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LETTER FROM THE CHAIRS

MIRIAM NAURI (CHAIR OF BIBS SC), MIRIAM SÄFSTRÖM (CHAIR OF CATS SC), MAJA ŽUMER (CHAIR OF C&I SC)

Dear members of the Bibliography Section, the Cataloguing Section, and “the section formerly known as Classification and Indexing”!

Summer is soon upon us, and as always, the UBC universe is bubbling with activity. Among other things, the FRBR-LRM has put out a worldwide review, the Cataloguing Section has held a midterm meeting, and the Classification and Indexing has been working on a name change! In the midst of this, we are proud to introduce our third joint newsletter. Metadata matters, and consequently our work is in the spotlight.

Judging from the programme, this year’s IFLA conference promises to be filled to the brim with interesting content. For those of you coming to Columbus, Ohio be sure not to miss out on the segments arranged by the UBC sections. We always welcome observers to our meetings. And those of you interested in the hands-on IFLA work, do not hesitate to approach us, or any of our Sections’ members, and talk about how to get involved.

Welcome to the Metadata newsletter #3!

With this we want to thank our newsletter editors for their hard work and wish you all a happy new metadata year!

Maja Žumer, Miriam Säfström and Miriam Nauri
CERVATHON: RDA AND LINKED DATA AT THE BNE

Ricardo Santos Muñoz, National Library of Spain

On 14-15 April, two RDA-themed events were held at the National Library of Spain, to promote working with RDA and FRBR from a different perspective, not constrained by MARC or the bibliographic/authority records structure. On 14th, as a part of the celebrations around Miguel de Cervantes’ 400th anniversary, a cataloguing hackathon based on the author and his work took place. The “Cervathon” (which was the name chosen for the event) was chaired by Gordon Dunsire (current RSC Chair), and Richard and Deborah Fritz (from The MARC of Quality, developers of RIMMF tool)

Using RIMMF, attendants were able to create and relate, from scratch, WEM records (conforming a so-called r-ball of data), with the goal of thinking about bibliographic entities from a new perspective. Cervathon was then the last of a series of x-athon events (see http://rballs.info/xathons/ for more info).

Held on the premises of the library, 33 librarians from different types of libraries from all over Spain, staff from the National Library, and specialists in different materials, could catalog resources using the RIMMF rendition of RDA, splitting the data among the Work-Expression-Manifestation-Agent structure, and establishing qualified relationships between them. The goal was to work entirely in an entity-driven, FRBR-guided, environment.

The attendees, having previously completed several tutorials on RIMMF, were distributed amongst seven tables, each one dealing with a kind of resources with similar characteristics: Don Quixote without added content, Don Quixote with added content, editions of Cervantes’ work La Numancia, editions of all or part of the Exemplary novels (itself a compilation), translations and audiobooks.

After the session, a wrap-up discussion arose full of interesting issues, and finally Gordon Dunsire explained the “RDA Strategy and RDA Internationalization”.

On 15th, an open session took place, called “RDA and Linked Data”, with the following speakers:

- Gordon Dunsire presented on RDA, its structure and developments, and a summary of Linked data basics

- Ricardo Santos (BNE) and Daniel Vila (OEG-UPM) gave a short overview of http://datos.bne.es, the BNE beta data service based on LOD and FRBR, its goals, current state and eventual developments;

1 http://www.slideshare.net/bne/rda-and-linked-data-gordon-dunsire
2 http://www.slideshare.net/bne/datosbnees-quines-somos-dnde-estamos-dnde-vamos-ricardo-santos-muoz
3 http://www.slideshare.net/bne/datosbnees-pensando-en-los-datos-daniel-vila-suero
Finally, Elena Roseras, from Basque Country ARTIUM Museum, presented on the Aliada project\(^5\) from the European Commission (a tool for automatic data publishing in Linked Open Data for heritage institutions) and its application in ARTIUM Museum\(^6\).

\(^5\) [http://www.aliada-project.eu/](http://www.aliada-project.eu/)
NEWS FROM THE GERMAN NATIONAL LIBRARY

Compiled by Renate Behrens, Elke Jost-Zell and Stefan Kretzschmar

Section AfS, Office for Library Standards

The first step of the RDA implementation in the German-speaking library community has been terminated in the beginning of 2016. Since then all project partners have started cataloguing according to RDA.

RDA training

In the autumn of 2015, many librarians from Germany, Switzerland and Austria have been going back to school in order to learn their RDA! Since then all 16 partner institutions of the implementation project - national libraries, state libraries, library networks and representatives of public and special libraries - have been starting to catalogue by using RDA. A multitude of comprehensive training courses have been conducted for preparing the staff of the participating libraries for the switch to RDA. The training material has been developed cooperatively by all project partners before the training courses and has been made available in a public wiki (in German): https://wiki.dnb.de/display/RDAINFO/Schulung

Since January 2016 librarians of the German National Library (GNL) have also been training colleagues from libraries not belonging to one of the library networks.

During the Library Congress in Leipzig in March the GNL organized a RDA workshop, presented “RDA – theory and implementation in Europe” and invited visitors into the library’s department of cataloguing. Two abbreviated 4-hour RDA training sessions, “RDA mini” were provided for colleagues from smaller libraries, untrained library staff and librarians from non-cataloguing departments. “RDA mini” will soon be published in the RDA-Info-Wiki. The presentations have been well received and will be continued at next year’s Library Congress in Frankfurt am Main.

Although the GNL provides regular external training, there will be continuing need for RDA training in the forthcoming years. This particularly affects public libraries as there is no consortium for a RDA working group supporting public libraries in Germany.

RDA Reworks / Special and Rare Materials, Old Books, Objects, Archival Materials

Some parts of the RDA Project had to be postponed. In December 2015 the Committee for Library Standards listed these work packages, prioritized them and passed them to the relevant working groups. The work packages included the discussion about first entry vs. latest entry for serials in the German-speaking countries and the description of hierarchical structures. A lot of preliminary work had been done during the project and needs evaluation now. The Committee for Library Standards will decide about these parts by the end of 2016.

In the first RDA implementation phase from 2012 - 2015 the German-speaking community already had a focus on special and rare
materials and tried to start a cooperation with archives and museums. A Joint Working Group between libraries and literary archives, the Working Group Literary Estates and Autographs Rules (RNA) have been established in 2014. Other groups followed, concentrating on the alignment of cataloguing guidelines for old/rare books, manuscripts and graphic and other visual material.

The experts group suggests the use of cross-references between the RDA Toolkit, and the guidelines and rules of other communities for covering the needs of cataloguers instead of integrating existing special rules into the RDA toolkit.

Following the RNA/RDA working group’s organizational model further working groups, like the AG Alte Drucke (a working group for rare prints) have been established in 2016 or are in the course of formation, like the working groups for graphic reproductions and for illuminated manuscripts.

The RNA/RDA working group, consisting of members from libraries and literary archives, aims to generate an accordance of the rules and standards of RNA, RDA and ISAD (G) for creating a revised version of RNA, linked from the RDA toolkit.

