OLAC NEWSLETTER
vol. 26, no. 1
March 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Jain Fletcher

Spring is the time of renewal. Never has that theme occurred to me more for my March issue column than with this period in cataloging, which is well reflected in this issue. As we all know, catalogers are involved in a renewal of their cataloging principles and the way they are presented. The topic of RDA has become dominant ever since it was first introduced just prior to the 2005 ALA Annual Meeting in Chicago. RDA runs throughout this issue, in the CAPC minutes, in the Conference Reports and even, at times, as an underlying impetus for change in Jay's "Cataloger's Judgment" column.

The most exciting outcome of the RDA movement is that two of its major players have graciously agreed to give plenary addresses to OLAC at its 2006 Conference. (I cannot resist an extra gesture of my enthusiasm about that here: !!!!!!!.) By the time of the OLAC Conference, the topics currently being discussed will be even more entrenched and RDA will have just aired its Part 2 at the 2006 ALA Annual Meeting. By that time, RDA will be sufficiently ingrained that OLAC members will be able to bring better background knowledge to the Conference and come away from it that much better informed. I see OLAC's opportunity to hear these speakers as a fabulous opening for members to become active participants in RDA, in any way possible. The RDA designers are well aware of OLAC's particular expertise, and have already sought their counsel (via CAPC). I believe that OLAC's advice will be sought more often in the future. I am certain that members are ready and willing to help, so that the

materials they catalog may become better represented in the guidelines.

I have to admit that I am equally excited about the location for the Conference--Mesa, Arizona, or, the "Valley of the Sun", as the Conference Committee keeps reminding us. I am a huge fan of the entire Southwest as a vacation (exploration) destination and can attest that Fall is one of the best times to visit. My hope is that some of you will consider taking a vacation, either before or after the Conference, to see what the Southwest has to offer beyond the "Valley of the Sun".

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Rebecca Lubas

Greetings, OLAC members! It was wonderful to see many of you at the OLAC meetings during ALA Midwinter.

If you were not able to make it to San Antonio, please do look at the meeting minutes in this issue, as there were some important reports from our liaisons to cataloging groups.

Thanks to all of you who stepped up to the plate to volunteer for CAPC positions or to be candidates for the OLAC offices in this year's elections. We have an excellent slate of candidates for OLAC Secretary and Vice-President/President Elect. Please take the opportunity to meet the candidates in the brief biographies in this issue.

Planning for our 2006 Conference in Phoenix, Arizona, "Preparing for a Brave New World: Media Cataloging on the Threshold of RDA", is reaching fever pitch. Please see the OLAC Conference Website <http://www.asu.edu/lib/olac/> for details, and get your hotel reservation in early! In addition to having the very latest on RDA developments, the Conference will be an exciting blend of the latest information on traditional formats, as well as several workshops offering practical advice on the use of non-MARC metadata for AV materials. It will be a terrific opportunity to learn a new format, brush up your core cataloging skills and hear about real live implementations in the wider world of metadata.

Before Phoenix, there will be another opportunity to meet as OLAC. OLAC will be

having its regular CAPC, Executive Board and Membership Meetings at ALA Annual in New Orleans. I hope as many of you as possible will be able to come to the OLAC meetings at that Conference and help the Big Easy return to is former glory by participating in the city's cornerstone economic activity, tourism.

TREASURER'S REPORT
First and Second Quarters
Through December 31, 2005
Bobby Bothmann, Treasurer

	1st Quarter July-Sept.	2nd Quarter Oct.-Dec.	Year-To-Date
OPENING BALANCE	$5,344.61	$3,704.54	
INCOME			
Memberships	$594.00	$2,930.00	$3,524.00
Other*	$35.00		$35.00
TOTAL	$629.00	$2,930.00	$3,559.00
EXPENSES			
ALA	$400.00		$400.00
Membership Overpayment		$5.00	$5.00
OLAC Board Dinner	$186.24		$186.24
OLAC Award	$227.00		$227.00
Stipends	$100.00	$150.00	$250.00
Postage & Printing	$1,355.83	$1,847.70	$3,203.53
Printing	*$1,355.83*	*$1,635.93*	*$2,991.76*
Postage		*$211.77*	*$211.77*
Web Domain		$15.00	$15.00
Miscellaneous		$37.00	$37.00
TOTAL	$2,269.07	$2,054.70	$4,323.77
CLOSING BALANCE			$4,579.84

* Other: Refund of re-registration of incorportion fee.

MEMBERSHIP as of January 22, 2006
    Personal: 402
    Institutional: 220
Total: 622

**ONLINE AUDIOVISIAL CATALOGERS
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA ANNUAL MEETING
San Antonio, Texas
Friday, January 20, 2006**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. *Members present*: Lisa Bodenheimer, (Chair), Valerie Bross, Jeanette Ho, Lisa Robinson, Susan Leister, Julia Dunlap, Kelley McGrath, Sandy Roe, Linda Seguin. *Ex officio members*: John Attig, Greta de Groat.

A total of 35 persons were in attendance.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

2. **Approval of Minutes**

   The minutes of the CAPC meeting held in Chicago, Illinois, on June 24, 2005, were approved.

3. **Announcements**

   There were no announcements.

4. **Reports**

a. *MARBI (J. Attig)* Several proposals were discussed. There was a lively discussion of Discussion Paper 2006-DP02, which is a proposal to create coding in the 008 field for audiobooks and talking books for the blind so that materials containing strong language, sex, or violence could be identified in a catalog search. The paper generated mixed feelings, with some participants seeing the utility of such information and others feeling that coding such information would be more arbitrary than describing the content in free text in the 521 or 520 fields.

There was also some follow-up information on the proposal to allow all subtitled languages to appear in Field 041, subfield $b. MARBI has asked for a follow up proposal to split subtitles and abstracts out so there is no confusion as to the meaning of the information in the field. Work is in process on this proposal.

Please see the full MARBI Report, given elsewhere in this issue.

b. *CC:DA/RDA (G. de Groat)*

There is an OLAC group providing comments about RDA. The JSC is also taking individual comments (individual comments on Part 1 are due to the Committee on February 7th).

Chapter 3--on technical description--was missing from the RDA draft that was initially posted. Chapter 3 is now available, though it still lacks the list of GMS/SMD terms, which is still under discussion.

During the all-day session on RDA that was held on Friday, January 20th, there appeared to be general consensus that the new draft is better than the AACR3 draft that was released last year. There are some issues with the consistency of use of FRBR terminology and differing opinions on the relegation of ISBD punctuation to an appendix. It also appears that RDA in its current draft is still print-centric, since there is ambiguity as to what information is truly "outside" the work and therefore in need of brackets and justification. This has implications for the cataloging of sound recordings, video formats, and electronic resources.

Please see the full CC:DA Report, given elsewhere in this issue.

c. *NACO/AV Report (L. Bodenheimer for A. Caldwell)*

The NACO/AV Funnel Project has two new members. BWI is the first

corporate member of NACO/AV. Ten of their catalogers have been trained in NACO work. Also, University of Missouri-Columbia has joined.

d. *OLAC/CAPC Best Practices Task Force*

The Task Force delivered a preliminary report, consisting of seven recommendations. The recommendations are: to create a page on the OLAC Website that would cover common cataloging problems; to make the site very visible on the OLAC Home page; that the Web page contain two distinct sections, one FAQ for factual information, and one of best practices that would follow trends in developing areas; the page should be administered by a Task Group of CAPC; that catalogers should be able to make recommendations for topics to cover; to organize the page so that like topics would be together; and finally, that the Best Practices Task Force be reappointed so that documentation for a FAQ and Best Practices could be made.

The Task Force also made a call for additional members. Contact the Chair, Cathy Gerhart, at <gerhart@u.washington.edu>.

e. *AACR3 Examples Task Force (L. Bodenheimer)*

Lisa noted that work done for this Task Force will now be offered to RDA.

5. **New Business**

a. *Working session on Form/Genre subject headings (Martha Yee, UCLA, and David Reser, Library of Congress)*

CAPC had asked the question: what is happening with form/genre headings at the Library of Congress, and what could be done to expedite the process of creation of these headings? David Reser and Martha Yee were asked here to discuss this issue. David Reser was able to report that progress is being made toward the goal of identifying LCSH headings to be transformed into form/genre headings (authority records with subject tag 155).

Cataloging staff from the Moving Image section of the Motion Picture, Broadcast & Recorded Sound (MBRS) division are working with policy

specialists from the Cataloging Policy Office to analyze form/genre terms from *Moving Image Genre-Form Guide* (MIGFG) and reconcile the terminology with LCSH. The Moving Image section and MIGFG were considered good places to start work since approximately 50% of moving image materials have 655s assigned, as opposed to 1.5% of books.

After the initial analysis of MIGFG is done, principles will be extrapolated, the draft form headings list will be created, and scope notes added to terms where appropriate. There will also need to be a constituency review before records are placed in the authority file. It is hoped that the draft list will be available by ALA Annual 2006.

The next step is to indicate unambiguously what is a topic and what is a form/genre heading by creation of appropriate authority records. These terms then need to be re-integrated into LCSH and other products and the rules for creation of such headings need to be documented in the *Subject Cataloging Manual*. The creation of a reference structure for form/genre headings needs to be developed.

There was discussion of some of the aspects of creating unambiguous form/genre headings. One thing mentioned was the need to keep certain headings both as 150 and 155 headings, since they had, in fact, been developed as topical headings for books. Concern was expressed that, as the terminology is developed, more types of material than moving images be considered in choosing terms, since there are some differences of usage among different media communities. Martha Yee discussed the need for clarity in developing terminology for filmed performances, such as plays and dance, and for events such as baseball games.

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy K. Weiss
OLAC Secretary

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
ALA Midwinter Meeting
San Antonio, Texas
Saturday, January 21, 2006

Minutes

---

1. **Welcome, Introductions, Announcements**

   The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m. Members present: Rebecca Lubas (President), Steven Miller, Lisa Bodenheimer, Robert Freeborn, Bobby Bothmann, Amy K. Weiss, Jain Fletcher. Visitors: Cathy Gerhart, Debbie Benrubi.

2. **Secretary's Report (A. Weiss)**

   The minutes from the Board Meeting from June 25, 2005, at ALA Annual in Chicago were approved.

3. **Treasurer's Report (B. Bothmann)**

   Please see the full Treasurer's Report elsewhere in this issue.

4. **Newsletter Editor's Report (J. Fletcher)**

   The double issue was sent out a few months ago. The March Newsletter will contain candidate biographies for the forthcoming OLAC election and the onset of notices for the next OLAC Conference.

5. **CAPC Report (L. Bodenheimer)**

   Please see the CAPC meeting minutes elsewhere in this issue.

6. **Old Business**

   a. *Brochure (R. Lubas and D. Benrubi)*

      Debbie Benrubi, the new Outreach Coordinator, was formally introduced

to the Board. The new brochure was examined and the Board edited the text of the "key events" portion of the brochure. Rebecca Lubas will take the completed brochure to a commercial artist for layout and graphics.

b. *OLAC 2006 Update (Conference Committee Members)*

Speakers are set for the Conference and the hotel arrangements are made. The Committee will start publicity for the Conference when the Website comes out. Announcements will be placed on a variety of cataloging and library oriented listservs.

c. *Conference Planning Manual (R. Freeborn)*

There should be a draft available by ALA Annual in New Orleans.

d. *NACO Funnel Future at OLAC Conferences (All)*

Training for the NACO A/V Funnel used to be a standard pre-conference offering of the OLAC Conference. However, the Preconference was not held in 2004 and will not be held in 2006. If this trend continues, rather than holding training sessions, the Board would like to consider the NACO Music Funnel model, mentoring catalogers and institutions that would like to contribute. The Board will discuss this idea further with E. Ann Caldwell, the Funnel Coordinator, and revisit the issue at Annual.

e. *OLAC Archives Planning (R. Bothmann)*

No processing work has been done yet at Minnesota State University on the OLAC Archive residing there. Whenever the processing does start, OLAC will need to contribute money for new Hollinger boxes and make a donation to the Library.

Iris Wolley, OLAC Archivist, would like some feedback from the Minnesota State University archivist on what materials to save. This issue will be revisited at the ALA Annual Conference.

After his term as OLAC Treasurer ends, Bobby Bothmann will become the OLAC Archivist.

7. **New Business**

Bobby Bothmann recommends the purchase of a new database program to use

for the membership database. He explained its advantages and demonstrated its capabilities. The Board agreed that he should purchase a license for the new software.

8. **Closed Session**

   The closed session topics included reports from the Elections Committee, the OLAC Award Committee, and an update on the AMIA liaison, and selection of new CAPC members.

