



**Minutes of the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Permanent  
UNIMARC Committee  
2017 March 20-21  
National Library of Portugal  
Lisbon, Portugal**

**Present:**

Ms. Maria Inês Cordeiro (National Library of Portugal), Director of the UNIMARC Strategic Programme, Interim Chair

Ms. Rosa Galvão (National Library of Portugal)

Mr. Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense and ICCU, Italy)

Mr. Philippe Le Pape (ABES, France)

Ms. Gordana Mazić (IZUM, Slovenia)

Mr. Jay Weitz (OCLC, USA), Vice Chair, rapporteur

Ms. Olga Zhlobinskaya (Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library, Russia)

**1. Opening of the Meeting**

Ms. Maria Inês Cordeiro, Director of the UNIMARC Strategic Programme, opened the 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) at 9:25 a.m. on Monday, 2017 March 20, and adjourned around 7:30 p.m. The Tuesday, 2017 March 21 session opened at 9:40 a.m. and adjourned around 7:30 p.m.

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

**2. Information/Discussion About the PUC Future Leadership**

The PUC has been seriously discussing the issue of its future leadership for several years now, following the unfortunate incapacitation of its longtime Chair Mr. Alan Hopkinson in early 2013 and his passing in April 2016. The National Library of Portugal has grown increasingly eager to relinquish its role of UNIMARC Strategic Programme host, which it has held since 2003.

In a 2017 March 14 communication, IFLA Professional Support Officer Ms. Joanne Yeomans passed on the IFLA Governing Board (GB) suggestion that “the PUC could move to a structure ... that operates without the support of a hosting institution.” This makes the choice of future leadership easier, in theory. Among other responsibilities, the chair organizes and leads PUC meetings, prepares UNIMARC proposals for discussion, organizes and invites papers for any UNIMARC open session at IFLA, works on the publication of UNIMARC formats, serves as the liaison with IFLA, and keeps the PUC website updated.

Ms. Galvão will continue as a PUC member, but hopes to retire within the next two years; she also lacks confidence in her English skills. Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi expects to be retiring within the next two years; he also agreed that having a hosting institution may not be essential for the work of the PUC. Mr. Le Pape expects to retire within the next year. Ms. Zhlobinskaya says that neither RUSMARC nor UNIMARC currently have much institutional support in Russia and that taking on more responsibilities could make the situation worse; she also lacks confidence in her English skills. Mr. Weitz reassured all other members of the PUC that their respective English skills were exemplary; he also felt that an OCLC employee taking on the chair position would be politically improper. Ms. Mazić reports that IZUM has been reluctant to take on hosting the PUC, but promises to discuss with IZUM again, now that the hosting responsibilities are no longer an issue. Additionally, she feels that her two years of PUC experience make her not the most appropriate person to take on the chair position. Nonetheless, Ms. Mazić reluctantly accepted the position with the understanding that responsibilities will be shared amongst the PUC membership.

From 2003 through 2015, the PUC has had a regular two-hour open session at each IFLA Congress to present news and host papers. In 2016 and again for 2017, the PUC has been limited to a mere five-minute reporting slot as part of the Committee on Standards (CoS) meeting (scheduled for 2017 August 20, 13:45-15:45). This seems to contradict the notion put forward by the CoS that promoting the standard is one of its roles. This also limits the PUC’s ability to promote relations with other groups and to communicate with the UNIMARC community at the biggest IFLA audience.

Since at least 2011, the PUC has been saying that it does not really require a host institution, a position now in line with the GB. The PUC has always played a maintenance role, trying to keep UNIMARC in line with other standards, and responding to user needs. It never requested that the PUC be made either a “Core Activity” or a “Strategic Programme.” The PUC requires informed members familiar with the UNIMARC standards who can intelligently take part in discussing and developing the standards, fulfilling the requests of its users, not members who can “support the work in other ways.”

Because of the PUC's responsibility for the continuous maintenance of the UNIMARC formats, a five-year plan along the lines of the ISBD Review Group does not really make sense. Communication from the CoS to the PUC has been poor; in fact, the CoS has proven to be merely an extra layer of bureaucracy. With the creation of the CoS, there are now two bureaucratic layers (CoS and GB) that do not understand the role of PUC, rather than just a single layer. It appears that the CoS has been more interested in process than in results, whereas the PUC is and always has been focused on its results.

