

CORE
(A Division of the American Library Association)
Metadata and Collections 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 24-25, 2024.

Complete text of the MAC proposals and discussion papers summarized below is available via the agenda for the winter 2024 virtual MAC meetings on the MARC Advisory Committee web site: https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2024_age.html

Executive Summary:

Four proposals and five discussion papers were taken up. The four proposals passed, two of those with amendments. Three of the discussion papers were approved for fast-tracking. One discussion paper will return as a proposal. One discussion paper will return as a subsequent discussion paper.

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 proposal 2023-FT03 was approved.

Closing comment: The Annual meeting sessions will be held on June 25/26 (Tues/Wed) to better support Thursday travel opportunities for ALA Annual.

Business Meeting: [none]

LC Report: The BibFrame to MARC/MARC to BibFrame conversions were published in November. BibFrame 2.5 was recently published, with further updates to those conversions.

Other Reports: [none]

Proposal 2024-01 would alter the name and definition of Field 383 (Numeric Designation of a Musical Work) in the authority and bibliographic formats to encompass the ability to record the numeric designation of musical expressions. To that end, it proposes revision of the field name and definition, articulating values for the first indicator, and revising the definitions of existing subfields. It builds on the discussions taken up in 2023-DP07.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive but with a couple major dissensions on the concept and several disagreements on the mechanism for differentiating between work and expression level details.

The pre-meeting concerns were quickly resolved.

The proposal passed.

Proposal 2024-02 would enhance the ability to record Accessibility Content in field 341, largely to allow it to record values for any mode of access not just “alternative modes” and expand its ability to values outside the previously articulated list. To that end, it proposes revision to various field and subfield definitions in field 341, as well as the inclusion of subfields \$0 and \$1. It builds on the discussion taken up in 2023-DP05 and the resulting preference among the offered options.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive, with some reservations about the inclusion of the \$0/\$1 subfields, and some others about changes to the definition.

The pre-meeting concerns were addressed by an amendment to editorially add language about need to repeat for pairings of multiple terms with their \$0/\$1 IRIs.

The proposal passed as amended.

Proposal 2024-03 would enhance the ability to record linked data elements for Dewey Decimal Classification numbers recorded in fields 082 and 083. To that end, it proposes adding \$1 to those fields. It builds on discussion taken up in 2023-DP0, including constraining this proposal to \$1 and not \$1/\$0 together.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive, although with concerns about favoring \$1 to the exclusion of including \$0, along with resurfaced general concerns regarding the distinction in content and practice of \$0 vs \$1. There were also concerns about referencing editions of DDC and the impact on persistent URIs (although per a prior paper, DDC 23 will be the last, as DDC has transitioned to an online integrating resource).

The pre-meeting concern about the \$1/\$0 issue was resolved by an amendment to include \$0 to the proposal. Discussion also touched on the pre-meeting concern regarding the

articulation of the difference in the nature of the identifiers to record in \$0 vs \$1, as well as best practices for their deployment.

The proposal passed as amended.

Proposal 2024-04 would enhance the ability to record the local applicability of select Linking Entry fields – 773, 774, and 787 in the MARC Bibliographic format. To that end, it proposes adding subfield 5 (\$5) to those fields. It builds on discussion taken up in 2023-DP01, including constraining this proposal to those three fields.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive, with one significant dissent.

The paper occasioned no further discussion during the meeting.

The proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP01 explores mechanisms to record the local applicability of Linking Entry Complexity notes. To that end, it suggests adding subfield 5 (\$5) to Field 580 of the Bibliographic format. This paper closely aligns with 2023-DP01 and 2024-03, which addressed a similar concern for the Linking Entry fields.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive, with one set of comments regarding details with respect to linking instances of paired fields. There was broad support for fast-tracking.

In response to the linking of paired fields concern, OCLC and BIC committed to providing examples incorporating subfield 8 (\$8)

The discussion paper was approved for fast-tracking.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP02 explores mechanisms to address historical language included in transcribed elements, particularly title statements. To that end, it suggests the addition of a subfield i (\$i) to field 245 to record a statement about the source of the origin of the title/source of transcribed title, as an optional addition.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally sympathetic to the use case, but conveyed a wide variety of operational and implementation concerns with the proposed solution, including the two existing ways to record this already and the placement of the proposed subfield, along with questions about definition of harmful language, limitation to only harmful language, and others.