**Strategic realignment of RDA Committees**

The German National Library represents Germany, Austria and the German speaking part of Switzerland in the RDA Steering Committee (RSC). The process of the RDA committee’s realignment has also affected the RDA user groups in those countries. The European RDA Interest Group (EURIG) needs to be restructured now. During the transition period from 2016 to 2018 the German National Library resumes the task of the European representative as only one representation for Europe is allowed. Planning the transition time has been a main focus of the European RDA Interest Group (EURIG) meeting in May.

As previously mentioned the German National Library represented the German-speaking community at the JSC/RSC Meeting last November in Edinburgh. The RSC Meeting next November will be hosted by the German National Library in Frankfurt am Main. A related Satellite Meeting and a Jane-athon are in the process of being planned.

In addition, the German-speaking library community is taking part in the world-wide review of FRBR-LRM. The Office of Library Standards at the German National Library is responsible for the commentaries of the German-speaking library community.

Information on RDA in the German-speaking countries is published in the RDA-Info-Wiki, in mailing lists and the social media.

https://wiki.dnb.de/display/RDAINFO/RDA-Info

For information on RDA in the German National Library, please contact Renate Behrens, Section AfS, Office for Library Standards, r.behrens@dnb.de
**MARCXML for content delivery of E-Journals**

Metadata delivery is an important part of the online document delivery process in the German National Library’s depository. The use of international and widely-used metadata formats like MARCXML is therefore essential. General requirements of metadata for the delivery of online publications is specifically documented in metadata core sets on the German National Library’s website[^1]. While e-books are quite easy to handle via MARCXML the content of e-journals is not. Bearing in mind that relations between the content parts of the e-journal and its title should remain intact and distinguishable so that users may easily find the e-journal title along with its relative content and vice versa. It should also be easy to recognize if the online publication is an article or a whole issue.

[^1]: http://www.dnb.de/DE/Netzpublikationen/Ablieferung/MetadatenKernset/metadatenkernset_node.html

**ORCID DE and GND**

The international ORCHID consortium connects publications and researcher’s data with a persistent digital identifier. For introducing ORCID in German universities and research institutions the German Research Foundation (DFG) has been supporting a project “ORCID DE – Förderung der Open Researcher and Contributor ID in Deutschland”, starting in May 2016.

The project aims for the distribution and linkage of ORCID for Open access repositories and publication services and the interlocking with the Integrated Authority File (GND). In the ORCID registry researcher manage their metadata und publication list and supervise the information and publication recorded in their profiles themselves. The GND gains metadata for persons from publications and other official sources by librarians. The linkage of identifiers from both systems enables the identification of researchers and their works and increases indexing efficiency.

**New edition of “Names of Persons” for Germany available**

The latest amended edition of “Names of Persons” was published in 2009. After the implementation of RDA in Germany, the search entries for persons have changed and the German data stock in the IFLA cataloguing site http://www.ifla.org/node/4953 became outdated.

The edition has been updated and deposited under [Germany](http://www.ifla.org)
For general information on the Office of Library Standards in the German National Library, please contact Brigitte Wiechmann, Section AfS, Office for Library Standards, b.wiechmann@dnb.de

**Section AEN, Automatic Indexing, Online Publications**

**DDC Short Numbers for Medicine**

Since October 2015 the German National Library has been issuing machine-generated DDC short numbers for online publications representing Series O of the German National Bibliography, DNB Subject Category 610 Medicine and Health. Short numbers for medicine consist of 140 shortened notations emanating from regular DDC numbers.

10.600 online publications (PDF and EPub data format) in English and German have been classified from October 2015 until March 2016, and in retrospect another 60.000 published from 2010 to 2013.

In a next step the results shall be improved by quality management librarians and the development of DDC short numbers for other DNB Subject Categories.

For information on DDC Short Numbers for Medicine please contact Frank Busse, Section Automatic Indexing, Online Publications, f.busse@dnb.de

For general information on automated indexing and classification procedures please contact Elisabeth Mödden, Section AEN, Automatic Indexing, Online Publications, e.moedden@dnb.de

**Department IE, Subject Cataloguing and Indexing**

**EDUG**

This year’s meeting of the European DDC Users Group (EDUG) was organized by the VZG (Verbundzentrale des Gemeinsamen Bibliotheksverbundes in Göttingen) and took place at the Göttingen State and University Library in April 2016. The business meeting was preceded by a one-day symposium focusing on presentations of projects dealing with DDC data, DDC mapping (procedures and mapping tools), and on the DDC applications WebDewey and WebDewey Search. Frank Busse held a talk on how the DNB issues machine-generated shortened DDC numbers for online publications in the field of medicine; Tina Mengel presented the German use case of WebDewey Search, then introduced the new Update & Notification Functionality in WebDewey (available in WebDewey Deutsch by mid-June) and announced an upcoming new functionality for the DDC translation software enabling the translator to process and publish topically coherent changes by creating working sets (projects). Since last year’s EDUG meeting, the German National Library has actively been participating in the EDUG’s work to find a standard method for DDC mapping. In Göttingen, discussions in this context went on, this time emphasizing on the updating of DDC mappings – considering not only changes in the target system (DDC) but also in the source vocabulary.

All presentations and further information can be found on the EDUG website at [http://edug.pansoft.de/tiki-index.php?page=2016+meeting].
Geographical coordinates

The German National Library adds geographical positions in catalogue records as well as in authority records. For the Integrated Authority File (GND) Centre coordinates with 2 digits are being imported from Geonames http://www.geonames.org and area coordinates (marginal coordinates) with 4 digits added for map sheets.

Coordinates are being added into catalogue entries of maps since 2010 as well as retrospectively converted into the older records of a newly catalogued edition. Sometimes geocoordinates are missing, for example in city maps or hiking maps. For city maps, the coordinates of the authority record are transferred into the catalogue entry. For hiking maps geodata enrichment with area coordinates is useful. Roughly, area coordinates can be determined via Bounding-Box http://klokantech.com/. The determined geographical space is chosen from an interactive map as a rectangle and the 4 marginal values are specified in MARC and transferred into the catalogue entry. The library’s data format visibly distinguishes between exact data and calculated data. The Bounding-Box coordinates are being tagged with “acx”, the coordinates taken from the map sheet by autopsi principle with “agx”. The level of precision is indicated by the second position in this code – either “c” for “circa” or “g” meaning “genau”, “exact”.

The German National Library has been indexing hiking maps etc. without geocoordinates this way since April 2016. City maps are further on indexed with area coordinates.

The acquisition of area coordinates in geo data-missing records ensures re-use of the German National Library’s bibliographic data in map portals with area search, like the “Kartenportal der Schweiz” (Swiss Map Portal) http://kartenportal.ch.

For information on geographical authority records please contact Esther Scheven, Department of Subject Cataloguing and Indexing, e.scheven@dnb.de

RSWK - Rules for the subject catalogue

In Germany, Switzerland and Austria subject headings follow the standard RSWK (Regeln für den Schlagwortkatalog = Rules for the subject catalogue). An expert panel (Expertengruppe Sacherschließung), lead-managed by the German National Library, is responsible for maintaining this standard. This panel has been installed by the Standardisierungsausschuss (STA), a political board for standardization in libraries.

