

Erica Titkemeyer  
Access: Data Mapping Standards  
Fall 2011

### **MARC**

After working through this mapping exercise it is clear what sort of flaws are inherent in the MARC standard. These issues were particularly clear in reference to existing fields in PB Core that relate to physical and technical info for digital materials. For example, there is no existing MARC field for data rate or file size. It also makes sense why new MARC formats are attempting to follow FRBR standards, as there is no way to extend information to alternative expressions. On the other hand, MARC provides a very extensive list of fields, some of which are extremely helpful in preservation, such as the scale note (507) field.

### **Dublin Core**

Of the three standards in this mapping assignment Dublin Core provided the least extensive list of fields. In many instances the refinements were still not substantial in providing enough granularity. This standard provides very straightforward and broad reaching fields, but it does not cover many necessary data fields seen in MARC or PB Core.

### **PB Core**

PB Core clearly has many fields directed towards instantiations of a catalogued object, something that neither MARC nor Dublin Core have. This is very beneficial for audiovisual material, which is what the standard was created for (public broadcasting community). Also, with fields involving intellectual property, important copyright and legal information is acquired into the catalog.