OLAC NEWSLETTER
vol. 28, no. 2
June 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From the Editor
Amy K. Weiss

Welcome to the June 2008 *OLAC Newsletter*! The Newsletter has its usual June features, with a few added bonuses. First, there are reports from Midwinter ALA in Philadelphia that missed the deadline for the March Newsletter. Those of you who were looking for reports from MARBI and CC:DA, look no further. Second, we have not one but two book reviews, each covering a book on FRBR. Hopefully you will find these reviews useful as the library community continues to explore the impact that FRBR will have on library catalogs and cataloging.

It seems like we were just in Philadelphia, but the ALA Annual Conference will be coming right up! I'm not going to be able to go this time around, but I will post the list of meetings of interest to OLAC members to the OLAC Website before the conference to help you with your planning. Hope you all have a great time in Anaheim!

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Vicki Toy-Smith

Greetings All! I can't believe that the year has gone by so quickly and that my year as OLAC President will come to a close this month. It has been a pleasure to serve you and to see how much OLAC has grown in the past year. Two highlights this year was the attainment of Affiliate status with ALA and the passing of several important amendments to the OLAC bylaws. This fall, we can look forward to the exciting OLAC/MOUG Conference to be held in Cleveland, Ohio (September 26-28, 2008): http://www.notsl.org/olac-moug/home.htm

I would like to thank the members of the OLAC Executive Board who have served our organization so well this past year. Kudos to Debbie Benrubi (Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator), Bobby Bothmann (Vice President/President Elect), Kate James (Treasurer), Kelley McGrath (CAPC Chair), Steven Miller (Immediate Past President), Kathy Rankin (Secretary), and Amy Weiss (Newsletter Editor). In addition, I would like to acknowledge Sue Neumeister (Webmaster) for her assistance with the online version of the *OLAC Newsletter*.

I look forward to seeing many of you at the ALA Annual Conference in Anaheim.

The CAPC meeting will be held on June 27, at 7:30 pm. The OLAC Membership meeting will be held on Saturday, June 28, at 4 pm. Three of our OLAC members have graciously volunteered to serve on the Q&A panel following the membership meeting. I would like to express my appreciation to Cathy Gerhart (University of Washington), Verna Urbanski (University of North Florida), and Jay Weitz (OCLC) for their willingness to help out with the panel and enrich our organization's mission.

I want to thank the members of OLAC for making this a very successful year!

TREASURER'S REPORT
Third Quarter, FY 2007/2008
January 1 through March 31, 2008
Kate James, Treasurer

	3rd Quarter	**Year-To-Date**
	Jan.-Dec. 2008	
OPENING BALANCE	$15,981.49	
INCOME		
Memberships	$4,099.00	$10,248.00
Dividends	$4.20	$9.52
TOTAL	$4,103.20	$10,257.52
EXPENSES		
ALA	$120.00	$320.00
Membership overpayment	$10.00	$45.00
OLAC Board Dinner	$128.90	$128.90
Bank Charges		
Savings		$25.00
Checks		$12.00
Stipends	$900.00	$1,000.00
Postage & Printing	$2,413.08	
Printing	*$1,774.08*	*$3,098.48*

Postage	*$639.00*	*$1,002.06*
Web Domain		$15.00
Outreach		$124.50
Miscellaneous		$81.77
TOTAL	$3,571.98	$5,852.71
CLOSING BALANCE		$16,512.71

MEMBERSHIP as of April 23, 2007

Personal:	355
Institutional:	174
Total:	**529**

2008 OLAC ELECTION RESULTS

Paige Andrew is the new OLAC Secretary.

Patricia Loghry is the new OLAC Vice President/President Elect.

Paige and Patricia will assume their offices at the end of the OLAC Membership Meeting at the ALA Annual Conference in Anaheim, California.

Thank you to everyone who participated in the elections!

