FROM THE CHAIR
H. Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University

As a child, I owned a toy called a "Magic 8-Ball." This peculiar object, which is still being sold and has become an icon of popular culture, is an oversized billiard ball which ostensibly answers questions about the future. The toy's packaging invites the user to ask a yes-or-no question and then turn the ball so that a small glass window faced upward. After a moment, an answer fades into view. These responses range from the evasive ("Reply hazy -- try again") to the coyly specific ("My sources say no"). Not even the most credulous child would take the 8-Ball's answers seriously; its limited repertoire of phrases quickly becomes obvious. Yet the occasional congruence of query and response, combined with the pompous wording of the canned replies, is nevertheless entertaining; it is amusing to pretend that this inanimate object is comprehending one's questions.

I thought of the Magic 8-Ball recently when I used AltaVista (http://www.altavista.com), the Internet search engine offered by Digital Equipment Corporation. AltaVista has always been one of the more reliable and effective of the tools for exploring the web, and I often use it when I need a thorough search. Yet I was taken aback when I noticed a minor though very striking addition to the AltaVista search screen. Adjacent to the box where one types search terms was the sentence, "Ask AltaVista a question."

The first time I saw this, I merely smiled and proceeded with my keyword search. However, when AltaVista presented its results, I received a second surprise. Above the list of "hits" were the words, "AltaVista knows the answers to these questions," followed by a few reference-type questions which incorporated my search keywords. I am relieved to report that this bizarre conceit has been dropped, and now the search results are presented without the list of questions. Unfortunately, the search screen still invites users to ask a question, just as the Magic 8-Ball does.

The problem with the Magic 8-Ball is that it doesn't comprehend one's questions at all; it's simply displaying a randomly selected answer which has no real connection to the original question. AltaVista is quite a bit more sophisticated than the Magic 8-Ball, of course; its responses are far more likely to be relevant. AltaVista and the 8-Ball have one significant characteristic in common, though: neither of them truly understands questions. They are both machines -- albeit at opposite ends of the technological scale, but machines nevertheless. Asking AltaVista a question is, in a way, just as silly as asking the 8-Ball; neither of them "knows" anything.

You might be wondering why I'm making an issue of a few words on a search screen -- words which ultimately have no effect on the power or efficiency of AltaVista. Indeed, these words probably do not impair most users' experience of AltaVista in any way. Even if someone does type a question in natural language, instead of merely typing keywords, it is probable that the search will still produce some relevant results because the question will contain the critical keywords. Yet there is a subtle and powerful distinction between inviting users to type a few keywords and inviting them to ask a question, and that distinction works against what we, as librarians, are trying to instill in our clientele.

In 1950, philosopher Alan Turing proposed what has become known as the "Turing test," a test which could reveal whether or not a computer could truly think. In this test, a person communicates textually, via a computer terminal, with two hidden entities, one of which is a human, the other a computer. The person does not know which is which, and must try to distinguish them by asking questions and evaluating the responses. The computer is allowed to lie and claim that it is the human, or invent other answers as needed. Turing stated that if a computer was chosen as the human about half the time, then it was intelligent. Needless to say, AltaVista cannot pass the Turing test. Although it invites the user to ask questions, its responses -- simple lists of websites -- could never be confused with the responses of a sentient being.
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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 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.
FROM THE CHAIR, continued

Machines do not think. This is a point which I’ve always tried to slip into my bibliographic instruction sessions without becoming too bogged down in philosophical matters. Most of our clientele knows, intellectually, that online catalogs and other electronic reference tools are not alive and cannot carry on a conversation with humans. Nevertheless, I have observed that library users often type queries in a manner that suggests they assume that the computer understands them. If a user searches “piano music,” the online catalog will likely retrieve bibliographic records for piano music, but the computer doesn’t know what music is, and doesn’t know what a piano is. “Piano music” is no more meaningful to the machine than “purple marigold” or any other string of characters. In my instruction sessions, I typically tell students that expecting a machine to understand what they want is like expecting a toaster to know the difference between a slice of bread and a bagel. The NIU graduate student who typed “Relationship of women and music in nineteenth-century France” as a subject search in our catalog might as well have been asking the same question of a Magic 8-Ball.

More and more often, users will come to me only after they have tried a web search and failed. Even more disturbing is that their question is often framed in Internet terms: “Do you know of any websites that have ...” A few weeks ago, a voice student asked me for help in locating a song translation. He approached me and asked, “Are there any websites that have translations of songs?” It hadn’t even occurred to him that there might be print sources for such things; he had spent a frustrating half-hour in a fruitless web search, while the book that contained the needed translation was on a shelf ten feet from where he was sitting.

Vast amounts of valuable information are available on the Internet, but it is mixed indiscriminately with even vaster amounts of misinformation or valueless junk. The intelligent user of the web must constantly sift and evaluate to a greater degree than ever before. We have all heard the analogy that using the web is like “drinking from a firehose.” This is somewhat inaccurate; it might be difficult to drink from a firehose, but at least one knows that everything emerging from the nozzle is water. Imagine a firehose that spews out a mixture of every liquid known, from water to wine to raw sewage, and you have a more accurate image.

The Internet often strikes me as being a funhouse-mirror reflection of a library, where nothing is organized, nothing is selected, and nothing is excluded ... and it is this bizarre antilibary that many of our users are treating as a first stop. How long, indeed, before it becomes the only stop? AltaVista is pretending to be an oracle, a sort of cyber-librarian, and somehow I suspect that few will challenge its presumption of that role. I wonder, at times, how many people aren’t using library because they think they can find whatever they need on the Internet. I’m not sure I want to know how many people have already decided that they don’t need us anymore.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Cheryl Taranto, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

With this newsletter comes the preliminary program and registration information for our annual meeting March 16-17, 1999 at the Regal Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. The program has shaped up quite nicely and promises to be a great learning experience. As you can see, more breakout sessions have been planned, two of which are "Ask MOUG" sessions. I encourage everyone to submit questions you may have in advance for these sessions. Early question submissions enable the presenters of these sessions to better prepare to address those issues you would like to hear about. You can either write them on the registration form or e-mail them to me at tarantoc@nevada.edu. A change from the recent past comes with making the Enhance and the NMP working sessions a part of the program as breakout sessions. It is hoped that this will allow more interested parties to attend sessions on the Enhance and NMP programs and learn from them.

The scheduled plenary session is a follow-up to the breakout session in Boston on WorldCat. OCLC has planned a re-indexing and reloading of WorldCat this year. You can come prepared to see the impact of the reload, particularly from the MOUG point of view based on the recommendations we have sent to OCLC.

The early registration deadline is February 12, 1999, and I urge all of you to get your registration. Please note that the deadline for hotel reservations at the Regal Biltmore is February 15, 1999. Make your hotel reservations directly with the Biltmore (213 624-1011). And, if you have any questions or comments about the program, or ideas for future MOUG programs, please do not hesitate to contact me at tarantoc@nevada.edu. I look forward to seeing all of you in Los Angeles.

