

**Bibliographic Control Committee**  
**Music Library Association conference – Las Vegas**  
**Business Meeting No. 1**  
 February 19, 2002, 3:30-5:00pm

**Present:** Matthew Wise, Terry Simpkins, Nancy Lorimer, Kathy Glennan, Paul Cauthen, Michael Colby, Michelle Koth, Susan Vita, Jay Weitz, Beth Tice

**1. Distribution of documents**

- a. Agendas
- b. 2002-03 Roster
- c. 2002-03 Calendar
- d. Minutes from the 2001 Meeting, NYC (*distributed via e-mail in June 2001*)
- e. International Music Metadata Projects WG Final Report
- f. LC report  
<http://bcc.musiclibraryassoc.org/BCC-Historical/BCC2002/LC2002.html>
- g. OCLC report  
<http://bcc.musiclibraryassoc.org/BCC-Historical/BCC2002/OCLC2002.html>

**2. Approval of minutes (NYC meeting)**

Kathy Glennan had corrections that had not been made yet. Matthew had a few corrections. These will be sent to Beth Tice, once those are made, the minutes will be approved.

**3. Preview of the open meeting**

Matthew will announce new format of the open meeting (only 1 hr.). Brad Eden will give a report on the IMMPWG's final report and gather audience response and ideas related to the recommendations of the group. Matthew will announce the current status of the Dublin Core Working Group. The afternoon sessions room changes will also be announced.

**4. Discussion of the final report of the IMMPWG and the BCC's role in the development of metadata standards and applications / Brad Eden**

Report is already 6 months old so already outdated. Open archives project people have changed. Metadata is fluid and continuous. Somebody needs to be responsible to keep on top of the issues to maintain currency, inform membership on regular basis of changes to standards, and maybe an education component. The group has presented three major recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Form a standing committee, or add this charge to existing subcommittee. Current group's website address should be moved to the MLA website.
- Recommendation 2: Certain Metadata standards should be assigned an MLA liaison (change representative to liaison).
- Recommendation 3: MLA should make a concerted effort to inform and educate its members regarding these Metadata standards through pre-conference workshops, etc.

Brad was approached by program committee for Austin to have a metadata plenary session and is willing to help in any way possible. There is a need to support education of metadata not only for the MLA association and music / musicologists, but also for cataloging trends.

Matthew: There seems to be two directional problems. While we need music subject input in these standards, we also want to bring back information from these Standards groups. One solution is establishing a formal liaison to these individual standards, however Matthew does not believe the MLA board would support these positions. Another way is to have formal titles that are not supported by the board. How can we control these liaisons and get information back? Matthew would like to see if it is possible to structure this around our current liaisons. Brad would like to see volunteers that are interested in areas and thinks

there are many people out there who have already shown some interest. There would be more coordination in keeping track with these liaisons. The 4 liaisons that already go to ALA have MLA backing and they are spokespersons. Brad: These positions would not serve as a representative, but as a liaison. We can encourage interest in liaisoning, but can't structure those within MLA. We need some way of providing an information exchange, since we may not have much of an input with pushing standards anyway. Matthew: What kind of mechanism do we have in place to get information back? Brad suggested that maybe a metadata liaison subcommittee that would coordinate these efforts... wouldn't necessarily meet, but just coordinate. Another option was raised with the possibility of creating an advisory task force. This advisory group would have a flexible appointment processes that may not need to pass through the MLA board. The chair of that group would report to BCC and would update on list as projects come up and not just once a year. This chair would need to be someone appointed as chair so there is a person for BCC communicate with. It's important for these liaisons to be backed by MLA if they are going to be contributing to these discussions. Preliminarily there is a need to get a group set up (informally) because it is different from current structure. Sue Vita said these Standards groups are interested in interest and guidance from outside groups to get help. Is it possible to have a virtual subcommittee keeping an amorphous list of people? Voting? Non-voting? Metadata is so important we need a member to be involved. Matthew would have to write a charge similar to subcommittee. BCC will raise these issues with open meeting tomorrow. Brad will read the final report/summary and read recommendations.

