

**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 Annual Conference in New Orleans, Louisiana.

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/an2018_age.html

Executive Summary:

Four proposals and five discussion papers were taken up. The four proposals passed. Two discussion papers will return as proposals and two will likely be consolidated into a joint proposal. One discussion paper did not gain favor with the Committee but the authors are free to invest further in its ideas if they choose.

Narrative:

From the Chair: Reported Fast Track changes to add \$4 to field 730, and to revise the definition of \$r for field 382. Next meetings announced for ALA Midwinter 2019 on January 26 and 27, 2019.

LC Report: [none]

Other Reports: From John Zargas (LC): Discussion papers previously converted to Proposals, and Fast Track proposals are now numbered and recorded in the proposal section of the website.

Proposal 2018-02 would add new subfields to field 041 for accessibility modes to improve machine actionability. This proposal passed with amendment to the \$p label and definition.

Proposal 2018-03 would establish new fields 341 and 532 to record accessibility content. This proposal passed with amendments to remove \$0/\$1 from field 341, to add \$8 to both fields, and

to modify 1st indicator value 2 for field 532 from “Accessibility hazards” to “Accessibility deficiencies.”

Proposal 2018-04 would provide a mechanism to record versions of resources using controlled vocabularies, either through a new subfield of field 250 or a new field 251. This proposal passed with option 2 to use new field 251 and amendments to add \$3, \$6, and \$8.

Proposal 2018-05 would provide mechanisms to record the script of a MARC field using ISO 15924 codes. This proposal passed with option 1 to deploy \$6 subfields at the field level.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP07 explores extending use of \$2 for source of vocabulary for 1XX and 7XX fields. This discussion paper will return as a proposal, focusing on names, with the possible addition of field 130, and further exploration of the complexities around \$2 deployment under a variety of \$0/\$1 scenarios.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP08 explores the need and mechanisms for recording URIs in Authority format field 024. This discussion paper will return as a proposal based on option 2.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP09 explores options for improving the granularity of subfields in MARC field 245. This discussion paper likely won't return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP10 explores a mechanism for denoting the nature of accessibility of a resource linked to in an 856 field. This discussion paper will return as a proposal in conjunction with findings from 2018-DP11.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP11 explores mechanisms to reflect open access and license information. This discussion paper will return as a proposal in conjunction with findings from 2018-DP10.

Details:

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

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-02.html>

Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

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

Related Documents: [2018-DP02](#); [2018-03](#); [2017-11](#); [2017-DP03](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/23/18 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion centered on three topics: separating subtitles from intertitles, in the manner that captions are being separated from subtitles; revisions to the proposal’s label and definition of \$p to “Language Code of captions”; and legacy data issues for \$j. Intertitles will be taken up at a later date if needed. The proposal was amended to address \$p concerns. OCLC will look into mechanisms to resolve the ambiguity of \$j in legacy data.

06/23/18 – Proposal approved unanimously, with the amendments for \$p label and definition.

Proposal 2018-03: Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-03.html>

SOURCE: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

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

RELATED: [2017-11](#); [2017-DP03](#); [2018-02](#); [2018-DP02](#)

STATUS/COMMENTS:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/23/18 – Discussed by MAC. Discussion initially focused on modes of interaction with a resource. Other issues will need to be addressed by community specific best practices documents. Incorporating \$0/\$1 into field 341 seemed problematic and speculative, so these subfields were dropped. The need for other amendments arising from off-line communications was acknowledged.

06/23/18 – Proposal approved unanimously, with amendment to remove \$0/\$1 from field 341, to add \$8 to both fields, and to modify 1st indicator value 2 for field 532 from “Accessibility hazards” to “Accessibility deficiencies” (with corresponding examples).

Proposal 2018-04: Versions of Resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-04.html>

Source: German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats

Summary: This paper proposes two ways to designate in a MARC record that a resource is available in a specific version, e.g. as a 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: [2018-DP06](#); [2013-03](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. There were three key topics under consideration: nature of the data under consideration by the proposal; “version” vs “status” as a labeling convention; and friendly amendments to add \$3, \$6, and \$8. Regarding the nature of the data, questions arose whether it would strictly be a controlled vocabulary or not, and would it solely be provided from publisher metadata or not. Part of this discussion involved solutions to these dynamics. After examining RDA, it was determined that it would be desirable to cleanly distinguish between a) typically transcribed data for RDA and other cataloging codes’ statements regarding edition and b) metadata-sourced terminology. As publisher-supplied metadata, we cannot dictate their use of a controlled vocabulary, so the field may contain a mix of controlled or uncontrolled terms. The absence of \$2, as in the 34X block, can be used as a flag that non-controlled terms are present. Deliberation followed regarding the labeling of the field for “publication version” vs a prospective alternative of “publication status.” There appears to be no conflict with RDA terminology by “version” that would generate confusion in this context. In contrast, “publication status” generated unease at the prospect of conflict within the format for publication statements generally recorded in the 26X block.

06/24/18 – Proposal using Option 2 deploying a new field 251 approved unanimously, with amendment to add \$3, \$6, \$8.

Proposal 2018-05: Multiscript Records Using Codes from ISO 15924 in the Five MARC 21 Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-05.html>

Source: German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats

Summary: This paper proposes ways on how to designate that the content of a MAREC 21 field is written in a specified script by using codes from ISO 15924. The options are: “script identification code” portion of subfield \$6 (Linkage), designation in field 066 (Character Sets present), and designation in field 546 (Language Note).

