IFLA Cataloguing Section's ISBD Review Group
ISBD/XML Study Group
http://www.ifla.org/en/node/1795

Ad hoc meeting
4 November 2011, Edinburgh, UK

Minutes

Present: Gordon Dunsire (consultant), Elena Escolano Rodríguez, Françoise Leresche (Chair), Mirna Willer (member & ISBD RG chair)

Agenda

1. Proposal for a new project and financial status

    F. Leresche reported on the project proposal for the 2012. It was agreed that the priority in 2012 should be securing a statement of understanding between the MMA (Metadata Management Associates) who are responsible for OMR (Open Metadata Registry) and IFLA, and the guidance on the use of OMR for bibliographic standards, and ISBD in particular. It was also agreed to use the rest of the 2011 budget on the MMA work on the Development and implementation of a dereferencing service for the ISBD, since IFLA has not made available such a service yet.

2. Actions according to the work plan for 2012:
    a. Translation of ISBD and OMR: Area 0 can be considered a priority. It is necessary to develop the guidelines for translators [Action: E. Escolano will compile preliminary text based on the experience with Spanish translation], and to upgrade the OMR to a secure environment [Action: G. Dunsire to coordinate]; when the appropriate tools are ready ISBD RG should promote and coordinate translations [Action: ISBD RG chair]
    b. Applications of ISBD/RDF: G. Dunsire reported that the DC Application Profile is still under development by DCMI, with ISBD used as a case study; testing of creating instance data in ISBD/RDF in National Library of Spain show particular issues that have to be described and exemplified in Guidelines for use of ISBD as Linked Data planned by ISBD RG for 2012.
    c. ISBD consolidated ed.: G. Dunsire noted that the term "statement" in the ISBD is ambiguous: in OMR the meaning is "aggregated elements", while in ISBD "the information from the source" (e.g., parallel title and parallel statement of responsibility). Itis necessary for the ISBD RG to review the current labels and definitions in OMR, while ISBD/XML SG reports on any requirement for ISBD change coming from the work on the application profile. [Action: urgent]
    d. Collaboration with JSC on the development of a representation of the RDA/Onix Framework in RDF: G. Dunsire reported that he will work on this issue within JSC. If the RDA/Onix Working group is reconstituted by JSC, ISBD/XML SG should also be represented [Action: G.Dunsire to inform and liaise]. In the meanwhile, ISBD RG will prepare a final version of the mapping between ISBD Area 0 and the RDA/Onix Framework. G. Dunsire will update the existing mapping according to the decisions made at the ISBD RG meeting in Madrid and prepare a document to be sent for approval to the ISBD RG in January 2012, with comments by the ISBD RG due 4

weeks later. The goal is to be able to implement the validated mapping in March 2012, using the OMR if the appropriate developments have been made, or otherwise as an RDF file.

e. <u>Liaison 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</u>: G Dunsire reported that the DCMI Bibliographic Metadata Group will be created in November 2011, with Diane Hillman and G. Dunsire as co-chairs but has already begun to work. G. Dunsire made an informal presentation at the DCMI Conference in The Hague in September 2011 on certain issues raised by ISBD. DCMI agreed to work with ISBD on the two actions in the ISBBD/XML work plan.

f. <u>Liaison with appropriate groups on translation issues</u>: When the OMR is upgraded to provide secure maintenance of translations of namespaces, produce Guidance on the use of OMR for translations that could be used by other IFLA working groups [Action : G. Dunsire, by the end of March]. See also point a) Translation of ISBD and OMR.

g. <u>UNIMARC representation in RDF and mappings between the ISBD and UNIMARC namespaces</u>: Continue to monitor and liaise with the Permanent UNIMARC Committee [Action: G. Dunsire and F. Leresche], especially on the choice of method. Also monitor the MARC 21representation in RDF and other relevant MARC21 developments [Action: G. Dunsire]. From March 2012, if the project of the development of UNIMARC representation in RDF is accepted by IFLA, prepare the preliminary working documents in order to discuss them with the PUC during the IFLA Conference in Helsinki and consider the need of reinforcing the taskforce of the ISBD/XML SG in such case.

h. <u>Mappings between the ISBD and FRBR namespaces</u>: A coordination of the different parties concerned by the evolution of the FRBR model (ISBD, ISSN, RDA) is necessary; a meeting should be set up by the FRBR RG. The ISBD/XML SG should continue to monitor and liaise with the FRBR RG [Action: G. Dunsire, E. Escolano and F. Leresche]. The mapping itself between the ISBD and FRBR namespaces depends on the results of the ISBD RG work on RDA Appendix D and the RDA application profile for national bibliographic agencies [to be validated by the ISBD RG at the next IFLA Conference , August 2012].

3. Other activities on the work plan are ongoing.

Respectfully submitted by Françoise Leresche
ISBD/XML Study Group, Chair

January 2012