ISBD Review Group
https://www.ifla.org/isbd-rg

Task Group for the Analysis of the Alignment and Impact of IFLA LRM on ISBD
Report

The Cataloguing Section Standing Committee meeting, held in Columbus, Ohio, in 2016, stated: "We recommend in 2016/2017 to start the ISBD/FRBR-LRM alignment in cooperation with RDA and ISSN, represented by Gordon Dunsire and Clement Oury." (Cataloguing Section Standing Committee meeting, Columbus, 2016. Minutes).

A task force was formed in December 2016 with: Renate Behrens-Neumann (representing RDA); Elena Escolano Rodríguez (chair); Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi; Dorothy McGarry; Clement Oury (representing ISSN); Pat Riva (representing the Consolidation Editorial Group of the FRBR Review Group) and Melanie Roche.

The work was organized and developed as follows:
- Communication by email and Skype meetings (16/01/2017 and 09/02) and one face-to-face meeting of 3 days in Paris (6-8/04), kindly hosted by the Bibliothèque nationale de France, to finish the work.
- Google Docs was the tool used to share and work on the same document. On 23/05 the draft was circulated to the ISBD Review Group and the FRBR Review Group.

The work was much more complex than expected and it was not possible to meet the 3 weeks time agreed. However, the group has been very productive; in a few months the task group has elaborated the ISBD – LRM alignment demonstrating the applicability of LRM (main aim) and providing issues for revision, looking for consistency in the related documents and supplying some indications for the future revision of ISBD (second aim).

Some crucial issues were clear from the first Skype meeting in January 2017:

- To use the ISBD-FRBR alignment table as the starting point (used v. 03 from July 2016, considered for "internal" use in view of the revision of ISBD)

- To use Transitional mappings FRBR – Library Reference Model (first v. file 2016-02-25 (full file as issued with the WWR of FRBR-LRM) was used; then v. 20170225)

- To use the last version of IFLA LRM (first v. 20161210; then v. March 2017 already published (https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11412) contained only minor changes from the previous version that was used for most of the work.

- To take into account the ISBD Namespace: from the ISBD RG Minutes, Columbus, 2016 the "7.2) Alignment between the ISBD and FRBR namespaces (Status update)". Although there was some

controversy in maintaining the URIs column, the "SG deemed the URI columns very useful, especially for reference purposes" and also that it was useful to include in the Introduction the necessary information in order to document how and why the major decisions were taken.

- According to the decision of fitting the declared ontology to ISBD, other elements that were not in the ISBD-FRBR alignment were included in the table:

    ISBD Resource class: it is aligned as a sub-class of RES, so it continues being the Domain of the ISBD elements. Resource needs to be disjoined with WEMI entities so that it can be related to any of them (for example, ISBD Notes could be related to W or E or I, not only to M).

    Areas and component statements were also included. Full ISBD areas are aligned as more specific (<) than the LRM Manifestation statement.

    ISBD syntax encoding schemes: there is a need for an encoding scheme for these statements including many elements. The reason is the added meaning that the ISBD's order of elements and punctuation provide to the information registered, that justify its declaration in RDF. Encoding patterns are not the transcribed statements themselves, but rather the meta-information about the format. ISBD as rules to which these schemes belong is a work. Decided for this alignment is that it could be included as a sub-type class of RES encoding schemes that will be sub-typed by areas and so on as necessary.

- The LRM is still not declared; instead, the identification label that in the model precedes each entity, attribute and relationship has been used.

- To preserve the nature of ISBD (Universal Bibliographic Control) when different options are possible, the one(s) where bibliographic control is not assured should not be used, recommended or discarded (deprecated).

Some other important issues that were repeatedly debated are:

- ISBD as an implementation of LRM, but **keeping its granularity**; that is, ISBD as an extension of LRM.

    be sub-typed according to the provisions of the cataloguing rules applied by the bibliographic The initial idea, based on the experience with the ISBD-FRBR alignment, was that elements could exist in ISBD but not in LRM. In order to accomplish the aim of demonstrating the applicability of LRM and not losing the identity of the standard as guiding rules for the description in cataloguing, there was agreement that ISBD needs to maintain its granularity.

    It would be reasonable to think that many of the elements of ISBD could not align one-to-one with the attributes in LRM, as on p. 7 where it was said "The model is comprehensive at the conceptual level, but only indicative in terms of the attributes and relationships that are defined".

Therefore, it was decided that starting from ISBD granularity, to follow the mechanisms given in LRM that permit the extensions needed for implementation, such as *manifestation statement*, that are intended to agency.

- The concept of **Manifestation statement** in both standards:

   Although the LRM-E4-A4 Manifestation statement definition is clear: "A statement appearing in exemplars of the manifestation and deemed to be significant for users to understand how the resource represents itself", the Scope Note seems controversial: "The manifestation statement attribute is a statement underline normally transcribed from a source present in exemplars of a manifestation. Transcription conventions are codified by each implementation. ...". This description may be found very limiting although the general idea reflected in the definition is the same.

   Transcription is not always the better way to describe how the resource represents itself. In ISBD there are many types of statements: descriptive, as they are recorded in notes in area 7; as they are transcribed in titles and statement of responsibility in areas 1 and 6; as information not fully transcribed but found in the resource that can be recorded in area 2 - 5-; or even a mix of transcription and description such as information on identifiers in area 8 and notes on relationships in area 7. There are even descriptive statements of information found outside the resource; it is in such cases that ISBD prescribes that the information be identified by square brackets.

   In the Introduction of LRM is the statement: "The model selected terms and created definitions so that they may be applicable in a generic way to all types of resources, or to all relevant entities"(p. 7). Therefore a decision was made whether to consider the scope note term "normally transcribed" in general sense to include all these ways of recording descriptive information in ISBD.

