

BCC2009/SMF/1**MARBI Report, ALA Midwinter
Denver, CO, Jan. 24-25, 2009**

MARBI (The Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee) met in Denver, Jan. 24-25, 2009. Of the proposals and discussion papers considered, some involved relatively minor changes required by European libraries to convert data to MARC 21 and will have little impact on the music cataloging community. However, MARC proposals No. 2009-01/1 through 2009-01/3 and Discussion Papers 2009-DP01/1 and 2009-DP01/2 all have to do with various aspects of adapting the MARC formats for RDA implementation, and some of them may have considerable implications not only for music cataloging, but for all cataloging communities as well.

All proposals and discussion papers can be found in their original form at <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/list-p.html> (proposals) and <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/list-dp.html> (discussion papers).

Proposal No. 2009-02: *Definition of new codes for legal deposits in 008/07 (Method of Acquisition) in the MARC 21 Holdings format.* This was brought forward by the National Library of Spain in order to code different types of deposits: “legal deposits” and material brought in through a more general depository program. The proposal was accepted with minor changes: code v was dropped and the definition of code d was changed to “deposit, unspecified.”

Proposal No. 2009-03: *Definition of filed 080 in the MARC 21 Authority Format.* Also brought by the National Library of Spain, this will allow use of Universal Decimal Classification numbers in authority records. It was accepted without substantial amendment.

Proposal No. 2009-04: *Addition of codes for map projections in 008/22-23 (Maps) in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.* Brought to MARBI by the National Library of the Czech Republic, this proposal expands the available codes in 880/22-23 of the Maps format to allow for a wider variety of projection methods than was hitherto available. The proposal was passed without amendment.

Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP02: *Definition of field 588 for metadata control note.* Brought forward by CONSER, this proposal suggested using field 588 for certain types of notes that frequently appear on serials records: the Description Based On/Title From, Latest Issue Consulted, and various other types of administrative notes now coded as 500 fields. There is some interest in having more granular control over some of these notes so they can be suppressed from public display, since they are generally regarded (outside of the rare materials serials cataloging community) as of limited use or interest for users.

Although MARBI recognized the potential usefulness of more granular encoding of these fields, it was argued that suppression could be better coded through use of the indicators, and also that the scope of notes covered by this discussion paper is not clear. The framers of this discussion paper seem to have been primarily concerned about the ubiquitous “description based on” and “latest issue consulted” notes, but examples in the discussion paper show that they are also considering applying the 588 to notes conveying other types of information. Related to this, the title of the discussion paper was thought to be misleading (or at least unhelpful). The discussion paper was returned to CONSER for more work, and it may be brought back at Annual as either a discussion paper or a proposal.

Proposal No. 2009-05. *Adding subfield \$u for Uniform Resource Identifier to field 510 (Citation/References note) of the MARC 21 bibliographic format.* This paper was passed with no amendments. MARBI members suggested that the subfields be ordered \$a (name of source), \$u (uniform resource identifier), \$c (location within source).

Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP03. *Changing field 257 (Country of producing entity for archival films) of the MARC 21 bibliographic format to include non-archival materials.*

Introduced by OLAC CAPC at the behest of the Library of Congress, this discussion paper suggests widening the possible use of field 257 for non-archival films. The rather tangled rationale here is that there is no place for country of

production of non-archival films in the bibliographic record, but this information was considered very useful, especially in light of LC's recent genre heading project for films. Since LC will not allow genre headings to be subdivided geographically, a different field had to be used for this information to be incorporated into the record. The 257 \$a will be repeatable for films that are international co-productions, and paper proposes making the 257 repeatable for multiple films from different countries in the same set (as often happens with DVDs).

The discussion paper will be returned to MARBI as a proposal at ALA Annual.

