Transcript of "Linked Data Overview: Live Webinar with PCC Cohort Members: 2019-05-17"
Video: http://login.icohere.com/PCC?pnum=CTZ65607

[Paul]
We'll start off. I'm Paul Frank from the Coop Section at the Library of Congress.

[Les]
Les Hawkins, I work with Paul Frank.

[Jodi]
Jodi Williamschen, from the Network Development and MARC Standards Office.

[Paul]
So I'm going to speak for myself, I can't say I'm speaking for my other colleagues here, but I'm definitely not a linked data expert and I wanted to tell you that when we first started experimenting with BIBFRAME, we took the Library Juice Academy courses on linked data and we did them in a sort of structured way. They're great courses but that's not the only way to learn about linked data but my knowledge of linked data is based on the bit of instruction that I got from Library Juice Academy. On the PCC Policy Committee call recently they were talking about coming up with a structured list of how people can learn more about linked data, because we're thinking forward not only to the cohorts but to all members of the PCC and how they might learn about linked data. So I'm definitely not advertising myself as an expert but we're help to help maybe answer some questions you have. That's our major purpose for this webinar, to answer questions if you have them.

[1:38]
And I know it's hard to start the ball rolling with questions, so if you don't have questions, we have some things prepared that we might just fill the time with and talk to you about, so if there are any questions on the webinar we did, if you watched, let us know, or anything that's not even related to that, that's linked data related, let us know and in the meantime we can think about what we can tell you about what we're doing.

[2:19]
[Les]
If I'm correct this is one of our last webinar meetings with you as far as the training goes so if there's anything else that you want to bring up with all the sessions we've done just feel free go ahead and ask, make a comment.

[Paul]
It's exciting to see all the affinity groups start to work. There are a lot of groups. I think they'll be exploring these linked data topics in specific detail as it relates to the topic of the affinity group, like the non-Latin started a couple weeks ago, and we have been doing linked data work with non-Latin scripts here in the pilot, the Library of Congress BIBFRAME Pilot, so it was interesting

to see the PCC Cohort affinity group on non-Latin scripts take that, and I'm looking forward to seeing them taking the ball and running with some of the things that we're dealing with. I think there's another affinity group that just got started...

[Les]
Recent one, was it the Ethics? At the meeting recently, we heard that was another group that just started up, beginning to figure out its scope.

[Paul]
And then there's the…

[Jodi]
Rare Materials has an affinity group.

[Paul]
And of course the one that's fascinating to me is the Wikidata group because for our PCC Operations Committee we had a Wikidata workshop. It's unfortunate because we, Les made it possible to stream all of those meetings, maybe some of you listened to them live. And if you didn't listen to them live the recordings are there for you to use, but the recording for the Wikidata workshop probably is not that useful because I reviewed it and you know there's a lot of silence in it.

[Les]
It was a hands-on workshop. It begins with an introduction about Wikidata generally and then the instructor just said now you have to go on and do some work. So there was a lot of kind of dead time in there.

[Paul]
We had a good time with that and I think any of you who were there I hope you agree it was a nice way to spend three hours on a Friday afternoon so we enjoyed it.

One of the things Les and I were talking about before the meeting we wanted to let you know that we know there's a Sinopia User Group on Monday right, this coming Monday, and I'm sure there will be some news about the progress with Sinopia, but we wanted to report a little bit about the progress we're making here with creating a BIBFRAME Manual that although it's going to be based on the LC Editor I think it would be useful to the cohort members too. The primary focus group for this manual is the new group of LC BIBFRAME Pilot participants that we will be training in July, but we're going to have this manual ready by June hopefully and we're going to post it publicly. If you looked at the old manual that we used it's based on that but it's become much more of an integrating resource and will be updated much more regularly so we hope that it's a much more useful and viable document and will be used internationally I hope so we're excited about that. Do you know of any BIBFRAME developments from the NetDev side of things that you could talk about?

That's a good idea...I'm trying a new kind of screenshare option and...