9. **Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted,
Amy K. Weiss
OLAC Secretary

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
MEMBERSHIP MEETING
ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
San Antonio, Texas
Saturday, January 21, 2006

Minutes

---

1. **Welcome, Introductions, Announcements**

President Rebecca Lubas called the meeting to order. She introduced herself and the Board Members introduced themselves. There were 31 members in attendance.

Board Members present: Rebecca Lubas, Steve Miller, Robert Freeborn, Robert Bothmann, Amy Weiss, Jain Fletcher, Lisa Bodenheimer. *Ex Officio members present:* Greta de Groat, John Attig.

2. **Secretary's Report (A. Weiss)**

The minutes of the Membership Meeting from the ALA Annual Conference, June 25, 2005, in Chicago, Illinois, were approved.

3. **Treasurer's Report (B. Bothmann)**

See the full Treasurer's report elsewhere in this issue.

4. **Newsletter Editor's Report (J. Fletcher)**

Deadline for the March Newsletter is in early February.

5. **CAPC Report (L. Bodenheimer)**

Please see the meeting minutes elsewhere in this issue.

6. **OLAC 2006 Conference Update (R. Lubas)**

The next OLAC Conference will be held during the last week of October 2006 and will be hosted by Arizona State University. The theme will be "Preparing for a Brave New World: Media Cataloging on the Threshold of RDA". Speakers will include Barbara Tillett and a representative from the JSC. There will be workshops on traditional cataloging and also on creation of non-MARC metadata. There will be a preconference given by SCCTP on Electronic Serials.

7. **Elections Committee (C. Gerhart)**

Cathy Gerhart could not find volunteers for this Committee, so ended up being the entire nominating committee this year. Next year, Robert Freeborn, as Past Past President, will Chair this Committee. Cathy was very pleased at the pool of candidates this year, with two people running for each position.

Candidates for Vice President/President Elect are: Amy K. Weiss and Vicki Toy Smith.

Candidates for Secretary are: Katherine Rankin and Kate James.

There were no nominations from the floor, and the nominations were closed.

8. **Nancy B. Olson Award Committee (R. Freeborn)**

Robert chaired this Committee, with the members consisting of Meredith Horan, Kay Johnson and himself. Next year, Rebecca Lubas, as immediate Past President, will be Chair.

Due to the lack of nominations received, there will not be an award presented this year.

9. **Liaison Reports**

   a. *Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) (M. Huismann)*

      The Music OCLC Users Group will be meeting February 21-22, 2006 at the Peabody Hotel, in Memphis, Tennessee, immediately prior to the Music Library Association Conference. The Conference will focus on sound recordings, and will conclude with the sessions "Ask MOUG" and with Enhance and NACO Participant's meetings.

   b. *OCLC (J. Weitz)*

      See highlights from the OCLC news elsewhere in this issue.

   c. *CC:DA (G. de Groat)*

      See the full CC:DA report elsewhere in this issue.

   d. *MARBI (J. Attig)*

      See the full MARBI report elsewhere in this issue.

   e. *LC Update (R. Lubas for D. Reser)*

      David Reser from CPSO attended the CAPC meeting and reported on the Library of Congress's current initiative to create form/genre headings. Please see under "Subject Headings" in the LC Liaison Report for LC's announcement of this initiative and under "New Business" in the CAPC meeting minutes for an informed discussion of this issue.

10. **New Business**

There was no new business.

11. **Adjournment**

   The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. It was followed by the traditional question and answer session, with Jay Weitz, John Attig, Paige Andrews, and Robert Freeborn serving as the panel.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy K. Weiss
OLAC Secretary

MEET THE CANDIDATES

Candidates for Vice President/President Elect

Vicki Toy-Smith
Catalog Librarian
Cataloging/Metadata Services
University of Nevada Reno Libraries

Background Information
Vicki Toy-Smith is Catalog Librarian at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) Libraries. She is responsible for special formats cataloging at UNR with a focus on electronic, sound recording, and other non-book materials; additionally, she provides metadata for various digital projects. She is currently participating in a Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) Metadata Task Force with representation from various academic libraries in Utah and Nevada. The Task Force is examining the application of the Western States Dublin Core Metadata Best Practices Guidelines. Vicki documents workflows, policies, and procedures for UNR's Cataloging/Metadata Department. Vicki has an MA from Eastern Michigan University, an AMLS from the University of Michigan, and an A.B. degree from the University of California, Berkeley.

Statement of Interest
I have been a member of the OLAC organization since 1992. I would like the

opportunity to serve OLAC in the role of Vice President/President Elect. If elected, my primary goal would be to maintain OLAC's objectives related to the cataloging of audiovisual materials, shared practices and standards, and advocacy. I would promote the development of more cataloging guidelines for online digital images, sound and video files. In addition, I would work on increasing the visibility of OLAC both nationally and internationally.

OLAC Activities

- CC:DA (Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access) Liaison, 1998-2001
- Ex-Officio Member, Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC), 1998-2001
- Book review Column Editor for *OLAC Newsletter*, 1994-present

Other Professional Activities

National

- American Library Association; 1982-1983; 1989-
- LITA/ALCTS (Library and Information Technology Association/Association for Library Collections and Technical Services) Retrospective Conversion Interest Group, Chair, 1995-1996; Vice-Chair, 1994-1995
- CCS (Cataloging and Classification Section) Copy Cataloging Discussion Group, Chair, 1995-1996; Vice-Chair, 1994-1995
- LITA (Library and Information Technology Association) Bylaws and Organization Committee, Member, 1995-1997
- PARS (Preservation and Reformatting Section) IAC (Intellectual Access Committee) Intern, 1994-1995
- CALA (Chinese American Librarians Association), 1993-1996, Newsletter Editor, 1994-1996; Annual Program editor, 1993-1994, Publications Committee, 1993-1996

Statewide and University

- Nevada Library Association; 1992-1994; 1995-
  - Co-chair of CAPTAIN, 1996-1997
- Ethnic Grants and Scholarship Committee, 1995-1998
- Affirmative Action Advisory Board, 1994-
  - Co-Chair, 1997-
  - Chair, Subcommittee on Retention of Faculty, 1994-1995
- Director of Financial Aid Search Committee, 1993-1994

Publications

In Refereed Journals

Smith, Vicki Leslie Toy. "Access to Basque Sound Recordings: A Unique Minimal Level Cataloging Project." *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 42(2), 2004: 167-174.

Smith, Vicki Toy. "Local Cataloging Procedures." *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 48 (2), 2000: 133-148.

Ressel, Maggie and Smith, Vicki Toy. "A New Approach to Subject Analysis: A Collaborative Success." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26 (3), 1998.

Smith, Vicki Toy. "Core Records: Is this the Answer to Cooperative Cataloging?" *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 36 (2), 1998.

Smith, Vicki Toy. "Outsourcing Cataloging: An Evaluation." *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 34 (4), 1997.

Rankin, Katherine L.; Rozzi, Joan; Smith, Vicki Toy; Fitt, Stephen D. "Video Cataloging: Reducing Backlogs." *College and Undergraduate Libraries*, 3 (1), 1996.

Smith, Vicki Toy. "Library Mission: Embracing Change in the Year 2000." *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 33 (3), 1996.

Book Chapters
Smith, Vicki Leslie Toy. "Staffing Trends in Academic Library Technical Services" (coauthored with Kathryn Etcheverria) in *Innovative Redesign and Reorganization of Library Technical Services: Paths for the Future and Case Studies*, edited by Brad Eden. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2004.

Smith, Vicki Leslie Toy. "Fundraising and Public Relations in the Electronic Environment." [coauthored with Betty Glass] in *Attracting, Educating, and Serving Remote Users Through the Web*, edited by Donnelyn Curtis. New York, N.Y.: Neal Schuman, 2002.

Other Professional Publications
Toy-Smith, Vicki. "Database Cleanup after Retrospective Conversion: a Report of the Program of the LITA/ALCTS Retrospective Conversion Interest Group, American Library Association Conference, New York, July 1996." *Technical Services*

Quarterly, 14 (4), 1997.

Smith, Vicki L. and Hoornstra, Jean. *Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: The Basic Materials, an Introduction and Guide to the Microfiche Collection*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1981.

Puravs, Grace; Kavanagh, Kathy L.; and Smith, Vicki. *Accessing English Literary Periodicals: a Guide to the Microfilm Collection with Title, Subject, and Reel Number Indexes*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1981.

40 book reviews published in Library Journal between 1993 and 2000.

Amy K. Weiss
Head of Cataloging and Database Management
University of California, Santa Barbara

Background information
In her current position, Amy is head of a section of 27 monographic catalogers and authority control and database maintenance personnel. She plans cataloging projects and workflow, oversees departmental committees, and coordinates cataloging policy in conjunction with other technical services librarians. She catalogs materials in all formats and in a variety of foreign languages. Since obtaining her first professional cataloging position in 1993, Amy has cataloged print materials, electronic resources, video recordings, maps, sound recordings, and a variety of other materials. Amy has an MLS from the University of Maryland (1993), an MFA in painting from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and a BA from Mount Holyoke College.

Statement
Audio-Visual catalogers have always dealt with the challenge of finding ways to provide access to materials that do not neatly conform to the categorizations of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Electronic resources have spearheaded a revolution where even print catalogers have had to face the disintegration of traditional cataloging norms. RDA, to judge by early indications, will offer a less restrictive framework for developing descriptions of all types of materials, but will offer less concrete guidance as well. I believe that OLAC is uniquely positioned to provide leadership and assistance to all catalogers in the coming years. OLAC can continue to offer educational opportunities, to develop guides to best practices in audio-visual and electronic resources cataloging, and to work with the architects of cataloging policy so that rules will reflect the vast universe of materials that we

catalog.

OLAC Activities
OLAC Secretary 2004-present
Member, 2002-present
Workshop, "Direct Access Computer File Cataloging." Online Audiovisual Catalogers Biennial Conference, Seattle, Washington, October 2000

Awards
"Best of LRTS" award for 2004, for the article, "Proliferating Guidelines: A History and Analysis of the Cataloging of Electronic Resources".

Other Professional Activities

- Library Administration and Management Association, 1998-present
  - Library Administration & Management Editorial Advisory Board, 2001-2004; Chair, 2003-2005
  - Jury member, YBP Student Writing Award, 2003-2004
  - Systems and Services Section Mgmt Practices Committee, 1999-2003
  - Middle Management Discussion Group; Program Assistant, 1999
- North Carolina Library Association, 1999-2004
  - Resources and Technical Services Section; Board Member, 2001-2003
  - Membership Committee; Chair, 2001-2003
  - Nominations Committee, 2003
  - Jury, RTSS Best Article in North Carolina Libraries, 2001
  - New Members Round Table, Nominations Committee, 1999

Selected Publications

Weiss, Amy K. "Proliferating Guidelines: A History and Analysis of the Cataloging of Electronic Resources." Library Resources & *Technical Services* 47 (4), 2003: 171-187.

Weiss, Amy K. and Timothy V. Carstens. "The Year's Work in Cataloging, 1999." Library Resources & *Technical Services* 45 (1), 2001: 47-58.

Weiss, Amy K. "LA&M Advisory Board." [conference report] *Library Administration & Management* 17 (2), 2003: 109-112.

Weiss, Amy K. "Dionne Sisters Are First Quintuplets to Survive." In *Great Events: 1900-2001*. Pasadena, Calif.: Salem Press, 2002: 710-712.

Weiss, Amy K. Poster Sessions. *OLAC Newsletter* 20 (4), 2000: 40-41.

King, R. James, presenter; Amy K. Weiss, recorder. "Hybrid Methods of Desktop Journal Delivery." In *From Carnegie to Internet2: Forging the Serials Future, Proceedings of the North American Serials Interest Group, 14th Annual Conference, June 10-13, 1999*. Binghamton, New York: Haworth Press, 2000: 263-267. (Also in *The Serials Librarian*, vol. 38, nos. 3/4).

Candidates for Secretary

Kate James
Special Formats Cataloger
Illinois State University

I am interested in serving OLAC as Secretary. My first cataloging experience was at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee where I worked for the Monographs Department headed by Steve Miller. At the law firm of von Briesen & Roper I was primarily responsible for cataloging monographs and serials, but did get experience cataloging video and sound recordings. In 2002, I was hired as the Special Formats Cataloger at Illinois State University, where I catalog electronic resources, video recordings, maps, study prints, kits, and tests. To do this, I use Endeavor's Voyager and OCLC Connexion regularly, as well as Classification Web and Cataloger's Desktop.

My various committee experiences have given me the kinds of skills needed to serve as Secretary for OLAC. At Milner, I chaired the Newer Librarians Interest Group, and served as the Bibliographical Services representative to the Policy and Procedures Steering Team, the Library Instruction Committee, and the Preservation Committee. As the representative for my department, I not only had to speak for us at meetings, but I also had to communicate important information back about possible impacts to our department.

