

## **AALL MARBI Representative Report 2008-2009**

Prepared by: George Prager  
New York University Law Library  
pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu

### **Introduction**

The Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) is an interdivisional joint committee of three units within the American Library Association. It is primarily responsible for the development of the MARC 21 formats. MARBI holds meetings twice a year, during ALA's Annual and Midwinter conferences. MARBI consists of nine voting members and three interns. The meetings are also attended by ex-officio representatives of national libraries and OCLC, and several dozen non-voting liaisons from ALA units and from non-ALA organizations with an interest in library automation standards. As the AALL representative to MARBI in 2009, I attended the MARBI meetings in Denver held during ALA Midwinter on January 24-25, 2009, and also the meetings held in Chicago, Illinois, on July 11-12, 2009, during the ALA Annual Meeting.

Several proposals and discussion papers relate to the mapping of RDA to MARC 21. These include: Proposals No. 2009-01/1, 2009-01/2, 2009-01/3, 2009-06/1, 2009-06/2, and 2009-06/3, and Discussion papers 2009-DP01/1, 2009-DP01/2, 2009-DP06/1, 2009-DP06/2, and 2009-DP06/3.

Internationalization of MARC 21 continues. The National Library of Spain and the Czech National Library both presented proposals to accommodate their conversion into MARC 21.

A new bibliographic field has been approved for cataloger's notes: field 588. Subfield \$x of the MARC Bibliographic 490 field has been made repeatable, so that ISSNs for both a series and a subseries may be transcribed in the same 490 field. Discussion papers on significant changes to the MARC 21 formats have been favorably received at the ALA Annual Meeting, and will be brought back as proposals at the 2010 ALA Midwinter. Two of the most noteworthy changes being considered are: Adding new fixed field codes to differentiate online resources from direct access electronic resources, and making the Cataloging source code (MARC Bibliographic 008/39) obsolete.

The agenda for the 2009 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings is available at:  
[http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2009\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2009_age.html)

The minutes for the 2009 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings are at:  
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/mw-09.html>

The agenda for the 2009 ALA Annual MARBI meetings is at:  
[http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2009\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2009_age.html)

Minutes and updated cover sheets for the 2009 Annual MARBI meetings are not yet available as of July 22, 2009.

Summaries of all the 2009 Discussion papers and Proposals are given below, with links to the full papers. I have also included any changes made to the papers during the MARBI meetings, and subsequently by the Library of Congress' Network Development and MARC Standards Office.

Following a summary of all the 2009 MARBI papers I have discussed the October 2008 release of Update no. 9 to the MARC formats, and the latest OCLC plans for implementation of new MARC fields and subfields.

**Proposal No. 2009-01/1: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-01-1.html>

New data elements will be needed in the MARC 21 Authority format to accommodate Resource Description and Access (RDA). This proposal defines new data elements for attributes relating to FRBR Group 2 entities: persons, corporate bodies, and families as defined in RDA. These attributes are sometimes also needed in the access point for the entity. Those institutions which implement RDA in MARC 21 will need to decide whether or not to include the data element in the access point only, or also to record the information in one of the newly defined fields or subfields as well. The following new fields were proposed for the Authority format: field 046, and 621x fields 621-628.

Field 046 is already available in the Bibliographic format for Special coded dates, but many of the subfields are not appropriate for the Authority format. But since the data will be broadly similar in the two formats, it was decided to use field 046 but to choose different subfields. The dates include birth, death, and period of activity dates for persons, date of establishment or termination for corporate bodies, and any significant date for families. It is recommended that dates used in field 046 be encoded in a structured way, using an ISO 8601 compliant format.

The proposal for field 628 was approved with no changes at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. For the other 62x fields, the proposal was amended during and after the Midwinter Meeting to replace a single "Dates" subfield (\$d or \$t) with \$s (Start date) and \$t (End date), to provide more controlled searching. Also, at the meeting it was decided to add three more subfields to most of the new 62X fields: \$0 (linking to another authority record), another subfield (value as yet undetermined), for source of the information, and subfield \$u for link to a source of information.

