

*Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access***Report of the MARBI Representative to
CC:DA
Annual Conference 2004**

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by MARBI at the ALA 2004 Annual Conference in Orlando, Florida. This report contains discussions which took place at the meetings regarding the MARBI proposals and discussion papers which may be of particular interest to CC:DA.

Complete text of the MARBI proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available from the MARC Advisory Committee web page: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/marcadvz.html>

Proposal No. 2004-06: Defining the First Indicator and New Subfields in Field 017 to Suppress Display Labels in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

Source: U.S. Copyright Office

Summary: This paper proposes the definition of a first indicator in field 017 to be used to suppress display labels as different types of copyright or legal deposit numbers are recorded in MARC records. This will provide flexibility in expressing a variety of types of registration numbers. The paper also proposes defining subfield \$d to record the date of copyright registration.

Related MARBI Documents: None.

Discussion: Discussion focused primarily on the fact that there were a few editorial changes necessary. For example, subfield \$a needs to be renamed "Copyright or legal deposit number" instead of "Copyright registration number"; and the \$i in the examples should read: "Suppl. copyright reg." and "Orig. copyright reg." respectively.

There was also discussion concerning subfield \$i. It should not be controlled, but contingent upon input by the cataloger.

MARBI action taken: Proposal approved, with editorial changes.

Proposal No. 2004-05: Changes Needed to Accommodate RISM Data — Music Incipits

Source: RISM Zentralredaktion (RISM), Music Library Association (MLA)

Summary: This paper proposes defining field 031 in the authority and bibliographic formats to contain information needed for encoding RISM incipits.

Related MARBI Documents: [Discussion Paper 2004-DP01](#)

Discussion: There was the general feeling expressed by MARBI that the proposal as written, may be too closely aligned and defined with its RISM usage.

The subfield ordering for the proposed 031 is very field-specific, and making them consistent with subfield usage within other fields is seen as unimportant at this time.

The 031 field itself, while it is obviously very specialized, would be useful for other music catalogers and musicologists.

For the moment, much of the subfielded data in this field should be recognized as uncontrolled. This in spite of the fact that MARBI recognizes that much of the data seems to warrant citing a specific source or inputting agency. As Karen Coyle mentioned though it may be that with time, once the cataloging community begins to use this field, the 031 may require further definition, including a subfield defining the source of some data.

MARBI action taken: Proposal accepted, with editorial changes so that the field definition is not so RISM-specific, and adding \$y (Link text) and \$z (public note).

Proposal No. 2004-07: Applying Field 752 (Added Entry — Hierarchical Place Name) for Different Purposes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

Source: ALA MAGERT Cataloging and Classification Committee

Summary: This paper discusses the variety of current usage of MARC 21 field 752, Added Entry — Hierarchical Place Name, for place of publication, production, or geographic subject areas. Institutions need to index information in this field in different ways. This paper proposes a way to facilitate different indexing by either adding indicators to the 752 field to show whether the place name designates place of publication or subject, or by defining a new field (field 652) for subject use. It also proposes a subfield to identify a thesaurus and a

technique for extending the place hierarchies if needed.

Related MARBI Documents: [Discussion Paper 2004-DP02](#) (January 2004)

Discussion:

Discussion of MARC fields: Mitch Turitz wondered why MARBI would include an option for a subject tracing within the 7XX block of fields? Subjects should remain in the 6XX block.

Betsy Mangan recalled the development of the use of the 752 by the LC Maps Division and other cartographic catalogers. Catalogers had a pressing need to accomplish both current functions of the 752 (e.g., place of publication/production, and hierarchic subject tracing), and were unable to wait for the format to develop accordingly.

There was a general consensus for two fields: the current 752, and a 6XX field for subject access. As Karen Coyle pointed out, the two may not always be identical. A map of the moon or Mars would have a 6XX quite different from what appeared in the 752 (e.g., place of publication/production).

Concern was expressed that the 652 is a legacy MARC field, and Rich Greene is fairly certain there are occurrences of the tag in the OCLC database. Consequently, some wondered if MARBI should instead use the 662 field.

MARBI approved defining a second 6XX field for subject usage. LC will determine whether to use the 652 or 662 tag. Unless there is some oddity discovered, the preference will be to use the 662 field.

Discussion of MARC subfields: Consideration should be given to having these two tags (e.g., 662/652 and 752) under authority control. Consequently, MARBI may well want to have the subfields defined consistently in both fields.

There was discussion that some of the subfields need to be repeatable in order to fill the needs of various constituencies.

MARBI suggested that LC take the proposal back to explore current uses of the subfield elements and determine whether additional subfields are needed, as well as whether any should be repeatable. LC will also consider any applicable ISO standards and the Getty Thesaurus, and then with the British Library and other constituent members further refine this proposal in time for the 2005 ALA Midwinter Conference.

