



RDA NACO Reviewers Handbook For OCLC Connexion

Created by the Cooperative Cataloging Section
Library of Congress
2011

Revised by the PCC Standing Committee on Training
2012

Topics to be Covered in this Handbook

Welcome!

What do Reviewees Already Know?

As you and your reviewee enter into the NACO review phase, what does the reviewee already know about what lies ahead?

What to Look for in Reviewing NACO Records

Focus on the areas in name authority records of importance to NACO work

Examples for Reviewing

A straight-forward NACO record
A more difficult NACO record
A complex NACO record

Contacts

How to find help and additional resources

NACO Reviewer's Things to Remember

NACO Reviewer's Tracking Sheet

Welcome!

Thank you for volunteering to become a NACO Reviewer! As the NACO Program grows and expands internationally, the volume of new authority records contributed by members increases exponentially. Training and review have always been a hallmark of the NACO Program, and by agreeing to become a NACO Reviewer, you are playing a critical role in the function and well-being of the NACO Program.

This handbook is meant to serve as a reference source as you begin your work as a reviewer. The handbook is also meant to be used in conjunction with the online training for NACO Reviewers created and conducted by the PCC Standing Committee on Training.

Please review the information in this handbook thoroughly before and after taking the online training. We hope that you will refer to this handbook many times in the future as your review skills develop.

Best wishes,

PCC Standing Committee on Training
July 2012

What do Reviewees Already Know?

Review guidelines and procedures are stressed in the NACO training workshop.

What are reviewees told about the review process?

- NACO independence must be achieved before direct contribution to OCLC
- A NACO reviewer will be assigned locally or regionally, or LC will review
- The review period is flexible, based on number of records submitted
- Create NAR and submit to review file
- Notify reviewer by email; include OCLC symbol in the message
- Ask brief questions or cite instructions in the 952 of the record; otherwise use email for questions
- Send both easy and tough records, no more than 10-15 at a time
- Make corrections based on reviewer's comments before submitting new records for review
- Avoid overloading email messages with multiple problems

- Send a representative range of records (language, level of difficulty)
- Reviewer is looking for no more than 10% error rate in areas that affect access
- The basic mechanics of submitting a NAR for review using Connexion
- 24-hour rule: a reviewer may request that access points in any record that has been in the review file for over 24 hours be re-searched before contribution to the LC/NACO Authority File
- Reporting to LC Cooperative Programs Section
- Independent NACO libraries handle their own review and quality control
- Libraries must contact LC Cooperative Programs Section (naco@loc.gov) with NAR delete requests:
 - Tell Coop which one to keep, which one to delete, and include LCCNs (not OCLC ARNs)
 - Certain categories of BFM must be reported to LC Cooperative Programs Section (naco@loc.gov)
 - Include LCCNs (not OCLC record numbers) for LC BFM

What to Look for in Reviewing NACO Records

All records will have an 008 Fixed Fields array

The 008 Fixed Fields of importance to NACO:

<u>Rec stat</u>	n	Entered	20120703	Replaced			
<u>Type</u>	z	<u>Upd status</u>	a	<u>Enc lvl</u>	n	<u>Source</u>	c
<u>Roman</u>	■	<u>Ref status</u>	a	<u>Mod rec</u>		<u>Name use</u>	a
<u>Govt agn</u>	■	<u>Auth status</u>	a	<u>Subj</u>	a	<u>Subj use</u>	a
<u>Series</u>	n	<u>Auth/ref</u>	a	<u>Geo subd</u>	n	<u>Ser use</u>	b
<u>Ser num</u>	n	<u>Name</u>	a	<u>Subdiv tp</u>	n	<u>Rules</u>	z

The highlighted fields are the ones to watch for:

Upd status (008/31)

Ref status (008/29) – The use of “|” (No attempt to code) in all new RDA authority records was recommended by the PCC RDA Decisions Needed Task Group in March 2012. However, that recommendation has not been approved as PCC policy, and there is no recommendation on retroactive recoding of this byte

Auth status (008/33)

Name (008/32)

Rules (008/10) – probably in the reviewee’s template

Variable Data Fields

The variable data fields of importance to NACO:

010		no2012055198
040		ICU #b eng #c ICU #e rda
100	1	Bourgouin, Simon, #d active 16th century
400	1	Bourgouyn, Symon, #d active 16th century
670		Les triomphes, 2012: #b t.p. (Simon Bourgouin) p. 11, etc. (Symon Bourgouyn; translator into French of Petrarch's Trionfi; also translated a Greek text of Lucian in 1529)

The highlighted fields are the ones that every record must have:

Every record will have an 040 with \$e rda.