NEWS FROM OCLC Compiled by Jay Weitz

National Library of China to Add its Records to OCLC WorldCat

The National Library of China, the largest library in Asia, will add its bibliographic records to the OCLC WorldCat database, making those records available to researchers worldwide. The National Library of China will develop software to convert the format of its records before they can be added to WorldCat. Following development and conversion of the records, the National Library of China anticipates that some 1.5 million records will be sent to OCLC in 2008. These records, when added to WorldCat, will display Chinese characters. The Library will continue adding records to WorldCat beyond 2008 once the format has been converted. OCLC opened an office in Beijing in July 2007 to better serve the growing information needs of libraries and other cultural heritage institutions in China and other parts of Asia. OCLC's relationship with libraries in the People's Republic of China began in 1986, when OCLC introduced its CJK system for cataloging Chinese, Japanese, and Korean materials. An OCLC Service Center was established at Tsinghua University in 1996, and access to the OCLC FirstSearch online reference service was made available to about 100 academic institutions in China. In 2004, the CALIS (China Academic Library and Information System) consortium, under the leadership of Peking University, began providing access to a NetLibrary eBook collection for 80 libraries in China. OCLC was selected to be the host site for the 4th China-U.S. Library Conference in October 2007 in Dublin, Ohio. Last held at Shanghai Library in 2005, this prestigious scholarly conference brought together leaders from libraries, museums, and archives in China and the United States for three days of presentations and meetings focusing on cooperation among institutions in China and the United States.

OCLC Offers Digital Archive Service for Long-Term Storage of Digital Collections

OCLC is now providing a Digital Archive service for long-term storage of originals and master files from libraries' digital collections. The Digital Archive service is simplified to fit with a variety of digital library workflows and to keep the costs of safely storing these important files within the budget of a library's digital program. The service will provide automated monitoring and reports on stored digital collections. OCLC has been leading preservation efforts in the library community with digital archive services since 2001. The Digital Archive service builds on that experience. OCLC has integrated the service to fit typical workflows for building and managing digital collections. The service provides a secure storage environment for libraries to easily manage and monitor master files and digital originals. The importance of preserving master files grows as a library's digital collections grow. Libraries need a workflow for capturing and managing master files that finds a balance between the acquisition of both digitized and born-digital content while not

outpacing a library's capability to manage these large files. Connexion is the OCLC tool that allows catalogers to perform original and copy cataloging with WorldCat, the world's most comprehensive bibliographic database. The Digital Archive service is a specially designed system in a controlled operating environment dedicated to the ongoing managed storage of digital content. OCLC has developed specific systems processes and procedures for the service tuned to the management of data for the long term. From the time content arrives, the Digital Archive systems begin inspecting it to ensure continuity. OCLC systems perform quality checks and record the results in a "health record" for each file. Automated systems revisit these quality checks periodically so libraries receive up-to-date reports on the health of the collection. OCLC provides monthly updated information for all collections on the personal archive report portal. For users of CONTENTdm, OCLC's digital collection management software for libraries and other cultural heritage institutions, the Digital Archive service is an optional capability integrated with various workflows for building collections. Master files are secured for ingest to the Digital Archive service using the CONTENTdm Acquisition Station, the Connexion digital import capability and the Web Harvesting service. For users of other content management systems, the Digital Archive service provides a low-overhead mechanism for safely storing master files. Libraries or other cultural heritage institutions interested in more information about the OCLC Digital Archive Service should contact Taylor Surface, taylor_surface@oclc.org.

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Jan Mayo, Column Editor

REPORTS FROM THE
2008 ALA Midwinter Conference
Philadelphia, PA

Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
Liaison Report
submitted by Cathy Gerhart
University of Washington Libraries

This report includes updates on proposals and discussion papers of interest to the OLAC constituency from the recent ALA MARBI meetings in Philadelphia. If you would like to see the complete list of topics discussed at MARBI, you can find them at: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/

Proposal No. 2008-02: Definition of field 542 for facts related to copyright status

The proposal was approved with some amendments. It adds field 542 to MARC 21, which will allow libraries and archives to document facts about copyright in an organized way, including an indicator that can be used to make the information private if needed. The field is repeatable so that if more than one copyright statement is appropriate for the record both can be documented; for instance, copyright of the introduction and copyright of the text itself.

