**Preparing for Migration of Local Bib Data to Alma Bibliographic Record Extensions**

**Overview**: Ex Libris has developed Alma functionality that will allow a library to migrate local bibliographic information into special local fields, currently being referred to as local bibliographic record extensions. These bib extensions would display to users in both Alma and Primo as if they were part of the bib record, but would be stored in the library’s Institution Zone. This protects the local information in the bib extensions from being lost when master records in the Network Zone are overlayed with an updated record.

**Importance**: Local information (information not contained in the WorldCat master record) in a non-local bibliographic field (e.g., 500 note or 700 added entry) will be lost when that record’s inventory (holding and item records) are relinked to the master OCLC record in the Network Zone. Information in fields with specific field tags, and marked with a subfield $9, will be moved to bib record extensions during migration and retained until deleted by the library).

**Background**: Ex Libris has proposed that the following MARC fields be reserved for local extensions:

09X – Local call numbers

59X – Local notes

69X – Local subject access fields

900-949 – reserved by Ex Libris for NZ shared local notes in order to allow NZ to determine standard use of local notes across the network for central access points – do not use these fields for local data

Note – one of these fields will be used as a marker for P2E records

950-999 – reserved for NZ members’ local notes

The Alliance has also asked for an 880 equivalent for the alternate graphic representation of names in non-Roman characters in local added entries. We are waiting for a response from Ex Libris, but this may not be possible in the amount of time available, or Ex Libris may not agree that this is essential functionality.

The list below represents a set of fields that should cover all of the use cases previously submitted by   
Alliance members. All fields would be indexed and searchable in Alma. Display and indexing of the fields in Primo is controlled at an installation level by the Alliance as part of standard Primo Back Office configuration. This is not institutionally customizable, though display labels are customizable at an institution level. The list below contains the bib extension tag, the standard MARC tag the field is intended as an equivalent to, the name of the bib extension field, and examples of field tags in existing records where the data may be stored.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alma** | **Format** | **Field Description** | **Pre-Alma** |
| 590-597 (590\*) | 500 | Local institution-defined public notes | 500, 590 |
| 598 |  | Local standard number | 020, 022, 024 |
| 599\* | 500 | Local institution-defined public note | 500, 590 |
| 690\* | 650 | Local–Topical Term | 650, 690 |
| 691\* | 651 | Local–Geographic Name | 651, 691 |
| 693 | 653 | Local uncontrolled index term | 693 |
| 694 | 655 | Local Form/Genre | 694 |
| 695\* | 90 | Added Class Number | 695 |
| 696\* | 600 | Local Subject Added Entry–Personal Name | 600, 696 |
| 697\* | 610 | Local Subject Added Entry–Corporate Name | 610, 697 |
| 698\* | 611 | Local Subject Added Entry–Meeting Name | 611, 698 |
| 699\* | 630 | Local Subject Added Entry–Uniform Title | 630, 699 |
| 952\* | 700 | Local Added Entry–Personal Name | 700 |
| 953\* | 710 | Local Added Entry–Corporate Name | 710, 791 |
| 954\* | 711 | Local Added Entry–Meeting Name | 711, 792 |
| 955\* | 730 | Local Added Entry–Uniform Title | 730, 793 |
| 957 | 752 | Local Hierarchical Place Name | 794 |
| 958 | 229 | Local Added Entry–Local Journal Titles | 229 not hyperlinked |
| 959 | 246 | Local Added Entry–Varying Form of Title | 246 not hyperlinked |
| 960\* | 740 | Local Added Entry–Uncontrolled Related/Analytical Title | 740 not hyperlinked |
| 961 | 830 | Local Series Added Entry–Uniform Title | 830, 899 |
| 962 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 963 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 964 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 965 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 966 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 967 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 968 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 969 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 970 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 971 |  | Local institution-defined internal note |  |
| 972 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 973 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 974 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 975 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 976 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 977 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 978 |  | Alliance-defined internal note: III .b number | III .b number |
| 979 |  | Alliance-defined internal note |  |
| 980 |  | Alliance-defined internal note: Order Information (e.g., WCP/PromptCat) |  |
| 981 |  | Alliance-defined internal note: Order Information (e.g., WCP/PromptCat) |  |

\*Fields marked by an asterisk conform to the field definitions in OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards.

\*\*Libraries can define which 9XX local notes they will use. Some possible 9XX notes would be:

950\* 500 Additional Standard Number 020, 022, 024, 028

976 500 Local action note 583

977\* 500 User-Option Data 910

977-999\* 500 Local Data Element

**X9X and 9XX Fields Reserved by Others**. OCLC has reserved the following fields exclusively for OCLC use: 936, 938, 950, 951, 994, 987, 989-999 (see “OCLC-MARC Record Output for Bibliographic Batchload” at <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/batchload/documentation/using/marcrecordoutputdetails.pdf> ). Although this restriction is for bibliographic records submitted for batch loading into WorldCat, you may wish to refrain from using these fields to preclude any potential problems in the future.

**Marking Fields for Migration**: Ex Libris is willing to migrate fields from our exported bibliographic records to Alma bibliographic extensions, but they must be moved to fields using tags in the list above (Alma column) and they must be marked with a “$9LOCAL” (no period at the end of the subfield). It is the library’s responsibility to move the data present into the Alma column tag, and to mark it with $9LOCAL.

