# PALNI CATALOGING STANDARDS

Version for ALEPH 17.01, September 20, 2005[1]

Approved by PALNI Board of Directors October 3, 2005

PALCAT Standards Committee

*Ruth Elder, Taylor University-Fort Wayne*
*Richard Lammert, Concordia Theological Seminary*
*Amber Meryman, Butler University*
*Bruce Sanders, DePauw University*
*Joe Springer, Goshen College*
*Janet Wagner, Earlham College*
*Colleen Gocken, PALNI staff liaison*

# *PALNI CATALOGING STANDARDS*

### Contents:

# INTRODUCTION

For more than a decade, PALNI libraries have been using the PALNI online catalog for cataloging and reference work. Sharing of bibliographical information and resources was one of the driving purposes behind forming and implementing the PALNI consortium.

---

[1] This is a revision of the Standards approved by the PALNI Board, May 30, 1995. The 1995 Standards were developed by the PALNI Cataloging Advisory Committee chaired by Laurie Wolcott (Taylor University). Other members were: Larry Baerveldt (Hanover College), Brian McCafferty (Wabash College), Randy Neuman (Huntington College), Eileen Saner (Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary), Bruce Sanders (DePauw University), Linda Shaw (University of Indianapolis), Joe Springer (Goshen College), Colleen Gocken (PALNI staff liaison).

Resource sharing continues to be a key consortium-wide goal as we have moved from the DRA to the ALEPH system. Our early goal of integrating the contents of each library's individual catalogs into a more accurate and efficient whole continues. Replacing the challenges of our initial move into a machine-environment are those presented by working within a more sophisticated, more complicated system.

Bibliographic records are the heart of our shared database. These records are the common property of all PALNI libraries, regardless of whether there is a single holdings record attached to a record or 25 holdings records attached. It does not matter which library "created" the record, who transferred it into the database, or who has edited it since. Maintaining the quality and integrity of each bibliographic record is an interest and a responsibility we all share. Our motivation in setting standards is to build on past strengths of the union database and continue to improve the quality of the information it contains.

Most of our cataloging energy is correctly devoted to new bibliographic records. We want to continue the PALNI practice of requiring that records representing fully processed materials in our collections meet the standards of national core- and full-level cataloging. Even after a decade of existence, we have as many as a million bibliographic records in our system from archival and retrospective conversion tapes. Such records were often edited for use in a single-library, non-machine environment. We want to continue to improve these records if time allows and need requires. We also want to continue to reduce the number of duplicate bibliographic records in the database. With this in mind, we will also suggest an etiquette to follow in editing existing data to better serve the needs of the consortium.

The basic standards that shape the data we enter in PALNI are ones with which we are already familiar:

- the current version of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*
- *MARC 21* [or current version] Machine-Readable Cataloging Format for Bibliographic Data and its companion Format for Holdings Data. (http://www.loc.gov/marc/)
- Library of Congress Authorities for subjects and other standardized access points (names, titles, etc.) (http://authorities.loc.gov/)

Many of us use OCLC's version of MARC on a regular basis, and PALNI will continue to consider OCLC-MARC acceptable except in cases where it conflicts with ALEPH's implementation of MARC 21 [or current version]. For example, MARC 21 reserves for local use and definition most fields containing the numeral 9 (xx9, x9x, 9xx). OCLC-MARC has defined some of those fields (e.g., the 690 field for local subject headings) and PALNI accepts those definitions. The union database contains bibliographic records with now-obsolete fields (e.g., the 305 field for Physical Description of Sound Recordings). Upgrading records already in the database to meet current MARC standards is optional. However, libraries adding new bibliographic records to the database should strip obsolete fields.

By working towards uniformity of the bibliographic description of a particular resource and uniformity of the terms by which we provide access to the description, we enhance our ability to meet user requirements to find, identify, select, and acquire/obtain materials. Without sharing these standards we cannot expect our cataloging to communicate as well as necessary across our shared environment.

**What are our basic assumptions?**

- Descriptive catalog records added to the database will be formatted according to current MARC standards, meeting or exceeding the core- or full-level description standards required by the current version of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR), and by the *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* (LCRI). Full bibliographic descriptions created under earlier cataloging standards are acceptable for pre-1981 imprints. We recognize that incomplete and not-yet-edited bibliographic records exist in the system for selection, acquisition, and other temporary purposes. The assumption of core- or full-level descriptions applies to fully processed resources linked to long-term holdings and item information.
- Added access points such as personal and corporate names, series and uniform titles, and subject headings, will conform to the forms found in the Library of Congress Authorities File (available online through LC and OCLC). Access points for all records, including pre-1981 imprints, will conform to these authorities. If the heading does not yet exist in LC Authorities, use a correctly-formulated equivalent heading already in PALNI if available. If no equivalent heading exists in LC or PALNI, construct one according to the principles outlined in AACR and LCRI.[2] Subject headings not found in LCSH should be constructed according to the principles outlined in the current version of LC's *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings.* Alternate forms deemed useful may be added only as local subject entries in the appropriate field (field 690).
- Our bibliographic records are shared, common PALNI "property" (even if only one library's holdings are attached) and we should construct them in ways which enhance, rather than limit, that sharing. Holdings records are specific to the library that has holdings represented and these records, rather than bibliographic records, are the appropriate place for most copy-specific, local information.

