

World-wide review of version 2.2 of FRBRoo

Response from the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on version 2.2 of FRBRoo.

In general, the JSC finds the FRBRoo model to be an elegant, well thought-out extension to the CIDOC CRM model which will support the description of and access to bibliographic and related resources. This represents a significant development of the FRBRer models on which RDA is based, and the JSC expects that version 2.2 of FRBRoo will be a useful tool for the future development of RDA.

The JSC has a number of specific comments on the text:

The figures have their local folder path as a "tool tip" which appears when the mouse hovers over the figure. This is distracting and should be removed if possible (a PDF artefact?).

The "comments" lists after some figures have inconsistent layouts, using dashes or indents to delineate individual items.

The arrows indicating "sub-class" links in the figures use inconsistent graphics, some solid black, some hatched.

p.18, section 1.3, 2nd paragraph: The meaning of "KOS" is not explained. The only place in FRBRoo where it is defined is in the scope note of F34. We think this should be defined here, at its first use.

p.19, section 1.3, final paragraph: The use of the Latin plural "themata" is less reader-friendly than "themas" and we suggest the English form of plural is used instead. The plural form appears only one other time in the text, on p.131.

p.20, section 2.1.1, comment e): The latter relationship "F1 Work R2.1 has type E55 Type [of derivation]" is missing from Figure 6.

p.21, section 2.1.1, comment h), fourth bullet : The relationship "F19 Publication Work R3 is realised in F24 Publication expression" is missing from Figure 6.

p.23, section 2.1.3, "Editorial product", first bullet: The reference should be to Figure 5 (not Figure 2)?

p.23, section 2.1.3, "Editorial product", second bullet: The relationship is in this figure, but without the P165 label.

p.27, 2.1.7.: "Works realised using the photographic medium are particular, in that their essence mostly resides ..." - words missing after "particular"?

p.30, section 2.5: second paragraph, fifth bullet says: "Classes that appear in more than one position in the class hierarchy as a result of multiple inheritance are shown in an italic typeface." However, the first occurrences are not shown in italics. Shouldn't italics be applied for every occurrence?

p.33-36, section 2.5.2: Different fonts and font sizes seem to have been used, with no explanation. They appear to represent the different sources of the classes (FRBR vs. CIDOC CRM), but because the numbering is different and the FRBR classes are in bold, it does not seem to be necessary to also use multiple fonts and sizes. The overall effect is distracting.

p.37, section 2.5.3: It is a bit confusing that the same label (without the numbering) is used for different properties. We note that the FRBRoo namespace labels are disambiguated, and suggest using similar labels in the FRBRoo text would be clearer.

p.40-42, section 2.5.4: As with section 2.5.2, the use of multiple fonts and font sizes is distracting.

p.43, sixth bullet: This explains that the "Examples" section contains "a bulleted list", but the actual examples listed are not bulleted. (They are bulleted in section 4.3, however.)

p.49, F9 Place: The reasons why this is scoped "in particular on the surface of the earth", and the relationship with E27 Site, are unclear.

p.50, F12 Nomen, first "Murders in the rue Morgue" example: "(to put the image of the formula)" should be deleted?.

p.51, F13 Identifier: The "Rite of spring example" has no explanation of what rules are used to formulate the Nomen. Note that, as of April 2015, this example does not conform to RDA; the rules for the example are AACR2.

p.52, F15 Complex Work, 3rd paragraph of the scope note: "Thus, derivations such as translations are regarded as belonging to the same Complex Work, even though in addition they constitute an Individual Work themselves." We find this confusing, as the model generally treats translations as Expressions.

p.52, F16 Container Work: The scope note includes "instrumentation to music scores". The act of "arrangement" with respect to music may result in an alteration to an existing work, or even a new work. The scope note should make it clear that use of this Class is restricted to instrumentation that does not alter the score, or perhaps the example should be removed or replaced.

p.56, F22 Self-Contained Expression: Would an example for musical sketches be useful? Perhaps OCLC #78680701 could be used as the basis for an example:

100 1 Schoenberg, Arnold, †d 1874-1951.  
240 10 Quartets, †m strings †n (1926 Mar.) †k (Sketches)  
245 00 [Sketches and rows for a fragment of a string quartet / †c by Arnold Schoenberg].  
260 †c [1926].  
300 2 leaves of ms. music ; †c 25.8 x 34.7 cm.  
500 Holograph sketches and rows.  
500 The sketches are written in black ink on paper with 15 printed staves. None of the sketches are to be found in the 1st draft.

