

 <p>Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC)</p>	<p>Minutes of the 32nd PUC Meeting Online 2022 June 17, 21 (22), July 11, 13</p>
---	---

32nd Online Meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee

2022 June 17, 21 (22)

Attendees:

- Gordana Mazic, Branka Badovinac, Genute Rutkauskiene, Maria Aslanidi, Olga Z., Florence Tfibel, Saeedeh Akbari, Flavia Bruni, Jay Weitz (June 17)
- Gordana Mazic, Branka Badovinac, Maria Aslanidi, Olga Zhlobinskaya, Florence Tfibel, Rosa Galvao, Jay Weitz (June 21 (22))
- Gordana Mazic, Branka Badovinac, Miguel Mimoso Correia, Saeedeh Akbari, Florence Tfibel, Rosa Galvao, Maria Aslanidi, Jay Weitz (July 11)
- Branka Badovinac, Miguel Mimoso Correia, Saeedeh Akbari Daryan, Florence Tfibel, Maria Aslanidi, Olga Zhlobinskaya, Jay Weitz (July 13)

Opening of meeting

PUC Business meeting minutes approval (11 January 2022)

- Minutes approved without comments.

Inform on the election and appointment of Maria Aslanidi as IAML's Representative to the IFLA Permanent UNIMARC Committee

- Maria is succeeding Massimo, Flavia will continue working with us but Maria will be music specialist
- Maria is music librarian, teaching faculty in Corfu, Greece; familiar with RDA, MARC 21, DC, LRM, works on RISM projects, advocacy groups

UNIMARC/Bibliographic format

Numismatic objects in UNIMARC (CfU text)

- Enabling cataloging of “Numismatic objects in UNIMARC” from BnF, which has large collections; tend to be treated apart from other collections. Standards generally don’t take

them into account. BnF tried to use INTERMARC; has never been any ISBD work on such description, but Linked Open Data has grown around them. Described in ways different from other objects, but without much standardization. Now BnF is offering UNIMARC this way to treat such objects.

- MARC 21 has similar accommodation for philatelic objects.

Proposals:

2022/5 - Record Label (change)

- Proposes new Record Label code “n” for numismatic object
- Question whether this is appropriate at the Record Label/06 level; more appropriate at 117
- BnF wanted code in Record Label because the contents of these records would be substantially different than those of other objects, would not look like other records; need to easily identify these records
- This particular proposal is not accepted but changes to field 117 will be appropriate; grouping numismatic objects in field 117 for easy identification and differentiation

2022/6 – 100 \$a/34-35 (change)

- Script of Title codes that have been defined in ISO 15924 but not yet in UNIMARC
- Accepted as proposed; same table will be used at all appropriate places in U/A and U/B.

2022/7 – 100 \$a/25 (change)

- Transliteration Code; differentiating ISO schema from non-ISO schema; trying to harmonize U/B with what is already in U/A
- Need to rewrite introductory text to allow for any additional codes
- Codes g and h seem OK; d and e could be useful; b and f are not well differentiated
- Revise definition of introductory text and clarify the definitions of the codes, both newly proposed and “b” for other.
- Postponed for revisions
- Follow-up (20220711): better differentiation of the “other” codes; third column for scope notes added; accepted as edited; needs to be harmonized with 2022/2 in U/A

2022/8 – 117 (change)

- SMD: Deprecating two existing codes (bg for coins and bh for medals) and defining a new set of codes, each beginning with “c” for various kinds of numismatic objects
- Possibly allow bg and bh to stand but limit use to when more specificity is not needed; use of the new codes could also be an indication that the new numismatic fields and elements would be used only in records that use the new codes.
- Institutions need to decide individually whether to convert old code new manually or by automation depending upon the size and character of their collections
- Consider creating 117 subfield \$b for numismatic objects

- Are there data in the numismatic proposals that would be better as coded data than as textual data?
- Nomisma.org: each element in the proposal corresponds to an element in this standard Numismatic Description Schema (NUDS); two record types: conceptual (manifestation) and physical (item); ancient items are archeological specimens, where the metadata relies on scholarship; 260 description of the physical item; 201 for title
- REVISED: created new 117 subfield \$b for numismatic resources; existing bg and bh; up to three codes for “Peculiarity of Production” and “Manufacture”
- Will need to adjust 117 definition to accommodate numismatic objects; additional editorial work to be done in the wiki
- This change allows the expansion of the field to other types of materials in the future.

