Thank you for joining us!
We will begin at 1:00 PM Eastern Time

Attendees are in listen-only mode

AskQC@oclc.org (Ask Quality Control) is the longstanding email address to which catalogers can send questions to OCLC Metadata Quality staff about cataloging policies, standards, and practices.
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How the OCLC-MARC Update Process Works, Or, “I’m Just a Field”
How the OCLC-MARC Update Process Works

What we now know as MARC 21 did not spring fully-formed from the brow of Henriette Avram in 1968 at the Library of Congress. It evolved slowly and painstakingly, code-by-code, field-by-field, subfield-by-subfield over the past fifty years. By the time what we now call WorldCat became available in 1971, MARC was already changing.

Between 1973 and 2013, most of the changes made to MARC went through a group called the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), which included the Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information, mercifully shortened to and familiarly known as MARBI. MARBI was an interdivisional committee of the American Library Association (ALA) with representation from the divisions now known as the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), the Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), and the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA).

In 2013, MAC was revamped, no longer sponsored by any ALA division (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/index.html).
MAC continued to advise the MARC Steering Committee, consisting of representatives from the Library of Congress (LC), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), British Library (BL), and Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB), and to serve as a discussion forum on the MARC formats and MARC data.
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Just like MARBI before it, the current MAC meets at every ALA Annual Conference and Midwinter Meeting. Unlike MARBI, MAC members, from various national libraries, library organizations, and specialist communities, all have a vote in making changes to MARC.

National Libraries:
- British Library
- Biblioteca Nacional de España
- Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
- Library and Archives Canada
- Library of Congress
- National Agricultural Library
- National Library of Australia
- National Library of Medicine

Other Constituencies:
- CC:DA
- SAC
- MAGIRT
- AALL
- ARLIS/NA
- ACRL/STS
- AVIAC
- ISSN Review Group
- Music Library
- Association (MLA)
- OCLC
- OLAC
- PCC
- PLA
- SAA
- VRA
• Library and Archives Canada
• Library of Congress
• National Agricultural Library
• National Library of Australia
• National Library of Medicine

Library association committees and groups, networks, and communities of users:
• ALA, CaMMS, Cataloging Committee: Description and Access (CC:DA)
  ALA, CaMMS, Subject Access Committee (SAC)
  ALA, CaMMS, Maps and Geographic Information Round Table (MAGIRT)
• American Association of Law Librarians (AALL)
• Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA)
• Association of College and Research Libraries, Science and Technology Section (ACRL/STS)
• Automation Vendors Information Advisory Committee (AVIAC)
• ISSN Review Group
• Music Library Association (MLA)
• OCLC
• Online Audio-Visual Catalogers (OLAC)
• Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)
• Public Library Association (PLA)
• Society of American Archivists (SAA)
• Visual Resources Association (VRA)

The MAC Terms of Reference (http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/MAC_ToR.html) make clear that any user of MARC 21 may submit discussion papers or proposals, regardless of one’s affiliation with any of the constituent entities.
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“I’m Just a Field”

When I started thinking about how to explain the OCLC-MARC Update process, it occurred to me to follow a particular MARC element through the whole sequence of events, from idea to reality, not unlike what Schoolhouse Rock did with “I’m Just a Bill.” It turned out that using the image of “Bill” might have been unconstitutional. So instead, we’ve substituted an image of one of the biggest “bills” of all, The United States Constitution, and encourage you to imagine the animated Schoolhouse Rock “Bill” wearing a button identifying him as “Field” and singing “I’m just a field.” Between the Constitution and LC, we’re still on Capitol Hill and we’re still stuck in committee, the MARC Advisory Committee.
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The Idea

The creation of a new MARC element, be it a new field, new indicator, new subfield, or what have you, begins with an **Idea**. The element we’ll follow actually began here at OCLC, as a result of the work on Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST) within OCLC Research (https://www.oclc.org/research/themes/data-science/fast.html).

Without going into a lot of detail here, FAST heightened awareness of a longstanding ambiguity in MARC 21, the need to differentiate subject access points for named events that **cannot** be regarded as responsible agents (such as earthquakes or wars) from named events that **can** be regarded as responsible agents (such as conferences or meetings).
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The Discussion Paper

Those within OCLC who were most familiar with the issues got together to draw up a Discussion Paper for the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC). In the paper, “Coding Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats,” they laid out the context of the problem they were trying to solve and, in this case, two possible options. In December 2015, OCLC submitted the discussion paper for consideration at the MAC
meetings during the 2016 ALA Midwinter Meeting.

As you can see in the “Status/Comments” section, a straw poll of MAC members revealed a clear preference for one of the options, as well as other suggestions for improving the eventual proposal.