As a result of discussion of No. 2009-DP-06/3 at the ALA Annual Meeting, the field tags were changed from the 62X range to the 3XX range. Proposal 2009-01/1 was updated in July 2009 to reflect the change in field names. The new fields include:

046		Special coded dates
370	originally proposed as 621	Associated place
371	originally proposed as 622	Address
372	originally proposed as 623	Field of activity
373	originally proposed as 624	Affiliation
374	originally proposed as 625	Occupation
375	originally proposed as 626	Gender
376	originally proposed as 627	Family information
377	originally proposed as 628	Associated language

**Proposal No. 2009-01/2: New content designation for RDA elements: Content type, Media Type, Carrier Type in the MARC 21 Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-01-2.html>

Three new fields have been proposed: Field 336 (Content type), 337 (Media type), and 338 (Carrier type). These fields are intended to replace the General material designation (GMD), defined in AACR2, and used in Bibliographic field 245. This proposal has been approved as amended: "Content type" will be used in the Bibliographic and Authority formats; "Media type"

and "Carrier type" will be used in the Bibliographic and Holdings formats. The following subfields have been defined for all 3 fields: \$a Content type term, \$b Content type code, \$2 Source MARC code, \$3 Materials specified, \$6 Linkage, \$8 Field link and sequence number. Also, new values for "Carrier type" were proposed and have been approved for addition to the Bibliographic 007 field; no new values were deemed necessary for Content or Media type. Other carrier characteristics are also discussed in Proposal 2009-06/3 below.

**Proposal No. 2009-01/3: Identifying work, expression and manifestation records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-01-3.html>

Field "883": "Entity type" was proposed to identify FRBR type 1 entities: Work, expression, manifestation, and item. This proposal was rejected by the MARBI Committee. A major problem is that clean mapping of FRBR levels is difficult in our current bibliographic records, most of which contain manifestation information (such as publication information) and work information (such as subject headings), and sometimes expression level information as well (such as many uniform titles). Subsequent review by the Library of Congress (LC), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), and the British Library (BL) concurred with the MARBI decision.

**Proposal No. 2009-02: Definition of new codes for legal deposits in 008/07 (Method of Acquisition) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-02.html>

The Biblioteca Nacional de España has proposed new codes for legal deposit. This proposal was approved as amended: Code "d" will be renamed as "Deposit (Unspecified)", and the definition will be revised. Code "l" (the letter) will be added for "Legal deposit" for institutions which require that level of description; Proposed Code "v" for "Depository program" was not approved; depository programs should go under code "d". (For more background on this proposal, refer to the section on Discussion paper 2008-DP06 in my 2007-2008 Representative's Report).

**Proposal No. 2009-03: Definition of field 080 in the MARC 21 Authority Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-03.html>

The Authority format has separate fields for many other classification scheme numbers, all of which are also valid in the Bibliographic format. The Biblioteca Nacional de España has proposed the addition of field 080 for a Universal Decimal Classification number, to be used in name, series, and subject records. This field already is used in the Bibliographic format. Status: Approved.

**Proposal No. 2009-04: Addition of Codes for Map Projections in 008/22-23 (Maps) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-04.html>

The National Library of the Czech Republic has proposed two new fixed field codes for map projections. Status: Approved.

**Proposal No. 2009-05: Adding subfield \$u for Uniform Resource Identifier to field 510 (Citation/References note) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-05.html>

Use of subfield \$u has grown in recent years to include many note fields, such as MARC Bibliographic fields 505, 520, and 545, and MARC Authority field 670. This subfield offers users access to online information that may be more current and more easily maintained outside of the MARC record. This proposal was approved. A recommendation will be added that the URI follow immediately after the citation. Although this proposal originated from the Bibliographic Standards Committee, ALA/ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section, the usage will not be

restricted to rare books and manuscripts, so examples will be added for citations to other types of material.

