<div align="center">

BCC2002/IMP/1

**INTERNATIONAL MUSIC METADATA PROJECTS WORKING GROUP
(IMMPWG)**

Final Report

Submitted by Brad Eden, Ph.D.,Chair
September 21, 2001

</div>

First of all, I would like to thank my fellow committee members for all of their hard work: Lynda Aldana, Candy Feldt, Rashidah Zahiyyah Hakeem, Cheryl Martin, Kerri Scannell, Lois Schultz, and Matthew Dovey. They were a wonderful working group, taking care of all assignments that I delegated to them, and Matthew provided us with a wonderful website on which to put the results of our work.

Each of the following charges of the working group will be addressed below:

1. Survey the current landscape to identify music metadata projects, including (but not limited to):
   - the work of the IAML Cataloging Commission (Anders Cato)
   - INDECS (http://www.indecs.org/)
   - Telematics for Libraries (http://www.echo.lu/libraries/en/music.html)
   - Indiana University Variations Project (http://www.music.indiana.edu/variations/)
   - Canadian Music Centre (http://www.musiccentre.ca/)
   - National Gallery of the Spoken Word (http://www.ngsw.org/)
   - Music Markup Language Project (http://is.up.ac.za.mml/index.htm)

   As indicated in the Interim Report of the Working Group presented in New York in February 2001, this survey was accomplished from November 2000 through February 2001, and the results of this survey (Phase I) can be viewed at http://www.lib.ox.ac.uk/immpwg/projects.asp

2. Monitor developments in existing music metadata projects and identifying new projects.

   The Working Group, after examining the initial list of projects indicated above, came up with a list of 36 projects grouped under 6 topics. These topics are: MARC, EAD, Dublin Core, Music Metadata Markup Languages, American Memory Projects (related to music), and Defined Parameters. Each of these topics was assigned to a Working Group member, who submitted a final report to the group, along with the projects that fit under that topic. We decided early on that only projects that incorporated metadata into their database or structural arrangement would be included in this report. Thus, digital projects incorporating music without metadata and musical websites not incorporating metadata are not included in this report. See http://www.lib.ox.ac.uk/immpwg/phase2\index.html for the results of Phase II.

3. Prepare a written and verbal report to the BCC for the MLA annual meeting in New York that inventories these projects, explains the meaning and relevance of them to music libraries, and appraises the membership of particularly noteworthy activities.

   This was done, and an extension of time granted in order to finish the activities of this working group and to submit the final report.

4. Make recommendations to the BCC for any appropriate actions that should be taken, both to keep music librarians informed of important developments, and to make sure that music librarianship is represented in those developing areas as needed.

   Recommendation: Form a standing committee under BCC specifically related to maintaining currency in the area of metadata developments in the area of music, as well as monitoring current and new projects in this area. Or, add this charge to an already existing BCC subcommittee. This group would be responsible for the currency and maintenance of the website established by this working group, currently available at http://www.lib.ox.ac.uk/immpwg/ It is also recommended that this website address be moved to the MLA website, renamed, and made available for use and reference to all MLA members.

Recommendation: Certain metadata standards should be assigned an MLA representative to act on its behalf and to monitor developments, as well as provide opinions and advice regarding needs related to music in their standards development. Currently, some MLA members are already active participants in many of the major metadata standards indicated, such as Dublin Core. However, standards such as EAD may not currently have representatives from the music field assisting in their standards development. BCC should inventory current MLA members who are participating in such meetings, and try to assign representation to those metadata standards that are of specific significance to MLA.

Recommendation: Whether a new committee is formed or an existing one is assigned, MLA should make a concerted effort to inform and educate its members regarding these metadata standards, how they fit into current and future access to digitized music in its many forms, and ways to incorporate these projects and their standards into their institutional services and local digital music projects. Some ideas include: preconference workshops, conference workshops, informational-type sessions during MLA conference sponsored by BCC, etc.

As chair, I would like to thank BCC for the opportunity to participate in this working group, and to provide assistance to the association in this informational and monitoring activity. It is extremely important that MLA continue to monitor and indeed participate in the activities of many of these standards and their development, and to educate association members on the relevance and use of these metadata standards in their current and future activities as music librarians. I am always at the service of the association in this regard, and willing to assist in these endeavors.

Respectfully submitted

Brad Eden, Ph.D.
Head, Bibliographic and Metadata Services
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
beden@ccmail.nevada.edu

Last updated January 31, 2003