Among the expectations resulting from these assumptions are that any PALNI library transferring a bibliographic record from another system (such as OCLC) or creating a new record on PALNI, will edit that record to make it conform to the above standards, including checking of name and subject authorities. This means being especially alert to any OCLC records with an encoding level (MARC Leader/17) other than blank, "1", "4", or "I" and, except for pre-1981 imprints, to records with a description (MARC Leader/18) coded other than "a".

---

[2] For libraries with access to it, additional guidance may be available in *The Library of Congress NACO Participant's Manual.*

# GENERAL EDITING ETIQUETTE

*Bibliographic records are shared among all PALNI libraries and may be edited by any library*

Whether a bibliographic record has a single holdings record attached or 25 different holdings records, the bibliographic record is something that is jointly-held "property" of the PALNI consortium. It does not matter which library transferred the record into the system or which libraries have holdings attached; all PALNI libraries have an interest in the correctness and fullness of the information included in each of the bibliographic records in our database.

*Be generous in adding information, careful in deleting information*

In general, consider more information to be better than less information. Always feel free to add relevant information, such as contents notes, to descriptive records. Do **not** remove **correct** information from a record even if the information is not *required* by rules, or the LCRIs suggest an abbreviated version or not to make a particular heading. For example, if a work has six authors and the record includes headings for all six, do not remove the "extra" names even if AACR/LCRI specify a different practice.[3] Correct *incorrect* information in controlled headings (MARC fields 1xx, 240, 6xx, 7xx, and 8xx). Note that, because of the dynamic nature of LCSH, a topical heading that at one time was correct may become incorrect. For example, the subdivision "—Controversial literature" was once used much more widely than currently applicable. Always correct LC subject headings to current LC practice.

*Be careful to verify and complete CIP records when completing cataloging of a bibliographic record*

Although libraries may use Cataloging-in-Publication (CIP) records during the acquisition and initial processing of a bibliographic resource, catalogers should upgrade these records to core- or full-level descriptions during the cataloging process. Verify all fields in CIP records carefully. These are prepublication-level records found with an encoding level (MARC Leader/17) of "8". If an upgraded OCLC record has become available, simply overlay the CIP record. Otherwise, add physical description and other information required. If you find a CIP record that has not been upgraded in the PALNI database and you have the item in hand, verify and complete the record. This includes changing the Leader/17 encoding level to blank and deleting the 263 field (projected publication date). Alternatively, you can check in OCLC and transfer corrections and additions to the PALNI record, or re-import the record into the PALNI database.

---

[3] Cataloging rules of course require that added headings be justified by the description or in a note.

*Consider the OCLC version of the record the "master record"*

The records in OCLC are continually maintained by LC and contributing libraries to correct them as subject headings change, or to add additional content (for example, contents notes). Because the OCLC record is the "master record," always feel free to add content in the OCLC record that is not in the PALNI record to that record, either by manual input, or by overlaying the record in ALEPH (in the latter case, always being careful to preserve content added by a PALNI library that is not in the OCLC record).

*Be alert to materials requiring different (rather than edited) records*

Before correcting or deleting information, especially if the apparent error is other than clearly typographical, examine the record carefully to determine whether or not the work you have in hand actually conforms to the record in front of you.

*Inform other holding libraries of substantial changes in PALNI records*

If altering the PALNI version of a record substantially, alert (via e-mail) the technical services personnel of other libraries holding the item about the change. You may notice, for example, that the PALNI version of a record has no edition statement but the current OCLC version of that record has an edition statement (as does your copy of the item). It is legitimate to update the PALNI version to "match" the OCLC version, but other PALNI libraries with holdings attached to that record may not have the specific edition you are editing the record to describe.

*Avoid adding duplicate bibliographic records*

Search the PALNI database carefully **immediately** prior to transferring new bibliographic records to the system or upgrading brief records created for order or other temporary purposes. See additional guidelines on duplicate records below. A title search is likely to be the most effective means of retrieving duplicate records. If performing a search on an OCLC number with fewer than eight digits, recall that the PALNI database includes OCLC numbers with or without leading zeroes, expanding the number of digits to eight, and that some PALNI records may not contain an OCLC number.[4] If you do find you have transferred a duplicate record, in most circumstances you should move your holdings information to the earlier record and delete the record you transferred. Follow procedures given below (under "Procedures for Eliminating Duplicate Records"), if the more-recently transferred record is fuller or of higher quality and you believe it is more useful to the PALNI database than is the present PALNI record. If in doubt as to whether a record is a duplicate or not, feel free to communicate with the other library or libraries with holdings attached to the record(s) in question. If in doubt about a brief record, overlay it with the full OCLC record.

---

[4] For example, bibliographic records originating from Bibliofile tapeloads may not include OCLC record numbers. If available, add an appropriate OCLC record number to any bibliographic record created in PALNI or transferred from a source (Z39, etc.) other than OCLC.

*Beware of editing bibliographic descriptions "blind" (without the item in hand)*

As a rule, do not change information in a bibliographic description unless you have the item in hand. Certain aspects of a bibliographic record may appear contrary to common sense, but unless you have the item to look at, it is not possible to tell whether the bibliographic description is faulty, or whether it accurately records an eccentricity of the item itself.

Typographical errors in name and subject access points are reasonably safe to edit "blindly" but even here, exercise care to ascertain that what looks like a typographical error in a name is not in fact a different name.