**Proposal No. 2009-06/1: Accommodating Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K in MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-06-1.html>

and:

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/2: Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp01-2.html>

Appendix J lists possible relationships between the Group 1 FRBR entities (resource to resource): works, expressions, manifestations, and items. Appendix K lists possible relationships between the Group 2 FRBR entities (name to name): persons, families, and corporate bodies. This Discussion paper recommends that subfields \$e, \$4, and \$u be added for use in linking entry fields of the Bibliographic format. It also recommends that subfields \$4 and \$e be added to 5XX fields in the Authority format wherever they are not yet authorized. The paper was discussed at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, but because the final texts of RDA were not yet available, no decisions were made at that time. It was brought back during the ALA Annual Meeting as Proposal No. 2009-06/1. The following changes were proposed in No. 2009-06/1:

1. Adjust the definition of subfield \$i in bibliographic linking fields (767-78X) to accommodate Appendix J (resource to resource links) relationship designators in textual form. It also suggests defining \$i in bibliographic fields X00, X10, X11, X30 for Appendix J relationship designators and adjusts the \$i definition in the 5XX fields of the Authority format for both Appendix J and K (name to name links) relationship designators.
2. Define subfield \$4 in bibliographic linking fields 76X-78X for Appendix J relationship designator codes.
3. Rename Bibliographic field 787 (Nonspecific Relationship Entry) "Other relationship."

At the Annual Meeting, the proposal passed as amended. The most significant changes were: Subfield \$4 will also be added to 4XX and 5XX fields in the Authority format. The name for \$i will be changed from "Reference instruction phrase." "Relationship designator" will get into the MARC description of \$i. Field 787 will be renamed "Other relationship entry", rather than "Other relationship."

Here's an example from the paper of how \$i could be used in a 500 field of an authority record:

100 1 \$a Snodgrass, Quintus Curtius, \$d 1835-1910  
500 1 \$a Clemens, Samuel, \$d 1835-1910 \$i real identity

**Proposal No. 2009-06/2: Transcribing Series and Subseries ISSNs**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-06-2.html>

When both a main series and a subseries each have an ISSN, AACR2 instructs us to transcribe only the ISSN of the subseries. RDA allows for the recording of both (this change to RDA was approved in March 2009). Currently, subfield \$x for ISSN in the series statement is not repeatable in the MARC Bibliographic format. No. 2009-06/2 redefines subfield \$x as repeatable. The proposal was approved at the ALA Annual Meeting.

**Proposal No. 2009-06/3: New coded values for RDA media carriers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-06-3.html>

RDA associates a group of carrier types with each media type. In April 2009, several new carrier types were added by the Joint Steering Committee to the description of RDA carriers. This proposal suggests that new coded values be added to field 007/01 and field 338 subfield \$b of the Bibliographic format for these new carrier types. (The format already allows the name of the carrier to be given in subfield \$a of field 338). This proposal passed without any changes. Other carrier characteristics are also discussed in Proposal 2009-01/2 above.

**Proposal No. 2009-07: Definition of field 883 (Source of description, etc. note) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-07.html>

and:

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP02: Definition of field 588 for metadata control note in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp02.html>

The CONSER Standard Record-MARC Working Group recommended the definition of a new field for data connected with the creation or updating of a bibliographic record. By assigning this field a unique MARC tag, the field could be readily distinguished from other notes on a record of interest to public online catalog users. The information contained in this note would be primarily of interest to catalogers creating or maintaining records in a cooperative database such as OCLC. Typical notes would be for Source of the description, Description basis, Latest part consulted, Source of title, and Date viewed. While such notes appear most often in serial records, they also are used in records for multipart and for all types of integrating and electronic resources. At the MARBI Midwinter Meeting, it was suggested that the field be renamed, narrowed in scope, and made more structured, with possibly a value added to allow suppression of the field upon a case by case basis. Subfield "i" was also suggested for introductory text, as well as a \$5 for institution to which field applies. Additionally, first indicators were proposed for Blank: Free text; 0: Source of title; 1: Description based on; and 2: Latest issue consulted. Using these indicators for common messages of this type will minimize keying, lessen spelling errors, and provide useful information in a language neutral manner.

