



MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

NEWSLETTER

ISSN 0161-1704

IN THIS ISSUE :

From the Continuing
Education Coordinator . . 3

**2012 Annual Meeting
Summary Report:**

MOUG Hot Topics 4

MLA Music Discovery
Requirements Document . . 7

WorldCat Local
Enhancement
Recommendations for
Music 8

Ralph Papakhian Travel
Grant Announcement . . . 14

News from OCLC 15

Questions & Answers
by Jay Weitz 19

FROM THE CHAIR

Marty Jenkins
Wright State University



Most people probably think of spring as the time of new beginnings, but for those of us in the academic world it's the fall that brings on such thoughts. That is especially true this fall at my institution, as we gear up for our first ever fall *semester*, after 40-plus years on the quarter system. There has been a great deal of wailing and gnashing of teeth in the faculty offices and student services departments over the last couple years as we prepared for this change. Fortunately for me, I am pretty well insulated from the worst of the upheaval. Really, I only become aware that the term has started when I notice that my staff have student assistants again!

Still, change is in the air here at Wright State, and it is in the air in the library world as well. *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) is finally a real tool, which some of us have adopted and many more of us are preparing to adopt. And MOUG is working to help in the transition. We are partnering with MLA to

present a pre-conference workshop in San José which will provide nuts-and-bolts training in creating both bibliographic and authority records in RDA. At our summer Board meeting we developed a tentative program for our own Annual Meeting in San José which will focus largely on issues raised by the coming of RDA for both public and technical services. I won't steal too much thunder from CEC Mac Nelson, except to say this: lightning talks!

Treasurer Casey Mullin is working hard to make it easier for all of you to renew your memberships this fall. Last year we sent out first and second renewal notices by email, with very pleasing results. This fall we expect to be able to add the ability for members to actually renew electronically using PayPal. We hope this will make renewing more convenient for you, and it should save us money on printing and postage. Of course, we will preserve other payment options for those of you who are PayPal-averse or who shun the "magic plastic"!

(Continued on page 3)

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: Mary Huisman, University of Minnesota Libraries, 160 Wilson Library, 309 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

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 Casey Mullin, MOUG Treasurer, Head, Data Control Unit, Stanford University Libraries, P.O. Box 20262, Palo Alto, CA 94309. (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 Website: <http://www.musicoclcusers.org>

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Chair

Marty Jenkins
Head, Technical Services
Wright State University Libraries
Phone: 937-775-4983
E-mail: martin.jenkins@wright.edu

Past Chair

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

Treasurer

Casey A. Mullin
Head, Data Control Unit
Stanford University Libraries
P.O. Box 20262
Palo Alto, CA 94309
Phone: 650-736-0849
E-mail: cmullin@stanford.edu

Secretary/Newsletter Editor

Mary Huisman
Music/Media Cataloging Coordinator
University of Minnesota
Phone: 612-625-5616
E-mail: huisml002@umn.edu

Continuing Education Coordinator

William ("Mac") Nelson
Cello Music Cataloger
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Phone: 336-334-5781
E-mail: wmlnelson@uncg.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 CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Mac Nelson

The University of North Carolina At Greensboro



At last year's meeting in Dallas, I had conversations with many of you about the implementation of RDA and its implications for the MOUG 2013 program in San Jose, CA, February 26-27. Even more of you made it clear in your meeting evaluation comments that continuing education on RDA is currently your top priority. Taking this as our point of departure, the Program Committee has spent the spring and summer in lively discussion of range of sessions and speakers we believe will engage both our technical and public services members.

While we are still working out details and sharpening the program's focus, we can assure you that the "Lightning Talks" session will be back in 2013—by very popular demand. Each of the speakers in next year's Lightning Talks will address one specific aspect of RDA, with the first speaker delivering a "talk the talk" RDA terminology guide. Also taking shape is an informative session on OCLC's WorldShare Management Services, the ILS, and music databases. This idea has emerged from Program Committee discussion of a number of questions very much on the minds of MOUG members at present: Where is the dividing line between WMS and WorldCat Local? Exactly where in development are these products now? What are the pricing structures for these products? Exactly how do these products change the way we use and pay for services

now? Is First Search going away? Is WorldCat Local going away?

In San Jose you will of course be treated to the familiar and always highly anticipated offerings—MOUG Hot Topics, the NACO-Music Project meeting, the Enhance Working Session, and the MOUG Business Meeting. Also, as many of you are aware, RDA training for catalogers is the subject of a proposed full-day preconference workshop in San Jose. This would overlap with the second day of the MOUG meeting and would be co-sponsored by the MLA-BCC, the MLA Education Committee, the MLA Educational Outreach Program Subcommittee, and MOUG. The Program Committee has been closely involved with the development of this event and is working with an eye toward meeting the needs of all MOUG members. For those planning to participate in the preconference workshop, we will offer a one-day MOUG meeting rate. For those planning to attend the second day of the MOUG meeting, we envision programming with a more public services orientation. Under consideration now is a panel discussion, with each panelist presenting briefly on specific topics such as FRBR, GLIMR, and the Public Interface, followed by a "hot topics" type session with the MOUG audience.

Members of the Program Committee look forward to MOUG 2013 in San Jose and will continue revising and refining the program until we see you there in February.

From the Chair

(Continued from page 1)

We hope that this new service will help us keep more of our current members. At the Board meeting, we discussed the fact that our membership numbers have been in steady decline for the last three years or so, and talked about ways to try to boost membership. A couple ideas were to reach out to former members whose renewals have lapsed with a request for a little information on why they have not renewed, along with a gentle request to con-

sider coming back, and to try to contact people new to the profession who might be interested in what MOUG has to offer. But of course, a theme that kept recurring in our conversation was that the best recruiting for MOUG is word of mouth. So if YOU know of someone at your institution or in your community or state who works with music materials in libraries and could benefit from MOUG membership, please tell them about us!

MOUG Hot Topics**Jay Weitz, OCLC
Vince Wortman, OCLC**

The Hot Topics session featured OCLC's Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, and Vince Wortman, product support specialist and OCLC public services representative to MOUG. This year, the majority of the session was a floor discussion on RDA practice. Prior to the discussion, Vince Wortman answered several questions about WorldCat that were submitted in advance. Vince began with an announcement about databases that MOUG 2011 attendees had suggested for inclusion in WorldCat Local. Oxford (Grove) Art Online and Oxford (Grove) Music Online are already loaded and available. Additional music-related databases, scheduled to be loaded in May, are from Alexander Street Press: African American Music Reference, American Song North America, Classical Music Library, Contemporary World Music, Garland Encyclopedia of World Music, Jazz Music Library, Music Online: Listening, Music Online: Listening Plus, and Smithsonian Global Sound for Libraries.