Proposal No. 2008-03: Definition of first indicator value in field 041

The proposal was approved, which will add an additional value in the first indicator position for field 041. Despite some very good points made to have a value rather than a blank be added, they went with the "blank". This new first indicator "blank" will be used when the cataloging agency does not know if a translation is included in the item represented by the cataloging record. Usually this will be used in retrospective conversion projects when the item is not in hand, making it impossible to determine if there is a translation, just that it includes multiple languages. There was general consensus that it will cause problems for catalogers if they forget to code this indicator, since it will now validate with no first indicator, whereas in the past, if it was left blank, an error message would occur to remind the cataloger to code this indicator.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP01: Identifying headings that are appropriate as added entries, but are not used as bibliographic main entries

This paper presented three options to identify headings that are appropriate as added entries, but not as main entries, in bibliographic records. The option preferred by the committee used field 008/14 to encode this information. The purpose of this code is to indicate that certain headings may be used as added entries in bibliographic records but not as main entries. The primary use will be for geographic headings and names of buildings to trace the place where an event occurs. It was agreed that, while a new field for this relationship might be better for display, the use of the 008 would make machine processing much easier. Relator codes can be used to make better displays. The third option was to use the 667 to document this use of the heading, but that option was the least favorite, since it would not allow machine processing and would

put this information in a field already used for a number of things.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP02: Making field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry--Title) obsolete

The second paper was yet another attempt to separate the transcription of the series from the tracing of the series by making field 440 obsolete and always using a 490 for transcription and an 8XX for access. This will come back as a proposal but it was not clear whether it will pass when it is brought again. The use of the subfield x in the series was also discussed, and it was agreed that its use might be good, but that it should come back in a separate document.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP04: Encoding RDA, Resource Description and Access data in MARC 21

The final discussion paper that might be of interest to OLAC is no. 4. It was a very long discussion paper that laid out the various MARC 21 changes that would be needed to implement RDA. Because of a fairly tight deadline, these changes need to be made fairly quickly so that RDA can be implemented quickly after being finished, without having to wait around for implementation of MARC changes. Without going into all the particulars, here are some of the proposed changes that might be of interest to OLAC: new subfields being defined for distributor; new subfield being defined for copyright and phonogram dates; adding indicators to field 511, 255 and 538, so that a display constant can be used, since in RDA uses the element in the label and it is not included in the recorded data; possible scenarios for representing FRBR entities in the records; defining coding that would identify when an entire field would be bracketed rather than adding the brackets, since users don't know what the brackets mean; adding three new subfields in the 100 field that would identify birth, death and period of activity dates separately. These are just a few of the proposed changes. If you would like to see them all, go to the MARBI web site listed above.

Lastly, I would like to thank OLAC for appointing me to this position and thank John Attig for his many years of service to OLAC as our MARBI representative. It is an exciting time to be involved in the cataloging community nationally.

————————

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 Philadelphia, PA

Work on RDA is proceeding on schedule with a targeted release date of early 2009. In a press release after the JSC meeting in October, the Library of Congress, the British Library, the Library and Archives Canada, and the National Library of Australia stated their support for RDA, agreed on a coordinated implementation in late 2009 and will work together on such matters as training, documentation, and any national application decisions. Though the final report of the LC Working Group on Bibliographic Control recommended suspension of work on RDA until FRBR is more fully tested, LC staff (as of ALA anyway) have not been informed of any change in LC's participation in the RDA process, and are operating with the assumption that the process is going forward as planned. Some Big Heads attendees were told that LC administration was going to discuss this after ALA. Given the mixed messages from LC, it is difficult as of this writing to know exactly how active their participation will be in the future.

The JSC reorganized the contents of RDA again to relate data elements more closely to FRBR entities and user tasks. It will have 10 sections (37 chapters) that focus first on recording attributes for FRBR and FRAD entities and then on recording relationships between entities. As has been noted by many reviewers, much of the text of RDA is identical to AACR2. However, the context has been greatly changed, and understanding a rule in AACR2 does not necessarily mean that one will understand the RDA version of the rule. As Barbara Tillett noted at CC:DA, it is very difficult to simplify wording without introducing ambiguity. For the current RDA prospectus and draft outline of chapters, see http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rdaprospectus.html and for the RDA scope and structure document, see http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-scoperev2.pdf.

RDA is not tied to any specific record structure. The JSC has provided three implementation scenarios that RDA must support: a scenario for flat records, a scenario for combination of current (i.e. MARC 21 compliant) bibliographic, authority, and holdings records, and a scenario for a relational/object oriented database structure which includes records for work, expression, manifestation, item, and a type of record for persons/places/concepts, etc. Though MARBI is discussing implementation issues, there is now an admission that a new, post-MARC data format is necessary to implement the optimal (relational/object oriented) scenario. Due to time constraints, however, initial implementation will surely be MARC 21 with as many modifications as can be made by the implementation rollout. For the RDA implementation scenarios, see http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/docs/5editor2.pdf and

http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/docs/5editor4.pdf.