2022/9 – 201 (new)

- 201 Material Specific Area: Monetary Standards; these items don’t have “titles” so must be supplied; denomination, theoretical weight, weight standard, issue, monetary status (official or unofficial status), other appellation, URI; this field is a title equivalent for resources that don’t have a title (substitute for 200); 260 is like 215, which does not fit numismatic description
- Florence will add examples
- Gordana suggests trying to combine 201 and 260 fields; differentiating data that are notes and those that are coded; trying to make these data conform to UNIMARC structure
- Florence will revise proposal that tries to combine the two fields 201 and 260 and try to determine if any elements are more properly in field 117.

2021/10 – 215 (change)

- New subfield \$f for “Weight.” expressed in grams, for numismatic objects.is removed But not limited to numismatic objects; revision of field definition
- Weight is not an element in ISBD Material Description Area; also subfield \$b

2022/11 – 260 (new)

- 260 Material Specific Area: Numismatic Description

2022/12 – 317 (change)

- 317 Provenance Notes, adding subfield \$b for Archeological Provenance Note; to differentiate from more general provenance
- Indicator could be defined to differentiate standard from archeological provenance
- Could use 621 Place and Date of Provenance
- Florence will revise 317 proposal without subfield \$b

2022/13 – Appendix B Relator Codes

- Adding codes for roles linked to numismatic objects: authority, issuer, mint, mint staff, moneyer; also changes to definitions of engraver, “medalist” reference to “artist”
- Terms and definitions are from Numisma.org
- Maria raises broader issue of standardizing relator code list for interoperability with other existing controlled lists
- “Monetary Authority” rather than “Authority”?
- “Issuer” needs to be better differentiated from “Issuing Body.” Could add numismatic use to “Issuing Body”; possibly “Issuer of numismatic object.”
- Accepted with various changes.

URIs in the UNIMARC format

- ISSN Centre needed accommodation for real world objects and other URIs for electronic resources into UNIMARC; locations, the objects themselves, and the electronic resources; options: use subfield \$u (deprecating the existing uses of subfield \$u that are not related to URI extend use of \$3 and \$0; create new control subfields for other types of URIs, but we’ve run out of space for control subfields (would require use of nonstandard characters)
- Does it cause problems to use a single subfield for the various sorts of URIs and identifiers; using capital letter subfield indicators is a problem for MARC 21 systems
- Maria: expanding use of subfield \$3 would be preferable; we also need to be looking forward to other identifiers and so on that come after URIs, need for flexibility
- Florence: in French UNIMARC systems, subfield \$3 is often used for local identifiers; adjustments would need to be made regardless of the options chosen for future developments
- Will continue discussing this in person at IFLA Dublin; continue to discuss within your institutions the possible use of capital letters as subfield indicators; need to accommodate RWO URIs; possible expansion of subfield \$3 and what issues that may cause
- Prepared to introduce use of capital letters. Location, RWO, URI for name or label

UNIMARC/Authority format

2022/1 – 100/21-22 (change)

- New codes for scripts not yet part of UNIMARC Code List, but in ISO; based on a survey of French institutions
- Accepted as is.

2022/2 – 100/12 (change)

- Transliteration codes
- This code list needs to be harmonized with list in 2022/7 U/B ; both need to be discussed together

- Discussion postponed so as to be harmonized with 2022/7.

2022/3 – 105 (change)

- Making the code list correspond with changes to 100/21-22, based on the same survey as in 2022/1.
- Accepted as is.

2022/4 – 500/501 (change)

- Two options to clarify responsibilities for Works and Expressions
 - Option 1 is to deprecate 500 for W & E, instead use 501 for W and 502 for E; LRM does not distinguish between primary and secondary responsibility.
 - Option 2 is to use 500 for creators of Work and 501 for Related Agents of Work
- Maria suggests that RSC is still considering how exactly to implement Representative Expression; this still needs to be clarified; LRM is stable, whereas RDA is always in flux; RSC encourages more specific relationships when possible
- this needs to be held off for now and return with additional and more complex examples

Florence has also reworked U/B proposals on B117, B260, and B360 to put coded data in 2XX Block and note data in 360. We will need time to look these changes over.

Submitted by Mr. Jay Weitz, OCLC