At the 2004 OLAC Conference in Montréal, I presented a poster with Sandy Roe, titled, "Integrating 150 Years of Research @ ISU with OpenURLs". I am currently on the Program Committee for the next OLAC Conference in Phoenix. I attended the ALA Annual Meeting in Chicago and the ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Antonio. I expect to be able to fulfill the requirement that the OLAC Secretary be present at ALA meetings.

I came away from the OLAC Conference in Montréal last year with a desire to become an active member of the organization. This position would provide me with this opportunity. Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine L. Rankin
Special Formats Catalog Librarian and Metadata Standards Librarian
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

Background Information
Kathy Rankin earned her MLS from the University of Arizona in 1977. Primarily she catalogs audio-visual material, maps, and monographic microforms and is in charge of metadata for digital projects. Prior to coming to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Kathy was the special collections cataloger at the University of Texas at Arlington where she was responsible for cataloging special collections monographs. Before that she was the audio-visual materials cataloger at Pan American University (now UT-Pan American) in Edinburg, Texas. Kathy has taught several workshops in audio-visual materials cataloging for state library association groups, has helped teach a continuing education class in cataloging, and has taught week-long classes twice for the Nevada State Library in audio-visual materials cataloging. She has been a member of OLAC since the Fall of 1989. Her hobbies are needlework, reading, genealogy, and travel.

Statement of Interest
Kathy would like to become more active in OLAC and has served as a secretary for other librarian special interest groups.

Selected Professional Activities

- ALA, 1977-
- ALCTS, 1977-
- MAGERT (ALA Map and Geography Round Table), 1987-
  - Served as Chair of Membership Committee
  - Editor of a map cataloging column in the newsletter for five years
  - Former member of the Map Cataloging and Classification Committee
- WAML (Western Association of Map Libraries), 1989-
  - Served as President, 2004-2005
  - Hosted Fall 2005 meeting
  - Served as Secretary
  - Served as Chair of Membership Committee

- - Served as book review Column Editor, 1996-present
  - Serve as WAML/MAGERT Liaison
- Southern District of Nevada Library Association
  - Served as Secretary
- Nevada Library Association, 1989-
  - Served on Bylaws Committee
  - Served on Scholarship Committee
  - Served as Chair (twice) of Technical Services Interest Group
- UALC (Utah Academic Library Consortium) Metadata Guidelines Task Force
- Texas Library Association Catalogers' Round Table
  - Served as Secretary, Vice-Chair, and Chair
- "Metadata: the Role of Technical Services Personnel" - a presentation that was part of a panel on "Future of Technical Services", presented by the Technical Services Interest Group of the Nevada Library Association at its Annual Conference on October 20, 2005

Selected Publications

From Drawer to Digital: a Statewide Collaboration for Building Historic Map Collections (in press). With Glee Willis, Vicki Toy Smith, Linda Newman, and Peter Michel.

"The Information Commons at Lied Library." *Library Hi Tech* 20.1 (2002): 58-70. With Jennifer Church, Jason Vaughan, and Wendy Starkweather.

"Video Cataloging: Reducing Backlog." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 3.1 (Spring 1996): 69-78. With Joan Rozzi, Vicki Toy Smith and Stephen D. Fitt.

"Helpful Hints for Small Map Collections." *Public Libraries* 35.3 (May/June 1996): 173-179. With Mary L. Larsgaard.

"FastCat: a Tool for Cataloging." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 69.8 (1995): 41-43. With Lamont Downs.

"Gambling with Subject Headings." *Technicalities* 13.3 (1993): 13-16. With Laralee Nelson.

Book reviews 1994-present in the *OLAC Newsletter*.

Book reviews 1997-present in the *Journal of the Western Association of Map Libraries*.

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Jan Mayo, Column Editor

** REPORTS FROM THE **
2006 ALA Midwinter Conference
San Antonio, Texas

————————

Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
Liaison Report
submitted by John Attig
Pennsylvania State University

The Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI) Committee and the USMARC Advisory Committee met for two sessions during the ALA Midwinter Conference in San Antonio, Texas. The following is a summary of the meeting. More information is available on the MARC Advisory Committee Web page at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marcadvz.html>.

Proposal No. 2006-01: Changes to Accommodate IAML Form/Genre Codes in Field 047
The proposal dealt with the Form of Musical Composition Code (008/18-19 and Field 047). Currently only codes defined in the MARC 21 formats are allowed in these fields. This proposal called for changes to the definitions that would allow codes from other sources (such as the new IAML code list) to be used, and for the addition of $2 to Field 047 in order to identify the source of the code.

MARBI approved the proposal with some minor changes:

- the second indicator in Field 047, rather than the first indicator, will be used to indicate the presence of subfield $2
- Field 047 will be made repeatable

- the code "mu" will be used in 008/18-19 to indicate the presence of codes in Field 047

Proposal No. 2006-02: Adding subfields for Relator Terms to X11 Fields

At the 2005 ALA Annual Conference, MARBI had approved the addition of subfield $e for relator terms to subject access fields (6XX). A remaining problem with this decision is that subfield $e has already been defined for a different data element in the X11 conference name fields. This proposal offered two alternatives for adding a relator term subfield to X11 fields: define a new subfield ($j) or redefine two subfields so that $e could be used for the relator term.

MARBI reaffirmed the principle that fields and subfields, once defined and implemented, are never redefined for a different purpose. MARBI approved the addition of subfield $j to the X11 Fields.

Proposal No. 2006-03: Standardized Terminology for Access Restrictions in Field 506

This proposal calls for coding to support the use of standardized terminology in Field 506 (Restrictions on Access Note). MARBI approved:

- the addition of subfield $f for standardized terms
- the addition of subfield $2 for the source of the terms
- an indicator position that shows whether or not there are restrictions on access

Proposal No. 2006-04: Technique for Conversion of Unicode to MARC-8

In response to a number of issues raised at the 2005 Annual Conference, this proposal defines an "official" MARC 21 technique for conversion of Unicode data to the MARC-8 character set. The conversion technique calls for a "placeholder" character to be used in cases in which the Unicode character has no equivalent in MARC-8. MARBI approved the proposal, but indicated that this technique would not allow round-trip mapping of data, and that a more complex technique should also be developed that would support round-trip conversion without loss of meaning.

Proposal No. 2006-05: Changes to Holdings Data Fields to Accommodate ONIX for Serials

This proposal called for defining additional subfields to support data elements in the ONIX Serial Release Notice. MARBI approved the addition of subfield $o for Type of Unit in Fields 853/863; the addition of subfield $2 for source of caption abbreviation in Fields 853-855; made subfield $o repeatable in Fields 854/864 and 855/865; and called for consideration of language of captions to be included in the proposal to be developed in response to Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP05.

Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP01: Recording Geographic Coordinates in Authority Records

This discussion paper calls for adding Field 034 to the Authorities Format, so that geographic coordinates can be added to headings for geographic names. This information would support searching based on coordinates; the headings retrieved in the authority records could be used to retrieve relevant bibliographic records.

MARBI endorsed the concept and made a number of recommendations about the details of the proposal, which is expected to be considered at the 2006 Annual Conference.

Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP02: Addition of Coded Value to 008 for Content Alerts

This discussion paper deals with the identification of sensitive material (sex and violence) in material for the visually impaired; these alerts allow users to avoid inadvertently giving offense to others when using audiobooks, for example. MARBI endorsed the concept, but felt that use of a single byte of coded data would not be adequate; Field 521 was suggested as an alternative. A proposal will be developed.

Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP03: Incorporation of Former Headings in Authority Records

The discussion paper suggests defining a note field (683) for recording former headings that do not qualify for inclusion as "see from" references. There was considerable discussion as to whether such former headings would be used for processing, i.e., to "flip" the former headings to the new headings; it was noted that the former headings may conflict with valid headings in the authority file and that processing would be risky. However, MARBI seemed inclined to recommend use of the 4XX "see from" reference fields, with appropriate codes in subfield $w to control display and processing. A proposal will be developed and may explore multiple options.

Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP05: Indicating Coverage Dates for Indexes in the Holdings Format

This discussion paper, like Proposal No. 2006-05 above, is based on the ONIX Serial Release Notice (SRN). The SRN distinguishes between the coverage dates of an index and its issue date (e.g., an index covering 2001-2005 issued in 2006). MARBI agreed that both types of dates should be supported in holdings records. A proposal will be developed.

Other Business
MARBI heard reports from:

- **The Deutsche Bibliothek**, which is leading the effort of German and Austria libraries to adopt the MARC 21 formats. They are developing proposals to deal with missing or conflicting data elements, and these proposals may be ready for consideration by MARBI at the 2006 Annual Conference.

- **The MARC Content Designation Utilization Project**, which is collecting data at a high level of granularity about the content of the catalog record, based on the WorldCat database. For further information, see <http://www.mcdu.unt.edu>.

- Jennifer Bowen on the development of *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, the forthcoming successor to AACR2. Jennifer suggested that MARBI might be interested in working with the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR in developing a mapping between RDA and MARC 21. MARBI expressed its interest.

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
Liaison Report
submitted by Greta de Groat
Stanford University Libraries

RDA Discussions and Actions at ALA Midwinter in San Antonio
The main point of discussion at the three CC:DA meetings in San Antonio was RDA Part 1, which the Joint Steering Committee made publicly available on their Website in mid-December. This draft lacked Ch. 3, the chapter on technical (formerly physical) description. The draft of Ch. 3, minus the lists of GMDs/SMDs was finally made available on the JSC Website on the Thursday before ALA, so was not discussed in any depth at the meeting.

Because the draft is publicly available, CC:DA was planning to take public comments on the draft from people who were not already commenting through an official channel. The JSC also started a list, called RDA-L, on which people could discuss RDA, but it is not an official part of the comment process. There is a FAQ on RDA on the JSC Website. There was an RDA forum at ALA, as well as focus groups. These outreach efforts will continue through the RDA process until publication in 2008. The JSC will then go back to its normal procedures concerning rule revisions. Talks are now beginning on the need for implementation and training, and of possible impacts on MARC.

CC:DA Discussions - January 2006

Jennifer Bowen, CC:DA representative to the JSC, reported that JSC received so many comments on AACR3 that they were unable to get to them at the October meeting, and the next meeting will largely address Part 2. Though much concern was expressed by CC:DA with the redundancy of instructions in RDA, Bowen explained that it is part of the design of the Web product, so that people do not miss the general rule when they search for the specific. Since basic decisions on arrangement and principles have already been decided, issues discussed generally centered on individual rules which were unclear or had unintended consequences. As rules are supposed to be "principle-based", there is less of a case-law approach than in AACR2. Users are intended to follow principles when a novel situation occurs rather than having separate rules/exceptions for every possible situation. In CC:DA discussion, opinions were split on the role of transcription of data, some wanting to "record what is there", others wanting the type of normalizations and omissions currently prescribed in AACR2. Similarly, some members welcome the separation of ISBD punctuation from the rules into an appendix, others find this confusing. FRBR concepts are not used consistently in the draft, and it still seems to be text-centric. Sources of information were considered problematic by many CC:DA members. In particular, representatives from OLAC and the Music Library Association, as well as people involved in metadata, find the definition of container and accompanying material as "outside the resource" to be problematic, as it would result in the bracketing of much information which is not currently bracketed. A straw poll of CC:DA members favored JSC returning to an earlier proposal on source of title by the Library of Congress, to take the title from anywhere in the resource but always note its source.

Other CC:DA activities included reports on:

- Recent Library of Congress activities - by Barbara Tillett
- CC:DA's Website - by Webmaster John Attig
- NISO - by Mary Larsgaard for Betty Landesman--indicating concern that NISO is moving away from library-related standards
- Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media - by Greta de Groat
- Task Force to Maintain "Differences Between, Changes Within" - by Kevin Randall
- Task Force for the Revision of *Guidelines for Cataloging Microform Sets* - by Becky Culbertson--a revision of a 1989 publication which will include record sets for digital reproductions
- ALA publishing - by Donald Chatham
- Task Force on Planning for the Cataloging Cultural Objects program - by Matthew Beacom

- MARBI - by John Attig
- Task Force to Review Draft *Functional Requirements for Authority Records* (FRAR) - by Helen Schmierer

---

Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
Cataloging Committee
Liaison Report
submitted by Arlene Balkansky
Library of Congress

AMIA's 2005 Annual Conference was held in Austin, Texas, from November 30-December 3. The sessions covered a wide range of materials--from digital files to small gauge amateur film collections (Super 8 mm, etc.)--and focused on preservation, management, processing, and access to these varied materials.

It is a time of change for the AMIA Cataloging Committee. Unfortunately, Nancy Dosch, elected Chair of the Committee, was unable to attend the Conference and resigned as Chair, although she hopes to continue to participate in AMIA and the Cataloging Committee. Arlene Balkansky volunteered to act as Interim Chair until a special election arranged by the AMIA Board is held.

