

# AALL MARBI Representative Report 2010-2011

Prepared by: George Prager  
New York University Law School Library  
[pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu](mailto:pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu)

July 6, 2011

## Highlights

The Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) is an interdivisional joint committee of three units within the American Library Association. It is primarily responsible for the development of the MARC 21 formats. MARBI holds meetings twice a year, during ALA's annual and midwinter conferences. MARBI consists of nine voting members and three interns. The meetings are also attended by ex-officio representatives of national libraries and OCLC, and several dozen non-voting liaisons from ALA units and from non-ALA organizations with an interest in library automation standards. As the AALL representative to MARBI in 2011, I attended the MARBI meetings in San Diego held during ALA Midwinter on January 8-9, 2011, as well as the meetings held in New Orleans on June 25-26, 2011, during the ALA Annual Meeting.

Many of the proposals and discussion papers related to the mapping of RDA into MARC 21. **Proposal No. 2011-02** added a new field 264, with indicators to differentiate production, publication, distribution, copyright, and manufacture statements, as these are all separate elements in RDA. Field 260 will remain valid to accommodate legacy data, and for cases in which it is unnecessary to distinguish between the four types of imprint statements. No action was taken on **Proposal No. 2011-03**, dealing with copyright dates, as copyright dates were included in the version of No. 2011-02, as amended at the June 2011 MARBI meetings. **Proposal No. 2011-04** broadened the definition of field 377 (Associated language) in the Authority Format, to include not just language of person and corporate body, but also language of family and expression. **Proposal No. 2011-05** broadened field 373 (Affiliation [of a person]) in the Authority Format to include institutions and groups associated with a corporate body. **Proposal No. 2011-06** added a new field 378 to the Authority Format for fuller form of a personal name. Information in this field may be useful for distinguishing one personal name from a similar name or names in the case of conflicts. **Proposal No. 2011-07** approved a new field 368 for use in the Authority Format, which will contain additional corporate body attributes (type of corporate body, type of jurisdiction, or other designation). **Proposal No. 2011-08**, relating to the Bibliographic Format, expanded field 340 (Physical medium), and added new fields 344 (Sound characteristics), 345 (Projection characteristics of projected media), 346 (Video characteristics), and 347 (Digital file characteristics). These characteristics relate to Chapter 3 of RDA, and had previously only been mapped to coded values in MARC 21 fields Leader/06, 007/00, and 007/01.

No. 2011-DP05 discussed additional means of identifying medium of performance in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. Medium of performance terms are currently incorporated as part of subject headings, but have been recognized as a separate facet, distinct from subject headings and genre/form terms. This DP will be brought back as a proposal at ALA Midwinter 2012.

The agenda for the 2011 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings is available at:

[http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2011\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2011_age.html)

The minutes for the 2011 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings are available at:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/mw-11.html>

The agenda for the 2011 ALA Annual MARBI meetings is available at:

[http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2011\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2011_age.html)

Minutes and updated cover sheets for the 2011 Annual ALA MARBI meetings were not yet available as of July 6, 2011.

Summaries of all the 2011 discussion papers and proposals are given below, with links to the full papers. I have also included any changes made to the papers during the MARBI meetings, and subsequently by the Library of Congress' Network Development and MARC Standards Office. All proposals may be changed slightly until the time when they are incorporated into the MARC 21 documentation. Following a summary of all the 2011 MARBI papers, I have discussed several other news items related to MARC 21.

My term as AALL Representative to MARBI will conclude after the AALL Meeting in July 2011. It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve AALL in this role. I am pleased to report that Patricia Sayre McCoy, Head of Law Cataloging and Serials at the D'Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago, has been appointed as AALL's new MARBI representative for 2011-2013. I am sure that Pat will be a more than worthy successor.

## **Summaries of 2011 MARBI Discussion Papers and Proposals**

### **Proposal 2011-01: Coding for Original Language in Field 041 (Language Code) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-01.html>

In the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, field 041 \$h is defined as "Language code of original and/or intermediate translations of text." This subfield is used to record not only the original and/or intermediate languages of main works, but also for recording the original and/or intermediate languages of librettos and accompanying material such as liner notes. Although each 041 \$h is supposed to follow the subfield with which it is associated, automated parsing based solely on order can be problematic. In this paper, Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. (OLAC) proposed the following:

1. Redefining subfield \$h so that it will contain only the language code of the primary original text/soundtrack regardless of whether the resource is a translation. It would not be required to supply the original language if the resource is not a translation. Since the majority of existing 041 \$h represent the original language of the primary work, only a modest amount of database maintenance should be required.
2. Defining new subfields for language code of intermediate translation and language code of the original language of subsidiary materials. Alternately, separate subfields could be defined for the original language of different types of subsidiary materials. The desire is for the coding to enable users to search by original language-- especially useful information in the case of moving image materials.

