

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION  
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE

MARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic  
Information Committee) Report  
January 8-9, 2011  
San Diego, California

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 proposal presented by OLAC had a potential impact on those in our constituency that catalog audio/visual materials. Also of note, Matthew Wise, NYU Music Cataloger and former chair of MLA's Bibliographic Control Committee, officially presided over his first MARBI meeting as its chair.

**Proposals/Discussion Papers:**

**Proposal No. 2011-01:** Coding for Original Language in Field 041 (Language Code) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-01.html>

This proposal was brought forth by OLAC, and proposed redefining \$h so that it only contains the language code of the original (regardless of whether the resource is a translation), and defining new subfields for language code of intermediate translation and language code of the original language of subsidiary materials.

The discussion opened with a suggestion to clarify that \$h would stand for the original language *of the primary content*, which was agreed to. Additionally, I brought forth a suggestion from our constituents to remove libretto from \$m for subsidiary materials and put it in its own subfield. OLAC will take this suggested change under consideration.

Other discussion served mainly to affirm the proposal. So a motion was put forward to have \$h for primary content of the original language, to not be required for items that don't have a translation, to find a subfield for original language of libretto, and change \$m to be only for subsidiary material. The motion was approved.

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP03:** Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats:  
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp03.html>.

This DP was presented by The Library of Congress, and discusses defining a new field in the MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings formats (883) to identify that the record is for a Work, Expression, Manifestation or Item.

Many people were unclear how these fields would be used, and were concerned about them being so loosely defined. For example, one person wondered if you would use the 883 if the record contained

all WEMI attributes, rather than just one. Those that thought the 883 could be useful down the road confirmed that its application and uses need to be more clearly defined.

After much discussion, the group leaned in the direction of applying this field strictly towards authority records. A suggestion was also made to make this field applicable only when one FRBR attribute was present in a given record. The group decided to shelve further development in the meantime, but if something were to emerge in the RDA test showing it to be useful, it could be developed further.

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-04:** Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Attributes in RDA and the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp04.html>.

This DP was presented by The Library of Congress, and discussed RDA controlled lists of values for carrier attributes and possible fields and subfields for recording them. Most of the discussion was supportive of these changes with a few suggested clarifications and revisions, such as adding “carrier characteristics” to the title of the proposed 340 field, and also giving stronger examples of the field’s usage. LC will take the suggested corrections under consideration if they decide to bring this DP back as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-01:** Changes to the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to Accommodate RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp01.html>.

This DP was presented by The Library of Congress. There were three different options for application of these data elements, and opinions on these options were diverse. Generally, people preferred Options 1 and 3, because they prescribed separate fields for each data element. The new fields, though, need to be extensible. Also, people stressed that the 260’s field’s current uses should not be made obsolete. The Library of Congress representative will take all of these suggestions under consideration should they choose to develop this DP into a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2011 DP02:** Additional Elements to Support RDA in the MARC 21 Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp02.html>.

This DP was presented by The Library of Congress. It proposed elements for: Language of expression, Associated institution, Fuller form of name, and Type of jurisdiction.

Most people during the language of expression discussion -- which focused on the options of expanding the 041 and creating a new 377 -- strongly preferred the 377 option, and keeping the 041 from growing even more complex. For fuller form of name, a few folks wanted separate subfields for each element, and pointed out that this is not strictly an RDA-centric concept. And lastly, there was support for creating the 334 field for type of geographic entity or jurisdiction. The LC representative will take all of the varying suggestions into consideration for further development of this DP into a proposal, should they choose to do so.

