

**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 2016 Annual Conference in Orlando, Florida.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2016 ALA Annual Conference on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2016_age.html

Owing to the briefness of the allotted time for the meetings, and the extensive agenda, committee members were asked to read and respond to the proposals and papers in advance of the meeting. When this was done, comments were posted to the public MARC list. Notations throughout this report of “minimal discussion” are indicative that the committee’s consensus was previously arrived at through the publicly posted comments.

As this dynamic strengthens, I will work to improve the communication stream from CC:DA to MAC through the liaison (that is, me). So rather than attempting to compile a draft-skeletal report before conference, I will forward the MAC agenda and solicit comments. [RSC Representative responded: focus our attention on descriptive aspects, rather than areas where there is other specialized representation at the MAC table.]

Executive Summary:

Eleven proposals and fourteen discussion papers were taken up. Ten proposals passed, one will be reworked and return as a subsequent proposal. Seven discussion papers will return as proposals, five papers were converted to proposals at the table and passed. One will return as a reworked discussion paper. Discussion for one resolved the problem in question through existing MARC structures.

Narrative:

From the Chair: There was no formal report. During discussion of one of the proposals, there was an informal report that the Secretariat would be exploring how to effect “fast track changes” for minor editorial emendation.

LC Report: [no report]

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2016-03 would clarify the use of field 046 \$k (Bibliographic format). This proposal passed, with the understanding that NDMSO would finesse the definitions.

Proposal 2016-04 would expand the use of field 257 to include “autonomous regions” (Bibliographic Format). This proposal didn’t pass. Needs to be reworked to address concerns with the term “autonomous region.”

Proposal 2016-05 would define new X47 fields to provide content specific fields for named events that do not have agency (Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This proposal passed, with the addition of a \$n.

Proposal 2016-06 would add field 347 (Holdings Format). This proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-07 would add \$3 to field 382 (Bibliographic Format). This proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-08 would redefine code values for 008/20 -- Format of Music byte (Bibliographic Format). This proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-09 would add a new 2nd indicator value to field 028 to support recording of Music Distributor number (Bibliographic Format), with adjustments to field 037. This proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-10 would engage LDR/18 to create coding to indicate the absence of ISBD punctuation (Authority Format). This proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-11 would create field 885 to record the algorithmic results of record comparisons for potential matching as duplicates (Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This proposal passed with significant amendments.

Proposal 2016-12 would add field 677 for recording a definition (Authority Format). This proposal passed with amendments.

Proposal 2016-13 would create field 075 to indicate the entity type represented by the record (Authority Format). This proposal passed with amendments.

Proposal 2016-DP17 explores how to record URIs for relationships, through expansion of \$4 (Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This discussion paper [will/won’t] return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP18 explores the removal of (uri) as a qualifier from \$0 data when recording dereferenceable HTTP URIs. This discussion paper was converted to a proposal and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP19 explores the addition of \$0 to fields 257 and 377 (257: Bibliographic Format; 377: Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This discussion paper was converted to a proposal and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP20 explores the means of recording temporary locations with greater granularity in 87X fields (Holdings Format). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP21 explores the addition of \$e and \$4 to field 752 (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper was converted to a proposal with minor amendment and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP22 explores the addition of new \$g to field 340 to record color content (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP23 explores the addition of \$b and \$2 to field 567 to support controlled vocabulary usage to record methodology (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper generated comments that will be passed to the source agency. It likely will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP24 explores a coding value in LDR/18 for the absence of non-ISBD punctuation (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper was converted to a proposal with minor amendment and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP25 explores new mechanisms in LDR/17 and field 042 for additional granularity in recording Encoding Level (Authority). The issues from this discussion paper were resolved with existing MARC structures. This discussion paper won't return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP26 explores options for designating the Romanization scheme used in a record (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper will be reworked as a new discussion paper.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP27 explores the expansion of linking field usage with \$8 (All Formats). This discussion paper was converted to a proposal using its Option 2, and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP28 explores use of a Classification Record Control Number as a link (Bibliographic Format). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP29 explores defining subfields \$i, \$3, and \$4 in field 370 (Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP30 explores defining subfields \$i and \$4 in field 386 (Bibliographic and Authority Formats). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Details:

Proposal 2016-03: Clarify the Definition of Subfield \$k and Expand the Scope of Field 046 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-03.html>

Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

Summary: This paper proposes clarifying the meaning of the sentence “Dates contained in subfield \$k may not be coded elsewhere in the formats” as currently defined in subfield \$k (Beginning or single date created) in field 046 (Special Coded Dates) of the Bibliographic format and making it clear that the dates that are recorded in 008/06-14 may additionally be recorded in 046..

Related Documents: [2016-DP08](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minor editorial clean up desired for the first sentence of the revised definition. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-04: Broaden Usage of Field 257 to Include Autonomous Regions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-04.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: [2016-DP07](#)

STATUS/COMMENTS:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. The term “autonomous regions” is problematic. Exploration at the table of using \$b for region, but ultimately rejected; \$b defeats the need for a high level identification of the region and introduces the undesirable prospect of catalogers specifying at the state/province level. Other efforts to improve the definition by changing to “cultural region” (rejected) and other means to expand the definition beyond just country without explicitly using “autonomous region.” This proposal will return again, reworked to resolve this issue.

Proposal 2016-05: Defining New X47 Fields for Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-05.html>

Source: OCLC

Summary: This paper proposes the establishment of a new X47 series of fields to accommodate coding of named events used as subject access points in the MARC Authority and Bibliographic formats.

Related Documents: [2016-DP09](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Debated the addition of \$n (not presently needed, but foreseeable), and the implications for existing thesauri which treat Events as topical subject terms (it will be up to the communities to retain or change such treatment, with consideration for the costs and benefits of changing the coding). The proposal passed, with the addition of \$n.

Proposal 2016-06: Defining Field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-06.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: [2016-DP10](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minimal discussion. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-07: Defining Subfield \$3 in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-07.html>

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper proposes the need for subfield \$3 (Materials specified) in Field 382

(Medium of Performance) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: [2012-01](#); [2016-DP01](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minimal discussion. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-08: Redefining Code Values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-08.html>

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper presents a proposal to redefine four code values and define one new code value 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](#); [2016-DP02](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minimal discussion. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-09: Recording Distributor Number for Music and Moving Image Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-09.html>

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

Summary: This paper proposes a way to unambiguously record distributor numbers separately from publisher numbers in Field 028 (Publisher Number). At the same time, it proposes changes to language in Field 037 (Source of Acquisition) to clarify language that confused its function with that of Field 028.

Related Documents: [2016-DP03](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Some discussion on the historical use of 1st indicator value 2.
The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-10: Punctuation in the MARC 21 Authority format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-10.html>

Source: German National Library

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

Related Documents: [2010-DP01](#); [2010-07](#); [2016-DP11](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minimal discussion. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2016-11: Designating Matching Information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-11.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way that information about matching two records can be expressed in the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats.

Related Documents: [2016-DP12](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Extensive discussion leading to several amendments: revision to \$a definition, revision to \$c definition, purpose of \$d changed to “Generation Date” (cf field 883, substituting “matching process” for “linking record”), add \$x Not-public note, add \$z Public note. Passed with these amendments.

Proposal 2016-12: Designation of a Definition in the MARC 21 Authority format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-03.html>

Source: German National Library

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

Related Documents: [2016-DP13](#)

MAC Action taken:

6/01/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Definitions revised to those suggested by the British Library in their response. Added \$u. Considered making \$a and \$v non-repeatable, but this change was rejected. Passed as amended (definitions and \$u).

