



International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions

Cataloguing Section FRBR Review Group

Meeting Report

Helsinki, Finland, Monday, August 13, 2012

Business meeting attended by 7 members, 2 liaisons, 15 observers (see Appendix A).
Regrets: Rajesh Chandrakar, Felipe Martinez.

1) Welcome and Announcements

FRBR Review Group working meeting is Thursday Aug. 16 from 13:00 to 17:00 at National Library of Finland. Thanks to Eeva Murtomaa for coordinating rooms for the August meetings. Appreciate the support of the Finnish Transportation Agency and Finnish National Library in hosting us.

APPROVED 2011 minutes from business meeting.
APPROVED 2012 April mid-year meeting minutes.

2) Chair's report

2013 is an election year. Need to recruit active members and identify a new chair.
Added items:

a) Request from Cataloguing Section SCI meeting that we name a member to the new ICP revision WG. Elena agreed to be the official liaison.

b) Copyright issues statement needed for the GB consideration.

ACTION: Pat to draft 2 notes: (a) Application of open access to existing publications. In particular, open access to FRAD. All standards need this availability. (b) Clarification of copyright assignment for IFLA committee and working group documents. These documents are developed and written primarily by volunteers. We agree that copyright for committee reports and models or standards be held by IFLA. This is the most convenient arrangement as it centralizes requesting permission for translations. However, we note that the committee members and document editors named in the publications as being responsible for their preparation and intellectual content are never asked formally to sign any copyright assignment or release form. We think that it would clarify the situation for all concerned to have a formal procedure. We think that the situation for

proceedings of satellite conferences or other collections of papers may be different. In such cases, it is more typical that authors retain ultimate copyright but grant IFLA permission to publish them in the collection.

2.1) FRSAD and FRAD errata

FRSAD: an errata sheet for section 5.4.2 was prepared Nov. 2011, but only just now posted to FRBR pages. In progress translations (Romanian and Chinese) were notified of the errata in the fall. Croatian translation is aware of it. The French and Spanish translations include it.

FRAD: Errata (including new Language of family attribute) was published in fall 2011. Korean translation was updated to include the errata

FRBR: French translation updated to take into account the expression amendment.

2.2) Translations

FRBR: No new translations were finished this year. The Portuguese translation is published in print and the citation was included on the webpage. Vietnamese is still listed as in-progress, no status update has been received.

FRAD: Newly completed: Korean (Taesoo Kim, Yonsei University) under contract from National Library of Korea. A total of 9 translations are posted on the website. Japanese (National Diet Library) requested permission just before IFLA. Persian and Portuguese (BN Portugal) are still in progress.

FRSAD: Published: French (Patrick Le Boeuf), Korean (Taesoo Kim, Yonsei University, under contract from National Library of Korea), Spanish (BNE). Almost finished: Chinese (Wuhan University), Croatian. Permission granted, in progress: Romanian.

2.3) Namespaces

FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD namespace declarations are published. An announcement was circulated in May.

2.4) SCATNews updates

Published in the Dec. 2011 issue explaining the errata; in the June 2012 issue reported on the April 25 London meeting and on namespaces.

2.5) Website

Only minor updates were done this year.

2.6) Finances / special project funds for 2011, 2012 and 2013

Special projects:

2011: Were granted 3000 Euros for work relating to model consolidation (oo and er). Spent all the money funding three members for the May 2011 Heraklion and November 2011 Amsterdam FRBR/CRM meetings. Also C&I funded some of the Amsterdam expenses for Maja and the Cataloguing Section funded another 160 euros for Pat, enabling us to get close to covering all the expenses.

2012: The second year of the Consolidation of models project was originally to receive another 3000 Euros. However, in fall 2011 an additional 3000 to fund a mid-year meeting was granted. Have spent 4200 euros to date funding attendance of 4 people for the April

25-28, 2012 London meeting (FRBR RG mid-year meeting plus DCMI task groups and the 5 Years On seminar) and the immediately following April 30-May 4, 2012 Heraklion FRBR/CRM meeting. 200 euros were spent on programming for dereferencing services for the FRBR namespaces in the Open Metadata Registry. There remains 1600 euros for supporting attendance at a fall CRM/FRBR meeting which is scheduled for November in either Amsterdam or The Hague.

2013: It will be time to submit a project funding request this fall. Decision to focus the request on Consolidation of models continuation with emphasis on e-r models. Expenses might include meeting space for a mid-year meeting as well as travel support for mid-year meeting. Part of the justification should include namespace implementation for consolidation and mapping / alignment adjustment due to consolidation.

Gordon notes that JSC will be making a request for formal alignment of the FRBR namespaces with the RDA namespaces so that these can encourage the take up of the IFLA FRBR rather than using non-IFLA versions (such as FRBRcore which is no longer maintained, or FaBIO).