Until March 2012 subject headings were maintained in a subject heading authority file called Schlagwortnormdatei (SWD). SWD contained individual names for persons, families, corporate bodies, places, uniform
titles and topical terms. In April 2012 the subject heading authority SWD file was merged with three other name authority files (GKD – for corporate bodies; PND – persons; EST – music uniform titles) to the Integrated Authority File (GND = Gemeinsame Normdatei). The data model of GND constitutes an entity relationship model, a fundamental change to the former files. This new future-oriented principle entailed changes in the rules for creating subject headings. Many RSWK rules needed adaptation to the new data model of GND, and new GND rules were agreed upon.

The GND authority records for entities of FRBR-Group 1 + 2 (persons, families, corporate bodies, uniform titles) are being used for both descriptive and subject cataloguing. Joint rules (GND rules) for descriptive and subject cataloguing have been developed as well.

Due to lack of time, neither modifications resulting from the new entity relationship model nor the common GND-rules for persons, corporate bodies and uniform titles had been incorporated in the standard RSWK but were published separately. In July 2014 the GND rules for persons, families, corporate bodies, in October 2015 the rules in GND for uniform titles were converted to RDA. All this lead to the point that the RSWK was no longer a satisfying valid standard for subject cataloguing. Some rules are replaced by RDA others still by GND-rules, others are still valid.

So the political board for standardization, STA, has been assigning the expert panel for revising RSWK most efficiently by referring to RDA and incorporating the changes due to the new entity relationship model. The task should be accomplished by the end of 2016 in order to supply an up-to-date RSWK in 2017. The new edition will be published as an online document only.

In 2017 the rules for subject cataloguing in Germany ought to be further refined and adapted to new technical conditions. User needs and expectations as well as automated indexing procedures need to be considered. The expert panel has been collecting many topics and recommendations but fundamental revision and advancement do need some time. In the meanwhile, an updated standard RSWK will suffice.

For information on updating RSWK please contact Esther Scheven, Department of Subject Cataloguing and Indexing, e.scheven@dnb.de

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC REGISTER PROJECT

Mathilde Koskas, BnF

Audrey Benoist, an LIS student at Limoges University, was an intern with the French National Bibliography (books section) for three months in early 2016. Her internship focused on national bibliographies as a vantage point for the observation of the publishing sector’s output.

In that context, part of her task was to work on IFLA’s National Bibliographic Register, a project of the Bibliography Section currently comprised of 44 different forms filled by national
bibliographic agencies about their national bibliographic products.

During the 2015 WLIC in Cape Town, the Bibliography Section's standing committee discussed the idea of giving access to the data from the different forms in a single 'database' which would allow comparisons. Audrey's task consisted first in an analysis of the existing data. She then created a series of excel spreadsheets to compile the information. Finally, she gave a series of recommendations for the future.

The Standing Committee must now review her work, and discuss how to make it available on the website and keep it up to date, or what relation it could have to the Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in a Digital Age.

THE 26TH MEETING OF THE PERMANENT UNIMARC COMMITTEE

4-6 APRIL 2016 AT THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF PORTUGAL

Jay Weitz, OCLC

The 26th Meeting of the Permanent UNIMARC Committee

On 2016 April 4-6, IFLA’s Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) gathered at the National Library of Portugal in Lisbon for its Twenty-Sixth Meeting. In attendance were Dr. Nijolė Bliūdžiuvičienė (National Library of Lithuania), Ms. Maria Inês Cordeiro (National Library of Portugal, Director of the UNIMARC Strategic Programme), Ms. Rosa Galvão (National Library of Portugal), Mr. Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense and ICCU), Ms. Gordana Mazić (IZUM, Slovenia), Ms. Mirna Willer (University of Zadar, Croatia, Honorary Member and Special Consultant), Ms. Olga Zhlobinskaya (Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library, Russia), and Mr. Jay Weitz (OCLC, USA, Vice Chair and Rapporteur). Also present for portions of the meeting was Mr. Gordon Dunsire (Independent Consultant, Scotland, and Chair of the RDA Steering Committee).

During the three days of meetings, the PUC discussed a total of ten UNIMARC/Bibliographic (U/B) and UNIMARC/Authority (U/A) change proposals, the draft of the UNIMARC Guidelines for Archives, issues that have arisen in the course of Mr. Dunsire’s work on the UNIMARC in RDF Project, and other topics. Minutes from the informal PUC meeting in Cape Town, South Africa (August 2015) were reviewed, updated, and corrected.

On the afternoon of 2016 April 6, following the PUC meeting proper, Mr. Dunsire and Ms. Willer presented a seminar entitled “Unleashing UNIMARC to the Semantic Web: UNIMARC in RDF” to an audience of around fifty attendees.

UNIMARC Formats and Guidelines

The UNIMARC change proposals were discussed mostly in numerical order. Unless otherwise noted, the proposals were accepted or accepted as amended. In some cases, these actions represent final approval of previously accepted proposals that were subsequently found to need additional work.

- U/B Record Label Position 09 (Type of Control) has a new code “m” (Museum) to better accommodate control of museum objects for artefactual value and curatorial information.
- U/B Control Subfield $2 (System Code) was broadened to allow its use for any controlled vocabulary.
- U/B 183 (Coded Data Field – Carrier Type) had several changes and clarifications approved including the definition of subfield $a as Carrier Type Code.
- U/B 240 (Physical Characteristics) is a newly defined field allowing for greater detail in describing Dimensions (subfield $a), Materials and Technique Display (subfield $b), Medium Material (subfield $c), Support Material (subfield $d), and Technique (subfield $e), particularly for cultural objects.
- U/B 600, 601, 602, 604, 605, 606, 607 (Subject Analysis and Bibliographic History Block): A proposal to add subfields $o (Relator Term) and $4 (Relator Code) was not accepted.
- U/B 631 (Occupation) and U/B 632 (Function) are new fields functioning as collection-level subject data regarding the persons, families, and/or corporate bodies documented in the archival material being described.
- U/B 700, 702 (Personal Name) subfield $k (Attribution Qualifier) was defined for attribution qualifiers for a personal name (such as “follower of”). Clarifications will also be made to the corresponding subfields $4 to limit their use to relationships between a name and a work (such as “formerly attributed to”).
- U/B 700, 702, 710, 712, 720 (Responsibility Block, Personal, Corporate Body and Meeting, and Family Names): Subfields $j (Relator Term), $2 (System Code), and $8 (Materials Specified) were added to each field. The definition of subfield $4 (Relator Code) was broadened to include the use of non-UNIMARC code lists.
- U/B Appendix C: Relator Codes: Two new Relator Codes have been defined for “Author, Attributed” (062) and “Former Attributed Author” (385). Proposed new Relator Codes for “depicted” and “setting” were not accepted.
  o U/A Control Subfield $2 (System Code) was broadened to allow its use for any controlled vocabulary.
  o U/A 200 (Authorized Access Point – Personal Name) subfield $k (Attribution Qualifier) was defined for attribution qualifiers for a personal name (such as “follower of”). Clarifications will also be made to the corresponding subfield $4 to limit its use to relationships between a name and a work (such as “formerly attributed to”).
  o U/A 223, 423, 523 (Authorized, Variant, and Related Access Point – Character) were approved in principle to accommodate the names of characters primarily in performance-related resources.
  o U/A 340 (Biography and Activity Note) subfield $c was defined for Occupation/Profession and subfield $d for Field of Activity. Defining the Second Indicator to differentiate structured from unstructured notes and defining subfield $3 (Authority Record Identifier) were not accepted.