Proposal 2016-13: Designation of the Type of Entity in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-13.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: [2016-DP14](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. The British Library would prefer the less ambiguous word “methods” for the “systems” as found in the proposal; concurrence. They would also prefer \$a and \$b be non-repeatable; concurrence. The addition of \$4 considered briefly but dropped. Some discussions about the dynamics of coding for category and subcategory. Passed with amendments incorporating the British Library’s recommendations.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP17: Redefining Subfield \$4 to Encompass URIs for Relationships in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp17.html>

Source: British Library in consultation with the PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

Summary: British Library in consultation with the PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

Related Documents: [2010-DP02](#) ; [2016-DP04](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Some discussion around the table but general acknowledgement that this is the best solution of the limited options available. This will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP18: Redefining Subfield \$0 to Remove the Use of Parenthetical Prefix "(uri)" in the MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp18.html>

Source: PCC Task Group on URI in MARC in consultation with the British Library

Summary: This paper discusses modifying \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in the Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings formats so that dereferenceable HTTP URIs may be recorded without the parenthetical standard identifier source code prefix code “(uri).”

Related Documents: [2007-06/1](#), [2010-06](#), [2015-07](#), [2016-DP04](#), [2016-DP05](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Brief consideration of making the inclusion of (uri) optional, but this would make an already bad situation worse; the field guidance will have to be explicit that (uri) is deprecated. Discussion about the mechanics of machine action on a URI as a “naked” standard number. Converted to a proposal, incorporating the explicit deprecation of (uri), and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP19: Adding Subfield \$0 to Fields 257 and 377 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format and Field 377 in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp19.html>

Source: PCC URI in MARC Task Group

Summary: This paper proposes adding subfield \$0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to certain fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats that currently do not have subfield \$0 defined. MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: Country of Producing Entity (257) and Associated Language (377). MARC 21 Authority Format: Associated Language (377).

Related Documents: [2016-DP08](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/25/16 – Discussed by MAC. Converted to a proposal and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP20: Recording Temporary Sublocation and Temporary Shelving Location in the MARC 21 Holdings Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp20.html>

Source: OCLC

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of subfield \$k (Temporary sublocation or collection) in the 87x fields (Item Information – General Information) of the MARC 21 Holdings Format and the redefinition of subfield \$l (Temporary location) to specify the temporary shelving location to provide more specificity to the temporary holdings information so that it can be easily identified in machine processing and to allow for its use relative to circulation policies.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minor discussion. This will return as a proposal, configured to incorporate three subfields with parallelism with the three in field 852.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP21: Defining Subfields \$e and \$4 in Field 752 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp21.html>

Source: ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)

Summary: This discussion paper presents the need for subfields \$e (Relator term) and \$4 (Relator code) in Field 752 (Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Considered the use of indicators as in field 264; rejected. Minor editorial modifications from the British Library. Converted to a proposal with those amendments and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP22: Defining a New Subfield in Field 340 to Record Color Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp22.html>

Source: The Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) of The Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA)

Summary: This paper discusses defining a new repeatable subfield in field 340 (Physical Medium) in order to record the color content of resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. British Library recommended making the subfield repeatable for multiple color configurations. An expand definition was requested. Further recommendation that NDMSO liaise with RSC on some details. Will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP23: Adding Subfields \$b and \$2 to Field 567 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp23.html>

Source: National Library of Finland

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfield \$b (Controlled term) and subfield \$2 (Source of term) to field 567 (Methodology Note).

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. There was not a representative from the National Library of Finland present. There was a question whether this could be considered for the Authority format as well. The British Library noted that there is a similar mix of uncontrolled and controlled data recorded in field 518. Contrastingly, the NLM saw a parallel to the separate field approach such as that for fields 300 and 340.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP24: Define a Code to Indicate the Omission of Non-ISBD Punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp24.html>

Source: OCLC and PCC ISBD and MARC Task Group

Summary: This paper discusses the need for an additional code in Leader/18 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to indicate that non-ISBD punctuation has been omitted.

Related Documents: [2010-DP01](#), [2010-07](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Paper amended to retain the current label and definition for code value # [blank]. Converted to a proposal with that amendment and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP25: Extending the Encoding Level in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp25.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a way of extending Leader position 17 - Encoding level in combination with field 042 (Authentication Code) in the MARC Authority format.