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled by Jay Weltz

General News

OCLC and WLN Begin Negotiations to Merge

OCLC and WLN announced in October 1998 the signing of a letter of intent that could lead, following negotiations, to the merger of WLN and OCLC. WLN is a nonprofit corporation devoted to the provision of innovative and high-quality
information products and services, including an online bibliographic database, Internet services, CD-ROM catalogs, database preparation/authority control services, and collection assessment services (http://www.wln.com). WLN serves 550 libraries in the Pacific Northwest region of the U.S. and Canada from its office in Lacey, Washington. The letter of intent results from extended discussions, started in April 1998, between board chairs and senior management of each organization. According to the letter of intent, subject to satisfactory negotiations and approvals by both boards of trustees, the merger would result in the following:
- WLN users would migrate to OCLC cataloging and resource sharing services, and the WLN union catalog would be merged with WorldCat (the OCLC Online Union Catalog).
- WLN full member libraries would become OCLC general members, with the opportunity to participate in OCLC's governance through the OCLC Users Council.
- WLN would continue with its MARS Authority Control, Collection Analysis and bibliographic services.
- The WLN office would continue to be based in Lacey and would become an OCLC/WLN Service Center, providing support and training to libraries in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and British Columbia.
- WLN's Information Technology Research and Development staff would remain at the OCLC/WLN Service Center where they would supplement OCLC's extensive research and development efforts and continue to develop authority control and collection analysis services. OCLC would make these services available to libraries worldwide through OCLC's sales offices, U.S. regional networks and international distributors. The parties hope to conclude an agreement and complete the transaction by early 1999.

OCLC Receives ISO 9001 Registration

OCLC has met ISO 9001 quality standards and has received registration. OCLC sought ISO 9001 registration to promote continuous improvement in OCLC products and services. OCLC's registration is to ISO 9001, the International Standard for Quality Systems-Model for Quality Assurance in Design, Development, Production, Installation and Servicing. OCLC's quality management system was approved by Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance, Hoboken, New Jersey, in accordance with ISO 9001: Design and Development of Automated Library Services, Databases and Telecommunications Facilities with provisions for User Documentation and Technical Support. The registration excludes OCLC conversion and contract cataloging services, which OCLC plans to add to the registration within the next year. Richard Hale, director of Quality Assurance, was responsible for day-to-day management of activities leading to ISO 9001 registration. The ISO 9000 certification procedure involves ongoing internal assessment of systems and procedures for conformity to the standard and third-party evaluations by an accredited outside registrar. The International Standard for Quality Management and Quality Assurance Systems, ISO, was developed to equalize quality systems between companies. The standard has 20 elements for the basic management of a system of quality assurance.

The Ontario Colleges Bibliocentre Joins OCLC

The Bibliocentre, a not-for-profit organization that provides cataloging for 25 community colleges in Ontario, has become an OCLC member. The Bibliocentre was established by the government of Ontario in 1968 to purchase, catalog and process materials for 25 Community College Learning Resource Centres throughout the province of Ontario. The Ontario Ministry of Education and Training funds the Bibliocentre located in Scarborough as a separate agency for Ontario College Learning-Resource Centres. As one of the earliest consortium models, this central service agency was created to save money, staff and resources, and to provide a union catalog that would include information on materials held by all college libraries in Ontario. The Bibliocentre has recently negotiated for the community colleges of Ontario the purchase of a new library system and access to various electronic resources to support college learners.

James Houfek Named OCLC Vice President and General Counsel

James T. Houfek has been named vice president and general counsel by Jay Jordan, president and CEO, OCLC. Mr. Houfek joined OCLC in 1993 as senior attorney and has served as director of legal affairs and general counsel since 1997. Prior to joining OCLC, he was vice president and general counsel for the Newtowne Companies from 1990 to 1993. He was chairman and general counsel for the Oakhurst Company from 1983 to 1990. At both Newtowne and Oakhurst, Mr. Houfek managed the entire legal function of the companies, including areas of contract administration, employment, insurance, regulatory law and tax, as well as the legal staff. After receiving a bachelor's degree in business from the University of Notre Dame, in Indiana, and a Juris Doctor from Ohio State University, Mr. Houfek began practicing law in 1969.

OCLC Issues 1997/98 Annual Report

OCLC has issued its 1997/98 Annual Report, the 31st for the international, nonprofit, membership, computer library service and research organization. For the year ended June 30, 1998, OCLC's revenues were $136.2 million, up 3.3 percent from comparable prior-year revenues after adjusting for the sale of Information Dimensions effective July 1, 1997. During the fiscal year, OCLC provided approximately $1.1 million in subsidies to member libraries to trade in their old workstations for newer Pentium-based machines. OCLC also provided
member libraries with $10.2 million in credits for cataloging and resource sharing to encourage the growth and quality of WorldCat. Over 1,000 libraries used OCLC ILL Fee Management to exchange over $3.8 million in interlibrary loan fees, thereby avoiding processing charges for about $400,000 invoices and a similar number of checks. Other highlights of the 1997/98 Annual Report, which covers OCLC's fiscal year (July 1 to June 30), include:

- The number of participating libraries increased from 25,108 to 30,154.
- Libraries in 65 countries now participate in OCLC.
- Libraries cataloged 37.1 million items on OCLC.
- 2.1 million cataloging records were added to WorldCat.
- Location listings grew from 638 million to 668 million.
- 8.2 million interlibrary loans were arranged online.
- More than 12,000 libraries around the world used the OCLC FirstSearch service, which is ranked first in terms of connect time among end-user reference systems in the information community.
- FirstSearch users performed nearly 50.4 million searches, an increase of 40 percent over the previous year.
- OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online had more than 1,200 journals from 30 publishers available online.
- The OCLC Institute conducted 35 educational events for 586 people since its founding in January 1997.
- OCLC was certified to ISO 9001, the International Standard for Quality Systems—Model for Quality Assurance in Design, Development, Production, Installation and Servicing. Printed copies of the report can be obtained by writing to: OCLC Support Services, MC 437, 6565 Franz Rd., Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395, or requested by e-mail (orders@oclc.org) or fax (+1-614-798-5728). Please include the item number—MAN8440—and the quantity needed in the request. The annual report will be available on the World Wide Web in January 1999 (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/ar98/ar.htm).

Preservation Resources to Produce SilverLock Polysulfide Solution

Preservation Resources is now producing SilverLock, the polysulfide solution developed by the Image Permanence Institute (IPI) to inoculate microfilm against rerox and atmospheric pollutants. IPI stopped making SilverLock in 1997 but continues to test and certify each batch Preservation Resources formulates. SilverLock polysulfide treatment converts most of the silver in the film emulsion of silver halide microfilm to silver sulfide, which is more resistant to contaminants. The SilverLock polysulfide treatment does not cause a significant color or density change in film but provides an 'insurance image' from which another print or duplicate can be made. Polysulfide treatment can be applied to masters, print masters and service copies, in both high-contrast and continuous tone microfilm. Preservation Resources is currently the only source of polysulfide solution made to IPI's original specifications and certified by IPI. The need for additional treatment of microfilm masters became apparent in the 1980s when red spots or redox blemishes were observed in microfilm collections. These films had been processed with improved standards yet still showed signs of oxidation. With funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the New York State Preservation Grant program, IPI researched the problem. Ultimately, an accelerated test for image oxidation was created, and a preventative treatment was developed. Preservation Resources extends the success of IPI's efforts by continuing to produce and apply SilverLock. When put through rigorous tests such as dichromate bleach test, hydrogen peroxide test and accelerated aging, microfilm treated with SilverLock is still readable and shows no signs of redox. More information about SilverLock is available at the Preservation Resources Web site (http://www.oclc.org/presres/).

