

**Association for Library Collections and Technical Services
(A Division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Classification Section**

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

Report of the MAC Liaison

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: John Myers, CC:DA Liaison to MAC

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by the MAC during virtual meetings scheduled on January 26-28, in lieu of the ALA 2021 Midwinter Meeting.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the winter 2021 virtual MAC meetings on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2021_age.html

Executive Summary:

Ten proposals and six discussion papers were taken up. Nine of the ten proposals passed, some with amendments. A tenth was withdrawn to be reworked and resubmitted. The six discussion papers are anticipated to return as proposals, one possibly fast-tracked.

Narrative:

From the Chair: The Chair opened each session with careful instructions regarding the logistics of holding the meeting virtually – how to signal to be recognized, how voting would be conducted, and a request for brevity.

Fast track proposals: Make 043 repeatable, add 375 \$0/\$1, add 384 \$0/\$1.

Closing comment: the summer meeting will be virtual, regardless of ALA's conference configuration.

LC Report: LC intends to offer a set of files of records that convert from BibFrame to MARC, to encourage others at trying to load them into ILS as MARC records. McCallum provided a recap of BibFrame Update Forum presentations.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2021-01 would amend the use of the \$2 subfields in fields 082 and 083. Specifically, it would enhance the structure in two ways: first, a language component would be necessary in all instances, following a slash after the initial recording of the edition; second, a date component following a slash after the language component would be added for publication or printing year for numbers assigned from print editions, or for the date of assignment for numbers assigned from an online version.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. Discussion followed up on the recommendation to ensure the field 852 documentation remains in sync with the changes proposed for fields 082/083. This occasioned an amendment to engage editorial synchronization across all three fields with respect to first indicator value 7 and its corresponding instances of \$2. Additional discussion regarding specifying the source of the language notation within the documentation.

Moved as amended for 1st indicator value 7 and \$2 synchronization by Young (with friendly amendment to include field 852 in such edits by Cui); second by Cui.

This proposal passed with amendments.

Proposal 2021-02 would expand the options for recording chronology information in the holdings format, in cases where only chronology information was available. Specifically, it would preferentially allow such information to be consistently recorded in the “chronology” subfields of the various fields, rather than requiring it to be recorded in the otherwise empty first level “enumeration” subfields.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. No further discussion.

Moved by Myers; second by Maier.

This proposal passed.

Proposal 2021-03 would enhance the coding options in the “Type of continuing resource” byte (008/21 and 006/04). Specifically, it would add code values for “h” Blog, “t” Directory, “j” Journal, “g” Magazine, “s” Newsletter, and “r” Repository. Definitions for the existing “p” Periodical, “d” Updating database, and “w” Updating website would be modified to support and clarify use of the new code values.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. The presenter responded favorably to suggestions for minor edits around the hierarchy and granularity concerns. Following edits ensued for modifying the proposed definitions:

“p” – strike “only”

“d” – add “may”

“w” – retain as “web-site” per usage throughout existing documentation

“h” – change to add “contributed by users”

“g” – remove “specialized”

“s” – remove “short”

Deanna White (ISSN International Centre) made the additional observation that each national center has responsibility for its own records. They would not change existing ISSN records, but would incorporate the new codes for retrospective original cataloging. Everett pointed out that the option to remain “blank” remains.

Moved as amended per the discussed edits (and strike redundant “be used”) by Schiff; second by Myers/Young.

This proposal passed with amendments.

Proposal 2021-04 would provide a mechanism for recording authority control numbers and RWO URIs to field 022. Specifically, it would add subfields \$0 and \$1 in line with conventional use across the formats.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. The presenter responded that the positioning detail arose from developing the paper but would be willing to remove it. The forthcoming movement of ISSN-L entries to a new field and how this would resolve the ambiguity issue was stressed. There was discussion about the lack of \$1 examples but it was observed that there was a paucity of such across the formats.

Moved by Myers; second by Young.

This proposal passed.

Proposal 2021-05 would modify Field 348 and Field 546. Specifically, it would rename field 348 to support an expanded function and that expanded function would add new subfields \$c and \$d for recording “Form of musical notation” as a term or code, respectively. It would further modify Field 546 \$b to direct the recording of Form of musical notation to Field 348.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. There was discussion about the desirable content of the examples with respect to placeholder content vs. RDA registry content, and then the possibility of confusion with similar RDA registry codes.

Moved, subject to editorial cleanup of the examples, by Myers; second by Weitz.

