminded users of CatME 1.20 and 1.21 that you can now click on a tag in CatME then right click to move into the BFAS at the explanation for that tag.

Jay also surveyed the group on how and why they used the OCLC Technical Bulletins. Most attendees used the T.B.s as necessary and usually went to the web to consult and print off the pages needed. One participant indicated that she liked the revision pages OCLC used to issue to the format documents instead of or in addition to the T.B.s.

A question was raised regarding Enhance training for people working with the new category of 'continuing/integrating' resources. Who will maintain an integrating resource record? That is yet to be decided.

The final topic for the evening centered on enhancing foreign language records. Jay indicated that it is important to leave the subject headings in the foreign language even though you are adding English language subject headings and converting the rest of the record to English language. It was also noted that if you are converting the rest of the record to English, you should also remove the language code in 040 subfield 'b'.

The meeting was slightly over an hour and a half long. Participation was lively and much valuable information was shared.

Notes provided by Verna Urbanski, Head, Copy Cataloging and Chief Media Cataloger, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL. Ellen Caplan, OCLC Metadata Services Division, and Jay Weitz, OCLC Metadata Standards & Quality Division, added some additional information.

The following is the 'flyer' that Jay distributed at the sharing session.

**News From OCLC**  
Compiled by Jay Weitz  
For American Library Association Annual Meeting  
San Francisco, California, 2001 June 14-20

*WorldCat Statistics.* As of 2001 May 1, there were 1,504,155 (3.38%) Sound Recordings; 1,034,284 (2.32%) Scores; 1,354,393 (3.04%) Visual Materials; 158,068 (0.36%) Computer Files; 610,242 (1.37%) Maps; and 37,332,339 (83.86%) Books records in WorldCat, the OCLC Online Union Catalog. There are now more than 793 million holdings attached to the total of 44,516,456 bibliographic records. Bibliographic record number 47 million was added to WorldCat on 2001 May 23.

*OCLC Cataloging and Metadata Services Migration.* Over the next several years, OCLC will phase in a new, single interface to its cataloging and metadata services. The new interface will offer unprecedented functionality, flexibility and efficiency to OCLC cataloging institutions around the world. For more information and timelines, please visit us at <http://www.oclc.org/services/collections>

*CatME.* CatME for Windows software allows users to catalog both interactively online or offline in batch mode. CatME is available at no charge. Later this year, NACO support will be added to CatME. OCLC recently made available the Spelling Checker for CatME, which can be downloaded at no charge from the CatME home page at <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/catme.htm>

*PromptCat.* The OCLC PromptCat service has been enhanced to create cutters for Dewey numbers. PromptCat can also create call numbers for biography and fiction titles. This new functionality allows PromptCat to provide labels for Dewey libraries. Statistics for PromptCat libraries are now available via the Web to help PromptCat libraries create reports and manage workflows and processes.

*NLM Control Numbers Moved to Field 016.* In April 2001, OCLC moved National Library of Medicine (NLM) control numbers from field 069 to field 016 and changed Cataloging Source (Srce) codes from 'c' and 'd' to 'blank' as appropriate in a total of 754,769 records (as explained in Technical Bulletin 236 at <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb236/index.htm>). This conversion relates to Technical Bulletin 241: National Library Control Number Changes (<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb241>). Field 016 was formerly used for the National Library of Canada control number only. As part of OCLC-MARC Bibliographic Update 2000, field 016 was renamed and redefined to be used for unique numbers assigned to a record by a national bibliographic agency other than the Library of Congress. OCLC invalidated field 069 in May 2001. Do not input field 069; use field 016 instead.

*NLC Control Numbers Removed from Field 010.* In May 2001, OCLC removed National Library of Canada (NLC) control numbers from field 010, constructed field 016 using data from field 029, and changed the Cataloging Source to 'blank' where appropriate (as explained in TB 236). A total of 734,697 records in WorldCat were modified. Field 010 is restricted for Library of Congress control numbers and National Library of Canada serials control numbers. NLC control numbers in serial records are stored in field 010 and field 016; NLC control numbers in all other records are stored in field 016 and field 029. Do not input NLC control numbers in field 010 in records other than serials; use field 016 instead. For additional information about this conversion see Technical Bulletin 241: National Library Control Number Changes <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb241>.

*Arabic Cataloging.* The OCLC Arabic Cataloging Pilot, which tested cataloging of Arabic-language materials including the Arabic script characters, made the transition into production during February 2001. Users can search

for MARC records using both roman and script indexes, edit records, upgrade existing records, create and add records that are not found in WorldCat, and download MARC records to a local system. The pilot project, which began in July 2000, involved eleven institutions in the U.S., six institutions in the Arabian Gulf area, and one in France. The software is available to all OCLC Cataloging members at no charge. If you attempt to lock a record with Arabic script using other software, you will receive an error message. You can determine if a record includes Arabic script by the presence of field 066 with values of either (3 or (4. For more information about OCLC Arabic Cataloging, please visit the OCLC Web site at <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/arabic/>.

