



79th IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, SINGAPORE –17-23 AUGUST 2013

Cataloguing Section

ISBD Review Group

ISBD/XML Study Group

<http://www.ifla.org/node/1795>

Minutes

Meeting: Tuesday, 20 August 16:00-17:30

Attendees: Maria Violeta Bertolini, Gordon Dunsire, Lynne Howarth, Françoise Leresche, Dorothy McGarry, Mirna Willer.

Apologies: Elena Escolano.

Observers: Harriet Aagaard, Massimo Gentili Tedeschi, Patrick Le Boeuf, Chris Oliver, François-Xavier Pelegrin, Pat Riva, Sandy Roe, Jay Weitz

1. Welcome and introductions

F. Leresche welcomed the members and the observers.

2. Agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the ISBD/XML SG meetings held in Helsinki, Finland, August 2012

Minutes were adopted without changes.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes of the Helsinki meeting and Action list

The following issues were examined in detail:

4.1) Alignment between ISBD and RDA namespaces

- 5.1.1) Alignment of the ISBD element set with RDA element set vocabularies

This work was prepared last year and sent to the ISBD Review Group. The JSC response is available on the ISBD RG website.

5.1.2) Mapping of ISBD area 0 vocabularies to RDA/ONIX Framework vocabularies
This work was also completed and sent to the ISBD Review Group. The JSC will constitute a new RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group, in which the ISBD RG has been invited to send a representative.

4.2) Alignment between ISBD and FRBR namespaces

4.2.1) Resource vs WEMI entity resolution: discussion paper

Gordon Dunsire presented the document he had circulated beforehand. He specified that this document had been produced in the sole perspective of an alignment between classes of two namespaces published in RDF: it only takes into account the definitions such as they are published in those namespaces. Yet the definition of “Resource” in the ISBD Namespace does not always match the use of the word in the ISBD text. The FRBR definitions for each of WEMI are clear but also self-referential, hence not particularly useful.

WEMI represent four primary classes of FRBR. Their definition in the FRBR Namespace is tightly constrained: they are disjoint classes, and relationships are subjected to very specific cardinality rules. The diagram illustrates the cardinality of the relationships, i.e., one-to-one; one-to-many; many to one. Some relationships are stronger than others, i.e., there can only be one work for each expression; on the contrary, an expression may have many manifestations.

It is difficult to determine whether a resource is a “Work”, an “Expression”, a “Manifestation”, or an “Item”. ISBD “Resource” is not equivalent to any of the WEMI classes, but fits into the four WEMI classes put together. Yet a relationship between the ISBD “Resource” and FRBR Group 1 would be too generic and pointless. The report suggests instead, declaring four distinct relationships to relate ISBD “Resource” to each of the FRBR Group 1 entity that the resource reflects, i.e., creating the four proposed RDF properties and their inverses with domains and ranges as specified in the report.

Declaring these 4 properties is important to implement linked data: it will allow existing records to be published into RDF and aggregated with FRBR-based metadata.

If this recommendation is adopted, then a second recommendation is to liaise with the FRBR Review Group to decide which namespace (i.e., ISBD or FRBRer) to use for the properties.

The properties extend both namespaces.

P. Le Boeuf asks if “component” is the right word. He has suggested using “aspect” instead of “component”; in order to give slightly more semantics in the definition. P.Riva says that “component” is suggestive of whole-part relationships and one could then be misled into thinking of a superclass.

The decision was to introduce the terminology change in the document and circulate it to the Study Group, and also the FRBR WG. The document will be discussed further at the joint meeting in October (16-18, 2013) in Paris, with decisions on further work and impact on the ISBD revision process.

The second recommendation was to publish it in the ISBD namespace.

Action: Change the label and improve the definitions of the new properties according to Patrick Le Boeuf's suggestions. Circulate the amended document to the Study Group, and also the FRBR WG. (See Action 6 in the revised work plan below)

Action: Publish the new properties in the ISBD namespace. (See Action 6 in the revised work plan below)

4.3) Other alignments and mappings

4.3.1) Diagram of mappings/alignments

At the Helsinki conference, ISBD RG asked the ISBD/XML SG to Develop a diagram of mappings/alignments and related projects in order to have a view of the many mappings/alignments and projects of groups and subgroups and to make clear how they interrelate.

The diagram was prepared by Gordon Dunsirei. It gives a high level view of activities and how they link one to another. The alignments can be complete or partial.

