Um, hi. I don't even know what to say. Is this thing on? Check, 1, 2. Hello-o-o-o-o ou-ou-ou-out the-e-e-e-e-e-ere…

This is my first "From the Chair" column. It's after a MOUG Annual Meeting that I had to miss myself. It's during a time when we are amidst a pandemic—our buildings are closed, our personnel are staying at home, and everyone is getting intimately familiar with Zoom. I've seen lots of great Zoom backgrounds, lots of pets, and lots of kids; how about you? There are also some funny potential nicknames for people living in this era, such as Zoomers and Quaran-teens. As I personally work from home (a privilege in itself) I have the privilege of sitting in a place with a window that overlooks some nice landscaping, and have made friends with some squirrels, scolded some robins for fighting, witnessed a double date with two mated pairs of cardinals, and watched an award-worthy prance from a doe as she roamed the quiet landscape with her four best friends.

This column also comes in a time ripe with QoA = Questions ohne Answers. Will we or won't we? Will we or won't we meet in person in 2021? Will we or won't we be able to afford the trip if we do? Will we or won't we get to go back to work? Will we or won't we be able to do the same work? Will we or won't we continue to be trusted to work remotely? I am sure the list can go on infinitely. We all know the questions, and none of us know the answers. Very much of our world right now is TBD, and its future will understandably be very different than its past in many respects.

So what about MOUG? The MOUG Executive Board is definitely trying to consider all of the potentialities, cognizant of the balance between hope and reality. We will continue to work with our colleagues (co-conspirators?) in other organizations to continue to provide the same or similar experiences for our members, and possibly expand those or create new experiences. Every day comes with new information dipped in uncertainty and wrapped in hope where I am, and I am sure that is the case for most or all of you, but we are all doing our best and
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We welcome those Executive Board members who took office or moved into their next roles at the MOUG Norfolk 2020 meeting. That includes Jake Schaub (Vanderbilt University) who has become Past Treasurer, Melissa Moll (University of Iowa) who has become Treasurer, Kevin Kishimoto (Stanford University) who is now the Continuing Education Coordinator, and Heather Fisher (Saginaw Valley State University) who is now the Secretary/Newsletter Editor. Additionally, Nancy Sack (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa) and Molly O-Brien (University of Massachusetts—Dartmouth) have agreed to continue as MOUG-L Co-Owner and E-Ballots Manager, respectively.

For those who were able to be there, I hope you enjoyed MOUG Norfolk 2020! Many thanks to the Program Committee for putting together an interesting and engaging program, and to Rahni Kennedy (Southern Methodist University), outgoing Continuing Education Coordinator, for expertly planning another successful event and taking all of the unexpected changes in stride. Thanks also to the presenters for sharing of their time and talent to the benefit of the attendees. I have heard nothing but great things, and am sorry to have missed everything myself! To the Executive Board for supporting everything for, during, and after the meeting, and to the volunteers who dedicated themselves in any way to making everything go smoothly. In the future we will get back to it in some way and I just know it will be equally as successful.

After the MOUG Norfolk 2020 meeting, the Executive Board met as usual to wrap up and reflect. Many, many thanks to all of them for their flexibility given the circumstances, and especially to Monica Figueroa (University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill), MOUG's Reference, Discovery and Collection Coordinator, for taking on the technology to allow me to attend virtually. I will forever be indebted to you! At that time, things were moving right along as usual, and I thoroughly enjoyed seeing the familiar faces and hearing the familiar voices. The Executive Board does intend on meeting as usual this summer. Whether online or in-person is to be determined given numerous factors, but I know everyone will be grateful for the interaction either way.

In closing: to alleviate the strain on everyone in the current climate, we are extending deadlines and being more flexible with our timelines. MOUG takes up a significant part of my heart, but it is not life or death (possibly an essential amenity?) and we want to be sure to take care of ourselves and each other first. Don't be too hard on yourself if you can't get to everything right away as you might normally do. Reach out if there is anything you need, even if you aren't sure there is anything we can give. Keep in touch even if it's just to vent a little frustration or anxiety. To quote the invaluable Mr. Fred Rogers, “When I was a boy and I would see scary things in the news, my mother would say to me, 'Look for the helpers. You will always find people who are helping.'” We are out here. We are thinking of you.
The “Quality of Linked Open Data” session was presented by Rebecca (Becky) Dean who is Senior Product Operations Analyst, Data Solutions at OCLC, along with being a Musicologist as well. She started her talk with giving examples from incidental music and linked it with the question of how to measure the “quality” aspect of linked data. She then spoke about how she tried to answer these questions together with her team. She talked about the attributes and elements of data. Later, she spoke about reliable and persistent identifiers. She asked a lot of thought-provoking questions to the audience, such as: “Does the library community working on the intellectual relationship with data?” Her presentation was outlined in 5 sections and mainly she focused on the concept of quality data. She gave the example of a “testing kitchen” when explaining the concept of quality. “Quality is aligned with customer’s expectation and needs,” she says, and gave the famous philosopher Cicero as an example by asking “What is knowledge?” She explains the quality as it equals to correctness, usefulness and beauty. But what are the quality owners? She talked about international standards, businesses, federal government and so on by explaining the owners of quality gate keepers. Just like the food example, she used the same question when she asked, “What is a quality food?” as she was describing the quality of data. However, she continued her speech as the customer’s perception of quality depends on: longevity, fulfillment, cost vs. need, security, usability, efficiency. Then she asked to the audience to give input about the five criteria of the metric that she mentioned during her talk. Then she connected these concepts with the criteria of having a quality data. It was a presentation with a lot of interaction from the audience that she implemented in her talk.

Then she finally moved on explaining OCLC’s journey into defining linked data when she was explaining data in two-dimensional format and when she started giving musical examples from Copland, Bernstein and Led Zeppelin. She asked what they have in common. The introduction and some parts of the presentation left the audience with thought-provoking intellectual anecdotes, just like a good movie ending with still a lot of questions that cannot be answered right away that leaves us wondering in a good feeling. Dean mentioned the actions that she is taking with her team about the Wikibase platform, such as some of the gaps that needed to be filled (robust tools required for data management such as OpenRefine). She mentioned the data quality task force and deliverables. When she was explaining this part, she again gave another metaphor – the “Body of water” as it was chosen as a concept for the group exercise. She found 18 concepts about water, asked the audience, and showed the exercise from the group interpretation (the goal of the exercise was to push thinking differently when defining terminologies using concepts). Then she linked her talk with the attributes of data: accuracy, accessibility, comprehensiveness, consistency, and currency. She also mentioned that she assigned two data examples of “What is quality,” using the eleven attributes of “data” and assigned a value.

The next assignment was to find some bad data. They still could not find anything bad, but reached the same results with the first exercise. The task force outcome was explained in four high level concepts: confidence, completeness, confidence, and composite score, which actually summed up her project in these concepts. Then she quoted Jonathan Raymond – “You can’t know about things you have to yet to discover.”

She was also very excited to say that OCLC was awarded a Mellon Foundation grant that she is involving with the project: production infrastructure and enabling improvements, web-based discovery, connecting materials and collections, richer context, consistency and efficiency of workflows, quality, data use and machine manipulation. These were the partial elements that she mentioned during her talk when she was talking about linked data and the project. She mentioned that Wikidata, which is, multi-lingual, crowdsourced, is growing in importance in the library community.

Areas of concern, however, are that the ontology is very broad and not very detailed, but, again, it all depends on the user needs and how to assess their needs. Then she showed a chart of various types of data. Mellon Foundation Entity
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Backbone data sources include VIAF, WorldCat, and Wikidata.

When she also talked about structured and unstructured data, she gave the example of Tom Hanks’s record (the text on the slide in purple represents structured data, red represents challenge, and green represents what the data mean). 670 MARC fields are as unstructured data for example she mentioned. Then she also talked about machine learning and how the structured data could be created by machines.

Next she mentioned about the entity backbone overlaid with personas, for example: Copland’s students and relationships with other persons. Her final thoughts were also about the changing nature of the information science field and the job market, and the increasing roles as information scientist, data curator, data science, which is becoming a more and more interdisciplinary field. She also kept mentioning how it is important to improve ourselves in this changing environment professionally, which she is doing and taking an online classes from Ohio State University that helps to understand these concepts. Things to ponder as she offered: “Should all MARC fields and subfields continue to exist in linked data?” This was an open-ended question also left unanswered as were most of her thought provocing-questions and metaphors.

At the end of her talk, she invited the audience to become Wikidata editors. Also, she encouraged attendees to register classes from Library Juice Academy for further professional education. There were also questions from the attendees at the end of her presentation and one question was about the convenience of data. The answer to that was “Accuracy is the biggest challenge…” as it is with many of the challenges with linked data, and the many things to think about when dealing with it.

Reported by: Nurhak Tuncer
(Elizabeth City State University)

Lightening Talk 1: A Brief History of Music Cataloging and Classification at the Library of Congress

Damian Iseminger (Library of Congress)

In the first lightning talk of the 2020 MOUG Annual Meeting, Damian Iseminger from the Library of Congress gave a chronological history of the Music Division at the Library of Congress (LC), and outlined how this affects finding music materials at LC today. Starting with it’s development in 1896, Iseminger highlighted many impactful moments for the Music Division. In 1902, Oscar Sonneck, the second chief of the Music Division, created the M schedule of Library of Congress Classification. Music was classified and shelved by classification number, followed by composer surname and title. In these early years (1902-1943), few of the Music Division’s holdings were cataloged, and for those that were, the cards were not made available to the public. Classification and cataloging were done by the Music Division staff as part of many duties until 1941 when LC hired their first full time music cataloger. In 1943, the Library underwent a large reorganization process, resulting in the removal of music cataloging from the Music Division. Music cataloging of purchases, gifts, and exchanges was now done by the Descriptive Cataloging Division in the Processing Department, while music cataloging of copyright deposits was completed by the Cataloging Division of the Copyright Office. In 1946, the Copyright Office established their own Music Section within the Cataloging Division.

For a long time, music librarians at the Library of Congress did not agree with LC’s music subject headings because they are driven by form/genre while the LCC M schedule is driven by medium of performance. Therefore, LC Subject Headings were not implemented in the Music Division until 1981. For those searching via medium of performance at the time, an elaborate system of cross-references was used to connect each item with various applicable call numbers to ensure the best access.

