

BCC2008/SMF/1**MARC Formats Subcommittee Report from ALA Annual Meeting
Philadelphia, PA, Jan. 12-13, 2008**
Compiled by Jim Alberts**Discussion Papers**

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP01: *Identifying headings that are appropriate as added entries, but are not used as bibliographic main entries*

The Visual Resources Association and others brought this proposal forward as a way of recording locations, such as palazzi, amphitheaters, and other venues of performance or display in the form of access points within the bibliographic record when these locations do not have a direct subject relationship with the item being described. Until now, such buildings or objects were created in the subject authority file and could not be coded as 7xx fields unless they were coterminous with a corporate body.

This proposal would allow such features, which are routinely recorded in the bibliographic record elsewhere (as in the 518 note) to be accessible in a controlled format as 7xx entries. Although this was brought forward by the art community as a way to have controlled 7xx access to exhibit venues, the potential usefulness of this for the music community is self-evident, in that it would allow music catalogers to make added entries for performance venues that could be legitimate access points for catalog users.

This paper will be brought back as a proposal at the ALA Annual 2008 meeting.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP03: *Definition of subfield \$3 for recording information associated with series added entry fields (800-830) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format*

This proposal was brought forward by CONSER representatives as a way to indicate which volumes of a serial were part of given series or sub-series on the bibliographic record, when multiple series were present. The general usefulness of the proposal was conceded, and it was suggested that it be applied more broadly to non-serial bibliographic records, such as map sets and collected works editions. It will be returned for discussion at ALA Annual.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP04: *Encoding RDA, Resource Description and Access data in MARC 21*

The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for the Development of RDA crafted this discussion paper, which outlines areas in which changes and additions will have to be made to the MARC format in order to accommodate RDA data. It was acknowledged that the current MARC record structure is not an optimal data encoding structure for RDA, and any modifications to MARC for the sake of RDA should be considered in part provisional, so that data can be encoded with sufficient granularity that when the time comes to migrate to a new data structure, RDA data will not be lost due to the relative lack of granularity in the MARC formats. Also, this discussion was less about making implementation decisions than giving guidance to the JSC on general preferences and methods for moving forward.

Much of the discussion centered on questions of granularity and encoding methods. For instance, the RDA elements that roughly correspond to the general material designation (media type, carrier type, and content type) will probably be disconnected from the 245 and could be encoded as one field with three subfields or three separate variable fields. One general suggestion that covered many of the questions raised in the discussion paper was the preference for using encoded data, which is language neutral and could display in the language of the cataloging agency, rather than language-based tags.

Another instance illustrating the need for a higher degree of granularity to accommodate RDA data occurs in the data generally collected in the MARC 300 field. RDA requires production, publication, and distribution statements, each with up to six sub-elements, all of which need to be parsed in MARC in order for the data to be fully retrievable and make eventual system migration feasible without unacceptable data loss. Karen Coyle suggested that while a higher

degree of granularity was necessary, current MARC fields should retain their meanings and new fields should be designated to accommodate RDA data needs.

There are several other specific problems mentioned in the discussion paper, having to do with specific content designation for copyright and phonogram dates, serials numbering conventions, thesis information, and information on actors, narrators, producers, musicians, and other names occurring within the bibliographic description.

The sense of MARBI was that the JSC should proceed with an RDA/MARC proposal for ALA Annual, with the proviso that it have enough granularity to accommodate RDA data and make as much use as possible of coded data and fixed field elements.

Proposals

MARC Proposal No. 2008-01: *Representation of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) System in MARC 21 formats*

The Dewey editorial team at OCLC has been developing methods to encode Dewey information in a MARC framework rather than the proprietary framework that has been used for online Dewey development to the present time. Also, the editorial team felt that Dewey numbers could be exploited for faceting and subject access if inner numbers and alternative numbers could be displayed in the MARC bibliographic and classification formats.

The current proposal updates many of the items discussed at ALA Annual 2007 in Washington, DC. The proposal, which will be of interest to any music librarians who work with Dewey, was approved with minor editorial alterations.

MARC Proposal No. 2008-02: *Definition of field 542 for information related to copyright status in the MARC 21 bibliographic format*

This proposal, brought forward by the California Digital Library, provides for MARC coding and full parsing of copyright information, when known to the cataloging agency. This was conceived in part as a way of pushing copyright information on digital objects (such as digitized historical photographs) to the user when such data is known. Clearly, the 542 field could have applications beyond digital resources, but the application of field 542 will generally be determined at the level of the cataloging agency. The data elements recorded are the primary elements used by Berne Convention signatories.

This proposal went through two iterations as a discussion paper, and MARBI members from outside the United States expressed concern that copyright data recorded within a certain jurisdiction might be inapplicable or inaccurate outside of that jurisdiction. It was noted, however, that the data recorded in the 542 field is factual data derived from the item, typically at the time of cataloging or digitization, and does not represent interpretations of copyright or rights information.

The proposal was accepted with minor editorial changes and corrections.

MARC Proposal No. 2008-03: *Definition of first indicator value in field 041 (Language code) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic format*

The British Library brought forward this change in order to facilitate language coding for objects in multiple languages in which the relationships between languages within an item is not clear or cannot be determined. The proposed change is the addition of 1st indicator blank to the current set of 0 (item is not or does not include a translation) and 1 (item is or includes a translation). The blank 1st indicator would mean that no determination had been made regarding whether or not an item is or includes a translation. The usefulness of this code, especially for digitization and retroconversion projects in which it may not be feasible to examine individual items for this type of information, was agreed upon by MARBI, and the proposal passed with minor editorial changes.

Last updated March 12, 2008