Jean Touzot Libraire Editeur Joins the OCLC Selection Service

Jean Touzot Libraire Editeur (JTLE), a general agent for French language books and periodicals, has agreed to contribute bibliographic records for French materials to WorldCat (the OCLC Online Union Catalog) and help libraries manage their acquisition of French books and periodicals through the OCLC Selection service. Touzot, OCLC symbol TZZ, joins Casalini Libri, Iberbook International, and Puvill Libros as participants in the OCLC Selection service specializing in non-English materials, and has been serving American libraries and research institutions since 1930. JTLE supplies French books published in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Africa, Canada and other francophone regions; creates a selective blanket order or approval plan tailored to the needs and budget of the institution; and offers a highly trained bibliographic staff, which receives nearly all new titles published in France and creates a unique bibliographic database from the book in hand. To date, OCLC has processed some 7,000 JTLE records—1,600 of them unique. JTLE plans to send some 800 new records each month. Jean Touzot Libraire Editeur is located in Paris, France and is on the Web at j touzot@worldnet.net.

Cataloging

Eleventh Pass of DDR Through WorldCat

The eleventh pass of OCLC's Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software ran November 9th through 28th, 1998, merging a total of 47,074 Books duplicates in WorldCat. The grand total of Books duplicates resolved by DDR since its first run in 1991 is now 1,098,531.
Research Project to Automate Cataloging of Internet Resources Seeks Participants Worldwide

The OCLC Office of Research is seeking participants for a project to explore the cooperative creation and sharing by libraries of metadata—data about data. The Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) project is designed to help both libraries and OCLC cope with the vast amount of material becoming available on the World Wide Web. Libraries, museums, archives, publishers and other institutions that face similar problems with the proliferation of resources on the Web are invited to participate. Additional information and applications are available via E-mail at corc@oclc.org. Among the goals of the project: producing HTML pages suitable for use on library portal sites, providing the ability to mix local and shared information, allowing easy upgrading of records, sharing and minimizing link maintenance, and providing automated support for metadata creation and maintenance. The project will build upon OCLC's prior activities in creating Internet resource databases through such projects as the OCLC NetFirst and InterCat databases, but the CORC project will rely more heavily on automated means to build its database. Both NetFirst and InterCat records will be used initially to seed the CORC database. OCLC's pioneering work with metadata will also come into play in the project. Both full USMARC cataloging and an enhanced Dublin Core metadata mode will be used (the Dublin Core is a 15-element metadata set intended to facilitate discovery of electronic resources (http://purl.org/metadata/dublin_core/). The underlying engine of CORC, originally developed for the OCLC SiteSearch 4.0 software, will automatically catalog resources on the Web. It includes sophisticated harvesting and automated description capabilities developed in OCLC's Scorpion research project.

Type Code Editing Capability Expanded

The "Type of Record" code (USMARC Leader/06) is the one-character alphabetic code that helps differentiate most records for various bibliographic formats. When a record in WorldCat has an incorrect Type Code, searches qualified by format do not yield accurate results. Recent changes in USMARC due to format integration—reflecting the shift toward coding bibliographic record Type Codes for record content rather than physical carrier—have resulted in an increased need for libraries to edit Type Codes. Until now, the OCLC system has limited users' ability to change Type Codes within a given bibliographic format (for instance, i/j or g/k/r/o) only. All Type Code changes between bibliographic formats and all Type Code changes to WorldCat master records had to be reported to OCLC, where they were done within 24 hours of receipt. Beginning immediately, OCLC Passport software users with any authorization level Limited and above can change the Type Code on all unlocked or locally edited bibliographic records to any other valid Type Code value. This allows users to continue work on such records without serious disruption of workflow. OCLC encourages users to continue reporting Type Code changes as before (by phone, electronically, or on paper), so that master records in WorldCat can be corrected. To change a Type Code:
1. Overtype the incorrect Type Code with the correct one.
2. Press <F11>. The record redisplayed with the fixed-field mnemonics of the new Type of Record. Further editing of the redisplayed fixed field (and possibly other elements in the record) is necessary before the record will pass validation. This enhancement will be included in OCLC CatME for Windows 1.10 and CJK software 3.0. OCLC expects to release these new versions of software in early 1999.

Contents Note Editing Capability

OCLC has long encouraged users to enrich bibliographic records by adding contents notes to records without them. The addition of a contents note results in a Database Enrichment credit. Because contents notes are often lengthy and involved, typographical errors are common. These errors are easy to overlook and, with the advent of keyword searching of notes, may hinder access. Until now, Full mode users have been prevented from correcting contents notes and must instead report any errors to OCLC. Beginning immediately, OCLC users with authorization level Full and above will be able to lock and replace records to edit contents notes (USMARC field 505). This allows the correction of typographical errors in contents notes, as well as the filling in of incomplete contents notes, without reporting those records to OCLC. Such replaces will result in a Database Enrichment credit when the institution's symbol does not already appear in the 040 field. Users can continue to add contents notes to records that lack them, but cannot add additional 505 fields. All other Database Enrichment edits continue to be allowed in conjunction with this change. Please see the Cataloging User Guide, 2nd edition, Chapter 6 for details on locking and replacing records and on Database Enrichment. This new capability is now automatically available to users of OCLC CatME for Windows, OCLC CJK software, and OCLC Passport software users without workstation software changes.

Joan Mitchell to Head Forest Press

Gary Houk, vice president, OCLC Services, has announced that Joan Mitchell, chief editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) since 1993, will succeed Peter Paulson as executive director and editor-in-chief of OCLC Forest Press. Mr. Paulson has announced plans to retire on Dec. 31, 1998. In the interim, Ms. Mitchell will serve as deputy director. In conjunction with the management change, by June 1999 OCLC Forest Press offices will be relocated from Albany, New York, to OCLCs headquarters in Dublin, Ohio. Under Ms. Mitchell's
editorial leadership, the DDC has been published in new full and abridged print editions, and in an annual electronic version, Dewey for Windows. The DDC is updated continuously on the Dewey home page (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/fp/). Ms. Mitchell has also been working with OCLC's Office of Research and others to explore new uses of the DDC in the electronic environment. Mr. Paulson has led Forest Press since 1985 and has overseen the evolution of the DDC from print-only to both print and electronic formats. OCLC Forest Press, a division of OCLC since 1988, publishes the Dewey Decimal Classification. The DDC is used by more than 200,000 libraries around the world.

Greg McKinney Named Director, Conversion Services Division

Greg McKinney, manager of OCLC's Conversion Services Department since 1993, has been promoted to director, Conversion Services Division. He will direct the OCLC RetroCon services in Dublin and Washington Court House, Ohio, and OCLC CJK RetroCon services. He will also be responsible for OCLC Authority Control and OCLC Batchload services. Mr. McKinney was promoted to a management position shortly after he joined OCLC in 1980. In addition to his management responsibilities over the 220 RetroCon staff, he served as project manager for the five-year conversion of more than 5 million monograph and serial titles in 46 Harvard University library units. The project, the largest in the history of computerized catalogs, was completed in 1997. From 1994 to 1998, he was manager of the conversion of 1.8 million titles from the Bodleian Library's post-1920 collection at the University of Oxford in England. During his tenure with RetroCon, his staff converted over 55 million records for nearly 900 libraries globally. Mr. McKinney received his bachelor's degree in business administration from Ohio State University in 1986 and has done graduate work toward a master's degree in business administration.