Proposal No. 2009-01/1. *New data elements in the MARC 21 authority format.* Although this proposal probably generated the most discussion of any brought forward at Midwinter, most of it was approved as written with some additions and emendations. Once approved through official MARC channels, it will add a number of new fields and subfields to the MARC authority record as well as new means of linking between authority records and authorized lists of values. A primary driver of this development was the need to incorporate RDA and especially FRAD values in the current MARC 21 authority record structure. The proposal includes field 046 (analogous to that in the bibliographic formats) for coded date information, field 621 (Associated Place), field 622 (Address), field 628 (Associated Language), 623 (Activities), 624 (Affiliation), and 625 (Occupation). It was noted by MARBI members that some of these categories, such as "affiliation" and "occupation," are inherently ambiguous in certain ways (for many people, their affiliation or pastime is also a profession, but for most it is not; some people identify very strongly with their work, others don't, etc.). While these concerns are not invalid, they are fundamentally qualms about RDA, not its implementation in MARC.

Other new fields include field 626 (gender) and 627 (family information). The first satisfies the FRAD requirement that gender be specified as part of authority data. Subfield 0 will be added to many of the fields, so that they can be dynamically linked to controlled vocabulary lists. Also, a non-repeatable, as-yet unspecified subfield will be added to many of the current fields for "source of information" so that not all additional information in these RDA/FRAD-compliant authority records would have to be justified by an additional 670. Depending on the complexity of the relationship between the data and resource, however, the 670 will remain optional for the new fields. No change to current practice in sourcing names, titles and variants in 670s is contemplated.

Proposal no. 2009 01/2: *New content designation for RDA elements Content type, Media type, Carrier type.* This proposal suggests using three fields (336, 337, and 338) in the bibliographic record to convey the RDA values content type, media type, and carrier type. When approved, this will replace the General Material Designation. Although this scheme has been widely criticized on Autocat, librarians who have commented are generally more concerned about the loss of the eye-readable GMD and the scattering of information over three (or more, since they're repeatable) fields. MARBI viewed these problems as display issues which can be resolved locally in different implementation schemes. The three-field solution promises a "clean and identifiable change from previous practice without compromising the semantic integrity of either the new RDA elements or existing MARC 21 elements" (2009 01/2 section 2).

Some controversy erupted over section 4.5, sparked by disagreement over the definition of "chorus score." Although this was subsequently resolved, a certain tension over the use of MARC 008/20 (format of music) remains, especially regarding the sometimes-overlapping definitions of condensed score, chorus score, and vocal score.

Proposal No. 2009 01/3: *Identifying work, expression, and manifestation records in the MARC 21 bibliographic and authority formats.* This proposal was intended to identify whether a bibliographic or authority record represented work, expression, or manifestation-level data. Since it was quickly concluded that such information could be confusing and misleading in an implementation scenario in which some records could represent either manifestations or expressions (or works), and the RDA/MARC Working Group agreed that they could move forward without this specific addition to the bibliographic and authority formats, this proposal was not adopted.

Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/1: *Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records.* This paper explores the addition of uniform resource identifiers to the MARC record, so that bibliographic and authority records can include persistent, network-accessible URIs for such values as controlled name, title, and subject fields, data fields that use controlled vocabulary in RDA (as in 300 subfield b), some coded fields, and any fields or subfields that use controlled vocabularies.

MARBI agreed to the need for encoded URIs as part of RDA implementation. Discussion Paper 2009 DP/01 will be returned to MARBI as a proposal at ALA Annual, largely unchanged.

Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/2: *Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K*. Appendices J and K of RDA list possible relationships between Group 1 (Appendix J) and Group 2 (appendix K) entities. The discussion paper suggests using subfield e to specify appendix J-K values in name and name-title strings. While MARBI saw the value of specifying work-to-work or expression-to-work relationships (as provided for in Appendix J) the group was seriously divided over whether subfield e should be used for this.

The \$e has been used extensively in the past as a relator code, typically articulating the relationship between a person or corporate body that is an added entry on a bib. record with the main entry (to use pre-RDA terminology). The suggested use of \$e would be a considerable addition to the baggage of that field, and it caused serious concerns among MARBI members. John Attig also mentioned that use of the \$e, especially for personal names in name-title combinations, could cause problems in the authority file if the \$e became an integral part of the heading. Some alternatives, such as \$4, were discussed, but none were agreed upon. The RDA/MARC working group may bring this paper back as a proposal at Annual, but it was unclear at the end of the meeting what direction it might take if \$e were not adopted.

*Prepared by Jim Alberts
Feb. 2009*

Last updated February 25, 2009