CC:DA discussions January 2008

CC:DA met three times at ALA Midwinter, with most business concerning the RDA draft and the report of the JSC representative. This latest draft concerns identifying and recording attributes of works, persons, families, corporate bodies. There are more attributes than are recorded in current MARC21 authority records. This is the last new material to be issued before July, when the final draft, including all previously issued material, will be released. There will be placeholders for future material that will not be released until 2009 or later. That draft may be in a hyperlinked form, which we are assured will be much easier to navigate than the paper/PDF drafts. It was reiterated at the meeting that a print product is also needed. An RDA implementation task force has been created and a program is planned for ALA Annual.

Other CC:DA activities included reports on:

Recent Library of Congress activities, by Barbara Tillett

NISO, by Cindy Hepfer, ALA's new representative

Task Force on Specialist Cataloging Manuals, Mark Scharff – this generated a question as to whether it is appropriate to include manuals based on AACR2 since AACR2 will be obsolete on the publication of RDA, thus rendering the specialist manuals also obsolete.

ALA publishing, by Donald Chatham

MARBI, by Everett Allgood

PCC guidelines on Multiple Character Sets, by Peter Fletcher

CC:DA internal and external communication, by Laura Smart – note that there will soon be a public CC:DA listserv

CCS Executive Committee, by Cheri Folkner

SCCTP INTEGRATING RESOURCES CATALOGING WORKSHOP

Four-Week Web-based Online Workshop
Dates:
July 14 - August 8, 2008

Fee: $299.00

Online registration:
https://www4.uwm.edu/sois/epayment/registration/?a1=edit&course_id=10
Please use the email address of the person taking the workshop when registering; this
address will be used for workshop communication.

Description:
This four-week online workshop is designed for practicing catalogers from all types of
libraries who have a working knowledge of the MARC21 bibliographic format and
AACR2. The course provides guidance to catalogers who may be responsible for
cataloging integrating resources of all types, with an emphasis on remote access
electronic integrating resources. The workshop covers AACR2 cataloging rules from
chapters 9 and 12 and the recent implementation of Bibliographic Level code "i" in
OCLC. The sessions include an introduction to integrating resources and their
identification, instructions for originally cataloging updating Web sites and databases,
making changes to existing records, and case studies covering more difficult aspects
of cataloging electronic integrating resources.

SCCTP:
This workshop is part of the Library of Congress' Serials Cataloging Cooperative
Training Program (SCCTP), which provides standardized training materials and
trained trainers in the field of continuing resources. For further information, see:
http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/scctp/

Instructor:
Steven Miller is a Senior Lecturer at the UWM School of Information Studies. He has
given numerous conference presentations and continuing education workshops on
cataloging electronic and integrating resources, and is the primary author of the
content of this workshop.

Originally Posted by:
Steven J. Miller, Senior Lecturer
UWM School of Information Studies
PO Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201
Email: smiller@sois.uwm.edu ; Phone: 414-229-6640

ANNOUNCING THE BEST OF MOUG, 8th ed.
Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), editor

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is pleased to announce the publication of the 8th edition of *The Best of MOUG*, a browsable, two-volume compendium of authorized name/uniform title headings from the Library of Congress/NACO Name Authority File for C.P.E. Bach, J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Boccherini, Brahms, Clementi, Handel, J. Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann, and Vivaldi. There are also lists arranged by thematic index number for Bach, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Telemann, and Vivaldi (by both Fanna and Ryom numbers, with a concordance from the former to the latter). Each list includes uniform titles and corresponding authority record control numbers and is current to September 2007.

It also includes an index of commonly searched English and other cross references with corresponding authority record control numbers for works by Bartók, Dvorák, Glazunov, Glière, Glinka, Grechaninov, Janácek, Kodály, Martinu, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky.