Responding to the seven "considerations" in Ms. Yeomans' 2017 March 14 e-mail, the PUC submits the following and would also be happy to resend any or all of the similar responses sent by Ms. Cordeiro going back through at least 2008.

1. The PUC's five-year plan remains constant: To keep the standard updated according to the proposals generated internally and submitted by users; to periodically make the updates available on the Web; to occasionally prepare for new editions of the standards. The only major financial resources would be associated with the publication of any new editions.
2. Ms. Cordeiro has personally kept the PUC website updated for the past ten years. Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi has volunteered to continue to do this.
3. Tasks include the preparation of the annual report, making PUC minutes available online, and preparing UNIMARC publications, as Ms. Cordeiro has written to former CoS chair Mr. Patrice Landry several years ago, and will send again to the current CoS. (**Action: Ms. Cordeiro**) These minutes and the report derived from them will serve as the current report to the CoS.
4. The PUC does not need elections. Instead, it needs UNIMARC experts and users willing and able to participate in the committee activities. The PUC currently follows the procedures for getting members that it inherited from the UBCIM, as Ms. Cordeiro has reported to the CoS in the past, as found in its Terms of Reference (<https://www.ifla.org/unimarc/puc>).
5. All of this reporting has already been transmitted to the CoS in the past. The PUC discusses proposals and its other work during its annual meeting and its meeting at the IFLA Congress. PUC minutes going back to 2003 are available on the PUC website. Narrative reports on each meeting have been regularly published in the *IFLA Metadata Newsletter*, and have previously appeared in *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* and the *SCAT Newsletter*.
6. The PUC will be represented for the five-minute report to the CoS as part of the IFLA Congress 2017 by Mr. Weitz.
7. The PUC will be represented in Athens in April 2017 by Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi, who will also bring to the committee's attention the fact that Review Group chairs are not considered "officers" of IFLA.

Although the PUC felt little explicit need for a five-year plan, several ideas for one emerged during its conversations, including:

- Future 4th editions of both UNIMARC/Authorities and UNIMARC/Bibliographic, each incorporating data from the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) such as standardized definitions and harmonization with the IFLA Library Reference Model (LRM).
- The creation of a protocol between the PUC and the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), so that RDA/UNIMARC mappings may be added to the RDA Toolkit. This would also result in increased UNIMARC visibility, and so could be IFLA-financed. RDA Chair Mr. Gordon Dunsire was consulted during the PUC meeting, noting that the existing protocols involving the RSC are online at <http://www.rda-rsc.org/RSCprotocols>. The RSC/PUC protocol could parallel the existing LC NDMSO protocol (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-Chair-15.pdf>), generally replacing NDMSO references with PUC and MARC 21 with UNIMARC Bibliographic and Authority data. Mr. Dunsire should adapt the text and send a draft “Protocol Between the RSC and the IFLA Permanent UNIMARC Committee” to the PUC for approval. (**Action: Mr. Dunsire**) Such a protocol could eventually result in PUC participation in the RSC itself.
- An update to the PUC’s world-wide survey of UNIMARC users and institutions, although not an immediate need, could be useful.
- Succession planning for the PUC to find additional committee members with an eye toward cultivating future leadership.

Current needs and assignments for distributing PUC chair activities:

- Updating the PUC website: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi.
- Leading meetings: Ms. Mazić.
- Preparations for the PUC informal meeting at the 2017 IFLA Congress: Ms. Cordeiro has already arranged for the time and place of this meeting, which will appear in the IFLA program.
- PUC five-minute “news” report for the CoS meeting at IFLA 2017: Mr. Weitz.
- PUC representation in Athens, April 2017: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi.
- PUC account with IFLA is now at zero, so the new chair will need to request more funding for UNIMARC in RDF Project: Ms. Mazić.

### **3. Approval of the Minutes of the Informal Meeting Held in Columbus, Ohio, August 2016**

Columbus minutes were approved with previous corrections already incorporated.

