



MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

NEWSLETTER

ISSN 0161-1704

FROM THE CHAIR

Tracey Rudnick, University of Hartford

At this writing we're in summer's final stretch, a contonym of lazy, hazy days and the back-to-school whirl. MOUG has certainly kept busy.

In June MOUG's membership approved amendments to update the bylaws. The amendments authorized electronic balloting, so look for an announcement in this newsletter about e-voting for upcoming officer elections. Many thanks to MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor Alan Ringwood

(University of Texas at Austin) for setting up Survey Monkey for e-voting, organizing test runs, and preparing documentation. This year's candidates are Sharon Benamou (University of California, Los Angeles) and Damian Iseminger (New England Conservatory of Music) for Secretary/Newsletter Editor, and Catherine Gick (Brown University) and William "Mac" Nelson (University of North Carolina at Greensboro) for
(Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE:

**From the Continuing
Education Coordinator4**

News from OCLC.....4

**OCLC Members Council
Meeting, May 2009.....8**

***Best of MOUG,*
8th ed.11**

**Questions & Answers
by Jay Weitz.....14**

MOUG to Implement Electronic Voting for Fall Officers Election

The Music OCLC Users Group will conduct its next officers election by electronic ballot. Voting will be conducted November 1-21, 2009.

MOUG members in good standing will receive an e-mail invitation to participate in the election. The invitation will include a unique link to the official ballot and candidates' biographies.

Members who do not see an invitation in their inbox after balloting has begun should see if the invitation was placed in their junk mail folders. If it was not, they may wish to verify their membership status (contact MOUG Treasurer Diane Napert: diane.napert@yale.edu).

Some members may have previously opted out of receiving surveys

from SurveyMonkey. They will need to unblock their e-mail addresses in order to receive the invitation and access the ballot. This can be done by going to www.surveymonkey.com/OptOut.aspx and clicking on "Unblock E-mail Address." Everyone who follows this procedure should send an e-mail message to Alan Ringwood, MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor, letting him know that one's address has been unblocked. He will add unblocked e-mail addresses to the list of eligible voters and see that invitations are sent.

Questions or concerns about MOUG's implementation of electronic voting may be addressed to any member of the Executive Board.

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It is published three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Alan Ringwood, P.O. Box P, University of Texas Libraries, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78713-8916.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted electronically in Word. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240. (Dues in North America are \$30.00 for personal members, \$40.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, \$45.00 for personal members, \$50.00 for institutional subscriptions; back issues for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for \$5.00 per copy.) A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes: (1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group. MOUG's FEIN is 31-0951917.

MOUG-L: MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals and users of OCLC products and services. To subscribe to MOUG-L, send an e-mail to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of the message type: SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L <your name>

MOUG Web site: <http://www.musicoclcusers.org>

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Chair

Tracey Rudnick
Head, Allen Library
University of Hartford
Phone: 860-768-4404
E-mail: Rudnick@hartford.edu

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect

Stephen Luttmann
Music Librarian
University of Northern Colorado
Phone: 970-351-2281
E-mail: stephen.luttmann@unco.edu

Treasurer

Diane Napert
Catalog Librarian
Yale University
Phone: 203-432-0726
E-mail: diane.napert@yale.edu

Secretary/Newsletter Editor

Alan Ringwood
Head, Music Cataloging Unit
The University of Texas at Austin
Phone: 512-495-4191
E-mail: a.ringwood@austin.utexas.edu

Continuing Education Coordinator

Bruce J. Evans
Music and Fine Arts Catalog Librarian
& Bibliographic Access Unit Leader
Baylor University
Phone: 254-710-7863; Fax: 254-710-3116
E-mail: Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu

OCLC Liaison

Jay Weitz
Senior Consulting
Database Specialist
OCLC Online Computer
Library Center
Phone: 614-764-6156
E-mail: jay_weitz@oclc.org

From the Chair

(Continued from page 1)

Continuing Education Coordinator. Many thanks to the candidates for agreeing to run, and to the Nominating Committee for assembling an excellent slate.

MOUG's executive board met in Columbus, Ohio in August, and were again hosted impeccably by Jay Weitz and Esther Silverman. The Board had the privilege of touring OCLC with Larry Olszewski, Director of the OCLC Library. The tour included OCLC's library science collection, which contains a published first edition of the Dewey Decimal system that Melvil Dewey annotated in preparation for the second edition. In OCLC's Kilgour Building atrium, dozens of countries' flags are displayed in order of OCLC participation. (According to U.S. Flag Code, flags are to be hung alphabetically by country, but accession order is more meaningful and practical in this case. We also learned that Vice-Chair/Chair Elect Steve Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado) knows most of these flags.) Board members tramped to the grand finale: Jay Weitz's lair.

As part of the OCLC tour, the Board met OCLC's new public services liaison to MOUG, Vince Wortman. Vince is a Product Support Specialist in the FirstSearch section. He has worked with Retropective Conversion, TechPro, and NetLibrary collections at OCLC Metadata Contract Services, and is currently enrolled in the MLIS program at Kent State University School of Library and Information Science. Last year's liaison, Michael Sarmiento, has changed responsibilities. The Board thanks Michael for his efforts last year, and welcomes Vince.

In other news, MOUG's Task Force on Charitable Tax Status 501(c)(3)—Karen Little, Chair (University of Louisville); Jean Harden (University of North Texas); Deborah Morris (Roosevelt University); and Holling Smith-Borne (Vanderbilt University)—is completing 501(c)(3) paperwork to be submitted before the end of 2009.

The Best of MOUG, 8th edition, is still available for purchase for a limited time; please order your copies from Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University) now. There may be new tax implications for *The Best of MOUG* if our 501(c)(3) application is approved.

Ann Churukian, Chair of the NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee, reported that NMPAC is significantly revising the NMP Web site.

MOUG's Reference Services Committee (chaired by Steve Luttmann) submitted its first and very fine iteration of its *WorldCat Local Enhancement Recommendations for Music* to the MOUG Board, to be shared with MOUG members and OCLC in the future. Many thanks to the committee for their work. Special thanks go to Committee member Rebecca Belford (University of Oregon), who contributed significantly to the report, and to Cathy Gerhart (University of Washington) and Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) who laid groundwork in previous MOUG presentations. Their work on the WorldCat Local report is critical, especially if libraries adopt WCL as their public-access library catalogs. That scenario is even more likely as OCLC moves toward Web-scale management services that incor-

porate many functions of the traditional interactive library system (see p. 10 for more information). Continued input from MOUG members and their non-MOUG colleagues is critical if WCL is to adequately meet the needs of our music users. Even better, *join* the

committee and help keep this work moving.

In May I had the privilege of observing this year's OCLC Members Council meeting in Dublin, Ohio. This was the last meeting of the Members Council before it is replaced by the new Global and Regional Councils; see meeting highlights in this newsletter (p. 8). A good number of Members Council (now Global Council) delegates are library directors, which lent a certain viewpoint to the meeting. The Regional Council meetings will probably open up participation to library professionals at many levels, and I believe MOUG will find new opportunities to get information and give feedback on OCLC's products and services. The Council's international makeup created a wonderful opportunity to talk to professionals from other countries and learn more about how the economic situation affects their daily and professional lives. Much of the meeting focused on "Next Generation" tools and sea change that Web-scale management services will likely bring.

