

# Report to ISBD/XML Study Group on the W3C Library Linked Data Incubator Group Face-to-Face Meeting and DC- 2010, Pittsburgh, USA, 21-24 Oct 2010

---

## Presentation to DCMI RDA Task Group session, 22 Oct 2010

Diane Hillmann (Co-Chair of the DCMI RDA Task Group) gave a presentation on progress with the goals of the Task Group. I followed with a presentation on "Important related work", including progress on the work of the ISBD/XML Study Group, and some preliminary work on inter-relating ISBD elements in RDF with equivalent properties in the RDA, FRBRer, Dublin Core (DC), Dublin Core Terms (DCT), and Bibliographic Ontology (BIBO) namespaces. The session had an audience of approximately 25, including several librarians involved in the current testing of RDA being coordinated by the Library of Congress. The presentation is available at:

<http://www.slideshare.net/smartzbroad/dcmirda-task-group-report-dc2010-pittsburgh>

## Presentation to Joint Meeting of W3C Library Linked Data Incubator Group (LLDXG) and DC-Architecture Group, 22 Oct 2010

The main focus of this meeting was the Dublin Core Abstract Model (DCAM) and the utility of the Dublin Core Application Profile (DCAP). The agenda for the meeting is available at:

<http://www.w3.org/2001/sw/wiki/JointMeeting2010>

I gave a "lightning" (10 minute) presentation contrasting the representation of the FRBRer conceptual model in Web Ontology Language (OWL) with that of the ISBD data model as a DCAP. The presentation is available from the minutes of the meeting on the LLDXG wiki at:

<http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/minutes/2010/10/22-lld-minutes.html>

It should be noted that the ISBD/XML Study Group's approach of developing a DCAP for ISBD was not challenged during the meeting, or during subsequent informal discussion. The minutes should be treated as an informal note of the main points discussed; they are not a comprehensive record of the discussion.

## Discussion at LLDXG Face-to-Face Meeting, 23-24 Oct 2010

ISBD was frequently mentioned during discussions at a face-to-face meeting of the LLDXG following the DC-2010 conference, particularly during the Vocabularies section. Topics discussed included the relationship between ISBD and MARC (UNIMARC and MARC21), the structure of ISBD, and liaison between W3C, the Semantic Web, and IFLA standards including ISBD. Required reading for this

section was a wiki page I created about library standards and linked data, including a section on ISBD, available at:

[http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/Library\\_standards\\_and\\_linked\\_data](http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/Library_standards_and_linked_data)

This wiki page will be kept up-to-date with progress on the work of the ISBD/XML Study Group.

The agenda for the meeting is at:

[http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/F2F\\_Pittsburgh](http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/F2F_Pittsburgh)

The discussion was scribed and is available from the LLDXG wiki at:

<http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/minutes/2010/10/23-lld-minutes.html> (Day 1)

<http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/minutes/2010/10/24-lld-minutes.html> (Day 2)

The minutes should be treated as an informal note of the main points discussed; they are not a comprehensive record of the discussion.

The outcomes of the meeting are available at:

[http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/F2F\\_Pittsburgh\\_Outcomes](http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/lld/wiki/F2F_Pittsburgh_Outcomes)

It is worth noting the first line of the section on Vocabularies development, which is of direct relevance to the liaison between the RDF representations of ISBD and UNIMARC.

## **Discussion with developers of Open Metadata Registry (Diane Hillmann and Jon Phipps), 24 Oct 2010**

I had an extensive discussion with Diane Hillmann and Jon Phipps about plans for the development of the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) and its relevance to the work of the ISBD/XML Study Group.

A major upgrade of the OMR is planned which will include support for DCAP. This should make it easier to maintain and extend the ISBD Application Profile (ISBD-AP) in the future. It is likely that this upgrade will be available by the time the draft ISBD-AP is completed in early (spring) 2011.

A script is available which can be incorporated in the ISBD namespace maintained by IFLA to dynamically generate the ISBD RDF/XML file directly from the OMR, instead of publishing static snapshots uploaded from the OMR. This will remove at least three stages from the workflow to publish ISBD in RDF for de-referencing: 1) generate the static file using the "Get RDF" button in the OMR; 2) transmission of the static file to the IFLA webmaster; and 3) publication of the static file on the IFLA Namespace server. This is likely to be particularly important if the ISBD Review Group wishes to provide access to the draft ISBD RDF/XML file via the IFLA namespace (rather than, as at present, the OMR) before the final version of the consolidated edition of ISBD is approved. This might be useful, for example, for branding purposes and for collaboration with experiments using the draft ISBD URIs such as the British Library and University of Mannheim.

The OMR supports non-English languages and non-Roman scripts. The planned upgrade will include a facility for registering a username and password to allow access to language-specific views of an

element set. For example, someone entering Spanish translations of ISBD element labels, definitions, and scope notes can be restricted to Spanish-only areas, preventing access to areas for other languages. This is an important safety feature, allowing translations in multiple languages to be carried out simultaneously on the ISBD elements without the need for synchronisation: a Russian translation of the scope note for one element is isolated from the Spanish translation of the label of another element, even if both are carried out at the same time by different personnel with their own usernames and passwords.

It would be very useful if this facility could be used for the pilot translation work agreed by the ISBD Review Group to be carried out in 2011. That is, those members of the Group (or their representatives) who agree to supply translations could update the OMR directly instead of relying on my availability and limited language skills. This would also allow the testing and development of processes for eventual full translations following the final agreed version of the ISBD consolidated edition. Some administration and training by Metadata Management Associates will be necessary if this work is to be carried out by personnel other than myself, which will require resourcing.

Gordon Dunsire  
2 November 2010