• UNIMARC Guidelines for Archives.
  o The Draft 3rd Version of Guidelines for Archives (dated 2016) is still in need of non-Russian examples.

UNIMARC in RDF Project
Various issues that have arisen in the course of Mr. Dunsire’s work on representing UNIMARC codes and terms as a Resource Description Framework (RDF) vocabulary in the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) were discussed. He strongly suggested that the Library of Congress (LC), Music Library Association (MLA), and International Association of Music Libraries (IAML) try to consolidate their various controlled vocabularies for medium of performance, format of notated music, and form of musical work, incorporating the best qualities of each.

Within UNIMARC itself, the consolidation, harmonization, and rationalization of code lists and vocabularies would also be greatly advantageous. UNIMARC currently has codes and vocabularies that purport to cover the same areas (including formats of notated music, colour, sound, and illustrations) with inconsistent and/or contradictory lists. Members of the PUC are working on this.

There are also occasional confusions over the use of the letter “l” (el) versus the numeral “1” (one) and between the letter “O” (oh) and the numeral “0” (zero) that need to be straightened out. The UNIMARC namespace can be found at
“Unleashing UNIMARC to the Semantic Web: UNIMARC in RDF”

Following the 2016 April 6 session of the PUC meeting, Mr. Dunsire and Ms. Willer presented the seminar entitled “Unleashing UNIMARC to the Semantic Web: UNIMARC in RDF” to an audience of around fifty attendees, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. The Resource Description Framework (RDF) is designed for worldwide machine processing of metadata, requiring disambiguation, simplicity, and machine-readable identifiers. In contrast to most common Web searching, which has no intelligence behind it, RDF allows data to be expressed as simple irreducible statements called “triples,” consisting of subject, predicate [nature], and object [value]. In this way, IFLA standards including UNIMARC may be represented for use in the Semantic Web. Legacy data can be published as Linked Data using RDF, backed by the authority of the IFLA brand. Universal Resource Identifiers (URIs) have no intrinsic meaning; they are just identifiers. RDF requires the subject and the predicate to be URIs, but the object can be a URI or a literal string. Controlled terminologies are represented as RDF value vocabularies, with entities, attributes, and relationships as RDF element set vocabularies; attributes and relationships as RDF properties/predicates; and entities as RDF classes. UNIMARC Bibliographic has one entity, “Resource.” URIs must be globally unique. In UNIMARC, this is achieved thanks to the domain and the local UNIMARC part. Lossless data require the finest level of detail, including coded indicators and subfields. Blanks are represented by an underscore. Both the UNIMARC and RDA element sets are housed in the Open Metadata Registry (OMR). For the most part, UNIMARC has historically kept semantic and content separate, with the one major exception being the parallel title indicated in U/B 200 subfield $f followed by an equal sign. When the same URI is used for translated elements and vocabularies switching among different languages for equivalent terms is allowed. Aggregating statements (such as place, publisher, and date being located together in U/B 210) are yet to be developed, as are aspects of sequencing and repeatability. Application profiles may help with some of these issues yet to be dealt with. UNIMARC and ISBD have corresponding elements, but they have not yet been updated to account for the Consolidated ISBD. The alignment of terms can be equal (“same as”), broader, or narrower, depending upon circumstances. Both Ms. Willer and Mr. Dunsire remain hopeful that these and other issues will eventually be resolved at Semantic Web levels above that of library data. UNIMARC Level 0, which is the most granular, is based on the OMR MARC 21 element set. BIBFRAME (BF) is coarser, so lossier. UNIMARC mostly separates content/values from structure/encoding, whereas MARC 21 mixes them regularly. The BF model is largely based on data found in legacy records.

In Memoriam: Mr. Alan Hopkinson

It was with great sadness that members of the PUC learned right after the April 2016 meeting that the committee’s former chair, Mr. Alan Hopkinson (Middlesex University) passed away on 2016 April 7. Mr. Hopkinson had been involved in UNIMARC work since compiling and editing the original UNIMARC Handbook, published in 1983. He served as chair of the PUC from 2005 until 2013.

Upcoming UNIMARC Meetings

There will likely not be an informal meeting of
the PUC in August 2016 at the IFLA Congress in Columbus, Ohio, USA, because the majority of members are not planning to attend. The venue for the 2017 formal PUC meeting is yet to be determined, although it is expected that a UNIMARC Users Meeting will be held in conjunction with it.

NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Susan R. Morris, LOC

The following is a summary of news from the Library of Congress since our previous report in the December 2015 issue of the IFLA Metadata Newsletter (vol. 1, no. 2).

Staffing

The Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) currently has 414 employees and about 60 contractors and volunteers, many of whom are retired employees who wish to contribute to librarianship on a part-time basis. The ABA Directorate has permission to hire nearly 40 new employees in 2016.

BIBFRAME

The Library continues to develop BIBFRAME, the Bibliographic Framework model and vocabulary to replace MARC 21 as a cataloging metadata standard in order to reap the benefits of newer technology, particularly data linking. The BIBFRAME initiative is publicized through websites, an electronic discussion group (“listserv”), and an open meeting at each American Library Association conference. To encourage community experimentation with BIBFRAME, the BIBFRAME tools are made available for download on the software sharing site GitHub at URL https://github.com/lcnetdev/bibframe-catalog.

Using the BIBFRAME tools developed in 2014-2015 and BIBFRAME Vocabulary 1.0, the Library undertook a six-month project that created bibliographic descriptions of the same titles in both BIBFRAME and in MARC, the latter for distribution through the Library’s Cataloging Distribution Service. This pilot ended March 2016, with an extension until July for some formats, notably visual images. The 44 pilot participants now catalog in BIBFRAME one day a week to maintain their skills. The pilot included monograph sound, music, maps, DVD, CD-ROM, visual image, and other materials. Findings are being evaluated and will inform a second pilot to begin in late 2016.

The Library of Congress Linked Data Service, ID, at URL id.loc.gov, which averages over 300,000 page view and machine-only visits per day, supported the BIBFRAME pilot. ID makes vocabularies available in RDF and other
semantic-oriented formats. New batch downloads of the Name Authority File and Library of Congress Subject Headings were made available in May 2016.

Based on experience of the last two years reported on the BIBFRAME listserv, comments from the GitHub site for the conversion programs, expert advice, the pilot experience, and comments from a Program for Cooperative Cataloging task group, the vocabulary was redeveloped and published as 2.0 in April 2016.

**Cataloging in Publication (CIP)/Library of Congress Dewey Program**

The Cataloging in Publication (CIP) and Dewey sections of the Library of Congress merged their operations effective February 7, 2016. This merger fosters greater collaboration between the CIP and Dewey programs as they work together to prepare descriptive and subject metadata for nearly 50,000 electronic galleys received annually by the Library from more than 5,300 U.S. publishers. Most of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) assignment done by professional classifiers at the Library of Congress is for Electronic Cataloging in Publication (ECIP) title galleys. The Dewey Program maintains an editorial office at the Library through a cooperative arrangement with OCLC, Inc., so that classifiers can consult the editors on new and emerging literature, much of which is received via the CIP Program, and discuss the best way to classify such material. There are other ways that the CIP and Dewey program staff members have overlapping responsibilities. Dewey classifiers assign Library of Congress Classification to ECIPs cataloged by the U.S. National Library of Medicine and have been developing correlation tools to allow for automatic assignment of DDC from the Library of Congress Classification. CIP Program Specialist librarians are also being trained for DDC assignment. Dewey classifiers have served as reviewers or points-of-contact for questions from those ECIP Cataloging Partnership Program institutions that arrange their collections according to Dewey. Caroline Saccucci is the CIP and Dewey Program Manager and Section Head.