Two questions addressed new MARC fields related to RDA as displayed in WorldCat Local. One cataloger cited examples of RDA records where the new subfields in the 518 field (recording information) were not displayed. A more general question was how new MARC fields to accommodate RDA, including fields 33x, 34x, and 38x (attributes or characteristics of content, media, carrier, works, or expressions), will be handled. New subfields in 518 should be visible in WorldCat in May and in WorldCat Local by August. Additional fields will be evaluated along with field 518, and a list of fields and any suggestions should

be sent to Vince, the WorldCat Local list, or the WorldCat Local user support center.

Another question addressing new cataloging practice noted the critical importance of genre headings for music in the future and asked when genre headings would function similarly well to subject headings in WorldCat Local. Vince suggested looking at WorldCat Genres; the OCLC Office of Research product teams are looking at how to integrate this functionality into WorldCat Local and WorldCat.org. There was an inquiry about the "awful" AllMusic metadata in WorldCat Local that has been replacing cataloger-supplied contents notes in sound recording records. The good news from Vince is that this content will be removed as of March 2012, following the expiration of OCLC's agreement with AllMusic.

Local information is a frequent question with WorldCat Local. In response to a request for clarification on the display of local titles and uniform titles and the use of local information and local fields, Vince recommended the Local Data for WorldCat Local Quick Reference document (http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcatlocal/WCL_local_data.pdf), which describes how to make use of local fields. As of November 2010, libraries have been able to display local holdings records including volume, issue, call number, and location for all formats. As of June 2011, libraries could load, display, and search local information including local subject headings and uniform titles.

Reports from the MOUG Annual Meeting February 14-15, 2012, Dallas, Texas

Moving from WorldCat Local to FirstSearch, Vince addressed a request for an update on FirstSearch and the question of whether there will continue to be an interface with advanced search functionality for end users to search the WorldCat database. Yes, “there will definitely be a public interface available for advanced and precise searching of WorldCat.” A new interface will include features from WorldCat.org. Users will not need to authenticate to search, and the interface will allow users to search WorldCat content and link to electronic items to which the library has access. Librarians will be able to conduct index-specific or command line searching, it will be easy to link to WorldCat resource sharing or Connexion, and cataloging libraries will have the ability to view MARC records from the WorldCat interface. Twenty five libraries will be beta testing in May 2012. Vince’s authority at OCLC says to “stay tuned for exciting news on this project”; presentations on the new FirstSearch interface from ALA Midwinter will be repeated in webinars.

The remainder of the session was a floor discussion on how people are handling RDA bibliographic and authority records at their libraries and what training is taking place at libraries that are not yet using RDA. Attendees from fifteen institutions, only two of which (Stanford and University of Chicago) have implemented RDA, participated in the conversation. Stanford participated in the RDA test and has continued using RDA since then. The University of Chicago also adopted RDA but is working with a “mixed shop;” original catalogers are cataloging with RDA, but copy catalogers are still using AACR2. All other participants had not yet implemented RDA. Participants from the remainder of the libraries explained that their libraries were waiting for several things before implementing: implementation at LC, a critical mass of

libraries to implement, and availability of best practices.

Training and preparation for RDA has been a collaborative or group experience. Catalogers—original and copy—at different libraries have been viewing ALCTS and other webinars, meeting in groups for training and discussion, and working collaboratively to create and review practice records or give presentations for colleagues. (Kathy Glennan recalled searching for “a book with four authors—I don’t care what it’s about!” to use for a practice record.) Additional training at Stanford has included the JSC/LC train-the-trainer programs.

Most libraries hadn’t adopted RDA for original cataloging, but all reported that they accept RDA copy. Records are checked against the item in hand, in most cases headings are checked, and catalogers are on alert for serious errors (the word “egregious” was used several times) that require attention. Jay Weitz, fielding his only question in the session, noted that OCLC will not require Enhance participants to re-apply for Enhance status for RDA records. Damian Iseminger (New England Conservatory) pointed out that he was already able to enhance an RDA record and decided to do so to correct information that was clearly *wrong* (sound recording described as a video) and only after checking the documentation.

Even though many participants said they have not encountered a lot of RDA copy, Nancy Lorimer (Stanford University) reminded the group that she and Kevin Kishimoto (University of Chicago) have created “huge numbers” of RDA records for sound recordings; RDA records in all formats can be found by searching “dx:rda” in Connexion. Although Connexion indexes description con-

Reports from the MOUG Annual Meeting February 14-15, 2012, Dallas, Texas

ventions (040\$e), local catalogs may not. Kathy Glennan reported that is the case with the University of Maryland's system, in which RDA records music be located in Connexion and then searched by OCLC number.

There are other indexing and back-end considerations for local catalogs. Batch load profiles might need to be changed to bring in new fields such as the 3xx fields. Vendors (Marcive and possibly others) may strip out RDA fields from records before sending them to libraries, so those should be checked. Three libraries use LTI for authorities processing; Stanford selected LTI because of RDA. It may be necessary to make it clear that the desired outcome of processing is for headings in bibliographic records to match the LC/NACO authority file.

In public catalog interfaces, it remains to be seen exactly how systems or vendors will handle changes. Consensus was that vendors may err on the side of displaying everything, but that is not necessarily a desired outcome. Participants recommended checking indexing and display of the 33x fields, which may not be worth the real estate to display, especially if icons are generated from other parts of bibliographic records. On the other hand, some systems, including Primo, may hide 5xx fields, so there may be a need to adapt the out-of-the-box version. Staff should be certain to check the indexing of the descriptive information in \$i in 7xx fields, which may by de-

fault be included in an index. A check can be done by browsing "contains" or following linked headings with \$i. Casey Mullin (Stanford) offered to share the workaround for Blacklight.

Participants reported that reception from public services staff has so far been positive. Nancy Lorimer had yet to hear any feedback about records without a GMD; Kevin Kishimoto added that the music bibliographer at University of Chicago noticed the lack of GMD, but there were no complaints. The GMD is not likely to be missed in systems that use icons for content/carrier. Public services staff in general welcomed the spelling out of abbreviations and thought it would be a tremendous help to patrons.

There was a brief PCC update: PCC has stopped training for new NACO participants in AACR2. RDA NACO training for new participants will probably start in September 2012. An online, modular, training for independent NACO contributors will be available in late March. For the first time, the PCC is considering BIBCO training that includes general cataloging training to cover RDA cataloging along with BIBCO requirements. PCC Day One for RDA Authority Records will be sometime in the first quarter of 2013; there is no Day One for descriptive cataloging for BIBCO/CONSER.

*Reported by Rebecca Belford,
University at Buffalo*

Correction

On p. 8 of the June *MOUG Newsletter*, Tracey Snyder was incorrectly identified as the author of the summary of the Lightning Talks session. The actual author of the summary was Chuck Peters, Indiana University.

The Editor apologizes for this error.

