#### **Principles**

The PCC URIs in MARC Pilot recognizes that there are valid use cases for including URIs in NACO records, in order to:

- Enhance discovery and identification for all users
- Incorporate the LC/NACO Authority File into the identity management environment
- Move the LC/NACO Authority File away from the single-silo environment of authority control

However, the following is equally true:

- The NACO authority record is not a hub to record all of the possible URIs that can be found
- The LC/NACO Authority File is not intended to be a reconciliation service for URIs
- Large numbers of 024s in a NACO record create visual clutter for many users and often duplicate information which is not necessary
- Large numbers of 024s in a NACO record create unnecessary maintenance of authorities in local systems

With these considerations in mind, the PCC URIs in MARC Pilot proposes these best practice recommendations when adding URIs in the 024 field of NACO authority records.

The recommendations are not prescriptive and should be considered as best practices to facilitate the exchange of information in a shared database environment. Catalogers are expected to use judgment and common sense, concentrating on need and usefulness to the overall library community when adding 024s.

#### Best Practice Recommendations

- As a general rule, limit the maximum number of 024s in a NACO authority record to five (5)
- 024 fields may be added in any order, adding new ones after existing ones, according to the needs of the community or institution
- Do not routinely delete or change existing 024 fields when adding new 024 fields. If an authority record already contains five or more 024 fields, and the

- cataloger wishes to add one of the "Core" vocabularies identified below, an exception is made in this case for the maximum number of 024 fields in the record, and the "Core" vocabulary may be added
- Record URIs from vocabularies that provide additional information rather than repeating information that is already present in other 024 fields whenever possible
- Generally, if a \$1 contains a URI known to be mapped in a widely used external service (e.g. VIAF, Wikidata), additional URI(s) that are also found in those services need not be added
- If both an authority URI and a RWO URI are given from one source, include both subfield \$0 and subfield \$1 in the same 024 field
- When there is an "equivalence" conflict, exercise cataloger's judgment in deciding which NACO record(s) should include an 024 field to the vocabulary
  - O For example, a vocabulary does not treat a new name for a corporate body as a new entity; the vocabulary considers linear name changes as variant terms, not as separately-established terms. NACO creates a new authority record when a corporate entity changes its name.
- MARC allows a source to be specified in subfield \$2 of the 024 field (first indicator = 7), and an unspecified type of standard or code to be recorded with no subfield \$2 (first indicator = 8). The examples below show both options.
   Cataloger's judgment determines the choice; there is a preference for the source to be specified in subfield \$2 (first indicator = 7) for ease of identification.
- Keep in mind what happens when duplicate records are merged in other systems. When that happens, NACO 024 URIs may not resolve any longer. For this reason, when evaluating a source for use in a NACO 024 field, take into account how duplicates are resolved in the source itself

The PCC URIs in MARC Pilot recommends that catalogers use the following sources, considering them a "Core" group of PCC-sanctioned vocabularies. The "Core" group will be evaluated over time and new vocabularies may be added, based on PCC needs and use.

Personal Names		
SOURCE	024	BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
<u>Wikidata</u>	\$1	024 7# Q550288 \$2 wikidata \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q550288
		024 8# \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q550288
<u>ISNI</u>	\$1	024 7# 000000109223014 \$2 isni \$1_https://isni.org/isni/000000109223014
		OR  024 8# \$1 https://isni.org/isni/000000109223014
ORCID	\$1	024 7# 0000-0002-1726-573X \$2 orcid \$1_https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1726-573X
		OR  024 8# \$1 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1726-573X
VIAF	\$1	024 7# 265641931 \$2 viaf \$1_http://www.viaf.org/viaf/265641931
		OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.viaf.org/viaf/265641931

ULAN	\$0 \$1	024 7# 500308857 \$2 gettyulan \$0 http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500308857 \$1 http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500308857-agent
		OR
		024 8# \$0_http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500308857 \$1_http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500308857-agent

2020-12-04 4

Family Names		
SOURCE	024	BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
VIAF	\$1	024 7# \$a 199748948 \$2 viaf \$1 http://viaf.org/viaf/199748948  OR
		024 8# \$1 http://viaf.org/viaf/199748948
<u>Wikidata</u>	\$1	024 7# \$a Q112707 \$2 wikidata \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q112707
		OR
		024 8# \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q112707
<u>CERL</u>	\$1	024 7# \$a cnp00587401 \$2 cerl \$1 http://thesaurus.cerl.org/record/cnp00587401
		OR
		024 8# \$1 http://thesaurus.cerl.org/record/cnp00587401
<u>ULAN</u>	\$0	024 7# \$a 500373119 \$2 gettyulan \$0 http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500373119
	\$1	\$1 http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500373119-agent
		OR
		024 8# \$0 <u>http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500373119</u> \$1 <u>http://vocab.getty.edu/ulan/500373119-agent</u>

2020-12-04 5

Corporate Names		
SOURCE	024	BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
<u>Wikidata</u>	\$1	024 7# Q3030466 \$2 wikidata \$1_http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q3030466
		OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q3030466
<u>ISNI</u>	\$1	024 7# 000000121515490 \$2 isni \$1_https://isni.org/isni/000000121515490
		OR  024 8# \$1 https://isni.org/isni/0000000121515490
VIAF	\$1	024 7# 296374097 \$2 viaf \$1_http://www.viaf.org/viaf/296374097
		OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.viaf.org/viaf/296374097