Subject Headings for Children, Second Edition, Available

OCLC Forest Press announces publication of a new and updated edition of Subject Headings for Children, edited by Lois Winkel. More than 5,000 new Library of Congress subject headings have been added to the list, making the edition current through April 1998. Volume 1 of the two-volume set provides a list of children's subject headings taken from Library of Congress authority files with abridged Dewey numbers added. The source for the Dewey numbers is Abridged Edition 13 (published in 1997) and its updating service, DC&D Dewey Decimal Classification, Additions, Notes and Decisions (through Vol. 6, no. 1, 1997). The abridged edition was chosen because it is used most often by public and school libraries for children's materials. Volume 2, the Keyword Index, lists the main words in the subject headings, as well as the first term in each subdivision, allowing children, parents, teachers and children's librarians to locate material quickly and easily. Subject Headings for Children is recommended for school and public libraries that use Library of Congress juvenile subject headings.

SABINET Online Libraries to Use OCLC Cataloging Services

SABINET Online, an OCLC distributor in South Africa, and OCLC have announced plans for SABINET Online libraries to migrate on a national level to the OCLC Cataloging service. Under the plan:

- A telecommunications link will be established between SABINET Online's system in Centurion, South Africa, and OCLC's corporate headquarters in Dublin, Ohio.
- SABINET Online libraries will have access to both the SACat mounted locally in Centurion and to the OCLC Cataloging system. The agreement provides for the 400-plus client libraries of SABINET Online to become users of OCLC Cataloging services and to participate in OCLC programs.
- OCLC will provide state-of-the-art workstations to the first implementing libraries under the OCLC Workstation Replacement program. SABINET was founded in 1983 as a not-for-profit organization dedicated to improving the information infrastructure in Southern Africa, and became an OCLC international distributor in 1995. SABINET Online, which took over the operational activities from SABINET in January 1997, is based in Centurion in the province of Gauteng, South Africa (http://www.sabinet.co.za/). SACat, South Africa's union catalog residing on the SABINET Online system, consists presently of approximately 3 million records and is used for copy cataloging, holdings addition, downloading of records into local libraries' catalogs, etc.

Harid Conservatory Music Library Enters 40 Millionth Record into WorldCat

The Harid Conservatory Music Library, in Boca Raton, Florida, entered the 40 millionth bibliographic record into WorldCat on Oct. 4, 1998. The record was for "Ballade Celtique," a music score for a solo harp piece, written by Denise Mégévand, and published in Paris, France, in 1973. The Harid Conservatory Music Library has a collection of some 11,000 volumes. The Harid Conservatory Music Division is a college-level program for students who have had extensive music training. The program focuses on rigorous professional performance training in solo, chamber and orchestral music, and offers a full undergraduate curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Music--Performance degree, as well as a post-baccalaureate program leading to the Professional Studies Diploma. The music division is an accredited institutional member of the National Association of Schools of Music. The Harid
Conservatory Music Library is a member of the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET).

**BTJ and OCLC Work Together to Restore Catalog of Rare Materials in Swedish Library**

Biblioteksjänst (BTJ), OCLC's distributor in Sweden, and the OCLC TechPro service are working together to restore the catalog of rare materials from the main public library of Linköping, Sweden, which burned to the ground Sept. 20, 1996, after an armchair in a locked office caught on fire. The Old Collection—which dates to the 13th century and consists of 225,000 volumes and 2,300 manuscripts in history, religion, law and fiction—was kept in the basement and spared, but its catalog was destroyed. Construction has begun on the Old Collection's new home on the site of the old library, with completion scheduled for early 2000. The Linköping staff have already sent several thousand photocopies of title pages to the OCLC TechPro service. The title pages are for non-Swedish materials, which amount to 60 percent of the rescued collection. The materials are in Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Icelandic, Italian, Latin, Norwegian, Portuguese, and Russian. As OCLC completes its portion of the cataloging, the records are provided via FTP through OCLC's MARC Subscription Service to BTJ in Lund, Sweden. BTJ adds Swedish Library Association classification codes and modifies the forms of the names and uniform titles that occur as access points to be in strict accordance with Swedish library cataloging practice. The records edited by BTJ will subsequently be downloaded to the local database of the Linköping Municipal Library and, at a later point, to the Swedish research libraries database, LIBRIS. Once the work is complete, the records for the Old Collection will be accessible and public.

**Reference Services**

**French and Spanish Interfaces Are New FirstSearch Options**

OCLC has released French and Spanish language interfaces for the OCLC FirstSearch service. The new interfaces are the first non-English interfaces offered for FirstSearch. Users now choose an English, French, or Spanish interface, and all screens, including Help, appear in the language selected. The content of the French and Spanish screens is identical to the English version. The databases are not translated, however. The French interface will benefit French-speaking FirstSearch users in France, Canada and Francophone countries, while the Spanish interface is intended for users in Spain, Spanish-speaking Latin America, and Hispanic communities in the United States.

**Facts On File World News Digest Now on FirstSearch**

Eighteen years of the Facts On File World News Digest is now available on the OCLC FirstSearch service. Updated weekly, the full-text Facts On File database covers all aspects of the news—U.S. and foreign politics, international affairs, the environment, science, medicine and health, economics and business, crime, education, social issues, accidents and disasters, art and popular culture, sports, and deaths. Facts On File editors use more than 100 of the world's top news sources to create original, concise, authoritative stories written specifically for reference. The 70,000-record database contains the complete full text of Facts On File since 1980. Hypertext linking allows developments to be traced back in time through see also references. The Facts On File World News Digest is published by New York City-based Facts On File News Services (http://www.facts.com), a PRIMEDIA company. PRIMEDIA acquired Facts On File News Services in March 1996. Facts On File News Services is no longer connected with Facts On File Inc., the book and CD-ROM publishers.

**Electronic Collections Online Journal Licensing Program Now Offers One-Stop Shopping**

OCLC's new Journal Licensing Program offers one-stop shopping for electronic subscriptions, access and archiving of titles available through the OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online service. New institutions can subscribe to the electronic version of journals available through Electronic Collections Online directly with OCLC and its affiliates at the same time they open or renew their Access Accounts. OCLC and its affiliates will quote pricing and provide license terms for electronic journals, process subscription orders and provide libraries with consolidated billing for subscription, access and archiving. The program complements the Electronic Collections Online Certified Partners Program, through which libraries license electronic journal content directly through subscription agents. Electronic Collections Online allows libraries to search across hundreds of journals from many different publishers, using a single interface and access point. Titles are available in many different subject areas, including life and physical science, social science and the humanities. More information about Electronic Collections Online, including a list of available journals, can be found at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/eco.htm.