2.7) Presentations and publications

Gordon: many relevant presentations and papers, see list in Namespaces report
Pat gave presentations on the development of FRBR family namespaces at the *Five Years On* seminar (jointly with Mirna Willer, ISBD RG) on April 27 in London and at the Seminar *Global Interoperability and linked data in libraries* on June 18-19 in Florence.
- *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* v.50, no.5/7 (2012) special theme issue titled *The FRBR Family of Conceptual Models: Toward a Linked Future*, guest edited by Richard P. Smiraglia, contains articles by several FRBR RG members.
- *Modelling Aboutness*. ABC-CLIO, Libraries Unlimited. Due in Sept. 2012 by Maja and Marcia Lei Zeng.

ACTION: Collect recent (2010-) publications by members and others directly relating to our work and list the citations on the website.

3) ISSN Network issues for FRBR (François-Xavier Pelegrin, ISSN)

See the document in appendix B. Presented by François-Xavier Pelegrin with a period for discussion and initial reaction from the RG to inform the ISSN Network's working group's further work.

Issue 1) Which entity level should the ISSN-L identify?

Some general thought that it relates to serial expressions, unlike the basic ISSN which identifies manifestations.

Eeva: FRAD has identifier as an entity, can be associated / assigned to any bibliographic entity.

Pat: Concurred and indicated that the attributes lists do not need to be explicitly expanded to allow expressions to have identifiers (FRBR does not list identifier as an attribute of expressions). However, this is a question with regards to consolidation. ISSN-L identifies both individual expressions and expression groups within a type of media.

GD: ISO, Work identifiers, ISTC, ISMN etc. Can be hard to see how they match with FRBR because terminology is not clear.

Maja: Her IFLA paper 2010 dealt with identifiers and their importance. Usage coverage is still poor, but GD says that this is of growing importance within the semantic web.

Issue 2) Mode of issuance: which entity is it an attribute of?

Maja: In FRBRoo terms, mode of issuance is part of the Publishing plan, making it part of the aggregating work, probably at the expression level of that work?

FL: The first analysis BnF did went in the direction of the aggregating work.

PR: Think it is an expression attribute, by process of elimination (a change in mode of issuance is too significant to result in merely a new manifestation, but is not enough to result in a new derived work).

PR: (Not speaking as an FRBR RG member) In RDA-AACR2, bibliographic records are at the manifestation-level (one of the conclusions of the JSC Format Variation WG), which explains why, in the RDA-AACR2 tradition, a change in mode of issuance (creating at least a new manifestation) requires a new description. Practically, in an RDA-AACR2 context, it would be impossible to handle a change from monograph to serial or from serial to monograph on the same record. Although the number of records is not an issue that is directly within the responsibility of the FRBR RG.

Issues 3 and 4) Applying the Expression definition to continuing resources, interpreting relationships of serials.

The ISSN group would be interested in examining some concrete examples.

Please send us correspondence throughout the year and the FRBR RG will be happy to comment on them. Closer cooperation is certainly welcome and appreciated in the review of the models taking place in the consolidation process.

Maja: did they look at the Aggregates Report? May have some relevant principles, even though it was issued after most of this analysis was done.

4) EURIG Aggregates Working Group (Françoise Leresche)
(Full report posted separately)

A number of specific issues for FRBR were presented but not discussed for lack of time.

(1) Format of notated music. The definition of the attribute requires clarification, it comprises aspects of both the element and the transcribed statement.

(2) Scale. Presently defined as an attribute at the expression level, but may be more appropriate at the work level. The differentiation between the scale and the scale statements also seems required. (A more general issue of differentiation between information and the statements to be transcribed which are manifestation attributes, a general statement in the consolidated model to this effect would be appropriate rather than attempting to list each of these in the model.)

(3) Attribution relationship. Generally viewed as relating an agent to a work, but in FRAD it is defined only as person-to-person.

MZ: This a qualification of the certainty of the creation relationship in general modelling

terms.

(4) Issues of aggregates in RDA have resulted in the creation of a EURIG WG on aggregates, which is meeting Aug. 15.

A common theme is the issue of extensibility of the models: the lists of attributes or detailed relationships is not a place to be exhaustive, but the consolidated model should have principles of where to fit things in that give sufficient guidance that specific implementations or applications to specific types of materials can fill in the needed attributes or relationships with confidence.

5) ISBD data elements and FRBR attributes

5.1) Alignment issues

RDA to ISBD alignment is going ahead and ignoring this issue outside of the namespaces. FRBR should follow the methodology that ISBD is using for RDA alignment to permit comparison between the mappings. Aligning between IFLA standards should be a priority.