p.64, F40 Identifier Assignment: Here, and elsewhere in FRBRoo, the term "uniform title" is used without a definition. There are brief explanations of "uniform" title and heading in FRBRer. Is this terminology to be retained in the consolidated FR model? The Goethe example says that an "author-title heading" is a uniform title; is this correct? The relationships between "controlled access point", "uniform title", "author-title heading", etc. are unclear; cf R8 consists of (forms part of).

p.67, F50 Controlled Access Point: The spacing artefacts arising from right-justification of the examples are particularly bad, and very distracting. It might be better to avoid using justification in any of the examples; there are distracting instances in other sections.

p.69, fifth bullet: Indicates the use of the phrase "Is covered by shortcut" in the following text. However, the phrase is used only once, although shortcuts are noted in several scope statements. It would be better to put all shortcut references in separate, labelled sections. Also, the terminology is inconsistent in the text as a whole: "shortcut" in the main, but also "short cut" and "short-cut". See also comment for p.94.

p.69, tenth bullet: refers to examples in bulleted lists, but bullets are not used in the examples lists.

p.92, R52 used rule (was the rule used in): It seems strange to refer to AACR2 examples (here and elsewhere in the text), but to have no RDA examples, especially given the relationship between RDA and FRBR. For this property, the last example (currently a second AACR2 example) could be changed to:

Assigning the controlled access point 'Guillaume, de Machaut, approximately 1300-1377' (F40)  
R52 used rule RDA 9.19 (F43)

p.94, R57 is based on (is basis for): This property, and several on p.95, uses the phrase "Shortcut of" instead of "Is covered by shortcut" as indicated on p.69.

p.98: CLP2 should have type (should be type of): This has a heading for "Subproperty of", but with no content. We assume that content should be added, or this line removed.

p.103-121, Section 3.3: Entries in the Mapping column containing F50 Controlled Access Point sometimes have a Condition "used as part of an identifier", and sometimes not. This seems to be inconsistent.

p.104, entries for 4.2.5: The Condition includes the Mapping; this is inconsistent with other Conditions.

p.104, first entry for 4.2.8: The Mapping should be F1 Work P2 has type E55 Type {Medium of performance}?

p.106, entry for 4.3.17: The convention of using "N ..." at the end of a E55 Type mapping is not explained, here or elsewhere (see p.115 for more examples).

p.106, first entry for 4.3.20: The Mapping should be "F2 Expression P2 has type E55 Type {Presentation technique}"?

p.106, entry for 4.3.21: The mapping should be "F2 Expression P2 has type E55Type {Representation of relief}"?

p.122, entry for 5.3.1.2: "SKOS" is not defined anywhere in FRBROO.

p.122, entry for 4.2.2.: The Comment includes symbols that are not explained anywhere, and the box character also indicates an encoding problem. Logic symbols also appear elsewhere, for example p.130 entry for 3.4.

p.123-142: Variations in font size, and the arbitrary splitting of words, without hyphenation, over two lines is distracting.

p.125, entry for Person: Profession/occupation: The Mapping text has an extraneous blank line between the two items.

p.126, first and second entries: The Mapping refers to "as above". This is ambiguous, and would be improved by a specific reference to the Pseudonymous relationship".

p.128: Contains an extraneous blank row.

p.130, entry for Work: Place of origin of the work: The Comment that the Place of origin of a cinematographic work is tied to the place of citizenship of the producer seems inappropriate. Such a work does not have a single creator, so why is producer singled out? The FRAD definition "The country or other territorial jurisdiction or cultural area from which the work originated" does not seem to justify this: the Work may "originate" in the mind of the film director or producer, for example.

p.133, entry for 4.13: The Comment uses the acronym CAP, but the expansion is not given here or anywhere else in the text. CAP is then used frequently in subsequent entries.

p.133, last entry: The Comment seems to be missing text following the word "Includes". The final part of the Comment on the following page seems to be an editorial note.

p.135, last two entries, and following: There are vertical alignment problems which can be very confusing.

p.145-146: Again, variations in font and font size are distracting, and appear to be redundant when bold is used to make distinctions.

p.155, E24 Physical Man-Made Thing: Some text is grayed-out. It seems to indicate that FRBROO does not contain this definition, which comes from CIDOC CRM, but this is not explained.

p.173, E77 Persistent Item, third paragraph of scope note: There is a stray dash before the semicolon on the first line.

p.174, E84 Information Carrier: There is a Properties section but nothing is listed.

p.198, Bibliography: The first three citations are out of alphabetic sequence with the others. Is there a reason why these are cited first?

p.209: There is yellow highlighting on this page.

The JSC hopes that IFLA and the FRBR Review Group will find these comments helpful.

Gordon Dunsire  
Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
19 April 2015