

**ALA Annual Conference Report
Reports from the MARC Advisory Committee
and MARBI (Machine Readable Bibliographic Information Committee)
Anaheim, California, June 23-24, 2012**

Announcement

The ALCTS Board announced that MARBI will be dissolved as of the conclusion of ALA Annual 2013. In its place, the Board will create an ALCTS-LITA Metadata Standards Committee with a liaison from RUSA. The charge is basically the same charge as MARBI – to play a leadership role in the creation and development of metadata standards for bibliographic information. The 9 division members of MARBI will be discharged and new members appointed.

The MARC Advisory Committee will still continue their relationship with LC, including contributing proposals. Sally McCallum, head of the LC Network Development and MARC Standards Office, invited the liaisons to remain involved with MAC. The MARC Advisory Committee will no longer meet concurrently with the new Metadata Standards Committee, as they did with MARBI. The MARC Advisory Committee's role in relation to the new Metadata Standards Committee is still unclear.

Music-Related Proposals and Discussion Papers

Proposal No. 2012-06: Defining Subfield \$c (Qualifying information) in Field 028 (Publisher Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-06.html>

The paper was presented by MLA and proposed that subfield \$c (Qualifying information) be added to field 028 (Publisher Number) to accommodate RDA instructions on recording identifiers for the manifestation. Prior to the meeting, the Canadian Committee on MARC had proposed changing \$c to \$q, since 01X-08X can also potentially have this qualifying information, and the subfield would need to be available for all of those fields. The proposal was approved, with the coding applying to just the 028 field at present.

Proposal No. 2012-07: Defining New Code for Vocal Score in Field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-07.html>

The paper was presented by MLA. It proposed the creation of the code value k for vocal score in field 008/20 (Format of music) and the redefinition of code values c and d in field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The paper was approved without discussion.

Proposal No. 2012-05: Making the 250 Field Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-05.html>

This paper was submitted by the Library of Congress and presented by Matthew Wise as chair. The paper was meant to address the absence of the musical presentation statement in RDA. The paper proposed making the 250 field (Edition Statement) repeatable, so that musical presentation statements for RDA could be recorded under edition.

If repeatability of 250 were allowed for other formats (like DVDs), it could become difficult to tell which statements were subsequent edition statements versus separate edition statements. More guidance would be needed on when to repeat the 250 field. It was also suggested that this is a problem relating to the content standard, rather than a MARC coding problem. Suggested solutions include folding the musical presentation statement into the edition element in RDA, or broadening the scope of the 254 (AACR2 field for musical presentation statement) to include music-specific edition statements under RDA. The paper was not approved, and a request will be made of the paper's original author (LC) to work with the Music Library Association in revising the paper.

Discussion Paper No. 2012-DP02: Authority Records for Medium of Performance Vocabulary for Music

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp02.html>

This paper was presented by MLA. It explored options in the MARC 21 Authority Format for authority records for a new controlled vocabulary that is under development consisting of medium of performance terms for music. The 382 field was approved at Midwinter (Proposal No. 2012-01) for medium in bibliographic records, and now a corresponding place was needed in authority records. Field options included 142, 152, 162, and 182. Chair Matthew Wise expressed preference for the 162 field. There was no clear consensus on changing the wording from "heading" to "term", though "term" might correspond with the 16X block which is for index terms. If having multiple separate terms in a single field is a problem, use of linking functionality could help (e.g. subfield \$8). In revising this paper as a proposal, MLA will investigate system issues and linking options, especially to determine if any ILS exists which can make use of linking fields.

Other Proposals

Proposal No. 2012-02: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-02.html>

This proposal was presented by PCC. The purpose of the proposal was to make title information buried in the free text of an authority record's 670 field machine-actionable. After a lengthy discussion, the group decided there were many issues that still needed to be sorted out, and recommended tabling consideration of the paper until Midwinter.

Proposal No. 2012-03: Data Provenance in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-03.html>

This paper was presented by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Library of Congress, and OCLC. It proposed two approaches for documenting data provenance; one for provenance of machine-generated classification data, and one for a new MARC field for Metadata Provenance. The second approach was preferred.

Proposal No. 2012-04: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format for *Other Designation Associated with the Person and Title of the Person*

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-04.html>

This paper was presented by the British Library and discussed ways in which the RDA elements in question could be recorded as discrete data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format. The paper was approved.

Discussion Paper General Introduction

All of the discussion papers had genre/form characteristics, so Janis Young (genre specialist in LC-PSD) gave a general introduction. Until now, LCSH included all subject-related terms. With the advent of the genre projects, 12 facets related to genre were identified. Many of these facets are currently pre-coordinated with genre terms and will need to be preserved during implementation of *LCGFT*. Some of these facets can be brought out with relator codes and other ways, but not all. Concerns were expressed about overloading MARC with so many new fields, but those involved in the genre/form projects reiterated the fact that these elements, which are also RDA elements, will need to be covered. LC is in agreement with this point of view. All three papers were presented by the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation and were approved to be submitted at Midwinter 2013 as proposals.

Discussion Paper No. 2012-DP03: Chronological Aspects in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp03.html>

This paper explored possibilities for recording chronological aspects of works, specifically the date or period of origin or creation.

Discussion Paper No. 2012-DP04: Recording Audience Characteristics of Works and Expressions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp04.html>

This paper suggested establishing a new 3XX field in both the Bibliographic and Authority formats to record audience characteristics related to genre/form, including both specific audience and intellectual level of the content.

Discussion Paper No. 2012-DP05: Recording Creator/Contributor Group Categorizations of Works, Expressions, and Persons in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp05.html>

This paper suggested establishing a new 3XX field for group characteristics of creators/contributors which are related to genre form. Group categorizations could include things like ethnicity, nationality, gender, and sexual orientation groups.

Submitted by Bruce J. Evans