

**CORE**  
**(A Division of the American Library Association)**  
**Metadata and Collections 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 28-30, in lieu of meetings during the virtual ALA 2021 Annual Conference.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the summer 2021 virtual MAC meetings on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: [https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2021\\_age.html](https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2021_age.html)

Executive Summary:

Six proposals and six discussion papers were taken up. The six proposals passed, most with minor amendments. The five of the discussion papers are anticipated to return as proposals, with another to be reworked into a subsequent discussion paper.

Narrative:

**From the Chair:** 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. Fast track proposals: [None].

**LC Report:** [None]

**Other Reports:**

- A late submission of a follow on paper from the German cataloging community concerning 2021-DP10 on data provenance. The paper provides amplifying information regarding their practices with meta-metadata, and hence their strong support for a solution on the question.
- It was announced that Matthew Wise would be stepping down as chair after 8 years (and 5 years of prior service as a MARBI member). His contributions to the committee were lauded, in particular navigating three significant challenges: transitioning from MARBI

to the reworked MAC, the welter of papers in 2016, and transitioning to a virtual meeting format during the pandemic. The new chair will be Cate Gerhart.

**Proposal 2021-11** would provide the means to record invalid and cancelled ISSNs in the 490 series field. Specifically, it would define the \$y and \$z subfields to that end (supporting descriptive recording opportunities parallel to those in the 022 field).

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. Discussion followed up on the implications for \$x, in which it was reiterated that \$x will not be changed and can continue to hold an ISSN of any condition; the new subfields are for distinctly recording invalid and cancelled ISSNs when such conditions are known with respect to the ISSN being recorded. Additional discussion took up the question of repeatability, which is there to support mutual recording of series and subseries. Additional questions concerning more closely defining \$x and of expanding the scope of ISSN validation beyond those currently handled were deemed complex and angst inducing.

This proposal passed.

**Proposal 2021-12** would provide a means to record “reverse relationships” in field 672 of the authority format. Specifically, it would define \$i and \$4 for text strings and coded values to indicate the nature of the relationship between the content entity recorded in the 672 field with the creator entity recorded in the 1XX of the authority record. In plain language, it would support the syntax [672 entry] [is edited by] [100 entry].

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, including suggested revision for the label of the proposed \$i to “Relationship Information.” Discussion touched on the “directionality” of the relationship being recorded, although it is less a matter of “directionality” of the relationship than the field to which the relationship designation is appended, so it is almost a shift of “voice” than of “direction. The question of a source code was covered by using either a sole MARC approved code list, analogous to the MARC Code List for Relators or the use of URIs which will be self-identifying. Relationship Designator List. The utility of making the new subfields repeatable to support recording multiple roles by the same individual in connection with a manifestation was raised and met with approval.

This proposal passed, as amended for the subfield label and repeatability.

**Proposal 2021-13** would support the recording of geographic data for non-cartographic resources. Specifically, it would expand the applicability of field 034 for recording coordinates for any kind of resource/resource description. It provides the necessary edits to field 034 and clarification of the use of field 255 for cartographic resources.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, including minor modifications to the wording of the proposed revision to the second paragraph of the field definition and scope. The general thrust of conversation was that an expansive reading of

the current definitions could support the desired use but that making it more explicit did no harm. A question regarding the relative positions of the object displayed and the creator of the image would be up to application profiles of communities making use of the field. The intersection of the paper with 2021-DP11 regarding scale was brought up, but largely deferred to that paper.

This proposal passed, with minor editorial amendment to the proposed language for the second paragraph of the field definition and scope.

**Proposal 2021-14** would support a mechanism for recording “Original Sound Capture and Storage” within the variable field block (to parallel the coded values in the 007 control field). Specifically, it would add subfield \$j to field 344 to support this purpose, to supports \$0 and \$1 in line with conventional use across the formats.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. The question from submitted comments for 2021-15 was also raised here concerning “rationalizing” the labels for the code values so they distinctly identify the capture and storage techniques and record them consistently as capture, then storage technique. This concern could be reviewed and addressed editorially.

This proposal passed, subject to editorial review of the labels.

**Proposal 2021-15** would clarify definitions regarding “Capture and storage technique.” Specifically, it would revise position label and the definitions of the code values to make it clearer that they apply to original capture and storage techniques only.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments. Having discussed the relevant concerns under the previous paper, there was no further discussion.

This proposal passed, subject to editorial review of the labels.

**Proposal 2021-16** would provide a mechanism for recording the original binding technique of a published or unpublished resource. Specifically, it would define \$l (el) of field 340 for recording this information. Initially intended to support only RDA VES entries, the definition has been expanded to support entry from other vocabularies.

As part of the introduction, it was stressed how much the final paper had shifted from its origins to record strictly RDA terminology (the RDA VES) to a more broadly conceived subfield to support binding information as identified in varying thesauri used by various cataloging communities.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments, including a suggested revision to the wording of the subfield definition for further clarity, and a suggestion to move a reference to field 563 from the overall field definition to the text concerning the new subfield. There was some further discussion regarding how explicit to make various

references to binding be more explicit with respect to the original binding but the complexities and implications for the rare book community made that daunting.

This proposal passed, as amended for the revised definition text and moving the reference to field 563.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP07** explores the recording of cluster ISSNs in the MARC formats. To that end, it proposes the addition of new field 023 to record such cluster ISSNs and deprecating the existing 022 \$l and \$m that had been previously developed for recording ISSN-Ls.

Introduced, with a clarifying definition of what is a cluster ISSN and notice that the paper's authors will offer a late development to the paper as an alternative to indicators.

