

AALL MARBI Representative Report 2006-2007

Prepared by: George Prager
New York University Law Library
pragerg [at] juris.law.nyu.edu

Introduction

In Part I, I will highlight some of the most significant developments in the MARC formats during 2006-2007 resulting from the MARBI meetings at the American Library Association's January and June 2007 meetings. I will follow in Part II with more detailed summaries of all the proposals and discussion papers, and any other MARC news of note. Links to full text of the proposals and discussion papers are given in the sections with detailed summaries. Unless noted otherwise, all the proposals were approved. In Part III, I will give other MARC news.

Texts of all the papers are available online via links on the MARC Development section of the MARC Web site:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/development.html>

MARBI Minutes of the Jan. 2007 ALA Midwinter Meeting are available directly at:

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

MARBI Minutes of the June 2007 ALA Annual Meeting are not yet available.

Part I. Highlights

1. Incorporating Invalid Former Headings in 4XX fields of the MARC 21 Authority Format (MARC Proposal No. 2007-02)

Even though former headings are sometimes invalid as cross references, it is highly desirable to have some means of identifying any invalid headings for purposes of data correction. These invalid headings will be marked by the following:

A new value 'h' (Do not display) has been defined for subfield \$w/1 in 4XX fields.

Subfield \$w/2 will use either of the two existing applicable values:

'e' for earlier established form of heading (national authority file), or

'o' for earlier established form of heading (other authority file).

Subfield \$i may be used to contain the date on which the heading became invalid.

2. Addition of Linking ISSNs to MARC 21 Bibliographic field 022 (MARC Proposal No. 2007-05 and MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP03)

ISSNs serve as one way to differentiate serial publications, not only different serial titles, but also versions of the same serial in different medium (print, online, CD-ROM, etc.).

The ISSN centers have historically assigned different ISSNs to print and online versions

of a continuing resource. However, there is also a need to collocate all the medium versions of a continuing resource. The recently revised ISO ISSN standard has defined a “linking ISSN” or “ISSN-L”, which has now been defined in MARC 21 as well. MARC Proposal No. 2007-03 has added two new subfields to field 022: a new subfield \$l for the linking ISSN, and also a new subfield \$m for a cancelled and/or incorrect ISSN-L. The first ISSN assigned to the publication in any medium will function as the ISSN-L.

3. Changes for the German and Austrian Conversion to MARC 21 (MARC Proposal No. 2007-06 and DP No. 2007-DP01)

In 2004, Germany and Austria decided to move from their own bibliographic format (Maschinelles Austauschformat für Bibliotheken, MAB) to MARC 21, a more internationally used standard.

In general, Proposal No. 2007-DP01 aims to reconcile the major differences between MAB2 and MARC 21. It defines some new elements on a national basis (D-MARC), or proposes them for inclusion into MARC 21. The proposal is divided into thirteen parts. Some of the most significant changes are:

Addition of Subfield \$0 for the Authority Record Control number to all headings fields (MARC 21 Bibliographic, Classification, and Community Information formats). (Proposal No. 2007/06/1)

The major use of this subfield will be to link headings on bibliographic records with the corresponding authority record/s for purposes of heading verification and correction.

Linking the series added entry field on an analytic record to the series record by means of subfield \$w. (Proposal No. 2007-06/2)

Adding Codes for multivolume monograph record levels in the MARC21 Bibliographic format. (Proposal No. 2007-06/5)

In the German model, it is necessary to distinguish between a set record for a multivolume monograph and a record for a single volume monograph. The set record is chiefly used for acquisition purposes, while the single volume records are needed for lending and interlibrary loan. The German model also distinguishes between single volume records with strong titles and those with weak titles.

Leader 19 in the Bibliographic format has been renamed “Multipart monograph record level”, and has new values for:

- # Not specified or not applicable
- a Set record
- b Multipart monograph record, independent title
- c Multipart monograph record, dependent title
- r Linked record requirement (Obsolete)

It is hoped that these new values will also be useful in the cataloging of cartographic and music nonserial items.

Establishing Codes for Offprints, Preprints, and Postprints in MARC 21 Bibliographic 008/24-27 Books. (Proposal No. 2007-06/6)

Defining indicators for type for uncontrolled keywords in the MARC21 Bibliographic, Classification, and Community Information formats (Proposal No. 2007-06/8)

MARC 21 Bibliographic field “653” (Index term – uncontrolled) did not differentiate between types of uncontrolled subject terms. Second indicator values have been approved for topical term, personal name, corporate name, meeting name, chronological term, geographic name, and genre/form term. There is also a blank default for “No information provided.”

