



Minutes of the FRBR Review Group's Meeting Oslo, August 18, 2005

The FRBR Review Group had one meeting on the occasion of the World Library and Information Congress in Oslo, on August 18th, 2005. It was attended by 19 participants from 13 countries (see Appendix A).

1) Activity reports from the Working Groups

a) Working Group on the FRBR model and continuing resources

The Working Group on the FRBR model and continuing resources, chaired by Janifer Gatenby, suggested its own disbanding last year in Buenos Aires, but the WG is officially disbanded this year only. Considering, however, that there still is some conceptual work to be done, but that the topic should be broadened in order to include other kinds of materials as well, the Review Group decides that the Working Group on continuing resources should be replaced with another Working Group, the task of which will be to refine FRBR by striving to solve the specific problems posed by the modelling of *aggregates* – that is, (1) collections, selections, and anthologies, (2) augmentations (text + illustrations, notes, introductions, etc.), (3) series, (4) journals, (5) integrating resources, and (6) multi-volume monographs.

This new WG is formed for a duration of 2 years, with Ed O'Neill appointed as chair. Its initial members are: Anders Cato, Paula Goossens, Judith Kuhagen, Barbara Tillett, Carol van Nuys, Maja Žumer.

Ed O'Neill drafts a brief text to explain why the need for that new WG was felt: "Aggregates are only briefly described in the original *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* report. During the 2005 IFLA FRBR Workshop in Dublin, Ohio and at the FRBR Review Group meeting in Oslo, difficulties and inconsistencies in applying the FRBR model to aggregates were identified as an impediment to FRBR implementation."

b) Working Group on the Expression entity

Anders Cato reported on the meeting that took place on August 15th (see the minutes at <<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/WG-Expression-minutes2005.pdf>>), and on the occasion of which the following issues were addressed:

- Music materials: the WG opined that the decision to split the Expression entity into more specific entities depends on the needs of local applications, and should be restrained to specialised institutions. In the general model, an instance of the Expression entity is always directly related to an instance of the Work entity, even though two instances of the Expression entity related to the same instance of the Work entity can be related to each other.
- Illustrated editions: once again, it depends on the needs: in a given context, it can prove helpful to regard the text and the illustrations as two separate works, in other contexts, the presence of illustrations can be regarded as a mere attribute of a given instance of the Manifestation entity.
- Collections and anthologies: the WG reaffirmed the distinction between an anthology, which requires a significant intellectual effort, and a mere compilation. Anthologies are more likely to be regarded as “Works” on their own than mere compilations. It depends once again on your needs.
- Translations and use of uniform titles: Barbara Tillett reported on the current trends in the design of the future RDA Code (Resource Description and Access). The phrase “citation title” will probably be substituted to the phrase “uniform title.” The idea would be to have a kind of “core” title for the identification of the Work, and to add elements to it in order to identify the various Expressions of that Work.
- Hand-press materials: Gunilla Jonsson proposed to change the definition for the Expression entity so that it can apply to hand-press materials. A finalised proposal will be submitted to the WG by October 31st.

All members of the WG are asked to send examples of different types of Expressions before December 31st. FAQ will have to be drafted as well.

c) Working Group on FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonisation

The Working Group on FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonisation, co-chaired by Martin Doerr on behalf of the CIDOC CRM community and Patrick Le Bœuf on behalf of the IFLA FRBR Review Group, had two meetings during the term 2004-2005: one in London, February 14-16, 2005, and the other in Heraklion, Crete, July 4-6, 2005.

At the beginning of the July meeting, the WG hoped that the meeting would result in the production of deliverables that could be circulated in order to show to a wider audience the work in progress, but eventually it had to be recognised that it was still premature.