The Committee met twice. In place of one of the standard meetings, Kris Kiesling, from the Society of American Archivists, gave a presentation about *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS), a new SAA standard for description of archival materials. Her talk provided an overview of DACS, including its development, basic structure of the rules, and some comparison of DACS to AACR2, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts, and Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual*.

The second meeting covered Subcommittee and Liaison reports, cooperation with the AMIA Digital Initiatives Committee, and discussion about Conference sessions.

The Cataloging Committee's Standards Review Subcommittee (SRS), under the leadership of Sarah Ziebell Mann, was involved in two important projects in 2005. The first project was the review of the December 2004 draft of AACR3. The individual members of the SRS were able to participate in the review, first on a consultancy basis through OLAC in February and one month later as a direct contributor. The SRS has been asked by OLAC to participate in the review of the next draft--now titled *RDA: Resource Description and Access* --and Arlene volunteered to

contribute comments through OLAC. That review has since been completed. In addition to Arlene's contributions, Martha Yee, Andrea Leigh, and perhaps additional AMIA members contributed comments through OLAC and other organizations. For the second project, the SRS submitted comments to MARBI regarding Discussion Paper 2005-DP01, "Subject Access to Images".

The Liaison report from the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) Cataloguing and Documentation Commission described current projects, which include updating the *FIAF Cataloguing Rules* and the *Glossary of Filmographic Terms*, as well as the Commission's ongoing focus of updating the four databases on the *FIAF International FilmArchive Database*. The Liaison report from the Library of Congress described the planned move of most of the activities and staff of the Library's Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division to the National AudioVisual Conservation Center in Culpeper, Virginia, scheduled to fully open in late 2006 or early 2007. The LC report and the MIC: Moving Image Collections project report stated that LC will serve as permanent host site for MIC <http://mic.loc.gov>, which documents moving image collections around the world. Jane Johnson, MIC Project Manager, is currently working with LC staff to effect the MIC technology transfer from the three developer universities to LC. The OLAC community may be particularly interested in MIC's Cataloging and Metadata Portal, which includes information on standards and tools, systems and utilities, organizations, and training and education at: <http://mic.imtc.gatech.edu/catalogers_portal/cat_index.htm>.

There was discussion about working with the Digital Initiatives Committee through the formation of a Joint Metadata Subcommittee. This Joint Subcommittee has since been approved by both sets of Committee members and will begin work in the near future.

Discussion of future Ccnference program sessions focused on presenting a moving image cataloging and metadata workshop. The workshop has since been proposed for the next AMIA Conference in Anchorage, Alaska, with a possible regional workshop to follow at NYU.

For more information on the Conference, Committee projects, or general questions relating to AMIA, please feel free to contact Arlene Balkansky at . Also see the AMIA Website at <http://www.amianet.org>. In addition to consulting the MIC Website, Jane Johnson <jjohnson@loc.gov> may be contacted for more information about MIC.

NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Compiled for OLAC by David Reser*
For the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting
San Antonio, Texas
January 2006

*With special thanks to colleagues Lynn El-Hoshy and Susan Morris for their help with this compilation.

More information about initiatives undertaken at the Library of Congress since the ALA Annual Conference in June 2005 is available on the "LC at ALA" Website, <http://www.loc.gov/ala/ala-sanantonio-update.html>.

National AudioVisual Conservation Center

In December 2005, the Library took possession of Phase 1 of the new National AudioVisual Conservation Center (NAVCC) in Culpeper, Virginia. Phase 1 is comprised of the 140,000 square foot Collections Building and the Central Plant servicing the entire facility. Staff will begin working onsite in early January to prepare for the massive task of moving the Library's moving image and recorded sound collection throughout the Winter and Spring months. The Packard Humanities Institute continues to construct Phase 2 of the facility--comprised of the Conservation Building and Nitrate vaults--which is now scheduled for completion and final turnover to the Library at the end of 2006. At that time, the Library's audiovisual preservation laboratories and the staff in the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division will be relocated to Culpeper.

Integrated Library Management System

In November 2005, the Library upgraded its integrated library management system to Voyager with Unicode Release. This upgrade accomplished the conversion of the LC Database to Unicode, a character coding system designed to support the interchange and display of the written texts of the diverse languages of the modern world. Users can now search and display Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese, Korean, Persian, and Yiddish characters and scripts in the Library of Congress Online Catalog. During the upgrade, the Library reduced the number of simultaneous external OPAC and Z39.50

sessions in order to allocate additional system resources for processing the conversion and indexing of the database. Shortly after the completion of the upgrade the Library resumed all previous levels of access. The Library regrets any inconvenience to users and appreciates their patience during this brief period. The Library has provided extensive Help Files to guide users in adjusting the settings in their operating systems and Web browsers to enable proper display of all characters in the LC Online Catalog. These Help Files are available at: <http://catalog.loc.gov/help/unicode.htm>, and contain information about fonts for display and printing records. A presentation on the Library's implementation of Unicode is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/ils/>.

Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS)

Free PDF Versions of Selected Publications. The following publications will be available as free PDF files beginning with issues published after January 1, 2006: *Cataloging Service Bulletin, Updates to Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, Updates to Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, Updates to CONSER Editing Guide, Updates to CONSER Cataloging Manual, and Updates to MARC 21 Formats* documentation. The traditional paper publications will continue to be available from CDS by paid subscription. Based on the experience offering PDF versions of these selected publications throughout 2006, CDS may decide to offer additional titles in PDF format.

Descriptive Cataloging

The Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) continues to move forward with its mandate to revise its documentation. The following LCRIs have been modified, cancelled or simplified:

- *LCRI 1.0G1, Accents and Other Diacritical Marks*. This LCRI prohibited the use of accent marks on initial capital letters of words in manifestations published after 1801 in French, Spanish and Portuguese. At that time of issuance in 1982, this policy aligned with the practices of the Library and Archives, Canada (LAC); however, since that time LAC has changed its practice and asked the Library of Congress to conform with that change. Effective January 1, 2006, CPSO is canceling this LCRI and will reissue the LCRI with guidelines for implementation. This LCRI will be available February 1, 2006 via Cataloger's Desktop. Catalogers may begin to implement this decision immediately. Cf. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/accents.html>
- *LCRI 22.17, Dates*. In late June 2005, CPSO posted a proposal for the addition of dates to existing personal name headings, and solicited comments from the wider cataloging community. This proposal stimulated a tremendous response

and interesting discussions. A complete summary of the comments received, and a discussion of the resulting decisions made by Library of Congress cataloging management is available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/deathdates.pdf>. In brief, these decisions are: Allow the optional addition of death dates to established headings that contain birth dates only. Continue the "status quo" regarding the restriction of adding dates (birth and/or death) to existing headings that previously had no dates and are not in conflict with other headings. Additional simplification and implementation issues are addressed in the full report. A draft of LCRI 22.17 incorporating these decisions is available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/22-17-rev05.pdf>. The final version will be available via Cataloger's Desktop on February 1, 2006. Because of the expected impact and in the interest of an orderly implementation, LC requests that the new policies not be followed until the LCRI is published.

- *LCRI 25.13. Manuscripts and Manuscript Groups Draft Available for Comment*. Because this complex rule is used infrequently by most catalogers, the lack of explicit guidelines has caused considerable frustration and disparate results. The revisions are designed to give clear instructions so that catalogers will 1) know exactly how to create a heading for a manuscript and provide appropriate references, even though they only occasionally create these headings, 2) achieve consistency in creating manuscript headings, 3) provide specific instructions for relating a manuscript heading to the heading for the work contained in the manuscript, and 4) limit the creation of an authority record for the work to situations in which it is actually needed. The draft is available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/25_13.html>. The deadline for comment on this draft is January 30, 2006. Comments may be sent to CPSO by e-mail at .

- *Descriptive Cataloging Manual, Z1*. The 670 section has been updated to include guidelines for the use of subfield $u that allows catalogers to add a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) in authority records when needed. Appendix 1: "Ambiguous headings" has been updated to reflect recent policy changes in regard to Forests, parks, and reserves as well as to the appropriate MARC coding for U.S. tribal entities. Appendix 2: "Canadian Names" clarifies that the Library and Archives, Canada will maintain the status quo in regard to Canadian forests, parks, and reserves as well as to names of Canadian First Nations.

- *LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data* (i.e., the "Blue pages") has been updated to reflect the use of subfield $u in the 670 field and guidelines for the use of 043 in authority records have been issued.

LC Unicode Cataloging Policies. CPSO will be working on adjustments to the cataloging policies related to bibliographic and authority records using non-roman scripts over this coming year. Currently, LC is planning to hold changes until 2007 to allow time for testing and coordination with the NACO nodes; discussions have already started.

CONSER Access Level Record for Serials. The Library of Congress Serial Record Division and several PCC members have formed a group to develop and test an access level record for serials. This collaborative pilot project is co-chaired by Regina Reynolds (LC) and Diane Boehr of the National Library of Medicine. The access level record pilot for serials takes advantage of the model used for non-serial e-resources developed by Dave Reser (LC), LC contractor Tom Delsey, LC cataloging staff, and LC reference staff. The effort is designed to enhance the utility of catalog records, both to end users and those in the library that use catalog records for processing serials, by assuring that essential elements for user tasks are present in the record. Cataloging cost savings may result by supplying only those record elements that are essential for performing the user tasks identified in *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR): find, identify, select, and obtain. The project is expected to result in a chart of essential data elements and an outline of cataloging guidelines by January 2006. A progress report, including an evaluation of the pilot, is expected by the end of April 2006. The charge for the pilot, including a detailed discussion of background, methodology, and deliverables is available at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Access-level-chargelc-pccaug17.pdf>.

Subject Headings

Genre/Form Headings for Moving Images in LCSH. Cataloging staff from the Moving Image section of the Motion Picture, Broadcast & Recorded Sound (MBRS) Division, working with policy specialists in CPSO, have begun a project to analyze the genre/form terms from *Moving Image Genre-Form Guide* (MIGFG) and reconcile the terminology with LCSH. The terminology from *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* (MIM) will also be consulted as part of this project. The goal will be to move as much of MIGFG as possible to LCSH, and to indicate unambiguously in LCSH whether the terms are to be used as topics (i.e., subject authority records tagged as 150) or genre/form headings (i.e., subject authority records tagged as 155). The resulting subject authority records will be the first issued as part of LCSH with the 155 tag and will be supplemented with instructions for applying such headings in bibliographic records in the *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings*. As soon as LC has developed a draft list of headings to be established in LCSH as genre/form headings, along with scope notes where necessary and a list of principles used to establish such headings, the proposal will be shared with the larger moving image

community for input and comment before the genre/form headings are established and distributed as part of LCSH. The staff envisions releasing the draft sometime prior to the ALA Annual Conference in the Summer of 2006.

Geographic Authority Record Enhancement. OCLC staff have been consulting with CPSO staff to develop guidelines and procedures for enhancing a selection of name authority records for jurisdictions by programmatically adding 043 fields with geographic area codes (GACs) and 781 fields showing their geographic subject subdivision forms. It is expected that several thousand records that meet project criteria can be handled in this fashion and that the project could begin after ALA.

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled for OLAC by Jay Weitz
For the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting
San Antonio, Texas
January 2006

General News

OCLC Releases International Library Research Report

OCLC has found that information consumers view libraries as places to borrow print books, but they are unaware of the rich electronic content they can access through libraries. The findings are part of *Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources*, a report issued in December 2005 by OCLC. The new report, based on surveys of information users across six countries and administered by Harris Interactive on behalf of OCLC, is a follow-up to *The 2003 OCLC Environmental Scan: Pattern Recognition*, the award-winning report that describes issues and trends that are impacting and will impact OCLC and libraries. Among the findings of the report:

- Respondents use search engines to begin an information search (84%). Only 1% begin an information search on a library Website.
- Information consumers use the library; however, since they began using the Internet, they use the library less and read less.

- Borrowing print books is the library service used most; "Books" is the library brand.
- Quality and quantity of information are top determinants of a satisfactory electronic information search, not speed of results.
- Respondents do not trust purchased information more than free information.
- 90% of respondents are satisfied with their most recent search for information using a search engine.
- Information consumers like to serve themselves; they use personal knowledge and common sense to judge if electronic information is trustworthy, and cross-reference other sites to validate their findings.
- The survey results show that library and information preferences and use are consistent among respondents in the six countries surveyed.

Survey findings are generally consistent across geographic regions. Responses about awareness, familiarity and usage of electronic resources showed consistent views among respondents in the six countries surveyed. *Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources* is available for download free of charge at <http://www.oclc.org/reports/2005perceptions.htm>. Print copies of the 286-page report are also available for purchase from the same site.

