

Report of the Sub-commission on UNIMARC

2012 Montreal IAML Conference Cataloguing commission: Sub-commission on UNIMARC Working meetings (23 and 27 July)

On 23 and 27 July 2012, the IAML Sub-commission on UNIMARC gathered in Montreal, for its tenth annual meeting which was held during the 61th IAML annual Conference. The current chair Isabelle Gauchet Doris (Centre de documentation de la musique contemporaine, Paris) was represented by Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (Ufficio Ricerca Fondi Musicali, Biblioteca Nazionale Brai-dense, Milan), past chair. In attendance were also: Sandrine Ferrer (CNSMD Lyon), Elizabeth Giu-liani (Bibliothèque nationale de France), Sergey Konaev (Boshoi Music Library Archive), Mary Wedgewood (Library of Congress) and Jay Weitz (OCLC, member of the PUC).

This published version of the report is intentionally devoted to the interview of Jay Weitz by Mas-simo Gentili-Tedeschi as it was the main content of the first session and dealt with many key issues (the 2nd session was a more 'traditional' working meeting).

The full minutes of the two sessions are available online on the IAML website, on the page of the Unimarc sub-commission

(www.iaml.info/organization/commissions/cataloguing/unimarc#activities).

Isabelle Gauchet Doris

The "Interview" with Jay Weitz at the session of the IAML Sub-commission for UNIMARC, Mont-real, 23 July 2012

A summary by Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi

MGT

Jay Weitz, you are one of the outstanding figures in the library field, as you are member of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) for many years, and you have an impressive CV. It is a pleasure to see you once more at a IAML conference, and an honour to have you at this session of the Sub-commission on UNIMARC and music. We would like to take advantage of your presence to know what is going on and what this Sub-commission may do in the future to collaborate with the PUC.

JW

The PUC has recently received several proposals and is currently discussing them.

The work on field Medium of Performance (UNIMARC 146) has been a good one, and codes have been transferred to MARC21. The ability to use the IAML Musical Form codes (UNIMARC 128) in MARC 21 field 047 (Form of Musical Composition Code) and the IAML codes for field 146 in MARC 21 field 048 (Number of Musical Instruments or Voices Code) was added to MARC 21 in 2006 and 2005, respectively.

MGT

What about the proposals on work and expression?

JW

Most proposals have been accepted; it would be desirable to receive feedback, and reactions from users.

We are still working on some proposals, but we focus mainly on what is more useful for more people.

A UNIMARC update is expected in about one month.

The UNIMARC fields that have been created or altered to accommodate Work, Expression, and Manifestation are too numerous to mention, but they include: UNIMARC/Bibliographic 101, 105, 122, 123, 127, 128, 180, 182, 506, 507, 576, 577; UNIMARC/Authority 101, 122, 127, 128, 180, 230, 231, 232, 240, 241, 242, 333, 430, 431, 432, 440, 441, 442, 500, 501, 502, 510, 511, 512, 520, 521, 522, 530, 531, 532, 540, 541, 542, 600, 601, 602, 606, 607, 610, 616, 617, 631, 632, 641, 642, 730, 731, 732, 740, 741, 742.

MGT

Free access to the UNIMARC documentation would benefit all users groups, and could increase the use of UNIMARC itself; are there negotiation between IFLA and the publishers?

JW

According to IFLA's "open access policy", all documentation should be freely accessible a stated injunction period after publication by SAUR, but until now that has not happened. Negotiations are underway, there is much tension now, and any support to the IFLA action is welcome.

MGT

Is there anything that IAML might do to help? Maybe a letter of support?

JW

A letter of support sent to the PUC secretary and to the Director of the IFLA UNIMARC core activity may help.

MGT

Are there any repercussion on the UNIMARC format from the implementation of RDA?

JW

It depends on users needs; but there are also alignments with MARC21 that will probably be necessary: if UNIMARC must be aligned with MARC21 there will be changes.

There are also issues of best practices in the application of RDA.

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Access Points for Expressions Task Force is doing tests of best practices at the expression level: how deep to go into the details for the identification of every single expression. Our report is due 2012 October 15.

BIBCO (the Monographic Bibliographic Record Program of the PCC) is preparing standards for RDA. RDA will be implemented at the Library of Congress on 31 Marc 2013, but they are not "rules", they are guidelines, and there are people that work on them in many different environments.

MGT

The RDA toolkit includes a mapping table RDA/MARC21 that shows many paragraphs mapped with a general note field or without a corresponding MARC field; is it an ongoing process?

JW

MARBI (Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information) is taking care of the problem, establishing new fields, subfields and code values.

The first issue is the application of ISBD Area 0 (content) and the corresponding RDA element. Then there are new structured fields, e.g. for formats of video-recording.

In MARC 21, many new elements have been defined to accommodate RDA. ISBD Area 0 has been implemented in MARC 21 as the repeatable fields 336 (Content Type), 337 (Media Type), and 338 (Carrier Type), each with a controlled list of terms and codes. Again, the other MARC 21 changes are too numerous to mention, but include new fields or subfields implemented in 340 (Physical Medium), 344 (Sound Characteristics), 345 (Projection Characteristics of Moving Image), 346 (Video Characteristics), 380 (Form of Work), 381 (Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression), 382 (Medium of Performance), 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work), 384 (Key).

ISBD Area 0 is also a new development in UNIMARC; there have been several proposals from the Comité français UNIMARC (CfU) for the UNIMARC equivalents of MARC 21 fields 336, 337, and 338. So far they have been discussed but postponed for action, waiting for the CfU to decide what will work best in coordinating the requirements of ISBD, FRBR, and RDA with their own needs.

MGT

I have in mind one RDA element that has no MARC21 mapping, except a note, while there is a specific UNIMARC coded field; it is the RDA element 7.20 (Format of notated music), containing a list of controlled terms, just like the UNIMARC 125 field, including codes for the format of music. Is there anything that may be done to face this issue?

JW

IAML might propose to MARBI the creation a new MARC21 field corresponding to the UNIMARC coded field.

There are other subjects where there might be a mutual advantage from reciprocal information; among them the Genre-Form thesaurus that the Library of Congress and the Music Library Association are implementing.

RDA 7.20 is actually accounted for in MARC 21 in field 300 subfield \$a, in spite of RDA's lack of a mapping. We really have to wait for the music community's best practices document, but it could also be argued that MARC 21 field 340 subfield \$k (Layout) and/or 381(Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression) subfield \$a could be appropriate. Also, it's important to note that D.2.1 Mapping of MARC 21 Bibliographic to RDA purposely excludes all MARC 21 00X fields, including the 008. The Music 008/20 and 006/03 (Format of music) has codes for most of the notated musical format terms listed in 7.20. At the MARBI meeting in June 2012, MARC Proposal 2012-07 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-07.html>), which was accepted, defined a new code "k" for vocal score and redefined several codes, discouraging their use in RDA records. There is also a CC:DA Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3 (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/tf-MRData3.pdf>) that is looking at possible improvements to how extent data is recorded. The report, discussed at the June 2012 CC:DA meeting, is going to be reworked into a discussion paper for the JSC and comments will be solicited from other constituencies. This could be another opportunity for the Sub-Commission to present its own suggestions and/or to cooperate with the MARC 21 music community to make sure that the needs of music are met.