Related Documents: [2018-DP04](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. Despite the British Library’s concern during the Discussion Paper stage of the impact of intermingling MARC-8 and ISO codes in \$6, they found no negative effect within their processing of data. They advocated on behalf of prospective institutions where it might still prove problematic. General sense is that the ISO codes are a cleaner and more granular solution than offered by the MARC-8 set, and that addressing non-Latin scripts at the subfield level is preferable.

06/24/18 – Proposal using Option 1 deploying \$6 subfields approved with one abstention.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP07: Designating Sources for Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp07.html>

Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

Summary: This paper explores some reasons for extending the use of \$2 for source vocabulary to the 1XX and 7XX name entry fields in the Bibliographic format, and the implications of doing so.

Related Documents: [none]

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. Lengthy discussion around the issue of authority control and identity management (i.e. \$0 and \$1). MARC cleanly delineates these concepts but actual registries are less stringently bifurcated between those solely functioning for one task or the other. The structure of authority files in German cataloging communities would support addressing title entries but this is not supported in Anglo-American cataloging practices except in the simplest case of field 130. Any further investigations should focus on names and possibly field 130. The complexities of \$2 in conjunction with \$0/\$1 should be further explored.

06/24/18 – The discussion paper will return as a proposal, focusing on names, with perhaps the addition of field 130 for titles in that field. The committee expressed the desirability for the complexities of the authority and RWO URIs to be better explored in the narrower context of names.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP08: Use of Field 024 to Capture URIs in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp08.html>

Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

Summary: This paper discusses the need to capture Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) in field 024 (Other Standard Identifier) of the MARC 21 Authority Format in a manner that clearly differentiates between: URIs that identify a “Record” or “Authority” entity describing a Thing, and URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (aka RWO). The paper further considers differentiating MARC subfields for URIs that are alphanumeric standard numbers or codes already accommodated in 024 \$a and dereferenceable HTTP URIs promoting the conversion of MARC data to linked data format.

Related Documents: [2017-08](#); [2017-DP01](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. Consensus coalesced around Option 2.

06/24/18 – Option 2 is preferred and will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP09: Improving Subfield Structure of Field 245 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp09.html>

Source: OCLC EMEA, Leiden (Netherlands) and OCLC, Dublin, Ohio (US)

Summary: This paper describes two options for a more granular subfield structure of Bibliographic field 245 (Title Statement) to improve data exchange with other more granular formats, matching (and merging), displays, and indexes.

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

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. Despite the historical appeal of such, the general consensus is that it introduces more complexity and confusion as well as moving in a direction away from RDA's "manifestation statement" of a single, undifferentiated string of characters derived from the preferred source. Additional comments observed that attempting to make a single field serve double duty (description and access) has proven problematic. A straw poll on whether it would be fruitful or not to move forward was 12 to 8 against. The authors, OCLC's Leiden office, were not present and the OCLC liaison did not feel comfortable burdening them or speaking for them with respect to pursuing the idea further.

6/24/18 – It is unlikely the paper will return (but the authors are free to pursue if they are so motivated).

Discussion Paper 2018-DP10: Designating Access to Online Resources in Field 856 in the MARC 21 Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp10.html>

Source: OCLC and the German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats

Summary: This paper proposes adding a new subfield to field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) containing a numeric designator indicating accessibility (restricted, open, or partly restricted) to the online resource linked in the URI in subfield \$u. For the purposes of this

paper, an “open access” document can be reached without requiring payment or a login.

Related Documents: [2018-DP11](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/23/18 – Discussed by MAC. The use case for a binary coding between “open access” and “restricted access” (values 0 and 1) was readily acknowledged. Significant discussion occurred around the “mixed access” (value 2) possibility for aggregate resources. There was willingness to defer on development of value 2 in order to expedite implementation of values 0 and 1, which were the vast majority of cases and for which need is most pressing. \$7 would be preferable as a destination for the coding, as the DNB was proposing \$e for a textual analogue in its complementary paper, 2018-DP11. It was observed that the entire 856 field was developed early in the Internet era and was formulated to encompass a variety of mechanisms that haven’t been realized, and so it may be appropriate to review and overhaul it, with even the exceptional practice considered of redeploying some subfields for new uses.

06/23/18 – The paper will return as a proposal, likely in conjunction with developments from 2018-DP11.

Discussion Paper 2018-DP11: Open Access and License Information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holding Formats

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2018/2018-dp11.html>

Source: German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats, and OCLC

Summary: This paper explores ways on how to reflect open access and license information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings formats. It analyzes the existing fields 506 (Restrictions on Access Note), 007 (Electronic Resource), 008 (Fixed-Length Data Elements), 540 (Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note) and 856 (Electronic Location and Access) and makes suggestions for extensions to cover needs identified by the German speaking part of the MARC community, in cooperation with OCLC.

Related Documents: [2018-DP10](#); [2018-04](#); [2018-DP06](#); [2006-03](#); [2002-10](#)

MAC Action taken:

05/25/18 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

06/24/18 – Discussed by MAC. A more expansive paper than 2018-DP10, it addressed a number of prospective solutions for recording rights management, licensing, and access to electronic resources. The presenter addressed previously expressed concerns about whether these details were appropriate at the holdings rather than the bibliographic level.

06/24/18 – The paper will return as a proposal, likely in conjunction with developments from

2018-DP10.

Other Reports: The Chair announced the next meetings at ALA Midwinter 2019, on January 26 and 27, 2018. The Chair reported Fast Track changes to add \$4 to field 730, and to revise the definition of \$r for field 382. John Zargas of LC announced that Discussion papers previously converted to Proposals, and Fast Track proposals, are now numbered and recorded in the proposal section of the website.

Business Meeting:

LC Report: [none]