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June 28-30, 1997

MARBI and the USMARC Advisory Group met in three sessions during the ALA annual meeting in San Francisco. Chair Jacqueline Riley (University of Cincinnati) led the sessions.

The paper of most interest to the music library community was Discussion Paper No. 103 on current uses of the 028 (Publisher Number) and 037 (Source of Acquisition). Discussion Paper No. 100 on recording additional characteristics in authority records and Discussion Paper No. 102 on the treatment of non-filing characters along with Proposal 97-3R, which concerned the definition of code m (Computer file), are also of potential interest. These and the other papers presented at the San Francisco meeting are summarized below.

The Library of Congress reported on the release of several documentation updates. The updates to the Bibliographic and Authority Formats should be out in August or September. The Relator, etc. Code List should be available in July. The holdings update should be released in September. A printing of the new concise formats with the March updates should be available by September or October.

Discussions continue with the National Library of Canada regarding harmonization with a new combined edition expected next year. The British Library is working through USMARC and is currently reviewing those fields that are not included in UKMARC. A major challenge lies in UKMARC's subfielding of ISBD punctuation.

Proposals

97-3R: Redefinition of Code "m" (Computer file) in Leader/06 in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved as amended)

This paper proposed the redefinition of Leader/06 code m (Computer file) with electronic resources falling outside that definition being coded for their significant aspect. In addition, it proposed that field 007 be added as a mandatory element for electronic resources. The new definition for code m directs the use of code m for the following classes of electronic resources: computer software, numeric data (not alphanumeric as originally proposed), computer-oriented multimedia (which includes interactive multimedia), and online systems or services. Field 007 will be mandatory in the Bibliographic and Holdings Formats for all electronic resources unless only the accompanying material is an electronic resource.

97-8: Redefinition of Subfield $q (File transfer mode) in Field 856 of the USMARC Formats (Approved with typographical correction)

This paper proposed a redefinition of subfield $q (File transfer mode) to Electronic format type. The type of file rather than the mode of transfer will be recorded with the approval of this proposal. This field is non-repeatable.

97-9: Renaming of Subfield 856 $u to Accommodate URNs (Approved as amended)

This proposal suggested changing the name of 856 $u to URI to accommodate both URLs and URNs and adding an indicator value blank (#) to show that the access method is not provided for use with a URN. Because of the current inability for a number of systems to resolve URNs, it was proposed (and approved) that a subfield other than $u be used for URNs and that $u continue to be used exclusively for URLs. A redefinition of little used subfield $g will be considered by the Library of Congress for use. The value blank (#) for No information provided was approved for the first indicator position, field 856.

97-10: Use of the Universal Code Character Set in MARC Records (Approved in part)
This proposal suggested a technique for encoding MARC data using a repertoire of characters from the universal character set (ISO 10646 (UCS)) to which the existing USMARC character sets have been mapped. The mapping of the USMARC ASCII clones in Arabic, Cyrillic, and Hebrew sets to the unified repertoire in the universal coded character set (ISO 10646) without the use of script flag characters in private use space was approved. Issues related to the indication of the use of universal character set encoding in USMARC records were referred to a technical task force charged with reviewing those issues.

97-11: Definition of Subfields in Fields 043 (Geographic Area Code) and 044 (Country of Publishing/Producing Entity Code) to Accommodate Indication of Subentities in the USMARC Bibliographic, Community Information (043 only), and Authority (043 only) Formats (Approved as amended)

This paper proposed defining new subfields to accommodate codes for subentities below the country level in USMARC records. As MARC use expands, some countries would like to code for subentities under the country level in the geographic area and country codes. This proposal addresses the desire to standardize the use of subentity codes as much as possible in order to make them useful to the larger community. Two new subfields were approved for use in field 043 $b (Local extended GAC) and $2 (Source of local code). Three new subfields were approved for use in field 044 $b (Local subentity code), $c (ISO 3166-2 code), and $2 (Source of local code).

97-12: Definition of Separate Subfields in Field 536 (Funding Information Note) for Program Element, Project, Task, and Work Unit Numbers (Approved)

This proposal suggested defining four new elements in field 536 and redefining subfield $d for undifferentiated numbers. The four new elements, as approved, allow users of this field to more specifically indicate which type of number is recorded, all of which were previously lumped in subfield d.

97-13: Changes to Field 355 (Security Classification Control) for Downgrading and Declassification Data (Approved)

This proposal suggested defining subfield $g (Downgrading date), $h (Declassification date), $j (Authorization), and redefining subfield $d to limit it to downgrading or declassification events. Although questions were raised about why the new subfields were not made repeatable, the proposal was approved.

