Minutes of the 22nd Meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee
2011 March 14-15
National Library of Portugal, Lisbon

Present: Ms. Inês Cordeiro (National Library of Portugal), Director of the UNIMARC Core Activity
Ms. Rosa Galvão (National Library of Portugal)
Mr. Alan Hopkinson (Middlesex University, UK), Chair
Mr. Philippe Le Pape (ABES, France)
Ms. Cristina Magliano (ICCU, Italy)
Mr. François-Xavier Pélégrin (ISSN International Centre, France), corresponding member
Mr. Jay Weitz (OCLC, USA), Vice Chair, rapporteur
Ms. Olga Zhlobinskaya (National Library of Russia)

I. Opening of the Meeting
Chair Mr. Alan Hopkinson opened the 22nd meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) at 9:10 a.m. on Monday, 2011 March 14.

Note that these minutes do not necessarily reflect the chronological order in which each topic was discussed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Informal Meetings Held in Gothenburg, August 2010
The minutes from the Gothenburg informal meetings of the PUC, 2010 August 13-14 were reviewed, updated, and approved, with the following changes and updates, in italics:

II. Status of Actions from 21st Meeting of PUC in Lyon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Adapt MARC 21 fields to satisfy need for fields for Digital Registry</td>
<td>Galvão</td>
<td>31 December 2011</td>
<td>Still in progress; Deadline extended (Action, Ms. Galvão)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IFLA to provide private closed space for PUC.</td>
<td>Cordeiro</td>
<td>31 August 2010</td>
<td>IFLA will provide PUC with a wiki space; Still in progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Define for U/A new subfield to record ISO identifiers assigned to a name recorded in a 7XX field (e.g. ISNI)</td>
<td>CfU</td>
<td>31 December 2010</td>
<td>2009/15 Still needs to be done (Action, Mr. Le Pape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Create online framework for annual update</td>
<td>Cordeiro</td>
<td>31 July 2010</td>
<td>Ms. Cordeiro will continue work on this; Still pending (Action, Ms. Cordeiro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Produce update for U/B</td>
<td>Hopkinson</td>
<td>31 May 2010</td>
<td>Still pending (Action, Mr. Hopkinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Produce update for U/A</td>
<td>Willer</td>
<td>31 December 2010</td>
<td>Still pending (Action, Ms. Willer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. UNIMARC Authorities Format

*March 2011: Mr. Le Pape will ask Ms. Annick Bernard of the CfU if any errata have been identified. (Action, Mr. Le Pape)*

III. Approval of the Minutes of the 21st PUC Meeting Held in Lyon, March 2010

The minutes from the Lyon meeting of the PUC, 2010 March 29-30, were reviewed, updated, and approved, with the following changes and updates, in *italics*:

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Informal Meetings Held in Milan, Italy, August 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Translate UNIMARC/EAD</td>
<td>Manneheut</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Still in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crosswalk to English</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>progress; Mr. Le Pape will follow up with Ms. Manneheut (Action, Mr. Le Pape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Redraft 013</td>
<td>Magliano</td>
<td>31 December 2008</td>
<td>Completed, now available on Web</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will not be incorporated into Authorities because it is inappropriate, but will be in U/B 4th edition.
The editor also needs to discuss with Saur the online availability of U/B after the proper waiting period.
The editor has discussed this with Saur. There is a six-month wait. The online version will be available for purchase through one of the digital libraries.

March 2011: UNIMARC Bibliographic is currently available through one of the digital libraries. Ms. Cordeiro has followed up with Mr. Sjoerd Koopman about the online availability question, but has not yet received a response. Still being investigated. (Action, Ms. Cordeiro)
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2008/34: U/B 717.
Postponed, pending revision by Ms. Magliano to align U/B 717 with U/A 217.
Comments should be sent to Ms. Magliano.
Still outstanding.

March 2011: Postponement continues, with revisions still pending.

(Action, Ms. Magliano)

UNIMARC Portal: Closed Access Areas
IFLA will provide a closed access area for the PUC to use as a working space as part of its Web site.

March 2010: Still not available; PUC would still like to have a private working space.

March 2011: This is still pending. IFLA has offered a working space, but one has not yet been created. (Action, Ms. Cordeiro)

VIII. New Proposals
Accepted. A corresponding proposal for UNIMARC/Authorities is needed.

March 2011: This corresponding proposal is still pending. (Action: CfU)

Postponed, pending verification with photograph specialists at national libraries. Mr. Hopkinson will consult with the British Library’s Mr. Alan Danskin.