The introduction of the paper provided additional background to the use case. Discussion took up the question of existing/alternative mechanisms in MARC to convey this information, in particular, the data provenance subfield, subfield 7 (\$7) and exceptional

alternatives. There remained concerns that the restrictions of the solution to the title field and to identify the source of transcribed titles from non-traditional resources were too confining – that there were other elements in records and other types of resources where such a prospective solution could be warranted. There was continued acknowledgement of the need to take up the concern articulated in the use case. Ultimately, further development of the use case and exploration of other potential solutions was desired.

The discussion paper will return as a subsequent discussion paper.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP03 explores the means of enhancing the use of relationship designator elements in particular subject entry fields – Fields 647 and 648. To that end, it suggests adding subfield e (\$e) to those fields for the purpose of recording relationships such as “setting” or “depicted.”

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally supportive in terms of the appropriateness for these two fields and the inappropriateness for the remaining 6XX Index fields. The Library of Congress, while supportive, highlighted some BibFrame concerns.

The paper occasioned no further discussion during the meeting, other than the question of whether to fast-track it.

The discussion paper was approved for fast-tracking.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP04 explores supporting linked data elements in fields addressing access, use, and reproduction of resources. To that end, it proposes the addition of subfield 0 (\$0) and subfield 1 (\$1) to Fields 506 and 540 of the Bibliographic format.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally favorable, with one strong dissent. The Library of Congress raised concerns here and more broadly about the desire for clarity around the definition and use of subfields \$u, \$0, \$1.

Discussion centered around the theme of how \$u, \$0, and \$1 are deployed generally and specifically to these fields. There were additional discussions around with subfield the proposed \$0/\$1 would be paired and best practice with respect to the pairings for multiple terms.

The discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP05 explores mechanisms to update the recording of Classification Numbers Assigned in Canada to better reflect the current dynamics between Library and Archives Canada (LAC) and other libraries in Canada. To that end, it proposes revision of the definition and scope of field 055 and revision of some of the 2nd indicator values for the field.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally favorable and deferential to the needs of the paper's authors.

The authors responded to pre-meeting concerns with additional background from the history of the field's creation and the continued desirability that the field continue to be maintained so as to not disrupt current practice and legacy data. There was additional discussion around the use of an asterisk in the recorded data. There was support for fast-tracking.

The discussion paper was approved for fast-tracking.

My responses:

Proposal 2024-01 would alter the name and definition of Field 383 (Numeric Designation of a Musical Work) in the authority and bibliographic formats to encompass the ability to record the numeric designation of musical expressions. To that end, it proposes revision of the field name and definition, articulating values for the first indicator, and revising the definitions of existing subfields. It builds on the discussions taken up in 2023-DP07.

My comments: I recall pushback during discussion of the DP from the RSC about the place of such expression designations within Official RDA (basically, these numbers at the Work level are carry overs from prior standards and would not have been included in RDA if it had been developed fully independently; these “new” numbers will not be shoehorned into a system that is already out of sync with the underlying modeling). I think the use case has been sufficiently articulated by peers in MLA who are much better informed on these matters than I am. As the case for many pragmatic proposals of the past, the agnostic nature of MARC with respect to content standards governs here. How MLA will reconcile these practices with RDA will be up to them. I will support the proposal.

Proposal 2024-02 would enhance the ability to record Accessibility Content in field 341, largely to allow it to record values for any mode of access not just “alternative modes” and expand its ability to values outside the previously articulated list. To that end, it proposes revision to various field and subfield definitions in field 341, as well as the inclusion of subfields \$0 and \$1. It builds on the discussion taken up in 2023-DP05 and the resulting preference among the offered options.

The proposal aligns with discussions from the Discussion Paper stage. It addresses issues that could be viewed as shortcomings in the original articulation and definition of Field 341. I intend to support the proposal.

Proposal 2024-03 would enhance the ability to record linked data elements for Dewey Decimal Classification numbers recorded in fields 082 and 083. To that end, it proposes adding \$1 to those fields. It builds on discussion taken up in 2023-DP0, including constraining this proposal to \$1 and not \$1/\$0 together.

The proposal aligns with discussions from the Discussion Paper stage. As a matter of classification, it is outside the strict bounds of descriptive cataloging. It does seem entirely in keeping with the overall approach in MARC with respect to linked data – a larger dynamic with which CC:DA engages. In light of this and that it is typical of all members of MAC to vote on any given paper, I intend to support the proposal.

Proposal 2024-04 would enhance the ability to record the local applicability of select Linking Entry fields – 773, 774, and 787 in the MARC Bibliographic format. To that end, it proposes

adding subfield 5 (\$5) to those fields. It builds on discussion taken up in 2023-DP01, including constraining this proposal to those three fields.