This DP was brought back at ALA Annual as Proposal No. 2009-07, but prior to the meeting, the field tag was changed in the proposal's name from 588 to 883. After much spirited discussion during the ALA Annual Meeting, the proposal passed as amended. Field 588, the original field suggested in the DP, will be used, not field 883. The field will be called "Cataloger's note" rather than "Source of description, etc. Note". Many members of the MARBI Committee thought that there was insufficient justification for adding multiple subfields for different types of notes, so only subfield \$a (repeatable) will be used for this type of information. Subfields \$5 (Institution to which field applies), \$6 (Linkage), and \$8 (Field and sequence number), will also be added. Subfield \$i was not added, nor was an indicator for suppression of the field.

**Proposal No. 2009-08: Changes to field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) for use with non-archival materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-08.html>

and:

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP03: Changing field 257 (Country of producing entity for archival films) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to include non-archival materials**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp03.html>

Despite widespread interest in access to information about the country of production for non-archival films, this information can only be given in MARC Bibliographic field 655 (Index Term—Genre/Form), with a subfield \$2 for the source of the term coded as “local.” (LC’s current position is that geographic subdivisions are not allowed after form/genre headings unless they are coded in such a manner). The Online Audiovisual Catalogers Group (OLAC) has proposed that field 257, currently restricted to information on the country of production for archival films, be broadened to include information about non-archival films as well. At the ALA Annual Meeting, this proposal passed as amended. Field 257 will be added to the format as a repeatable field, with subfield \$a repeatable as well. When a bibliographic record describes multiple films, each film will have its own 257 field. If multiple countries are involved in the co-production of a film, each country will be entered in its own \$a.

**Proposal No. 2009-09: Adding new codes to Music 008/18-19 (Form of composition) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-09.html>

The National Library of Spain has proposed adding codes for four musical forms of composition in field 008. These codes may also be used in field 047 (Form of musical composition) subfield \$a. Codes for zarzuelas, flamenco, villancicos, and lyric theater music were approved, with the name of the last mentioned changed to “Teatro lyrico.”

**Proposal No. 2009-10: Adding subfield \$3 to field 534 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-10.html>

This proposal also originated from the National Library of Spain. Field 534 is used for an “original version note” when the main portion of a bibliographic record describes a reproduction. A subfield \$3 in this field would indicate the part of the original version from which the reproduction recorded in the main body of the record was made. It would parallel the current use of this subfield in field 533. The proposal passed without changes at the ALA Annual Meeting.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/1: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp01-1.html>

and:

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP06/1: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC 21 records**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp06-1.html>

LC’s Network Development and MARC Standards Office is working on a registry for controlled lists (such as the MARC Code List for Languages), and establishing uniform resource identifiers (URIs) both for the list itself and for each value on the list. Other agencies are also developing URI lists. 2009-DP 01/1, presented at ALA Midwinter, proposes a new subfield “1” (the number “1”), for coding URIs in place of, or in addition to, using terms from a controlled vocabulary. While both \$1 and \$u may contain a URI, they differ in use. Subfield “1” links to a vocabulary value; subfield “u” most commonly links to a bibliographic entity that is the resource described, a related resource, or supplemental information.

This DP was brought back again at the ALA Annual Meeting as 2009-DP06-1. The later paper also presented an option of using MARCXML attributes to carry a URI for controlled values, in addition to “classic” MARC 21 (technically known as MARC 2709). During the Annual Meeting, it was stressed that while “RDA-compliant” records can be created without URIs, it would be worth exploring just how the URIs might be used in systems. One problem with the proposal (as expressed in both DPs), is that systems must depend upon the order of subfields to make the URI subfield meaningful. After much discussion during ALA Annual, it was decided not to bring

forward 2009-DP06-1 as a proposal. Several people on the MARBI Committee felt that a new DP was needed, to explore what is the best way of doing experimentation in MARC.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/2. See above under: Proposal No. 2009-06/1**

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP02. See above under: Proposal No. 2009-07**

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP03. See above under: Proposal No. 2009-08**

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP04: Adding codes for "online access" and "direct access" in 008 for Form of item in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp04.html>

This proposal originated from the PCC Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group, a group which I co-chaired. Soon after we began our work on the task group, it became apparent to us that records for online electronic resources are not clearly distinguished from records for direct access electronic resources in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. The paper discussed the limitations of fields currently being used in the format to indicate that the record represents an electronic resource, a resource with electronic aspects, or is accompanied/supplemented by an electronic resource. MARC fields which will be used in RDA for this purpose were also discussed. We presented three options for Form of item codes, with the first option being the preferred one:

Make code "s" (electronic) obsolete in the Form of item fields across all formats. Define new codes "r" or online and "d" for direct access.

