ALA Annual Meeting 2014, Las Vegas
Report from the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), and from MARC- and BIBFRAME-related Sessions
Submitted by Sandy Rodriguez, Chair, MARC Formats, MLA-BCC
(Note: Two BIBFRAME sessions were scheduled concurrently with meetings of the Metadata
      Standards Committee, so those sessions were covered by Sandy Rodriguez as MARC
      Formats Chair and Beth Iseminger as BCC Chair)

MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)

Chair, Matthew Wise (NYU) welcomed everyone to the meeting of the MARC Advisory
Committee (MAC). Introductions were made and the 2014 Midwinter Meeting MAC minutes
were approved.

Proposal No. 2014-04: Adding Miscellaneous Information in Topic Term and Geographic Name
Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

Presented by the German National Library. After a merger of four authority files in German-
speaking countries, the same entities used different subfields resulting in the use of subfield $g
"Miscellaneous information" to parse out parenthetical qualifiers. The Germans are formally
proposing the use of subfield $g for this purpose in the topical (X50) and geographic name (X51)
fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats and would also like for the subfield
to be repeatable. This proposal follows the recommendations made from Discussion Paper No.
2014-DP03 at Midwinter 2014.

The Germans recognize the concern raised regarding the exclusion of X55 genre/form, and
although agreeable to including it in their proposal, it would not be based on their immediate
need. The group decided to err on the side of caution and advised that it not be included. The
proposal was unanimously accepted as written.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP07: Broaden Usage of Field 088 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic
Format

Presented by Alaska Resources Library and Information Services (ARLIS). This discussion
paper enumerates options to coding series numbers commonly found in technical reports and
government publications. The primary recommended option: the broadening of MARC
Bibliographic field 088 – Report number which currently excludes the use of numbers associated
with series statements. Another option presented is the implementation of a new field, either 087
or 089 for this purpose.

Several members expressed appreciation to ARLIS for bringing this issue forward as they felt the
use case presented by ARLIS justified its need. The committee recommended the following: 6.1)
No one could recall why series numbering was excluded from MARC Bibliographic field 088,
but Sally McCallum posited that format consistency may have been a consideration. The
committee did not feel that redundant data in records would be a concern. 6.2) The broadening of
Bibliographic field 088 seems like a reasonable solution; therefore, it is not necessary to

establish a newly-defined field. 6.3) There was very little concern regarding compromising the integrity of field 088 if its use were expanded to include series numbering. The committee recommended that ARLIS move forward with a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP06: Defining Values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

Presented by the British Library. This discussion paper examines solutions for sequencing sources of acquisitions in MARC Bibliographic field 037 – Source of acquisition in a controlled and machine-actionable way. The British Library's primary solution is to define values for indicator 1 in Bibliographic field 037 in order to manage the exchange of metadata for electronic serials with third parties.

Much concern was raise over this proposal including: whether coding this information would favor a particular provider; whether sequencing source of acquisition is only of local benefit to the British Library and therefore not prudent to record in the master record; the potential for an inordinate amount of 037s in the bibliographic record; how the 037s might be maintained and the potential for confusion; conflation of recording what is available from a vendor versus recording the vendor that a particular library acquired the resource from; etc. Most on the committee agreed that a local solution seemed appropriate for the scope of the problem presented by the British Library. The committee responded to the questions posed by the British Library even though there was general dissent for moving forward with the proposal. The responses were: 5.1) Yes, the definition of values for indicator 1 in the 037 would be an acceptable means of recording sequential source of acquisition information. 5.2) Yes, the definition of values for indicator 1 should be based on the indicator values present in the 264 field. Subfield $5 could also be added. 5.3) Not applicable given the response to 5.2.

Proposal No. 2014-05: Designating Relationships Between Subject Headings from Different Thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority Format

Presented by the German National Library. The paper proposes a method to establish cross-thesaurus mapping in the MARC authority record and follows the recommendations made by MAC during discussion of Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP02 at the Midwinter 2014 meeting.

