

 <p>Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC)</p>	<p>Minutes of the 33rd PUC Meeting Online 2023 May 15-17, June 13</p>
---	---

33rd Online Meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee

Monday, 2023 May 15

Attendees: Gordana, Branka Badovinac, Mirjam Kessler, Florence Tfibel, Heloise Lecomte, Olga Zhlobinskaya, Maria Aslanidi, Saeedeh Akbari Daryan, Miguel Mimoso Correia, Jay Weitz

Last Meeting Minutes Approval: we will postpone this until the May 17 meeting to allow folks to review the minutes. On May 17, Meeting minutes accepted as written.

Information on the IFLA election 2023 and the Chair of PUC

- After business meeting in Rotterdam, we will proceed with adding Saeeda and Heloise as experts to the PUC; we are not the only group has had the same problem (ISBD, LIDATEC); we expect that this may be solved in the near future; Committee on Standards will discuss this larger problem with IFLA
- New Chair needed by 2024; Gordana is retiring in 2024; Gordana and Branka will later distribute an outline of what they do to run the PUC
- Heloise suggests that it has been a while since there's been a report on UNIMARC to the IFLA Congress; in recent years, PUC has presented an update as part of the CoS open session and can be published in the CoS Newsletter; Florence and Heloise will collaborate on a report; can be made available afterwards on the IFLA Repository, on the UNIMARC site; <https://2023.ifla.org/call-for-papers/>; after IFLA 2023, we can begin to plan for a UNIMARC session or one with the cooperation of other IFLA units

Revision work U/B

- 2022/7 – 100 \$a/25 (change; postponed for the harmonization with U/A 2022/2, 2022/3)
 - Transliteration Code table harmonized between U/B 100 \$a/25 and U/A 100 \$a/12 accepted for both formats, as stated in proposal.
- 2022/8 – 117 (change; proposal update received)
 - Coded Data Field: Three-Dimensional Artefacts and Realia, to accommodate numismatic objects as catalogued under Numismatic Description Standard (NUDS)
 - Do we need to accommodate digital tokens also
 - Use the more general term “resource”
 - Olga’s comment about the Scope Note in the document is accepted
 - Subfield \$a first sentence deleted

- Florence will harmonize the terminology used throughout the numismatic proposals with help from Gordana and Branka; otherwise accepted with corrections and editorial changes.
- 2022/9 – 201 (new; new proposal for field 360)
 - New field 360 Note on Specific Elements of Numismatic Description
 - Field refers not to the numismatic resources described in the record itself, but the elements used as part of the design; this is additional information about the object, its design, how it has been made
 - Subfield \$b Citation: This subfield contains a citation for a published work that provides information about or a description of the element in subfield \$a.
 - Proposal accepted pending addition of more examples
- 2021/10 – 215 (change; new comments)
 - 215 Physical Description
 - "... physical characteristics if the resource."
 - Weight (subfield \$f): add that it is usually expressed in grams.
 - Proposal is accepted.
- 2022/11 – 260 (new; proposal updated received)
 - Main way for numismatic resource to be described; repeatable for multiple IRIs and for description of obverse, reverse, edge, that may be described, "Repeatable when attributes to more than one specific part (obverse, reverse, edge) of the numismatic resource is described."
 - Indicator 1 definition revised.
- 2022/12 – 317 (change; proposal updated received)
 - Could include location, other aspects of provenance, including the circumstances
 - Subfield \$8 Intended to be Not Repeatable
 - Add an example for something such as a vase
 - Indicator 1: Blank (Unspecified)
 - Proposal accepted pending editorial changes and addition of examples.
 - One example is accepted, the other needs to be replaced.

Tuesday, 2023 May 16

Attendees: Gordana Mazic, Branka Badovinac, Mirjam Kessler, Florence Tfibel, Heloise Lecomte, Olga Zhlobinskaya, Maria Aslanidi, Miguel Mimoso Correia, Jay Weitz

Heloise will not be able to attend the meeting on May 17; We will record the meeting and she can share any comments after she listens.

Issues left to resolve from May 15 meeting were discussed and resolved, as noted above.

Florence will work on best practices on UNIMARC use for numismatic resources, by the time of IFLA Congress 2023.