This proposal passed at the MARBI Midwinter meeting:

1. \$h has been redefined as “Language code for primary content of original.” Optionally, original language may be recorded, whether or not the resource is a translation.
2. \$k has been defined as “Language code of intermediate translations.”
3. \$m has been defined as “Language code of original for accompanying materials [other than librettos].”
4. \$n was later selected for “Language code of original for librettos.”

For further background information on this proposal, please refer to my discussion of Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP05 in my MARBI report for 2009/2010, or to the discussion paper itself, available respectively at:

<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/representatives/2010/marbi2010.htm>

and: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp05.html>.

**Proposal No. 2011-02: RDA Production, Distribution and Manufacture Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-02.html>

**and:**

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP01: Changes to the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to Accommodate RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp01.html>

**and:**

**Proposal No. 2011-03: Encoding Date of Copyright Notice in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-03.html>

MARC 21 bibliographic coding does not differentiate between statements of production, publication, and distribution: 260 \$a and \$b are defined as Place of publication, distribution, etc., and Name of publisher, distributor, etc. (Manufacturer already has separate subfields). There is also no separate field or subfield for date of copyright notice, which may appear in 260 \$c by itself, or with other dates, such as date of publication. However, these are all separate elements in RDA. During the testing of RDA, some catalogers found it difficult to properly apply RDA in this area, due to a difference in granularity between RDA and MARC 21. The discussion paper presented several options for distinguishing these separate RDA elements in MARC 21. These options included:

**Option 1.** Add a second indicator to field 260 for function of statement (#-3). Separate 260 fields would be used for publication, distribution, production, and manufacture statements. A value of “blank” would apply for unspecified statements (primarily legacy data).

**Option 2.** Add separate subfields for each function in field 260 for place, name and date of production, publication, and distribution. Subfields \$a, \$b, and \$c would remain for legacy data, and for cases when the cataloger cannot distinguish which function is involved.

**Option 3.** Define new fields (264, 266, 267-268). Field 260 would be retained for legacy data, and cases when the cataloger cannot distinguish which function is involved.

A new field or subfield was also proposed for date of copyright, depending upon which of the above options were chosen. (Field 542, defined in 2008, would not be suitable: its purpose is to give information on whether or not a resource is legally protected by copyright. The RDA copyright element serves a different purpose, as it is simply a statement of copyright notice on the item itself). If a new field were to be defined, it would be something in the 2XX block of MARC fields.

At the MARBI Midwinter 2011 meetings, there seemed to be support for both Options 1 and 3; Option 2 was not popular. The preference of the MARBI Committee seemed to be for Option 3, with some in favor of a new fourth option: Adding one new field to accommodate these statements, with each function marked by an indicator value. This discussion paper was brought back as Proposal No. 2011-02 at the 2011 ALA Annual Meeting.

The proposal presented two options: Adding a new field 264 with an indicator to distinguish the functions (the new Option 4 above), and Defining four new fields (Option 3 above). In either option, field 260 would remain valid, both to accommodate legacy data as well as for content standards that do not make a distinction between the functions. The paper also discussed the impact on 008 coding, and suggested a new definition under 008/06 (Type of date publication status) that would be in accord with the proposed changes to the imprint fields. Date “1” would be determined by arranging the types of dates in precedence order and choosing the first one available, with the goal of always providing a date in Date 1 whenever possible. For published resources, the precedence order would be: 1 Publication; 2 Distribution; 3 Copyright; 4 Manufacture. For unpublished resources: 1 Production; 2 Copyright.

