



INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS
AND INSTITUTIONS
WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS

84th IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND ASSEMBLY
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
24-29 AUGUST 2018

ISBD Review Group

<http://www.ifla.org/en/isbd-rg>

MINUTES – DRAFT

(as of 11 August 2019)

Meetings:

ISBD Review Group

Sunday 26, 10.45-13.15 (Room 301)

Tuesday 28, 8.00-10.30 (Room 301)

Thursday 30, 9.30-16.00, "ISBD-revision" full-day working meeting (National Library of Malaysia - Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 232, Jalan Tun Razak, Titiwangsa) - not included in these minutes

Attendees, members and liaisons: Renate Behrens (liaison with the RDA Steering Committee), Vincent Boulet (member), Gordon Dunsire (member, RDA Steering Committee chair), Elena Escolano Rodríguez (member, via Skype, 1st meeting), Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (chair, IAML liaison), Dorothy McGarry (member, via Skype), Susan Morris (member), Clément Oury (member, ISSN Network liaison), Mélanie Roche (member), Ricardo Santos Muñoz (member)

Apologies: Ben Gu (corresponding member), Irena Kavčič (corresponding member), Iman Khairy Weheba (member), Françoise Leresche (corresponding member), Mirna Willer (member)

Attendees, representatives of other bodies and groups: Diane Beattie (Committee on Standards chair), Adelaida Caro Martín (Rare Books and Special Collections Section, liaison), Agnese Galeffi (Cataloguing section communication officer, webmaster for the ISBD RG pages), Gordana Mazić (Permanent UNIMARC Committee chair), Chris Oliver (BCM Review Group chair), Rehab Ouf (Committee on Standards), Pat Riva (BCM Review Group Consolidation Editorial Group member), Jay Weitz (Permanent UNIMARC Committee vice-chair), Joanne Yeomans (Professional Committee secretary)

Observers, 1st meeting: Nadine Abec (National library of Luxemburg), Saeedeh Akbari-Daryan (National library and archives of Iran, Permanent UNIMARC Committee), Nijolė Bliūdžiuvienė (National library of Lithuania), Alejandra Muñoz Gómez (Library of congress, Chile), Maria Liisa Seppälä (National library of Finland), Jenny Wright (BDS)

Observers, 2nd meeting: Alejandra Muñoz Gómez (Cataloguing Section Standing Committee), Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon), Angela Omiroz (Biblioteca del Congreso, Chile), Sandy Roe (Cataloguing and Classification Quarterly), Daniel Saulean (University of Vermont), Marijana Tomić (University of Zadar, Croatia), Jenny Wright (BDS)

Note that these minutes do not necessarily reflect the chronological order in which each topic was discussed.

1. Welcome and introductions

M. Gentili-Tedeschi welcomed the members, representatives of other bodies and groups, and observers. He remembered John Byrum, a long time chair of the ISBD Review Group, who passed away earlier this year.

2. Agenda

The agenda was adopted but the discussion on item 6 concerning the development of the standard in the 1st meeting was anticipated, in order to enable members needing to attend a conflicting session of the Cataloguing Section to take part to the discussion.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the ISBD RG Meeting, Wrocław 2017, https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrp/isbdrp_meeting_2017.pdf.

Minutes were approved.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes of the Wrocław meeting and the Action List, (updated version of 2 August 2018). Specific topics to be discussed:

- 4.1 Guidelines for use of ISBD as Linked Data (A. 1/16, 1/17, M. Gentili-Tedeschi)

Action 1/17: Verify status of *Guidelines for the use of ISBD as linked data*, re-submit if needed

Guidelines were sent re-submitted to the Committee on Standards on 29 September 2017 and published on the IFLA website, <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/10834?og=628>.

- 4.2 Guidelines for translations of the IFLA ISBD namespace in RDF (A. 3/15, 1/2016, 2/17, M. Gentili-Tedeschi)

Action 2/17: Publish *Guidelines for translations of the IFLA ISBD namespace in RDF, ver. 1.0* on the IFLA website (see A. 3/15)

The Guidelines were published on 30 April 2018, https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/guidelines-ifla_isbd-namespace-translation-_v.1.0_august2017.pdf, see <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/10835?og=628>.

- 4.3 Check the existing mapping of compound terms from ISBD Area 0 Content form and Content qualification with ROF base categories, send to ISBD RG, CS SC and LIDATEC for comments and approval, publish (A. 3/17, G. Dunsire)

Action 3/17: Check the existing mapping of compound terms from ISBD Area 0 Content form and Content qualification with ROF base categories, send to ISBD RG, CS SC and LIDATEC for comments and approval, publish

Gordon Dunsire reported that no change was detected, therefore there was no action to be taken; the action keeps ongoing.

