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Today is NOT a training session for RDA, but for FRBR (which underpins RDA)
1. What is FRBR?
   • Where does it “fit” in our cataloguing toolkit?
2. Basic examples & sources
3. Books in the FRBR model
4. Exhibition catalogues
5. Artists’ Responsibilities
6. ArtWORKS inside and outside the FRBR model
7. What next?
What is FRBR?

1998 text and current text (with amendments and corrections to date) available as PDF downloads from [http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records](http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records)

“An end point of almost 175 years of thinking about what catalogs are for and how they should work – an end point, not the end point.”

Ranganathan’s Laws

1. Books are for use.
2. Every reader his book.
4. Save the time of the reader.
5. The library is a growing organism.
Objects

1. To enable a person to find a book of which either
(A) the author
(B) the title
(C) the subject is known.
2. To show what the library has
(D) by a given author
(E) on a given subject
(F) in a given kind of literature
3. To assist in the choice of a book
(G) as to its edition (bibliographically)
(H) as to its character (literary or topical)

Catalogue cards have a “flat” structure. We search under an entry point (e.g. “Gaskell” and find a monolithic record for the book we seek).
This electronic record is still fairly flat. If we click on the author name or the subject, the catalogue runs a search on those terms.
A bibliography of the Foulis Press.
Gaskell, Philip, 1926-2001

Description: 420 p. illus., facsims. 23 cm.
Series: Soho bibliographies, 14
Bibliography: Bibliographical references included in "Introduction" (p. 11-13)

Search Results
Browsing results matching Soho bibliographies, 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sohm Dossier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soho bibliographies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soho young writers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Soi, Praneet, 1971-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sokorovishch'a zodchestva narodov SSSR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sokrovišča Peterburga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sokrovišča russkogo iskusstva</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sokrovišča russkogo zodchestva</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sokrovišča russkogo narodov SSSR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sokszorosított grafika története</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screenshots from http://catalogue.nal.vam.ac.uk

Here, there is a link in the series field that takes us to an intermediary screen.

... clicking on the series name in this list takes us to ...
...a list of all the catalogue records in that series.

1. A bibliography of A. Conan Doyle / by Richard Lancelyn Green and John Michael Gibson; with a foreword by Graham Greene.
   Name: Green, Richard Lancelyn, 1953-2004
   Date of Publication: 1983

   Name: Fifoot, Richard. 1925-1992
   Date of Publication: 1971.

3. A bibliography of Frederick Rolfe, Baron Corvo / Cecil Woolf.
   Name: Woolf, Cecil
   Publisher: London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1972.
   Date of Publication: 1972.

4. A bibliography of Ronald Firbank / by Miriam J. Benkovitz.
   Name: Benkovitz, Miriam J.
... this feature is drawing on the relational database style of the NAL catalogue, using MARC 490 and 830 to create the links ...

http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd490.html
In MARC 21, the 830 field is a series uniform title – i.e. a heading that ensures consistent entry for the series each time it occurs. In the case of the NAL catalogue, the intermediate screen shows us the list of series uniform titles, so when we click on it, we are taken to all the catalogue records that have this series uniform title in the 830 field.
Search results 1–8 of 8 for Author: gaskell ; Title: foulis press

1. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FOULIS PRESS.
   Printed

   London : Rupert Hart-Davis 1964
   Printed

3. A bibliography of the Foulis Press ...
   London : Rupert Hart-Davis 1964
   Printed

   2nd ed.
   Winchester : St. Paul's Bibliographies 1986
   Printed
Arguably, the *really* interesting relationship is that between the two editions that we know exist. FRBR provides a model that can cope with these kinds of relationship (and others).
“Frankenstein” work conceived by Mary Shelley

Frankenstein
original expression – text completed 1817

Frankenstein.
Harding, Mavor & Jones, 1818.
original manifestation in English

Individual item

Frankenstein.
Whittaker, 1823.
second manifestation in English

Individual item

Frankenstein.
Colburn & Bentley, 1831. “Popular ed.”
third manifestation in English; text changed substantially

Individual item

Practical Cataloguing p. 94.
Work
Expression
Manifestation
Item
Figure 3.1: Group 1 Entities and Primary Relationships

WORK

is realized through

EXPRESSION

is embodied in

MANIFESTATION

is exemplified by

ITEM

http://www.ifla.org/publications-functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records
Four generic user tasks have been defined for the purposes of this study. The tasks are defined in relation to the elementary uses that are made of the data by the user:

• to **find** entities that correspond to the user’s stated search criteria (i.e., to locate either a single entity or a set of entities in a file or database as the result of a search using an attribute or relationship of the entity);

• to **identify** an entity (i.e., to confirm that the entity described corresponds to the entity sought, or to distinguish between two or more entities with similar characteristics);