The “translation” of FRBR into the object-oriented formalism has not been finished yet but is in good way. It will be accompanied by an introduction that will state the reasons for such an initiative. The introduction will insist for instance that there is no internal difference between “E-R FRBR” and “OO FRBR” as to the concepts expressed, that the aim is not to force museum concerns into bibliographic information but to enable interoperability between those two kinds of information without having to waive the specific needs of either, and that the idea is not to substitute “OO FRBR” to “E-R FRBR” but to have two expressions of basically the same conceptual construct, in order to meet different needs.

2) Nomination of a new Chair for the Review Group

For a number of reasons, Patrick Le Bœuf had to resign from his position as a member and chair of the FRBR Review Group. The RG nominated unanimously Pat Riva to succeed him. The nomination has to be approved by the chair of the Cataloguing Section [and was approved on the occasion of the second meeting of the Section’s Standing Committee.]

It will not be possible for Pat Riva to participate in the next IME ICC meeting. Elena Escolano Rodríguez volunteers to read out an updated version of *Brave new FRBR world*. Patrick Le Bœuf will have to provide that updated version before September 15th.

3) Future plans for the Review Group

Given the importance of the topics to be addressed, the newly formed WG on Aggregates will presumably prove to be a major element in the RG's policy for the two years to come.

The WG on FRBR teaching and training, chaired by Maja Žumer, and that was dormant until now, might become active this year. Materials such as lectures, experience reports from teachers, etc., could be posted on the page of the RG's Web site that was created for that purpose.

Maja Žumer suggested that the conclusions from the Dublin Meeting be taken as a starting point for the RG's future plans. Those conclusions are examined and distributed among the various WGs affiliated to the RG:

- "The FRBR Review Group will focus on the revision of attributes and relationships that are defined for Group 1 entities, as the FRANAR and FRSAR Study Groups will deal with Group 2 and Group 3 of entities": this task remains to be done at the RG's level.
- "A 'middle implementation model', which will include a practical definition for the Expression entity, will be developed by the FRBR Review Group": this task is to be done by the WG on the Expression entity.
- "The FRBR Revision Group will post on its Web site more examples of 'agglomerates' for commentators to react, so that consensus can be reached about the best way to deal with such complex entities as anthologies, collected vs. selected works, serials, etc.": this task is to be done by the WG on Agglomerates.
- "The FRBR Review Group will contact the CONSER Task Force on FRBR & Continuing Resources in order to take benefit of their approach to continuing resources": this task is to be done by the WG on Agglomerates.
- "The utmost complex topic of Web resources is postponed for the time being": but it will have to be addressed by the WG on Agglomerates.
- "Is the Subject relationship a Work property only? The FRBR Review Group thinks that 'aboutness' is actually only at the Work level, but that subject headings such as we currently know them do not deal exclusively with 'aboutness'. The FRSAR Study Group will explore that": as a consequence, it goes out of the scope of the FRBR RG.
- "The FRBR Review Group will contact vendors in order to ask them what they think the issues are for introducing the FRBR concepts into library catalogues. What do they expect from us in order to go ahead? What are their needs?": this has been incepted by Alan Danskin.
- "The FRBR Review Group will besides strive to promote and stimulate research and study by doctoral students, professors, etc.": this is to be done by the WG on FRBR teaching and training.
- "The FRBR Review Group acknowledged that the FRBR model would benefit from an ontology, and that the FRBR/CRM Harmonisation Group is going in that direction": this task is therefore already distributed.

Barbara Tillet also insists that the suggestions from the FRANAR Group and IME ICC should be examined. She volunteers to compile all of them after the series of IME ICC meetings will be over.

4) Examination of the chart with all suggestions for changes in FRBR

As the chart with all change suggestions in the FRBR model (available from http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/d_read/frbr/Suggestions_for_Reviewing.doc) is very long, it could not be completely examined during the meeting. Once again, many topics were distributed to the WG on Aggregates. Appendix B contains the list of all of the decisions that were made in Oslo.