## **5. Brief Reports**

### **a. Authorities**

Terry Simpkins: The "types" document is going through changes, looking at streamlining getting changes made. Three members are going work with Mickey and bring back to whole subcommittee. This is generally a small group and they can move terms through quicker and deal with old terms that are still out there. Terry will write a response to PCCSCS task group on function of authority file. This task force has been working on the "role of the authority file". Mostly their report seems to emphasis maintenance of authority file and Terry thinks issues with music headings and title headings need to be brought to their attention. The subcommittee is in the initial discussion stage finding topics for an Open meeting. Possible topics would include "Authority control for non-MARC data". Terry will talk to Brad Eden about how that will all relate. One idea is how authority control is built into metadata schemes.

### **b. Descriptive Cataloging, including RBMS/MLA Joint Committee**

Nancy Lorimer: There has been recent discussion about merging manuscript and printed music into one big document. Appendixes 510 and major changes will include guidelines when to make a new bibliographic record. This appendix will not be included in new AACR2, however look for website that will be coming up in next week or two off the ALA site. In today's meeting, they will discuss the preliminary document addressing the concept of conventional terminology and the relationship of Chpt.9 electronic resources physical description field. In revised Chpt.6, area "5" under "physical description" allows option for uncontrolled terminology and LC has adopted this option. There was some discussion about working through ALA to create a rule change to Chpt. 6. Nancy knows of a related proposal by Canadian Libraries, but there is a need to have something concrete before action can begin.

### **c. MARC Formats**

Kathy Glennan: Produced a document from subcommittee describing discrepancies in subfield "n" which analyzed these documents. Findings showed that everyone was using it right, but documentation was different. A discussion paper, naming the subfield. Dates used, etc...suggested changes. Given to MARC standards office and not go to MARBI? If a major issues it will go to MARBI as a discussion paper. These papers hardly ever go to the proposal stage. They could be ready for next mark up changes in October. Kathy was approached by MARBI about a sound recording preservation proposal. IAML is bringing this proposal to UNIMARC and we have a copy of proposal. This proposal would have to be substantially tweaked to get ready for MARC21 as the coding is very extensive. Graphics and codes in proposal need possible expansion. The proposal does have merit with definite interest for MLA, however this document will be hard to get to MARBI, so we should wait and see what happens with UNIMARC.

### **d. Subject Access**

Michael Colby: Discussed idea of a pre-conference slot with SACO workshops. Generally, should be as morning session covering SACO proposals. They've been in touch with the Education Committee and they thought maybe meeting before the D.C. meeting because most of the people involved will be coming from D.C. Maybe MOUG would consider coordinating with

this?

#### **e. Music Cataloging Bulletin**

Michelle Koth: Printing and mailing should be moved to AR Editions. Right now it is mailed from NY to AR Editions. She heard that the MLA board may have approved it and would like to ask the board to expand scope of MCB. This would include soliciting articles such as: "Liturgical music uniform titles", which at this time is not in the scope. Material is not just coming from LC anymore, there are also contributions from NACO, etc. She has also talked about making MCB available in electronic form preferring html form.

#### **f. Library of Congress**

SueVita: Two new members helped prepare the LC report and did an excellent job. LC is working through formats, now on CDs (current CDs, backlog CDs). Next year, work will begin on LPs. LC Report explains system for copy cataloging. No mail has come into LC since October. They were out a week because of anthrax cautions. Soon after September 11<sup>th</sup>, interesting new developments at LC include web projects. There is a web site up now about interviews and reactions to the day after Pearl Harbor, and they are now working on similar page for after Sept. 11 reactions. Preservation issues are included in the LC Report.

#### **g. BCC Website**

Talked about standardizing the format for subcommittee and liaison reports with the past year's MARC formats subcommittee reports as an example.

