From the Chair
Casey Mullin
Western Washington University

As I write this on the morning of August 21st, the moon and Earth are beginning their tandem journey from west to east, casting a magnificent shadow over the continental United States. Here in Bellingham, it will reach .89 magnitude (enough to prompt me to draw my east-facing window shades for fear of eye damage!). Just over 250 miles south of here, closer to the zone of totality, is Portland, Oregon, where MOUG and MLA are preparing for another exciting joint annual meeting (see Molly O’Brien’s column on page 8 for more information). Along with the usual cavalcade of thought-provoking, dynamic sessions, we will be celebrating MOUG’s 40th anniversary. Plans are underway for a splendid reception on Tuesday evening, at a nearby offsite restaurant. In addition to offering food, drink and merry-making with your fellow music enthusiasts, this event will honor MOUG’s storied history. Specific information about scheduling and other details is forthcoming; stay tuned! (And don’t forget that we are meeting a month earlier than usual!)

We will all remember “where we were” during the Total Eclipse of 2017, just as we all cherish memories of our beloved organization. Won’t you please share your favorite MOUG memories with us? Our Social Media Coordinator Michelle Hahn (whose column on page 7 will inspire you to action) has mounted a web form where you can easily do so. Visit http://tinyurl.com/MOUGat40, early and often! If you are inclined to honor MOUG with a monetary donation, Steve Luttmann explains how to do that on page 5.

If you are considering joining us in Portland, but travel costs are a concern, we invite you to see page 4 for details about the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant and its newly-revised eligibility requirements (hint, they’re more favorable). We are perpetually grateful for the financial generosity of our members that makes the grant possible. Many of our recent RPTG awardees have quickly gone on to serve MOUG in various capacities. Thank you for investing in MOUG’s future!

(Continued on page 3)
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: Jennifer Vaughn, Syracuse University Libraries, 222 Waverly Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13244.

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 Tomoko Shibuya, MOUG Treasurer, Metadata and Discovery Services, Northwestern University Libraries, 1970 Campus Dr., Evanston, IL, 60208. (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 501(c)(3) 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
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At the MOUG Executive Board meeting in July in Columbus, we were treated to the usual visit of OCLC’s recently-renovated headquarters, including the OCLC Library, Archives and Museum and one of OCLC’s state-of-the-art data centers. During our visit, we continued the recent tradition of taking a meeting with OCLC product developers, including Jay Holloway (Product Analyst, End User Services), who is also MOUG’s recently-appointed public services liaison. On page 6, Nara Newcomer gives a detailed report of that visit and the latest in the ongoing work of the Reference, Discovery and Collection Committee.

Yours truly will have the privilege of attending OLAC’s conference in Richmond, Virginia in October. In addition to learning new things about special formats cataloging (my current job has me overseeing map and video cataloging in addition to serving as the resident music cataloger), I will have the opportunity to chat informally with our OLAC colleagues about topics of mutual interest. In addition, select board members from both organizations will be gathering for a conference call in the near future to further explore the ideas put forth in past discussions. Many thanks to everyone who participated in the MOUG-OLAC survey last fall and the ensuing conversation during MOUG’s meeting in Orlando in February. We look forward to sharing the fruits of that discussion with the membership soon.

In the mean time, enjoy your 10-digit OCLC numbers, and I’ll see you on the flip side!

MOUG Board Visits OCLC Headquarters

MOUG Board at OCLC HQ

Also pictured: OCLC HQ main lobby & vintage OCLC terminals.

Thanks to Casey and Alan for the photographs.
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 free conference registration for the MOUG annual meeting (January 30-31, 2018); reimbursement of up to $200 in associated expenses (lodging, meals, etc.); and one year’s free membership in MOUG, including three issues of the MOUG Newsletter.

Eligibility: Students, paraprofessionals, and professionals in the first five years of their careers who are likely to benefit from MOUG’s educational opportunities are eligible to apply. This includes everyone who works with music materials in libraries or 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. Preference will be given to applicants who will be attending the MOUG annual meeting for the first time (this means that an applicant who meets the preceding conditions and who has attended a previous MOUG annual meeting is eligible to apply), and to applicants who have not previously been awarded a Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant.

Applications are due October 1, 2017 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 October 1) 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 Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Alan Ringwood (a.ringwood@austin.utexas.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 1, 2017.

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.

