

BCC2002/SMF/1

# REPORT OF THE MARBI/MARC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

New Orleans, LA  
January 19-21, 2002

MARBI and the MARC Advisory Committee met concurrently in three sessions during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in New Orleans. Chair William Jones (NYU) led the sessions.

## ***Announcements:***

Tom Delsey has prepared a functional analysis of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats, using the FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) model and the AACR cataloging code model. The Library of Congress commissioned this study as a tool for future developments to the MARC 21 formats. It is available as a PDF file at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc-functional-analysis/home.html>

The Library of Congress has shipped the October 2001 MARC 21 and has incorporated the changes into the online documentation. Specific changes are described through links at: <http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/status.html>

A Spanish language MARC homepage has been developed to support the use and understanding of MARC 21 in Latin America; it is linked to the LC MARC homepage.

## ***Highlights:***

Proposals of interest to the music community include:

- 2002-01 to add a URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) subfield to field 670 in the Authorities format
- 2002-02 to add a URI subfield to fields 508 and 511 in the Bibliographic format
- 2002-07 to extend the 600-651 2<sup>nd</sup> indicator values to field 655 in the Bibliographic format

Some discussion papers gave direction to the future development of MARC 21, including:

- 2002-DP04, which proposed a new approach to cataloging multiple versions
- 2002-DP05, which looked at applications of the non-filing control character technique
- 2002-DP07, which explored changes requested in harmonizing MARC 21 and UKMARC.

## ***Proposals***

2002-01: *Definition of Subfield \$u (URI) in Field 670 (Source Data Found) in the MARC 21 Authority Format* (approved)

In part because of the Library of Congress decision not to record URIs in field 856 in the Authority format (approved by MARBI in 1998), this proposal requested the definition of subfield \$u for URI in field 670. In response to objections from the audience, MARBI noted that this new 670 subfield serves a more specific purpose (“Source data found”) than the URI recorded in field 856 (“Electronic location and access”).

2002-02: *Definition of Subfields \$u, \$y and \$3 in Fields 508 and 511 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format* (not approved)

This paper proposed adding subfields to the 508 and 511 Bibliographic fields to provide remote access to complete lists of credit or performer notes. Neither MLA nor OLAC were consulted for this proposal, and both groups expressed

reservations about it, especially in regard to moving descriptive elements outside of the bibliographic record. MARBI defeated this proposal unanimously.

*2002-03: Expanding Field 046 for Other Dates in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format* (approved as amended)

Building on two separate discussion papers in 2001, this proposal asked for additional subfields in field 046 to provide a place for date modified (\$j), date created (\$k), date valid (\$m for beginning date valid and \$n for end of date valid) and source of date (\$2). To the proposal, MARBI added \$l for end of date creation, \$3 for materials specified, and suggested that \$k be defined as single or beginning date created. The new subfields will be used for dates of importance to the resource that are not coded elsewhere in the record.

*2002-04: Definition of Subfield \$p (Number of pieces per issuance) in Fields 853-855 of the MARC 21 Holdings Format* (approved)

This paper requested a new subfield \$p in fields 853-855 of the Holdings format to accommodate coding both for when to expect an issue and how many physical pieces are expected.

*2002-05: Expansion of Regularity Pattern Coding in Fields 853-855 Subfield \$y in the MARC 21 Holdings Format* (approved)

This proposal asked for an expansion of subfield \$y in fields 853-855 of the Holdings format to better express spanned enumeration and chronology for serial issues, especially for skipped and combined issues.

*2002-06: Changes in Field 008 in the MARC 21 Holdings Format* (tabled)

This proposal requested changes to field 008/07 and 008/08 in the Holdings format, in part to identify additional methods of acquisition and to further identify lending policies. MARBI expressed concerns about putting acquisitions and circulation data in the Holdings format, although consortia may need this type of information due to licensing agreements. The group did not support renaming 008/08 to "Subscription end date" as suggested in the paper, since this can also be used for multi-part items which do not have subscriptions. In tabling this proposal, MARBI requested further revisions and clarifications before taking it up again at a future meeting.

*2002-07: Definition of Additional Second Indicator Values for Specific Subject Systems in Field 655 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format* (approved)

Because the Bibliographic formats present two means of encoding subject schemes in fields 600-651 (2<sup>nd</sup> indicator and subfield \$2), this paper proposed adding those same 2<sup>nd</sup> indicator values to field 655, which currently only uses the subfield \$2 technique. Issues raised in the discussion included the possibility of eliminating the 2<sup>nd</sup> indicator values for all subject fields and relying solely on subfield \$2 (not a popular choice), the comment that making field 655 match other subject fields improves training and understanding, and the fact that technically, nothing is broken. If the Library of Congress moves in the direction of coding form/genre terms in field 655, consistency in coding all 6XX fields would become more important, especially to music catalogers.

*2002-08: Making the First Indicator Value 0 (U. S. Dept. of Defense Classification) Obsolete in Field 052 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats* (approved)

Noting the unfortunate data migration error which caused the need for this paper, MARBI approved this proposal to make one indicator value in field 052 obsolete and to define a new indicator value for the same information.

*2002-09: Encoding Variable Length Coordinate Formats in Field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic* (approved)

This paper requested an expansion of field 034 to include variable length coordinates. MARBI approved the proposal while requesting better instructions in the language of application.

## *Discussion Papers*

### *2002-DP01: Coding Electronic Formats for Different Media in Field 007 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats*

By presenting possible additions for coding electronic formats to field 007 in the Bibliographic and Holdings formats, this paper inadvertently raised the question of the continued usefulness of field 007 in general. While MARBI reached no consensus to eliminate the 007, few had interest in continuing to expand the available coding. The discussion brought out several problems with 007s: coded data is an old technique; many existing 007s have incorrect coding; bytes within 007s code at different levels of granularity. MARBI expressed some support for expanding the definition of code “s” to include all electronic formats (such as MP3s) regardless of the playback equipment used.

