

## **Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)**

Reported by Bruce Evans (Baylor University), Chair, MARC Formats Subcommittee

### **Music-Related Proposals**

#### **[Proposal No. 2013-03](#): Making Field 250 Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

Presented jointly by MLA and LC. This paper is a follow-up to [Proposal No. 2012-05](#), which was presented by LC at Annual last summer. After a meeting of the JSC last fall rejected a proposal by IAML to carry the Musical Presentation Statement (known in ISBD as “music format statement”) into RDA, the way was cleared to bring this proposal back to not only incorporate MPS into the Edition area, but also certain statements that were recorded in the statement of responsibility in the 245 field under AACR2, such as “piano/vocal score by the composer”. The paper also contained examples how this could be applied to materials beyond music, such as serials.

Discussion centered mainly on whether or not it would be possible to have all of these statements strung together in a single 250. Past-Chair Matthew Wise pointed out that if you do not have the option to repeat, how are you going to determine the order of a long string; could get very complicated. Other constituencies confirmed the usefulness of a repeatable 250 beyond the area of music. A motion to approve the Proposal as written passed.

#### **[Proposal No. 2013-04](#): Defining New Code for Score in Field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

Presented by MLA. After the successful adoption of MLA’s [Proposal No. 2012-07](#), which created a new value k for vocal score in field 008/20 (Format of music) and corresponding redefinition of code values c and d in field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, we realized that since RDA defines score to include “music for solo instruments, etc.” the current values of codes a and z are also no longer valid. Therefore, with the precedent set with the vocal score paper, we proposed the creation of code value l to accommodate the RDA-specific definition of score, and then redefine codes a and z, all in field 008/20.

Discussion centered around whether electronic music is considered for solo or ensemble, per the definition for code l, but mainly focused on lack of clarity behind the proposed redefinitions of code a and z. A motion was put forward to accept the proposal, provided that MLA will work with LC to tweak the wording for the scope of codes a and z, which was approved.

#### **[Proposal No. 2013-02](#): New Fields to Accommodate Authority Records for Medium of Performance Vocabulary for Music in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

Presented by MLA. This paper is a follow-up to [2012-DP02](#), presented by MLA at Annual last summer. The paper proposes the creation of four new fields to accommodate authority data that will utilize controlled terms from the *Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus for*

*Music* (LCMPT). Those fields are 162 (Heading – Medium of Performance Term), 462 (See From Tracing – Medium of Performance Term), 562 (See Also From Tracing – Medium of Performance Term), and 762 (Established Heading Linking Entry – Medium of Performance Term). A motion was put forth to accept the Proposal as written. After a brief discussion, the motion was approved.

## **Other Proposals and Discussion Papers**

### **[Proposal No. 2013-01](#): Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

This paper was presented by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. In the hopes that the kinks associated with its previous iterations, [2012-DP01](#) and [2012-02](#), have been worked out, this proposal seeks to make title information buried in the free text of an authority record's 670 field machine-actionable. After much debate concerning what subfields should be added or removed, the paper's author put forward the motion to approve the paper with the following changes: 672 and 673 \$a--change to title proper, include 111 tag, and add 673 \$f for date (R). The motion was approved as amended.

### **[Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP01](#): Identifying Records from National Bibliographies in MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

This paper was presented by the OCLC National Libraries Working Group. The paper explores possibilities for identifying records from national bibliographies, most notably through coding them in the 042. The premise behind this DP is that a cataloger may want to pick out these records because they are assumed to be more fully cataloged than others.

Much discussion centered on the fact that records created by national bibliographies are frequently changed. Many also questioned the paper's premise that records from national bibliographies are unique, are of consistently higher quality than others. Furthermore, this could also open up the possibility that these records could no longer be edited. The outcome was that LC will create a specific and unambiguous code that will identify a national bibliography in a record (in field 042). No need for changes in MARC documentation and no need to bring back as a proposal at this time. OCLC will then issue a statement on its rules for use of the code in WorldCat and the MARC listserv, and the rules for modification of records identified as national bibliography record.

### **[Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP02](#): Defining Subfields for Qualifiers to Standard Identifiers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats**

This paper was presented by the Library of Congress (LC) and the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM). This DP builds on the successful passage of MLA's [Proposal 2012-06](#) from Annual last summer, which defined subfield \$q (Qualifying information) in Field 028 (Publisher Number) in the MARC Bibliographic format, by exploring the addition of subfield \$q (Qualifying information) to field 020 (International Standard Book Number), field 022 (International Standard Serial Number), field 024 (Other Standard Identifier) and field 027

(Standard Technical Report Number) to accommodate qualifiers to the standard identifiers recorded in those fields.