#### 4. Status of the Revision Work Since Last Meeting

**2016/9:** U/A 223 (Authorized Access Point – Character), U/A 423 (Variant Access Point – Character), U/A 523 (Related Access Point – Character), U/A 723 (Authorized Access Point in Another Language and/or Script – Character), U/A Record Label/09 (Type of Entity)

Corresponding U/B 623 Character field was approved in 2015. This proposal creates the X23 set of U/A fields. It also defines new Record Label/09 value “m” for authority records for fictitious characters and for real persons treated fictionally. Proposal accepted with the following additional changes:

##### U/A 223 (Authorized Access Point – Character)

- U/A 223 subfield \$a definition, change “heading” to “access point.”
- U/A 223 subfield \$b, delete reference to “(EX. 9).”
- U/A 223 subfield \$c, reword as follows: “... indications of office, *or* the relationship with another character (EX 2.1 and 2.2). Repeatable.”
- Delete subfield \$6 from U/A 223 proposal.
- Subfields \$7 and \$8 are Not Repeatable.
  - These subfields need to be similarly harmonized throughout U/A.
- In “Notes on Field Contents,” delete the text beginning with “linked, if relevant ....”
- Delete all U/A 502 fields from examples in U/A 223.
- For U/A 223 Example 1, third character (Vespone), delete second subfield \$c from U/A 223 field.
- For U/A 223 Example 2.2, add note: “See also Example 2.3 under field U/A 523.”
- For U/A 223 Examples 2.2 and 4, change “unstructured” to “subfields.”
- For U/A 223 Example 3, reword note to read: “One character in Michael Chapman’s film ....”
- For U/A 223 Example 5, delete both subfields \$6 from U/A 223 field; in the note, delete the text beginning with “is played by ....”

##### U/A 423 (Variant Access Point – Character)

- Delete second sentence from “Field Definition.”
- Subfield \$a is Mandatory and Not Repeatable. Subfield \$b is Not Repeatable. Subfield \$c is Repeatable.

- Add subfields \$0, \$2, \$3, \$5 to U/A 423.
- Subfields \$7 and \$8 are Not Repeatable.
  - These subfields need to be similarly harmonized throughout U/A.
- U/A 423 “Notes on Field Contents” should read: “The access point in 423 is a variant or non-preferred form of the access point of the character name in the 2-- field in a performance-related resource (notably audio or video recordings, movies, opera scores, plots, and librettos).”
- For U/A 423 Example 2, add “##” indicators in field 223 and subfield \$a to 423. Revise second and third sentences of note: “Voice range specified in coded field 146. Field 541 in standard *subfields* technique.”

#### U/A 523 (Related Access Point – Character)

- Delete second sentence of “Field Definition.”
- Subfield \$a is Mandatory and Not Repeatable. Subfield \$b is Not Repeatable. Subfield \$c is Repeatable.
- Add subfields \$0, \$2, \$3, \$5 to U/A 523.
- Subfields \$7 and \$8 are Not Repeatable.
  - These subfields need to be similarly harmonized throughout U/A.
- Add U/A 523 “Notes on Field Contents”: “The access point in 523 is a related access point of the character name in the 2-- field in a performance-related resource (notably audio or video recordings, movies, opera scores, plots, and librettos).”
- Re-number examples, starting from 1.1.
- In U/A 523 Example 1.1 (formerly 2.1), revise second sentence of note to read: “Field 241 *in* embedded fields technique.”
- In U/A 523 Example 1.2, revise final sentence of note to read: “Field 231 *in* standard subfields technique ....”
- In U/A 523, renumber Example 4.1 to Example 3.
- In U/A 523 Example 5, revise second and third sentences of note to read: “Voice ranges specified in coded field 146, with suffixes. Field 241 in standard *subfields* technique.”
- In U/A 523 Example 6, first 502 second subfield \$6 should read: “\$6z07523”.
- In U/A 523 Example 6, final 502 second subfield \$6 should read: “\$6z06523”.