**Note**: At this time, the design for Primo support of bib extensions will display and search all bib record extensions (except local notes) from all Alliance libraries to all patrons. Therefore, the number of fields migrated as bib record extensions needs to be restricted to information which is truly local information. If libraries move head variants (e.g., a 700 heading that doesn’t match the form in the OCLC master record) to a specified 9xx field and mark it for migration to bib record extensions, it will clutter up the Primo display and make it more difficult for our patrons.

**Specific note about call numbers in the bib record:** If institutions have their local call number in the item record, and any data in their bib records with an 09x can be disregarded in the migration process, they simply do not mark those bib fields with $9LOCAL and no localized fields will be created in Alma.

If institutions want to use the call number from the bib, this is reflected in the answer on the Millennium (III) Migration form and they do not need to mark that field as $9LOCAL, but that call number will be selected from the bib and used in the Alma holding.

**Process**: There are many approaches a library could use in finding and marking local fields for migration to Alma bib extension fields. The following general procedural steps are simply one possible approach:

1. Find fields that contain specific words or phrases that denote a local field that does not use one of the standard bib record extension fields, e.g., 500 notes with ‘restricted’ or ‘gift’. Other common fields might be local collection names in 7XX added entries or local form/genre headings. In Millennium, copy those fields to their corresponding localized Alma field (example: copy your 730 to a 955 field in Millennium), and mark that Alma field with “$9LOCAL”.

2. (Optional) After step 1 is complete, select one or more sets of records which are most likely to contain important local fields, such as records for your special collections. Export and send those records to Kyle Banerjee, along with a small number of field tags you are most interested in. He will compare your local records against the OCLC master records and provide you with a list of fields in your records that are not present in the OCLC records. You can then review that list of fields to determine which fields should be marked for migration to Alma bib record extension fields.

Additional information about Kyle Banerjee’s Catalog Analysis Tool from a previous email:

One of the areas of great concern related to the migration of our bibliographic data to Alma is the potential loss of information added locally, particularly for specific types of resources such as the rare and unique resources in many of our special collections. Kyle Banerjee, a member of the Shared ILS Cataloging Working Group, has a created a tool that can help you isolate some of that local information so that your library could chose to add it to the master record in WorldCat, or code it so it would migrate into the Alma bibliographic record institution extensions fields (more details will be provided on this process over the next few weeks as Ex Libris firms up the specifications for the bibliographic record institution extensions fields).

*Update: Kyle’s Catalog Analysis Tool uses a static set of OCLC master records extracted in February 2013 (which will be replaced by a new master file in May 2013). Therefore, the reports provided may include fields which have already been added to or updated in the current WorldCat master record.*

**What is the purpose of the tool?**

* To compare a library's local MARC bib records against the version in WorldCat to find specific types of differences

**What does it do?**

* It looks at the presence, absence, and number of fields. This allows you to know if a local record has field X and the master record does not. It can also tell you if the local record has more occurrences of field X than the master record
* It is efficient enough to work with any catalog in the Alliance
* It can tell you about a specific field in your database (i.e. how many times it appears, what is in it, etc)

**What does it not do?**

* It currently does not perform complex comparisons. However, complex operations can often be accomplished by breaking problems into multiple steps
* If there is a specific problem you’d like to solve, let me know

**How does it work?**

* It’s a collection of scripts that optimizes Alliance and local data into tables which can then be compared and queried using SQL
* It is run entirely from the command line since the file sizes cause problems with graphical editors
* It uses data downloaded from OCLC in February (i.e. not live data). This means it does not account for recent activity

**Can a user friendly interface be made for it?**

* That would require a web interface. The data, computational requirements, and time needed to run routines exceed anything that could reasonably done on the web

**Can I use it myself?**

* It is not designed to be portable, but people with systems and database skills could duplicate it. It uses a lot of data (> 50 GB). The most efficient way to achieve this would be to download all the Alliance data, create tables, process the files using scripts, and then query it in SQL. I can provide scripts and assistance with setup, but you would need to be comfortable parsing files using command line tools and nested queries in SQL

**I want to get started. What should I do?**

* The first thing you need to do is prioritize what must be fixed
* One of the easiest things to detect (and resolve) is if the local record contains a field that is absent in the master record. If you’d like a list of all records in the master file that are lacking field X, simply use Create Lists to find all records containing that field and export the OCLC numbers. Then send me the file and let me know which field you’re interested in. I can send results back quickly
* Other problems require more intense processing and additional data. The best way to communicate these is in the form of a prioritized list. In most cases, I’ll need the entire MARC file (which I can get from the EL test site) and to preprocess it.
* Priority will be given to cohort 1 libraries
* Expect to do a lot of work. If 3% of your records contain local data that need to be added to OCLC, that translates to 3,000 updates per 100,000 records or 30,000 updates per million.
* If your library does not have PCC or CONSER status, there are a large range of edits you can’t perform on records created by these agencies. There are almost 2 million of these (i.e. a little less than a quarter of all our records). Right now, the only realistic option for such records is bibliographic extensions. But these can be separated out in output lists

Please send questions about this tool/process to Kyle Banerjee ([banerjek@ohsu.edu](mailto:banerjek@ohsu.edu)), Digital Collections and Metadata Librarian, Oregon Health & Science University.
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