(Continued on page 6)
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From 1957-1981, all music cataloging activities were centralized in the Music Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division in the Processing Department. This became the first LC Section to use whole-item cataloging. From 1981-2007, music, audiovisual materials, manuscripts, and rare books formed the Special Materials Cataloging Division. In 2007, recording sound catalogers moved to the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center as part of the Recording Sound Processing Unit in the Recorded Sound Section of MBRS (Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division) and print catalogers returned to the Music Division as the Bibliographic Access Section.

Iseminger continued with searching strategies influenced by some of this history. For music acquired since 1981, LC’s online catalog is the best option, and searching will operate as expected. For material pre-1981, be aware that format limits may not be 100% reliable due to a partial conversion of the pre-1981 shelflist done in the early 1980’s by Carollton Press. Records created around this time are still riddled with inaccuracies, so take special caution when approaching these records. When searching for music that was acquisitioned between 1943 and 1981, the best record system is, in fact, the card catalog at the Library of Congress, which contains roughly 20-25% of the holdings. The M Classification is another strategy for finding materials, as 75-80% of the Music Division’s Division’s general collection are classed-only. This will work best for music acquired before 1981, since almost all popular music acquired before 1981 and almost all material acquired before 1943 is classed-only. At the end of the day, Iseminger reiterates that if you need help and can’t find the item you are seeking, feel free to contact them via the Library of Congress’ Ask A Librarian service.

Reported by: Alica Stephens (BookOps)

Lightning Talk 2: Harvested Quick and Dirty Records—Institutional repository

Nurhak Tuncer (Elizabeth City State University)
Reed David (Washington State University)

In the second lightning talk of the conference, Nurhak Tuncer presented together with Reed David. Tuncer pioneered and signed up her library at Elizabeth City State University to become part of NC DOCKS digital repository, and is currently the coordinator of NC DOCKS along with her music librarian and music cataloging duties. NC DOCKS an open access repository of scholarship from partner schools in the University of North Carolina system, made up of over 20,000 openly available scholarly items including music and visual arts materials. Tuncer created many profiles in other disciplines but specifically mentioned the music items that she uploaded from music faculty and students. She stressed the importance of this in order to make their items more visible and promote open access to these items.

The core problem addressed in the lighting talk was that when these records were machine harvested directly to OCLC, they did not map to the correct fields. The machine harvesting was done remotely by another university and Tuncer and her team had no control over it. The format mapped to the 245 $h, and creators appeared in the 720 field, instead of 100 or 700 fields as expected. Metadata in these unexpected fields could cause problems with the display and searching difficulties for the user, as the information will not appear where the computer expects to find it. Another difficulty was that the imported items from NC DOCKS were all listed as archival materials instead of musical scores. Tuncer then asked the question, how are other libraries handling uploading music items to OCLC in their digital repositories or are they doing it at all?

In the second part of the talk, David added to Tuncer's question, giving examples to show that this situation was no different at other libraries. Davis contrasted Tuncer's experiences with NC DOCKS with an institutional repository record from Eastman School of Music, which was originally created in Dublin Core. These materials appeared correctly as musical scores, but had other similar field mapping problems to the NC DOCKS records.
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An example was given of how these types of institutional repository records could be enhanced to make them ideal. Right now, these corrections would have to be done individually by the cataloger, but the presenters are hopeful that machine learning could eventually take on this tedious role. The presentation ended with questions to the audience: What can be done to ensure that IR records for music items will be recorded as their format in OCLC? How are other libraries making their IR records available? Nurhak and Reed hope to see more discussions regarding this topic of how to make music items in digital repositories in OCLC more visible and accessible.

 Reported by: Alica Stephens  
(BookOps)

Secrets of the Save File: Using Connexion and Microsoft Access for Efficient Batch Cataloging Projects

Rebecca French (James Madison University)

Rebecca French began her presentation with background information on herself and a batch cataloging project she headed at James Madison University (JMU). She started as the Music and Media Metadata Specialist, and later became the Metadata Analyst Librarian. In this role, she creates workflows and tools to efficiently create, edit, and process large quantities of metadata. She structured her presentation around the workflow they used for their Jazz LP Project: prior to 1990 they acquired 3,484 LPs from a local radio station and JMU initially created brief records in their local ILS for the LPs. These included title, performer or composer, publisher name and number, and an accession-based call number.

In great detail, French described the workflow for batch cataloging the Jazz LPs. They used the information in the local brief records to construct batch search strings in OCLC. Then, they focused on the 008, 028, 245, 260 (or 264) and 300 fields, comparing items in hand with the results in Connexion and matching the items with the best records to winnow the results. The next step was to open the local save file database in Microsoft Access. French recommended making a copy of the database, so that the only copy of the database file could not be accidentally damaged.

Next, she took a diversion from the workflow to give background information on the local save file database. This database can be found on your computer at the following file path: C:\Users\{username}\AppData\Roaming\OCLC\Connex\Db. It is a hidden folder, and French explained that to access it, a person may need to change their computer settings to make the folder visible. Assuming you use the default save file, the filename will be DefaultBib.bib.db. After opening the copy of the local save file database in Microsoft Access, three main components will be visible: tblSaveFile, tblBatchSearch, and tblRecords. In tblSaveFile, a person can see information about holdings and GLIMIR clusters, which is information that can only be seen in the individual records in Connexion. The information contained in tblBatchSearch looks similar to what you seen in the batch search function in Connexion, and tblRecords contains the save file number and record text.

After explaining the database components, French continued describing the workflow. They had a spreadsheet with all the local brief record information in it, and they imported that as a table in Access, calling it SierraData. They were able to link this new table with the information from tblSaveFile and tblBatchSearch by making a query that created relationships between the tables. After creating these relationships, the data can be queried to obtain OCLC numbers and local bib record numbers, which can then be exported to a spreadsheet. French explained that to finish up, this spreadsheet was turned into brief bib records using MarcEdit. Then, these brief bib records were merged with the OCLC records matching on the OCLC numbers, essentially adding local bib record numbers to the OCLC records in the local save file, which facilitated overlaying the correct local records with OCLC records. A few additional edits were made to all the records, before the records were loaded into the local catalog using a custom load table.

(Continued on page 8)
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Overall, the project was very successful. They found records for 95% of the 3,484 LPs. The entire process could be completed on 30 to 80 LPs in an hour. The benefits of this workflow included the efficiency of batch searching and using the save file database to match OCLC records to local records. French also stressed that this workflow is highly accessible, since it involves programs that most people already have, and does not require advanced database skills. At the end of her presentation, French summarized that JMU has used a modified version of this workflow on two other projects, including cataloging e-books, and that more detail on these projects can be found in an article she wrote for the Code4Lib Journal, “Direct database access to OCLC Connexion’s local save file.” French’s slides and a transcript of her presentation can also be found at tiny.cc/MOUGSaveFile.

Reported by: Linda Bagley  
(University of Colorado—Boulder)

Ask Everything!  
Combining Hot Topics, Ask OCLC, and Ask LC

Damian Iseminger (Library of Congress)  
Jay Weitz (OCLC)

The Ask Everything Session was held on February 25, 2020 at the MOUG Annual Meeting in Norfolk, VA. Jay Weitz (OCLC) and Damian Iseminger (Library of Congress) fielded questions from the audience as well as those sent in before the meeting. The OCLC-related questions were wide-reaching. A question sent in prior to the meeting inquired about how to report errors and fixing multiple fields in OCLC records from OCLC institutions creating excessive or incorrect fields. Jay Weitz mentioned that OCLC can and will contact offending institutions to stop the behavior. An additional OCLC question addressed entering dates in the 518 MARC field for place and/or dates of recordings. Jay mentioned that there are no specific rules to recommend on how to input the data, but that the same information could be added in the 033 MARC field and would present in a specific manner. Yet another question related to the 033 MARC field was introduced about dates listed in a range and how one might get to a date in the middle of the range. Jay guessed that the indexing is not smart enough to recognize that information.

The next OCLC question regarded the date entered field in an OCLC record being listed as possibly ten years before the item was published. Jay answered that the record might have been created in another system or may have been cloned from another record. We then had an OCLC-related question about the date replaced field in the MARC record. Does the date change if the record was just touched by OCLC or only if actual field changes are made? Jay Weitz responded, explaining that OCLC has various codes when working on records and that some processes do change the date, while other processes do not. An audience member asked about Alexander Street Press records or other provider neutral records and how much one can or should delete in the 856 MARC field, particularly given the fact that there is no information on data provenance. Jay responded with OCLC prefers to keep things in records rather than delete fields. The final OCLC question asked was about OCLC symbols with $$$ (dollar sign) and how these records create problems within the Alma ILS. Jay mentioned that the $ symbol used to mean something. He suggested calling the OCLC help desk or chat via other online communities to get the word out to other institutions who might be able to deal with it.

Library of Congress-related questions complimented those asked about OCLC. Damian Iseminger mentioned that Library of Congress gets communication from OCLC, particularly about music authorities. Members of MOUG (or otherwise), therefore, do not need to be participants in the NACO Music Project in order to engage and send questions in. Damian reminded us that we should not use NACO Music Project as a place for pet projects, and that this space is more for collaborative work. The question regarding date discrepancies above, may in part be due to the face that the Library of Congress is working on a legacy project to transcribe bibliographic cards with older dates and to be added into OCLC. Thus, the dates and information in the records may not match up. An additional question addressed the Library of Congress’s policy regarding making changes to records. Historically, when errors were reported on old catalog records, the Library of Congress oper-
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At Stanford University, plans were underway to clear a warehouse of library materials—many of them belonging to the
Music Library or the Archives of Recorded Sound—to make way for new offices. Kevin Kishimoto, Head of Music
Metadata Services, and Clare Spitzer, Sound Archives Metadata Librarian, detailed four recent projects devised to stream-
line the processing and cataloging of large numbers of music materials from the warehouse backlog:

- CDs from the Robert Baxter Collection
- 78 rpm album covers
- LPs from the Theodore Chandik Jazz Collection
- Piano rolls

Successful factors of the four projects included workflows that were built around student and staff collaboration; the
use of spreadsheets and batch loading; OCLC batch searching; and the use of MarcEdit and OpenRefine.

