

# **Minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee**

**2018 March 22-23**

**Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico delle Biblioteche Italiane**

**Rome, Italy**

## **Present:**

Ms. Saeedeh Akbari-Daryan (National Library and Archives of the Islamic Republic of Iran)

Ms. Branka Badovinac ((IZUM, Slovenia)

Ms. Flavia Bruni (ICCU, Italy)

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), Chair

Mr. Stanislav Golubtsov (National Library of Russia)

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

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

## **1. Opening of the Meeting**

Ms. Gordana Mazić, Chair of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC), opened the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting of the PUC at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, 2018 March 22, and adjourned it around 5:00 p.m. The Friday, 2018 March 23 session opened at 9:05 a.m. and adjourned around 4:00 p.m.

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

## **2. PUC Membership**

Ms. Flavia Bruni, ICCU, will succeed Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi upon his retirement later in 2018. Currently a corresponding member, Ms. Bruni will be elected to the PUC at the next election period.

Mr. Stanislav Golubtsov, National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg, is a new corresponding member of the committee. He worked on the Russian translation of UNIMARC.

Mr. Philippe Le Pape, ABES, is retiring in a few weeks, to be replaced by a colleague in September 2018.

Ms. Mirna Willer, University of Zadar, Croatia, Honorary Member and Special Consultant, is retiring in October 2018.

### **3. Approval of the Minutes of the Informal Meeting Held in Wrocław, Poland, August 2017**

Wrocław minutes were approved with previous corrections having already been incorporated.

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

All UNIMARC Manuals need references changed from the Functional Requirements family to the IFLA LRM, with citations of the Entity, Attribute, or Relationship number and possibly to the UNIMARC Namespace URI, when applicable. This will also need to be explained in the introduction to each format document. (**Action: Ms. Badovinac, Ms. Mazić**)

The committee discussed the idea of giving public access on the web to the UNIMARC proposal form. The concern is that such access tends to attract impractical or poorly-conceived ideas. Instead, the committee will add text to the PUC site suggesting that non-PUC members contact the closest PUC member for making proposals. Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi will work on this with IFLA Professional Support Officer Ms. Joanne Yeomans and the IFLA Webmaster. (**Action: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi**) Ms. Mazić will work on drafting the text. (**Action: Ms. Mazić**)

**2012/10:** U/A 180 (Form of a Textual Language Work), U/B 180 (Form of a Textual Language Work)

Work on this is considered to be complete.

**2015/7:** U/B 856 (Electronic Location and Access)

**2015/8:** U/B 857 (Electronic Access)

**2015/7** originally proposed making U/B 856 subfield \$q (Electronic Format Type) repeatable, which led then-PUC Chair Ms. Cordeiro to propose **2015/8**. Its intention was to make U/B 856 obsolete in favor of a cleaned up and leaner replacement field, U/B 857, eliminating all of the now-useless historical baggage. This from the March 2015 PUC meeting minutes:

**2015/8:** U/B 857: Terms of Access. The National Library of Portugal (Action: Ms. Cordeiro, Ms. Galvão) will work on a proposal as follows: Consider renaming Bibliographic field 857 as “Electronic Access,” making the existing 856 obsolete. Then rename field 857 as “Electronic Location and Access,” carrying over the subfield values that are still used (such as subfield \$u) and eliminating the remainder. The subfield \$a

defined in **2015/8** would be renamed to subfield \$j and be edited to match field 325 subfield \$j as in Proposal **2015/6**.

**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 Other Language and/or Script – Character)

Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi and Mr. Le Pape will work together to finalize this, using invented identifiers in subfield \$3 examples for characters. When completed, this will be published on the web. (**Action: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi, Mr. Le Pape**)

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

Accepted, with edit to the “Note on Field Contents: “... ISBD Consolidated Edition **or RDA.**”

Also see **2018/17**.

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

Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi and Mr. Le Pape will work together to finalize field U/A 146. When completed, this will be published on the web. (**Action: Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi, Mr. Le Pape**)

**2018/1:** U/B Appendix H (Value Vocabularies List)

“RDAfrCarrier” is the vocabulary used by BnF and Sudoc in U/B 183 (Coded Data Field: Type of Carrier). Code was accepted for addition to the Value Vocabularies List.

**2018/2:** U/B Control Subfield \$8 (Materials Specified)

In U/B, subfield \$8 was limited for use in the U/B 3XX Notes Block and U/B 852 (Location and Call Number). Proposal to make it applicable in any field was accepted.