Adding field 751 for a geographic name added entry to the MARC 21 Bibliographic format (Proposal No. 2007-06/11)

Field 751 has been added for non-hierarchical geographic names. Subfield \$4 will use three letter relator codes for the following: event place, publication place, distribution place, and university place. Additional codes may be useful.

Adding field 363 for normalized dates and sequential designations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format (Proposal No. 2007-06/13)

The German and Austrian MAB community use highly structured start and end information for serials. In the case of serial title changes, this structured data facilitates machine identification of which serial record contains an article—quite useful for interlibrary loan purposes.

Field 363 will be coordinated with the existing 863 field subfields, and repeated for starting and ending information, linked via \$8. A new subfield, \$u, first level textual designation is also proposed.

The first indicator will be for Start/End designator (No information given, Starting information, Ending information); the second indicator for State of issuance (Not specified, Closed, or Open).

I think field 363 has great benefits for automated international bibliographic record exchange. At some point, it could replace field 362.

4. Considering a new field for data elements needed to ascertain copyright facts (MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP05).

Currently, the MARC 21 formats have no field which allows the recording of detailed information about the copyright status of a work. Some information of this nature may appear spread over some or all of the following MARC bibliographic fields: 260 \$c, 506, 540, and 017. While many works in archives and on the Internet contain scant copyright information, it would be beneficial for users if any copyright information available at the point of cataloging were encoded into the bibliographic record. The

MARBI Committee favored a new field 543 for this information. No. 2007-DP05 will be brought back as a proposal.

5. Consideration of how to represent the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) System in MARC 21 Formats (Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP06)

Changes are proposed to the MARC21 formats to accommodate the conversion of DDC classification data from a proprietary system into the MARC 21 formats. This conversion will make DDC classification information available in a format using an international standard, and will also further the integration of data in OCLC's WorldCat and in related authority files. The Dewey editorial team will be working together with the German National Library which has also made suggestions for changes in the same area, due to their ongoing conversion from MAB to MARC 21. This is a long and complex discussion paper. Several of the proposals would enhance information retrieval by allowing searching by meaningful parts of a call number or by multiple Dewey numbers in the same record.

6. *Access Level Record for Serials Working Group Final Report, July 24, 2006. Appendix N, MARC 21 Recommendations*

While developing the "Access level record for serials" (now called the "CONSER standard record"), the Working Group came up with recommendations for changes to the MARC21 bibliographic format. The major recommendations include:

Increasing the number of 7xx linking field indicators to make a greater range of note displays possible.

Adding Subfield \$i to these fields to allow for note generation from these access points.

Adding dates to 7xx and 8xx fields of corporate bodies and series to indicate spans of time that the body or series was associated with the work.

Assigning specific MARC tags to the "Description based on" and "Latest issue consulted" fields to allow suppression of these fields, or add display control indicators to all fields to allow their suppression.

Regularizing and simplifying MARC 21 prescribed punctuation

7. Update #7 to the MARC Formats (October 2006)

As announced on May 14, 2007, Update #7 to all five MARC 21 formats is now available.

Part II. Summaries of all 2007 MARC Proposals with any related 2007 Discussion Papers

MARC Proposal No. 2007-01: Definition of subfields \$b and \$j in field 041 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-01.html>

This proposal arose out of 2006-DP06 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2006/2006-dp06.html>). For further information on the background for this proposal, see the discussion in last year's AALL MARBI report at: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/representatives/2006/marbi2006.pdf>

Subfield \$b in field 041 previously included language codes for summary, abstracts or subtitles. This broad definition was problematic, particularly for moving images, as some may have different languages for subtitles or captions than they do for abstracts or summaries. Proposal 2006-DP06 narrows the scope of subfield \$b and redefines it as "Language code of summary or abstract." It also defines a new subfield \$j in field 041 as "Language code of subtitle or caption." This proposal passed at the MARBI January 2007 Meeting, with the change that "subtitle" and "caption" be presented in the plural in MARC 21 documentation.

MARC Proposal No. 2007-02: Incorporating Invalid Former Headings in 4xx fields of the MARC 21 Authority Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-02.html>

The issues in this proposal were first discussed in Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP03 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2006/2006-dp03.html>) and 2006-DP08 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2006/2006-dp08.html>). I have previously reported on these two DPs in my 2005/2006 MARBI report (<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/representatives/2006/marbi2006.pdf>)

Even though former headings are sometimes invalid as cross references, it is highly desirable to have some means of identifying any invalid headings for purposes of data correction. This paper proposes that 4XX fields be used, with a new code defined in subfield \$w/2 (Control subfield/Earlier form of heading) to show that the earlier heading appearing in the field is invalid. The proposal was approved, with the following modifications agreed to at the January 2007 MARBI Meeting:

A new value 'h' (Do not display) will be defined for subfield \$w/1.