Robert Baxter Collection

Baxter, a music and theater critic, had built a large collection of mostly opera performances, in a variety of formats.
Acquired by Stanford Libraries in 2011, the collection consisted of 182 boxes of LPs (about 18,000 recordings), 151 boxes
of CDs (about 20,000 discs), plus videos. The current project focused on the CDs.

Workflow strategies: Search for matches in the local catalog and OCLC; route items according to the search results;
perform triage; review local save file; batch load bibliographic records into ILS; final check.

Kishimoto knew that bibliographic records existed in OCLC for many of the CDs; the challenge was to devise a work-
flow that allowed the processing to be done in large batches and quickly, and that utilized student employee assistance.
Checking specific fields, students searched the local catalog for matches, dividing the results into categories of “close,”
“exact,” or “no matches.” Close matches were set aside for triage by cataloging staff, and exact matches were deacces-
sioned by circulation staff after verification. CDs with no matches were then searched in OCLC, with matching biblio-
graphic records saved in a local file.

(Continued on page 10)
Students then applied constant data to the records in the local save file to add local notes and collection information. After spot checking by staff, records were ready to be batch loaded into the ILS, after which a final check was performed by students. Kishimoto pointed out the usefulness of building various check points into the workflow, as well as assigning students according to their skills and experience, which boosted the speed and accuracy of the work.

**78 rpm album covers**

This project was designed to reunite separately stored album covers and their discs onto the same bibliographic record while accomplishing further cataloging as a part of the process. There were 144 boxes of uncataloged album covers in storage; a few of the corresponding discs had been cataloged, while others had not.

**Workflow strategies:** Establish a priority of materials to be handled; create a process for batch item creation; search the local catalog; create batch searches for OCLC; export saved records and add local fields with MarcEdit.

Spitzer explained that although both albums and covers had been stored by label and album number, boxes of covers had not been kept in order and needed to be extracted from storage where they had been placed among other materials. Personal inspection at the warehouse provided the opportunity to prioritize what was brought to the library for processing, focusing on well-known labels first with the expectation that cataloging copy might already exist in OCLC.

The Data and E-resources Department helped design a batch process to create system IDs, call numbers, and barcode information from four spreadsheets of information pertaining to the album covers. Those covers not in the local catalog were batch searched in OCLC using publisher and album numbers. The spreadsheet approach gave students the ability to shelf read for discrepancies before searching in OCLC. Results of the searches were saved and exported to MarcEdit, where local fields were added.

Spitzer said almost 3,000 album covers had been added, and as a result, patrons are able to search the Archive’s disc collection in the local catalog and may also request the album covers.

**Theodore Chandik Collection**

This is a collection of 1600 LP jazz albums, in addition to CDs. Some of the albums are from local labels. The project was organized to add LPs to the Archive.

**Workflow strategies:** search locally for items already owned; sort albums that contain artists’ signatures; batch search in OCLC with spreadsheet data; add local fields in MarcEdit; batch load into the ILS.

LPs in the collection were searched against holdings in the Archive. Albums not already owned were added, while duplicates were compared to determine which copy was in better condition. A feature of this collection—and complicating factor—is that many of the album covers are signed by the recording artists. Spitzer said decisions had to be made regarding the signed copies: would they replace unsigned copies already owned? Should they be shelved separately? Might they be accidentally replaced in the future, with copies in better condition? In the end, signed copies did not replace held unsigned copies; however, they were given a collection name and labelled with identifying stickers. Signed first copies were interfiled with other LPs, while signed second copies were stored offsite. Local notes were added to bibliographic records to provide information about the signatures.

Students were actively involved in the project, handling all the preliminary steps. Students also created the spreadsheet with label and publisher numbers, which was then used for shelf reading and OCLC batch searching. Spitzer reported that close to 500 LPs and 1800 CDs from the Chandik Collection have been added to the Archive and Music collections.

(Continued on next page)
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Stanford Piano Roll Project

Piano and organ rolls from the first half of the 20th century are included in this project, and members from the Department of Music have assisted the Stanford Libraries to scan and analyze them.

Workflow strategies: Transcribe data from the rolls into spreadsheets; clean the data with OpenRefine; create multiple records with MarcEdit; apply constant data to the records in a local OCLC save file; batch import bibliographic and item records into the ILS.

Kishimoto said the challenge was to devise a way to provide metadata at the roll level, rather than the box or collection levels. The Stanford Archives of Recorded sound holds more than 15,000 rolls, most described at the collection level, with spreadsheet inventories available. Few OCLC bibliographic records exist for individual rolls. The plan was to create multiple MARC records from a spreadsheet.

A spreadsheet was designed, which students populated with data from the rolls. Rolls with similar attributes were grouped together for streamlined processing. Staff then used the contents of the spreadsheet in OpenRefine for complex data remediation, to reconcile names, and to split columns by subfields. The data went back to a spreadsheet and was transferred to MarcEdit for more remediation, then exported to an .mrc file. In a Connexion local save file the final touches were added, including constant data, local notes, subject and item records, an so forth, with the results exported back to an .mrc file. The bibliographic records could then be batch loaded into the ILS. Kishimoto reports that, although it is time consuming work, he has successfully converted spreadsheets containing between 50 and 150 rolls, and is working on converting a spreadsheet of over 2,000 rolls.

For details on any of the four projects, the slides and notes from this presentation are found here: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/letfspubs/185/.

Reported by: Chuck Peters
(Indiana University—Bloomington)

Laura Haynes’s presentation focused on issues regarding using certain relationship designators when cataloging hip hop albums. For some relationship designators, such as producer, the definitions as provided by RDA do not necessarily fit the actual activities carried out by hip hop producers. In RDA, producers are more responsible for the financial and organizational aspects of a record. While according to sources like the Encyclopedia of Rap and Hip-Hop Culture or the requirements for qualifying for a Grammy Award from the Recording Academy, producers have a much more active role in the actual creative process of the music. In addition, some producers are listed on the album label as having “mixed” the works.

Likewise, DJs, arrangers, and mixing engineers working on hip-hop albums also do not always follow the definition of those participants as defined by RDA. Haynes’s slides, which can be at www.musicoclcusers.org/meetings/meeting-presentations, provide more in-depth definitions of these roles by RDA, the Record Academy, and the Encyclopedia. Discogs also may help in some situations. They sometimes differentiate between executive producers and producers of albums.

One of the solutions exercised by Columbia University was to use other fields in the bibliographic record to describe what each participant contributed to the album. For example, Columbia uses notes fields to establish access points for the producers. In an example provided at the end of the presentation, the producers of the album used in the example included
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two relationship designators – one being producer, and one being composer to acknowledge their participation in the creative process.

Linda Bagley from the University of Colorado Boulder presented CU Boulder’s current workflow for acquiring, cataloging and providing access to PDF scores in their music library, while commenting on the rewards and challenges of adding these items to their collection. There are many advantages to enhancing a library’s digital collections with PDF scores. One advantage is that these scores do not need to be bound, so they have a faster processing time. In addition, PDF scores are easy for off-campus users to access, save physical space in the library, and help to satisfy the growing demand for electronic resources from faculty and students. However, there are issues to be addressed as well, such as copyright concerns and compensation concerns for the composers and publishers involved.

CU Boulder’s initial workflow for these items begins when a score is requested by a patron. Acquisitions then purchases the item, obtains the proper permissions, and places the PDF on the CU server. Bagley is then notified and can begin the cataloging process. Following the PCC Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA Combined Version, there are several differences to note between cataloging physical scores and their PDF counterparts. The main differences lie in the 006, 007, and 588 fields, as well as in the formatting of the 300 field. At CU Boulder, local notes are added for these materials, and may include a 506 access restrictions note and an 856 field with a URL to the PDF. As far as the type of access provided to these scores, CU Boulder currently cannot support view-only access, so students are able to print scores out as they see fit. This is a beneficial characteristic, as this allows students to mark the scores as needed.

In the future, Bagley would like to see PDF’s added to approval plans, as well as a streamlining of the acquisitions process. The PDFs are not yet accompanied by audio files, and when asked if these materials were available through interlibrary loan, Bagley answered that they are not currently, but hopefully will be in the future.

Lightning Talk 3: Providing Digital Access to PDF Scores: An Initial Workflow for Processing and Cataloging

Linda Bagley (University of Colorado—Boulder)

Linda Bagley from the University of Colorado Boulder presented CU Boulder’s current workflow for acquiring, cataloging and providing access to PDF scores in their music library, while commenting on the rewards and challenges of adding these items to their collection. There are many advantages to enhancing a library’s digital collections with PDF scores. One advantage is that these scores do not need to be bound, so they have a faster processing time. In addition, PDF scores are easy for off-campus users to access, save physical space in the library, and help to satisfy the growing demand for electronic resources from faculty and students. However, there are issues to be addressed as well, such as copyright concerns and compensation concerns for the composers and publishers involved.

CU Boulder’s initial workflow for these items begins when a score is requested by a patron. Acquisitions then purchases the item, obtains the proper permissions, and places the PDF on the CU server. Bagley is then notified and can begin the cataloging process. Following the PCC Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA Combined Version, there are several differences to note between cataloging physical scores and their PDF counterparts. The main differences lie in the 006, 007, and 588 fields, as well as in the formatting of the 300 field. At CU Boulder, local notes are added for these materials, and may include a 506 access restrictions note and an 856 field with a URL to the PDF. As far as the type of access provided to these scores, CU Boulder currently cannot support view-only access, so students are able to print scores out as they see fit. This is a beneficial characteristic, as this allows students to mark the scores as needed.

In the future, Bagley would like to see PDF’s added to approval plans, as well as a streamlining of the acquisitions process. The PDFs are not yet accompanied by audio files, and when asked if these materials were available through interlibrary loan, Bagley answered that they are not currently, but hopefully will be in the future.

Reported by Alica Stephens
(BookOps)

Urge to Merge: Adventures in WorldCat Duplication Resolution

Casey Mullin (Western Washington University)

In this session, Casey Mullin (Western Washington University) discussed about overview of the OCLC Member Merge Project and shared his experience through the process of participation.