March 2011: Mr. Hopkinson and Mr. Alan Danskin had an e-mail exchange on 2011 March 10.
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The more current UNIMARC Bibliographic Change Proposal 2011/2
was discussed in Lisbon in March 2011. Ms. Magliano will coordinate
2009/22 and 2011/2 in consultation with photographic cataloguing
experts.  (Action, Ms. Magliano) Mr. Hopkinson will forward the
results to Mr. Danskin.  (Action, Mr. Hopkinson)

IX. UNIMARC/Bibliographic Format

March 2011: The cumulated errata for U/B 3\textsuperscript{rd} edition should be mounted on the
Web.  (Action, Mr. Hopkinson)

XVII. Relations with Other International Organizations and Committees

March 2011, correction of typographical error: ISO TC 46 SC 4. There will be a
meeting in Korea in May 2010, where there will be work on a standard for
presentation of theses.

IV. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Meetings and the Action Lists

Matters arising from the minutes of the most recent meetings have been covered in Sections II and III
of these minutes. No Action List for this Lisbon 2011 meeting was either distributed or discussed.

V. Composition of the PUC

Ms. Cristina Magliano (ICCU, Italy) is retiring in 2011 and will be replaced by an ICCU colleague.
The old list of PUC Corresponding Members was discussed and needs to be updated. Ms. Cordeiro
will write to all of those on the list either thanking them for their service or asking them if they would
like to continue as Corresponding Members.  (Action, Ms. Cordeiro) Among the specific points
made:

- Mr. François-Xavier Pélégrin of the ISSN International Centre, France, has replaced Mr. Alain Roucolle.
- Mr. Alan Danskin of the British Library will be renewed as a Corresponding Member.
• Ms. Sally McCallum of the Library of Congress will not continue as a Corresponding Member.

• Some representation from Northern Africa (Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria) would be advantageous. Mr. Khaled Habchi (Higher Institute of Documentation of Tunis, University of Manouba) is a likely candidate.

• Mr. Anthony Curwen (Consortium of European Research Libraries) has retired and not yet been replaced. The CERL Executive Manager is now based at the National Library of the Netherlands.

• Representation from the former Yugoslavia (particularly Slovenia) and from Iran are possibilities.

• Georgian State Book Chamber is switching from UNIMARC to Koha and MARC 21.

• There are no institutions in India that are currently known to be using UNIMARC.

VI. Chairman’s Report
No report from the Chair of the PUC was submitted.

VII. Status of Addition and Change Proposals
These were not discussed.

VIII. New Proposals
Before discussions of the specific proposals began, Mr. Le Pape presented the PowerPoint “FRBR in UNIMARC: New Change Proposals from the CfU” as an overview of the CfU’s understanding of the issues and ideas for dealing with them. Among the main points:
• Implementations of the FRBR Group 1 Entities:
  o Work: UNIMARC/A.
  o Expression: UNIMARC/A. The CfU had originally considered using U/B but decided that it would be too complex.
  o Manifestation: UNIMARC/B.
  o Item: UNIMARC/H.

• For titles identifying Works and Expressions:
  o New U/A and U/B fields to be defined for FRBR-ized data.
  o Existing fields will continue to contain mixed data for pre-FRBR and non-FRBR-ized catalogues.

• For names associated with Works and Expressions:
  o U/A Block 5XX will be developed similarly to U/B Block 7XX.
  o Subfield $5, Position 4 to be defined in 5X0 to create a relationship to field 200, which is not currently possible.

• For subject relationships at the Work level:
  o U/B subject fields to be defined in U/A.
  o New U/A fields for titles to be defined.

UNIMARC Bibliographic/Authorities Change Proposal 2011/23 outlined the same points in a general discussion, listed most of the U/B and U/A fields to be changed or added, and included examples. The PUC accepted the CfU’s proposals in principle. All of the FRBR-related changes to U/A will be submitted to Ms. Mirna Willer for rationalization within the context of U/A.