Appendix A

List of participants

Name	Institution	Country	Statute
Buizza, Pino	Biblioteca Queriniana	Italy	observer
Cato, Anders	National Library of Sweden	Sweden	observer, chair of the WG on the Expression entity, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates
Danskin, Alan	British Library	UK	member
Escolano Rodríguez, Elena	National Library of Spain	Spain	observer
Goossens, Paula	Royal Library of Belgium	Belgium	observer, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates
Guerrini, Mauro	University of Florence	Italy	observer, member of the WG on FRBR teaching
Howarth, Lynne	University of Toronto	Canada	member
Inahama, Minoru	National Diet Library	Japan	observer
Kuhagen, Judith	Library of Congress	USA	observer, member of the WG on continuing resources, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates
Le Bœuf, Patrick	National Library of France	France	outgoing member & chair of FRBR RG
Magliano, Cristina	ICCU	Italy	observer, member of the WG on Expression entity
Murtomaa, Eeva	Helsinki University Library	Finland	observer, member of the WG on Expression entity
Nuys, Carol van	ABM-utvikling	Norway	member of the FRBR RG & of the WG on continuing resources, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates
O'Neill, Ed	OCLC	USA	member of the FRBR RG & of the WG on Expression entity, chair of the newly formed WG on aggregates
Patton, Glenn	OCLC	USA	member
Riva, Pat	McGill University	Canada	new member & new chair of FRBR RG
Tillett, Barbara	Library of Congress	USA	member of the FRBR RG & of the WG on Expression entity, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates
Zagorskaya, Elena	National Library of Russia	Russia	observer
Žumer, Maja	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia	member, chair of the WG on FRBR teaching, member of the newly formed WG on aggregates

Appendix B

List of the decisions made in Oslo as to the chart of suggested changes in FRBR

1. Generalities

Proposal	Take a better account of <i>time</i> aspect (Michael Heaney)
Reasoning	“Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records largely ignores the time aspect, but I suggest there is much to be gained from an analysis, at each level (Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item) of: (a) how objects/entities of library interest exist over time; (b) how or whether they change over time (c) how or whether their existence is reflected in some sort of physical reality, tangible or not (d) whether the physical reality is continuous or intermittent.”
Source	HEANEY, Michael. <i>Time is of the essence</i> . [S. l.]: [s. n.], 11 August 1997 [cited 9 March 2000]. Available from World Wide Web: < http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/users/mh/time978a.htm >. Mentioned in LE BŒUF, Patrick. FRBR and further. In: <i>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</i> . 2001, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 15-52. ISSN 0163-9374.
Discussion	This suggestion has very much to do with Carl Lagoze’s proposal to develop the notion of <i>Event</i> in FRBR, and with Bearman et al.’s <i>Action</i> entity. It also is related to notions developed in CIDOC CRM. (Patrick Le Bœuf, 29 October 2004).
Result	The FRBR Review Group keeps the entity-relationship version of FRBR such as it stands, but will expand the definition of the Event entity so that there can be a connection with the future object-oriented version of the model (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Name	Ed O’Neill
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	Introduce 3 definitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Work: The smallest autonomous intellectual or artistic entity – Aggregate: An entity comprised of multiple works. Three models of aggregates are available: 1. single work, 2. work of works, and 3. (his preference) manifestation of works. – Component: A subunit or component part of a work. This entity is recursive: any component can in turn consist of smaller components.
Reasoning	“Clear guidelines for identifying components, works, and aggregates are a key to developing the full potential of FRBR.”
Source	“Relational Models for Aggregates”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/oneill/ONeill-Aggregartes.ppt >
Discussion	to be discussed by the WG on Aggregates (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Name	Godfrey Rust
Date	May 4, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	FRBR would benefit from an ontology, especially with the emphasis being placed on relationships.
Reasoning	The FRBR systems librarians are designing now will be mainstream in several years time. Is librarians’ world going to get simpler or more complex? Can librarians predict the functional requirements they will have for 2010 or 2015? If not, then they should

	focus on the underlying flexibility of the model. Settle the model and put the change management into an ontology.
Source	“Thoughts from a different planet (only slightly different)”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/rust/050502_Godfrey_Rust_FRBR_presentation.ppt >
Discussion	It was recognized during the Dublin Workshop that the work currently being done by the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonization Group will eventually result in the ontology that will support the FRBR model (Dublin Workshop, 02-04/05/2005). Maja Žumer insisted however that the outcome of the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonisation WG will not be a “neutral” ontology, but an ontology designed to be compatible with the museum community (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