Historical links to MARC Discussion Papers from 1995 to the present are available on the MARC Standards website at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/list-dp.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/list-dp.html).
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The proposal

Taking the results and recommendations emerging from the MARC Advisory Committee, the OCLC stakeholders revised the discussion paper into a Proposal, “Defining New X47 Fields for Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats.” It addressed the concerns raised in the MAC discussion and provided much more detail about the set of proposed set of fields.
Again as you can see in the “Status/Comments” section, the proposal was approved with the proviso that OCLC would “generate and distribute a list of LCSH headings which are modelled as events in FAST.”

Historical links to MARC Proposals from 1995 to the present are available on the MARC Standards website at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/list-p.html.
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The MARC 21 Update

Some months following the MAC meetings at ALA, the Library of Congress announces a new **MARC 21 Update** with the official versions of new and changed MARC elements incorporated into the respective current “base edition” of MARC 21:

- Bibliographic, February 1999
- Authority, October 1999
- Holdings, January 2000
- Classification, January 2000
- Community Information, January 2000

Historical links to all of the MARC 21 Format Updates from 2000 to the present are available on the MARC
How the OCLC-MARC Update Process Works

The OCLC Technical Bulletin

Usually once a year during the third quarter of the calendar year, OCLC issues a Technical Bulletin that announces the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings format and MARC Code changes to be implemented. Most of the changes are from the two most recent MARC 21 Updates and all MARC Codes announced by LC in Technical Notices issued since the most recent OCLC-MARC Update. Additionally, we often include other changes requested by members of the OCLC cooperative and suggested by OCLC staff. With the most recent OCLC-MARC Update a few weeks ago, we have also begun issuing OCLC WorldCat Validation Release Notes, which may be found on the OCLC website at https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Release_notes.

Ordinarily, within a few weeks of the release of the OCLC Technical Bulletin, we install the OCLC-MARC Update and
announce the implementation via an array of discussion lists, the OCLC Connexion Message of the Day, and elsewhere.
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As soon as an OCLC-MARC Update is implemented, we begin the process of making changes to the OCLC documents *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* and *OCLC-MARC Local Holdings Format and Standards*. 
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The OCLC Indexing

In general, changes to WorldCat indexing occur on a schedule independent of the rest of the OCLC-MARC Updates. As a result, changes to the *Searching WorldCat Indexes* document are not made until later, once the appropriate changes have been made to the indexes.
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The OCLC Authority Files

The OCLC document *Authorities: Format and Indexes* (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/Authority_records/Authorities_Format_and_indexes) gives the full information about the valid authority fields and the indexes for each of the files. OCLC now maintains what amounts to two sets of validation rules for its authority files.

More familiar is the long-established set of rules that govern OCLC’s version of the traditional Library of Congress-Name Authority Cooperative (LC-NACO) Authority File. These validation rules, covering LC names and LC subjects, conform to the *LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data*, popularly known as “The Blue Pages” (https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcmarcswpl.pdf). Validation changes to the LC-NACO Authority File have to be coordinated among LC, OCLC, and each of the other NACO nodes. LC has delayed making any such changes
for several years now, although there have been signs that they could be happening in the not-too-distant future.
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The OCLC Authority Files

The other, newer, and less-familiar set of OCLC Authority validation rules covers all of the non-LC authority files that are made available only through OCLC’s Record Manager:

- **Canadiana (Autorités de noms Canadiana en français)**
  - Source: Bibliothèque et Archives Canada
  - The Canadiana Name Authorities in French is used by Library and Archives Canada (LAC) and other Canadian libraries when creating bibliographic descriptions in French.

- **GND Germany Authority File**
  - Source: Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (German National Library)
• GND is an Integrated Authority File that contains over 9 million records for Persons, Corporate bodies, Conferences and Events, Geographic Information, Topics and Works.

• Māori Subject Headings File
  • Source: Ngā Upoko Tukutuku
    • Māori Subject Headings provide subject access in te reo Māori to materials for and/or about Māori.

• MeSH (Medical Subject Headings)
  • Source: U.S. National Library of Medicine
    • Subject authority file: 630,000 records

• NTA Names (Nederlandse Thesaurus van Auteursnamen)
  • Source: Koninklijke Bibliotheek (National Library of the Netherlands)
    • Name authority file: 2,571,933 records representing only personal names.

The OCLC document Authorities: Format and Indexes (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/Authority_records/Authorities_Format_and_indexes) also gives the full information about the valid authority fields and the indexes for each of these files. Changes from OCLC-MARC Updates may take some time to filter out to this document. As with bibliographic indexing, authority indexing occurs on a schedule independent of the rest of the OCLC-MARC Updates. As a result, changes to the Authorities: Format and Indexes document are not made until later, once the appropriate changes have been made to the authority indexes.
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The MARC Codes

New MARC Codes are announced by the Library of Congress in irregularly-scheduled Technical Notices, on the average of about 11 or 12 per year. Each LC Technical Notice includes the proviso: “The codes should not be used in exchange records until 60 days after the date of this notice to provide implementers time to include newly-defined codes in any validation tables.” In recent years, OCLC has tried to validate new MARC Codes at the next opportunity for installation of validation changes. Ordinarily, that happens once each quarter, but that often varies. Sometimes that can be more quickly than sixty days, but sometimes longer.

