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 2017 Midwinter Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the MAC meetings of the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2017_age.html

Executive Summary:

Seven proposals and five discussion papers were taken up. All proposals passed. For the proposals, from a descriptive cataloging standpoint, we can look forward to: the incorporation of relationship URIs to be recorded in $4; a new subfield in field 340, $g, to record color content. Meanwhile, four of the five discussion papers will likely return as proposals. The future of 2017-DP05 regarding the use of $5 in subject fields is questionable – there was significant discussion regarding the adaptation of a copy specific notation (the current purpose/definition) to reflect institution specific application of subject guidance. We can expect future proposals to utilize the last control subfield, $1, to record "real world object" URIs, distinct from the authority URIs that will remain in $0; a new field to record the URIs of associated works or expressions from various schema; new fields to record controlled and free-text information regarding accessibility, and new subfields to field 777 to support "Issued with" relationships for monographs (the field was originally developed for and only carried subfields to support such relationships with respect to serials). The LC report focused on confirming an acceptable workflow for "fast track" proposals. The Chair reported on the likelihood of the need for new fields to address new entities emerging from the IFLA LRM, although no mechanism for developing the necessary proposals was articulated.

Narrative:

From the Chair: The release of the IFLA LRM will have a subsequent impact on RDA, and subsequently result in new entities and a need to incorporate them in MARC. To facilitate this,

would like a list of fields and subfields that are still available. A detail to consider is structural policy to keep related data in blocks of fields and/or in similar subfields, and whether that will still be possible and whether it should still be adhered to, given the anticipated transition to a post-MARC environment.

LC Report: There are staffing announcements in the general LC report. Update on the Fast Track process: after a Fast Track item is approved, it would be added to the documentation in red and add to the history. It would not update the date of the field: that action would only happen on the date of the formal releases. Three have been submitted: one approved, while two remain in progress: making field 562 repeatable – almost ready to go through; making field 384 repeatable – still in dialogue with MLA. There was a question about the 60-day embargo question, to which discussion indicated a preference for that to persist.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2017-01 would redefine subfield $4 (Relator code) in the Address field, See From Tracing fields, See Also From Tracing fields and $4 (Relationship code) in Heading Linking Entry fields in the MARC Authority Format. Further, it would redefine $4 (Relator code) in Heading fields, Subject Added Entry fields, Added Entry Fields and $4 (Relationship code) in Linking Entry fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal passed.

Proposal 2017-02 would add subfields $i (Relationship information), $3 (Materials specified), and $4 (Relationship code) to field 370 (Associated Place) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This proposal passed with a proviso to modify some wording in response to MARC list comments.

Proposal 2017-03 would add subfields $i (Relationship information) and $4 (Relationship code) to field 386 (Creator/Contributor Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This proposal passed with the incorporation of $4 from 2017-01, and a proviso to modify some wording in response to MARC list comments.

Proposal 2017-04 would provide a linking mechanism from a MARC Bibliographic or a MARC Authority record to a MARC Classification record by using a subfield $0, containing the record control number of the MARC Classification record as an identifier. This proposal passed with the withdrawal of field 083 in the Authority format.

Proposal 2017-05 would define a new repeatable subfield $g in field 340 (Physical Medium) in order to record the color content of resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal passed with a modification to the label for the subfield.

Proposal 2017-06 would add subfield $b (Controlled Term), subfield $2 (Source of Term), and subfield $0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) to field 567 (Methodology Note) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This proposal passed.

Proposal 2017-07 would add value "# = No information provided" to the first indicator (Existence in NAL collection) of field 070 (National Agricultural Library Call Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP01 explores the need to capture URIs in the MARC 21 Formats in a manner that clearly differentiates between:

- URIs that identify a 'Record' or 'Authority' entity describing a Thing (e.g. madsrdf:Authorities, SKOS Concepts for terms in controlled or standard vocabulary lists) and,
- URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual).

To that end, the paper proposes restricting the use of the $0 to URIs that refer to Records describing Things, and defining the $1 to record URIs directly referring to the Thing. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP02 explores the possibility of defining a field 758 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats to identify related works. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP03 explores options for recording the RDA data element Accessibility Content (7.14) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP04 explores the need for subfields $r (Report number), $u (Standard Technical Report Number) and $z (ISBN) in Field 777 (Issued With Entry) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP05 explores a way to designate in a MARC Bibliographic record that a subject access field in the 6XX region has been added according to the policy of a specific Cultural Heritage Organization. The approach taken is defining a subfield $5 (Institution to which field applies) containing the MARC Organization Code to the 6XX fields. The future resolution of this discussion paper is unclear, owing to the significant concerns with coopting a subfield presently defined for copy specific data to indicate local policy implementation decisions regarding subject heading assignments.