The Library continues work to create sustainable Cataloging in Publication workflows to ingest new e-book content from the United States' most significant publishers for the Library's permanent collections. From October 2015 through May 2016, bibliographic records have been created for 7,836 e-books; 1,995 e-books have been received through the CIP Program, and 1,913 have been moved to long-term storage. A single print + E-book application enables publishers to apply for a title in both formats. Since October 1, 2015, an additional 671 publishers have joined the CIP E-books Program. In addition, 12 new publishers have established sftp accounts to submit e-books to the CIP Program. The CIP/Dewey Section is working with a contractor to assist smaller/medium sized publishers in submitting their e-books via CIP. This effort will allow publishers to upload their ECIP e-books one at a time as they are published, without needing to establish sftp accounts with the Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress has made key CIP Program web pages available in Spanish translation at URL http://www.loc.gov/publish/cip/spanish/. This development will enable Spanish-language publishers in the U.S. and Puerto Rico to have easier access to information about the CIP Program.
Demographic Group Terms: Pilot Phase 3

In the June 2015 issue of this newsletter, the Library of Congress reported that it was developing a new vocabulary, Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT). This vocabulary is used to describe the creators of, and contributors to, resources, and also the intended audience of resources. Terms may be assigned in bibliographic records and in authority records for works. The initial 387 demographic group terms were approved as the first phase of the pilot development in June 2015. Phase 2 of the pilot consisted of some revisions to previously approved terms and over 400 proposals for additional terms. Those proposals were approved in December 2015.

Phase 3 of the pilot will continue through the end of 2016. Proposals for terms that are needed in new cataloging only will be accepted from PCC and non-PCC agencies. Proposals that appear to be made for retrospective projects will not be considered, because of PSD workload considerations.

In January 2016, PSD published a draft Demographic Group Terms Manual that is based chiefly on the guiding principles that are available on LC’s website at URL <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcdgt-principles.pdf>. The draft manual provides guidelines and instructions for making proposals and applying demographic group terms in bibliographic records and in authority records for works.

Members of SACO, the PCC subject authority cooperative, should use the Proposal System when making proposals for LCDGT. They should email <saco@loc.gov> when the proposals are ready, according to the normal procedure. PSD is also continuing to accept proposals from catalogers who do not work at the Library of Congress or in a SACO institution. They may contribute through a survey available at URL <http://www.surveymonkey.com/LCDGTProposals>. The survey requests the same information that the Proposal System does, but in a simplified format. Staff in PSD will make the formal proposals, which will be vetted during the standard editorial process. The survey will be available for the duration of Phase 3 of the pilot.

The Draft Manual and additional information about the project may be found on the ABA Directorate’s genre/form web page, URL <http://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCGFT/freelcgft.html>. Questions and comments about LCDGT may be directed to Janis L. Young at <jayo@loc.gov>.

Genre/Form Terms

In January 2016, the Policy and Standards Division published a draft genre/form term manual that provides guidelines and instructions for making proposals and applying genre/form terms in bibliographic records and in authority records for works. The manual replaces the informal and occasionally ad-hoc guidelines that had been in place since the project to develop the Library of Congress Genre Form Terms (LCGFT) began in 2007. The Manual may be found in PDF form at URL <http://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCGFT/freelcgft.html>. It will be incorporated into Cataloger’s Desktop, the Library of Congress’s subscription-based online documentation service, in late 2016.
Indian Law Schedules in Library of Congress Classification (LCC)

LCC subclasses KIA-KIK, Law of Indigenous Peoples in North America, specifically Canada and the U.S., are now in their final form and are fully authorized for use, as is the associated expansion of KF, Law of the United States (General), at KF8200-8578. Proposals for additions or changes to KIA-KIK and KF8200-8578 may be submitted through the proposal system in Classification Web following normal procedures.


Online Training for Subject Cataloging

In cooperation with the Simmons College School of Library and Information Science (Boston, Mass.), the Library of Congress is developing free online training in Library of Congress Subject Headings. The training is being developed primarily to meet the Library’s internal staff training needs, but it is also being made freely available through the Cataloger’s Learning Workshop (CLW) website as a service to the library community. Training units are divided into two or more modules, each of which consists of a lecture and one or more exercises or quizzes. Technology requirements include an Internet connection and the ability to play audio and video files. The initial modules have been mounted on the CLW at URL https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/LCSH; additional modules will be added as they are completed.

The lecturers are Janis L. Young, MA MLS, a senior cataloging policy specialist in PSD, and Daniel N. Joudrey, MLIS Ph. D., an associate professor at Simmons SLIS. Email questions or comments about the training to Janis L. Young at jayo@loc.gov.

Place Names

Malaysia. The Library of Congress has completed a project to update the name and subject authority records associated with place names in Malaysia. The University of California, San Diego, helped with the name authority updates. This project was a result of a change to RDA 16.2.2.9, which removed Malaysia from the list of federations that includes the U.S., Canada, and others. The unqualified state name remains valid for descriptive use for the time period before September 16, 1963, when the current Malaysian federation was formed.

Taiwan. The Library of Congress has begun a project to update geographic name headings for places in Taiwan to reflect current U.S. Board of Geographic Names (BGN) policy. Following RDA and LC-PCC PS 16.2.2.3, a conventional name will be used if BGN lists one, and places without a conventional form will use the BGN authorized form with pinyin romanization. Taiwanese place names were excluded from the pinyin conversion project in 2000 because at the time, Wade-Giles romanization was used by BGN. Library of Congress Subject Headings for geographic features in Taiwan were updated in 2015.

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

A new NACO funnel has been formed in Chile, complementing the considerable PCC representation in Latin America. The new Chile
funnel is based at the Universidad de Concepción. Members include the host institution and eight other Chilean institutions. NACO is the Name Authority Cooperative, a component of the PCC, for which the ABA Directorate provides the secretariat.

**RDA: Resource Description & Access**

The 5th annual update to *Resource Description & Access* (RDA) was published in April 2016, containing the changes based on constituency proposals discussed at the 2015 meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (now renamed: RDA Steering Committee). To assist catalogers applying the new and revised instructions, PSD has provided a summary table that highlights changes to RDA, available at URL <http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/summary_rda_changes_2016.pdf>.