MARBI action taken: LC will work further on this proposal and resubmit it at the 2005 ALA Midwinter Conference.

Discussion Paper 2004-DP04: Use of ISBNs and LCCNs in MARC 21 Bibliographic Records

Source: The MARC of Quality; Karen Anspach Consulting

Summary: This paper discusses the use of ISBNs and LCCNs in systems and the problems when ISBNs or LCCNs is recorded in the bibliographic record for a manifestation other than the one being cataloged. It suggests the possibility of defining a new subfield \$y for inappropriate ISBN/LCCN in fields 020 and 010 respectively or expanding the definition of subfield \$z to allow for the recording of these numbers.

Related MARBI Documents: None.

Discussion: There is the need for catalogers to input ISBNs and LCCNs that appear on an item, and that are valid for manifestations other than the one described by the record. For example, monographs often print three separate ISBNs on a particular bibliographic item (one for the hardback, one for the audio-book, and one for the large print edition).

Consequently, libraries are noticing catalogers using the \$z (cancelled/invalid LC Control number or ISBN) for a number of different purposes.

Adam Schiff recommended refining and clarifying the current subfield definitions to instruct catalogers that only the LCCN/ISBN for the description at hand belongs in the \$a; any others on the piece should be placed in \$z.

MARBI action taken: A straw poll vote indicated clear preference for the addition of \$y to the 010 and the 020 MARC tags, and in so doing to consider the current uses of \$y in the 022 field. The proposal should also include revised, clarified definitions for the usage of subfields \$a, \$y and \$z in each of these MARC fields (e.g., 010, 020, 022).

MARBI also recognizes there are other control no. fields that may need to be considered when this proposal returns.

Proposal No. 2004-08: Changing the MARC-8 to UCS Mapping for the Halves of Doublewide Diacritics from the Unicode/UCS Half Diacritic Characters to the Unicode/UCS Doublewide Diacritic Characters

Source: RLG

Summary: The doublewide tilde of Tagalog and the ligature used in Cyrillic Romanization are encoded as half diacritic characters in ANSEL. In Unicode/UCS, there are two ways to represent each of these double-wide diacritics: use the appropriate double diacritic character that spans two base letters (recommended in the Unicode Standard) or use the Combining Half Mark characters (analogous to current MARC 21 practice).

The current mapping for the four ◊ diacritic halves ◊ in ANSEL is to the

Combining Half Mark characters. This proposal, in response to MARBI Discussion Paper 2004-DP03 in January 2004, recommends that the MARC 21 community change the official mapping to Unicode/UCS to the double diacritic characters, U+0360 COMBINING DOUBLE TILDE and U+0361 COMBINING DOUBLE INVERTED BREVE. A specification for conversion is included in the proposal.

Related MARBI Documents: [Proposal no. 96-10 \(July 1996\)](#) [Discussion Paper 2004-DP03 \(January 2004\)](#)

Discussion: Karen Coyle asked if this situation was analogous to what MARBI discussed and resolved in earlier MARC-8 discussions? At the time of the MARC-8 discussions, the desired solutions were not the same. Display measures were treated in a sequential manner with diacritics preceding the characters they modified.

Adam Schiff moved that the proposal be approved.

OCLC expressed that they are not in favor of this proposal. The current focus at OCLC is upon translations of character sets back and forth (e.g., MARC-8 to Unicode and vice-versa) that they are seeing quite often. OCLC expects this translation trend to continue for the next few years.

MARBI action taken: Proposal approved.

MARBI resumed a discussion from the 2004 Midwinter Conference in San Diego, of a report prepared by Hal Cain, entitled: [“Assessment of options for handling full Unicode character encodings in MARC 21.”](#)

Discussion: Several MARBI members expressed concern about some of the indexing issues that are not fully addressed in the paper. Sally McCallum (LC) confirmed that there are additional indexing issues and that Part 2 of the report will address them more fully.

Joan Aliprand (RLG) mentioned that in addition to the indexing issues, there are display issues that need to be addressed as well.

Gary Smith (OCLC) emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the MARC-8 repertoire and the MARC 21 character encoding system.

Several MARBI members and audience members expressed confidence that as character sets and font repertoires continue to develop, some of the issues raised in this paper may be resolved.

Those libraries with Innovative Interfaces, Ex Libris and VTLS Integrated Library Systems should consider themselves ahead of the game as these three systems are currently Unicode compliant.

For at least the next few years though, all libraries dealing with importing and

exporting data should be cognizant of the potential lack of perfect translations when dealing with 8-bit and 16-bit files. This obviously includes MARC-8 to Unicode translations and vice-versa.

Part 2 of the report will likely be ready in time for discussion at the 2005 ALA Midwinter Conference in Boston.

Everett Allgood,
MARBI Representative to CC:DA

www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/marbi0406.html

Copyright © 2021 American Library Association

Last updated 12/08/2023 10:02:51 – jca