REPORT OF THE MARBI/MARC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
San Antonio, TX
January 15-17, 2000

MARBI and the MARC Advisory Committee met concurrently in two sessions during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Antonio. Chair Bruce Chr. Johnson (Library of Congress) led the sessions.

Announcements:

The Library of Congress’ Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) will publish the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data shortly; the other three formats (Holdings, Classification and Community Information) are expected to be available before this summer.

The 1994 publication *USMARC Specifications for Record Structure, Character Sets, and Exchange Media* was updated in July 1999 to reflect MARC 21 changes; it will be published by CDS this year.

A new edition of the language code list will be out after February. It includes changes from the last six months, many of which arose out of the alignment with ISO 639-2. Implementation is likely within six months.

LC ceased using indicator value “2” for multiple surnames in MARC 21 on January 1, 2000. For details, see http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/multsur.html

This summer, CDS is planning a pilot project to provide access to LC’s MARC Classification format on the web. They are looking for test participants.

Highlights:

While none of the papers discussed at this meeting addressed music specifically, a few may hold particular interest within the music library community:

- Proposal 2000-02, redefining the URI (URL/URN) subfields in field 856
- Proposal 2000-06, defining URI subfields in additional fields, including 505

Discussions about these and the other proposals and discussion paper are summarized below.

Proposals

**2000-01**: Definition of Subfield $z (Numbering scheme) in Fields 853-855 (Captions and Patterns) of the MARC 21 Holdings format (deferred)

This proposal investigated several options to better record publication pattern information for serials to predict the next issue. The numbering scheme may be in Arabic numerals, upper or lower case Roman, upper or lower case alphabetic characters, or some combination of the above. The second option, which proposed a repeatable subfield $z$ in fields 853-855 with values to indicate both the numbering scheme and the number’s script or type, had greater acceptance at the meeting because it is more easily extendable to the international community. However, MARBI felt that the proposal needed to address additional possible numbering schemes such as alphanumeric, symbolic, etc., thus the proposal was deferred to a future meeting.

**2000-02**: Renaming of Subfield $u$ to Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) in Field 856 in MARC 21 Formats (approved)

With the evolution of URIs and their encoding in the MARC formats, the URL/URN subfields in field 856 needed to be brought into conformance with the practice implemented in other fields. MARBI approved making subfield $g$
2000-03: Definition of Subfield $2 (Source of term) in Field 583 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats (approved as amended)

Creating an authorized way to refer to the type of action in Field 583 (Action Note) will likely serve four basic communities: archives, rare books, collection development, and preservation; however, additional uses may arise. MARBI approved this proposal, which establishes subfield $2 and makes it non-repeatable. If multiple subfield $2 values are needed, field 583 will be repeated.

2000-04: Anonymous Attribution Information in Personal Name Headings (approved option 2)

The art cataloging community brought this proposal forward, since they often have situations where the creator of a work of art is unknown or uncertain. Scholarship frequently attributes these works as relating to a particular style or artist (i.e., School of Andrea Mantegna; Copyist of Rodin). MARBI approved the creation of subfield $j to encode such anonymous attribution information in the X00 fields in MARC 21. While the possibility exists that authority records may be made for these attributions, that practice cannot be mandated.

2000-05: Uncontrolled Names as Subjects in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Community Information Formats (tabled)

This proposal originated with the CORC project, arising out of issues in mapping Dublin Core to MARC 21 and back. New indicator values were proposed for field 653 to code uncontrolled names. MARBI expressed concerns about this proposal, including whether or not additional indicator values should be added, and what was meant by the indicator value terms. They also questioned if the terminology would mean the same thing to catalogers and non-catalogers. The proposal was tabled and will be reworked for a future MARBI meeting.

2000-06: Defining URI Subfields in Fields 505, 514, 520, 530, 545, 552 and 773 (approved except for Field 773)

This proposal suggested creating a subfield $u for URIs (which includes both URLs and URNs) in several additional fields, as requested by the MARC 21 user community. Discussion centered around whether the URI would be in addition to or instead of the information currently contained in these fields. If the latter, how would users determine if the link is worth following? While there concerns were raised about indexing trade-offs if using a URI instead of the text in a record, the majority felt that in most cases, adding the URI would provide additional information instead of replacing data already carried in the record. The Library of Congress will identify a subfield for display text in fields 514 and 552 before validating the URI subfield in these tags. Because 773 functions more as a local field with access limited due to contractual arrangements, it was voted down from this proposal; however, adding subfield $u was approved for the other fields.

Discussion Papers

DP 120: Community Information Format Integration with the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

This discussion paper raised the question about the ongoing viability of keeping the Community Information and Bibliographic formats separate, since they share many of the same tags and it is sometimes difficult to determine which of these formats to use. Some drawbacks to integrating these formats are that 008 fixed field values and length are quite different and that field 245 is not required in the Community Information format. A straw poll taken in the room indicated very little support for bringing this paper back to MARBI as a proposal.

Reports

Lennie Stovel (RLG) updated the group on the progress made in Z39.50 attribute sets; a new attribute architecture has been developed which includes more hierarchy. One set is closely related to the Dublin Core standard. Stovel needs
input from the bibliographic community on the bibliographic attributes to be included in the new standard.

Mary Larsgaard (UCSB) updated MARBI on the metadata preconference planned for the 2000 ALA meeting. They are planning to publish the proceedings in the ALCTS Paper Series by the end of summer or early fall. She also reported on CC:DA’s Task Force on Metadata, which has viewed prototypes for searching multiple databases at one time. Some changes may be needed in MARC 21 for Dublin Core compliance in date and relationships as the standard evolves.

Phelix Hanible (Univ. of Mass., Amherst) presented an update on the “Is MARC Dead” program scheduled for ALA Annual on July 9.

John Espley (VTLS) stated that the East Asian Character Task Force would likely have a proposal ready for the Chicago meeting. Their proposed mappings are available at ftp.rlg.org/pub/EACC.

The Unicode Task Force expects to bring a final report to the ALA Annual meeting in Chicago, and the Multilingual Record Task Force expects to bring an interim report to then as well.

MARBI agreed to co-sponsor a program with the PLA Services to Multicultural Populations Committee for ALA Annual; they also agreed to continue the ongoing joint meeting at Annual with CC:DA.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Glennan

Chair, Subcommittee on MARC Formats

Music Library Association Liaison to MARC Advisory Committee
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