

## Report of the MARBI Representative to CC:DA Midwinter Meeting 2009\*\*\*

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers to be considered by MARBI at the ALA 2009 Midwinter Conference in Denver, Colorado. The report in its present form is intended for the benefit of CC:DA members at the above conference. Coverage of items of particular interest to CC:DA will be expanded in the final report submitted to the committee following this conference.

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>.

[MARBI Proposals](#)

[RDA Proposals](#)

[RDA Discussion Papers](#)

**Proposal No. 2009-02:** Definition of new codes for legal deposits in 008/07 (Method of Acquisition) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format

**Source:** Biblioteca Nacional de España

**Summary:** This paper proposes defining new codes for legal deposits in 008/07 (Method of Acquisition) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper 2008-06](#) (June 2008)

**Discussion:** The definition of code d will be clarified as type of deposit unspecified, including legal deposit and other depository programs. Code l (letter L) will be added for legal deposit for those institutions which require that level of granularity. Code v was not approved; depository program will go under code d.

**MARBI action taken:** Approved, with the amendments noted above.

**Proposal 2009-03:** Definition of Field 080 in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**Source:** Biblioteca Nacional de España

**Summary:** This paper proposes adding Field 080 to the MARC 21 Authority Format to contain a Universal Decimal Classification Number to be used for name, series and subject records.

**Related MARBI Documents:** None

**MARBI action taken:** Approved.

**Proposal 2009-04:** Addition of Codes for Map Projections in 008/22-23 (Maps) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**Source:** Národní knihovny České republiky (National Library of the Czech Republic)

**Summary:** This paper proposes adding two new codes in 008/22-23 (Projection) to the Bibliographic Format (Maps)

**Related MARBI Documents:** None

**MARBI action taken:** Approved.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP02:** Definition of field 588 for Metadata control note

**Source:** CONSER

**Summary:** This paper proposes a new field 588 for information useful for administrative or record management metadata.

**Related MARBI Documents:** None

**Discussion:** In general there was support for adding the field, but more work is needed on the scope and structure. Suggestions included defining an indicator value which would say whether the note should be displayed or suppressed, adding more subfields, perhaps including \$i for introductory text or indicators for types of notes, adding \$5, and changing the name of the field. Ideas will be discussed with the aim of coming back with a proposal at ALA Annual, 2009.

**MARBI action taken:** The paper will come back as a proposal for 2009 ALA Annual.

**Proposal No. 2009-05:** Adding subfield \$u for Uniform Resource Identifier to field 510 (Citation/References note) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

**Source:** Bibliographic Standards Committee, ALA/ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section

**Summary:** This paper proposes adding subfield \$u (Uniform Resource Identifier) to the field 510 (Citation/References note) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format in order to provide an active link and immediate online access to a full description of the bibliography cited.

**Related MARBI Documents:** None

**Discussion:** The 510 field is used for citing standard bibliographies (in print or electronic form) and abstracting and indexing services that cover the item being described. This proposal focused chiefly on the former, but will include examples for other types of material in the published version. During the discussion, it was agreed that the positioning of the \$u field is significant; it should follow whatever subfield it references (for example, if the URL points to a description of the resource, it should follow the \$a, while if the URL points to an entry within the bibliography or database, it should follow the \$c).

**MARBI action taken:** Approved with the understanding that there would be some more examples that are not rare books and some instructions about positioning added.

**[Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP03:](#)** Changing field 257 (Country of producing entity for archival films) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to include non-archival materials

**Source:** Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Cataloging Policy Committee

**Summary:** This paper suggests broadening the use of field 257 (Country of producing entity for archival films) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to include non-archival materials by renaming it Country of producing entity. It also proposes removing non-repeatable (NR) restrictions on field 257 and field 257 subfield \$a. Additionally, it recommends adding subfield \$2 (Source) to be able to indicate a controlled list of terms from which information has been taken.

**Related MARBI Documents:** None

**MARBI action taken:** The committee agreed that this could be brought forward as a proposal.

### **RDA Proposals**

**[Proposal No. 2009-01/1:](#)** New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes new data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format that are needed to support RDA detail with respect to dates, places and several other elements associated with the entity for which the record was made.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper No. 2008-04](#) (December 2007); [MARC Proposal No. 2008-05/1](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/2](#) (June 2008)