Proposal 2011-02 generated lengthy discussion at the June 2011 MARBI meetings. Eventually, the MARBI Committee approved the option to add only one new field: 264, with an indicator to designate the function. The proposal was amended to incorporate copyright information (only copyright date) into this field (using 2nd indicator “3”, and moving “Manufacture” to 2nd indicator “4”). Therefore, no action was taken on Proposal No. 2011-03 on Copyright, which had presented 3 different options to record copyright date. Here is the new field, as approved:

- **Field 264 - Production, Publication, Distribution, Copyright, Manufacture Statements (R)**
  - **Indicators**
    - *First - Sequence of statements*
      - # - Not applicable/No information provided/Earliest
      - 2 - Intervening
      - 3 - Current/latest
    - *Second - Function of entity*
      - 0 - Production
      - 1 - Publication
      - 2 - Distribution
      - 3 - Copyright
      - 4 - Manufacturer
  - **Subfield Codes**
    - \$a - Place of production, publication, distribution, manufacture (R)
    - \$b - Name of producer, publisher, distributor, manufacturer (R)
    - \$c - Date of production, publication, distribution, copyright, manufacture (R)
    - \$3 - Materials specified (NR)

- \$6 - Linkage (NR)
- \$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP02: Additional Elements to Support RDA in the MARC 21 Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp02.html>

Proposal No. 2009-01/1 and No. 2010-04 previously defined new attributes for Group 2 FRBR entities (persons, families, corporate bodies) and Group 1 FRBR entities (work, expression, manifestation, item), respectively. These attributes can be recorded as part of the heading, but are separate elements in RDA that may also be recorded separately even if they aren't currently needed in a heading. It is useful to record each such RDA element in its own field or subfield, in case it later becomes necessary to differentiate the heading from another one that is otherwise identical. For example, field 046 \$f may contain birth date, such as 1946 or 19460101. This information may or may not also appear as part of the authorized access point (1XX) on the authority record.

No. 2011-DP02, presented at the January 2011 MARBI meetings, discussed several additional RDA data elements that are not well accommodated in the MARC 21 Authority Format. All four parts of the DP were brought back as separate proposals at the June 2011 MARBI meetings (Proposals No. 2011-04, 2011-05, 2011-06, and 2011-07).

**Proposal No. 2011-04: Adding Field 377 (Associated Language) for Language of Expression in the Authority and Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-04.html>

Language of expression (RDA 6.11) is a core element when needed to differentiate an expression of a work from another expression of the same work. In our current database models, this information usually appears in authority records, not in bibliographic records. Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP02 (section 2.1) presented two options: Field 041 might be defined in the Authority Format, or Authority field 377 (Associated language) might have its definition broadened to include Language of the expression. (It currently includes only Language of the person and Language of the corporate body). It might also be helpful to add a subfield for the recording of language terms, rather than just codes. Field 377 could more easily accommodate both language codes and language terms. (Language codes are currently used in Bibliographic field 041, but not language terms). The Committee's preference was to broaden field 377, rather than to use field 041. This part of the DP was brought back at the June 2011 MARBI meetings as Proposal No. 2011-04.

Proposal No. 2011-04 presented two options:

Option 1: Revise the definition of field 377 to also include Language of family and expression, but keep the subfields as they are.

Option 2: Revise field 377 as above and add subfield \$b for Language term. (Language terms would be used more often for the name of a specific language when the language code is a collective code. For example, "cau", "Caucasian (Other)" is the collective code assigned for any of 18 different Caucasian area languages).

Option 2 was approved by the MARBI Committee, with the substitution of \$l (the letter “L”) for Language term, rather than \$b.

**Proposal No. 2011-05: Broadening field 373 (Affiliation) for Associated Institutions in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-05.html>

“Associated institution” (RDA 11.5) is a core element for conferences in many cases, and sometimes for other corporate bodies as well. No. 2011-DP02 (section 2.2) suggested that field 373 (Affiliation [of a person]; RDA 9.13) be broadened to encompass Associated institution. (Field 373 was previously defined in the MARC 21 Authority Format with Proposal No. 2009-01/1). Field 510 would not be an option, because RDA requires that the data is in the form as found on the resource. (Field 510 is a controlled field, defined as “See also from tracing—Corporate name). The MARBI Committee decided at the ALA Midwinter 2011 meetings to broaden the name and definition of this field, as well as the scope of its subfield \$a. This DP was brought forward at the annual meeting as Proposal No. 2011-05.

The proposal passed as written. The Library of Congress will broaden the name of the proposal to include groups, and the definition will be revised accordingly (exact wording to be worked out).