The Library of Congress and the NACO Nodes (British Library, OCLC, Inc., and SkyRiver) continue to work with Gary Strawn of Northwestern University and the PCC Phase 3 RDA Authorities Task Group to prepare for the final phase of recoding all eligible name authority records in the LC/NACO Authority File (LC/NAF) with the appropriate RDA indicia. The two major tasks to be achieved in Phase 3B are re-coding AACR2 authority records as RDA when 1XX fields contain no RDA-contrary elements, and enhancing records with other data elements including the addition of 024 fields for ISNI (the International Standard Numerical Identifier) to names in the LC/NAF that match the OCLC-Leiden supplied list of ISNI (these additions may occur on records already coded as RDA). As of June 10, 2016, the date of the production change was still pending a test of the process. Announcements on the timing of the changes will be made after testing has been scheduled and completed.

**U.S. ISSN Center**

Regina Reynolds, director of the U.S. ISSN Center at the Library of Congress, spoke on “The Predatory Publishing Phenomenon: Actors, Bystanders, Consequence” at the 2016 annual meeting of UKSG, the United Kingdom Serials Group, in Bournemouth, England. She presented the experience of the ISSN Network and the U.S. National Library of Medicine with publishers who seem to be exploiting the open access author-pays model. She emphasized the ISSN Network policy that ISSN is an identifier, not an indicator of quality.

The U.S. ISSN Center has experienced an upsurge in requests for ISSN to be assigned to subscription databases, especially those available from EBSCO Information Services. ISSN is now being recognized in the U.S. and in countries such as Italy as a needed identifier for these products. The EBSCO affiliate representative to CONSER, Melanie Watts, has been working on updating prepublication records for the ISSN Section and is being trained to create or update descriptions in OCLC for EBSCO databases to expedite the process of having ISSN assigned to them.

The U.S. ISSN Center is working on a request from IEEE, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, for 1,000 ISSN to be assigned to print and online versions of conference proceedings. The project began with batch searching by ProQuest of the CONSER and PCC files in WorldCat to identify CONSER serial records and PCC monograph records that can be used for copy cataloging. Original cataloging will be done by ISSN
librarians at the Library of Congress with help from CONSER institutions that have volunteered to assist.

Karl Debus-López, chief of the US Programs, Law, and Literature Division at the Library of Congress, continues his second two-year term as Chair of the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) Governing Board.

NEWS FROM THE CLASSIFICATION & INDEXING SECTION

Maja Žumer (Chair) and Sandy Roe (Secretary)

This is a special moment for our section – this will probably be the last newsletter report with this title. Why the drama? We are at a turning point: the section is changing its name.

For a couple of years our Standing Committee has been discussing the possible change of name of our section. We all agreed that the current name, Classification & Indexing, is not widely understood, but there was no clear alternative. The phrase “Subject access” was somewhat accepted, but there was concern that it does not include the subject cataloguing process, tools and services.

We propose “Subject Analysis and Access” as the new name of our section. It is short and a good compromise among the different proposals identified so far. In addition to the end-user focus (“Access”) we also include the role of the professional. “Analysis” refers to the work and thought that goes into determining "aboutness" (or “determining what a document is about”) and then creating subject access – be it assigning classification or headings, developing thesauri, or devising tools and other automatic ways to achieve subject access.

The vote was held in March. No one objected the name change and (out of 18 members) there were 10 explicit YES votes. It was understood that no vote means agreement with the proposal. In the next round (held in April), when we were approving the (minor) changes to the mission statement, 3 more explicit YES votes were added. There was general agreement with the new mission statement, which is:

The Section on Subject Analysis and Access focuses on methods of providing subject access in catalogues, bibliographies, and indexes to documents of all kinds, including digital documents. These methods include controlled systems, such as thesauri, classification systems and subject headings, as well as automated tools and uncontrolled keywords. The Section serves as a forum for producers and users of subject access tools and services, and it works to facilitate international exchange of information about methods of providing subject access.

We are now submitting all the forms to the IFLA Headquarters for the formal approval.
This is not the first change to the name of our section. When Robert Holley, one of the standing committee's founding members, visited the section's meeting in Lyon, he told us that the section was created in 1981. This is confirmed by a piece published in the *IFLA Journal* in 1981:

IFLA's 29th Section

A New IFLA Section, previously a Round Table, was recently established: the *Section on Classification and Subject Cataloguing*. The terms of reference are:

- to provide a forum for exchange of information between and among the makers and users of the various internationally used classification and verbal subject indexing systems concerning the development and application of those systems;

- to promote uniform application of the various classification systems used in national bibliographies and by the institutions providing cataloguing in publication in order to facilitate the international exchange of subject access to bibliographic information;

- to examine the use of subject heading lists for cataloguing in publicaiton and in national bibliographies, and to promote uniform application of such lists within a single language;

- to examine the problem of subject access to bibliographic information in a multilingual environment, and to encourage the development of mechanisms for linking different classification systems or verbal subject headings in a variety of languages.

The officers of the Section are: Chairman, Mr J. Downing (British Library, Bibliographical Services Department, Store Street, London WC1E, UK) and Secretary, Ms F. Hinton (105 W. Walnut Lane, Philadelphia, Pa. 19144, USA).  

Issues of *International Cataloguing* from 1984 and other sources dating back to that year refer to the section as: *Classification and Subject Cataloguing*. But by the July/September 1986 issue of *International Cataloguing*, the section name had become *Classification and Indexing*. The current name of our Section was approved by the Professional Board during a meeting of the Executive Board in The Hague on 7 November 1985. The Terms of Reference for *Classification and Indexing* were subsequently approved and published in 1987.

---


8 *International cataloguing : quarterly bulletin of the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing* was published in 16 volumes from 1972-1987. In 1988 it became *International cataloguing and bibliographic control : quarterly bulletin of the IFLA UBCIM Programme* which published 23 volumes until it ceased with vol. 39, no. 4 in 2010.


Terms of Reference:
- to be a forum for users and producers of classification and subject indexing tools
- to promote standardization and uniform application of such tools by institutions generating or utilizing bibliographic records
- to initiate and give advice on research in the subject approach to information and to disseminate the results through open meetings and publications.11

From four years as Classification and Subject Cataloguing to more than thirty years as Classification and Indexing, we now anticipate the renaming of our section to Subject Analysis and Access.

EUROPEAN DEWEY USER GROUP
10th ANNUAL MEETING

Elise Conradi,
National Library of Norway

For its 10th annual business meeting, the European Dewey User Group (EDUG) met in Göttingen, Germany this past April. The business meeting was preceded by a symposium hosted by the Verbundzentrale des GBV (VZG) during which various aspects of research on the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) were highlighted, including number building and analysis, mapping, and automatic classification. It was also preceded by two seminars. The first seminar was led by the Oslo University Library and served as a follow-up to last year’s mapping workshop. The Norwegian mapping team discussed their experiences with the use of EDUG’s mapping recommendations and proposed modifications. The second seminar was led by the EDUG board and consisted of open discussions on a number of issues related to the DDC, such as Dewey as Linked Data, versioning, the history of DDC numbers, and data driven development. There was much concern displayed regarding the fact that Dewey.info still is not functioning, and alternatives to a central Linked Data source were discussed as back-up options. During the business meeting, members discussed the new EDUG website (http://edug.pansoft.de/) and ways in which the site’s forum could be used as a place to exchange ideas about areas in the DDC that need improvement.

Members also discussed EDUG’s new status as corresponding member to the DDC’s Editorial Policy Committee (EPC). Harriet Aagaard and Elise Conradi were reelected as chair and secretary of the board, while Emma Rogoz was elected as vice-chair. Next year’s symposium and business meeting will be held in Stockholm, Sweden.

