

MARC Formats Subcommittee Business Meeting
Thursday, February 10, 2011, 4pm
Philadelphia, PA
Compiled by: Bruce Evans

Attendees: Catherine Busselen, Bruce Evans (chair), Robert Freeborn, Peter Lisius, Daniel Paradis, Jay Weitz (OCLC Representative), Stephen Yusko (LC Representative), (Committee member Grace Fitzgerald was unable to attend the conference)

Bruce began the meeting by having the committee members introduce themselves. He then thanked Catherine Busselen and Peter Lisius for their four years of service on the committee, as they are set to rotate off. Therefore, there are now openings on the committee, and Bruce encouraged everyone to consider applying for membership.

The beginning of the meeting focused on MARBI discussion papers and proposals, addressed by Bruce Evans as MLA's liaison to MARBI and by Steve Yusko, the LC representative to the subcommittee. For details on the discussions at ALA Midwinter, see the liaison report published in the Music Cataloging Bulletin and linked at the BCC website.

MARBI Proposal 2011-01: This proposal, sponsored by OLAC, was a follow-up from an earlier discussion paper, focusing on more specific coding for the original language in field 041. MARBI approved the proposal with a few amendments. The revised definition of subfield \$h will specify that the language code is for the original language of the primary content of the item and that it is not required to use it if the item is not a translation. A new subfield \$k will be used for Language code of intermediate translations; \$m will be Language code of original for accompanying materials; and \$n will be added for original language of librettos.

For 2011-DP01 (which proposes changes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format so that the RDA elements for production, publication, distribution and manufacture are given separate MARC elements) there was support for Options 1 (indicator option) and 3 (definition of NEW fields), but not Option 2 (to add separate [new] subfields). Another option was suggested to define one new field (rather than add an indicator to field 260 or add multiple new fields) with an indicator designating the function. Participants felt that we need to continue to be able to use 260 as we do now if the function is not clear. There was support for the suggestion to add a field for copyright date in the 26X block of fields. A proposal will be presented at the next meeting reflecting the preferences expressed.

For 2011-DP02 (which discusses additional elements that may be needed to accommodate RDA in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority format: these include elements for

Language of expression, Associated institution, Fuller form of name, and Type of jurisdiction) there will be proposals presented for the additional elements at ALA Annual 2011. For Language of expression (377): preference is for broadening field 377 (Associated Language). If added to the bibliographic format and used for expression records, the definition needs to state that it is only used for language of expression. It was noted that the current definition should also be broadened so that it can be used for language of family, since currently it is defined for persons and corporate bodies. For Associated institution (373): in broadening the definition of 373 (Affiliation), the paper suggested a \$a for Affiliation of person and \$b for Associated institution for corporate body. It was suggested that instead we could broaden \$a to be Associated institution rather than separate these into two subfields. Consideration needs to be given to whether we need to include both the preferred form and the form on the piece, in which case subfields could be provided for each. For Fuller form of name (378): There may be a need to define two subfields, one for fuller form of surname and one for fuller form of given name. In that case one or the other or both could be used. There is no need for \$0 because there wouldn't be a record to link to, since this is only part of the name entry. For Type of jurisdiction (334): it was pointed out that currently the scope of RDA is limited to only some types of jurisdiction, but this will change to include all types. It was suggested that \$0 be added to link to a record; the Germans make authority records for jurisdiction types.

For 2011-DP03 (which discusses defining a new field (883) in the MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings formats to identify that the record is for a Work, Expression, Manifestation or Item) the majority of participants wanted to continue to pursue the ability to identify this information in the record. It will be important to tighten the definitions and provide guidance to users, including restricting the use of the field to those records that are explicitly work or expression (manifestation being the default), rather than a combination. It was noted that this supports applications that may not exist yet, but could be very useful in the future.

2011-DP04 (which discusses RDA controlled lists of values for carrier attributes and possible fields and subfields for recording them): Participants agreed that this should come back as a proposal. Examples are needed especially to show when to use field 340 [Physical Medium (Carrier Characteristics)]. We may need to broaden the definition of field 340; it is used widely in the museum community. Subfield \$3 (Materials specified) should be added in the proposed new fields.

Bruce summarized the subcommittee's efforts in getting the 028 field definition and scope updated to reflect the content in MARBI Proposal 98-03. This included reporting a discrepancy between the description available via Cataloger's Desktop and the file available at www.loc.gov/marc. At MLA's request, LC also updated the 037 field description

and scope to properly refer to field 028. Mark Scharff noted that very few cataloging agencies use 1st indicator 5 as defined; Steve Yusko suggested that LC could investigate this further.

After receiving liaison reports from OCLC and LC (available on the BCC website), the subcommittee opened the floor to discuss music-related MARC concerns that have arisen from the RDA Test. Mark Scharff raised the first issue: how to include a thematic index data element in the new 383 field. Discussion centered on the subfields required (a new subfield for the name of the thematic index and a \$2 for a source list), as well as the mechanics for developing the source list. The latter task will be undertaken by the Authorities Subcommittee. Various BCC subcommittees will work together to create the necessary documentation so this idea can go forward to MARBI at ALA Annual. Another issue is the creation of a more specific field for Format of notated music in RDA (this element currently is mapped to a general 500 note).

Other BCC efforts may require subcommittee involvement. For example, the documentation limits the repeatability of field 048 to five occurrences. The Subject Access Subcommittee is also investigating the expansion of field 382 for Medium of Performance. Another possibility is validating the 047 and 048 in the authority file.