**Proposal No. 2011-06: RDA Fuller Form of Personal Name Attribute in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-06.html>

“Fuller form of name” (RDA 9.5) is a core element when needed to distinguish a person from another person with the same name. This information, if included in a heading, is given in \$q of the access point, i.e.: *100 1# \$a Smith, John A. \$q (John Allen)*. It might be useful to record this information in a discrete field, regardless of whether it is needed at the time that the heading is created. No. 2011-DP02 suggested a new field 378 for this purpose. This DP was brought back at the June 2011 MARBI meetings as Proposal No. 2011-06.

The proposal passed as amended. Rather than using \$a for Fuller form of personal name, subfield \$q will be used instead (making life easier for catalogers). The documentation will specify that this field is nonrepeatable, and applies only to the heading in the 1XX (not to 4XX fields). Coding for the new field is shown below:

- **378 - Fuller Form of Personal Name (NR)**
  - **Indicators**
    - *First - Undefined*
      - # - Undefined, contains a blank
    - *Second - Undefined*
      - # - Undefined, contains a blank
  - **Subfield Codes**
    - \$q - Fuller form of personal name (NR)
    - \$u - Uniform Resource Identifier (R)
    - \$v - Source of information (R)
    - \$6 - Linkage (NR)
    - \$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

**Proposal No. 2011-07: Additional Corporate Body Attributes for RDA in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-07.html>

Type of jurisdiction (RDA 11.7.15 and 11.13.1.6) is added to the name of a government other than a city or town when needed to differentiate between access points for two or more governments with the same name. Example:

*Preferred name: Cork (Ireland : County)*

*Type of jurisdiction added as an element: County*

Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP02 (section 2.4) suggested the addition of a new field to the Authority Format for Type of jurisdiction. This part of the DP was brought back at the June 2011 MARBI meetings as Proposal No. 2011-07.

The proposal also treats two other categories of attributes covered by RDA 11.7 in addition to jurisdiction (11.7.1.5): Names not conveying the idea of a corporate body (RDA 11.7.1.4), and: Other designation (RDA 11.7.1.6). An example of “Other designation” would be the designation “Seventh Day”, for the heading “Church of God (Seventh Day).” While RDA allows all three categories of designations to be added to authorized access points, a new field to include this information would be useful as well. Proposal No. 2011-07 offers two options for a new field 368:

Option 1: Define a new field 368 (Other Corporate Body Attribute) with an indicator to identify the type of attribute.

Option 2: Same as above, but using different subfields instead of indicators to identify the type of attribute.

Option 2 was approved as written, and appears below.

- **Field 368 - Other Corporate Body Attributes (R)**
  - **Indicators**
    - *First - Undefined*
      - # - Undefined, contains a blank
    - *Second - Undefined*
      - # - Undefined, contains a blank
  - **Subfield Codes**
    - \$a - Type of corporate body (R)
    - \$b - Type of jurisdiction (R)
    - \$c - Other designation (R)
    - \$0 - Record control number (R)
    - \$2 - Source of term (R)
    - \$6 - Linkage (NR)
    - \$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP03: Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp03.html>

**and:**

***Report on the RDA/MARC Working Group Discussion of Identifying Entity Types in MARC Records***

[http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/WEMI\\_report.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/WEMI_report.html)

Several earlier discussion papers and proposals have offered ideas on how to identify FRBR Group 1 entities in the MARC 21 formats (2008-DP04, 2008-05/1, 2008-05/2, and 2009-02/3, available from the MARC Development Web page: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/development.html>). The identification of FRBR entities did not seem vital for the initial implementation of RDA. However, since the major testing of RDA has been completed, the Library of Congress would like to revisit the issues. Clear identification of type of Group 1 entity should assist in the design of better displays and the support for user tasks, as well as facilitating more analysis of record content.

While most institutions are currently using authority records for works and expressions, and bibliographic records for manifestations and items, it is likely that in the future, authority, bibliographic, and holdings records will be used to support more varied configurations. Therefore, the DP proposes that a new field 883 (Entity type) be defined in all three formats. Subfield “a” would be used for Primary entity type term (work, expression, manifestation, or item), \$b for Primary entity type code (“w” (work), etc.), \$n for Cataloger’s note, and \$2 for Source of term (frbrgroup1). Bibliographic records lacking 883 fields would by default be considered manifestation records; holdings records lacking 883 fields would be considered item records. A note field could be included for the cataloger to explain exceptional circumstances.

Bibliographic records for manifestations would include 245 fields. Bibliographic records for works or expressions would contain a 130 or 240 field, but no 245 field.

