



INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS  
AND INSTITUTIONS

WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS

78TH IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND COUNCIL, HELSINKI, FINLAND - 11-17 AUGUST 2012

**IFLA Namespaces Task/Technical Group**

**Minutes of meeting  
APPROVED**

**Meeting:** Monday, 13 August 2012

**Present:** Emmanuelle Bermes, Leda Bultrini, Anders Cato, Charlene Chou, Gordon Dunsire (Chair), Elena Escolano, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Lynne Haworth, Francoise Leresche, Pat Riva, Barbara Tillett, Mirna Willer.

**Observers:** 20.

1. Welcome and introductions.
  - 1.1. The Chair welcomed members and observers to the meeting.
2. Approval of agenda.
  - 2.1. The Chair proposed to move item 8 after item 6; this was approved.
3. Minutes of meeting held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, 2011.
  - 3.1. The minutes were approved.
4. Matters arising.
  - 4.1. **Action:** The Chair of the Task Group to prepare a short text outlining the situation and asking the Sections represented on the Task Group, and the Professional Committee itself, to be prepared to respond to unexpected requests for funds to assist the Task Group in its work.
    - 4.1.1. Completed; funding of 2000 euros was approved via a Cataloguing Section project.
  - 4.2. **Action:** Members of the Task Group to discuss the matter with appropriate Sections and standards groups.
    - 4.2.1. Superseded; see the previous action.
  - 4.3. **Action:** The Task Group to review the use of the MulDiCat vocabulary in other IFLA namespaces, and if necessary to develop a project to improve synchronisation between MulDiCat and other IFLA bibliographic namespaces.
    - 4.3.1. Part completed. The MulDiCat namespace was transferred to the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) by arrangement with G. Dunsire and A. Cato. Some parts have not been published, awaiting resolution of issues identified during the transfer process. These will be reported to A. Cato in the near future. The meeting re-

affirmed that MulDiCat should be maintained and aligned with other namespaces, and that any additions to IFLA namespaces should consult MulDiCat.

- 4.3.1.1. **Action: A. Cato to consider the issues and options for MulDiCat identified in the forthcoming report.**
- 4.3.1.2. **Action: Group to contribute to any projects involving alignment of MulDiCat and other IFLA namespaces.**
- 4.4. **Action:** To invite the IFLA Webmaster to become a member of the Task Group.
  - 4.4.1. Completed: the Webmaster was added to the Group.
- 4.5. **Action:** The Task Group to produce guidelines for the translation of IFLA bibliographic namespaces, based on discussion at the DC-2011 conference and elsewhere.
  - 4.5.1. Completed; the guidelines are discussed as item 7 in this agenda.
- 4.6. **Action:** The Chair of the Task Group and Convenor of the [IFLA Semantic Web] SIG to monitor the development of the SIG and ensure cross-representation between the groups.
  - 4.6.1. Completed; the Convenor of the SIG is a member of the Task Group, and invites the Chair to give a presentation on Task Group activities to the SIG session at the annual conference.
- 4.7. **Action:** The Bibliography Section to be asked to review and update, if necessary, the IFLA statement on universal bibliographic control.
  - 4.7.1. Completed: B. Tillett reported that the statement on UBC was approved by the Bibliography Section and will be published on the IFLA website in due course.
- 4.8. **Action:** The Chair of the Task Group to prepare and circulate a text on the potential role of national bibliographic agencies in the creation and maintenance of resource URIs to improve the efficiency of production of library linked data.
  - 4.8.1. Not initiated; superseded by other actions.
- 4.9. **Action:** The Bibliography Section to be asked to consider further action on the role of national bibliographic agencies in the Semantic Web, specifically in the creation and maintenance of resource URIs.
  - 4.9.1. Completed; the Bibliography Section and Cataloguing Section planned the pre-IFLA satellite conference discussed as item 11 in this agenda.
5. Relationship between IFLA Namespaces Technical/Task Group and IFLA Committee on Standards.
  - 5.1. The Group remains without a formal position in terms of reporting line, remit, and funding, and this needs to be clarified as soon as possible for the Group to work effectively. The meeting recommended that the Group should report to the Committee on Standards (CoS) because it works across multiple Sections. The Group's requirements and options paper presented to the Professional Committee in 2010 focussed on IFLA standards in the Semantic Web environment, and overlaps significantly with the responsibilities of the CoS. IFLA has provided no formal feedback on the report, although a specific recommendation has been included in the list of CoS responsibilities. G. Dunsire noted that he had been asked to give a presentation on the Group's activities to the open session of the CoS during the current conference. The Group's current position is as a project of the Cataloguing and Indexing Section, and its membership and activities involve other Sections within Division III, so it would also be appropriate for Division III to host it. However, it is likely that namespaces will be

required in the future for Sections in other Divisions. The fall-back position would be to continue as a project within the C&I Section.

