REPORT OF THE MARBI/MARC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

San Francisco, CA
June 16-18, 2001

MARBI and the MARC Advisory Committee met concurrently in three sessions during the ALA Annual Meeting in San Francisco. Chair William Jones (NYU) led the sessions.

Announcements:

After consultation with UKMARC users, the British Library made the decision to adopt MARC 21 and to phase out UKMARC. The Library of Congress has entered into discussions with the British Library regarding their role in decision-making in regard to the MARC21 formats; the outcome will probably mirror the relationship with the National Library of Canada. Expect future discussion papers and proposals that request accommodating existing UKMARC practices not currently supported by MARC21.

The pilot test of Classification Plus on the web proved the viability of the product. The Cataloging Distribution Service is proceeding with plans to make Classification Web available as a subscription-based service. For more details, see http://classweb.loc.gov/

The Library of Congress has synchronized the MARC21 language codes with their ISO and NISO equivalents; in the future, they will attempt to keep these codes in synch wherever possible.

Highlights:

Two proposals, approved at this conference, constitute the most significant changes to MARC21 since format integration:

- Proposal 2001-04: Making field 260 repeatable in the bibliographic format
- Proposal 2001-05: Changes to accommodate seriality

In addition, there were several other proposals and discussion papers of interest to the music community:

- Proposal 2001-06: Changes to bibliographic field 041, including the elimination of "stacked" language codes
- Proposal 2001-10: Definition of additional codes in field 007/10 for archival sound recordings
- Discussion Paper 2001-DP05: Multilingual authority records in the authority format

Proposals

2001-04: Making Field 260 Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (approved as amended)

This proposal suggested making field 260 "Publication, Distribution, etc. (Imprint)" repeatable to accommodate changes in publishers over time, so that earliest, current, and, if desired, intervening publishing information could be included in the record. Because a repeatable 260 could apply to monographic sets, integrating resources or serials, each with their own particular needs, no display constant was possible. In the subsequent 260s, catalogers will use subfield $3 (materials specified) to record the range of dates that a later publisher had responsibility for the work; the complete date range for the work will remain in the first 260. Comments during the discussion included a reminder that this proposal does not address display issues; all the publisher information does not need to display in a block. In fact, many believed that the subsequent publisher information should still display with the notes; local systems will have to address these issues. MARBI defined new first indicator values: 2 for "intervening publisher" and 3...
2001-05: Changes in MARC 21 to Accommodate Seriality (approved as amended)

Due to the changes in AACR2 to accommodate integrating resources, this paper proposed four separate changes:

- establish a new Leader/07 Bibliographic level code "i" for integrating resource and rename the "serials" 006 and 008 to "seriality;"
- define a new Frequency code (008/18, 006/01) "k" for continuously updated resources;
- rename 008/21 and 006/04 from "Type of serial" to "Type of serial or integrating resource" and add three new values for loose-leaves ("l"), databases ("d"), and Web sites/online resources ("w");
- create a new code "2" in 008/34 and 006/17 for latest entry integrating resource.

2001-06: Accommodating Non-MARC Language Codes in Field 041 of the Bibliographic and Community Information Formats (approved as amended)

This issue returned as a proposal after the discussion paper at the Midwinter 2001 conference. No one opposed the basic premise of this proposal—accommodating non-MARC21 language codes in a separate 041 field. MARBI approved a new indicator value to indicate the use of non-MARC codes and the addition of subfield $2 to indicate the source of the language code. However, significant discussion ensued about the proposal to discontinue the practice of "stacking" language codes in field 041 (e.g., $g eng$g fre$g ger) in favor of making all subfields repeatable and unstacking the codes in the future (e.g., $g eng $g fre $g ger). Proponents of each option spoke during the discussion. Issues included the impact on legacy data, the complexity of the coding, and attempts to improve precision in retrieval. Ultimately, MARBI voted to make the practice of stacking 041 codes obsolete. Legacy data will be retained in its current configuration; thus, the Library of Congress, the bibliographic utilities and the local systems will still need to handle both stacked and unstacked codes in field 041. It was noted that given the field’s history and the retention of legacy data, systems cannot mandate use of unstacked codes in the future, even if the documentation does.