U/A 723 (Authorized Access Point in Another Language and/or Script – Character)

- U/A 723 “Field Definition” should read: “This field contains fictitious character *name* that is ...”
- U/A 723 “Occurrence” should be: Optional. Repeatable.
- Subfield \$a is Mandatory and Not Repeatable. Subfield \$b is Not Repeatable. Subfield \$c is Repeatable.
- Add subfields \$2 and \$3 to U/A 723.
- U/A 723 “Notes on Field Contents” should read: “The field contains a character name formulated in accordance with the descriptive cataloguing rules or subject system in use by the agency which created it, and linked to the form in 223.”
- For U/A 723 Example 1, reverse the order of fields 541 and 723.

**2017/1:** U/B 230 (Material Specific Area: Electronic Resource Characteristics), U/B 231 (Digital File Characteristics)

New field U/B 231 approved in general, but harmonization with U/B 215 (Physical Description) is suggested as additional work needed. Consider making U/B 230 obsolete. Add examples for electronic resources that include U/B 336 and U/B 337.

- For U/B 231 “Field Definition,” substitute the following adaptation of the MARC 21 definition of Bibliographic field 347 (Digital File Characteristics): “Technical specification relating to the digital encoding of text, image, audio, video, and other types of data in a resource. This information could also be recorded in field 215 (Physical Description) subfield \$c (Other Physical Details). Multiple values from the same source vocabulary may be recorded in the same field in separate occurrences of subfields. Terms from different source vocabularies are recorded in separate occurrences of the field.”
- U/B 231 Indicator 1 is “Blank (Not Defined).”
- For U/B 231, make all the alphabetic subfields Repeatable.
- For U/B 231 subfield \$b, substitute the following adaptation of the MARC 21 definition of Bibliographic field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) subfield \$b (Encoding Standard): “A schema, standard, etc., used to encode the digital content of a resource.”
- U/B 231 subfield \$2 is Not Repeatable; delete the second and third sentences.
- U/B 231 Example 5B should be reorganized in two fields 231, according to subfields \$2.

**2017/2:** U/B 214 (Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture Statements)

After considerable discussion about either revising the existing U/B 210 (Publication, Distribution, Etc.) and living with the ambiguities that solution would exacerbate, or creating the new field U/B 214, a tied straw vote of 3 to 3 left the issue unresolved. A revision of U/B 210 that incorporates appropriate elements of the proposed U/B 214 will be drawn up for comparative consideration (**Action, Ms. Galvão**) In any case, U/B 210 and U/B 214 should be mutually exclusive. It would also be good to have a place to unambiguously indicate unpublished versus published; one possibility is the currently undefined Label/19, perhaps.

**2017/3:** U/B 283 (Carrier Type)

Approved with the following changes:

- Delete the phrase “if \$a is present” from the definitions of both subfields \$a and \$2.
- For U/B 283, Example 2 reorder the subfields in both U/B 183 and U/B 283 fields to subfield order \$8, \$a, \$2.
- Add the following text to U/B 4.3, Order of Subfields: Subfield \$2 should immediately follow the element to which it refers; subfield \$8 should be added to subfields preceding all other subfields. Also in the table for “Numeric subfields have specific values ...,” in subfield \$2 Source, add 2-- block.

**2017/4:** U/B 110 (Coded Data Field: Continuing Resources) Subfield \$a/0 (Type of Continuing Resource Designator)

Approved with the following changes:

- For U/B 110 Subfield \$a/0 codes “g” and “h”, substitute the single word “website” or “websites” instead of two words. Revise the code “h” definition as follows: “Use this code for blogs that are *websites consisting* of a series of entries arranged in reverse chronological order, frequently updated with new information.”
- Omit all the proposed examples, which do not fit into the structure for examples in 1-- fields.

**2017/5:** U/A 017 (Other Identifier), U/B 017 (Other Identifier)

Approved field U/A 017 with the changes that follow. Approved changes to field U/B 017 that follow. The proposed U/A 088 field was deleted from the proposal.