The OCLC member merge project began 2013 with 4 member libraries, just to see what it would mean if OCLC
Metadata Quality staff outsource some of their database maintenance work. In 2017, additional 4 members, including Western Washington University, were added. 10 additional institutions joined in 2018 as the third cohort, and the project includes a broad mixture of different kind of institutions, including the National Library of Medicine. In 2019-2020, the fourth cohort rolled out with 24 additional institutions, including a couple of consortia, joined the project. The statistics shows that the member libraries are very productive and make high impact on OCLC now.

The Western Washington University’s participation started early 2017; they did their cohort training and worked on the book format through 2017. Then they expanded the formats—they are currently independent in five different formats, including scores and sound recordings. Also, they were asked to serve as a reviewer for another member library. Currently they work on about 105 merge transaction per month.

The prerequisite for the participation is that the library needs to be PCC member (NACO is sufficient). The library needs to express the interest by contacting OCLC Metadata Quality (AskQC@oclc.org). When OCLC is able to bring on the other cohorts, then the library is invited to join. All members of the cohort attend training webinars and undertake a common exercise set. The all cohort members have typically started learning on the book format, but OCLC will ease the requirement so that a library that works in a more specialized format, such as music libraries, could start with a different format and they can launch right into scores, sound recordings, serials, or maps, etc. The review process is basically filling out a template that says “I think these records should be merged. I think this one should be kept and grow. Here’s my rationale for why.” And then the reviewer responds with feedback to say, “Yes, I agree, go ahead” or “No, you may want to think of this” or “No, you can switch this around.” Mullin noted this is a very good dialogue and there’s a lot of learning that goes on both sides. After the review has taken place for that particular merge set, the member library is free to actually perform the merge with special permissions (using “Master mode” authorization level) and mechanics in Connexion. After about 100 done, the OCLC reviewer grants the member library independence, and then the member continue merging on their own. And then, if the library wishes, they can move on to other formats. Similar to NACO Music Project, the relationship of reviewer and reviewee continues after gaining independent status, and the reviewer is still available for asking questions. If you accidentally make a mistake, or something, you can’t undo the record yourself, you have to report it back to the OCLC—and they can undo it.

There’s a special space for the member of the merge projects within the Community Center, and it includes documentation on various matter (the documentation is not password protected/anyone can access: https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/Metadata_Quality/Member_Merge):

- General merging principles: Favor textual data over coded data when a record has internal inconsistencies. Self-reported duplicate records may be merged if the record reported has only the reporting library’s holdings attached. Looser criteria for vendor/batch-loaded records (ELvl 3/M), and Mullin pointed out these are the most common types of records he deals with.
- Field by field guidelines per format: Similar to an inverse version of “When to put a new record” chapter in Bibliographic Format And Standards documentation (BFAS)—while “When to put a new record” tells you when a new record is justified, these guidelines tell you when the merge is justified (i.e., when a new record isn’t justified).
- Field transfer guidelines and the merge matrix: Tells you which fields will and will not automatically go over in the merge transaction, and more importantly it tells you which record you would pick as the retain record. National library record, like a DLC record, that is almost always the preferred record; for the other records, you retain the most complete one, but it’s not necessarily the one with the most number of fields, but the one that’s most complete in terms of the robustness of the description.
- Other features includes contact information for the OCLC Metadata Quality staff and other member libraries, and a discussion forum where Questions and Answers (you can subscribe email updates).

Mullin showed a screenshot of how the login screen and the merge menu in Connexion look like. Then he walked us through the process. First of all, Mullin mentioned two ways of searching WorldCat: (1) targeted searching—find the best
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record as quickly as one can, and (2) dragnet searching—finding competing records for a particular resource one can find. The latter search uses keywords, such as a combination of title keywords and publisher keywords; number of pages might also included as it can be a good indicator. The aim is to not have 100 results, but about 10 or so—reasonably manageable amount to look at. The next steps are to look for the best record or benchmark record, discard records that are legitimate variant additions that don’t match the one’s item, and merge the rest of the records. Connexion is capable in merging up to 10 records in a single transaction. As he walk through the merging process, Mullin pointed out the questions he was asking for every record is “why didn’t DDR (OCLC duplicate detection and resolution program) merge this record?” and “Is that reason legitimate reason to keep it separate?” Some of the common themes and things encountered particularly with the scores: order of elements in 245; 245 subfield placement ($b in a different place is very common), source of title, choice of publisher/distributor (common in sound recordings), etc.—the DDR doesn’t see those as the same record even if they have the same words.

The merge project has great possibilities in retrospective projects, collaborative projects, etc., as well as day-to-day workflow. Mullin gave some examples as follows:

- M-level records project at WWU—thousands of original records were batch-loaded into OCLC at the time of retrospective conversion (mid 1990s) and remain M-level to this day; many of these can be matched and merged to full-level records without item in hand; those cannot be merged will be upgraded to full-level; the ultimate goal is to have no records with 040 $a/$c XFF and Elvl M.
  
- Orbis Cascade Alliance merging hub idea—emerging requests, sharing expertise, expanding idea of shared cataloging.

Mullin concluded with a reminder: Remember to “catalog defensively” as more people now doing merging, so you want your records to look very different from everything else [to avoid your record being merged.]

Reported by Tokomo Shiyuba
(Northwestern University)

My Data is so (Open) Refined: Make Your Data the High-Class Kind

Maristella Feustle (University of North Texas)

In one of the more memorable lines from Maristella Feustle’s February 26th presentation, “My Data Is So (Open) Refined: Make Your Data the High-Class Kind,” she described raw data as “a little bit like a shaggy dog” in need of grooming. For her presentation, Feustle used search results for Pathé records from the Internet Archive’s Great 78 Project to demonstrate the various ways in which OpenRefine can groom “shaggy” data. Specifically, she showed how OpenRefine could clean and edit the Pathé data for the sake of comparison with the holdings in her own catalog.

To begin, she shared information about setting defaults in OpenRefine and showed some ways to tinker with the settings in order to alter the display. Next, she walked through some basic editing techniques, including how to trim leading and trailing whitespace, how to use GREL commands to find and replace certain values, how to edit single cells and identical cells for uniformity, and how to fix mistakes via the undo/redo tab. Additionally, she demonstrated the use of the faceting tool for spotting trends within the data, isolating similar kinds of data, and making edits en masse. She also showed how sound-alike algorithms can be used to merge similar-sounding transliterations, which can be especially useful when a composer’s name uses a number of different spellings.

(Continued on next page)
In addition, Feustle demonstrated how to merge and separate columns of data, including how to add separators between bits of data when columns are merged. This proved especially useful for extracting matrix numbers from the Pathé data which tended to be embedded within larger blocks of text. In order to extract the numbers, Feustle used the value replace function to transform colons into tildes—a way of distinctly marking the matrix numbers—and then used the split function to extract the matrix numbers on the tildes. In this manner, she was able to create a column of matrix numbers for comparison with the matrix numbers in her own catalog.

Feustle pointed out that these techniques are applicable for other kinds of data, including XML-based data. Further, OpenRefine’s ability to store JSON scripts of actions undertaken in a particular project allows for a “lather, rinse, repeat” method of extracting data history from a particular project, which can then be used as a template for other projects.

Reported by Alex Chisum
(University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill)

---

**Batch Game: Processing a Large CD Gift Using UPCs and APIs**

**Hermine Vermeij (University of California—Los Angeles)**
**Callie Holmes (University of California—Los Angeles)**
**Andy Kohler (University of California—Los Angeles)**

Callie Holmes, Andy Kohler, and Hermine Vermeij of UCLA reported on a batch project for processing the Donovan Meher collection, a large gift of 10,000-12,000 compact discs covering United States and British rock genres from the 1980s-2000s, including the genres of alternative, industrial, goth, and techno, and included fairly comprehensive holdings for each artist or group. The donation allowed UCLA to fill in holes in their popular music collection, while offering a home that would value preservation of the materials, many of which only had holdings in public libraries.

Using traditional item-by-item cataloging procedures, the gift would have taken over ten years to process. Inspired by Lucas Mak’s 2017 ALA presentation on leveraging information from Discogs for enhancing bibliographic records (Mak, Lukas. API for Music Cataloging: Leveraging Expert Community Data Sources. At ALA Annual Conference, Chicago, 2017), a decision was made to use information from Discogs and MusicBrainz to either access pre-existing OCLC records, or to create new encoding level 3 records in OCLC based on the information sourced from MusicBrains or Discogs (primarily the latter).

Using student workers, duplicates in the local database were searched and then removed from the collection for return to the donor. Thereafter, each remaining CD was assigned a local accession number and barcode, and stored in accession number for trouble-shooting retrieval. The accession number, barcode, UPC barcode and title of the disc were entered into a Google sheet document. A physical bookplate was created at the request of the family, and a digital code was created for the MARC record to track the collection.

Andy Kohler created a Perl program to automate the work. The UPC number was used to search Discogs and MusicBrainz APIs, harvesting the bibliographic information located there, including publishing number. This information was cross referenced with information drawn from the WorldCat search API. The first search looked for UPC in WorldCat, followed by a search for the publisher number (028 $a only), with a limit to 20 items, given the non-unique nature of this subfield.

The program evaluated each matching WorldCat record for suitability (format type, language of cataloging, and then comparison with transcribed titles). Priority was given for records that had the higher encoding level and which were held by
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more libraries.

If there was no suitable record in OCLC, the program took the Discogs/MusicBrainz data and created records to load into WorldCat (preference was for Discogs information because of the contents notes). These new records were encoded as ELvl 3, with concessions to batch processing, including default information for 007, fixed language and country fields, and place of publication. In addition, the publisher number was listed in 024 8 (to cover both UPC and EAN), genre terms were placed in 655 3, and artists in 720. Titles were encoded 245 00 unless the title began with “the”, “a”, or “an”. Each of the records included a 500 note “Title from Discogs database” (although in the future they may change this to reflect that the entire record was actually derived from Discogs).

Some stumbling blocks included retail barcodes pasted over the originals, record club releases or promotional copies with different UPCs, DVDs that looked like CDs, inaccurate title transcriptions, titles with symbols or non-Latin characters. There was the occasional duplicate record creation in WorldCat, and some records were marked as subpar and were flagged for missing required fields (007, 300, 650, 1xx/7xx, 26x, 5xx).