Every record will have a 1XX access point

Every record will have at least one 670. It is often the 670 that causes the most difficulty for new NACO trainees

Please check the 670 fields very closely

A mistake in a 670 will often carry over into other access-related parts of the record

Variable Data Fields—“as needed”

The “As needed” variable data fields of importance to NACO:

010		no2011149779
040		NdU #b eng #c NdU #e rda
046		#s 1892 #t 1911
110	2	Grand Forks College
370		#c U.S. #e Grand Forks, N.D.
371		Belmont Avenue #b Grand Forks #c N.D. #d U.S. #e 58201 #s 1892 #t 1911
372		Education #2 lcsh
377		eng
510	2	#i Hierarchical superior: #a Grand Forks Lutheran College Association #w r
670		Collection, 1892-1909 #b (Grand Forks College; opened its doors in 1892 as a multipurpose college, functioning as a preparatory school and classical college, provided with a Lutheran background. Located on a six-acre space on Belmont Ave. south of Grand Forks; forced to close its doors in 1911 due to competition with UND. The Grand Forks Lutheran College Association was established as the governing body of Grand Forks College.)

A 5XX is needed in this record

Remember that there must be a separate authority record for the 5XX entity. The 5XX must match the 1XX in another authority record, but a reciprocal 5XX in that other authority record is not required in all cases.

Variable Data Fields—“as needed”

The “As needed” variable data fields of importance to NACO:

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
100	1	Smith, Zachary
667		Cannot identify with: Smith, Zachary A. (Zachary Alden), 1953- (n 84191476)
670		Official legends of wrestling, ©2001: #b title page verso (Zachary Smith)

667 note: consult DCM Z 1 667 for examples and formatting

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
110	2	Hungarian Astronautic Society
670		COSPAR Colloquium (2nd : 1990 : Sopron, Hungary). The environmental model of Mars, 1991: #b page facing title page (The Hungarian Astronautic Society)
675		Telefon, Telex, Telefax, 1989; #a Magyar nemzeti bibliográfia, 1989, Index.

675 field– watch for indicators that one is needed

An undifferentiated personal name NAR should have a 675, a corporate NAR should have one if the heading is in an unexpected language, etc.

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
034		#d W0684640 #e W0684640 #f N0444804 #g N0444804 #2 geonames
043		n-us-me
151		Bangor (Me.)
451		Bangor, Me. #w nnaa
670		GeoNames, algorithmically matched, 2009 #b (populated place; 44°48'04"N 068°46'40"W)
781	0	#z Maine #z Bangor

034 fields (as of 2009), 043 fields, and 781 fields may be added by NACO participants for geographic names.

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
053		PS3606.A36
100	1	Fairbanks, Nancy, #d 1934-
500	1	#i real identity: #a Herndon, Nancy, #d 1934- #w r
663		Works by this author are entered under the name used in the item. For a listing of other names used by this author, search also under #b Herndon, Nancy, 1934-
670		Truffled feathers, 2001: #b t.p. (Nancy Fairbanks) title page verso (Nancy Herndon) page 3 of cover (Nancy Fairbanks is a pseudonym for Nancy Herndon, author of the Elena Jarvis mystery series for Berkley Prime Crime; historical romances written under the name Elizabeth Chadwick; r. El Paso, Tex.)
670		Contemporary authors online, May 7, 2001 #b (Nancy Herndon; born May 29, 1934, St. Louis, Mo.; romance and mystery novelist; uses pseudonym Elizabeth Chadwick; r. El Paso, Tex.)

An 053 may be added for a literary author– but in order to add this to a new NAR, be sure that the NACO reviewee has applied to

LC for the correct number

(<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/053/053prop.html>).

Although not required, judiciously adding 046 and 37X-38X fields can greatly enhance the value of the record, if the information is readily available.