The discussion on this DP focused almost exclusively on the part concerning the 022. The LC ISSN International Center Head was in attendance, and discussed inconsistency with coding the 022 correctly, and according to CONSER standards, which therefore complicates implementing what this DP proposes for the 022. Many in attendance also had concerns with the 022 part of the DP. The groups recommended that this matter needs to be studied more before it is brought back as a Proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP03: Defining a control subfield \$7 in the Series Added Entry Fields, for the Type and the Bibliographic level of the Related Bibliographic Record**

This paper was presented by the German National Library. Since German speaking countries describe a series in an equivalent to a MARC Bibliographic Record -- the MARC Authority format is not used for series -- this paper discusses a way to designate the type and bibliographic level of a series in a record that describes a part of that series. After deliberating over the DP's questions for discussion, the paper's author got what he needed to bring it back as a Proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP04: Separating the Type of Related Entity from the RDA Relationship Designator in MARC 21 Bibliographic Format Linking Entry Fields**

This paper was presented by the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM), and is predicated on the fact that parenthetical qualifiers used to indicate the type of related entity, while useful to catalogers, may be confusing to the public. Therefore, the paper advocates an option for recording RDA relationship designators in 76X-78X subfield \$4 that correspond to the terms in Appendix J, that the Library of Congress establish a list of relationship codes, and that user-friendly versions of the designators will be recorded in subfield \$i (other options are presented as well).

The discussion opened with a JSC representative supporting the direction of this paper, and that the machine actionable relationship between \$i and \$4 will be worked on through a JSC paper; the work on that paper will be significantly informed by today's discussion.

Here is what the committee recommended: 1) Do not propose repeating subfield \$i. 2) Do not limit the changes to just 787, i.e. all of the 76X-78X linking entry fields should be included because the community seems to have decided to take advantage of the existing semantics. 3) Develop another discussion paper which includes a place for user-friendly labels and for codes. The recommended best practice could be to record the unqualified designators in \$i. 4) The title of the next discussion paper will focus on recording relationship designators rather than on the "type of related entity."

**Proposal No. 2013-05: Defining New Field 385 for Audience Characteristics in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

This paper was presented by the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation, and is a follow-up to [Discussion Paper No. 2012-DP04](#), presented last summer at Annual. The paper proposes the establishment of a new 385 field in both the

Bibliographic and Authority formats to record audience characteristics of works and expressions, in order to enable the full implementation of the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT). After discussion about the need for subfields, and whether terms should be singular or plural, a motion to approve this proposal was made, provided that \$m would be included for terms, \$n for codes, and dropping \$u. The group voted to approve the motion as amended.

**[Proposal No. 2013-06](#): Defining New Field 386 for Creator/Contributor Group  
Categorizations of Works, Expressions, and Persons in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

This paper was presented by the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation, and is a follow-up to [2012-DP05](#), presented last summer at Annual. The paper proposes the establishment of a new 386 field in both the Bibliographic and Authority formats to record group categories of creators and contributors of works, expressions, and persons, with the same LCGFT considerations as 2013-05. There was considerable discussion concerning overlap and possible redundancy with the 374, but in the end decided to come up with best practices to navigate this instead. Additionally, when the motion came forward to approve the Proposal, the group decided to deal further with the redundancy by dropping a paragraph concerning personal names (Section 2.1), and taking out the second paragraph under the field definition and scope for the authority format (Section 3.1). The motion was approved as amended.

**[Proposal No. 2013-07](#): Defining Encoding Elements to Record Chronological Categories and Dates of Works and Expressions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

This paper was presented by the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation, and is a follow-up to [2012-DP03](#), presented last summer at Annual. The paper proposes the establishment of a new encoding in fields 046 and 648 in the Bibliographic format and 046 in the Authority format to record chronological categories and dates for works and expressions previously expressed in relation to genre/form. Before discussion on the main paper commenced, the presenter handed out an amendment he wished to have added to the paper, and that was 348 or 388 Chronological Term Representing Date or Time Period of Creation or Origin of Work/Expression (R). The group decided that it should have more time to consider this amendment, and so it was dropped for now. A motion to approve the paper as written was passed with little discussion.