At the 2011 Midwinter meetings, this paper generated much spirited discussion. John Attig (Penn. State; audience) advised that we should only use the coding when it can be done cleanly. Our current bibliographic records are broader than just manifestation level (for example, they usually contain some work level information, such as subject headings). Sally H. McCallum (Chief, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress) reminded the group that the fields wouldn’t be mandatory; their use would be as structural metadata that would hopefully support experimentation; the fields are not meant to be displayed or used directly by searchers. John Espley (AVIAC representative from VTLS) added that the VTLS OPAC has been using local fields for these levels for a long time; defining values in MARC 21 for this information would be beneficial. A straw poll indicated that the MARBI Committee and the audience were in favor of having this DP brought back as a discussion paper or a proposal at the 2011 ALA Annual Meeting.

After the 2011 Midwinter meetings, the RDA/MARC Working Group had several discussions on this DP, but couldn’t come to agreement on whether this paper should be brought back as a proposal. Several of us in the group (myself included), wanted to bring back the DP as a proposal, but others thought it would be too difficult to correctly assign the codes at this time. Also the



ideas in the paper had been presented in several earlier discussion papers, without becoming successful proposals. Therefore, it was decided not to bring it back again. Instead, a report was written for discussion: *Report of the RDA/MARC Working Group Discussion of Identifying Entity Types in MARC Records*. The report distinguishes between strict and loose entity type definitions, and the problems of both approaches. It suggests that next year, as more use is made of RDA, systems experiment with a “local field”, perhaps field 883. Based upon the results of the experimentation, it may become feasible at some point to add this field to the MARC 21 formats, possibly with revised definitions. The report was on the agenda for the June 2011 annual meeting, but it wasn’t discussed at the meeting.

**Proposal No. 2011-08: Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Characteristics in RDA in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-08.html>

**and:**

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP04: Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Attributes in RDA and the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp04.html>

Carrier attributes are given in the new MARC fields 336-338 as either terms or codes (or both). These attributes are mapped to Leader/06 (Type of record), 007/00 (Category of material), and 007/01 (Specific material designation). Prior to RDA implementation, it was decided to use the coded data fields in MARC rather than establish new fields or subfields for the carrier attributes. However, based on experiences during the testing of RDA, the Library of Congress has suggested that it might be clearer to assign specific MARC fields or subfields for each of the carrier attributes listed in RDA (Chapter 3). No. 2011-DP04 presented the following suggestions at the 2011 Midwinter meetings:

- 1. Field 340 Physical Medium** (expansion of field; to be renamed: Carrier Characteristics)  
New subfields could be added for the RDA elements: Generation, Layout, Book format, Font size, and Polarity.
- 2. Field 344 Sound Characteristics** (New)
- 3. Field 345 Projection Characteristics of Motion Picture Film** (New)
- 4. Field 346 Video Characteristics** (New)
- 5. Field 347 Digital File Characteristics** (New)

Other notes pertaining to carrier attributes currently map to MARC 500 notes. This DP suggests that subfield \$i could be added for the attribute name.

Example: *500 ## \$i Mount: \$a Mounted on starched linen*

2011-DP04 was brought back as Proposal No. 2011-08 at the June 2011 MARBI meetings. One option presented the same fields as in the DP above (although 345 has been renamed: Projection Characteristic of Projected Media). Another option suggested using a new 34X field with subfields for each of the detailed characteristics. A problem with this option is handling growth in the number of characteristics. Additional suggestions included making 300 \$b repeatable, and adding “\$i” (Display text) as a new subfield in the 500 field.

The MARBI Committee approved Option 1, adding new fields 344-347, as well as adding new subfields to field 340 as above. Subfields \$6, \$8, and \$0 (not in the actual proposal) will also be added to 340 and to the new fields 344-347. The other suggestions were not approved.

**Proposal No. 2011-09: Identifying the Source of Thematic Index Numbers in Field 383 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-09.html>

Field 383 was previously defined in Proposal No. 2010-04. It provided for the coding of a serial number, opus number, or thematic index number to help distinguish a work from others with the same title. Sometimes different indexes for the same composer use different serial and opus numbers to represent the same composition. For additional clarification, No. 2011-09 proposes \$d (Thematic index citation code), \$e (Publisher associated with serial or opus number), and \$2 (Source code). \$2 will be especially useful, as the Music Library Association has recently developed an authoritative compilation of citations for thematic indexes, entitled: *Thematic indexes in the Library of Congress/NACO Authority File*. This proposal passed as amended, the most notable change being that \$e will only be for publisher associated with opus number, not also publisher associated with serial number.