*Restrict local and copy-specific information to holdings and/or item records*

The vast majority of local notes ("Library's copy imperfect", "Library's copy in vellum binding", "Library owns vols. 1–4, 6, 8.", "From Prof. Whitnagle's collection.", etc.) should not appear on bibliographic records. Instead, these notes should go in public or non-public note fields of the holdings or item records. In some cases information which is a necessary component of the bibliographic record may not be true of every holding attached to the record. For example, a library may create an original record containing a date and the name of the broadcasting station specific to that copy. The same may be true for dates in the reproduction note (field 533) of certain microforms or on-demand photocopies. In such cases, another library making subsequent use of the record should leave the original record unchanged, noting any differences it considers important in its own holdings or item record. In other cases, local information may rightfully appear with the bibliographic record but should be identified as local information by adding a $5 with the library's NUC symbol at the end of the field. Examples of local information which could be necessary components of the bibliographic record are notes regarding an incomplete copy which served as the source copy for an original catalog record, or various added entries (7xx fields to trace physical characteristics of a volume, former owners, etc.) which one cannot attach to the holdings record. A note about information likely to be true of most, though perhaps not all, copies of a work (e.g., the presence of an errata slip) may also be added to the bibliographic record. Add a $5 to the note, if you suspect the information may not be true of all copies.

*Retain most information when exporting records from a bibliographic utility (OCLC) or another bibliographic database*

Because we cannot clearly predict future uses of our bibliographic database and future capabilities of equipment we may use to mount and search the database, and because costs of storing information have tended to decline rather than increase, PALNI does not recommend stripping information from bibliographic records being transferred to PALNI from other sources. If a library chooses to strip information from any records exported to PALNI, it should not delete any fields other than those listed below. *Except as specified in the following sections, all other fields should be retained.*

# SPECIFIC MARC FIELDS AND SUBFIELDS

***Fields to be deleted***

*Use this list when transferring records into PALNI's ALEPH database from a source (OCLC, etc.) outside PALNI to determine which fields can be deleted, or when editing existing records in PALNI:*

011 Linking Library of Congress control number [obsolete]

012 Terminal Display

016 National Bibliographic Agency Control Number

055 Call Numbers Assigned in Canada ***(only if 050 is present in record)***

061 NLM Copy Statement

069 Other System Control Number [obsolete OCLC-defined field]

071 NAL Copy Statement

080 Universal Decimal Classification Number ***(only if 082 present)***

096 Locally Assigned NLM-type Call Number

098 Other Classification Schemes

211 Acronym or shortened title [obsolete]

212 Variant access title [obsolete]

214 Augmented title [obsolete]

241 Romanized title [obsolete]

263 Projected Publication Date (this field should be stripped when upgrading a record from prepublication-level to full-level cataloging)

350 Price [obsolete]

359 Rental Price [obsolete]

652 Subject added entry—Reversed geographic [obsolete]

653 Index Term - Uncontrolled

654 Subject Added Entry - Faceted Topical Term

656 Index Term - Occupation

657 Index Term - Function

658 Index Term - Curriculum Objective

699 Added Classification Number

755 Added Entry—Physical characteristics [obsolete]

850 Holding Institution

852 Location/Call Number (defined as part of the MARC Format for Holdings so inappropriate in bibliographic records)

87x Variant Forms of Entry [obsolete]

886 Foreign MARC Information Field

890 Local Library of Congress Holdings

9xx These fields can be deleted *except for* 987 and 994 (and see below for moving the data in field 936).

*Subject Fields (6xx Fields)*

It is the intent of PALNI to maintain its database under full authority control (see the section below on "Batch Authority Processing"). Within the 6xx field range, PALNI-provided automatic authority processing covers only those headings coded with second indicator "0" (=LC Subject Headings). The PALNI database will include any LC- or NACO-established cross references for such headings. Any 6xx fields with second indicators "3" or higher should be edited into conformity with LCSH/AACR2 or stripped from the bibliographic record. Retain any 6xx fields with a second indicator "1" (LC subject headings for children's literature) or "2" (Medical Subject headings); however, they will not receive authority processing. Past PALNI practice means that headings with second indicators "1" or "2" were frequently either stripped from records or upgraded to LCSH/AACR2. Carefully considered local subject headings (690/691 fields) may be used, (655 field, with second indicator "0" for a genre term from LCSH, or with second indicator "7" and source specified in $$2).

*Fields for Genre Headings (650/655)*

PALNI does not require the use of genre headings, but libraries may add such headings in either field 650 or field 655, if desired. The record should at a minimum reflect the genre headings included in the master record in OCLC. If editing a record added to PALNI's database by another library, do not delete genre headings (whether 650 or 655); instead, add an additional field, if desired.

*Summary tables for subject headings(6xx fields) in bibliographic records*

| 2nd Indicator | Meaning | Action | PALNI Authority Control |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | LC Heading [LCSH] | Must retain and/or include at least one* | Yes |
| 1 | LC Children's [AC Annotated] | Retain if present in record | No |
| 2 | Medical Subject [MESH] | Retain if present in record | No |
| 3-6 | Other source | Delete | No |
| 7 | Other source (specified in $$2) | Retain 655 if present in record; delete others | No |
| blank | [Undefined] | Retain 690 if present in record; delete others | No |

*Some categories of materials (for example, Bibles) do not have subject headings; most older MARC records for fiction have no subject headings; if the existing record in OCLC has no subject headings, there is no requirement for adding them, unless one wishes to do so.