97-14: Addition of New Characters to Existing USMARC Sets (Approved)

This proposal suggested defining three new characters in the existing USMARC character set for the basic Arabic script and was approved without discussion.

Discussion Papers

DP 100: Recording Additional Characteristics in USMARC Authority Records

This paper presented several characteristics—language, script, transliteration, country (nationality), and catalog rules—that might be coded in authority records and indicated possible uses and problems along with techniques. Discussion of each characteristic not currently recorded was substantial with the general conclusion that continued discussion, rather than proposals, should result.

The language of the catalog (the language of the expected users of a catalog) generated little discussion as this is currently done. Most rules for the construction of catalogs specify the language to be used for additions to headings and notes in the record already.

Consideration of recording the language of the heading generated a great deal of discussion and was viewed as extremely problematic. One problematic area was mixed language headings that occur, for example, in name/title headings. Mixed language headings also occur with names and qualifiers. It was also noted that it must be clear that the recording of this characteristic is different than recording, at the record level, the language of the catalog. Differentiating these concepts has been problematic in earlier discussions. This is
intended to be a recording of the language of a particular heading at the field level. The concept of a
resource record rather than an authority record as we know it was presented. From this resource record
different countries could extract various fields for authority control, display, and/or retrieval.

The discussion of recording the script used, again at the field level, also generated much discussion. Several
questioned why one would want to indicate script. The possibility of eliminating the 880s in the authority
format if this technique was used was raised. It was noted that removing 880s might well result in multiple
100s and if they were similarly removed in the bibliographic format, multiple 245s might result. By this
point in the discussion, great angst was apparent and continued discussion on this and related topics on the
USMARC list was encouraged.

During the discussion of the coding of transliteration it was emphasized that this coding would apply only if
the cataloger provided the transliteration as it may not be known what scheme was used by the publisher.
The recording of this characteristic may also be of value in bibliographic records. It was noted that there
may be a desire to record other characteristics such as county of origin, gender, etc.

Catalog rules are already consistently coded in USMARC and the recording of this characteristic was only
briefly discussed.

DP 101: Notes in the USMARC Holdings Format

This paper suggested the inclusion in the holdings format of additional note fields that would contain copy
specific information but are currently defined only in the bibliographic format. The result of the discussion
was a request for a proposal to be written for mid-winter which will propose that fields 541 (Immediate
Source of Acquisition), 561 (Ownership and Custodial History), and 562 (Copy and Version Identification
Notes) be added to the holdings format. In addition, a discussion paper will be drafted that will present the
general problem of copy specific information currently recorded in bibliographic records.

DP 102: Non-filing Characters

This discussion paper presented problems and possible solutions for dealing with non-filing characters
associated with variable field data in USMARC records. With the goal of solving this problem in a general
way that would work for the long term, a discussion of using either control characters or subfielding took
place. A proposal will come back to the group that will suggest the use of two characters or a combination
of characters, one which will mark the beginning of the non-filing characters and one which will mark the
end of the non-filing characters. Much discussion ensued regarding whether these characters should be
graphic or control characters and the proposal will likely present both options for further consideration.
The desire to retain the use of indicators, where defined, to denote non-filing characters was expressed.

DP 103: Current Uses of the 028 (Publisher Number) and the 037 (Source of Acquisition) in the Bibliographic Format

This paper explored the current uses of the 028 (Publisher Number) and the 037 (Source of Acquisition)
and considered possible changes to the fields to allow for more consistent recording and less redundancy of
the information. After a great deal of discussion, outlined below, it was decided that a proposal would be
drafted, for review at mid-winter, that would recommend a slight broadening of the definition of the 028 to
permit the recording of publisher numbers for music-related items in addition to printed music, sound
recordings, and videorecordings.

A great deal of concern was expressed regarding the expansion of the 028 to permit the recording of
numbers found on all types of materials. It was recognized that music and audiovisual catalogers currently
have a problem distinguishing between some publisher and stock numbers. Expanding the definition of the
028 to include all types of materials was seen as a way to extend this problem to the catalogers of material
other than music and this was not seen as desirable. To avoid this problem, the proposal will attempt to
expand the definition in such a way as to allow the inclusion of numbers used like music publisher
numbers by music publishers on non-music materials. Problems inherent in this solution include the need
for the cataloger to recognize a music publisher and to recognize their use of a number in a way similar to their use of numbers on printed music. Cataloger judgment will still be needed for those encountering videorecording numbers and inconsistency and redundancy will continue with regard to those numbers. Little favor was expressed for redefining field 028 to include information previously found in field 037 and to make field 037 obsolete. The need to define the subfields found in the 037 in the 028 as well as little demonstration of the advantage of this redefinition are reasons for this lack of enthusiasm.
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