• to **select** an entity that is appropriate to the user’s needs (i.e., to choose an entity that meets the user’s requirements with respect to content, physical format, etc., or to reject an entity as being inappropriate to the user’s needs);

• to acquire or **obtain** access to the entity described (i.e., to acquire an entity through purchase, loan, etc., or to access an entity electronically through an online connection to a remote computer).

http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records
Cutter’s Objects <<< FRBR’s User Tasks

1. To enable a person to find a book of which either
   (A) the author
   (B) the title
   (C) the subject is known.
2. To show what the library has
   (D) by a given author
   (E) on a given subject
   (F) in a given kind of literature
3. To assist in the choice of a book
   (G) as to its edition (bibliographically)
   (H) as to its character (literary or topical)

If FRBR’s been around since 1998, why are we starting to care about it NOW?
Today is NOT a training session for RDA, but for FRBR (which underpins RDA)
Some Basic Examples

Image: by Leo Reynolds, copyright commons, some rights reserved, http://www.flickr.com/photos/lwr/4381756806/
Explore and Discuss

There are a range of examples of FRBR in action on the web. Here are two quite simple ones to get you started.

http://www.aurochs.org/frbr_example/frbr_example.html

http://www.frbr.org/eg/hp-goblet-1.html#
Explore and Discuss

There are various ‘FRBR-ized’ catalogues on the web. Although the ‘look and feel’ of the website is a little dated now, the FRBRization is interesting in this one.

Variations – try searching the basic Scherzo catalog – e.g. ‘Moonlight Sonata’
http://www.dlib.indiana.edu/projects/vfrbr/

Compare what you find with the results for the same search on Indiana’s general (un-FRBRized) catalogue
http://www.iucat.iu.edu
Books in the FRBR model
Explore and Discuss

The Library of Congress has run a number of projects exploring FRBR and the FRBRization of the catalogue. This set of 15 MARC records relating to Scott’s *The Heart of Midlothian* is basic in terms of display, but there is much to discuss in terms of FRBR and its uses in bringing related publications together.

Look at the records, thinking in particular about how the relationships might be further displayed (e.g. between works derived from Scott’s novel). Remember, this is generated from MARC records massaged into FRBR as opposed to being a list of records created with FRBR as a guiding principle.

Explore and Discuss

OCLC has similarly explored FRBRization. This is one of the most recent outputs.

OCLC FictionFinder – search for novels with different editions and think about the WEMI relationships; are they related works, or editions, or just different manifestations?
http://www.oclc.org/research/themes/data-science/fictionfinder.html
If you are struggling to find a novel with lots of different editions, try Murder on the Orient Express, which has loads.


Reworked 5 times.

Prints of individual pages available.

Also:


Also:

Website and web app – see [http://humument.com/](http://humument.com/) and DISCUSS
Exhibition Catalogues

Image: by Leo Reynolds, copyright commons, some rights reserved, http://www.flickr.com/photos/lwr/4381756806/
Today is NOT a training session for RDA, but

- FRBR is a theoretical model, and is ‘silent’ in terms of certain important specifics, which are left for implementations of the model to work out
- RDA is an implementation of FRBR
- RDA is probably the reason you have come to find out about FRBR today

Obviously in the UK, we refer to the (more recent) BL policy first; this slide is to illustrate the key issues that need to be considered with regard to catalogues

Is it an exhibition catalog?

Is all the art owned by the...

Is one person...

(LCPS 19.2.1.1.1 Art Catalogs)

Enter under corporate body

Enter under person

See RDA Chapter 6 for relevant rule(s)
Artists’ responsibilities

Image: by Michael ™ Smith, copyright commons, some rights reserved
http://www.flickr.com/photos/sideshowbarker/2520211534/
Figure 3.2: Group 2 Entities and “Responsibility” Relationships

- WORK
- EXPRESSION
- MANIFESTATION
- ITEM
- PERSON
- CORPORATE BODY

Connections:
- WORK is created by EXPRESSION
- EXPRESSION is produced by MANIFESTATION
- MANIFESTATION is realized by ITEM
- ITEM is owned by PERSON
- PERSON is created by CORPORATE BODY
QUESTION: I am having some difficulty determining appropriate relationship designators for artists when cataloging art catalogs and art exhibition catalogs. Current practices recommend that if a book contains reproductions of a single artist’s works, unless the person who wrote the catalog is represented as the author in the chief source of information, the main entry for the catalog is under the heading [authorized access point] for the artist. In RDA., in such cases do we consider the artist the author, even if he has not providing any content for the work in hand but is only reproduced, i.e., [name or artist],$eartist,$eaauthor?

