Report

Present:

Mirna Willer (Chair) (MW)
Boris Bosancic (BB)
Gordon Dunsire (GD)

Update from GD:

GD reported on discussions which took place at meetings of the W3C LLDXG in Pittsburgh on 22-24 October (http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/isbdrg/lldxg-meeting_201010.pdf).

GD's presentation to the RDA workshop included some diagrams which relate the ISBD RDF property labelled "has extent" to its equivalents in FRBR, RDA, Dublin Core, and the Bibliographic Ontology (http://www.slideshare.net/smartbroad/dcmirda-task-group-report-dc2010-pittsburgh - last two slides). This preliminary work has exposed some of the similarities and differences between ISBD and other bibliographic models represented in RDF, and their impact on interoperability of instance metadata derived from corresponding catalogue records.

Progress on development of a Dublin Core Application Profile (DC AP):

A draft of the ISBD element set has been developed and relevant amendments and additions made to the Registry to ensure that all elements have assigned URIs. All properties have the domain Resource and no range. The draft was sent to the ISBD Review Group for further discussion.

As well as the aggregated elements constituting the ISBD areas, a number of aggregated elements within areas have been identified; that is, at least two levels of element aggregation occur within ISBD. Syntax Encoding Schemes (SES) for each aggregated element have been represented in the Registry as sub-classes of a generic ISBD SES, itself a sub-class of the RDF class Datatype. Each SES has an assigned URI. There are currently 23 schemes in the ISBD namespace.

Each aggregated element is given its own description template in the Description Set Profile in the AP. Each description template contains a statement template for each component element of the aggregation and a nested description template for each sub-aggregation, if any. The description template for the lowest level of aggregation therefore contains only statement templates for its components.

BB reported on his work on the AP. He has completed construction of the AP table as a guide to what values are to be entered in the Description Set Profile templates, and produced completed description and statement templates for ISBD Area 1.

The meeting agreed that BB should add the remaining ISBD areas to produce a first draft of the AP by mid-December 2010. The first draft would then be circulated to the full Study Group and ISBD Review Group for comment by mid-February 2011.

Action: BB to complete first draft of the AP; MW to circulate the draft to the ISBD/XML SG and ISBD Review Group.

Mandatory status of title proper

The ISBD Review Group has pointed out that the title proper element might not be strictly mandatory because ISBD allowed for a substitute for the element in specific circumstances associated with resources which are supplements or parts of another resource, including series and multipart monographs. In such cases an aggregation of common title, dependent title designation, and dependent title should be used. Aggregated elements labelled "has title proper (compound)", "has title proper (compound) of multipart monograph", and "has title proper (compound) of series" were therefore added to the Registry and assigned URIs.

BB pointed out that the mandatory status of the component elements within these aggregations seem to be ambiguous in ISBD. The meeting agreed to refer the issue to the ISBD Review Group for resolution.

Action: MW to refer the issue of the ambiguity of the component elements of the aggregated element "has title proper (compound)" to the ISBD Review Group.

The meeting discussed whether the elements labelled "has title proper" and "has title proper (compound)" were equivalent or had a hierarchical relationship, and how the substitution of "title proper" with "title proper (compound)" could be indicated in the AP.

GD pointed out that if "has title proper (compound)" was declared a sub-property of "has title proper" in the Registry, then any instance triple using the "has title proper (compound)" property would generate an inferred triple based on the "has title proper" property, and that this might be solution to the problem. GD will investigate this further.

GD is still investigating how to model "mandatory if applicable" elements in the AP. One solution might be to create a separate Description Set Profile for each type of Resource.

BB asked if the AP should include the sequencing and punctuation patterns for each SES. GD thought that this would properly belong in the Registry.

Action: GD to further investigate the appropriate approach for SES patterns.

ISBD element table:

MW reported on progress by the ISBD Review Group to produce a definitive list of ISBD elements.

The list also includes aggregated elements (such as the ISBD Areas) and "super-elements" under which sub-elements can be gathered (e.g. types of title).

The RG list was compared with the list of elements being used by BB. A number of discrepancies were noted.

Action: MW will contact ISBD RG; GD will investigate further, make any necessary changes to the Registry, and advise BB of required changes to the draft AP.

Journal article:

MW, GD, and BB submitted an invited article on "ISBD and the Semantic Web" to JLIS.it, the Italian Journal of Library and Information Science (http://leo.cilea.it/index.php/jlis/). The article has been accepted and is expected to be published in December 2010.

The article covers the work of the ISBD/XML SG up to October 2010.

Next meeting:

The group will next meet in Edinburgh, probably on 24 or 25 February 2011.

The main topics for discussion will be the final draft version of the AP and any feedback from the process of approval of the final consolidated edition of ISBD by IFLA's Cataloguing Section.

Action: GD will contact the National Library of Scotland and the Cataloguing and Indexing Group in Scotland to see if a meeting room is available and to invite observers.

Gordon Dunsire
1 Dec 2010