Ms. Zhlobinskaya will research the various uses and definitions of subfield \$2 (Fingerprint System Code, Source, System Code, Link Text) and suggest a means of harmonizing them. (**Action: Ms. Zhlobinskaya**)

Control Subfield \$1 (Linking Data): Add use in U/B 576 and U/B 577 to the table in U/B Chapter 3.10 (Numerical Subfields).

Control Subfield \$3 (Authority Record Number): Add use in U/B 506, U/B 507, U/B 576, and U/B 577 to the table in U/B Chapter 3.10 (Numerical Subfields).

**2018/3:** U/B 372 (Copyright Status of Digital Resources)

Representatives of the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania were not in attendance to present this proposal. Discussion revealed the need to vastly expand this field, perhaps along the lines of MARC 21 Bibliographic 542 (Information Relating to Copyright Status), adding new subfields, making it repeatable, and removing its limitation to digital resources only. It was suggested that ideas from this proposal and discussion might be combined with the existing U/B 371 (Notes on Information Service Policy). The Lithuanians have been asked to work with others interested in the field to try to harmonize the proposed U/B 372 and the existing U/B 371, if possible. (**Action: Ms. Bliūdžiuvienė and Ms. Buckienė**). Field 371 was originally in U/H because it was intended to be about rights for the item, rather than about the copyright status of the work. Field 371 is also a possible addition to U/A to document the search for copyright

status, especially to identify orphan works. The proposal was postponed for these discussions and any possible changes as a result.

**2018/4:** U/B 100 (General Processing Data) Subfield \$a/22-24 (Language of Cataloguing)

Delete word “descriptive” from revised first paragraph text; otherwise the proposal was accepted.

**2018/5:** U/B 101 (Language of the Resource)

The intention of **2018/4** and **2018/5** is to accommodate ISO 639-3 and other Language Code sources so that additional lesser-known languages can be coded.

Define field U/B 101 subfield \$2 for System Code, although the name of the subfield will be harmonized with the overall decision about the name of subfields \$2. Reword subfield definition: “For a list of the **language code schemas** ....”

Field U/B 101 is made repeatable for when multiple subfield \$2 Language Code sources are used.

Reword “Occurrence:” “Repeatable if more than one code **schema** is used ....”

Notes on Field Contents: “... For codes use ISO 639-2 or other standards language code schemas specified in subfield \$2....”

Example 15 First Indicators should be “2” (plus Indicator 1 text should add “EX 15”). In Examples 10-15: “... are carried in **an authority** record.”

**2018/6:** U/B 200 (Title and Statement of Responsibility), U/B 225 (Series), U/B 510 (Parallel Title Proper), U/B 532 (Expanded Title), U/B 541 (Translated Title Supplied by Cataloguer), U/B 670 (Precis), U/B 675 (Universal Decimal Classification (UDC)), U/B 676 (Dewey Decimal Classification)

For U/B 200, U/B 225, U/B 510, U/B 532, and U/B 541: “... when the Language Code scheme is other than ISO 639-2.” Rework this proposal to explain that subfield \$2 will be used only when U/B 101 is repeated (that is, when there is other than a single language in U/B 101). Examples are needed for U/B 200, U/B 225, U/B 510, U/B 532, and U/B 541. (**Action: Ms. Zhlobinskaya**)

No changes will be made to U/B 670, U/B 675, and U/B 676.

Otherwise, the proposal is accepted in principle in conjunction with changes to U/B 101.

**2018/7:** U/B 623 (Character)

Subfield \$2 will not be added to U/B 623.

Subfield \$3 will be added, but as Not Repeatable.

**2018/8:** U/A 450 (Variant Access Point – Topical Subject)

Proposal was accepted. The change will be added to the list of typographical corrections. These sorts of changes should be able to be made by the editor without proposals or discussion.

**2018/9:** U/B Appendix A (Codes)

U/B Appendix A had been “Language Codes” in the previous edition. Now it will be entitled “Codes.” The language code section will be entitled “Sources of Language Codes” and contain

only the language code source codes. Description: “Sources of Language Codes contains a list of standard sources of language codes, assigning a code to each schema. Entries in the list are represented by the source code followed by the bibliographic citation for the source documentation.” Accepted as amended.

**2018/10:** U/A 100 (General Processing Data) Subfield \$a/9-11 (Language of Cataloguing)

Reword description of subfield \$a/9-11: “... For codes see ISO 639-2 (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/langhome.html>).”