Subfield \$w/2 will use either of the two existing applicable values:
'e' for earlier established form of heading (national authority file), or
'o' for earlier established form of heading (other authority file).

Subfield \$i may be used to contain the date on which the heading became invalid.

MARC Proposal No. 2007-03: Addition of subfield \$5 (Institution to which field applies) in fields 533 (Reproduction Note) and 538 (Systems Details Note)

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-03.html>

The Registry of Digital Masters, a joint project of the Digital Library Foundation (DLF) and OCLC, intends to register the existence of “persistently digitally reformatted and born book and serial publications.” OCLC records will indicate which institutions have locally digitized an item and have assumed responsibility for preserving the item, and where service copies are available. Bibliographic records for items which are part of the registry will have the symbol “dlr” in field 042.

Both the separate and single record approaches are allowed for cataloging locally digitized serials and monographs. (See: *Guidance for Cataloging Locally Digitized Resources*, available at: <http://www2.lib.uchicago.edu/~rd13/CIC/Guidance.html> ; created Nov. 13, 2006, and last revised June 8, 2007, and: *Registry of Digital Masters Record Creation Guidelines*, version 2, published May 2007: <http://www.diglib.org/collections/reg/DigRegGuide200705.html>)

Field 583 (Action Note) already allows subfield \$5 for indicating to which institution the note applies. The addition of this subfield to fields 533 (Reproduction Note) and field 538 (System Details Note) would be useful as well, so that an institution could view information about which (if any) issues of a publication have already been digitized by another institution prior to making any such decisions itself. There might be cases of multiple 533, 538, and 583 fields representing the digitized versions of different institutions, if the different institutions have digitized different issues of a serial.

An alternative to use of subfield \$5 in the MARC bibliographic note fields would be to use the holdings format. Although holdings records could be used for copy specific information, they are frequently not indexed or available for OAI harvesting. At some future point, if these problems are overcome, then the holdings format could be used instead of the \$5 in the bibliographic note fields.

This proposal was approved as amended at the January 2007 MARBI Meeting: Subfield \$5 will also be added to the corresponding holdings fields (Fields 538 and 843). The name of the proposal is also changed to include the final addition of the words “in the MARC 21 bibliographic and holdings format.”

MARC Proposal No. 2007-04: Use of field 520 for content advice statements in the MARC 21 bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-04.html>

and: MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP02: Use of field 520 for content advice statements

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp02.html>

In 2003, a web-based union catalog of materials available in accessible formats was launched in the United Kingdom. This catalog is called RevealWeb (<http://www.revealweb.org.uk/>), and is primarily geared towards visually impaired users. Most of the records are for Braille, moon, audio and digital talking books, and large print books. For some materials, content advice statements would be helpful.

Discussion Paper 2006-DP02 proposed adding a coded value to field 008/32 in the bibliographic format so that this information could be used as a search filter. (See 2006 MARBI report at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/representatives/2006/marbi2006.pdf>). Because this would entail re-using an obsolete position in the 008, MARBI decided against this proposal. A new discussion paper (2007-DP02) was then brought forward at the January 2007 MARBI Meeting, proposing that a variable field, either 520 (Summary, etc.) or 521 (Target audience note) hold content advice statements. The Committee had a slight preference for use of the 520 field, because field 521 appears to be more of a value judgment.

The following changes for field 520 were proposed and then approved at the June 2007 MARBI Meeting:

Define first indicator value 4 (Content advice)
Define subfield \$c for Assigning agency
Define subfield \$2 for Source

Example [from the proposal]:

520 4#a Contains violence \$c [Revealweb organization code]

Example/s will be added to the proposal for field 520, some with, and some without, field 521.

MARC Proposal No. 2007-05: Definition of 022 subfields for recording the linking ISSN (ISSN-L) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-05.html>

and: MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP03: Recording the linking ISSN (ISSN-L) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp03.html>

The ISO ISSN standard (ISO 3297) has recently been revised, and is expected to be published in a new edition by the end of summer 2007. This revised standard defines a “linking ISSN”, or “ISSN-L”, which serves to collocate all the medium versions of a continuing resource. Separate ISSNs will continue to be assigned to print and online versions of a resource; the first ISSN assigned will be designated by default to also function as the ISSN-L. This linking ISSN should be implemented in June 2008. As announced by Regina Reynolds at the June 2007 MARBI Meetings, the ISSN Center will make tables freely available matching up pre-existing ISSNs with their corresponding ISSN-Ls.