5.1.1. **Action: A. Cato to report to the Committee on Standards and seek clarification of the situation**

6. Progress on UNIMARC namespace

6.1. A. Hopkinson reported that the Permanent UNIMARC Committee (PUC) has agreed to initiate a project on representing UNIMARC in Resource Description Framework, but a request for project funding needs to be submitted. He is a member of the CoS, and will take action so that the proposal goes through the CoS, which already has the item on its agenda. There is evidence on a suitable methodology, from G. Dunsire's experimental research with MARC21 and the paper presented by him and M. Willer at the IFLA conference in San Juan in 2011 which was subsequently updated and published in the IFLA Journal<sup>1</sup>. PUC will submit the project proposal.

6.1.1. **Action: G. Dunsire and M. Willer to assist PUC in preparation of the proposal for funding by October 2012.**

7. Translations of RDF representations of IFLA standards, Version 1.0, 9 April 2012. Draft prepared by IFLA Cataloguing Section, ISBD Review Group's ISBD/XML Study Group.

7.1. G. Dunsire introduced the draft guidelines on translations of IFLA namespaces, initiated by the ISBD/XML Study Group. The Study Group had originally intended to develop guidelines for the ISBD namespace, but recognized the value of general guidelines for all namespaces. The intention is that specific IFLA groups can augment the common approach by adding local procedures for their namespaces. The general guidelines needed to be tested with new translations of IFLA standards and updated if necessary. Translation of namespaces should be considered as a natural extension of the translation of the underlying standard. G. Dunsire noted that many translations were of superseded versions of standards and attention should be paid to updating them.

7.2. The meeting discussed the relationship between the guidelines and MulDiCat, and agreed that the implementation and translation of a namespace should include a check of MulDiCat, which is applicable to all IFLA namespaces. G. Dunsire noted that there are synchronisation issues between MulDiCat and standards still to be resolved. MulDiCat has multiple purposes, and its relation to IFLA namespaces needs to be clear.

7.2.1. **Action: A. Cato to review the scope of MulDiCat and amend if necessary.**

7.3. The meeting agreed that the translation guidelines should recommend that terms added or amended in a namespace should first be cross-checked against MulDiCat, and then applied to MulDiCat if appropriate. A new translation of a standard should focus on the namespace in the first instance, on the assumption that the namespace contains clearly defined terms and definitions from the underlying standard. Choice of terminology translations, influenced by MulDiCat, could then be applied during the translation of the main text of the standard.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dunsire, G., Willer, M. UNIMARC and linked data. Presented to meeting 187: Advancing UNIMARC: alignment and innovation, IFLA UNIMARC Programme (UNIMARC), World Library and Information Congress: 77th IFLA General Conference and Assembly 13-18 August 2011, San Juan, Puerto Rico. Available at: <http://dcevents.dublincore.org/index.php/IntConf/dc-2011/paper/view/52/6>. Updated version in: IFLA Journal, vol. 37, no. 4 (December 2011).

- 7.3.1. **Action: G. Dunsire to amend draft guidelines to add recommendations that translations follow MulDiCat terminology, and that new and amended namespace terms should be applied to MulDiCat in the first instance, where appropriate.**
- 7.3.2. **Action: A. Cato to develop MulDiCat documentation to indicate how MulDiCat synchronises with other IFLA namespaces.**
- 7.4. Representatives of the Cataloguing Section noted that any review of the International Cataloguing Principles should be synchronized with MulDiCAT.
  - 7.4.1. **Action: Cataloguing Section to ensure that any review of ICP is synchronised with MulDiCat.**
- 7.5. The meeting suggested that the draft guidelines be checked by Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (CJK) translators and amended if necessary to accommodate the needs of languages using non-Latin scripts.
  - 7.5.1. **Action: G. Dunsire to invite CJK colleagues to review the draft guidelines.**
- 7.6. The meeting discussed various other aspects of the guidelines and translation processes. G. Dunsire noted that incremental translation of a namespace using the OMR was feasible, and probably necessary in many circumstances. OMR version control and history audit provided tools to support this. G. Dunsire further noted that the DCMI community had recently investigated the functional requirements and availability of systems and services for namespace vocabulary management, but no single solution had been identified. Currently, the OMR was used to maintain IFLA namespaces, and provide minimal services in the form of de-referencing. A planned upgrade to the OMR would introduce new facilities such as better support for multilingual namespaces and mappings between vocabularies.
  - 7.6.1. **Action: G. Dunsire to investigate OMR capabilities and report back to the Group.**
- 7.7. G. Dunsire noted that the current draft guidelines document included an extensive preamble which was only necessary for developing the guidelines and would be removed from the final version. The meeting suggested that the guidelines should not contain any references to the OMR and other specific methods and infrastructure in order to keep them general. It was also suggested that examples be included; these could be taken in the first instance from the notes on the ISBD translations.
  - 7.7.1. **Action: G. Dunsire to replace the current preamble with a short introduction, remove references to specific infrastructure for implementing the guidelines, remove the notes and transfer appropriate examples to the main text. The revised document, including CJK issues, will be circulated to the Group for final approval before the end of 2012.**
- 8. Guidelines on using and extending IFLA namespaces.
  - 8.1. The ISBD Review Group had requested funding in 2012 to develop guidelines on using and extending the ISBD namespaces, based on requests from external user communities. The Semantic Web environment allows anyone to extend existing namespaces; an example is the extension of RDA's "variant name for the place" to "fictitious name for the place" by the Consortium of European Research Libraries (CERL); RDA is itself an extension of the Functional Requirements (FR) namespaces. The

ISBD proposal was not funded. The meeting agreed that it was important to develop such guidelines for all IFLA namespaces to maintain coherency and improve utilisation.

