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 (Preliminary)

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 2016 Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2016 ALA Midwinter Meeting on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2016_age.html

Executive Summary:

Two proposals and sixteen discussion papers presented. Both proposals passed. Also, one discussion paper was converted to a proposal and passed. Ten discussion papers will return as proposals. Two more will likely return as proposals after significant reworking. Three discussion papers will likely return as reworked discussion papers.

Narrative:

From the Chair: The next meetings will be held June 24 and 26, 2016 in Orlando.

LC Report: Update and Tech notices put out. Work advancing on the Bibframe Pilot.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2016-01 would define new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate digital reproductions of sound recordings. This proposal passed with minor revisions to the definition of sound recording and to the definitions of the codes "not applicable."

Proposal 2016-02 would establish two new subfields within MARC Field 382 (Medium of Performance), one to describe the total number of ensembles and the other to describe the number of solo instruments performing with the ensembles. This proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP01 explores the need for subfields $3 (Materials specified) and $5 (Institution to which field applies) in Field 382 (Medium of Performance) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The definition and deployment of subfields $3 (vs. $8) and $5 were discussed. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP02 explores clarifying four code values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, in order to bring the code values in line with RDA and clarify their use. The treatment of piano scores was raised as a corollary concern. This discussion paper will return as a proposal, with suggestions for addressing piano scores.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP03 explores a need to distinguish music and video recording distributor numbers from music and video recording publisher numbers recorded in MARC field 028 (Publisher Number) and suggests defining a new first indicator 6 for Distributor number to accomplish this. Some concerns expressed about being able to differentiate publisher from distributor numbers, but this will be a matter for best practices. Need to distinguish music from video distributors is not necessary. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP04 explores the definition of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in linking entry fields 760, 762, 765, 767, 770, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 780, 785, 786, 787 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This paper occasioned significant discussion about the use of $0 for subjects/objects and the proposed use for a predicate (relationship). The least worst solution, given expanding types of data to record and limitations on available subfields is to expand the use of $4 to this end. This discussion paper will return as a joint proposal from the BL and the PCC URL TF.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP05 explores expanding the scope of subfield $w (Bibliographic record control number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP06 explores adding $2 (Source of term) and $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to field 753 (System Details Access to Computer Files).. This discussion paper was converted to a proposal, and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP07 explores broadening the usage of field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) to include autonomous regions so that regions with strong film cultures can be used in this field. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP08 explores removing the sentence "Dates contained in subfield $k may not be coded elsewhere in the formats" currently in subfield $k (Beginning or single date created) in field 046 (Special Coded Dates) of the Bibliographic format. There was general support for the intent of the discussion paper. This discussion paper will return as a proposal, with an exploration of its implications for recording dates across the format.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP09 explores options for coding of named events used as subject access points in the MARC Authority and Bibliographic formats. Consensus coalesced around using an X47 field, with subfields. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP10 explores defining field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) (R) for the MARC 21 Holdings Format to contain copy specific technical specification relating to the digital encoding of text, image, audio, video, and other types of data in the resource. Discussion focused on use of $3 (what is typically used) vs. $8 (a preferable solution from a machine standpoint, but one that is not typically supported by current ILSes). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP11 explores coding to indicate the absence of punctuation redundant to field and subfield coding via a Leader position. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP12 explores a way that information about matching two records can be expressed in the MARC Authority format. Discussion about the permanent vs. ephemeral nature of the data to be recorded, particularly with respect to recording that two potential records are confirmed as NOT a match. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP13 explores a way of giving a definition in a MARC Authority record. Consensus was that the paper's underlying assessment that field 680 was restricted in a way to preclude using it to record the definition data was overly restrictive, although some adjustments to the subfields of field 680 may be in order (and possibly of field 678). This discussion paper will likely return as a further discussion paper exploring solutions in these two fields.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP14 explores a way of coding which type of entity is described in a given MARC Authority record. A preference for a variable field solution emerged, and it was suggested that field 072 could be explored to this end. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP15 explores a way of coding the RDA Media Type and Carrier Type in the MARC Authority format. This occasioned substantial discussion about the recording of manifestation level information in the context of a work authority record: this information should be confined to a manifestation/bibliographic record. It was advocated by many that a cataloging agency may need the authority record for a "singletons" (say as a subject), but not possess the singleton in question. So there is no corresponding bibliographic record in the local system. There needs to be a way to record these manifestation characteristics for the original without making it appear that they apply to subsequent manifestations (e.g. reproductions of whatever sort). Discussion did not lead to a clear resolution of the issue. This discussion paper will return as a further discussion paper.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP16 explores a way of extending Leader position 17 - Encoding level in the MARC Authority format. The need of the authoring agency was acknowledged. The concern emerged that the proposed categories had more to do with the "authority" of the agency or agent creating the data than with the encoding level/completeness of the data itself. Field 042

was brought forward as a preferable solution. This discussion paper will return as a further discussion paper, exploring adjustments to field 042 to meet the identified needs – possibly a new subfield for content, development of indicators, and use of $2.

