**Committee on Standards
FRBR Review Group**

Meetings Report

**Wroclaw, Poland**

Attendance: see Appendix A

Regrets: Agnese Galeffi, Ben Gu, Patrick Le Boeuf, Tanja Merčun

**Business Meeting 1**

**Tuesday, 22 August 2017**

**+**

**Business Meeting 2**

**Wednesday, 23 August 2017**

Explanatory notes:

[ ] indicates that the information supplied was not part of the record of the meetings.

The meeting notes are in the order according to the agenda, even though at the meetings we moved agenda items to accommodate availability of liaisons to give their reports.

1. Welcome and announcements

IFLA LRM was endorsed by the Professional Committee at their meeting on August 18th. IFLA LRM is an official IFLA standard.

2) Approval of agenda

 Additions to the distributed agenda

 6.2) Other liaisons

 9.4) Extensions of FRBROO

14 ) Doremus update , RDA all day event in Kuala Lumpur, 2018

 Approved with changes

3) Minutes of 2016 business meeting

3.1) Approval

 Approved as circulated.

 3.2) Business arising

 Already specifically included in the agenda

4) Membership

Outgoing members were thanked for their years of service and valuable contributions: Maria Violeta Bertolini, Gordon Dunsire, Patrick Le Boeuf, and Anke Meyer.

This year, for the first time, membership for the Review Groups was decided by the Committee on Standards in consultation with the Chairs of the Review Groups. The meeting was to take place after the CoS business meeting. However, CoS changed the time for the consultation at the last moment so the Chair of the FRBR RG was not present because she had to be present at her Standing Committee business meeting. Luckily, the Chair’s delegate for the CoS business meeting was present and able to participate in the FRBR RG membership decisions. CoS promised to regularize the election procedure well in advance of the next round of elections.

There were twelve nominations. CoS decided to approve twelve members for the FRBR RG, but with four continuing members, this still required choosing eight names from the twelve nominees.

Elected members for 2017-2021

 Second term: **Tanja Merčun** (Slovenia)

Chris Oliver (Canada)

Athena Salaba (USA)

 First term: Matthew Beacom (USA)

Anita Goldberga (Latvia)

 Mélanie Roche (France)

Marja-Liisa Seppälä (Finland)

Ana Vukadin (Croatia)

 New corresponding member:

Saeedeh Akbari-Daryan (Iran)

CoS did not have a majority of its members present in Poland, so endorsement of the RG membership decisions was to be done by email after WLIC. [Endorsement received.]

5) Election of Chair, 2017-2019

Since election of members was delayed this year, many new members were not at WLIC in Wroclaw. Therefore election of a Chair was deferred to an email ballot after WLIC.

[CoS informed the past Chair that there is currently no limit to the number of terms a RG Chair can serve. The call for nominations was distributed in September. Only one nomination. Chris Oliver continues as Chair for a third two-year term]

6) Liaisons

6.1) Liaison with the PRESSOO Review Group

 Mélanie Roche

6.2) Other liaisons

 The idea was suggested that we explore having a liaison with LIDATEC

 Other liaisons will continue in their current roles.

7) Chair's report

 7.1) activities 2016-2017

The Chair asked for any questions or comments on the RG Activity Report. See Appendix B at end or at: <https://www.ifla.org/node/794>

Global Vision – several participants in the Global Vision meetings shared information and thoughts about the process.

 7.2) report on the Committee on Standards meeting

a) Action plan

CoS would like us to prepare a two year action plan. Action plans will be critically important for success with funding proposals.

b) Terms for corresponding members

RG corresponding members currently have no length of terms. CoS would like us to implement terms for corresponding members.

The RG decided that the clock starts now and it would be unfair to go back in time. Thus, all corresponding members start their first term in August 2017. In line with other IFLA committees, corresponding members will have two terms of two years each.

c) Governance

CoS will work on procedures and documentation related to RG governance in the next year, in consultation with the RG Chairs.

d) What is a standard, what is a revision; also what constitutes a supporting document versus one that needs to go through the approval process. CoS and Cataloguing SC discussing. Cataloguing SC has volunteered to take the lead to propose revisions to the Standards Manual.

e) 2018 open program: CoS wants to focus on the impact of IFLA standards and has asked the Chair of the RG to be part of the organizing group

8) IFLA LRM

8.1) update: LRM endorsed

Pat Riva, Chair of the Consolidation Editorial Group, outlined the work and developments during the last year since the RG business meetings in 2016. She also outlined the process of approval.

The subtitle and summary phrase on title page were added at the last moment to give context for the model and its scope. This averted the need to change the model’s name since it is already known as LRM before its formal publication.

Aim: to get LRM endorsed at the August 18, 2017 PC meeting and this was accomplished.