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP03 presented various options for how to incorporate the new ISSN-Ls into the MARC 21 formats. One proposal was to repeat field 022 and to add an indicator to make clear whether the field had an ISSN or ISSN-L. At the January

2007 MARBI Meetings where this DP was discussed, it was decided to define new subfields in field 022 for the ISSN-L and for the cancelled and/or incorrect ISSN-L. At the meeting, the consensus of the group was to define new subfields in field 022 for an ISSN-L and for a cancelled and/or incorrect ISSN-L.

The subsequent proposal, MARC Proposal No. 2007-03, defines subfield \$l for the ISSN-L, and also subfield \$m for the cancelled ISSN-L. Each cancelled ISSN-L (if more than 1), are contained in a separate subfield \$m. Catalogers will not need to record any cancelled ISSN-L; rather it will be the responsibility of ISSN centers.

MARC Proposal No. 2007-06: Changes for the German and Austrian conversion to MARC 21

Date: May 25, 2007: made available to the MARC community for discussion
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html>

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP01: Changes for the German and Austrian conversion to MARC 21

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp01.html>

Background:

Germany and Austria have exchanged bibliographic and authority data by means of their own machine readable format (Maschinelles Austauschformat für Bibliotheken, MAB), which was developed in 1973. The latest version is called MAB2. In December 2004, the Committee for Library Standards (Standardisierungsausschuss) decided to move from MAB2 to the more internationally used standard, MARC21.

In 2005, the Data Format Expert Group (Expertengruppe Datenformate) undertook a complete mapping from MAB2 to MARC21, which was finished in 2006. Three major differences were identified by the Expert Group:

1. The connection between headings and appropriate authority files.

The DNB maintains 3 German language authority files: PND (Personal names), GKD (Corporate bodies), and SWD (Subject headings). It provides a weekly update service for the national authority files which subscribers import as routine updates. The updates rely on authority record control numbers for every established heading which appears in an authority and bibliographic record. The authority record control numbers need to be put in a special subfield. (This will be further discussed under Proposal No. 2007/06/1).

2. The mapping of hierarchical structures in the context of multivolume works (multipart monographs, series)

The MAB format creates a record for every volume of a multivolume work, and a collected set record as well. No authority records are created for multivolume monographs or for monograph series. The Germans distinguish between a “Stucktitel” (a single volume with a strong title) and “Bandaufführung” (a single volume without a dependent title; also called a “weak title”). A “weak title” is similar to the AACR2

concept of a part with no title of its own (AACR2 & LCRI 25.6A), such as “Teil” (General part).

Strong title:

245: Volume title

490 1: Series title

830: Series title

Field 440 is not used.

Weak title or no title:

245: \$a \$n \$p

773: Connection to record for the multivolume set, with \$w for record control no. of set

Volume bibliographic records sometimes give bibliographic control numbers referring back to the record number of the collected set record.

3. Sorting of volume numbers and dates. (Discussed under Proposal No. 2007/06/4).

In general, Proposal No. 2007-DP01 aims to reconcile the major differences noted above between MAB2 and MARC 21. It defines some new elements on a national basis (D-MARC), or proposes them for inclusion into MARC 21. The proposal is divided into thirteen parts.

Proposal No. 2007/06/1: Authority record control number subfield in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Classification, and Community Information formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p1>

\$0 – Authority record control number (Repeatable)

In headings fields, the MARC organization code (in parenthesis) will be followed immediately by the authority record control number. Subfield “0” will be repeatable, as there may be more than 1 authority record associated with a text string.

This proposal was approved, with the stipulation that several new fields will be added to the list of fields for which \$0 is valid: 4xx and 8xx series fields, and field 880 for nonroman data.

Proposal No. 2007-06/2: Bibliographic record control number subfield in series added entry fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. Subfield \$w is proposed, to be consistent with its use to link to bibliographic records in the 7xx linking entry fields in the bibliographic format.

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p2>

In MAB, each volume/item bibliographic record carries the record control number for the bibliographic set record, along with an added entry field for the set. The control number assists in the linking of the added entry with the corresponding set records, as no authority records are created for multivolume monographs or monographic series.

Proposal No. 2007-06/3: Authority record control number in the 260 field of the MARC 21 Authority format.

