

**AALL MARBI Representative Report  
2004-2005**

**Prepared by: Karen Selden  
University of Colorado Law Library  
(with thanks to Everett Allgood, MARBI Representative to CC:DA, for assistance  
with proposal and discussion paper summaries)**

The January 2005 and June 2005 MARBI meetings continued the trend of fewer proposals and discussion papers than normal. A total of nine proposals, one discussion paper, and two Library of Congress reports were presented during the two sets of meetings. Most of the 2005 proposals involved changes to the bibliographic formats, although one involved the classification format, and one involved the holdings format. The lone discussion paper resulted in a formal proposal for the addition of subfields for relator terms/codes for subject access to images in the bibliographic format, which was passed with some revisions. One of the two proposals that failed to pass proposed defining a new subfield for non-unique or non-applicable ISBNs or LCCNs in fields 020 and 010, respectively. Instead of defining this new subfield, the committee asked the Library of Congress to refine the definition of subfield z for these fields to include these types of ISBNs and LCCNs.

Adoption of the Unicode character set in MARC 21 continues to be a topic of discussion. The Unicode character set is of particular interest to law librarians because the section (§) and paragraph (§§) symbols are available in Unicode, but not in MARC-8, which is the current character set used in MARC 21 records. Many technical issues remain to be resolved in the transition from the use of the MARC-8 character set to the use of Unicode. One of the Library of Congress reports addressed some of these issues, and resulted in a motion to disallow the use of the few non-standard Unicode characters in MARC21 records. The motion passed unanimously. In addition, it was noted that the Library of Congress has created a "Unicode-MARC" electronic discussion list ([marc-unicode@loc.gov](mailto:marc-unicode@loc.gov)), which is devoted to the technical aspects of implementing Unicode in MARC21 records.

The other Library of Congress report addressed another continuing topic of discussion, which is the impact of FRBR on the MARC 21 bibliographic, authority, and holdings formats. Other business included the decision of the MARBI Chair to create a MARBI Task Force to review and make comments on the forthcoming drafts of ***RDA: Resource Description and Access*** (the cataloging rules revision formerly known as ***AACR3***). A joint meeting of CC:DA (ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access) and MARBI to address the potential MARC21 implications of ***RDA*** will be scheduled during a future ALA conference.

Of interest to all catalogers is the announcement that the Automation Vendor Information Advisory Committee (AVIAC) plans to submit a proposal to MARBI in January 2006 for the creation of a separate subfield for 13 digit ISBNs in the 020 field of bibliographic records.

## **MARBI Proposals (Approved)**

### **Proposal 2005-01: Definition of Field 766 in the MARC 21 Classification Format**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-01.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** While law catalogers do not directly use this MARC format, the addition of this particular field will enable automated Library of Congress Classification systems, such as Classification Web, to function more seamlessly when a secondary table must be consulted to construct an LC classification number. Since the LC law classification schedules are complex and can be difficult to use, any change that will enhance the ease of use of products such as Classification Web is welcomed. *The proposal was approved, with the amendment that the field be made repeatable.*

### **Proposal 2005-03: Definition of Subfield \$2 and Second Indicator value 7 in Fields 866-868 (Textual Holdings) of the MARC 21 Holdings Format**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-03.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** 2005-03 proposes defining a subfield \$2 (Source of notation) and value 7 in the second indicator (Type of notation) of fields 866-868 in the MARC 21 Holdings Format to indicate the source of the notation used in the holdings statement. This would allow for indicating that United States Newspaper Project (USNP) guidelines are used in the textual holdings statement. *The proposal was approved, with minor editorial changes.*

### **Proposal 2005-04R: Hierarchical Geographic Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-04R.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This proposal is a revision of **Proposal 2005-04**, which was not approved at the January 2005 MARBI meeting. 2005-04R proposes expanding the definition of Field 752 (Added Entry — Hierarchical Place Name), adding new subfields to 752 and the newly defined 662 and making some current subfields repeatable to enable a hierarchical approach to subject-oriented geographic coverage. *The proposal was approved, with some revisions.*