8.1.1. **Action: Group to develop draft generic guidelines on using and extending IFLA namespaces during 2013.**

8.1.2. **Action: G. Dunsire to submit a funding proposal through appropriate channels.**

9. Unconstrained namespaces.

9.1. G. Dunsire introduced the briefing paper on unconstrained namespaces. There has been considerable criticism from some Semantic Web communities that the semantic constraints on elements in IFLA namespaces would prevent their wider adoption. However, the constraints were necessary to ensure the cohesion of IFLA models and schemas within their immediate local communities. For example, the FRBR Review Group had affirmed that strong semantic constraints should be kept for the FR family namespaces, but also agreed that unconstrained versions of the FR elements could be developed if necessary. The ISBD/XML Study Group has also identified a need for unconstrained ISBD elements to follow the methodology proposed for semantic mappings with RDA elements. Ad hoc experiments to map elements from multiple bibliographic standards have also shown the need for unconstrained versions. Such unconstrained versions should not be regarded as part of the original IFLA standard; at best they were extensions to a standard namespace, and lay within a fuzzy boundary area between official standards and extended user communities. Two basic approaches were identified: to maintain unconstrained versions within the same namespace as the official standard; or to use a separate namespace. There were many issues to be resolved, including the management of synchronisation between constrained and unconstrained versions of elements, and branding, trust, and “social responsibility” of IFLA as the publisher of standards. The meeting agreed that these issues should be investigated during 2013.

9.1.1. **Action: Group to investigate the issues of constrained and unconstrained namespaces during 2013.**

9.1.2. **Action: G. Dunsire to submit a project funding proposal through appropriate channels.**

10. Bibliographic namespaces sub-group.

10.1. G. Dunsire said he had scanned the List of IFLA standards compiled for the CoS, and noted several standards outside the bibliographic area which would be candidates for a namespace. These included standards with controlled terminologies, and lists of attributes and relationships. There remained a natural affinity between the bibliographic standards, exemplified by the concepts of universal bibliographic control, and it was important that a focus be kept on bibliographic standards while IFLA namespaces continued to develop. He therefore proposed that the Group should seek to form a task or working group on bibliographic standards. This was accepted by the meeting.

10.1.1. **Action: G. Dunsire to monitor the situation and initiate a bibliographic namespaces sub-group when necessary.**

11. Report from Bibliography in the Digital Age satellite conference.

11.1. P. Riva reported on the satellite conference held in Warsaw, Poland and co-sponsored by IFLA’s Bibliography Section and Cataloguing Section. The conference discussed

national bibliographies in a wider environment which included the Semantic Web and was therefore of interest to the Group. Topics included new users and usage of national bibliographies and the need to update the Guidelines on national bibliographies in the digital age published by the Bibliography Section, and the use of linked data technologies to integrate researchers' profiles. Many national bibliographies now have some form of linked data output. The meeting suggested that information on these developments would help the work of the CoS.

11.1.1. **Action: A. Cato and others to keep the Committee on Standards informed of linked data needs of national bibliographies.**

12. Report from ad hoc meeting with ISBD/XML Study Group and ISBD Review Group.

12.1. G. Dunsire report on his meeting with F. Leresche and M. Willer to discuss ISBD namespace requirements. The meeting covered namespace activities related to ISBD liaison with the ISSN Network and the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA. These included the mapping of ISBD Area 0 and RDA vocabularies for content type and media type using the RDA/ONIX Framework as a hub, and the high level alignment of the ISBD element set with the RDA element set and subsequent semantic mapping of their namespaces. Draft alignments and other documentation have been circulated for comment. Some ad hoc work has been done on aligning and mapping ISBD elements to other standards, and the ISBD/XML Study Group wishes to continue with this activity. The Group agreed that mappings between IFLA namespaces and with external namespaces were an important and desirable task.

13. Other reports.

13.1. There were no other reports.

Gordon Dunsire  
Chair, IFLA Namespaces Task/Technical Group  
September 2012

## Appendix A: Members of the Task Group

<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Emmanuelle Bermes	Centre Pompidou	Information Technology Section
Leda Bultrini	ARPA Lazio	Knowledge Management Section
Anders Cato	Gothenburg University Library	Cataloguing Section
Charlene Chou	Columbia University	Bibliography Section
Gordon Dunsire	Independent	Classification & Indexing Section
Elena Escolano	Ministerio de Defensa (España)	FRBR Review Group
Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi	Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense	ISBD Review Group
Lynne Howarth	University of Toronto	Classification & Indexing Section
Francoise Leresche	Bibliothèque nationale de France	ISBD/XML Study Group
Sally McCallum	Library of Congress	Knowledge Management Section
Pat Riva	Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec	FRBR Review Group
Barbara Tillett	Library of Congress	Bibliography Section
Mirna Willer	University of Zadar	ISBD Review Group