2. User tasks

Proposal	Add user task “navigate” (AIB. Gruppo di studio sulla catalogazione, Elaine Svenonius [Svenonius 2000])
Reasoning	
Source	ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA BIBLIOTECHE, Gruppo di Studio sulla Catalogazione. An Italian comment on <i>Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: final report</i> . In <i>Bollettino AIB</i> [Associazione italiana biblioteche]. 1999, vol. 3, pp. 303-311. Also available in: <i>FRBR seminar... proceedings</i> . Also available from World Wide Web: < http://www.aib.it/aib/commiss/catal/frbrengh.htm >. SVENONIUS, Elaine. <i>The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization</i> [printed book]. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000. Mentioned in LE BŒUF, Patrick. FRBR and further. In: <i>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</i> . 2001, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 15-52. ISSN 0163-9374.
Discussion	Barbara Tillett commented that when the FRBR model was being designed, Tom Delsey thought that the user task “to navigate” was implicitly contained in relationships, while she wanted to have it included as a task on its own. Maja Žumer pointed out that “to navigate a catalogue” is not a goal in itself. Patrick Le Bœuf said that perhaps the Web has changed our behaviours and expectations as to the way information is presented. Carol van Nuys asked whether we can regard serendipity as a task in itself. (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	Decision: Barbara Tillett and Patrick Le Bœuf will propose some phrasing in order to make it clear that the task “to navigate” is implicitly a component of the broader task “to find”; they will also address the task “to collocate”, which is also a component of “to find” (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Proposal	Add user task “relate”.
Reasoning	
Source	Barbara Tillett, “FRBR and Cataloging for the Future”, in <i>FRBR: Hype or Cure-All?</i> , and again in “Relationships in FRBR”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/tillett/FRBR_Relationships.ppt >
Discussion	
Result	Decision: Barbara Tillett and Patrick Le Bœuf will propose some phrasing in order to make it clear that the task “to relate” is implicitly a component of the broader task “to find” (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Name	Barbara Tillett
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	Further possible user tasks might include: “to attribute royalties to”, and “to preserve”.

Reasoning	
Source	“Relationships in FRBR”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/tillett/FRBR_Relationships.ppt >
Discussion	The FRBR Review Group agreed that such user tasks are relevant to particular applications, but should not be introduced into the general model (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	Decision: Barbara Tillet and Patrick Le Bœuf will draft a text that will state that any kind of specific user tasks can be defined depending on the needs of local applications, without having to be introduced at the general level (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Name	Maja Žumer
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	From a methodological point of view, the FRBR model was developed on the basis of extant normative documents identifying the data elements that met each user task for each entity; would it not be better to take user tasks as a basis, and to list all data elements that would best suit those user tasks?
Reasoning	That way, we could make sure that no data elements are missing in current normative documents.
Source	“Some outcomes of the CRM/FRBR harmonization: the definition of manifestation and a review of attributes”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/zumer/Manifestation_and_attributes.ppt >
Discussion	Maja added that many users go to Amazon instead of library catalogues and bibliographies, perhaps because the latter do not include all relevant information elements (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	Decision: Maja will develop the argument in her future articles (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

