REPORT OF THE MARBI/USMARC ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

Chicago, Illinois
June 24-26, 1995

MARBI and the USMARC Advisory Group met in three sessions during the ALA convention. Priscilla Caplan (Harvard University) chaired the sessions.

Several of the discussions were of particular interest to music librarians. Proposal 95-7 and Discussion Paper No. 89 both explored the use of the field link and sequence number proposed by the music library community in 1994. Proposal No. 95-9, related specifically to the encoding of digital maps, has implications for the encoding of digitally produced "print" music.

The phased approach to format integration is proceeding on schedule at the Library of Congress with implementation expected for early 1996. Bibliographic Update #1 has gone to printing and will be out soon.

Proposals

94-10: Encoding of Patent Information in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved)

This proposal called for adding specific guidelines to the USMARC Bibliographic Format and defining new data elements for the treatment of patent information. After a lengthy discussion during which many questions could not be answered by those in attendance, it was decided to approve the proposal. This was done with the belief that the individuals involved with the cataloging of patents would request further changes if necessary.

95-6: Linking Code for Reproduction Information in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (no vote taken; will reappear at Midwinter)

This paper proposed a code for use in marking the fields pertaining to a reproduction that are added to a record for an original when creating the record for the reproduction. There was a great deal of discussion about the limitations of field 533 and whether or not pulling out the information found in that field was possible. Discussion also focused on which fields could have a subfield $8. The repeatability of a field seemed to be key. The presence of subfield $8 in a repeatable field was not seen as a problem. The proposal will come back with an explicit listing of fields that can have the subfield $8.

95-8: Define Field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) in the USMARC Classification Format (Approved)

This paper proposed the addition of field 856 to provide a link from a USMARC classification record to a related electronic resource. It is needed so that visual aids previously printed in a classification schedule can be digitized and accessed from an online database of classification records. It was approved without discussion.

95-9: Encoding of Digital Maps in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved)

This paper proposed changes that would allow cartographic material that originates in digital form to be cataloged as cartographic material rather than as a computer file. It was recognized that this suggestion was a specific example of the content versus carrier debate—the question being, which are we cataloging? The change approved was the renaming of Leader/06, subfields $e and $f, to "Cartographic Material" and "Manuscript Cartographic Material" from "Printed Map" and "Manuscript Map."
95-10: Making Field 755 Obsolete in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved)

This paper suggested making field 755 (Added Entry–Physical Characteristics) obsolete and modifying the definition of field 655 (Index Term–Genre/Form) to accommodate terms related to physical characteristics. This had been discussed in detail in Philadelphia and as the distinction between the two fields was still seen as difficult to make, the proposal was approved.

95-11: Definition of X55 Fields for Genre/Form Terms in the USMARC Authority Format (Approved)

This paper proposed definitions of X55 fields that would lead to the creation of separate authority records for those terms that function both as topical and genre/form, one coded as 150 and the other as 155. Although duplicating headings in the same file may be difficult in some systems, option 1 was approved, with the note that if all headings are appropriate as both topical and genre/form that the file need not be duplicated.

95-12: Change in Subfield $v (Record Control Number) to $u in the USMARC Authority Format (Approved)

This paper proposed the change in subfield $v to $u so that subfield $v could be defined for Form subdivision in the USMARC Authority Format linking entry 7XX fields. It was approved with little discussion.

95-13: Improved Coding for Citation Data in Field 524 (Approved, with examples corrected)

This paper proposed the addition of subfields to field 524 to make the field more useful for citations, especially law citations, and it proposed that the field be made repeatable. Although there was some discussion of the definition of subfield $2 and whether or not the name of the field (Preferred Citation of Described Materials Note) should be changed, the proposal was readily approved.