Collections and Technical Services

OCLC-MARC Update

Work is progressing on the OCLC-MARC Update that will cover the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format Updates 4 (October 2003) and 5 (October 2004), as well as several other elements that had been postponed while OCLC was migrating to its new technological platform. Among the changes:

- Implementation of Bibliographic Level (Leader/07) "i" for Integrating Resources.
- Invalidation of "ISSN" Fixed Field (Continuing Resources 008/20 & 006/03) in conjunction with corresponding changes to Bibliographic Field 022.
- Implementation of two new Bibliographic Fixed Field elements for Scores: "Musical Parts" (008/21 & 006/04) and "Transposition and Arrangement" (008/33 & 006/16).
- Implementation of new Authority Field 024, "Other Standard Identifier".
- Implementation of new Bibliographic and Authority Field 031, "Musical Incipits Information".
- Implementation of new Bibliographic Field 258, "Philatelic Issue Data.

- Implementation of a "privacy" indicator to Bibliographic Fields 541 ("Immediate Source of Acquisition Note"), 561 ("Ownership and Custodial History"), and 583 ("Action Note"), which will determine whether the field is retained in the master record.
- Implementation of new Bibliographic Ffield 648, "Subject Added Entry--Chronological Term".
- New and changed codes for Languages, Countries, Geographic Areas, Relators, Classification Sources, and other MARC Code Lists.
- Character Set changes and additions, including degree sign, phonogram copyright mark, copyright mark, musical sharp, inverted question mark, inverted exclamation point, eszett, Euro sign, left and right curly brackets, spacing circumflex, spacing underscore, spacing grave, and spacing tilde.

Details of the OCLC-MARC Update will be released in the upcoming *Technical Bulletin* 252, with full implementation expected by the end of June 2006.

Connexion Client 1.50 Now Available

Connexion Client version 1.50 is now available. Client 1.50 includes Unicode export, additional WorldCat searching customization, a simplified process for adding/deleting holdings, and more. OCLC discontinued Client 1.30 on January 1, 2006. As of this date, users were unable to log on with client 1.30. OCLC will discontinue Client 1.40 on March 1, 2006. As of this date, users cannot log on with Client 1.40. To verify the version number, go to the "Help menu" and select "About OCLC Connexion Client". The complete version number is 1.50.2146.28406. Client 1.50 enhancements include the ability to:

- Batch set or delete holdings without having to retrieve the records first.
- Apply constant data automatically to records downloaded via batch searching.
- Customize short index list in Search and Browse WorldCat dialogs.
- Limit WorldCat searches by Material Type using drop-down list of values.
- Look at WorldCat truncated lists to determine if the item is held by the user's library.
- View drop-down lists for valid values for each Fixed Field element.
- Populate fields from other records.
- Customize the validation level used for setting holdings and for exporting records.
- Define an action to be completed each time the Client software is opened.
- Take advantage of Unicode export and import options.
- Assign user Tools 1-10 to characters, macros, or text strings.
- Use new Macro commands.

- Make use of improvements in non-Latin script cataloging.
- Employ new German and Korean interfaces.

Resolutions to several reported problems are listed in the Known Problems document at <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/support/client_known_problems.htm>. To read more about the changes and to download the software, visit <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/interface/client/enhancements/recent.htm>.

Connexion Changes, November 2005

OCLC installed the following changes to Connexion in November 2005:

- A problem in Client 1.40 that resulted in "an error has occurred" message has been resolved. This problem affected users who executed a search in the LC Names and Subject Authority File, then selected a single record, locked and replaced, and upon replacing the record, tried to navigate forwards or backwards through the set of records.
- With this installation, the ability to control headings in the Browser from the Dublin Core template has been disabled. In Dublin Core template, the following functionality is no longer present: the option to "Control heading" from the functions drop-down list in DC template view, the option to "Control all" from the actions menu in DC template view. However, the ability to uncontrol a heading in the Browser on the functions drop-down list in DC template view is a viable function. Also, all controlled headings will be presented to users in the Browser in DC template view, and users can continue to click on links to view the authority record.
- Stopwords have been added for the Authorities Online Constant Data and Online Save File databases in both the Browser and the Client, so that they are consistent with the Bibliographic Online Constant Data and Online Save File databases. The list of stopwords are: a, an, and, are, as, at, be, by, for, from, in, is,of, on, or, that, the, to with, http, www.
- With this installation, derived searches result sets from WorldCat will now sort correctly regardless of diacritics. This will affect both Client and Browser searching. This partially corrects a known problem. Keyword search results are still affected.

For more details, see the Connexion Client problems Website <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/support/client_known_problems.htm> or the Connexion Browser problems Website <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/support/browser_known_problems.htm>.

End of Connexion Browser Support for IE Versions 5.0 and 5.01

OCLC plans to end Connexion Browser support for Internet Explorer versions 5.0 and 5.01 on February 19, 2006. At that time, Connexion Browser users, including CatExpress and WebDewey users, will no longer be able to log on using IE 5.0 and IE 5.01. In preparation for this, beginning after the November 13, 2005 Connexion Browser enhancement installation, all users accessing OCLC Connexion Browser with IE 5.0 or IE 5.01 began receiving an alert message as part of the logon screen. For maximum functionality within OCLC Connexion Browser, users should upgrade to Internet Explorer 6.0, as soon as possible. After February 19, 2006, Connexion Browser will continue to support Internet Explorer 5.5 and above, as well as Netscape 7, Netscape 8, Firefox, and Mozilla.

OCLC MEMBERS COUNCIL
Kevin Furniss

The October 2005 OCLC Members Council meeting was called "Partnerships: Building and Expanding the Collaborative". The following report includes topics discussed at the various meetings that should be of interest to OLAC members.

Topic 1: Cataloging Strategy

Bob VanVolkenburg, Director, Cataloging Products & Services, provided an overview of the cataloging environment that informed the strategy: fewer catalogers and reduced budgets; little growth in print materials acquisitions; and increasing e-resources, not necessarily cataloged. From this four main themes emerged:

1. Increased automatic delivery of cataloging through
   o partnering with major materials providers
   o building on PromptCat and Cataloging Partners success
   o pushing cataloging further upstream into ordering
   o exploring RFID technologies
2. More scripts/language support: grow WorldCat in both database size and membership
3. Metadata support for e-content
   o e-serials holdings pilot

- support new formats with extraction/creation and crosswalks
- investigate appropriate views of WorldCat
4. Continue to deliver value through
  - ongoing Connexion maintenance and enhancements
  - staying current with standards
  - rolling out subscription pricing to all libraries in FY07

David Whitehair, Cataloging Consulting Product Manager, reviewed projects either currently under way or being planned that will implement this strategy. These include:

- Automatic delivery
  - Baker & Taylor cataloging agreement, early 2006 implementation
  - Improving PromptCat
  - Combining PromptCat and Cataloging Partners programs
- More scripts/language support
  - New scripts support including Cyrillic, Greek, Hebrew (July 2005) and Non-MARC scripts such as Tamil and Thai (1st half 2006)
  - Connexion interface translations--Chinese (traditional and simplified) and Japanese in July 2005, and German and Korean in Nov. 2005; French for CatExpress is planned for the future, date to be determined
  - Unicode export--November 2005
- Metadata support for e-content
  - Re-implement Connexion browser extraction function as a Web service for use by both Browser and Client as well as other OCLC services, such as Digital Archive
  - Crosswalk Web service--improve MARC/Dublin Core crosswalk and add others
  - Content Cooperative pilot
- Continue to deliver value
  - Client releases twice a year, including 1.50 in Nov. 2005
  - Authority enhancements, including Terminologies pilot and consideration of MeSH as a Connexion accessible authority file
  - Standards projects
    - MARC 21 Update
    - ISBN-13
    - OCLC Control Number expansion
  - MARC Subscription Service rewrite to handle larger records

Discussion by the committee included concern for the quality of WorldCat as a result of vendor partnerships, while others supported this effort. Concern was expressed for getting records/metadata into WorldCat as early as possible. A committee member asked if RFID meant the death of the bar code. Others indicated that currently this is

cost prohibitive, and another mused whether there will be enough physical materials even to worry about this.

Topic 2: Content Cooperative Concept

Charly Bauer, Product Manager, Collections & Archives, Digital Collection Service, described the Content Cooperative pilot which will allow libraries and other cultural heritage institutions to upload digital objects to the Digital Archive and attach links for this digital content to a WorldCat record using the Connexion interface. This content will then be accessible via FirstSearch or OpenWorldCat. The pilot, scheduled to begin March 2006, will determine the feasibility of integrating digital content management with cataloging to increase the visibility of unique library content.

Topic 3: FRBR in Action and Implications for Cataloging

Dawn Hendricks, Content Models Product Manager, and Bill Brembeck, Open WorldCat Product Manager, provided an overview of how FRBR concepts are being applied to FirstSearch WorldCat and Open WorldCat results. Dawn explained that they used the OCLC Research FRBR model which combines records based upon author and title, uses existing bibliographic records, OCLC Authority file for variant forms of access points, and pulls together a family of works for all editions, all formats and all languages. The system organizes results "on-the-fly" into works records so that the searcher gets only what they requested, but the search can be expanded. System performance is a concern, since it can take a long time to organize the results. Dawn then showed examples of FirstSearch results before and after FRBR was applied. Committee members provided reactions and suggestions for improvements of the displays, including making the fact that "Your library owns this" more prominent in the display. The committee also suggested that OCLC should consider filtering the results based upon the country where the search originates and displaying the appropriate cover art for that country rather than the most widely held. Mark Scharff from MOUG provided suggestions for improving the display for musical works, including making the composer's name more prominent in the display. The committee also asked if OCLC is confident about use of uniform titles for FRBR collocation. Dawn explained that it is using not only uniform titles, but also the statement of titles. Additionally, OCLC Quality Control staff is performing significant clean-up work on both authority and bibliographic records in support of this project.

Bill Brembeck then provided a brief overview of Open WorldCat, stating that currently 3.4 million records have been indexed by Yahoo and Google, with plans for WorldCat to be available via an entry portal page. He then summarized the Open WorldCat FRBR view, explaining why it is different than the FirstSearch view. Open

WorldCat is seen as more of an end user view and FirstSearch more of a librarian view. The Open WorldCat has an "Editions" tab that shows all formats available. They are also working on plans to internationalize the results, recognizing the geographical area from where the user is searching. Committee members' feedback included the need to standardize the views between Open WorldCat and FirstSearch. They also urged that OCLC continue to usability test these changes with all types of end users.

Glenn Patton, Director, WorldCat Quality Management, was scheduled to speak on the implications of these developments upon cataloging, however, because of time constraints, his part of the discussion was deferred.

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OLAC 2006 CONFERENCE WEBSITE AVAILABLE

The Website for the 12th Biennial OLAC Conference, "Preparing for a Brave New World: Media Cataloging on the Threshold of RDA", is now available at <http://www.asu.edu/lib/olac/>. The Conference will be held in Mesa, Arizona from Friday, October 27 to Sunday, October 29, 2006. There will be an opening keynote address by Jennifer Bowen and a closing address by Barbara Tillett, as well as workshop presentations covering varying aspects of audiovisual cataloging. Registration will be available soon as well as other updates to the site. We look forward to seeing you at the conference in the Valley of the Sun.

Adapted from original posting by:
Timothy Diel, Conference Co-Chair
Arizona State University Libraries
<timothy.diel@asu.edu>

NETSL SPRING 2006 CONFERENCE

The New England Technical Services Librarians Board (NETSL) is accepting registration for its 2006 Spring Conference, to be held Thursday, April 6th, at the Hogan Campus Center of the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts.

The theme for this year is: "Exploring the 'Open' Universe: A Librarian's Guide".

The keynote speaker is Eric Lease Morgan, Head of Digital Access and Information Architecture Department, University of Notre Dame. His topic is: "The State of 'Openness': Trends, Challenges, and Opportunities of Working in 'Open' Environments".

The afternoon speaker is Kat Hagedorn, OAIster/Metadata Harvesting Librarian, DLXS Bibliographic Class Coordinator, Digital Library Production Service, University of Michigan. Her topic is: "The Open Archives Initiative and OAIster: Past, Present, and Future".

There will also be a choice of breakout sessions:

- "Open URL: Implementation and Impact" - Amira Aaron, Digital Content and Access Services, Office for Information Systems, Harvard University Library
- "Playing Tag: Cataloging by the Crowd" - Elizabeth Thomsen, Member Services Manager, NOBLE, North of Boston Library Exchange
- "Open Access to Science Content: A View from the 'Hole'" - Ann Devenish, MBLWHOI Library Data Library & Archives
- "Automating Metadata Creation with Open Source Software" - Patrick Yott, Digital Initiatives Librarian, Center for Digital Initiatives, Brown University

Advance registration is required--there will be no onsite registration. Registration ends March 24, 2006. The Conference program, schedule, and registration form is available at <http://www.nelib.org/netsl/conference.htm>.

