

**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 2015 Annual Conference in San Francisco, California.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2015 ALA Annual Conference on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2015_age.html

Executive Summary:

Three proposals, one discussion paper, and one “informal discussion paper” presented. All three proposals passed. The formal discussion paper will return as a proposal. The informal discussion paper occasioned discussion about the current and possible future formatting of subfield 0 (\$0), with guidance that short-term actions would concern policy and surveying current practices better handled through PCC for whom the paper was initially written, and other similar bodies.

Narrative:

From the Chair: The next meetings will be held January 9 & 10, 2016 in Boston.

LC Report: The most recent update and Tech Notices have been released.

Other Reports: The DNB reports that 5-10 proposals will be presented at Midwinter 2016 to bring forward several elements they believe to be generally useful that were developed locally as the GND has been incorporating entries from multiple countries.

Proposal 2015-07 would add subfield 0 (\$0) to MARC fields 336, 337, 338 in the Bibliographic format and field 336 in the Authority format, to allow recording of URIs for the controlled vocabulary terms in these fields. This proposal passed, with a minor amendment to extend it to fields 337 & 338 in the Holdings format.

Proposal 2015-08 would add new MARC field 348 to the Bibliographic and Authority formats, to allow recording the RDA data element, Format of Notated Music. This proposal passed, with minor amendment to incorporate a scoping paragraph addressing repeatability.

Proposal 2015-09 would define subfield w (\$w) to MARC field 670 in the Authority format, to allow recording the associated bibliographic control number for the resource being cited in the field. This proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2015-DP02 explores new values in field 007 of the Bibliographic format to better accommodate digital sound recordings. This discussion paper will return as a proposal, with minor changes as articulated in the committee's discussion.

Informal Discussion Paper "URIs in MARC: A Call for Best Practices" lays out issues, current practices, and proposed guidance for future best practices regarding the recording of URIs in the MARC format. The paper was originally developed for the PCC. The MAC supports its intent to address the concerns it raises, but defers to the PCC for the policy decisions needed to resolve them.

Details:

Proposal 2015-07: Extending the Use of Subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to Encompass Content, Media and Carrier Type

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-07.html>

Source: British Library

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in fields 336, 337 and 338 in the Bibliographic Format and 336 in the Authority Format.

Related Documents: [2009-01/2](#) ; [2011-08](#) ; [2010-06](#)

MAC Action taken:

6/04/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/28/15 – Discussed by MAC. The absence of inclusion of \$0 for the corresponding 337 & 338 fields in the holding format was noted. Proposal amended to address this. Put to a vote: passed, as amended.

Proposal 2015-08: Recording RDA Format of Notated Music in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-08.html>

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Summary: This paper proposes defining new field 348 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats for recording the RDA data element Format of Notated Music.

Related Documents: [2015-DP01](#)

MAC Action taken:

6/04/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/28/15 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion of whether to allow repeatable \$a or require repeated fields for multiple values. Discussion referred to the repeatability of both field and subfield in the 33X fields, as well as the scoping guidance there indicating that the \$a (and \$b) may be repeated, provided they are from the same vocabulary list. Proposal amended to include this (and noted that this is likely a good documentary changes for the 34X fields). Discussion moved on to the contrasting approach via the 655 field. Counterpoints were made that the respective fields addressed different access and descriptive purposes and needs, which different communities might choose implement either or both of the fields as meets their respective needs and using different vocabularies. Put to a vote: passed, as amended.

Proposal 2014-09: Defining 670 \$w (Bibliographic record control number) in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-09.html>

Source: Library of Congress, Policy and Standards Division

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield \$w (Bibliographic record control number) in the 670 field (Source of Data Found) of authority records to contain a bibliographic record control number of the title being cited.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

6/04/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/28/15 – Discussed by MAC. The use of 672, with its existing \$w was suggested as an alternative. The differences between the intents for 670 and 672 were raised, and that 672 wouldn't always suffice and where used would still require a duplicative 670. Put to a vote: passed.

Discussion Paper 2015-DP02: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-dp02.html>

Source: Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM)

Summary: This paper proposes defining new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate digital sound recordings.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

6/04/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/27/15 – Discussed by MAC. There were 6 questions in the discussion paper.

- 1) The definition for the 00 byte, Category of Material, that is, for the ‘s’ code, will be further revised along the lines proposed by the British Library;
- 2) The proposed new value for the 01 byte, Specific Material Designation, further revised to ‘r’ Remote;
- 3) The proposed new value for the 03 byte, Speed, is acceptable as ‘n’ Not applicable, per the Discussion paper;
- 4) The proposed new value of the 10 byte, Material, is acceptable as ‘n’ Not applicable, per the Discussion paper, although there was discussion around the validity of using the ‘u’ Unknown value without adding ‘n’ since the remote resource ostensibly is stored on some medium – this seemed overly pedantic to the group;
- 5) With respect to other needs or codes, discussion posed the need for a further value to address devices like Playaways and USB drives;
- 6) The combo was deemed adequate. Further meta-discussions ensued:
 - a. From the National Library of Australia’s comment about whether a more systematic review was warranted – it would be a good idea, but no one has the resources with which to undertake such an endeavor.
 - b. From the CCDA Liaison, whether resources should continue to be invested in the “muddied” categories and details of the 007, especially since we are developing controlled values within the variable fields to address this information – there is value in continuing to maintain existing data structures until records can be migrated to new structures and frameworks.
 - c. The OCLC liaison noted that the issues presented in the paper find parallels for other media, e.g. video, although the committee will wait for a further discussion paper or proposal to address these.

The discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Informal Discussion Paper: “URIs in MARC: A Call for Best Practices

URL: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fuHvF8bXH7hldY_xJ7f_xn2rP2Dj8o-Ca9jhHghleUg/edit?pli=1

Source: Steve Folsom (Discovery Metadata Librarian, Cornell University)

Summary: This paper lays out issues, current practices, and proposed guidance for future best practices regarding the recording of URIs in the MARC format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

6/04/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/27/15 – Discussed by MAC. The paper was originally developed for PCC and then suggested to be presented to MAC. Background for the use case behind developing the paper. Discussion of dereferencible and non-dereferencible URIs, the digital objects to which they point, and their usage within MARC fields. Ultimately, while supporting the intention of the paper, it was clarified that the MAC only developed the format but did not set policy questions, and that development was not initiated by the MAC but at the response of communities' needs as prompted through proposals. The author of this paper was encouraged to coordinate with PCC (with whom he was meeting immediately following) to explore and articulate policy, to survey current practices, and then to submit proposal(s)

Other Reports: [none]

Business Meeting:

LC Report: Update released on schedule; also, a large Tech Notice was released in last few weeks, regarding source code lists.

Update from DNB: The international participation in the GND authority file is expanding. In the work to date, it has merged 4 files, using MARC to communicate data recorded in the local storage format PICA. This has necessitated the use of some local fields and elements though: regarding both entities and relationships. As the scope of participants and use of the data expand, DNB believes these may be more broadly useful. Several forthcoming developments to the MARC21 format are likely (detailed list enumerated). So, DNB intends to present 5-10 papers for Midwinter 2016.