

BCC2010/SMF/3

**MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE
MARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee) Report**
June 26-27, 2010
Washington, D.C.

Submitted by Bruce J. Evans

For this report I will present the proposals and discussion papers in the order they were discussed at the meetings, rather than in numerical order. MLA did not present any proposals or discussion papers this time around, although the DP presented by OLAC had a potential impact on those in our constituency that catalog audio/visual materials.

Report from Library of Congress:

LC Representative, Sally McCallum, reported that they have reorganized the way subject headings are structured, such as occupation or genre. They would like to do considerably less printing of LCSH and other cataloging tools. A suggestion came from the audience about maybe just producing concise print version. Sally said they would put relators, country codes, and thesaurus of geographic materials at <http://id.loc.gov>.

In relation to recently-announced split between LCSH and genre/form headings, John Attig suggested that we work with their vendors to enable this split in their ILSs.

Proposals/Discussion Papers:

Proposal No. 2010-08: Encoding Scheme of Coordinate Data in Field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-08.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the Library of Congress. Discussion opened with questions about the hdddms format for coordinates, specifically with having more leeway with different kinds of data to represent it in the 034. Additionally, someone mentioned that you need to represent data that would be useful in searching. A motion came from the floor to reject the proposal, was seconded, and was carried.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP05: Language Coding for Moving Images in Field 041 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp05.html>

This DP was presented by Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC), and had two objectives. 1) It suggests revising the application of 008/35-37 and 041 \$a and \$j for moving image materials to create a spoken/sung/signed versus written language distinction. 2) In addition, it suggests distinguishing between original language and language of intermediate translations that are both currently coded in subfield \$h. As previously mentioned, since this paper would have an effect on those who perform audio-visual cataloging, I made a special call for feedback from the music cataloging community (in addition to members of the MARC Formats Subcommittee) and received a generous number of helpful responses.

This DP yielded a fruitful and diverse discussion on its objectives, and the OLAC representatives made some minor corrections to the proposal before the discussion began. Some suggested creating a subfield for just moving images, rather than redefining and parsing out the \$h. I asked the OLAC representatives how often the \$h is used for intermediate translations, as some constituencies report that this rarely happens. Others suggested adopting the first part, and putting forth the second part as a proposal. Still others thought OLAC should revise the current draft.

After discussing the four implementation options for the 041 \$h idea at the end of the DP, other options were brought forward, such as having an additional 041 for just the original language information, separating out intermediate translations from the \$h, creating multiple 041's for the many different kinds of data that can be represented in a single 041 string.

The discussion came to a close with a remark noting that we're stretching the complexity of this field, so perhaps we're making it bigger than it can be meaningfully used. At that, Laura Snyder, MARBI Chair, asked the OLAC representatives if they had enough information to go back to their constituents to revise this. The OLAC representatives responded that they will in fact take this back to the OLAC membership, and suggested getting examples from those who provided them during the discussion. So essentially, this particular DP will not be carried forward as a proposal.

Proposal 2010-06: Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-06.html>

This paper was presented by The British Library. The most notable response to this proposal was that attendees thought the \$0 should only apply to bibliographic data, not for authority data. The British Library representative agreed to this change. A motion to accept the proposal with this revision was approved.

Proposal No. 2010-09: Addition of Subfield \$u to Field 561 (Ownership and Custodial History) to the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-09.html>

This was put forth by OCLC. After the proposal's presentation to the group, a question was asked about whether there was a move with this proposal to make the \$u repeatable, since provenance can change, or have other facets. The OCLC representative said that this could be done. On a related note, someone asked if the 541 was repeatable. Library of Congress representatives will check. Motion to accept the proposal, with amendment to make \$u repeatable, was approved.

Proposal 2010-07: ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-07.html>

This was presented by The German National Library, and advocates the use of Leader/18 (Descriptive Cataloging Form) to indicate the absence of ISBD punctuation at the end of subfields.

Discussion began with questions about the clarity of wording for proposed \$c. Specifically, what does "end of subfield" mean? Does it mean punctuation immediately after "\$c", or does it mean at the end of the subfield's content? Attendees proposed alternate wording.

Another important consideration—we need to be explicit with what we mean by ISBD, because in some cases ISBD and RDA are not compatible. The German National Library representative responded by saying that he would be okay with amending the proposal's language so it refers to just ISBD punctuation, not rules.

In relation to the point above, someone suggested making the fixed field "i" in desc refer to punctuation only. Also, it was pointed out that for "a" in the desc fixed field there is a part that talks about access points, and the fact that those access points will eventually be converted over to become RDA-specific. Some replied that pre-AACR2 headings have been made current by automated authority work.

With that, a slightly amended motion was put forth, which was later approved by the The German National Library representative. It entailed making \$c defined as "ISBD punctuation excluded when redundant", making "i" in desc fixed field to mean "ISBD punctuation included", and removing the part of the definition for the value of "a" in desc fixed field that says "form of access points." The motion was put to a vote and passed.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP04: Encoding the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp04.html>

This DP was presented by The British Library, and explores options to encode the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format, as well as the Authority formats. Discussion focused primarily on the four options. People favored option 2.

After further discussion, The British Library representative clarified that this discussion paper will not be returning to the Committee as a proposal, since no change to the format is required. (Note: The British Library was not actually

hoping for this to eventually become a proposal, but rather just to encourage discussion on using ISTCs in bibliographic records, as well as authority records.)

Highlight from Business Meeting

A notable transition occurred here. The position of MARBI Chair passed from Laura Snyder to Matthew Wise, NYU Music Cataloger and former chair of MLA's Bibliographic Control Committee.

Last updated July 23, 2010