<u>Details:</u>

Proposal 2017-01: Redefining Subfield $4 to Encompass URIs for Relationships in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-01.html

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

Summary: This proposal recommends the redefinition of subfield $4 (Relator code) in the Address field (371), See From Tracing fields (400, 410, 411, 430, 448, 450, 451, 455, 462, 480, 481, 482 and 485), See Also From Tracing fields (500, 510, 511, 530, 548, 550, 551, 555, 562, 580, 581, 582 585) and $4 (Relationship code) in Heading Linking Entry fields (700, 710, 711, 730, 748, 750, 751, 755, 762, 780, 781, 782, 785, 788) in the MARC Authority Format. It also discusses the redefinition of $4 (Relator code) in Heading fields (100, 110, 111), Subject Added Entry fields (600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 654, 662), Added Entry Fields (700, 710, 711, 720, 751) and $4 (Relationship code) 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 ; 2016-DP04 ; 2016-DP17

MAC Action taken:
  12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/21/17: Discussed by MAC. A question was posed about the deployment of URIs in $4 and whether they would only relate to the code values from the MARC code list for relators, but the prospective URIs to record in $4 could relate either to a $4 code from the MARC code list, or to terms in $4 (or even $i), and hence drawn from multiple thesauri. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2017-02: 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/2017/2017-02.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: 2009-01/1; 2016-DP29

STATUS/COMMENTS:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/21/17: Discussed by MAC. There was discussion concerning how to flag the data as relevant to the work or expression. An indicator value was suggested as an ad hoc addition to the proposal, but there were counter concerns about explicitly incorporating a specific content standard into MARC, so perhaps $2 was a more appropriate solution. These concerns were set aside for a future paper. The proposal passed with the proviso to modify the final text to reflect rewording issues raised on the MARC list.

Proposal 2017-03: Defining New Subfields $i and $4 in Field 386 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-03.html

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

Summary: This paper proposes 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; 2016-DP30

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/21/17: Discussed by MAC. Incorporated $4 per prior approval of 2017-01. The proposal passed with the proviso to refine wording per discussion on the MARC list.

Proposal 2017-04: Using a Classification Record Control Number as a Link in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-04.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper proposes a linking mechanism from a MARC Bibliographic or a MARC Authority record to a MARC Classification record by using a subfield $0, containing the record control number of the MARC Classification record as an identifier.

Related Documents: 2016-DP28

MAC Action taken:
  12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. Field 083 withdrawn from the original proposal in response to
        comments on the MARC list. Significant discussion about the extent to which the
        $0 would apply to the call number in the field – it would not apply to the work
        mark in $b; it would have variable applicability to the class number "stem" or a
        fully developed class number relying on tables depending on the investment in
        fully articulating such combinations in a registry. There was a concern, from the
        MARC list responses, that use cases had not been adequately developed for the
        balance of classification fields beyond the 084 which instigated the paper, but it
        seemed reasonable to take up the "block" of fields now in order to forestall the
        need to revisit each field in turn. A further question was raised about the
        incorporation of $1 per 2017-DP01, but this was deferred pending action on a
        follow up proposal for 2017-DP01. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2017-05: Defining a New Subfield in Field 340 to Record Color Content in the
MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-05.html

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

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

Related Documents: 2016-DP22

MAC Action taken:
  12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
  01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. Concern raised about the label "color content" vs "color
        characteristic of content." Another concern raised about potential misuse of $2 rda,
        where "rda" refers to the entire standard, rather than a specific vocabulary list from
        which the (sub)field content is drawn. To address that, the British Library has
        developed a new list of RDA vocabularies for forthcoming release. The proposal
        passed with the incorporation of the new label.

Proposal 2017-06: Adding Subfields $b, $2, and $0 to Field 567 in the MARC 21
Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-06.html

Source: National Library of Finland

Summary: This paper proposes adding subfield $b (Controlled Term), subfield $2 (Source of Term), and subfield $0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) to field 567 (Methodology Note) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.

Related Documents: 2016-DP23

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. A discussion about opening up validation of the field content to allow content in $a and/or $b, which is a matter of updating validation routines rather than the format proper. The proposal passed.

Proposal 2017-07: Adding Value "No information provided" to the First Indicator of Field 070 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-07.html

Source: National Library of Finland

Summary: This paper discusses adding value "# = No information provided" to the first indicator (Existence in NAL collection) of field 070 (National Agricultural Library Call Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. Significant discussion around the current definition of field 070 as being restricted to numbers assigned by NAL. Addressing this concern will be deferred to a fast track follow up. The possibility of defining the 2nd indicator value to identify assignment by NAL or others was also raised. Without a representative from NAL present, it seemed unwise to take up. The proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP01: Use of Subfields $0 and $1 to Capture Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) in the MARC 21 Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp01.html

Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

Summary: This paper discusses the need to capture URIs in the MARC 21 Formats in a manner that clearly differentiates between:
- URIs that identify a 'Record' or 'Authority' entity describing a Thing (e.g. madsrdf:Authorities, SKOS Concepts for terms in controlled or standard vocabulary

lists) and,

- URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO, whether actual or conceptual).

To that end, the paper proposes restricting the use of the $0 to URIs that refer to Records describing Things, and defining the $1 to record URIs directly referring to the Thing.