Action 1/18: Check the existing mapping of compound terms from ISBD Area 0 Content form and Content qualification with ROF base categories, send to ISBD RG, CS SC and LIDATEC for comments and approval, publish: G. Dunsire, ongoing

- 4.4 Write to CoS to withdraw the request for approval of the *Alignment of ISBD element set to IFLA LRM element set*, reopen approval process (A. 4/17, M. Gentili-Tedeschi)

Action 4/17: Write to CoS to withdraw the request for approval of the *Alignment of ISBD element set to IFLA LRM element set*, reopen approval process

The chair wrote immediately to the Committee on Standard. The alignment table will be revised in due time after the publication of the LRM element set in the IFLA namespace, but will be used as a base document for the ISBD revision.

- 4.5 Contact LIDATEC to establish a liaison (A. 5/17, M. Gentili-Tedeschi)

Action 5/17: Contact LIDATEC to establish a liaison

The chair contacted LIDATEC, the proposal was accepted on 24 August 2017 and Mélanie Roche, who is also chair of the ISBD and Linked Data Study Group, was nominated liaison.

- 4.6 Write an article about ISBD RG activities for the IFLA Metadata newsletter (A. 6/17, M. Roche)

Action 6/17: Write an article about ISBD RG activities for the IFLA Metadata newsletter

Considering that the revision activity will start after WLIC 2018, the publication of the article was postponed.

Action 2/18: Write an article about ISBD RG revision for the IFLA Metadata newsletter: M. Roche, in due time for the publication on December 2018 issue

4.7 Present options for consideration by the IFLA Committee on Standards, so that a decision can be made on how to implement the LRM in the future version of ISBD (A. 7/17, group to be established)

Action 7/17: A working group is charged to present options for consideration by the IFLA Committee on Standards, so that a decision can be made on how to implement the LRM in the future version of ISBD

A Working group was established during the extra meeting held in Wroclaw after WLIC on 25 August 2017, composed by Renate Behrens (chair), Elena Escolano Rodriguez, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Françoise Leresche, Dorothy McGarry, Chris Oliver (FRBR RG), Clément Oury, Mélanie Roche. The group drafted a proposal of a two-phase work, two years focusing on ISBD elements aligned to manifestation entity of IFLA LRM or to relationships of manifestation to manifestation, then analysing the gap; at the end of this phase, a report will be drafted, recommending possible further actions, i.e., if needed, working on ISBD mandatory or optional elements aligned to other LRM entities or relationships.

The report containing a proposed work plan was accepted by the ISBD RG and sent to the Committee on Standards in April 2018, approved in principle at a conference call meeting on 17 May 2018 with some observations concerning communication of the work progress, then finally approved at the CoS meeting on 24 August 2018, and published on the IFLA website.¹

Following the recommendations of the Committee on Standards, the start of the revision work on ISBD was announced through social media, together with a call for volunteering; there were three replies, two from IFLA members (Rehab Ouf, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, member of CoS; Sadeeh Akbari-Daryan, National library and archives of Iran, corresponding member of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee), and one from outside IFLA (Rosinda Ferreira, School librarian, Portugal). Their participation has been welcomed, and will be duly considered in the revision work.

4.8 Ask of the FRBR Review Group the exact meaning of the expression “normally transcribed” in the Scope Note of the LRM attribute “Manifestation statement” (Action 8/17, group to be established)

Action 8/17: Ask to the FRBR Review Group the exact meaning of the expression “normally transcribed” in the Scope Note of the LRM attribute “Manifestation statement”

A letter requesting clarifications was drafted on 27 September 2017 (see Appendix 1), the FRBR Review Group kindly responded on 23 October, attaching the remarks of the Consolidation Editorial Group (see Appendix 2); the IFLA LRM text was edited accordingly, the minor revision was published in December 2017 on the IFLA website.² The chair thanked the FRBR RG - now renamed Bibliographic Conceptual Models Review Group - for the prompt reply and action.

5. Chair’s report

M. Gentili-Tedeschi observed that the written report had been sent to the Review Group members and published on the IFLA website³, and that a large part of the report had already been discussed; in order to leave as much time as possible to the discussion on the development of the ISBD, he limited his speech to only a few essential points:

5.1 ISBD activity report: Project and financial reports

¹ https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/proposed_work_plan_for_isbd_revision_2018-2022.pdf.