**Proposal No. 2011-10: Geographic Codes in Classification Records**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-10.html>

This Paper proposes adding fields 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) and field 043 (Geographic Area Code) in the MARC 21 Classification Format to characterize geographic headings. Both fields would be useful to provide access to classification records. These fields already exist in the Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This proposal passed as amended, with \$0 also added.

**Proposal No. 2011-11: Addition of Indicator Value 7 (Other edition specified in \$2) in DDC Number Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority and Community Information Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-11.html>

Currently, fields 082 and 083 only contain values for full and abridged editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification. These values are not applicable to some editions of DDC, such as Norwegian DDK 5, a translation not directly derived from the English language standard edition. Therefore, a means to record other values is needed. This proposal was approved as written at the June 2011 MARBI meetings.

**Proposal No. 2011-12: Defining Subfield \$q for an Assigning Agency in Field 084 (Other Classification Number) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-12.html>

This new subfield was proposed in order to distinguish the assigning agency of a particular 084 field when more than one 084 field has been assigned to the same record, as is sometimes the case with records emanating from the German National Library. At the June 2011 MARBI meetings, this proposal was approved as written.

## **Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP05: Additional Means of Identifying Medium of Performance in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2011/2011-dp05.html>

Many Library of Congress subject headings for music combine medium and genre/form terms. Example: *Sonatas (Flute and piano)*. It is now recognized that medium of performance is an facet of musical works that should be separate from both subject headings and from genre/form terms. Therefore, when genre/form terms for music are implemented, LCSH headings with medium terms in them will no longer be valid to assign to music. Medium of performance terms will need to be contained elsewhere in the MARC 21 record. This DP presents three possible MARC fields that might be suitable for medium of performance. The 048 field (a coded field, already in the Bibliographic Format, but not yet in the Authority Format), 382 (Medium of performance, currently used to differentiate expressions), or a new 6XX field in the Bibliographic Format (requiring also a new 1XX field in the Authority Format). Each of the fields would have advantages and disadvantages. During discussions at the June 2011 MARBI meetings, there was little support for the 048 option, but no clear preference expressed for the other two options. This DP will be brought back as a proposal, with links provided to examples.

## **Other MARC News**

### **Transforming Our Bibliographic Framework**

Deanna B. Marcum, LC's Associate Librarian for Library Services, will be leading a new initiative "to analyze the present and future [bibliographic] environment, identify the components of the framework to support our users, and plan for the evolution from our present framework to the future—not just for the Library of Congress, but for all institutions that depend on bibliographic data shared by the Library and its partners." Two issues in the initiative are directly related to the future of the MARC 21 formats:

- *Determine which aspects of current metadata encoding standards should be retained and evolved into a format for the future. We will consider MARC 21, in which billions of records are presently encoded, as well as other initiatives.*
- *Explore approaches to displaying metadata beyond current MARC-based systems.*

The initiative was announced in the statement: *Transforming our Bibliographic Framework: A Statement from the Librry of Congress (May 13, 2011).*' The full text is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/news/framework-051311.html>

### *Report and recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee*

On June 20, 2011, the above report was made publicly available. One of the recommendations of the report was to "Demonstrate credible progress toward a replacement for MARC" within an 18-

24 month timeframe. The report is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/rdatesting-finalreport-20june2011.pdf>

### **MARC 21 Update No. 12 Available Online**

MARC 21 Update No. 12 (October 2010) was made available in late 2010 from the MARC Standards home page (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/>). Changes to the documentation resulted mainly from MARBI proposals that were approved at the ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual Meetings in 2010. The update has been integrated into the documentation for each of the online full and concise formats that are maintained on the MARC website. The changes to the formats are indicated in red. Appendix G of the Bibliographic Format, and Appendix F of the Authority and Holdings Formats, give a list of all the changes made in Update 12. The major change to the Bibliographic Format was the introduction of a new code “c” in Leader 18, used for “ISBD Punctuation only”, and the change in definition and description of code “i” “ISBD punctuation included”, also in Leader 18. Another significant change in several formats was the change in definition of \$0 from “Record control number” to “Authority record control number or standard number.”

### ***RDA in MARC***

The document *RDA in MARC* continues to be regularly updated with approved and proposed changes to MARC 21. It is available at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/RDAinMARC29.html> (last updated June 14, 2011).