Variable Data Fields—“highly encouraged”

The “highly encouraged” variable data fields of importance to NACO:

010	no2011118097
040	NdU #b eng #c NdU #e rda #d DLC
046	# 19631118
100 1	Busan, Robert, #d 1963-
370	Sydney, N.S.W. #c Australia #c U.S. #e Sydney, N.S.W. #e Urbana, Ill. #e San Francisco, Calif.
372	Music #2 lcsh
373	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign #s 1999 #t 2001
373	San Francisco State University #s 2002
374	Conductors (Music) #s 1984 #t 1999 #2 lcsh
374	Graduate students #s 1999 #t 2001 #2 lcsh
374	Instructors #s 2002 #2 lcsh
375	male
377	eng
670	György Ligeti's <i>Musica ricercata</i> and <i>Six bagatelles for wind quintet</i> , c2006: #b title page (Robert Busan)
670	György Ligeti's <i>Musica ricercata</i> and <i>Six bagatelles for wind quintet</i> , c2006: page 201 (Robert Busan; born in Sydney, Australia, Nov. 18, 1963, conductor, Sydney, Australia 1984-1999, studied at the Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in the field of music, completing Bachelor of Music and Master of Music, 2001. Wind ensemble director and clarinet instructor at San Francisco State University, clinician and adjudicator in U.S. and Australia.)

Summary: There is a ranking in what to look for. Obviously the 1XX field is of critical importance, as well as a correctly-formatted 670 field as justification. But are some errors more critical than others? Think about access. It helps to mention to a reviewee that a certain type of error is not as critical as another type. That helps to build confidence and solidifies the reviewer-reviewee relationship.

Although the NACO reviewee already knows about the “24-hour rule,” it is advisable to discuss this during the outset of the review

process, since understanding the authority distribution cycle lessens the possibility of contributing a duplicate record.

As a NACO reviewer, you also may want to notify your reviewee that you intend to search “behind” him or her—meaning that you intend to perform the same searches to be sure that every relevant authorized access point, variant access point, or bibliographic record (potential BFM) was identified.

Examples for Reviewing -- 1

Rec stat	n	Entered	20120706	Replaced	
Type	z	Upd status	a	Enc lvl	n
Roman		Ref status	n	Mod rec	
Govt agn		Auth status	a	Subj	a
Series	n	Auth/ref	a	Geo subd	n
Ser num	n	Name	a	Subdiv tp	n
				Source	c
				Name use	a
				Subj use	a
				Ser use	b
				Rules	z

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21	1
046		#f 1962	2
100	1	Dannerslee, Jerome D., #d 1962-	
370		Chicago	3
372		Religion	
373		Harvard University #s 2000 #t 2007 #a University of Michigan #s 2007	4
377		English	5
378		#q Jerome Dennis	
670		Faith in hard times, 2010: #b title page (Jerome D. Dannerslee) page 4 of cover (Jerome Dennis Dannerslee; born in Chicago on April 3, 1962; lecturer in religion, Harvard University, 2000-2007; professor of religion at the University of Michigan since 2007)	

Reviewee submits this personal name NAR.

You notice a couple of things right away

- 1) There is a "z" in the 008/10 (good), but the 040 lacks a \$e rda (bad).
- 2) The reviewee correctly recorded the date of birth in the 046 \$f (good), but did not record the full eight-digit code in compliance with ISO 8601, even though the 670 shows that the full birth date is known (bad).
- 3) The place of birth is recorded in the 370 \$a (good). However, it is not in the form found in the qualifier of an authorized access point (bad).
- 4) The associated groups (Harvard and Michigan) are both coded in 373 \$a with their associated dates recorded in the \$s and \$t subfields (good). However, the \$s and \$t are not repeatable, so the associated bodies should be recorded in separate 373 fields.

5) The associated language should be recorded in the three-digit form found in the *MARC Code List for Languages* (i.e.: “eng”).

What is a good response?

“This NAR looks good— you made a very good choice on the access point, diligently applying the option under 9.19.1.3, while *not* applying the option under 9.19.1.4. You’ve also correctly recorded “z” into the 008/10 byte, indicating that this is an RDA NAR. Remember to also record “\$e rda” in the 040, since this, in combination with the 008/10 byte, properly identifies this as an RDA record.

You’ve added many of the new optional fields to the record, providing a wealth of rich information! Remember the LCPS under 9.3.1.3, which says to follow the ISO 8601 date scheme when the date of birth is certain. Since— judging from your 670—you know the month, date, and year, be sure to record the full 8-digit code in the 046 \$f. Remember also to record the place of birth, as 9.8.1.3 instructs, “in the form prescribed in Chapter 16.” Roughly speaking, this would mean the form you’d find in the qualifier of an authorized access point.

