

**MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE
MARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee) Report
June 25-26, 2011
New Orleans, La.**

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 presented two papers for consideration: Proposal No. 2011-09 (Identifying the Source of Thematic Index Numbers in Field 383 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats), and Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP05 (Additional Means of Identifying Medium of Performance in the MARC21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats).

Proposals/Discussion Papers:

Proposal No. 2011-10: Geographic Codes in the MARC 21 Classification Format:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-10.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the Dewey Editorial Team. Discussion focused on the desire to move away from practice of repeating data in multiple places, to which a suggestion was made to add \$0 to each of these fields to enable linking out. Motion to accept proposal, with an amendment to add \$0, was approved.

Proposal No. 2011-11: Addition of 1st Indicator Value 7 (Other edition specified in \$2) in DDC Number Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority and Community Information Formats:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-11.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the Dewey Editorial Team. The most notable question regarding this proposal surrounded the placement of this information in indicators versus subfields. After it was noted that what this paper proposes is already done in other cataloging communities, a motion was made, seconded, and approved to accept this proposal as written.

Proposal No. 2011-12: Defining Subfield \$q for an Assigning Agency in Field 084 (Other Classification Number) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-12.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the German National Library. The only question during the discussion was concerning the need for a \$q in the final 084 in Example 2. After it was determined that this revision was not needed, a motion to approve the proposal as written was accepted.

Proposal No. 2011-02: RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-02.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is directly related to the outcome of discussion surrounding 2011-DP01, presented at Midwinter 2011. This proposal's discussion was spirited and went in many different directions. Suggestions to pursue redefining the 260 field's 2nd indicator instead were met with problems that would create with obsolete codes still out there, and also with the reminder that we had decided to leave legacy data alone; moving beyond the 260 for this type of data. After much discussion and lack of consensus on how to move forward, the MARBI chair asked for someone to suggest an objective way to move forward. Someone responded by suggesting that we keep an eye on the next proposal (No. 2011-03) before we make a final decision, as they are closely related. Before bringing this discussion back for the next day, the MARBI chair asked for a straw poll on the group's preference between Options 1 and 2. A vast majority of people favored Option 1.

When discussion resumed the following day, a motion was put forward to accept Option 1 with the addition of copyright coding. In other words, the proposed 264 3rd indicator would be changed from manufacture to copyright, and a 4th indicator would be added to cover manufacture. The motion passed.

Proposal No. 2011-03: Encoding Date of Copyright Notice in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-03.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is directly related to the outcome of discussion surrounding 2011-DP01, presented at Midwinter 2011. The discussion for this proposal also featured many diverse opinions on how to proceed. Major points of discussion surrounded replacing \$a with \$c, certain options conflicting with how RDA instructs catalogers how to record numerals (i.e. solely Arabic versus how it is on item), recording both copyright and phonogram date versus recording latest date only, inability of some systems to generate phonogram symbol, making subfield order replicate order of precedence should Option 1 be adopted, adding \$i to denote type of data, and pointing out interest among attendees for actionable data. As with 2011-02, since there was no strong consensus with how to proceed, the discussion was postponed for the following day.

When discussion resumed, a straw poll list revealed a preference for keeping things simple and allow for granularity. Eventually, MARBI decided to fold this proposal into its motion on 2011-02, including subfield \$c for copyright and phonogram dates in the newly created field 264. As a result, no action was taken on 2011-03.

Proposal No. 2011-04: Adapting Field 377 (Associated Language) for Language of Expression in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-04.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is a revision of 2011-DP02. Discussion surrounded the need for consistency with usage of terms and codes; specifically, code and term need to be parallel, but have not been used that way so far. A suggestion was made to use the real language name in place of a term, thereby necessitating changing \$b to \$l. Further support for this change was shown by the fact that language names can be taken from a controlled list. A motion was made to go with Option 2, but replace \$b with \$l. Motion was approved as amended.

Proposal No. 2011-05: Broadening field 373 (Affiliation) for Associated institutions in the MARC 21 Authority Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-05.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is related to Section 2.2 of 2011-DP02 from Midwinter 2011. Discussion began with the observation that CC:DA decided to break up affiliation into 1) name of institution, 2) position within institution, and 3) date of affiliation. In response to the question of what CC:DA's decision does to this proposal, it was noted that these elements need to be defined, and if this proposed change happens, LC will revise it again. A motion was thus put forward to change title of field (Affiliated rather than Associated). However, it was determined that this would only require a documentation change, so no motion was needed.