PUC members then discussed the current disposition of FRBR and RDA in their respective countries or organizations:
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- Mr. Pélegrin reported on an ISSN working group that started discussing ISSN cataloguing and the FRBR model a few months ago. The report of this group will be presented and discussed during the next ISSN directors meeting at the beginning of October 2011. It could be then discussed with FRBR specialists. Another ISSN working group has started recently reviewing the ISSN Manual, including UNIMARC changes that have occurred since the last update of the ISSN Manual in January 2009.
- Mr. Le Pape reported that the French academic union catalogue, Système Universitaire de Documentation (SUDOC), would prototype the CfU proposals in UNIMARC within its database.
- The Bibliothèque nationale de France wants a FRBRized catalog but also wants to be able to export and share “traditional” bibliographic data.
- Ms. Zhlobinskaya reported that in Russia, FRBR is more familiar and more discussed than is RDA, which is still quite new and differs considerably from current national rules and practices. RDA is generally known among Russian librarians but is best known only among specialists.
- Ms. Magliano reported that in Italy, their new cataloguing code incorporates FRBR concepts but that the new code has not yet been widely adopted.

Proposals are presented here in numerical order for ease of reference, although they were not necessarily discussed in numerical order during the meeting. The PUC has further authorized the UNIMARC editors to make any other editorial changes and corrections that do not alter meaning. The editors may decide to circulate questions and issues as appropriate.
2010/1: U/B 100 subfield $a/8 (Type of Publication Date).
   This revised proposal was submitted too late for formal consideration by the PUC. Members will review and respond by 2011 May 31. (Action, All, by 2011 May 31)

2010/20: U/A 033, U/B 033, U/H 033, U/C 033 (Other System Persistent Record Identifier).
   Accepted.

2010/21: U/B 105 subfield $a/4-7 (Form of Contents Codes).
   Accepted, with changes:
   - 7 = Clarify that code is intended for academic work below the doctoral level, including for the masters level.
   - m = Add: “If doctoral dissertation/thesis needs to be distinguished from others, use code ‘7’.”

   Accepted, with corrections and replacement examples. (See Proposal 2011/25 for Cyrillic examples.) Ms. Galvão will also apply any changes appropriate to these examples that emerge from this 2011 PUC meeting, plus any additional spacing or other errors she discovers. (Action, Ms. Galvão)
   - Introduction should read: “In this Manual, examples of individual data elements are provided with each field. This Appendix provides complete examples. These examples reflect the different origins of the records and are in no way intended to be prescriptive with respect to the form of the data.”
   - Example 1: Correct “für” in fields 200 and 225. Correct 410 as follows: “#1$15301#$aZeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik / Beihefte”.
• Example 2: Correct “Ottawa.” Indicators in field 410 should be “#1”.
• Example 3: Mr. Pélegrin will supply substitute set of examples for 3 a-d. (Action, Mr. Pélegrin)
• Example 4: In field 105, substitute “##” for blank space.
• Example 5: Delete “Note that the language code ‘hrv’ used in these examples is a local system code, not an ISO 639-2 code.”
• Example 5b: In field 215, close up first blank space. In field 482, close up blank space in front of subfield $a$. In field 702, First Indicator should be “#”.
• Example 5c: In both fields 702, First Indicator should be “#”.
• Example 6: Delete “Note that the language code ‘hrv’ used in these examples is a local system code, not an ISO 639-2 code.”
• Example 6a: Close up space in field 011. Field 135 should read: $avrunu---unnau”. Supply field 801.
• Example 7: Correct spelling of “Lithuanian.”
• Example 12: Correct numberings of Examples 12b, 12c, 12d, 12e, and subsequent examples. In all five Examples 12, close up the blank in field 110 subfield $a$.
• Example 12e: Additionally, supply missing 430 field. In 530 field, supply subfield $b$ and remove parentheses.
• Example 15: Supply field 801.

2011/1: U/B 116 subfield $a/0-1$ (Specific Material Designation; Primary Support Material).
Proposals 2011/1 and 2011/2 need to be coordinated with pending proposal 2009/22 on new codes for photographic material, which has been forwarded to Mr. Alan Danskin.
Ms. Magliano will confer with photographic experts for further clarification, then revise
2009/22 with these additions. (Action, Ms. Magliano)

- U/B 116 “Field definition” to be revised to remove reference to “ISBD(NBM).”
- Correct proposed definition of code “f = Photoprint” to read: “... more precise term
  than ‘photograph’."

2011/2: U/B 116 subfield Sa/10-15 (Technique (Prints)).