Related Documents: 2007-06/1; 2009-DP01/1; 2009-DP06/1; 2010-DP02; 2010-06; 2015-07; 2016-DP04; 2016-DP18; 2016-DP19

MAC Action taken:

01/04/17: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

01/21/17: Discussed by MAC. Significant discussion about the modeling and value of distinguishing between the two types of URIs, including the unfortunate labeling of URIs as referring to "real world objects" when the matter was Direct vs. Indirect reference. A reservation about deploying the last potential control subfield. There was general positive concurrence on the questions posed. It is expected that the discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP02: Defining Field 758 (Related Work Identifier) in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp02.html

Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC, Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

Summary: This is a discussion of the possibility of defining a field 758 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats to identify related works.

Related Documents: 2017-DP01; 2017-01

MAC Action taken:

12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

01/21/17: Discussed by MAC. Concern about the lack of definition in the discussion paper, but this would be forthcoming in a subsequent proposal. Concern about the label "related work identifier" which is a little too broad for the purpose of providing an identifier for the work articulated through the manifestation in question. Suggestion to see the 7XX block in the Authority format for existing labels and text. An additional suggestion of a $a "Label" rather than a $a/$t combination.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP03: Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp03.html

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Summary: This paper presents options for recording the RDA data element Accessibility Content (7.14) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. The section on 007 withdrawn based on comments from the MARC list. OLAC liaison reported they have a task force on accessibility and would be willing to partner with CCM on future papers/proposals. Some suggestions for future papers/proposals: incorporate $0 and $3, add a 1st indicator value of # "no information provided." There was a discussion about record maintenance if accessibility support changes. These dynamics are complex – in tangible, print manifestations, the presence of new features generally leads to a new manifestation and hence a new record, but this dynamic is less clear for e-content in a provider-neutral record environment and also in media content, both tangible and online/streaming. There were further concerns expressed about redundancy of data, and the potential need to include "accessibility hazards" (e.g. flashing content)
Formal tally of questions:
6.1: Yes. McGraff: DVD accessibility features tied to language.
6.2: Most for 532, but 2 doubt. Me, 538?
6.3: skipped (007)
6.4: No (good thing)
6.5: "Don't reinvent the wheel" McGrath: OLAC looked at this, the DP focuses on web-content but other content platforms need to be addressed.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP04: Defining Subfields $u, $r and $z in Field 777 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp04.html

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Summary: This paper proposes the need for subfields $r (Report number), $u (Standard Technical Report Number) and $z (ISBN) in Field 777 (Issued With Entry) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

Related Documents: 88-1 [no link available]

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. There is no institutional memory of why such subfields were not taken up when format integration was enacted. Observation that this field

presently only accommodates identifiers for print books, but there are identifiers for non-print resources as well (which will need to be taken up in future discussion papers/proposals)
Formal tally of questions:
5.1: Yes
5.2: Yes, Spain disagrees with use of J.2.5 (Me submit the Blake example)
5.3: Matthew: J.3.5? Susan: Textbook and workbooks issued separately/Teachers edition & Student edition.
5.4: One "yes" BL – sufficient flexibility.
5.5: Yes
5.6: No (need use cases) – but okay to include, IF use cases are found.

Discussion Paper 2017-DP05: Providing Institution Level Information by Defining Subfield $5 in the 6XX Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp05.html

Source: German National Library

Summary: This paper explores a way to designate in a MARC Bibliographic record that a subject access field in the 6XX region has been added according to the policy of a specific Cultural Heritage Organization. The approach taken is defining a subfield $5 (Institution to which field applies) containing the MARC Organization Code to the 6XX fields.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:
12/13/16: Made available to the MARC community for discussion.
01/22/17: Discussed by MAC. Mixed support and disagreement with the overall thrust of the discussion paper. An observation that the format should not confine its use to the practices that emerged from application of LC's Subject Heading Manual; other cataloging traditions may have looser conventions that do not so tightly adhere to details from the SHM such as "specific and direct" or the Rules of 2, of 3, of 4, etc. Significant discussion about the current definition of $5 as recording copy specific details for the item held by the organization recorded. The proposed use would reflect the institution specific application of a standard to the resource as a whole. The only other available subfield is $i, but this is typically deployed for recording relationships, and it is anticipated that there are forthcoming developments that would warrant reservation of this subfield for that purpose. Perhaps competing proposals will emerge, pitting DP2017-01 against DP2017-05 for use of $1. The future of this discussion paper is unclear – there is a clearly articulated need, but the constraints of existing and available subfields do not present convenient solutions.

Business Meeting:

LC Report: There are staffing announcements in the general LC report. Update on the Fast Track process: after a Fast Track item is approved, it would be added to the documentation in red and add to the history. It would not update the date of the field: that action would only happen on the date of the formal releases. Three have been submitted: one approved, while two remain in progress: making field 562 repeatable – almost ready to go through; making field 384 repeatable – still in dialogue with MLA. There was a question about the 60-day embargo question, to which discussion indicated a preference for that to persist.

From the Chair: The release of the IFLA LRM will have a subsequent impact on RDA, and subsequently result in new entities and a need to incorporate them in MARC. To facilitate this, would like a list of fields and subfields that are still available. A detail to consider is structural policy to keep related data in blocks of fields and/or in similar subfields, and whether that will still be possible and whether it should still be adhered to, given the anticipated transition to a post-MARC environment.

Other Reports: [none]