Past Award Recipients

2017:
Jen Bort, Central New York Library Resources Council
Clara Burns, University of Colorado Boulder
Synae Yoon, Southern Methodist University

2016:
Alyssa Hislop, Project Sound Recording Cataloger, Stanford University
Laura Thompson, Reference/Music Librarian, Central Michigan University
Rahni Kennedy, Temporary Music Cataloging/Metadata Specialist, Southern Methodist University

2015:
Anna Alfeld LoPrete, Music Cataloger, Indiana University
Colin Bitter, Graduate Library Assistant, Music Library, University of North Texas
Sophie Rondeau, Sound Recordings Cataloger, Syracuse University

2014:
Elizabeth Hille Cribbs, Cataloging (Music) Librarian, Northern Illinois University
Chris Diamond, Library Information Specialist IV, Baylor University
Keith Knop, Associate Music Cataloger, Florida State University
Jennifer L. Vaughn, Technical Specialist, Syracuse University Libraries
Elin Williams, Music Librarian, Victoria Conservatory of Music (British Columbia)
Mark Zelesky, Music Circulation and Stacks Manager, Rowan University

2013:
Claire Marsh, Senior Librarian for Library Systems and Projects, Jazz Archivist, Leeds College of Music
Christina Linklater, Project Music Cataloger, Harvard University
Jacey Kepich, Digital Imaging Technician, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Karla Jurgemeyer, Cataloging and Acquisitions Associate, St. Olaf College
Kristen Heider, Music and Digital Resources Cataloging/Metadata Specialist, Southern Methodist University

2012:
Sonia Archer-Capuzzo, Library Technician and Cataloger, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

2011:
Sally Bauer, Music/Media Cataloger, New York Public Library
Sandra Schipior, Cataloger, Juilliard School of Music
Tim Smolko, Library Associate (Acquired Music Cataloger), University of Georgia

Papakhian Travel Grant
(Continued from page 4)

MOUG Fundraising Update
Stephen Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado)

The Challenge is back!

Some news from the 2017 annual meeting: This time six of the “MOUG Elders” -- Laura Gayle Green, Neil Hughes, Steve Luttmann, Ruthann McTyre, Mark Scharff, Jay Weitz – have teamed up to match your donations at 200% until we reach a total of $15,000. If you pledge more than $150, you can pay off over a period of three years (ending December 31, 2019).

Send your pledges to MOUG Treasurer Tomoko Shibuya (t-shibuya@northwestern.edu). To donate directly, just go to http://musicoclcusers.org/community/donate/. You may pledge or donate to either the Papakhian Travel Grant Fund or the MOUG General Fund in order to take advantage of this matching opportunity. And remember: All donations to MOUG are tax deductible!

Help give MOUG (and the Papakhian Travel Grant Fund) another little push on the way to stability and sustainability!
Reference, Discovery, and Collection (RDC) work this summer focused on optimizing WorldCat Discovery for music. As you may know, OCLC currently offers both FirstSearch and WorldCat Discovery as public-facing interfaces to WorldCat and other content. For details, see OCLC’s “Frequently Asked Questions: Next Steps for WorldCat Discovery and FirstSearch” https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/worldcat-discovery/WCD-FirstSearch-FAQs.pdf MOUG’ers will be happy to know that MOUG’s own former RDC Coordinator Rebecca Belford serves on the FirstSearch Advisory Group which is assisting with plans for FirstSearch.

The 2016 OCLC Search and Discovery Task Force Report is the primary basis for RDC work. This summer, RDC Committee members posted the Task Force’s fourteen highest priority recommendations to OCLC’s Community Center where the postings gathered comments and ratings from the music community and beyond. The reports, details, and links to the full text of the recommendations and all reports mentioned in this article are on the MOUG Reference, Discovery, and Collections web page http://musicoclcusers.org/resources/discovery-reference-collections/. Thank you to all who commented! It is not too late to add more comments.

The July MOUG Board meeting provided the opportunity to discuss WorldCat Discovery in person with three representatives from OCLC’s End User Services Team: Jay Holloway (Product Manager, End User Services, as well as MOUG’s own OCLC Reference, Discovery, and Collection Liaison), Bridget Dauer (Senior Product Analyst for discovery services), and Tom Haney (Senior Project Manager, End User Services.) At that meeting we agreed to prioritize six recommendations: three that received the most votes in the Community Center (numbers 1-3 below), plus three others of MOUG’s own choosing (numbers 4-6 below).

1. Display subfields $b, $c, $d, and $q in name headings, to allow for identification and differentiation of names. For linked searches generated from displayed controlled names, search on all name subfields within the field as a single phrase to link to the correct entity. Note: $k is removed from the original recommendation. While $k is infrequently used in 110, adding $k would create problems because of the frequent use in 700 name-title headings for title (not name) data, specifically $k Selections.

2. Display all instances of the 028 field (publisher number) when present.

3. Treat search strings entered in separate lines of the Advanced Search as if there are parentheses around the set of all terms entered within a single search box - i.e. support nested searching in advanced search.

4. When fields 700, 710, or 711 contain subfield $t, display all title-related subfields (currently $t, $k, $l, $m, $n, $o, $p, $r, $s), together with the name (all name-related subfields).

