From the Chair

Mark Scharff, Washington University

Readers may recall from my last column that Ernie the Wonder Dog, the MOUG Board honorary member who designed to let Jay Weitz and Esther Silverman host our summer meetings, had died unexpectedly shortly before this past August's meeting. Word from Columbus is that the Weitz/Silverman household has since grown to include a pair of terrier mixles named Phoebe and Zoe—the former a shy one-year-old, the latter a rambunctious, friendly five-month-old. We're awaiting their Board applications.

I attended the OCLC Members Council meeting in Columbus Oct. 23-25 as an observer by virtue of my office of MOUG Chair. The general theme of this meeting was "Reaching out to new partners--international and rural libraries." OCLC member libraries are in 109 countries and comprise nearly 29% of the membership. About the same percentage of OCLC revenue comes from abroad, double that of five years ago. On the ground, though, there are challenges ahead in collaborating with economies and government structures different from those in North America, not to mention the need to support additional languages and scripts. Within the U.S., serving rural libraries will require different modes of OCLC services delivery. As one member observed, OCLC's goal should be to do things with others, not to or for others.

Of particular interest for music folk should be President Jay Jordan's inclusion of FRBR as a "compelling reason" for joining the OCLC collaborative (along with international resource sharing, collection analysis, the option of group catalogs by region or type of library, Open WorldCat, and Unicode support). One of the demos at the Members Council meeting showed the latest proposal for bringing FRBR principles to WorldCat in FirstSearch, and another extended them to displays in Open WorldCat. The latter actually looked better. There were no music examples to show what this might look like for Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, but the developers are aware that our community has specialized needs; questions will soon be coming about what this ought to look like and how it should function in the cataloging interface. Another initiative MOUG members might want to look into is that of collecting links to controlled vocabularies that can be brought into the Research Task Pane of MS Office 2003. See http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/teremservices for more information. I talked with Diane Vizine-Goetz, one of the developers, and pointed her toward the MLA Types of Composition document. Finally, I made a contact that might help MOUG find ways to work with OCLC networks to enhance their training offerings for music cataloging.

As always, if you have further questions about the meeting, feel free to ask me.

Now for the cheerleading section. You will be receiving a ballot for a new Secretary/Newsletter Editor and a new Continuing Education Coordinator. The Nominating Committee (Marty Jenkins, chair, with Stephanie Bonjack and Candy Feldt) has presented us with a superb slate of candidates. Please vote. Please, please, please.

Elsewhere in this issue you'll see articles from Neil Hughes and Candy Feldt. Neil is looking for guidance as to whether MOUG should pursue 501(c)3 status to allow receipt of tax-deductible contributions. Please give this your thoughtful consideration; it will be on our agenda for the February meeting. Candy will be unveiling the program for the Memphis meeting, which promises to continue the MOUG tradition of timely, practical sessions (and a newer, but important, tradition of good food).

Here's wishing all of you safe travel and happy holidays, and I hope to see y'all in Memphis.
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Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It appears three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Stephen Luttmann, Music Library, University of Northern Colorado, Campus Box 68, Greeley, CO 80639-0100.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted on 3.5" disk in ASCII format, Word, WordPerfect, or sent electronically. 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 Holling Smith-Borne, MOUG Treasurer, Music Library, Performing Arts Center, DePauw University, Greencastle, IN 46135 (Dues in North America, $15.00 for personal members, $20.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, $30.00; 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.

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

MOUG 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 Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect
Neil Hughes, University of Georgia

Update on MOUG's Pursuit of Federal Tax-Exempt Status as a Charitable Organization

In the previous issue of this Newsletter, the Board posed the following question: Would you be likely to make monetary donations to MOUG in the same way that you do to other professional organizations--either in honor or memory of a MOUG colleague, or just as a matter of your ongoing commitment to MOUG--if we were to attain federal 501(c)3 tax status as a charitable organization? Several of you have responded (mostly in the positive), and we thank you for your early replies. As noted in the previous article, the issue will be discussed at the business meeting in Memphis, so there is no need for you to reply immediately--we want you to give as serious consideration to the issue as you can, and we recognize that this requires time--but of course the better an idea we have of which way the membership is leaning, the better prepared the Board can be to lead the discussion.

Since the previous article appeared, several people who have served MOUG as Board members in earlier years have responded with information about the history of MOUG's current tax status. (Thank you, Karen Little, Jean Harden, and Ann Caldwell.) Several current MOUG members also wrote to tell us that they successfully pursued, or helped pursue, tax-exempt status for other 501(c)3 charitable organizations with which they are involved, and they graciously volunteered to assist MOUG should the membership and the Board decide to proceed.

Jean Harden informs us that MOUG is currently covered under section 501(c)6 of the Internal Revenue Code. Nonprofit organizations ruled tax exempt under section 501(c)6 of the Internal Revenue Code include business leagues, chambers of commerce, trade associations, real estate boards, and boards of trade. Contributions to 501(c)6 organizations are not deductible as charitable donations for federal income tax purposes. Donations may be deducted as a business expense if they are "ordinary and necessary" in the conduct of the taxpayer's business. (My source for this summary is the Web site for the association Give.org, an arm of the Better Business Bureau, viewed October 31, 2005: http://www.give.org/tips/tax.asp#501c6. In other words, your annual MOUG dues, as well as the meeting expenses you incur when traveling to MOUG meetings, are currently deductible if you itemize on your federal tax return, but donations that you might be inclined to make to MOUG are not. According to what I've been able to determine from the Internal Revenue Service website, MOUG would not lose its status as a 501(c)6 trade association (which includes the right to lobby Congress concerning issues of interest to MOUG) if we were also to pursue status as a charitable organization under 501(c)3. See http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/etopick03.pdf, p. 39, for the pertinent text. Our educational mission affords us the opportunity to enjoy this dual status--provided, of course, that we complete the required paperwork thoroughly and accurately!

On behalf of the entire Board, I'd like to thank Jean, Karen, and Ann for their invaluable insights into how MOUG arrived at its current legal status as a professional association. Thanks also to all those of you who have offered to help. I encourage you to keep thinking, between now and February, about what purposes or added value (other than the obvious one of fundraising) might accrue to MOUG as a result of our also becoming a charitable organization in the eyes of the IRS.

From the Continuing Education Coordinator
Candice Feldt, Harvard University

Focus on Sound Recordings

Both the program and the registration form for our annual MOUG meeting in Memphis are included in this newsletter. I hope you will join us for what promises to be a fascinating meeting focusing on various aspects of sound recordings in libraries. Our plenary session will be a panel moderated by Michael Rogan of Tufts University. Panelists will cover special issues concerning recordings, including selection, acquisitions, reference, cataloging and the current topic of digital recordings in libraries. Following the plenary session will be a dinner buffet which will feature all sorts of southern delights!

