

**Association for Library Collections and Technical Services  
(A Division of the American Library Association)  
Cataloging and Classification Section**

**Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

**Report of the MARBI Liaison**

**To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

**From: John Myers, MARBI Liaison to CC:DA**

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by MARBI at the ALA 2011 Annual Conference in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Complete text of the MARBI proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available from the MARC Advisory Committee web page: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/marcadvz.html>

**Proposal 2011-02:** RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-02.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes two options to allow for separate statements for production, publication, distribution and manufacture in the Bibliographic format. Option 1 is to define one field 264 with an indicator that designates the function being recorded in the field. Option 2 proposed 4 separate fields for each function. Included is a discussion of coding in the 008 date positions.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP01](#)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This is submitted in order to support the more specific granularity of Production, Publication, Distribution, and Manufacture Statements in RDA. Alternatives from the Canadian Committee on Cataloging and from the MARBI meeting were considered. Concern regarding indexing and display issues when this data is recorded in multiple fields was raised, but then realized to already be an issue with previous change making field 260 repeatable and sequencible. An

informal straw poll heavily favored option 1 of using a single new field with indicator values to address whether production, publication, distribution, or manufacture data was recorded in the specific instance of the field. This proposal is closely tied to 2011-03 for Encoding Date of Copyright Notice, which was discussed in conjunction with it.

6/26/2011 – Continued discussion at MARBI

Following along the lines of the solution offered by the Canadian Committee on Cataloging, an amendment was made to incorporate Date of Copyright Notice into Option 1, with the appropriate addition of Copyright to the name of the field, adding an additional indicator value, resequencing the indicators to put Copyright before Manufacture, and add Copyright to the definition of \$c.

Final action: Approved as amended.

**Proposal 2011-03:** Encoding Date of Copyright Notice in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-03.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes adding a new field to the Bibliographic format for Date of copyright notice. It presents two options: adding separate subfields for copyright and phonogram dates or adding one subfield for either of these.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP01](#), [2008-DP05/4](#)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This is submitted in order to support RDA specifying the date of copyright as a separate element, distinct from date of publication, production, distribution, or manufacture. There was discussion regarding the ability to use this field for machine processing, but given the flexibility of RDA regarding the format of the date data, it was recognized that this is strictly a recording function. Concerns of the Canadian Committee on Cataloging regarding the sequencing with respect to date of manufacture were considered but ultimately the point was raised that all dates could be recorded, beyond those instances where copyright date would be a core element. There was general agreement that \$a was a problematic break with the recording of dates in other areas of MARC, with \$c, and possibly \$p for Option 2, offered as a better solution. Issues regarding the ability to present the phonogram symbol when it wasn't provided (as in Options 1 & 2) were raised. Modifications to Option 3 were offered, that would offer the ability to parse the data in a more RDF style "predicate-object" format, with the type of date in a \$i and the actual date in a \$c.

6/26/2011 – Continued discussion at MARBI

Final action: Moved to Proposal 2011-02.

**Proposal 2011-04:** Adapting Field 377 (Associated Language) for Language of Expression in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-04.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This proposal suggests adapting the definition of field 377 in the Authority format to include Language of expression, and adding it to the Bibliographic format.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP02](#); [2009-01/1](#); [2008-DP05/2](#)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

Currently, field 377 is only authorized for the language of a person or corporate body. It is desirable to expand the usage to include families and expressions.

Option 1 left the subfield structure unchanged. Option 2 added a \$b to provide for recording a language term. Discussion indicated that the language term subfield proposed for \$b might be better recorded in a \$l.

Final action: Approved Option 2 as amended with \$l.

**Proposal 2011-05:** Broadening field 373 (Affiliation) for Associated institutions in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-05.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This proposal suggests broadening the definition of field 373 to include not only the affiliation for a person but also any institution associated with the entity described.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP02](#) (Section 2.2)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

Currently, field 373 addressed affiliation. It is desirable to include association with other groups (but not families). It was noted that these groups need not be formally corporate.

Final action: Determined to be a documentary change requiring no formal approval by MARBI.

**Proposal 2011-06:** RDA Fuller Form of Personal Name Attribute in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-06.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes to establish a new field, 378, in the MARC 21 Authority Format for the fuller form of a personal name.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP02](#) (Section 2.3)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

Several discussion threads regarding the name of the field, its applicability to name forms in field 400 and how to link a given fuller form to the appropriate field 400, and its utility for machine processing to add to the previously established name heading forms. These issues were ultimately disregarded in favor of making it specifically applicable only to the preferred name form found in field 100. Since the data recorded in this field had the potential to be added to the preferred name form in a \$q, it was felt desirable to amend the proposal to change the basic subfield from \$a to \$q.