#### U/A 017 (Other Identifier)

- Change field name of U/A 017 to “Other Identifier.”
- Revise U/A 317 “Field Definition” to read as follows: “This field contains an identifier associated with the entity named in the 2XX field that cannot be accommodated in another field and a qualification that distinguishes between identifiers when more than one identifier of the same type is contained in a record. The field also contains the source of the identifier.”
- In U/A 017, change Indicator 1 to “Type of Identifier,” change value “7” to “System specified in subfield \$2,” and change value “8” to “Unspecified Type of Identifier.”
- In U/A 017, rename subfield \$a as “Identifier” and revise description to read as follows: “A correctly formatted identifier. Numbers or codes are formulated according to type. Not Repeatable.”
- In U/A 017 subfield \$b, revise description to read as follows: “An indication of the scope of the identifier in subfields \$a or \$z. Not Repeatable.”
- In U/A 017, rename subfield \$z as “Erroneous Identifier” and revise description to read as follows: “An identifier that has been identified .... If a valid identifier of the same type is not known ....”
- In U/A 017 subfield \$2, revise description to read as follows: “An identification in coded form for the system from which the identifier is derived. Use only when the first indicator contains the value 7 (System specified in subfield \$2).”
- In U/A 017 “Notes on Field Content,” revise text to read: “Other Identifiers are unique, permanent, and internationally recognized alphanumeric codes used to identify entities. The structure of these identifiers is determined by the agencies formulating them.”

#### U/B 017 (Other Identifier)

- Change field name of U/B 017 to “Other Identifier.”
- In U/B 017 “Field Definition,” revise text to read: “This field contains an identifier, published on an item that cannot be accommodated in another field and a qualification that distinguishes between identifiers when more than one identifier of the same type is contained in a record .... even if it does not contain an identifier.”
- In U/B 017 “Occurrence,” revise the description to read: “... when more than one type of identifier is used ... a specific type of identifier is to be recorded.”

- In U/B 017, change Indicator 1 to “Type of Identifier,” change value “7” to “System specified in subfield \$2,” and change value “8” to “Unspecified Type of Identifier.”
- In U/B, change Indicator 2 description to read as follows: “The second indicator position contains a value that indicates whether there is a difference between a scanned *identifier* and the same *identifier* in eye-readable form.”
- In U/B 017, rename subfield \$a as “Identifier” and revise description to read as follows: “A correctly formatted identifier. Numbers or codes are formulated according to type. Not Repeatable.”
- In U/B 017 subfield \$b, revise description to read as follows: “An indication of the scope of the identifier in subfield \$a (if present) ... the relationship of an identifier to a set or to a particular volume. Not Repeatable.”
- In U/B 017, rename subfield \$z as “Erroneous Identifier” and revise description to read as follows: “An identifier that has been identified ...”
- In U/B 017, subfield \$2 should be changed to “System Code.”
- In U/B 017 subfield \$2, revise description to read as follows: “An identification in coded form for the system from which the identifier is derived. Use only when the first indicator contains the value 7 (System specified in subfield \$2).”

**2017/6:** U/B 115 (Coded Data Field: Visual Projections, Videorecordings, and Motion Pictures), U/B 116 (Coded Data Field: Graphics), U/B 117 (Coded Data Field: Three-Dimensional Artefacts and Realia), U/B 120 (Coded Data Field: Cartographic Materials: General), U/B 130 (Coded Data Field: Microforms: Physical Attributes), U/B 135 (Coded Data Field: Electronic Resources)

U/B 115 (Coded Data Field: Visual Projections, Videorecordings, and Motion Pictures) Subfield \$a/4 (Colour Indicator)

- For code “a”, revise the text as follows: “The image or motion picture is in black-and-white tones only.”
- For code “b”, revise the text as follows: “The image or motion picture is in more than one colour.”
- Rename code “c” as “mixed” and revise the text as follows: “The image(s) or motion picture(s) is in a combination of black-and-white, one colour, and/or colours.”
- For code “d”, revise the text as follows: “The image is in a single colour. Used only ....”

- Rename code “z” as “other” and revise the text as follows: “The image or motion picture has colour characteristics not covered by the other defined codes. Includes stained, tinted, toned (e.g., sepia).”

