**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 during virtual meetings scheduled on June 30-July 3, in lieu of the cancelled ALA 2020 Annual Conference.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the summer 2020 virtual MAC meetings on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2020_age.html

Executive Summary:

Five proposals and ten discussion papers were taken up. The five proposals passed, some with amendments. The ten discussions papers are anticipated to return as papers.

Narrative:

From the Chair: There were no fast-track proposals since the last meeting. The Chair also opened each session with careful instructions regarding the logistics of holding the meeting virtually – how to signal to be recognized, how voting would be conducted, and a request for brevity.

LC Report: The Library of Congress published the MODS 3.7 to MARC conversions and the BibFrame to MARC conversions. The latter are particularly important as it will preclude the need to double-key into MARC those records being created by the BibFrame pilot team.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2020-03 would alter the existing make up of field 856. Specifically, it would deprecate the following subfields: $b, $h, $i, $j, $k, $l, $n, $r, and $t. Additionally, it proposed changes to the second indicator structure to add a new value "4" for "portion of resource" and modifying definitions for the existing values.

There was general support in the submitted comments for deprecating the identified subfields. There were differences of opinion about the proposed new second indicator value and changes to the existing second indicator values.

In committee discussion through a straw poll, there was general consensus to drop the indicator value components of the paper. These may return following closer scrutiny of how to address the intersection of portion of resource with portion of version of resource that lay at the heart of concerns with the proposed value 4, and how to better articulate the desired constraints on the use of existing value 2. This action obviated the question of dealing with $3 for the time being. The question was raised regarding the shape of things to come with the prospect for repurposing the subfields being proposed for obsolescence. No definitive answer was offered, other than future papers on recording URLs would be forthcoming.

This proposal passed with an amendment to drop the indicator changes.

Proposal 2020-04 would provide a mechanism for recording illustrative content in field 340. Specifically, it would add subfield $p to support this.

There was general support in the submitted comments, with one dissent that argued against mixing content and carrier data within one field. OCLC expressed a concern about the implicit binary between illustrations/no illustrations when there would be value in identifying the specific nature of illustrative content. They suggested a modification to the proposed $p definition to support this. A question that recurs in multiple subsequent papers was raised about whether to record associated URIs in $0 or $1 as heretofore our papers have modeled on use of $0 but RDA registry entries are articulated as RWOs to be recorded in $1.

In the committee discussions, there was an extended discussion on the $0/$1 issue. Ultimately the point was conceded as an implementation question for communities of practice. In the meantime, the PCC URI Best Practices Working Group has engaged the question and is soliciting feedback within its community. A response will be forthcoming.

This proposal passed as amended with OCLC's revised definition of $p.

Proposal 2020-05 would provide a mechanism for record aspect ratio in field 345. Specifically, it would rename the field to "Moving Image Characteristics" and add new subfields $c and $d for "Aspect ratio value" and "Aspect ratio designator" respectively.

There was general support in the submitted comments, with one dissent that argued for field 346. There was concern expressed about implications for the definitions of the subfields.

The authors were open to refining the definitions through coordination with NDMSO. There was an extensive conversation about the applicability of these elements to various content formats, such as still images, with the possible implications to the field name and scope. This was resolved by a report that RDA currently restricts aspect ratio to moving images.

This proposal passed subject to the aforementioned editorial cleanup by NDMSO.

Proposal 2020-06 would provide a mechanism for recording the new RDA element, "Manifestation Statement." Specifically, it would create field 881 with a $a for a general manifestation statement and a series of additional subfields for specific manifestation statement sub-elements as articulated in the post 3-R Beta RDA Toolkit.

> There was general support for the concept in submitted comments, although there were still considerable concerns about the exclusion of a possible $i/$2 for the source of the data and an indicator to indicate the deployment of basic vs enhanced coding (such as that deployed in the 505). There were also concerns with how "series-like statements" and epigraphs are to be treated when the sub-element subfields were used.

> The issues surrounding the intersection of scanned vs keyed data and single vs multiply subfielded data were discussed further. The challenges of such intersections were acknowledged, with the additional statement that the field as proposed is intended for maximal flexibility while meeting the minimum element and sub-element requirements of Post 3-R Beta RDA Toolkit. The $i/$2 subfields concerning data provenance could not be adequately resolved by the MARC/RDA Working Group at this time, but they will address data provenance holistically in the future.

This proposal passed.

Proposal 2020-07 would provide a mechanism for recording the new RDA element, "Extension Plan for Bibliographic Works." Specifically, it would create field 335 to record terms, codes, and URIs to hold such data.

> There was general support in submitted comments, with one concern about inferring the "static" plan and another comment regarding the intersection with the LDR/19 position. Issue was taken with the duplicative nature of the code values in the examples with their corresponding terms.