Question 1 of the paper asked if field 008/23 should be added to the Computer File format (Leader 06 "m"), since this is the one Bibliographic format where there is no field for Form of item. Adding this field would help to more clearly mark records for online resources such as numeric data or fonts.

At the ALA Annual Meeting, there was a discussion about how networked CD-ROMs should be coded. Most Committee members felt that electronic resources should be coded for how they have been issued, not for how they are being used by an individual institution. In bibliographic utilities or union catalogs, CD-ROMs should be coded as "direct access"; in an OPAC, networked CD-ROMs might be coded however the institution wishes, either as direct or online access.

This DP will be brought back as a proposal at ALA Midwinter 2010. The MARBI Committee preferred the first option, and was also in favor of "Form of item" being added to the Computer File format. Codes "o" for online and "p" for direct access will be proposed, rather than codes "r" and "d", which are not available across all formats.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP05: Making 008/39 (Cataloging source) obsolete in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp05.html>

This code is defined in both the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats as a "one-character code that indicates the original cataloging source of the record." However, when PCC participants authenticate a bibliographic record which was not created at the national level, they change the Cataloging Source code from its existing value (usually "d" for "other") to "c" (cooperative cataloging programs) or "#" (national library agencies). There is a resulting disconnect between the definition of the code in the MARC format and its actual use: it ends up

reflecting the authoritativeness of the record in respect to national level cataloging rather than the cataloging source. Since code 040 and 042 are more reliable indicators of the source and the authoritativeness of the record, this DP proposes to make 008/39 obsolete. There was some discussion at the ALA Annual Meeting as to whether the code should be made obsolete, or a fill character should be used instead. This Discussion paper will be brought back as a proposal at ALA Midwinter 2010.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP06/1. See above under: Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/1**

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP06/2: Enhancing Field 033 and Field 518 for Place and Date of Capture in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp06-2.html>

The MARC/RDA Working Group has assessed all instances where the granularity of data in RDA and the MARC 21 formats are not in alignment. One such area is fields 033 and 518, which map to two separate RDA elements, Place of Capture (7.11.2) and Date of Capture (7.11.3). Field 033 provides more granularity and is controlled and structured; field 518 is in note form. Field 033 allows for place of capture up to and including the city level, but does not usually allow for specificity beyond this level. Such information may be given in the eye-readable 518 field: Recorded at New York University Law School, New York, July 2009. Field 518 does not reflect RDA's separation of date and place of capture, since it gives both RDA elements together in the same subfield. DP-06/2 proposes that the following subfields be added:

Field 033 \$d Name of place [beyond what can be specified in the codes]  
Field 518 \$d Date of capture; \$i Introductory phrase; \$p Place of capture

The German National Library would also like \$0 and \$2 added to field 033 to control the newly proposed \$d Name of place. These control fields would link to an authority file. This Discussion paper will be brought back as a proposal at ALA Midwinter 2010.

**Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP06/3: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Format for works and expressions**

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009-dp06-3.html>

This paper offers definitions of new data elements for attributes of works and expressions as defined in RDA. Not all the elements are needed for MARC 21 RDA records; some of them are intended to be used at first for FRBR experimentation, such as creating bibliographic records at the work or expression level. Like the elements defined in Proposal No. 2009-01/1 (above), some of these elements may also be needed in the access point for the entity. The new data elements needed in the Authority and Bibliographic formats include: Other distinguishing characteristics of the work [or] expression, Medium of performance, Numeric designation of a musical work, and Key. Form of work is also needed for the Authority format, and its placement in the Bibliographic format needs to be determined (field 653 or 655 could be used). In this Discussion paper, the fields for these new elements are indicated by letters, such as "AAA" for Form of work; the consideration of which MARC fields to use was deferred to the MARBI meetings at ALA Annual. At that meeting, the Committee voted to define the new authority fields in the 33X range. (As a related change, the as yet unimplemented 62X authority fields approved in Proposal No. 2009-01/1 will be changed to the 37X range). Fields 653 or 655 will be proposed for the Authority Form of work when this DP returns as a proposal at ALA Midwinter in 2010. Other RDA elements will be considered for inclusion into the Authority format, such as Signatory to a treaty, Title of a person, Fuller form of name, etc.