² https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr-lrm/ifla-lrm-august-2017_rev201712.pdf.

³ https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/isbdrg_report_2017-2018.pdf.

An application for funding the project *Development of the International Standard Bibliographic Description* was made, with the following terms:

- to cover travel and hotel expenses for two three-day meetings of subgroups of the ISBD RG, for members who do not have other sources of funding for the working meeting;
- one meeting, in Spring 2018, will focus on the structure of the revised ISBD, the second, in Autumn 2018, on drafting the revised text.

The Professional Committee approved partial funding to support this plan, as follows:

- Partial funding of 2000 Euros to support one meeting (of the group's choice).
The Professional Committee recognized the hard work of the group and noted that the funding request was supported by the Committee on Standards. However, they did not see justification for two meetings and would like to see a clearer strategic plan detailing at a higher level, the directions, and explaining the priorities and deadlines. They were pleased to hear that this is something the Committee on Standards is working on with all the Review Groups.

It was thus decided to reserve the funding for the Autumn meeting.

5.2 ISBD Review Group Activities Report, August 2017 – August 2018

See report, https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/isbdrg_report_2017-2018.pdf.

5.3 Revision work

In view of the revision work the chair recalled the recommendation to involve a wider community; to that purpose, Adelaida Caro Martín has been nominated as liaison to the Rare Books and Special Collections Section, and Elena Ravelli has volunteered to replace Patrizia Martini (ICCU, Italy), who retired this year, as the liaison with the Commissione REICAT. Other liaisons might be established, and the existing ones should be as active as possible in involving the respective communities.

Another way to get the revised text as international and collaborative as possible is to create content groups on special subjects, such as manuscripts, older monographic resources, continuing resources, music, cartographic and graphic resources, language/alphabet-related issues, etc., so to get input from wide communities of experts.

5.4 IFLA Namespace

The issues caused by the delay in the closure of the contract for the registration of IFLA namespaces has been reported on all possible occasions. At last, after the closure of the numerous meetings of the interested IFLA units where the subject was discussed, thanks to the insistence of the chair of Division III Maja Žumer, the solution was announced: the Governing Board in its meeting of 30 August finally decided to sign the contract with Metadata Management Associates without further delay, so that the work on vocabularies may restart.

5.5 Publications and presentations

The Slovene translation of the ISBD Consolidated Edition is ready for publication.

6. Development of the standard

The discussion on the development of ISBD took the largest part of the meetings, essentially focused on the establishment of an editorial committee, its tasks, the timeline, the number of members, its membership, and how to deal with special content topics. The final decision was to nominate an ISBD Editorial Group (IEG), composed of about six members, focused on the structure of the future text, starting with a sample chapter. Terms of reference were drafted and approved in principle, leaving some time for observations; for the final version, sent to the Committee on Standards, see Appendix 3.

Content groups dealing with specific topics will be activated in due time when needed by the IEG, and members of the IEG acting as liaisons will have the same role as connections with the respective bodies.

For the revision of the standard some actions are needed:

Action 3/18: Send draft Terms of Reference for the ISBD Editorial Group to ISBD Review Group members for comments (M. Gentili-Tedeschi, immediately)

Action 4/18: Send comments to the draft Terms of Reference for the IEG (all, by 29 August)

Action 5/18: Send approved Terms of Reference for the IEG, amended if needed, to the Committee on Standards chair, and to the Communication officer for publication (M. Gentili-Tedeschi, immediately after deadline for approval)

Action 6/18: Organise Autumn meeting of the IEG, date and place tba (chair of the IEG, asap)

Action 7/18: Contact local people for an extra whole-day meeting in Athens, Friday 30 August 2019, after WLIC 2019 (M. Gentili-Tedeschi, mid-September 2018)

Action 8/18: Send project plan including two face-to-face meetings of the IEG to be held in Spring and Autumn 2019, to be partially funded by IFLA (M. Gentili-Tedeschi, mid-October 2018)

7. Review Group members nomination process

The nomination process for the Review Groups was approved by the Governing board during its meeting of 23 August; compared with the one presented by the Committee on Standards only the deadlines were modified: the Call for candidacies opens on 3 October and ends on 3 January, which makes the period shorter than originally proposed, but allows more time for the selection of members, if needed, so that nomination is well in advance of the early registration for the following annual congress of IFLA.

Criteria for the nominations have to be defined in due time.

