

**MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE
MARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee) Report
January 21-22, 2012
Dallas, Tex.**

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 one paper for consideration: Proposal No. 2012-01 (New Data Elements in the MARC21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for Medium of Performance). There was also a lengthy discussion about the future role of MARBI, in light of the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative.

Proposals/Discussion Papers:

Proposal No. 2012-01: New Data Elements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for Medium of Performance: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-01.html>.

This Proposal was presented by me on behalf of the Music Library Association, and builds on MARBI's response to 2011-DP05 from last summer. Kathy Glennan, Hermine Vermeij, Damian Iseminger, Nancy Lorimer, and Janis Young were in attendance to field genre/form and subject related questions from attendees, as they either had a major part in this Proposal's creation or could offer additional expertise. MLA participants reiterated the importance of choosing one of the options before the close of this meeting, or else Medium of Performance (MOP) data would be lost. Notable discussion threads surrounded the plausibility of having MOP data in two places (should 6xx option be adopted), issues of genre versus retrieval usage for MOP, needing MOP to accommodate RDA's current structure and what the music thesaurus will have, and lastly the German response and associated revision requests to the proposal. Eventually, a motion to adopt the 382 was put forward, and passed. Further discussion ensued to deal with the Germans' suggested changes. A motion was made to adopt those suggested changes, which also passed.

Discussion Paper 2012-DP01: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp01.html>.

This Discussion Paper was presented on behalf of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. This DP seeks to make title information buried in the free text of an authority record's 670 field machine-actionable. After the presenter received confirmation that this DP was worthy of consideration by the group, he led us through each of the five questions for discussion at the end of the paper. Participants made observations about ways RDA makes these proposed changes useful, additional needs for maintenance should the changes be adopted, and differences with treatment of undifferentiated names in RDA. Overall, the expansion of the 670 vis-à-vis this DP was seen as worthwhile by those in attendance. The speaker will rework the DP based on the feedback and bring it back in the future as a Proposal.

MARBI-specific Business Discussions and Reports:

The Future Role of MARBI in the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative:

Building on the initial discussion of this topic from last summer, MARBI members were given questions for discussion prior to the meeting. Shown below are the actual questions, and then discussion comments.

1. MARBI has been mentioned as one of the informal partners in LC's Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative. Specifically, how will MARBI assist with this initiative? What is the appropriate role of MARBI in this period of investigation and possible transition away from (some or all of) the MARC formats?

Discussion: Sally McCallum of LC sees MARBI as reviewers of the group's work, and would encourage our participation. This prompted the question of whether MARBI should have a liaison to speak on our behalf to the Bibliographic Framework. MARBI Chair Matthew Wise volunteered for this role, but would welcome nominations by MARBI members for others to do so.

2. How does MARBI see itself fulfilling the more encompassing elements of its charge from ALA (which never mentions MARC specifically)? Should MARBI review its current charge and determine whether the committee's actions and/or the charge itself need to be changed? How do the current MARBI sponsoring divisions of ALCTS, LITA, and RUSA feel about this? How are the roles and charges of MARBI and the MARC Advisory Committee distinct?

Discussion: Matthew Wise noted that we were asked about changing our charge, and said that this would be a very difficult process. Matthew asked about any concerns from MARBI about our charge? (Matthew read the charge.) Matthew then asked if we should look at standards outside of MARC, since our charge allows us to. The group agreed, so now Matthew will send requests he receives to look at various non-MARC standards (such as NISO) to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) list.

Someone also asked about the lack of clarity concerning the role of MARBI versus MAC. What will become of MAC when MARC goes away? To help this discussion, Sally McCallum recounted the formation of both groups. They were formed in the 1970s. When MARBI convened, national library representatives and liaisons (i.e. MAC) were there to advise group; both groups are equally important. After suggestions to make changes to our structure, the group agreed the best thing for now is to just rethink our role.

3. How should MARBI allocate its resources in the coming years? How should we balance the needs of communities still using MARC with the needs of those that are moving to another framework?

Discussion: Matthew asked the group about how much time we should devote to our work at ALA? The responses to this question centered on how much change we wish to bring to the MARC format while we are in the midst of transitioning to something else. The consensus of the group was that while we do not wish to inhibit change, we also need to maintenance and enhance

MARC as long as it is being used. This means we could be very busy until a new standard is in place.

4. Should a list be generated of the perceived strengths and shortcomings of MARC? What are some of the features that would be desirable in a "next generation" bibliographic framework -
- data structure (strings, elements, linkages), functional requirements of the data (transcription, controlled access, display), language of tagging (coded, natural, or neutral)?

Discussion: Participants agreed that a group should be formed to do this work. The rest of the discussion centered on its membership, that is, should it be open to anyone or just folks on MARBI or MAC? The group decided that membership should be open to anyone and that a message will be sent over the MARC list to solicit volunteers.

5. Karen Coyle reminds us that we need to use a new vocabulary when discussing these issues. Although we are accustomed to terms such as "field," "subfield," "fixed field," and "indicator," these concepts are tied to the structure of MARC. Also it would be prudent to avoid using terms from any specific data model, such as FRBR. We need to be able to talk about our metadata needs without reference to any particular record or data structure, since we currently do not know the format in which our data will live. What are these "clean" terms? Could a list be generated? And how could MARBI promote their adoption and usage?

Discussion: Karen Coyle was in the audience, and suggested that we should migrate towards calling ourselves the Machine Readable Group, so as to not reference MARC. Matthew Wise agreed. Karen continued by noting that we need to get away from thinking about MARC; be forward thinking. Others replied by noting that we just formed a group to do this, vis-à-vis conversation on the previous question. The discussion ended with a suggestion to be mindful of how we move forward with any other formal studies of MARC.

Library of Congress Report:

Sally McCallum reported the creation of new country codes for Southern Sudan and the Netherland Antilles. LC published Update 13 in September, and after this meeting they will do another update. Linked data with name authorities are now available.

Business Meeting:

Other than what has already been covered, there was no further business to discuss.

