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Provided below are summaries of the proposals and discussion papers considered by the MAC during virtual meetings scheduled on January 28-29, 2025.

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/mw2025_age.html>

Executive Summary:

Two proposals and four discussion papers were taken up. The one proposal was rejected and one proposal. One of the discussion papers were approved for fast-tracking. Two discussion paper will return as a proposals. 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.

The Chair recognized the contributions of the late Reinhold Heuvelmann of the Deutsche National Bibliothek (German National Library) and longtime committee member representing the German Language Cataloging Community) who passed away this past fall. The Chair invited members to share their memories.

Fast track proposal 2024-FT04 (from 2024-DP07, to establish $3 in fields 508 and 511) was approved.

Closing comment: The Annual meeting sessions will be held on June 25/26 (Wed/Thurs), just before ALA.

**Business Meeting**: [none]

**LC Report**: On the website there is a new paper about [Modern MARC](https://www.loc.gov/marc/ModernMARC-index.html) that outlines some of the changes in LC’s bibliographic record entry. Some of the highlights are:

* the elimination of 007 entry, except for the first 2 positions, in favor of the new 3XX fields to eliminate redundancy and leverage the use of identifiers.
* the 008/006 will remain
* there are changes related to the presence of ISBD punctuation
* there will be changes for non-Latin scripts, with increased preference for vernacular transcription in transcribed fields and changes to the use of the 880
* historically, publication information went into a single 260; these will be split out moving forward [that is, as legacy records are processed through BibFrame]
* similarly, field 490 with multiple statements will be split out into multiple 490 fields
* the genre form in LCSH entries as $v will be moved to 655 fields

That is a capsule of what is in the paper and people are encouraged to read it.

**Other Reports**: [none]

**Proposal 2025-01** would modify Fields 368, 376, and 381 of the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats to add subfields $i and $4 to record relationship information between the primary entity of the record and the attributes recorded in those fields. It builds on the discussions taken up in 2024-DP09.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were mixed. There remain reservations regarding privacy concerns over the data that could be recorded in these fields. The examples are particularly problematic, even among those who conceptually agree with the proposal, both with respect to the aforementioned privacy concerns and the structuring of the relationships with the recorded data. There is also concern about the deployment of field 381 to provide a form of subject access to Works.

During discussion, pre-meeting comments were re-iterated. As articulated, there remain concerns with privacy issues around the potential data being recorded and there are concerns about the relationships that are being paired with the recorded data in the examples included in the paper. The counterpoint was that the fields exist now, regardless of existing concerns, and that there is benefit to including the relationship information. The PCC Privacy Task Force has recently submitted its report and the examples could be reworked to take its findings into consideration. The different dynamics between the attributes for people and family (fields 368 and 376), as distinct from those for works or expressions (field 381), were raised as possible justification to split the paper to address them separately. Ultimately, given the anticipated impact of the PCC Privacy Task Force’s findings on improving the examples and implicit guidance on use of the fields, a consensus was arrived at to return the paper to the authors for revision.

The proposal failed.

**Proposal 2025-02** would improve the dynamics for recording numberings associated with first names (aka “regnal” numbers) to redefine subfield $b in X00 fields of the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic formats. This redefinition would de-Westernize the terminology and specification for the subfield, as well as support the recording in scripts other than Roman numerals the $b entry in reference fields (aka 400 and 500).

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were supportive.

There was minimal discussion, aside from agreement to remove one of the examples.

The proposal passed.

**Discussion Paper 2025-DP01** explores mechanisms to flag the source of title entries that would appear pejorative, and reflective of institutional bias if the source were otherwise assumed to have been assigned by the institution. To that end, it suggests adding subfield z ($z) to the Field 245 field of the Bibliographic format. This paper resumes discussions explored in Discussion Paper 2024-DP02, and responds to concerns associated with that initial paper.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were supportive with appreciation for the refinements over the previous paper. Operationally, there is consensus that the proposed subfield z ($z) should be positioned at the end of the field, although there were reservations expressed about recording this data in brackets. There was general consensus that the terminology deployed in $z should be left to best practices guidance from the respective cataloging communities. There were various other questions and solutions suggested.