Contact for questions, problems, and/or special arrangements:
Anne Meringolo
<anne.meringolo@simmons.edu>

Adapted from original posting by:
Sue Neumeister
On behalf of:
Marsha Starr Paiste
Tufts University

ALCTS "RULES AND TOOLS" WORKSHOP

ALCTS Rules and Tools for Cataloging Internet Resources Workshop
April 27-28, 2006, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The School of Information Studies Institute for Professional Development at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the School of Library and Information Studies of the University of Wisconsin-Madison are co-sponsoring a two-day workshop, "Rules and Tools for Cataloging Internet Resources".

Designed for practicing catalogers from all types of libraries who have a working knowledge of the MARC21 bibliographic format and AACR2, this two-day workshop provides attendees with a solid foundation in the principles and practices of online resource cataloging using current descriptive cataloging standards (AACR2/MARC21) and practices (LCRI/CONSER/PCC).

This workshop is part of the ALCTS "Cataloging for the 21st Century" continuing education series, which offers practicing catalogers instruction in bibliographic control practices that will help them continue to play a significant role in shaping library services in the emerging digital information environment.

At the end of the workshop, participants will:

- Understand the concepts behind the 2002 AACR2 revisions and how they affect electronic resource cataloging
- Know what tools to consult to support the online resource cataloging process
- Be able to catalog online monographs, serials, and integrating resources
- Be able to correctly update integrating resource records to reflect changes to the resource
- Have a better understanding of how record sets and machine-generated cataloging can be used to support electronic resource record processing

Instructors

- Debra Shapiro, Continuing Education Specialist, UW-Madison School of Library & Information Studies
- Steven Miller, Senior Lecturer, UW-Milwaukee School of Information Studies

Tuition

- $319 for ALCTS members
- $359 for ALA members
- $399 for nonmembers
- $150 for students

Registration
Registrations will be administered by the UW-Milwaukee School of Continuing Education. To register, please contact the School no later than April 25th using the course code and other information below:

Course code
M06B5110156104

Mail registration
UWM School of Continuing Education
Drawer 491
Milwaukee, WI 53293
Phone registration: 414-227-3200
Fax registration: 414-227-3146

Location, Directions, and Lodging
The workshop will take place on April 27-28, 2006, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. each day, in the facilities of the UWM School of Continuing Education in a historic downtown location. For directions and hotel information see their online guide to facilities, see <http://cfprod.imt.uwm.edu/sce/facilities.cfm>.

For questions about the content of the course, please contact:
Steven Miller
<mll@uwm.edu>

Adapted from original posting by:
Steven Miller
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Libraries

2006 ARSC ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The vibrant Pacific Northwest city of Seattle, Washington will be the setting for the 40th annual ARSC Conference on May 17-20, 2006. This event is hosted by the University of Washington School of Music.

The Red Lion Hotel, located at 1415 Fifth Avenue, is the Conference site. The Red Lion is offering special Conference rates of $139 per night, single or double; $149 triple; and $159 quad. To reserve a room, visit <http://www.redlion5thavenue.com/>. On the Reservations page, click on "Change rate types" in the "Rate types" section, and enter 0000784000 in the "Group block" box. For questions about or problems with reservations, call the hotel at (206) 971-8000. The special rates are valid until April 24.

Full conference registration, postmarked by April 24, is $120 for ARSC members, $150 for non-members, and $60 for students. After that date, registration is $145 for ARSC members, $175 for non-members, and $75 for students.

For those wishing to attend only one day, single-day registration, postmarked by April 24, is $35 for ARSC members, $45 for non-members, and $25 for students. After that date, single-day registration is $45 for ARSC members, $55 for non-members, and $30 for students.

For the complete preliminary program, registration form and further details about the Conference, visit <http://arsc-audio.org/conference2006.html>.

Questions concerning local sponsorship and exhibitor opportunities should be directed to Paul Jackson at research@ruralfree.net.

For all other questions, contact the Conference Manager, Kurt Nauck, at <nauck@78rpm.com>.

Conference Program
ARSC is dedicated to the preservation and study of sound recordings--in all genres of music and speech, in all formats, and from all periods. Reflecting this broad mission, the upcoming conference offers a diverse array of talks and sessions that will appeal to both professionals and collectors. Scheduled talks include:

- "New Imaging Methods Applied to Mechanical Sound Carrier Preservation and Access" (Carl Haber)
- "Licensing in the Music Industry" (Ava Lawrence)
- "80,000 LPs Times 1122 Miles: The Wilson Processing Project & OCLC Take on NYPL's Uncataloged Vinyl" (Peter Hirsch)
- "The Northwest Sound: Recordings, Marketplace, and Memory" (Craig Morrison)
- "The Ins and Outs of Making a Good Oral History" (Marie Azile O'Connell)

- "From the Handcrank to the Hyperlink: Technical Means and Technological Methods of the UCSB Cylinder Digitization Project" (David Seubert and Noah Pollaczek)
- "Saving the Unique Sounds of American Political Campaigning" (Lewis Mazanti)
- "Grant Funding Strategies for Sound Collections" (Gayle Palmer)
- "MuDoc: A New Model for Digital Music Archiving and Retrieval" (Michael Frishkopf)
- "Milton Kaye--New York Pianist" (Dennis D. Rooney)
- David Levine on the Naxos Decision
- "Dobbin: New Techniques in Audio Mass Processing" (Joerg Houpert and Jerome Luepkes)
- "Gospel Music as Story: The Life and Work of Otis Jackson" (Robert M. Marovich)
- "Progress and Problems in Modern-Day Jazz Discography" (Noal Cohen)

The ARSC Technical Committee's roundtable is scheduled for Thursday afternoon. Later that evening, there will be a chance to ask questions at the "Ask the Technical Committee" session.

There will also be a chance to share expertise or favorite collecting stories at the "Collectors' Roundtable" on Friday evening. This informal session always features amusing anecdotes among the informative and entertaining discussions.

Workshop
The Pre-conference Workshop, "A Tutorial on the Preservation of Audio in the Digital Domain", will be held May 17, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m., at the hotel's Bainbridge Room. The Workshop registration fee is not included in the Conference registration fee. Early Workshop registration (postmarked by April 24) is $70 for ARSC members, $80 for non-members, and $30 for students. Detailed information about the Workshop can be found at <http://arsc-audio.org/workshop2006.html>.

Adapted from original posting by:
Anna-Maria Manuel
ARSC Outreach Committee Chair

ARSC MEMBERSHIP FOR 2006

While it is still early in 2006, the Outreach Committee would like to remind anyone

who is not a member to consider joining ARSC.

The Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation and study of sound recordings--in all genres of music and speech, in all formats, and from all periods. ARSC is unique in bringing together private individuals and institutional professionals--anyone with an interest in recorded sound.

Members will receive:

- The peer-reviewed ARSC Journal: published twice each year, containing a wealth of in-depth articles, papers, reports, and book and record reviews
- The ARSC Newsletter: published three times per year, delivering timely announcements, short articles, and a calendar of coming events (submitted by the membership)
- The ARSC Membership Directory: compiled every two years, providing contact information for members and listing their collecting interests and research activities. A new edition of the directory will be prepared very soon, so now is a good time to join
- Discounted registration for the annual ARSC Conference

A one-year membership is just $36 for individuals, $40 for institutions, and $20 for students. First-time members save $3. (Sorry, no discount on new student memberships.) Any amount donated beyond the Individual or Institutional dues levels may be tax deductible.

To join, please visit <http://arsc-audio.org>, or contact Peter Shambarger, ARSC Executive Director, at execdir@arsc-audio.org.

Adapted from original posting by:
Anna-Maria Manuel
ARSC Outreach Committee Chair

ISMIR 2006 - CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 06)
October 8-12, 2006
Fairmont Empress Hotel, Victoria, BC, Canada
<http://ismir2006.ismir.net>

ISMIR 2006 is the seventh international conference on Music Information Retrieval. It will be held at the Fairmont Empress Hotel in Victoria, Canada. The annual ISMIR Conference is the established international forum for those working on accessing digital musical material. It reflects the tremendous recent growth of music-related data available and the consequent need to search within it to retrieve music and musical information efficiently and effectively. These concerns are of interest to academia, industry, entertainment, and education. ISMIR therefore aims to provide a place for the exchange and discussion of news, issues and results, by bringing together researchers and developers, educators and librarians, students and professional users, working in fields that contribute to this multidisciplinary domain, to present original theoretical or practical work. It also serves as a discussion forum, provides introductory and in-depth information in specific domains, and showcases current products and systems.

Scope
Papers, posters/demos, tutorial and panels are solicited for, but not limited to, these general areas:

- Music libraries, archives, digital collections
- Intellectual property rights and business issues
- Western and non-western musicology, music analysis
- Composition, musical forms and structures
- Searching, navigation, retrieval
- Knowledge representation
- Music perception, cognition, affect, emotion
- Human-computer interaction and interfaces
- Databases, languages, protocols
- Systems, internet software, mobile devices
- Social and ethical issues

Schedule

- Papers, posters/demos, tutorials, panels --April 17, 2006
- Notification of acceptance --June 15, 2006
- Camera-ready paper submission --July 8, 2006

Check the Conference Website <http://ismir2006.ismir.net/> for more details and updates.

Adapted from original posting by:
Ralph Papakhian

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT
Jay Weitz

Computer File 007/01 Coding for Rewritable CDs and DVDs

Question: The scope note for the Computer File 007, subfield $b, code "m" in *MARC21 for Bibliographic Data* indicates it is "an erasable or semi-erasable storage medium, similar to a CD-ROM disc, capable of storing data at a very high density". Can you verify that this code should be used for a CD R/W? This disc is written to and read from using a laser beam that is used to heat the recording surface to a point at which regions of the surface of the disk become magnetically aligned to store bits of data. Would "m" therefore apply to non-audio CDs (optical discs) that can be written and rewritten and also to non-audio CDs that can be written only once, in contrast to CD-ROMs coded as "o"? Would "m" also be applied to rewritable non-video DVDs?

Answer: Several readers, most notably Bryan Baldus of Quality Books Inc. and Suzanne Pilsk of the Smithsonian Institution, correctly questioned my faulty original answer to this question on the OLAC List, which read:
"As I read the definitions for the codes in the Computer File 007 subfield $b (007/01), code 'm' would seem properly to apply to non-audio CDs and non-video DVDs that are either read/write or write once only."
Clearly, I had jumped to some incorrect conclusions in that response, and was prompted to do some additional and more careful research. I had been blinded by the statement in the definition of code "o" that "... these discs are usually a read-only medium" whereas the original question was specifically asking about read/write and write-once media. In the course of my research, I concluded that the brief definitions of codes "m" and "o" in MARC 21 may not have kept up with rapidly changing and forever proliferating technology (no surprise there). Some distinctions that catalogers once thought could be made may no longer be as clear. In particular, the statement in the "optical disc" definition that "these discs are usually a read-only medium" is no longer accurate--if it ever was. Among the many resources I have examined and have pilfered information from are:

- "DVD Frequently Asked Questions (and Answers)" <http://www.dvddemystified.com/dvdfaq.html>
- "CD-Recordable FAQ" <http://www.cdrfaq.org/>
- "Online Glossary of CD/DVD Terms" <http://www.proactionmedia.com/cd_dvd_glossary.htm>
- "DVD+RW Alliance Glossary of Terms" <http://www.dvdrw.com/why/glossary.htm>
- "Writable DVD: A Guide for the Perplexed" <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FXG/is_1_12/ai_53578863>
- Various documents on the Philips Website <http://www.licensing.philips.com>
- Various documents on the Website of the Optical Storage Technology Association <http://www.osta.org/technology/cdqa.htm>
- Various Wikipedia entries <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Technology>

It seems that, in discussing erasable, read/write, and/or write-once CD and DVD media, there is actually a growing cluster of different types of discs that employ different types of technologies of varying compatibility; this includes, but is hardly limited to: CD-R, CD-RW, DVD-R, DVD-RW, DVD+R, DVD+RW, and DVD-RAM. As should be crystal clear from my over-hasty original answer, I am no expert on these technologies. The following paragraphs include some of what I have gleaned from my research.

There appear to be three major recording technologies involved here:

- Dye-sublimation: Optical disc recording technology that uses a high-powered laser to burn readable marks into a layer of organic dye.
- Magneto-optical: Recordable disc technology using a laser to heat spots that are altered by a magnetic field.
- Phase-change: A technology for rewritable optical discs using a physical effect in which a laser beam heats a recording material to change an area reversibly from an amorphous state to a crystalline state, or vice versa. Continuous heat just above the melting point creates the crystalline state (an erasure), while high heat followed by rapid cooling creates the amorphous state (a mark).