[Les]
Share your desktop and then…

[Paul]
Actually I can just take the link and put it into the text chat. Page 2 right?

[7:37]
Oh here it is. It's this right? Yeah that's it.

[Les]
Folks aren't seeing the screen.

[Paul]
That's okay cause if it's wrong...Let's leave it up. We can actually talk through it. Alright everyone, sorry for the problems here.

[8:20]
I've got it now. Here's the link. [from https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/bibframe/ go to The BIBFRAME Editor and the BIBFRAME Database]

That's a start. That will get you toward where it is.

[Les]
And there's several other documents there we used during training.

[Paul]
I'm glad Les said pull it up and I'm glad we did because this is the manual that we used for the actual training in the BIBFRAME Editor but look at some of this terminology that I realized we changed. When we first had a database we called it the BIBFRAME Linked Data Store now we just call it the BIBFRAME Database. That's the first thing that needs to be changed.

This is from two years ago now when we first trained the second group of participants. If you haven't seen this manual it's actually probably still relevant, it's still helpful, it gives you a lot of screenshots, table of contents, that basically goes through the Editor interface and how you input data. Lots of caveats, remember this is a pilot and some things may not work the way you think they will, you'll probably discover bugs and things.

I encourage you to take a look at that. I had a thought that just came in and out of my mind all at one time.

[Jodi]

The Editor screenshots in this manual and the Editor that you would see going to bibframe.org are similar but quite different. The Editor has been changed a lot.

[10:22]
[Paul]
The whole thing with BIBFRAME had such an iterative approach so what happens the way the pilot works here is that we meet periodically with all of the pilot participants so right now there's how many? 60? 40? 48? 50. We'll say 50. We meet with them as a group and that's generally in a like in an auditorium about once a month but then each of the divisions have meetings on BIBFRAME and Les and Jodi and I and Jodi's colleagues in the Network Development and MARC Standards Office attend those meetings and in a way those are more informative because we're dealing with specific profiles, we're dealing with specific cataloging needs. And each time we have a meeting with this people often Jodi can make instantaneous changes to the Editor and sometimes they're done the next day if it's something that can't be done live it's done the next day, and it's constantly changing so as a person who develops training it's a little frustrating because every time you come up with a training document the very next day it's out of date. But that's the approach we're taking and that's the reason for making this new manual more of an integrating resource so we can update and modify things as we go along.

[Les]
The new manual is really a user manual as opposed to a training document, see this refers to training and number of hours of training and so forth. The document we're putting together is really for the users doing cataloging in the BIBFRAME Editor.

[Paul]
We met with a group here yesterday and realized that we need to, probably these will go into an appendix, but we want to come up with specific workflows that people might use. One of the ones, and maybe I'm going to make this a challenge to all of you when you start working in Sinopia, is to figure out how you're going to deal with aggregate works. That seems to be one of our big issues here, aggregate works. When we have people in our BIBFRAME pilot who maybe rightly or wrongly, I'm not really sure if this is the right approach or not, will want to almost over-catalog an aggregate work, whereas my take on it is that you shouldn't have to do anything differently in BIBFRAME than you do in a flat MARC environment. So if you have an aggregate work and you have a collective title you're generally going to use that as the title of the work, right? The collective title, and maybe make Related work links to the individual works within the aggregate, but you know some of our catalogers have been wanting to describe individual Works for each of those components of the aggregate work. I don't know, that works but it's a lot more work. We're sort of discouraging that and trying to focus things to just keeping it to what we would do in a MARC environment. I don't know maybe with serials?