This diagram is expected to be regularly updated.

Action: Transmit to Cataloguing Section and to FRBR RG for additions reflecting FRBR perspective. (See Action 13 in the revised work plan below)

Action: Put it on the ISBD/XML web site in a visible manner. (See Action 13 in the revised work plan below)

4.3.2) Unconstrained namespaces for ISBD:

G. Dunsire presented his report of 28 July, 2013, "ISBD unconstrained elements and other extensions". Unconstrained elements are attractive to external communities.

Unconstrained elements are also necessary for alignments. For example, the only way to align RDA and ISBD is to unconstrain both namespaces and map RDA unconstrained properties to ISBD unconstrained properties. There are over 40 ISBD elements that are semantically broader than RDA elements or 30% of total ISBD elements.

This will be also useful for mappings between ISBD and other schemas, and also for developing more complex data models, such as models expressing the relationship between ISBD elements within each ISBD area (see the model developed by ABES for ISBD area 1) The SG comes to the conclusion that an unconstrained set of ISBD properties should be published, with the following recommendations:

- Develop versions of all of the basic ISBD properties with generalized definitions and add to the OMR.
- Use simple automated processes for deriving generalized definitions by replacing references to "resource" with references to "thing".
- Create a separate sub-domain for unconstrained ISBD elements in the official element set.
- Relate official ISBD properties to unconstrained ISBD properties using the *rdfs:subPropertyOf* relationship.

Concerning the extension of the ISBD namespace, it was decided to

- Monitor internal extensions and amendments to the ISBD element sets.
- Develop guidelines for external users and applications on using and extending the ISBD element sets and value vocabularies, based on generic guidelines for IFLA namespaces.
- Monitor external extensions to ISBD and determine if any should be included in the workflow and processes for reviewing ISBD.

Action: Publish an ISBD unconstrained namespace, as a separate sub-domain of the domain for the official element set. (See Action 14 in the revised work plan below)

Action: Monitor internal extensions and amendments to the ISBD element sets. (See Action 1 in the revised work plan below)

Action: Develop guidelines for external users and applications on using and extending the ISBD element sets and value vocabularies, based on generic guidelines for IFLA namespaces. (See Action 9 in the revised work plan below)

Action: Monitor external extensions to ISBD and determine if any should be included in the workflow and processes for reviewing ISBD. (See Action 8 in the revised work plan below)

4.4) ISBD Application Profile

The ISBD Application Profile would specify how usage constraints, such as mandatory/optional, order and repeatability of elements, and aggregated statements, such as ISBD areas, should be modelled.

The work is ongoing and will continue; it depends on DCMI's progress on the development of the Dublin Core Application Profile (DCAP).

4.5) RDF representation of ISBD resources and use of ISBD classes and properties in library linked data triples

4.5.1) Questions raised by ABES

ABES's project is interesting and important because it rests upon the use of the whole of ISBD namespace in order to expose in RDF records created according to ISBD rules. This is an opportunity to test the ISBD namespaces in order to identify where further developments are required. The questions raised are important and relevant. They evidence a need to declare new classes so as to account for complex cases (for instance, aggregations of several works with different authors). They also demonstrate the interest of unconstrained properties (see above).

This case also illustrates the need for guidelines supervising the use of ISBD namespace, especially for complex cases.

4.5.2) Modelling proposal

The proposal of an RDF modelling of ISBD area 1, sent out beforehand, was not examined for lack of time. It will be presented by ABES during the SG meeting in Paris next October, where it shall be discussed.

Action: Discuss the modelling proposal of ISBD area 1 prepared by ABES during the October meeting. (See Action 8 in the revised work plan below)

4.6) Guidelines for use of ISBD as linked data

Such Guidelines are important for the promotion and the use of the ISBD namespace (see 4.3.2 and 4.5.1 above). It should be a priority task for the next years.

4.7) Guidelines for translations of RDF representations of ISBD

Guidelines for translations of RDF representation of IFLA standards will be discussed during the meeting of the Namespaces Technical Group.

It was recognized that there could be a need to develop specialized translation guidelines for ISBD in the framework of this general document.