**Electronic Collections Online Expands Medical Content with Major Publishers**

Recent agreements with the BMJ Publishing Group, Marcel Dekker, Project HOPE, and the Royal Society of Medicine will increase the medical titles available through the OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online service. Some 15 publishers have contracted to provide more than 325 medical
[MOUG registration form, MOUG preliminary, and MLA conference information could not be reproduced because they were printed on dark paper. 8 pages total]
titles via the service. For libraries also using the OCLC FirstSearch service, MEDLINE records indexing many of these titles are linked to the Electronic Collections Online full-text articles. In all, over 1,400 journals from 32 publishers are now accessible or scheduled to be available soon through the service. BMJ, the publishing arm of the British Medical Association, and OCLC will make the British Medical Journal, one of the world's leading medical journals, available through Electronic Collections Online. Electronic Collections Online will also distribute 30 of the group's specialist clinical journals, many of which are leading journals in their fields. BMJ, based in London, is noted for its innovative approach to journal publishing and has been at the forefront of the evidence-based medicine movement (http://www.bmj.com/). With headquarters in New York, Marcel Dekker is a privately held, international publishing firm specializing in the scientific, technical and medical fields. The firm publishes reference books, textbooks, encyclopedias, journals and newsletters for students, researchers and practitioners across a variety of disciplines (http://www.dekker.com/). Project HOPE (Health Opportunities for People Everywhere), publisher of Health Affairs, is an international health education foundation. Established in 1958, Project HOPE provides health policy research and analysis, training for health care professionals, and consultations in health systems planning and development. Health Affairs has offices in Bethesda, Maryland (http://www.projhope.org/). Based in London, the Royal Society of Medicine Press is the publications division of the Royal Society of Medicine, a long-established postgraduate medical society with a worldwide multidisciplinary and multiprofessional membership (http://www.roysoomed.ac.uk/).

**PsycINFO Database Reloaded with Improvements**

PsycINFO, the American Psychological Association's database of over 1.5 million citations from scholarly literature in psychology, the behavioral sciences and related disciplines, has been reloaded on the OCLC FirstSearch service to provide more value to users of the database. In August 1998, OCLC made the PsycINFO database available on FirstSearch in three versions, from 1984 to present, from 1967 to present and from 1887 to present. Subscribers to PsycINFO were automatically converted to the version covering 1967 to date. New and renewal PsycINFO subscribers should contact their regional network, international division or distributor to discuss the new options these changes make available. PsycINFO now indexes almost 1,400 periodicals written in more than 30 languages. Its chapter and book coverage includes worldwide English language material published from 1887 to the present. The reloaded database contains more than 52,000 records for books and almost 86,000 for book chapters, original research and scholarly contributions to psychology, literature reviews, reports of surveys, case studies, theoretical discussions, published conference reports, case law reports, and bibliographies.

**Resource Sharing**

**VALE Project to Provide Access to Electronic Resources Throughout New Jersey**

Virtual Academic Library Environment (VALE) and OCLC now provide public and independent colleges and universities across New Jersey with seamless access to shared electronic information resources. VALE information resources are being made accessible to institutions throughout the state via the World Wide Web through a common, customized search interface using the OCLC SiteSearch suite of software. Funding for the VALE project is being provided from the New Jersey Higher Education Technology Infrastructure Bond and a grant from the New Jersey State Library, along with matching funds from the participating institutions. To provide quick and easy access to information resources, the VALE system is run on two mirrored SUN server sites located at Rutgers University's New Brunswick campus and at Seton Hall University in South Orange. More information on the VALE project is available at http://www.valenj.org.

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

Compiled by Jay Weitz

Q: I'm cataloging a CD with a fake-URL for a title and am wondering exactly how to deal with it. An exact transcription would be:

```plaintext
ents:/wind
ensemble@cbdna.in.concert
3.1.1996.edu
```

The typeface is perfectly uniform throughout. So, do the line breaks separate words? Should the backslashes be retained, even though they would be used to distinguish the statement of responsibility? I know that according to AACR2, I do not have to transcribe punctuation exactly — but are these symbols "punctuation" or computer coding or perhaps there is no difference (since punctuation is coding for human language); I also know that if I put a colon after "entsu" our indexing system thinks that everything after the colon is other title info (even without the subfield $b$ - GRRRRR!). And regardless of how I transcribe it, I know I'll put in plenty of added titles. My impulse is pretty straightforward: "ENTSU Wind Ensemble @ CBDNA in concert, 3-1-1996.edu $h$ [sound recording]."
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A: We're probably going to be seeing a lot more of these "clever" imitation URLs as the Web further infiltrates our culture. This particular one seems to be combining and/or confusing the URL convention of "access method-colon-slash-slash" with the e-mail address convention that includes the "at" sign and "dot-edu". LCRI 1.1B1 offers a little guidance on how to treat punctuation that, in other contexts, would be ISBD. If it is possible (and does not violate sense) to keep the spaces surrounding the punctuation in question closed up, there is no problem. Remember that most ISBD punctuation (certainly the colon and the slash) would have blank spaces on each side. That being said, I would transcribe the title almost exactly as it appears:

245 00 etsu://wind ensemble@cbdna.in.concert 3.1.1996.edu +h [sound recording].

Although I find nothing in AACR2 or the rule interpretations to tell us how to treat line breaks, I have chosen to retain as spaces those breaks that serve to separate words (between "wind" and "ensemble" and between "concert" and the numeric date), but to close up the space between the "at" sign and "cbdna" to follow the electronic address convention. If you transcribed it this way (and there is no one "correct" transcription, of course), providing a 246 line breaks transcription impulse), but try to use discretion (as well as AACR2, Follow-up Q: Upon reflection and careful perusal of date), but to close up the space between the "at" sign and "ensemble" and between "concert" and the numeric date), but try to use discretion (as well as AACR2, Maybe even a bit more, since you are being more faithful to the conventions for electronic addresses, whereas I am still a slave to the English language. Either alternative seems perfectly acceptable to me. One thing I had neglected to mention, especially if you choose to go with no breaks, was that you might optionally want to include some sort of 500 note explaining the character of the title. This would be in the spirit of LCRI 1.0E, perhaps something like, "Title is presented as a pseudo-Uniform Resource Locator."

Q: I'm team-teaching a workshop in sound recording cataloging next month and was double-checking some things in BF&S. Something seems wrong with "DtSt," p. FF:25 in the precedence table at the top for single-part items. Value "s" for single date is ABOVE values "p" and "t" and "q". How can that be? I'll swear that the precedence order used to be "r," then "p," then "t," then "q," and if none of those applied, you were left with "s." With the current order in BF&S, if there was a single date in the 260, you'd never get to "p," having been stopped by "s." What I want to tell the folks--and how I've trained people here--is once you've finished the description and have all the dates lined up, look first for an "r" relationship and record it in DtSt. If the item is not a reissue, look then for a "p" relationship and record it in DtSt. If there's no 518, then look at the 260 for a "t" or a "q" relationship, and record them. (I'm not absolutely certain whether "t" has precedence over "q" or the other way around, from what I remember of the precedence order, and the "q" "p" precedence is what sent me to BF&S to begin with.) No "t" or "q," then you have "s." Am I all wet?

A: That table of precedence comes straight from USMARC (008/06-14), but it is only superficially different than it used to be. The revisions were inspired by Format Integration's introduction of that beloved little "u" character (or more correctly, its expansion beyond the Serials format). The "u," you'll recall, substitutes for missing digits in a date. This meant that the single date code "s" would be used even more often than previously, especially when you encountered the run-of-the-publishing-mill uncertain date that used to be coded as Date Type "q" (for instance, our old favorites of the ilk "[199-?]", doesn't the imminent prospect of "[200-?]" just give you chills of anticipation?). That's why code "q" had its rank busted; nowadays it's used mostly for those relatively infrequent dates explicitly expressed as uncertain ranges (in AACR2 1.4F7, "[between 1946 and 1955]") and those that are conjectural translations of non-Gregorian dates (in AACR2 1.4F1, "5730 [1969 or 1970]"). In fact, if you go back to an old OCLC format document, you'll notice that value "q" was divided: The top ranking was for "Questionable date (when Date 1 lacks digits in imprint)" and the lower ranking, fifth in the list of seven, was for "Questionable date (except when Date 1 lacks digits)." That first use of "q" would now be coded "s" and the second use is how "q" is mostly used now. When you remove that top "q" from the old table of precedence, it is almost exactly the same as the current table (except for a few new codes, the fact that the old "t" is now "l," and that "t" and "q" have switched places near the bottom). Setting aside the table itself, though, you would still determine the code to use the same way you always did (or should have), pretty much as you've described it. Consider all the pertinent dates associated with an item, determine their relationships to the others and their bibliographic significance, and only then look at the table of precedence to see which relationship of which dates is considered the most important. If you've got more than one
bibliographically significant date associated with the item, you're probably not going to use "s" regardless of where that value ranks.