Proposals 2011/1 and 2011/2 need to be coordinated with pending proposal 2009/22 on new
codes for photographic material, which has been forwarded to Mr. Alan Danskin.

2011/3: U/A 500, 510, 520, 5-1, 5-2; 240, 241, 242 (Defining subfield $4).

Accepted, with changes:

- Correct definition of subfield $4 to read: “... between the person, corporate body, or
  family named in the field ....”
- In Examples 8 and 9, correct references to “Field 240” to read “Field 241.”

2011/4: U/A Control Subfield $5 (Relationship Control).

Accepted, with changes:

- Revise Position 4 as follows:
  4 Relationship Code between Agents and a Work or an Expression
  A one-character alphabetic code indicates a specific relationship
  between a person, a corporate body, or a family who participated in the
  creation of a work or contributed to an expression of a work, and the
  title of that work or that expression.
The relationship code may be used only in 5-0 access point fields. *This subfield is mandatory in 5-0 fields that are access points for names associated with a work.* The following code values are defined:

- a = creator of a work
- b = contributor to an expression of a work
- x = not applicable

- Revise “Subfield Definition” of subfield $5$ (U/A, 3rd edition, page 93): “If only a relationship in character position 2, 3, or 4 is needed ....”
- Add to “Occurrence” (U/A, 3rd edition, page 93): “This subfield is mandatory in 5-0 fields that are access points for names associated with a work.”
- Add to “Notes on Subfield Contents” (U/A, 3rd edition, page 93): “Relationship Code between Agents and a Work or an Expression; Number of Characters: 1; Character Position: 4.”


Accepted, with corrections noted, as well as any others that Mr. Le Pape may identify:

- Subfield $2$ (U/A, 3rd edition, page 91) corrected to “System Code.” Revise “Subfield Definition” to read: “... the system or thesaurus from which the subject access point in fields 60- and 61- is derived ....”
- In field 600, correct the names of “Related Fields” as follows:
  - Change 600 to “601: Subject Access Point -- Corporate Body Name. When a corporate body rather than a person is the subject, field 601 is used.”
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- 602: Subject Access Point -- Family Name.
- 604: Subject Access Point -- Name and Title.
- 607: Subject Access Point -- Geographical Name.

- In field 606, correct the name of “Related Fields” as follows:
  - 607: Subject Access Point -- Geographical Name.

- In field 607, correct the names of “Related Fields” as follows:
  - 601: Subject Access Point -- Corporate Body Name.
  - 617: Subject Access Point -- Hierarchical Geographical Name.

- In field 617, correct the name of “Related Fields” as follows:
  - 607: Subject Access Point -- Geographical Name.

2011/6: U/A 230, 430, 530, 730; 240, 440, 540, 740 (Limiting use of Title and Name/Title Access Fields to non-FRBR compliant records).

  Accepted, with changes:
  - Revise the “Field Definition” of all eight fields as follows: “This field is intended for records that do not comply with the FRBR model. If compliance with the FRBR structure ....”
  - Remove parenthetical “(Work)” from names of fields 430, 530, and 730.

2011/7: U/A 231, 431, 531, 731 (Defining corresponding U/A Title Access Point fields for FRBR “Work”).

  Accepted, with corrections:
• Revise 231 “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues that comply with the FRBR model, and is found in a record describing a work that has no creator’s name associated with it. Note that a record ....”

• Add to field 531 the Control Subfield: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”

• Revise 431, 531, 731 “Field Definition” as follows: “This field has been designed for catalogues that comply with the FRBR model, and is found in a record describing a work.”

2011/8: U/A 232, 432, 532, 732 (Defining corresponding U/A Title Access Point fields for FRBR “Expression”).

Accepted as Provisional, pending work on other types of resources.

• Revise the “Field Definition” of all four fields as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ....”

• Additionally, revise 232 “Field Definition” as follows: “Note that a record ....”

• Add to field 532 the Control Subfield: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”

2011/9: U/A 241, 441, 541, 741 (Defining corresponding U/A Name/Title Access Point fields for FRBR “Work”).

Accepted, with corrections:

• Add the following to “Notes on Field Contents” for 2-- Block on U/A, 3rd edition, page 91): Subfield $3 could proceed any subfield that represents an entity with an authority record identifier.” Also adjust the text on U/A, 3rd edition, page 92 to reflect this change.
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- Revise the “Field Definition” of all four fields as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ....”
- Additionally, revise 241 “Field Definition” as follows: “... whose name is known to be associated with it.”
- Additionally, revise 241 “Field Definition” final sentence as follows: “Note that a record ....”