We have all heard about the need to retool libraries in response to changing economic and information climates. These days OCLC is focusing more on ways to maximize resources and less on things that are "nice to have." Members Council attendees repeatedly commented on the need to

(Continued on page 13)

Our activities must strike a balance, offering practical fare that helps members and music users in their day-to-day work, yet staying at the forefront of change so that we can be prepared to serve music users tomorrow.

From the Continuing Education Coordinator Bruce Evans, Baylor University

The Program Committee is hard at work on next year's program for San Diego, and as of this writing many potential topics are coming into clearer focus. Archival cataloging for music is an area that many feel needs greater attention; this quickly rose to the top of our list of potential topics. Another matter of great importance and much discussion is the overall direction of our profession, exemplified to a degree by the Taiga Forum Provocative Statements (<http://www.taigaforum.org/documents/Taiga%204%20Statements%20After.pdf>), "NextGen" cataloging issues, and many new developments—such as the Web-scale initiative recently announced by OCLC (see p. 10 of this newsletter)—that seek to improve upon the ILS and discovery tool

options. These are all matters that we are considering for program topics. Other potential topics include using WorldCat Selection for music materials and a music cataloging workshop. We are also very excited about offering a programmatic version of Ask MOUG, where Jay Weitz and Vince Wortman give their views on many of the hot topics affecting the music library world.

In developing the San Diego program, the Program Committee and the Board are trying to emphasize overarching "hot" topics that are of interest to both public and technical services music librarians. Whatever shape the final program takes, we will do our very best to make sure there is something to entice each of you to San Diego.

NEWS FROM OCLC

COMPILED BY JAY WEITZ AND VINCE WORTMAN

Review Board on Principles of Shared Data Creation & Stewardship Final Report

"We affirm that a policy is needed, but not this policy," says Review Board Chair; OCLC to appoint group to draft new policy

The Review Board on Principles of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship, convened jointly by the OCLC Board of Trustees and Members Council to represent the membership and inform OCLC on matters concerning shared data, has issued its final report recommending that the proposed Policy on Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records be withdrawn and a new policy drafted.

After review of the recommendations, OCLC has formally withdrawn the proposed policy. A new group will soon be assembled to begin work to draft a new policy with more input and participation from the OCLC membership.

The Review Board's final report is available on the Web at www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/policy/board/default.htm.

In May Jennifer Younger, Review Board Chair, and Edward H. Arnold Director of Hesburgh Libraries, University of Notre Dame, presented a report to OCLC Members Council recommending that the proposed policy be formally withdrawn and a new policy should be drafted. "We affirm that a policy is needed, but not this policy," said Dr. Younger.

The Review Board gathered input from Members Council before submitting its recommendation to the OCLC Board of Trustees in June.

"The dialogue and debate surrounding OCLC's record use policy have demonstrated some of the great strengths of the OCLC cooperative—that we are indeed a membership organization, that our members are vocal, and that we listen to the membership," said Jay Jordan, OCLC President and CEO. "Soon we will announce a new initiative to develop a record use policy that reflects both the rights of individual libraries and the needs of the cooperative to sustain and grow WorldCat for future generations. In the meantime, I want to thank Jennifer Younger and the Review Board for their efforts. I would also like to thank the members of the OCLC community who expressed their concerns and offered constructive criticism and support."

A new group will be named to begin work to draft a new policy. Until a new policy is in place, OCLC has reaffirmed the existence and applicability of the "Guidelines for the Use and Transfer of OCLC-Derived Records," which have been in place since 1987, as recommended by the Review Board.

Re-Implementing Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR)

Beginning in 1991 OCLC used its Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software to match WorldCat bibliographic records in the books format against themselves to find and merge duplicates.

By mid-2005, when WorldCat migrated to its new platform, sixteen runs through WorldCat had been completed, resulting in the elimination of 1.6 million duplicate records.

In 2005 a project was started to re-invent the DDR software to work in the new environment and to expand its capabilities to deal with all types of bibliographic records. This large multi-year project is now bearing fruit. Great improvements to our matching software, which are a key component of the new DDR, have regularly been incorporated into the batchloading process. This helps bring both DDR and batchloading processes into alignment as never before in dealing with the problem of duplicate records in WorldCat.

In May 2009 the new software was put into production following rigorous planning, development, and testing. In addition to its ability to deal with continuing resources, scores, sound recordings, visual materials, maps, and electronic resources, as well as books, this new DDR is much more sophisticated than its predecessor in its power to distinguish legitimate matches from incorrect ones. It also has the flexibility to allow selection of certain categories of bibliographic records to target for deduplication. Processing of small subsets of WorldCat against the live database began in May 2009. A full pass through the WorldCat database will likely begin in January 2010.

Having the new DDR software in production will result in the merging of a larger number of bibliographic records. Regular removal of duplicates will provide a better WorldCat for all its users.

OCLC, IDS Project, Atlas Systems to Develop Solution for Article Resource Sharing

OCLC is working with IDS Project staff, creators of the Article Licensing Availability Service (ALIAS), and Atlas Systems staff, creators of ILLiad and Odyssey resource sharing management systems, to use holdings data and license management tools to develop an integrated resource sharing solution for serials in any format.

By combining data from WorldCat, and querying OCLC and third-party knowledge bases and electronic rights management data to determine lenders, OCLC delivery services will offer automated processing for fulfillment of non-returnable materials. This makes it possible to streamline resource sharing workflow for copy requests with a particular emphasis on requests for electronic resources. At the present time, this process is labor-intensive.

The OCLC network-level delivery solution is intended to significantly improve the effective use of journal articles in libraries.

This solution is an effort to transform the IDS Project's Article Licensing Information Availability Service (ALIAS)

from a local, unmediated article service to a network-level solution serving more than 10,000 libraries worldwide. OCLC development staff will build the network-level service based on requirements gathered by OCLC product staff in concert with partner consortia, IDS Project, and Atlas Systems staff. OCLC will provide WorldCat Resource Sharing and ILLiad libraries with the use of this network-level service at no additional charge.

A 2008 recipient of the Rethinking Resource Sharing Innovation Award, the IDS Project is a mutually supportive resource-sharing cooperative within New York State whose members include public and private academic libraries, the New York Public Library, and the New York State Library. The goal of the Project is to continually implement and objectively evaluate innovative resource-sharing strategies, policies, and procedures that will optimize mutual access to the information resources of all IDS Project libraries. More information about the IDS Project can be found at: <http://idsproject.org>.

OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2009

On August 16, 2009 OCLC implemented changes related to the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2009. This included MARC 21 Updates No. 8 (October 2007) and No. 9 (October 2008), MARC Code List changes since July 2008, and user and OCLC staff suggestions. OCLC Technical Bulletin 257, which presents the details, is now available at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/257/default.htm>. Among the points of interest:

- Defining Videorecording 007/04 (subfield \$e) code “s” for Blu-ray Discs.
- Linking ISSN (ISSN-L) in bibliographic, authority, and holdings fields 022.
- Changing field 041 to separately subfield subtitles/captions for moving images (subfield \$j).
- Validating codes for subfield \$2 in field 047 (musical form) and 048 (medium of performance) for the respective code lists maintained by IAML (International As-

sociation of Music Libraries).

- Implementing two new Dewey fields: 083 (Additional Dewey Decimal Classification Number) and 085 (Synthesized Classification Number Components).
- Implementing the repeatable 260 field.
- Making field 440 obsolete and converting appropriate 4XX/8XX combinations.
- Defining new subfields in field 502 for dissertation details (degree, school, date, etc.).
- Implementing new field 542 for Information Relating to Copyright Status.
- Implementing subfield \$0 (zero) for the Authority Record Control Number in 28 bibliographic fields and three authority fields.