[Les]
Serials have been an issue too as a type of aggregate. We had a meeting, there were serials catalogers there. And of course the LC workflow for serials is that we do what other CONSER

libraries do, we create the records in OCLC or we authenticate existing OCLC records or we claim existing CONSER records in OCLC and pull it into our local Voyager database, so the workflow for serials becomes a little different from what we would do with monographs where we do the original cataloging or pull in copy and do the work in our local Voyager database so that's been a little bit of an issue for us when working with serials. The other thing is that the 7xx fields in general in all of the records, whether they're monograph or serials, tend to create what's called work stubs when we pull them into the BIBFRAME database that we're looking at, so in some cases it's kind of hard to discern where you should start, if you want to start with the Work or the Instance. The thing with serials is we have all of these linking entry fields and the related print and online serials have been a real issue because when they get converted each one of those 776 fields gets converted into a stub work along with the 787, 785, the continues, continued by, links so these are all related works, and it's just kind of a little bit confusing to look at within our BIBFRAME database. So our serials metadata specialists have been struggling with that [...] and work out some of these issues.

[Paul]
Is there a serials group that's going to…in Sinopia?

[Les]
Yeah we have some serials users.

[Paul]
But is there a formal group?

[Les]
Oh in Sinopia? I believe Tina Shrader...

[Tina Shrader]
Hi this is Tina Shrader from NLM. We do plan on starting a Serials Affinity Group. We're just trying to put our own ducks in a row a little bit before we send out the call for everyone but you can expect to see that within the next couple of weeks.

[Paul]
Another area that we're working through and I hope to have an appendix to put in our manual about this is dealing with editions. Maybe in MARC even there's a problem with linking editions. And we thought linked data will solve all of those issues for us but I'm not so sure that we've got it nailed down yet.

[Jodi]
No we haven't, my first thought is that they're all separate Works and use the Related Works property to tie them together but that may or may not be how they're cataloged. I think once we get our data reconverted we can start re-evaluating all of these things. In the Network Development and MARC Standards Office we are trying to get our BIBFRAME database loaded

and available on id.loc.gov before ALA and this will require reconverting the data and so I've been busy changing the conversion specifications for our contractor to modify the conversion program and then the developers are looking at different ways of linking works through relationships instead of creating or merging works together because we discovered it's very hard to peel them apart [...] we're trying to keep the works a bit more separate in the database and that's about all I know about it although I imagine they will be talking more about it at ALA.

[Paul]
Yeah I think there needs to be a lot more discussion about Works, how they get into BIBFRAME or into Sinopia, whether they're ingested from authority records or sort of pulled out of bibliographic records. A lot of times if you look at a flat MARC record and pull out the Work elements you might lose some of the other data that's in the record, if you just....the Strunk & White example, remember how we kept losing all sorts of information?

[18:51]
[Jodi]
We lost a lot of contributor information...

[Paul]
because of the different level of... I can't think of the word that I want, we were losing important information when we culled the Work description out of a bibliographic record that included also RDA expression information and manifestation information. So there's some real issues but it's exciting to think that the entire database is going to be in id, I mean the BIBFRAME database. I know it's a lot of work but

[Jodi]
I don't know what the search interface will look like, I imagine that will change quite a bit once the database is loaded.

[Paul]
By the way we can put in a plug. If any of you are attending ALA we're happy to welcome you to Washington in steamy June. It will be very hot and very muggy but we're going to be at our Library of Congress booth, colleagues, all of us here, and others will be presenting, in, they call it the Pavilion, so at our booth at the convention center there are little outposts around it, and we'll be presenting id.loc.gov so maybe we could demonstrate the conversion and show it looks and we're going to be talking about BIBFRAME and here on the campus of the Library of Congress and I found out that there's going to be, we're going to be on the shuttle bus route. Because the Convention Center, if you don't know Washington, you can walk it, but it would be really nice to get on a shuttle to be brought up to the Library of Congress especially if it's a hot day in June. So we're excited about that. We've got a lot going on and I know the cohort group is going to meet that very week after ALA on the 26th I think and 27th, 25th and 26th, I can't remember, but it's a Tuesday and Wednesday after ALA so it will be nice to see a lot of you all for that too.

I'm going to do a better job of getting that link but I'm afraid I'm going to mess stuff up. How do I do that Les?

[21:25]
[Les]
Okay, the link for...right-click on the BF2 Manual in blue up there, right under Info, right-click, try the "C", right-click on that, gives you an option copy link...why don't you select copy and see what it gives you.