**2011/10:** U/A 242, 442, 542, 742 (Defining corresponding U/A Name/Title Access Point fields for FRBR “Expression”).

   Accepted as Provisional, pending work on other types of resources.
   - Revise the “Field Definition” of all four fields as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ....”

**2011/11:** U/A 500, 510, 520 (Limiting repeatability of fields to cases when they are used for the name of a FRBR creator).

   Accepted, with corrections:
   - Correct “Field Definition” of all three fields to refer to subfield $5$ position 4.
   - Mr. Le Pape will clarify repeatability text in all three fields. *(Action, Mr. Le Pape)*

**2011/12:** U/A 501 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Personal Name with Responsibility for the Work”).

   Accepted, with changes:
   - Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Personal Name with Responsibility for the Work.”
• Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues that comply with the FRBR model, and is found in a record describing a work. In a record describing such an entity, it is mandatory that a creator’s name be recorded in a field 500, 510, or 520 according to whether the name is that of a person, a corporate body, or a family.” Omit final sentence of second paragraph as well as the entire third paragraph.
• Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
• Correct “Notes on Field Contents” to read: “... access point in the 241 field ....”
• In “Related Fields,” correct field 511 to “Related Access Point – Corporate Body with Responsibility for the Work” and field 521 to “Related Access Point – Family Name with Responsibility for the Work.”

2011/13: U/A 502 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Personal Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression”).

Accepted, with changes:
• Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Personal Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.”
• Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ....”
• Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
• In “Related Fields,” correct field 512 to “Related Access Point – Corporate Body Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression” and field 522 to “Related Access Point – Family Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.” Also add field 232 “Authorized Access Point – Title (Expression).”
2011/14: U/A 511 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Corporate Body with Responsibility for the Work”).

Accepted, with changes:

- Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Corporate Body with Responsibility for the Work.”
- Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues that comply with the FRBR model, and is found in a record describing a work. In a record describing such an entity, it is mandatory that a creator’s name be recorded in a field 500, 510, or 520 according to whether the name is that of a person, a corporate body, or a family.” Omit final sentence of second paragraph as well as the entire third paragraph.
- Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
- In “Related Fields,” correct field 501 to “Related Access Point – Personal Name with Responsibility for the Work” and field 521 to “Related Access Point – Family Name with Responsibility for the Work.”
- In text following Example 1, correct reference to “Field 241.”

2011/15: U/A 512 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Corporate Body Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression”).

Accepted, with changes:

- Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Corporate Body Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.”
- Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field contains the access point for an authorized form of corporate body name for a contributor associated with an expression of the work described by the record. This field is intended for catalogues ....”
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- Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
- In “Related Fields,” correct field 512 to “Related Access Point – Corporate Body Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression” and field 522 to “Related Access Point – Family Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.”
- In text following Example 1, correct reference to “Field 242.”

2011/16: U/A 521 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Family Name with Responsibility for the Work”).

Accepted, with changes:
- Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Family Name with Responsibility for the Work.”
- Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues that comply with the FRBR model, and is found in a record describing a work. In a record describing such an entity, it is mandatory that a creator’s name be recorded in a field 500, 510, or 520 according to whether the name is that of a person, a corporate body, or a family.” Omit final sentence of second paragraph as well as the entire third paragraph.
- Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
- Correct “Notes on Field Contents” to read: “… access point in the 241 field …”
- In “Related Fields,” correct field 501 to “Related Access Point – Personal Name with Responsibility for the Work” and field 511 to “Related Access Point – Corporate Body with Responsibility for the Work.”
- Mr. Le Pape will provide appropriate examples. (Action, Mr. Le Pape)
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2011/17: U/A 522 (Defining field for “Related Access Point – Family Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression”).

Accepted, with changes:

- Change field name to: “Related Access Point – Family Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.”
- Revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ....”
- Add to list of the Control Subfields: “$5 Relationship Control. Not repeatable.”
- In “Related Fields,” correct field 512 to “Related Access Point – Corporate Body Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression” and field 522 to “Related Access Point – Family Name for a Contributor Associated with the Expression.”
- Mr. Le Pape will provide appropriate examples. (Action, Mr. Le Pape)


Accepted, with changes:

- For all three fields, remove “Mandatory” designation for subfield $5.