Appropriate data conversions will begin following the August installation. Please note that new capabilities, new elements, and new practices cannot be used until after the August installation.

Now search FirstSearch databases through WorldCat Local, WorldCat Local “quick start” and WorldCat.org

Users of WorldCat.org, WorldCat Local and WorldCat Local “quick start” can now search FirstSearch databases and all other OCLC electronic resource services you provide through an upgraded interface. Integrated search results include resources from all services - OCLC FirstSearch® databases, NetLibrary™ eBooks and eAudiobooks, Electronic Collections Online™ eJournals, ArchiveGrid® archival collection descriptions and CAMIO® (the Catalog of Art Museum Images Online).

A simple search box connects users with FirstSearch databases – including WorldCat - and other OCLC electronic resources to which your library subscribes in a user-friendly experience that delivers relevancy ranking of locally-owned items cataloged in WorldCat, faceted browsing and simultaneous searching of an unlimited number of databases. Soon, users also benefit from access to social tools such as personal profiles, reviews and ratings and list creation and sharing that are not available in existing service interfaces.

This enhanced access is the first step toward more full integration of OCLC electronic resources, with the goal of eventually making WorldCat.org, WorldCat Local and WorldCat Local “quick start” the primary interface to these

services. OCLC plans to release enhancements to the new interface on an ongoing basis.

A URL just for YOUR library

A new WorldCat URL specific to your library has already been created if you purchase content through the OCLC services FirstSearch, NetLibrary, Electronic Collections Online, CAMIO or ArchiveGrid. Log on to the new [Service Configuration module](#) to review your library’s URL and customize your site with library-specific branding. Also configure settings that enable access to the OCLC content to which your library subscribes.

Access to current services continues

These enhancements let your library offer users a new interface for access to OCLC electronic resources at no additional charge. Existing interfaces for FirstSearch, NetLibrary, CAMIO and ArchiveGrid will be available through at least 2011 to ensure a smooth transition for library staff and users. Staff at your library controls the timing of the introduction of these enhancements to your library’s users.

For more information visit www.oclc.org/access for additional details about access enhancements.

OCLC Centralizes Product Support for U.S. Libraries

OCLC management is pleased to announce the launch of OCLC's new service model, which will provide OCLC members throughout the U.S. with more choices to obtain OCLC products and services, and expanded training options.

OCLC and our Service Partners have collaborated for more than three years to achieve these improvements on behalf of members.

Effective July 1, 2009, all U.S. members will now connect directly with OCLC for Product Support. OCLC has centralized our capacity to provide direct product support to member libraries throughout the U.S. Our teams of product support specialists are available to help you maximize your application and use of OCLC products and services by providing quality, consistent service. We have also added a team of consultative service librarians, who are dedicated to

providing libraries with more ongoing support, such as helping you to structure and streamline your library's workflow, and help coordinate the batchloading your library's records into WorldCat.

Many of our members have historically obtained technical support for OCLC products and services from Service Partners, or Regional Service Providers (RSPs). OCLC and these service organizations have worked in partnership to coordinate and communicate these changes regarding support to U.S.-based members. These Service Partners will continue to provide OCLC members with valuable billing and ordering assistance and OCLC-certified training. To contact OCLC Support, please call 1-800-848-5800, visit <http://www.oclc.org/us/en/supportandtraining/> or e-mail support@oclc.org.

For Music Scholars, Teachers, Performers, Librarians—

Notes

Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association

Your Indispensable Companion For:

- Scholarly Articles
- Penetrating Reviews
- Bibliographic Essays
- Lists of New Publications
- Advertisements for Books, Recordings, Scores, Journals, and Other Services
- Sound Recording Reviews
- Digital Media Reviews
- Music Publishers' Information
- Video Reviews

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Annual membership in the Music Library Association (includes a subscription to NOTES): Individuals, \$90.00; Institutions, \$125.00; Students, \$35.00; Retirees, \$60.00; Corporate Members, \$450.00; Corporate Patrons, \$750.00. Annual U.S. subscription without membership: Individuals, \$85.00; Institutions, \$100.00. Postage (surface mail) supplement for Canadian and other foreign addresses: members, \$10.00; subscribers, \$5.00. Recent single issues are available at \$20.00 each (\$21.00 foreign). All back volumes are also available. All payments must be in U.S. funds, payable to the Music Library Association, Inc., and sent to the business office: 8551 Research Way, Suite 180, Middleton, WI 53562.

Report from the OCLC Members Council Meeting May 17-19, 2009

Prepared by Tracey Rudnick, University of Hartford and Music OCLC Users Group Chair

In May 2009 I attended the OCLC Members Council meeting in Dublin, Ohio as an observer for the Music OCLC Users Group. My interest primarily focused on how the work of MOUG and its members would be affected by directions OCLC and Members Council are taking. What follows is a report of what I observed and learned. All URLs in this document were accessed July 27, 2009.

The theme of the meeting was “Embracing the Differences and Celebrating the Past, Present, and Future.” It was the last Members Council meeting under the old council structure. Delegates celebrated Members Council’s history and accomplishments since first convening in 1978, passed resolutions to implement the new Global Council and three Regional Councils, and shared information about OCLC and partner initiatives.

NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Maggie Farrell, Chair of the Governance Transition, reported on transition activities. Transition procedures indicate that “Regional Councils exist to facilitate discussions of local, regional, and national issues within the OCLC cooperative,” serving as incubators, two-way conduits, an inclusive forum, and “a vehicle for interested memory institutions to learn more about OCLC and opportunities for participation in the cooperative” (OCLC Governance Transition Procedures, 5/4/09 draft, p. 3). Farrell reported that the Regional Councils currently lack structure and will need to develop governance procedures; Members Council has established implementation committees (for additional details see the section on Regional Council meetings below).

Global Council will bring together delegates from the Regional Councils, and its initial structure and membership closely resemble the current Members Council structure. Global Council’s role is to provide a voice for governance, reflecting and articulating priorities and critical issues that may influence OCLC strategic planning.

Progress will be measured in terms of improved communication between members and OCLC, an increase in OCLC membership (especially from heritage organizations), issues brought forward from regions to global to OCLC, responsiveness to regional issues by OCLC, and evidence that OCLC is meeting current and emerging needs of libraries and cultural heritage organizations across the world.

REVISED DEFINITION OF MEMBERSHIP

Bruce Newell (Chair, OCLC Board of Trustees) led discussion at the first business meeting on a revised definition of OCLC membership. A contract with OCLC is a necessary condition, but is not enough; the institution must also contribute or share resources. Delegates put off a vote until an amended version could be produced for the second business meeting. Revised wording says:

Any library or other memory institution that embraces the OCLC values of collaboration and sharing is welcome. Institutions worldwide become members of OCLC by contractually agreeing to contribute intellectual content or share resources. Our cooperative is strengthened by our membership’s diversity, such as geographical, institutional type, or size.

See the entire statement at <http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685/-/articles/content/59323281>. (I observed some controversy and sensitivity over the words “memory institution” during the course of my stay.) If approved by the trustees, the new definition will be added to Membership and Contributions Protocols that take effect July 1, 2009.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PAST AND FUTURE OF COUNCIL

Delegates reflected on Members Council’s history and accomplishments. For a twenty-three-page history, see “From Users Council to the Global Council: 30-Year Transformation in a Nonprofit Governance and Advisory Body, The OCLC Members Council,” by Richard Van Orden, Program Director, OCLC Members Council, 2009, at <http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685/-/articles/content/59323454>. Delegates also played Members Council Jeopardy (with questions about OCLC and the bibliographic universe) and enjoyed a Grand Finale video.

REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

The three Regional Councils—Americas Regional Council; Europe, Middle East and Africa Regional Council; and Asia Pacific Regional Council—met separately then reconvened and approved frameworks that specify their respective charges and governance. See the Regional Council frameworks at <http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685>.

The Americas make up 80% of OCLC's membership. The brief Americas Regional Council meeting was mostly a question and answer session, with some review of transition documents and future meeting plans (noted below). See [transition documents at http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685](http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685) and <http://www.oclc.org/memberscouncil/global/meetings/2009/may/default.htm>.

Initial Americas Regional Council meetings (see dates below) will be held at ALA. This is convenient for controlling costs and encouraging attendance at first, but will not be typical in the future. The length of meetings outside of ALA is to be determined. Each Regional Council has \$100,000 annual funding to help delegates (non-elected positions) attend. (MOUG sends an observer, not a delegate.) Global Council (elected positions) has \$200,000 plus contingency funds to aid the Regional Councils and to support virtual meetings. There are concerns about losing the "personal touch" as communication moves out to the much larger Regional Councils; it is hoped that online sites will help.

Americas Regional Council delegates asked several questions.

Q: Are Regional Councils really user groups?

A: They are a vehicle for frank, open conversation between OCLC and librarians/library staff (e.g., responses to the Record Use Policy, or comments about functionality), with some hope of engaging users back at home.

Q: With Global Council having one annual face-to-face meeting (not three), how will process and feedback be shown?

A: This is an issue of concern; using the blogosphere may be an option.

Q: Do all Americas Regional Council members have a vote?

A: For Regional Council operations see Americas Regional Council framework at <http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/685/-/articles/content/52651808>. Regional Councils do not have a vote in overall Global Council governance, but their documents will bring issues to Global Council, and Global Council and Regional Councils can/will be asked for input.

Q: Will the practical service groups continue at Global or Regional Council meetings, or both? Will such groups meet via the Web? Will meetings be spread throughout the year? Such groups entice delegates with the excitement of innovation.

A: Communication should flow beyond the Regional Councils.

Q: Can simultaneous service group meetings be avoided? Delegates often need to attend more than one.

A: More engagement and cooperation is possible if sessions are Web-based. However, everyone is inundated with webinar solicitations that get ignored; also, at the meetings delegates are captive and face-to-face.

NEXT GLOBAL AND REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

- Americas Regional Council Informational Meeting: January 15, 2010, Boston, MA (ALA Midwinter).

- Americas Regional Council's First Annual Meeting: June 2010 (in conjunction with ALA June 24-30; specific date TBD), Washington, DC. This meeting is scheduled to include online, virtual participation by institutional representatives.

- First Global Council annual meeting: Dublin, OH, April 19-22, 2010. (Jay Jordan announced at the OCLC ALA Update Breakfast that the first two Global Council meetings would be in Dublin due to travel budgets. The 2011 meeting may be outside the U.S.A.). The plan is to have one in person annually and two online (one of which will be more informal).

GLOBAL COUNCIL DOCUMENTS

Global Council delegates and observers can review documents, communicate, and collaborate at a new WebJunction community site, as demonstrated at the Members Council meeting by WebJunction's Chrystie Hill. WebJunction started as a resource for small and rural libraries and is now a learning community. It supports groups, "friends," and public or private personal profiles. Contributing or changing content (e.g., uploading documents, images, or video; adding comments; creating new sections or topics) is easy and does not require input or approval from an administrative intermediary (i.e., Webmaster, gatekeeper, or moderator). It can be a more efficient and effective form of communication than e-mail.

- Global and Regional Councils on WebJunction: <http://globalcouncil.webjunction.org/home>
Planning documents (e.g., minutes, governance transition procedures, Regional Council frameworks, etc), Members Council history, and mechanisms for communicating with Global Council.

- Global and Regional Council at OCLC Site: <http://www.oclc.org/memberscouncil/global/default.htm>

(Continued on next page)

OCLC Member's Council Meeting

(Continued from previous page)

Articles of incorporation, bylaws, past meeting minutes, selected videos, and Powerpoints.

- May 2009 Members Council Meeting: Agenda, PowerPoints, videos: <http://www.oclc.org/memberscouncil/global/meetings/2009/may/default.htm>; OCLC press release: <http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200931.htm>

- February 2009 Members Council Meeting: Minutes: <http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091oclc.doc>; OCLC press release: <http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200915.htm>

OCLC PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND DISCUSSION

(JAY JORDAN)

Jordan briefly discussed the economy: OCLC's approach is not just cost recovery, but strategic and entrepreneurial; salaries are frozen, performance-based compensation is reduced, OCLC is tough on expenses, and contingencies are in place. Jordan invited attendees to see OCLC press releases for announcements regarding initiatives, but spoke about the following:

- OCLC's March 2009 **Symposium for Publishers and Libraries** to discuss metadata needs, practices, lifecycles, and economics, and explore opportunities for change. Find reports at <http://www.oclc.org/publisher-symposium/summary/default.htm>.

- An **OCLC/EBSCO agreement** that makes it possible for libraries that subscribe to both WorldCat Local and EBSCOhost services to provide content from EBSCO through WorldCat Local. See press release at <http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200922.htm>.

- The **Expert Community Experiment**: more participants, more corrections on a timelier (real time) basis; a test of a social model in ring fence of experts.

- **Quick Start programs**, e.g., a free limited version of WorldCat Local for libraries that already subscribe to First-Search; a similar service is available for CONTENTdm. This allows libraries to test drive these products and more easily provide more access to unique resources with minimal start up. Institutions can upgrade if more robustness is needed. See press release at <http://www.oclc.org/worldcatlocal/quickstart/default.htm>.

WEB-SCALE MANAGEMENT SERVICES (ANDREW PACE, OCLC)

Andrew Pace (Executive Director for Networked Library Services, OCLC) spoke about the Web-scale management services. In today's ILS/information model, 70% of

the effort is going into building infrastructure and 30% goes into ideas/propulsion. OCLC's Web-scale initiative reverses this. The motivation for this initiative stems from dissatisfaction with integrated library systems, the need and/or desire of libraries to reduce costs of ownership, the power of the cooperative, and the existence of sufficient functionality to replace and support systems at network levels. Current OPACS and other finding aids set a very low bar, and are like an "old home generator" approach, adding more generators as needed—this is *not* the way to power the world. It is better to (metaphorically) add power outlets and plug into a centralized power source. Libraries have a significant investment in systems yet a fragmented presence.

Pace said to stop misusing the term "next generation." It is not about "catching up." The Web-scale initiative is next generation: it is Web-based (not browser-based), will help drive down cost of ownership, is flexible and customizable, and built on concentrated data. The architecture reflects an understanding that libraries have many workflows, business models, and processing systems that go beyond the standard circulation, cataloging, and acquisitions modules of the ILS. Components include licensed resources (e.g., electronic resources) management, license management, workflow management, ILL fulfillment, technical workflow, task assignments, process management (e.g., procedure for buying an electronic book), consortial fund management, collection shifting, and more. The initiative congregates library activities and information all in one place, building on WorldCat Local and Connexion. In the question and answer period, Pace said there are obvious areas to collaborate with open source initiatives, but said open source is not always built for scalability and there is no benefit to a Frankenstein's monster. Jay Jordan (who is open to reasonable quid pro quo) was not so sure certain vendors are willing to be helpful.