URIs in the UNIMARC Format

- Option 3: Use new ASCII Characters to Create two New Control Subfields Dedicated to URIs for Entities
 - Use of capital letters for subfield indicators would be problematic for data exchange with MARC 21 systems, which generally limit to small characters
 - Trying to avoid the use of capital letters as too problematic
- Option 1: Make \$u a Control Subfield Dedicated to URIs
 - Changing use of subfields \$u that are defined for other uses would be bad practice
- Option 2: Extend the Use of \$3 (UNIMARC/A and B) and \$0 (UNIMARC/B) to Accommodate URIs
 - More use of identifiers in subfield \$3
 - CfU suggested postponing Real World Object URIs (requested by ISSN International Center, without current use case) until there is actual need; perhaps only limited number of fields would need to accommodate them and so the problem would be smaller
 - Florence notes that at 2022 Congress, some MARC 21 users were not entirely sure about how to use RWO URIs
 - CfU will create a formal proposal for Option 2 for the next PUC meeting

UNIMARC harmonization with ISBD Manifestation

- Work on harmonizing UNIMARC with ISBD Manifestation
- Mirjam and Maria have been added to this working group, working with ISBD Manifestation group material archived on the UNIMARC wiki; Mirjam will lead the subgroup.
- Mirna Willer and Gordon Dunsire are the contacts.

2022/4 (5X0, 5X1 Control subfield \$5 pos. 4

- Moving toward LRM practice, away from use of A500 for agents with responsibility for Work/Expression, instead using A501 for agents with responsibility in a Work and A502 for agents with responsibility in an Expression (Option 1)
- RDA relationships have tended to be upward (such as Expression to Work)
- If there is a need for a broad change of “authorized” to “preferred,” a discussion paper could be written to that effect.
- Subfield \$4 (Relator Code) is to be retained, may be used in older author/title records; Examples 9 and 10 moved to field 501
- Delete Notes on Field Contents
- All “IFLA/LRM” references to be changed to “IFLA-LRM”
- Control Subfield \$5/4: Relationship Code Between Agents and a Work or Expressions
 - Value “b” now Obsolete; Table of Position 4 values will have righthand column added for value “v” reading “Use field 502”
 - New value “c” for “Related agent of a Work”
 - New examples will be added
- A clean version of the proposal will be created and put on wiki; proposal accepted pending the agreed upon changes and new examples.

Information from the PUC Namespaces working group

- Data elements of UNIMARC/A have been submitted to LIDATEC, expected approval by IFLA 2023
- Documented invalid values and combinations
- Branka edited as much as possible
- All control subfields that could be applied have been added both to manual and to the Namespace
- Final table and open issues are documented on the wiki

Wednesday, 2023 May 17

Attendees: Gordana Mazic, Branka Badovinac, Mirjam Kessler, Florence Tfibel, Olga Zhlobinskaya, Maria Aslanidi, Saeedeh Akbari Daryan, Miguel Mimoso Correia, Jay Weitz

New 2023 proposals from CfU

- U/A: dataset of entity records created within past year by the CfU, which gave rise to these proposals because of problems and issues brought to light.
- 2023/1, B3-- Block \$5
 - Proposing that subfield \$5 may be used in any 3XX field
 - Gordana says that the possible use of subfield \$5 is already documented (Section 3.10) so does not need to be added here
 - Branka says that for namespaces, it is beneficial to document subfield \$5 in each field, this is opportunity to expand that documentation in each field
 - Decision to document the subfield in each field, but not necessary to add the “Subfields” note.
 - Field 325 examples indicators have been corrected
 - Field 330 example 3 will be replaced
 - Field 321 is used for abstracts external to the resource, field 330 for summaries of the resource
 - Field 345 is specified as Not Repeatable, but Example 6 has the field repeated; it seems useful to be able to repeat it; repeatability of the field and of each subfield that context will be re-evaluated
 - All examples in the proposal will be completed with an identifier in subfield \$5
 - Proposal will be postponed pending reconsideration of field 345 repeatability and other issues
- 2023/2: A140 Coded Data Field: Content and Form of Work
 - Form of Work list for subfield \$b borrowed from B 105 list
 - If the provided list is used, subfield \$2 is not needed
 - Proposal postponed: Florence will rewrite the proposal with two options: either a third subfield \$c or with use of indicator specifying the choice of provided list or encoding scheme defined in subfield \$2
- 2023/3: A231 Authorized Access Point – Title (Work); A232 Authorized Access Point – Title (Expression)
 - Subfield \$g for Form of Work Subdivision
 - In B605, subfield \$j was defined for two separate uses: for Form Subdivision for subject and for Form Subdivision for Title)
 - Choice between defining subfield \$g or using existing subfield \$c (Form of Work)