Action: Develop specialized translation guidelines for ISBD in the framework of the *Guidelines for translations of RDF representation of IFLA standards*, as adopted and published by the IFLA Namespaces Technical Group. (See Action 4 in the revised work plan below)

5. Project ISBD Namespaces Alignments and Publication as Linked Data

An amount of 1500 Euros was allocated in 2013 for funding the project on *ISBD Namespaces Alignments and Publication as Linked Data*. The SG's project meeting will take place in Paris, 16-19 October, 2013, in conjunction with a meeting of the FRBR RG on the consolidation of the FR.. models (Paris 14-15 October), in order to take the opportunity of the presence of the FRBR RG members for discussing the mapping between FRBR and ISBD.

6. Evolution of the ISBD/XML Study Group

At the ISBD RG meeting, volunteers were invited to join the ISBD/XML Study Group. Two new members joined the SG: Maria Violeta Bertolini and Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi.

The current name of the SG is misleading as the SG's activity has no particular focus on XML, but is devoted to maintaining the ISBD namespace and liaising the ISBD with the Semantic Web community, and more and more to creating mappings and alignments with other bibliographic standards.

F. Leresche proposed to change the name of the SG to more appropriately represent its actual tasks. The meeting, as well as the ISBD RG and the Cataloguing Section's SC approved of the change of the name to: *ISBD Linked Data Study Group*.

7 Revised Work plan for 2013-2014

7.1. Follow up any changes required in the ISBD namespace resulting from the Glasgow meeting in November 2011.

This includes the alignment work between ISBD and RDA which corresponds to Action 24 of the Outcomes of the Glasgow meeting.

7.2. Follow up developments regarding publication of the RDA/ONIX Framework namespace, and start the implementation of the ISBD/ROF namespaces mapping as appropriate. Ensure that ISBD's interests are represented in further development of the Framework itself.

This corresponds to Action 23 of the Outcomes of the Glasgow meeting.

This corresponds to Action 4 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.3. Liaise with DCMI on improving its infrastructure and support for Application Profiles, using the ISBD AP as a case study, and subsequently further develop the ISBD AP as soon as conditions are met.

This corresponds to Action 8 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.4. Consider developing specialized translation guidelines for ISBD namespaces.

This corresponds to Action 5 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.5. Continue to monitor and liaise with the Permanent UNIMARC Committee on the proposals to represent UNIMARC in RDF and develop mappings between the ISBD and UNIMARC namespaces.

7.6. Revise the document on Resource vs. WEMI entity resolution according to the decision of the Singapore meeting and post it on the ISBD Linked Data web site.

Publish the new properties in the ISBD namespace.

This corresponds to Action 7 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.7. Monitor development of RDF representations of ISSN elements and instance data, and develop appropriate alignments with the ISBD namespaces.

7.8. Monitor developments in the release of instance data based on legacy catalogue records, especially standard identifiers that can be linked to URIs that may apply to instances of ISBD Resources. Monitor use of ISBD classes and properties in library linked data triples.

7.9. Plan work on Guidelines for use of ISBD as Linked Data for 2013-2014.

Develop and make available guidelines on appropriate use of the ISBD namespaces by creators of instance triples. Develop and make available guidelines on refining the ISBD namespaces, for example with properties for notes at a lower level of granularity. Such guidelines will promote use of the ISBD namespaces.

This corresponds to Action 6 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

Postponed for 2014 : see Project "Development of ISBD namespace alignments and usage"

7.10. Develop mappings between the ISBD and Dublin Core Terms (DCT) namespaces.

All ISBD elements can be considered refinements of the broad DCT elements. ISBD data can thus be "dumbed-up" to interoperate with instance data from non-ISBD communities. Liaise with DCMI on any development of the DCT or associated namespaces, and on mappings with ISBD. Mappings can be direct or indirect, via mappings to other namespaces.

7.11. Monitor developments in related namespaces such as Bibliographic Ontology (BibO), SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization System), and Friend of a friend (FOAF), and take ad

hoc action to liaise with related namespaces and develop appropriate mappings from the ISBD namespaces.

7.12. Report to the ISBD RG on any issues relevant to the ISBD revision process.
This corresponds to Action 9 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.13. Transmit the diagram of mappings/alignments and related projects to Cataloguing Section and to FRBR RG for additions reflecting FRBR perspective
Put the diagram of mappings/alignments and related projects on the ISBD/XML web site in a visible manner

This corresponds to Action 10 of the ISBD RG's Work plan adopted during the 78th IFLA General Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

7.14 Publish an ISBD unconstrained namespace, as a separate sub-domain of the domain for the official element set.

Respectfully submitted,

Françoise Leresche
ISBD Linked Data Study Group chair, July 24th, 2014