Action 9/18: Define criteria for selection of candidates, present to the Committee on Standards (all, by 3 October 2018)

This year two members of the Review Group will end their second term and may not be re-elected (M. Gentili-Tedeschi, M. Willer), while six will end their first term (V. Boulet, G. Dunsire, D. McGarry, S. Morris, C. Oury, M. Roche), and should express their wish to continue for a second one.

The ISBD RG has at present 12 members, with the following terms:

- Renate Behrens 1st term ends 2021
- Vincent Boulet 1st term ends 2019
- Gordon Dunsire 1st term ends 2019
- Elena Escolano Rodríguez 2nd term ends 2021
- Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi 2nd term ends 2019
- Iman Khairy Weheba 1st term ends 2021
- Dorothy McGarry 1st term ends 2019
- Susan R. Morris 1st term ends 2019
- Clément Oury 1st term ends 2019
- Mélanie Roche 1st term ends 2019
- Ricardo Santos 2nd term ends 2021
- Mirna Willer 2nd term ends 2019

Irena Kavčič and Françoise Leresche who are Corresponding members should be renewed for two more years, if they so wish.

Corresponding liaisons for the RG are Renate Behrens (RDA Steering Committee), Adelaida Caro (IFLA Rare Books and Special Collections Section), Anders Cato (Danish Agency for Culture), Elena Ravelli (Commissione REICAT), Regina Varnienė-Janssen (Kompiuterinių bibliografinių ir autoritetinių įrašų sudarymo metodika), Takahiro Watanabe (Committee on Cataloging of the Japan Library Association), Iman Khairy Weheba (Qatar National Library).

8. Status of projects, activities and issues arising during IFLA meetings

8.1 Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee (M. Byörkhem)

M. Björkhem reported on the activities of the section, see the Standing Committee reports.⁴

8.2 ISBD Linked Data Study Group (M. Roche)

The group has proposed to change its name and task, to reflect a wider coverage of all IFLA bibliographic standards and their presentation as linked data. The group has proposed to change its name into Bibliographic Linked Data Study Group, and to refer to LIDATEC; membership should reflect the new tasks and include at least two representatives of the ISBD RG, the BCM RG, and the Permanent UNIMARC Committee. Terms of reference will be drafted by M. Roche by the end of September, so to be approved by the group by the end of October and sent for final approval to the Committee on Standards.

The proposed changes were accepted by the BCM Review Group, and the ISBD Review Group approves them as well.

8.3 FRBR Review Group (Ch. Oliver)

The Review Group changed its name into Bibliographic Conceptual Model Review Group.⁵

The object-oriented model, FRBR_{oo}, is under revision in collaboration with CIDOC, it will be called LRM_{oo} and will change the methodology of numbering classes and properties equivalent to CIDOC CRM ones, not replicating them. Mapping is also under revision.

The degree to which PRESS_{oo} should be incorporated into LRM_{oo} is under discussion.

8.4 Linked Data Technical Sub-Committee (LIDATEC, A. Vukadin for A. Cato)

LIDATEC has been collecting information about element sets and given them to IFLA Headquarters, and preparing the agreement between IFLA and the Metadata Management Associates (MMA), that has been chosen as the provider of services regarding the namespaces maintenance. A positive reply from IFLA HQ is still waited.

8.5 Permanent UNIMARC Committee (G. Mazić)

The Permanent UNIMARC Committee held the usual annual meeting in Rome, 22-23 March 2018, to discuss the updates to the format.⁶

A new edition of the UNIMARC manual of the bibliographic and authority format is in preparation.

8.6 Committee on Standards (D. Beattie)

In the past year the Committee on Standards has been working on the definition of IFLA standard, on the terms of reference for the Review groups and on the nomination process for Review groups, which has to be ready in time for the next elections, which take place in early 2019.

8.7 RDA Steering Committee (RSC) (R. Behrens)

The RDA toolkit restructuring and revision process, better known as 3R project, is almost accomplished, the future task will be to focus on application profiles: there is surely an impact on ISBD, in what concerns the treatment of the Manifestation entity, of aggregates, on transcription of elements, and on the way data are transcribed.⁷

8.8 ISSN Network (C. Oury)

The opening of the new ISSN portal in January 2018 is the result of a one-and-a-half year IT design and development project carried out in conjunction an IT contractor via agile software development. This structuring project for the ISSN International Centre (ISSN IC) is in line with the objective of partial

⁴ See <https://www.ifla.org/cataloguing/reports>.

⁵ See also the full report at <https://www.ifla.org/node/794>.