On Wednesday morning we will begin with a buffet breakfast, and then move right along to two separate sound recording cataloging workshops, which we hope will appeal to catalogers and non-catalogers alike. Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University) will lead a workshop on the basics of sound recording cataloging, while Howard Jaffe (LC) and Robert Freeborn (Penn. State University) will discuss cataloging non-musical and unusual format sound recordings. Our Ask MOUG program will again combine public and technical services issues, with Jay Weitz and Deb Bendig from OCLC on hand to answer your questions.

Many thanks to the MOUG Board and to the Program Committee over the last two years for being so helpful and supportive during my term as Continuing Education Coordinator of MOUG. As usual, it has been a pleasure to serve!
General News

Ching-chih Chen Joins OCLC as Consultant

Ching-chih Chen, Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College, Boston, has joined OCLC as Consultant to the President for global digital initiatives among libraries, museums and archival institutions. Dr. Chen will consult for OCLC on special assignments and projects led by Phyllis Spies, Vice President, OCLC Collection Management Services.

OCLC Research Updates its List of the Top 1000 Works Held by Libraries

OCLC Research has updated its "OCLC Top 1000" Web site, which lists the works most widely held by OCLC member libraries around the world. In addition to the main list, the site includes thematic sublists, sample cover art, Open WorldCat "Find in a Library" links, comparisons to other lists, and data files available for downloading in popular Excel format. As with the 2004 edition, visitors can view all 1,001 ranked titles or any of a baker's dozen different sublists, including banned books, biography, books made into films, children's books, drama, fiction, librarianship, music, poetry, and others. Cover art and links to local libraries are available for most titles. For the latest "OCLC Top 1000" and further information about it, go to http://www.oclc.org/research/top1000/.

OCLC PICA Acquires Fretwell-Downing Informatics

OCLC PICA, the leading library systems and service provider in Europe, has acquired Fretwell-Downing Informatics, an information discovery, library management and knowledge delivery organization, to strengthen and extend their combined worldwide network for information delivery to libraries. OCLC PICA, based in Leiden, the Netherlands, and Fretwell-Downing Informatics, based in Sheffield, United Kingdom, will continue to offer their current products lines while they work to develop new services that take full advantage of an expanded information delivery network. As a result of this acquisition, OCLC PICA and Fretwell-Downing Informatics will share technologies, capabilities and skills to offer more and faster service enhancements and updates. Fretwell-Downing Informatics has supplied leading-edge information management solutions to over 250 organizations worldwide. The organization operates from its offices in the U.K. with a U.S. subsidiary in North America and additional offices in Australia and Europe.

IMLS Makes Award to OCLC, Getty Trust

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) has made a $399,197 award to OCLC, in conjunction with the J. Paul Getty Trust, to plan and co-host the 2006 and 2007 Web-Wise Conferences on Libraries and Museums in the Digital World. Web-Wise is a signature initiative of the IMLS. Each year it brings together representatives and thought leaders from museums, libraries, archives, systems science, and other fields interested in the future of high-quality online content for inquiry and education. The focus of each annual conference is on sharing the latest research and newest innovations in digital technology, exploring their potential impacts on library and museum services, and on promoting effective museum and library collaborations in the digital environment. The conference also provides IMLS grant recipients the opportunity to showcase exemplary projects. The 2006 Web-Wise Conference will be held February 16-17 in Los Angeles, California. The conference theme is "Inspiring Discovery: Unlocking Collections." Sessions will explore current and emerging practices for information discovery as well as promising innovations that could revolutionize the ways in which information seekers find digital content. Projects featuring museum and library resources, and the paths to their discovery, will be featured in plenary sessions and demonstrations. Half-day workshops requiring separate registration will be offered on February 15. Online registration for both the conference and the workshops will be available in early December via the IMLS Web site.

Collections and Technical Services

Connexion Changes, August 2005

The August 2005 Connexion installation includes changes to validation options, and several problem fixes.
- Set Validation Options for Bibliographic and Authority Records in Connexion Browser:
  - The August install includes the addition of options for validation which allow a choice in validation level when setting holdings (Update Holdings, Produce and Update Holdings, and Alternate Produce and Update Holdings) on existing bibliographic records or when exporting bibliographic (Export Record in MARC, Export Record in DC HTML, and Export in DC RDF) or authority records (Export Record in MARC).
  - Users can set holdings on records without having to edit records to resolve problems with master records. These options do not apply to new records being added to or to existing records being replaced in the WorldCat or the Authority File. In addition, validation will continue not to occur when taking
a Delete Holdings action. There are three validation levels:

- **No validation (None).** The system does not perform any validation checks. Holdings will be added regardless of the number of errors in the existing record at the time the user sets holdings or exports.
- **Basic validation (Basic).** The system checks for the validity of elements, length, repetitiveness, type of data or codes, etc. For example, validation errors occur when:
  - a tag, e.g. the 069, is not valid for input.
  - a field, e.g. the 043, occurs too often.
  - a code, e.g. "enl", is not valid in Lang.
- **Full validation (Full).** The system does a basic-level check along with a check of relationships between elements. For example, validation errors occur when:
  - Field 255 is present and the 034 subfield 8 is not.
  - DiSt (005/06) is equal to s and Date2 (008/11-14) contains a date when it should contain blanks.
  - Field 012 is present and Bl.vl (Leader/07) contains m when it should contain s.

- **Cataloging, Authority and Export Options in Preferences.** The new option, Validation Levels, can be found in Preferences on the Cataloging and Authority Option screens. A revised export option can be found on the Export Option screen as Validate Exported Bibliographic and Authority Records. Validation levels for exported bibliographic records have been changed from On or Off to None, Basic, or Full. The ability to change validation levels in the export option for authority records is new. The validation options for export apply only to a single bibliographic or authority record. There continues to be no validation when exporting a list of flagged bibliographic or authority records.

- **Setting or changing options.** The default is set to None for all validation options. No changes are necessary in order to avoid the interference of validation with processing records. If users keep None as the setting, they can always take an explicit Validate Record action to check for errors prior to setting holdings or exporting. The export option for validation is available on all three screens. If it is changed on one screen and saved, it will change automatically on the other screen. For example, if Export Bibliographic Record in Cataloging is set to Full and the settings are saved in Cataloging, the option will change on the Export Option screen automatically. If users would rather validate records automatically with the Update Holdings, Produce and Update Holdings, Alternate Produce and Update Holdings, or Export actions, they must change the appropriate option in Preferences. When using Basic or Full, users must correct the errors reported before attempting to set holdings or export again. The validation options for setting holdings and exporting apply to records viewed in both MARC and Dublin Core.

- **Changes to Validation in Connexion Client:**
  - For Connexion client 1.30 and 1.40, validation will no longer occur automatically when holdings are set (Update Holdings, Produce and Update Holdings, and Alternate Produce and Update Holdings). Validation will continue not to occur on an Export action or a Delete Holdings action. When checking for errors prior to setting holdings or exporting, users must take an explicit Validate action. The ability to customize the validation level will be added to client 1.50, expected to be released in November 2005.