[Paul]
Let's see what happens. Nope. Never mind. I hope this has nothing to do with linked data...

[Les]
Don't worry. It's just a URL.

Does anybody have anything they'd like to raise? Just feel free to unmute yourselves.

[Paul]
We're certainly not going to sit here for an hour and try to fil.l. On the last Q&A this is sort of the way it turned out, maybe I shouldn't be speaking for the group, but I think it's just a great opportunity to share information, so even though we said this is going to be a Q&A for linked data I think it's helpful to talk about what's coming up here and what the cohort group is going to do. Here we go, very good, we got a question.

[23:20]
[Jodi]
Well, that's a very interesting question Michael because we have started to look at putting URIs in place of the pieces of information. One of my colleagues in the NetDev office did a scan of all the publisher names in the LC database and created entity records. Paul, will you go to id? I think they're available...

[Paul]
Oh they are, that's right.

[Jodi]
So if you go to id.loc.gov and I think it's on the far right column. Scroll down, I think it's past the preservation... Oh!

[Paul]
I know it's here...

[Jodi]

Well, they were available for a while but I guess the entities list is only internal at the moment but we're encouraging the catalogers when they are cataloging in BIBRAME to do a lookup. It's a pretty basic and somewhat crude combination which really exposes all of the typos that can exist in one's database, but it's an attempt to group things together, and then if we decide this is the way to go, then we may be looking at ways of combining the entities in this list with the existing LC Name Authority File entries for some of the publishers.

For place of publication we're encouraging the catalogers at this time to use the country file lookup which makes the place of publication more analogous to the place of publication that's encoded in MARC tag 008.

This has some conflicts with the catalogers [...] to transcribe everything, and we're still working through some of that.

[Les]
See if we can show you that...

[Jodi]
Create Monograph, Instance, if you go to Publication. So Place, okay so the Place lookup in the Editor is tied to the Library of Congress country file, so you cannot transcribe it as New York, New York, it's just nyu for New York the state.

[Les]
It's the 008

[Paul]
It's not the Name Authority File.

[Jodi]
Close out of this. So cancel, and do the name lookup, search name, put in your favorite publisher. So what you can see...

[Paul]
Random Hosue [sic]. [Laughter] I love that one!

[Jodi]
That's a typo that was not caught.

[Paul]
Oh look it says view on id, should we click on that? Maybe it will take us to it!

[Jodi]
Let's maybe do a legit one.

[Paul]
I love that. Here's a legitimate one, Random House Books. How much more generic can you get? Random House Books. Ok, let's look on ID. Ok, there it is!

[Jodi]
So the list is just not a lookup right away.

[Les]
Providers so it must have been under ...

[Paul]
Nevermind. Question is, it's in the chat, but it's about the elements for Place of Publication, Manufacture, etc., why are they not represented by URIs in the Editor. Originally they weren't because under RDA these are not controlled elements, these are transcribed elements, so there would be no way to control unless we created blank nodes, we're trying to get away from so many blank nodes, so that's why we've added this provider entity level where we are trying as Jodi was saying to get some level of linked data control over the providers. We already have it over the places at least in the MARC country list but the provider names themselves we really don't have control and we don't want to link to the name authority file for this because often they're not represented and if they are they're often established in a way that might violate the principles of representation that you would use in the 260 or 264 field because we add qualifications in certain cases in the Name Authority File so there needs to be a separate file in order to see how this experiment will work and that's what you're seeing right here is the entity provider which does have a link so here's that link.

[Les]
URI that represents that entity.

[Jodi]
You can tell that it's a in-house generated URI because it's a very long cache number and not an LCCN.

[Les]
It is a unique URI.

[Jodi]
Random House Books for Young Readers. Scroll down, we can see if there's any variants. No…

[Paul]
There's one variant right?

[Jodi]

No, there was an attempt when this file was created to try to streamline and consolidate so that if you had like Lonely Planet Publishers Incorporated, Lonely Planet Publishers Py os something like that there would be some combining that went on and then you do get variants, typos and all.

