CORE
(A Division of the American Library Association)
Metadata and Collections Section

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

Report of the MAC Liaison

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: John Myers, CC:DA Liaison to MAC

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by the MAC during virtual meetings scheduled on June 28-29, 2022.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the summer 2022 virtual MAC meetings on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2022_age.html

Executive Summary:

Two proposals and six discussion papers were taken up. The two proposals passed with minor amendments. Four of the discussion papers are anticipated to return as proposals, while two others seem to warrant further exploration in subsequent discussion papers.

Narrative:

From the Chair: The Chair opened each session with careful instructions regarding the logistics of holding the meeting virtually – how to signal to be recognized, how voting would be conducted, and a request for brevity.

There were two fast-track proposals submitted and approved since the last meeting: one to add subfields $i and $4 to field 373 of the authority format, and one to add subfield $5 to field 788.

Business Meeting: The Library of Congress distributed a report on the future treatment of title authorities, namely the possibility of migrating them to the bibliographic format. Essentially, existing title authority records would be converted to "title hubs" in the bibliographic format which could then be mapped to BibHub records in BibFrame. This engendered some discussion by the committee as the implications and dynamics for particular use cases were raised.
LC Report: MARC Update 33 published in November 2020, so users can now implement those changes.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2022-07 would further modify field 856 to accommodate coding for constituent parts of the resource described, namely by adding second indicator value 3 for constituent part of the resource described and second indicator value 4 for constituent part of a version of the resource described.

Pre-meeting comments were generally favorable with some concerns about implementation, with additional clarification desired regarding the terminology "as a whole" and "online." Meeting discussion took up those comments.

Proposal was approved with amendments to substitute "remote electronic" for "online," to remove "literal" where it appears in the revised text, and to move the examples for the sections on second indicator value 2 and the subfield $3.

Proposal 2022-08 would further modify field 856 to phoenix subfields $g and $h (that is, redefine these previously deprecated subfields to a new purpose). To that end $g would be defined for recording persistent IRIs (URNs and URIs), while $h would be defined for recording non-functioning URLs. Subfield $u would be revised for general repeatability.

Pre-meeting comments were generally favorable, although not without concerns warranting further development. Meeting discussion delved into the difference between URLs and IRIs/PIDs – addresses versus identifiers – and to what extent catalogers in the field would be able to properly distinguish them so as to record them in the respective subfield. Various dynamics for repeatability of individual subfields were taken up. In general, the solution would be to move guidance on when and how to deploy repeated subfields to the General Guidelines for field 856.

The proposal was approved with amendments to specify the inclusion of a pointer to revised General Guidelines and to change the text "up to date" to "codes taken from"

Discussion Paper 2022-DP06 explores a mechanism for recording Electronic Archive location and access. To that end, it articulates the development of a new field, field 857, roughly parallel to the existing field 856.

Pre-meeting comments were divergent, with several significant issues raised. These were picked up in the committee's deliberations. One early concern was the potential applicability of non-URL modes of access (such as FTP). These could be addressed via indicator values as is done in field 856. Considerable deliberation was engendered by the question of whether the use case was sufficiently widespread to warrant development of a new field at all. In response, it was pointed out that institutional repositories are integrating resources under RDA, which would be a not insignificant category of resources of potential concern. A further observation was made about the challenge of reliably identifying a repository and the place of commercial collections in this use case. The point was raised that some of the subfields under consideration for field 857 are

roughly analogous to counterparts in field 856 but sufficiently different that they would warrant distinct subfields if a solution were to be pursued in field 856, resulting in again filling up the subfield options in field 856. Ultimately, it was pointed out that the question was resolved in favor of a new subfield under the discussion undertaken for 2022-DP02. Discussion turned to the labeling and definition of subfield $e concerning archiving dynamics, namely whether it addressed the date range(s) of the content or of the harvesting action. This was clarified to specify the date range(s) of the content. This then raised the question of the date range of publication of the content or the date span of the subject matter addressed by the content. This was clarified to concern the publication date(s) of the content. A suggestion was made to deploy the "coverage/coverage dates" terminology from the continuing resources cataloging community. There were additional comments regarding what subfield $e should and would encompass. An additional subfield, possibly a subfield $f, was suggested for the other use case(s) under discussion. The closing discussion concerned the dynamics between subfields $c and $d for Name of Archiving Agency and Name of Web Archive. It was agreed that the potential for divergence over time between these two elements was possible and so distinct subfields to record them were warranted.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2022-DP07 explores a mechanism for individually coding the language dynamics for the constituent parts of a composite resource. To that end, it develops subfield $3 to be added to field 041, with field 041 being made generally repeatable (it is currently only repeatable in order to record language coding for separate schema).