3. Entities

3.1 Extant entities

Name	Ed O’Neill
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recognize the universality of works (“if ever a work, always a work”), – Define works as the smallest autonomous entry, – Exclude recursive relationships for works, – Treat aggregates as manifestations.
Reasoning	Based on the experience with WorldCat and the Humphry Clinker case
Source	“Relational Models for Aggregates”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/oneill/ONeill-Aggregartes.ppt >
Discussion	to be discussed by the WG on Aggregates (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Name	Maja Žumer
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	A Manifestation should be deemed to embody as many Expressions as there are distinct parts corresponding to distinct types of Works (text, illustration, music), rather than just one “main” Work (traditionally, the textual work) for which a new “augmented” Expression is defined. In some cases, however, a new, composite Work (consisting of textual, graphic and musical aspects) can be recognized, if needed. The

	important thing is that all works (and expressions) deemed to be important for our users are recorded.
Reasoning	
Source	“Modeling Augmentations”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/zumer/Modeling_augmentations-1.ppt >
Discussion	to be discussed by the WG on Aggregates (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Name	Judith Kuhagen
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	<p>Judith Kuhagen suggested that we consider that all segments of a serial (represented by one or multiple bibliographic records due to different methods of accommodating seriality) together equal one serial work; that we recognize that reproductions may not be issued/released with same mode of issuance as the “original” and that they should be considered as same to satisfy the user’s need to find and identify (they are just a surrogate for the original).</p> <p>Other resources have seriality: finite integrating resources and multipart monographs are also likely to change over time.</p> <p>Judith Kuhagen suggested some adjustments to the FRBR model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledging seriality of resources (noted in “Areas for further study”) (the attributes of a manifestation are now only defined for concurrent manifestations: Different title, place of publication, publisher, series, physical medium, etc.; we need concept of consecutive manifestations of same work/expression: Change in title, place of publication, publisher, series, physical medium, etc.); – Reconsidering some attributes (the CONSER Task Force on FRBR and Continuing Resources has already suggested that “Expected regularity of issue (serial)” and “Expected frequency of issue (serial)” be moved from the Expression level to the Manifestation level; in addition, “Edition/issue designation”, now at the Manifestation level, should also be at the Expression level for some serials); – Another mode of issuance: streaming resources (e.g., news feeds that change in real time), should be recognized.
Reasoning	
Source	“Modeling Continuing Resources in FRBR (and more...)”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/kuhagen/Kuhagen_OCLC_FRBR.ppt >
Discussion	to be discussed by the WG on Aggregates (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Name	Carol van Nuys & Ketil Albertsen
Date	May 2, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	Add the concept of “box classes” to the model, for Web resources
Reasoning	This would address the finding that it was not sufficient to have implicit aggregates – it was too costly and they needed to automate the attributes. The creation of synthetic “boxes” to hold Web objects enabled them to put objects in several boxes and clearly identify each object. They described 8 types of relationships and the box classes and box class properties, modeling the “real world” as their solution for their Web archive.
Source	“Modelling web resources”, < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/vannuys/Modelling_web_resources.ppt >
Discussion	to be discussed by the WG on Aggregates; this an implementation thing, not to be added to the general model (FRBR RG’s meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