5. Change the facet option for “music” to “music recording.”

6. Display 245 subfields together; alternatively, identify 245 subfield $c as responsibility instead of names from 1xx/7xx.

Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator
Nara Newcomer
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Dewey Decimal Collection at OCLC Headquarters Library, Dublin, Ohio (photo credit: Casey Mullin)
While we did not set implementation timelines, I am encouraged to see these recommendations prioritized. Number 1 addresses the infamous “John Adams problem,” so-called because it is well exemplified by the challenge of distinguishing materials associated with the composer (Adams, John, 1947-) from those associated with the two U.S. presidents or the myriad of other people named “John Adams.” Numbers 2, 4, and 6 encourage display of vital information for identifying and selecting music. Number 5 would harmonize Boolean searching with database norms, improving the user experience far beyond music. Read the full recommendations in the OCLC Community Center, which OCLC now uses as an important place to gather input and share information. Visit https://www.oclc.org/community/home.en.html to set up your login. All you need is an OCLC authorization (100-xxx-xxx) and password.

The MOUG Board and OCLC staff also discussed OCLC’s work on implementing MOUG’s 2015 and 2017 WorldCat Discovery Display Preference for Medium of Performance (for MARC 382). I shared OCLC numbers of records containing various 382 situations with OCLC staff for testing and look forward to implementation of our Medium of Performance recommendations soon.

The Reference, Discovery, and Collection front changes rapidly! For latest on WorldCat Discovery and music, watch MOUG-L. To receive WorldCat Discovery updates beyond music, sign up for OCLC’s “Discovery and Reference” email updates at https://www.oclc.org/en/email/subscribe.html and watch the OCLC Community Center for release notes and other updates.

It may seem unbelievable, but MOUG is already turning 40! As members and subscribers to this elite organization, you may also think this is unbelievable: WE WANT TO HEAR ABOUT YOUR MOUG-ING!

If you’ve been a member for 10 minutes, or a member for 40 years, we encourage you to submit your memories or favorite moments in your MOUG history. What made you interested in MOUG? Who encouraged you to take part? What was your favorite presentation from a meeting? What has been your favorite thing about MOUG? What do you love about it? What keeps you paying your dues or attending meetings? How has MOUG supported your work? What do you think is the best thing MOUG has accomplished? What do you consider MOUG to be for you? Etc. etc. etc.

There is no such thing as a small memory. There is no such thing as an unimportant thought. There is no such thing as a mundane recollection. At least not in this celebration! “I found the discussion about the display of 382 fields in WorldCat interesting” is NOT beyond the scope of this request.

So, please tell us everything that brings MOUG to mind! Send us your pictures! Do an oral history interview! Be a part of something big!
OCLC Celebrates 50 Years of Innovation, Collaboration with Libraries Worldwide

OCLC, the library technology and research organization that changed the way libraries work, is celebrating 50 years of innovation and collaboration with libraries around the world. On July 6, 1967, the nonprofit Ohio College Library Center was established to create a shared electronic library for Ohio colleges and universities. Frederick Kilgour, founder and first President, had a plan to build a shared, online cataloging system that would effectively merge library catalogs through a computer network and database so that libraries could work collaboratively, save time, and share resources.

What began 50 years ago as a regional computer system for 54 Ohio colleges has become OCLC, a global library cooperative that provides shared technology services, original research, and community programs to over 16,000 libraries in 120 countries. Thousands of libraries around the world use OCLC services to locate, acquire, catalog, lend, preserve, and manage library materials and collections. Researchers, students, faculty, scholars, professional librarians, and other information seekers use OCLC services to obtain bibliographic, abstract, and full-text information. The OCLC Online Union Catalog began operation in 1971. Catalogers at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio, were first to catalog a book using the online cataloging system. That database, now known as WorldCat, is the world's most comprehensive database of information about library collections.

Today, WorldCat comprises more than 396 million records representing more than 2.5 billion titles in libraries worldwide. Libraries cooperatively contribute, enhance, and share bibliographic data through WorldCat, connecting people to cultural and scholarly resources in libraries worldwide. OCLC’s technology and team of expert catalogers and data quality specialists constantly enrich WorldCat records with new and corrected information to ensure that WorldCat contains the highest quality records possible. Data shared through WorldCat supports a variety of network services and spurs innovation.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Molly O'Brien
Curtis Institute

Once again, the program for the annual conference is in good hands with a diligent program committee. Your Program Committee members this year are Casey Mullin, Western Washington University; Heather Fisher, Saginaw Valley State University; Synae Yoon, Southern Methodist University; Clara Burns, University of Colorado Boulder; Jared Rex, College of the Holy Cross; Ann Shaffer, University of Oregon; Rahni Kennedy, Southern Methodist University; and Anne Adams, Harvard University. We were very fortunate to have an excellent slate of presentation proposals to choose from. Thanks to everyone who answered our call for speakers. As a result, this year’s sessions will not disappoint! Topics will include managing audio collections, digital score acquisitions, data cleanup projects and tools, and data rescue, among others. OCLC’s own Jay Holloway will also be returning with an update on discovery services and enhancements. Finally, there will be plenty of time for an Ask Everything session. Start saving your questions now and send them to me at molly.obrien@curtis.edu. Questions received in advance are appreciated!

