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**FORTH-ICS**

Iraklion – Crete

Discussion about LRM (issue 360)

## LRM

The meeting started with the presentation of LRM. Comments before or during the presentation were:

* We should clarify how formally envisage the relationship between FRBRoo and LRM.
* FRBR constructs are still valid to LRM
* Mapping between FRBRoo and LRM.
* A statement is needed from IFLA that the FRBRoo is still valid as document
* We have to check all the scope notes what part of FRBRoo is inconsistent with FRBRER
* We should check the PRESSoo with the changes
* FRBRoo version 3.0 : FRBRoo-LRMoo
* The mapping section will be drastically changed
* We will not change the numbering schema, we will keep the same codes for classes and properties.
* Open issue on CRM itself: The Appellation is identified by its own. This probably leads to inconsistencies
* Definition by Shannon : “the receiver and sender have an a priori common understanding of signs”
* The provenance is unknown, the identity assumptions are based on common provenance
* A basic confusion which is nice to solve is that a sequence of symbols is a message from a particular provenance

### F1 Work:

(a) to get rid of F14

(b) to revise the scope note of F15

The work is always explicit to expression and to make a statement that it isn’t stated if we encounter more than one expression of the same work

A work exist if exists at list one expression

### **R1 is logical successor of (has successor): F1 Work**

=> (it should be added a relation it is inspired by)

### R2 is derivative of (has derivative): F1 Work

=> (we should revise this since we don’t have the F14)

We should clarify since it might be recognizable pieces)

(R2.1 has type: E55 Type)

### R3 is realised in (realises): F22 Self-Contained Expression

=>(this is exactly the same)

### R40 has representative expression (is representative expression for): F22 Self-Contained Expression

* we should preserve in some form

### F2 Expression

[F23](#_F23_Expression_Fragment) Expression Fragment (we should revise the F23) to check the emails “what is the ontological notion of page” is it a fragment or is it a compliment of a self contained expression; is it a manifetastaion level concept

[F34](#_F34_KOS) KOS (just check )

[F35](#_F35_Nomen_Use) Nomen Use Statement (it was the presctive part)

[F43](#_F43_Identifier_Rule_1) Identifier Rule just check to see along with linked open data rules

### [~~R41~~](#_R41_has_representative_manifestatio) has representative manifestation product type (is representative manifestation product type for): [~~F3~~](#_F3_Manifestation_Product) Manifestation Product Type

* (it might be not needed)

### F3 Manifestation Product Type => Manifestation

It seems to be identical with the manifestation in LRM, we should include something about manifestation singleton as in LRM

Whatever manuscript we have there is a manifestation. If we consider production planning we may have problem.

In LRM manifestation is a publication expression

### F4 Manifestation Singleton (deleted)

We may get rid of this

### ~~R42~~ => deleted

### F5 Item

We may distinguish items that are compatible with the manistation and items that are not. In that case would a subclass E22 Man-made Object, the text should be revised

### ~~F6 Concept~~ => deprecated

We deprecate

### ~~F7 Object~~=> deprecated

It is deprecated to physical thing

### ~~F8 Event~~=> deprecated

E52 Time –span should be introduced to FRBRoo

### F9 Place

in LRM is E53 Place. E53 place is more than that in LRM. It is not clear in CRM. It becomes clearer if we associate with space –time volumes. We should revise the place concept and to distinguish with what GIS calls “features” in order to relate to geometric extent

When we consider place names as authority data then they are inconsistent with the above comment. When we refer to a city and we make the restriction to administrative area then this definition is unambiguous with place names as they referred in gazetteers. The city limits at medieval times are clear.

F9 Place should be revised

### F10 Person

We need to introduce to FRBR the entity E39 actor which might be identical with agent (LRM agent = E39 Actor)

### F11 Corporate Body = LRM: Collective agents

F11 label should be changed to collective agent (replace scope note with LRM scope and get rid of corporate body)

### F12 Nomen

To review the scope note. The F12 Nomen are not exactly the LRM-E9 Nomen

It is decided to harmonize CIDOC CRM with LRM concept of identity of Nomen

### F13 identifier

F13 identifier in LRM does not pertain identifiers. In LRM “has appellation” shows to a relationship

It can only compare with CRM PC. We should think to Nomen as a reification

### F14 Individual Work

We have to consider to which degree express the expression creation

### F16 Container Work

To make aggregation Work distinct from container work

### F19 Publication Work

It is an aggregation work.

### F20 Performance Work

The sig questioned that a performance work is a container work and need it incorporate other works?

Recording Work is modelled redundantly, it is a recording work because it is recorded.

it’s only property is R13 which relates it to its special type of event

is the perfomance itself an expression creation?

The expression creation could be generalized to externalization of signs (not the particular case of writing which necessarily leaves traces)

It is decided to be reviewed if this is a container work?

### F21 Recording Work

It is redundant but not the recording

### F24 Publication Expression => manifestation

Publication expression has properties inconsistent with the scope note because the scope note says that this is the moment of distribtion but the property says that only the publication expression is created. But this is a step before actually ‘making available’ a publication expression.

Keep , to be merged with F3 and call it manifestation

### F25 Performance Plan

Is the traces of the expression, it is outside of the core but it is used, to be revised to see the performance as an expression creation, we could simplify the performance model

### F30 Publication Event

To be considered if we keep, if we keep revision is needed

Note Pat: we do not have something exclusive to distribution

### F31 Performance

To be revised along with performance plan

### F32 Carrier Production Event

[R26](#_R26_produced_things) produced things of type (was produced by): [F3](#_F3_Manifestation_Product) Manifestation Product Type to be merged with R27

### F33 Reproduction Event

[R29](#_R29_reproduced_(was) reproduced (was reproduced by): [E84](#_E84_Information_Carrier_) Information Carrier-> the range should be F54

[R30](#_R30_produced_(was) produced (was produced by): [E84](#_E84_Information_Carrier_) Information Carrier the range should be F54

### F34 KOS

Update the scope note for continuously updated (to consider the Parthenos volitate content). The volaitet data set takes are identified from the plan

### F35 Nomen Use Statement

= it is a relationship as it occurs in authority document. The fact that a nomen appears in KOS is a statement

### F38 Character

We keep it is not part of FrBRoo core

### F39 Family

We keep

### F40 Identifier Assignment

review

### F41 Representative Manifestation Assignment

To keep out

### F42 Representative Expression Assignment

To be revised

### F44 Bibliographic Agency

Deprecated

### F50 Controlled Access Point

out

### F53 Material Copy

out

### F54 Utilised Information Carrier

We should deprecate E84 information carrier in CRM since it is a class without properties while F54 is nice and to be isA E24 Physical Man-made Thing

E84 will be replaced with F54 everywhere

### E52 Time span (+)

should be introduced in FRBRoo

where should time validity staement go? F35 or the KOS?

The KOS no longer has versions. It is not present library practice.

decision: the validity period is still okay and should stay on KOS. It is more granular than some documentation practice.

Chryssoula should put in TELOS the new version 3.0 of FRBRoo