- Gordana prefers definition of subfield \$g
 - Choices: Use Subfield \$j for both, original proposal of subfield \$g for Subdivision, unsubfielded as part of subfield \$c, make \$c repeatable
- Staying with the original proposal to define new subfield \$g, which is accepted (Branka will apply the same change to U/B (\$j for Subject, \$g for Title), more and different examples are requested – send to Florence
 - Branka will clarify and explain this in the History section of each field in question
- 2023/4: A240 Authorized Access Point – Name/Title
 - Subfield \$a (Name) is Optional and Repeatable
 - Subfield \$b (Additional Information on Intellectual Responsibility) is Not Repeatable
 - Subfield \$3 (Authority Work Identifier for the Name Associated with the Work) is Not Repeatable; CfU does not understand why it cannot be repeated because the system is interested only in the identifier and humans can understand the field as it displays in its order
 - Proposal accepted regarding subfield \$b to be used only when subfield \$a is used; not changing repeatability of \$a; Add field 541 to all examples
- 2024/5 A246 Authorized Access Point -- Name/Collective Title (Work)
 - Proliferation of fields for titles: 12 fields for 3 different types of titles
 - Field Definition and Scope: “... to bring together two or more expressions of one or more works by a single author.”
 - Field must be accompanied by field 501, 511, or 521 as appropriate
 - Request for additional examples.
 - <http://rdaregistry.info/termList/RDATerms/1020>; proposal for aggregates for next year, coding information for the type of aggregate.
 - Postpone proposal pending completion of Definition and Scope, Occurrence for some subfields, adding examples.
 - The same postponement applies to each of the remaining proposals 2023/6, 2023/10, 2023/11, 2023/12.

The future of the UNIMARC format – opening discussion

- Heloise suggests this for topic; we will pick up the discussion when she can join us again.
- Gordana will circulate a poll for additional meeting in June or early July to discuss:
 - 2023/7
 - 2023/8
 - 2023/9

Planning next IFLA WLIC Business Meeting

- This will be reports, business meeting.
- Mirjam lives close to the site of the conference and can offer advice about accommodations and the area.

Tuesday, 2023 June 13

Attendees: Gordana Mazic, Mirjam Kessler, Florence Tfibel, Branka Badovinac, Maria Aslanidi, Heloise Lecomte, Saeedeh Akbari Daryan, Jay Weitz

Last Meeting Minutes Approval (May 2023)

Revision work U/A and U/B

- **Updated proposals 2022**
 -
- **Updated proposals 2023**
 - 2023/2: U/A 140:
 - Option 1
 - Indicator 2 defined
 - Subfield \$b Form of Work table added
 - Branka will bring the Indicator 2/subfield \$b relationship into compliance with our common practice
 - Option 2
 - Use subfield \$b for external source code, subfield \$c for UNIMARC code list, both “Form of Work”
 - Maria raises the question that the categories of codes in the proposal are not logically equivalent (U/B 105); Maria suggests two separate fields in the long run
 - Eliminate Option 2, rework Option 1 to keep subfield \$b for Form of Work, new separate subfield that would allow for use of many other specific lists to be identified by Second Indicator 7 and subfield \$2
 - Start with separating form terms from genre terms in the B105 list for Form of Work; separate subfields for each; maintain U/B and U/A compatibility; separate code lists can be extended over time
- **U/A 327, 370, 371 (first discussion)**
 - 2023/7: U/A 327 Contents Note
 - Specific note for contents of an aggregated work or in any case when contents need to be described at the expression level; modeled closely on U/B 327
 - Suggest that we use the word “aggregating” consistently, when possible, rather than “aggregative”
 - Avoids having to describe contents each time at the manifestation level (LRM: commonality of content)
 - “Note that describes the content of a work or an expression. It can be used for any case where the content needs to be described at the work or expression level, as well as in the case of an aggregating expression.”
 - Indicator 1