The transition mappings and other supporting documentation are intended to be “one-time” documents, simply to document important points and assist during the transition period; they will not be continuously revised.

 8.2) next steps:

 8.2.1 CEG

Discussion of whether the work to update FRBROO to align with LRM should be assigned to this group. Unanimous decision to formally end the Consolidation Editorial Group and to constitute a new group to work on the revision of FRBROO.

It was acknowledged by all that the CEG did extraordinary work to bring scattered ideas about the consolidation into a polished, coherent model definition. LRM captures the essence of the original models and also brings the model in line with contemporary specifications. The Review Group cannot begin to express its thanks.

8.2.2 Expansions of the model – see 9.4: both points cover the same subject: the scope of the RG’s role for externally developed extensions of its models.

8.2.3 Future alignments

* see 9.2 below
* alignment with ISBD – a mapping from ISBD to LRM has already been produced and is available: *Alignment of the ISBD element set with the IFLA LRM element set*

<https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/isbd-lrm_alignment_v.1.3.1a.pdf>

8.2.4 Promoting LRM

FRBR RG will add more supporting documentation, such as the PowerPoints of Pat’s and Maja’s 2017 presentations, as well as the link to their papers. The RG will add new papers and presentations to further round out the supporting documentation, but it will not keep a comprehensive bibliography (as was done with FRBR). Documents will be chosen for their suitability to explain, give guidance, or present illustrative examples of implementations. The RG wiki has many past PowerPoints, and some may be seen as useful.

Maja and Pat already have commitments throughout the next year to speak and write about LRM. All RG members need to keep an active watch for opportunities to introduce and promote the LRM model.

9) FRBROO

9.1) update: to bring FRBROO in line with LRM, a new version will need to be created. Work on this new version has already begun at the April joint meeting with the CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group (CIDOC CRM SIG)

9.2) next steps for version 3 of FRBROO

This will be a significant revision. The RG agreed to call version 3 LRMOO.

The work will be done by a new working group: LRMOO Working Group.

Members of LWG: Patrick le Boeuf, Pat Riva, Mélanie Roche, Maja **Žumer.**

**This group will work closely with the CIDOC CRM SIG.**

9.3) representation and co-chairing the Working Group on FRBR/CRM Dialogue

The co-Chair for the IFLA side will continue to be the Chair of the FRBR RG, ex officio. The RG Chair may delegate this function to a member of the Working Group. The actual harmonization work will be delegated to the LRMOO Working Group who will all automatically, ex officio, also be members of this working group.

9.4) extensions of FRBROO – expansions for actual implementations.

The discussion covered extensions to any IFLA bibliographic conceptual models, notably LRM and FRBROO.

Some expansions may happen within the FRBR RG, with RG members involved, and others may happen outside IFLA. Does the RG have a role in verifying and endorsing official extensions of the model? Various arguments were made for and against this role:

* FRBR RG endorsed PRESSOO, an extension of FRBROO
* PRESSOO became an official IFLA standard, but to be viable, the Cataloguing Section had to create the PRESSOO Review Group
* CIDOC CRM SIG works on extensions of its model with representatives from the respective domains; we have a formal working group on harmonization or dialogue with CIDOC CRM SIG and FRBR RG representatives
* If three different groups work independently on classical music extensions, does one want to end up with three potentially conflicting extensions for classical music?
* FRBR RG is responsible for the high-level model. If someone sees that a new entity needs to be added, then the FRBR RG needs to be involved. If someone wants to refine an existing entity into various sub-entities, then it may not necessarily be the role of the RG
* The models can be used in many different ways
* The RG cannot control how groups may use or interpret the models; they can offer advice if asked, offer guidance, point to good examples of extensions, implementations, etc.
* The RG does not want to be in the position of having to choose between several extensions for the same type of material, so it should steer clear of ‘”endorsing” particular extensions
* The RG’s responsibility is to maintain stability of the model

There was no formal resolution of the issue. The RG will remain open to proposals from the community, and to requests for guidance, answers to questions from those developing extensions, but at this time does not take on a formal role of endorsing extensions.

10) Terms of reference

 10.1) changes to the phrasing

The name of the RG. With the publication of IFLA LRM, the current name of the group becomes misleading and unclear.

After discussion: decision on a broader name: Bibliographic Conceptual Models Review Group. Members not in attendance to be consulted by e-mail after WLIC.

Terms of reference need to be updated because we will not further develop FRBR, FRAD, FRSAD. These three models are now obsolete. Create a historical page within our section of the IFLA website, so people can be led from the old to the new pages.

Reword the first and second points in the TOR. Split the third one into two and delete the final paragraph.

Check if there are other groups with a similar name, is the acronym ok, is it translatable?

 10.2) relationship with CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group

The relationship itself will not change, but we will need to revise the name of the harmonization working group, and keep the CIDOC CRM community informed of what we are doing.

