Meeting Report

IFLA WLIC Seoul, Korea

Monday, 21 August 2006, 15:45-17:45
COEX Convention Center, Room 203A

Membership was discussed, and four new Working Group members were added:

**Continuing Members:**
Ed O'Neill (USA, chair)
Anders Cato (Sweden)
Barbara Tillett (USA)
Carol van Nuys (Norway)
Judy Kuhagen (USA)
Maja Žumer (Slovenia)
Paula Goossens (Belgium)

**New Members:**
Patricia Thurston (USA)
Ulrike Junger (Germany)
Eeva Murtoamaa, (Finland)
Sam Oh (Korea)

**Observers:**
Pat Riva (Canada)
Natalia Kulygina (Russia)
Christel Hengel (Germany)
Anne Munkebyaune (Norway)
Elena Lazorskaya (Russia)
All continuing and new members attended the meeting except for Carol van Nuys, and Sam Oh.

Barbara Sigrist (Germany) has been invited to join.

Members and observers discussed the proposed changes to the FRBR text by the IFLA WG on the Expression Entity (FRBR Chapter 3.2.2 Expression). The changes included the treatment of augmentations such as illustrations, notes, glosses, etc. as separate expressions of their own separate works. Thus a manifestation could be an aggregate of two (or more) works. The proposed changes will be submitted by the Expressions WG as part of a World Wide Review. The Aggregates WG agreed to accept the work of the Expressions WG on this topic.

The Committee addressed several continuing issues for the coming year:

1. Identifying the boundaries and attributes of the Work/Expression/Manifestation/Item entities (see Alan Danskin’s report). The FRBR Review Group is currently addressing this issue. The Aggregates WG will continue to monitor the discussion, and contribute when the topic addresses issues under the WG’s charge.

During the FRBR workshop in Dublin, Ohio (USA), 2-5 May 2005, participants reviewed the definition of “Work” in terms of aggregates. While the FRBR model allows for an interpretation that treats illustrations as works, the general public did not describe illustrations that way. Subsequent discussions with constituent groups have led to an acceptance of treatment of illustrations as separate works.

The following two agenda items generated a lengthy and lively discussion about modeling aggregates, and the treatment of independently created works that are published together.

2. Reviewing the definition of “Work” and the FRBR model, in the context of aggregates (see decision chart from Oslo: http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/FRBRRG_MeetingReport_20050818.pdf)

3. Reviewing the treatment of collections of independently created resources including: two or more novels published together as a single manifestation, an audio CD containing multiple songs (tracks), Web sites, conference proceedings, journals, etc.

The discussion centered on a debate describing two distinct models for aggregates (independently created works published together).

Examples:
- Audio CD
- Web sites
- Conference proceedings
- Anthologies of poetry and/or prose literature
Song/music books  
Trilogies  
Conference proceedings  
Serials (collections that are intended to be together)  
Monographic series (collections that are intended to be together)

Model 1: The whole is a manifestation that functions as the glue that holds a set of works together.

Model 2: The whole is a work in and of itself: a “work-of-works”.

The group discussed numerous points.
“Issued with” concept; a novel’s relationship to its sequel(s); and poems selected for an anthology.
A “unique manifestation”: one item with two items randomly bound together by a library.
A “published manifestation”: two or more works published together intentionally.
Collocation issues.
The Compiler as “creator” vs. author as “creator”

Proposed activity: The group will collect examples of aggregates, whose relationships will be described using each of the two models under review. Ed O’Neill and Maja Žumer will apply the “manifestation-as-glue” model; Barbara Tillett will apply the “work-of-works” model. We will use a tree structure to illustrate the relationships between different elements.

Deliverable: By IFLA WLIC Durban 2007, the WG will either:
  a. Create a draft FAQ that describes the two models for aggregates. The FRBR model does not consistently address the treatment of aggregate relationships. The FAQ would discuss what an aggregate is, the ambiguity of the model in terms of the treatment of aggregates, and the pros and cons of each model for aggregates.

  or,

  b. Create a draft a proposal to revise the FRBR text. This revision would clarify the model in the context of aggregates, eliminating the current ambiguity.

Procedures for the coming year: Several conference calls will be scheduled. The first will review the examples submitted, and establish a schedule for the tasks related to modeling assignment and deliverables. Although committee members reside in seven time zones, everyone very willingly volunteered to adjust their schedules to accommodate the conference calls.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia Thurston