The program in Portland, Oregon will cover a full day Tuesday and end mid-day Wednesday with plenty of time to join an afternoon tour. Registration rates will remain the same as last year. The early registration rate for MOUG members in good standing will be $90 and for non-members, $120. If you are a student, first-time attendee, paraprofessional, retiree, non-salaried, or part time there is a reduced registration rate of $45 for you.

Hope to see everyone in Portland!

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled by Jay Weitz

OCLC Celebrates 50 Years of Innovation, Collaboration with Libraries Worldwide

OCLC, the library technology and research organization that changed the way libraries work, is celebrating 50 years of innovation and collaboration with libraries around the world. On July 6, 1967, the nonprofit Ohio College Library Center was established to create a shared electronic library for Ohio colleges and universities. Frederick Kilgour, founder and first President, had a plan to build a shared, online cataloging system that would effectively merge library catalogs through a computer network and database so that libraries could work collaboratively, save time, and share resources.

What began 50 years ago as a regional computer system for 54 Ohio colleges has become OCLC, a global library cooperative that provides shared technology services, original research, and community programs to over 16,000 libraries in 120 countries. Thousands of libraries around the world use OCLC services to locate, acquire, catalog, lend, preserve, and manage library materials and collections. Researchers, students, faculty, scholars, professional librarians, and other information seekers use OCLC services to obtain bibliographic, abstract, and full-text information. The OCLC Online Union Catalog began operation in 1971. Catalogers at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio, were first to catalog a book using the online cataloging system. That database, now known as WorldCat, is the world's most comprehensive database of information about library collections.

Today, WorldCat comprises more than 396 million records representing more than 2.5 billion titles in libraries worldwide. Libraries cooperatively contribute, enhance, and share bibliographic data through WorldCat, connecting people to cultural and scholarly resources in libraries worldwide. OCLC’s technology and team of expert catalogers and data quality specialists constantly enrich WorldCat records with new and corrected information to ensure that WorldCat contains the highest quality records possible. Data shared through WorldCat supports a variety of network services and spurs innovation.
OCLC also shares original research with the library world. OCLC Research is one of the world’s leading centers devoted exclusively to the challenges facing libraries and archives in a rapidly changing information technology environment. Its WebJunction program is an online community where library staff gather to build the knowledge, skills, and support needed to help libraries thrive. Governance of the cooperative is unique. OCLC Regional Councils—Americas; Europe, Middle East and Africa (EMEA); and Asia Pacific—determine their own leadership structures, programs, and priorities. Regional Councils elect representatives to serve on the OCLC Global Council, which is responsible to elect members to the OCLC Board of Trustees. Of OCLC’s current board of 14 trustees, 10 are librarians. Together with libraries, OCLC continues to innovate and grow. A brief timeline of highlights during OCLC’s 50 years of service to libraries:

1967: OCLC is founded

1971: Ohio University is first to catalog a book online using the online shared cataloging system

1979: OCLC introduces the Interlibrary Loan (ILL) system

1988: OCLC begins publishing the Dewey Decimal classification system

1991: FirstSearch is introduced as the first end-user interface for library reference services

2003: WebJunction launches as an online professional resource for public libraries, librarians

2006: WorldCat.org launches to provide online access to library collections over the internet

2011: WorldShare Management Services debuts as the first cloud-based library management system

2015: OCLC prints its last library catalog card after a multi-decade run of 1.9 billion

2017: Tipasa launches as first cloud-based interlibrary loan management service

See more about OCLC’s 50 years of service at http://www.oclc.org/en/fifty.html. Follow memories at #OCLC50 on Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook.

