

FAQ about BibPURLs

Contents

1. [What if the URL stays the same but the content changes?](#)
 2. [What if a website reorganizes and the BibPURL\(s\) are no longer valid for the resource being described?](#)
 3. [Is it appropriate to create BibPURLs for resources that point to a search page or a list of publications when it's not possible to create a direct URL to a resource, journal homepage, or browse issues list?](#)
 4. [What is the best way to handle multiple publications presented on one website? What are the implications for sharing the same BibPURL for different resources?](#)
 5. [How to treat e-resources that are available in both PDF and HTML formats?](#)
 6. [When updating the master OCLC record with BibPURLs, is it okay to delete PURLs created by other institutions if they are institution-specific?](#)
 7. [Should we retain BibPURLs for resources that are no longer open access?](#)
 8. [Should we retain BibPURLs for resources that are no longer completely free but still have partial open access content?](#)
-

1. What if the URL stays the same but the content changes?

Example: OCLC#45433644

Striking gold in California (2000 ed.)

<http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/3975> => <http://www.taxes.ca.gov/striking.pdf>

The BibPURL and URL for the above publication now points to the 2003 ed. and the 2000 ed. is no longer available online. Basically, the URL itself has not changed and is still a valid link but the content has been updated (the 2000 ed. has been replaced with the 2003 ed.).

Solution:

If an archived version exists (e.g., Internet Archive), modify the BibPURL to the archived version.

If the e-resource is no longer available anywhere, there are two possible approaches to choose from:

1. OCLC Quality Control Group recommendation:

- Change the 530 to indicate that a later version is available online.
- Change the 856 indicators to 42 and add \$3 that indicates that the URL now goes to the 2003 edition.
- Add the BibPURL to the record for the 2003 ed.

Record for 2000 ed.

530 __ A later version is available online.

856 42 \$3 2003 ed. \$g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/3975> \$u
<http://www.taxes.ca.gov/striking.pdf>

Record for 2003 ed.

856 41 \$u <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/3975> \$u <http://www.taxes.ca.gov/striking.pdf>

2. CONSER recommendation:

- On the record for the 2000 ed., add a \$3 note indicating that the URL is no longer valid.
- Add the BibPURL to the record for the 2003 ed.

Record for 2000 ed.

856 41 \$z Link no longer valid for this resource as of: 10/31/08 \$g
<http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/3975> \$u <http://www.taxes.ca.gov/striking.pdf>

Record for 2003 ed.

856 41 \$g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/3975> \$u <http://www.taxes.ca.gov/striking.pdf>

2. What if a website reorganizes and the BibPURLs are no longer valid for the resource being described?

Example:

Title: California primary election: official voter information guide.
OCLC record #69120937

The online version is cataloged using the single record approach. Separate records for the online English version and individual language versions do not exist in OCLC.

There are seven language- and issue- specific 856 fields in this record with separate PURLs that point to the 2006 issue for each language:

856 41#3 Web site homepage. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13420> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/>

856 41#3 English. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13430> #u
<http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/elections%5Fviguide06.htm>

856 41#3 Spanish. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13432> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/spanish%5F06.pdf>

856 41#3 Chinese. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13441> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/chinese%5F06.pdf>

856 41#3 Japanese. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13451> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/japanes%5F06.pdf>

856 41#3 Korean. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13453> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/korean%5F06.pdf>

856 41#3 Tagalog. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13455> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/tagalog%5F06.pdf>

856 41#3 Vietnamese. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13460> #u
<http://voterguide.ss.ca.gov/pdf/vietnamese%5F06.pdf>

In this example, when these BibPURLs were originally assigned, only the most current issue was available online. Since then, the earlier issues have been digitized and the Calif. Secretary of State website was reorganized. Now, all the language editions can be found online at the journal homepage: http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_i.htm (i.e., <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/13420>). At the homepage, users must choose the year they want and that link will take them to the English version with options for the other languages. As a result of this change, the PURLs need to be reevaluated.

What to do about the BibPURLs?

In this case, the BibPURLs for the individual language editions should not have been assigned in the first place since they only go to individual issues, but since they are there, we need to take care of them.

UCSD treated this title as follows:

No changes were made to the OCLC master record. The PURLs were modified behind the scenes to point to the homepage. The following 500 field was added to the local record:

500 __ Also issued in Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. Follow the link for the English ed.

Alternative proposed solution:

- (a) Make sure that the variant language BibPURLs have not been used on other OCLC records.
- (b) Consult with original cataloging agency and ask if there would be any objection to your cleaning up the record, leaving one 856 field.
- (c) Re-link the main BibPURL to the new site. If the language BibPURLs have not been used on other records, after clearing out the catalog record, go into the BibPURL server and re-link the BibPURLs to point to the currently-used BibPURL. That way, access in local ILSs will not be adversely affected but the 856 in the OCLC master record will represent an online version of the serial described.
- (d) If not already in our ILS, I would ask our State Docs Collection Manager if we could catalog for our ILS the Integrating Resource (California Ballot Propositions Database) [OCLC #45148399]

3. Is it appropriate to create BibPURLs for resources that point to a search page or a list of publications when it's not possible to create a direct URL to a resource, journal homepage, or browse issues list?

Yes! Catalogers should use their judgment about when to create BibPURLs for search pages (canned searches) or lists of publications.

