



**IFLA Cataloguing Section's ISBD Review Group &
ISBD/XML Study Group with Namespaces Task Group**
<http://www.ifla.org/en/isbd-rg>

Ad hoc meeting
17, 18 and 21 June 2012, Zadar, Croatia

Minutes

Present: Gordon Dunsire, Namespaces Task Group chair & consultant to ISBD/XML Study Group and ISBD Review Group; Françoise Leresche, ISBD/XML Study Group chair & ISBD RG member, and Mirna Willer, ISBD Review Group chair & ISBD/XML Study Group member

Agenda: Review of the state of art of the ISBD Review Group and ISBD/XML Study Group's activities.

- I. Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA with IFLA ISBD Review Group and ISSN Network Harmonization Meeting, 3-4 November 2011, Glasgow, UK: Outcomes¹
 - a. Action 24: *Alignment of the ISBD: International Standard Bibliographic Description element set with RDA: Resource Description & Access element set*: the version that was sent to the ISBD RG and DCMI Bibliographic Metadata Task Group for comments was further discussed and finalised as Version 1. This version has been issued in the form of two documents: a working document with reference to ISBD namespaces and working comments, and the high-level alignment document to be published by ISBD RG and sent to JSC for Development of RDA. Deadline for sending version 1 to the ISBD RG for approval at its IFLA meeting in Helsinki and to the JSC is 1 August 2012. This version will be sent also to the DCMI Bibliographic Metadata Task Group.
 - b. Action 23: RDA/ONIX Framework (ROF) & ISBD/RDA mapping to the ROF: *Mapping of ISBD area 0 vocabularies to RDA/ONIX Framework vocabularies, version 1.0, 4 April 2012* has been approved by the ISBD RG; it was acknowledged that further work on mapping depends on the publication of the RDA/ONIX Framework (ROF) namespaces, as well as on JSC's mapping of RDA to ROF.
- II. ISBD/XML Study Group activities:
 - a. Guidelines for translations of RDF representations of ISBD: the work on these guidelines has been extended to include guidelines for other IFLA standards as *Translations of RDF representations of IFLA standards, version 1.0, 9 April 2012*. This version was sent to the ISBD RG and DCMI Vocabulary Management Community Task Group for comments. No comments that would change the text were received by the time of the ad hoc meeting. It was decided, however, that this document should be passed on to the Namespaces Technical Group for maintenance due to the fact that it is a general document dealing with all IFLA namespaces, including ISBD as well as the FR-family of models, with the intention of its extension to UNIMARC formats. The need to develop a specialized translation guideline for ISBD as part of the *Guidelines for use of ISBD as Linked Data* still seems to be needed. However, as the funds for its development were declined, no further action was envisaged for 2012.

¹ http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/isbdrg/JSC_ISBD_ISSN_Outcomesfinal.pdf

- b. ISBD Application Profile: the work is stalled due to further development of the DCMI AP that is still in progress; Singapore Framework for DCAP² should be also consulted.
 - c. ISBD/XML Study Group should consider a change of its name and renewal of its membership; the decision can depend on further development related to bibliographic standards bodies in the context of the Semantic Web – discussion is expected to start within Standards Committee meeting in Helsinki.
- III. Other issues (to be dealt with in 2013)
- a. ISBD/RDA mapping: the problem of defining the relationship between the classes Resource (ISBD) and WEMI (RDA) has been recognized as crucial for further work on alignments and mapping between the two standards; clarification is needed even more so as this is a general issue to be resolved with respect to ISBD mappings to FRBR and other standards/models, as well as future revision of the ISBD.
 - b. ISBD unconstrained namespaces need to be published: discussion for approval to be held at the ISBD RG and Namespaces Technical Group meetings in Helsinki; for further work on the ISBD/RDA and RDA/ISBD interoperability, RDA unconstrained namespaces should be published too.
 - c. Glasgow Outcomes, Action 24: no work was done on the RDA to ISBD alignment due to the lack of funding for the project; this issue should be discussed at the ISBD RG meeting in Helsinki, and with the JSC chair to decide which group is prepared to do this mapping. The mapping is, however, important because it informs back on the ISBD to RDA alignment.
 - d. National Bibliographic Agency Application Profile, Glasgow Outcome 6: face-to-face meeting is required for the progress of the work.
 - e. Aggregate statements, such as Area 5 & granularity of notes: the need to refine and break down the elements to more primitive and granular units was recognized, and some kind of generalization is needed in line with defined functional requirements for the ISBD standard.
 - f. ISBD elements and rules: it was recognized that the standard text does not clearly separate the elements from the rules, or specify their definitions; that should be considered in the review of the ISBD as it is a requirement for publishing ISBD in RDF, and the use of the ISBD as a Semantic Web content standard.
 - g. The relationship between the ISBD RG and Permanent UNIMARC Committee related to representing UNIMARC formats in RDF, as well as the relationship between ISBD and UNIMARC/Bibliographic format were discussed and should be clarified and developed as a matter of urgency.

Respectfully submitted by Mirna Willer, University of Zadar, Croatia
ISBD Review Group, Chair

30 July 2012

² <http://dublincore.org/documents/singapore-framework/>