MLA MUSIC DISCOVERY REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT

*Rebecca Belford, University at Buffalo
Nara L. Newcomer, East Carolina University*

A working group formed by the Music Library Association's Emerging Technologies and Services Committee has released a document, "Music Discovery Requirements," that details the specialized needs of music materials for discovery interfaces of all kinds. The document is accompanied by appendices with technical details intended to be used in conjunction with the document: index and display requirements in areas which are music-specific or particularly important for music, and MARC mapping for content and carrier. The final version and appendices are available at <http://committees.musiclibraryassoc.org/ETSC/MDR>.

The Discovery Requirements document discusses the issues related to unique needs posed by music materials, and when possible gives concrete recommendations for discovery interfaces. Many requirements are met by appropriate display and indexing, but others present more complex challenges. Given that most libraries will be dealing with large bodies of legacy data recorded according to AACR2 and encoded in MARC, particular attention is paid to MARC data and to AACR2, as well as issues related to RDA. Furthermore, because the document identifies areas where deficient data creates particular problems for discovery, those inputting or creating standards for data can use this document to identify areas where there is particular need for fuller, more consistent data.

The document is not limited to any one vendor or system. However, it can be useful to users or potential users of OCLC products in at least several ways:

- Libraries already running WorldCat Local together with a local catalog may use it to determine the most appropriate use of each catalog.
- Libraries contemplating migration to a different discovery service may use this document to assist in evaluation or comparison.
- The WorldCat Local Product Team has access the requirements document together with recommendations from MOUG, many of which are closely related to the discovery requirements outline in the MLA document.
- The document may help in the development of the revised FirstSearch interface to create a product that meets the requirements of music users.

Discovery tools like WorldCat Local/WorldCat.org have the potential to meet needs of music users, particularly in their use of faceted browsing. WorldCat is also in a unique position to eventually take advantage of the capabilities of VIAF (Virtual International Authority File) to fully and appropriately display works and expressions and to realize FRBR and FRAD principles. It is hoped that continued communication with MOUG and information in the MLA document will assist in the growth of WorldCat in all its interfaces into a tool that meets or surpasses the requirements of music users.

WorldCat Local Enhancement Recommendations for Music

*Rebecca Belford, University at Buffalo
MOUG Reference and Collection Services Coordinator*

Background

MOUG has a long history of issuing recommendations to maximize music discovery in WorldCat. From 1991 to 2006, MOUG issued recommendations for functionality in the FirstSearch interface. These culminated in the final revision of “WorldCat Enhancement Recommendations for Music” in 2007, published in issue no. 96 of the *Music OCLC Users Group Newsletter*. In 2009, the focus shifted to the WorldCat Local interface. A draft form of “WorldCat Local Enhancement Recommendations for Music” was issued by the MOUG Reference Services Committee in August 2009 with revisions to the draft made in April 2010. Since then, the committee chair or the reference and collection services coordinator have shared periodic status updates and revised recommendations with MOUG and OCLC. These have evolved following changes made by OCLC and invaluable input from the MOUG board, MOUG members, and WorldCat Local users. Thanks are also due to Vince Wortman, OCLC’s public services liaison to MOUG, who, in addition to fielding MOUG member questions at annual meetings, has communicated MOUG recommendations and questions to the WorldCat Local Product Team and in turn sought and shared responses from the Product Team, including all responses reproduced here. The recommendations listed here refer to the

WorldCat Local product, but these also apply to WorldCat.org. Issues listed will also serve to identify features to evaluate in future public WorldCat interfaces.

The most recent status report on music recommendations for WorldCat Local, issued March 14, 2012, listed recommendations roughly in priority order, grouped into critical, important, and enhancements. The WorldCat Local Product Team grouped their responses to the March document by topic; recommendations listed here are renumbered and grouped similarly, with priority indicated with each recommendation. Resolved issues and general comments from the Product Team precede the list of outstanding recommendations. Questions not included in the March 2012 report sent to OCLC appear at the end. Specific examples and resolved/unresolved status of recommendations are current in WorldCat Local/WorldCat.org as of August 19, 2012.

Improvements made by OCLC

It is a pleasure to report that the following changes made to WorldCat Local resolve enhancement recommendations for music.

- Uniform titles—name-titles and titles—in subject headings (fields 600, 630) display and function as hyperlinks.
- Production, performer, and place/date notes display (508, 511, 518 \$a).

- Nested parenthetical advanced search capability was added.
- “Editions and formats” has been clarified and options are more visible.
- Corporate names main entries (110) appear in the author facet.
- Third-party metadata: AllMusic metadata is no longer incorporated into records, meaning there is currently no external metadata that replaces or suppresses cataloger-supplied information. However, should third-party metadata from any source be added in the future, the recommendation stands that the source of the information should be displayed, and cataloger-supplied information should be displayed.

Comments from WorldCat Local Product Team

In their response to the March 2012 update on enhancement recommendations for music, the WorldCat Local Product Team included the following general comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to address the MOUG’s suggestions to enhancing WorldCat Local. We see enhancement opportunities here that seem to fall into larger categories such as **Authorities, Field/Subfield displays, Hyperlinking** enhancements. . . .

. . . [T]hese enhancement suggestions would not only affect WorldCat Local, but WorldCat.org and the future version of FirstSearch. We examine

all perspectives and considerations before moving forward on any adoption of any given enhancement suggestion before placing it into the product roadmap.

All suggestions – from the MOUG or otherwise – will continue to be considered and discussed as we move forward with the FirstSearch migration as well as overall impact on WorldCat.org/WorldCat Local.

Recommendations and WorldCat Local Product Team responses

1. Problem: Name hyperlinks lead to works by multiple people with similar names. *Critical.*

Recommendation: “Name” hyperlinks (1xx and 7xx) should lead to other bibliographic records containing the same authorized name heading with matching subfields, e.g., \$d. (i.e., it links to the “same person”)

Example: OCLC record number 213300731, author hyperlink on “John Adams” generates an author keyword search for “John” and “Adams” rather than “Adams, John, 1947-.”

2. Problem: Uniform titles and author-title pairs cannot be used as hyperlinks to search for other manifestations of the same work. *Important.*

Recommendations:

a All controlled author-title pairs (100/240, 7xx 1x \$a \$t) should be bound hotlinks in order to enable quick searches for specific works.

b) Reserve “Other title” information for title-only fields.

Note, 8/17/12: Recommendation (b) is

intended to prevent name-title pairs from being labeled as titles; generic titles linked to names are often meaningless for identification or linking without an associated name. This is secondary to the recommendation (a). MARC fields in recommendation (a) should read: 1xx/240, 7xx \$a \$t.

Note: Full display of these fields must precede or co-occur with this change. See recommendations number 4, 6, 7 below.

3. Problem: No distinction in displays of names shared by multiple people. *Important.*

Recommendation: Display personal names (100, 700, 800) with sufficient information to minimize ambiguities.