⁶ See the full report at https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/uca/puc-meetings/27th_puc_meeting_2017_march_20-21.pdf.

⁷ More on RDA at <http://rda-rsc.org/>.

opening of metadata specified in the 2015-2018 Strategy. In 2018, the ISSN Network comprised 90 member states. Discussions about new accessions took place with representatives from Botswana, Kenya, Mongolia, and Ukraine. Unfortunately, preliminary discussions held with Austria and Kazakhstan have not yielded any positive results so far.

8.9 PRESSoo (C. Oury)

PRESSoo is an extension of FRBRoo (the “object-oriented”, i.e. linked-data oriented, version of FRBR). As such, with the adoption of the new conceptual model IFLA LRM replacing FRBR, also PRESSoo will have to be adapted to the new model.

An issue on reports of liaisons has been raised: the repetition of the same information at all the sessions of the liaised groups. Such duplicated information slows down the work of each group/committee. Just like at the meeting of BCM RG, there was discussion and consensus about the possibility of having joint “information sessions” for the RGs, and then we each proceed with our specific agendas and work. This suggestion was also proposed at the CoS business meeting 2.

9. Relations with other international organizations and committees: updates from other projects and groups

There were no updates or reports.

10. Any other business

No other business was reported.

Respectfully submitted by
Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, ISBD Review Group, Chair
Milano, 19 September 2018

Attachments:



INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS
AND INSTITUTIONS
WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS

ISBD Review Group
<http://www.ifla.org/en/isbd-rg>

To the FRBR Review Group

Object: Clarification on the interpretation of a statement in the IFLA Library Reference Model

Dear colleagues,

The **object** of this request is to obtain the necessary clarification that will allow the ISBD RG to be able to make better decisions on possible strategies that can be envisioned for the ISBD revision.

Background:

LRM as a highly abstract conceptual model should accommodate many possible ways of application, as it is said in 2.2 Conceptual Model as the Basis for Implementation “Definitions of certain key elements in IFLA LRM are intended to be compatible with the operationalization of the model through a variety of cataloguing codes...” The Manifestation entity and Manifestation Statement attribute definitions are not in conflict with ISBD, but the selected explanatory text for the Scope Note of the Manifestation Statement attribute seems not to be clear. It offers different interpretations with very important implications, especially for the IFLA standard ISBD.

The meaning of the expression *normally transcribed* used in the Scope Note of Manifestation Statement is interpreted in two senses by the members of the ISBD Review Group.

The working document ISBD-LRM alignment was made following the advice of the FRBR representative, who was also a member of the Editorial Committee and recommended to apply the alignment with a wide and general understanding of the sentence. It seems that these words were not selected with a specific intention. In LRM there is not the restricted meaning that is in the ISBD glossary for “transcribed”, but in a more general sense comprehends all the elements that are mentioned in the ISBD Introduction and also in its Scope: “The ISBD is the standard that determines the data elements to be recorded or transcribed ...” In this way many alignments of elements not properly transcribed according to the ISBD definition of the verb were made with the Manifestation Statement, and the report of this Study Group, in charge of the alignment, was made on the applicability of LRM and consistency between the IFLA standards.

The other interpretation, presented by some members of the ISBD Review Group, constrains very much the possible alignments of ISBD to LRM, to the point that the alignment can be rejected, and consequently there would be questions on whether LRM is applicable to ISBD, with ISBD an application of LRM.

In fact, the verb “record” is used in the Manifestation entity Scope note, instead of “transcribe”:
“ On a practical level, the degree to which distinctions between manifestations are **recorded** will depend to some extent on the anticipated needs of users and on the differences that the

cataloguer can reasonably be expected to recognize.” This could induce readers and developers of standards to understand that when used transcription in the commonly understood sense, it is used as it is recognized in ISBD, limiting very much the application of this attribute.

After the WLIC Congress, a special meeting was held on August 25th on "Impact of the IFLA Library Reference Model on ISBD, RDA and other bibliographic standards" <http://www.rda-rsc.org/news> with the participation of the ISBD RG, the RDA Steering Committee, EURIG, the ISSN Network, and NUKAT. The issue mentioned was one of the important subjects of the meeting. Pat Riva, representing the FRBR RG, made a presentation and explained the scope of this controversial sentence.

Following this meeting, there was a working meeting of the ISBD Review Group. Surprisingly, there was no change in the situation; the two interpretations were maintained.