This browsable print resource is particularly handy at a reference desk to assist patrons when it may be inconvenient, if not impossible, to log on to OCLC's WorldCat and search the online authority files. It is also an inexpensive yet authoritative resource for catalog departments that need to limit online searching of the LC/NACO Name-Authority File because of budget considerations, and has proven extremely useful in classroom settings and in workplace training situations.

This is the first new edition to appear since 2000, and the first to be issued in two volumes. The editor, Margaret Kaus, and the Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the editors of the 1st through 7th editions, Ann (McCollough) Caldwell (Brown University; 1st-2nd eds.) and Judy Weidow (University of Texas at Austin, ret.; 3rd-7th eds.), who laid

the groundwork for the present edition.

The cost per two-volume copy of the 8th edition is as follows (payable and shown below in U.S. funds only; includes shipping and handling):

$36.00 (for orders to locations in the U.S.) $46.00 (for orders to Canada or Mexico) $58.00 (all other countries)

To order *The Best of MOUG*, 8th ed., please point your browser to http://www.musicoclcusers.org/bestofmougorder.pdf. Complete the form online, print it, and mail it via postal mail with your check to the indicated address. (Only pre-paid orders can be filled.)

For questions about the new edition, please contact the editor:

Margaret Kaus
Associate Professor
Original Cataloger
Kansas State University Libraries
Hale Library
509 Hale
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
mkaus@ksu.edu
ph. 785-532-7263
fax 785-532-7644

Originally Posted by:
Neil R. Hughes
Past Chair, MOUG
nhughes@uga.edu

Announcing MOUG-L (New Address)

MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals. Postings routinely include discussion of music cataloging issues, OCLC products and services as related to music cataloging and reference work, related announcements, and information about conferences and other professional development opportunities. MOUG-L is an open discussion list; anyone may subscribe.

Originally established at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas by Cheryl Taranto, the list has served the organization as a discussion medium since 2000. In 2008 the list was moved to a new location at the University of Kentucky. For questions about the list or to report any problems with the list, please contact Kerri Scannell Baunach at kscannell@uky.edu.

SUBSCRIBE to MOUG-L:

Send an e-mail message to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of your message, type ONLY the following (no signature): SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L YOUR NAME (substituting your own name; commands are not case-sensitive).

Please note: If you are currently subscribed to the old listserv, you must subscribe to the new listserv if you wish to receive MOUG-L postings. The current subscriber roster will not be migrated from the old listserv to the new one.

For more instructions, see http://www.musicoclcusers.org/listserv.html.

Originally posted by:
Alan Ringwood
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor

JOINT STATEMENT ON RDA ISSUED BY NATIONAL LIBRARIES
May 1, 2008

A joint statement of the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Library of Agriculture on RDA (Resource Description and Access) implementation is now available at: http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/RDA_Letter_050108.pdf

---

BOOK REVIEWS
Douglas King, Column Editor

FRBR: a guide for the perplexed
by Robert L. Maxwell

Robert L. Maxwell has written a book to help meet the need for catalogers to get up to speed on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, better known as FRBR. Maxwell, Senior Librarian at Brigham Young University's Lee Library, is a member of the Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access of ALCTS (CC:DA) and the author of the award-winning *Maxwell's Guide to Authority Work* (2002). His experience with both authority work and rare book cataloging is evident in his discussions in *FRBR*. He states his objectives for the book: "The purpose of this book is to explain and illustrate the FRBR model, show why the document and model are important for the future of information organization, and offer suggestions along the way for what a database founded on FRBR principles might look like".

Many explanations of FRBR are available, such as Barbara Tillett's helpful though brief *What is FRBR*? Maxwell takes the reader further by integrating FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data) into his explanation at each salient point. The book is well organized, clearly written, well documented and illustrated. Most significantly, at 137 page of text, it is of reasonable length for busy librarians, who desire a summary of FRBR.

After a brief introduction to history and goals of IFLA's intention behind FRBR and a chapter on the diagramming (discussed below), Maxwell treats, in the remaining chapters, each of the entities, relationships, and user tasks pertaining to FRBR and (where appropriate) FRAD. The text contains copious end notes with each chapter, and suggested readings in the basic documents and secondary literature, noting when any of the resources are available on the Internet.