2001-07: Repeatability of Field 508 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (approved)

Several groups representing videorecording catalogers sponsored this paper, which suggested making field 508 (Creation/Production Credits Note) repeatable. It passed with little discussion.

2001-08: Coding DVDs in Field 007 for Videorecordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats (approved as amended)

This proposal addressed a long-held need: how to encode field 007 for DVDs. Discussion centered on the appropriateness of including "common" names in the formats (e.g., DVD, Laserdisc) and whether dimensions should be included in 007/04. Ultimately, MARBI approved renaming code "g" as "Laserdisc" and creating code "v" for DVDs—dimensions were omitted.

2001-09: Mapping of EACC Characters to Unicode/UCS (approved)

This proposal brought the work of the East Asian Character Code Task Force to closure. Given the distribution of the proposal and its review by appropriate groups outside of ALA, it passed with little discussion.

2001-10: Definition of Additional Codes in Field 007/10 for Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats (tabled)

The Library of Congress authored this paper to meet specific needs of their sound recording preservationists. MARBI expressed concern that a broader community, such as ARSC, had no input into this proposal, since they might request additional codes. An amended version of this paper will return at
Midwinter 2002.

**2001-11: Definition of Field 887 (Non-MARC Information Field) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (approved)**

Another proposal arising out the need for crosswalks between various metadata schemes and MARC21, this paper suggested the creation of field 887 for metadata that has no corresponding MARC tag for mapping. MARBI approved this addition, in spite of some concerns about how the field can represent non-MARC characters.

**Discussion Papers**

**2001-DP04: Expanding Field 046 for Other Dates in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Community Information Formats**

This paper returned in a revised form after a previous discussion at the Midwinter 2001 meetings. It explored expanding field 046 (Special coded dates) for date types not currently accommodated in MARC21, such as date modified, date valid and date created. This field would contain dates that are not already present in the record. Because field 046 is used in both the bibliographic and community information formats, the paper also presented options for harmonizing the subfields between these two formats.

**2001-DP05: Multilingual Authority Records in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

The Multilingual Record Task Force presented this paper, which offered three different models to encode authority records containing headings in multiple languages. With the preferred model C, the context of the heading (AACR2, RAK, etc.) would be emphasized over the languages used in the entry, and separate records created according to different cataloging rules could be linked. Given the mix of languages in some headings, this approach would simplify the content and encoding of authority records over models A and B. MARBI requested further study of the issues involved.

**2001-DP06: Coding Series Numbering in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

This paper investigated options to encode volume designations in subfield $v in the 4XX and 8XX fields in the bibliographic format to generate better browsing displays and to eliminate the need for 8XX fields when the only difference is the format of the volume designation (e.g. "v." vs. "vol."). MARBI considered the suggested changes to be impractical solutions and found the situation to be a systems issue rather than a data issue. The discussion focused on a solving this problem by developing an algorithm to be shared among local systems which would treat all volume designation data – without actually changing coding conventions.

**2001-DP07: Name/Title of Unit in MARC 21 Holdings Records**

This paper considered how to record a distinctive title associated with a basic bibliographic unit that applies only to a constituent part, using field 844 (Name of Unit) and/or subfield $o in fields 854/864 and 855/865.

**Discussion papers relating to enumeration and chronology in the holdings format:**

1. **2001-DP08: Coding for Publication Pattern at the First Level of Enumeration in MARC 21 Holdings Records**

2. **2001-DP09: Repeatability of Subfield $w in Fields 853-855 of the MARC 21 Holdings Format**
3. **2001-DP10**: Incrementing Intervals in Publication Patterns in the MARC 21 Holdings Format
4. **2001-DP11**: Spans of Enumeration and Chronology in Expressing Publication Patterns in the MARC 21 Holdings Format

These four discussion papers explored options for further expanding the holdings format (fields 853-855) to further accommodate combinations of enumeration and chronology to better predict the next serial issue to be received. While the examples included in these papers represent fairly common patterns, it may not be possible to solve all prediction issues via expansion these fields. During the discussion, practitioners preferred the possible techniques which most closely mirrored current coding conventions.

**Reports**

Gary Smith (OCLC) reported that the Unicode Task Force continues to work on its charge.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Glennan  
Chair, Subcommittee on MARC Formats  
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