- **Problem fixes:**
  - The following fixes have been installed for various problems. The Known Problems pages for both client and browser have been updated to reflect these changes.
    - In the client, when browsing for authorities (scanning heading indexes) in the Browse Authorities dialog, users may now enter both a browse term for a heading and an expanded term to limit the scan to a subheading. Users no longer have to wait to get the browse results list to enter an expanded term. This is fixed for both 1.30 and 1.40.
    - Previously in the client, when scrolling up or down multiple times in authority browse lists, the index list reverted to showing tag numbers only, with no text. This is resolved for both 1.30 and 1.40.
    - Client users were not able to see the list of constant data records sorted by name in the online constant data file. This has been fixed.
    - Client users were not able to retain the 007 when saving constant data records to the online constant data file. This has been fixed.
    - The client and the browser now recognize search terms consisting of 10 digits as ISBNs if no index label is entered or selected.

**Connexion Changes, October 2005**

The following changes were installed at the Connexion host on October 2, 2005.
• Problems replacing records that have 007s resolved. Previously, when replacing bibliographic records that have 007s, users got an error message, "Not authorized to replace record," even when they had the appropriate authorization level. This problem has been resolved for both the Connexion browser and client interfaces.

• Connexion client offline validation errors for 049 with special characters resolved. Previously, when the 049 holding library code included some special characters such as the greater than symbol (>), the ampersand (&), Connexion client 1.40 offline validation failed with an error message saying that the 049 is too short. This problem has been resolved.

• Connexion client, imported OCLC records, delete holdings. When importing OCLC records (e.g. records received from the PromptCat service), users cannot delete holdings initially. Imported OCLC records do not indicate whether the item is Held or Not Held by the user's library. Therefore, the Delete Holdings action cannot be taken on an imported record. However, logged-on users can now validate imported records to update the holdings information and then use the Delete Holdings command.

• Connexion client, Control All command, problems resolved with paired fields. Previously, when bibliographic records contained paired fields for non-Latin script data and corresponding romanized data, the Control All action (Edit, Control Headings, All) incorrectly deleted the romanized field or its indicator values. This problem has been resolved.

Connexion Client 1.50 Coming in November 2005

Connexion client version 1.50, which will be released in November 2005, will include the following enhancements:

• Batch set or delete holdings without having to retrieve the records first. Enter or import a list of OCLC control numbers and specify to update Holdings, Produce and Update Holdings, or Delete Holdings using menu item Batch, Holdings by OCLC Number. Run the batch to set or delete holdings based on the control number without downloading the records before taking the actions. Specify whether holdings should be set on records the library already holds. View a report summarizing the batch.

• Apply constant data automatically to records downloaded via batch searching, or apply the default constant data record to all records downloaded via batch searching, similar to the option to assign a My Status value to all downloaded records. Set this option under Batch, Process Batch, Search Options.

• Customize short index list in Search and Browse WorldCat dialogs. In the Search WorldCat and Browse WorldCat dialogs, select the customize button to customize the short drop-down list of indexes. Add, remove, or change the order of indexes. In the Browse WorldCat dialog, "Title phrase (ti-)") has been added to the full index list.

• Limit WorldCat searches by Material Type using drop-down list of values. In the Search WorldCat dialog, limit by Material Type such as biography, CD audio, DVD video, and fiction using a short list of 10 pre-selected material types or a complete list of over 100 types. Or customize the short list by adding, removing, or changing the order of material types.

• WorldCat truncated lists. WorldCat truncated lists are displayed by default for searches that result in 6-100 matches. The truncated list now shows whether the item is held by the library. Optionally, click the right mouse button and select List Settings to add columns to the truncated list to display the total number of holdings on the record and the OCLC control number.

• Fixed field elements. View drop-down lists for valid values for each fixed field element, similar to what was previously available in CatME. Optionally, turn off this feature by unselecting "Use drop-downs for fixed fields" under Tools, Options, Record Display.

• Populate fields from other records. Automatically add linking field data by entering tag 760-787 and an OCLC control number. Select Edit, Insert from Cited Record to derive the data from the OCLC record you enter. The client populates the field automatically. This functionality was formerly available in the Connexion browser interface only.

• Set validation options. Customize the validation level used for setting holdings on existing WorldCat records and for exporting bibliographic and authority records. Choose among three levels—none, basic, full—under Tools, Options, General, Validation Options. The default option is "none."

• Define Start-up action. Define an action to be completed each time when opening the client software. Some examples include Logon, Logon + Search WorldCat, or Search Local File (bibliographic). If the selection includes logon, the client logs on using the default authorization number and password. Specify a start-up action under Tools, Options, Startup Options. Or continue to specify a macro to run automatically at startup.

• Unicode export options. Export bibliographic and authority records in the Unicode 8-bit environment, as described in the LC documentation. Or, continue to export in the MARC-8 format as with previous versions of the client. Choose the option under Tools, Options, Export. (Note: OCLC is testing this
functionality with local system vendors and will list vendors who have successfully tested the option when client 1.50 is released.)

- Unicode import options. Import files of bibliographic and authority records in the Unicode format into the online or local save file. Or, continue to import MARC-8 format files as with previous versions of the client. Select File, Import to specify the format.

- User Tools definition. User Tools 1-10 can be assigned to characters, macros, or text strings. They can be accessed from the Tools, User Tools menu or from the 1-10 buttons on the toolbar. New with client 1.50, view a default description of the user tool that shows on the Tools, User Tools menu list and in the pop-up tool tip on the toolbar. Or customize the description in Tools, User Tools, Assign, Modify Description. For example, the OCLC Four Figure Dewey Cutter Macro default description is "Macro Dewey!FourFig". Optionally, change to "Run Dewey Macro".

- Macro commands. Use new macro commands IsHeadingControlled to determine if a field in a bibliographic record contains a controlled heading and CopyRecord and MoveRecord to copy and move records in local files.

- Non-Latin script cataloging. When cataloging using the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Hebrew, Cyrillic, and Greek scripts, only characters that can be converted to MARC-8 are valid. From the Edit menu, select MARC-8 Characters, Verify to easily check the record for invalid characters. All invalid characters in the record are changed to a different color (default color is red; customize the color under Tools, Options, Record Display, Invalid MARC-8 characters). Edit the characters before validating the record or taking a final action. Optionally, continue to validate the record and receive validation errors if the record contains invalid characters. Create non-Latin script records without linked romanized fields. Previously, dummy linked fields were created automatically that included the placeholder data "<=>". Now, the client supports non-linked fields and no longer creates the dummy fields except for the 245 field. In the future, after previous versions of the Connexion client are no longer supported, OCLC will replace WorldCat records that currently include the placeholder data.

When using Chinese, Japanese, and Korean scripts, use the CJK E-Dictionary from the Tools menu to select characters that are in MARC-8 (EACC for CJK use). The CJK E-Dictionary was previously available in the OCLC CJK cataloging software.

When using Arabic script, add Arabic script manually with romanized data using Edit, Transliterate, Arabic.

