



IFLA Cataloguing Section
FRBR Review Group
Working Group on Aggregates

Meeting Report
76th IFLA World Library and Information Congress
Gothenburg, Sweden
12 and 14 August 2010

The Working Group met twice during the 2010 IFLA Congress.

Meeting I

August 12, 2010, Thursday
(Room G2)
16:00-18:00

Members present: Edward O'Neill (chair), Anders Cato, Eeva Murtomaa, Barbara Tillett (recorder), Maja Žumer
Regrets were received from Judy Kuhagen and Patricia Thurston
Also present: Pat Riva (Chair FRBR Review Group)

1. Review of the minutes for the Milan meeting – no further additions or changes – Edward declared them approved.

2. Review and revision of the draft report – Edward reviewed that at the last meeting we had agreed to “aggregates” at 3 levels:

Mosaics at work

Aggregates of expressions

Compound items

Barbara noted those were examples and not an exhaustive listing. She shared some further examples to show for the theoretical model that “aggregates” could occur at any of the Group 1 entities. She recommended we allow that in our report and had sent Edward her suggestions, but those revisions to the draft report were not distributed to the other members of the Working Group. Unfortunately the Working Group only received the updated report after August 3, 2010, despite the original plan to have it last October.

There was further discussion among Edward, Maja, and Barbara about the examples and figures.

***All agreed that an “Aggregate expression” occurs and that a “Parallel” (the DVD Manual example) is a subtype, where there is a single work with multiple expressions. This may also include movies in translation on a DVD, bi-lingual editions of things, etc.

***All also agreed that “Augmentations” occur when there is a primary, independent work with other dependent parts. Edward again reminded everyone that from the FRBR amendment about expressions, that in such situations each is a work, but it may or may not be recorded in a bibliographic description. Maja noted there are many augmentations that do not recognize there are separate works for the layout, design of the cover, or other creations that are visible but not usually recorded.

Maja wished to view a text issued by a particular publisher with an introduction as being 2 expressions in a manifestation. The decision whether or not to record the introduction, does not affect that there are several expressions. The text and illustrations are separate expressions of 2 works. One may just describe the text. Barbara then asked if that should be considered an aggregate, because we are not recognizing any parts. Maja continued that it could be modeled as a new manifestation with different illustrations that we may want to record, and Barbara suggested it could be bundled as a new expression. There was not agreement about this.

Barbara asked if we might consider declaring an aggregate based on the agent doing the compilation – if the creator, it’s an aggregate work, if a compiler of expressions, it’s an aggregate expression; if a publisher, it’s an aggregate manifestation; if by a local institution, etc., it’s an aggregate item. Would that work? Maja pointed out that we may not know who did the combination, and instead we should judge based on the relative independence of the pieces. Maja said it was easier to model those as separate expressions of the same manifestations. We know “mosaics” exist, so it’s not just theoretical. Augmentations like illustrations and a text are expressions that lead to a new manifestation. We need to have typifying examples, not borderline cases, but simplify the types with straightforward types and scenarios.

Edward asked to differentiate between the appendix to FRBR versus examples, to give structure and crystallize thinking. Barbara asked what this meant.

Maja suggested having an exhaustive list of scenarios. For modeling we want to

- 1) list all approaches
- 2) be sure we have covered the majority and test with real examples.

Edward asked us to move on to an Aggregation of Expressions, a subtype of “Collection” However, first, all agreed that an Aggregate work (work of works) exists and that a “Mosaic work” is a subtype. Barbara noted that we can aggregate works to get a new work, and we can aggregate expressions that become a new expression, etc. Or we could model it so that an aggregate expression is only when you combine two or more expressions into a new manifestation. That model was agreed. Barbara suggested we should also allow for having the model show that two expressions could combine to a new expression that in turn has its own manifestation, because we would want to describe that combined expression (aggregate expression). Maja and Edward did not agree.

Edward pointed to collections, the example of 2 novels with nothing in common by the same author (Grisham example) – or there are 2 papers published together that are manifested in a book. Barbara said it was possible to look at it different ways.

Is a serial a work? Maja sees a journal as a collection of articles, so expressions of works, and keeping the autonomy is important and the editor’s work involves a process to prepare an issue and to prepare the journal as a whole. The contribution of the editor is the glue, but does not include works aggregated. Barbara viewed a journal as a work of works.

Edward noted we were out of time, but suggested we can have 2 expressions in a manifestation. Barbara agreed and said we just need to remember that is not the only way to look at it for the conceptual model.

Going back to the definitions of 1 independent and many dependents as an “augmentation” – all agreed this was another subtype.

Edward mentioned that a Collection can be subject-based or a random set of poetry, not created as an integral unit, but could stand alone. Maja offered the example of music that can now be downloaded as individual tracks. Edward said for Collections, a distinctive characteristic for a collection is that the individual works are usually similar in type and/or genre, such as a collection of novels. Maja asked if any aggregations at the expression level are missing as it seems these 3 types are exhaustive. Barbara pointed to the example of the DVD Manual where two expressions could be combined to a new expression that produced a new manifestation. Edward and Maja seemed to think that if we combine 2 expressions to form a new expression, there is a new work, but Barbara noted our DVD example is the same work. In all expression-level aggregations there is an important contribution from the aggregator, for example the Arlene Taylor example; but Barbara pointed out indeed the compiler in this case has added her own notes and comments, but it could be viewed as a work of works, rather than an aggregate of expressions.

There seemed to be agreement that when we have two or more expressions embodied in the same manifestation, i.e., we have an aggregate of expressions in a manifestation, then we have an “aggregate manifestation” that has brought those together, combined them.