WebJunction to Offer Training for Librarians Interested in Wikipedia Engagement

This fall, OCLC’s WebJunction will offer a free, 10-week online training program for public library staff interested in gaining skills in Wikipedia editing and engagement in a collaborative learning environment with public library peers. Librarians can register now for a July 19 webinar, "Wikipedia for Libraries: Preview the Possibilities, Discover the Opportunities" (http://www.webjunction.org/events/webjunction/wikipedia-for-libraries.html) that will preview the fall program and describe how librarians can use Wikipedia to connect more people to their library collections and creatively involve community members. The training program and webinar are part of Wikipedia + Public Libraries: Better Together (http://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/wikipedia-libraries.html), a project designed to strengthen ties between U.S. public libraries and Wikipedia to expand public access to authoritative information and serve public libraries’ diverse communities. The project is funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and the Wikimedia Foundation. Today, people go to Wikipedia and search engines to find a great deal of content, but they may be unsure about the quality of that information. This training program connects public libraries to frameworks that Wikipedia editors have developed to indicate the accuracy and verifiability of a Wikipedia article. Libraries are custodians of authoritative materials and library staff have the reference expertise to help point readers to reliable sources. Expanding access to library collections with Wikipedia is now easier because editors can easily add citations that link to library resources in WorldCat. The free, 10-week online training program, scheduled to begin September 13, will equip public library staff with the necessary tools and peer support to become confident in contributing to Wikipedia and engaging their communities around it. Registration for the online training program will begin July 19.

OCLC WorldShare Management Services Expands Mobile Capabilities

OCLC is introducing Digby, a new mobile app that will soon be available as part of WorldShare Management Services, the cloud-based library services platform. Digby is specifically designed to increase the efficiency, accuracy, and independence of student library workers. As a suite of web-based applications, WorldShare Management Services (WMS) already allows library staff to do their work wherever needed—in the library, at home or on the go. Now with the Digby app, WMS helps the library’s student workers become more productive too. The intuitive design of the Digby app provides student workers with
clear instructions for handling pull-list and re-shelving tasks. Digby lets student workers scan library materials right in the stacks—saving them time and reducing their reliance on paper slips. WMS is built on the cloud-based WorldShare platform that supports a suite of library services and provides flexible access to library data through APIs and other web services. With WorldCat as its foundation, WMS enables individual libraries to draw on the collaborative data and work of libraries worldwide for more efficient workflows. WMS also offers interoperability with third-party and campus systems, including financial management, learning management, and student records systems as well as self-check technologies. The Digby app will be available from the Apple and Google Play app stores in August 2017—initially for WMS libraries in the United States, and subsequently for all WMS libraries worldwide.

**OCLC-MARC Update 2017**

The OCLC-MARC Bibliographic and Holdings Format Update 2017 is scheduled to be installed during August 2017. All details are now available in OCLC Technical Bulletin 267: OCLC-MARC Format Update 2017 available at http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/267_en.html. This update will implement MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings format changes announced in MARC 21 Updates No. 23 (November 2016; http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update23_online.html) and No. 24 (May 2017; http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update24_online.html), including:

- New code “n” in Bibliographic Leader/18 (Descriptive cataloging form; “Desc”) is defined for “Non-ISBD Punctuation Omitted.”
- Bibliographic format Score 008/20 (Format of Music; “FMus”) has new code “p” for “Piano Score;” code “b” redescribed and renamed “Miniature or Study Score;” and codes “I” (Condensed score), “k” (Vocal score), “I” (Score), and “z” (Other) redescribed.
- Bibliographic field 028 has been redefined and renamed “Publisher or Distributor Number,” has First Indicator name “Type of Number,” has First Indicator code “1” (Matrix Number) redescribed, has First Indicator code “3” renamed to “Other Music Publisher Number,” has First Indicator code “4” renamed “Video Recording Publisher Number,” has a new First Indicator code “6” for “Distributor Number,” has subfield Sa renamed “Publisher or Distributor Number,” and has subfield Sb (Source) redescribed. There have been corresponding clarifications to Bibliographic field 037.
- Bibliographic field 340 (Physical Medium) has new subfield $g defined for “Color Content.”
- Bibliographic field 382 (Medium of Performance) has new subfield $3 defined for “Materials Specified.”
- Bibliographic field 647 has been defined for “Subject Added Entry -- Named Event.”
- Bibliographic field 885 has been defined for

“Matching Information.”

- New subfields $0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) have been defined for many existing Bibliographic fields.
- Subfield $4 has been renamed “Relationship” consistently throughout the Bibliographic format.
- Subfield $6 (Linkage) has been defined in over 230 Bibliographic fields where it has been defined by MARC 21 and in corresponding local OCLC fields.
- Subfield $8 (Field Link and Sequence Number) has had the new Field Link Type “u” defined for “General Linking, Type Unspecified” in both Bibliographic and Holdings records.
- New Holdings field 347 “Digital File Characteristics” is defined.