#### **h. OCLC**

Jay Weitz covered some of the highlights. Catme 2.10 was made available 2/18/02. Some fixes and improvements have been made with metadata interface that we will be moving to in next 2 years. OCLC is implementing improvements to keyword searching on 2/24/02. The Kenyon conversion project converted over 150,000 LC authority records and over 90,000 bibliographic records, mostly Chinese. This was a vast accomplishment. Other issues include quality control in FirstSearch. They are still converting old "gmd" file ("interactive multimedia" to "electronic resource") from Chpt. 9. OCLC bought Netlibrary. This purchase took place officially last month. There is also the new version of guidelines for cataloging electronic resources that includes a URL on last page of handout.

Discussion followed regarding the agenda for 2<sup>nd</sup> business meeting.

Meeting was adjourned.

#### **Open Meeting**

February 20, 2002, 9:00-10:00am

**Present:** Matthew Wise, Kathy Glennan, Nancy Lorimer, Sue Vita, Michael Colby, Terry Simpkins, Jay Weitz, Beth Tice

#### **1. Introduction of the members**

BCC Chair, Matthew Wise introduced the members.

#### **2. Announcement of subcommittee vacancies**

Matthew Wise announced the positions that would be rotating off the subcommittees and announced the new chairs. Paul Cauthen is the incoming chair for the Subcommittee on MARC Formats and Mark McKnight is the incoming chair for the Subcommittee on Subject Access. Matthew publicly thanked Kathy Glennan and Michael Colby for their hard work with these committees. Also announced were several vacancies on various subcommittees as well as the BCC Recording Secretary/Webmaster vacancy. Interested MLA members were encouraged to refer to the "statement on participation in the work of the committee" and to submit letter for application for these positions.

#### **3. Explanation of the new BCC meeting format**

There will be only one hour scheduled for the BCC Open meeting. Now that reports are on the BCC website, there is no need to spend time reading reports. BCC decided it was more important to use these meetings for discussion.

#### **4. Approval of the Dublin core metadata element set (Z39.85-2001) and the status of the DC “relations” element “type” Qualifier Working Group**

Since the interim report at the N.Y.C. meeting, the group hadn't done much. After the N.Y.C. meeting, the element set was approved, so there was no need to have group reviewing these same issues. One can download the set for free at <http://www.niso.org/>

#### **5. Final report of the International Music Metadata Projects Working Group**

*(Brad Eden, University of Nevada, Las Vegas)*

Final Report is completed. The group made several recommendations to BCC. Brad Eden is the chair. During the BCC business meeting on 2/19/02, the committee came to some recommendations about next steps. BCC would like input from the assembled group during the Open meeting today.

Brad Eden presented final report summary:

Brad Eden publicly thanked all the members and all the hard work they had done.

The first charge to this group was to survey current landscape to identify projects. Some projects are no longer working and some have changed. Between 11/00 – 2/01 they found well over 100 web sites. The second charge was to monitor developments in existing music metadata projects and identify new projects. The group narrowed down the focus on the projects and identified the major projects. The third charge was to prepare a written report. This report was completed with an extension of time. The fourth charge was to present BCC with recommendations for any appropriate actions that should be taken.

- Recommendation 1: Form a standing committee, or add this charge to existing subcommittee. Current group's website address should be moved to the MLA website.
- Recommendation 2: Certain Metadata standards should be assigned an MLA liaison (change representative to liaison).
- Recommendation 3: MLA should make a concerted effort to inform and educate its members regarding these Metadata standards through pre-conference workshops, etc.

#### **6. Open discussion and questions**

Brad Eden: Presented the direction of the BCC's discussion on this final report after Tuesday's business meeting. There are already existing liaisons to these standards and BCC may want to draw on the talent of these. This role would open a two-way street. One way would be representing the MLA community but they would also be responsible for bringing material back to MLA as needed. One obstacle with this suggestion is how do these liaisons fit into the MLA structure? This would need to be a flexible group of people. Because of the fast changing nature of these issues/standards, membership would be very malleable and would be difficult to keep track off. Official membership through MLA board requires a lot of paperwork and time. One possible solution is to consider a virtual advisory group that would have an appointed chair, who would solicit new members, coordinate and solicit reports. BCC could draw on a great number of people that would not have official MLA positions. Brad Eden asked the group: “How do you feel about a virtual group?”