All presentations can be found at: http://edug.pansoft.de/tiki-index.php?page=2016+meeting

MIDTERM MEETING: “We’ll always have Paris”

Miriam Säfström

The Standing committee of the Cataloguing section held a midterm meeting in Paris on April 29th. More than half of the members were able to attend, some via Skype. As the annual IFLA WLIC business meetings seldom allow ample time for free discussion, this meeting was a good opportunity to be able to share and compare impressions on metadata trends. It also provided the chance to ensure that the CATS SC is on the right track, to catch up on recent progress in the different CATS working groups, and discuss other ongoing activities. The full-day meeting also allowed time to report, discuss, and reflect on current issues in our respective cataloguing communities. Some national reports are included in this newsletter, and the minutes from the meeting will be posted on the CATS website.

Those who were able to attend shared a day was filled with insights, coffee, and vibrant discussion. It was also a historic event, as it (as far as the SC knows) was the first midterm meeting ever held by the CATS SC. Be sure it was not the last!

The CATS SC wishes to thank the Bibliothèque nationale de France, represented by member Vincent Boulet, which served as our generous host.

**Midterm meeting - Cataloguing Section – Country reports**

Unni Knutsen

Prior to the midterm meeting of the Cataloguing section, the SC members were asked to give a short summary of the current situation in their countries, to report on cataloguing codes in use and describe ongoing activities and/or challenges their communities are facing. By doing so, the section might understand more clearly the needs and expectations of the various communities and hopefully identify how we can assist further in meeting the needs of the cataloguing community.

We received reports from Chile, The Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, German speaking countries (Germany, Austria and Switzerland), Italy, Norway, Spain, and the USA.
All countries mentioned RDA, although not all the countries have made a clear decision on whether to move to RDA as the cataloguing format. Some show signs of having split opinions. The Danish Bibliographic Council has recently recommended to the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces to move to RDA. In Bulgaria, the present national standards will be replaced by ISBD Consolidated edition. Some countries, such as the German speaking countries, The Czech Republic and USA, already use RDA as their cataloguing code. Others, like Norway, have made a decision to implement RDA and are under way.

In France, new cataloguing rules “RDA-FR : a French Transposition of RDA” are under development. The French rules are based on RDA, but also on other international standards such as ISBD and the FRBR and FRAD models. Some countries have made translations of RDA, but the degree of translation differs from translating only parts of the text to full translations (Finland, Germany) or no translation at all (the Czech Republic).

Although some use the UNIMARC format, most members reported that their countries currently use MARC 21. Some report that they follow the developments of BIBFRAME closely.

Linked Data is also a visible part of the picture. The Italian National Libraries Service (SBN), for example, is in the process of being published as Linked Open Data.

The increased focus on authority data makes it sensible to start revising GARR (Guidelines for Authority Records and References).
RDA IN THE BALTICS AND EASTERN EUROPE, 23-25 MAY, 2016

Anita Goldberga, National Library of Latvia


Seminar presentations covered topics on implementations and experiences of working with RDA in Europe by representatives of institutions who have already implemented or are planning implementations, especially in the Baltics and Eastern Europe; the internationalization of RDA’s governance and development structures; potential of RDA for memory institutions - authority data as linking point for cultural heritage; IFLA FRBR - Library Reference Model etc.

Among the seminar speakers were Simon Edwards, Chair of the EURIG Board; Gordon Dunsire, Chair of the RDA Steering Committee; Alan Danskin, Chair of EURIG; Renate Behrens (Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) and Christian Aliverti (Swiss National Library); Marja-Liisa Seppälä (National Library of Finland). All seminar presentations can be found at: http://www.lnb.lv/en/eurig-seminar-rda-baltics-and-eastern-europe

The seminar was followed by the RDA & EURIG workshop on transition to the European Region; the EURIG annual Business meeting, and “Riga-thon” - the hackathon, which participants from 5 European countries focused on creating RDA data for resources by Dr Vaira Vike-Freiberga - a scholar, writer and former president of Latvia. Riga-thon was led by Gordon Dunsire, Deborah and Richard Fritz. One of the Riga-thon goals was to have fun and get excited about RDA.

RDA IN SWEDEN

Harriet Aagaard
National Library of Sweden

The Swedish RDA project started in 2014. RDA will not be translated in full into Swedish, only the glossary. The project has now finished
writing statements for the use of RDA in Sweden. A draft of the statements was published on 31 May and was accepted on 10 June after a short review. In autumn, training will begin at the National Library and will continue with training courses to other Swedish libraries in 2017. Most of the training will be web-based.

When the RDA project started, the plan was to implement RDA in a catalogue based on RDF and not on MARC21. Unfortunately, the Libris XL project is delayed, and the statements have examples in MARC21. To get a better idea of the possibilities with RDA, the RDA project hosted a “Selmathon” on 9-10 May – a workshop that featured the works by Selma Lagerlöf using the RIMMF cataloguing tool. RIMMF (RDA in Many Metadata Formats) is a training tool for cataloguing in RDA created by Richard and Deborah Fritz who came to Stockholm for the workshop. Judy Kuhagen and Gordon Dunshire from the RSC – RDA Steering Committee also participated. It was a lot of work preparing for the “Selmathon,” both for the RDA project and for all participants, but we are pleased with the results. Thinking about entities instead of MARC fields is useful.

WORLD-WIDE REVIEW OF THE FRBR LIBRARY REFERENCE MODEL

Consolidation Editorial Group (Pat Riva (chair), Patrick Le Bœuf, and Maja Žumer)

The FRBR Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM) is a consolidation of the three existing models in the FR family of conceptual models (FRBR, Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, FRAD, Functional Requirements for Authority Data, and FRSAD, Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data) into a single coherent model of the bibliographic universe. The draft of FRBR-LRM has been prepared by the Consolidation Editorial Group (CEG), constituted by the FRBR Review Group in 2013.

The FRBR Review Group issued a call for World-Wide Review of the February 21, 2016 draft of the FRBR Library Reference Model from February 28 to May 1, 2016. The FRBR-LRM text was accompanied by Transition Tables documenting the mappings from the three existing models to the new model.

Summary of Responses

All responses received by the RG chair, including one late submission received on May 4, were considered by the CEG at its meeting in Paris on May 19-23, 2016. Meeting space for this four and a half-day meeting was provided by the Bibliothèque nationale de France, including special permission to use a meeting room on Sunday morning prior to the library's normal opening hours.
In total 34 distinct submissions were received. The submissions range from a succinct paragraph expressing full agreement with the draft, to a 32 page compilation of messages. Most were four pages or less, 10 were five pages or more. The combined total is 163 pages of documents received.

Submitters were either representing their own points of view, or submitting on behalf of an institution such as a national library, or a national or association committee. Among the later we mention separately submissions from cataloguing rule-making bodies.