Geographic Names		
SOURCE	024	BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
<u>Wikidata</u>	\$1	024 7# Q172 \$2 wikidata \$1_http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q172
		OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q172
<u>GeoNames</u>	\$1	024 7# 2411586 \$2 geonames \$1 http://sws.geonames.org/2411586/
		OR  024 8# \$1 <u>http://sws.geonames.org/2411586/</u>
<u>TGN</u>	\$0	024 7# 7005233 \$2 gettytgn \$0 http://vocab.getty.edu/tgn/7005233 \$1 http://vocab.getty.edu/tgn/7005233-place
	\$1	OR
		024 8# \$0 http://vocab.getty.edu/tgn/7005233 \$1 http://vocab.getty.edu/tgn/7005233-place

2020-12-04 7

Works and Expressions		
SOURCE	024	BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
<u>Wikidata</u>	\$1	024 7# Q50948 \$2 wikidata \$1_http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q50948 OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.wikidata.org/entity/Q50948
VIAF	\$1	024 7# 177008880 \$2 viaf \$1 http://viaf.org/viaf/177008880
		OR 024 8# \$1 http://viaf.org/viaf/177008880
MusicBrainz	\$1	024 7# 993d7955-0b1a-4a6f-837f-346cfae5a71b \$2 musicb \$1 https://musicbrainz.org/work/993d7955-0b1a-4a6f-837f- 346cfae5a71b
		OR  024 8# \$1_https://musicbrainz.org/work/993d7955-0b1a-4a6f- 837f-346cfae5a71b
BBC Things	\$1	024 7# e90ed6f6-37ac-4564-bd3f-516e696ca6c3 \$2 bbcth \$1 http://www.bbc.co.uk/things/e90ed6f6-37ac-4564-bd3f- 516e696ca6c3#id
		OR  024 8# \$1 http://www.bbc.co.uk/things/e90ed6f6-37ac-4564-bd3f- 516e696ca6c3#id

<u>DBpedia</u>	\$1	024 8# \$1 http://dbpedia.org/resource/Little Women  [for DBpedia 024 8 is the only option]
<u>FAST</u>	\$0	024 7# 1360526 \$2 fast \$0 http://id.worldcat.org/fast/1360526  OR  024 8# \$0 http://id.worldcat.org/fast/1360526

#### NACO Records and 667 Fields

When URIs were added to the 024 field in NACO records as part of the PCC URIs in MARC Pilot, a 667 note was added to the record:

URIs added to this record for the PCC URI MARC Pilot. Please do not remove or edit the URIs.

As of October 15, 2020, over 6,000 NACO records have this 667 note.

The PCC URIs in MARC Pilot Authorities Subgroup will continue its work now by looking at other fields in NACO records that can be enhanced with URIs. When URIs are added to these other fields as part of the pilot, the same 667 note will be added to the record.

However, since NACO best practices for adding URIs to the 024 field are now documented, and the PCC moratorium on adding 024 fields to NACO records has ended, all NACO members can begin adding URIs in the 024 field of NACO records.

There is no need to add the 667 field to a NACO record when you add an 024 field. If there already is a 667 field in the record, though, do not delete it.

# **PCC** Autonomy

Certain communities and institutions may need to use other sources than the ones given above. For example, an area studies project may be working with foreign entities only. The "Core" vocabularies listed above may not be appropriate, or the collection or institution has special requirements beyond what is recommended. The "Core" vocabularies are not mandatory: any combination of vocabularies may be used by the cataloger in accordance with the needs of their institution/collection, as long as there is an effort to keep the maximum number of 024 fields in a NACO authority record to five or less.

Use cataloger's judgement, exercising restraint so as to avoid overpopulating a NAR with 024s.

The recommended vocabularies above, in addition to other vocabularies that may be appropriate for the 024 field in NACO records, are identified in the PCC document, Formulating and Obtaining URIs: A guide to commonly used vocabularies and reference sources. The document gives search tips, guidance on constructing the correct URI for

the vocabulary, and the correct subfield (\$0 or \$1) to use in the 024 field of the NACO record. However, the document is not a PCC policy document. It is intended to be a resource guide only.

Please also keep in mind that the Authority Toolkit in OCLC Connexion can be used to search external vocabularies and construct the correct formulation for the URIs from those vocabularies.

This is an "organic" document that will be revised periodically as experience and practice reveal new information. The cataloging environment is changing rapidly. The PCC URIs in MARC Pilot recommends that this document be reviewed every 1-2 years, and suggests that, based on an analysis of the number and types of identifiers that are added to NACO records over the next 1-2 years, a companion document be created that records a brief description of the pros and cons and special features of the "Core" vocabularies, and where the "Core" vocabularies have crossover to other vocabularies.

The PCC URIs in MARC Pilot also acknowledges that there are many important related issues that are not addressed here. These omissions are intentional, and decisions on the issues are left to cataloger's judgment. For example, maintenance of external vocabularies, or dealing with duplicate records in external vocabularies, are issues that can improve the LC/NACO Authority File, but are out of scope for these NACO best practice recommendations.

Questions or comments on these best practices can be sent to coop@loc.gov.