Edward asked that when we meet Saturday, we should focus on putting 2 expressions in the same container. If there is an aggregate of expressions, there is no overall expression, not an aggregate expression, because for an aggregate expression, you must have an aggregate work. He said there is no advantage to modeling an aggregate expression. Barbara said there could be a great advantage if an application wished to state information at the expression level about that aggregation – languages, compilers of the expression, etc. Edward said if we cannot resolve this we will need to do a majority and minority report, because we do not want this to drag out for many more years. Pat Riva said we should show where there are alternatives in our report. Edward reiterated that there can be no expression without a work.

The meeting ended.

Meeting II

August 14, 2010 (Saturday)

Members present: Edward O’Neill (chair), Anders Cato, Eeva Murtomaa, Barbara Tillett (recorder), and Maja Žumer
Also present: Pat Riva (Chair FRBR Review Group)

Edward said he and Barbara met earlier that morning and suggested a fresh look at how to proceed so we can have a better understanding of alternate views, that there appear to not be minor semantic differences, but different views of aggregates. Edward explained the differences he sees as aggregates occurring at work level versus aggregates occurring at the manifestation level, but these are conflicting approaches. We tried to reach a common approach, but we have oil and water, we can talk and shake up the mixture but it separates when you put it down. Shaking it harder or longer won’t produce a better result. Barbara commented that she was surprised, because this was not the impression she had of the morning meeting where she thought Edward had asked her to work on providing another version by the end of September to see if we could do a single report that would be reviewed and commented on during October and November to send to the FRBR Review Group in December.

Edward then distributed a Procedure draft. All agreed this has dragged on longer that it should for various reasons. Edward proposed to change direction to make progress on understanding, because he does not see a shared or common view, but 2 separate efforts should be used to produce reports and we would edit the 2 in parallel. Barbara is to draft one, so others can understand the views.

We have until October 1 to produce the draft and send to the Working Group. If the 2 are similar, we can reconcile them. If not, we would submit 2 reports that would evolve through the end of November with comments from the Working Group and others interested.

By the end of November (December 1), if we agree, the report(s) would be sent to the Working Group for approval. Barbara asked if “Working Group” was really meant, as the Working Group was already deciding if agreed and helping comment and evolve the drafts. Edward confirmed it was intentional. If the Working Group cannot reconcile, they would vote on a preference and forward both drafts with a Working Group recommendation. It was agreed.

Maja asked about the style of the report, she basically feels the current draft is a good structure and we want to use examples, perhaps add 2 more, such as the Trilogy of the “Lord of the Rings” novels and perhaps Asterix with a story and drawings by separate contributors. Barbara asked why that would be viewed as an aggregate – would it mean we have an aggregate every time we have two or more “agents” involved? Maja also suggested an opera, Edward suggested an illustrated book with multiple historic images pulled together, where the photos were from a pre-existing work. Barbara suggested we not limit to printed texts, but perhaps include a Web mash-up. Edward offered to add a music CD (Simon and Garfunkel as in earlier discussions of the Working Group). Eeva asked about including archival collections, which could be seen as item level combinations, and the issues of when they are digitized and treated as an archive – conceptual versus structural levels – are they aggregates? It was generally felt they could be considered “Compound items” and we could include archival collections in a box or file cabinet. Edward encouraged all to suggest examples but to avoid any that are too complex. He included the audience in this call.

DEADLINE: By September 15, Edward said we all are to offer examples via email of manifestations that exhibit aggregates to consider for inclusion in our report.

The last part of our report will be a recommended amendment to FRBR, and it will be due in December. Maja asked if Patricia and Judy would continue work on this? Edward said yes.

Edward continued that we will need to address the need to fix FRBR with regard to the cardinality of item to a single manifestation as we have shown with compound items that an item can be associated with more than one manifestation. We may also want to challenge the 1 work to many expressions because an expression could have many works (not all agreed with this). The FRBR Review Group will act and amend FRBR accordingly. Edward affirmed we would forward recommendations to the Review Group. Pat suggested the Working Group send to Review Group the amendment, then the Review Group does the document for a worldwide review and incorporates it, so the Working Group would be discharged once the report is received. She was happy with the timing. She stated the report to the Review Group needs to be clear but will not be used for the world-wide review, so not to worry about typos or finding the most elegant way to say things. She said she would be happy to read over the recommendation and report. Edward welcomed that and asked her to let us know if we are falling into holes. He also said he would be glad to take comments from anyone willing to take the time.

Maja asked if the recommendation for an amendment should go beyond the text and address everywhere in FRBR that aggregates are mentioned, including examples? She suggested we need to look at the larger document, including relationships. Pat suggested chapter 5 and the residuals from the Expression amendments. Edward said we need a careful review of FRBR and changes that would be needed resulting from an amendment. Eeva noted that FRAD also uses the term “aggregate” with a different context, do we need another term? Edward said we are to keep the same term. Maja asked if there are other terms in English? Barbara noted several: collection, combination, compilation, etc. Edward said “aggregates” is a nebulous term intentionally to be able to define it in the library context.

Barbara noted the timetable was tight with December holidays. Maja suggested keeping the time for the report and postpone the amendment to later in order to keep the momentum so we can finalize the report. Edward then said to keep the December 1 date and use the month of December and January to write the amendment and send to the Review Group by the end of January. Pat asked that we identify the sections where change is needed in FRBR, but not the rewording, just show what needs changing. Then Edward changed to say that the substance of the report to be done by December 31 and use January to do the amendment.

The meeting was ended.