

BCC2009/SMF/4

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEEMARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic
Information Committee) Report
July 11-12, 2009
Chicago, Ill.

This report will be divided, as were the meetings, into two sections. The first consists of proposals and discussion papers from various MARC constituencies, including OLAC, CONSER, and the National Library of Spain. The second section includes proposals and discussion papers from the RDA/MARC Working Group.

Proposals/Discussion Papers from the Constituencies

[Proposal 2009-07](#): *Definition of field 883 (Source of description, etc. note) in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

This proposal was brought forward by the CONSER Standard Record/MARC Working Group. It proposed a new field for catalogers' notes on sources of information and some other types of information. The proposal was passed as field 588 (not 883) with subfields \$a, \$5, \$6, and \$8, but not with the additional subfielding included in the proposal. For the purposes of those outside of the serials community (including music catalogers) the most important change stemming from this proposal will be the eventual use of field 588 for all source of title notes.

[Proposal 2009-08](#): *Changes to field 257 (Country of producing entity) for use with non-archival materials in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

This proposal, brought forward by OLAC, concerns broadening of the 257 field to include non-archival films, and was passed with minor amendments.

[Discussion Paper 2009-DP05](#): *Making 008/39 (cataloging source fixed field) obsolete in the MARC 21 format.*

PCC and OCLC jointly brought this paper to MARBI. They felt that because of changes in the cooperative programs (mainly BIBCO and CONSER) the cataloging source fixed field was no longer informative and often misleading. The 040 and 042 fields provide more reliable and detailed source of cataloging information. This discussion paper will be returned as a proposal using a fill character in 008/39 (cataloging source).

[Discussion Paper 2009-DP04](#): *Adding codes for "online access" and "direct access" in 008 for Form of item in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

This paper concerns creating a code to clarify differentiation between electronic resources available online and electronic resources requiring direct access (i.e. CD-ROMs and other types of "tangible" e-resources). The discussion primarily concerned the possibility for ambiguity arising from the use of technologies such as networked CD-ROMs and changes in the life cycle of electronic resources (as in an online resource that is downloaded, which may be thought to become direct access). MARBI felt that the proposal had merit and the possibility of ambiguity could be overcome by focusing on the item in hand (or online) and applying cataloger's judgment.

[Proposal 2009-09](#): *Adding new codes to Music 008/18-19 (Form of composition) in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

The National Library of Spain requested that four new form genre codes be added to the 008/18-19 and 047 fields. Part of the IBERMARC/MARC 21 harmonization process, these are for frequently-used Spanish genres. Some MARBI members and representatives had misgivings about adding to the 048 (which has been largely a closed list for many years) and felt that using codes available from the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives, and

Documentation Centres would have been a preferable alternative. However, there are no practical problems with adding three of the four codes requested in the proposal (za, for zarzuelas, fl, for flamenco, and vi, for villancicos) to the 048 code list.

The fourth code, tl for “lyric theater music,” was thought to be too ambiguous to add when the original Spanish musical context was not clear from the code or title, and “lyric theater music” has no clear meaning applied to non-Spanish genres. It was proposed that this be retitled “teatro lírico,” which indicates the Spanish origins and usage of the term. This compromise was accepted.

[Proposal 2009-10](#): *Adding subfield \$3 in field 534 (materials specified note) to the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

Also proposed by the National Library of Spain, this proposal suggests using \$3 to indicate the component part of a resource that is being referred to when the main portion of the bibliographic record describes a reproduction and the data for the component part (broken out by \$3) and the main item differ. The proposal was approved as written.

Proposals and Discussion Papers from the RDA/MARC Working Group

[Proposal 2009-06/1](#): *Accommodating relationship designators for RDA Appendix J and K in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

In RDA, Appendix J covers relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, and items, while Appendix K includes relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies (name to name relationships).

Subfield \$i is proposed for indicating name/title relationships in X00-X11 and X30 fields. The definition of \$i in this context will include the term “relationship designator” (in part to differentiate it from the current use of \$i in other fields). Other proposed changes include defining \$4 in bib. 76X-78X for enabling use of coded forms of resource-to-resource links. \$4 will also be added to fields 4XX and 5XX in the authority format. This proposal was approved as amended.