http://lib.stanford.edu/metadata-department/stanford-rda-questions-and-answers#1
ANSWER: If a corporate body is involved, start at RDA 19.2.1.1 and the related LCPS section on art catalogs. If no corporate body is involved, just follow the general RDA instructions on determining if there is a creator. Is the catalog the result of collaboration? Is it a compilation? As far as the relationship designator issue, remember first that such designators are not required in RDA. If your determination is that the artist is the creator of the catalog, then the artist is given in the 1XX field. Be careful about using the term "author" as a synonym for creator. If you want to use a relationship designator in the 1XX field, "author" would not be appropriate (see the definition for this designator in appendix I) because I assume that the resource is not primarily textual. Remember also that appendix I is not a closed list; you can devise your own term as long as the type of relationship you want to express is not already covered by a term already in the appendix. (6 October 2010)

NO CHANGE AS OF 4 JUNE 2012 (KRT)

http://lib.stanford.edu/metadata-department/stanford-rda-questions-and-answers#1
ArtWORKS

Image: by tim rich and lesley katon, copyright commons, some rights reserved http://www.flickr.com/photos/timrich26/2988966837/
DO YOU SENSE HOW ALL THE PARTS OF A GOOD PICTURE ARE INVOLVED WITH EACH OTHER, NOT JUST PLACED SIDE BY SIDE? ART IS A CREATION FOR THE EYE AND CAN ONLY BE HINTED AT WITH WORDS.
“An end point of almost 175 years of thinking about what catalogs are for and how they should work – *an* end point, not *the* end point.”


“Just as we know there isn’t a “one-size-fits-all” metadata schema or set of controlled vocabularies suitable for all types of resources, neither is there a single conceptual model. For unique cultural works, the FRBR model has some areas of potential application, but also several significant points of divergence.”

What Next?

Image: by Darwin Bell, copyright commons, some rights reserved http://www.flickr.com/photos/darwinbell/533439638/
RIMMF – RDA in Many Metadata Formats.
Allows you to play around with data and see how it looks under RDA’s implementation of FRBR’s WEMI

RDA Special Topics -

RDA Toolkit - http://www.rdatoolkit.org/ especially LCPS 19.2.1.1.1

Discuss, discuss, discuss. RDA is just beginning its implementation phase. The only way to survive is together!
BIBFRAME  (The Bibliographic Framework Initiative)
Transforming our Bibliographic Framework
A Statement from the Library of Congress (May 13, 2011)

The Library of Congress is sharing this statement, by Deanna B. Marcum, LC’s Associate Librarian for Library Services for the benefit of its external constituents. Dr. Marcum will be leading the initiative that will drive this transformation process. The Library is mounting the statement now for early review. Following the June 2011 Annual Conference of the American Library Association, where discussions about the statement will occur, the Library will make further announcements.

The recent publication of Resource Description & Access (RDA), and the US National Test of RDA that is now being analyzed, have come at a time when technological and environmental changes are once again causing the library community to rethink the future of bibliographic control, including the MARC 21 communication formats. The content and packaging of RDA itself attempt to address this question and in so doing have raised further issues. Quite apart from a decision about implementing RDA, we must evaluate the wider bibliographic framework.

Adding to the uncertainties that accompany change, libraries and other cultural heritage institutions and information centers around the world are facing serious budgetary constraints. Cultural heritage institutions see their resources dwindling at the same time that they need to invest in dramatic new uses of bibliographic data. In this environment, many institutions have been forced to relax standards of quality in bibliographic records while still being asked to broaden their services, especially in terms of the availability of digital data. Efficiencies in the creation and sharing of cataloging metadata are therefore imperative: information providers and cultural heritage institutions must reevaluate their use of scarce resources, both as individual organizations and as a community.

The Associate Librarian of Congress for Library Services, Deanna Marcum, is leading an initiative at the Library to analyze the present and future environment, identify the components of the framework to support our users, and plan for the evolution from our present framework to the future—not just for the Library of Congress, but for all institutions that depend on bibliographic data shared by the Library and its partners. The Library of Congress has invested considerable resources in the development of broadly implemented encoding standards such as MARC 21, as well as cataloging standards and vocabularies such as the

The Library of Congress Announces Modeling Initiative (05/22/12)

The Library of Congress is pleased to announce that it has contracted with Zepheira to help accelerate the launch of the Bibliographic Framework Initiative. A major focus of the project is to translate the MARC 21 format to a Linked Data (LD) model while retaining as much as possible the robust and beneficial aspects of the historical format. Zepheira brings to the project extensive experience in LD technology for library applications.

Eric Miller, who was a leader in the Semantic Web Initiative in its early days for the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) and who has also worked in the library and information science field, leads the Zepheira team. The company, under Mr. Miller’s leadership, has been active in the development of Semantic Web and Library standards as well as open source tools to support LD technologies and library applications. These activities represent knowledge and experience that are instrumental for constructing a core data model and to support prototype services that will serve as a basis for a new bibliographic framework and related services.