And finally, there is an additional subset of discs that had been separated from their containers (which had been discarded prior to acquisition). This will be the next project and will be matched against Discogs/MusicBrainz data using available info on the disc label, marked with an appropriate note to inform users that the original container is absent.

There are currently 6115 records in the catalog, 98% of which were done by batch, and 11% of those were original records from Discogs or MusicBrainz. Some possible improvements in the future UCLA may include use of OpenRefine on original records to add correct access points for names and genres, improved mapping to include more detail and accuracy, and use of WorldCat metadata API to set holdings automatically. Included at the end of the program was a list of programming resources for others to peruse.

*Reported by Anne Adams*  
(Continued on next page)

---

**Lightning Talk 4: Score Reclassification for as a Site for Cataloging Instruction**

*Alex Chisum (University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill)*

Alex Chisum, a graduate student at University of North Carolina (UNC), discussed a reclassification project that he works on, and how it has led to important opportunities in cataloging instruction. At UNC, the bulk of the collection uses LC Classification, but a small legacy collection is shelved separately and uses Dewey Decimal Classification. This presents several problems for students and patrons, especially regarding browsing capabilities. Reclassification has not been able to occur up until now due to space and time constraints, as the project includes a large shifting component to integrate the two collections in the stacks. Fortunately, this is now underway. Scores are selected for reclassification in two different ways. If a patron checks out a score that has Dewey classification, it is sent for reclassification when the item is returned. Or, if a score is of interest for a music course at the university, music library staff will pull it for reclassification. After determining that a score will be reclassified, it is sent to technical services for reclassification and recataloging by a graduate student. The item is then checked by the librarian, and sent back to the library to be shelved in its new location.

Chisum points out several cataloging learning opportunities through this project. First of all, the older scores in the legacy collection have old records, and often this means less information. This can cause difficulties in identification, which can lead to learning more about cataloging practices, such as when to create a new record. Looking at older records also gives the student an opportunity to examine the way cataloging used to be done, and give real life juxtapositions of old vs. (Continued on next page)
Implementing the Genre and Medium of Performance Algorithm in a Local Catalog

Jeff Lyon (Brigham Young University)
Greg Reeve (Brigham Young University)

Brigham Young University’s Harold B. Lee Library has implemented Gary Strawn’s genre and medium of performance program to improve faceted searching in over 340,000 bibliographic records. The algorithm, developed by the Vocabularies Subcommittee of MLA, derives faceted data from LCSH terms and is used in Strawn’s program to output data for LCGFT and LCMPT. During this session, Jeff Lyon and Greg Reeve described their process of preparing data, running the program, post-processing, and how this affected their local practices and changes in their discovery layer. Their process was outlined in nine steps: initial test run, assessment phase, local music cataloging procedures, record pulling, pre-processing, running the algorithm, post-processing, load changes, and instrumentation search.

In the initial test run, all music MARC records were extracted and local fields were removed to avoid duplication later in the process before running the MusicFormGenre tool. After verifying output records, they were loaded into the ILS test server. Output files were grouped into cases where nothing happened and where changes were made, with both MARC and text files generated for each category.

The initial run was evaluated with counts of the different scenarios of changed and unchanged records, as well as any encountered problems. During the assessment phase, records were manually verified and a 650 heading report was created. After extracting all subject and genre headings, a unique list of headings with a usage count was created. Dummy MARC records were created for each heading and run through the MusicFormGenre tool to programmatically analyze outputs. A spreadsheet generated headings and usage counts, and the top 200 headings and their outputs were analyzed. At this point, the audience was asked to guess the top heading. Piano music was called out but it was Songs with piano that was by far the top heading (22,899) distantly followed by Operas--Excerpts (8,149). Required cleanup was identified, such as instances where the Chamber music appeared when it shouldn’t and when nothing was produced for headings like Vocal music, Choral music, and Brass ensembles. Additionally, potential cleanup was identified to address local catalog holes in data including no 382 fields, no genre or no useful genre, and data errors.

After the test run, the full process was implemented. MARC records were extracted and pre-processed in MarcEdit. Some challenges were encountered like problematic metadata (Viola and music$Scores and parts) and program crashes. The algorithm was run to derive both 382 and 655 fields, with 650_4, 655_0, and 655_4 fields treated as 650_0s. 382 fields were selected to attempt reconciliation and delete and report. In post-processing, 583 tags allowed for modified records to be identified and tracked by the categories of changes made to be tracked. After remediating based on heading analysis, records were loaded by coordinating with Library IT.

In establishing their local cataloging rule set, they plan to use the OCLC macro for future records and to automate in other areas. One takeaway was the large number of single use headings in their catalog, 21,461 and 60.81% of all headings.

Reported by Alicia Stephens
(Book Ops)
A future question is how far they should go in curating existing metadata. Their scripts and processes for heading analysis are posted at tinyurl.com/byugenre.

Reported by Clare Spitzer
(Stanford University)

---

**Discovery Services Update**

**Monica Figueroa (University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill)**
**Jay Halloway (OCLC)**

During the Discovery Services Update session, Monica Figueroa (MOUG Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator) and Jay Halloway (OCLC Sr. Product Manager and MOUG Public Services Liaison) presented 2020 MOUG attendees with updates on WorldCat Discovery and MOUG RDC Committee activities and encouraged attendees to engage in further conversations—both virtual and in-person—about services and features.

The session centered on upcoming changes and enhancements to WorldCat Discovery that are in direct response to an increase in on-demand services and programs. Jay Halloway explained that recent OCLC research found that users want systems that are intuitive, smart, personal, and universal—systems that offer a one-stop, quick shop for all their library needs. Indeed, as Holloway stated, expectations for library services have evolved and users increasingly seek out experiences based on their interactions with other commercial services and websites, such as Amazon, Netflix, and UberEats. In response to this research, WorldCat Discovery will incorporate intuitive discovery (the ability to browse local collections with decluttered search results) and smart fulfillment (one search with easy access) through a single account (all transactions in one spot with the ability to save search histories). All of this will require robust configuration that will allow institutions to filter behavior, select custom search boxes, and incorporate local metadata.

Moreover, the intuitive discovery updates will be based upon iterative and rigorous relevance methodology that ensures that the search results remain relevant and are presented in the most relevant order, and that users understand why the result is relevant. Relevance algorithms are employed to aid WorldCat Discovery in this endeavor. It should be noted that all intuitive discovery features discussed are available through WorldCat Discovery with a FirstSearch subscription, whereas new smart fulfillment, single account, and robust configurations features are only available via WorldCat Discovery.

The RDC Committee remains hard at work! Figueroa encouraged attendees to visit and engage with the OCLC Community Center. An OCLC authorization and password is required for the first sign-in. As always, be sure to watch MOUG-L for updates and invitations for input and feedback.

Reported by Monica Figueroa
(University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill)
**News from OCLC**

Compiled by Jay Weitz

**LC Products and Services Release Notes**

Find the most current release notes for many OCLC products and services as well as links to data updates and to dynamic collection lists at https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Release_notes. Included are CONTENTdm, EZproxy, Tipasa, WorldCat Discovery, WorldCat Knowledge Base, WorldCat Matching, WorldCat Validation, WorldShare Acquisitions, WorldShare Circulation, WorldShare Collection Evaluation, WorldShare Collection Manager, WorldShare Interlibrary Loan, WorldShare License Manager, WorldShare Record Manager, and WorldShare Reports.

**WorldCat, Cataloging, and Metadata**

**WorldCat Matching and WorldCat Validation Updates**

OCLC has recently made WorldCat Matching release notes (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Matching_release_notes_and_known_issues) available for the first time. These are mainly relatively small improvements to Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) and/or Data Sync matching.

WorldCat Validation release notes (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_and_known_issues) have been made available on a regular basis since September 2018. Sixteen additional bibliographic fields (mostly 3XXs) are now eligible for addition and/or correction in non-CONSER records as part of Expert Community capabilities. See the WorldCat Validation Release Notes, November 2019 (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_and_known_issues/2019_release_notes/085_WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_November_2019) for details.

In February 2020, the MARC Bibliographic and Holdings Update Number 29 validation changes were implemented (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_and_known_issues/2020_Release_notes/100WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_February_2020), including all new MARC Codes announced between November 2019 and January 2020.

The long-anticipated updates to the validation rules for MARC Authorities began to be rolled out in March 2020 (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_and_known_issues/2020_Release_notes/095WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_March_2020). This is in coordination with the Library of Congress (LC) and all of the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) nodes and when completed will cover most MARC Authority updates going back to 2014. As the first step in bringing OCLC-MARC Bibliographic Encoding Levels (Leader/17) into closer alignment with those defined in MARC 21, you now have wider latitude in Encoding Level choice when creating new records or editing existing records. There are additional details in the WorldCat Validation Release Notes, April 2020 (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_and_known_issues/2020_Release_notes/090WorldCat_Validation_release_notes_April_2020).

**OCLC Awarded Mellon Grant to Support Linked Data Management Initiatives**

OCLC has been awarded a grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (https://www.mellon.org/programs/scholarly-communications/) to develop a shared "Entity Management Infrastructure" that will support linked data management initiatives underway in the library and scholarly communications community. When complete, this infrastructure will be jointly curated by the community and OCLC and will ultimately make scholarly materials more connected and discoverable on the web. The two-year grant, for $2.436 million, will support work on the project that will run from January 2020

(Continued on page 20)
to December 2021. The Mellon grant funding represents approximately half of the total cost of the Entity Management Infrastructure project. OCLC is contributing the remaining half of the required investment. OCLC will use the grant funding to publish authoritative and easily accessible entity descriptions for works and persons as part of a persistent, centralized infrastructure. The infrastructure will aggregate links to other representations of those works and persons in external vocabularies and authority files. OCLC will also provide APIs to support libraries implementing metadata workflows for linked data. Libraries are always seeking opportunities to make scholarly materials and other collections more discoverable on the web. They also want to expand opportunities to connect their collections to other relevant collections. The creation of a centralized infrastructure that provides linked data entities that are discoverable, reliable, and sustainable will provide a critical foundation for libraries working to achieve those objectives. OCLC will work with leading national libraries, federal agencies, and research libraries to ensure that its infrastructure is sustainable and compatible with their efforts. Specifically, OCLC will engage with the LD4P (https://www.ld4l.org/) community—libraries participating in the Linked Data for Production project, led by Stanford University Libraries and also funded by Mellon—to ensure that the system matches the evolution of the library linked data environment. OCLC anticipates offering a range of options for access to the entity infrastructure—some made freely available to the library community and others made available via subscription. OCLC will publish URIs and metadata for the entities via the web, and will provide methods for library staff to edit, enrich and add to this set of entities. OCLC will also provide APIs to expand the adoption and integration of these entities in workflows in and outside of the library.