Related Documents: [2016-DP16](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Previous comments were taken up focusing on leaving the LDR/17 byte unchanged and solely relying on 042 values. The possibility of having a “master” agency code in \$a, with qualifications to that code in \$b was considered, possibly with \$b values set locally by the agency in \$a. Examining the MARC Authentication Action Code List revealed a mix of agency and qualification values. Adding the seven values desired by DNB to this list would be in keeping with historical practice. The issue is considered resolved.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP26: Designating a Norm or Standard used for Romanization in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp26.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explores options to designate in a bibliographic record which transliteration and Romanization norm or standard has been used during the creation of the record, or during the creation of parts of the record.

Related Documents: [DP100](#); [DP109](#); [DP111](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Recommendation to add a \$0 for a reference to the process recorded in \$a. Initial consensus around Option 3 (incorporating Option 1’s record-level approach and Option 2’s field-level approach). A guest from LC ABA reported that their CJK unit would prefer Option 2 only, due to the potential complexity of mixed scripts. The ISSN liaison provided another perspective that ISSN records use ISO Romanization but LC requires ALA-LC Romanization. Expansion of the proposal to the Authority format was suggested. This was countered with the report that the 880 field deployed in Option 2 was not available in the Authority format.

While conceptual agreement exists for the value of the paper and consensus emerged around Option 2, significant issues remain with the specific implementation. DNB and LC will coordinate to author a new discussion paper.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP27: General Field Linking with Subfield \$8 in the Five MARC 21 Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp27.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper describes the reasons why a general designation of field linking with subfield \$8 (Field link and sequence number) is needed. This applies to subfield \$8 throughout the MARC format, i.e. MARC Bibliographic Data, MARC Authority Data, MARC Holdings Data, MARC Classification Data and MARC Community Information.

Related Documents: [2014-02](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Some discussion of the Options and a straw poll revealed a preference for Option 2. Converted to a proposal with the language of Option 2 and passed.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP28: Using a Classification Record Control Number as a Link in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp28.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explores the options of linking from a MARC Bibliographic record to a MARC Classification record by using the record control number of the MARC Classification record as an identifier.

Related Documents: [2016-DP19](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Comments revealed a preference for Option 1. There was a question whether this would also be an appropriate solution in the Authority format for fields 053 and others. Will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP29: Defining New Subfields \$i, \$3, and \$4 in Field 370 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp29.html>

Source: ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfields \$i (Relationship information), \$3 (Materials specified), and \$4 (Relationship code) to field 370 (Associated Place) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. Subfields \$i and \$4 would be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the relationship of the associated place recorded in the field to the resource being described. Subfield \$3 would be used to indicate that an associated place applies to only a part or portion of the resource.

Related Documents: [2009-01/1](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. The initial discussion paper mixed and matched the caption and definition for \$4 – the contributors want them consistently to refer to “relationship code.” Conceptual agreement with the intent of the paper. A question about \$3 usage for “material” in the context of Work/Expression authority records, but this is standard language for \$3 across the formats. A follow up request for \$3 examples for the Authority format. Another concern about confusing the distinctions between Works/Expressions/Manifestations, but this would be up to policy decisions by cataloging agencies/programs. This will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2016-DP30: Defining New Subfields \$i and \$4 in Field 386 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp30.html>

Source: ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfields \$i (Relationship information) and \$4 (Relationship code) to field 386 (Creator/Contributor Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. The subfields will be used to provide a note or relationship designator term or code that may be used to clarify the relationship of the creator/contributor terms recorded in the field to the resource being described.

Related Documents: [2013-06](#)

MAC Action taken:

5/27/16 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

6/26/16 – Discussed by MAC. Minimal discussion (most prospective issues were debated in 2016-DP29). Will return as a proposal.

Other Reports: [none]

Business Meeting:

LC Report: [none]