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p3>

“This proposal adds a subfield to authority field 260 (Complex See Reference – Subject) for the authority record control number of any established heading that appears in the field.”

In MARC 21, established heading fields except the 1XX in the authority format will also need a subfield for established record control number. Subfield \$0 is already authorized for use with 5XX and 7XX fields, to reference the control number of the established heading in the field. But field 260 does not yet allow a record control number.

The proposal gives an example of a compound German word, an unauthorized heading, which is represented by 2 authorized single terms (a German subject heading preference).

Proposal No. 2007/06/4: Normalization of numbers and names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p4>

This proposal is for additional subfields in several bibliographic fields to carry normalized forms of part names and numbers, series numbers, and edition numbers. MAB community would like a subfield defined for sorting forms of numeric (primarily) data and some name data, for fields where number information is recorded traditionally in transcribed form and normalization is needed to sort them properly in ILS/OPAC displays for end users. The areas where the subfield is especially needed:

1. Numbers and names of part/section in field 245 \$n and \$p
2. Volume designations in 8XX series entry fields, subfield \$v
3. Edition designation in 250 \$a

Proposed changes: In the Bibliographic format, for the following fields define a new subfield \$y for the normalized data:

Field 245 \$y

Fields 800-830 \$y

Field 250 \$y

While the normalization algorithms aren't officially standardized in Germany, the German National Library's rules function as a de facto standard. At the ALA Annual Meeting, this proposal didn't pass. The consensus was that it would be difficult to make this kind of information generally useful, and it would be better treated at the local level. I found the examples in the Proposal difficult to understand.

Proposal No. 2007-06/5: Codes for multivolume monograph record levels in the MARC21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p5>

“This proposal establishes codes to enable indication of the level of a multilevel record within its bibliographic hierarchy.”

In the German model, it is necessary to distinguish between a set record for a multivolume monograph, and a single volume monographic record. The set record is chiefly used for acquisition purposes, while the single volume records are needed for lending and interlibrary loan. It also needs to distinguish between single volume records with strong titles, and those with weak titles.

A coded position needs to be defined where the following values can be indicated:

1. Set record (for multivolume monograph)
2. Volume level record (of multivolume monograph), independent title
3. Volume level record (of multivolume monograph), dependent title

Discussions in January 2007, to use Leader/19 (Linked record requirement) which currently has values # (related record not required) and “r” (related record required). “r” hasn’t been used at all in OCLC since its implementation, so the proposal is as follows:

Proposed Change:

Redefine the Leader/19 in the Bibliographic format as follows:

Position 19 Multivolume monograph record level

Not specified or not applicable

a Set record

b Volume record, independent title

c Volume record, dependent title

r Linked record requirement (Obsolete)

This proposal passed, with changes. At the Annual Meeting, it was decided to change the phrase “Volume record” with “Multipart monograph record”, so that the proposal would be more broadly applicable for cartographic and music nonserial items (among others).

Proposal No. 2007-06/6: Nature of Contents for offprint in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p6>

This proposal was to establish a code for offprints in MARC Books Format 008/24-27, Nature of Contents.

Some Committee members preferred use of 655 “Offprints” or its German equivalent, field 787 with link to original publication. Eventually, it was agreed that 008/24-27 in the Books 008 was the best place for this type of information.

This proposal was approved, and codes will also be added for preprints and postprints as well.

Proposal No. 2007 06/7: Subfield for Cancelled National Bibliography Numbers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p7>

Subfield “\$z” is defined in field 015 for cancelled or invalid national bibliography numbers.

This proposal was approved, as amended. In order not to limit the structure of the number in this field, the last sentence of the proposal before the examples was deleted: “The number content would have the same structure as in field 015 \$a.”

Proposal No. 2007-06/8: Define indicator for type for uncontrolled keywords in the MARC21 Bibliographic, Classification, and Community Information formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p8>

MARC 21 Bibliographic field “653” (Index term – uncontrolled) has not been differentiating between types of uncontrolled subject terms. Because these distinctions are important to the MAB community, Second indicator values are proposed for field 653. The following values were approved:

Second - <Type of term or name>
<No information provided>
<0 – Topical term>
<1 – Personal name>
<2 – Corporate name>
<3 – Meeting name>
<4 - Chronological term>
<5 – Geographic name>
<6 – Genre/form term>

Examples will be added to the Proposal, with 2nd indicator “#”, and with multiple subfield \$a.