It is very important for the future revision of ISBD to know the meaning of such controversial words, as it would affect and force a decision in favor of one or another option or strategy that the ISBD Review Group is exploring and analyzing for the ISBD revision process. This decision will have implications and impact on the cost and/or time that these options could imply, finally forcing selection of the option that would make ISBD inconsistent and not able to be an application of LRM.

This is the reason why this clarification in written form requested from the FRBR RG is extremely important, so that the ISBD Review Group can properly analyze the response, without any doubt and without spending more time in debating the same issue, about what point or limit of each of the options is more convenient for the ISBD revision.

It is for this reason that we **REQUEST** the answer to these precise questions below:

- Could it be considered that with the expression "normally transcribed from the resources", information present in the resource and recorded but not transcribed in the ISBD sense, could be considered a Manifestation Statement? Please be concrete and respond YES or NO.

If affirmative, can the following examples (it is not a comprehensive list of rules) be comprehended by the meaning of this sentence as a Manifestations Statement attribute?

- 1.1.4.5 Resources without any title. When a resource bears no title, a title is devised and recorded in square brackets...
- 1.4.5.2 A statement of responsibility that appears not on the preferred source of information but elsewhere on the resource may be transcribed in area 1 enclosed in square brackets or it may be given in area 7 (see 7.1.4). The source of such a statement of responsibility may be given in area 7. A statement of responsibility taken from outside the resource may be given in area 7 (see 7.1.4) with, if appropriate, the source of such information.
- 2.1.2 Transcription. The edition statement is given in the terms in which it appears on the resource. It is enclosed in square brackets if it does not appear on a prescribed source. Standard abbreviations may be used (see A.6.4). Arabic numerals are given in place of other numerals or spelled-out numbers. Explanatory phrases appended to the edition statement are given when considered necessary for identification of the edition.

Examples

. — Novissima ed. (7a), interamente riveduta

. — Hohe Stimme (Originallage)

- ISBD 2.1.3. When no edition statement appears on the resource, although it is known that the resource contains significant changes from previous editions or is a reproduction, a suitable edition statement in the language of the preferred source of information and in accordance with the provisions of 2.1.2 may be supplied, enclosed in square brackets.

- 3.1.1.1 The scale is given as a representative fraction, expressed as a ratio (1:). There is no space before or after the colon in the ratio. The term scale or its equivalent in another language and/or script may be recorded with the representative fraction.
- 3.1.1.2 When the scale relates only to particular parts of the resource, the part to which it relates is indicated.

Examples

- . — Scale 1:3 982 200 at equator
- . — Scale 1:59 304 960 along meridians

- 3.1.1.3 A statement of scale is given when known or calculated, even if the scale is included in area 1.
- 3.1.1.4 When the representative fraction is computed from a verbal statement of scale, it is given in square brackets. The verbal expression of the scale may be transcribed following the representative fraction.

Examples

- . — [1:7 200]. 1 ponce pour 100 toises
- . — Scale [1:63 360]. 1 inch to 1 mile

- 3.1.1.5 When there is no numeric or verbal statement of scale, the representative fraction is derived from a bar scale, a graticule (i.e. from 1° of latitude that on average is 111 kilometres) or grid, or by comparison with a map of known scale, and is enclosed in square brackets with an indication that it is an approximation.
- 3.2.1.1 The music format statement is given in the terms in which it appears on the resource. Explanatory phrases added at the end of a music format statement are included if they are considered important to users of the catalogue. Further explanations may be given in area 7
- 3.2.1.2 When no music format statement appears on the resource, a suitable statement may be supplied, enclosed in square brackets, in the language and script of the title proper or in the language and script chosen by the cataloguing agency.

Example

- . — [Partition et parties]

- 3.3.2 Numeric designation. A numeric designation is given as it appears, except that arabic numerals are given in place of other numerals or spelled-out numbers and multiple levels of numbering are given in a hierarchical order. A numeric designation may include alphabetic or other characters as well as numbers. Words in the designation may be abbreviated.
- 4 PUBLICATION, PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC., AREA. Prescribed sources. Information taken from a source other than one of the following prescribed sources is given in square brackets if it is recorded in this area. However, if the different elements of this area are present on different sources of information, it may be necessary to combine these elements from the different sources.
- 4.1.2 If the information appearing on the prescribed source of information is known to be incorrect, a correction may be supplied in square brackets (see A.8) and/or an explanation given in area 7 (see 7.4.1).
- 4.2.12 Name of publisher unknown. When no name can be given as that of the publisher, producer or distributor, the abbreviation s.n. (sine nomine) or its equivalent in another script is supplied, enclosed in square brackets.

