Report from the Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) and MARC Formats Transition Interest Group
ALA Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, June 27-July 2, 2013
Submitted by Sandy Rodriguez, Music Library Association liaison to MARBI

MARBI

Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP05: Defining Indicator Values for 588 Source of Description Note in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
Presented jointly by CONSER and OCLC. This paper presents options on defining the first indicator of MARC 21 bibliographic field 588 to allow for a display constant controller for commonly used captions *Description based on* and *Identification of resource based on* in order to avoid common misspelling, enable the subfield $a data to be manipulated for other purposes, and allow for language specificity. Additionally, a display constant for *Latest issue consulted* and No display constant generated are proposed.

There was some discussion on how one indicator value might be used for two different phrases, but most agreed that these phrases are local display decisions. Some concern was expressed on the increase of administrative metadata and whether using indicator values (essentially limited to 0-9) would be sustainable for this use going forward. Most of the discussion centered on whether there might be some use for adding an indicator value for *Website viewed on* so that catalogers would not have to rely so heavily on programming; however, it was noted that format-specific display constants should generally be avoided in preference for a more broadly-applied generic phrase when possible.

The committee recommended the following: 1) Yes, an indicator value should be established in place of using the spelled-out captions in subfield $a. 2) Yes, a single indicator value to represent both *Description based on* and *Identification of the resource based on* is fine as these should be local display decisions. 3) Option 1 with # (blank) redefined as *No information provided.*

Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP06: Defining New Field 388 for Chronological Terms in the MARC 21 Authority Format
Presented by the ALCTS Subject Analysis Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation. This discussion paper is a follow-up to approved proposal 2013-07 which established new encoding in fields 046 (Bibliographic and Authority format) and 648 (Bibliographic) to enable the recording of "chronological categories and dates for works and expressions previously expressed in relation to genre/form." The discussion paper proposes a new field 388 in the Authority format that would allow for the recording of chronological terms representing the date or time period of creation or origin of works and expression.

Discussion centered on the confusion with indicators representing creation for single versus aggregate works and how the vocabulary might be developed for chronological terms. There was also a spirited debate on the nature of chronological terms, but it was agreed that these terms were more of a facet or work attribute. Additionally, most agreed that the examples were quite confusing, and as such, encouraged the development of guidelines by communities of practice.

The committee recommended the following: 1) Yes, there is a need for recording chronological terms representing creation dates and time periods in authority records and field 388 can be used for this purpose. 2) Yes, the first indicator can be used to distinguish the difference between the date/time period of creation or origin of a work/expression (including an aggregate work) and the date/time period of creation or origin of the individual works/expressions included in an aggregation. The paper needs to be re-worked with better, less confusing examples.

Proposal No. 2013-08: Defining Subfield $7 in the 8XX Series Added Entry Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Record

Presented by the German National Library. A follow up to 2013-DP03, German speaking countries use bibliographic records for series, and as such, are seeking a way to designate type and bibliographic level in a record that describes a part of that series. They propose the use of $7 for 800-830 in much the same way it is used in Linking Entry field 76X-78X, defining /0 as type of record and /1 as bibliographic level from Leader/07 of the related record. A motion to approve this paper as written was passed with little discussion.

Proposal No. 2013-09: Defining Subfields for Qualifiers to Standard Identifiers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats

Presented jointly by LC and the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM). This paper follows the precedent established in 2012-06 which defined a repeatable subfield $q (Qualifying information) in field 028 (Publisher Number) and extends it defining subfield $q (Qualifying information) for 015 National Bibliography Number, field 020 International Standard Book Number, field 024 Other Standard Identifier, and field 027 Standard Technical Report Number.

In general, the committee expressed strong support for the parsing of qualifying information. A concern was raised regarding the 015 example which displayed multiple subfield $a and subfield $q's in the same field, but it was noted that this is not recommended practice and any examples demonstrating this practice in the MARC documentation would be removed or revised. It was also noted that ISBD punctuation in qualifying information, e.g., parentheses, had been removed which had not been done in MARC bibliographic 028 so we may need to revisit. A motion to approve the paper as written was passed.