Product Team response, recommendations 1-3 (“authorities”):

Regarding the problems that relate to authorities, we recognize this is an issue for not only WorldCat Local but for all of WorldCat.org. We are planning to utilize VIAF which as a result should improve not only music-related authority issues but other authority-related improvements we are also addressing. This is a large undertaking but in the end, it will be of benefit for all users. We hope to not only gain better precision for music-related records, but for all records. Our work continues to move forward and we’ll keep you and the larger user community apprised of our progress on this project.

4. Problem: Uniform titles do not fully display, hindering identification of works in the bibliographic record. Titles in 7xx fields do not display at all;

subfields other than \$a in field 240 are omitted. *Critical.*

Recommendations: Continue to display uniform title in field 240; add display of all subfields. Display uniform titles from other controlled all fields (e.g., 6xx, 7xx) in their entirety (with all subfields) in the bibliographic record.

Examples: OCLC record number 16803012, “Concertos” displays instead of “Concertos, violins (2), string orchestra, RV512, D major; arr.” from field 240. OCLC record number 30340365, 12 analytic titles from repeated 700 fields do not display.

5. Problem: Conference names (x11) do not display as subjects, added authors, or main entries. *Critical.*

Recommendation: Display and make bound hotlinks (fields 111, 611, 711, 811).

Examples: OCLC record number 177016883, “Tanglewood (Music festival)—History” and “Berkshire Music Festival—History” in repeated 611 fields do not display. OCLC record number 18477417, “English Bach Festival” Chorus, Percussion Ensemble, and Orchestra in repeated 711 fields do not display. OCLC record number 57516614, “International Computer Music Conference (2003 : Singapore)” in field 111 does not display.

6. Problem: Musical works and expressions do not appear together with their composers, often rendering identification of works impossible. *Critical.*

Note, 8/17/12: This is particularly critical in cases with records lacking contents notes, which may be prohibited

by cataloging rules.

Recommendation: Display complete analytic and added-entry uniform titles together with the names of composers/authors when present (full 7xx \$a ... \$t display), with all subfields.

Example: OCLC record number 21844158, “Symphony no. 1 in E minor Turkish fragments ; Turkish march” appears above “Author: Mikhail Mikhaïlovich Ippolitov-Ivanov; Hui Zhu; Singapore Symphony Orchestra;” it is difficult to determine the number of works and the composer of each (in this case, three works, each by Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov).

7. Problem: Combining all names into Authors/Contributions makes recognition of individual names difficult. *Important.*

Recommendations: Display 7xx names on separate lines; display name-title added entries in separate area, using indicators to generate label if possible; utilize relator terms or codes present in records to identify roles of names/bodies in added entries. Display complete analytic and added-entry uniform titles together with the names of composers/authors when present (full 7xx \$a ... \$t display), with all subfields.

Examples: OCLC record number 48062438, over 26 names appear together in a single block. Individual names and relationships/roles are apparent only in notes; relator codes present in MARC record for 24 of these names are not utilized. OCLC record number 70511633, names in author/contributor block (here, a mix of performers and composers of works represented in added entries in

MARC record) are meaningful only with notes; names from name-title analytic entries are included but work titles are only visible in transcribed form in a contents note. Also see OCLC record number 21844158, example in recommendation number 6.

Product Team response, recommendations 6-7:

We will look further in Problems # [6], and #7 and determine if this suggestion (full or in part) can be addressed in the near term. We’ve bundled these together into one support ticket as they are so closely related.

8. Problem: Display of the title and responsibility information (245) separating title from responsibility can make interpreting records difficult. In single record display, “author” lists names from 1xx/7xx fields; “responsibility” and transcription from 245 \$c appears at end of Details. *Important.*

Recommendation: Display 245 fields together; alternately, identify 245 \$c as responsibility instead of names from 1xx/7xx fields.

10. Problem: Notes field 518 (event place/date) does not display new subfields \$b and \$c where RDA records indicate information currently in \$a. *Important.*

Recommendation: Display additional subfields: \$d \$o \$p; adding labels Date and Place before \$d and \$p, respectively, could be an enhancement.

Example: 764337591, “Recorded 2009 October-November Henry Wood Hall, London” does not display.

Product Team response, recommendation 10:

[This problem] was already represented in a support ticket. It is being currently being reprioritized among other WorldCat Local enhancements we have scheduled for FY13.

12. Problem: The musical presentation statement field (254) does not display, limiting descriptive information for scores. *Important.* Note: This field will be obsolete in new RDA records but present in unedited legacy records.

Recommendation: Display field 254.

Example: OCLC record number 436029724, “Partitur” does not display.

Product Team response, recommendations 4-12 (“field/subfield displays”):

All of these display enhancement suggestions will be taken into consideration – if not within the current version of WorldCat Local, then within the design of the ‘new’ FirstSearch interface. For your information, the ability to view the full MARC record is planned to be an option within the ‘new’ FirstSearch interface. (This function is for authorized FirstSearch users only).

13. Problem: Genre headings (655) are not linked, curtailing functionality, especially but not exclusively for motion pictures. Currently they do display but lack any hyperlink functionality. *Important.* Note: *Critical* immediately upon implementation of LC genre/form headings for music.

Recommendation: Add hyperlink functionality for genre headings.

Example: OCLC record number

271240983, genre/form terms listed are not links.

Product Team response, recommendation 13 (“hyperlinking”):

This item is currently already being discussed and we’ll communicate when we should be able to add this enhancement based upon our prioritized FY13 plan. A support ticket was created for this request.

14. Problem: Additional authors/creators (7xx) do not appear in post-search author facet.

Recommendation: Include additional authors/creators (700, 710, 711, regardless of presence of \$t) in author facet.

Product Team response:

This problem was listed together with the response related to authorities. Although display, linking, and differentiation of terms in a facet are related to authorities, the inclusion or omission of creators other than those in fields 100 or 110 in an author facet warrants discussion as a separate issue.

Enhancement recommendations

Additional recommendations for general enhancements were included in the various iterations of recommendations.

E1. Increase prominence of link to Help window in Advanced Search.

The primary reason behind this recommendation was the use of nonstandard Boolean operators for “or” and “not.” Standard operators are now employed, but a prominent help button or link is still desirable.

E2. Add Next/Previous links to facilitate navigation between detailed displays within results.

According to the March 13, 2012 “sneak peek” on the future of FirstSearch offered by OCLC, this feature will be part of the new WorldCat discovery interface.

E3. Enable prelimiting by multiple formats in Advanced Search.

The current functionality of the post-search format facet permits users to select multiple formats (score OR CD), so users have the option to select multiple format if more than one is suitable. Adding this feature to the advanced search would be an enhancement, but is not critical.

E4. Highlight search terms in retrieved records so users can quickly identify search terms, and allow users to toggle this feature on or off.