This is still an experiment that we're seeing if there are advantages to it. Part of it was really driven to reduce the number of blank nodes in the RDF output.

[29:59]
[Les]
Catalogers still have a place to transcribe the provider information within the BIBFRAME Editor.

[Paul]
For Michael's follow-on question place of publication, yeah, for place of publication, Zariya[?], Nigeria, what we're aiming at here is trying to mimic what you would see in an 008 field in a MARC record. So in the 008 field you're not going to go below the country level or the first-level admin for U.S., and for Great Britain, and Australia, those Anglo, and Canada, so all you would have here is Nigeria, with the nr, so that would be the Place of Publication, we would save that, and then we would put the name, publisher name, I'll just put in something, and I'm going to create, okay let's just do that, yeah, cut that.

And put it here and we don't mess up the prototype file and then save that and let's say it was published this year, 2019, save that,

[Jodi]
Save it, and then below it...

[Paul]
Here right below that, transcribed provider statement, this is what RDA would tell you to do, and including ISBD punctuation right?

[Les]
That's what we're doing right now so this still kind of results in a blank node but at least the efforts to at least code the country in kind of the quickest and easiest way we could set up, the cleanest way to be able to code at least some sort of place to the MARC country codes.

[Paul]
So it would look something like that, did I get that right? Is that ISBD correct?

[Les]
Looks good to me

[Paul]

But this is really going to result in nothing. Let's see, let's test it. Let's look at the...let's see what happens with our...you like to go to the lower level.

[Jodi]
Well I prefer the xml because I just find Turtle very difficult to interpret sometimes...

[Paul]
Okay so here's our xml, let's see...

[Jodi]
Farther up, at the top. So the first thing...

[Paul]
Okay so here's our control data for Nigeria from that 008 prototype, and date...

[Jodi]
Oh the name [...]

[Paul]
Oh here's the activity statement so here we go this is...there's no link, it's a dead link, right, there's no link.

[Jodi]
Provision Activity Statement is just a literal field so it's just a statement. The problem was becoming, from the developer point of view, were all of the blank nodes that were generated when you had object properties, so that you had provision activities, the property publication, the class place, the property place, the class, and then you just had a label so that was what the developers were very unhappy about. We're trying something different, it's still a work in progress.

[Paul]
Definitely that.

[Jodi]
So, the utility of any of the transcriptions is the question in the chat.

[Paul]
We could not agree more. We could not agree more. This is an area that is contentious but is being dealt with by PCC and will be in the future. At what point do you move away from a cataloging code that demands so much transcription that's going to result in blank nodes? I mean in a BIBFRAME environment how loyal do you have to be to a certain cataloging code? And of course RDA, we'll have to wait and see what happens with the LRM, the new RDA, which will probably allow us to do a lot more linked-data friendly things, but in the current

version of RDA, I agree with you that it's basically useless from the linked data standpoint to have a transcribed piece of information.

[Les]
Another question is: If place is a separate element why can't we be more precise? I presume you mean why are we just coding at a country level instead of being able to deal with the Name Authority File for specific cities and things like that.

[Jodi]
I think that if you wanted to set up a linked data editor that was much more precise and maybe used GATT codes or GeoNames then go for it. It's our decision locally to stick with the authority we have.

[Les]
It sounded like the experience of the people who put this feature together was they were first looking at publisher names in the authority file and not finding an easy way to resolve the differences and the variances and I think that for place that would be magnified maybe and much more difficult to put it into place and take more time.

[Jodi]
Yeah and I think that we also at the Library are a bit, we're very focused on acknowledging that MARC is not going away anytime soon and we will still have a commitment to supply MARC data and so I think a lot of our decisions are being influenced by thinking about how things will go back into MARC, and it's not perfect, but I think it's the reality we have right now, your reality may be different.

There might be more place questions but we do have another question about something completely different that we don't want to forget.