- Personal comments (individual or joint submissions) 14
- Institutional (including 6 national libraries) 9
- Rule-making bodies 4
- National or Association Cataloguing Committees 7
- **Total responses** 34

The responses came from 13 different countries, as well as from multi-national or international groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries or Regions represented</th>
<th>Number of distinct responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International or multi-national</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, Europe (14 responses) and North America (17 responses) are well represented. We would also have liked to receive responses from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

**Content of Responses**

As typically happens, opposing points of view are expressed among the commenters on just about every topic. As an illustration of this tendency, consider the editorial matter of examples. On the one hand some call for “more examples”, either in general or relating to their particular speciality, and some generously even propose actual examples. On the other hand, others warn of the danger of too many examples which may lead readers to attempt to understand the content of the model merely by extrapolating from examples.

*Caption: CEG members selfie!*
The substantive issues raised may lead to either actual changes to the model, or to modifications in the explanations and scope notes provided in the model.

Several respondents expressed surprise that the model proposed in FRBR-LRM is considered a library model and does not encompass all memory institutions. As it issues from an IFLA working group composed entirely of members drawn from libraries without any participation from other communities, this is only to be expected. Although the working group was informed by developments outside the library domain, the model is proposed from a library point of view. This is also relevant in many ways from a book trade (publishers, rights management) point of view. A joint model can only be produced through cooperative action in which all the participant memory institutions are represented as equals. No one community has the right to create a model to impose on another. Once the library community adopts a comprehensive and updated model of bibliographic data, then we will be ready to participate in the preparation of a cross-community model. This development is highly desired.

Others wondered about the compatibility of FRBR-LRM with a host of other models and projects. These investigations would be appropriate topics for research and publication. Anyone who is interested in the opportunity should go ahead!

**What next?**

The CEG has reviewed all the submissions and is preparing a revised draft of the FRBR-LRM model definition for the consideration of the FRBR RG at its meeting on Friday, August 19, 2016 in Columbus, OH. The CEG's mandate is to report back to the FRBR RG with recommendations. Once the FRBR RG has received and considered them, further changes will be made iteratively. When the draft is stable, the outcome will be forwarded to the Standing Committees of the Cataloguing, Bibliography, and Subject Analysis & Access Sections. The final goal is to proceed through the IFLA standards approval process.

Ideally the CEG would prepare responses to each of the comments and post them publicly. However, due to the volume of responses, detailed reactions to each point in each response will not be possible. The CEG will recommend that the Review Group issue a document to address those points raised in multiple submissions.

A word is needed about the interrelationship between FRBR-LRM and FRBRoo. FRBRoo is an adaptation of the entity-relationship model into an object-oriented framework compatible with the CIDOC CRM. The current version of FRBRoo (version 2.4, November 2015), which is in the final stages of the standards approval process, is based on the three separate existing models. It is expected that once FRBR-LRM is approved, work will begin to bring FRBRoo into compatibility with it, resulting in FRBRoo version 3.
MEMBER SPOTLIGHT

For this issue’s Spotlight, we are focusing on North American Members! We look forward to welcoming you at the WLIC in Columbus, OH!

Classification & Indexing

John DeSantis has worked as a Cataloging and Metadata Services Librarian and subject bibliographer at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire since 1995. Prior to that, he worked as a cataloger at Amherst College Library in Massachusetts and at the University of Toronto Libraries in Canada.

He has been active in the American Library Association, having served on both the ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee and the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. He has served on numerous other ALA committees, and has also been an elected member of the ALA Council since 2004. In 2016 he was elected to a two-year term on the ALA Executive Board.

John has been a member of the IFLA Standing Committee on Classification and Indexing since 2011 and is currently in his second term. During this time he has twice been the session coordinator for the Committee’s open session. He has been attending IFLA conferences regularly since 2005.

John is also active in the governance of OCLC. He is currently in his second term as a delegate to OCLC’s Global Council, where he is also completing a two-year term on the Executive Committee of the Americas Regional Council.

His academic background is in Slavic languages, and he is fluent in Russian, Polish and Czech (as well as French and Italian). He has represented Dartmouth in the East Coast Consortium for Slavic Library Collections since 2000.

In 2012 he was the recipient of the New England Technical Services Librarians (NETSL) Award for Excellence in Library Technical Services.

He resides in rural Vermont with his life partner, three pug dogs, and seven cats.
Cataloguing

Maria Violeta Bertolini is a librarian from Buenos Aires, Argentina, and has more than 12 years of experience in library and information management. She is passionate about cataloguing, metadata issues, linked data, and taxonomies. She was a cataloguing and classification professor in Buenos Aires, until she moved to Washington, DC in 2013, where she works as an Embedded Librarian. She is a member of the IFLA Cataloguing Section 2013-2017, the ISBD Review Group 2013-2017, the FRBR Review Group 2015-2019, and Chair of the ISBD Linked Data Study Group 2014-2016. Since August 2015, she is also the Convenor of the IFLA New Professionals Special Interest Group 2015-2017.

In addition to John and María, many of us from North America will be in attendance and will be happy to welcome you!

Susan Morris, Library of Congress (Cataloguing)
Lynne Howarth, University of Toronto (C&I)
Sally McCallum, Library of Congress (C&I)
Chris Oliver, University of Ottawa (C&I)
George Prager, New York University Law School Library (C&I)
Sandy Roe, Illinois State University (C&I)
Rebecca Lubas, Claremont Colleges (Bibliography)
Pat Riva, Concordia University (Bibliography)
Jay Weitz, OCLC (Bibliography)

SEE YOU IN COLUMBUS, OHIO!

We invite and encourage you to attend our Sections’ meetings and programmes! Below is a day-by-day schedule. Please refer to the Congress Programme for details and the web app on-site for up-to-the-minute information and any scheduling changes. We look forward to seeing you there!
11-12 August

Subject Access: Unlimited Opportunities. A Classification & Indexing Section Satellite Conference
HTTPS://SITES.GOOGLE.COM/A/KENT.EDU/IFLA2016-CLASSIFICATION-INDEXING/

11 August

RDA in a wider world, A Cataloguing Section joint with Serials and Other Continuing Resources Section Satellite Conference

13 August

Section Meetings:

9:45-12:15 SC1 Cataloguing
12:30-15:00 SC1 Bibliography
15:15-17:45 SC1 C&I

15 August

9:30-12:45 Open session Cataloguing + IT:
Let’s Make IT Usable!
11:30-13:00 SCII Cataloguing
13:45-15:45 IFLA standards Open session
16-18 C&I Open session

17 August

9:45-11:15 SCII Bibliography
11:45-13:45 Semantic Web and Linked Data SIG open discussion session
14:15-15:45 SCII C&I
13:45-15:45 Open session and business meeting – Big data

18 August

8:30-10:30 National Libraries Open session: National Libraries and Digital Collaboration: Building Connections and Communities
10:45-12:45 Bibliography Open session: Opening the National Bibliography
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The newsletter is published twice a year (June and December).

Contributions are welcome at any time.

Please contact one of our three editors:

**Bibliography Section:**
Rebecca Lubas
Email: Rebecca.Lubas@cuc.claremont.edu

**Cataloguing Section:**
Unni Knutsen
Email: Unni.Knutsen@ub.uio.no

**Classification & Indexing Section:**
Harriet Aagaard
Email: harriet.aagaard@kb.se

Ongoing projects, activities, and publications can be found at:

http://www.ifla.org/bibliography
http://www.ifla.org/en/cataloguing
http://www.ifla.org/classification-and-indexing