During discussion, respondents thanked the authors for reworking the paper to address previous concerns. There was discussion around cataloging conventions in response to pre-meeting questions about the use of square brackets – the ISBD and the DCRM both support this convention, while DACS does not, and RDA defers to the respective string-encoding standards. The use of $7 for data provenance was raised as an existing alternative solution, although the ability of systems to leverage this was questioned, particularly their ability to selectively use it in displays solely for this situation. The impacts of disagreements over the course of time regarding what constitutes problematic language and across cataloging agencies using the same record are also issues revisited from pre-meeting comments. The authors will seek to address these.

The discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2025-DP02** explores mechanisms to address the encoding of Remote Sensing Images and Aerial Photographs. To that end, it suggests the addition in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format of a new 008/25 (and 006/08) code value as an option for such resources.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were generally sympathetic to the use case. There is consensus that relying on the “other” categorization was undesirable. Comments conveyed a wide variety of operational and implementation concerns with the proposed solution, including the existence of code values for this content in other control fields and the possibility of leveraging genre terminology.

During discussion, the need to address the question was acknowledge but the complexity of the overall situation was also raised. There is broad agreement that using the value of “z” for “Other” is inadequate. There are complex dynamics regarding aerial photographs in the context of remote sensing images and regarding remote sensing images in the context of cartographic resources. RDA is fairly broad in the categories of image sources – sonar, radar, LIDAR – that can constitute a remote sensing image. Relying on the use of genre terminology to aid in differentiating and collocating records for such resources is not entirely suitable as a solution as some agencies don’t use genres at all and the use of genres as a facet in faceted systems would be less effective than the typically more prominent facets drawn from the constrained selection of broadly applicable options in a control field. There was strong support in the committee and agreement by the authors to collaborate with the cartographic cataloging community to develop any future paper.

A future paper will be forthcoming, most likely a follow-on Discussion Paper.

**Discussion Paper 2025-DP03** explores the means of better identifying item-specific genre dynamics. To that end, it suggests defining Field 655 (Index Term-Genre/Form) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were mixed. There was appreciation for addressing the use case. There were operational concerns expressed by various constituencies, ranging from the preferability of other solutions, the suitability of recording item-level data in the Holdings format, the complications of recording item-specific data in a Holding record for multiple items, the extension to inclusion of 7XX fields, to the question of whether such data in the Holdings format would be able to be indexed or displayed.

During discussion, the place of item-specific information in the holdings record was identified as just as problematic as in the bibliographic record. Solutions for connecting such item-specific information to the respective individual item(s) within a holding record for multiple copies were discussed, focusing on use of $3 or multiple holding records. There may be insights to gain from the corresponding NISO and ISO standards. There is a long-standing desire by the serials community to better leverage the Holdings format by enhancing the data recorded there. Record sharing concerns were raised both from perspective of the presence of institution specific data in records serving multiple institutions and the transmission and ingest of such data when shared with other institutions. The rare book cataloging community is exploring the use of field 842 to similar ends and to facilitate linked data enhancements. There were other observations regarding the distinctiveness of genres/field 655 in the wider cluster of subject headings/6XX fields. It would be helpful, with the prospect of the addition of 7XX fields, to know how broadly the authors might intend to pursue the path of Holding record enhancements. The authors welcome collaboration with RBMS and other interested parties.

The discussion paper will return as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper 2025-DP04** explores the means of providing data provenance for Persistent Identifiers recorded in Subfield g ($g) of Fields 856 and 857. To that end, it proposes redefining Subfield $7 to accommodate its use with Subfield $g in Fields 856 and 857.

The Chair summarized pre-meeting comments, which were in favor of addressing this oversight that arose during the re-insertion of $g in 2022. There are a few minor adjustments noted.

Discussion was minimal, with some minor editorial observations and a desire for addressing an example for a blended situation where some URI’s are open-access and others are closed. There was consensus that these could be editorially addressed through a fast-track process.

The discussion paper was approved for fast-tracking.