Next steps include summer testing, then a fall pilot that will continue through 2010; it will be an iterative process and will include council advice. (Pace quipped that we should not look for "faster horses" when testing an airplane.) See more at Pace's blog, Hectic Pace, or contact him at pacea@oclc.org. Also find an interview with Pace at <http://www.ala.org/ala/online/resources/selectedarticles/paceonquickstart42909.cfm>.

SOCIAL NETWORKING AND WORLDCAT

OCLC's Jasmine de Gaia, Product Management, WorldCat Consumer Discovery, demonstrated several social

(Continued on page 13)

Announcing *The Best of MOUG*, 8th edition
Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), editor

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is pleased to announce the publication of the 8th edition of *The Best of MOUG*, a browsable, two-volume compendium of authorized name/uniform title headings from the Library of Congress/NACO Name Authority File for C.P.E. Bach, J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Boccherini, Brahms, Clementi, Handel, J. Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann, and Vivaldi. There are also lists arranged by thematic index number for Bach, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Telemann, and Vivaldi (by both Fanna and Ryom numbers, with a concordance from the former to the latter). Each list includes uniform titles and corresponding authority record control numbers and is current to September 2007.

It also includes an index of commonly searched English and other cross references with corresponding authority record control numbers for works by Bartók, Dvořák, Glazunov, Glière, Glinka, Grechaninov, Janáček, Kodály, Martinů, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky.

This browsable print resource is particularly handy at a reference desk to assist patrons when it may be inconvenient, if not impossible, to log on to OCLC's WorldCat® and search the online authority files. It is also an inexpensive yet authoritative resource for catalog departments that need to limit online searching of the LC/NACO Name-Authority File because of budget considerations, and has proven extremely useful in classroom settings and in workplace training situations.

This is the first new edition to appear since 2000, and the first to be issued in two volumes. The editor, Margaret Kaus, and the Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the editors of the 1st through 7th editions, Ann (McCollough) Caldwell (Brown University; 1st-2nd eds.) and Judy Weidow (University of Texas at Austin, ret.; 3rd-7th eds.), who laid the groundwork for the present edition.

The cost per two-volume copy of the 8th edition is as follows (payable and shown below in U.S. funds only; includes shipping and handling):

\$36.00 (for orders to locations in the U.S.)

\$46.00 (for orders to Canada or Mexico)

\$58.00 (all other countries)

To order *The Best of MOUG*, 8th ed., use the order form on the reverse side of this page; or point your browser to <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/bestofmougorder.pdf>. Complete the form online, print it, and mail it via postal mail with your check to the indicated address. (Only pre-paid orders can be filled.)

For questions about the new edition, please contact the editor:

Margaret Kaus
Associate Professor
Original Cataloger
Kansas State University Libraries
Hale Library
509 Hale
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
mkaus@ksu.edu
ph. 785-532-7263
fax 785-532-7644

Order form appears on reverse

ORDER FORM

THE BEST OF MOUG, 8th EDITION

THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP 2008

The Best of MOUG is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians because it can be kept at a desk, card catalog or online terminal for quick access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online.

Cost per 2 volume set (includes shipping):	Quantity	Price
\$36.00 (United States)	_____	_____
\$46.00 in U.S. funds (Canada and Mexico)	_____	_____
\$58.00 in U.S. funds (all other countries)	_____	_____
Total:	_____	_____

All orders must be prepaid, with checks made out to the Music OCLC Users Group.

SHIP TO: _____

ADDRESS: _____

Contact info

Name: _____

Phone: _____ E-mail: _____

Please make your check payable to the Music OCLC Users Group

Check number _____

Send to:

Margaret Kaus
Best of MOUG editor
K-State Libraries
509 Hale
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
Phone: (785) 532-7263
FAX: (785) 532-7644
E-mail: mkaus@ksu.edu

MOUG
Tax no./FEIN no.:
31-0951917

From the Chair

(Continued from page 3)

“show the value of libraries” and to “avoid cocooning.” MOUG and its members likewise need to remain mindful of the cocoon. Our activities must strike a balance, offering practical fare that helps MOUG members and music users in their day-to-day work, yet staying at the forefront of change so we can be prepared to serve music users tomorrow.

In that regard, the Program Committee has made excel-

lent progress on the March 2010 meeting in San Diego. Continuing Education Coordinator Bruce Evans (Baylor University) says more about this in his column (p. 4 of this newsletter). As always, send ideas to the Program Committee, if not for this year, then for next year. Change is in the air, and MOUG is here to both shape our future and help us adapt. In the meantime, have a great fall!

OCLC Member's Council Meeting

(Continued from page 10)

networking features available at www.worldcat.org. These features spring out of WorldCat.org's strategy to “create a worldwide Web-scale end-user centered presence for libraries” driven by key objectives:

1. Raising global awareness and findability of libraries (e.g., Twitter, widgets, Find in Library, YouTube instructional videos);
2. Increasing library relevancy by providing more access, content, and value (e.g., reviews/ratings, lists, list watching via feeds, save search, tags, citation management tools); and
3. Connecting users physically and online to libraries and services (e.g., library affiliates, library profile pages (add your library!); looking up library items by phone when shopping or comparing deals, mobile apps (www.mobileworldcat.org)).

WorldCat Hackathons at the New York City Public Library in November 2008 and in Amsterdam in May 2009 generated ideas and informed product plans. OCLC will use WorldCat.org to build Web-scale for libraries (embed libraries in the Internet, provide unique and aggregated content for users, and drive usage of libraries). Next steps include enhanced digital material search and access, more internationalization, authoritative content, more widgets, and more strategic partnerships.

RETHINKING RESOURCE SHARING INITIATIVE

Ann Beaubien (University of Michigan Library) is Chair of the Rethinking Resource Sharing (RSS) Steering Committee. RRS is partnering with OCLC and other organi-

zations and meets annually. Beaubien presented the committee's report on “Worldwide Resource Sharing: Looking to the Future.” The committee advocates “a complete rethinking of the ways libraries conduct resource sharing,” especially given changes in the Internet, user expectations, the Internet and mobile technology, and the publishing world.

Beaubien referenced “A Manifesto for Rethinking Resource Sharing” that advocates seven points: (1) fewer restrictions/barriers, (2) more choice for users (e.g., delivery format), (3) global access (formal and informal agreements to reduce barriers), (4) more item and expertise sharing among cultural institutions (e.g., libraries, museums, archives), (5) using reference services to facilitate sharing (“no findable object should be totally unattainable”), (6) service for a fee rather than refusing service (e.g., people are willing to pay for the convenience of NetFlix), and (7) “everyone is a library user” (make checking out a book as easy as renting a car). The manifesto was affirmed by the ALA/RUSA/STARS Executive Committee and others in 2007 and is available at <http://rethinkingresourcesharing.org/manifesto.html>.

The committee's next steps include obtaining endorsement by state library organizations, developing a collection of examples to support the seven points, and innovation rewards. Other Rethinking Resource Sharing committees are working on projects, including interoperability to create more intuitive paths and reduce “mazes” for users. A User Needs Committee is looking at common user needs in and out of the library; a Delivery Committee is investigating a home delivery clearinghouse, international delivery, and digitization. For more information about Rethinking Resource Sharing's work, or to become involved, see <http://rethinkingresourcesharing.org/>.