Product Team response, general enhancement recommendations E1-E4:

All of these are under strong consideration for the new version of FirstSearch.

E5. Ensure that Contents field begins on first screen before “Get This Item”; or, provide first-screen link to Contents field or complete bibliographic record.

Note, 8/17/12: Taking into consideration the response from the product team and the length of some contents notes, a link may be an acceptable or preferable solution.

Product Team response, general enhancement recommendations E5:

The 5th item is something that would require further investigation as this impacts beyond music-type information currently provided on the detailed record screen.

Additional questions and enhancement opportunities

The following, reflecting feedback from MOUG members and WorldCat Local users, were not included in the March 2012 status report sent to OCLC for comment. They have been forwarded to MOUG’s OCLC Public Services Liaison and will be revisited in future revisions and updates of enhancement recommendations.

- Explore and determine options for use of MARC fields added to accommodate RDA, particularly 33x fields related to content, media and carrier (33x and 34x) and characteristics of work and expression in 38x. Treatment of field 382 is of critical importance for music materials when Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus is implemented along with the Genre/Form Thesaurus terms for music.
- Explore the possibility of more granular formats as options in the facet, such as 78 rpm.
- In the new version of FirstSearch, will a full, non-MARC record view will be available to end users, libraries that are not authorized FirstSearch users, or in WorldCat.org?

Final note

It is clear that as changes continue to be made to the WorldCat public search interfaces, there will be many opportunities for enhancement and improvements to meet functionality requirements for different types of users. MOUG looks forward to being a part of this discussion and to continued collabora-

tion with OCLC. MOUG members and WorldCat users—especially those at institutions using WorldCat Local or that are involved in an advisory or beta testing role for the new FirstSearch interface—are encouraged to help MOUG participate in the conversion by contributing questions, thoughts, challenges, or suggestions.

Announcing the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant Call for Applications

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is now accepting applications for the **Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant**. The grant supports attendance at the annual MOUG meeting and, in recognition of Ralph's mentoring role in music librarianship, is especially intended to support newer members of the profession in both public and technical services.

The award offers a first-time MOUG attendee free conference registration for the MOUG annual meeting (February 26-27, 2013, immediately preceding the Music Library Association annual meeting); free MOUG membership for the 2013 calendar year, including three issues of the MOUG Newsletter; and reimbursement of up to \$100 in associated expenses (lodging, meals, etc.).

Preference will be given to applicants who are students, paraprofessionals, or professionals in the first five years of their professional careers; and who are likely to benefit from MOUG's educational opportunities. This includes everyone who works with music materials in libraries or in library systems, whether they are music specialists or generalists. Professional and workplace need, financial need, past training and experience, demonstration of initiative, likely further contributions to the profession, and

comments from reference letters are also considered. Applicants need not be current members of MOUG.

Applications are due **November 9, 2012** and shall consist of a letter that includes a rationale for attending the MOUG annual meeting, an explanation of financial need, a brief vita, and the name of at least one person who will submit a letter (also due **November 9**) in support of the application.

All application materials shall be sent by e-mail, either as in-text messages or as attachments in .pdf, .doc, or .docx format, to the MOUG Past Chair, Stephen Luttmann (stephen.luttmann@unco.edu). Letters of support should be sent directly by their authors, not by the applicants.

Applicants will be notified of the outcome by e-mail no later than November 30, 2012, and will be acknowledged at the MOUG 2013 annual meeting.

For more information about MOUG, please see <http://www.musicoclcusers.org>. MOUG has helped train and mentor dozens of music library professionals, and has helped shape the OCLC products and services we use every day. Please help distribute this announcement as widely as possible.

NEWS FROM OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz

Jay Jordan Will Continue as President and CEO of OCLC

The OCLC Board of Trustees has concluded that rather than moving forward with the appointment of Jack B. Blount as its President and CEO, it is in the best interest of OCLC to have Jay Jordan continue serving in these capacities. Mr. Jordan has agreed to postpone his retirement to continue leading OCLC. The OCLC Board of Trustees believes Mr. Jordan's strong track record, his skills as a leader, and his ability to identify and navigate emerging trends, make him uniquely qualified to serve the nearly 72,000 institutions that use OCLC services. Board Chair Larry Alford said, "The Board of Trustees has complete confidence in the global management team and

the 1,250 employees, who are working diligently to serve libraries around the world and fulfill OCLC's mission and goals." Mr. Alford also said, "The Board is committed to an orderly transition of leadership and will be assessing its succession planning process as it moves forward." Mr. Jordan is the fourth president in OCLC's 43-year history. He came to OCLC after a 24-year career with Information Handling Services (IHS), an international publisher of databases, and prior to joining IHS, Mr. Jordan held positions with the 3M Corporation in Europe and the United States.

OCLC Opens Data Center in Toronto, Canada

As part of a plan to operate local and global systems at Webscale service levels, OCLC is now operating a new data center in Toronto, Canada. The Toronto center becomes the fifth international data center in OCLC's worldwide network and will enhance the cooperative's ability to deliver OCLC WorldShare Management Services to member libraries in Canada. Over the past eight months, OCLC opened data centers in Sydney, Australia, and London, England, while maintaining its two primary operations data centers in the United States. Another data center in Europe is scheduled to come online in 2013. The Toronto center employs best-in-class technologies to ensure the highest levels of performance, reliability, scalability, and cost-effectiveness. It also provides services 24/7 and is backed up by uninterruptible power systems and redundant heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems. In addition, the new center enables OCLC to comply with access and data privacy requirements in Canada and adhere to tech-

nical standards that promote the cost-effective, worldwide sharing of information across platforms, scripts, languages, and cultural materials. The new data center will support expansion of WorldShare Management Services, which provide a Web-based environment that streamlines cataloguing, acquisitions, license management, and circulation, and offer a next-gen discovery tool for library users. Both replacing and standing apart from traditional integrated library systems, OCLC WorldShare Management Services enable libraries to share infrastructure costs and resources, as well as collaborate in ways that free them from the restrictions of local hardware and software. WorldShare Management Services also offer the ability to manage collections of print, electronic, and digital material from start-to-finish, and the integration of license management features into interlibrary loan processes set WorldShare Management Services apart from legacy systems.

OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update

In May 2012, OCLC implemented the changes related to the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2012, which are detailed in OCLC Technical Bulletin 261 (<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/261/default.htm>). This installation includes MARC 21 Updates No. 13 (dated September 2011) and No. 14 (dated April 2012), code list additions and changes published chiefly since August 2011, and other suggestions from WorldCat users and OCLC staff. Many of these elements, including those from MARC 21 Updates No. 13 and 14, are related to Resource Description and Access (RDA). Among the points of interest:

- Implementation of new subfield \$0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) in fields 034 “Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data” and 043 (Geographic Area Code) in the Bibliographic and Authority Formats.
 - Implementation of new subfields \$k (Language Code of Intermediate Translations), \$m (Language Code of Original Accompanying Materials Other Than Librettos), and \$n (Language Code of Original Libretto) in field 041 (Language Code) in the Bibliographic format.
 - Implementation of new First Indicator “7” (Other Edition Specified in Subfield \$2) in fields 082 (Dewey Decimal Classification Number) and 083 (Additional Dewey Decimal Classification Number) in the Bibliographic and Authority Formats.
 - Implementation of new subfield \$q (Assigning Agency) in field 084 (Other Classification Number) in the Bibliographic format.
 - Implementation of new fields 264 (Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture, and Copyright Notice), 344 (Sound Characteristics), 345 (Projection Characteristics of Moving Image), 346 (Video Characteristics), 347 (Digital File Characteristics), and 377 (Associated Language) in the Bibliographic format. OCLC strongly recommends not using the new Bibliographic field 264 until guidelines for its use are available.
 - Implementation of new subfields \$j (Generation), \$k (Layout), \$m (Book Format), \$n (Font Size), \$o (Polarity), \$O (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number), and \$2 (Source) in field 340 (Physical Medium) in the Bibliographic format.
 - Implementation of new fields 368 (Other Corporate Body Attributes) and 378 (Fuller Form of Personal Name) in the Authority format.
 - Implementation of new subfield \$l (Language term) in field 377 (Associated Language) in the Authority format.
 - Implementation of new indicators and new subfields \$b (Soloist), \$d (Doubling Instrument), \$n (Number of Performers of the Same Medium), \$p (Alternative Medium of Performance), \$s (Total Number of Performers), and \$v (Note) in field 382 (Medium of Performance) in the Bibliographic and Authority formats. Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) participants should not implement the changes to Authority field 382 until OCLC announces that implementation and testing by all NACO nodes is complete.
- Implementation of new subfields \$d (Thematic Index Code), \$e (Publisher Associated with Serial or Opus Number), and \$2 (Source Code) in field 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work) in the Bibliographic and Authority formats.

OCLC Adds Linked Data to WorldCat.org

OCLC is taking the first step toward adding linked data to WorldCat by appending Schema.org descriptive mark-up to WorldCat.org pages. WorldCat.org now offers the largest set of linked bibliographic data on the Web. With the addition of Schema.org mark-up to all book, journal, and other bibliographic resources in WorldCat.org, the entire publicly available version of WorldCat is now available for use by intelligent Web crawlers, like Google and Bing, that can make use of this metadata in search indexes and other applications. Commercial developers that rely on Web-based services have been exploring ways to exploit the potential of linked data. The Schema.org initiative—launched in 2011 by Google, Bing and Yahoo! and later joined by Yandex—provides a core vocabulary for markup that helps search engines and other Web crawlers more directly make use of the underlying data that powers many online services. OCLC is working with the Schema.org community to develop and add a set of vocabulary extensions to WorldCat data. Schema.org and library specific extensions will provide a valuable two-way bridge between the library community and the consumer Web. Schema.org is working with a number of other industries to provide similar sets of extensions for other specific use cases. The opportunities that linked data pro-

vide to the global library community are in line with OCLC's core strategy of collaboratively building Webscale with libraries. Adding linked data to WorldCat records makes those records more useful—especially to search engines, developers, and services on the wider Web, beyond the library community. This will make it easier for search engines to connect non-library organizations to library data. OCLC sees Schema.org as a timely and significant development toward linked data technology adoption that will provide recognizable benefits for libraries. Further demonstrating its role in providing linked library data, OCLC has recently announced that the full set of DDC 23 --more than 23,000 assignable numbers and captions in English--is now available as linked data. OCLC is committed to the stability and improved functionality of linked bibliographic data. It is likely that such markup may evolve over the coming months as the community develops a common understanding. This release should be considered experimental and subject to change. This linked data release of WorldCat.org is made available by OCLC under the Open Data Commons Attribution License. (<http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/by/summary/>).

Issue 5 of OCLC Research Quarterly Highlights Now Available

The periodic bulletin *OCLC Research Quarterly Highlights* gathers items from the previous quarter of work in OCLC Research, the OCLC Innovation Lab, and the OCLC Research Library Partnership. Issue 5 covers the period April-June 2012. Highlights include:

Jim Michalko, in a guest essay on Mobilizing Unique Materials.

Senior Research Scientist Jean Godby on her interest in language, linguistics, and language processing at OCLC Research.

Featured prototypes and publications.

A recap of OCLC Research News, Events, Webcasts, and Presentations.

Featured activities from the six themes of our agenda of current work.

The current issue of *OCLC Research Quarterly Highlights* is available at <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/newsletters/quarterlyhighlights/current.htm>. Previous issues are available at <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/newsletters/quarterlyhighlights/default.htm>.

New Report: *Print Management at “Mega-Scale”*

The report *Print Management at “Mega-scale:” A Regional Perspective on Print Book Collections in North America* provides insight into the characteristics of regionally consolidated print collections, key relationships across these collections, and their implications for system-wide issues such as information access, mass digitization, resource sharing, and preservation of library resources. Written by OCLC Researchers Brian Lavoie, Constance Malpas, and JD Shipengrover, *Print Management at “Mega-scale”* combines urbanist Richard Florida's mega-regions concept with WorldCat data to construct twelve regionally consolidated print book collections. The analysis of the regional collections is synthesized into a set of stylized facts describing their salient characteristics, as well as key cross-regional relation-

ships among the collections. The stylized facts motivate a number of key implications regarding access, management, preservation, and other topics considered in the context of a network of regionally consolidated print book collections. The report also presents a simple framework to organize the landscape of print book collection consolidation models, as well as to clarify and distinguish basic assumptions regarding print consolidation. *Print Management at “Mega-scale”* provides a unique perspective on the new geography of library service provision, in which services and collections are increasingly organized “above the institution.” Read the report at <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2012/2012-05r.htm>. Learn more about the OCLC research activity associated with this report at <http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/mega-scale/default.htm>.

New Release of WorldCat Digital Collection Gateway

OCLC is pleased to announce a new release of WorldCat Digital Collection Gateway release (version 2.8). The Digital Collection Gateway is the self-service tool that enables repository managers to expose their library's, museum's, or archives' metadata through WorldCat and all of its syndicates. With this new release, OCLC has added more features to support increasing the visibility of unique, open access digital collections, including:

- **Thumbnail mapping.** If your repository metadata includes thumbnail URLs you can now map that URL so the thumbnail will be displayed in WorldCat Local and WorldCat.org.
- **A-Z List.** Any repository you've registered is always included in the A-Z List of contributors to the OAIster collection in WorldCat.
- **Collection descriptions.** If your repository includes descriptions of its collections in the OAI ListSets response those descriptions are included in WorldCat as collection description records. The Digital Collection Gateway adds search links to retrieve all the items in a collection, and each item record includes a link to its associated collection description.

