



IFLA Working Group on the Expression Entity

Working Meeting, IFLA 2005, Oslo

Monday, 15 August 2005 10:45 – 12:15 am

Minutes

Attendees:

Cato, Anders, Kungl. biblioteket (Royal Library), Stockholm, Sweden (chair)
Jonsson, Gunilla, Kungl. biblioteket (Royal Library) Stockholm, Sweden
Le Bœuf, Patrick, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, France
Magliano, Cristina, ICCU-SBN, Rome, Italy
Murtomaa, Eeva, Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto (Helsinki University Library), Helsinki, Finland
O'Neill, Ed, OCLC, Dublin, OH, USA
Tillett, Barbara B., Library of Congress, Washington, DC, USA

Observers:

Escolano, Elena, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid, Spain
Gu, Ben, National Library of China, Beijing, China
Guerrini, Mauro, Università di Firenze, Florence, Italy
Inahama, Minoru, National Library of Japan (National Diet Library), Tokyo, Japan
Kuhagen, Judy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., USA
Lelikova, Natalia, Российская национальная библиотека (National Library of Russia), St. Petersburg, Russia
Movilla, Franzisca, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid, Spain
Riva, Pat, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
Teplitskaya, Alexandra, Российская государственная библиотека (Russian State Library), Moscow, Russia
Zagorskaya, Elena, Российская национальная библиотека (National Library of Russia), St. Petersburg, Russia
Žumer, Maja, Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica (National and University Library), Ljubljana, Slovenia

§ 1. Opening of the meeting

Anders Cato bid everyone welcome to the meeting and declared the meeting opened.

§ 2. Formalities

The chairman excused that the working group had not advanced as far as he had anticipated a year ago. One of the reasons for this was quite a heavy workload at home, another that not so many examples had been handed in, actually only one document with examples up to the summer of 2005, by Cristina Magliano.

§ 3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of last meeting were examined and approved.

§ 4. Specific problems

- a) Music materials. Can an expression be looked upon as an expression of another expression (or of a manifestation) rather than directly of a work, e.g. a recording of an opera which is played from a music score?

The problem was presented by Cristina. The need for one, or several, extra levels within the expression entity has been felt very strongly within the Italian cataloguing community.

The matter was discussed and several members of the working group proposed that instead of creating sub-levels of the entity, it should be dealt with as relations between different expressions of the same work. It is quite clear that there exist several types of expressions, e.g. one “representative expression” as in the example above. However the group preferred the expression entity definitions to stay in the way they are in order not to make the entity too complex, but would instead prefer the different relations between the types of expressions to be further looked into. They can so to speak form clusters. Barbara stressed that it is up to the local application to define how distinct one needs to be in defining the relations between the various types of the entity. Some systems might decide to come up with easy solutions, others with more complex ones, all depending on what needs the users of their respective systems have.

- b) Should an illustrated edition be looked upon as a new expression or is the illustrated edition a combination of the text work and several pictures which themselves are a different work/different works?

Ed pointed out that it is more rational to look upon the illustrations of an illustrated edition as a separate work, as a whole. The illustrated edition should be looked upon as an aggregate. Gunilla replied that the solution to this problem could actually be the same as in paragraph 4 a above. It all depends on the ambition of the system in use. Illustrations can be looked upon as separate works, but it is not always needed. If they are not they instead become an attribute of the manifestation. Pat added that it can never be concluded what solution is always the best, so the decision to take in individual cases can be hard.

The meeting finally agreed upon the fact that even in this case it is for the system developers to decide which solution is the most preferable, but the problem can in most cases be solved by expressing relations between the textual work and the illustrations.

- c) Collective works – Does a collective title imply a new work? Is there a difference between anthologies and other collective works?

The group agreed on the fact that anthologies are different from collections. In an anthology there is put in a lot more intellectual effort than in just a compilation. Maja insisted that the separate pieces that are collected in an anthology do not become part of the new work, but are in themselves distinct works on their own. Maja pointed out that it is not necessary to distinguish between levels of importance. What is important is whether or not we want to record the collection as a work. The systems should at least make it possible to register the collections as separate works, even if we might not always want to use that possibility.