Optionally, automatically add the Arabic script data when retrieving Arabic language records from WorldCat. Set this option and specify which variable fields to automatically transliterate under Tools, Options, International. Arabic script fields added automatically are noted with a special character to the left of the tag number so that users can determine fields that have auto-transliterated output to review.

- German and Korean interfaces. Select a newly available German or Korean interface language, in addition to English, Spanish, Chinese (simplified or traditional), or Japanese interfaces, which are currently supported in client 1.40. Change the interface language under Tools, Options, International.

WebDewey/Abridged WebDewey Quarterly Release, August 2005

WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey are updated quarterly. Both services contain the latest version of the schedules, tables, Manual, and Relative Index entries from their respective enhanced DDC databases. The hierarchical displays in WebDewey and Abridged WebDewey feature updated main class and division captions. One new interface change is available: Linking to local OPAC. Easily send a DDC search from WebDewey or Abridged WebDewey to the local web-based OPAC. For details and setup information, see www.oclc.org/dewey/enhancements/enhancement200508.htm

WebDewey is a Web-based version of the enhanced DDC 22 database. This August 2005 release includes:

- Updated PPT mappings to Edition 22 numbers in the religion class (200s).
- All updates to Dewey Decimal Classification, Edition 22, through June 2005 (corrections, new developments, new built numbers, and additional electronic index terms).
- Thousands of LC Subject Headings (LCSH) that have been statistically mapped to Dewey numbers from records in WorldCat (the OCLC Online Union Catalog) and intellectually mapped by DDC editors (through LCSH Weekly List no. 37, 2004).
- Thousands of Relative Index terms and built numbers not available in print.
- Links from mapped LCSH to the LCSH authority records.
- Selected mappings from Medical Subject Headings (MeSH).

Abridged WebDewey is a Web-based version of the enhanced Abridged 14 database. This August 2005 release includes:
• All Abridged Edition 14 content through June 2005.
• LCSH that have been intellectually mapped to Dewey headings by DDC editors, including mappings to Abridged Edition 13 numbers from the OCLC publication, Subject Headings for Children
• Links from mapped LCSH to the LCSH authority records.
• Mappings between abridged Dewey numbers and the 2005 update to the 18th edition of H.W. Wilson's Sears List of Subject Headings.

The next Dewey Services quarterly release is scheduled for November 2005. For details about enhancements, see www.oclc.org/dewey/updates/enhancements/default.htm. OCLC has recently improved its WebDewey tutorial (www.oclc.org/dewey/resources/tutorial/): It's easier to access, it loads faster, and it's printable. For details, see www.oclc.org/dewey/updates/tips/webdewey/tip31.htm.

End of Life Extended for Connexion Client 1.30

OCLC previously announced the end of life date for Connexion client version 1.30 as December 1, 2005. Since some client 1.30 users are waiting to upgrade directly to client 1.50, OCLC has extended the 1.30 end of life date to January 1, 2006. Connexion client 1.50 will be released in late November. At that time, client 1.30 users will receive an upgrade message each time they start the client software. Optionally, client 1.30 users can upgrade to 1.40 ahead of the 1.50 release. Client 1.40 will be supported until March 1, 2006. Users can verify their version numbers by going to the Help menu and selecting About OCLC Connexion client.

Reference Services

OCLC and Rutgers to Study Virtual Reference Services

OCLC and the Rutgers University School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies are the recipients of a $684,996 grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to study virtual reference services (VRS). Marie L. Radford, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Library and Information Science, Rutgers, and Lynn Silipigni Connaway, Ph.D., Consulting Research Scientist, OCLC, are the two principal investigators. This study, "Seeking Synchronicity: Evaluating Virtual Reference Services from User, Non-User, and Librarian Perspectives," will study and evaluate VRS sustainability and relevance, as well as improve libraries’ ability to respond to increased demand. The project will develop a theoretical model for VRS that incorporates interpersonal and content issues and will make research-based recommendations for library staff to increase user satisfaction and attract nonusers. It will also make recommendations for VRS software development and interface design and produce a research agenda for user-centered VRS. The National Leadership Grants for Libraries program enhances the quality of library services nationwide by supporting innovative projects that can be widely replicated. Areas of funding include education, research, digitization, and library-museum collaboration.

PAIS Archive Completed

The PAIS Archive database on the OCLC FirstSearch service has been updated with a third and final installment. The PAIS Archive is a retrospective database chronicling global public policy and social issues from 1915-1976, and complements the contemporary social sciences coverage of the PAIS International database on FirstSearch. Originally published as PAIS Bulletin, the PAIS Archive contains over one million records for periodicals, books, hearings, reports, gray literature, government publications, and other English-language materials published around the world. For more information, including ordering, please visit http://www.oclc.org/firstsearch/.

Resource Sharing, Shelf-Ready, and Contract Services

WebJunction Awarded Gates Grant to Extend Spanish Language Outreach Program

WebJunction, the online community where library staff meet to share ideas, solve problems, and do online coursework, has received a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation that will extend a Spanish Language Outreach Program designed to provide public library staff with skills and resources to increase the number of Spanish speakers using public access computers in libraries across the United States. The three-year, $2 million grant follows a successful 18-month pilot program in New Mexico, Colorado, Illinois and Florida, which was also funded by the Gates Foundation. The pilot program created a training curriculum, conducted 37 workshops, and trained 482 library staff members. The program will use the new funding to replicate the training program nationwide in partnership with state libraries. Libraries participating in the program's regional workshops will also share their experiences and resources through the online community at WebJunction, available at http://webjunction.org/spanish. Using this interactive environment, WebJunction is building a collection of best practices, case studies and resources to facilitate similar outreach to any library in the country. By developing a community of interest around serving the needs of Spanish speakers, the grant will also help achieve WebJunction's mission of creating a comprehensive nationwide online resource for training, materials, and library staff interaction.
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2006 MOUG Meeting Schedule
Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., Feb. 21-22, 2006
Focus on Sound Recordings

Tuesday, Feb. 21, 2006

1:00-3:00 pm  MOUG Board meeting
2:30 pm        Registration opens (until 7:30 pm)
3:00-3:50 pm  Enhance working session
4:00-5:30 pm  Concurrent sessions:
                • NACO Music Project working session
                • Reference Services Committee

5:30-7:00 pm  Plenary Session Panel: Focus on Sound Recordings
               Michael Rogan, Tufts University, moderator, Reference issues
               Michael Fling (Indiana Univ.), Selection and acquisitions
               Jenn Riley (Indiana Univ.), Digital issues
               Jay Weitz (OCLC), Cataloging issues

7:00-9:00 pm  Dinner/Reception

Wednesday, Feb 22, 2006

7:00-8:30 am  Registration
7:00-8:00 am  Breakfast buffet
8:00-9:20 am  Concurrent sessions:
                • The Basics: Cataloging sound recordings (Margaret Kaus, Kansas State Univ.)
                • Cataloging non-musical recordings, and unusual formats (Howard Jaffe, Library of Congress and Robert Freeborn, Penn. State Univ.)