Q: In BF&S, field 041, p. 0:98 subfield input standards at the top, subfield #a is shown as mandatory (for VIS, COM, SCO, REC only). Subfield #d is only required if applicable. Ah, since REC does not use subfield #a, using subfield #d in its place, should subfield #d be mandatory for REC? I'm a little hazy on the meaning of "Required if applicable." The text for 041 seems to be saying that if I have a libretto or other accompanying material, say, in a CD booklet, I have to code 041. Catalogers aren't doing that; everyone is acting as if everything but subfields #a (or #d for REC) as optional, including me. Are all of us all wet?

A: "Only mandatory for VIS, COM, SCO, REC" really is misleading, a legacy of OCLC's split of the single USMARC "Music" format into the two formats, Scores and Sound Recordings. If we look at USMARC (Appendix A, p. 9) we read of 041 subfield #a, "Only Mandatory if applicable for Computer files, Music, and Visual materials." My guess is that we translated USMARC's "Music" format into OCLC's SCO and REC without thinking it through entirely. Both USMARC and BF&S make clear elsewhere that you don't use 041 subfield #a in sound recording records. Subfield #d is "Required if applicable" rather than mandatory for sound recordings because so many recordings don't have a sung or spoken text associated with them, all instrumental recordings, for example. Now "Required if applicable or readily available" is a multifaceted standard. As BF&S (p. xii or http://www.oclc.org/oclcl/bib/about.htm#about in the online version) puts it: 'Data is readily available from: (1) The item in hand; (2) Other bibliographic records in the Online Union Catalog; (3) OCLC Authority File records. Data is applicable if: (1) AACR2 1988 rev. instructs you to enter the data when it applies; (2) It is necessary to justify the existence of an added entry (AACR2 1988 rev. rule 21.29); (3) It is essential for efficient access to, or effective processing of, records." If you are cataloging a sound recording that has only one language associated with it (that is, spoken/sung text, printed text/libretto, notes, etc. all in a single language without any translations being involved anywhere), the language coded in the fixed field is enough and you can dispense with the 041 all together. If there is no meaningful language code in the fixed field because the recording is instrumental (Lang: N/A), for instance, and there is some other language associated with the item such as the language of program notes that are mentioned in notes, field 041 would be required in an I-Level record. Regardless of the contents of the Language fixed field, if there is more than one language or a translation associated with any language aspect of the item (that is, spoken/sung text, printed text/libretto, notes, etc.), an I-Level record would need field 041 if those language aspects were mentioned in notes or elsewhere. Many catalogers do neglect to input field 041 when it would be required in an I-Level record (for Core-Level sound recordings records, only subfields #d and #h would be required if applicable), but this is substandard. If it's worth mentioning in a note or elsewhere, it's worth coding correctly. Although you may not be all wet, you might want to start pricing dehumidifiers.

Q: Say you have a sound recording containing two symphonies and one opera overture, all written by the same composer. Would the collective uniform title be "Orchestra music. Selections" (assuming he or she had written more for this medium than these three pieces) or "Selections"? The latter considers the overture part of a vocal work, hence overriding the medium. I seem to remember a rule about this, but I might be wrong. Please refer me to the rule or rule interpretation, if it does exist.

A: As far as I have been able to determine, there is no AACR2 Rule, LCRP, or MCD that directly addresses the question (which is what yours boils down to): Is an orchestral overture to a vocal work considered an orchestral work or an excerpt from a vocal work? AACR2 25.34 deals with collective uniform titles; I find only one tiny hint, taken shamelessly and inexcessably out of context, that sheds any light. In the little introductory paragraph to MCD 25.34B-25.34C, it states in part "For excerpts from one work, treat each excerpt the same as a separate work ..." But if you think about it, that sort of makes sense. Given a miscellaneous collection of, say, marches taken from all manner of compositions by a single composer (independently composed marches, marches from suites, etc.), a collective uniform title that began with the word "Marches" would not be surprising. That's a roundabout way of suggesting that "Orchestra music. Selections" sounds correct for the recording of two symphonies and overture you've invented. After a little searching, I found an LC record of that exact description (91-761850/R+94; OCLC #25089409) containing two symphonies (numbers 4 and 5) and an opera overture ("Maskarade") by Carl Nielsen, with the collective uniform title "Orchestra music. Selections", confirming the guess. A few other similar collections cataloged by LC are treated likewise. So, although there doesn't appear to be strict chapter and verse, it looks like excerpts from larger works may be treated as independent compositions when collective uniform titles are being formulated.

Q: OCLC#37007224 is a recording of Die Meistersinger. It basically seems to match what we have, with three problems: (1) 246: There is no such title on my CD, on the label or anywhere else; (2) 260: "London" is clearly the label on my CD; Decca does appear in tiny letters as the copyright (i.e., phonogram) holder; (3) 300: Ita: The container of my CD has a clearly stated total time
of 255 min., 26 sec., in pretty big letters; rounding up to 260 seems unusual. The 028s match, recorded date is same, etc. I guess most troubling is that "When to Input a New Record" guidelines don't consider variant titles—they used to be in a 500 note, after all. But a variant title that just ISN'T THERE seems like a good reason to make the record new.

A: My inclination would be to say that the label difference alone would justify a new record. The history is convoluted, as you can imagine (you can get a flavor/flavour from the "Decca" and "London" articles in the New Grove Jazz", but the (British) Decca Record Company seems to market its records in the U.S. and Japan under the London label, at least. Decca and London discs often use the same publisher number, just to confuse things further. (For some reason, I'm reminded of the old Hellmann's mayonnaise labels when I was growing up in New Jersey. In fine print there was a note that said something like, "West of the Rockies, Hellmann's is known as Best Foods Mayonnaise. It's the same fine product." Of course, when was the last time you had to catalog a jar of mayo?) Why the timing would be different, I can only guess. Your London disc has the total time prominently displayed on the container. One wonders if the Decca version didn't have the times totaled, and if rounding up over the course of four discs might not account for the difference. Then again, they do tend to take things more slowly on the other side of the pond. The presence or absence of a possibly title-like thing such as "Solti 50 golden jubilee" could be another corroborating factor in the decision. In short, I'd say a new record is justified.

Q: I'm cataloging a children's sound recording that has five musical numbers and four narrated stories. What type would you use, an "i" or a "j"? Also if you used a "j," what would you place in the "Comp" field, "sg" or "mu"?