*Bibliographic Record Notification.* The OCLC Bibliographic Record Notification service has been enhanced to deliver OCLC-MARC records that have been upgraded with either new, or changed, or deleted Electronic Location and Access fields (856 tag) according to a BibNote user's selection profile. Although the entire contents of the 856 tag will be delivered in the upgraded record, only changes to the \$u (URL) and the \$z (Public Note) will trigger delivery of an upgraded MARC record. For more information about OCLC Bibliographic Record Notification, please visit the OCLC Web site at <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/bibnote.htm>.

*Pinyin Conversion.* During the week of May 7, 2001, OCLC began its conversion of Chinese language bibliographic records in WorldCat from the Wade-Giles transliteration scheme to pinyin. Working in close cooperation with the Library of Congress and the Research Libraries Group, OCLC has been planning and testing this conversion process for nearly two years. This bibliographic conversion started from the highest OCLC number and is working backwards through WorldCat should be completed by the end of August 2001. On May 8, the complete set of approximately 8,900 converted Chinese language CONSER serial records were loaded into WorldCat. Once all Chinese language records are converted, OCLC will continue on to convert non-Chinese language records that contain identifiable Wade-Giles data, which is expected to be completed before the end of 2001. **Especially during this transitional period, it may be wise to search both Wade-Giles and pinyin forms of data before creating new records.**

*Cataloging Internet Resources.* The OCLC Institute, in conjunction with Amigos Library Services, NELINET, and SOLINET, and OCLC Institute consultant Steve Miller (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Golda Meir Library), has developed a web-based educational module "Cataloging Internet Resources Using MARC 21 and AACR2." This is the first offering in the Institute's Online Library Learning Series. It consists of 28 individual interactive lessons totaling nearly 16 hours of self-paced online learning and requires only a browser and an Internet connection. Each lesson includes objectives, examples, and quizzes that offer immediate feedback. The course is appropriate for all levels of expertise. For details see the OCLC Institute Web site <http://www.oclc.org/institute/elearning/oll/index.htm>.

*OCLC-MARC Records Published.* In April 2001 OCLC published *OCLC-MARC Records*. This manual describes OCLC-MARC record structure, character sets, and exchange media formatting for OCLC-MARC records. It lists tags, fields, indicators, and data elements for OCLC's implementation of ANSI Z39.2. *OCLC-MARC Records* does NOT supersede the previous edition, *OCLC Tape and Export Records Formats*, which covers earlier records.

*WorldCat Collection Sets.* Special low pricing is available until July 2002 for all electronic sets offered through OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets. Please visit our Web site for additional information and a complete listing of sets available at [http://www.stats.oclc.org/wcs\\_list.html](http://www.stats.oclc.org/wcs_list.html).

*Institution Symbol Expansion.* OCLC institution symbols are being restructured to allow each symbol to remain unique. OCLC plans to begin to assign longer symbols to new institutions on August 12, 2001. Newly assigned institution symbols will be 5 characters. The holding library codes (located in the 049 field) for the expanded symbols will remain 4 characters and will no longer be unique across the OCLC system. Current OCLC members will continue to be identified by their existing 3-character institution symbols and 4-character holding library codes. See Technical Bulletin 242 for details (<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb242/>).

*CORC.* OCLC continues to enhance the OCLC Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) service (see [www.oclc.org/corc](http://www.oclc.org/corc) for more information). New features and updates are installed on a monthly or better basis. OCLC has completed 15 upgrades since CORC became a production service in July 2000. Notable changes in the first half of 2001 include: improvements to the metadata extraction feature; introduction of TCP/IP record export to support seamless export of records from CORC to local systems; quarterly updates to the optional WebDewey database and improvements to its browse feature; improvements to CORC Authority File browsing and the linked headings feature in the CORC Resource Catalog; enhancements to the CORC Pathfinder module; and the announcement of the suspension of charges for all pathfinder activities (as of May 1, 2001). Coming later in 2001:

integration of the OCLC CatExpress service into the CORC platform, introduction of NACO support (including a function similar to the authority macro [authwfm.mbk]; workforms; a save file; the ability to clone [new command]; the ability to perform various actions/commands such as add, replace, or submit; plus a new function that allows the user to sort records in the save file based on workflow statuses the user may set), improvements to CORC's Pathfinder module. Database counts (June 6, 2001): Resource Catalog: 470,500 records; Pathfinder Database: 1,700 pathfinders.