*Guidelines for other fields and subfields*

AACR and LCRI generally tell how to use most of the MARC fields. In some cases, however, there are a variety of ways to use fields, and some obsolete fields have been replaced by other valid fields. Use the following guidelines when working with these fields:

**Subfield 6 – Linkage (found in field 880 and any other MARC field)**
This subfield is required to link the text in field 880, containing the vernacular text, to its romanized version in a regular MARC field. *Do not delete* this subfield from any field in which it occurs, even though ALEPH reports an error "Field '880' contains sub field '6' which is not allowed." Deleting this subfield will destroy the link between the two fields.

**MARC field 019 – OCLC Control Number Cross-Reference (OCLC-defined)**
This field contains the OCLC control number of duplicate records that have been deleted from WorldCat and replaced by the present record.

**In ALEPH:** OCLC numbers in field 019 must be moved to field 035 $z in order to be indexed and be retrievable. Each OCLC number from field 019 should be placed in a separate 035 field. (Alternatively, if there is only one OCLC number in field 019, this can be placed in a $z subfield following the 035 $a OCLC number of the record.) A macro has been developed that does this movement automatically. We recommend that the existing field 019 be left in the record, so that an electronic trail can be found.
If adding the related 035 field(s) manually (without using the macro), note that the OCLC number must be preceded by "(OCoLC)" and be left justified with enough zeroes to make a length of eight characters. Example:

| 019 | _ _ | a | 123 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | a | 4567 |
| 035 | _ _ | a | (OCoLC)12345678 |

After moving 019's to 035's:

| 019 | _ _ | a | 123 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | a | 4567 |
| 035 | _ _ | a | (OCoLC)12345678 |
| 035 | _ _ | z | (OCoLC)00000123 |
| 035 | _ _ | z | (OCoLC)00004567 |

**MARC field 035 – System Control Number**
This field is used (and has been used) for various purposes in OCLC and PALNI.
**In ALEPH:** Both indicators blank; subfield $a or subfield $z with OCLC number preceded by (OCoLC)—these fields are indexed, providing access to a record's OCLC number. Do not delete. See notes under MARC field 019 for moving numbers from 019 to 035.
First indicator "7," "8," or "9"—cross references from the old system number for records migrated to ALEPH. Do not delete.
Both indicators blank; subfield $b with a union listing code such as "MULS" or "UCU"—a subfield no longer used by OCLC, and one that no longer exists in the master record. This field can be deleted.
Both indicators blank; subfield $z with an LC control number (usually in the same field as an OCLC number in subfield $a)—moved from DRA. This subfield can be deleted.

**MARC field 265 – Source for acquisition /subscription address**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in 037 $b.
**In ALEPH:** Change this field to 037, and the subfield from $a to $b.

**MARC field 503 – Bibliographic history note**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in an undifferentiated field 500.
**In ALEPH:** Change the field tag from 503 to 500.

**MARC field 505 – Formatted Contents Note**

MARC standards allows for an enhanced contents note (second indicator "0"), where parts of the contents note are individually subfielded as $g, $r, and $t. Enhanced contents notes allow for more precise retrieval of items from the bibliographic database.
**In ALEPH:** PALNI permits either basic (second indicator blank) or enhanced (second indicator "0") contents notes. When possible, cataloging libraries are encouraged to provide enhanced notes because of the more precise retrieval that is possible.

**MARC field 570 – Editor note**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in an undifferentiated field 500.
**In ALEPH:** Change the field tag from 570 to 500.

**MARC field 590 – Local note**
This field, originally part of the MARC standard, is now obsolete, but is still defined for OCLC-MARC records. OCLC allows input of the field, but does not retain it in the master record. The field, when present in the record, is exported to the local system.
**In ALEPH:** Move true local notes to the holdings record, to display with the library's copy. If the note is absolutely needed in the bibliographic record (which may be the case, for example, in rare book cataloging), the contents should be input in a 500 field, with a $5 subfield.

**MARC field 705 – Added Entry—Personal name (Performer)**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in a field 700.
**In ALEPH:** Change the field tag from 705 to 700, and add the appropriate $4.

**MARC field 715 – Added Entry—Corporate name (Performing group)**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in a field 710.
**In ALEPH:** Change the field tag from 715 to 710, and add the appropriate $4.

**MARC field 840 – Series added entry—Title**
This field is now obsolete. The information formerly found in this field is now found in field 830.
**In ALEPH:** Change the field tag from 840 to 830 (or other appropriate 8XX tag).

**MARC field 880 – Alternate Graphic Representation**
This field is undergoing changes as Unicode is implemented in the MARC environment. Currently, the MARC standard allows its use only for characters in Unicode that are also found in the MARC-8 repertoire. (The OCLC Connexion client does not permit any Unicode characters that do not map to a MARC-8 character.) However, ALEPH permits *any* Unicode character to be used in the field. The MARC standard is slowly moving to full Unicode implementation, but ALEPH is clearly ahead of the curve.
**In ALEPH:** PALNI permits use of any Unicode character in MARC field 880. It is to be expected that by the time any migration from ALEPH needs to be made that Unicode will be completely supported in this field. If not, the entering library must recognize the

potential loss of information from this field. In addition, care must be taken not to use non-MARC-8 characters if using the uploading capability to OCLC.
For subfield 6 in this field, see the note at the beginning of this section.

**MARC field 935 – Previous System Number of Record**
This is a locally-defined field used during the conversion of the previous databases to ALEPH.
**In ALEPH:** Since the number is duplicated in a 035 field, delete this field.