Proposal No. 2007-06/9: Field for replacement record information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p9>

This proposal defines a new field “882” for use on a bibliographic record which is to be deleted. The field carries information about a record which is replacing the deleted record. OCLC uses field 019 on the record to be retained to record information about a deleted record, but there’s really no field currently defined for use on the bibliographic record to be deleted (CONSER participants use field 936 to record this

sort of information for serials, but this field has other uses as well, and (more importantly), is defined for local use. Field “882” would be the bibliographic counterpart of field “682” in the authority file.

This field would have the following subfield codes:

\$a Replacement title

\$i Explanatory text

\$w – Replacement bibliographic record control number

\$6 – Linkage

\$8 – Field link and sequence number

Proposal No. 2007-06/10: Define a replacement record control number subfield in MARC 21 Authority format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p10>

When an authority record is to be deleted, Field 682 is used to redirect any bibliographic records associated with the old authority heading. (This field appears currently only on LC’s subject heading weekly lists).

Information on the replacement heading is already given in field 682 subfield “a”. This proposal defines a new “Subfield \$0” to give the replacement authority record control no.

Authority Record to be deleted:

100 1 \$a Heading to be deleted

682 \$a Valid replacement heading \$0 (MARC Organization Code) control number

An example will be added from LCSH, which puts the control number along with informative text in subfield \$i.

Proposal No. 2007-06/11: Add a field for a geographic name added entry to the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p11>

MAB users create non-subject added entries for various types of place names: place of publication, distribution, part of the university to which dissertations are submitted, place of events such as conferences. Field 751 was proposed for the authorized form of non-hierarchical geographic name. At first field 752 had been considered, but this field is used for hierarchical place names, and the German authority file uses only one level for place names. Relator terms may be used in subfield \$e, or relator codes can be used in a subfield \$4 for indicating the type of role. The following relator codes were proposed:

Evp – event place

Pup – publication place
Dbp – distribution place
Uvp – university place

At the June 2007 ALA Annual Meeting, this proposal passed. Additional codes were also suggested by the Committee for building place, and for place of production (generally for rare books).

Proposal No. 2007-06/12: Subfield for former call numbers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p12>

A new subfield is proposed in field 852 of the Bibliographic and Holdings formats to provide information about former call numbers or shelf locations. This proposal is primarily intended for manuscripts and other archival materials. A researcher may sometimes know the former shelf location, but not the current one.

“Subfield \$d - Former shelving location” was added to the format. “Former call numbers” is to be changed to “former shelf numbers.”

Proposal No. 2007-06/13: Field for normalized dates and sequential designations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-06.html#p13>

The German and Austrian MAB communities use highly structured start and end information for serials. In the case of serial title changes, this structured data facilitates machine identification of which serial record contains an article—quite useful for interlibrary loan purposes.

During the ALA Midwinter MARBI meeting in January 2007, three options were discussed:

1. Field 362 with additional subfields
2. A new field 363
3. Field 863

The 362 option was eliminated during the midwinter meeting. Field 863 has been used to indicate a specific institution’s holdings rather than universal holdings, and would need various adaptations. Therefore, the proposal chiefly discusses the creation of a new bibliographic field “363” (Option “1”), which is coordinated with the existing 863 field subfields, and repeated for starting and ending information, linked via \$8. A new subfield, \$u, first level textual designation is proposed.

**363 Normalized Date and Sequential Designation
Indicator 1 – Start/End designator**

This indicates whether the information given is for the starting information in a sequence, or the ending information

- No information given
0 – Starting information
1 – Ending information

Indicator 2 – State of issuance

“Indicates whether the data in this field is for a single issue not issued sequentially or for a sequence that has terminated (value 0) or a sequence of issues that have not terminated (value 1).”

- Not specified
0 – Closed
1 – Open

Subfields: similar to Holdings field 863, with addition of subfield \$u for first level textual designation.

No provision is given for unsure dates or enumeration. One of the German representatives stated that the Germans wouldn't give this field if there were uncertain beginning or ending dates (which is a relatively common occurrence).

Here's a straightforward made up example:

245 00 Journal of 21st century law cataloging.
3620 Vol. 1 (2001)-v. 7 (2007).
36300 \$a 1 \$i 2001 \$8 1
36310 \$a 7 \$i 2007 \$8 1

Option “1” was approved at the ALA June 2007 Annual Meeting. Examples with multiple start and stop dates will be added to the proposal as well.

I think field 363 has great benefits for automated international bibliographic record exchange. At some point, it could replace field 362, which has many problematic aspects, especially now that the CONSER standard record has come out in favor of unformatted 362 notes.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP04: Definition of Field 004 (Control Number for Related Bibliographic Record) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp04.html>

OCLC has suggested this field, to provide a link between separate institutional records and the OCLC master record. The same field exists in the holdings format

which links a holdings record to a bibliographic record. Currently, there is no field which links to another bibliographic record in the same system.