Elena: So many alignment projects are planned, need to prioritize and see if there is a logical order of work.

5.2) Namespace linkage

The namespaces cannot be linked directly because the domains of the properties differ. A possible approach maybe via an unconstrained FRBR namespace.

6) WG on FRBR/CRM dialogue (P. Riva)

6.1) FRBRoo version 2.0

Following the two meetings held in 2011-2012 (details included in the FRBR RG activity report submitted to the Cataloguing Section), FRBRoo version 2.0 just needs some editorial work to be ready for comment from within and then outside the RG.

6.2) Namespace for FRBRoo

Agreed that the namespace in the OMR for FRBRoo will only be issued with version 2.0. It is not worth doing version 1.0.2 at this point.

7) IFLA Namespaces Technical Group (Gordon Dunsire)

Report from meeting earlier in the day and any followup actions for FRBR RG.

- Document on translations of namespaces: for information and comment, does not require specific action from FRBR RG.
- Projects affecting FRBR: use of unconstrained namespaces (see 5.2)
- Guidelines on use of and extending the IFLA namespaces.
- Agreement to support the proposal to create a bibliographic namespaces subgroup.

8) Domain name from FRBR blog (www.frbr.org – see last post)

Principle of branding leads to the policy that IFLA's public face is always to be under IFLA's domain names. As the IFLA website has blogging facilities, we cannot use www.frbr.org as an official IFLA blog. Also, the membership does not feel that we have

sufficient official news to sustain a blog, nor do we have the time to review all the literature, which we acknowledged when we decided we could no longer update the bibliography. However, the existing information on the blog is valuable (and substitutes for the bibliography for several years) and we want to prevent its use for unrelated, or worse contradictory, purposes which would also be damaging to the FRBR brand.

ACTION: Chair to check with Bill Denton if any other volunteers want to continue the blog. If not, to investigate at least keeping the registration of the domain alive and re-discuss in 2013 once we can see if the standards landscape becomes clearer.

9) FRBR family consolidation progress

Brief report for given for the benefit of observers. Mid-year meeting April 2012 in London resulted in user tasks and users done in draft (published in SCATNews #37, June 2012). Currently working on entity definitions and primary relationships.

10) Issues for IFLA Committee on Standards open session

- Points that FRBR RG members should either raise or support if raised by others:
- Support the Namespaces TG reporting structure clarification.
 - Support having a Bibliographic Namespaces Subgroup of the Namespaces TG with at least representatives from ISBG and FRBR RGs.
 - Enquire about the role of this committee on project funding for standards.
 - Liaison role with other communities, for instance archival. Remember the liaison request from EAC/CPF and it was unclear where to attach.
 - The domain name branding protection issue.
 - Social responsibility! Such as open access to standards, transparency in maintenance.

11) Updates from other projects and groups

Not done for lack of time.

12) Other business

2013 meetings in Singapore:

Staying any additional nights is likely to be an issue for several members due to cost to their institution. Attempt a half-day meeting during the conference week.

Appendix A

List of participants

Name	Institution	Country	Status
Bélaire, Jo-Anne	Université Laval	Canada	observer, chair of Classification and Indexing Section
Buzina, Tanja	National Library	Croatia	observer
Cato, Anders	Göteborg University Library	Sweden	observer
Clatin, Marianne	Bibliothèque nationale de France	France	observer
Dunsire, Gordon	Freelance	UK	member
Escolano Rodriguez, Elena	Defense Ministry	Spain	member
Galeffi, Agnese	Vatican School of Library Science	Italy	observer, Cataloguing Section Information Coordinator
Gentili-Tedeschi, Massimo	Biblioteca nazionale Braidense, Milano	Italy	observer
Hakala, Juha	National Library of Finland	Finland	observer
Hostage, John	Harvard Law School	USA	observer
Howarth, Lynne	iSchool, University of Toronto	Canada	observer
Kavčič, Irena	National and University Library	Slovenia	observer
Leresche, Françoise	Bibliothèque nationale de France	France	member
McGarry, Dorothy	University of California, Los Angeles	USA	observer
Murtomaa, Eeva	National Library of Finland	Finland	corresponding member
O'Neill, Ed	OCLC	USA	chair of the WG on Aggregates
Patton, Glenn	OCLC	USA	Chair of FRANAR

FRBR RG minutes 2012

Pelegrin, François-Xavier	ISSN International Centre	France	liaison
Reser, David	Library of Congress	USA	observer
Riva, Pat	Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec	Canada	Chair of FRBR RG
Säfström, Miriam	National Library of Sweden	Sweden	member
Seppälä, Marja-Liisa	National Library of Finland	Finland	observer
Willer, Mirna	University of Zadar	Croatia	Chair of ISBD RG
Žumer, Maja	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia	member, member WG on FRBR/CRM Harmonisation