- The concept of **Manifestation** in both standards is different:

   The LRM concept of Manifestation includes factitious volumes or collections: "However, when multiple items from different manifestations are physically combined or joined (books or pamphlets bound together, audio tapes spliced together, etc.) the result is a new singleton manifestation." This point of view doesn't correspond to the ISBD manifestation concept. Until ISBD is extended to include non-published resources, singleton manifestations are outside the scope of ISBD and of this alignment. Text was approved to be included in the introduction of the alignment: "This alignment takes into account that ISBD, in its current version, considers "manifestation" as a published resource, while LRM encompasses any manifestation, published or not", thus manifestation singleton sets are excluded from this alignment. Manifestation singletons will be reconsidered in the future development of ISBD, when it will be extended to non-published resources.

   When ISBD will be extended to non-published resources in the revision process, an updating of this alignment will be necessary.

Some problematic alignments: Since the beginning it was clear that the ISBD element could align with many attributes in LRM. After some debates, it was decided that it is possible to have **multiple alignments** for a single ISBD element, e.g., to the Manifestation statement and any other entity, attribute or relationship. The reason was the objective of this alignment: to reflect the applicability of LRM, but this opened the range of the possible alignments too much; for example, possible **alignments to relationships** that were excluded at first, except when the relationship is explicit in ISBD (e.g. in area 7). After the debates, it was decided simply to suggest the correct possible alignments, even with relationships, but in order to be consistent with the ISBD view, it was decided to restrict them mainly to Series (area 6), Notes (area 7), identifiers (area 8), and some other few elements in other areas where they represent links of the described resource to other entities. It was also decided to differentiate the multiple alignments in different lines in order not to confuse them as options, or at least to show that the Manifestation statement is the first alignment according to ISBD. This alignment table is not the place to make recommendations on a mandatory level.

- A good example is: ISSN usually transcribed from resource, can present an errata, therefore the corrected version would be as descriptive Manifestation statement. But also as identifier is a Nomen for the series so it could be made a relationship. See ISBD 8.1.3 last paragraph. The same is true for Key title, considered as an identifier by the ISSN agency.

- Area 6 information, which deals with multivolume explicit relationships among resources.

- In the table the relationship at the Work level is illustrated, however this should be interpreted as the main component of a path that also includes the relationship from Manifestation to Expression and from Expression to Work. Inverse relationships are not considered. As an example, common and dependent titles are both mapped to LRM-R26 *has part*, even though dependent titles would otherwise be treated as LRM-R26i *is part of*.

Possible recommendations for the ISBD Revision:

Related to the content of the standard:

- Both mappings ISBD-FRBR and ISBD–LRM are used as bases for the future revision of ISBD.

- **The concept of manifestation should be adapted to the LRM Manifestation –** this will affect the entire ISBD, from Introduction through all areas. (This will accomplish what has been requested by the Rare and Ancient Books Section since 2010).

- The alignment has been made among ISBD elements and LRM entities, attributes and relationships. ISBD elements accord also with the five LRM generic user tasks, in some way or another, and also confirm its "outward orientation to the end-user's needs." Still, a **corresponding mapping of ISBD elements to the five LRM user tasks** has not been carried out. This work is necessary to revise the need for such information and therefore <u>revise the mandatory level in ISBD</u>; it was done in the past according to FRBR.

- In order to analyze the elements according to user tasks, analysis should be done on **who are the users of ISBD**?

- **Adaptation to ICP** (Statement of International Cataloguing Principles); revise the text considering adaptation to the principles, specifically to Accessibility and Interoperability principles, etc.

- Update the full correspondence between the *List of elements in ISBD* **A.3.1 Outline of ISBD** with the Elements Set declared in OMR. This could become a section of correspondence between the standard and the OMR, including their URIs and URLs. Much of the information that is in the Metadata Registration comes from the meaning in the text of the rules; therefore the ISBD definitions should be adapted to be self-significant, in OMR and the ISBD text. Include in this section the Resource, areas, component statements, and encoding schemes, etc.

Related to the shape of the standard:

- The standard should be easy to use but more dynamic: although using PDF, take advantage of the links and html to facilitate the quick finding of information if it is used in electronic form; but make sure that it can also be used in printed form, in order not to handicap any possible user.

- After the Introduction, using a Chapter A or B, or right after the List of elements in A.3.1, the alignment with LRM should be included. This will justify consistency between standards and will provide a global understanding to cataloguers. In this table ISBD elements could have links to ISBD elements set in OMR (URIs and URLs) and also links to the part in the text where rules on this element are developed in detail.

- In areas, as it is now, make distinction between **Definition** of elements at the beginning, **Encoding schemes**, **Rules** on transcription/descriptions.

- Other relationships coming from LRM alignment could be added, but if included the table should in some way be explicit, but ISBD is more focused on rules guiding description, not in access points.

Conclusions:

It has to be highlighted that the work done has been useful in calling attention to small errata that are to be corrected in documents used, providing the general consistency that is one important aim.

A possible relational ISBD will be considered in future developments of the standard.

The alignment ISBD-FRBR, a model less abstract and closer to practice, recording all the elements used in bibliographic records, presents some non-applicable correspondences. However, unexpectedly, this has not been the situation in the ISBD-LRM alignment, as this model contemplated versatile properties and extensions such as Manifestation statement being always possible.

The levels of abstraction of the models being different, it is not strange that the value of the correspondences are different.

As a result it can be concluded that the LRM is applicable and that ISBD is a valid and needed extension of LRM.

Prepared by:

Elena Escolano Rodríguez (chair of the Task Group)

August 2017