

**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 2018 Midwinter Meeting in Denver, Colorado.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2018 ALA Annual Meeting on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2018_age.html

Executive Summary:

One proposal and six discussion papers were taken up. The proposal passed. Four discussion papers will return as proposals. One was converted at the table into a proposal and passed. One may be reworked and resubmitted as subsequent discussion paper.

Narrative:

From the Chair: Chair reported on two MLA fast-track proposals: making field 384 repeatable and adding \$3; and clarify the wording for field 382. Next meetings announced for ALA Annual 2018 on June 23 and 24 in New Orleans.

LC Report: Update is out, but took longer than expected owing to complexity of the changes and the budget dynamics.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2018-01 would incorporate new coding for the Maps 007 for digital maps. This proposal passed with a minor amendment.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP01 explores deploying RDA subject relationship designators in the 600-630 fields. This discussion paper occasioned significant resistance from the Library of

Congress and the British Library, and subsequent broad ranging discussion. The authors will regroup to see if they will submit a reworked paper.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP02 explores incorporating accessibility codes in the 041 field. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP03 explores a set of newer 3XX fields to which \$3 could be added. This discussion paper was converted to a proposal at the table and passed.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP04 explores mechanisms for indicating the presence of Unicode scripts in a record. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP05 explores mechanisms for indicating local applications or interpretations of subject thesauri guidance in the assignment of subject headings in a record. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP06 explores mechanisms for indicating which version a resource consists of in the publication process (online articles in the context of the paper). This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Details:

Proposal 2018-01: Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Cartographic Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-01.html>

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM) and the ALA Map & Geospatial Information Round Table (MAGIRT)

Summary: This paper proposes adding a new value in position 04 and making some modifications to definitions in other positions in the 007 fixed field for maps in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats to better accommodate digital cartographic resources..

Related Documents: [2017-DP06](#); [2016-01](#); [2015-DP02](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. Amended to replace “item” with “resource” in a couple existing definitions. Passed.

Discussion Paper 2018-01: Defining New Subfield \$i in Fields 600-630 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp01.html>

Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC), Standing Committee on Standards

Summary: This paper discusses adding subfield \$i (Relationship information) to the 600-630 group of fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The subfield could be used to record a subject relationship designator term to identify more specifically the nature of the relationship between the resource being described and an entity that is topically related.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. These included significant concerns from LC about conflict and redundancy between the RDA relationship designators and LCSH form subdivisions. Also, concerns from BL with the potential to “explode the format.” Extensive conversations ensued, with numerous sympathetic responses from outside the national libraries. A criticism had been raised that there are “no actual use cases” but the rebuttal was offered that one can’t make a case if the subfielding doesn’t exist. The points were raised that the entries in fields 600-630 are not actually LCSH entries but are LCSH-compatible entries from the NAF, and that there are thesauri schema outside LCSH. There were ancillary discussions about MARC’s (in)ability to fully support RDA in a number of aspects. There were contrasting concerns about the relationship between an LCSH string and the RDA nomen and whether the MARC bifurcation between agent and subject entries is an appropriate construct for RDA, analogous to the integrated filing in some card catalogs. A counterpoint was raised that if \$4 is already in use, then why shouldn’t an analogous subfield for the corresponding textual string be developed. The point was articulated that ultimately, the national libraries will make the decision so recommending adoption of a solution to which they were opposed would not be productive. Despite sympathetic positions around the table, there was also a sense that an improved paper, perhaps exploring a variety of options rather than advancing only one, would be desirable. The authors will regroup to determine whether to submit a reworked paper.

Discussion Paper 2018-02: Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Accessibility in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp02.html>

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Summary: This paper suggests adding new subfields in field 041 (Language Code) for accessibility modes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to allow for machine sorting.

Related Documents: [2017-11](#); [2017-DP03](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Minor corrections and suggestions incorporated. Summary of submitted comments. There was a discussion about incorporating coding for Makaton, but it was determined that it is a program and not a language, using signs, signals, and sounds to represent each language. Consequently, the base language would be recorded in the 041, while the use of Makaton to represent that language could be recorded in 546. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP03: Inventory of Newer 3XX Fields that Lack Subfield \$3 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp03.html>

Source: Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper looks at the new 3XX descriptive fields in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format that lack a defined Subfield \$3 of fields 377 (Associated Language), 380 (Form of Work), 381 (Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression), and 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work) and discusses which fields could be improved by having a defined subfield \$3 available for use.