You’ve helpfully provided the names and dates of the person’s associated bodies: Harvard University and the University of Michigan. While it is true that the 373 \$a is repeatable, the \$s and \$t are not. So, in this case, it would be better to provide separate 373 fields for the two institutions. This is allowable since the 373 field, itself, is repeatable. Recording the information in separate 373 fields would also make it clearer.

One more point to remember: Be sure to record the associated language as the three-digit code found in the *MARC Code List for Languages*.

You've added so much useful information to this NAR! Why don't you make the above corrections and resubmit it to me. I'll give it one more review to make sure I haven't missed anything, after which you can add it to the authority file!"

Examples for Reviewing -- 2

Reviewee submits this personal name NAR.

Rec stat	n	Entered	20120705	Replaced	
Type	z	Upd status	a	Enc lvl	n
Roman	■	Ref status	a	Mod rec	
Govt agn	■	Auth status	a	Subj	a
Series	n	Auth/ref	a	Geo subd	n
Ser num	n	Name	a	Subdiv tp	n
				Source	c
				Name use	a
				Subj use	a
				Ser use	b
				Rules	z

040		MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
100	1	Creighton, Elise 1
400	1	Thornton, Elise Creighton 4
670		Reflections, 2012: #b title page (Elise Creighton Thornton) 2
670		OCLC, July 5, 2012 #b (access points: Creighton, Elise; Creighton Thornton, Elise; usage: Elise Creighton; Elise Creighton Thornton) 3

It is a good job, but there are some things that are not clear. The reviewee searched OCLC, and did a good job also of citing what was found there. Is this a case of 9.2.2.5.1 where the reviewee found that the usage Elise Creighton was the commonly found form and chose that as the authorized access point, or could this be a name change by marriage to Elise Creighton Thornton, and instead RDA 9.2.2.7 applies? It is not clear. The reviewee seems to have thought it through, though. So this is a good record with a complicated twist.

What is a good response?

“Great job on this one– it is a true test of the NACO rules. You are applying good insight and it shows. You did an excellent job with the OCLC citation. It looks to me like you identified a commonly found form of name Elise Creighton. Remember, if you could not identify a commonly found form according to RDA 9.2.2.5.1, you would have gone with the latest form (probably Elise Creighton Thornton, based on the publication date of the work you have in hand), or the fullest form (also Elise Creighton Thornton). But did you consider that this may be a name change (by marriage) according to RDA 9.2.2.7? Please think about this and let me know what your thought process was and what you think of my question.”

Examples for Reviewing – 3

Reviewee submits this corporate name NAR.

Rec stat	n	Entered	20120705	Replaced			
Type	z	Upd status	a	Enc lvl	n	Source	c
Roman	■	Ref status	a	Mod rec		Name use	a
Govt agn	■	Auth status	a	Subj	a	Subj use	a
Series	n	Auth/ref	a	Geo subd	n	Ser use	b
Ser num	n	Name	n	Subdiv tp	n	Rules	z

040		MARC 2 #b eng #c MARC21 #e rda
110	2	Czech institute of Astronomy 3
410	1	4 Czechoslovakia. #b Institute of Astronomy
670		Studies in astrophysics, 2009: #b title page (Czech Institute of Astronomy)

5 675?

A lot is going on here. You see the access point in English for a non-English-country body. Should it be established in Czech? (See

1
RDA 11.2.2.5.2.)¹ Did the reviewer code this one provisional to indicate that the language of the access point is not the correct language? (See 8.10.1.3.) You notice some other things: the word “institute” is lower-cased in the access point– a typo? (See A.16.) There is a variant access point with the body recorded indirectly under Czechoslovakia, indicating this is a government body– no indication of that in the record, though. And why Czechoslovakia and not Czech Republic for an item published in 2009? No 675 indicating that an attempt was made to identify a Czech form for the access point? (See 8.13.1.3.)

Is this an appropriate response?

“This is not a good job. You should wait to submit NARs for corporate names until you have done a better job with personal names. I don’t know why you set this up in English? Did you look for a form in Czech? You should remember from training that this is one case where research is required. The variant access point is not correct, either. Why did you use Czechoslovakia? Is this really a government body? You did not show that. Reread the instructions on Government bodies. Didn’t Czechoslovakia cease to exist in the 1990s? This is a 2009 publication! This record needs a lot of work. Please start over and resubmit it after you answer all the questions I asked. Oh, and did you read the instructions on capitalization for corporate names in English?”