If I am reading these definitions correctly (always an iffy proposition), in MARC terms, media that use "dye-sublimation" and "phase-change" techniques appear to fit under code "o" for "optical discs" and media that use "magneto-optical" techniques fit under code "m" for "magneto-optical discs". Again, culling from the aforementioned sources, here is my determination:

- CD-R: dye-sublimation (code "o")

- CD-RW: phase-change (code "o")
- DVD-R: dye-sublimation (code "o")
- DVD-RW: phase-change (code "o")
- DVD+R: dye-sublimation (code "o")
- DVD+RW: phase-change (code "o")
- DVD-RAM: Here is the tricky one. According to DVD FAQ 4.3.4, DVD-RAM uses "phase-change dual (PD) technology with some magneto-optic (MO) features mixed in". The Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DVD-RAM>, however, says: "It is a common misconception that DVD-RAM uses magneto-optical (MO) technologies: DVD-RAM is a pure phase change medium". So, anyone's guess is as good as mine regarding the coding.

In summary, *most* erasable, read/write, and/or write-once CD and DVD media should be coded "o" in the Electronic Resource 007/01.

---

006 and/or 007?

Question: In cataloging a book with accompanying transparencies, I have coded the transparencies in the 007 (with their description contained in subfield $e of 300). However, I am re-considering this decision, thinking, perhaps, that they should have been coded in the 006. What is your interpretation in the different use of 007 vs. 006?

Answer: Fields 006 and 007 are not mutually exclusive. In many cases, such as this one, both could be used. Because the transparencies are accompanying material and not the main content, however, both the 006 and 007 are optional, helpful though they may be. As you have no doubt noticed, there is some redundancy between the two fields, but they really do serve different purposes within MARC. Fields 007 are intended to be coded extensions of the physical description--color, dimensions, support material, etc. (hence the name "Physical Description Fixed Field"). Fields 006 are extensions of the Fixed Field (Leader and 008), usually intended to give access to secondary aspects of a resource ("Additional Material Characteristics")--the electronic resource-ness of a text on the Web, for instance. OCLC uses many 006 and 007 elements and values to help assign what we call administrative "document types" and "material types" of a record for indexing, matching, and identifying purposes.

STEMRA, the Dutch Musical Performing Rights Organization

Question: I am cataloging a music CD collection. On the disc and box is a term

within a box. The term is STEMRA, and it is located near the DDD (in a box) on both the CDs and box. Any assistance would be helpful in determining what STEMRA is.

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

Change of Sound Characteristics Between VHS and DVD

Question: In cataloging a program on DVD that previously came out on VHS, does a change in the soundtrack constitute a change in the item such that the 008 date would be an "s" for the copyright or packaging date of the DVD? The converse view would be that this is not a significant change in content, and therefore a "p" date, reflecting the previous manifestation, would be used. An example is a Biography (A&E) program which appeared in 1995 on VHS, not in stereo. It is my contention that, since the DVD is clearly marked "Dolby digital stereo" sound, the program is significantly changed. Therefore, the previous VHS manifestation should be given in a 500 note, but the single date of 2005 should be used.

Answer: It is my observation that catalogers have tended to be spotty about including mono/stereo information in records for videos, especially those from the pre-DVD era. So unless one has both the VHS and the corresponding DVD in hand (or an existing VHS record happens to be clearly specified), one really does not know for sure if there has, in fact, been a change from mono to stereo. That said, I would lean in the direction of not considering such a change alone to be the sort of change in content that would justify a DtSt (008/06) code "s".

Transcribing and Tracing Corporate Entities for Videos

Question: In LCRI 21.29D, under "Audiovisual materials", catalogers are instructed to "... make added entries for all openly named persons or corporate bodies who have contributed to the creation of the item, with a few exceptions given. There is further instruction to "... make added entry headings for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area". A colleague contends that every production company named is, therefore, to be traced. At our institution, this involves making name authority records for personal or corporate entities that lack them. My

contention is that the rule as stated is ridiculous in application to many video titles where the following verbiage is not uncommon: "'PorchLight Entertainment' in association with 'Videal' presents a 'PorchLight Pictures' production", or, "'Drop of a Hat' presents a 'Red Barn/Andrew Upjohn' and 'Hat Factory Studios' production, in association with 'Clear Pictures' and 'Red Farm Films'", or, "'PorchLight Entertainment' presents a 'PorchLight Pictures' production in association with 'Edgewood Studios' and 'Videal'". My feeling is that tracing each of these entities is similar to tracing the printer, typesetter, color separator, etc. for a book. Leaving aside for a moment the conundrum of "separate" corporate entities that occupy the same street address ("PorchLight Entertainment" vs. "PorchLight Pictures"--or better yet, the many manifestations of "PPI" and "Goldhil"), my opinion is that just because they are named in the credits does not mean they have anything approaching overall responsibility for the program carried by the disc or tape being cataloged. My colleague disagrees with my opinion. I might note that, although the assembled wisdom of AUTOCAT, the OLAC-List and OCLC-CAT generally comes down on the side of tracing everything in sight, records found in the utilities suggest that these catalogers either do not follow their own interpretations or they are not the ones contributing records to the utilities. Even in cases where a record has a profusion of tracings, most of the tracings are not related to any name authority record. Frankly, I do not see how overloading the database with tracings that will never be utilized (for instance, "Greystone Communications", "Pangolin Pictures, Inc.", "What If Productions (Firm)", "Alba Communications (Firm)"--all four of which, along with tracings for the "History Channel", "A&E", and "New Video"--were made on one record) serves users well or enhances the quality of the cataloging appreciably.

Answer: Regarding corporate entities associated with AV materials, LCRI 21.29D has always been one of those rule interpretations that appears to be more helpful than it really is in practice (precisely because of the sorts of questions raised here). And that has only been exacerbated by the proliferation of credits surrounding theatrical films in particular, which often seems to have more to do with financing, egos, and union rules than with what catalogers so quaintly insist on calling "intellectual responsibility". I tend to agree with the analogy relating all those mysterious production credits to book printers, typesetters, and so on. The problem is that catalogers have no reliable way of knowing which entity has responsibility for what, and so cannot judge what is really important and what may be less so. Neither the rules nor the LCRIs for 21.29 and 21.30 generally are much help, either, except that catalogers can choose to invoke the so-called "rule of three" in 21.30A1, transcribing and tracing only the first of the myriad corporate entities that clutter so many opening credits nowadays.

It would be so good if there were clear guidelines about which such entities are worth

acknowledging and which can be ignored. Unfortunately, there are no such guidelines, and the best that one can suggest is to use judgment, which is really no help at all. For those of the obsessive persuasion, transcribing and tracing everything in sight offers a certain satisfaction and (within reason) does not seem to violate the rules. For those who prefer to be selective (for reasons of time, money, resources, and/or sanity, among others), one could meekly suggest certain tentative criteria for inclusion. Please understand that these suggestions have no force of "law" or explicit justification in any rules; they are merely my personal suggestions for those who may want to exercise cataloger's judgment. Concentrate on entities that are identified directly as "presenting" and "producing" and set aside those that are identified as "in association with" and other such implications of subordination. If any relationships among named entities can be determined, and if the presentation of the credits allows, opt for transcribing and tracing only the highest/broadest named entity in a hierarchy. If there is a way to differentiate one-time entities created solely for a particular film from ongoing entities that did have and will have a continuing life, that could be another criterion for choice. Do not be afraid to make exceptions in special cases (regarding both inclusion and exclusion).

Aside from these ideas, I am not sure what else I can say. Most institutions will need to make some sort of decision about how much detail and access to provide in such cases, depending especially upon the needs of their own users. Clearly, the library of a film school will want to offer much more than, for instance, a library with just a small collection of popular DVDs, for instance.

Subfields for TV Season, Episode, and Disc Numbering

Question: Is there something written specifically spelling out the cataloging of television episodes, or seasons or discs of a season? Here are examples of what can be found in the utilities:
245 00   Seinfeld. $n Season 2, $p Disc 2, Episodes 1-5

245 00   Seinfeld $h [videorecording] : $b Season 1
520   Contains episodes 1-5 from the 1st season of Seinfeld.

245 00   Seinfeld. $p Season 1

245 00   Smallville. $p The complete fourth season disc 1

245 00   Smallville. $n The complete second season

245 00 Smallville. $p Season 1. $n Disc two, Episodes 5-8

245 00 Smallville. $n The complete third season [disc 3]
What is the correct practice for presenting the subfield information?

Answer: For the simple season, disc and episode numberings, there is no doubt that these should appear in subfields $n. There is also little doubt that such "multiple alternative numberings" as "Disc 2, Episodes 5-8" belong in a single subfield $n. That is, Disc 2 is Episodes 5-8, that both numerical designations are coextensive. The major question is how to consider such formulations as "The complete first season". MARC21 says: "Numbering is defined as an indication of sequencing in any form, e.g., Part 1, Supplement A, Book two". Considered narrowly, phrases such as, "The complete first season", do, indeed, indicate sequence (plus a little more). Therefore, my inclination would be to regard them as such and put these in subfield $n, also. The following are my subfield and punctuation suggestions for the instances given above:
245 00 Seinfeld. $n Season 2. $n Disc 2, Episodes 1-5
        [This example is a bit puzzling, if accurate, because if disc 2 contains episodes 1-5, what is on disc 1?]

245 00 Seinfeld. $n Season 1 $h [videorecording]
520   Contains episodes 1-5 from the 1st season of Seinfeld.

245 00 Seinfeld. $n Season 1

245 00 Smallville. $n The complete fourth season. $n Disc 1

245 00 Smallville. $n The complete second season

245 00 Smallville. $n Season 1. $n Disc two, Episodes 5-8

245 00 Smallville. $n The complete third season. $n [Disc 3]

"Unpublished" Materials

Question: I am fairly new to cataloging videos, sound recordings, CD-ROMs, etc., but I am learning. I have a stack of videotape cassettes to catalog. A lot of them are recordings of college functions, events, celebrations, etc., which appear to be in-house productions, but that fact is not made clear. How does one tell whether such a video is "published" or "unpublished"? I know that if it is not published, only the date is given

in the imprint field. However, it is difficult to determine its publication status. Any guidelines would be greatly appreciated.

Answer: As far as I am aware, there is really no formal definition of "unpublished" in AACR2. The closest that AACR2 comes to a definition is the following, which appears with some variations in 1.4C8, 1.4D8, and 1.4F9: "... unpublished items (e.g., manuscripts, art originals, naturally occurring objects that have not been packaged for commercial distribution, unedited or unpublished film or video materials, stock shots, non-processed sound recordings, unpublished electronic resources)". Not that this explication answers this question very well. Regarding "non-processed sound recordings", there is a slight elaboration--one that comes closer, perhaps, to a definition--in Footnote 2 of Rule 6.4C2: "… a noncommercial recording that generally exists in a unique copy". For cataloging, the term "unpublished" usually indicates an item that is not commercially available and that exists as a unique copy or as one of a small number of copies intended for limited distribution. For videorecordings, specifically, OCLC offers some cataloging guidelines in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*, Section 3.7, "Locally Made Videorecordings" (p. 39 in print; <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging/default.shtm> in the Web version). Videos of local events such as those listed in the question are prime examples of things likely to be unpublished.

Notes Identifying Recordable DVDs

Question: Do you have a position on recorded DVDs? "Films for the Humanities" is releasing many of its titles on DVD, but so far, they are all DVD-Rs. My opinion is that it is important to make note of this information in the bibliographic record, at the very least in the 538 field, although our institution is doing more than that in the local catalog. However, it seems as if catalogers outside our institution are not all including this level of information in their records. Is it kosher for us to go to this extent? Here is what the catalogers in our institution are putting in the record, as well as what will be given in our original/upgraded records, if you agree:
538   DVD-R
     or
538   DVD+R
     or
538   Recorded DVD [this if it is not clear which technology was used]

     and the note:

500   This disc is a recorded DVD and may not play on all DVD players or drives.
Answer: Not only is this kosher, but I would highly recommend including both the specific erasable/rewritable/whatever DVD technology in 538 when known, and also the appropriate caveat about compatibility.

Different Publishers or Entities in a Hierarchy?

Question: Our library has been receiving DVDs from both "PBS Video" and "PBS Home Video" of the same titles that contain the exact same content. According to the authority records, "PBS Home Video" replaced "PBS Video" in 1994; however, according to the PBS Web page (accessed in 1997): "'PBS Home Video' and 'PBS Video' are two different co-existing entities; 'PBS Video' serves the education market". A recent check of the PBS Website (in late 2005) shows that it still makes this claim. Indeed, each of the authority records for these entities has a 5xx reference to the other name. Still, it would seem correct to treat these two as distinct entities and use separate records for them. However, an OCLC *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* (BF&S) instruction says: "Variation in choice of a publisher when the publishers are part of the same organization (e.g., 'Puffin' vs. 'Penguin')" does not justify a new record." The reasoning behind this guideline is not exactly clear, but the example that BF&S uses seems to be a different type of case, where one name is an imprint of the publisher, not a separate entity. If you could clarify the BF&S instruction, it could help catalogers decide if using separate records to catalog titles from "PBS Video" vs. "PBS Home Video" is correct in this context.

