

## BCC2009/SMF/2

### MARC Formats Subcommittee Business Meeting Chicago, Ill., Feb. 20, 2009

Present: Jim Alberts (Chair), Kerri Scannell Baunach, Catherine Gick (recorder), Joe Hafner, Peter Lisius, Steve Yusko (LC representative), Jay Weitz (OCLC representative), Matthew Wise; absent, Spiro Shetuni.

The meeting began with an announcement that Spiro Shetuni and Joe Hafner would be rotating off of the committee, with thanks for their service.

Jay Weitz reported on activities at OCLC highlighting the Expert Community Experiment; OCLC MARC Update 2009, no. 8 and no. 9; work on the Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR); and completion of the first phase of Controlled Headings project. In response to questions regarding parallel records and the DDR, Jay stated that parallel records would not be considered duplicate records, however, duplicate records in the same cataloging language (i.e. German) would be potentially detected and resolved.

Steve Yusko reported on activities at the Library of Congress stating that he has attended several meetings regarding RDA discussions and proposals. Steve mentioned that MARC proposal no. 2009-01/2: New content designation for RDA elements: Content Type, Media Type, Carrier Type was passed by MARBI at ALA Midwinter, but with concern about visibility in MARC records and with some questions regarding terms of extent of music. He also noted that RDA Appendix J and Appendix K are problematic so we should stay tuned for more information on these appendices.

Kathy Glennan reported on the new RDA-MARC Working Group. The group prepared discussion papers and proposals relating to implementing RDA in MARC for the ALA Midwinter meeting in Denver. She has been serving as a music expert on this group since mid-December, specifically helping address issues in RDA Appendix J.

Jim Alberts led a brief review of the Subcommittee's charge. He began by reading the charge and asked if we are living up to some of its provisions. He mentioned that he is trying to move faster to get MARBI proposals and discussion papers to subcommittee members so that MLA can develop responses to documents that may not be explicitly music-related but could have an impact on the music community. It was noted that the timeline between the release of MARBI proposals and discussion papers (generally less than a month before MARBI meets) leaves the chair and the subcommittee very little time to review these materials before ALA. He also hopes that his successor as chair will continue to pursue this. More discussion on this will take place via e-mail following this meeting including a discussion on how to deal with the metadata issue with regards to our Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee discussed MARC proposal 2009-01/1: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format. Much of what is in this proposal aligns current practice with FRAD requirements. It was asked whether we will start using these codes once we implement RDA, to which Jim responded that we probably won't be using them until at least 2011; Kathy pointed out that the current target implementation of RDA is not until Fall 2010. Additionally, we will have to wait until changes are both published and implemented in the MARC Format to make use of these codes.

Jim began a discussion of MARC proposal 2009-01/2 with a summary of the proposal, which creates new fields for content, carrier and medium information, replacing some of what is currently coded in the 245 General Material Designation and field 300. He then turned the discussion over to guests Damien Iseminger and Kathy Glennan. Damien described how to use the fields and noted that these create redundancy in the record. The specific problems arising with changes to the extent of notated music codes (Bibliographic Format, Music 008/20) may warrant official proposals to be put forth by MLA.

Daniel Paradis brought up MARC field 518, Date of Issuance vs. Date of Recording noting that place of capture and date of capture are in two different subelements of RDA which does not work with existing coding. While the capacity to link fields in MARC exists, there would need to be an additional subfield in the 518 to break date of recording out separately. A poll of the Subcommittee indicated that this issue is worth pursuing. Jim will contact Rebecca Guenther

to determine whether this should be put forward as a proposal or if the RDA-MARC Working Group would be interested in taking it on.

Jim noted that he had been asked about MARC Proposal 98-16 and 98-16R, which allows for the use of control characters (ISO 6630 hex'88' and hex'89', or “curly brackets”) around non-filing characters. Matthew Wise and others noted that this dated to format integration and implementation of MARC field 246 and other fields in which non-filing indicators could not be used. The proposal was approved by MARBI but has never been implemented except in some UNIMARC systems in other countries. Since this has already been approved for use in MARC21, it was recommended that individual institutions should lobby themselves if they want to make use of this.

Kathy Glennan repeated Steve’s concerns about RDA Appendix J and Appendix K. She noted that both are in a state of flux and that the JSC representatives at CC:DA encouraged Diane Hillmann not to work on developing the RDA vocabulary registries on these appendices until after the March 2009 JSC meeting.

On this note, the Chair closed the meeting with thanks to all subcommittee members and visitors.

Compiled by Jim Alberts (based on minutes recorded by Catherine Gick)

---

*Last updated April 6, 2009*