**Delivery Services**

**COVID-19—We’re in This Together: Continuing to Manage Your ILL Services**

Over the last few weeks, everyone’s had to make many adjustments—to both our work and home lives. We truly appreciate your commitment to serving your patrons and your suggestions on ways to continue ILL services at a time when physical collections are less accessible, or perhaps not at all. Your engagement and partnership have resulted in several initiatives, which are summarized below.

- **Managing your library’s ILL services during the COVID-19 crisis.** This session offered useful information to help your ILL department navigate these challenging times. Meg Atwater-Singer (University of Evansville) and Meg Massey (Penn State University Libraries) joined us to share the adjustments their libraries were making.
  - Watch the recording: https://oc.lc/3bqul3U (90 minutes).
  - Read notes for slides 70-81 (there were some audio issues) here: https://oc.lc/3amoT1Y.
  - View the full slide deck: https://oc.lc/2UFvVrQ.
- **Reason for No (RFN) = Preferred Delivery Time Not Possible.** Many of you suggested the community use a consistent RFN for tracking and reporting the number of requests impacted by the COVID-19 crisis. This News post (https://www.oclc.org/community/interlibrary_loan/research/news.entry.html/2020/03/17/reasons_for_no_rfn-3vDL.en.html) on the OCLC Community Center* describes the use of Preferred Delivery Time Not Possible for materials you’re currently unable to supply.
- **Profiled Groups ACOV and BCOV and Days-To-Respond indicators.** Two new profiled groups help you identify libraries that can supply electronic documents (ACOV) and whole e-books (BCOV). Setting your library’s Days to Respond for loans provides a visual cue to other libraries about what you are able to supply: 16 days indicates you can supply copies from both print and electronic holdings; 20 days indicates you can provide copies from your electronic collections.
  - For a video tutorial that demonstrates two workflows for using ACOV and BCOV profiled groups, setting Days To Respond, and adjusting Deflections, please go to this News post (https://www.oclc.org/community/interlibrary_loan/ill-news.entry.html/2020/04/09/covid-19_we_re_inth-vdlJ.en.html) on the OCLC Community Center*.
  - To add or remove your library from ACOV or BCOV, complete this short form (https://oc.lc/covgroups).
News from OCLC

- **ILL professional development:** Recorded webinars and on-demand training. Some of us may have extra time to devote to learning and professional development. This News post (https://www.oclc.org/community/interlibrary_loan/research/news-entry.html/2020/03/23/ill_professionaldev-Nh02.en.html) on the OCLC Community Center* lists the most popular ILL sessions from the past year. Also, OCLC training materials (https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Training/Available_OCLC_training?_ga=2.1372345.929784444.1588084047-389913570.1588084047) are freely available. *Note that some materials referenced are available from the OCLC Community Center. All WorldShare ILL, Tipasa, and ILLiad users have access to the Community Center. If you are not sure of your WorldShare credentials that are needed to login, click https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/OCLC_Community_Center?_ga=2.223721363.929784444.1588084047-389913570.1588084047.

And as always, please contact OCLC Customer Support (support@oclc.org) if you need assistance or guidance.

Management Services

**University of Roehampton Selects OCLC’s WorldShare Management Services**

The University of Roehampton (https://www.roehampton.ac.uk/) has selected OCLC’s WorldShare Management Services (WMS, https://www.oclc.org/en/worldshare-management-services.html) as their new library services platform to improve workflow efficiencies and the user experience. An advanced, cloud-based library services platform, WMS integrates electronic and print resource management workflows into one interface, helping to provide library users quicker access to electronic materials. Including hundreds of standard reports and the ability to create custom ones, WMS provides data to improve library activities and track key metrics used in the decision-making process. The University of Roehampton initially consisted of four teaching colleges, the first one dating as far back as 1841. In 2004, Roehampton was granted independent university status after a four-and-a-half-year federation with the University of Surrey. They opened their new state-of-the-art library in 2017 with more than 350,000 books and 1,200 new study spaces.

**EZproxy 7.0.16 Available**

- EZproxy v7.0.16 was released on, 9 April 2020. This maintenance release builds on our recent release of EZproxy v7.0 and includes:
  - OpenSSL 1.1.1f (released 31 March 2020) for improved security.
  - Fix for an issue that caused EZproxy to fail to start on Windows systems.
  - Fix for an issue that prevented EZproxy from accessing system randomness (entropy) on some Linux systems.

  The EZproxy 7.0 release notes (https://help.oclc.org/Library_Management/EZproxy/EZproxy_release_notes_and_known_issues/2020_EZproxy_release_notes/EZproxy_v7.0_release_notes?_ga=2.250122054.1549576261.1588016261-1665416294.1586985835) have been updated to reflect these changes. Detailed information about EZproxy v.7.0 was also shared in our recent EZproxy Product Insights session (https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/lsr.php?RCID=1502845e40614bb09ec2ec6125e0b564b).

  Stand-alone EZproxy customers can download the new version at https://help.oclc.org/Library_Management/EZproxy/Install_and_update_EZproxy? _ga=2.251373766.1549576261.1588016261-1665416294.1586985835. EZproxy hosted customers will be notified when their site is scheduled to be updated.

(Continued on page 22)
OCLC’s COVID-19 Page to Help Libraries Serve Communities During Pandemic

OCLC’s COVID-19 page (https://www.oclc.org/en/covid-19.html) brings together timely information, valuable resources, and opportunities for online discussion and instruction to help library professionals continue to serve their communities during the pandemic. The COVID-19 resource page offers options to provide remote access to library collections, optimize OCLC products and services, and connect and collaborate with other libraries. Resources available on the page include:

- Information to guide library professionals through options (https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/COVID-19-OCLC-Services.pdf) available to modify OCLC services if necessary.
- A growing list (https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/covid-19/COVID-19-Partner-Content.xlsx) of freely available content, including recommended options to access this content through OCLC services, made accessible by OCLC partners (http://www.oclc.org/blog/main/covid19-free-e-content-partnerships/).
- A COVID-19 Discussion Board available on the OCLC Community Center to help OCLC customers share information, ideas, and best practices about how they are responding to the pandemic.


Online Learning Opportunities

Many library staff are in communities that have closed their buildings to protect both the staff and community from the spread of the coronavirus. In the last month, we have seen unprecedented interest in the WebJunction Course Catalog (https://learn.webjunction.org/), with learners using time to pursue professional development interests. With courses on topics ranging from Collection Management to Marketing to Customer Service, our collection of over 300 webinar recordings and self-paced courses can help strengthen your knowledge and skills.

COVID-19 Update and Online Learning Opportunities

Libraries around the world are facing the impact of COVID-19 on their programs and services, colleagues, and community. These are unprecedented times and information is changing constantly. To help get useful information and resources out to our library community, we have published Libraries and the Coronavirus: Evolving Information and Resources (https://www.webjunction.org/news/webjunction/libraries-and-the-coronavirus.html?utm_source=SFMC&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=March+18+2020+Crossroads+-+web&utm_term=All%20Subscribers), a compilation of links about what is happening in libraries and resources that can aid in decision-making.

OCLC, PLA Report on Strategies for Public Libraries’ Response to Opioid Crisis

OCLC and the Public Library Association (PLA) have issued Call to Action: Public Libraries and the Opioid Crisis (https://www.oclc.org/content/research/public-libraries-opioid-crisis.html), a report that offers tested strategies to consider as libraries determine local responses to the nationwide public health emergency. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 130 people die every day from an opioid overdose. As trusted local institutions, public libraries connect community members to credible, accurate information and services that can help support needs around substance use disorder. The call to action was informed by case study research with eight public libraries that have created community responses with local partners, as well as discussions with government agencies, public health and human services organizations, community organizations, and library leaders. The call to action encourages public libraries to:

- Evaluate local health data
- Seek community partners

(Continued on next page)
Educate staff and community members on the issue
Consider the need for staff care
Offer programs and services that support local needs

Even in communities where the overdose rate isn't high, the issues connected to opioids can be challenging. Opioid misuse impacts not only the individual, but also families and friends who may be seeking relevant information and resources. The OCLC-led project was supported by a $249,714 National Leadership Grant by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (https://www.imls.gov/, IMLS, project number LG-00-18-0298-18) to collect and share knowledge and resources that support public libraries and their community partners to address the opioid crisis. The previously released case studies (https://www.oclc.org/content/research/publications/2019/oclreresearch-public-libraries-respond-to-opioid-crisis/supplemental.html) and summary report (https://www.oclc.org/content/research/publications/2019/oclreresearch-public-libraries-respond-to-opioid-crisis.html) feature opioid responses from libraries serving populations from 16,000 to more than 800,000 people. Documented activities and programs include training on naloxone use, access to peer navigators, author talks, film screenings, and public awareness campaigns. The project team conducted eight research-based case studies highlighting varying opioid response efforts across the US, involving the following libraries and community partners:

- Barrington Public Library; Barrington Adult Youth Team (BAY Team) (Rhode Island)
- Blount County Public Library; Blount County Recovery Court (Tennessee)
- Everett Public Library; Snohomish County Human Services (Washington)
- Kalamazoo Public Library; Recovery Institute of Southwest Michigan (Michigan)
- New Orleans Public Library; New Orleans Health Department (Louisiana)
- Peoria Public Library; Human Service Center of Peoria (Illinois)
- Salt Lake County Library; Utah Naloxone; R&R Partners (Utah)
- Twinsburg Public Library; Summit County Community Partnership (Ohio)

Anja Smit and Shirley Chiu-wing Wong Elected to the OCLC Board of Trustees

On 24 March 2020, OCLC Global Council convened virtually for its annual meeting. The agenda included the introduction of candidates to serve on the OCLC Board of Trustees along with instructions for the 2020 online election. The election concluded on 17 April, and the votes have been counted. Global Council delegates have elected Anja Smit, University Librarian at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, and Shirley Chiu-wing Wong, University Librarian at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, to the OCLC Board of Trustees. Both will take their seats on the Board in November 2020. The OCLC Global Council is elected by OCLC members to represent the global library community. They provide reflection and insights regarding the needs and issues facing modern libraries. They also elect members to the OCLC Board of Trustees. There are currently nine librarians from five countries serving on the 15-member OCLC Board of Trustees. Learn more about OCLC Global Council (https://www.oclc.org/en/membership/councils.html) and the OCLC Board of Trustees (https://www.oclc.org/en/about/leadership.html#board) on the OCLC website.