Details:

Proposal 2016-01: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Reproductions of Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-01.html

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Summary: This paper proposes defining new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate digital reproductions of sound recordings. Changes to 007c/01 to better accommodate certain types of commonly used storage devices are also included.

Related Documents: 2015-DP02

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Considered alternative proposals from BIC Metadata Group and MLA for the definition of "sound recording." Accepted the BIC Metadata Group version. Additionally, accepted the addition of "remote" to the definition of 'n' "Not Applicable" under Speed and Kind of material, as proposed by the BIC Metadata Group. Put to a vote. Passed.

Proposal 2016-02: Defining Subfield $r and Subfield $t, and Redefining Subfield $e in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-02.html

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper looks at the need to establish two new subfields within MARC Field 382 (Medium of Performance), one to describe the total number of ensembles and the other to describe the number of solo instruments performing with the ensembles. Also suggests a clarification of the field's existing subfield $e (Number of ensembles).

Related Documents: 2015-06

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Consensus of responses reported. Put to a vote. Passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP01: Defining Subfields $3 and $5 in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp01.html

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This discussion paper presents the need for subfields $3 (Materials specified) and $5 (Institution to which field applies) in Field 382 (Medium of Performance) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: 2012-01

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Lengthy discussion of the appropriateness of using $5 in Example 4. Also discussion of the merits of $3 vs. $8. Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP02: Clarifying Code Values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp02.html

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper presents suggestions for clarifying four code values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, in order to bring the code values in line with RDA and clarify their use.

Related Documents: 2009-01/2; 2012-07; 2013-04

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion focused on piano scores – they are not strictly "other" as they are scores, and other special scores are explicitly provided with codes, e.g. "study score." Should return as a proposal, with the addition of a code for piano scores (possibly 'p').

Discussion Paper 2016-DP03: Recording Distributor Number for Music and Moving Image Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp03.html

Source: Music Library Association (MLA), Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

Summary: This paper examines the need to distinguish music and video recording distributor numbers from music and video recording publisher numbers recorded in MARC field 028 (Publisher Number). It suggests defining a new first indicator 6 for Distributor number to accomplish this. The paper also suggests minor clarifying changes to MARC field 037 (Source of Acquisition) regarding the numbers to be recorded there.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Some concerns raised about the pragmatics of distinguishing between publishers and distributors, but this would largely be a concern of "best practices." Question raised about the need to distinguish between music and video distributors, since there is a distinction between music and video publishers – not needed. Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP04: Extending the Use of Subfield $0 to Encompass Linking Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp04.html

Source: British Library

Summary: This paper discusses the definition of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in linking entry fields 760, 762, 765, 767, 770, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 780, 785, 786, 787 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: 2010-DP02; 2009-06/1; 2010-06; 2011-08; 2015-07

MAC Action taken:
12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. The BL representative summarized a number of concerns raised in preliminary responses. The primary issue is conflating two purposes for the $0 recording both "things – people, etc." and "relationships" – that is, subjects/objects and predicates, in the language of RDF. The value of being able to record $i data in URI form was affirmed. Solution coalesced around $4 as the least problematic. PCC is also doing work on handling of URIs in MARC context. BL and PCC will work together to return a joint proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP05: Expanding the Definition of Subfield $w to Encompass Standard Numbers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp05.html

Source: British Library

Summary: This paper discusses expanding the scope of subfield $w (Bibliographic record control number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats.

Related Documents: 2010-06; 2011-08; 2015-07

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Some further discussion along the lines of that under 2016-DP04. Additional discussion about $0 for "authority" references and $w for "bibliographic" references. Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP06: Define Subfield $2 and Subfield $0 in Field 753 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp06.html

Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC), GAMECIP

Summary: This paper proposes to add $2 (Source of term) and $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to field 753 (System Details Access to Computer Files). Subfield $2 will allow the vocabulary used for the terminology in subfields $a (Make and model of machine) and $c (Operating system) to be documented and the subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) would allow the URI of the vocabulary term to be entered.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Responses were all favorable. The discussion paper was ad hoc converted to a proposal and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP07: Broaden Usage of Field 257 to Include Autonomous Regions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp07.html

Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

Summary: This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) to include autonomous regions so that regions with strong film cultures can be used in this field. This will involve changing the name of the field and changing the field definition and scope.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. A variety of minor concerns raised – general applicability of the field outside the film community, the need to address the caption of both field and $a, the need for respective communities to address "best practices" after the change. There was an in depth explanation of the context for the film cataloging community's work (and the limited current scope of autonomous regions with distinct film making industries). Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP08: Remove Restriction on the Use of Dates in Field 046 $k of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp08.html

Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

Summary: This paper proposes removing the sentence "Dates contained in subfield $k may not be coded elsewhere in the formats" currently in subfield $k (Beginning or single date created) in field 046 (Special Coded Dates) of the Bibliographic format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion of possible historical antecedents for imposing the current restriction. General agreement that the change was warranted. Acknowledgement that changes from card catalog to online environments shift the "how"s, "why"s, and kinds of data to be recorded and where. Should return as a proposal, incorporating an examination of the entire field and subfields for similar issues.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP09: Coding Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp09.html

Source: OCLC

Summary: This discussion paper presents options for coding of named events used as subject access points in the MARC Authority and Bibliographic formats.