At the January 2007 MARBI Meeting, the Committee thought that a broader solution suitable for the entire MARC community would be better. For now, OCLC should use a local solution for the present, and then if the group decides on a broader solution, OCLC can implement it retroactively. A new discussion paper with a broader range of examples will be issued.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP05: Data elements needed to ascertain copyright facts:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp05.html>

The issues involved were first presented in MARC Discussion Paper No. 2006-DP04, which was discussed at the June 2006 MARBI Meeting (Text of the DP: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2006/2006-dp04.html>)

For a brief description of this DP, see my AALL MARBI 2005/2006 report: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/representatives/2006/marbi2006.htm>

Currently, the MARC 21 formats have no field which allows the recording of detailed information about the copyright status of a work. Some information of this nature may appear spread over some or all of the following MARC bibliographic fields: Field 260 subfield \$c: Date of publication, distribution, etc., which may give a copyright date in the absence of a readily available publication date; field 506: Restrictions on Access Note; field 540: Terms Covering Use and Reproduction; and field 017: Copyright or Legal Deposit Number.

While many works in archives and on the Internet contain scant copyright information, it would be beneficial for users if any copyright information available at the point of cataloging were encoded into the bibliographic record.

2007-DP05 provides a broader range of examples and complex situations. It presents the following options for recording copyright information:

1. Option 1: Modify Field 540 – Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note:
Many new subfields codes are proposed
2. Option 2: Define a new field “543” for all copyright information.
Most of the same data elements which would be added to Field 540 would be added for this field.

Since Field 540 also covers other general use restrictions, there might be advantages to having a completely new field dedicated to copyright information.

3. Option 3: Use Authority Record

While copyright is often at the expression level, authority records may be at the work or manifestation level.

4. **Option 4: Use Holdings Record:**

The largest current disadvantage to using this approach is that holdings records are not usually exchanged between institutions.

There are still many questions to be answered (See the list at the end of the DP). Whenever some or all of the pertinent copyright information is unknown, it is still useful to put that information in the record, so the potential user can try contacting the producer of the information rather than the institution itself.

At the June 2007 MARBI Meetings, most of the group were in favor of using a new bibliographic field.

This DP will be brought back as a proposal.

MARC Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP06: Representation of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) System in MARC 21 Formats

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-dp06.html>

Changes are proposed to the MARC21 formats to accommodate the conversion of DDC classification data from a proprietary system into the MARC 21 formats. This conversion will make DDC classification information available in a format using an international standard, and will also further the integration of data in OCLC's WorldCat and in related authority files. The Dewey editorial team will be working together with the German National Library which has also made suggestions for changes in the same area, due to their ongoing conversion from MAB to MARC 21.

Changes are suggested in the following areas:

1. Identification of external table numbers in the bibliographic format

Adding the Classification Format representation of external table notation to the Bibliographic Format through a new subfield \$z – Table identification.

2. Identification of internal add table numbers

Adding subfield \$y- Internal add table identification, to the Classification format.

3. Inclusion of component parts of numbers in bibliographic records

Dewey editorial team suggests defining a new field "085" in the Bibliographic Format containing the same subfields as the "765" field in the Classification Format. (Field "765" shows how a number is built, shows the meaning of the individual parts, and enables searching of a particular component parts in classification number records. This type of searching could be quite powerful when combined with a subject heading search.

Use of subfield \$8 is recommended to link the 082 field with the corresponding 085 field(s) and to provide information on the sequence of steps involved.

Addition of this field to the Bibliographic Format would enhance information retrieval by allowing searching by meaningful parts of a call number.

- 4. Classification number edition and source information in the bibliographic format.** The Dewey team “proposes to develop and maintain a registry of edition identifiers in which every edition would have a standard representation in subfield \$2.” In cases where LC is not the agency assigning the call number, Subfield \$5 would give the assigning agency of a Dewey number subfield.

- 5. Designation for optional numbers in the Bibliographic Format**

While there are many optional numbers in WorldCat bibliographic records (such as in class 340 Law), there is no special designation to label a number as optional. Because of the large number of optional numbers already coded in subfield \$a in legacy data, putting these numbers in a separate subfield is not deemed desirable.

- 6. Multiple numbers in the Bibliographic Format**

Example: 082 10 \$a 780.92 \$a B \$2 22

German libraries are interested in assigning partial numbers. There is also general interest in offering multiple numbers for works with aspects in several Dewey categories.