Library of Congress Report

Announcements from Library of Congress include:

- The incorporation of the new relator codes resulting from a comparative analysis of MARC relator codes/terms and RDA terms into the MARC lists and codes (additions here).
- The discontinuation of printing by the Library of Congress. Reports and other documentation will be available in downloadable PDF on the website.

Future of MARBI Report

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) will continue to convene to maintain MARC by community representation and will also be looking at BIBFRAME, particularly MARC conversion issues. MAC members will have voting privileges. Current MAC member have agreed to continue under the new structure, with addition of Regina Reynolds (ISSN Review Group), a representative from PCC, serials specialist, and possibly an ALCTS/LITA

representative. The meeting space and time will be set up with the hopes of retaining some of the same times, but less time overall, making more effective use of listservs and wikis to help in the effort of reducing meeting time.

MARC FORMATS TRANSITION INTEREST GROUP

On BIBFRAME Instance #bibframe
Kevin Ford (Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office) presented a brief introduction to BIBFRAME (a post-MARC bibliographic environment) demonstrating its basic concepts with monographs as a starting point.

In his introduction, Ford provided background about the contract with Zepheira and the publication of http://bibframe.org in January 2013. According to Ford, BIBFRAME responds to increased user expectations, some of which include the use of URIs, reduced ambiguity, decentralization of data, ability to annotate or otherwise augment data, flexibility (for future cataloging and uses), leveraging technology while leaving librarians to their areas of expertise, and web-ready/web-accessibility (more openness, be on the web).

Linked Data was identified early on for BIBFRAME. The RDF vocabulary/data model allows for explicit relationships via the use of links (URIs) to replace text strings and atomization of data for increased flexibility. BIBFRAME has four core classes: work, instance, authority, and annotation. An instance is "a resource reflecting a material embodiment of a BIBFRAME work," and is less ambiguous and more uniquely identified, reusable, flexible and annotatable than our current MARC bibliographic records. Ford demonstrated the splitting of MARC bibliographic records into two instances of a monograph (hardback and paperback) via an ISBN test. The benefits of this atomization include better identification and selection, linking, alignment with contemporary practice, and facilitation of inter-library linking for more precise copy cataloging.

Redesigning the English Short Title Catalog: From MARC to Data Agnostic Triplets
Brian Geiger (UC Riverside) and Carl Stahmer (UC Santa Barbara) discussed the results of a planning grant for redesigning the English Short Title Catalog (STC). The goal of the redesign was to move the catalog data from MARC to an agnostic data-store so that scholars could link to and comment on STC data, allowing for extensibility and flexibility for data migration and shifting of data cores. By setting boundaries as a discriminating factor and establishing relationships between these boundaries along with a few simple set of rules, a simple framework could prove useful.

Geiger and Stahmer proposed an events driven triplets model (subject-predicate-object) that is agnostic. The model would have a core layer, event layer, and schema mapping layer and would allow for as many views as the requestor would want (e.g., MARC, FRBR, etc.). However, they noted that the long-term scalability and overhead would be a barrier to achieving this goal, but would pay off in the end.

In order to accomplish this new model, Geiger and Stahmer looked at existing tools such as the eXtensible Catalog's Metadata Services Toolkit and Collex. The Metadata Services Toolkit is a

plugin architecture that allows users to build custom, Java transformation scripts to match a specified output data model. It also exports records into user-defined XML format and/or pushes it back to the ILS. Collex is a born-digital tool designed to be a union catalog with combined digital archives. This tool allows users to collect and annotate data. Geiger and Stahmer want to develop a RESTful API for Linked Data that will output in RDF and Dublin Core, and as such, have applied for an implementation grant.