Related Documents: 2002-DP03; 2002-13

MAC Action taken:

12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Background from FAST development shared. This will also come into play with anticipated developments in the FRBR-LRM to be release in the next months and its subsequent impact on RDA. Field 072 offered as a possible location of the data or as a source of insight. Consensus coalesced around option 2 (creating an X47 field), and of developing a subfield structure similar to that in the X11 field. The question of the utility of indicator values in X11 was raised, but that would be outside the scope of a proposal to create X47 (where it might have been reasonably included in a proposal along Option 1). Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP10: Defining Field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp10.html

Source: CONSER, Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

Summary: This paper proposes defining field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) (R) for the MARC 21 Holdings Format to contain copy specific technical specification relating to the digital encoding of text, image, audio, video, and other types of data in the resource.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion of utility and appropriateness of $3 vs. $8 usage to connect associated 347 and 856 pairs. Should return as a proposal, incorporating both subfields.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP11: Punctuation in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp11.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explains why libraries from German speaking countries do not provide punctuation when content designation identifies an element sufficiently. It proposes coding to indicate the absence of punctuation redundant to field and subfield coding via a Leader position.

Related Documents: 2010-DP01; 2010-07

MAC Action taken:

12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Clarification that not all punctuation is absent, just that which is redundant to the subfield coding. The possibility raised of differentiating the source of the punctuation convention – this would follow from the 040 $b, trying to avoid the mistake of hardwiring a cataloging standard into the fixed field, such as the 'a' "AACR2" code present for 008/18 in the bibliographic format. Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP12: Designating Matching Information in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp12.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper discusses a way that information about matching two records can be expressed in the MARC Authority format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Diverse opinions in responses and discussion regarding the need to record ephemeral data, and the potential valuable use of recording similar information in the bibliographic format. Field 885 suggested as one available in both formats. While positive matches would result in the data no longer being needed. Confirmed mismatches would benefit from retention of the data (to preclude an endless cycle of queuing the same records as potential matches). Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP13: Designation of a Definition in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp13.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way of giving a definition in a MARC Authority record.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Field 668 as suggested in the DP is not available as it was previously defined but is now obsolete. Field 677 recommended as a alternative, if needed. Discussion then focused on whether the DP was treating field 680 too

restrictively. Further exploration of fields 680 and 678 warranted. Depending on results of that exploration, a proposal to enhance those fields may be forthcoming (or they may serve as currently defined, or 677 may need to be developed).

Discussion Paper 2016-DP14: Designation of the Type of Entity in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp14.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way of coding which type of entity is described in a given MARC Authority record.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/09/16 – Discussed by MAC. Enthusiasm for the concept. Consensus for a variable field solution. Suggestion that field 072 could be adapted to this purpose. Should return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP15: Media Type and Carrier Type in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp15.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way of coding the RDA Media Type and Carrier Type in the MARC Authority format.

Related Documents: 2008-DP04; 2008-05/3; 2009-01/2

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. A challenging discussion without resolution. The Media Type and Carrier Type data typically assigns at the manifestation level, i.e. bibliographic records, where authority records concern works and expressions. For "singletons" there may not be a bibliographic record to support holding this information, either because the item isn't under bibliographic control, locally or otherwise. Some members saw value in parallelism between the bibliographic and authority formats, in line with discussion at a prior meeting about leveraging bibliographic format for work/expression records or the authority format for manifestation records – a possible "entity agnostic future." At present, a mechanism needs to be found for recording this data for the original, without implicitly imposing these values as constraints on reproductions of the singleton. Returned to authors for further work and likely

resubmission as a new discussion paper.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP16: Extending the Encoding Level in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp16.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way of extending Leader position 17 - Encoding level in the MARC Authority format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
  12/09/15 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/10/16 – Discussed by MAC. Strong sentiments by some that this is strictly local data, to be recorded in a local field. Conceptual support from others, although concerns that the proposed categories are too specific with respect to the person doing the work. Comparisons to bibliographic encoding levels, which deal with completeness and field 042, which deals with authoritativeness of the data. Observation that 042 is not repeatable. Returned to authors for further work exploring a solution with 042, dealing with repeatability, possible indicator values, and possible new subfields. Likely to return as a further discussion paper.

Other Reports: [none]

Business Meeting:
LC Report: Update and Tech notices put out. Work advancing on the Bibframe Pilot.