Mark Scharff: attended the Tuesday BCC meeting. He asked if BCC wasn't envisioning these liaisons to be carrying forth official MLA backing. If latter, MLA needs official representation for standards, how do we envision that coming through?

Matthew Wise: These standards don't lend themselves toward this environment. It would be difficult to justify an official MLA position, however these standards do represent a broader music community. This person would need to understand the music prospective. The nature of MLA does not allow us to give official position titles. Transfer of information would lie in the hands of this chair or report gatherer. The chair would be an official position with BCC, so would be a direct liaison. We can assume that our ALA representatives also have official positions with BCC.

Lois: Discussed the danger of this business. Metadata is many different issues, MARC, Subject and Authority. Metadata includes all of these issues so it is difficult to know how to draw lines. EAD, OAI standards, etc. General Standards groups

don't understand music. Music doesn't often fit into the structure of the standards. So, these Standards groups are having difficulty too. Liaisons could get funding from their institutions to gather information from these Standards groups. Administrators need to be convinced that these Metadata issues are broad and deal with systems automation, description, etc. and should get funding for influencing all library issues.

Matthew Wise: It is hard to spread out where metadata fits. BCC seems to touch a lot of these issues. Funding is difficult and it could be that many liaisons and the MLA board may not want to fund that many people, however these official titles can help with local institutions as far as funding.

Q: Another role for music metadata group: begin to think of putting together standards for ourselves. IYU spent a year trying to put together a set of elements: descriptive, administrative and structural elements for sounds recordings. Question: is it a logical action for this group to standardize these three areas for MLA? They posted a question to MLA and found through the listserv that on the whole our information about Metadata is not very deep. We could make our own document type. This speaker believed this would be an appropriate charge for this group, in addition to gathering information from other groups.

Joe Bartl / LC: The need is there for this group. MLA now has 4 subcommittees that touch on Metadata. There could be a member from each (existing) subcommittee that would specialize in a specific area and be responsible for education and communicating information from the Standards groups.

Matthew Wise: These subcommittee chairs can't take more on. Asked if it were possible to have a member on each subcommittee as the Metadata liaison.

Q: Concerning digital music library projects. MLA should be proactively involved in developing support for these projects. There is a concern for developing standards for the digital music library setting but also using these for instructional aids.

Question to Matthew Wise: Speaker felt that he was still not addressing the idea of BCC/MLA creating standards of our own to bring forth to the various Metadata standard groups. Matthew Wise said many of these groups are not highly organized such as MARBI and it would be difficult to organize.

Q: What is going on at ALA regarding metadata? Discussion: we have no representation on some of these committees. LITA is struggling with this too. ALA is a highly political group and they are having trouble creating liaisons for all these various standards groups as well.

Brad Eden suggested there be an MLA group that standardized the element sets to be used and brought by the liaisons to these different groups, such as Dublin Core.

Power outage occurred (too many neon lights!).

Meeting adjourned.

## **Business Meeting No. 2**

February 21, 2002, 10:30am-12:30pm

**Present:** Matthew Wise, Terry Simpkins, Nancy Lorimer, Kathy Glennan, Paul Cauthen, Michael Colby, Michelle Koth, Susan Vita, Jay Weitz, Beth Tice

**Discussion** began on ALA representative's travel. The procedures manual lists \$75.00 reimbursement; the \$300.00 does not exist in print. Discussion continued on the role of the representative during the ALA meeting. Matthew informed them that the draft is fine covering the need for flexible monies and asking MLA to financially support representatives if MLA needs them to stay longer and/or when the meetings are geographically far. Document will go to the Financial committee. There may be more meetings in the future that need to be attended as well. Does OLAC have a liaison? Nancy Lorimer goes to these meetings. Jay Weitz attends as the OCLC representative. OLAC does work with projects like "authorities guidelines" which includes music, so there is a need to have a MLA supported representative there.

