

## **Comments on the draft of FRAD**

From the national bibliographic agency, *The National Library of Sweden* together with *Svensk Biblioteksförenings kommitté för katalogisering* (The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee)

Anders Cato  
27. June 2007

### **General views**

All in all the difference between the old FRAR draft and this new FRAD draft are not that great. Many of the views brought forward in our last comments are still valid and we therefore include them as an addendum to this reply. The changes mainly apply to changed figures, examples and some clarifications.

The FRAD draft is a big step towards creating a functioning model of the authority universe. The way it looks today it is quite useful to the library and developers' communities, but of course some parts of it could be further looked into and developed, something that is also stressed in several of the chapters of the draft. However the model does not give us the feeling of such a huge breakthrough as FRBR was. It is more of a "facing of facts", a feeling that this is really the way things work; this is the way we handle authorities today. Of course it is useful to have a model describing that.

### **Specific comments for each part**

#### 5.3.1 Relationships between persons

Why are there no dates added to the variant forms? At least examples should be made with dates to avoid misunderstandings.

#### Parent/child relationship

Is this really "rarely expressed"? In European catalogues we often include "the younger", "the older" etc. and that must be seen as some kind of parent/child-relationship.

#### 5.3.6 Relationships between works. Whole/part relationship

Treaty of Amiens-example. Is the "Cataloguer's note" really a cataloguer's note? The text is taken directly from Encyclopedia Britannica. Shouldn't that note be called something else?

#### 4.1 Attributes of a person: Address

We find it problematic that the third sentence states that relevant www sites must be "operated by" the person. Is this not unnecessary specific? Could not www sites "about" or "related to" a person be of interest? Not many persons "operate" a private site

#### 5.4.1 Relationship between persons and names

##### Secular name relationship

The official form Merton, Thomas lacks dates which the authorized form in LC Authorities has. The year of death in the see reference is also wrong, should be 1968.

#### 5.3.5 Second example

At the end of p 37, should not the members of “Body B” all have oval heads? And the “Merged body” consist of members with both round and oval heads?

#### 5.4.2 Relationships between families and names

##### Alternative linguistic form relationship

The form in the example is not the autorised German form. In the German Authorities database the form given is Trapp <Familie, Salzburg>

Or does the example deliberately use a variant form?

#### Figure 1

We appreciate that FRAD in this second draft emphasizes the fundamental principle of the model (“Entities in the bibliographic universe are known by names and/or identifiers and those names and identifiers are used as the basis for constructing controlled access points”). The (new) figure 1 (p 4) is meant to illustrate this principle.

But we think that the single-headed arrows could lead to some confusion about this important figure. As stated on page 3 a single-headed arrow (according to diagramming conventions in ER-models) represents “a relationship in which any given instance of the entity at the opposite end of the line may be associated with only one instance of the entity to which the arrow is pointing”. We fully understand that figure 1 is something of a simplification of figure 2, but we do not think it is a good idea to replace the double-headed arrows with plural forms within the entity rectangels, especially as the figure comes right after the explanation of ER-diagram conventions.

NB In our earlier reply we have noted a similar problem with the entity “Rules” and single-headed/double-headed arrows. Here we also discuss some problems with making “name” a separate entity (as opposed to how it was treated in FRBR).

#### Figure 4 and 5

Would it be possible to merge these two figures and make them into an appendix or fold-out? It is difficult to grasp the figure as it stretches over two pages.

## Addendum:

Comments on the FRAR Draft 19 October 2005

### ***Svensk Biblioteksförnings kommitté för katalogisering (The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee)***

## **Reply to: World-Wide Review of Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR)**

The draft report, prepared by The Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR) is impressive. The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association has read it with great interest and has the following suggestions for minor changes that might increase its clarity.

### ***The entities***

#### *Name as a separate entity*

By making *name* an entity in its own right the FRAR report has made the attributes “*work/expression/manifestation title*” redundant and replaced them with the logic relation to *name*. A consequence of this is that the entity *item* also gets logically related to *name*. In the report “*item title*” is mentioned a couple of times. But could this not be problematic, and won't it lead to confusion on which entity level the term “title” should be used? Some *work/expression/manifestations* admittedly only do exist represented by one physical *item*. But even in these cases, would it be correct to refer to an “item title”?