The illustrations, both schematic and bibliographic, are perhaps the strongest feature of the book. Maxwell finds, in the reviewer's opinion, legitimate fault with the style of FRBR diagramming (with its boxes, arrows, and subprimes), and chooses to present FRBR relationships with entity-relationship diagramming. This decision returns FRBR to its native environment since it is all about entities and relationships. This choice could also assure that the book will prove useful to OPAC designers and programmers, to whom librarians depend to provide the interfaces that will reflect the potential of FRBR.

The bibliographic examples used in the book are well-selected; revealing how FRBR handles each circumstance. Audiovisual and music catalogers will be pleased to observe how Maxwell uses two recurring examples (Debussy's Syrinx and Mozart's

Die Zauberflote) to make many of his points.

Maxwell touches on two problems with FRBR. One is the lack of integration of form/genre into the model, although form/genre has been a user need articulated since the days of Cutter. He also attempts to clarify what a "fingerprint" is in rare book cataloging (p. 46). Otherwise, in an environment in which FRBR, by virtue of its association with RDA, is regarded with suspicion, disdain, disgust, or perplexity, Maxwell is hopeful about the prospects of cataloging in a FRBR future.

Chapter six, though unfortunately brief, is the most interesting portion of the book. Maxwell admits that millions of MARC/AACR records impose conservatism about moving to FRBR relationships. Nevertheless, he optimistically points to early OCLC research that FRBR would affect only 20 percent of the total WorldCat database. Maxwell indicates that relator codes are important in making this transition. He is aware that the cataloging community will (once again) face the decision whether to use a fixed or gradual approach to the changeover to FRBR and favors a decisive pre/post FRBR dateline (p. 137). Originally, MARC was conceived in a flat-file format. The rise of machine-readable name and subject authority files has added some dimensionality to our cataloging, but in many ways we are still operating in a world much like that of Edwin Abbott's Flatlanders. Maxwell sees FRBR as the way to add that needed third dimension to our bibliographic universe.

Published in 2008 by: American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. (151 p.) ISBN: 0-8389-0950-7

Reviewed by:
Scott M. Dutkiewicz
Special Formats Cataloger
Clemson University Libraries

Understanding FRBR:
What It Is and How It Will Affect Our Retrieval Tools
Edited by Arlene G. Taylor

The term "FRBR", or its less commonly-used proper name "Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records", tends to provoke one of three responses. One response is that FRBR is a better, more intuitive method for organizing the bibliographic information used to describe materials in today's increasingly online environment. The second response is FRBR as a print-centered framework that does not adequately

address the issues involved with non-book materials. A third response is confusion.

Understanding FRBR: What It Is and How It Will Affect Our Retrieval Tools "… is written for librarians, bibliographic systems designers, library and information science faculty and students, and anyone else who is interested in learning about the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records …" Thirteen experts in different fields of information processing have contributed chapters to this book. The chapters are appropriately organized into a progression from an overview of the FRBR model and one of its counterparts, FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data; formerly, Functional Requirements for Authority Records) to a history of cataloging focusing on the roots of FRBR and its theoretical aspects to its application to several classes of non-book formats. The book is nicely indexed, listing most every concept and named person mentioned in its 186 pages, and contains see-references.

The readability of this book varies, as in many compilations, from author to author and from topic to topic. Arlene G. Taylor's introduction to FRBR contains a phrase that can be applied to the chapter: "A conceptual model, being theoretical, has to be thought about." The sections addressing FRBR relationships and the model for organizing Web resources may result in some head-scratching and re-reading. The reader already familiar with entity-relationship diagrams and other representations of database structures will find the illustrations useful. Richard P. Smiraglia's chapter describing bibliographic families and "superworks" reads rather like the transcript of a library school class lecture, which is intended as a complement. He relates FRBR to the various expressions and manifestations that are members of a given work's bibliographic family by using numerous instructive examples ranging from print materials to sound- and video-recordings. While every chapter contains bibliographic notes, Smiraglia's also contains a bibliography of texts further discussing his topic.

One of two chapters of particular value to OLAC Newsletter readers is Martha M. Yee's discussion of FRBR and RDA's application to moving image materials. Yee, a longtime advocate for audio-visual materials in the conversations surrounding the development of RDA, discusses the problems that arise from applying the concepts of Manifestation and Expression to these materials. She raises many good points about what constitutes a change in expression or manifestation and what constitutes a new work. Her arguments are supported with examples, particularly from the realm of video representations of dramatic musical works.