The Library of Congress has asked Zepheira to provide a model (or models) that can serve as a strong starting point for discussion, and an analysis of related initiatives underway that will be useful to this effort. LC expects that the proposed model(s) will change and be further tuned based on valuable feedback from the community and a natural progression of requirements as they are addressed. The initial model(s) will serve as a basis for work focused on a demonstration system/service which will then, in turn, be used to further refine the model(s). The expectation is that such iterative feedback loops will eventually ensure a flexible bibliographic framework, a robust reference code, a supporting infrastructure for deployment, and an effective migration plan to support the community in making a transition from MARC to a new framework.

The Library of Congress will now proceed to organize various scenarios to enable community participation that will be broad and include international users and partners, various types of information agencies and libraries, and library suppliers. We will be posting information as it emerges from this initial work, especially relating to projected milestones at the BIBFRAME Web site (www.loc.gov/bibframe).
BIBFRAME Primer Document Announced (11/21/12)
Linked Data Model and Supporting Services

Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services

The Library of Congress is pleased to report that we have reached two important milestones with respect to our Bibliographic Framework Initiative: the introduction of a draft data model for web-based bibliographic description and a first meeting of a small group of early experimenters currently exploring the feasibility of the proposed model. The new model is simply called BIBFRAME, short for Bibliographic Framework.

The model document is a high-level view of the BIBFRAME model - a primer. Although the model is a draft and expected to change, we want to share it now with the community not only so that you are informed of progress being made but also to engender conversation and constructive feedback. The URL for the document "Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services" is: [http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/pdf/marcld-report-11-21-2012.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/pdf/marcld-report-11-21-2012.pdf)

As the document states in its introduction, much remains to be done, but it is important to remember that this model, like MARC, must be able to accommodate any number of content models and specific implementations of the broader information community, but still enable data exchange between libraries.

Our second milestone was partnering with six organizations to join us in testing and experimenting with this new model. We call these organizations the Early Experimenters and they are: British Library, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, George Washington University, National Library of Medicine, OCLC, and Princeton University — and of course LC. We met in Washington, DC for two days in October and since then we have all be investigating how past and future data might fit into the model. After a follow-up meeting in December, they have agreed to share the experience and results with the wider community with the expectation it will stimulate broader explorations. The Library of Congress will be doing the same, on both counts.

Although it is important to understand the Bibliographic Framework Initiative, and the proposed model, in a larger context, within the library community it is equally important to consider this document as a starting point upon which the community will continue to build. When reading about the BIBFRAME model, it is clear that much remains to be done. It is important to remember that this model, like MARC, must be able to accommodate any number of content models and specific implementations, but still enable data exchange between libraries. It needs to support new metadata rules and content standards that emerge, including the newest library content standard - RDA (Resource Description & Access). The BIBFRAME model must therefore both broaden and narrow the format universe for exchange of bibliographic data.

MARC … can be reflected in 3 primary functions:

1. Data related to the intellectual essence of a work
2. Data related to the actual instance of the work - that is what you hold in your hand, retrieve from an electronic source network, etc.
3. Record metadata such as control numbers, record handling codes and other annotations.

What do cataloguers NEED to know NOW?

- The future for library cataloguing is Linked Data
- Plans are in place at the Library of Congress for a move to BIBFRAME, which will replace MARC
- BIBFRAME is not envisaged as an entry tool, but as an exchange format in the background with an entry screen
  - So we don’t have to be linked data (RDF) experts
  - But MARC was envisaged in the same way …
    - … so *some* understanding of RDF may be wise
- There’s a basic transformation tool from MARCXML to BIBFRAME but systems would do this in a batch

Some Caveats

- Other RDF schemes for bibliographic data exist
  - e.g. British National Bibliography
  - OCLC and BIBFRAME have a mapping
  - The JSC for RDA is looking at linked data too
- BIBFRAME’s WI model is a contraction of RDA’s WEMI
  - Not all the benefits of WEMI are present
  - In theory, it’s easier to convert batches of MARC to WI than to WEMI
  - But watch out for developments from JSC for RDA
- Some vendors already have linked data products
  - Not all bibliographic data is library data

From: http://cilipconference2015.org.uk/anne-welsh/
Core Concepts for Future Cataloguers

• At this stage, it’s still all about the conceptual models
  • As cataloguers, we are good at those
• Explore RDF at least enough to understand what a triple is, and why it matters
  • http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-primer/
• Familiarise yourself with the BIBFRAME model
  • http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/model.html
• Keep up with the JSC for RDA
  • http://www.rda-jsc.org/
  • Meeting in Edinburgh in November
• Relax. It took from 2005 until 2013 until we had to implement RDA

From: http://cilipconference2015.org.uk/anne-welsh/