Answer: With the ever-growing phenomenon of consolidation in the publishing industry, the question of what exactly is a "different publisher" has become more and more difficult to determine. The intention of the OCLC guideline cited above was intended to reflect differences in cataloger's judgment when choosing between different elements within the same publishing hierarchy, *all of which are named in the item*, to be the publisher named in field 260. The case of "PBS Video" and "PBS Home Video" is somewhat unusual because both of the respective authority records (n81062763 and no94021892) and the Website <http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/aboutpbs_beyond.html> note the independent existence of the two entities ("'PBS Home Video' markets and distributes programs on videocassette and DVD to consumers, and 'PBS Video' is the leading source of top-quality video and related products for classrooms, libraries, and workplaces"). Although I do not know this for a fact, I suspect that each individual video usually cites either one or the other as publisher, but rarely if ever includes mention of both

entities, nor presents the two in a hierarchical relationship. Therefore, the practice of creating separate records for publications of "PBS Video" and of "PBS Home Video" is correct.

Distributor Data on a Sticker

Question: On a videocassette of "Scarface" starring Paul Muni, the container's logo indicates that the item should be the "MCA Universal Home Video" version that was issued in 1991. The copyright information gives the company name as "MCA Home Video, Inc." and MCA's address is listed as Universal City, California. According to the OCLC authority file, "MCA Universal Home Video" and "MCA Home Video" are two separate entities. The publishers, the ISBN, the publisher number and the UPC on the box all match the information given in the national bibliographic record. Unfortunately, there is also a sticker pasted to the bottom of the box stating: "Exclusively manufactured and distributed by 'Universal Studios Home Video Canada', a division of 'Universal Studios Canada'". The videocassette case gives a copyright date of 2002 for "Universal Home Video" and gives the company's address as Willowdale, Ontario. The opening frames of the film show an MCA Home Video logo, followed by the Universal globe logo with "an 'MCA Company' release" printed underneath it. It is not clear whether the existing record for the 1991 edition should be used, tweaking it with some notes for the local catalog or if a new record should be created for the Canadian 2002 edition. If it is preferable to create a new record, how should the misleading information on the box be treated? Perhaps a 590 local note could be inserted and 02x fields added after the new record is loaded into our system.

Answer: The situation described is pretty sticky, and, when in doubt, it is always good to remember that one option available to the cataloger is to edit an existing record locally. Still, as I read the various rules and rule interpretations for 1.4D, 1.4F, 7.4D, and 7.4F, I think any cataloger would be justified in adding a new record, especially given the time gap between the 1991 publication and the 2002 manufacture and distribution. Check in particular the "Distributors" section of LCRI 1.4D4 and its reference to a distributor that "... appears on a stamp or label anywhere in the item". If I understand the situation correctly, here is roughly the 260 that I would formulate: 260   Universal City, Calif. : $b MCA Universal Home Video, $c 1991 ; $a Willowdale, Ont. : $b exclusively manufactured and distributed by Universal Studios Home Video Canada, $c 2002.

Extrapolating from LCRIs 1.4A2 and 1.6A2 regarding data taken from such labels, I would suggest transcribing the information without brackets and to make a note indicating that the data was found on a label.

The Concept of the Order of Parts

Question: There are several numbered multiple disc sets of DVDs that contain multiple episodes of television programs (examples: "Seinfeld Season 3"; "The Irish R.M. Series 2"). With multiple episodes, it is inevitable that the credits information--such as director, producer, etc.--would vary between episodes. If such DVDs were to be cataloged as multipart sets on single records, should AACR2 1.0A3b be followed? (This is the rule that reads: "In more than one physical part. Use the chief source of information of the first or earliest part as the chief source of information for the bibliographic resource as a whole".) It seems the rule could be followed as long as the concept of order of parts is appropriate to this situation. If so, would it be correct to transcribe the statement of responsibility from the first episode on the first disc and put the credits for the other episodes in the note fields? There is no unifying statement of responsibility for any of the discs, and the credits tend not to be the same for all episodes.

Answer: Let us take this in steps. A multiple-disc set of television programs (for instance, one season's worth of episodes) is being cataloged. Relying on my general familiarity with such publications, I am guessing that the several discs were published together and at the same time in some sort of unifying container. This container serves as the chief source of information. If I read and understand Rule 1.0A3b correctly (especially when it is read with 1.0A2b in mind): when something in more than one physical part is published together and at the same time, "... the concept of the order of parts is not appropriate". Again, as I understand this (and recalling some heated discussions in which I took part concerning this issue in RDA/AACR3), "order of parts" in this context has to do with order of publication (and this is where referring back to 1.0A2b is crucial) when different parts of the resource are published and/or distributed at different times (as in a finite multipart monograph that comes out volume by volume, and not necessarily in order). Since "... the concept of the order of parts is not appropriate" in such a case, then Guideline iii applies: "If the container is a unifying element for the bibliographic resource, prefer the container as the chief source of information". If there happens to be no "unifying statement of responsibility", then none needs to be created. It would be perfectly appropriate, however, to list any credits in a contents note with the corresponding episode title or in a credits (508) note, whichever makes more sense and is sufficient for your

audience and purposes. Of course, such detailed credits could also be omitted altogether, if they are too complicated or not needed for a library's particular collection and its users.

"Mixed" Configurations of Playback Channels

Question: In the 007 fixed field for videorecordings--specifically the Configuration of playback channels (position 08)--does the "mixed" code mean a mixture of channels within the video? An example would be: a documentary on FDR, created in stereo, with speeches by FDR in mono. There are a lot of records for DVDs in the utilities that give "mixed" as the playback channel code, even though it is clear these are alternate sound tracks, not a mixture within one track. The "mixed" code on a VHS is even more confusing, as there is no way to choose an alternate track. In checking the Dolby Website <http://www.dolby.com>, it states that, for both Dolby Surround (which is now outdated) and Dolby Digital: "Dolby Digital technology can transmit mono, stereo (two-channel), or up to 5.1-channel surround sound [4 channels for DS]". The first question is: lacking a way to physically determine the number of tracks, if the VHS says Dolby Surround, but also says stereo, can it be assumed that the Dolby Surround is delivering two channels, not four? The second question is: if there are alternate sound tracks on a DVD, should the code for the highest number of tracks be used in that 007 position, with an added explanation about alternate sound tracks in a 538 or other 500 note? Or is "mixed" correct for these situations?

Answer: The wording of the definition for "mixed" in the Videorecording 007/08 is certainly open to interpretation. It states: "Code 'k' indicates that more than one configuration of playback channels for the sound portion is available on a single videorecording. An example would be a tape with both monaural and stereophonic sound tracks". Still, it is perfectly reasonable to read the definition as including alternate sound tracks. And *if--a big if*--MARC 21 is correct in its separate definitions for codes "q" (quadraphonic, multichannel, or surround) and "s" (stereophonic), catalogers would have to regard separate mentions of "stereo" and "surround" as indicating the availability of more than one configuration of playback channels. As the example noted in the definition of code "k" suggests, a choice of different playback configurations must not be completely unknown in the videotape medium.

007s for Streaming Media

Question: Where in the guidelines does it stipulate that the first 007 field has to be for

the original format, rather than the format-in-hand? Records for "Films for the Humanities" streaming videos have 007 v $b f ... and records for the Naxos Music Library have a Sound Recording 007 for the online format itself (007 s $b z. ...), in addition to field 007 for the Electronic Resource aspect. What are your thoughts on treating streaming audio/video as a new format, with distinct 007 coding?

Answer: As far as I am aware, there are no explicit guidelines anywhere on the order of multiple 007 fields (or multiple 006 fields, for that matter). I have checked OCLC's BF&S, MARC 21, and several PCC documents, including the *BIBCO Participants' Manual*, and found nothing.

In cataloging streaming media, it is not really a case of one 007 for the "original format" and another 007 for the "format-in-hand". As I see it, the 007 fields are actually used for different (but intertwined) aspects of the streaming medium. As such, a mandated hierarchy would be sort of arbitrary. Between the Computer File 007 and the Videorecording 007 there is overlap (subfield $d Color and to some extent subfield $f Sound), but there are also elements that can be coded in one but not the other (in the CF 007 subfield $b, the remoteness aspect can be coded, and in the subfields $g through $l, various technical and preservation aspects may be recorded; in the Video 007, the configuration of sound playback channels can be coded in subfield $i). One can say similar things about overlap and uniqueness when comparing the CF 007 and the Sound Recording 007 for streaming audio. Again, remember that, when coding the Videorecording 007 for streaming video or the Sound Recording 007 for streaming audio, the coding is for the *streaming* medium, not for any "original" video or audio medium, at least as far as the current coding standards allow.

There has been no concerted attempt to keep 007 coding current with technological change. As a result, many specific codes for streaming media simply do not exist, and I am not aware of any proposals that would create such codes. After RDA is published in 2008, there are bound to be repercussions throughout the MARC format. Perhaps at that time we will see some new and revised coding possibilities, but I strongly doubt that catalogers will see much before that time.

Finally, with all that being said, here are my suggestions for 007 coding for streaming media, without any implications for the order of the 007 fields. Keep in mind that many of the elements will be "unknown", "other" or "not applicable", rather than anything directly meaningful.
Videorecording 007 for Streaming Video
007   v $b z $d c $e z $f a $g z $h u

Sound Recording 007 for Streaming Audio
007   s $b z $d u $e ? $f n $g n $h n $i n $n ?

Computer File 007 for Streaming Media
007   c $b r $d c $e n $f a

In these examples, the assumption is that the videos have color and sound, but those may not always apply. The question marks indicate other elements that would be coded according to the specific resource. Some optional subfields have been omitted.

---

300 for Streaming Video

Question: Our institution will soon be cataloging a number of streaming video segments that will be mounted on the Web. They are about 10 minutes long (or less). These segments come from film rolls originally taken in Shannon County, Missouri, as part of raw footage for two documentary films. A grant was obtained to preserve them in streaming video for researchers on the heritage of the Ozarks. There will be a URL to take the user to the finding aid (however, as we understand it, not to the segment itself). The following 300 is what we have devised for this situation. Does this 300 work or should it be revised?

300   1 streaming video segment (XX min., XX sec.) : $b sd., b&w.

Cataloging note 1: Using the word "segment" seemed debatable, but without it, a library user who encountered the phrase, "1 streaming video" in the catalog record might think it was describing a VHS.

Cataloging note 2: There is no $c because there is no a physical item.

Answer: After looking at the various options in 9.5B and 9.5C, here is my suggestion:

300   1 streaming video file (XX min., XX sec.) : $b digital, [type of] file, sd., b&w.

By "[type of] file", I mean such designations as "AVI file", "MOV file", "MPEG file", "WMV file", or "RM file", which are among the more common video file types.

Closely Related Relator Codes

Question: There seem to be two relator codes with very similar meanings that are confusing when cataloging DVDs and videos. One is the relator code "aus" (author of screenplay, etc.), whose description reads, "Use for a person or corporate body responsible for a motion picture screenplay, dialog, spoken commentary, etc". The other is the relator code "sce" (scenarist), which is described as author of motion

picture screenplay. What is meant by the distinction in the descriptions, "responsible for" vs "author of"? Even more confusing, "aus" is also categorized as "author of" in its label. One conjecture might be that "aus" would allow for a broader interpretation, but it is not clear why.

Answer: If you look too long and too closely at the list of relator codes, you will not go blind, as you would by looking at the sun, but you *will* notice lots of overlap among the terms. Check out the list--at your own risk--on the Library of Congress Website at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/relators.html>. One chief reason for the overlap is that terms on the list have come over the years from a wide variety of cataloging communities, each with its own terms, definitions and needs. The resulting MARC list of relator codes has never been fully coordinated to minimize or eliminate overlap or redundancy. Inside the film industry, there may well be some subtle differences between: (1) "Author of screenplay, etc. [aus]: Use for a person or organization responsible for a motion picture screenplay, dialog, spoken commentary, etc.;" and (2) "Scenarist [sce]: Use for a person or organization who is the author of a motion picture screenplay". If specialized glossaries of the film industry were checked, distinctions between a screenplay and a scenario might be found, although the two quoted code definitions seem to treat them synonymously. Since there does not seem to be a good way to distinguish between the two terms, my suggestion would be to choose one for use within the institution, document it carefully, then try to ensure its consistent use. Remember that the use of these codes in subfield $4 is optional.