**MARBI action taken:** Approved as amended. Proposed new data elements:

- 046 - Coded dates. Approved with the following changes: a subfield will be added for source of information and \$u added for link to a source of information.
- 621 - Associated place. Approved with the following changes: \$d dropped, subfields added for start period and end period (\$o and \$p were approved by MARBI but because of a conflict in field 270 Address field, it was later decided that \$s and \$t will be used), \$0 added for linking to another authority record, a subfield will be added for source of information, and \$u added for link to a source of information.
- 622 - Address. Approved with the following changes: \$t replaced by \$s and \$t, \$m added for email address, a subfield will be added for source of information, and \$u added.
- 628 - Associated language. Approved with no changes.
- 623 - Field of activity; 624 - affiliation; 625 - occupation. All approved with the following changes: \$d replaced by \$s and \$t subfields added for start period and end period (\$o and \$p were approved by MARBI but because of a conflict in field 270 Address field, it was later decided that \$s and \$t will be used), \$0 added, a subfield will be added for source of information, and \$u added.
- 626 - Gender. Approved with the following changes: \$d replaced by \$s and \$t subfields added for start period and end period (\$o and \$p were approved by MARBI but because of a conflict in field 270 Address field, it was later decided that \$s and \$t will be used), \$0 added, a subfield will be added for source of information, and \$u added.
- 627 - Family information. Approved with the following changes: \$2 added, \$d replaced by \$s and \$t subfields added for start period and end period (\$o and \$p were approved by MARBI but because of a conflict in field 270 Address field, it was later decided that \$s and \$t will be used), \$0 added, a subfield will be added for source of information, and \$u added.

**[Proposal No. 2009-01/2:](#)** New content designation for RDA elements: Content type, Media Type, Carrier Type

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes to establish new content designation for Carrier type and Media type in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. It also proposes to establish new content designation for Content type in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats. Code lists for use in the new fields are proposed. Adjustments to coded data in 007 are proposed.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper No. 2008-04](#) (December 2007); [Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/3](#) (June 2008); [MARC Proposal No. 2008-05/1](#) (June 2008); [MARC Proposal No. 2008-05/3](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper 2009-01/1](#) (December 2008)

**MARBI action taken:** Approved as amended. The committee decided on a few minor revisions in wording. Field 336, content type, approved only for bibliographic and authority formats. Fields 337, media type, and 338, carrier type, approved for bibliographic and holdings formats. In all of these the last sentence about using only terms or codes in input conventions is removed. Coded data in 007 bytes also approved.

**[Proposal No. 2009-01/3:](#)** Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation Records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper proposes defining a new field in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats to identify that the record is for a Work, Expression, or a Manifestation.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper No. 2008-04](#) (December 2007); [Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/1](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper 2008-05/2](#) (June 2008)

**Discussion:** Since RDA is organized around FRBR entities, catalogers would find it helpful to be able to identify which type of entity is involved. This could be done by defining a new field for bibliography and authority formats to identify whether the record is for a work or an expression. The field would be optional. But the idea foundered on the issue of why the field should be defined for both formats (the answer is because not everyone can implement the full relational database required to fully realize a truly FRBRized catalog, so the option to use the bibliographic record has to be left open). There was also the question of record maintenance-- when a work suddenly acquires new expressions, who goes to the authority record and creates records for the expression(s) it has whelped? It was eventually agreed not to pursue the definition of a field for this purpose, until there is more guidance from JSC on implementation.

**MARBI action taken:** Rejected. Participants felt that adding the data element was not vital to the initial implementation of RDA and may make it more confusing in the current scenario 2

environment. If experimenters feel the need to indicate this explicitly, a local field could be used.

### **RDA Discussion Papers**

**[Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/1](#)**: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper explores the use of URIs for controlled values in MARC records to accommodate RDA descriptions. It considers using a URI in place of or in addition to the value in a number of fields in the format where controlled vocabularies are used. It suggests either encoding the data in a new subfield \$0 that would be defined in all applicable fields or reusing the existing subfield that would be used for the data in another form, and allowing the URI to be self-defining as such.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper No.2008-05/2](#) (June 2008); [Proposal No. 2008-05/3](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper No. 2008-05/1](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/3](#) (June 2008)

**MARBI action taken:** The committee decided to move this discussion paper forward as a proposal using subfield 1 (the number one). A mechanism will be established if it applies to more than one subfield in the field.

**[Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/2](#)**: Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K

**Source:** RDA/MARC Working Group

**Summary:** This paper summarizes the issues involved in accommodating RDA Appendices J and K in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats.

**Related MARBI Documents:** [Discussion Paper No.2008-05/1](#) (June 2008); [Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/1](#) (December 2008)

**MARBI action taken:** The committee decided not to proceed until there is a final text for these appendices since they are still seriously being worked on. It may come back as another discussion paper or it may come back as a proposal for ALA Annual 2009.

Everett Allgood,  
MARBI Representative to CC:DA