9:30-10:45 am Ask MOUG for public and technical services (Jay Weitz and Deb Bendig (OCLC)
11:00 am-12 noon MOUG Business Meeting
Questions and Answers

Jay Weitz, OCLC

MP3 Files on CD

Q: I need some clarification on cataloging MP3-CDs. In the 007 tag, do we still assign "i" (1.4 mps)? And what does the "mps" stand for? Also, in the 300 tag, subfield 3a is still "sound recording" as well as the GMD in the 245 tag, correct? Is there anywhere in the record besides the notes that item is a MP3-CD versus the traditional CD? Any and all information would be greatly appreciated.

A: Compact discs containing MP3 files would be cataloged as sound recordings (musical or non-musical, as appropriate) with electronic aspects (that is, Type "j" or "i" with Computer File 006, the "File" element of which is coded "h" for "sounds"). The GMD should be [electronic resource]." The "Form" fixed field should be coded "s," and there would need to be a source of title note. You'd need two 007 fields, one for Sound Recordings (probably: s j a d b u z e f t n y g e w n f z e tw n a u), the other for Computer Files (probably: c j b o z d n y g f a; the remaining optional subfields can be included or not depending upon what information you have). It should be noted, however, that there are currently no hard and fast rules for cataloging such audio files, and that the rules that do exist are in a state of flux, to say the least.

Because the cataloging of MP3 files on CDs requires reference to both Chapter 6 and Chapter 9 of AACR2, you theoretically have a choice about the physical description in the 300 field, but I would strongly recommend sticking with "1 sound disc: digital; 4 3/4 in." according to Chapter 6. Use field 538 for the designation "MP3 files" and any other appropriate information about playback requirements and the like.

Regarding the Sound Recording 007 subfield 3d (Speed) code "f", traditional audio CDs have a "speed" of 1.4 meters per second. The whole issue of the "speed" of an audio compact disc is pretty complicated, however. The audio track is optically scanned by a laser beam at a "constant linear velocity" of (roughly) 1.4 meters per second. In order for that scanning rate to remain constant, and because of the circular shape of a CD, the actual number of revolutions per minute of the CD (called the "angular speed") varies from about 500 rpm near the inner edge to about 200 rpm on the outer edge. Here's what MARC 21 currently says in defining code "f": "Code f indicates that the speed of the disc is 1.4 meters per second. This is calculated from the distance the playback mechanism covers on the surface of the disc per second, and not the number of revolutions of the disc. It is associated with compact discs (CDs)." My recommendation for coding the Sound Recording 007 subfield 3d is to use "u" for "unknown," because I have no idea how these MP3 files may be read by the proper playback equipment.

Although it is five years old now, an article entitled "Cataloging MP3s: The Sound of Things to Come?" (http://wings.buffalo.edu/publications/mejnl/v7n2/freebor nmp3.html) by Robert Freeborn (Pennsylvania State University, and past president of Online Audiovisual Catalogers, OLAC) offers some interesting information. Please note that some details about the cataloging rules and the MARC format have changed since 2000.

Plate Number Transcription

Q: I'm in the middle of cataloging a score and part of Dvorak's Rondo for cello & piano, op. 94, published by R. Schauer. This will require a new record in OCLC, although what I have is similar to OCLC #30432413 (except that there's a different publisher and no "Elite Edition," along with a few other variations). The plate number on the cello part is 10111. The numbers appearing on the bottom of each page of the score are (in this format):

10111.10185
13380.13381

The score indicates that versions of this publication exist for cello, violin, viola, or clarinet. The clarinet arrangement is cataloged as OCLC #40328981. My question: What is the appropriate way to record the plate number(s)? It's clear that one 028 should exist for the unambiguous number on the cello part; but how should the score number(s) be treated? There are at least four options:

1. Transcribe one 028: 10111.10185.13380.13381 7b ....
2. Transcribe two 028s: 10111.10185 7b ....
   13380.13381 7b ....
3. Transcribe four separate 028s: 10111 7b ....
   10185 7b ....
   13380 7b ....
   13381 7b ....
4. Do not transcribe any plate numbers from the score, because this is just a listing of the four different plate numbers used by the parts. Instead use the part plate number only in the record.

Finally, we have one other question: Would it be appropriate to take the final approach (just the part plate number) but still record a 000 as follows?

Pl. no.: 10111.10185.13380.13381 (score); 10111 (part).

Thanks in advance for your advice.
A: Because these numbers actually appear at the bottom of each page of the score, my inclination is to transcribe them. Furthermore, my inclination is to transcribe them in a single 028 field, pretty much literally as they are presented (option one). A corresponding 500 note (as in your second question, which becomes moot with my answer) would be appropriate. If there's some sort of explanation that you can include that would be enlightening, useful, and succinct, that might not be a bad idea, either. I can't say that this is the definitive answer (one could make arguments for each of the other options), but when it comes to publisher and plate numbers, I tend to be a literalist. Especially when all else fails.

A Compound Copyright Date

Q: I am cataloging a facsimile score of Barbara Strozzi's Cantate arietta e duetti, opera seconda. The facsimile is published by Cornetto-Verlag. None of the three OCLC records match my item precisely; their publisher no. is CORN-10-1-0206, while that in my item is CF206. While you can see a relationship, I think they're different enough to justify a new record. My question is about how to deal with the copyright date, which is given in my item as 2000/2003. Would you consider 2003 as an inferred publication date with 2000 as a copyright date, or does the change in the publisher no. (which incidentally was not accompanied by a change in the ISMN) remove 2000 from the picture entirely? Or am I on the wrong track in making a new record?

A: Sounds as though a separate record is justified, by both the different publisher number and the different date. It's hard to know exactly what the year "2000" signifies if the configuration is "<2000/2003:". My inclination would be to ignore the "2000" (considering it merely an older copyright date in a series of such dates) and simply use the "<2003:" date. If there's something useful and succinct that you can say about the "<2000/2003:" date and/or the existence of the previous (2000) publication, you could add a note.

STEMRA

Q: I am cataloging a music CD collection. On the disc and box is a term in a box: STEMRA. This is located near the DDD (in a box) on both the CDs and box. Any assistance would be helpful in determining what STEMRA is.

A: STEMRA is the Dutch musical performing rights organization for composers, lyricists, and music publishers. Its Web site, http://www.bumastemra.nl, is unfortunately (if understandably) in Dutch, but you can find a brief English description on the Web at "The CD Factory" (http://www.cdfabric.nl/cdfactory/buma_stemra.htm).

A Single Volume of Notated Music Containing More Than One Format

Q: Here's something I've been puzzling over for some time. I have a "notated music" collection of works by Piazzolla; the first 4 works are for piano solo (p. 2-21); the final two works are for piano with one or more instruments (p. 22-32). See OCLC #48021333. I'm modifying the record for local use, and the following questions arose. First, is it appropriate to code FMUs as "m" for multiple formats? Does the mixture of two musical formats constitute "several"? Second, what is the best approach to creating the content of field 300 ?

