

**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 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 at the ALA 2014 MidWinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2014 ALA MidWinter Meeting on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2014\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2014_age.html)

Executive Summary:

Three proposals and four discussion papers presented. Proposals 1-3 passed. Discussion papers 1-3 will likely return as proposals. Discussion paper will likely not return as a proposal.

Narrative:

**From the Chair:** By way of review, in light of the recent transition from the arrangements under MARBI, the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) advises the MARC Steering Group comprised of LC, LAC, BL, DNB. Under the new arrangement, rather than solely being participants in discussion, members of the MAC will now vote on the actions of the committee. Also, with loss of an ALA appointed intern, minutes will be more concise, recording the actions of the committee but not the full dialogue of its deliberations.

**LC Report:** Update 17 released; discontinuing the PDF version of the Concise, owing to the small number of downloads performed. It is still available in HTML format.

**Proposal 2014-01** would create two indicator values for the first indicator of field 588 – value 0 and 1 to generate print constants for the prevalent notes “Description based on,” “Latest issue consulted,” and their RDA equivalents. The value ‘blank’ remains for other uses, where explicit leading text can be input. This proposal passed.

**Proposal 2014-02** would make subfield c (\$c) for Location of Meeting in the X10 and X11 fields repeatable. There was discussion about transitioning from the conjunction “and” to semicolons, and explicitly or programmatically addressing the presence of semicolons in bibliographic headings and authority records. This proposal passed.

**Proposal 2014-03** would rename and redefine field 347 subfield f (347 \$f) from transmission speed to encoded bitrate, to correct a misnomer in the original RDA element, and to expand the scope beyond strictly audio and visual resources. This proposal passed.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP01** explored whether and how to indicate that the resource described in a preliminary record was not subsequently published. The suggested mechanism was rejected, other options were explored, including the existing 366 field, and philosophical discussions took place. This discussion paper will likely return as a proposal, leveraging field 366 and a new code for LDR/05.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP02** explored how to establish relationships between headings arising from different thesauri. Mechanisms were discussed. This discussion paper will likely return as a proposal, along the lines of the Discussion Paper.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP03** explored the development of subfield g (\$g) for Miscellaneous information in subject and geographic fields in the Bibliographic and Authority formats (fields 650/150; 651/151). This information is usually of the nature of qualifiers, which the German cataloging community, represented by the DNB, codes in a separate subfield. There was general support for the intent of the discussion paper, although there was acknowledgement that this approach was not generally taken by the LCSH community. This discussion paper will likely return as a proposal along the lines of the Discussion Paper.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP04** explored options for improving the user-friendliness of RDA's relationship designators. Acknowledgement that neither solution is optimal: solution 1 is convenient but loses data, solution 2 options are klunky. JSC is focusing work in 2014 in resolving the issue of the user unfriendliness of the current terms. Gordon Dunsire recommends option 1 in hopes of a more robust solution (within RDA and/or outside of MARC). This discussion paper likely won't return as a proposal, following the first option.

Details:

**Proposal 2014-01:** I Defining Indicator Values for Field 588 Source of Description Note in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-01.html>

**Source:** CONSER/OCLC

**Summary:** This paper proposes defining the first indicator position of the 588 field as a display constant controller to facilitate the correct creation of the captions to the note and enable the data in the field to be treated more as a data element that could be readily mapped to other formats or used for other purposes.

**Related Documents:** [2013-DP05](#)

**MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/25/14 – Discussed by MAC. Determined that the draft documentation could be improved by formulating it along the lines of other fields using print constants, for example the 505. Put to a vote: passed.

**Proposal 2014-02:** Making Subfield \$c Repeatable in Fields X10 and X11 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-02.html>

**Source:** Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM)

**Summary:** Recording multiple location names in relation to conferences is sometimes needed (e.g., RDA 11.13.1.8). Subfield \$c (Location of meeting) is currently not repeatable in fields 110, 111, 610, 611, 710, 711, 810 and 811 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format and fields 110, 111, 410, 411, 510, 511, 710 and 711 of the MARC 21 Authority Format. Catalogers are instructed to record multiple adjacent locations in a single \$c subfield, which does not support optimal machine parsing of the data, potentially impeding identification and retrieval activities.