U/B 116 (Coded Data Field: Graphics) Subfield \$a/3 (Colour)

- For U/B 116 subfield \$a/3, revise the description as follows: A one-character code is used to specify the colour of the non-projected graphic item ....”
- Rename code “a” as “one-colour” and revise the text as follows: “The image is in a single colour ....”
- For code “b”, revise the text as follows: “The image is in black-and-white tones only.”
- For code “c”, revise the text as follows: “The image is in more than one colour.”
- For code “d”, revise the text as follows: “... photographic process, is coloured by hand.”
- For code “v”, revise the text as follows: “The image is in a combination of black-and-white, one colour, and/or colours.”
- For code “x”, revise the text as follows: “The colour characteristics do not apply.”
- For code “z”, revise the text as follows: “The image has colour characteristics not covered by the other defined codes. Includes stained, tinted, toned (e.g., sepia).”

U/B 117 (Coded Data Field: Three-Dimensional Artefacts and Realia) Subfield \$a/8 (Colour)

- Rename code “a” as “one-colour” and revise the text as follows: “The item is in a single colour. Does not include black-and-white.”
- For code “b”, revise the text as follows: “The item is in black-and-white tones only.”
- For code “c”, revise the text as follows: “The item is in more than one colour.”
- For code “d”, revise the text as follows: “the item is coloured by hand.”
- For code “v”, revise the text as follows: “The item or collection is in a combination of black-and-white and/or colours.”
- For code “x”, revise the text as follows: “The colour characteristics do not apply.”
- For code “z”, revise the text as follows: “The item has colour characteristics not covered by the other defined codes. Includes stained, tinted, toned (e.g., sepia).”

U/B 120 (Coded Data Field: Cartographic Materials: General) Subfield \$a/0 (Colour Indicator)

- For code “a”, revise the text as follows: “The item is in a single colour, including black-and-white.”

- Rename code “b” as “multicoloured” and revise the text as follows: “The item is in more than one colour.”

U/B 130 (Coded Data Field: Microforms: Physical Attributes) Subfield \$a/7 (Colour)

- Rename code “a” as “one-colour” and revise the text as follows: “The item is in a single colour, including black-and-white.”
- “multicoloured” should be code “b”, and revise the text as follows: “The item is in more than one colour.”
- Rename code “v” as “mixed”, and revise the text as follows: “The item is in a combination of black-and-white and/or colours.”
- For code “z”, revise the text as follows: “The item has colour characteristics not covered by the other defined codes. Includes stained, tinted, toned (e.g., sepia).”

U/B 135 (Coded Data Field: Electronic Resources) Subfield \$a/2 (Colour)

- Set all definitions to lower-case.
- Rename code “a” as “one-colour” and revise the text as follows: “The resource is in a single colour. Does not include black-and-white and greyscale.”
- For code “b”, revise the text as follows: “The resource is in black-and-white only (i.e., only on two levels).”
- For code “c”, revise the text as follows: “The resource is in more than one colour.”
- For code “g”, revise the text as follows: “The resource is in a large number of shades of grey.”
- For code “m”, revise the text as follows: “The resource is in a combination of black-and-white, greyscale, and/or colours.”
- For code “n”, revise the text as follows: “The colour characteristics do not apply.”
- For code “z”, revise the text as follows: “The resource has colour characteristics not covered by the other defined codes. Includes stained, tinted, toned (e.g., sepia).”

**2017/7:** U/A Subfield \$5 (Relationship Control)

The “Rationale for Proposal” divides the proposal into two points:

- (1) Generalizing the use of Subfield \$5/0 Name Relationship Code values for personal names from specifically “author” to simply “person” in acknowledgement that authorship is merely one possible role of responsibility. Point One of the proposal was accepted.

- (2) Subfield \$5/3 Specific Relationship Code for Agents values are thought to be confusing for the Founding, Membership, and Ownership relationships and their reciprocity. After considerable discussion, it was determined that the Reference Displays are not intended to be prescriptive. The Reference Display phrases in U/A Subfield \$5/3 are simply possible suggestions for ultimately more general “see also” references. Examples 4 and 5 in the proposal will be added to the text, but the remainder of Point Two needs further study.