In the past, OCLC has announced just once each year in its Technical Bulletin all of the new MARC Codes validated since the most recent OCLC-MARC Update, even though some codes have been valid for months by that time. As mentioned earlier, we now have the new mechanism of WorldCat Validation Release Notes and Known Issues.
(https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_validation_release_notes_and_known_issues), where we have begun announcing and linking to the LC Technical Notices that have been implemented each quarter. That means not just more timely MARC Code implementations, but also more timely notifications that they may now be used in WorldCat.
The MARC Update Timeline

- 6 Months: Idea
- 6 Months: MARC Discussion Paper
- 6 Months: MARC Proposal
- 6 Months: MARC Update
- 6 Months: OCLC-MARC Update
- Implementation in WorldCat

The MARC Code Timeline

- Days or Weeks: MARC Code Requested
- AC Technical Notice
- Up to 4 Months: WorldCat Validation
- Implementation in WorldCat
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The MARC Update Timeline

This really rough timeline is a worst-case scenario, but certainly not unusual. From an element’s idea stage through its implementation in WorldCat as part of an OCLC-MARC Update can take as long as two years. Each of these six-month periods may be longer or shorter, depending upon many circumstances both in the MARC Advisory Committee or at OCLC. Discussion Papers may have to be revised more than once. Proposals may be rejected and need to be reworked. Occasionally, a Discussion Paper may be fast-tracked and be voted upon as though it were a Proposal, which shortens the timeline.

The MARC Code Timeline

The timeline for new MARC Codes tends to be much more brief and flexible because they don’t need to go through
the MAC approval process. The typical time from the request of a new MARC Code until it can be implemented in WorldCat would typically be four to six months, again depending upon many factors at LC and at OCLC.
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The Results: MARC Update Timeline

The idea for Bibliographic field 647, Subject Added Entry--Named Event, became the subject of a MARC Discussion Paper submitted to MAC in December 2015, for discussion at the MAC meeting at ALA Midwinter in January 2016, the next month. The MARC Proposal was submitted in May 2016 and was approved the next month at ALA Annual in June 2016. LC issued the MARC 21 Bibliographic Update in November 2016. The field was implemented in WorldCat in early September 2017 as part of the 2017 OCLC-MARC Update. This entire cycle took roughly 21 months...
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The Results: MARC Update Timeline

...at which point you can see such Bibliographic fields as these in WorldCat:

647 7 Bunker Hill, Battle of þc (Boston, Massachusetts : þd 1775) þ2 fast þ0 (OCoLC)fst01710024

647 7 Hurricane Katrina þd (2005) þ2 fast þ0 (OCoLC)fst01755264

647 7 Eruption of Mount Saint Helens þc (Washington : þd 1980) þ2 fast þ0 (OCoLC)fst01353018

This would be a typical cycle for the odd-numbered MARC 21 Bibliographic Updates issued late in a calendar year.
(September through December). Even-numbered MARC 21 Bibliographic Updates issued in the second quarter of a calendar year (April through May) would usually have a timeline shorter by roughly four to seven months. But remember that there are lots of variables.
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The Results: MARC Code Timeline

As noted earlier, the timeline for new MARC Codes is much shorter because there are fewer steps, but it is also subject to many variables both at LC and at OCLC.

Let’s look at one new MARC Genre/Form Code and Term Source Codes (http://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/genre-form.html) that was implemented as part of the 2018 OCLC-MARC Update in early October 2018.

Code “gtmm” is for the list of Genre Terms for Makerspace Materials (https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc1132759/), which the University of
North Texas made available online on April 4, 2018. UNT requested a MARC Code, which was announced in the LC Technical Notice dated May 25, 2018 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/tn180525src.html). The code was implemented in WorldCat as part of the OCLC-MARC Update 2018 in early October 2018. That was roughly six months in all. But again, that can be longer or shorter depending upon many factors...
gtmm: Genre terms for makerspace materials

655 7 Electronic textiles. ‡2 gtmm
655 7 3D printers. ‡2 gtmm
655 7 Cameras (DSLR) ‡2 gtmm
655 7 Video cameras. ‡2 gtmm
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The Results: MARC Code Timeline

...Now you could see fields such as these 655s in WorldCat:

655 7 Electronic textiles. ‡2 gtmm
655 7 3D printers. ‡2 gtmm
655 7 Cameras (DSLR) ‡2 gtmm
655 7 Video cameras. ‡2 gtmm
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Thank you!
Send cataloging policy questions at anytime to:
askqc@oclc.org

Session links available at:
oc.lc/askqc

Next Virtual AskQC Office Hours:
We will resume office hours in January.
Look for information posted to OCLC-CAT and
the Record Manager Community Center.