Final action: Approved as amended.

**Proposal 2011-07:** Additional Corporate Body Attributes for RDA in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-07.html>

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes to establish a new field, 368, in the MARC 21 Authority Format for additional attributes of corporate bodies that are identified in RDA.

**Related Documents:** [2011-DP02](#) (Section 2.4)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

Two questions were raised, was the proposal appropriately granular (yes), and what was

preferable, Option 1 or 2? Option 1 differentiated between the types of “Other Corporate Body Attributes” by using indicator values; Option 2 differentiated them by using subfields.

Final Action: Approve Option 2 as written.

**Proposal 2011-08:** Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Characteristics in RDA in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-08.html>

**Source:** LC's Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) Directorate

**Summary:** This paper discusses RDA controlled lists of values for carrier characteristics and possible fields and subfields for recording them.

**Related Documents:** [2008-DP05/3](#); [2011-DP04](#)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

There were four potential solutions to be used singly or in combination to address the various issues to be addressed. Discussion indicated that making field 300 \$b repeatable did not meet with favor. Neither did the addition of a \$i to field 500 to specify the nature of the contents of the field when the note applied to Carrier Characteristics (and possibly other similar specifying of content). The additions to field 340 were acceptable for incorporating print carrier characteristics. There were two options for addressing the other carrier characteristics: the first to break them up into four separate fields to hold sound, projection, video, and digital characteristics respectively; or the second to hold them all of the added characteristics into one field.. The four field solution was favored. The addition of \$0, \$6, and \$8 to existing field 340 and the four proposed fields 344-347 was amended to the proposal.

Final action: Approve use of additional subfields to field 340, addition of fields 344-347 to the format, and addition of subfields \$0, \$6, and \$8 to all five fields.

**Proposal 2011-09:** Identifying the Source of Thematic Index Numbers in Field 383 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-09.html>

**Source:** Music Library Association

**Summary:** This paper proposes the addition of subfields \$d (Thematic index citation code), \$e (Publisher associated with serial or opus number) and \$2 (Source code) in field 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work)

**Related Documents:** [2010-04](#) (Section 3.5)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

RDA increased the granularity of music information, the proposed subfields support that increased granularity.

Minor editorial changes were received from the Canadian Committee on Cataloging and incorporated into the proposal. An additional editorial change was made to the name and definition of \$d.

Final action: Approved as amended for the editorial changes.

**Proposal 2011-10:** Geographic Codes in the MARC 21 Classification Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-10.html>

**Source:** Dewey Editorial Team

**Summary:** This paper proposes defining fields 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) and field 043 (Geographic Area Code) in the MARC 21 Classification Format to describe geographic headings

**Related Documents:**

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This is submitted in order to support improved linking and presentation of geographic data within the Classification Format. Sally McCallum asked if the incorporation of the \$0 subfield for linking data would be helpful. A \$0 subfield was amended to the proposal.

6/25/2011 – Approved as amended at MARBI.

**Proposal 2011-11:** Addition of 1st Indicator Value 7 (Other edition specified in \$2) in DDC Number Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority and Community Information Formats

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-11.html>

**Source:** Dewey Editorial Team

**Summary:** This paper proposes adding first indicator value 7 (Other edition specified in \$2) to Dewey Decimal Classification number fields in the Bibliographic format, the Authority format

and the Community Information format. This will allow values other than the ones defined (full and abridged).

**Related Documents:**

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This is submitted in order to support the use of DDC editions outside the standard full and abridged editions. For instance, the Norwegians have a full edition with an independent edition history.

6/25/2011 – Approved as written at MARBI.

**Proposal 2011-12:** Defining Subfield \$q for an Assigning Agency in Field 084 (Other Classification Number) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-12.html>

**Source:** German National Library

**Summary:** This paper proposes to define a new subfield in field 084 "Other Classification Number" to designate an agency that assigned a classification number.

**Related Documents:**

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This is submitted in order to support slight differences in classification practices/selection between major classification projects/efforts in Germany, although it could have wider applicability. It follows the model of using \$q in fields 082 and 083.

6/25/2011 – Approved as written by MARBI.

**Discussion Paper 2011-DP05:** Additional Means of Identifying Medium of Performance in the MARC21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp05.html>

**Source:** Music Library Association

**Summary:** This paper explores options in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for more specific encoding for medium of performance, especially medium of performance data

currently recorded in subject headings.