**2018/11:** U/A 101 (Language of the Entity)

Changes to U/A 101 should parallel those made to U/B 101 in 2018/5.

Occurrence: “... more than one code schema ...” : subfield \$2 name will harmonize “For a list of the **language code schemas** ...”

Define field U/A 101 subfield \$2 for System Code, although the name of the subfield will be harmonized with the overall decision about the name of subfields \$2. Reword subfield definition: “For a list of the **language code schemas** ...”

Field U/A 101 is made repeatable for when multiple subfield \$2 Language Code sources are used.

Notes in Field Contents: “... For codes use ISO 639-2 or other standards language code schemas specified in subfield \$2...”

**2018/12:** U/A 675 (Universal Decimal Classification (UDC)), U/A 676 (Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC))

Rejected, in parallel to the rejection of similar changes to U/B 675 and U/B 676 in **2018/6**.

**2018/13:** U/A 231 (Authorized Access Point – Title (Work)), U/A 232 (Authorized Access Point – Title (Expression) (Provisional)), U/A 432 (Variant Access Point – Title (Expression) (Provisional)), U/A 532 (Related Access Point – Title (Expression) (Provisional)), U/A 632 (Subject Access Point – Title (Expression)), U/A 732 (Authorized Access Point in Another Language and/or Script – Title (Expression) (Provisional))

This Greek proposal is incomplete as it currently stands, so it was difficult to fully evaluate and comment upon it. If possible, a Greek representative should attend the PUC meeting in Kuala Lumpur to flesh out the proposal and discuss it in more depth, even if the Greeks cannot nominate a standing or corresponding member to the committee.

It was also strongly pointed out that the proposal is based on FRBR. The IFLA-LRM is much more clear regarding titles of Expressions.

**2018/14:** U/B 604 (Name and Title Used as Subject)

U/B 604 is only U/B 6XX field that does not define subfield \$2, which was judged to be an oversight. Accepted.

**2018/15:** U/B 2.1 (General Organization)

The terms “obsolete” and “reserved” have never been defined in U/B. Because these terms can apply at both the field and the subfield levels, as well as to different elements including indicators

and codes, a new Section 2.3, “Status of UNIMARC Content Designators and Data Elements,” is being added to Chapter 2, “Organization of the Manual.” According to UNIMARC definitions, “Content Designators” and “Data Elements” cover everything that is relevant. Include the following definitions:

- “deleted”: Designator or element determined with near certainty to have never been used and therefore available for redefinition in a format.
- “obsolete”: Designator or element may have been used in records and may continue to appear in records created prior to the date the content designator or data element was made obsolete. Obsolete elements are not to be used in new records.
- “provisional”: Designator or element established for the time being but subject to further refinement.
- “reserved”: Designator or element defined for future or local use.

These definitions should also be added to U/A Chapter 3 “Definitions” under the heading “Status of UNIMARC Content Designators and Data Elements.”

**2018/16:** U/B 215 (Physical Description)

See **2018/17**.

**2018/17:** U/B 231 (Digital File Characteristics)

U/B 215 (**2018/16**), U/B 230 (**2017/1**), U/B 231 (**2018/17**), U/B 336 (Type of Electronic Resource Note), and U/B 337 (System Requirements Note (Electronic Resources)) are to be considered together during a conference call following the PUC meeting. Ms. Zhlobinskaya, Ms. Mazić, and Mr. Le Pape will share comments and additional materials in advance of the conference call. (**Action: Ms. Zhlobinskaya, Ms. Mazić, Mr. Le Pape; by 2018 March 31**)

## **5. Information from IFLA Groups/Sections and from CoS Activities on Procedures for Review Group Nominations and Elections of Chairs and Members for the Review Groups**

As a result of the IFLA-LRM, the names of various review groups are currently subject to change. The ISBD Review Group has created two different groups to examine both the structure and the content of ISBD in its efforts to align it with the LRM. The ISBD RG will look more closely at several topics including the ISBD’s treatment of unpublished materials, ISBD’s concentration on the Manifestation level and its relationships, and what may be missing from the ISBD. Other groups will need to deal seriously with other parts of the LRM model that are not dealt with in ISBD. The ISBD RG hopes to formally begin its revision of ISBD by the end of the 2018 IFLA Congress.

Mr. Gordon Dunsire is the official PUC liaison to LIDATEC.