**2017/8:** U/A Different Rule Data page 27, U/A 305 (Textual See Also Reference Note), U/A 450 (Variant Access Point: Topical Subject), U/A 520 (Related Access Point: Family Name), U/A Appendix L (Complete Examples)

This proposal corrects errors in various examples throughout U/A:

- U/A Different Rule Data, Examples, page 27: Subfield \$5 was erroneously repeated in the 500 fields in Example 1; U/A editor Ms. Mirna Willer will be consulted. The corrected Example 2 is accepted, adding subfield “\$5n” to field 510.
- U/A 305 Textual See Also Reference Note, Example 2, page 158: The example is corrected, adding subfield “\$5z0” to the first 500 field.
- U/A 450 Variant Access Point: Topical Subject, Example 6, page 194: Example 6 correction accepted.
- U/A 520 Related Access Point: Family Name, Example 3, page 212: Example 3 correction accepted.
- U/A Appendix L: Complete Examples:
  - Personal Names, pages 285-285: Example 7 correction accepted. Example 8 correction accepted. Example 9 correction accepted.
  - Family Names, pages 295-296: Example 1 correction accepted.

**2017/9:** U/A 146 (Coded Data Field: Medium of Performance)

U/A 146 (Coded Data Field: Medium of Performance) is similar to U/B 146 (Coded Data Field: Medium of Performance) except that U/A 146 is for use in work and expression records and examples have been revised accordingly. The proposal was accepted in general, with the following corrections, pending Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi’s sharing of a corrected version after the meeting. (**Action: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi**).

- U/A 146 “Field Definition” should read: “... devices, and other media of performance ...” rather than “performers.”

- For U/A 146 subfields \$c and \$e, substitute “medium” for “performer.”
- U/A 146 subfield \$i should be “Number of Instruments, Voices, Etc.”
- In the U/A 146 “Notes on Field Contents,” change references to “players” in the final two paragraphs to “instruments, voices, etc.”
- In U/A 146 Example 3 (and in other examples, as appropriate), field 242 needs subfield \$4.
- In U/A 146 Examples 4 and 5, the final sentence of the note should read “Field 241 in standard subfields technique.”

**2017/10: U/B 338 (Funding Information Note)**

The proposal was accepted with the following changes:

- U/B 338 “Field Definition” should read: “... when the *work* results ....”
- U/B 338 Indicator 2 description should read: “Specifies *whether* the field is structured.”
- U/B 338 Indicator 2 value “1” description should read: “Information is recorded as necessary in subfields other *than* \$a.”
- U/B 338 subfield \$a second sentence should read: “Subfield \$a should be present if Indicator 2 is blank (#).” The same correction needs to be made in U/B 325 (Reproduction Note).
- U/B 338 subfield \$d should read: “A unique identifier in the scope of funding organization (e.g., a grant agreement number). Not Repeatable.”
- U/B 338 subfield \$e should read: “... formally constituted *legal* body (e.g., EU for European Union). Repeatable.”
- U/B 338 subfield \$f should read: “The full form of the project name. Not Repeatable.”
- U/B 338 subfield \$g should read: “The project acronym. Not Repeatable.”
- In U/B 338 Example 1, the 200 subfield \$f should be “\$f[organizer] ....” The 338 subfield \$a should have extra spaces deleted in “Self Help.” The note should read: “Unstructured *note* about the grant ....”
- In U/B 338 Example 2, the note should read: “... refers to the *funding* organization ....”
- In U/B 338 Example 3, the 200 field First Indicator should be “1”. The note should read: “Structured note with the name and acronym of the project.”

**2017/11: U/B 115 (Coded Data Field: Visual Projections, Video Recordings, and Motion Pictures)**

Subfield \$a/16 (Presentation Format: Videorecording)

The proposal to add code “1” (letter “e1”) for Blu-ray Disc was accepted, but without the proposed definition.

**2017/12:** U/B 717 (Printer/Publisher Device)

After considerable discussion, the proposal was rejected.

**2017/13:** U/B Appendix H (Cataloguing Rules and Format Codes)

Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi explained that he intended this more as a discussion paper for adding the “Value Vocabularies List” than as a proposal.