This proposal passed

Proposal 2021-06 would provide a mechanism for differentiating between Work and Expression dates in field 046 of the Bibliographic and Authority formats. Specifically, it offers a choice between using an indicator value, using a set of new subfields for distinctly recording entity terms, codes and URIs, or using a single subfield for terms, codes or URIs. Additionally,

subfields \$3, \$x, and \$z would be added for Materials specified, Nonpublic note, and Public note.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. Option 2.2 was distinctly rejected in the pre-comments. Discussion focused on the choice between Option 1 and Option 2.1, with a further alternative of a blended solution suggested early on. Option 2.1 seemed to offer more flexibility, especially if entities like printings and states that are outside the LRM entity model are considered. Option 1 represents a more pragmatic solution that would be simpler to implement. Consensus coalesced around Option 1. Previous resistance to \$x and \$z was restated but consensus was in favor, especially as potential solutions for the printings and states issues. The new representative expression entity was introduced into the discussion. In response, this could return as an additional indicator value to the ones being proposed.

Moved by Myers with Option 1 to include \$3, \$x, \$z; second by Schiff.

This proposal passed as configured with Option 1.

Proposal 2021-07 would provide a distinct and discreet mechanism for recording the element “Sound content” in alignment with RDA’s treatment. Specifically, it would add a new \$i subfield to field 344.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. The paper occasioned extensive discussion around the suitability of the field for the use proposed, with fields 340 and 345 being raised as more appropriate alternatives. After considerable discussion on the respective merits and disqualifications of each field and acknowledgement that as long as the data was “parked” somewhere then it could reliably be mapped to/from BibFrame, field 344 was conceded as the least problematic choice. In the course of that discussion, there was firm resistance by the sound cataloging constituencies to the idea that the subfield should be universally be deployed with “sound” for audio recordings that inherently have sound, or deployed with “silent” for various content types that are inherently without sound, to which community-specific application profiles was offered as the solution. As a result of the discussion, some revision to the examples seemed warranted, particularly the third. Discussion took up the question of the definition of the proposed subfield. Revisions to the proposed definition settled on “Indication of the presence or absence of sound in a resource. Primarily for projected graphic resources, moving image resources, and their electronic equivalents.”

Moved with the amended definition to \$i, and examples to be subsequently resolved, by Schiff; second by Abrahamse.

This proposal passed as amended (8-5).

Proposal 2021-08 would provide a mechanism for encoding supplementary content characteristics. Specifically, it would create field 353 to record terms, codes, and URIs to hold such data.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, chief of which was a proposal by MLA to amend the definition and scope with the addition of “only if considered significant.” In response to a concern about the placeholder values in the examples, it was observed that they are the same due to the current configuration in id.loc.gov.

Moved as amended by Young; second by Moore.

This proposal passed as amended.

Proposal 2021-09 would provide a mechanism for recording the new RDA element, “Mode of Issuance for Manifestations.” Specifically, it would create field 334 to record terms, codes, and URIs to hold such data.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, which focused on cases where a cataloger had incomplete data at the time of cataloging to correctly infer the Mode of Issuance. Additionally, Allgood provided editorial changes to the discussion portion of the proposal. Discussion coalesced around agreement that addressing such cases would be a workflow decision by respective cataloging communities whether to modify the description or create a new one.

Moved as written by Myers; second by Schiff.

This proposal passed.

Proposal 2021-10 would provide a mechanism for recording the new RDA element, “Type of Binding for Manifestations.” Specifically, it would add subfield \$l (el) to field 340. 335 to record terms, codes, and URIs to hold such data.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. Numerous issues were identified in those comments and subsequently discussed or independently raised in the meeting.

- Whether it is necessary to specify “original” in the scope and definition, in order to remove ambiguity that might arise from rebinding efforts
- Whether the subfield could accommodate formats of electronic publication as virtual equivalents to “binding”
- Revisiting the issue from the Discussion Paper phase regarding applicability for provider neutral records and current binding neutral practices
- Whether the subfield, which was envisioned solely as a place for RDA vocabulary, can (or would) be used for other vocabularies, with the additional concern that the scoping of the RDA vocabulary and hence the subfield as

proposed is quite narrow, where other vocabularies incorporate not just the type of binding but various aspects of the binding. Also as written, the definition is “A type of binding” corresponding to the singular entries in the RDA vocabulary, where other vocabularies express in the plural.