Discussion Papers

DP 85: Changes to Personal Name First Indicator Values

This paper proposed that a new code # (Blank) be defined to indicate that the type of name is unknown and to make value 2 (Multiple Surname) obsolete. The NLM's use of Medline data and a move toward format alignment with UKMARC were the reasons for this discussion. Defining field 720 (Discussion Paper No. 88) would provide a solution for the NLM without defining the new code #. WLN and the Library of Congress strongly objected to making value 2 obsolete. This issue will be discussed again in the context of format alignment.

DP 86: Mapping the Dublin Core Metadata Elements to USMARC

This paper reviewed the discussions held at the OCLC/National Center for Supercomputer Applications (NCSA) Metadata Workshop in Dublin, Ohio in March about core data elements for the discovery and retrieval of Internet resources ("metadata") by a diverse group of Internet users. There was lengthy discussion, much of which focused on the differences between this type of "cataloging" and the type of cataloging with which members of the USMARC Advisory Group were familiar. It was emphasized that the thirteen "core" elements need to be defined such that the provider of the information (typically the author) need not know anything about cataloging. Specific questions were raised on some of the core elements and some elements that were lacking from the core, such as version information. Much more discussion will take place before a proposal is presented.

DP 87: Addition of Subfield $l (Uniform Resource Locator) in Linking Entry Fields 76X-78X in the
USMARC Bibliographic Format

This paper discussed a new subfield in the linking entry fields for a URL. This subfield would provide a link to a related electronic item. There was much concern about putting dynamic information, such as the URL, in several places (the linking fields and the 856) in the bibliographic record. There was also much discussion about the purpose of the linking fields being to link to another record, not to the item itself. Having a URL defined in the linking fields would change this purpose. It was also suggested that if the item was important enough to want to link to it, that it should have its own bibliographic record. If this was the case, the linking field could link to the bibliographic record and the link to the item would then be through the 856. This discussion paper is not expected to appear as a proposal in the near future.

DP 88: Defining a Generic Author Field in USMARC

This paper explored the options for recording author names in USMARC records that do not use standard cataloging rules. The group favored defining a new, repeatable USMARC field explicitly for names of authors not formulated according to the cataloging rules or contained in an authority file or list. The 720 was suggested. The definition of first indicators remained unclear at the end of the discussion. A proposal is expected at Midwinter.

DP 89: Defining Field 774 as a Component Item Entry Field in the USMARC Bibliographic Format

This paper explored defining field 774 to contain information about items that are constituents or elements of the item being cataloged or contained in the collection, group, or set being cataloged. This concept was discussed at Midwinter 1995 as Discussion Paper No. 80. Option 1, defining a URL subfield in the linking entry field, was quickly dismissed. Option 2 received much discussion. It was noted that the examples were for one bibliographic record representing multiple bibliographic items—a concern for some. Also, it seemed necessary to change the definition of "Component Part" under 76X-78X (Linking Entries—General Information), removing the requirement that the component part be physically part of another bibliographic item. It was also felt that defining this field would be a move toward cataloging the content rather than the carrier. This discussion paper is expected to come back as a proposal.

DP 90: MARC Format Alignment

This paper presented issues related to discussions on the alignment of USMARC, CAN/MARC, and UKMARC. Aligning the formats would increase the interchange opportunities that are currently inefficient because of format differences. The driving force behind this discussion is the participation by the British Library in NACO. The goal would be to perfectly align the bibliographic and authority formats. How closely this goal can be realized depends on the impact of the necessary changes. A more detailed proposal will be presented at Midwinter.

A discussion of the governance issues surrounding the alignment of the different MARC formats took place at the close of the regular meeting. A document, "Toward a Common MARC Format," was distributed to MARBI and MARC Advisory Group members. Current governance structures for USMARC, CAN/MARC, and UKMARC were outlined in this document. Two models for a new, combined governance structure were presented. One was the model which operates in the case of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. The other, strongly favored by MARBI and the USMARC Advisory Group, was that of the USMARC Advisory Group. Discussions on the governance options will continue but decisions will be deferred until more is known about the extent of the alignment to be undertaken.
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