- 5 MATERIAL DESCRIPTION AREA. 5.1.2 Specific material designation. The number of physical units constituting a resource is given in arabic numerals with the specific material designation. If the resource is still being issued or the number of units is unknown, the number of physical units is not given. The terms used as specific material designations are not prescribed and may be given in terms appropriate to the resource being described and the language of the description. Terms may be abbreviated
Etc.

Time:

Due to the delay in starting the revision of ISBD, the Study Group to analyze the strategies is set up and will have six months to realize their task. This group cannot start its work until this important point is clarified or modified by the FRBR RG. This is the reason why we request that the answer will be sent no later than 15 days from now, that is to say by 13 October 2017.

Actions:

If the doubts persist even with the answer, the Committee on Standards will be asked to clarify the meanings with the FRBR RG for the benefit of interpretations and of translators who are not part of the FRBR Review Group and who are not involved in internal discussions. It would be necessary that the FRBR RG publicize the necessary document explaining what the intention is behind this sentence.

Thanking you for your assistance, on behalf of the ISBD Review Group

Yours sincerely

Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi

Roma, 27 September 2017

Appendix 2 - Response by the Consolidation Editorial Committee, 23 October 2017

The former CEG recommends to the FRBR RG the following edits to the approved text of LRM to attempt to clarify the ISBD RG's concerns about the LRM text raised in their letter of 2017-09-27.

1)

IFLA LRM p.26 (found in the Scope notes for the entity LRM-E4 manifestation):

On a practical level, the degree to which distinctions between manifestations are recorded accounted for in catalogues will depend to some extent on the anticipated needs of users and on the differences ...

CEG reasoning: The original wording used the common English verb “recorded” in its first dictionary sense (make a record of something, keep track of information in written form for later reference), and was not in any way intended to suggest anything about how attributes of manifestations are to be formulated (the sentence is not even about attributes, but about whether a new manifestation is recognized as existing or not). Since LRM devolves to each application the method by which attribute data is to be captured and stored (cf. LRM section 4.2.1 (Introduction to the Attributes section)), the “how” of attributes is an issue entirely outside the scope of the model.

Given its context, it is quite a stretch to relate this sentence to whether a given cataloguing standard should recommend that specific attributes be “recorded as opposed to transcribed” in the technical ISBD sense of those terms.

2)

IFLA LRM p.49 (Scope notes for attribute LRM-E4-A4 manifestation statement):

Option 1:

The manifestation statement attribute is a statement normally most often transcribed from a sources present in exemplars of a manifestation. Transcription conventions are codified by each implementation.

Option 2 (more explicit):

The manifestation statement attribute is a statement normally which is either transcribed from a sources present in exemplars of a manifestation, or, in some particular cases that may be prescribed by cataloguing rules, devised by cataloguers. Transcription conventions are codified by each implementation.

CEG reasoning: Changed from “a source” to “sources” as there was no intent to insist that an instance of the manifestation statement attribute had to be found entirely “as is” in a single source and that it could not be assembled from more than one part of the resource. That level of detail in the assignment of attribute values is beyond the scope of a conceptual model. Note also that the original wording of the scope note of this attribute says “from a source present in exemplars” (and the definition says “appearing in exemplars”) and does not say anything about prescribed sources, as the concept of prescribed sources is also entirely outside of the scope of a conceptual model.

The version given as option 1 also substitutes one of its many synonyms for “normally”. It could just as easily be any of: usually, ordinarily, as a rule, generally, in general, mostly, for the most part, by and large, mainly, most of the time, on the whole. The choice of “normally” had no special significance and is not related to a “norm” or standard of transcription. It was only intended to indicate a broad latitude in the understanding of how transcription would be applied. Having a modifier in the sentence at all, rather than just saying “transcribed” should indicate that certain hyper-strict technical interpretations of the term “transcribed” are not intended.

The dictionary meaning of transcribe (to put into written form) is broad enough to accommodate any of the many methods of transcription that have been used by different communities. In conjunction with the repetition that each implementation specifies its own transcription conventions, this means that LRM takes no stand on which transcription conventions are to be considered appropriate. This is sent back to the cataloguing standards for their decisions.

The current examples at LRM-E4-A4 should illustrate that LRM does not take any stand on the nature of transcription conventions, as different examples illustrate different conventions. Also, the first example illustrates both the mark of omission and a supplied character in square brackets using ISBD conventions, another sign that statements handled according to current ISBD conventions are considered to fall under this attribute.