- Preponderance of format in item?
- First format in item?
- A standard preference of one format over another (score vs. p. of music)?

I'd appreciate any guidance you can give.

A: You'd think that this question would have come up before, but I don't believe it has. And AACR2 only appears to offer help, but it really doesn't. That second paragraph of 5.5B2 reads: "If the item consists of different types of score, or a score and parts separately, or different types of score and parts, give the details of each in the order of the list in 5.5B1, separated from each other by a space, plus sign, space." The examples that follow, however, seem to address only cases where the different types of score are physically separate or at least have discontinuous pagings. Yours is one continuously paged physical item, and I can't figure out a way to indicate such a situation that is accurate, understandable, and within the spirit of the rules. Well, I can, sort of, with additional inspiration from 2.5B2, 2.5B6, and 2.5B9, among other rules, but I'm not sure how much sense it makes.

21 p. of music, 1 score (p. 22-32) ...

By separating the two sequences with a comma rather than a space, plus sign, space, we suggest (to catalogers, at least) the single physical item rather than two physically separate things (as the space, plus sign space would indicate). But I'm not sure anyone would know exactly what the situation was from that physical description unless there was some explanation in a note.

Because we're trying to be helpful and informative in a bibliographic record, though, we might want to consider something more commonsensical. In this case, both the first format and the dominant format are "p. of music," and it might simply make sense to describe the whole thing as such: "32 p. of music," explaining the different format of the final two works (p. 22-32) in a note.
My first suggestion can be defended by reference to the rules and by rough analogy to some of the examples found in AACR2, MARC 21, and/or LC's Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual. I think. And the more I think about it, the more I'm inclined to go in that direction, in spite of its non-intuitiveness. My second suggestion has the virtue of simplicity but also the flaw of inaccuracy. I'd be most interested to hear your reaction.

To answer your first question about FMUs, the code "m" seems proper here.

"Digalog" Cassette Recording

Q: Is the designation "DIGALOG" on a cassette tape a statement of "Type of Recording" as described in AACR2 6.5C2? The record in question is #24314234, which notes "digalog" in 300 subfield $b$, and the 007 subfield $m$ is marked "e" for analog electrical storage. I'm wondering if that is proper or not.

A: Back in MOUG Newsletter 65 (November 1996) p. 16-17, there was an earlier related question about "digalog," reproduced here:

Q: Is "Digalog" on audiocassettes another way of saying that it is a digital recording? Can I put a "d" in subfield $m$ of the 007?

A: The "digalog" designation, judging from the little blurb that accompanies the logo on the accompanying insert, seems to be marketing hype for a "new cassette manufacturing process [that] links state of the art digital mastering and duplication directly to the finished analog cassette." If this description is accurate, it says nothing directly about how the sound was originally captured (the basis for 007 subfield $m$ coding), only about mastering and duplication. Unless there is other evidence elsewhere on the item, we know nothing about the original capture and storage. Strictly speaking, 007 $m$ should be "u" for unknown in this case. Nowadays, however, unless there is specific evidence to the contrary (a SPARS code, something that says "analog recording" or something to that effect, a pre-digital era recording date, etc.), most recently captured recordings tend to be digitally captured and stored. Given that, code 007 $m$ according to how far out on a limb you are willing to go.

To answer your questions, though, "digalog" (presumably an amalgam of "digital" and "analog") is not a legitimate "type of recording" under 6.5C2. Judging from the remainder of the record, this appears to be a standard analog sound cassette, and should have been designated "analog" in field 300 subfield $b$. My strong suspicion is that "digalog" was no more than a piece of hype earlier in the digital age trying to convince buyers that what they were getting was not just some old-fashioned analog recording but something that had been jazzed up with digital mastering and duplication. The code "e" in field 007 subfield $m$ may very well be correct (and as noted in the earlier Q&A, there might even be evidence on the item). That coding could also be construed as evidence for my suspicion that, even though this was originally recorded via analog means, Elektra Nonesuch has applied modern digital technology to its subsequent production to make it sound as good as it can, under the circumstances.

Order of 028 Fields

Q: Why is it the apparent OCLC convention to enter 028 fields for scores with both plate numbers and publisher numbers with the plate number first, given the LCR1 for AACR2 5.7B19, 2nd paragraph, "Transcribe a publisher's number before a plate number"? I don't see this preference documented in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, but the majority of score records I see in OCLC do list 028s with a 1st indicator of 2 prior to those with a 1st indicator of 3. I guess I also have a related question, and it may really answer the first. I see in BFAS that only the first 028 can print as a note if its second indicator is so coded. How important is it for my (update, Enhance, or original) cataloging to reflect this card-related instruction? If I have one publisher number and one plate number that are otherwise uncomplicated, would it be acceptable to code both of these with a second indicator of 2, or should I code both with 2nd indicator of 0 and then create a 500 to explain the situation?

A: As you note, there's nothing explicit in BFAS mandating the order of 028 fields, but here's my guess about why you generally see plate numbers (First Indicator 2) placed before Publisher numbers (First Indicator 3) in score records. It's largely a legacy of card printing (nor is it the only one). In OCLC, only the first 028 field was able to generate a note if it was so coded in the Second Indicator. When the First Indicator of that first 028 field is 2, 3, 4, or 5, that 028 field prints "as the last note following notes printed from the 5XX fields, but before field 020 and field 022/field 222 notes." The data in any subsequent 028 fields would need to be explicitly input as 500 fields, if appropriate. So if we're following AACR2 for scores and placing publisher's numbers and then plate numbers as the final notes (baring any 5.7B20 or 5.7B21 notes), the system-generated note for the plate number from the first 028 would be printed below the explicitly input 500 note conveying the data in a second 028 for the publisher.
number. Of course, nowadays local systems presumably have much greater flexibility for note display (but old habits die hard). My suggestions would be to input the 028 fields in the order, and to code the Second Indicators in the manner, best suited to your own local system's note generation capabilities and the peculiarities of the specific record (that is, taking into account whether an intelligible note can be generated from the 028).

Conductors as Principal Performers

Q: My questions regard main entry for sound recordings. My general question is whether it is ever correct to make a conductor the main entry. But the specific sound recording that brings this question up is "Howard Hanson conducts American masterworks" (Mercury 475 6274). This work includes pieces by many different composers, but all performed by the Eastman-Rochester Orchestra and all conducted by Howard Hanson. I know that usually in a situation like this the performer (in this case the orchestra) would be the main entry. But in this case the conductor (Howard Hanson) is given much more prominence on the item than the orchestra. Now, in the OCLC database there are two records for this recording (#60644092 and #60629783). One of them is title main entry and the other has Howard Hanson as main entry. I am planning to use record #60644092 because it seems more complete than the other record (and it was entered into OCLC before the other record, also). But I'm not sure what the main entry should be.