Questions and Answers

Jay Weitz, OCLC

Monograph/Series, Language/Script

Q: I have a question regarding record #43582554. This item has four title pages, in this order:

- series title page in English
- analytical title page in English
- series title page in Russian (Cyrillic)
- analytical title page in Russian (Cyrillic)

The publishers are given as follows: Muzyka, based in Moscow; and Schott, with multiple locations including Mainz, London, etc. In the OCLC record, the description has been based on the analytical title page in English. My reading of 1.0A3 and the associated LCRI would lead me to believe, though, that the chief source of information should be the analytical title page in Russian since the resource is a score for a symphony (no original language involved) and the first publisher is based in Russia. Would it be correct to edit the record in OCLC so as to base the description on the Russian title pages (to be consistent, the series information would be taken from the Russian series title page)? What makes me hesitant is that the record was used by LC but they didn't bother to change the source of information.

A: We can probably ignore the fact that LC has chosen not to change the source of information when they used this record. If memory serves, they accept a lot of things on "lccopycat" records that they would not do on original cataloging, for the sake of efficiency (or something like it).

That being said, as you have described this particular score, we seem to have two considerations for the question of chief source. One is that "the sources of information present the bibliographic resource in different aspects (e.g., as a single-part monograph and as part of a monographic series)"—the situation addressed in 1.0A3(a)(i). The other is that "it is a work that does not contain words (e.g., some music)"—the situation addressed in LCRI 1.0A3. This LCRI, by implication in its first sentence talking about language and then explicitly in its second sentence, appears to apply directly to 1.0A3(a)(ii), the only part of the rule that mentions language/script as a consideration. In a rule such as 1.0A3, I'd take the order of its elements as important, which would put the "different aspects" consideration of 1.0A3(a)(i) over the language/script" consideration of 1.0A3

(a)(ii). In the former, we "prefer the source that corresponds to the aspect being described," that is, the first occurring source that describes the score in its single-part monograph aspect, which you've noted is in English. If the score were not *also* part of a monographic series as well as having multiple language/script sources of information, I think your reading of the rule and LCRI would be correct. But in 1.0A3, the "different aspects" question comes first.

Follow-up Q: You are right about the two aspects that the sources of information present and that the order of elements in 1.0A3(a) is important. Applying 1.0A3(a)(i) first makes sense and I agree that the order of the instructions reflects this logical approach. But once we've applied 1.0A3(a)(i) and decided on the chief source that corresponds to the aspect being described (i.e. an analytical title page since the resource is described as a part of a larger resource), we are still faced with the problem of having more than one analytical title page to choose from since they exist in English and in Russian. This is where I thought that 1.0A3(a)(ii) and LCRI 1.0A3 would have been invoked. In other words, I thought that both 1.0A3(a)(i) and 1.0A3(a)(ii) would be applied to the case, but one after the other, since the case in question raises both the aspect and the language problems. Would that constitute a misapplication of the rule?

Follow-up A: That is open to further interpretation. My guess is that this is yet another of the many instances where the rule makers didn't think through every possible permutation of the rules (as though *any* of us could think through them all). If we read the rule literally, word for word, it says: "Use the first occurring source of information as the chief source of information unless *one* of the following applies" (emphasis mine). It seems to ignore the possibility that (as in your example) more than one of the five conditions might apply. Without too much trouble, I think we might even be able to imagine a musical case where three, four, or even all five of the conditions occur. And you know what? You've just convinced me that you're right. We need to move from 1.0A3(a)(i) on to 1.0A3(a)(ii), and then to apply the LCRI, which leads us to use the analytical title page in Russian (Cyrillic) as the chief source. Thanks for working through this with me.

Tracing Titles Without Distinction

Q: Could you clarify the practice of making an added entry for a title proper or parallel title which may not be sufficiently distinctive to be a useful access point? I find many examples, particularly in edited OCLC records originating with Harrassowitz, which trace these (245 1X and 246 21). Music Cataloging Decision 21.30J1 covered titles consisting of the name(s) of type(s) of composition and medium of performance, key, date of composition, or number. Should these be edited when upgraded?

A: When the Music Cataloging Decisions were transformed into LCRIs, they also got re-evaluated in the larger context of consistency with the rest of AACR2 and the LCRIs. AACR2 21.30J reads in part: “Make an added entry under the title proper of every item entered under a personal heading, a corporate heading, or a uniform title. *Optionally*, make such added entries in accordance with the policy of the cataloguing agency.” That most useful exception of allowing us not to create added entries for such helpful titles proper as *Sonata no. 1* went the way of the eight-track tape cartridge. In its place we got the “Basic Guideline for Making Title Added Entries for Titles Proper” section of the monstrous LCRI 21.30J: “Follow the provisions of the rule as written. *Option decision*. There are no conditions covered by the option decision for making ‘... such added entries in accordance with the policy of the cataloguing agency.’” The

upshot is that there are no longer any instances when, in MARC 21 terms, we would use any first indicator in field 245 other than “1.” Remembering what Emerson said about “foolish consistency,” you can likely guess how I feel about this. On the other hand, if we put this into the specific context of Section (1) of the Introduction to LCRI 21.30J, which essentially tells us that, in contrast to the card environment, the electronic environment can give us even unwanted (or unneeded) access regardless of the coding of such indicators, perhaps it doesn’t make much difference.

Now, we should note that in the LCRI, there is the little provision of “*LC practice*: Catalogers may change the field from 245 00 to 245 10 only when updating a record for another reason.” We could take that little “*may*” as license to leave any 245 first indicator as “0” when the resulting added entry would not be useful under the former practice. You’d hear no objections from me.

As for any corresponding 246 fields, subsequent sections of the LCRI are considerably more reasonable regarding numbers that occur within the first five words filed on in a title proper. There are several examples that explicitly tell us not to create 246s “for spelled-out form because not sufficiently distinctive” and for ordinal numbers that are not integral parts of a title. You can delete any such 246s from master records with a clear conscience.

Upgrading Headings but Not Description

Q: I am going through thousands of records for scores and recordings—clean-up from the OCLC reclamation that was a spectacular disaster for the music records. The least messy, least painful solution was to delete all our holdings that were attached through this process. Now I am going through our files by hand, matching records in our catalog to OCLC records to attach holdings. For a number of these items, we have kept headings current in our catalog over the years, but the master record has older headings (especially uniform titles) that I would like to update, or is missing access points that I would like to add (librettists, editors, series tracings, etc.). I’m not sure what to do about the older OCLC records coded “i” in Description. Is it okay to add/update headings and replace the record, leaving the rest as is, or is it necessary to update the rest to current practice? I don’t have time to change anything else, and I definitely don’t have the time to retrieve these items, so I won’t have any of these in hand. I did search the BFAS page but nothing seems to fit this situation. There are sections on tran-

scribing pre-AACR2 copy when creating new records, but I’m not creating new records. The section on recataloging only seems to apply if one has the item in hand. I want to maximize the benefit to everyone as long as I have to go through all of these anyway, and leaving pre-AACR2 headings in master records doesn’t seem like much of a help to anyone.

A: You certainly may upgrade headings in pre-AACR2 records to their correct AACR2 form, as well as add headings prescribed by AACR2. You are encouraged to do so. Strictly speaking, however, you must have the resource in hand in order to accurately upgrade the description from pre-AACR2 form to AACR2 form. Many of the rules about transcription and choice of entry, for example, are completely different and require one to have the resource (or an appropriate surrogate) in hand to perform accurately. Upgrading a record to AACR2 is not merely a case of slapping ISBD punctuation into a pre-AACR2 record.