[Proposal 2009-06/2](#): *Transcribing series and subseries ISSNs.*

This proposal makes \$x (ISSN) repeatable in field 490, so that multiple ISSNs can be encoded for series and subseries, in accordance with RDA instructions. The proposal passed as written.

[Proposal 2009-06/3](#): *New coded values for RDA media carriers in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.*

This proposal asks for new codes in the 007/01 position, for “microfilm roll” and “film roll.” In addition, the position LDR/06 code was defined to include “r” for object for certain types of realia and naturally occurring objects.

This proposal was approved without modification.

[Discussion Paper 2009-DP06/1](#): *Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC 21 records.*

The RDA/MARC working group proposes two ways of encoding URIs, one in MARC 21 and one in MARCXML. \$1 is proposed for addition across all formats and fields for encoding Uniform Resource Indicator information. Much of the discussion concerned the potential complexities of encoding this information in traditional MARC 21, and the possibility of exploring in greater detail than has hitherto been done the possibility of expanding the use and coding of MARCXML in ways that are not always practical in traditional MARC. There was also an alternative suggestion to use linking fields, modeled on field 880 for alternative graphic representation, to better parse the various URIs for machine processing. While the complexities of coding this information in traditional MARC are known, it was thought (in regard to Question 1 of the Questions for discussion) that it would be best to pursue encoding URIs for values from controlled vocabularies should be pursued in both traditional MARC and MARCXML at this time. A revised version of this paper is expected for discussion at Midwinter.

[Discussion Paper 2009-DP06/2](#): *Enhancing field 033 and field 518 for place and date of capture in the MARC 21*

bibliographic format.

This paper suggests methods for encoding place and date of capture information in both 033 and 518 fields in more granular ways than is currently done, mainly to satisfy RDA, which considers date of capture and place of capture as separate elements. Currently, all of this information is in the 518 in eye-readable form only, and some is encoded in field 033. Field 033 currently allows date of capture to be encoded, and place of capture down to the level of area and subarea following cuttering derived from LC G classification schedule. This typically allows for coding to the level of city or town (where cutters are available) but not more specific locations, such as performance venues or recording studios. It is suggested that \$d could be added to 033, for specifying performance/recording venues in textual form. While some MARBI members and liaisons were concerned about mixing coded and free-text information in a single field, there seemed to be a certain amount of support for this concept.

For field 518, several options were introduced, including using the repeatability of field 518 to display place and date of capture in separate fields. It was also suggested that new subfields be added to field 518: \$d (date of capture), \$i (introductory text), and \$p (place of capture). This would allow the information to be coded in a way that is not inconsistent with RDA.

This discussion paper will be returned as a proposal. It was agreed that place/date of capture information should be recorded in both fields 033 and 518.

Discussion Paper 2009-DP06/3: New data elements in the MARC 21 authority and bibliographic format for works and expressions.

This paper suggests adding a number of fields to the bibliographic and authority formats in order to accommodate certain RDA information including form of work, date of work/date of expression, distinguishing characteristics of work/expression (when necessary to differentiate a work or expression from another work or expression), medium of performance, numeric designation of a musical work, and key of musical work. Note that medium of performance, numeric designation, and key are recorded currently in the authority format only when they are needed to formulate the heading. This paper gives specific fields for this information to be included (when applicable) even if the information is not needed for the access point.

The discussion paper does not specify fields to be used for this information. In order for the information to use the same field numbers in the bibliographic and authority formats, numbers in the 3XX range will be defined in the bibliographic and authority formats. Some field numbers that were defined (in draft form) in the *MARC 21 Format 2009 Changes to Accommodate RDA* will be moved from 6XX to 3XX in order to keep the added information and field numbers consistent and use the same field numbers in both bibliographic and authority formats.

This discussion paper will be returned to MARBI, with suggested modifications, as a proposal. *Submitted by Jim Alberts*

Last updated August 19,

2009