[Paul]
About MARC holdings, which is actually really interesting. Is that the one you were looking at?

[Jodi]
Yes that's the one I was looking at. Right now in BIBFRAME there's the Item record...

[Paul]
Go back to the…

[Jodi]
Yeah let's go back, looking at an Item for a Monograph. All the commands are at the top, Paul, it's hard to get used to it.

[Paul]

I know, just kick me out of the room.

[Jodi]
Click on this yellow arrow and you'll go back to your record.

[Paul]
We want to be at Item right?

[Jodi]
Now scroll down to Item. So the Item fields that are in the BIBFRAME ontology are pretty generic and there isn't the split for the three-tiered you know MARC BIB holdings item structure that a lot of ILSes use so we've kind of put everything at the Item level.

The fields here are not particularly specific to any one vendor.

I would anticipate that as ILS vendors started to work in a linked data environment that they would create kind of a separate ontology so that Alma would have like bf:alma when you have all of the Alma-specific items [...]

We have had some cataloging groups that are treating the Item records in different ways. The rare materials catalogers have a lot of bibliographic data at the Item level because it's very piece specific.

This Monograph Item is a fairly generic setup. We haven't spent a lot of time in detail going through.

[Paul]
Yeah we need to repeat our questions. Did we say what that question was? I think it was, the question came through in the explanation but it was about what happens with item-level or local data that we need to include, and Jodi gave an explanation about that, and I could say that we're, we've looked at it to a considerable degree but when or if BIBFRAME ever becomes our database of record for which we are using BIBFRAME data to retrieve resources for patrons, then I think we're going to have to really have that firmly in place so I think there's still some experimentation that needs to be done.

There was an earlier question and maybe this will be a good chance for me to tell an old man story, it was about our provider information, like why are we giving controlled access to place and publisher and in a way even date where following RDA that would be a transcribed element that really wouldn't be under any type of linked data control and we talked about trying to recreate what's done in the MARC 008 field. But here's a funny story, and a follow-on question was why are we limiting the place to the country or the first-level admin entity, states and all that, we're doing that because that's the way it is in the MARC list, but when we first got the BIBFRAME Editor, when we first started working with it years ago, under Publication Place it

wanted a lookup to the NAF, to the Library of Congress Name Authority File, and I thought why are they doing that so I was approaching this from a cataloger and I remember I said to the developers well we would not do that in cataloging, you would never look up a specific place, you would just transcribe the place of publication as it appears on the resource so you need to have a transcribe area and so that's how the transcribe area got there, but now we've gone in the complete opposite direction and I feel even more strongly about this now, and I support the question that was asked about why not go to a lower level because when you're doing specific type of research like for example rare book research you want to know all the resources that came from a specific city not necessarily from a specific country so that type of linked data granularity will allow us to do a lot more with the data than we can do now. So I think we've sort of made a full circle on that one.

[Jodi]
I can't tell on the chat if there's more questions.

[Paul]
Yeah here's admin, no did we do that? This is a new question.

[Les]
Want to read that?

[Paul]
Go ahead Les.

[Les]
Has there been discussions at LC about how to deal with admin metadata? The current MARC-to-BIBFRAME converter for example, the admin metadata is currently attached to the Work resource. Longterm this practice does not seem sustainable.

[Jodi]
True, and then in the BIBFRAME Editor with admin metadata, it's kind of getting assigned at all levels...

[Les]
Here's a link from the Item level to BIBFRAME…

[Jodi]
...and we're also as most of the LC catalogers now when they are cataloging in BIBFRAME they're starting with a brief MARC record that's in the BIBFRAME database, and they're reading that vendor-supplied data into the BIBFRAME Editor and then modifying it so it's bringing admin metadata characteristics along with it. So we're still working our way through but we're getting to the point where every Work will have an admin metadata you know file that comes along with it,

every Instance will have admin metadata and every Item will have admin metadata. I wonder how this will be sustainable as well, so we'll see.