**MARC field 936 – Dates or Volume Designations of Last Issue Consulted**
This field has been used for various purposes. The field, with the ending "(LIC)" notation, was previously defined by CONSER to identify the piece used for cataloging if the piece was something other than the first issue published, is now obsolete for this purpose. The information, while still useful, should be entered in field 500.
**In ALEPH:** If the field ends with "(LIC)," change the field to MARC field 500. The "LIC" at the end of the note should be deleted, and the new 500 note should be introduced with the phrase "Latest issue consulted:" Other uses of this field should be deleted.

**MARC field 987 – Local Romanization/Conversion History**
This field was defined by OCLC for use in the Pinyin Conversion Project. It contains information on the conversion of romanization from the Wade-Giles to the Pinyin romanization.
**In ALEPH:** Retain in the record if present.

**MARC field 994 – OCLC Export Information**
This field is defined by OCLC for information relating to the export of the record. In particular, it contains the OCLC symbol of the library exporting the record.
**In ALEPH:** Since this contains information about the bibliographic history of the record, retain this field in the record.

**MARC field FMT – Record Format**
This field is defined by Ex Libris ALEPH to indicate the format of the bibliographic record. It is roughly equivalent to OCLC's bibliographic format.
**In ALEPH:** The field is automatically produced when exporting from OCLC. The field is correct *except* for sound recordings. The record is exported with a FMT field with value "MU"; this should be changed to "MR".


# BATCH AUTHORITY PROCESSING

Early in the DRA implementation of the PALNI database, as part of the initial Standards documentation, a group of PALNI library staff investigated various vendors for authority processing. In June of 1995, PALNI made their first move toward assuring the integrity of the bibliographic database and incorporating online authority records by sending the

full database to LTI (Library Technologies, Inc.) for processing. This processing brought twenty years of cataloging into conformity with then current MARC headings. The records were reloaded into the PALNI database in August of 1995. Name and subject authority files for these records were also loaded at this time.

In 1997, we recognized that there was no way to keep up with changes to the rules and headings in a manual way. After a pilot group of catalogers tested a manual option, they approached the PALNI EC and Board with a request to begin Authority Express with LTI. Authority Express provided a venue for sending records that were new or had been changed to LTI on a regular basis for matching with a current authority file and receiving new or updated records from LTI for loading to the PALNI database. The committee proposal was accepted by the PALNI Executive Committee and subsequently by the full PALNI Board.

From 1995 to early fall of 2003, all new records in PALNI were sent for authority work to LTI. During the conversion of the database from DRA to ALEPH this process was suspended. Complete reprocessing of the database by LTI was included as part of the grant proposal to The Lilly Endowment, a project completed in January 2005. Authority Express is again following a regular schedule as outlined below:


**Authority Express**

1. When a new bibliographic record has been added to the PALNI database by a cataloger and that record is ready to be sent to LTI, a 953 field should be added to the record by the cataloger. This should also be done if an old record is updated with access points that would benefit from authority cleanup. [Note that the capitalization in the subfield is not important.]
       953   __   a   Auth
2. On a monthly basis, PALNI staff will announce to the e-lists, PALCat and PALSys, that LTI records will be extracted on the weekend and that adding 953 fields should cease until further notice. This does not mean that new records cannot be added to the database. It does mean that the responsibility is on the cataloger to go back and add the 953 field when this is again allowed
3. PALNI staff will extract all of the records that contain 953 fields and send this file to LTI.
4. After 2–5 hours PALNI staff will retrieve the bibliographic records and new authority records from LTI.
5. PALNI staff will reload the bibliographic records into the PALNI database.
6. PALNI staff will run a service to delete the 953 field from all of the records.
7. PALNI staff will announce that the ban on new 953 fields has been lifted.
8. PALNI staff will load the new authority records and run the linking program to connect them to the bib records.

This full process took 1–2 days on DRA. The extract and reload was done late Saturday through Sunday evening with the deletion function frequently lasting through Monday.

However, the bulk of the work was done over the weekend to lessen the impact on library staff. This will be the method again. The timing may improve, as ALEPH field deletions seem to complete more quickly.

# BATCH LOADING DATA IN THE PALNI DATABASE

With the proliferation of electronic data for current and retrospective collections, vendors of these collections will usually provide electronic files of the bibliographic records in MARC format at no cost. An individual library may contract with such a vendor to receive files for loading to the PALNI database. These loads are processed by the PALNI central staff with programs that create the holdings record, a single item record, and copy the URL data into the holdings record. The central processing of such files allows for close monitoring of system resources during the data loading and processing. Data loads impact the automatic indexing programs and can slow the indexing of new data.

One example of such a process is the NetLibrary collection in which several PALNI libraries have joined a group of academic libraries to order NetLibrary titles from OCLC. Every six months PALNI staff is notified that a file is ready to be collected from the OCLC website. This file is downloaded from the vendor site, converted from MARC format into ALEPH sequential format, tested to see that there are no duplicates, and loaded into the PALNI database. After the bibliographic records are loaded, the holdings record and item record are created. The URL for accessing the records online is copied to the holdings record for display in the WebOpac. Library staff is not required to do any processing of the data for access.

Some individual libraries have contracted for large online collections such as Early English Books Online. The same process of download, conversion, testing, loading and building holdings data is used.

In all cases it is important to include the PALNI staff in the communications at an early stage with the vendor. PALNI staff will request a small file of records to test the conversion and load processes from the vendor. This will assure that the records are in a valid format. PALNI may also need to provide the vendor with record changes needed to create holdings and items data during the load.