OCLC Research

New COVID-19 Discussion Board for Libraries

To help libraries share information, ideas, and best practices about how they are responding to the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the global COVID-19 pandemic, OCLC is adding a new COVID-19 Discussion Board to the Community Center. This moderated forum is open to all OCLC members. Current OCLC Community Center members can use existing service log-ins to access the forum here: oc.lc/covid19-discussion-login. OCLC members who do not currently have Community Center log-in credentials can request them here: oc.lc/covid19-discussion-request.
New OCLC Research Update

Explore the newest offerings from OCLC Research in the March – May edition of our Research Update (https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2020/Research-Update-2020-03-01.pdf). This latest issue includes Works in Progress webinars on topics from A/V special collections to student information choices, a new publication and upcoming free webinar on Public Libraries and the Opioid Crisis, resources on the latest work in linked data, blog posts on intra-campus collaboration, and more.

NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Compiled by Damian Iseminger

MUSIC DIVISION

Highlights from Fiscal Year 2019

The Division completed the processing and finding aid for the 17,700-item collection of jazz pianist, composer and arranger Billy Strayhorn (1915-67); conducted a public, taped interview with family members and colleagues, produced a press release, blog and video promo with Dr. Hayden, and, following a timely NPR mention, immediately began serving the collection to scholars.

- The Division hired 16 FTEs, including 9 NEPR hires (5 archivists, 4 archival technicians) Head of Acquisitions and Processing, 2 concert producers, 3 reference technicians and an audiovisual production specialist.

- The Division established a team to identify and report rare and important holdings to RISM (Répertoire International des Sources Musicales). To date, we have reported c. 300 early imprints, and identified c. 260 additional items that do not yet have entries in the RISM database. We have also discovered 70+ items that had neither Voyager nor RISM records, meaning they were totally unknown; in some cases, the Library was the only known repository. Music scholars eagerly await each new installment of LC entries.

- The Division presented a series of events, including panel discussions, talks, displays, and performances, focusing on the history and preservation of video game music. This culminated in a day-long arcade of playable vintage videogames (ca. 3,000 participants), and a performance of a commission of an interactive composition for a newly created video game. The multigenerational appeal of these unique events brought in new audiences of all ages.

- The Division’s Digital Projects Team put online 3 new digital presentations: Women’s Suffrage in Sheet Music, Books about Music before 1800 (approx. 2,000 items), and 10th-16th Century Liturgical Chants. In addition, they successfully migrated the Federal Theatre Project from American Memory to Project One, updating it and adding more than 5,500 items.

(Continued on next page)
Highlights from Fiscal Year 2019

- Led Library Services’ efforts to modernize its audiovisual collections management system, a Library-wide priority for FY2019. NAVCC documented the current state of all its workflows, developed a new metadata schema to reduce the cost of data migration to the new system, wrote the statement of work for procurement, and reached all milestones on time.

- Completed a multi-year project to build out the Library’s first ever multi-track audio preservation room and workflows. The facility will be able to capture multi-track recordings at the highest resolution audio available in the industry.

- Preserved 41,643 collection items, including 17,245 video items, 15,365 sound recordings, 2,673 reels of film, as well as 6,360 digitized television and radio programs added to the American Archive of Public Broadcasting collaboration with WGBH.

- Signed a groundbreaking agreement with Paramount Pictures to increase access to more than 100 silent feature films in the Paramount Collection produced from 1914-1930. The agreement allows the Library to stream the films online and loan digital copies for public screenings – the first time any major Hollywood studio has allowed such broad access.

- Finalized two major collaborative agreements to digitize and make accessible two important recorded sound collections. National Public Radio and the Sigmund Freud Archives will fund the digitization of over 20,000 audio recordings in the two collections.

- Organized the eighth annual “Mostly Lost” Film Identification Workshop, with 200 attendees from around the world participating in the three-day event. Films screened were from the Library’s holdings and other archives and collectors throughout North America and Europe. Numerous presentations on neglected aspects of film history were featured.
Circumstances Beyond Our Control

**Question:** I’m cataloging a trio sonata for flute, violin, and continuo. There is a heading for "Trio sonatas (Flute, violin, continuo) $v$ Scores and parts." But when I paste this exact string into the 650 and try to control it, I get a message basically saying the heading doesn’t exist. What’s going on here?

**Answer:** The authority record you cite (sh2008113010) cannot be controlled to because of the presence of field 667 reading “Record generated for validation purposes.” This is documented (pretty obscurely) in OCLC Technical Bulletin 259R (https://help.oclc.org/@api/deki/files/4200/tb259.pdf?revision=2), on page 24. It was also widely announced at the time of the implementation back in 2014 (see for instance the SACO discussion list archives at https://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1406&L=SACOLIST&P=940), not that anyone would remember all these years later.

**Follow-up Question:** I have sometimes seen “Record generated for validation purposes” for a subject heading and the 650 in the bibliographic record does indeed control. I have seen this when a country (e.g., United States) is added to a heading in subfield $z$ in the authority file. How does this differ?

**Follow-up Answer:** Without having actual authority (and bibliographic) record examples to look at, one can only guess. One possibility is that the heading in the bibliographic record may have been controlled prior to the date in 2014 when the 667 fields were added to the authority records and the controlling function was changed in Connexion (as explained in TB 259R). If the bibliographic record has not been touched since, the heading in question could still be controlled. More likely is that there exists a valid and controllable authority record for the unqualified subject access point (that is, without any additional subfields beyond subfield $a$) to which the heading can be controlled. For instance, although sh2010117121 for “Trio sonatas (Violins (2), continuo) $v$ Parts” has the 667 field and cannot be controlled to, sh85137568 for “Trio sonatas (Violins (2), continuo)” does not have the 667 field and can be controlled to. Although in this particular case, a geographic subdivision may not be appropriate, if it were appropriate, the heading and its subdivision could very well be controllable.

Lack of version control

**Question:** I was reading the Q&A (as usual) in the December issue of the MOUG Newsletter and wondered about the second one, titled “Version Control.” The piece in question was originally for horn and orchestra but the manifestation in hand identified it as “reduction for horn and piano.” Your answer included the point that such a situation fit the RDA definition of “piano score” and you quoted the RDA definition: “A format of notated music consisting of a reduction of an instrumental work or a vocal work with instruments to a version for piano.” I’ve always understood that definition to mean ONLY for piano. Not piano and horn. That is, the instrumental parts of the orchestra AND the solo line are all contained in the piano. Granted, I have never seen such an animal, except in sketches or “short scores” (which we’re now calling “condensed scores”). But we certainly have never used “piano score” for the many “solo instrument with orchestra reduced for piano” stuff out there. Indeed, I think you and I have discussed the lack of an instrumental analog to “vocal score” to wit: If you have a piece for voices and orchestra, it’s a score; and if the orchestra is rewritten for piano but the vocal parts are kept separate from that, it’s a vocal score. Whereas, if you have a piece for solo instrument(s) and orchestra, it’s a score; and if the orchestra is rewritten for piano but the instrumental solo line(s) is kept separate from that, it’s still a score. Am I misinterpreting or misreading something?
Questions & Answers

(Continued from previous page)

**Answer:** Right you are. I have to admit that the continuing churn in both the codes and definitions for Format of Music (SCO 008/20 and 006/03) has left me eternally confused. The question in question had to do with whether the statement “reduction for horn & piano” was to be regarded as a statement of responsibility or as an edition statement. In the reference to MLA BP 2.5.2, such a reduced version would really have been included under the parenthetical “etcetera” category: “Some formats of notated music (e.g., vocal scores, chorus scores, piano scores, etc.) are special cases inasmuch as they have dual identities: as a format of notated music, subject to this instruction, and as a type of arrangement.” In FMus terms, this reduction would of course be code “c”, “Accompaniment Reduced for Keyboard.” And yes, “piano score” (now code “p”, introduced in 2016) would not describe notated music for a solo instrument with the accompaniment reduced for keyboard. My apologies and thank you for the correction.

(Continued on page 28)

Churn, Churn, Churn

**Question:** Following up on that, I guess it has been awhile since I last looked at BFAS for the 348 field. The example in the MLA BPs for RDA 7.20 has one 348 field with multiple terms listed in separate subfields $a$. That is how I have always encoded it, “score $a$ part $2$ radmin.” I must have missed a conversation or paper or announcement about possibly using multiple 348 fields. I suppose this would make sense, considering that we seem to be moving in a more modular direction. I do know that some people would use multiple 300 fields for score and part(s) even if the score and part(s) are the same height, which means it would make sense to then use separate 348 fields. I believe that either approach is correct. It is being left up to each institution to decide how it should be done. To muddy the waters even more, I find the example under the guidelines in BFAS interesting in regard to subfield $b$. I have not been using subfield $b$, but I can understand its use when one thinks of the parallel structure in the 33X fields. I suppose this would make sense, considering that we seem to be moving in a more modular direction. I do know that some people would use multiple 300 fields for score and part(s) even if the score and part(s) are the same height, which means it would make sense to then use separate 348 fields. I believe that either approach is correct. It is being left up to each institution to decide how it should be done. To muddy the waters even more, I find the example under the guidelines in BFAS interesting in regard to subfield $b$. I have not been using subfield $b$, but I can understand its use when one thinks of the parallel structure in the 33X fields. I believe that the reasoning for using a separate field for subfield $b$ is that the code in subfield $2$ refers to the term in subfield $a$ and not the code in subfield $b$. I know that it was recommended that the 33X fields be treated like this (not to mention the change in the code for subfield $2$). However, there doesn't seem to be a desire in the wider community to use a separate 33X field for subfield $b$ or to use the RDA registry codes for subfield $2$. I wouldn't mind using this structure for the 33X fields if LC PCC PSs and MLA BPs recommended it, but I don't think that I will worry about using subfield $b$ for field 348 until there is a code list that is more in line with RDA. (The FMus codes have a complicated history if I remember correctly.)

