

APPENDIX B. RELATIONSHIP OF FRSAD WITH FRBR AND FRAD

Two models, FRAD (by FRANAR Working Group) and FRSAD (by FRSAR Working Group), complement and further develop some aspects of the original model of FRBR. The three models together have been labelled the ‘FRBR family’, suggesting that they are all considered parts of a larger general model. There exist some differences among them, though; the respective FRBR, FRANAR and FRSAR working groups have made different modelling decisions during their independent model development. Eventually FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD will have to be harmonised and a resultant new consolidated model will be developed. In order to facilitate this process the FRSAR Working Group takes this opportunity to list the most important differences below.

B.1 Relationship of FRSAD with FRBR

The FRSAR Working Group follows FRBR in the methodology, specification, and presentation of entities and relationships. The “has as subject” (many-to-many) relationship, established between the *work* and the entity(ies) representing the aboutness of the *work*, is kept in its entirety in FRSAD. As in FRBR, the FRSAD model also starts with a user tasks analysis and follows with the establishment of appropriate entities and relationships. The four areas where some differences were introduced in FRSAD are:

- The addition of the “Explore” task;
- *Thema* is introduced as a superclass of all entities that can be subjects of a *work*. Attributes and relationships of *thema* are presented;
- No entities are explicitly predefined in Group 3;
- *Nomen* is introduced (including attributes and relationships) and is defined as a separate entity instead of an attribute.

The inclusion of the “explore” task is based on the findings of the user study conducted by the FRSAR Working Group. Users of subject authority data also use these data to explore a domain, to get acquainted with the terminology, and to identify semantic relationships. The FRSAR Working Group is confident that the same is true for bibliographic information in general, and recommends that the ‘explore’ task be added to the general model.

In Fig. 3.3 of the FRBR report, the depicted “subject” relationship has three boxes representing all three groups of entities respectively, on the right side of the ‘has as subject’ relationship. FRSAD has developed this further by creating a superclass (*thema*), thus enabling the modelling of the "has as subject" relationship on a more general level. *Thema* includes Group 1, Group 2 and all other entities that can be the subjects of a *work*. Therefore, the subject relationship can easily be modelled as "*work* has as subject *thema*."

FRBR defines four entities in Group 3: *concept*, *object*, *event*, and *place*. The FRSAR Working Group, based on the pilot user study, literature review, and independent analysis, decided to avoid any predefined subclasses. There seems to be no universal categorisation of *themas* and any attempt to declare one would necessarily limit the usability of a general model. Each particular implementation will need to define the categories or types of *themas*. The original FRBR Group 3 entities are, therefore, only one possible scenario. (Please refer to Section 4.1.1.)

FRSAD introduces a differentiation between a thing itself and its appellation. The appellation (name, label, etc.) is often modelled as an attribute of the entity it refers to (also in FRBR). While simpler, this approach makes it impossible to introduce the attributes (e.g. language) and relationships (e.g. the relationship between a former and current name) of the appellation itself, because in an E-R model one may not have attributes of an attribute. *Nomen* is therefore introduced in FRSAD as an entity, rather than an attribute, to enable appropriate modelling.

B.2 Relationship of FRSAD with FRAD

The FRANAR Working Group was established in 1999 with the mandate of developing FRBR further in the area of authority files. Later the decision was made by FRANAR to focus on Group 2 entities and *work* only. As a consequence, the FRSAR Working Group was established to cover the ‘has as subject’ relationship and the appropriate entities. The FRAD and FRSAD models were therefore developed independently. The working groups, although both following FRBR and its modelling approach, have made several different decisions. The most significant ones are:

- User tasks: “Contextualise” and “Justify” in FRAD vs. “Explore” in FRSAD;
- *Name* in FRAD vs. *Nomen* in FRSAD;
- *Name*, *Identifier* and *Controlled access point* as separate entities in FRAD vs. values of the attribute “Type of *Nomen*” in FRSAD;
- *Rules* and *Agency* as new entities in FRAD and not explicitly modelled in FRSAD.

B.2.1 User tasks

The Working Group believes that “explore” is a generalisation of “contextualise” and expresses better the user task of browsing, getting acquainted, becoming familiar with, and discovering.

“Justify,” on the other hand, is a task of information professionals and not end-users. It is an important task on its own, but falls within metadata creation and not metadata use. Since FRSAD follows the FRBR approach that has not extended its model to cover such tasks, it is not included in the FRSAD model.

B.2.2 Name and Nomen

Although similar at first glance, the two entities are different: FRAD *name* is defined as “a character or group of words and/or characters by which an entity is known in the real

world”. The FRSAD *nomen* is a more general entity, comprising any (textual or other) appellation both in the real world and in artificial systems. In relation to FRAD, *nomen* is a superclass of FRAD *name*, *identifier* and *controlled access point*.

B.2.3 Separate appellation entities in FRAD vs. *nomen* entity and “type” attribute in FRSAD

Nomen is the general appellation entity in FRSAD with specific types. This allows the introduction of any type that will be necessary for an implementation. In addition, some possible general values of the attribute “type” are already suggested, such as “identifier”. FRAD “name,” “identifier” and “controlled access point” are therefore possible types of *nomens*. This approach allows flexibility; even particular kinds of identifiers (URI, ISBN, etc.) can be defined as values of “type” of a *nomen*.

B.2.4 *Rules and Agency*

Rules and *agency* are not specifically modelled in FRSAD. The position of the Working Group is that the focus of the model is not on the cataloguing process and it is not necessary to include that level of detail. If needed, *rules* (which are applied in all phases of cataloguing, not only in creation of controlled access points) should be considered instances of *work*. *Agencies*, which apply the rules, should be considered instances of *corporate body*. If modelled, they are in a relationship with the attribute assignment event.