There was acknowledgement of support from the National Library of Spain and the Canadian Committee on MARC sent over the MARC Forum listserv. There is still no good solution for addressing the 2-to-1 mapping issue when there is no exact equivalent, but the German National Library hopes to come up with a local solution that may benefit all in the MARC community. The proposal was unanimously accepted with minor revision to correct any occurrence of "EG" to "EQ" (equivalence).

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP05: Adding Dates for Corporate Bodies in Field 046 in the MARC 21 Authority Format

Presented by the British Library. The discussion paper considers options for accommodating date of establishment and date of termination of a corporate body in MARC Authority field 046. The

options include: (1) defining a new subfield $q for date of establishment and subfield $r for date of termination; or (2) broadening the definition of subfields $f and $g to include dates of establishment and termination for corporate bodies. If the committee felt there was a need to parse out and codify this data, the British Library also propose modifications to the field definition and scope section for corporate bodies and the field labels and definitions for subfields $s and $t.

Because date of establishment is distinctly different from date of activity in RDA, there was much support for parsing this data out; however, international responses were split between the two options. The committee recommended the following: 5.1) Option 1 – defining new subfield $q for date of establishment and subfield $r for date of termination is preferred because it is cleaner for mapping and display. 5.2) Yes, the 046 field definition and scope should be expanded to specify that the period of activity is a type of date which can be associated with a corporate body. 5.3) The labels should stay as they currently conform to LC's style guide, but the definitions will be amended.

[Proposal No. 2014-06](): Defining New Field 388 for Time Period of Creation Terms in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats

Presented by the ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation. The paper proposes a new field 388 in the Authority and Bibliographic formats to record chronological terms representing the time period of creation or origin of works and expressions. This would allow for the retention of LCSH chronological/time period that are not retained in LCGFT and would move the terms out of the 6xx block where they do not belong. The proposal follows recommendations made by MARBI during discussion of [Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP06]() at Annual 2013.

Concern was raised over the lack of a chronological terms list, but given that it's a question of content rather than coding, the issue is out of scope for MAC. SAC plans to develop best practices to address this concern. The proposal was unanimously accepted with an amendment to repeal the change made to the first indicator of MARC Bibliographic field 648 (Subject added entry – Chronological term) and return it to first indicator blank – undefined.

Business meeting

Library of Congress Report
The 382 Medium of Performance terms and American Folk Society's Ethnographic thesaurus have both been added to [http://id.loc.gov/]() so they now have URIs. MARC Update No. 18 was published in April.

German National Library
Reinhold Heuvelmann provided an update on [Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP01]() presented at Midwinter 2014. The German National Library looked closely at whether MAC's recommended solution of using MARC Bibliographic field 366 - trade availability information for designating "never published" for a bibliographic resource would meet their requirements. They concluded that it, in fact, would and expressed their appreciation to MAC for proposing this solution. In

mid-September, the Germans will begin using Bibliographic field 366 with subfield $2 and subfield $c AB.

Announcement
Rich Green (OCLC) is retiring and his participation at this year's ALA Annual is the last act of his career. Jay Weitz will be replacing him as OCLC representative on the MARC Advisory Committee.

RDA, MARC, and BIBFRAME: Transition and Interaction
(a program sponsored by the MARC Formats Transition Interest Group)

Gordon Dunsire, chair of the Joint Steering Committee for RDA and Deborah Fritz, founder and co-owner of The MARC of Quality (TMQ, Inc.) presented the session, "RDA, MARC, and BIBFRAME: transition and interaction" which focused on identifying the entities that underpin RDA and how they align with BIBFRAME and MARC 21 in a linked data environment.

Dunsire noted how FRBR locks the WEMI (Work-Expression-Manifestation-Item) stack in a particular way—an expression can have one and only one work, item has one and only one manifestation, and a manifestation must have at least one expression but can have more. He also observed that the PFC (Person-Family-Corporate Body) grouping interacts in a fundamentally different way—all three together as an agent. RDA takes the FRBR/FRAD model and instantiates it into an environment with multiple works, WEMI stacks, and agents interacting with each other (i.e., relationships). These relationships have reciprocals. For instance, taking the point of view from cataloging, catalogers describe and then add access; yet the users' point of view starts with access that eventually ends up with the item. Fundamentally, the goal is getting the item to the user.