(Continued on page 28)
Questions & Answers
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Answer: It must be noted that the MLA BP RDA 7.20 example, 348 vocal score $a piano conductor part $a part $2 rda

reflects the former practice of coding subfield $2 simply “rda” for the source of the term. RDA, the LC-PCC PSs, and the best practices have essentially been frozen for several years during the 3R Project and in preparation for the full introduction of the new version of the RDA Toolkit. The current practice of coding subfield $2 for the individual RDA Value Vocabulary associated with the particular field (the RDA Format of Notated Music vocabulary, coded “rdafnm”, https://www.rdaregistry.info/termList/formatNoteMus/, in the case of field 348) was introduced during the RDA freeze. We can, however, see current practice exemplified in the MLA Supplements to Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21, Supplement 3: Complete MARC Record Examples (http://cmc.blog.musiclibraryassoc.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2020/02/Supp_RDA_Best_Practices3.pdf), which is dated December 31, 2019. Examples 3 (page 7), 10 (page 23), and 13 (page 27) each have fields 348 with repeated subfields $a (score $a part $2 rdafnm). Example 17 (page 35) has field 344 with two subfields $g (Sg stereo Sg surround $2 rdacpc). As for the use of subfield $b in field 348, any music cataloger who has followed the activities of the Music Library Association’s Cataloging and Metadata Committee (MLA CMC) or the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), especially during the RDA era, will be familiar with the churn of codes, terms, and definitions that has riled the MARC Music 008/20 and 006/03, Format of Music. Just take a look at the Content Designator History of Music 008/20 (https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd008m.html) or merely the Background section of MARC Proposal No. 2016-08 (https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-08.html). The aforementioned RDA Format of Notated Music vocabulary (rdafnm) contains controlled terms for field 348 but no associated codes. Although MLA BP 7.20 and MARC Music 008/20 do associate MARC codes with Format of Music terms, the associated terms are inconsistent and anything but “controlled.” Not every code that could be included in field 348 subfield $b would correspond with a controlled RDAFNM vocabulary term; no field 348 that contains a code in subfield $b could legitimately be coded with subfield $2 containing “rdafnm”, at least not currently. Although really strictly speaking, the 33X terms in subfields $a and the “MARC Codes for RDA Terms” in the 33X subfields $b might more properly be separated into pairs of 336, 337, and 338 fields (as was discussed and rejected several years ago), they at least have a consistent one-to-one correspondence documented in the trio of Term and Code Lists for RDA Content Types (rdaccontent) in field 336 (https://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdaccontent.html), RDA Media Types (rdamedia) in field 337 (https://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdamedia.html), and RDA Carrier Types (rdacarrier) in field 338 (https://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdacarrier.html). For the 33X fields, OCLC does prefer the inclusion of both subfields $a and $b, although WorldCat validation requires only one or the other. In the Connexion client, the Add33X macro adds subfields $a, $b, and $2. The forward-looking argument for including codes when they are available and appropriate is that codes are functionally language-independent, even when may be derived from English-language terminology, as they are in the 33X fields. Furthermore, the coding of subfield $b in the 338 field is the only legitimate means of distinguishing the otherwise identical eight “other” Carrier Type terms from each other.

Settling the Score

Question: We have some instrumental parts for a work for chorus and ensemble that will be cataloged apart from the score. What would you give for the Language code in the bibliographic record for the parts, the language of the score, or “zxx”?

Answer: If you are cataloging the instrumental parts separately and those parts include none of the choral text, my inclination would be to code the language “zxx”. If textual cues (or more) are present, I would lean in the direction of coding for the language of the text.

(Continued on next page)
(Continued from previous page)

Oblique Strategies

**Question:** I have not been able to figure out how to narrow a search down to podcasts in WorldCat. Do you know if that's a possibility?

**Answer:** “Podcasts” (gf2011026450) is a legitimate LCGFT term, making it a logical starting place for a Genre/Form (ge:) search, which yields over 2000 hits. You could narrow that further to either sound recordings, motion pictures, or video recordings to get smaller result sets. If you want larger result sets from which to choose, you can approach things more obliquely. My guess is that many, if not most, podcasts identify themselves as such, so using the word “podcast” itself in a Keyword (kw:) or Notes (nt:) or even Title (ti:) search in WorldCat would be a fairly effective initial limiter. Material Types “nsr” for Non-Musical Recording and/or “ele” for Electronic would be logical limiters. If you want to limit to higher-quality records, you could limit to DLC/PCC, by Authentication Code (ac=) or by “/dlc” or your favorite strategy.

Restraining Order

**Question:** My understanding of subfield coding in the 245 field is that once subfield $c$ is entered, one may not employ any other subfield coding. So, imagine my surprise when I encountered the following in #37035396:

245 10 Violin concerto in D minor, op. 47 / $c$ Sibelius. Sérénade mélancholique : $b$ op. 26 ; Scherzo : from "Souvenir d'un lieu cher" : op. 42, no. 2 / Tchaikovsky.

And my additional surprise when I validated the record and received no error message about incorrect subfield coding. Has use of subfields after $c$ changed and I’m just not aware of it, or is this in fact an error? If the latter, should the validation routine have caught it? I’ve consulted BFAS, and the subfield $b$ above appears to be an error. The fact that validation overlooked it gave me pause, though, prompting me to seek confirmation or clarification.

**Answer:** Your understanding that in field 245 no subfielding is allowed to follow subfield $c$ is correct. Unfortunately (and yes, surprisingly, I have to agree), validation doesn’t check for subfield order in field 245. That is something we can think about for the future. Aside from field 245, I’m having a tough time coming up with too many other fields where such a check would be possible (although it deserves more study). Even in field 245, I’m thinking it might not be possible to get more sophisticated than “no subfielding after subfield $c$.” Even that would be useful, of course.

Setting A Part Apart

**Question:** I’m cataloging a score with parts and I put “score” and “part” in separate 348 fields (the instructions and examples in the BFAS field 348 seem to indicate this as the preferred method). However, I also am using the Music Toolkit, and when I ran it, it added “score” and “part” in the same 348 (each in its own subfield $a$). Which is correct? Or does it matter?

**Answer:** Here is what I would argue, although others are certainly welcome to disagree. When terms (and codes) are from the same value vocabulary and so share the same code in subfield $2$, alphabetic subfields may be repeated in the same field when appropriate. When terms are not from a defined value vocabulary (such as field 340 subfield $b$; field 344 subfield $c$ or $f$; field 345 subfield $b$; field 347 subfields $b$, $c$, $d$, or $f$; and others) and subfield $2$ is therefore omitted, multiple alphabetic subfields may be included in the same field when appropriate. One advantage of that practice is fewer repeated 34X fields. One big disadvantage that I see, however, is the inconsistency with the much more common instances of mandated separate fields for each unique term. One also suspects that we will continue to develop controlled vocabularies where they may not currently exist; separate fields would make identification and conversion of such terms easier (at least in theory). To answer the original question, either a single field 348 (with two subfields $a$ and the one subfield $2$) or separate fields 348 would be permissible. The more forward-looking practice and the one more consistent with how we treat the 34X fields in general is to use separate 348 fields.
Statement from the MOUG Executive Board to the Members of MOUG

Dear MOUG,

There are no right words or best words, and there is no such thing as enough words to undo an eternity of intentional violence against Black people. As we collectively mourn the deaths of George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, Philando Castile, Trayvon Martin, and all Black lives taken by the hand of those who are supposed to do the opposite, MOUG makes the following statement:

The Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) stands with its members against racism and racially motivated violence. Throughout history, we have too often witnessed violent acts of racism in person, on camera, and through the eyes of our friends and family. There is nothing we can do to erase the pain felt by the Black community as a result of the innocent lives lost and brutal treatment at the hands of the police. Such actions fly in the face of all that we hold sacred including human dignity, civil rights, and social justice. Within our organization and our profession we all CAN and WILL:

- amplify the voices of our members of color;
- do more to ensure our BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and People of Color) members experience a safe and welcoming environment; and
- do our level best to grow diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In a humble start, the MOUG Executive Board is developing a DEI statement to guide our efforts. We commit to listening, to reflecting on ourselves and our organization, and to identifying what we can individually and collectively do to keep improving. In September, a draft of the MOUG DEI statement will be available in the Newsletter, on MOUG-L, and on the MOUG website for input and feedback. The MOUG Executive Board will discuss more steps to take at its upcoming meeting.
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Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association

Your Indispensable Companion For:

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

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Annual U.S. membership in the Music Library Association (includes a subscription to NOTES): Individuals, $130.00; Institutions, $165.00; Students, $65.00; Retirees, $95.00; Corporate Members, $480.00; Corporate Patrons, $778.00. Non-U.S. addresses add $10.00 to all memberships and subscriptions. All payments must be in U.S. funds, payable to the Music Library Association, Inc., and sent to the Business Office: 1600 Aspen Commons, Suite 100, Middleton, WI 53562. For availability and pricing of back issues, contact the MLA Business Office.

OLAC
Catalogers Network

Founded in 1980, OLAC is an organization for catalogers concerned with all types of nonprint materials, including a wide range of digital and physical resources like video and sound recordings, websites, maps, multimedia, streaming media, graphic materials, and realia.

Through conferences, workshops, publications (including OLAC’s notable best practices guides), and the electronic discussion list, catalogers exchange information and enjoy expert and practical advice on cataloging audiovisual resources.

For more information, visit http://www.olacinc.org
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Personal Membership is $30.00 (North America) and $45 (outside North America); institutional membership is $40.00 (North America) and $50.00 (outside North America). Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members will also receive any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.
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Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Tomoko Shibuya, MOUG Treasurer, Music Metadata Librarian, Metadata & Discovery Services, Northwestern University Libraries, 1970 Campus Dr., Evanston IL 60208.