It was stressed that editors often play an important role in a collection and therefore

should be access points in the system. In that sense we are again back to the issue of different kinds of relationships.

Patrick made a comparison with 16th and 17th century music in which many anonymous works are published with reference to the publisher [e.g., the tunes published in John Playford's *The English dancing master*, or the musical works printed by Pierre Attaignant]. There it must be possible to make an access point for the publisher. A fact that is also applicable for many books.

Gunilla finally stressed that Maja's solution was quite a practical one. The publisher/editor is the "glue" which holds the collection together. Records are needed for the collection as a whole as well as for the individual pieces, but just because they have been put together as a collection they don't necessarily form a new work. Mostly the relation between the separate work and the collection can be expressed through different relationship attributes.

This question will also be a question which the new Working Group on Aggregates will have to deal with.

d) Translations and the use of uniform titles.

Barbara made a report from the progress of the work within the Joint Steering Committee of the AACR2. Having received quite heavy criticism on the first draft the JSC decided to make not a revision, but a completely new code, named RDA, Resource Description and Access. There is not so much to be reported so far, but at next year's IME/ICC and at IFLA there will be more to say. Barbara also promised to forward relevant information from the JSC to the working group as soon as it is available. Within the area of uniform titles there are different ideas, but still no consensus. The main ideas focus on a uniform title being assigned to a work and then building further on that title for the expressions. However it is not certain that the new uniform title will be the primary access point. The JSC is also moving away from the "uniform title" term and instead prefers the term "citation title".

Pat Riva advised everyone to read an article by Jennifer Bowen with the title "FRBR: coming soon to your library?" in the January 2005 issue of *Library resources & technical services*. More can be read about the article at <http://hdl.handle.net/1802/1770>.

e) Hand press materials

Gunilla presented the problem which occurs when applying the FRBR model to hand press materials. According to the model, when applying it in its strict sense, even the slightest modification in a manifestation makes the expression above it a new expression; just an added comma should actually turn it to a manifestation of a new expression. It was stressed that this does not only apply to hand press materials, but also applies to much of the material that is published today. Even between new prints there very often exist smaller differences.

The proposal that Gunilla wanted to make was to add the phrasing "substantially the same" to the definition of the expression entity. The current definition assumes that all items that exemplify a given manifestation are identical, which is very often not the case. It was agreed that Anders, with the help of Patrick, Gunilla and the new chair of the FRBR Review Group, should write a proposal for a new definition of the entity and send it out to the members of the working group.

§ 5. Examples of different types of expression entities.

Elena Zagorskaya mentioned that she had gathered several examples and was going to send them to the working group as soon as she had prepared them with comments etc. Ed agreed to put up a sub-site for the Expression Working Group on the OCLC FRBR website, as an extension of the Dublin workshop. On that site the examples could be published. Judy Kuhagen pointed out that on that page it could be advisable to have FAQ's on the expression entity as well, in order to reassure colleagues who might be "afraid" of FRBR and the Expression entity, so that they can see that there are not just problems, but also solutions (the FAQ should contain a number of proposed situations, and answers as to how to best deal with them).

The members were urged to send in all there examples as soon as possible to the chair. Examples must be sent in no later than 31. December 2005.

§ 6. Schedule for the Working Group for 2005-2006.

The group agreed on the following deadlines:

31 October 2005: Last date for sending out the proposal for a revised definition of the expression entity to the group (Anders Cato with the assistance of Patrick Le Boeuf, Gunilla Jonsson + new chair of the FRBR Review Group). Also last date for preparing the FAQ's that should be put on the OCLC website (Anders Cato, Patrick Le Boeuf + new chair of the FRBR Review Group).

31 December 2005: Last date for sending in examples to be discussed by the working group during spring 2005.

Summer 2006: Draft report ready to be sent out to the group for final discussions during the meeting in Seoul.

It is important for the working group to stay in contact with the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR (RDA) and to have their minutes as soon as they are ready.

Patrick Le Bœuf promises once again to finish his planned article about how to FRBRise bibliographic records about publications associated with the name of Emily Dickinson.

Anders Cato
25. August, 2005