Related Documents: [2016-07](#); [2017-02](#); [2016-DP01](#); [2016-DP29](#); [2017-FT01](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. The example of the fast-track change to field 384 was raised as an example and model for handling the discussion paper. General agreement with the discussion paper, but an issue was raised with the inclusion of examples that identified specific content as “1st work,” “2nd work,” etc., with the suggestion that specifically identifying the content in question, e.g. “Bartok’s sonata” would be a better practice from the perspective of better serving human and machine use of the designations. The desire for non-music example(s) was expressed. The discussion paper was converted at the table to a proposal and then passed. (There was a follow on discussion about the tracking of such “converted at the table” papers in the indexes of discussion papers and proposals maintained by LC. Currently, only a notation is made in the affected discussion paper, but it was acknowledge that a better solution needs to be put in place. LC will explore solutions.)

Discussion Paper 2018-DP04: Multiscript Records Using Codes from ISO 15924 in the Five MARC 21 Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp04.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper describes a way to cover all scripts in multiscript records according to Model A by using codes from ISO 15924 as the script identification code portion of subfield \$6 (Linkage) in all five MARC 21 formats.

Related Documents: [DP 111](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. Observation made that its intention was to “make MARC even more Unicode compliant than it is now.”

Discussion of the use case occasioned the questions of whether the field content would be more for the use of a person or a machine, and aren't the Unicode characters self-identifying as to their associated script. A couple use case examples were offered of a) using it to identify clusters of records where scripts of interest had been corrupted, and b) where users could profile a search session to their preferred script and so the interface would present them with the script-appropriate choice in a paired vernacular-Romanized entry. There was discussion about the use of the field by developers and a response with the history of the development of the field's values, which correspond to the escape character sequence in a MARC-8 vernacular string. The point was raised that records are either MARC-8 or UTF8, but can continually be flipped from one to the other. The deployment of a separate subfield for the ISO values re-emerged as a potential solution after previously being rejected in preconference responses. The 546 field was suggested but then rejected as it applied to the content of the resource, not the script of the record. A request was made to incorporate some of the development history for the MARC-8 codes into the relevant appendix. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP05: Adding Institution Level Information to Subject Headings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp05.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explores different ways of designating in a MARC record that a subject access field in the 6XX region has been added according to the policy of a specific Cultural Heritage Organization. While the preceding Discussion Paper 2017-DP05 focused on subfield \$5 in the 6XX fields of the MARC Bibliographic format, this Discussion Paper introduces a second option by using and extending field 883 (Machine-generated Metadata Provenance).

Related Documents: [2012-03](#); [2017-DP05](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. This paper adds field 883 as an additional prospective solution to previous paper. The use case of local deviations from the Subject Cataloging Manual in U.S. cataloging identified (e.g. subject headings applied for material of local interest that does not meet the SCM's 30% guidance). The analogous use in series authority records for analysis, tracing, and classification decisions (fields 644, 645, 646) to the proposed use of \$5 in the paper. A question whether the institution identifying information would be manually or machine applied – it would be machine applied as the record was transferred from the native PICA format to MARC 21. Consensus aligned around the 883 solution, with the addition of a new indicator value. The possibility was held out for a constituency to submit a new proposal for \$5 to address the local U.S. practices may be warranted, should a constituency wish to take up the matter. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP06: Versions of Resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp06.html>

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explores different ways to designate in a MARC record that a resource is available in a specific version, e.g. as preprint, postprint, publisher's version, etc., including, but not limited to values from NISO-RP-8-2008 *Journal Article Versions (JAV): Recommendations of the NISO/ALPSP JAV Technical Working Group*.

Related Documents: [2007-06](#) and its part [2007-06/6](#)

MAC Action taken:

01/17/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

02/10/18 – Discussed by MAC. Summary of submitted comments. These expressed general agreement around Option 4, 250 \$v, with possible additional use of Option 1 (008/24-27 code) and use of \$2 if controlled vocabulary used in \$v. There was general agreement with the establishment of the use case, but there was substantial discussion about cataloger "dithering" over recording editions and versions, particularly when some publications explicitly identify their edition as "Version 2.0" or cases where catalogers must supply an edition statement that incorporate "version" terminology. There was also concern whether a field labeled "Edition Statement" could even incorporate controlled vocabulary terminology not found on the piece. Discussion reached a consensus that the data should be recorded in a distinct field and that clarifying language such as that in the 562 Note should be incorporated stating that it was solely for recording version iterations in the publishing process, such as those

articulated in the JAV standard. Fields 251 or 266 were identified as prospective candidates in the population of as yet undeveloped fields. in the same field NLM, concern with cataloger dithering over edition or version. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Other Reports: Chair reported on 2 MLA fast-track proposals: making field 384 repeatable and adding \$3; and clarify the wording for field 382.

Business Meeting:

LC Report: Update is out, but took longer than expected owing to complexity of changes and the budget dynamics.