In addition, these Digital Collection Gateway features, which were released earlier in 2012, have been enhanced for better performance in version 2.8:

- **Search capability added to metadata map function.** Users can now search for a specific OAI record identifier when editing the metadata map for a collection.
- **More MARC notes fields available for mapping.** When a user selects More -> Show Unmapped Fields they are presented with many more MARC "notes" field options to support digital content descriptions. New fields include 518, 520, 530, 533, and 820.
- **Detailed help for Repository Registration Test.** When a user is registering a new repository they are presented with detailed troubleshooting help after their repository has had the Digital Collection Gateway's compatibility tests run against it.
- **Gateway updates repository display name if it changes.** If a repository changes the display name of the repository in the OAI-PMH Identify response, the Digital Collection Gateway will pick up this change and use it in all user interface displays. Prior to this the Digital Collection Gateway saved the display name at registration time and never updated it.

Many thanks to all the Digital Collection Gateway users, CONTENTdm and other OAI repository administrators, who suggested these useful feature enhancements!

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Jay Weitz, OCLC



Battling for Prominence

Question: I am not sure about what to do in the case where a performer is singly mentioned on the chief source, but the overall performer on the entire disc is the group he or she is in. Example:

245 10 Special edition \$h [sound recording] /
\$cJack DeJohnette.

511 0 Performed by Jack DeJohnette's Special
Edition.

The songs were composed by DeJohnette or by John Coltrane, who is not in the group. Some of us here feel there are almost two performers here, DeJohnette, who gets top billing, and the group. A comparable example might be a disc that has Miles Davis on the chief source, but shows on the container and throughout the program notes that the Miles Davis Quartet is the performer (and Miles Davis did not compose all the pieces.) Should the main entry be the performer or the group?

Answer: Under AACR2, the choice of the main entry in this case would be most dependent upon the elusive notion of “prominence” (LCRI 21.23C): “In judging relative prominence on the basis of wording, layout, and typography, consider names printed in the same size and style of lettering and in association with one another to have equal prominence. When names appear in the same size and style of lettering but in different areas of the same source of information, consider those in a location implying superiority (e.g., a higher position) to have greater prominence. Do not consider names near the beginning of a list or sequence to have greater prominence than those near the end.” You will need to make a judgment regarding which entity is presented on the resource with more prominence: DeJohnette himself or the group as a whole. Whichever wins the prominence battle would legitimately be the main entry. Hope that helps at least a little; it’s not much to go on.

The Mouth and Pharynx ARE Part of the Upper Gastrointestinal Tract, Right?

Question: I’m staring at two scores of music by “Fanny Hensel geb. Mendelssohn” (as the title page has it). The first: [big letters] Three Songs on Poems by Lord Byron [some space, then smaller letters] für hohe Singstimme und Klavier The second: [big letters] Three Songs on Poems by Lord Byron [next line, smaller letters] for Mezzo-soprano or Baritone ... [no mention of the piano]. The songs are the same in each. The high voice version is the original, the lower voice version is transposed. I’m trying to decide whether the vocal range goes in the 250 or not. That seems to hinge on whether the voice range phrase is grammatically linked to the title or other title info. The problem is, my grammar is weak, or perhaps I’m just not sure where the line is drawn on “grammatically linked.” I don’t think the mere presence of für/for is enough. You can have stand-alone statements “For high voice,” “For low voice,” etc. But in the first one, it seems odd to pull out “für hohe Singstimme” in the 250, leaving “und Klavier” dangling; and I’m pretty sure I’ve never seen “für hohe

Singstimme und Klavier” in a 250. The second, however, doesn’t have that problem. My gut says to leave these statements in the 245 subfield \$b, but my gut doesn’t know why. Do you?

Answer: My reading of “grammatically linked” (LCRI 5.2B2) is that it is precisely the presence of “for” or some other preposition (or their equivalents in other languages) that relates the voice range to the title proper, other title information, or statement of responsibility that is the requirement. The LCRI actually makes the point of referring to “a statement designating the voice range (*as distinguished from a statement of medium of performance*)” (emphasis mine), so as to exclude such cases as your “für hohe Singstimme und Klavier” from consideration as an edition statement. My gut and yours agree that both of the statements in question belong in field 245 subfield \$b.

Questions & Answers
More Proliferating MP3s?

Question: I'm hoping you can help me. I have an optical disc which contains MP3 files of music. What is the correct way to code this in MARC? He is my attempt:

- Sound Recording workform.
- Type: "j".
- 006: Type "m" and File "h".
- 007 for Electronic Resource.
- 300: 1 computer disc (9 files) : digital, mp3 file ; 4 ¼ in.

Does this seem correct, or should I use "1 sound disc" in the 300? And last week, I cataloged a book with an accompanying disc of MP3 files. So, would that require an additional 006 for the sound recording?

Answer: For an optical disc containing musical MP3 files, you would use the musical Sound Recording workform (Type "j"). Include an Electronic Resource 006 for the electronic aspects, coded as you've suggested. Include both an Electronic Resource 007 and a Sound Recording 007. In the 300 field, you may describe the disc following either of the options noted in 9.5B1 and its LCRI, "1 computer optical disc" or using an appropriate "term in common usage" for the physical medium of your disc (such as "CD-ROM"). You can include the number of files parenthetically "if readily available and considered to be important" (9.5B4). The rest of your 300 field is correct, except that "MP3" should be capitalized. In an AACR2 record, the GMD would be "[electronic resource]". For a book with an accompanying disc of MP3 files, a Sound Recording 006 would be advisable.

An ISBN Suggestion, with Qualifications

Question: I am cataloging an audiobook titled *Outrageous Fortunes*, by Daniel Altman, read by William Hughes; OCLC #650217760. There are four sets of ISBNs in the OCLC record. The top set, ending 275 (for the 13-digit) matches the ISBN on my item. By looking at other formats for this title, I have discovered that the 2nd set, ending 282, is for MP3 files stored on a CD-ROM; and the fourth set, ending 251, is for the cassette. I can find no version that matches the third set. A search on that set of ISBNs brings up only this record. I found a similar ISBN for the electronic audiobook; the print book editions have ISBNs that differ significantly. None of the other formats—print, electronic, or sound—have more than one set of ISBNs. We have seen the opposite situation in books. The hardback book will have an ISBN for itself, but also print in the hardback the ISBNs for the paperback and/or the electronic book. We include them all, as they appear on the item we are cataloging, but put the ones for the versions we don't actually have in subfield \$z. This follows OCLC's suggested practice. But I have only one ISBN on my item. It's the record that has all the extras. Is there any reason to keep all the ISBNs? I was thinking of axing them

and replacing the record. There are some suspect outfits in the 040.