Questions & Answers

Much Ado About Noting

Q: LCRI 2.7B18 provides guidance and instruction for formal and informal contents notes as well as notes for the presence of bibliographies and indexes. But it does not, that I can see, say anything about the order of notes (505 before 504 or vice versa), nor does LCRI 1.7B provide anything useful. My interpretation reading LCRI 2.7B18 and my expectation based on other patterns where something is mentioned first or used first (Chapter 9 rules taking precedence over Chapter 12 for note order or 700 before a 700 with subfield \$t, for example), would be to present contents notes (505) before bibliography/index notes (504 or 500), because that is the order in which it is presented in the LCRI. This would also seem logical to me, as the bibliography and index would typically come at the end of a book, so having that note follow the 505 would also parallel the order on the page. What I typically see is the reverse, 504 before 505, and often “500 Includes index” before a 505. I’m just curious if I’m missing some LCRI or guidance somewhere (and I’ve been looking everywhere), or if this practice of 504 before 505 has just evolved outside of any guidance at all.

A: The only general guidance about the order of notes that I am aware of is in the rule X.7B of AACR2 Chapters 1 through 12. The wording varies slightly and a few of the chapters (4, 11, and 12) include advice on special circumstances, but the essence is that notes are to be in the order of the rules, although a particular note may be placed first when it is judged to have “primary importance.” The rules cleverly ignore the instances where a particular rule can generate multiple notes, as is commonly the case with the X.7B18 series on Contents notes. The preponderance of LC records do appear to place a bibliography and/or index note

before a formal contents note, although it’s not difficult to find even the occasional LC record that does it the other way around.

We might attribute the relative consistency of practice to something as simple as the order of the examples that are found in 2.7B18, listing the bibliography and index notes before the formal contents notes. We might attribute it to the wording of the actual rule, which reads in part: “List the contents of an item, either selectively or fully . . . ,” possibly suggesting that such selective contents notes as a bibliography and/or index note would precede a full contents note. We might attribute it to the order of LCRI 2.7B18, in which the section on the “Informal Contents Note” (including “bibliographies and bibliographical references, discographies, and filmographies . . . and indexes”) is before the section on the “Formal Contents Note.” But then the LCRI confuses things with its special sections specifically on the “Bibliography Note” and “Indexes” after the “Formal Contents Note” section.

If I were asked to cite a justification for putting the informal bibliography/index notes before a formal contents note, it would be the placement of the former before the latter in the LCRI. It’s also interesting to note (pun intended) what it says in the LC “Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual” in the 5XX Notes—General Information section: “Notes should be recorded in the order prescribed by AACR2, LCRIs, MCDs, and other instructions, without regard to their numerical tags. *Notes not in one of the categories explicitly covered should be placed immediately before the position of the contents note.*” (Emphasis mine.) That doesn’t really apply to the bibliography/index notes, but is interesting anyway.

Musings on the Mu

Q: Is there any way to insert the character μ into an OCLC record? I’ve looked at the special characters and symbols list and I don’t see it. Is our only option to type in the phrase [Greek letter mu] each time?

A: For the treatment of Greek characters, OCLC’s document, “Entering non-ALA Diacritics and Special Characters” (<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/diacritics/default.htm>), says, “Spell out in English and enclose in square brackets.” It furthermore refers to LCRI 1.0E for additional details, where one finds, “In roman script records romanize all occurrences of Greek letters . . . regardless of the facilities available (the intent is to

assist filing and searching even though there are characters for alpha, beta, and gamma in the character set and certain Greek capital letters are identical to their roman equivalents).” Included in the LCRI is the following example:

chief source: . . . materials lists for high-power 10.6 μ windows . . .

transcription: 245 10 \$a . . . materials lists for high-power 10.6 [mu] windows

Simply substitute the designation “[mu]” for the Greek character.

Type of Dates Coding

Q: I'm confused about when to use codes "s," "r," or "p" in the DtSt of the fixed field. For example, I have a CD issued by Capitol Nashville in 1996 of Tennessee Ernie Ford songs as part of their "Vintage Collection." The selections were originally recorded between 1949 and 1965. My first inclination is to use a "p" with dates of 1996, 1949. However, from the program insert, it shows the songs were originally recorded by various recording companies. So would it then be "r" with dates of 1996, 1949? I found some notes from the "Music Cataloging at Yale" guidelines that say to use "r" for "a collection with previously released material from numerous sources." In order to use code "r" does the entire collection of songs have to be previously released together under a different format (such as audiocassette) or a different label? If this is the first time this specific collection of songs has been issued, is this an "s"?

I also have a similar type of CD released in 2004 with a collection of songs by Petula Clark (originally released on various albums between 1964 and 1969). However, there's also a 2004 remix of her song *Downtown*. Since the remix was never "released" before, I don't think I can use "r." Do I use "p" because the other songs were previously recorded, or do I use "s" since this is a unique collection of her songs?

A: There is a hierarchy of DtSt codes to use depending upon what information about any previous release and/or the date of original sound capture that you have. It appears in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* under the DtSt

fixed field, "Non-continuing resources" at <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/dtst.shtm> and in the MARC format under 008/06 "Precedence of Codes" at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd008a.html>. If you have the date/dates of previous release/publication, the earliest of these dates would be your Date 2 and you would use DtSt "r." If you had no date of previous release, but did know the date/dates of original sound capture, the earliest of these would be your Date 2 and you would use DtSt "p." For sound recordings, a previous release in any recording medium (78, LP, cassette, CD, etc.) qualifies as a previous release. The previous release may be on the same label, or on different labels, or a combination. The previous release does not have to have been all at the same time, nor do all of the works in question have to have been released previously.

So if I have understood your cases correctly, the Tennessee Ernie Ford disc would be DtSt "r" with Date 1 as 1996 and Date 2 as 1949 (if 1949 represents the earliest date of a previous release/publication of any of the cuts). For the Petula Clark disc, DtSt would also be "r" with Date 1 as 2004 and Date 2 as 1964, the earliest date of previous release/publication of any of the cuts. There will be occasional instances, such as "greatest hits" compilations, that you can consider to be DtSt "r" even in the absence of specific dates of previous release (using "uuuu" as Date 2). Otherwise, if you have no evidence of previous release and no date of original capture that differs from the year of publication, use code "s."

Sounds Like Ambisonic

Q: We have just cataloged OCLC #303137320, a Nimbus Records CD. On the face of the CD "Stereo Ambisonic" is stated. We included this information in the 300. Is this correct? If "Ambisonic" should be included, should it be capitalized?

A: My first thought was that "Ambisonic" probably didn't belong in the 300, because it sounded to me like similar sorts of marketing hype that publishers have confused us with in the past. But the optional addition allowed in AACR2 6.5C8 ("Give the recording and reproduction characteristics [e.g., *Dolby processed*, *NAB standard*]) and its "LC practice" LCRI ("Apply the rule whenever the information would be needed for selecting playback equipment for

the full audio effect") strongly suggested that I needed to look more closely at what exactly Ambisonic signified.