[Paul]
I'm curious to see how that will be done in Sinopia. I can't remember...I haven't looked at Sinopia enough to figure out how they're dealing with it although maybe this isn't an issue for Sinopia because they're doing it at a higher level they may not have to worry about the local information that would be part of admin metadata for Sinopia, but excited to see how all that plays out.

[Jodi]
Yeah one of the things internally in our network, when admin metadata is created the profile is usually presupplied so that we know if it's coming from say a monograph profile or a cartographic profile. Scroll down a little bit, there's process information.

[43:12]
The process information field is also getting automatically generated internally so that we can track how data is created, so the options are basically create work, create instance create item, update work, update instance, update item. I think we coded for delete although we have not started working on that part of it yet. That's one thing that our developers wanted to do [...]

[Paul]
We're going to scroll back through chat and make sure we got everything. Got the link to the manual. This was actually Paul Burley's question i guess yeah we answered that...about provider information.

Continuation on provider information, we went through that, BIBFRAME holdings we went through, place of..., yeah, that's what I want...more precision there.

Oh here's one we didn't get, from Barbara: Why can't the transcribed element be three separate statements with URIs associated?

I think that's the way we were doing it originally, right, we didn't have just a transcribed statement, we had place of publication, publisher, and date, and people were just transcribing what they saw but we were creating three blank nodes for each thing right?

[Jodi]
There's a couple things that were happening. When the publisher statements from the 26x fields were converted from MARC to BIBFRAME they were converted twice. One the complete string was output as a transcribed provider statement or whatever the property is. And then the data from subfield a was put into place, the data from subfield b was put into the publisher name, and then the data from subfield c went into the date. Based on the indicators in the 264 tag set you coudl set up that it was publication manufacture, distribution or production. So that

was all very nice but it did create a lot of blank nodes because it was just straight up this label is going in to this field as a label. Within the editor we're trying to be more precise with the lookups, and I was even asking the developers the other day how I needed to change the conversion specifications and they said for now everything can just go as it has been which is label label label everywhere but then they're going to generate the lookups internally to our database.

It's very interesting that people on the phone are interested in these elements because they have been very popular discussion topics with our catalogers internally so this is obviously an area of interest to many catalogers.

Oh here's a new one.

[Paul]
Another one from Tim...

[Jodi]
What happens if a cataloger chooses a monograph profile in the BIBFRAME Editor, enters a bunch of data, then realizes that what they're cataloging is really a serial or vice versa?

Hmmmm...

[Paul]
Well let's see...the system would crash, right?

Let's think through this logically. If the purpose of selecting a profile is because you have all the data elements that you need for that profile, but if you're able to describe a monograph using the serial profile, and you have all the data elements that you need, I wonder if you could just make a...maybe you don't need? How is it marked as a serial in the database, that's what I'm trying to figure out, how would that be marked as a serial?

[Les]
When it's converted it's marked in MARC as a serial, so you know it's a continuing resource from the 008 field...

[Paul]
From the [...] leader...

[Les]
So you have that information, I don't know how the BIBFRAME Editor, probably doesn't deal with it at all.

[Jodi]

The Editor really doesn't do a lot of typing like, it's RDF typing is what we've been calling it.

I guess one scenario would be that you're cataloging this as a monograph, you realize that it needs to be a serial, and you don't want to lose all your typing, would be you would save the record and then re-import it using the new profile.

[Paul]
That's what I was going to say! Isn't there some kind of tag or marker once it's added to the BIBFRAME database that says this is a serial?

[Jodi]
It's not very [...]

[Les]
The differences between the monographic profile and the serial profile it's the other elements that you add...don't have to add...

Otherwise you know besides the name of the profile being monographic and the other one being serial, they're kind of generic. It's not like MARC where you have clear formats, you have monographs and you have serials and they're important in our cataloging interfaces, when we're working with MARC. Maybe they're less important...Maybe the difference is not so...

[Paul]
One of the reasons we originally had to have separate profiles for each format because we wanted to streamline the profiles for the needs for the catalogers describing those resources, those formats. But now thanks to the work of the Network Development Office you're able to customize and I wonder if…

[49:37]
[Les]
There's a question that addresses that right there.