Answer: It so happens that recently, several of us here were treated to a webinar from the Book Industry Study Group entitled "Understanding BISG's Policy for Identifying Digital Products." The disc in question isn't an electronic resource, but especially after that webinar, absolutely nothing regarding ISBNs would surprise me. The earliest iteration of the record that I can still access in our Journal History dates from 2011 January 4 and contains the first four ISBNs and only the first 040 subfield \$d. The other four ISBNs transferred from #650219995 when it was merged on 2011 March 31; aside from the differing ISBNs (which alone would not justify separate records), the merge seems to be valid. My suggestion would be to remove locally the ISBNs that don't apply to your resource, but to leave them all in the master record. The ones that you've identified as belonging to other versions of the resource (MP3s, cassettes, etc.) can be moved to subfield \$z and parentheti-

The Locally Reproduced Frown

Question: I'm cataloging a CD containing the recorded content of an LP; the CD was produced locally. I'm adding a 534 note describing the original LP. Here is what the field looks like at the moment:

534 \$p Originally issued: \$c New York, N.Y. : S&R Records, [1972]. \$e 1 sound disc : analog, 33 1/3 rpm ; 12 in. \$o No. 752 \$o C 10603

In the subfield \$o, do I need to add "S&R Records" before giving the number, even though the publisher is included in the subfield \$c?

Answer: Under AACR2, the standard practice for this sort of local tangible reproduction would be to follow LCRI 1.11A, describing the original in the body of the record (including the 028, 260, and 300) and describing the reproduction in field 533. If you have local policy reasons for doing otherwise and choose to go the 534 route, we can take a cue from the example of subfield \$o in MARC 21 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd534.html>) and include the name of the record label in subfield \$o. That would be coding by example rather than the frowned-upon cataloging by example.

Singing the Praises of Greater Specificity

Question: It seems the 041 subfield \$d tends not to be added on bibliographic records for popular music. For example, if there is a CD of popular music where lyrics are included on the insert, the 041 only has a \$e, rather than also a \$d for the singing text. Is it just assumed that popular music has singing text? Anyway, thought I'd check on that if there is a special practice for popular music recordings that I'm not aware of.

Answer: Although the name of field 041 subfield \$d is somewhat ambiguous ("Language code of sung or spoken text"), the MARC 21 definition of the subfield clarifies that the subfield is used "for the audible portion of an item, usually the sung or spoken content of a sound recording or computer file," rather than any eye-readable text, the language(s) of which would be coded in subfield(s) \$e. In the past, when the single code in the Language fixed field (008/35-37) covered all the languages associated with a sound recording (that is, the sung lyrics, the printed lyrics,

and the accompanying program notes are all in English, for example) one didn't even bother with field 041 because all relevant subfields would simply repeat the same Language Code. The fixed field Language Code by itself was assumed to cover the language of the audible, sung text. As it says in the MARC 21 definition of 008/35-37, "For music, the predominant language of the sung or spoken text associated with the score or sound recording is recorded in 008/35-37." As we've moved toward the greater specificity in our coding inspired by FRBR and RDA, which allows us in this instance to more closely associate particular languages with particular aspects of a resource, more catalogers are coding all of those relevant subfields even in cases where they would all contain the identical Language Code. That would apply to all sound recordings, not just popular music, but this evolution in practice might explain some of what you're seeing.

Questions & Answers

Clear Title

Question: When a spiral-bound score comes with a clear cover, is THAT the cover? Is the first printed page the cover? Or is that the title page? I'm thinking cataloging-wise: "cover title" or no "cover title"?

Answer: Here's my take under AACR2. Keeping in the spirit of LCRI 6.0B1 for sound recordings ("For compact discs and cassettes, consider information which can be read

through the closed container (including information on the front cover of a booklet inserted in the container) to be on the container"), a "cover" read through a clear plastic cover is still a cover. So a "cover title" note would be appropriate. To my mind, this is in keeping with the general AACR2 notion in 0.23 to "Use the chapters in Part I alone or in combination as the specific problem demands."

Performance Enhancement

Question: My mind is blanking and the example in BFAS doesn't quite show me what I need to know. Do you give a second subfield \$r for performers in "enhanced" contents notes after the composer? For example, which is correct?

505 00 \$t Title / \$r composer (performer) \$g
(duration) –

Or

505 00 \$t Title / \$r composer \$r (performer) \$g
(duration) –

Answer: Any statements of responsibility that are not separated by either title (subfield \$t) or miscellaneous (subfield \$g) data – that is, any adjacent statements of responsibility - - would be placed in the same subfield \$r in an "enhanced" contents note. Hence, your first example would be correct. By contrast, adjacent titles are separately subfielded. Just to make things confusing.

If RDA is All About Relationships, Is Everything RDA-Related?

Question: I'm cataloging a CD containing the recorded content of an LP; the CD was produced locally. I'm adding a 534 note describing the original LP. Here is what the field looks like at the moment:

534 \$p Originally issued: \$c New York, N.Y.
: S&R Records, [1972]. \$e 1 sound disc : ana-
log, 33 1/3 rpm ; 12 in. \$o No. 752 \$o C 10603

In the subfield \$o, do I need to add "S&R Records" before giving the number, even though the publisher is included in the subfield \$c?

Answer: Under AACR2, the standard practice for this sort of local tangible reproduction would be to follow LCRI 1.11A, describing the original in the body of the record (including the 028, 260, and 300) and describing the reproduction in field 533. If you have local policy reasons for doing otherwise and choose to go the 534 route, we can take a cue from the example of subfield \$o in MARC 21 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd534.html>) and include the name of the record label in subfield \$o. That would be coding by example rather than the frowned-upon cataloging by example.

For Music Scholars · Librarians · Performers · Faculty Members

Notes

Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association



Your Indispensable Companion For:

- Scholarly Articles
- Score Reviews
- Book Reviews
- Sound Recording Reviews
- Digital Media Reviews
- Video Reviews
- Lists of New Publications
- Music Publisher Information
- Advertisements for Books, Recordings, Scores, Journals, and Other Services

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Annual membership in the Music Library Association (includes a subscription to NOTES): Individuals, \$100.00; Institutions, \$135.00; Students, \$45.00; Retirees, \$70.00; Corporate Members, \$460.00; Corporate Patrons, \$760.00. Annual U.S. subscription without membership: Individuals, \$85.00; Institutions, \$100.00. Postage (surface mail) supplement for Canadian and other foreign addresses: \$10.00. Recent single issues are available at \$20.00 each + \$7 shipping and handling (\$0.75 for each additional issue). 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.

Mary Huisman
MOUG Newsletter Editor
160 Wilson Library
University of Minnesota
309 19th Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUEST

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: Casey A. Mullin, MOUG Treasurer, Head, Data Control Unit, Stanford University Libraries, P.O. Box 20262, Palo Alto, CA 94309