It's important to look at the definition rather than labels in order to effectively map the relationship between the BIBFRAME (BF) point of view and the RDA point of view. For instance, "ascension and declination" in the RDA domain places the entity in Work while BF places it in cartography. If further exploring the cartography definition in BF, however, we see it is a sub-entity of BF Work. RDA provides a parallel set of unconstrained elements with range and domain allowing for mapping of BF to RDA data, but Dunsire remarked that the question of whether BF should develop unconstrained properties needs resolution.

Ultimately, the real crux of the matter is in mapping entities. ISBD is mapping resource to the WEMI stack; BF has two high-level entities (Work and Instance); and MARC 21's high-level entity is resource. At this stage there are no relationships between RDA and MARC data. RDA Manifestation and BIBFRAME Instance maps, but what about BIBFRAME Work? Does it map to RDA Expression? The discrepancies between these standards may need to be reviewed and reconciled somehow, to enable accurate mapping.

Deborah Fritz noted the difficulty of crosswalking MARC data to the RDA record in a way that can fit the entity-relationship model. Using the tool she developed, RIMMF (RDA in Many Metadata Formats), she demonstrated how one MARC record can explode into five entity linked

records forming a relationship tree. RIMMF is a training tool, but isn't being used much because it doesn't fit into the cataloger's workflow in the current environment where no system has taken advantage of RDA. Fritz noted that she is working on getting RIMMF to import and export MARC. When crosswalking RDA into BIBFRAME, Fritz had to use MARCXML and the BIBFRAME tool, but a lot of data was lost. She concluded that any crosswalking of RDA data to MARC in complicated situations would need human intervention, and that design work needs to start outside of MARC, but MARC would have to be accommodated. She closed with the questions: How do we transition? If they build it, will you use it?

Library of Congress BIBFRAME Update Forum

BIBFRAME Tasks
Sally McCallum (LC) provided an overview of BIBFRAME work by the Library of Congress since ALA Midwinter 2014 and a preview of what's next. Since the Midwinter meeting: the BIBFRAME website has been reorganized; the testbed registry has been established; the BF vocabulary has been stabilized; draft specifications for authorities, relationships, and profiles have been posted; and the BIBFRAME editor interface has been made available. The next steps in BIBFRAME development includes: modeling recorded sound and moving image resources; a study of the relationship and overlap of PREMIS and BIBFRAME for audiovisual resources; open source and experimentation with extension of Metaproxy; and the provision of downloadable open software such as the profile editor along with a search and display interface.

#bibframe TechDev Update and BIBFRAME Editor Demo
Kevin Ford (LC) gave an update on technical developments with the BIBFRAME effort and a demonstration of the BIBFRAME Editor (BFE) tool. In the last six months, the BFE was developed with the addition of a MARC-2-BIBFRAME Transform and enhancements to http://bibframe.org website. Development work is focused on reimagining the bibliographic environment in a post-MARC world. In the future, they'd like to greatly simplify this data exchange environment where most (machine, patron, developer, cataloger) are working in the ILS web layer only to get to the ILS database.

Ford also demonstrated the new MARC-2-BIBFRAME Transformation Tool which allows for uploading of MARCXML records to output BIBFRAME; the MARC-2-BIBFRAME Comparison Tool which allows for fetching a MARC record by entering a bib number and outputs Turtle notation; and finally, the BIBFRAME Editor which allows for creation of profiles such as instance/manifestation.

Stanford and BIBFRAME: Big Data, Big Issues, Big Solutions
Philip E. Schreur (Stanford University) presented on Stanford's investigation of BIBFRAME through a two-year Mellon Foundation grant collaboration with the Cornell University Library and the Harvard's Library Innovation Lab called "Linked Data for Libraries" (LD4L). The goal is to develop an ontology, provide a collection of linked data open resources, and create a suite of open source software tools. In an effort to leverage existing tools, Stanford is looking at BIBFRAME and is leading in evaluating it as the possible ontology to work with. Schreur noted that they chose BIBFRAME because it's the replacement for MARC, flexible enough to go

beyond MARC, and has a recently established testbed for asking questions, getting answers, and generating discussion.