How could this response be improved?

¹ Note: the LCPS that says to not apply the alternative under RDA 11.2.2.5.2 currently reflects LC practice only. PCC practice has not officially been determined for this.

Contacts

Knowing when to ask for help is more important than knowing where to go for help.

You may need to ask for help in a lot of situations. This happens to all of us. Situations such as:

- 1) Lack of language expertise – your reviewee submits a record in a language you do not know. What do you do? Wing it? Do your best with what you have?
- 2) Lack of experience in a given category of authority records – not everyone is strong in all categories of NACO. Some persons prefer personal names, others, corporate or geographic names. For others, it may be works or expressions. If you feel out of your league as a reviewer, it is not a mark against you. It happens to all of us. You may need to ask for help.
- 3) Work overload affecting NACO review – also can happen very easily. You start off on a good note with your reviewee, things are rolling along at a good pace, then you are pulled for a special project. Your timeliness in review starts to falter. It is not a strike against you to work out another arrangement, hopefully in the short term only. Where do you turn if this happens?
- 4) Bad reviewer-reviewee relationship – this is what we all hope will never happen, but it can. For whatever reason, you and your reviewee are just not making the best of the situation. Is it wrong to ask for a reassignment? Where do you go for help?

- LC Cooperative Programs NACO staff

LC Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov) is always able to help, or at least lend a sympathetic ear– NACO review workflow issues, putting you in touch with someone with necessary language expertise, BFM questions, NAR delete questions, PCC listserv questions, further training questions, etc.

- Local NACO colleagues

Your local NACO colleagues may be a good support, too, especially with the language issues.

- ALA PCC Trainers' Meetings

Held on the Friday of the ALA weekend, generally at 2:30 PM. A good venue to meet and greet other NACO trainers and run things by them.

- Cataloger's Learning Workshop (CLW) web site

There is a wealth of PCC-approved NACO training materials on the Cataloger's Learning Workshop (CLW) web site. The [CLW](#) web site is the PCC's training portal.

NACO Reviewer: Things to Remember

- Review records submitted by reviewees in a timely manner
- Remember the 1XX and 670 fields are of critical importance—examine those thoroughly
- Look for errors in all areas of access and fixed fields
- Perform the same bibliographic and authority searches as the reviewee, especially at the beginning of the review process (often termed “searching behind the reviewee”)
- Emphasize the “24-hour rule” in searching and contributing records
- Review, if possible, a variety of records before considering NACO independence
- Try to start a response to a reviewee with the “good” point(s); then bring out the “bad” point(s)
- Always supply the guideline (RDA, LCPS, DCM, etc.) to each situation, where possible
- Cite instructions clearly and specifically, especially in the beginning stages of review
- Always track and document the reviewee’s progress
- Instill the correct BFM reporting method before and after independence

- If your workload affects your NACO review—ask for help from Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov)
- Notify Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov) when an institution is ready for NACO independence
- Once the reviewer recommends NACO independence, the reviewee may start to contribute directly to the LC/NACO Authority File
- A formal notification letter will be sent from PCC/Coop to the institution, but the reviewee does not need to wait for this letter to be received before starting independent contribution to the LC/NACO Authority File
- Remember, reviewees are looking to the reviewer for guidance and direction toward NACO independence

NACO Reviewer's Tracking Sheet

The form on the next page can be used by a NACO Reviewer to track the progress of the Reviewee.

Please remember that once NACO independence is recommended, the NACO Reviewer will be asked to submit to LC's Coop Section an approximate figure representing the total number of records reviewed. This figure will be included in the formal "notification of independence" letter that will be sent by Coop to the institution.

This Tracking Sheet is intended for the NACO Reviewer's personal use, not necessarily to be shared with the Reviewee.

The form will allow the Reviewer to keep a count of the number and types of NARs submitted for review, and to keep general statistics on the types of errors and on areas where improvement takes place.

There also is an Excel spread sheet that can be used for tracking purposes. That document is included in the materials sent to you before the webinar; if you need a copy of this document, send a request to naco@loc.gov.

Name of Reviewee:

Institution:

Category of NAR (e.g., Personal Name, Corporate Name, Expression, etc.) or Specific 1xx	Date Submitted	Date Reviewed	Comments

Name of Reviewee:

Institution:

--	--	--	--