- A suggestion was made that the RDA element be renamed, but that is out of scope for the RDA-MARC WG and would need to go through the formal RDA revision proposal process.

Young, as the presenter for the RDA-MARC WG, acknowledged both the concerns and the general consensus that generalizing the deployment of the subfield would be desirable.

This proposal was withdrawn for further work.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP01 explores the recording of incorrect/cancelled ISSN in series statements recorded in field 490. To that end, it proposes the addition of new \$y and \$z to field 490 to record incorrect and cancelled ISSNs, respectively.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments which were generally supportive. A concern was the prospective additional work on the part of catalogers to accurately code whether a recorded ISSN should be in \$x, \$y, or \$z. The possible solution was offered that a second indicator value be developed to indicate whether the \$x content had been assessed. Other observations were that this validation process in other instances relies on OCLC's validation routines, and that such validations are not required. Further remark that records are no longer static and can be edited as evidence becomes apparent or is sought out to enhance the information by altering the subfield to more specific granularity (that is, changing from the general \$x to the replaced/invalid \$y/\$z of the discussion paper). The point was raised that field 490 is strictly for transcription and that we are beginning to impose access functionality on it by these distinctions in the nature of the recorded ISSN value, with the rebuttal that agencies that do not control series would find it valuable to be able to park the data rather than strip it out.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP02 explores a mechanism for recording “introductory statements” in field 672, as a means of reflecting the role by the 100 entry in relationship to the citation in the 672 entry. To that end, it proposes defining a new \$i or \$p for recording such information.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, which generally agreed with the principle but differed on specifics of implementation. The presenter articulated the value to the source community regarding relationships and their reciprocal dynamics for exploring and navigating resources, but also a desire to avoid overengineering a solution. Discussion raised the question of providing a subfield for encoding the relationship as well as the proposed term-based solution. The use of \$4 was considered (as it had been with \$e in some of the submitted comments), but there was a sense that this would require \$e to work in the opposite direction from which it is normally deployed and

would thus warrant clarification in the documentation (or a different solution). It was observed that the discussion paper includes a number value in the terms, to correspond to the order of the creator/contributor in the source description, which would be out of scope for recording of such reciprocal relationships in an RDA context. Of the options in the paper, there was a preference for \$i which is analogous to its use elsewhere, with an amendment to the label to be “Explanatory text.”

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP03 explores a mechanism for recording the geographic coordinates for the position of structures in images. It articulates the current mechanism for recording coordinates for cartographic content in fields 255 and 034. It considers the means in which field 034 could be expanded to support this new use.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, which were generally supportive of the use, but not always in agreement that the use wasn’t already supported by field 034. Other issues of concern raised in the comments and discussion were:

- the interoperability implications for MARC syntax for the data in comparison to standards in the wider geospatial field
- dynamics between center point and bounding coordinates as is usual for cartographic resources
- conversion to/from decimal coordinates
- the point of reference for the coordinates, that is, of the object in the image or the point from which the image was captured.
- Whether additional examination of the 255 was warranted to support eye-readable representation for end-users beyond the machine functionality supported by 034
- Prospective differences for field 034 between the bibliographic and authority formats’ documentation
- Dynamics for use in the authority format when possible but resorting to the bibliographic format when a corresponding authority record did not exist and was deemed impractical to create.

Discussion addressed some of these issues. The need for any real change to 034 to adapt it for use beyond cartographic resources was questioned since that restriction is not explicit already (and some constituencies already use it for the purpose that occasioned the paper). If the twinning of 034 with 255 is “broken” then it should be retained for cartographic resources. Guidance would need to be provided for appropriate use of center point vs bounding bound references, or more accurately direction in the format to refer to communities’ application profiles. There was a distinct preference to avoid non-numeric methods of geospatial referencing, such as the “what3words” system, in order to maintain cultural neutrality. Field 255 would be desirable but not required for images. It was suggested that necessary changes are sufficiently small to warrant fast-tracking.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal or be fast-tracked depending on the prospective scope of changes and how they are received by the Steering Committee.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP04 explores a mechanism for recording “Original Sound Capture and Storage” information. To that end, it suggests adding new subfield j to field 344.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, which were generally supportive, although the implications of 2021-DP05 were noted. Given cataloger confusion on how to interpret the label “Capture and Storage” as (Capture and Storage) as intended or (Capture) and (Storage) as regularly misinterpreted in the closely associated 007 position, the inclusion of “Original” in the label there to better align with the definition was recommended.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP05 explores a mechanism for differentiating between types of digital storage as encoded in the 007/13 position for Sound Recordings. Specifically, it proposes constraining the “d” Digital storage value to use with pulse-code modulation techniques and creating a new “s” Direct stream digital value to use with pulse-density modulation techniques deployed for streaming audio.