[Jodi]
Actually there's a previous question from Barbara Bushman we should answer first. Barbara has asked about: Isn't mode of issuance part of the profile?

And the answer is yes, I think at the Work level.

[Paul]
Mode of issuance? It should be on the Work. Let's go back and check. We're on mono right?

[Jodi]
Yeah, so go up.

[Les]
So, mode of issuance...

[Paul]
Content type is at Work but…

[Les]
See if you can change it.

[Jodi]
Well, yeah. Cancel this and then scroll down, yep, there it is, Mode of issuance.

[Les]
So trash that...

[Paul]
So you'd trash that and then you would…

[Les]
Serial or integrating resource, so yes it is part of the Editor interface here but it can be changed.

[Jodi]
The serials profile has so many more material-specific fields, you probably just want to save it, bring it back up to the serials profile and use it...with your other fields.

For instance, ISSN is not on the monograph profile.

[Les]
Can we add...where's the templates, add a property...

[Jodi]
At the bottom

[Les]
Can't use the template feature

[Paul]
I'm waiting for someone to ask about this

[Jodi]
The Add a Property is at the bottom, so you could type all the serials properties into the monograph, change the mode of issuance, and probably get on, but that's a lot of typing.

[Les]
It's just a text field?

[Paul]
You key in what you want.

[Les]
How about frequency?

[Jodi]
Frequency may not work because that's [...]

[Les]
Add a property...

[Jodi]
I think that it would be an interesting test when Sinopia is ready to try to catalog a serial within the monograph profile and then see what happens.

[Les]
We have some other questions here. How does your templates functionality differ from the cloning a profile process, i.e., with Sinopia. Would any templates you create just save to your desktop?

[Jodi]
That is correct, templates save to your desktop and so you can customize them locally. I don't know how much our catalogers are using those features yet. But the template option is probably going to be nice for monograph catalogers where many people are sharing the same profile and they want to tweak it for their own needs. Our special format catalogers, we're working with a such a small group that we can kind of customize their formats to meet their exact needs.

The cloning option is nice when you have a stack of materials that are all say from the same publisher, and you can fill in the base bibliographic information like the publication information and the date and maybe they're all 27 pages and 22 cm and illustrated, and you can fill in all that data once and keep cloning the instance and then supplying just the data that is unique to that individual piece, so that's nice when you have a large stack of materials that are very similar.

Templates are more, these are the fields I always need to include, but we haven't yet combined the two features so that you can have templates with pre-supplied data in them.

[53:50]

But as far as the templates and the cloning, those are all available on the public-facing editor so you can try them out.

[Paul]
So the view that we're looking at right now is accessed from the external, and I discovered, I'm always learning something, you're never too old to learn, I discovered that you can save descriptions that you put in using the external thing actually show up in...that we saw yesterday...so you can actually...if we went to the browse area here

[Jodi]
At the very top

[Paul]
It sometimes takes a while to load. But all of these descriptions have been done not by LC people but people outside sort of testing it out. Sort of neat to see that. Or maybe not. The whole world can…

[Jodi]
You can delete them within our Editor.

[Paul]
Okay everyone well we really made a U-turn here. We were going to talk about linked data but we talked about the BIBFRAME Editor but it's all related, all under the same umbrella. Maybe we can call it a day.

We've had a lot of fun creating these webinars for you all, I think the jury's out on how helpful they might have been but we sure had a lot of fun doing them and we're excited to see how things work in Sinopia. We're going to be playing around with it too I hope, so we're going to continue working with you all but have fun, enjoy. It's a wonderful thing to do. It has frustrating times but working with linked data and working with BIBFRAME is just a very refreshing thing most of the time so I think you'll enjoy it and have fun with it so I'll stop the recording and we'll say goodbye but any further follow-up questions just email us and we'll do our best to help.

[Jodi]
Thanks for joining us.