The Dewey editorial team proposes using successive 082 fields for each number, rather than the current practice of repeated \$a subfields in the same 082 fields. Also, coding should be introduced to represent numbers provided for access, and to distinguish between the primary number and additional numbers provided for access, and between standard and optional numbers. The following new optional subfields are proposed for field 082:

\$m Standard or optional designation

a – standard

b – optional [suggestion to use “alternative” instead of optional]

\$o Primary or access designation

a – primary

b – access

An alternative to this proposal would limit the use of the 082 field to full Dewey numbers, and give this information in new field 085 (Number components). This would add complexity to the 085 field, but avoid it in the more widely used 082 field.

- 7. Segmentation information in the Classification Format**

Proposal to add new fields 653 and 654 to the Classification Format

653 – Segmented Classification Number (when a single Dewey number or number span is involved)

654 – Segmentation Instruction (for Dewey record numbers that contain number-building instructions to give segmentation information that can't be expressed using a single number of number span).

8. Encoding topic information in some Classification format fields

Subfield \$t – Topic information, is proposed for topics named in other classification fields. This field should assist in automated identification of the meaning of DDC numbers in examples.

9. Number hierarchy

This proposal is to add subfield \$e – Classification number hierarchy – single number or beginning number of span in Classification Format, field 153 – Classification Number. At present, only the upward caption associated with these captions in subfields \$h and \$k is given.

Part III. Other MARC News

1. RDA/MARC Report (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/5chair12.pdf>)

On November 17, 2006, the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) issued a report on “areas that the JSC considers would benefit from discussions with the MARC community.” While not a final report, it includes a mapping from MARC 21 to RDA. At the January 2007 MARBI Meeting, this report was introduced by Mary Stewart of Library and Archives Canada. There was some criticism that the report does not address weaknesses of MARC, but Ms. Stewart replied that this was not the intent of the report.

2. Access Level Record for Serials Working Group Final Report, July 24, 2006. Appendix N, MARC 21 Recommendations

(<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/pdf/alr/MARC21Proposals.pdf>)

While developing the “Access level record for serials” (now called the “CONSER standard record”), the Working Group came up with recommendations for changes to the MARC21 bibliographic format. These recommendations have been made available to the PCC Standing Committee on Standards and LC’s Network Development and MARC Standards Office for consideration; some or all of them may be developed into MARBI proposals. There are six proposals. I will mention four of them:

Recommendation #1: “Increase the number of 7XX linking field indicators to make a greater range of note displays possible and avoid the need for catalogers to spend time writing notes for field 580 (complex relationship notes.” Fields 780/785 indicators could more accurately describe relationships involved in mergers and splits.

Recommendation #2: “Add dates to 7XX and 8XX fields of corporate bodies and series to indicate spans of time that the body or series was associated with

the work.” Subfield \$i should also be added to these fields to allow for note generation from these access points.

Recommendation #5: Specific MARC tags should be assigned to the notes: “Description based on:” and “Latest issue consulted:”, so that systems can suppress these notes from public view. (These 2 fields are required for CONSER standard records, even when the cataloging is based on the first issue). Alternately, all note fields should have display control indicators so libraries can more easily suppress and display whatever notes they wish. In my opinion, I’d like to see every MARC 21 variable field have such display control indicators.

Recommendation #6: “Examine the uses (and users) of MARC 21 prescribed punctuation with the goal of regularizing and simplifying it, especially punctuation at the end of fields.”

3. Update #7 to the MARC Formats issued

As announced on May 14, 2007, Update #7 (October 2006) to all five MARC formats is now available. The updates include changes made to the formats resulting from proposals considered by MARBI, the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM), and by the BIC Bibliographic Standards Group (BIC/BSG) at its 2006 Meetings.

Most notable among the additions:

Bibliographic Format:

Addition of subfield \$j (Relator term) in fields 111, 611, 711, and 811
Addition of subfield \$u (Uniform Resource Identifier) in field 852

Authority Format:

Addition of field 034 (Coded cartographic mathematical data)
Addition of subfield j (Relator term) in fields 111, 411, 511 and 711

Holdings Format:

Addition of field 506 (Restrictions on access note)
Updated examples

Classification Data:

Addition of subfield \$j (Relator term) in field 711

Community Information:

Addition of subfield \$j (Relator term) in fields 111, 611 and 711

Full text of the announcements is available from links on the MARC standards: General information: News and announcements page (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marcinf.html#naa>)