## **6. Defining the Criteria for PUC Members and Selecting the Team to Renew the PUC Website**

The PUC and the Committee on Standards (CoS) are still somewhat at odds regarding PUC membership and term limitations. The CoS allows no more than two consecutive terms, except by special request, and prohibits permanent memberships. This contradicts the PUC’s historical need for both continuity and

UNIMARC-specific expertise. The PUC works by consensus rather than by formal vote, so the idea of not voting after two terms is not really relevant to what the PUC does. We may be able to have members alternate between being a standing member and being a corresponding member to prolong terms. It is vital for members to have institutional support because of the special work the PUC does. The PUC will do its best to arrange for its needs within what the limitations that the CoS imposes.

The committee drafted criteria for applying for PUC membership, to be published on the PUC website. The criteria include:

- Being a UNIMARC format professional (present a current CV)
- Working in an institution that uses UNIMARC or a UNIMARC-based scheme as the cataloguing format or as an exchange format (present a brief biography outlining UNIMARC familiarity via cataloging and/or research)
- Having the support of one's institution, because PUC work requires time and attendance at the annual regular meetings, with attendance at the informal meeting held at the IFLA Congress optional but preferred (present a letter of support)
- Having sufficient fluency in English, because meetings are conducted in English

In principle, members represent countries, so only one standing member per country can be selected, although others may be corresponding members. The member must be willing to promote UNIMARC within one's community. A prospective member should plan for at least a four-year commitment to the PUC. The PUC site (<https://www.ifla.org/unimarc/puc>) says that the committee may have 7-9 standing members, and up to 12 corresponding members.

## 7. Protocol Between PUC and RSC

Here is the edited protocol as determined by the PUC:

### **Background**

“RDA is a package of data elements, guidelines, and instructions for creating library and cultural heritage resource metadata that are well-formed according to international models for user-focused linked data applications” – <http://rda-rsc.org/>

The RDA Steering Committee (RSC) maintains and develops vocabulary encoding schemes (VESs) for several RDA recorded elements. The vocabularies are amended following established RSC policies and procedures.

The RSC provides linked data versions of the RDA vocabularies in the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) and RDA Registry.

The RSC maintains, jointly with the IFLA ISBD Review Group, a mapping between ISBD and RDA elements.

UNIMARC (Universal MARC format) is a format for the representation and communication of bibliographic, authority, classification, and holdings information in machine-readable form, originally created by IFLA. The IFLA Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) within the IFLA UNIMARC Strategic Programme is responsible for maintaining the UNIMARC format and for the editorial development of the UNIMARC documentation.

The PUC updates the UNIMARC format following established policies and procedures, and maintains and develops a number of VESs as UNIMARC code lists.

The RSC has a nominated representative on the PUC.

The PUC has a nominated representative on the RSC.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this protocol is to support communication between the editorial processes of the RSC and the PUC in order to support functional and semantic interoperability between data compatible with RDA and data compatible with the UNIMARC format.

The result of the editorial processes is RDA/UNIMARC mappings added to the RDA Toolkit.

### **Methodology**

The protocol is intended to be light-weight to avoid significant changes to the current practices, priorities, and workflows of the RSC and the PUC.

The usual channel of communication between the two groups are the RSC consulting liaison to the PUC and the PUC consulting liaison to the RSC, who are responsible for routine communication and reviewing each group's activity for potential issues.

### **Duties of the RSC**

The RSC will:

- Inform the PUC at the earliest opportunity of impending changes to RDA that may have an impact on UNIMARC.
- Liaise with the PUC on the development and maintenance of linked data mappings between RDA and UNIMARC value vocabularies.
- Liaise with the PUC on the development and maintenance of linked data mappings between RDA and UNIMARC element sets.
- Nominate a consulting liaison to the PUC.

### **Duties of the PUC**

The PUC will:

- Inform the RSC at the earliest opportunity of impending changes to UNIMARC vocabularies that may have an impact on RDA.
- Liaise with the RSC on the development and maintenance of linked data mappings between RDA and UNIMARC value vocabularies.
- Liaise with the RSC on the development and maintenance of linked data mappings between RDA and UNIMARC element sets.
- Nominate a consulting liaison with the RSC.