> During the meeting there was significant discussion, as was subsequently alluded to for Discussion Paper 2020-DP16, about implementing such data in cases where a cataloger inferred one circumstance that later turned out not to be correct, or if the Extension Plan was formally changed such as an electronic publication transitioning from a serial to an integrating extension plan. Would such instances warrant edits to track such changes, or would new descriptions be required? The feedback from various sources associated with RDA development was that the latter would be the case. In the face of pushback from

various practitioners, it was noted that this element is not part of the RDA minimum description, so if communities of practice did not like this prescription they could simply not implement the element. The instances where this field might be repeated should be confined to those where differing vocabularies covering the same concept are involved. As a counterpoint, it was observed that PCC has implemented the provider neutral record standard in contravention to RDA's specifications yet those records are still coded as "040 $e rda." Proposal amended to include a $3.

This proposal passed as amended.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP08 explores the recording of the date of assignment of a DDC class number, in response to changes in the publication model of DDC from a series of static, numbered print editions, to a continuously updated online product augment by print-on-demand print versions. It proposes the deployment of a new $e to record this date of assignment data from the electronic version and modification to the existing $2 to record this date of assignment data from print-on-demand versions. It would also simplify the background section concerning the evolution and development of the DDC documents.

> There was general support in the submitted comments for the proposed solution, with one dissent. Similar treatments for the other schema were floated.

> In meeting discussions, there were competing visions for how users would best be served with respect to distinguishing between class numbers assigned in the electronic or print products and with overall data conformity.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP09 explores an alteration of the means for recording Chronology-only data in Holdings fields 853-855 and 863-875. At present in the absence of enumeration data, chronology data is "bumped up" to $a, while it otherwise resides in $i in circumstances when it is paired with enumeration data. This paper proposes loosening the restrictions that enforce this dynamic, so that chronology-only data may optionally be consistently recorded in $i.

> There was a distinct divergence of opinion in the submitted comments, with some feeling that the proposed solution offered more consistency with where data is "parked," while others felt it represented increased inconsistency with legacy data.

> In meeting discussion, the genesis of the proposal was further expanded upon, describing how ILSes are frequently recording this data as non-MARC data in the acquisitions modules which then presents mapping challenges to MARC. So, despite the concerns from some constituencies regarding consistency with legacy data, there was consensus that this was already present. Consequently, the solution proposed would at least bring such transformations into compliance. The ISSN Centre had originally assessed that they were not a stakeholder, but recognizes that newly incorporated data to its Keepers Registry may be affected. They will follow up.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP10 explores an expansion of the coding values recorded in field positions 008/21 and 006/04 for Type of Continuing Resource. It proposes potentially optional values that are more specific than the current "p" value for periodicals. These would be values h, t, j, g, s, r for blog, directory, journal, magazine, newsletter, and institutional repository respectively.

> There was general support for the concept in the submitted comments, with one detractor that favored solutions through other MARC mechanisms such as the 655. Additionally if implemented as proposed, there was general consensus that the new values should be optional enhancements, not replacements for value p (much as was done when the LitForm 0/1 coding was expanded).

> In the meeting, there was substantial discussion about the appropriate "parking place" for this data, with alternative 008 positions offered. Various faceting dynamics were brought up for the ISSN Centre and other cataloging agencies. There was discussion about the scoping and sourcing of the definitions for the proposed values. The duplication here of "directory" when it is already defined in nature of contents (BKS 008/24-27; SER 008/25-27) was found to be especially problematic.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP11 explores a mechanism for recording URIs in field 022 in the bibliographic format. To that end, it suggests adding new subfields $0 (and implicitly $1 by extension).

> There was general support in the submitted comments, although with widespread concern about the question of pairing URIs for ISSN-L entries in $l (el) with $0 (or $1 (one)).

> In the meeting, confusion around the repeatability of the field was addressed – it is repeatable within the MARC specification but not within the ISSN Centre's system and internal policies. There was substantial discussion concerning the management of URIs to represent ISSN-Ls and the prospect of mixing and matching URIs in the same field for the ISSN proper in $a and an ISSN-L in $l (el). ISSN Centre is currently examining their ISSN-L practices in light of the issuance of IFLA's LRM. This may result in future papers to record ISSN-L in a distinct field. For the time being, they will structure the current solution to only encompass the ISSN proper in $a.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP12 explores the recording of "Form of Musical Notation" in the bibliographic format. It proposes moving this data from field 546 to field 348 to better support use of controlled vocabularies. A central choice is whether to 1) repurpose the existing 348 $b

from holding "Format of Notated Music code" to holding "Form of Musical Notation term", or 2) deprecate the existing 348 $b and create a new 348 $c to hold "Form of Musical Notation term." It discusses various subfield dynamics with the existing 546 $b and 348 $b.