### *2002-DP02: Renaming the 008 Positions to Reflect their Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format*

Because of changes to and introduction of new terminology, this paper suggested renaming the 008 for Books, Serials, Maps and Computer Files to reflect current standards. These changes would only affect documentation. Discussion centered on the costs and benefits of renaming these 008s, including the impact on hard-coded help screens and the improvement in training catalogers. MARBI noted that if the term “continuing textual resources” is selected, the 008 and 006 terminology could no longer be consistent, since the 006 is not limited to textual resources. While MARBI could support changing the terminology from “seriality” to “continuing resource,” there was no other consensus about how to proceed.

### *2002-DP03: Changes for FAST Subject Headings*

This paper presented possible changes to subject coding in the Bibliographic and Authority formats to accommodate the scheme for FAST subject headings, currently under development at OCLC. FAST is a thesaurus based on LCSH, but is intended to be easier to apply, since it has separate headings by facets: topical, geographic, chronological and form. Because strictly chronological descriptions do not currently have separate subject fields, a new tag would be needed for both the Bibliographic 6XX and the Authority format (1XX, 4XX, 5XX and 7XX). OCLC also wants a new position in subfield \$w of the 7XX fields to indicate whether the heading can be updated by machine or if it needs human review (“Near East” to “Middle East” vs. “Nurses and nursing” to either “Nurses” or “Nursing”). MARBI expressed some concern about whether systems would retain “Deleted” records in the FAST thesaurus, which OCLC needs to maintain links from obsolete headings.

### *2002-DP04: Addition of Imprint and Physical Description fields to the MARC 21 Holdings Format*

The Association of Moving Image Archivists prepared this paper, which explored a major change in transcribing copy-specific information, by including fields 260 and 300 in the Holdings format. They use *Archival Moving Images* instead of *AACR2* as their cataloging code and already transcribe multiple 300 fields in the bibliographic record for different physical formats (videodisc, videotape, film reels, etc.). The resulting record can be quite complex, and AMIA felt that moving this type of information to separate holdings records would simplify cataloging, display, and record interpretation issues. Because the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR has established a Format Variation Working Group which is looking into similar issues, MARBI found the paper premature. Implementing this practice would constitute a major change, and this concept also raises the issue of sharing holdings information among institutions. This will return as a proposal after the JSC’s working group has completed their final report, which should give guidance about how the FRBR principles will be incorporated into *AACR2*.

### *2002-DP05: Guidelines for the Nonfiling Control Character Technique in the MARC 21 Formats*

As the fifth in a series of discussion papers and proposals about using the nonfiling control character technique, this paper built on the discussion of DP118 from June 1999. However, presented with these examples and suggestions, MARBI backpedaled to express a preference for a narrower approach for applying this technique, with clear acceptance for use in 246, 700 subfield \$t, 780, and similar situations where no alternative non-filing coding is available. While discussion of this paper resolved little, MARBI noted that general application guidelines will be necessary, including how to treat non-alphanumeric characters and spaces associated with the non-filing zone.

*2002-DP06: Repertoire Expansion in the Universal Character Set for Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics*

This paper explored the possibility of adding all characters from the Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics set for the UCS/Unicode character set, but not MARC-8. In general, systems are not ready for full implementation of Unicode, and representatives expressed an interest in proceeding slowly; however, the Canadian Committee on MARC needs these characters. Although the paper suggests this might be a test case for character expansion, MARBI viewed this situation as an exception, since so few libraries would utilize these characters.

*2002-DP07: Changes for UKMARC Format Alignment*

Because the UK library community will soon adopt MARC 21, the British Library authored this paper which presented some suggested changes to accommodate certain UKMARC practices in MARC 21. This will likely return as a proposal at MARBI's Atlanta meeting.

- Fields 008 and 006 (multiple bytes affected): There was little discussion about the proposed expansion of the target audience coding, although MARBI supported LC's suggestion of reviewing the names and scopes of existing values. The group found the reinstatement of coding for the UK ISSN Center acceptable and had little comment on expansion of the codes available for "nature of contents." The MLA representative objected to the idea of re-establishing and expanding the code for music parts, given the reasons for eliminating this byte in the first place. With this background information, the British Library will rethink where to recommend putting this information. MLA also had misgivings about encoding transposition and arrangement in a new byte and suggested, if this goes forward to a proposal, the addition of values for n/a, unknown and no attempt to code.
- Adding subfield to field 040 for property rights: MARBI had strong misgivings about including this in the MARC record, and OCLC cannot accommodate the addition of new subfields to the 040.
- Creation of field 756 for "Fingerprint Note" (used for early printed books): MARBI questioned whether this information would be better in a 0XX field. Also, RLG requested a better correspondence with UNIMARC's treatment of this data.
- Addition of field 563 for "Binding Information": MARBI preferred this as an addition to the Holdings format; however, then binding information could not be shared. Catalog records for microforms would not use this field; however, it would not be limited to original items.
- Definition of field 356 for "Trade Price": The British Library representative clarified that book trade information does not equal acquisitions information, and thus this information should not be encoded in fields 037, 020 or 350.
- Creation of field 358 for "Trade Information": The British Library recommends only using the ONIX codes in this field, as they are currently making the previous list obsolete in UKMARC.
- Expansion of character set to include eszett and Euro sign: RLG cannot accommodate this request until after they fully implement Unicode, at an undetermined time in the future. MARBI noted that many other major currencies' symbols are not included in the character set, nor are some desired other characters, including the section symbol.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kathy Glennan  
Chair, Subcommittee on MARC Formats

---

*Last updated July 19, 2002*