Pre-meeting comments were generally supportive, but with a few dissents and concerns. These were sufficiently articulated in the pre-meeting comments for the authors' purposes in moving forward. Committee discussion focused on the scope and range of the provided examples, with a call for articulation of further use cases and examples beyond those primarily focusing on audio-visual resources.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2022-DP08 explores a mechanism for recording URIs in what are nominally uncontrolled fields 653 and 720. It argues that content strings that are uncontrolled from the perspective of formal thesauri (e.g. LC NAF and LC SAF) could still have associated URIs in other contexts (e.g. WikiData). To the end of recording such URIs, it proposes adding subfields $0 and $1 to these fields for use analogous to deployment in fields under thesaurus control.

Pre-meeting comments were generally supportive, but with a desire expressed for clarity around the definition of "uncontrolled" and a few other details to be addressed further. In response, the use case of having partial data available in a non-thesaurus source, but not sufficient data to develop a controlled heading. This solution would bridge that gap to point to what source is available. A concern was raised about the instability of WikiData entries to which the reply was made that the labels in WikiData could change but the URIs should be stable. There were further discussions of how the control subfield $0 should be formatted and the utility of subfield $2 for

recording the source of other standard numbers. The subfield $2 discussion ultimately resulted in a straw poll that yielded results in favor of its inclusion.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2022-DP09 explores a mechanism for recording standardized/formatted provenance information in the bibliographic, holdings, and authority formats. To that end, it explores several options, including: 1) doing nothing, 2) using the $8 linkage subfield to connect the existing field 561 to various other fields (for example, 655, 700, 755) in which the necessary formatted data could be recorded, 3) adding a new subfield to field 561 to record the formatted data, or 4) adding an entirely new field (possibly field 361) to record the formatted data.

Pre-meeting comments were generally supportive of the use case but there was no consensus on the mechanism. There was consensus that terminology reflective of "custodial history" was preferable to the "provenance" language in the discussion paper that closely mirrored what is in the current field 561. The authors rearticulated a need for a triple statement of the item in question, the nature of the provenance mark, and the ownership reflected by the provenance. They would prefer to avoid the challenges of structuring such statements in a single subfield and of connecting disparate fields (essentially, rejecting the second and third options). There was productive discussion to explore the dynamics of the various solutions and of expansion of the possibilities within them. There was some debate about the mixing and matching of free-text and structured data within the same field in the context of a linked-data future. This dynamic does appear in some existing fields but it might be preferable to avoid it where possible. The dynamics of the applicability and suitability of implementing in the various formats was taken up. The holding format seemed particularly suitable, provided platform vendors could make the holdings format more functional. A concern about perpetuating cultural biases in this controlled/formatted solution was raised, although ultimately it seemed more of an issue for the underlying authority structures than their utilization in this context. It was pointed out that the granularity of this provenance data was of particular importance to two European cataloging communities (D-A-CH and Spain). To this end, they need something functional at an operative level.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Papers 2022-DP10 and 2022-DP11 explore mechanisms for recording unparsed statements in fields 264 and 490 respectively. To that end, they propose adding a new subfield $s to those fields.

Pre-meeting comments generally conveyed little support for these proposals. Most felt they were a step backwards and did not see why the recently approved field 881 for manifestation statements could not be deployed for this purpose. The primary discussion occurred in the context of DP10. The authors clarified that "unparsed" would more accurately be described as "unsubfielded." The proposed solution drew from BibFrame but was not dependent on it and that RDA supports general, unparsed statements. The argument in the paper against use of field 881 was restated. Committee discussion generally exhibited further resistance to the papers' solutions

– from the utility of current subfielding practice to parse the data in contexts beyond mere keyword, to the ability of systems to parse the existing subfields into appropriately labeled data elements in displays, to the solutions' dependence on the original iteration of the RDA Toolkit (in contrast to the Official RDA Toolkit currently in publication and awaiting wider implementation). There were multiple comments re-iterating the position that relying on ISBD punctuation to eliminate subfielding was counter to the thrust of developing cataloging practice which was favoring subfielding over the use of punctuation. The authors continued to respond to cross purposes on this point. A further discussion occurred concerning transcription versus authorized forms but it was acknowledged that this was out of scope for the question at hand. The authors yield on the point of returning as a proposal in the next round of meetings. This was confirmed by a straw poll that rejected this possibility but a subsequent straw poll favored further development and discussion.

With respect to 2022-DP11, a distinguishing question between the two papers was the deployment of clarifying text. The point was raised that "clarifying text" would just be another mechanism of parsing the data, the elimination of which seemed to be the point of the papers. The response was that the cancelled or incorrect ISSN are distinctly coded in the existing $y and $z. The concern was raised about roundtripping data, with the need for examples of how this currently and would occur. Also desired is input from other communities.

These discussion papers should yield further discussion papers.