> There was strong consensus around option 2 in the submitted comments, although there were several questions why 348 $b needed to be deprecated in this case.

> In the meeting, there was discussion about the suitability of codes in this field as they are not generally deployed in the 34X block. There is also concern about the development of such code lists. There are RDA codes that are essentially stubs of the RDA vocabulary URIs; MLA has been working for years to develop a stable list. Codes would be preferable for multi-lingual interoperability. There were minor calls for addition of a 348 $d subfield to hold code values corresponding to the musical notation terms. Consensus coalesced around addition(s) to field 348 while leaving the 546 $b and 348 $b intact.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP13 explores a mechanism for recording the RDA element Expression Dates in the bibliographic and authority formats. To that end, it suggests adding new subfields for prospective starting and ending expression dates to field 046, as well as additional subfields for notes and data provenance.

> There was general conceptual support in the submitted comments, although there were differences of opinion regarding possible solutions and favorability for addressing notes and data provenance.

> Alternative solutions were discussed in the meeting, including 1) use of the existing date subfields augmented by a subfield or indicator value to specify the nature of the content of those date subfields, and 2) a focus on an authority format solution using field 075. This latter was largely rejected on the basis of the inconsistent availability of authority records for works and expressions and the lack of structures in MARC to provide inheritability of attributes/relationships between authority and bibliographic records. Consensus coalesced around the former solution as revealed through several straw polls. The authors will explore this in reworking the paper. Meanwhile, there currently is discussion in the MARC/RDA Working Group about data provenance, so it would be desirable to address the additional subfields holistically across the formats from the Working Group's efforts.

This discussion paper will turn as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP14 explores a mechanism for recording "sound content" in the bibliographic formats. To that end, it suggests adding new $i subfield to field 344. This originally was presented in 2020-DP03 where an addition to field 340 was suggested but that solution was rejected.

There was conceptual support in submitted comments, with one dissent about mixing content and carrier elements in the same field. Additionally, there was difference of opinion with respect to field 344 vs 345 as the optimal location.

Discussion in the meeting focused on the 344 vs 345 question. This data is primarily of concern to moving image catalogers, eliciting support for field 345. There were rebuttals, despite the prospect for redundant use (that is, recording "sound" for sound recordings and "silent" for non-sound content), that there was a generalized need when there was supplemental content with sound characteristics warranting better placement in field 344.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP15 explores mechanisms for recording supplemental content (indexes, bibliographies, supplements, etc.) through the use of controlled vocabularies and associated URIs in the bibliographic format. It offers two mechanisms: 1) additions to the existing note fields 504 and 525; and 2) creation of a new 353 field.

There was general support for option 2 in the submitted comments.

During meeting discussion, competing visions regarding data management arose – augmenting the 504 and 525 fields would reduce redundancy of fields across the format; deployment of field 353 would keep free-text and controlled vocabulary data in distinct places. A majority favored the latter option and the former was ceded by its adherents.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP16 explores mechanisms for recording the new RDA element, "Mode of Issuance for Manifestations. It proposes a new field, field 344 with associated subfields for terms, codes, and URIs to record this data.

There was general support expressed in the submitted comments.

In meeting discussion, the presenter addressed the reiteration of the concerns parallel to those raised for Proposal 2020-07, about implementing such data in cases where a cataloger inferred one circumstance that later turned out not to be correct.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2020-DP17 explores mechanisms for recording the RDA element, Type of Binding for Manifestation. It proposes a new subfield $l to field 340 to hold this data.

There was general support expressed in the submitted comments, with some reservations about the implications to the current practice in OCLC's WorldCat of being "binding agnostic." There was also a concern about differentiating between this manifestation level

element and the item level data historically addressed by the rare book cataloging community and how these details might intersect here.

There was extensive discussion in the meeting regarding the non-repeatability of the proposed subfield. It was observed that the RDA vocabulary encoding scheme (VES) for this element consists of categories that on the surface appear to be non-disjoint (for example, a spiral binding with paper(back) covers). It was observed that there could be multi-part resources where the constituent parts manifested different binding types. Practitioners at the table, led by OCLC, reiterated the concern that OCLC's WorldCat database is binding neutral in general, and which would be unduly complicated (that is, unduly populated by duplicative records) by the imposition of separate descriptions being required under the strictures of the proposed subfield in cases of (near) simultaneous publication of hardcover and (trade)paperback versions. It was restated that this element is not part of the RDA minimum description but is an immutable aspect of the LRM modelling that RDA is following. There was willingness expressed to work out particulars and clarifications regarding bespoke bindings from the rare book cataloging community and the question of multi-part resources.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.