Some of the modifications that may be requested are:

1. Normalization of the 049 field, if there is such in the record. This is the field that is commonly used for creating holdings and item data and copying the URL data from the bibliographic record to the holdings record. If the data in this field is not the same for all of the records, holdings will not be generated for some records and it will take more time to investigate and find the alternative information.
2. If no 049 field is present in the records, there must be a field/subfield with some unique data for PALNI staff to use in setting up the holdings/items create process.

3. Some libraries may have proxy information imbedded in the URLs for their electronic holdings. It is helpful if the vendor providing the bibliographic data also modifies the 856 field to contain any relevant changes that the contracting library requires.

At present it is not practical for PALNI library staff to batch load records to the database. If, at some future time, local library batch loading becomes feasible and practical, these instructions will be appended to the standards document.

# PRINCIPLES FOR HANDLING DUPLICATE RECORDS

Several principles will guide the handling of duplicate bibliographic records in the PALNI database:

1) ***Minimize number of duplicate bibliographic records.*** The PALNI consortium wishes to minimize to the greatest extent possible the occurrence of duplicate bibliographic records in its database.

2) ***Staff in PALNI libraries, not PALNI headquarters, are chiefly responsible to identify and resolve duplicates.*** Chief responsibility for identifying and removing duplicate bibliographic records lies with the individual PALNI libraries rather than with the PALNI Central Site staff, and that responsibility rests especially with those libraries whose holdings are attached to duplicate bibliographic records.

3) ***Edit preferred bibliographic record to retain unique information from other records.*** When working with duplicate bibliographic records, every effort will be made to preserve any unique information found in records chosen for deletion. In addition to all access points provided in 1xx, 2xx, 4xx, 6xx, 7xx and valid 8xx fields, the following fields are considered especially important in this regard:
    010 $a LCCN
    020 $a ISBN
    035 $a OCLC Control Number
    050 $a LC Call Number
    082 $a Dewey Decimal Call Number
    Contents Notes

4) ***The library initiating elimination of a particular duplicate is primarily responsible for undertaking selection and accurate editing of preferred record.*** The library initiating the steps to eliminate a particular bibliographic record should assume responsibility for determining a preferred record and edit it to include any legitimate information found on the record(s) proposed for deletion. The initiating library should also routinely check the current status of the bibliographic record in the OCLC database. This will ensure that PALNI's version of the record has not been edited to describe an item other than the one described in the current OCLC manifestation of

the record. The OCLC record should also be checked for an 019 field indicating a merging of duplicate records in OCLC.

5) ***Each library is responsible to move its own holdings and to verify the appropriateness of suggested alternate bibliographic record.*** Although any library may initiate the steps to eliminate a particular bibliographic record, each library with holdings attached to a bibliographic record slated for deletion should have the opportunity to verify the appropriateness of the alternate record to describe its holdings and should be responsible to move its own holdings record.

6) ***Libraries should resolve questions about particular duplicates directly with each other.*** If a library believes that the request to move its holdings results from a mistaken interpretation of information in the bibliographic records in question, it should carefully review the principles and procedures outlined here and then contact the initiating library to resolve its questions. In some cases, the appropriate resolution may involve the creation of an original bibliographic record which more clearly distinguishes itself from the previously existing duplicate records.

# PROCEDURES FOR ELIMINATING DUPLICATE RECORDS

Follow the steps outlined below when eliminating duplicate bibliographic records. Though the procedures below are written as though there are only two duplicate bibliographic records involved, apply the same procedures in cases where more than two records are involved.

### *1) Determine which duplicate record is to be retained.*

a.) If one of the records has many holding libraries attached and the other few, retain the record with many holdings. This means fewer libraries have to be notified to move their holdings.

b.) If neither record has many holdings retain the fullest bib record, i.e., the record that will require the least amount of editing to incorporate information from other records.

### *2) Edit the retained record to include unique access points and any valid additional information (e.g., 856 fields) from the record that will be deleted.*

In many cases the quickest way to edit the retained record will be to overlay the latest version of the record in OCLC onto the record to be retained and then add back any valid information lost in the overlay process. However, when using the overlay process, the PALNI participant **must** retain any unique information from the preferred record and edit the new record to include that information. The following fields will be retained in the overlay process automatically: 035, 086 (only if there is no field 086 in the OCLC record being imported), 505, 510, 541, 590, 690, 710 (with first indicator "2"), 776, 785, 880, and 935. Other unique fields will have to be noted and then added back into the record manually. If the original OCLC number is not applicable delete the relevant 035 that is retained.

*3) Except for local subject headings (690 fields), do not transfer local or copy-specific fields to the record to be retained. Instead, each library should move its local or copy-specific fields to their holdings or item records.*

*4) Include in the retained record all the OCLC control numbers associated with the record, i.e., include any new 019 fields from the record to be deleted.*

*5) Make sure every 019 field has an 035 subfield z that corresponds with it.*

a) Normalize the 035 subfield z to 8 digits.

b) Precede the digits with "(OCoLC)," e.g., 035 z (OCoLC)12345678

*6) Move any previous system control numbers in the record from Palni schools from the non-preferred record to the record to be retained, i.e., 035 7, 035 8, and 035 9 fields.*

*7) Notify other libraries with holdings or order records of the duplicate problem so they can attach their holdings or order records to the new bib record.*

Contact (via e-mail) the technical services personnel of libraries with holdings or order records attached to the "non-preferred" record(s) giving them relevant system numbers and titles. There is no need to contact libraries with holdings attached to the preferred record unless in updating that record some substantial part of the bibliographic description appears to have changed. This will occur infrequently, likely only in cases where an updated OCLC record has overlaid an earlier OCLC version on PALNI.

