

**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 MARBI Liaison (Preliminary)

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: John Myers, MARBI Liaison to CC:DA

Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by MARBI at the ALA 2012 MidWinter Meeting in Dallas, Texas.

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> (or should be once the page is updated, in the meantime, follow embedded links below, or the agenda at: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2012_age.html)

Proposal 2012-01: New Data Elements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for Medium of Performance

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-01.html>

Source: Music Library Association

Summary: This proposal addresses the need for more specific encoding for medium of performance in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats, beyond the data that is currently recorded in subject headings.

Related Documents: [2011-DP05](#); [2010-04](#)

MARBI Action taken:

1/6/2012 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/21/2012 – (To be) Discussed at MARBI

Discussion Paper 2012-DP01: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format

URL: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp01.html>

Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging

Summary: This paper explores options in the MARC 21 Authority Format for making titles related to the entity represented by the authority record machine-actionable.

Related Documents: [none]

MARBI Action taken:

1/6/2012 – Made available to the MARC community for discussion.

1/22/2012 – (To be) Discussed at MARBI

Discussion: The Future Role of MARBI in the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative

Questions for Discussion:

1. MARBI has been mentioned as one of the informal partners in LC's Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative. Specifically, how will MARBI assist with this initiative? What is the appropriate role of MARBI in this period of investigation and possible transition away from (some or all of) the MARC formats?
2. How does MARBI see itself fulfilling the more encompassing elements of its charge from ALA (which never mentions MARC specifically)? Should MARBI review its current charge and determine whether the committee's actions and/or the charge itself need to be changed? How do the current MARBI sponsoring divisions of ALCTS, LITA, and RUSA feel about this? How are the roles and charges of MARBI and the MARC Advisory Committee distinct?
3. How should MARBI allocate its resources in the coming years? How should we balance the needs of communities still using MARC with the needs of those that are moving to another framework?
4. Should a list be generated of the perceived strengths and shortcomings of MARC? What are some of the features that would be desirable in a "next generation" bibliographic framework -- data structure (strings, elements, linkages), functional requirements of the data (transcription, controlled access, display), language of tagging (coded, natural, or neutral)?

5. Karen Coyle reminds us that we need to use a new vocabulary when discussing these issues. Although we are accustomed to terms such as "field," "subfield," "fixed field," and "indicator," these concepts are tied to the structure of MARC. Also it would be prudent to avoid using terms from any specific data model, such as FRBR. We need to be able to talk about our metadata needs without reference to any particular record or data structure, since we currently do not know the format in which our data will live. What are these "clean" terms? Could a list be generated? And how could MARBI promote their adoption and usage?

Other Reports:**Business Meeting:**