### **1. Discussion of the Music Thesaurus Project**

Mark McKnight not able to present this discussion.

There are still miscellaneous issues that they will continue working on. There is a problem with creating a product. Work now is pushing data around they have not enhanced or changed the data. All data is still owned by Soldier Creek Press. They are nowhere near choosing software.

Q: Are they still working? Once they have finished with form genres and from LC, then they will move to IIMP and RILM headings. It is important to get all headings first then get into product. Obviously it will be a while before there is a thesaurus.

Q: Can we report to MLA or submit a written report to present at the next annual meeting discussing problems and software needed?

Q: What is the point of this thesaurus? Some are still not clear on why we are doing this and what the purpose is. This is similar to FAST, coming up with list of terms in specific categories that will be used for search interface.

There is still an ownership issue. Will Indiana take it over? Copyright claims? Support from IU and the position allows Harriet to continue work, and she doesn't consider this an MLA project. However, she is getting MLA assistance. More discussion followed about the role of this group and it's advisory capacity.

Q: If MLA is allowing room space at conferences, can we ask for a report?

Q: How much are they looking at FAST? They are now concentrating on constructing a super thesaurus. FAST is more than just breaking up subdivisions.

The working group has basically finished its work. They can be discharged and Ralph Hartsock has agreed to be appointed to an advisory group. This working group was started over 5 ½ years ago.

Matthew recommended re-appointment because of the expertise gained from membership. There is some justification because they are working again and have momentum.

## **2. Review of the new meeting format**

One complaint was that there was not enough time for Descriptive and MARC. We could have different pairings at a later date. Format could be submitted as 2 collective subcommittee meetings, but will need to get indexed better because it is hard to assign names. Another comment received supported this new format because of the overlapping issues. "Integrating resources" topic is one obvious overlap. However there is so much happening, can the meeting be longer? One solution would be to dump the reports and just concentrate on the issues. If this happens there will be a need to announce when BCC reports are on website to all groups. Possible schedule could have one 3 hour BCC in morning and one 3 hour in the afternoon. Matthew will ask for the 6 hours.

## **3. More discussion of metadata**

Should we create a 5<sup>th</sup> subcommittee chair who may or may not get travel funding? There could be flexible membership with certain named members who would liaison to top standards; other members would fill in cracks.

Q: Do we need an LC Metadata liaison?

Jim Cassaro suggested that we just need to defend a proposal and write a charge, as there is not a metadata group in place.

Q: Is the liaison coming from existing subcommittees? If so, they would not be able to match up to particular standards. The chair would be a BCC member and report to BCC. This chair would call on expertise. This group would serve 2 functions. 1) We need to get people out there and we also need to get information back. This kind of information could be presented through the chairs and through the BCC website. 2) We need to standardize metadata elements. Can we create a task force similar to the Automation Requirements task force, consisting of metadata members and others.

Q: Some subcommittee members may want to switch to metadata group and how will that work logistically? Interested parties may not be coming from cataloging areas or positions. We should try to balance and represent all areas.

Matthew will go forward with this structure. The size of the subcommittee should be at least 5 or 6 with an LC liaison, so between 8 or 10 members. Chair can decide exactly how many. The chair should have expertise in one standard as they will be

wearing “2 hats”.

Matthew will put a draft together and send out for comments.

**4. New appointments (Non-voting members are excused)**

Replacements needed for:

- Ann Churukian, Authorities
- Edie Tibbits, Authorities
- Brad Eden, Descriptive Cataloging
- Grace Fitzgerald, Descriptive Cataloging
- Paul Cauthen, MARC Formats (becoming chair)
- Alice LaSota, MARC Formats
- William Walker, MARC Formats
- Mark McKnight, Subject Access (becoming chair)
- Beth Tice, BCC Recording Secretary/Webmaster

Meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Beth Tice

---

*Last updated March 16, 2003*