*8) Contacted libraries should move their holdings or order record; the last library moving an attached holdings or order should delete the bibliographic record not being retained.*

Having taken the above steps, the initiating library completes its responsibilities. Libraries informed of holdings on duplicate records, should review the information, transferring their own holdings to the preferred record and checking the old bibliographic record for local or copy-specific information which they may wish to retain in their holdings record. The library removing the final holdings or order attached to the old record, should delete the old bibliographic record after transferring their holdings or order record.


## EDITING METHODS FOR DUPLICATE RECORDS

Ex Libris software and the setup of the PALNI consortium allow for several different ways of editing or deleting bibliographic and holdings records.

PALNI participants can merge information found in duplicate bibliographic records by several means. When working with an exact duplicate, it may be most efficient to overlay the preferred duplicate and delete the non-preferred duplicate record (see step 2 above).

If there is much unique information on the preferred record, relying on regular editing functions (including cutting and pasting of individual fields/subfields from one record to another) may prove a more accurate, if somewhat cumbersome, method of upgrading a preferred record.

Each PALNI library with holdings on the non-preferred bibliographic record will have to transfer holdings, item(s), and order records to the preferred bibliographic record. To move such records do the following:

*1) Call up one of the bibligraphic records in the GUI cataloging module* . **Split the screen using the split editor mode icon, and call up the second bibliographic record on the other screen.**

*2) Create an administration (ADM) record for your library on the preferred record.*

a) Make sure the preferred record is active (i.e., it has a red line around the pane).

b) Go to the record manager and right click on the xxx50 node, and then click on the "Load/Create record" choice (or double-click on the xxx50 node). An ADM record will appear in the active upper pane.

*3) Click on the "Overview Tree" icon on the Cataloging bar so that both records in the upper pane go to the overview tree view.*

*4) Left click (and hold) on the ADM node for your library on the non-preferred record and drag it to the ADM node you created on the preferred record and drop it there. Any order, subscription, item, and holdings records will be moved with it to the preferred record.*

*5) Delete your ADM on the old record.*

a) Switch back to the cataloging record by clicking on the "Overview Tree" icon on the Cataloging bar.

b) Highlight the non-preferred record in the split screen mode.

c) Right click on your ADM node in the record manager, then click on the "load/create" choice (or double-click on the ADM node). The ADM record will appear in the appropriate upper pane screen.

d) Right click and hold anywhere in the ADM record. Highlight the "delete" choice, click on the "delete record from server" choice, and hit "yes" to confirm (or type control-R and respond with "yes").

e) The bibliographic record will now appear in the pane.

*6) Delete the bibliographic record if no one else is on the bibliographic record.*

a) Right click and hold in the bibliographic record, go to "delete" on the menu that pops up, then click on the "delete record from server" choice (or again, type control-R and respond with "yes"). Do not worry about deleting a bibliographic record with attached records that you cannot see. ALEPH will prevent you from doing so.

*7) If the record from which you were moving information lacked holdings or item(s) records, then those records will need to be created in the usual way on the new record as part of the regular cataloging process on the preferred record.*

# GUIDELINES FOR HOLDINGS AND ITEM RECORDS

*Note: Some PALNI libraries have requested guidelines for holdings and item records. Because of PALNI's philosophy that holdings and items are not shared in the same way that bibliographic records are shared, these guidelines do not have the same force as the rest of the standards pertaining to bibliographic records. Nevertheless, the Standards Committee believes these guidelines will enable libraries to put the fullest information as possible into ALEPH (in some cases for future possibilities), and each library may or may not implement these guidelines as it chooses.*

Holdings records and item records in the PALNI database can only be input, modified, and deleted by the owning library. Thus, each library has essential control over what and how much information is put in these records. The Standards Committee recognizes that full information in these records (especially in the holdings records) may be more than some libraries can manage. Therefore, the following guidelines are meant as recommendations for what can be done to use the full power of the ALEPH system, but are not seen as requirements for any library.

## *Holdings records*

### Use of Holdings Data fields (853–855, 863–865, 866–868, 876–878)

Holdings records for multi-volume works (type "v") and serials (type "y") should include at least the following fields:
    853 — captions for the basic bibliographic unit
    863 — enumeration for the basic bibliographic unit
    866 — textual (display) holdings for the catalog
The 853/863 and 866 fields should be kept in synch, since the 853/863 pair provide a machine-readable version of the holdings, and the 866 provide a display version of the holdings. Only the 866 field gets displayed currently in the catalog.

The presence or absence of these fields does not change the functionality of ALEPH. These fields provide *summary* information on the holdings, which is spelled out in full by the item records attached to the holdings record. Only the 866 field is currently visible in the Web OPAC (both sets of fields are visible in the GUI client). Although the 853/863 pair currently has no noticeable use, it is likely that SFX, MetaLib, and other programs could, in the future, use the information in these fields to make an informed display of holdings.

In ALEPH version 15.5, these fields had to be maintained manually. With version 17.01 of ALEPH, there appear to be automated ways to maintain the field—but PALNI has not yet worked with this capability.