### **Proposal 2005-05: Change of Unicode mapping for the Extended Roman "alif" character**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-05.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This proposal presents a change for the mapping from MARC 8 to Unicode for the Latin "alif" character in the Extended Latin set. The new mapping is more compatible with the diverse use of the "alif" character and with the typical representation of the character. *The proposal was approved.*

### **Proposal 2005-06: Addition of Subfields for Relator Terms/Codes for Subject Access to Images**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-06.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This paper proposes defining subfield \$e in fields 630 and 651 and subfield \$4 in fields 630, 650, and 651 in order to use relator codes and terms to enhance the retrieval of visual materials. *The proposal passed with some revisions.*

**Proposal 2005-07: Revision of subfield \$b in field 041 in the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data** (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-07.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** 2005-07 proposes changing the coding convention of field 041 (Language code) subfield \$b (Language code of summary or abstract/overprinted title or subtitle) for audiovisual materials by removing the phrase “when they [the languages of subtitles] differ from the language of the soundtrack.” It also proposes changing the terminology used for subtitles and clarifies that captions are also covered in the definition of subfield \$b. *The proposal passed with some wording changes.*

**Proposal 2005-08: Changes to accommodate IAML coded data in bibliographic fields 008/18-19, 047 and 048** (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-08.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This proposal discusses the changes needed to incorporate IAML form and genre, and medium of performance codes in MARC 21. *The changes for field 048 were passed, with some revision. MARBI tabled action on the 047 field, and requested that a new proposal addressing changes in the 047 field be presented at the January 2006 MARBI meeting. Finally, in a matter related to the proposed coding changes in the 047 field, the Library of Congress was asked to investigate the ambiguous use of fill characters in the 041 field.*

**MARBI Proposals (Not Approved)**

**Proposal 2005-02: Definition of Subfield \$y in Field 020 (International Standard Book Number) and Field 010 (Library of Congress Control Number) in the MARC 21 Formats** (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-02.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** 2005-02 proposes defining a new subfield \$y for non-unique/non-applicable ISBN/LCCN in fields 020 and 010 respectively. *The proposal was rejected, and MARBI requested that the definition of subfields a and z in the 010, 020 and 024 fields (as well as any other applicable fields) be further clarified.*

**Proposal 2005-04: Hierarchical Geographic Names in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format** (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-04.html>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** 2005-04 proposes subfields to be used in Field 662 (Subject Added Entry - Hierarchical Place Name) to allow a hierarchical approach to subject-oriented geographic coverage. The proposal was sent back for further revisions. It was eventually passed as Proposal 2005-04R.

**Discussion Papers**

**2005-DP01: Subject Access to Images**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-dp01.html>)

**Summary:** 2005-DP01 discusses the possibility of changing MARC coding in order to distinguish between indexing terms for intellectual content and indexing terms for visual depictions. MARBI suggested this paper come back with further development, though there seemed to be little support from MARBI for the option of a new block of 6XX fields. The revised paper should fully explore the possibility of relator codes, and the

suggestion that perhaps some (or all) 6XX fields perform "double-duty." *The paper was returned to MARBI as Proposal 2005-06, which passed with some revisions.*

### **Library of Congress Reports**

#### **Assessment of Options for Handling Full Unicode in Character Encodings in MARC 21 -- Part 2: Issues** (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-report01.pdf>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This report addresses the many technical issues that remain to be resolved in the transition from the use of the MARC-8 character set to the use of Unicode. *Discussions centered on this report resulted in a motion to disallow the use of the few non-standard Unicode characters in MARC21 records. The motion passed unanimously.*

#### **Using MARC 21 with FRBR: Record Configurations**

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-report02.pdf>)

**Summary & Action Taken:** This report stemmed from discussions at an IFLA FRBR conference held in May 2005 at OCLC's headquarters in Dublin, Ohio. It aims to clarify the difference between exchange records and internal record configurations, and to begin to identify any changes to the MARC 21 format needed to support FRBR-based activities. The paper also presents 2 models of how MARC 21 authority, bibliographic, and holdings records can be used with FRBR entities. *While the report was the basis for much interesting discussion, no action resulted.*