- Value 0: Content information is not fully available to describe (EX 4).
 - Value 1: The content is fully described. (EX 1, 2).
 - Value 2: Only selected content is described (EX 3, 5).
- Example 4: “A multi-volume work ... only volumes 2 and 3 are available for description.”
- Add music examples, Heloise and Maria will suggest score and sound recording examples; also could add examples to exemplify each of the three types of LRM aggregates
- Proposal accepted with changes, pending the addition of examples.
- 2023/8: U/A 370
 - Addition of subfield \$d for Additional or Illustrative Content to field U/A 370 Note on Work
 - Work augmented by another work, such as appendix, illustrations
 - RDA “Augmentation of Work”
 - Subfield \$d, “Additional Content”
 - “Contains a note on augmentations to the main content of a work, such as This subfield is used to express a relationship between the work described and its augmentations. The subfield should be repeated for each distinct augmentation of the primary work.”
 - Maria will suggest another music example. Example 11 will also be corrected and revised.
 - Proposal accepted pending corrections and addition of examples as noted.
- 2023/9: U/A 371
 - Note on Expression
 - Subfield \$i (Note on the Content of the Aggregative Expression) is to be eliminated from proposal. Aggregating Expression may only be inferred from LRM; it is defined in RDA as “An expression that is the realization of an aggregating work.”
 - If there are other expression level attributes that need to be accounted for, report them so that they may be added.
 - Rationale and Comments to the proposal will be revised, also.
 - Subfield \$e will be omitted.
 - Proposal is postponed pending additional revisions, omitting subfield \$i, possibly adding other attributes from RDA.

Future of UNIMARC

Héloïse Lecomte, ABES (from email, 2023 June 12)

Propositions by Héloïse Lecomte, CfU, PUC member

- Do you understand the principles of UNIMARC E/R*, the differences with classic UNIMARC, and do you subscribe to these principles ?

- Should the PUC communicate on the principles of UNIMARC E/R as an exchange format ? Through IFLA papers ? Other means of communication ?
- Do you have plans to use UNIMARC E/R for data production or data exchange ?
 - o Do you plan to use UNIMARC E/R as an exchange format or will you keep using classic UNIMARC ?
- Do you plan to create data outside of UNIMARC in the upcoming years ? Do you plan to move to a non-MARC system ?
 - o If yes, what will be your next data production format ? MARC21 ? BIBFRAME ? Other format ?
 - o If you stop using MARC for data production, will you keep using UNIMARC as an exchange format ?
- Will you migrate your data from classic UNIMARC to UNIMARC E/R ? Do you plan to migrate your data to another format to comply with IFLA-LRM ?

*UNIMARC E/R = UNIMARC entity/relationship

Saeedeh Akbari-Daryan, Assistant Professor, National Library and Archives of Iran (from email, 2023 June 13)

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to passionately advocate the importance of organizing an open discussion regarding the future of UNIMARC.

As we are all aware, the Bibframe has gained significant traction as a replacement for UNIMARC. Bibframe, a dynamic framework designed to express and link library data in the Semantic Web environment, offers the advantages of linked data principles, facilitating the creation of more extensive and interconnected information networks. The increasing adoption of Bibframe has the potential to greatly influence the future of UNIMARC, as libraries explore its compatibility and benefits over existing formats.

In light of the importance of this discussion, it is crucial that we come together as UNIMARC members, library professionals, catalogers, and stakeholders to engage in an open and constructive dialogue. This proposed meeting will provide us with a valuable opportunity to discuss the challenges, opportunities, and requirements associated with the potential migration from UNIMARC to maybe Bibframe.

To facilitate this discussion, I suggest the development of a comprehensive research proposal that focuses on evaluating the feasibility and benefits of this transition. This research could delve into technical considerations, data migration strategies, training and support requirements, as well as the potential impact on interoperability with other library systems and services. By conducting rigorous research, we can make well-informed decisions and establish a roadmap for the future of UNIMARC.

Furthermore, this open discussion will empower UNIMARC members to voice their perspectives, concerns, and requirements, ensuring that their invaluable insights are taken into account in shaping the future of bibliographic formats. By fostering collaboration and inclusivity, we can collectively develop standards and frameworks that cater to the diverse needs of libraries worldwide.

I firmly believe that through the organization of this meeting and the implementation of thorough research, we can lay the groundwork for a smooth and effective transition, while simultaneously addressing any challenges or questions that may arise along the way. The outcomes of this discussion and research will guide our library community in making informed decisions, guaranteeing the continued relevance and usefulness of bibliographic formats in an ever-evolving information landscape.

I kindly request your support in promoting this initiative and bringing together the relevant stakeholders for an open and productive discussion. Your influence and active involvement in this matter will significantly contribute to the success of this endeavor and shape the future of UNIMARC.

Please note that although my membership in PUC will conclude in August 2023, I am committed to providing any assistance I can offer.

- Heloise will create a form to solicit comments from the global UNIMARC community, what are prospects for continued use of UNIMARC, BIBFRAME, based on her emailed questions (above)
- Future discussion with the Committee on Standards
- September 2023, meet to begin discussions among other IFLA groups, planning for a UNIMARC users conference or satellite on this topic in 2024