## **8. Presentation of the Material for Online Publications UNIMARC Bibliographic Format and UNIMARC Authorities**



Copyright issues remain with Saur concerning making the U/A and U/B documents available online. We will need to retitle the documents as one way to circumvent some of the copyright issues. Because we are in final preparations for online publication, we need to be in contact with Ms. Yeomans and IFLA Headquarters about how to proceed, following up on our conversations in Wrocław.

Ms. Badovinac has been working on the UNIMARC online publications. All of U/B is now in one large file, which is better for internal harmonization, but is slow because of its size. She has simplified the IFLA templates, standardized the “Subfields and Occurrence” sections, added history notes, updated the “Related Field” titles. Still under discussion are the appendices, some of which may be incorporated into other sections. Where appropriate, U/A and U/B can share appendices. In the online version of documents, we can link to outside sources rather than reproduce such things as code lists.

A PUC Editorial Group, consisting of Ms. Akbari-Daryan, Ms. Badovinac, Ms. Galvão, Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi, Ms. Mazić, and Ms. Zhlobinskaya, will define policies for the online editions. These will include harmonization with LRM, the disposition of superseded terms, standardization of vocabularies (such as the work Ms. Mazić did on colour vocabularies), and the relationship of the format documents to the Open Metadata Registry (OMR). The group will spend the weeks following the PUC meeting familiarizing themselves with the two documents and identifying tasks to be done. Reviewing and editing will be done in Microsoft OneNote. Ms. Badovinac will share her compilation of terminology and definitions to assist with this work.

## **9. Publishing FRAD-UNIMARC Mappings on PUC Website**

Ms. Akbari-Daryan shared her FRAD-FRSAD/UNIMARC mappings with the PUC on 2017 October 25. She will provide a foreword about how the mapping was developed and any plans for a more current mapping to the LRM. (**Action: Ms. Akbari-Daryan**) In the meantime, Ms. Akbari-Daryan’s mapping can be used in conjunction with the existing FRAD-FRSAD mappings to LRM. The plan is to complete review of the document during the first half of 2018 and make it available on the PUC website.

Ms. Mazić has confirmed that mappings do not need to be passed to the CoS but are instead the responsibility of individual groups. Mr. Gentili-Tedeschi pointed out that these are more “alignments” (the more current terminology) for human use than mappings, which are more intended for machine use.

## **10. Planning 5th UNIMARC Users’ Group Meeting and 1st Middle East Regional UNIMARC Users’ Group Meeting, November 2018**

The National Library and Archives of the Islamic Republic of Iran (NLAI) has generously invited the PUC to hold its 5th UNIMARC Users’ Group Meeting and 1st Middle East Regional UNIMARC Users’ Group Meeting in Tehran, tentatively in October/November 2018. The NLAI will provide accommodations and meals for PUC members in attendance. Copies of passports need to be submitted by 2018 April 14 in order to obtain the proper visas.

Ms. Mazić has applied to the IFLA Professional Committee for travel funding of 800 Euros for one UNIMARC expert to attend, and the application has been accepted. Although Ms. Willer had been Ms. Mazić’s first choice, Ms. Willer is retiring right around the time of the meeting. Ms. Zhlobinskaya will confer with her institution about the possibility of her attending. Ms. Akbari-Daryan, Ms. Zhlobinskaya,

Ms. Mazić, and Mr. Weitz will work on conference organization and planning. (**Action: Ms. Akbari-Daryan, Ms. Zhlobinskaya, Ms. Mazić, Mr. Weitz**) Previous UNIMARC Users' Group meetings have been held in Lisbon, Portugal; Florence, Italy; Lyon, France; and Maribor, Slovenia.

#### **11. UNIMARC in RDF Project**

The PUC is still awaiting Mr. Dunsire's instructions on editing U/A and U/B.

#### **12. Next Meetings**

The PUC will hold a conference call to follow up on certain issues left unresolved from the 2018 Rome and 2017 Lisbon meetings several weeks following the 2018 meeting.

The PUC will hold its next informal meeting on Sunday, 2018 August 26, as part of the IFLA Congress in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

The 5th UNIMARC Users' Group Meeting and 1st Middle East Regional UNIMARC Users' Group Meeting will be held in Tehran, Iran, tentatively in October/November 2018.

The 2019 regular meeting of the PUC is tentatively scheduled for 2019 May 9-10, in Maribor, Slovenia.

---

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

Incorporating corrections from Ms. Olga Zhlobinskaya, Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library, Russia; Mr. Philippe Le Pape, ABES, France; and Mr. Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense and ICCU, Italy.

2018 May 4