A: You should choose the Type Code for the predominant format. I'm guessing that it's musical ("j"), but the actual timings of the five songs versus the four stories may be the determining factor. Whichever choice you make, you can add a field 006 for the other, allowing you to code the Composition fixed field for the songs and the "LTxt" fixed field for the stories. Even a single item can exhibit aspects of different bibliographic formats: those "enhanced" CDs that have both sound recording and computer file aspects are a prime example. The 006 field would be optional in the case of your item, of course, but would allow you to code for both the songs and the stories. Only if the musical numbers were not all songs might you code "Comp" anything other than "sg." Since the stories are not musical, they would not have a Composition Code.

Q: Please bear in mind that this query comes from someone who isn't a USMARC user. As applied to Chopin and Beethoven (to take a couple of examples at random), we would all agree that the cataloguer-constructed uniform title "Piano music. 4k Selections" is a "collective title" since AACR 25.34C1 (the specific chapter and verse) is a paragraph within 25.34, Collective titles. The USMARC field for collective uniform titles is 243. It says so in the format. Why then do USMARC users seem to use 240 for "Piano music. 4k Selections" and for other similar collective uniform titles (i.e. I'm not talking about "Works," etc)? Can anyone point to chapter and verse explaining the logic, justifying the decision, or even documenting the same? There's nothing in the LCRIs (which seems fair enough), and the MCDs simply provide examples of use, without explaining how or why the coding was arrived at. UKMARC binds the format much more closely to the cataloging code, and we would expect to input all types of collective title in the same field. Splitting different types of collective uniform titles seems, on the face of it, "wrong," so does mixing two different concepts in the one field (240). And as for breaking the link between AACR2 and the carrier of the data (the MARC format) in such an apparently cavalier manner, well... OK, so I exaggerate slightly, but if it provokes some explanation, perhaps it will have been worth it.

A: Although I am not aware of any rationale for this practice in USMARC itself, the Library of Congress's "Music File Input-Update Manual" (compiled by Richard H. Hunter of LC and used internally at LC) excludes field 243 entirely. Under the description for field 240, there is a note that reads: "Field 243 (Collective Uniform Title) is not used in records created by the Library of Congress. Collective uniform titles are contained in field 240. If a 243 field in an imported record contains a correct AACR2 uniform title, the field should be changed to 240." OCLC has chosen to follow LC's lead in this instance. My suspicion is that the 240/243 split goes back to the early days of USMARC. Many such distinctions that were expected to be important or useful someday were built in to the MARC formats but turned out to be more unwieldy than helpful. (Remember the 700/705 and 710/715 splits, with the 7X5 fields limited to performers?) Remember too, that back in the days of catalog cards, collective uniform titles were supposed to file in front of specific uniform titles, so the 243 may have been a means to achieve this filing distinction by machine. In the post-card era, we've lost that distinction and so, the need for the separately fielded collective uniform title.
Q: We have several cards for scores with imprints like this: "Wien, A. Diabelli & Comp., Graben No. 1133 [1846?] Pl. no.8389." Does that "Graben No." mean anything to you? Should it be entered in the 260, or somewhere else, or not at all?

A: Though I've never seen that before, my guess is that here "Graben No." means "engraving no." I would have thought that meant "plate number," but since you also have a plate number in your example, you should treat it as another music publisher number. Put the notation in a 500 note and add a field 028/3_ for the number, with the publisher in subfield +b.

Q: We are cataloging several CDS of pieces by Fritz Kreisler. We have the Lochner biography of Kreisler, which includes a thematic catalog of works composed and arranged by him. One of the CDS has two minuets; the first "by Porpora" and the second "by Pugnani." Both are of course by Kreisler himself; these are two of the many pieces he originally passed off as being composed by earlier composers when in fact they are new compositions by himself. There is an authority record for the "Porpora" minuet (no 97009244). The uniform title is set up as "Minuets, violin, piano, D major" with cross-references to variations on "Menuet in the style of Porpora." The problem is that BOTH the "Porpora" and the "Pugnani" pieces are minuets, for violin and piano, in D major. The institution that created the authority record cited the Lochner book, but apparently failed to notice that the uniform title would match two completely different pieces, both of which are listed in the Lochner book. My second question is: What's the best way to handle an authority record that seems wrong? Seems I've heard lots of alternatives and find I don't know who to contact. My third question is how do I find out what institution corresponds to a particular NUC symbol? We no longer have the paper copy of OCLC institutions listed by NUC symbol, and on the OCLC web page section where you can search for participating institutions, there is no way to search by NUC symbol. My fourth question is how one would distinguish these two pieces. Locally, we could choose to make the distinctive titles ("Menuet in the style of Porpora" and "Menuet in the style of Pugnani") the authorized headings. But that defeats the luxury of the shared authority file, if you're just going to ignore it! Besides, we'd make a cross-reference for the "generic" title, and would still have to distinguish them. I actually had a brainstorm on distinguishing them--Rule 25.30E1, which allows you to qualify otherwise identical headings by date of composition, publication, or "any other identifying element." I thought of qualifying by who Kreisler ascribed the piece to, namely,

Minuets, violin, piano, D major (Porpora)
Minuets, violin, piano, D major (Pugnani)

I thought that was rather inventive! Maybe put quotes around the names. If I were to go this route, or something similar I might run across in the future, how would that qualifier be subfielded? When one qualifies by date, subfield "n" is used. But when qualifying by "any other element (e.g., place of publication)" what subfield code would be used? I did check Music Coding and Tagging under 240 and didn't find any examples.

A: Let's try to take these one at a time. When you've got a conflict such as this or an otherwise incorrect authority record, you should report it directly to Data Davis at LC (ddav@loc.gov) with any appropriate documentation or evidence. In the Participating Institutions search screen (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/forms/pisearch.htm), you can enter an NUC symbol into the "Any Field, Any Text" box and get results. You may get multiple hits, but it's easy enough to distinguish the NUC hit from the others. Although I've got New Grove available, I don't really have enough information to say how one would distinguish the two minuets in question. For instance, what are the first edition titles? Judging by AACR2 25.30E1, the dates of composition would be the first choice. I think that qualifying by the composer in whose style it was written, as you've suggested, might be ingenious but according to the same rule, would imply that the parenthetical name is that of the first publisher. Most such parenthetical descriptive words or phrases would not be separately subfielded; this is covered in Music Coding and Tagging at the bottom of p. 133 and following. But if the qualifier is a date used as a number to distinguish otherwise identical uniform titles, it would go in subfield +n (see MCAT p. 137).

Follow-up Q: I was thinking I might be able to retire before I had to ask this question. How are we peasants supposed to find out the title on the manuscript or first edition? I would solve my Kreisler minuet problems and hundreds of others if I could devise a way to follow 25.27A1 and discover "the composer's original title in the language in which it was presented." Without access to anything that would give the composer's title, we rely on secondary sources. For Kreisler, New Grove does not list titles. The Lochner book seems the best there is as far as general availability. It does not even have incipits for everything; some pieces are just listed with who knows where the title came from. Looking through the authority file on his works in OCLC, most records (largely by LC) choose the generic form as the authorized one, with the distinctive title (e.g., Precieuse in the style of Couperin) as a cross-reference. But there are a couple records where the distinctive title was chosen (e.g., Rondino über ein Thema von Beethoven) with the generic one as the
cross-reference. Most authority records quote the Lochner book as the citation. Looks like LC isn't having much more luck than I am in deciding which title was Kreisler's and in what language. Or am I missing something everyone else knows. Besides RISM and occasionally CD liner notes or the Forward to a score, how do you find the composer's original title, except as filtered through a reference source?