3.2 Proposals for new entities

Proposal	Add a fourth group of entities, <i>actions</i> , including: originate, compile, excerpt, reformat, use, acquire/relinquish object, acquire/relinquish rights, with a relationship to group 2, <i>agents</i> , to group 1, <i>information resources</i> , and to entities <i>time</i> (= conceptual part of <i>event</i> , or to be created?) and <i>place</i> from group 3 (6th Dublin Core Metadata Workshop)
Reasoning	
Source	BEARMAN, David; RUST, Godfrey; WEIBEL, Stuart... [et al.]. A common model to support interoperable metadata: progress report on reconciling metadata requirements from the Dublin Core and INDECS/DOI communities. In <i>D-Lib Magazine</i> [online]. January 1999, vol. 5, no.1 [cited 18 February 2000]. Available from World Wide Web: < http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january99/bearman/01bearman.html >. Mentioned in LE BŒUF, Patrick. FRBR and further. In: <i>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</i> . 2001, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 15-52. ISSN 0163-9374.
Discussion	to be discussed by the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonisation WG on Aggregates; the CIDOC CRM defines an Activity class that might correspond to this notion (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Proposal	Develop the notion of <i>event</i> within FRBR (Carl Lagoze)
Reasoning	
Source	LAGOZE, Carl. Business unusual: how "event-awareness" may breathe life into the catalog? In <i>Conference on bibliographic control in the new millennium</i> [online]. Washington: Library of Congress, October 19, 2000 [cited 28 December 2000]. Available from Internet: < http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/lagoze_paper.html >. Mentioned in LE BŒUF, Patrick. FRBR and further. In: <i>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</i> . 2001, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 15-52. ISSN 0163-9374.
Discussion	<i>Events</i> , and more generally <i>Temporal Entities</i> are fully developed in CIDOC CRM. Perhaps a merging between FRBR and CIDOC CRM, as attempted by the FRBR/CRM Dialogue WG, will make it possible to introduce the <i>Event</i> notion into FRBR? Anyhow, the result of the introduction of the <i>Event</i> notion into FRBR would be that all "date" and "place" attributes in FRBR would be expressed as a relationship between <i>Date</i> and <i>Place</i> entities and the <i>Event</i> entity, which, in turn, would have a relationship to other entities. (Patrick Le Bœuf, 29 October 2004). to be discussed by the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonisation WG on Aggregates; the CIDOC CRM defines an Activity class that might correspond to this notion (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
Result	

Proposal	Add <i>instrument</i> entity into group 2 of entities, renamed <i>agents</i> (6th Dublin Core Metadata Workshop)
Reasoning	
Source	BEARMAN, David; RUST, Godfrey; WEIBEL, Stuart... [et al.]. A common model to support interoperable metadata: progress report on reconciling metadata requirements from the Dublin Core and INDECS/DOI communities. In <i>D-Lib Magazine</i> [online]. January 1999, vol. 5, no.1 [cited 18 February 2000]. Available from World Wide Web: < http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january99/bearman/01bearman.html >. Mentioned in LE BŒUF, Patrick. FRBR and further. In: <i>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</i> . 2001, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 15-52. ISSN 0163-9374.
Discussion	Even though some instruments can be regarded as acting on their own (e.g., the Hubble telescope), there always is a human agent (either a person or a corporate body) that created the instrument and is responsible for the output of the instrument (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Result	Suggestion rejected (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).
---------------	---

Name	Marcia Lei Zeng and Athena Salaba
Date	May 3, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	Group 3 seems to be incomplete: Where is the Time notion? Where is the Process notion? The Event entity seems to be a combination of time and place. There should be a distinction between concrete concepts and abstract concepts. How could Ranganathan's facets (personality, matter, energy, space, and time) be introduced into Group 3?
Reasoning	
Source	"Toward an international sharing and use of subject authority data", < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/zeng/Zeng_Salaba.ppt >
Discussion	
Result	Out of scope of the FRBR Review Group – topic to be addressed by the FRSAR Group (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).

Name	Diane Vizine-Goetz
Date	May 3, 2005 – Dublin Workshop
Proposal	Tom Delsey (as quoted by John Attig) proposes that two entities be added: Form/genre and Time, and 2 further relationships: Work is an example of Form/Genre and Work covers/depicts Time and Place. Diane Vizine-Goetz actually proposes that 3 further entities be added: Genre, Time, and Summary.
Reasoning	Current subject heading strings include not only subject information but also genre, form, time, and place.
Source	"Subjects in fiction: the experience with WorldCat", < http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/presentations/vizine-goetz/vizine-goetz_FRBR_workshop.ppt >
Discussion	
Result	Out of scope of the FRBR Review Group – topic to be addressed by the FRSAR Group (FRBR RG's meeting in Oslo, 18/08/2005).