Background: In the beginning, the participants in the CONSER PURL pilot project decided that BibPURLs pointing to lists of publications were not a good idea since online content is volatile and gets organized, moved, deleted, and changed off the page which would affect all other publications listed on that page utilizing the same BibPURL. It was determined that these types of BibPURLs were unpredictable and would be too difficult to maintain. The PURL validation software would not detect anything awry if any of the titles moved off that page, unless the page itself was no longer valid (i.e., broken, 404). It would only detect broken links, not changes in content. Maintenance is not impossible but would be time-consuming (periodic manual link checking/verification) and messy (we are not supposed to remove BibPURLs from OCLC records once they've been entered).

Inevitably, as the pilot project progressed, situations and exceptions to the rule were brought to light. For example, at the time of cataloging, a serial title is accessible via its own website. Later, the serial can only be accessed via a search page or publications page. It was suggested by Steve Shadle that in cases like this, we should redirect the BibPURL "to point to the best substitute for a dedicated page that is currently available" even if that means linking to a search screen or publications page. The justification is that at one point there was a dedicated page for it and the resource is still available online.

As a result of the above example, CONSER PURL participants started creating BibPURLs for resources that could not be accessed directly.

OCLC #27025679

‡g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/4146> ‡u <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/Publications/ListingByTopic.ASP?452>

4. What is the best way to handle multiple publications presented on one website? What are the implications for sharing the same BibPURL for different resources?

Use the same BibPURL for each title. Also, add a note in the "Reason for Change" box that indicates: *This PURL is for several titles at one URL. Search PURL in Connexion to make sure all titles are at new URL before modifying PURL.*

This situation emphasizes the importance and need to re-search OCLC before re-linking a BibPURL to a new URL. If the cataloger is notified of a broken BibPURL on one record and forgets to re-search OCLC, then problems can occur. This is especially the case where the BibPURL represents many titles (e.g., for a series) and the reorganized website redistributes the titles across several pages.

5. How to treat e-resources that are available in both PDF and HTML formats?

If there is a resource home page that lists all of the variant versions (PDF, HTML, etc.), prefer to point to this page. If there is no resource homepage, create a separate BibPURL for each format and enter them in separate 856 fields. There is no policy favoring one format over the other.

Reverse Mortgages: is one for you?"
OCLC# 47285113

The resource can be viewed in both PDF and HTML but the URLs for each format are separate.

856 4 1 #3 PDF version. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/4035> #u http://www.dre.ca.gov/pdf_docs/reverse.pdf #7 0
856 4 1 #3 HTML version. #g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/4036> #u <http://www.dre.ca.gov/reverse.htm> #7 0

Note that for serials, this is less of an issue. It is hoped that the Provider-neutral monograph record will eventually resolve this problem for monographs as well.

6. When updating the master OCLC record with BibPURLs, is it okay to delete PURLs created by other institutions if they are institution specific?

Generally speaking, PURLs of any kind should be not be deleted from the master OCLC record. However, there are several schools of thought on the issue of institution-specific URLs in master OCLC records for serials:

CCM 31(rule 15.5) recommends leaving existing 856 fields and adding additional ones:

*"What should a cataloger do when encountering a record that has institution-specific access methods recorded in the 856 fields, links that are no longer valid, or links that point to a less than ideal location? For obvious errors in the access method (for example, if a typo prevents a URI from working correctly), the cataloger should make corrections. **Where it is difficult to determine the usefulness of an existing access method because of access restrictions, lack of a password to logon, uncertainty of whether links are broken temporarily or permanently, etc., it is best to leave the 856 field on the record and add additional 856 fields. Even for access methods that appear to be invalid, there may be an advantage to leaving them on the record ...**"*

IR 10.22, which applies both to BIBCO & CONSER records, states the following:

"Do not include institution-specific URLs in bibliographic records contributed as shared cataloging."

Adding institution-specific URIs in the OCLC master record for non-rare publications is akin to including institution-specific notes such as "ATL copy bound in green" in the master OCLC record. It creates more work for all the libraries that want to use the record, and there is no shared benefit.

BIBCO does not address the problem of institution-specific URLs. For now, leave them in e-monograph records.

7. Should we retain BibPURLs for resources that are no longer open access?

No. If the resource is no longer open access, deactivate the BibPURL and update the OCLC record as follows:

856 4_ \$g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/####> \$u [http:// ...](http://...) \$z **No longer freely available when searched on: 10/31/23**

8. Should we retain BibPURLs for resources that are no longer completely free but still have partial open access content? (e.g., current year requires a subscription but all earlier issues are open access)

Yes, as long as open access content is available, retain the PURL and update the OCLC record.

Example:

<http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/12489> => <http://www.wemjournal.org/wmsonline/?request=get-archive>

The earlier and later titles, Journal of wilderness medicine (ISSN: [0953-9859](#)), and Wilderness & environmental medicine (ISSN: [1080-6032](#)), respectively, both reside at the same URL.

The later title, Wilderness & environmental medicine, now requires a subscription for the current year. Therefore, the BibPURL is no longer appropriate for this title. However, the earlier title, Journal of wilderness medicine is still completely open access.

Solution: Retain the BibPURL since it is still valid for the earlier title. No changes are needed for the earlier title. For the later title, add an 856 \$z note for the BibPURL indicating that it's no longer freely available and add an additional 856 field for the link to the later title:

Later title:

Wilderness & environmental medicine

Add: 856 41 \$u <http://www.wemjournal.org/wmsonline/?request=get-archive&issn=1080-6032>

Edit: 856 41 \$z Link no longer valid for this resource and resource no longer freely available when searched on: Sept. 21, 2006 \$g <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/12489> \$u

<http://www.wemjournal.org/wmsonline/?request=get-archive>