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments, which included a reference back to 2021-DP04 and the need to resolve confusion regarding techniques and definitions of “capture and storage.” The dynamics for differentiating the pulse density modulation technique (PDM) were discussed through multiple lenses:

- If a new value is proposed for PDM, perhaps the current “d” value should be retained for general, unspecified digital coding with the addition of a further value specific to pulse code modulation (PCM) rather than redefining “d” for PCM use.
- Observations that catalogers, both generalist and specialist, might not be able to determine the specific modulation technique in use for a specific resource.
- If a new value is proposed for PDM, it should be defined in terms of PDM rather than using proprietary terms such as “Direct Stream Digital”
- Confusion on the part of non-specialists in addressing PDM with respect to the intermingling of “Direct Stream Digital” with its implication of an online format with “Super Audio CD” with its implication of a tangible format.
- A caution against getting too deep in the weeds with highly specific and possible ephemeral formats as occurred with tangible audio carriers.

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2021-DP06 explores mechanisms for expanding the recording data provenance information across the MARC formats in response to its greater prevalence and organization in RDA and in linked data contexts. It articulates several options to consider: 1) Selective changes, basically made on an ad hoc basis as specific use cases arise; 2(a) Generalized changes addressed by the expansion of subfield delimiter options; 2(b) Generalized changes addressed by the deployment of various existing subfields not yet in use, most notably the relatively unused \$7; 2(c) Generalized changes addressed by the addition of subfields to field

883; and 3 Development of new formats to hold data provenance information that would then link to the corresponding data fields in the existing formats

The Chair summarized the previously submitted comments. Young, as presenter on behalf of the RDA-MARC WG provided his perspectives on the comments – that there was a split between piecemeal/selective proponents and comprehensive components, although the latter did not favor as overarching a solution as proposed. Regarding the former approach, the Dewey paper at this meeting was a good model. For a more generalized approach there seems to be a preference for the field 883 solution, although the \$_ solution by the DNB as a limited non-standard delimiter approach was interesting. He acknowledged the concerns about designating VES and SES codes in repeated instances of \$2, with a potential solution of deploying the \$7. Discussion took up the question of the 883 field solution with concerns expressed that the necessity of \$8 subfields to pair the corresponding metadata and meta-metadata content would present unwarranted complexity. This was rebutted by the example of existing functionality in OCLC where interface functionality does the pairing automatically. There was discussion regarding the \$_ solution. After initial thoughts that it would require a reworking of the underlying ISO 22709 standard, it was realized after extensive discussion that the \$_ solution was ISO 22709 compliant but would require a slight adjustment to the *MARC Background and Principles* document which presently limits the choice of “data identifiers” to lowercase letters and numbers. There was further clarification that the “pseudo data identifier” – the a, b, c, etc., – to follow the \$_ would distinctly not be a second character to the data identifier (that is, would not “break the format”) but a prepend to the content of the subfield. Furthermore, this prepend would not indicate pairing to a corresponding metadata subfield but the particular tasks/aspects of the data provenance. The idea of simplifying the new format concept to a single one rather than the multiple options in the discussion paper was floated, without gaining traction. The question of distinguishing between VES/SES was raised, with several threads of discussion around the implicit nature of a VES by a controlled heading or a \$0/\$1 being present, and whether mixed strings of controlled and uncontrolled terms or controlled terms from different sources was raised (such as in AAT), but these are to be viewed strictly as SES instances. Young sought a sequence of straw polls to guide the development of the paper to the proposal stage:

- Would an 883 solution for data provenance be an avenue worth exploring further (Option 2.3)? 18-2 (with numerous abstentions)
- Regarding “flavors” of 883, do we want field specific or subfield specific? [Withdrawn after Wise observed that OCLC says both together are unavoidable]
- VES/SES differentiation of recording method? Explicit vs Implicit 1-19
- Defining new format, with pared down version? Yes or No? 1-22
- \$_ solution? Yes or No? 9-9
- Distinctions between VES/SES (whether supported by authority record or not)? Explicit indication whether headings authorized or not? 5-16

This discussion paper will return as a proposal.