2011/19: U/B 506 (Defining “Preferred Title – Identification of a Work” field for FRBR Manifestation level).

Accepted, with changes:

- Throughout, correct all references to “uniform title” to read “preferred title.”
- Additionally, revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ...” and the second reference to field 576 to read “577.”
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2011/20: U/B 507 (Defining “Preferred Title – Identification of an Expression” field for FRBR Manifestation level).

Accepted as Provisional, with changes:

- Throughout, correct all references to “uniform title” to read “preferred title.”
- Additionally, revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ...” and the second reference to field 576 to read “577.”

2011/21: U/B 576 (Defining “Name/Preferred Title – Identification of a Work” field for FRBR Manifestation level).

Accepted, with changes:

- Throughout, correct all references to “uniform title” to read “preferred title.”
- Additionally, revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ...” and the second reference to field 576 to read “577.”
- For section on “Subfields: Embedded Fields Technique,” substitute the Subfield $1 text found in U/B 3rd edition page 367.
- Section “Control Subfields” should be deleted.
- In “Notes on Field Contents,” additionally correct the spelling of “responsibility.”

2011/22: U/B 577 (Defining “Name/Preferred Title – Identification of an Expression” field for FRBR Manifestation level).

Accepted as Provisional, with changes:

- Throughout, correct all references to “uniform title” to read “preferred title.”
- Additionally, revise the “Field Definition” as follows: “This field is intended for catalogues ...” and the second reference to field 576 to read “577.”
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- For section on “Subfields: Embedded Fields Technique,” substitute the Subfield $1$ text found in U/B 3rd edition page 367.
- Section “Control Subfields” should be deleted.
- In “Notes on Field Contents,” additionally correct the spelling of “responsibility.”


No action necessary. This “proposal” was the general presentation of U/B and U/A changes proposed by the CfU, needed to accommodate FRBR and RDA.

2011/24: U/B 856 (Definition of new values for Second Indicator for “Completeness of the Accessible Item”).

Accepted, with changes:
- In “Field Definition,” correct reference from “ISBD(ER)” to simply “ISBD.”
- The entire section on “Occurrence” should read as follows: “Optional. Repeatable. For electronic resources: if 337 is not used, then 856 must be present.” Delete the remainder.
- For Indicator 2 value “2”, revise definition to read: “The field provides details to access the title page, table of contents, and/or other front matter of the described resource.”


Accepted, with corrections and pending additions (see also Proposal 2010/22 for non-Cyrillic examples):
- Ms. Zhlobinskaya will provide narrative explanations for each of the Cyrillic examples similar to the sorts of explanations present in existing examples. (Action, Ms. Zhlobinskaya, 2011 May 31)
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• In Record 9A, field 606, add subfield delimiter ("$") in front of “3RU....”
• In Record 10A, field 300 should be field 304.
• In Record 11A, introduction should read: “Resource as a whole ....”

IX. UNIMARC/Bibliographic Format
The updates to U/B 3rd edition will be mounted on the Web site in PDF format to correspond to the existing print document by the time of the IFLA meeting in August 2011. (Action, Ms. Cordeiro, August 2011)

X. UNIMARC/Authorities Format
Ms. Mirna Willer will be informed of the new direction of U/A and the changes discussed and approved at this meeting. She will incorporate as many of the changes as she can by the time of the IFLA meeting in August 2011. (Action, Ms. Willer, August 2011)

XI. Other UNIMARC Formats (Holdings, Classification)
a.) UNIMARC/Holdings
The PUC will be working on further alignment of U/H with FRBR elements of U/B. (Action, Ms. Galvão)

b.) UNIMARC/Classification
There has been no significant work done recently on U/C.

XII. UNIMARC Guidelines for Manuscripts
Ms. Galvão’s 2010 October 30 draft revisions to the 3rd version of the text were discussed. The following changes were made:
1. Purpose, Scope, and Use:
   • First paragraph was deleted.
   • Second paragraph:
     o Delete Footnote 1.
     o Change: “…manuscript materials of most kinds ….”
     o Change: “… these guidelines may apply also to manuscript surrogates (carbon copy, photocopy, transcript, microform, or digital copy).”