A: For titles of first editions, I think we rabble generally rely on thematic catalogs, many (but not all) of which try to give some sort of publication history, often with title page transcriptions. For many (but not all) composers, New Grove does actually try to give original titles, so sometimes other sorts of secondary sources such as encyclopedias, RISM, etc. can be useful. Kreisler is a sort of special case because of his half-joking attempts to pass off what were actually his own compositions as arrangements he made of existing classic pieces. That would mean that the "first editions" of most of these Kreisler works are deliberately misleading, presenting Kreisler as the arranger, with Padre Martini, Francoeur, Couperin, or some other unsuspecting dead white male as the composer. Here's my guess, based on a check of some of these Kreisler authority records and without benefit of access to Lochner. The uniform titles in the generic form of "Type of composition, medium, key" ("Andantino," "Siciliano," etc.) seem to be among those Kreisler joke "arrangements" that had a type of composition in their titles. Those Kreisler jokes that had more distinctive titles ("Chanson Louis XIII and pavane," "Chasse," "Precieuse," "Preghiera," etc.) were given the more distinctive uniform titles. And those that were first published explicitly "in the style of" or as "based on a theme by" (that is, those Kreisler did not try to pass off as composed by someone else and simply arranged by him) received those distinctive titles ("Rondino über ein Thema von Beethoven," "Scherzo in the style of Dittersdorf," "Variationen über ein Thema von Corelli"), based on the language of those first editions. Of course, I could be reading too much into those notes in the authority records. So, do you have your Individual Retirement Account in order?

**PCC Standing/Operations Committee Activities**

The Policy Committee ("PoCo") discussed several issues of concern presented by the Chairs of the PCC Standing and Operations Committees:

**Automation Committee (Karen Calhoun, Chair)**

1. Real-time record upload into both utilities. Currently real-time upload is available in RLIN via Z39.50. Options for OCLC libraries include using the forthcoming version (1.10 - early 1999) of the Cataloging MicroEnhancer (CatME), which will allow import of a bibliographic (but not authority) record created in a local system to a workflow in CatME. The record can then be edited and uploaded to OCLC in real-time, generating a cataloging credit. Other OCLC options include using the Cataloger's Toolkit developed by Gary Strawn or using the OCLC Z39.50 cataloging option, which is now in use in a few libraries. However, existing OCLC records cannot be updated in real-time using this last option.

To further facilitate sharing of PCC program records, RLG has offered to provide server space for libraries to contribute new BIBCO records so that they can be loaded into RLIN.

2. Machine-Proposed Authorities. RLG will provide an authority record generator akin to the macro available on OCLC sometime in early 1999.

3. Batch Loading Task Force. Batchloading of PCC program records is "on hold" at OCLC until after developers complete work on the Y2K project. At this time, OCLC has no plans to change its pricing structure to allow full cataloging credits for batchloaded records. The overlay of existing records will be a future enhancement - for now this "lock and replace" can be done using CatME. PCC records will be treated by OCLC in the same place in the overlay hierarchy as full-DLC records. RLG is interested in being able to pick up batch CatME files as well, and asked the Task Force to look into the feasibility of this.

4. Future concerns. The Automation Committee will put a high priority upon lobbying local system vendors to follow standards for record import/export.

**Standards Committee (Joan Schuitema, Chair)**

1. Research Models. The Committee has completed two research models for evaluation of the impact of core records upon original cataloging and upon copy cataloging. These will be posted to the PCC Web page to try to encourage their use. A third model, to evaluate the core record's impact upon library users, is on hold for now.

**Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Committee**

**Report on the November 1998 Meeting**

Jennifer Bowen, Eastman School of Music

NMP representative to the PCC Policy Committee

As one of two NACO representatives to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging's Policy Committee (representing the NACO Music Project), I attended the Policy Committee's annual meeting, held November 12-13, 1998, at the Library of Congress. The meeting was chaired by Sally Sinn, National Agriculture Library.
2. CC:DA. Joan Schuitema has begun to serve as the PCC representative to CC:DA, and will bring topics of mutual interest to the attention of PCC.

3. Core Record implementation at LC. Standards Committee voiced concerns about the wording of LC’s announcement of their planned implementation of the core standard. In particular, there is concern that the discussion of LC’s targeting of certain CIP records for “core” cataloging will result in confusion about the concepts of CIP and Core (i.e. a CIP record cannot be “core” while it is a CIP record). LC will only put an 042/pcc in the record once it becomes a core record.

4. BIBCO in new formats. While OCLC has a quality-control structure already in place (Enhance) for libraries contributing BIBCO records in new formats, RLG does not. To address this, the Standards and Training Committees will draft a policy under which all BIBCO participants can apply for the opportunity to begin contributing BIBCO records in additional formats.

Training Committee (Joan Swanekamp, Chair)
The Committee will participate in the ALA Summit on Education in May 1999. The first two Cataloging Now! institutes have been well-received. The Committee is now looking at revising the content to include more on non-book formats, and to find additional ways to serve the needs of support staff. PoCo discussed several possible future sites for the Institutes, such as Cleveland, Philadelphia, and the West Coast. Another Series Training Institute will be scheduled for March 1999.

BIBCO Operations Committee (Ana Cristan, Chair)
While the BIBCO program did not meet its intended goals this past year, preliminary studies at Cornell and UCLA have indicated that by using the core standard it is possible to have fewer people creating the same number of bibliographic records. Columbia had an initial drop in productivity when implementing BIBCO, but then an increase. Topics for the BIBCO At-Large meeting at Midwinter will include quality control and policies for establishing Cutter numbers.

CONSER Operations Committee (Jean Hirons, Chair)
The proposed changes to AACR being developed for the AACR Joint Steering Committee are in progress: a report of the broad issues will be sent to the JSC soon, while actual rule revisions will be developed later. Electronic serials pose many problems for CONSER members, especially large “aggregator databases” such as ABI Inform and Periodical Abstracts. Several possible approaches were discussed; this problem will be discussed at ALA’s Cataloging Management Discussion Group at the 1999 Midwinter meeting. A new Serials Training Program is being developed; training materials will be sold by CDS.

Update on LC ILS Implementation (Barbara Tillett)
LC’s target date for going “live” on their new Voyager system is October 1999. Tillett warned PoCo members that catalogers should be prepared to see many updated bibliographic and authority records after the implementation as LC begins to use Voyager’s global change capabilities. LC will also then begin to do more cataloging of electronic resources. After the system migration, it is also hoped that NACO and SACO contributions can be facilitated for program members. The CONSER database will reside in the Voyager system.

Review of PCC Tactical Plan
PoCo members discussed the PCC tactical plan in detail, updating the plan for the next five years. The updated plan will be available on the PCC website at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tacticalplan.html. The biggest substantive change to the Plan was the dropping of the PCC goal of facilitating the exchange of program records between OCLC and RLG. After five years of efforts, it is clear that this goal is not feasible. A statement about this issue is available on the PCC Website at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/recexchange.html.

Other Issues
1. Michael Kaplan (Indiana University) was elected the next Chair of the PCC Policy Committee.
2. Karen Muller (ALCTS) presented an opportunity for PCC to participate in satellite distance-learning programming at no cost to the PCC. She will investigate with the vendor on PCC’s behalf.
3. The Policy Committee also began discussions of how to systematically market various PCC products (such as training materials and automation capabilities) both to PCC members and to others.
4. The spring meetings of the BIBCO and CONSER Operations Committees will be held on April 22 and 23 at LC.
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