The other chapter of note is Sherry L. Vellucci's "FRBR and Music". Her substantial contribution delves into the complexity of cataloging music materials with regard to Work, Expression, and Manifestation. Those who work with these materials, particularly Western art music, will find that FRBR concepts map quite well to

established cataloging practices as. Vellucci describes how a person (e.g. Beethoven) can compose a work (e.g. Symphony No. 9 in D Minor) expressed through a medium (e.g. musical notation) or live performance and further expressed in print (e.g. full score, miniature score, condensed score, or instrumental parts) or sound recording (e.g. tape) and manifested as a publication (e.g. Peters edition score, Deutsche Grammaphon compact disc). The text of her chapter is also enhanced with diagrams.

There are two concerns with this book. The first is a problem of circumstance. At the time of this book's publication (and at the time of this review), the new cataloging rules built on the framework of FRBR, Resource Description and Access ("RDA") are not yet complete and subject to change. As such, the chapter discussing its relationship to FRBR is based in historical fact that may or may not be accurate once RDA is published. The second is the chapter about FRBR and serials. This can be a difficult read for anyone unfamiliar with serials cataloging. In fact, author Steven C. Shadle writes after a particularly challenging passage, "If the reader is completely lost at this point, it is perfectly understandable." While applying FRBR to serial materials may be complicated at best, this is not the type of phrase one wants to see in book that seeks to clarify the subject. To his credit, Shadle attempts to elucidate the relationships between journals, their component issues, and articles with diagrams, but trying to make sense of the crossing bi-directional arrows pointing between abbreviated attribute labels can make one consider joining the group of serials catalogers who resist FRBR application.

Overall, this is a fine book and for the most part, will be of value to its intended audience.

Published in 2007 by: Libraries Unlimited, Westport, Conn. (186 p.) ISBN: 978-1-59158-509-1.

Reviewed by:
Scott R. Phinney
Music Cataloger
Music Library
University of South Carolina

OLAC Cataloger's Judgment: Questions and Answers
Compiled by Jay Weitz

A Date with Bill Moyers?

Question: In hand is an episode of the TV program, *Now with Bill Moyers*. There is no title for the individual episode. The cassette label says:
Now with Bill Moyers
October 22, 2004
LCRI 25.5B Appendix I, (Cataloging a Television Program Itself) under "Individual titles not intended to be viewed consecutively" says to "use as the title proper a structured combination that consists of a comprehensive title and an individual title when one is available. ... In the absence of both a numeric designation and an individual title, use the date of telecast in the form [yyyy-mm-dd]." So then, is this correct?
130 0 Now with Bill Moyers (Television program). $n 2004-10-22.
245 10 Now with Bill Moyers. $n [2004-10-22] $h [videorecording]
It just seems odd to supply the date in a prescribed form in the 245, when I could transcribe it from the label.

Answer: Yes, that does seem odd, but the LCRI is trying to impose order on 245 fields to some extent as well as on uniform titles. (Remember, of course, that the LCRI is intended as PCC practice, which you may choose to follow or not, or to follow selectively.) There is no reason why one couldn't include a 246 field with the subfield $n date transcribed as it actually appears on the label, if that would be a useful alternative title entry in your catalog. Questions have arisen about the form of date the LCRI suggests. Ugly though it may be, that "yyyy-mm-dd" is actually the international standard Data Elements and Interchange Formats – Information Interchange – Representation of Dates and Times, otherwise known as ISO 8601. (See http://www.iso.org/iso/support/faqs/faqs_widely_used_standards/widely_used_standards_other/date_and_time_format.htm for some details.) It is intended, of course, both to internationalize the form of dates by removing the language element from the month and to eliminate the ambiguities of which numerals are the months and which are the dates of the month.

Public Performance Rights

Question: Where should a cataloger place a note indicating that performance rights are included with purchase? It is unclear whether to put this information in a 500, 540 (Terms governing use and reproduction), or a 650 subject heading (as seen in one

example). The 650 seems inappropriate since there is no evidence of an LC Subject Heading regarding "public performance." Is the 540 field the appropriate place for this information? Also, is there prescribed terminology? Examples in OCLC read "includes public performance rights," "public performance permitted," or "public performance rights included".