**Related Documents:** [2010-04](#)

**MARBI Action taken:**

5/27/2011 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/2011 – Discussed at MARBI

This discussion paper emerged from evolving understanding of the formulation of genre headings, and the application of those new understandings to the effort to develop genre headings for music. Basically, numerous existing subject headings that could be used to address genre are composed of a form term with medium of performance information. This medium of performance information is considered out of scope for genre headings. A new place to record this valuable information is required. The discussion paper raised the questions of which field(s) to use between the bibliographic and authority formats and what mechanisms should be used in the field to convey the needed information? Issues to address these questions revolve around grouping, indexing, and displaying of the data. Despite the “moving target” nature of genre headings, MLA would like sufficient feedback in order to return with a proposal.

The paper offered three prospective solutions: use of field 048 (currently in bibliographic, to be added to authority), use of field 382 (currently in both bibliographic and authority), use of a 6XX field (in bibliographic, with no analogue in authority). Discussion narrowed the potential solutions to the latter two. The mechanisms, that is, the subfields discussed in the paper largely met with favor, provided the subfields for medium of performance and number of performance were tightly coupled, and that extra thought was given to the treatment of individual instruments/voices vs. ensembles and some of the other musically more technical aspects of the medium of performance.

An additional factor for consideration is the use of Medium of Performance as an RDA element. This use is two-fold: as an element associated with the basic description of a musical work and as a potential element to differentiate between otherwise similar works. Is it possible and desirable to record Medium of Performance in a single place in the MARC 21 format for use in the dual contexts of RDA description and genre?

Lastly, evolving approaches to both contexts and to machine processing of this information leads to the issue of resolving formulation of the data with respect to singular and plural forms.

Action: Discussion will continue via the MARC discussion list and the BCC website to facilitate development of a proposal, hopefully in time for consideration at Midwinter.

**Report on the RDA/MARC WG discussion of Identifying Identity Types in MARC Records**

The RDA/MARC WG discussed the issues and points raised by Discussion Paper 2011-DP03, with the intention of presenting a proposal for ALA Annual 2011. The idea of denoting an identity type in a given MARC record has been discussed before but has not previously met with



favor. After lengthy discussions, the WG did not feel they could adequately address the issues to prepare a proposal with a realistic chance of passage. Rather than have such a proposal rejected outright, or burden the committee with another discussion paper, they summarized their discussions in hopes of laying the groundwork for further efforts.

Basically there were two approaches, the Strict Entity Type and the Loose Entity Type definitions.

The Strict Entity Type definition would allow record validation against the elements specific to a given entity level. This runs into problems though since not all of the required elements are available to the Authority Format and so many legacy records and practice in the Bibliographic Format have elements from more than one entity level.

The Loose Entity Type definition avoids this problem but at the cost of formally effecting a mechanism of limited utility. Given the rapid evolution of standards and practice, it was viewed as undesirable to lock the formats into this configuration when a better approach may emerge later.

#### **Other Reports:**

LC is relying heavily on the online updates and is not printing much anymore for the MARC 21 documentation, with the exception of the Concise version. There have been numerous requests for the ability to “print gracefully” from the web and this is being implemented, first for those sections being updated and eventually for the entire documentation.

Update 12 has been issued (in printable format) and Update 13 will be available shortly after ALA. The Concise for Bibliographic/Authority/Holdings formats will be issued in October, incorporating Updates 12 & 13.

Work continues on the Id.Loc.Gov site, with a richer format for code lists. They are migrating the platform, which shouldn't present any visible changes to the presentation of the current information but will offer better linking functionality and include names.

LC has launched the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative, see [www.loc.gov/marc/transition](http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition) for details and from there subscribe to the new BibFrame list for ongoing discussion. At this point, things are very preliminary, with efforts focusing on organizational, outreach, and communication strategies for advancing the initiative.

#### **Business Meeting:**

The business meeting focused on how MARBI and the MARC Advisory Group would respond to and have a role in the efforts of the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative. MARBI's meetings have largely been subsumed under the task of the MARC Advisory Group although its efforts have included sponsoring programming in the past. Moving forward, it was envisioned that the MARC Advisory Group would want to focus on the import on and crosswalks between MARC and the “what comes next” standard. Given MARBI's more general charge, it is likely

that it could have a role in developing “what comes next” and in the conversations leading to that determination. It is conceivable that MARBI will need to be reconfigured to address this wider engagement in machine readable initiatives. The allocation of agenda time to the two foci of efforts will need to be worked out, with the emergence of a time slot specific to MARBI’s discussions beyond MARC being necessary. Possible use of this time would be the presentation of white papers not specific to MARC, presentations regarding non-MARC “systems”, and considering specific components for non-MARC systems such as RDF. It was noted that interesting presentations for such mechanisms often take place at the same time as MARBI meetings, creating challenging scheduling conflicts.