A: AACR2 21.23C and its LCRI cover this instance. Hanson appears to qualify as the "principal performer" for this recording because of his prominence in being named (alone) in the title, and so is the legitimate main entry. It is perfectly proper for a conductor to be considered the principal performer and the main entry. Perhaps you've been thrown off by this in the LCRI: "When a person performs as a member of a corporate body, do not consider him or her as a separate person to be a performer. Do not consider a conductor or an accompanist to be a member of the body he or she conducts or accompanists." The intention of this is to have you consider a named conductor and a named ensemble separately in determining principal performers, but not to eliminate either. The two records, by the way, have been merged.

"Compact Disc" Notes

Q: Is there any place official that states to use "Compact disc" as the first 500 note? I know AACR2 says if you deem it necessary, a note can be placed first. Another question is: Why do we use the 500 note "Compact disc" and then add the 500 note "Enhanced CD"? I know that is my library's practice, though I'm not sure why we took that route. Recently, I think I read a document from you that stated it was OK to use the plural form "Compact discs" in the 500 if there were multiple CDs in a container. Is that correct? Then how do address that with the keyword searches in our local systems?

A: As far as I'm aware, it has never been mandated that the "Compact disc" note is intended to be the first 5XX or even the first 500 note. Strictly speaking, it would ordinarily be the order of notes outlined in AACR2 (according to 6.7B); that note is considered to be a physical description note, unless 6.7B10. For Sound Recordings, the traditional "note of primary importance" exception has generally been determined to be that for publishers' numbers (see LCRI 6.7B19). For so-called "enhanced" compact discs, I would suggest either quoting the disc's self-description in a 500 note (for instance, "Enhanced CD") or including a 500 note spelling it out ("Enhanced compact disc"), but in either case, you need not add a redundant "Compact disc" note. The question about the plural form "compact discs" for a multi-CD set appears in the MOUG Newsletter no. 90 (September 2005) p. 11-12, where I suggest using the plural form when appropriate. Searching varies so much from system to individual local system that I can't really comment on that issue. One would hope that nowadays, most systems are sophisticated enough to allow wild card searching for both singular and plural terms, as well as other means by which to search, qualify, identify, and/or differentiate various types of sound recording formats.

A DVD/CD/Booklet Package

Q: Yesterday I discovered quite a challenging item to catalog, and of course it requires original cataloging. It's a DVD/CD/booklet package. The booklet (70 p., hardbound) has two holders bound in: the one in the front holds the DVD and the one in the back holds the CD. The DVD and CD contain the same two performances: Friedrich Gulda playing Beethoven's Eroica concerto (with the Wiener Philharmoniker, George Szell conducting) and Gulda playing J.S. Bach's Chromatische Fantasie und Fuge. They were recorded in the 1960s. I decided I really needed to pick a primary format and opted for the DVD. Although colleagues have already reviewed my draft record, this publication raises some additional questions I'd love your advice on as well.

1. Language fixed field: As a music cataloger, I want to code this N/A; however, this isn't the "norm" for AV material. If I do need to pick a language, I have a bit of a problem. The primary text in the booklet, on the faces of the DVD and CD, and on the DVD menu screen, is
English. The little text as part of the moving image (first work only) is in German. There's no text for the second work as part of the moving images; however, Gulda does announce the name of the piece he's playing in German (but that totals about six words). Just to add to the complications, this was published in France, and the program notes appear in English, French, and German.

2. "p2004" vs. "c2004" in 260: Both of these dates appear on both the DVD and the CD. If my primary format is the DVD, which of these do I record in the 260 subfield "c"?

3. 300 field: I proposed the following 300: "1 videodisc (54 min.): 49 sd, b&w; 4 3/4 in. + 4 1 sound disc (digital; 4 3/4 in.) + 1 booklet (70 p. : ill. ; 14 cm.)." My colleague preferred something that would indicate that these are all together in one unit and suggested: "1 videodisc (54 min.): 49 sd, b&w; 4 3/4 in. + 4 1 sound disc (digital; 4 3/4 in.) + program notes (70 p. : ill. ; 14 cm.) all bound together in one booklet (14 cm.)." Is there any more concise or comprehensible way to formulate this? By the way, about half of the booklet is advertising for the publisher, Andante. However, all of the pages are numbered. Oh, and one other thing, when does a booklet become a book? This item does have hardbound covers.

4. Combined 500 vs. separate 500/538 fields: I'm trying to find the most concise way to describe this publication. I came up with the following 500 note: "DVD and compact disc contain the same performances." My colleague wondered if, in addition to that, we should add the "standard" format notes (538 with "DVD" and 500 with "CD", or if that would be overkill.

5. How to handle the variation in durations: The program notes give only one list of contents with two columns indicating where to find these tracks, a column each for the DVD and the CD. Only one set of timings appears there. However, based on viewing the DVD, we know that these are imprecise for that piece. I'm guessing the timings in the notes apply to the CD instead (which probably lacks the applause at the end of the concerto). Specifically, the timings on the DVD are: 44:08 (1st work); 9:55 (2nd work). In the program notes, the respective timings are 40:25 and 9:36. I need to give a contents note, and normally I'd include the timings there only. Because the DVD and CD contain the same performances, though, I really want to list the works only once, instead of doing the following 505 note: "DVD. Emperor concerto / Beethoven (44:08); Chromatic fantasy and fugue: BWV 903 (9:55) -- CD. Emperor concerto / Beethoven (40:25); Chromatic fantasy and fugue: BWV 903 (9:36)." Would it make sense to construct some sort of duration note to address this situation instead? Something like: "500 Durations: on DVD: 44:08; 9:55. On CD: 40:25; 9:36." My biggest problem with that (after the punctuation) is that the works aren't actually named until the 505. We've decided the title is: "Friedrich Gulda 1948 [videorecording] : \"Beethoven, Bach\". Do you have any other suggestions?

A: Where do you find these things? It sounds as though one could build an entire workshop around this item all by itself. Choosing the primary format, as you've done, is the first and most important decision. Considering it a DVD with accompanying material seems reasonable; considering it a sound recording with accompanying material would have made the language decision easier, but going with the DVD probably makes more sense.

1. My question back to you about the language is: In what language(s) are the DVD's title and credit screens? (From the way you've worded your description, I couldn't tell if "The little text as part of the moving image" constituted title/credits or something else.) MARC 21's description of the Language fixed field (008/35-37) for Visual Materials allows for the language content to be defined by "the accompanying printed script (for works with no sound or, if with sound, no narration)." AACR2 7.7.B2 says to "[g]ive the language(s) of the spoken, sung, or written content of a motion picture or videorecording . . . ." Seeing (or more literally, hearing) that the spoken content is just a few incidental words, we need to look at the predominant language of the projected titles and credits and the accompanying material. Sounds like the predominant language is English, and that's probably the best choice for 008/35-37. You may want to give more detail about any multiple languages (of the titles/credits, of the few spoken words) in a note, and of course, as part of the note describing the accompanying material, with all those languages appropriately accounted for in field 041.