In addition to 853/863 and 866, any applicable fields of the following should be input:
    854/864 and 867 for supplements
    855/865 and 868 for indexes

An example of an 853/863 pair and corresponding 866 (with an 855/865 and 868 for an index) follows:

<u>853</u> <u>01</u> <u>8</u>  1
        <u>a</u>  v.
        <u>i</u>  (year)
<u>863</u> <u>32</u> <u>8</u>  1.1
        <u>a</u>  30-54
        <u>i</u>  1979-2003
<u>855</u>    <u>8</u>  1
        <u>a</u>  v.
        <u>i</u>  (year)
<u>865</u> <u>43</u> <u>8</u>  1.1
        <u>a</u>  21/40
        <u>i</u>  1970/1989
<u>866</u> <u>31</u> <u>8</u>  1
        <u>a</u>  v.30(1979)–v.54(2003)
<u>868</u> <u>41</u> <u>8</u>  1
        <u>a</u>  v.21/40(1970/1989)

The form of summary holdings shown here is "adjacent display." An equally valid form is "separate display." For details, see p. 24 of *Holdings Statements for Bibliographic Items* (ANSI/NISO Z39.71-1999).

**Use of Field 856 (Electronic Location and Access)**

The bibliographic record for items with electronic components (full text from NetLibrary or table of contents from the Library of Congress, for example) contains an 856 field for the electronic link. The full record bibliographic display does not show these links; they *do* appear in the MARC tags display, but not as hot links.
The holdings record is the proper place for any 856 field providing access to an electronic resource for a particular library. These links are displayed as hot links on the holdings display. Any *applicable* field must be copied from the bibliographic record to the holdings record. This gives you full control over the links you provide to your patrons. If you do not have JSTOR or OCLC's Electronic Collection Online, or do not wish to provide a link for only the table of contents or publisher's description, do not copy these links into the holdings record. Such links should, however, be left in the bibliographic record, so that libraries that want to use them can find and copy them.

The MARC 21 Concise Format for Holdings Data can be found on the Web at
http://www.loc.gov/marc/holdings/echdhome.html.

*Item records*

In order to move items from DRA to ALEPH, artificial numbers were created for the first level of enumeration, composed of a concatenation of the 86X tag and the digit before the period of subfield 8, with the digit(s) after the period of subfield 8 put in the second level enumeration.

Although this served to get the holdings into ALEPH, it is not the use that the ALEPH system expects for these fields. The Standards Committee recommends that the field for the first level of enumeration be used as the ALEPH system expects (that is, volume 1 of a work will have a first-level enumeration of "1"), for the following reasons:

1) Using a system as designed is normally the preferred method of use.
2) Since the default item display only shows enumeration at the first level, one cannot tell what the actual ordering of items is without going into the full view (since the default loading of item records generally created a first-level enumeration of "863.0001").
3) Training persons in the future will be easier if one uses the system as shown in the training materials.
4) Using the first level of enumeration will allow one to use the "Select volume" pop-up on the item display screen to choose volumes in a meaningful manner, especially if multiple libraries are displayed.

However, the ALEPH system is flexible, and libraries desiring to continue using the numbering as brought over from DRA may do so.

In deciding how to use the varioius fields provided in the item record, one must realize that there is no MARC standard for items. Thus, every vendor can decide for itself what fields to use, and how they are used. In looking to the (far-distant) future and considering migration, this means that whether or not particular fields and/or contents will migrate cannot be known or predicted. However, we might note that almost all (if not all) of the data in the item records in DRA was successfully mapped to the fields available in the item records in ALEPH.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Descriptive cataloging rules*

*Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.* Prepared under the direction of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. 2nd ed., 2002 revision. Chicago: American Library Association, 2002. [Updates issued 2003, 2004; also available through LC's *Cataloger's Desktop.*]

*Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRI).* Edited by Robert M. Hiatt; formulated by the Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1989 base text with annual updates. [These are also available through LC's *Cataloger's Desktop* or uncumulated through the quarterly publication *Cataloging Service Bulletin.* A less-expensive cumulation is available through Oberlin College.]

*Subject cataloging*

Chan, Lois Mai. *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Principles of Structure and Policies for Application.* Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1990.

*Library of Congress Subject Headings.* Prepared by the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, Collections Services. 28th ed. 5 vols. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 2005. [Authorized headings available online through OCLC and from LC: http://authorities.loc.gov/]

*Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings.* Prepared by the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, Library of Congress. 5th ed. 4 vols. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1996. [with annual updates.]

*Name authorities*

*NACO Participant's Manual.* Edited by Patricia Van Ryn and William L. Starck. 3rd ed. Washington DC: Library of Congress, Cooperative Cataloging Team, [2005]. [Available online: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco/npm3rd.pdf]

*MARC Formats*

OCLC Online Computer Library Center. *Bibliographic Formats and Standards.* 3rd ed. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 2003. [Available online: http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/default.htm]

*MARC 21 Concise Formats.* Prepared by Network Development and MARC Standards Office. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 2003. [Periodic updates; covers bibliographic, authority, and holdings data in abbreviated form; available online: http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/; http://www.loc.gov/marc/authority/; http://www.loc.gov/marc/holdings/.]

*MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: Including Guidelines for Content Designation.* Prepared by Network Development and MARC Standards Office. 2 vols. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1999 [Periodic updates; also available through LC's *Cataloger's Desktop*].

*MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data: Including Guidelines for Content Designation.* Prepared by Network Development and MARC Standards Office. Washington DC: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 2000. [Periodic updates; also available through LC's *Cataloger's Desktop*.]