We are also concerned about the logical entities *person/family/corporate body (p/f/cb)* and the entity *name*. It is not always obvious whether an attribute should pertain to the *p/f/cb* or the *name*. The attribute “Other designation associated with the person” (now an attribute of the *name* p. 18) is an example of this. In practice, is this not often used as an attribute of the *name*? And should there be need of this “other designation” to formulate the *access point*, the logical model lacks a direct link between *person* and *access point*. We note that “number” has been placed as a *name* attribute and feel that the splitting of these “other designations” between *person* and *name* can prove to be problematic in practice.

We think the definition of *name* (and perhaps also *identifier*) as a separate entity arise some problems and could merit further study.

#### *Rule/rules/set of rules?*

The entity *rules* is the only entity defined in plural. Why? And don't the study group really mean “set of rules”? In accordance with the plural form the model uses a single-headed arrow from *access point* to *rules*, which looks a bit odd. It seems to us that an *access point* can be governed not only by many *rules*, but also by many “set of rules” (for example an access point chosen in accordance with AACR2 and formulated in accordance with GARR).

### ***Relationships/attributes***

Perhaps the list of relationships for persons could be increased to encompass “Other types of relationships” (in analogy with relationships between corporate bodies)?

Though maybe seldom applicable in the library world we wonder if there in an authority file could not be use of a “History of item” attribute to the entity *item*, especially in archives and museums (for exemple where something is found, or if something has been part of a collection: this latter perhaps covered by the FRBR attribute “Provenance of the item”)?

## ***Formulation/wording***

### Definitions vs reservations

This draft points out the differences in cataloging rules and local practice, which leads to different criteria in defining the bibliographic entities. It is good that this is so clearly stated throughout the report, so as not to give a false impression of automatic interchangeability between authority files.

Our opinion is that the strength in both this and the FRBR model lies in the conceptual model rather than in its detailed definitions. In spite of this we feel that the FRAR model somewhat disarms itself with its frequent reservations regarding “cataloguing rules” and implementations of the model. Take for example the entity *person*. In section 6.3.1 (p 36) the report seems to state its opinion of how the entity should be perceived (at least in respect to pseudonymous relationships). Earlier on the report has been more unclear (p 11). The italicized comments doesn’t serve to enlighten, but further blur the clarity of the model (this also goes for the italicized parts under work/expression/manifestation/event etc.).

We think that the report should keep to defining what (for example) a *person* is and is not, and how the entity should be used in respect to other entities (*name*, *access point* etc.). The solution chosen in the FRBR report, where the entity definitions are settled, but with the reservation that local user need must guide the practical work, is better than the FRAR reports elaboration about consequences in implementations.

### Examples person – name

The examples under 6.41 (p 43) are somewhat confusing. The explanatory text talks about the logical relation *person – name*, but many of the the examples show the relation between the authorised heading (*access point*) and the *name*. Ditto 6.4.3 and 6.4.4. (Once again the problematic relationship *p/f/cb – access point* comes across.)

### Definition Date of the work

Regarding “Date of the work” (an attribute defined originally in the FRBR report; FRBR p. 33) we think the text (FRAR p. 21-22) wrongly equates “date of first publication/release” with this (admittedly rather abstract) date. It should be stated clearly that even if this “originally created” date seldom can be given, it is only in the absence of this “date of first publication or release” will be used.

### \*Other\* relationships

The headings for 6.4 should be “***Other*** relationships between Names and Persons, Families, Corporate Bodies, and Works”. Otherwise it is not clear enough that this is relationships beyond the ones depicted in the high-level diagrams (these are mentioned in 6.2, but not elaborated). Another solution is to let the high-level relations be part of the diagram in table 2 and not only in the compilation in table 3.

### Typo?

Regarding Figure 5: the “basis for”-arrow connecting *name/identifier* with *access point*: should this not be double-headed in both directions?

### ***All in all...***

We congratulate the study group to a thorough work and a clear presentation of it. Especially the entity definitions are easy to follow. We also note with appreciation that many of the implicit “sibling” relations (for example “Different rules relationship” where the same *person/family/corporate body* has many *access points*, made in accordance with different set of *rules*) are mentioned expressly in the report.