Answer: Field 540 is appropriate for public performance rights notes. If the resource include a quotable statement, one can use that, but there does not appear to be any standardized wording for such a note.

Order of Added Entries

Question: This is a musical video cataloging issue. When giving the 7XX Added Entries, does one consider the information in 028 subfield $b, which would be the first added entry, or not? To clarify, here is an example:
028 40 B0002696-09 $b Deutsche Grammophon

245 00 Rigoletto $h [videorecording] / $c the Metropolitan Opera.

260 Hamburg : $b Deutsche Grammophon, $c [2004].
Then, would the following order of added entries be OK?
710 2 710 2 Deutsche Grammophon (Firm)

710 2 710 2 Metropolitan Opera (New York, N.Y.) $4 prf
Some music catalogers follow a different order, like this:
710 2 710 2 Metropolitan Opera (New York, N.Y.) $4 prf

710 2 710 2 Deutsche Grammophon (Firm)
Which one would be correct?

Answer: According to LCRI 21.29, within each group of added entries (in this case, those for corporate names), "generally follow the order in which the justifying data appear in the bibliographic description. If such a criterion is not applicable, use judgment." By that criterion, the corporate added entries would appear in the same order in which the corporate name was mentioned in the body of the record, which would exclude the 028 field, but include fields 245, 260, and 5XX. In this specific example, that would mean that the added entry for the Metropolitan Opera would come first. Although one should not worry too much about that order, generally place the added entry for the video publisher/label last among the corporate added entries.

041 Subfielding for Sung Language of Video

Question: Are there explicit instructions somewhere for cataloging video recordings of operas (ballets, etc.)? Specifically, in 041 is the sung language subfield $a or $d? Based on the CAPC best practices recommendations it should appear like this:
Recording of The Bridge, an opera performed in sign language, simultaneously sung in English.
008/lang eng
041 0# $a eng $j sgn
546 ## Performed with gestures, American Sign Language, a musical soundtrack, and in English.
But other OCLC records have the sung language in subfield $d. Which should it be? Also, where does one put the composer/librettist: 245 subfield $c, 508, 500?

Answer: Although a few details have changed in the past decade or so, "Cataloging Musical Moving Image Material: A Guide to the Bibliographic Control of Videorecordings and Films of Musical Performances and Other Music-Related Moving Image Material," published in 1996 by the Music Library Association (OCLC #33947073), remains the best source about cataloging videos of operas, ballets, and the like. For videorecordings, the sung language is coded in the Language fixed field (008/35/37) and if needed, in the subfield $a of field 041. It is for sound recordings only that the language of the sung text would be coded in the subfield $d of field 041 when needed. Under ordinary circumstances, the composer and the librettist of an opera would appear in field 245 subfield $c. If those credits do not appear in the chief source, they would be bracketed.

When a Title's on the Menu

Question: In OLAC's Guide to Cataloging DVDs under Chief Source of Information it states: "DVDs should always be cataloged from the title screen(s). Information for notes and areas other than title is often taken from the container." But what actually constitutes the title screen for a DVD? Is it the screen that pops up when the DVD is inserted, and there are choices to make, e.g. Play movie, or is it the title screen of the actual film? One example is the DVD "Tim". When "Tim" is inserted in the DVD player, a menu comes up with the title "Tim," an option to "Play movie" and an option to view Chapters. When Play movie is chosen, and the film begins, the title from the title screen of the film is "Colleen McCullough's Tim". If this were a videocassette,

there probably would not be a question as to the title, because the film usually begins immediately, and one sees only the title screen for the film. But with DVDs, there is often a title screen for the DVD. Should a cataloger provide the title of the DVD or the title of the film? In the 300 one provides the duration of the film, but in the 260 one provides publication information for the video.

Answer: For motion pictures on DVD, the title screen of the film remains the title screen that serves as the chief source of information. The menu screen is exactly that, the menu screen and should be referred to as such when information there differs from the title screen and needs to be identified. In this case, the cataloger would use the title screen title "Colleen McCullough's Tim" as the title proper and would add a 246 for "Tim" alone. Whether there is also need to document the menu screen title "Tim" is a matter of judgment, given that there will already be a 246 for that title. By the way, there is an OLAC CAPC task force currently revising the *Guide to Cataloging DVDs*, the final version of which should be available later this year.