Additionally, OCLC will validate MARC codes announced in fourteen LC Technical Notices (http://www.loc.gov/marc/marcinf.html#naa) issued between June 2016 and May 2017. OCLC has also converted all existing Bibliographic fields 260 (Publication, Distribution, Etc. (Imprint)) subfield $d (Plate or Publisher's Number for Music (Pre-AACR2)) to field 028 and will make field 260 subfield $d obsolete. Although MARC 21 Authority Format changes from Updates No. 23 and No. 24 are documented in Technical Bulletin 267, the Authority record changes will be implemented not at this time but instead at a future date in coordination with the Library of Congress and the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). LC, NACO, and OCLC will make announcements at that future date. OCLC plans to install the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic and Holdings Format Update 2017 during August 2017 and will make announcements widely through the usual discussion lists and Connexion logon greetings at that time.
In response to the Q&A entitled “Small but Voluminous” in MOUG Newsletter Number 125 (June 2017) Page 38, our colleague Terry Simpkins of Middlebury College pointed out: “While RDA 3.4.5.18 does provide an option to treat the description as you describe (‘1 study score (4 volumes (654; 756… etc.)’), the primary instruction actually says to ‘omit the pagination,’ and both the LC-PCC PS and the MLA BP documents say ‘Generally do not apply the optional [i.e., with pagination] provision.’ Your answer seems to me to suggest that the pagination in such cases would routinely be given, and that doesn’t appear to be the case (i.e., I would catalog this simply as ‘1 study score (4 volumes)).” Terry is correct. LC-PCC PS and MLA BP 3.4.5.18 both suggest following the main instruction by omitting the pagination. Thanks to Terry for the correction and for giving permission to share it.

Twilight Zoning Code

**Question:** Some years ago, a colleague of mine bought a little recorded music from all corners of the globe, with an emphasis on East Asian pop. RDA was about to hit, and to get the stuff on the shelves I put brief records in our catalog for most of the CJK material. I’m now circling back to fully catalog them in WorldCat and add them, or add our holdings when I am lucky enough to find copy. I do a couple a month. I was especially proud to crack the first one, as the only word in the Latin alphabet on it was “stereo.” Thank goodness for YesAsia.com which let me know what I was looking for, and for Wikipedia once I knew where to look. Truly a case of the blind leading the blind. The records are Encoding Level K, not because they are missing a lot of fields but to advertise that I don’t have a clue what I’m doing. But I have become accustomed to getting a system-supplied 066 with subfield $c$ coded “$1$” for CJK in these records. With these records, for the first time an additional subfield $c$, with “Hani” also appears. The recently-revised page for 066 in BFAS lists all the possible codes, and there ain’t no “Hani”. I checked the official MARC 21 format but it does not give the codes at all. Of course it is system-supplied so I can’t delete it. Do you know why the system is supplying a code that doesn’t exist? (Cue The Twilight Zone.)

**Answer:** You are traveling through another dimension, a dimension not only of sight and sound but of mind. BFAS, however, offers a signpost up ahead in the form of a link to the ISO 15924 Code Lists (https://www.unicode.org/iso15924/codelists.html), which defines the code “Hani” as “Han (Hanzi, Kanji, Hanja).” Since OCLC’s implementation of support for all of Unicode in 2016, not all of the relevant codes are listed in BFAS, although we should probably make that much more clear on the page for field 066. Searching WorldCat Indexes, under the entry for field 066 (http://www.oclc.org/support/help/searchingworldcatindexes/Default.htm#05_FieldsAndSubfields/0xx_fields.htm#066) offers a link to the OCLC document “066 Script Codes” (https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/connexion/documentation/client/international/066scriptcodes.pdf), which offers the same definition plus the following note: “CJK script is used for Chinese, Japanese, and Korean characters as well as other scripts. The script designated as Hani and/or $1$ is for CJK characters only. A search of vp:hani will include all CJK script, both MARC-8 and Unicode characters.”
Out of Practice

**Question:** The MLA Music Best Practices instructs us (in the BP to 3.19.3): "Use separate MARC 347 fields when recording both RDA and non-RDA vocabulary terms." I would have expected something similar relevant to the 344 to have been stated, but no such provision is in the Best Practices (that I can find), and the "Examples" in Supplements to Best Practices never show such a practice. In fact, one example has "344 analog Sc 33 1/3 rpm $g$ stereo," which is a mix of RDA and non-RDA terms. I presume the instruction about separate 347 fields for different vocabularies reflects the provision in authority records to use one (of any of a number of fields) for a value from a single controlled vocabulary and another instance of the same field for terms from another vocabulary or from no controlled vocabulary at all. So, in theory, one could have quite a string of like-tagged fields, if several controlled vocabularies happened to apply and some non-controlled terms were also relevant. Does anyone know why this sort of separation has never been applied to the 344 field?