- The “Cataloguing Rules” code “RDA” had already been added to U/B Appendix H as part of the 2016 Update.
- The “Cataloguing Rules” code “reicat” was accepted.
- The “Formats List” code “sbnmarc” was accepted.
- Ms. Cordeiro has requested the full bibliographic reference for IranMARC for its code to be added to the “Formats List.”
- The “Value Vocabularies List” codes “rdacarrier”, “rdacontent”, and “rdamedia” were accepted.

**5. Guidelines for Archives**

There is nothing to report on the *Guidelines for Archives*.

**6. Outreach Activities, Website, Users, Systems Suppliers, and Record Providers**

Ms. Zhlobinskaya reports that there is now a UZMARC (Uzbekistan MARC), based on RUSMARC, which is in turn based on UNIMARC.

Mr. Le Pape reported on a joint project between the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) and the Agence bibliographique de l’enseignement supérieur (ABES), “Transition bibliographique des catalogues vers le web de données” (<https://www.transition-bibliographique.fr/>). It involves the FRBR-ization of French catalogues, the creation of new French cataloguing instruction based on RDA, and the launch of a nationwide bibliographic transition program.

Mr. Weitz will write and submit to the editor of the IFLA *Metadata Newsletter* a narrative report on this PUC meeting. (**Action: Mr. Weitz**)

**7. Information Regarding the UNIMARC in RDF Project**

RSC Chair Mr. Dunsire provided the following “Report on the UNIMARC/Authorities in RDF Project” along with the Excel spreadsheet mentioned:

The work on modelling UNIMARC/Authorities in RDF started in March 2016 as a continuation of the UNIMARC/Bibliographic format in RDF.

The project covers the 3rd edition of UNIMARC/A (2009) and full updates of 2012 and 2016.

The same methodology as for the previous project UNIMARC/B in RDF was used, meaning that every content designator (combination of field + indicator + subfield) result in one RDF property. Each RDF property is expressed as a single row in Excel sheets (4.594 rows).

Predrag Perožić produced the spreadsheets and Mirna Willer updated the tables with definitions and scope notes. The shared Excel document was made available for review to Dr. Cordeiro.

It is planned that Gordon Dunsire will check the content, produce the input OMR spreadsheets, and send them to PUC members to review the content. After that, the sheets will be loaded to OMR.

Members of the PUC will review the spreadsheet. (**Action: All, by August 2017 IFLA Congress**) Mr. Dunsire has provided the following notes for the review:

The URI, label, and Registry name (regname) data conform to the standard templates.

The main focus for review is the definitions. These are derived from the manual, but are amended for consistency and clarity. Suggestions for improving definitions are welcome.

To make suggestions, highlight the spreadsheet cell with a background colour and enter the new wording. Please coordinate an overall set of amendments in a "master" version of the spreadsheet, and return it to me.

## **8. Information from Other IFLA Groups/Sections**

Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi reports that the ISBD Review Group will meet with the RSC in Warsaw, Poland, following the IFLA Congress to discuss harmonization of ISBD with the IFLA LRM. He intends to try to make it clear that a "more principled" ISBD along the lines of the LRM is not useful. A meeting of a subgroup preparing the alignment of the ISBD element set with the LRM is planned for 6-8 April in Paris.

## **9. Relations with Other International Organizations and Committees**

There is nothing to report on relations with NISO or ISO TC 46 SC 4.

As the IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to the American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), Mr. Weitz will continue to share with the PUC his twice-yearly reports on CC:DA activities. (**Action: Mr. Weitz**)

Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi reports that the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives, and Documentation Centres (IAML) has added many new percussion terms to its Medium of Performance (MoP). He needs to confer with Mr. Dunsire adding these and some new geographic area codes to the Open Metadata Registry (OMR). (**Action: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi**) There will be a IAML meeting soon during which work on harmonizing RDA and the IFLA LRM will be undertaken.

**10. Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

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

The PUC will hold its next informal meeting in August 2017 as part of the IFLA Congress in Wrocław, Poland.

Scheduling of the 2018 regular meeting of the PUC has not yet been started, but it is likely to be in March or April 2018 at a site yet to be determined. Note that Easter Sunday is 2018 April 1; the first night of Passover is Friday, 2018 March 30; and Eastern Orthodox Easter Sunday is 2018 April 8.

---

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

2017 April 4