2. A phonogram copyright (p) date can apply only to recorded sound. Because you've chosen the DVD as the primary format, the "c2004" date would go in field 260 subfield "c". It wouldn't be a bad idea to account for any other significant dates (including the "p2004 for the CD) in a note.

3. The term "booklet" is legitimate (appearing in many AACR2 examples, at least) but has no definition in AACR2, as far as I'm aware. Personally, I tend to think of a "booklet" as softbound rather than hardbound, but that's just me. My first thought was to alter slightly your proposal for mention of the "booklet" in field 300 subfield "e" to "I v. (70 p. : ill. : 14 cm.)" and to further describe the physical situation in a note. As I delved more deeply into the rules and the treatment of container/accompanying material/in-pocket situations in many of the chapters,
though, I began to change my mind. Every rule X.7B11 regarding accompanying material made the same point: "Give details of accompanying material neither mentioned in the physical description area nor given a separate description (see 1.5E)." As I read that, we are forced to choose between mentioning accompanying material in the physical description or mentioning accompanying material in a note, not both. With that understanding, here is my proposed solution (which includes a somewhat sneaky way to circumvent the X.7B11 restriction by describing the overall container in the 300 field and the accompanying material in a note). Also note the added period after "sd":"1 videodisc (54 min.) : []b sd., b&w : 3/4 3/4 in. + 8 e 1 sound disc (digital : 4 3/4 in.), in container 13 x 14 x 3 cm." You may want to describe the "container" more specifically, if something appropriate comes to mind, and of course, I'm guessing on the H x W x D dimensions. Now we can freely describe the accompanying material and the fact that the DVD and the CD are in pockets within the container, something along these lines in a note: 77"Program notes in English, French, and German (70 p. : ill.) bound in container; DVD and compact disc in pockets." Or they could be separate notes, with or without additional details in either case.

4. As I see it, the 538 "DVD" note is required. Your first 500 note is also a crucial detail to include (but see (5) following). An additional note indicating "Compact disc" does strike me as unnecessary redundancy, in context.

5. Because you've chosen to catalog the DVD as the primary format, you can present the contents and durations of the DVD alone as the 505 note: "Emperor concerto / Beethoven (44:08) ; Chromatic fantasy and fugue : BWV 903 (9:55)." My further suggestion would be to elaborate the 500 note mentioned in (4) along these lines: "DVD and compact disc contain the same performances, although the versions on the latter are shorter (40:25 and 9:36, respectively) because of the absence of applause." You can probably come up with a more felicitous way to word that.

Whew, that was fun.

Nonspecific Composition Codes in Field 047

Q: In the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format documentation, no restriction is made on the use of form of composition codes in field 047. With the statement, "The codes in this field are listed in field 008/18-19," one could assume that using "zz" along with other codes appropriate to the item being cataloged would be acceptable. Nothing appears in the description of "zz" in 008/18-19 to limit its use to this fixed field. However, in BFAS for tag 047, a list of acceptable codes appears (instead of referring users to field 008/18-19), and it omits both "zz" and "uu". While I can understand a reason for not including "uu" in field 047, why does BFAS restrict the use of "zz" here?

A: This is a case of OCLC strictly interpreting what MARC 21 says. In the definition for the Music 008/18-19 and 006/01-02 (Form of Composition), MARC 21 explains: "If more than one code is appropriate, the code 'mu' (Multiple formats) is used in this element, with appropriate specific codes given optionally in field 047 (Form of Composition Code)." (Emphasis mine.) The way we have read that is to discourage the use of the various nonspecific codes (mu, mm, uu, and zz; all four of which are missing from the field 047 list in BFAS) in field 047, as they add no useful information.

Edition Statement on a Sticker

Q: I have in hand a CD of Santana's "Abraxas." On the front of the jewel case is a sticker that says, among other things, "Santana's 30th Anniversary Expanded Edition." Is a sticker an appropriate source for an edition statement? Does it qualify as accompanying textual material? There are two records for this CD in OCLC; one with (#39984006) and one without (#39234039) the edition statement, but they both have the same publisher number, extra contents, etc. Are two records justified? In general, I prefer the record without the edition statement; maybe I should just peel the sticker off of mine.

A: Your suggestion about removing the sticker does have a certain, um, appeal, but let's avoid the easy way out. There appears to be no rule or rule interpretation that specifically addresses the question of an edition statement on this type of label/sticker. So we have to resort to the honorable AACR2 tradition of seeing how such label/sticker situations are dealt with in other contexts. I find nothing helpful in AACR2 proper, where all references seem to be about regular "labels" on sound recordings (6.OB1) or electronic resources (9.OB1). There are, however, three LCRIs that deal with the slapped-on sort of label, two about publication information (LCRIs 1.4A2 and 1.4D4) and one about series statements (LCRI 1.6A2). As I read each case, the instruction is to transcribe the data unbracketed and (in LCRIs 1.4A2 and 1.6A2, at least) to make a note indicating that the data was found on a label or stamp. Seeing that this edition statement sticker is on the container, and that the container is a prescribed source of information for a sound recording edition statement (6.OB2), I would suggest transcribing the data as a legitimate edition statement and noting where it came from (for instance, "Edition statement from label on container"). Regarding the potential duplicates, we'd have to ask the
inputting institution for the record without the edition statement if it is actually absent or was merely ignored.

**Variant Publisher Numbers**

**Q:** We have noticed a difference regarding 028 usage for variant forms of publisher numbers between the LCRI and the OCLC BFAS Web pages. According to LCRI 6.7.B19:

When a publisher's number appears in variant forms on a sound recording, its container, accompanying material, etc., transcribe only the form on the recording itself (e.g., the labels of a disc).

On disc: S-37337
On container: DS-37337
   028 02 7a S-37337 ...
   (Note generated: Angel: S-37337)

BFAS uses the same example, but asks that more data be captured (and now I see that you've include the same treatment in your book):

Variant forms of publisher number. If variant forms of a publisher number are found on a sound recording, its container, or other part, enter the numbers in separate 028 fields. Use 2nd indicator value 0 or 3 and enter the note in field 500:

028 00 S-37337 7b Angel
028 00 DS-37337 7b Angel
500 Angel: S-37337 (on container: DS-37337).

Is the treatment given in BFAS mandatory or optional, prescriptive or descriptive? What is the proper treatment in the case where a client has asked for cataloging to LC standards? Should the BFAS practice be followed more strictly for records being loaded into WorldCat?

**A:** OCLC consciously chose to be more comprehensive in providing data than the LCRI calls for, in this case, because of user feedback regarding access to different forms of publisher numbers. Only in infrequent instances do we choose to differ from LC practice. But, as here, it is usually because of the special needs of a cooperatively compiled database such as WorldCat, where such extra information as this can (in theory, at least) minimize the number of duplicates added. Given that many different catalogers will be coming across the same record, looking at the same information, and deciding whether they have found a match to the item they have in hand, including the variant forms of a publisher number will enable more of them to make a decision more accurately.

---
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