**Answer:** In working on the OCLC-MARC Update 2017, I brought up essentially the same issue to the MLA CMC and to the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC). It came to the fore in particular with the release of LC Technical Notice (March 10, 2017) (http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/tn170310src.html), which consisted of 23 additions to the Genre/Form Code and Term Source Codes list (http://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/genreform.html). In its earlier iterations, the MLA Best Practices glossed over the fact that not all of our elements have controlled vocabularies in RDA. Even now, as you’ve noticed, the BP remains inconsistent, although over time it has grown more strict in this regard, particularly with the removal of some controlled vocabularies from RDA (see, for instance, MLA BP 3.19.3). The 23 new codes suggest at least two alternative ways to code the 33X and 34X fields in which they would be used, or some inconsistent combination thereof. The first option is to continue coding them as we have since the 33X and 34X fields were defined in MARC, going as far back as 2009. In the case of the 33X fields, that would mean continuing to use the existing RDA terms in the respective subfields $a$ and the corresponding codes in the respective RDA vocabularies in a single field along with the Source code rdacontent in 336, rdamedia in 337, and rdacarrier in 338, for example:

336 performed music $b$ prm $2$ rdaco
336 $sb$ prm $2$ rdacontent
337 audio $2$ rdat
337 $sb$ s $2$ rdamedia
338 audio disc $2$ rdact
338 $sb$ sd $2$ rdacarrier

In the case of the 34X fields, that would usually mean continuing to follow the established coding practice of using the respective controlled RDA vocabularies in a single field along with the Source code rda in subfield $2$, for example:

344 analog $g$ stereo $h$ Dolby encoded $2$ rda

The second option is to switch to using the newly-defined codes, which would often result in having to code multiples of many of the fields in question to accommodate the various controlled vocabularies. With the 3XX fields, the older (spelled-out) Source codes defined both the terms and the codes for the content, media, and carrier types, so that including subfields $a$, $b$, and $2$ in a single 336, 337, or 338 field was perfectly legitimate. With the three new (abbreviated) codes, only the terms are part of the vocabulary, necessitating for example:

336 performed music $2$ rdaco
336 $sb$ prm $2$ rdacontent
337 audio $2$ rdat
337 $sb$ s $2$ rdamedia
338 audio disc $2$ rdact
338 $sb$ sd $2$ rdacarrier

We have consulted with LC about the 33X fields, and they apparently expect to continue the established coding practice of a single field in each 33X case. LC seemed to be noncommittal about the 34X fields, however. Employing the newly-defined codes would result in such examples as the following:

344 analog $2$ rdatr
344 $g$ stereo $2$ rdacpc
344 $h$ Dolby-B encoded $2$ rdaspe

MLA/CMC and OLAC/CAPC have created a joint task group to discuss and decide upon coordinated best practices. The debate might be defined as pitting strict adherence to RDA and MARC against ease and practicality. With some luck, by the time you read this we’ll know their recommendations. Of course, the conflict between making things potentially more useful for a Linked Data future and keeping things simple for catalogers is at the core of this discussion. Some side issues come to mind. Do we convert any or all of the existing 33X and 34X fields to conform with these new practices? How amenable to the changes will local system vendors be, especially if they have not already dealt well with the 33X fields that have been around since 2009 and the 34X fields, a few of which have been around since 2011 or longer?

(Continued)
The debate between codes and controlled vocabulary is also fraught. Codes have the advantage of being language-neutral and at least in theory allow for automated switches among languages (although depending upon the sophistication of the switches, the same could be said for controlled vocabularies). Codes, being usually shorter, may tend to be less error-prone than spelled-out controlled vocabularies. Perhaps the least obvious problem with the “new” controlled vocabularies for content, media, and carrier is that they don’t account for the “other” and “unspecified” designations that are accounted for in the original MARC/RDA vocabularies. That seems particularly shortsighted for what are supposed to be forward-looking sets of instructions and vocabularies that claim to be trying to anticipate the unanticipated. As it is, the existing “other” categories in the Term and Code List for RDA Carrier Types (http://www.loc.gov/standards/vocabulary/rdacarrier.html) can be distinguished from each other ONLY through their distinct codes, if they are present.

Taking Place

**Question:** I note in the new OCLC Technical Bulletin No. 267 (http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/267.en.html) that the Bibliographic 752 (Added Entry--Hierarchical Place Name) can now take a subfield $2$ code, plus a host of other subfields. I’m confused, as I’m not aware that this field can truly be said to belong to the NAF or any other source code. What am I missing here? Are there plans to make this field linkable?

**Answer:** Bibliographic field 752 has had the subfield $2$ defined since MARC 21 Update No. 6 in October 2005 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/changes_concise_up6.html#biblio), which was implemented by OCLC as part of the OCLC-MARC Format Update 2007 (http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/254.en.html). The change to 752 subfield $2$ that is part of the 2017 OCLC-MARC Update is merely a rewording of the subfield definition, which had previously referred to the source of the heading or term. MARC 21 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd752.html) has now been clarified to read: “MARC code that identifies the source list from which the geographic name was assigned. Code from: Name and Title Authority Source Codes.” There is no change to the use of the subfield itself. If by “linkable” you are referring to the controlling of WorldCat headings to the authority file, there are currently no such plans for field 752.