The version given as option 2 explicitly makes reference to some of the features of the current ISBD implementation of transcription conventions. This version should be explicit enough to set anyone's mind at ease who may be concerned that LRM is making some statement that may exclude some aspects of the ISBD conventions. However, it is so explicit in its relating of ISBD practices, that it may go too far, in the sense of giving the impression that LRM insists that those ISBD practices cannot be changed in the future, or cannot be otherwise in other cataloguing standards.

Whichever option is preferred, the essence of the LRM-E4-A4 manifestation statement is that it finds its source in the manifestation itself, as something significant for users to understand the resource. It has to have some specificity which allows it to be distinguished from a general note (LRM-E1-A2 note) brought down to the manifestation level.

Each of these expansions will require reformatting about 3 pages of text. However, as the meaning is the same, our contention is that they can be viewed as corrections, of no more substance than the correction of the erratum on p. 34 reported by the National Library of Israel, and will not require a new round of approvals.

3)

Details of the ISBD-LRM alignment: The former CEG does not feel that this document is part of our charge. The FRBR RG representative to the alignment working group happened to be a member of the CEG and has already agreed to the alignment draft as presented. Obviously this is considered of no account and so there is nothing more to add. If the FRBR RG wishes to disagree with the alignment, it may. However, no comments were received from any source by the alignment WG during a fairly lengthy comments period.

4)

Methods of resolution of technical issues: The former CEG members suggest that the standards bodies consider very carefully the ramifications of the dispute resolution mechanisms they suggest. Any mechanism that effectively means that the technical work of any of the bibliographic standards bodies (FRBR RG, PRESS00 RG, ISBD RG, PUC, or specific task groups) can be arbitrarily set aside by CoS against the express professional opinion of the originating body is very dangerous indeed and will not lead to IFLA standards remaining credible in the future.



International Federation of
Library Associations and Institutions

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

ISBD Editorial Group

Terms of reference

Background

The International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) is intended to serve as a principal standard to promote universal bibliographic control, that is, to make universally and promptly available, in a form that is internationally acceptable, basic bibliographic data for all published and unpublished⁸ bibliographic resources in all countries. From the beginning, the main goal of the ISBD has been to provide consistency when sharing bibliographic information.

The ISBD is the only freely accessible and open standard maintained by IFLA that determines the data elements to be transcribed and recorded as the basis of the description of the resource being catalogued. Its existence corresponds to the IFLA objective of providing accessible and open standards and tools for all, including communities that need simple and easy to use rules for describing resources. In addition, it employs prescribed punctuation and a specific sequence of recording information as a means of identifying and displaying data elements and making them understandable independently of the language of the description.

The need to revise the ISBD has been recognised for several years by the library community as a whole, and by the relevant expert bodies within IFLA (especially the Cataloguing Section, the Committee on Standards, and the ISBD Review Group).

- There is a general need to revise IFLA standards periodically in order to ensure that they remain up-to-date and that they continue to answer to the needs of their user communities.
- Since the ISBD Consolidated Edition was published in 2011, the ISBD Review Group has received several comments and revision requests.
- The ISBD should be aligned with the overarching conceptual model provided by IFLA, the IFLA Library Reference Model.
- The content of the ISBD should be extended in order to include a larger array of resources, especially unpublished resources.

⁸ The extension of the ISBD to the description of unpublished resources was decided by the ISBD Review Group in 2012.

Scope

After the approval of the *Proposed work plan for ISBD revision 2018-2022*⁹ by the IFLA Committee on Standards on 24 August 2018, the ISBD Review Group has appointed an ISBD Editorial Group (IEG) with the following tasks:

1. review the impact of the manifestation entity of the IFLA LRM on the current text of the ISBD Consolidated edition;
2. identify the parts of the ISBD Consolidated edition where revisions should be considered;
3. take into account the comments and revision requests received since 2011;
4. make recommendations for the future display of the ISBD;
5. produce a draft revision of the ISBD.

Timeline

The group is expected to complete the work and submit it to the ISBD Review Group by April 2020. Within this timeline, the group is expected to report regularly to the ISBD Review Group.

Membership

Members of the group are:

Renate Behrens
Elena Escolano
Dorothy McGarry
Rehab Ouf
Clément Oury
Mélanie Roche (chair)

Proposed workflow

The Editorial Group will be supported by content groups focusing on special topics.

Established in Kuala Lumpur
30 August 2018

⁹ https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/proposed_work_plan_for_isbd_revision_2018-2022.pdf.