

BCC2010/SMF/1**MARBI Report for ALA Midwinter
Boston, MA, Jan. 16-18, 2010****MARC DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 2010-DP03: Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) and the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format**

This discussion paper (DP), brought forward by the British Library, was amended before coming to MARBI to cover only the International Standard Name Identifier. The ISNI is a draft ISO standard that would provide a code uniquely identifying the “public identities of parties.” It is intended in part to provide a machine-actionable identifier that will allow “automated processes between libraries, other data providers, and different rights management societies.” There was discussion about the sources of name information and the possibly ambiguous or conflicting nature of name information that could come from numerous possible sources. The British Library, however, feels that it has adequate control of name information sources in order to move forward. The discussion paper will be returned to MARBI as a proposal.

MARC DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 2010-DP02: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records

This DP was brought forward by the RDA/MARC Working Group as a way to input uniform resource identifiers (URIs) for controlled values in the MARC fields to which they are appropriate. The paper suggests different possible input scenarios, typically using angle brackets to offset the identifiers from surrounding text. It was noted that because of the wide usage of angle brackets in various coding languages, primarily XML, angle brackets could be problematic for this data. The RDA/MARC Working Group and others will continue to experiment with different methods for encoding URIs in MARC; no decision was reached on the DP.

MARC DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 2010-DP01: ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

This DP, from the German-speaking MARC constituency, discusses the possibility of providing a position in the 008 that will indicate that a bibliographic record was formulated according to ISBD, but that ISBD punctuation is not included in the record. This is because German and Austrian catalogers are accustomed to system-provided ISBD punctuation and generally do not input it themselves. The discussion covered many possible implications of such a scheme, especially as it might relate to cooperative cataloging with Anglophone and other institutions. It was pointed out that some ISBD punctuation and positions do not have one-to-one relationships with the text that follows the punctuation and the absence of any punctuation before a \$b in a 245 (for example) would leave record-users unsure what the relationship of the title and other title or parallel title was. The representative for German MARC users suggested a new code be defined in the 008 that would indicate that a record was formulated according to ISBD but did not use ISBD punctuation. The DP will return as a proposal.

MARC PROPOSAL NO. 2010-05: Adding subfield \$3 (Materials specified) to field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

This proposal, brought by the Library of Congress, allows the use of \$3 in the 024 field to indicate to what part of a resource the coordinates in the 024 apply, if there is possible ambiguity about the location; the typical example is to use the \$3 to indicate that the coordinates apply to the mouth of a river, not some other part further upstream. The proposal was passed.

MARC PROPOSAL NO. 2010-04: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Format for works and expressions

This proposal, which has strong possible implications for music catalogers, was brought to MARBI by the RDA/MARC Working Group. It defines new fields and elements in the bibliographic and authority formats for works and expressions, with some implications for fields that had already been defined for the formats, mainly moving some information from 6xx fields to 37x fields. The proposal defines fields for works, including but not limited to musical works, that indicate the form, date, medium of performance, key and mode, and several other aspects of the work, including the widely debated “other

distinguishing characteristics of the work or expression,” which is somewhat analogous to a qualifier used to break a conflict in current name-authority practice. These new fields would allow music catalogers to include a great deal of relevant information in work-identifying headings in which the preferred title (i.e. uniform title) is formatted in such a way that this information is missing from the heading, as occurs with many distinctive titles.

This proposal was passed with some editorial revision, and the proviso that it would initially be used primarily as a way to experiment with creating work-and expression-level records.

MARC PROPOSAL NO. 2010-03: Recording Place and Date of Capture in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format

This proposal from the RDA/MARC Working Group also has some strong possible implications for music catalogers. Music catalogers attempting to create bibliographic records for sound recordings using RDA noticed that while “date of capture” and “place of capture” are defined separately in RDA, they map to two possible fields in MARC, and they are generally recorded in the same place in the 518 note without differentiation. Several possible remedies for this were proposed, including using multiple 518 fields, enhancing the content of the 033 field so that it could include full place of capture information, or adding subfields to the 518 note to make it possible to differentiate between place and time of capture through subfield parsing.

Use of multiple 518 fields was generally thought to be an imperfect solution, in part because it could trigger bibliographic records with numerous 518s. Both of the other options had positive and negative aspects, as the discussion of this issue on the MLA list in January 2010 indicated. MARBI decided to define the 033 \$d so that the field can include not only a date or date range and a place indicated by the appropriate LC geographic cutter, but also a field for free-text information on the specific location (i.e. a concert hall or recording studio) in which the location took place.

MARBI also decided to implement new codes in the 518 field, as the proposal suggests. Despite the sometimes-ambiguous information in the free-text 518, it was felt that this would bring both the 518 and 033 fields in line with RDA requirements. The proposal passed with some editorial revisions.

MARC PROPOSAL NO. 2010-02: Addition of subfield \$5 (Institution to which field applies) in the 80X-830 Series Added Entry Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

This proposal attracted a certain amount of controversy, because it was not immediately apparent how series information could be institution-specific. However, LC and PCC representatives clarified one specific aspect of the proposal: that it is primarily for institutions contributing to the Registry of Digital Masters and some other digital preservation initiatives, in which it would be useful to include local series information indicating which institution had contributed the record and some other information. Also, it was pointed out that series information can operate in a way similar to the common practice of citing named collections in some 7xx fields, and that practice in this area was so mixed that it was not thought feasible to choose any single solution. This proposal was passed with minor editorial revisions.

MARC PROPOSAL NO. 2010-01: Defining codes for online and direct access electronic resources in 008/23 and 008/29 (Form of item)

Although there was somewhat heated discussion of this when it appeared before MARBI as a discussion paper, the wording has been modified and the scope of the proposal clarified considerably. It was decided to go ahead with new codes to indicate whether an electronic resource were web-based or direct access (e.g. a DVD-ROM). One aspect of the proposal was changed, however: code s will be retained for use by institutions who do not wish to adopt the new codes.

Prepared by Jim Alberts

Last updated February 19, 2010