We Are Not Throwing Away Our Schott

**Question:** Is anyone using Schott numbers to describe/identify a Schott score? If so, what tag are you using?

**Answer:** Publisher and plate numbers for scores are coded in MARC field 028; see http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd028.html in MARC 21 Bibliographic or http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/028.html in OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards. If you’re cataloging under RDA, you will want to consult RDA 2.15, in particular 2.15.2 and 2.15.3, and the corresponding LC-PCC Policy Statements and Music Library Association Best Practices. If you’re cataloging under AACR2, you’ll want to look at 5.7B19 and its related LC Rule Interpretation.
Behavior Modification

Question: I was trying to improve a minimal level record. I thought my cataloging privileges allowed this, but the system will not allow me to add subfield $d with our OCLC symbol as modifying organization. Do I have to derive the existing record and create a new record? This would be a duplicate, though. It's been a while since I tried to modify an existing record.

Answer: When you replace the record, the system will automatically supply your institution’s OCLC symbol as the final 040 subfield $d. You don't have to do that yourself; in fact as you've discovered, the system won't allow you to do that. It happens automatically. At this point because you've already tried to edit the 040 field, it's possible that you may have to start over with a fresh copy of the record, cut and paste your edits from the other version, and then replace the fresh version.

Speak of the Devil and a Different Series Will Appear

Question: Looking for some advice. Please compare OCLC #1294111 and #756990058. These two records appear to be for the same manifestation, with the exception of the series. That is all that is different. In our local catalog, we have copy-cataloged the first record, with the shorter series. The item eventually went missing and we ordered a replacement. When it came, it had the second, longer series on it. Being somewhat anal (cataloger, y’know) I corresponded with a colleague at another holding institution who checked her copy and said yes, it had only the shorter series on it. This item, score and part, is reproduced from manuscript. At least my replacement copy is enclosed in a blue paper cover, and the verso of the cover is the first page of the saxophone part. (I didn’t know about those details.) Thus it is the part that is stapled into that cover, with the separate score just stuck into it. The cover functions as the preferred source, has all the typical title page-type information, and the series statement appears across the top of the cover: longer or shorter, it does not interfere with anything else. I’d say it’s easy enough to change what the cover says from one print run to the next. By the way, the number T108 I believe is not a series numbering, but a publisher’s number. Positioned in the top right corner of the cover, a common enough place for such a number, it just happens to be in reasonable proximity to the series statement. Both of these series have authority records. The longer one dates from 1942, though the item cited in the 670 is from 1980. (It must have been added when the authority record was put into the MARC format in 1983.) The shorter one is from 1997, but the item cited in 670 is copyrighted 1962. Neither indicates the series is numbered, another reason I think T108 is a publisher’s number. Tritone and Tenuto are essentially the same folks, according to the MPA directory. “When to Input a New Record” says different series = different edition, new record. My gut is rebelling against putting in a new, English-language record, which would be a parallel record to the one in French. I believe these manifestations are not different. They just come out with different versions of the series statement. I can see the folks at Tenuto/Tritone issuing the piece in Series A because it’s in manuscript and later someone saying, hey, you know, this guy is an American. We should issue his piece in Series B instead. The change is made to the cover, end of story. But if you say adding a new record is best, that is what I will do. I’ll admit to having some problems with what else to do. I could alter the existing WorldCat record with the shorter series by … what, adding the longer series too and a note that says the series statement varies among copies? That’s the best I can come up with. And then what should happen with the French-language record?

Answer: Who knows what evil lurks in the hearts of even our good friends at Theodore Presser/Tritone/Tenuto? (The tritone is “the devil in music,” is it not?) The folks at Presser may know the history of and/or the relationship between these two series titles. But given the bibliographic evidence and the two clearly separate series authority records, you needn’t go further. One of the many lessons learned from my retired former boss, Glenn Patton, was that publishers are not well-behaved. You’ve undoubtedly heard me say that dozens of time over the years, yourself. Just for good measure, I checked Journal History for both of the merged records in field 019 as well as for #1294111. Through the entire histories of both #222352842 and #976896391, and as far back as we can see the history of #1294111 (back to January 2011), each was part of the “Music in manuscript series.” The merges appear to be proper and no one’s fiddled with the edition statements. Remember, you always have the option of using an existing record and editing it locally for your own use; if you feel uncomfortable adding a separate record, local editing is a perfectly legitimate choice. But you are fully justified in adding a separate English-language record with the longer series statement. That would be my recommendation.
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