Appendix B

FRBR Review Group meeting

IFLA WLIC 2012, Helsinki, Finland

Monday Aug. 13, 2012, 10:15-12:15

Item n°3 of the Agenda: ISSN Network, issues relating to FRBR

François-Xavier Pelegrin and Marja-Liisa Seppälä, ISSN Network

- 2011: creation of a Working Group within the ISSN Network charged to analyze the FRBR-er model from the ISSN viewpoint
- Purpose of the analysis:
 - To improve the understanding of the FRBR model, particularly its applicability to continuing resources;
 - To contact FRBR specialists in order to present concerns and issues raised by the WG;
 - To establish internal ISSN “guidelines” for application of FRBR to continuing resources (that could be used, for example, in the framework of the FRBRization of catalogues).
- The WG was aware that:
 - FRBR is a theoretical model / the ISSN Manual is a manual for the assignment of ISSN and a cataloguing code (mainly conformable with ISBD) = two different types of texts for different purposes
 - The FRBR text itself states that “*the notion of “seriality” [...] merit further analysis*”.

The first conclusions of the work were discussed with some FRBR specialists (Patrick Le Boeuf, Françoise Leresche, Gordon Dunsire) during a technical meeting hosted by the ISSN International Centre in April 2012.

Issues and questions raised by the ISSN Working Group

1. Which entity level should the ISSN-L identify?

The ISSN-L (the linking ISSN) groups all the medium versions of a same continuing resource.

- Since the different medium versions of a continuing resource (including a specific linguistic, geographic, etc. edition of a continuing resource) are regarded as manifestations of the same expression, the ISSN-L could be considered as an identifier for the expression level. But “identifier” is not one of the attributes of expressions (FRBR 4.3).
- Even if it were possible to identify expressions with a specific identifier, the use of the ISSN-L would be problematic for continuing resources which are expressed both in different forms (“spoken word” and “alphanumeric notation” for instance) and embodied in distinct medium versions : a sound cassette version and a print version of the same continuing resource share the same ISSN-L according to the current ISSN rules, but the two different expressions (spoken word on one hand and alphanumeric notation on the other hand) would require distinct identifiers.
- If “identifier” becomes one of the attributes of the expression entity, a possible solution for the ISSN Working Group to consider would be to modify the definition of the ISSN-L by specifying that the ISSN-L groups the different medium versions of a continuing resource within the same content type. This possible solution should be discussed within the ISSN Network before any change of course.

2. Mode of issuance

For the time being, ISBD and ISSN on the one hand, and RDA on the other hand, are not harmonized regarding changes of mode of issuance.

RDA 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.3.1 state that in case of change of mode of issuance, a new description of the manifestation shall be made. ISSN and ISBD do not have such a provision. As a matter of fact, the ISSN Manual considers that such a change is less significant than a (major) title change or a medium change and thus does not require a new ISSN assignment.

The ISSN Network will submit a proposal to the RDA JSC recommending that the cataloger revise the existing description rather than creating a new one in such a case. The input of the FRBR Review Group would be appreciated in order to assess, with

FRBR concepts and within the FRBR model, the significance of this change, and to define for which entity level the mode of issuance is an attribute.

3. The expression level as a critical area for the application of FRBR to continuing resources

During the technical meeting held at the ISSN International Centre in April 2012, the French ISSN Centre presented some concerns regarding the expression level. The presentation was based on detailed analysis by Pierre Drouhin (Bibliothèque nationale de France) conducted within the framework of the French Technical Group about on the adoption of RDA in France chaired by Françoise Leresche.

The examples provided have confirmed that the dynamic nature of serials is not accommodated well by FRBR-er. They have also demonstrated that a number of the inconsistencies between the FRBR model and continuing resources are due to the fact that in the FRBR model some types of serial editions (linguistic, geographic...) are too systematically defined as pertaining to the expression level.

The ISSN Network agrees with the analysis made by the Bnf and would like to know if the FRBR Review Group has any specific plan to develop “further analysis” about “seriality”.

4. Difficulties in recording relationships between FRBR entities

The ISSN Working Group experienced some difficulties in applying the FRBR model to continuing resources, in particular in defining the entities involved by relationships (former/successor relationship for instance) in some cases. Our doubts concern relationships at the Work and Expressions levels.

We would be very interested in having the point of view and the “technical help” of the FRBR Review Group to consider some cases that we can provide.

5. General comments

Most of our questions and concerns, as illustrated by questions 2 and 3, for instance, show that deeper thought and further analysis about FRBR and continuing resources could help those who work with serials to deal successfully with harmonization issues between ISBD, ISSN rules and RDA. The ISSN working group would be thus very happy to establish a closer cooperation with the FRBR Review Group.