**Related Documents:****MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/25/14 – Discussed by MAC, particularly with respect to implementation vis-à-vis retention of the conjunction vs. punctuation vs. no punctuation. The necessity of underlying situation of two or more places was questioned, given how data in RDA is recorded as separate elements rather than articulated in the heading/authorized access point. Further discussion about the implications for communities that programmatically insert punctuation rather than explicitly including it, where there is no allowance for this in the authority format. Put to a vote: passed.

**Proposal 2014-03:** Renaming and Redefining 347 \$f (Transmission speed) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-03.html>

**Source:** British Library

**Summary:** This paper proposes renaming and redefining 347 \$f to reflect the changes which have taken place in the equivalent RDA sub-element

**Related Documents:** [2011-08](#)

**MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/26/14 – Discussed by MAC, briefly. Put to a vote: passed.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP01:** Designating Never Published in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp01.html>

**Source:** German National Library

**Summary:** This paper discusses a way to designate in a MARC bibliographic record that a bibliographic resource has never been published.

**Related Documents:** [none]

**MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/3/14 – Revised and reposted.

1/26/14 – Discussed by MAC. BL – use 366 field, which is already developed for this use in ONIX data? (Glennan, if so, then no proposal needed) Questions about indeterminate or questionable publication status. RDA implications for no extant manifestation, but there is a work nonetheless. Other options floated: 263 field with new subfield; LDR/05 with new code. Discussed the ONIX format options. “The archived data as a testament, a tombstone, of an intention” or “Foundation of an expression record for a manifestation that never was.” Will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP02:** Relationships Between Subject Headings from Different Thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority Format

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-dp02.html>

**Source:** German National Library

**Summary:** This paper discusses a way to designate relationships between entries of different thesauri in a MARC authority record.

**Related Documents:** [none]

**MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/3/14 – Revised and reposted.

1/26/14 – Discussed by MAC. Discussed \$w details to determine not an adequate solution (without creating further complications). Will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP03: "Miscellaneous information" in Topical Term and Geographic Name Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp02.html>

**Source:** German National Library

**Summary:** "Miscellaneous information" in Topical Term and Geographic Name Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

**Related Documents:****MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/25/14 – Discussed by MAC. Proposer noted there are additional fields in 502, 505, and 24X where \$g already occurs. John Attig observed that not generally used as part of (LCSH) headings; there are implication for coding practices. This presents a problem with ISO/MARC (as opposed to MARCXML), where the data under consideration corresponds to a variety of types of information, but there is a general lack of unassigned subfields remaining to address this across the format. There was general consensus on the merit of the addressing the issue, and acknowledgement that no better solution was available. This will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2014-DP04: Recording RDA Relationship Designators in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

**URL:** <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp03.html>

**Source:** Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM)

**Summary:** This paper presents options for recording RDA relationship designators in the Bibliographic and Authority formats to ensure that user-friendly versions of the designators will be available for public display.

**Related Documents:** [2009-DP01/2](#); [2013-DP04](#)

**MAC Action taken:**

12/20/13 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/26/14 – Discussed by MAC. Acknowledgement that neither solution is optimal: solution 1 is convenient but loses data, solution 2 options are klunky. JSC is focusing work in 2014 in resolving the issue of the user unfriendliness of the current terms. Gordon Dunsire recommends option 1 in hopes of a more robust solution (within RDA and/or outside of MARC). This discussion paper likely won't return as a proposal, following the first option.

**Other Reports:**

By way of review, in light of the recent transition from the arrangements under MARBI, the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) advises the MARC Steering Group comprised of LC, LAC, BL, DNB. Under the new arrangement, rather than solely being participants in discussion, members of the MAC will now vote on the actions of the committee. Also, with loss of an ALA appointed intern, minutes will be more concise, recording the actions of the committee but not the full dialogue of its deliberations.

**Business Meeting:**

**LC Report:** Update 17 released; discontinuing the PDF version of the Concise, owing to the small number of downloads performed. It is still available in HTML format.