2. UNIMARC Form and Content Data:
   • First paragraph was deleted.
   • Reword second paragraph: “ISBD does not cover manuscripts, so ISBD provisions are not applicable. Consequently ….”
   • Fourth paragraph:
     o Change: “… when creating records for manuscript resources. UNIMARC is not commonly ….”
     o Change: “… UNIMARC can be used by organisations whose collections are for the most part published resources when the need arises to include in the database records of manuscripts that are available in the collection.”

3. Data Elements and UNIMARC Location:
   • Contents Note: Delete “46X Fields” and substitute “464 Piece-Analytic.”
   • After “Contents Note” entry add:
     | A Manuscript in Unbound Collection | 461 Set |
   • Change “A manuscript bound in an ‘artificial’ collection.”
In addition, ISBD Area 0 will be incorporated into the draft. A proposal will be written to change subfield $5 from mandatory to optional in U/B fields 316 (Note Relating to the Copy in Hand), 317 (Provenance Note), and 318 (Action Note). (Action, Ms. Galvão and Ms. Cordeiro)

Before March 2012, Ms. Zhlobinskaya expects to be part of a project for archival materials, which will likely result in some guidelines for UNIMARC archives. From this project may arise suggestions for new fields, etc.

XIII. Session at IFLA Conference 2011

The call for papers for the UNIMARC session scheduled for IFLA 2011, entitled “Advancing UNIMARC: Alignment and Innovation,” drew a total of seven papers submitted. Four of those papers were accepted:

- *The Functionality of Bibliographic Records of IRANMARC Based on Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)*, by Saeedeh Akbari-Daryan and Sayyed Mahdi Taheri (Iran).
- *FRBRization: Using UNIMARC Link Fields to Identify Works*, by Manolis Peponakis, Michalis Sfakakis, and Sarantos Kapidakis (Greece).
- *UNIMARC and FRBR: Can We have Both?*, by Trond Aalberg (Norway), and Jan Pisanski and Maja Žumer (Slovenia).
- *FRBRisation of Koha in the Context of CMARC (a UNIMARC-derived Format)*, by Ms. Naicheng Chang and Yuchin Tsai (Taiwan).

Each of these papers will be allotted a fifteen minute presentation.
Additionally, there are two invited papers, each of which would be allotted thirty minutes:

- A paper from Ms. Willer and Mr. Gordon Dunsire.
- Mr. Le Pape’s PowerPoint presentation “FRBR in UNIMARC.”

One possibility discussed for a UNIMARC session at IFLA in 2012 is an invited paper from Ms. Galvão offering a historical look back at the evolution of UNIMARC.

XIV. Outreach Activities, Website, Users, System Suppliers, and Record Providers

No significant discussion.

XV. Future Developments of the Formats Resulting from FRBR, FRAD, ISBDs, ISSN, UNICODE

No significant discussion.

XVI. Relations with Other International Organizations and Committees

ISO TC 46 SC 4. Mr. Hopkinson will attend the upcoming meeting. Revisions to the MARC exchange standard are coming up and Mr. Tommy Schomacker will make sure the changes are compatible with UNIMARC. A new standard is in the works for the presentation of theses, which may prompt the PUC to accommodate new practices and/or fields.

ISSN Network. Mr. Pélegrin reports that, by the end of March 2011, the Network will have distributed a survey on changing ISSN assignment policies on electronic archives, to get input from the community. Although the survey has a long introduction, there are only a few
questions. Beginning in May 2011, the Network will begin discussions about dealing with resources that are made available for different electronic reading devices.

**IFLA.** Mr. Weitz will write and submit to Ms. Marie-France Plassard a report on this 2011 PUC meeting in Lisbon for ICBC. *(Action: Mr. Weitz)*

**XVII. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**XVIII. Date and Place of Next Meeting**

There will be an informal meeting of the PUC in San Juan, Puerto Rico, at IFLA in August 2011. There will also be an open UNIMARC session at the conference entitled “Advancing UNIMARC: Alignment and Innovation.”

Scheduling of the 23rd meeting of the PUC and the 4th Meeting of the UNIMARC Users Group for March 2012 is in progress. One possibility for a venue is Ljubljana, Slovenia. Because of the synergies of meeting at a school of librarianship or information science, such as enssib in Lyon, finding another such location could be advantageous. Ms. Cordeiro will research the place and date of these meetings. *(Action, Ms. Cordeiro)*

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m., Tuesday, 2011 March 15.

Respectfully submitted by Mr. Jay Weitz, OCLC Online Computer Library Center
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