### **MARC Formats Interest Group (MFIG) Meeting July 11, 2009**

This meeting consisted of two very informative presentations. The first speaker was Reinhold Heuvelmann, a MARC Advisory Committee liaison from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, who gave a fascinating presentation entitled “The German and Austrian Version of MARC 21 : Standard Compliance, Flexibility, and Implementations”. The second speaker was Richard N. Leigh, audiovisual cataloger at the University of Maryland and chair of the MFIG, who spoke on “Fun with Crosswalks : the Challenges (and Joys?) of Crosswalking out of MARC Formats”.

### **MARC 21 Update No. 9: Full and Concise available online**

As announced on the MARC listserv on Oct. 31, 2008 (6:11 pm), Update No. 9 (October 2008) has been made available on the MARC website ([www.loc.gov/marc/](http://www.loc.gov/marc/)). It is fully incorporated into the documentation for each of the online Full and Concise formats -- the Bibliographic, Authority, Holdings, Classification, and Community Information formats. The documentation includes changes made to the MARC 21 formats resulting from proposals which were considered at the MARBI Meetings in 2008.

The changes are indicated in red. Format changes for each of the five formats are listed in separate appendices. Users are cautioned not to begin using the new features in the format until 60 days from the date of the announcement. For background information on the changes enumerated in the appendices, see the AALL MARBI Representative Report for 2007-2008 at: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/reports/Marbi2008.pdf>

### **MARC 21 Format Changes to Accomodate RDA (Draft)**

LC has posted new documentation listing all the MARC 21 format changes related to RDA since the MARC 2008 Update (No. 9) at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/formatchanges-RDA.html>.

As of July 22, 2009, this document has not yet been updated to indicate that the 62X authority fields were changed after the ALA Annual Meeting to 37X fields. The proposed subfield \$1 mentioned in the document for value URIs was not approved at the recent MARBI Meeting. Information on the new fields will be published as part of the MARC 2009 Update (No. 10) later this year.

### **OCLC-MARC Format Changes in 2009**

As announced on the OCLC-CAT listserv on July 22, 2009 (9:38 AM), “On August 16, 2009, OCLC plans to implement the changes related to the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2009. This will include MARC 21 Updates No. 8 (October 2007) and No. 9 (October 2008), MARC Code List changes since July 2008, and user and OCLC staff suggestions. OCLC Technical Bulletin 257, which presents the details, is now available at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/257/default.htm>.” The most significant changes include:

Linking ISSNs (ISSN-L) in bibliographic, authority, and holdings fields 022.

Implementing the repeatable 260 field. (For more information on how the repeatable 260 fields should be used, refer to the draft document of June 11, 2009 entitled: LC/PCC guidelines for MARC 21 repeatable 260 field. Available at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/260-repeat-2009-June11.pdf> ). OCLC recommends not using the repeatable 260 field until the draft version of the PCC guidelines are finalized and the revised Library of Congress Rule Interpretation 1.4 is issued. It will be interesting—to say the least, to see how and when the repeatable 260 field is implemented by our OPAC vendors.

Making field 440 obsolete and converting appropriate 4XX/8XX combinations. (For information on PCC series policy, see: Series policies and practices 2006-2009 at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/seriesPCC.html>).

Defining new subfields in field 502 for dissertation details (degree, school, date, etc.).

Implementing new field 542 for Information Relating to Copyright Status.

Implementing subfield \$0 (zero) for the Authority Record Control Number in 28 bibliographic fields and three authority fields. OCLC does not want \$0 used in the master records (the control headings function should be used instead). Local authority identifiers may be entered in subfield \$0 locally.