Proposal No. 2011-06: RDA Fuller Form of Personal Name Attribute in the MARC 21 Authority Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-06.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is related to Section 2.3 of 2011-DP02 from Midwinter 2011. The discussion began with a question pondering whether we needed the two separate elements of Fuller Form of Name, and Preferred with Fuller Form Qualifier, and if so, what should we call them? It was noted that RDA only instructs us to put something in there to differentiate between similar headings. Another observation is that in the MARC environment, this type of information is encoded in the \$q, not \$c and \$b, which was confirmed by other attendees. A motion was put forward to accept the proposal as written, but to make \$a into \$q, to make data element non-repeatable and apply to 1XX. The motion was approved as amended.

Proposal No. 2011-07: Additional Corporate Body Attributes for RDA in the MARC 21 Authority Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-07.html>

This proposal was brought forth by the RDA/MARC Working Group, and is related to Section 2.4 of 2011-DP02 from Midwinter 2011. After it was determined that each option was equally granular, those in attendance expressed preference towards using subfields to code these attributes. Therefore, a motion was put forward to accept Option 2, which was approved.

Proposal No. 2011-08: Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Characteristics in RDA in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-08.html>

This proposal was brought forth by LC's Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) Directorate, and is a revision of 2011-DP04 from Midwinter 2011. The group began the discussion by deciding it would be most effective to discuss the four sections separately. The first (Section 2.2) to use 300 \$b for these attributes was rejected. The second (2.3) proposed adding new subfields to field 340. When a concern was raised about redundancy creating a lack of clarity as to where data elements go, the response was that JSC will be looking at these mappings to help clarify before they are applied. Discussion jumped to the fourth section (2.6), which was also rejected because it would consist of string, not encoded data. So the discussion narrowed down to Section 2.4, which contained two options, the first surrounding the creation of 344-347 fields (2.4.1), and the creation of a repeatable 34x (2.4.2).

A motion was put forward to adopt the second option (2.4.2). In the ensuing discussion, those in attendance began migrating towards favoring the first option (2.4.1) rather than second, and so the motion was ultimately rejected.

Motion was then put forward to adopt the first option (2.4.1), with an amendment to add \$0, \$6, \$8 (and to add these subfields to 340). The motion passed.

Proposal No. 2011-09: Identifying the Source of Thematic Index Numbers in Field 383 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-09.html>

This proposal was presented by me on behalf of the Music Library Association. I acknowledged earlier feedback from the Canadian Committee on MARC, requesting that the definition of \$2 should read “Specifies the source of the code that identifies the thematic index cited in \$d”, removing “and \$c”, and also that the \$e definition should have “serial number” removed, which would thus read “Publisher associated with opus number”. Another question was raised about whether the codes used for \$2 are actually codes, rather than publisher names, to which everyone was reminded of the fact that these in fact are codes, since they are taken from the newly-created Thematic Indexes Used in the Library of Congress/NACO Authority File. A motion was made to approve this proposal, with the CCM suggested revisions, which passed.

Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP05: Additional Means of Identifying Medium of Performance: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp05.html>

This DP was presented by me on behalf of the Music Library Association. Kathy Glennan, Hermine Vermeij, Beth Iseminger, and Janis Young were in attendance to field genre/form and subject related questions from attendees, as they had a major part in this DP’s creation. Discussion focused a lot on clarifying the usefulness of Medium of Performance data. Additionally, because Medium of Performance data will be removed from LCSH once music headings move to LCGFT, we need guidance on where this data should go (i.e. inaction is not an option). Eventually, the MARBI chair recommended that we rework the DP as a proposal, and bring back with examples that give a clearer impression of what we are asking for. Before the close of discussion, however, attendees expressed through a straw poll that we could eliminate the 048 option.

MARBI-specific Business Discussions and Reports:

Library of Congress Report:

Sally McCallum reported that they are no longer printing MARC updates. They will web-publish Update 13, and then print concise version in October. She also reported on the Bibliographic Framework Initiative. She reported where to go for the latest news, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition>, and that there is now a listserv devoted to this effort (to subscribe, send a message to bibframe@lc.gov). She made clear that they see this as long process, and that no one will be encouraged to get off MARC in a hurry.

Future of MARBI:

In light of the Bibliographic Framework Initiative, the MARBI Chair invited us to think about the future role of MARBI. He began the discussion by re-clarifying for everyone that two committees traditionally attend this meeting. One is the MARC Advisory Committee, which is the larger group, is made up of people that represent various constituencies, and is non-voting. The other group is MARBI, the voting members who are put forth by ALA.

Everyone agreed that MARBI would need to help determine new the standard. Regarding the scheduling of our meetings, a suggestion was made to accommodate discussion topics that go beyond MARC by adding back Monday slot for that, and to encourage presentations on what may come after MARC. For the larger question on the future of MARBI, it became clear that working with those involved at LC in the Bibliographic Framework Initiative would provide the best direction on how to proceed. The discussion closed with the comment that the building blocks for what will likely replace MARC already exist, such as RDF.