The proposal aligns with discussion from the Discussion Paper stage. I find the use case particularly compelling, especially in light of the use of the 773 or 774 architecture in my employer's LMS for host-constituent relationships for bound-with volumes. The presence of the \$5 will both contextualize the presence of the 773/774/787 field in a record within a consortial database, but can also be used as a marker to prevent the local edit from being overwritten. I intend to support the proposal.

My comments for the discussion papers largely follow and are in response to the questions presented in the respective papers.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP01 explores mechanisms to record the local applicability of Linking Entry Complexity notes. To that end, it suggests adding subfield 5 (\$5) to Field 580 of the Bibliographic format. This paper closely aligns with 2023-DP01 and 2024-03, which addressed a similar concern for the Linking Entry fields.

I agree with the use case presented; the examples draw directly from those of the corresponding Linking Entry fields in Proposal 2024-03; I don't foresee any potential [negative] consequences; and I advocate for this proposal to be fast-tracked.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP02 explores mechanisms to address historical language included in transcribed elements, particularly title statements. To that end, it suggests the addition of a subfield I (\$i) to field 245 to record a statement about the source of the origin of the title/source of transcribed title, as an optional addition.

In my assessment, this is by far the paper warranting the most discussion. Conceptually, I agree with its intention. Operationally, I have several questions, none of which need impede the paper progressing to a proposal but which I feel need to be considered:

- Does this proposed use of \$i fall out of the normal deployment for \$i elsewhere in the formats?
- Are there other places where such a \$i should be incorporated for transcribed elements?
- The argument is made that the existing Field 588 for Source of Title note is insufficient. But could/should this proposed use of \$i be expanded for the generalized purpose of Source of Title (much as is asked in the paper's 6.4).
- Observation – the general idea of embedding the Source of Title metadata adjacent to the Title statement elements within the confines of the MARC 245 field has considerable appeal from a modeling perspective, above and beyond the use case articulated, and notwithstanding the existence of field 588 for that very purpose.
- Corollary observation – I am particularly intrigued, subsequent to the loss in RDA of brackets to indicate supplied titles, at the prospective value of this proposed subfield to record "Cataloger supplied title" directly in field 245. (Although one

fervently hopes that a cataloger supplied title would avoid harmful language in the first place.)

I recognize the significance and value of contextualizing statements in service to reparative cataloging; I feel, in keeping with the questions above, that there are wider concerns to address beyond the immediate use case; I'm not convinced that MAC has any place advising the developers of content standards on how best to deploy this prospective subfield or the language used in it; the question of the suitability for wider use aligns with my own concerns and would certainly provide a more broad use case for instituting the subfield; I think my preliminary questions address prospective additional issues to consider.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP03 explores the means of enhancing the use of relationship designator elements in particular subject entry fields – Fields 647 and 648. To that end, it suggests adding subfield e (\$e) and subfield 4 (\$4) to those fields for the purpose of recording relationships such as “setting” or “depicted.”

As matters of subject cataloging, this paper addresses an issue largely outside the descriptive cataloging purview of CC:DA. But as relationship designators are part of RDA, and given the tradition of participation of all MAC members in discussions, I will provide responses.

I think that the use case for the two articulated use cases is sufficiently established, is not inherently denotable through existing structures, and is already present in other Subject Added Entry fields where parallel use could be deployed; there may be further use cases but none that come readily to mind or which the absence thereof should argue against the paper; I agree that the 653, 655, 656, 657, and 658 fields would warrant another layer of discussion that would detract from the focus of this paper; none of the other Subject Added Entry fields presently have \$i and that is a field to be tilled at another time; I think the paper adequately addresses any reasonable concerns.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP04 explores supporting linked data elements in fields addressing access, use, and reproduction of resources. To that end, it proposes the addition of subfield 0 (\$0) and subfield 1 (\$1) to Fields 506 and 540 of the Bibliographic format.

I did not immediately discern the value of adding these subfields to fields that largely involve free-text content. But \$f does support the recording of controlled vocabulary and as such should be supported by corresponding subfields in support of linked data architecture.

I agree with the use case for \$0 and \$1 in fields 506 and 540; the existing \$u in 506/540 or \$l and \$r in 856 have sufficiently distinct purposes that \$0 and \$1 are justified for the intended use; I don't see any [negative] consequences.

Discussion Paper 2024-DP05 explores mechanisms to update the recording of Classification Numbers Assigned in Canada to better reflect the current dynamics between Library and

Archives Canada (LAC) and other libraries in Canada. To that end, it proposes revision of the definition and scope of field 055 and revision of some of the 2nd indicator values for the field.

I feel that LAC and its Canadian library peers are best positioned to assess the needs and solutions for a field specifically developed for their use. I respond affirmatively and positively to the discussion questions they present.