Schreur provided some examples of issues that need addressing in their work with converting MARC to BIBFRAME in a multi-institutional environment, including chunking data, generating consistent URIs across chunks and institutions, and preventing the mixing of uncontrolled headings with controlled headings.

BIBFRAME AV Modeling Study
Andrea Leigh (LC) presented the background and results from a study of audiovisual materials at the Packard Campus, Library of Congress. After a visit from the LC BIBFRAME team and Eric Miller (Zepheira), use cases were constructed by Packard Campus catalogers starting in July 2013. An AV study was completed in May of 2014 and will be available at the end of the month (July 2014). The study included a plethora of moving images and recorded sound, published and unpublished, and a lot of non-MARC metadata.

One of the central challenges noted in the study was the often event-centric nature of AV materials-- time-based, documenting a continuum of activities; characterized by who, what, when, where; captured live action; that may or may not incorporate an underlying intellectual work; fixated on a specific device or medium for playback (content vs. carrier); with many agents performing different functions at many levels (recording, performance, distribution, etc.). Other challenge include the abundance of date types (e.g., data of release/broadcast, performance dates, etc.); aggregations and collections (albums with multiple tracks, compilation of news stories, compilation reels of various short films, TV broadcasts with commercials); multiple generations and uses (migration to different formats when original format becomes obsolete, relationships to multiple generations of items, pre-production to finished product, creation of access copies for fragile or not easily playable formats); and search and retrieval issues (important relationship information in notes, e.g., contents, cast and performers, credits, locations, original release and broadcast).

The AV Modeling consisted of a review of existing standards– FRBR, RDA, OLAC Moving image work-level records TF, FIAF cataloging manual—as well as the BIBFRAME model. They extended the BIBFRAME model to include an event aspect and developed the Content Description Model which considers a super-class for bf:content; introduces bf:event; considers more date types; and investigate timestamps and descriptions.

PCC Involvement With BIBFRAME
(During CONSER/BIBCO/SACO-at-Large meeting)

The Library of Congress and Zepheira are working on BIBFRAME from different, but complimentary, angles. They're testing the vocabulary, not the model or the tool at this point. It would be helpful if PCC librarians could work together to influence the developers of the BIBFRAME model, and perhaps create a PCC BIBFRAME profile, or BIBCO and CONSER profiles. It is important for PCC to be involved with BIBFRAME now, at a high level. To make BIBFRAME work, institutions will need to work together, though individual institutions must

get buy-in from library systems and administration. Is there something the PCC Secretariat can do to assist libraries in moving forward with BIBFRAME involvement?

Translating BIBFRAME, or, What is all this #$%!?: Making Its Potential Mutually Intelligible to Catalogers and Coders Alike
(a hot topics session sponsored by ALCTS-CaMMS and the ALCTS-LITA Metadata Standards Committee)

Philip E. Schreur (Stanford University) presented on Stanford's involvement with BIBFRAME. A BIBFRAME test project has been begun by various parties from Stanford, Cornell, and Harvard. Librarians at Stanford are currently testing the MARC to BIBFRAME converter using bibliographic records from Stanford's catalog. They are doing targeted review of records by format and by MARC field. The converter worked with MARCXML, but not all the testers could make use of that. Another problem is that the converter can't work in bulk, yet, and it was difficult to use repetitively. The systems department at Stanford is working on developing a front end for their BIBFRAME data.

Stanford has discovered some issues with MARC to BIBFRAME conversion, including loss of 730 fields and duplication of the 504 field. Broader conversion issues include: edition statements, need for consistent identifiers for entities, and holdings annotations.

Harvard is pushing for inclusion of usage data in the BIBFRAME model, in addition to the existing categories of bibliographic, personal, and external data.

To find out more about the converter, search the website GitHub for "marc2bibframe".