If we can trust the Ambisonic Web site (<http://www.ambisonic.net/>) and/or the Nimbus Records Web site (http://www.wyastone.co.uk/nrl/dvd_intro.html), "Ambisonic" is indeed information that could influence the choice of playback equipment. An appropriate decoder is needed "for the full audio effect," although the recordings are compatible with standard stereo playback equipment. The term seems to be pretty consistently capitalized in those two (and other related) Web sources. So here is the 300 field that I would suggest for your record: "2 sound discs : \$b digital, stereo., Ambisonic ; \$c 4 3/4 in."

Questions & Answers
Too Many Composers Spoil the Access

Q: I'm copy cataloging a CD titled *Retrospectacular*. It celebrates the 40th anniversary of the Dorian Wind Quintet and consists of tracks drawn from miscellaneous recordings they made over the years (often of live performances). The final piece is a new one. The Quintet commissioned five composers, all of whom had previously written pieces for the Quintet, to each write a variation on a theme from a piece by Anton Reicha. The five composers were sent the theme and each worked completely independently of the others. The resulting piece is titled *Anniversary Variations on a Theme of Antonin Reicha from the Wind Quintet in E-flat, op. 88, no. 2*. It consists of a statement of the Reicha theme, followed by the variations composed by Richard Rodney Bennett, George Perle, Billy Childs, Bruce Adolph, and Lee Hoiby.

I would like to give an added entry for this piece, but I'm not sure where to start in setting up such an access point nor in providing cross-references. I'm not even sure what chapter of AACR2 I should be looking in. I looked at the authority record for the *F.A.E. Sonata*, but there Schumann composed fully half of it, with Brahms and Dietrich each contributing roughly a quarter. There's also *Double Music*, by John Cage and Lou Harrison, but that was a true collaboration. The multi-composer *Requiem for Rossini* was completed but never performed.

I'm thinking maybe I have such diffuse authorship that the access point should be under uniform title. If that is true, what kinds of cross-references should/could I provide? I notice *F.A.E.* doesn't have any; but if you look at the authority record for the third movement, the one by Brahms, there is a cross-reference for Brahms. That authority record cites a source where the movement is used by itself, however, which is not the case here. I hate to lose access to those five composers, but I haven't found any way to get them all associated with this work. Any ideas?

A: The answer that I'm coming up with in AACR2 is profoundly unsatisfying, but here it is, as far as I can determine. This would be considered a work of shared responsibility and the five composers would be considered joint authors (well, joint composers). AACR2 21.6C2 says:

If responsibility is shared among more than three persons or corporate bodies and principal responsibility is not attributed to any one, two, or three, enter under title. Make an added entry under the heading for the first person or corporate body named prominently in the item being catalogued. If editors are named prominently, make an added entry under the heading for each if there are not more than three. If there are more than three named prominently, make an added entry under the heading for the principal editor and/or for the one named first.

Examples bear out the rules of AACR2's section on "Works of Shared Responsibility," 21.6. The *F.A.E. Sonata*, having three joint composers, falls under 21.6C1 and so is entered under the first named (which apparently was Schumann, according to the note in n92038661), with added entries for the others. *Double Music* gets treated similarly, with the entry under Cage (n97067197) and an added entry for Harrison. And to seal our fate here, the *Requiem for Rossini* with its thirteen collaborators gets entered under its uniform title (n90698899), as per 21.6C2.

What all this seems to mean is that this set of *Anniversary Variations* would be entered under its uniform title, and I suppose that for the sound recording, you might have an added entry for the first named of the joint composers. (Just between you and me, if you wanted to include added entries for the remaining four composers, I would think it's only fair intellectually, even if it isn't kosher by AACR2.)

Language Notes for Accompanying Material

Q: Do you use field 546 or 500 when you have a score with notes about the composer or program notes in three languages?

A: If the note is about accompanying material (such as

biographical notes or program notes) and its languages, that would go in field 500. You'd use field 546 for the languages of the main content, such as the texts of songs or the libretto of an opera.

Music Form/Genre Headings

Q: Recently, there has been discussion about music subject headings and the advisability of using currently existing headings and tagging them 655, because most music headings, as we all know, are indeed form/genre headings rather than “aboutness” headings. The music people who contributed said not to start using tag 655 on current headings. The non-music people advocated very strongly using tag 655 for current headings in music. Both camps said that database cleanup, once music genre headings are finally in existence, will be easier if the tagging is changed (the “use 655 now” people) or is not changed (the “stay with 650 until music genre headings are approved” people). The argument was offered that not using 655 now violates cooperative cataloging agreements, because 650 misrepresents the character of music subject headings and LC has validated the use of tag 655 with topical subject headings when they are used as form/genre headings.

What do you think of all this? Does OCLC have a position on the issue? Should we wait, or should we start using 655 now? (My institution is definitely in the “wait” camp, for many reasons but in part because our ILS can’t handle 655s yet—they are handled basically as free-text subjects, with no authority control. But if we are wrong, we need to know.)

A: My strong recommendation would be to wait. As I understand the project (from the LC statement, “Genre/Form Headings for Musical Works” at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/genremusic.html>), as well as sessions at OLAC,

MOUG, and MLA), the two current lists of form/genre terms and medium of performance terms are the raw material for what is intended to be a substantial re-thinking of this entire approach to music materials. At the time of this writing, the two lists themselves remain works in progress and are certainly subject to all sorts of changes. Furthermore, they are currently naked lists lacking any syndetic structure, which is being built with a target completion date of February 2010 (if things stay on schedule). There will be lots of policy issues to be decided and there may be MARC coding changes to be made at that time, depending upon how things develop.

The schedule currently envisions the creation of actual musical genre/form authority records to begin in April 2010.

Again as I understand things, the whole

structure of the future form/genre headings may well be hugely different from the LCSH headings we’ve been using for all these decades. Among many other things, that means that the current music form/genre-like headings should continue to be used *and coded* as they have always been (bibliographic 650s, authority 150s) according to the LCSH and *Subject Headings Manual* rules currently in place. Without knowing how things are going to end up, it’s hard to say what sorts of problems might be caused down the line by people prematurely entering current LCSH music 650 headings as 655s; but experience tells me that the more consistent and correct the existing data is, the fewer problems are encountered when trying to do machine conversion. Finally, yours is surely not the only local system unable to handle 655s adequately—yet another reason to wait.

The structure of form/genre headings may be hugely different from the Library of Congress Subject Headings we’ve been using for all these decades.

Corrections

On page 1 of the June 2009 MOUG Newsletter, Stephen Luttmann was incorrectly identified as the author of the Distinguished Service Award announcement. The actual author of the announcement was Tracey Rudnick.

On page 30 of the same issue, in the 2009 Business Meeting Minutes, at section 6.a.i. there is a note that refers readers to the full text of the Distinguished Service Award letter without specifying the page. That note should have referred readers to the DSA announcement on page 1.

The Editor apologizes for these errors.

Alan Ringwood
MOUG Newsletter Editor
University of Texas Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-8916

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is \$30.00 (North America) and \$45 (outside North America); institutional membership is \$40.00 (North America) and \$50.00 (outside North America). Membership includes subscription to the *Newsletter*. New members will also receive any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

NAME _____
PREFERRED ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____ COUNTRY _____
WORK PHONE (____) _____ FAX NUMBER (____) _____

INSTITUTION NAME _____
POSITION TITLE _____
E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

A check payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application. Rates are as follows:

- _____ \$30.00 Personal Membership (North America)
- _____ \$45.00 Personal Membership (outside North America)
- _____ \$40.00 Institutional Membership (North America)
- _____ \$50.00 Institutional Membership (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240.