The Chair summarize previously submitted comments. The paper's originators reported that, post submission, they had considered an alternative to using indicators, namely deploying another subfield to identify the cluster type and drawing on a controlled vocabulary. In response to a submitted comment, the paper's originators had investigated field 758 but felt that its definition was not consonant with their intended use for the cluster ISSNs. Lastly, the movement of data from one part of the format to another is not without precedent, as exemplified by the movement of the ISSN Centre Code from the LDR to the 022 \$2. Lastly, with respect to erroneous data and its potential impact on matching algorithms, it was already wrong and will only be "wrong in a different way" under the new field. There was further discussion on the alternative solution, with respect to the prospect of doubling of URIs for both the content of the field and the identification of the cluster type, to which it was observed that \$4 routinely accommodated this in other fields and could be explored in this case.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP08** explores the dynamics for cleaning up some redundancies that have emerged as the 34X block has been developed. To that end, it proposes tightening up the definition of field 340 \$f and then moving some legacy data from field 340 \$f into newer, more appropriate field/subfield combinations within the 34X block.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments. Committee discussion was sparse, having largely been supported in the submitted comments. The question of creating distinct subfields for reduction ratio terms vs reduction ratio values was raised. It was acknowledged that if rebuilding field 340 from the start, it would be ideal to separate them and record in adjacent subfields. At present, the options are to meld them into a single subfield or record them in subfields that are separated from each other.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP09** explores a mechanism for recording equivalent descriptions of resources through distinct language of cataloging records. It considers various options for conveying the linkage, through either existing or new fields.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments. There was discussion about clarifying the use case and use of the proposed field. It distinctly would not be for alternate language editions of the same work (language of manifestation(s)). It is primarily intended for the description of multi-lingual manifestations through distinct records with differing language of cataloging (typically corresponding to the languages of the manifestation). Several of the submitted comments alluded to a pilot project to identify parallel records in differing languages of cataloging for monolingual manifestations. Another question with respect to “parallel records with respect to cataloging standard, e.g. MARC vs DC” was raised. In a subsequent discussion of these two cases they were acknowledged as possibilities for development but were outside the authors’ interests and energies. Others are welcome to develop their own discussion papers to pursue these thoughts. The implications for RDA’s Work entity and preferred title was echoed from the submitted comments but was countered with the observation that, in RDA, the preferred title is not required to be single and unique. The general timbre of the discussion was that the various issues could be successfully addressed through an improved label for the field and additional clarity in the field definition and scope.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP10** explores a mechanism for recording data provenance or “meta-metadata” information. To that end, it further develops ideas previously submitted in 2021-DP06, once some of that paper’s options had been rejected.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments. In a late development, in response to general resistance in those comments, the German language cataloging community had subsequently delivered a follow on paper demonstrating their local mechanisms for recording meta-metadata. This significantly altered the “temperature of the room” on the matter at hand. It was even suggested that the German language cataloging community may be better positioned to author any subsequent papers, highlighting their operational needs and practices over the prospect of the more theoretical approach offered by the MARC/RDA WG. Various voices from the RDA development constituency made the triple points that: this data would be optional in RDA, up to individual communities and agencies to deploy or not; that such communities and agencies would be unnecessarily constrained in their use if MARC did not support it; and that this data would likely need to be round-tripped through MARC even if such communities and agencies did not use MARC natively. The representative from the German language cataloging community explained the four use instances outlined in their follow on paper. Some pragmatic questions were put to the committee by the CC:DA liaison with respect to addressing some of the disadvantage of the competing approaches. In response, the presenter sought a straw poll to confirm the sense of the room and guide

further development of the WG's efforts to focus on pursuing "Option 5" namely, use of \$7 where possible, paired with coded values. This was strongly affirmed.

This discussion paper will return as a further discussion paper.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP11** explores a mechanism for recording scale data for non-cartographic resources. Specifically, it proposes minor edits to the definition of field 507 to make it more generally applicable beyond cartographic resources.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments. The question of why field 034 was not suitable for recording controlled or numerical values was reiterated, since 2021-13 had essentially expanded the use of 034 for recording coordinates for non-cartographic resources. There is a tighter connection, with respect to recording scale, between 034 and 255, the latter being exclusively defined to apply to cartographic resources. Field 507 is the only acceptable place by the cartographic cataloging community for recording scale information for non-cartographic resources.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2021-DP12** explores mechanisms for recording data associated with the new RDA entity, "representative expression" – that is an expression that best articulates the abstract work. To that end it outlines several potential alternative approaches to consider.

The Chair summarized previously submitted comments, which had generally coalesced into two solutions from those offered – defining a new 387 field or making use of indicator values, although neither approach in isolation would satisfactorily meet the needs of the various communities or the constraints of their elements of interest. Of particular concern was addressing how to record medium of performance. In discussion, these dynamics pointed to the strong need for a blended approach, "use indicators where they work and other solutions where they don't." Additional points raised were: the possibility of expanding the number of expression attributes able to be recorded in the authority format, depending on the solution arrived at, and that different communities have implemented the recording of medium of performance in different ways within the MARC format. There were a series of straw polls:

- Is section 3.1 workable (insert bibliographic fields into the authority format)? (18-0)
- Is section 3.2 workable (use 075 in bib format, with \$8)? (4-15)
- Is section 3.3 workable (expand 381)? (8-9)
- Is section 3.4 workable (define a new field, possibly 387)? (28-4)
- Is section 3.5 workable (add new indicator values to existing fields)? (26-1)
- Is section 3.6 workable (combination approach)? Specifically, a 387 with indicators for medium of performance? (23-0)

This discussion paper will return as a proposal (incorporating a blended approach of indicators and field 387).