10.2) phrase “FRBR family of conceptual models”

 Now we will use: IFLA family of bibliographic conceptual models.

11) Website

11.1) review changes made when publishing FRBROO

No comments

11.2) strategy for changes to our website to accommodate and promote FRBROO

 and LRM

All in agreement that the website needs to be reviewed and updated. The idea was also proposed to work with the ISBD RG to develop a more consistent experience for those who use IFLA standards and consult our webpages. A small working group was named: Agnese Galeffi, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, and Chris Oliver.

The website will also need to redirect searches for FRBR with links to LRM as the model that supersedes FRBR.

12) Reports from liaisons:

12.1) PRESSOO Review Group

PRESSOO was endorsed in March 2017. This is a textual document. The next step will be preparing PRESSOO classes and properties for use in a namespace.

The RG is aware that with the endorsement of LRM, work now begins on revising FRBROO and this will have an impact on PRESSOO. So the RG knows it will have to start on a revision soon.

12.2) ISSN Network

The ISSN Network is revising the ISSN Manual to align with LRM. The publishing world has been interested in FRBR. Now with ISSN under revision, this will bring LRM to the attention of the publishing world.

12.3) ISBD Review Group

 12.3.1 Update: revision of ISBD

The RG is discussing the architecture of the future ISBD, what will ISBD be when one aligns it with LRM. The revision of ISBD will also include a study of the inputs and proposals that have been submitted to the RG since the last ISBD revision.

There will be an all-day meeting on Friday, August 25th, to look at the impact of LRM on ISBD, RDA, and other bibliographic standards. It is being organized by the RDA Steering Committee, NUKAT, the ISBD Review Group, and EURIG.

 12.3.2 ISBD-LRM alignment

Alignment of the ISBD element set with LRM. The document was completed by the Task Group in May. There seems to have been a problem with the email calling for comments on the alignment. Therefore the alignment is considered an internal document until there has been more review.

12.3.3 There will be a new Working Group looking to make a recommendation of how to move forward with ISBD revision. The WG will look at ISBD as an implementation or extension of LRM.

 12.4) RDA Steering Committee

At the RDA Steering Committee meeting in Frankfurt in 2016, the Committee made the decision to align with LRM. The RG made available a pre-publication version to the RSC that incorporated the main decisions made at the consolidation meeting in Columbus, Ohio. RDA’s alignment with LRM is taking place at the same time as a modernizing of the software infrastructure of the Toolkit – part of the 3R Project: <http://www.rdatoolkit.org/3RProject> The Liaison reminded the RG that the protocol will need to be revised to include LRM (and a possible name change for the group).

13) Update on IFLA namespaces

The current IFLA namespace is not stable. It needs to be upgraded. CoS coordinated the writing of a twelve page position paper from CoS and LIDATEC, with input from the FRBR and ISBD RGs. The paper presented options and made a recommendation.

The Professional Committee saw the need to create a stable and robust namespace for IFLA standards but was not able to allocate funds to have this work done. It has asked CoS to look at funding options, perhaps working in partnership with libraries that are actively developing linked data applications.

14) Updates from other projects, groups, individuals relating to the FRBR family of models (including publications)

 DOREMUS update (DOREMUS = Doing Reusable Musical Data)

 The project was first presented to the RG last year in the updates part of the meeting. The project will be continuing into 2018. The DOREMUS model extends FRBROO in the area of music, looking at all types of music, classical, jazz, ethnic. A lot of work has been done on modelling performances. The project is consulting CIDOC CRM SIG and the FRBROO group as they work on refining their model. The group would like to see a process similar to the way in which PRESSOO became an official extension of FRBROO. The project would like to see the DOREMUS model formally endorsed as the extension for music.

 There was then a discussion of the meaning of endorsement. Does an endorsement go through an approval process? If it becomes part of the IFLA standards approval process, then it becomes an official IFLA standard as was the case with PRESSOO. If one then needs a maintenance group for each extension, it becomes cumbersome for IFLA. If it is a non-IFLA standard, how can one have a formal IFLA endorsement process? The discussion raised interesting points but no immediate resolution of the issue emerged. See also 9.4.

 RDA at Kuala Lumpur WLIC, August 23, 2018

This is not an IFLA event but is coordinated to take place just before WLIC 2018 opens. There will be an all-day seminar on RDA, hosted by the National Library of Malaysia, and organized by the RDA Board.

15) Meetings at IFLA WLIC 2018 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: 2 business meetings as usual. The unfortunate consequence of the 2017 schedule was that there could be no feedback between committees and groups because some had finished all their work before others had begun.

 Meeting rooms must be of an adequate size. The meeting room where the FRBR RG met was inappropriately small, when one considers that the RG consistently draws a large number of observers at its business meetings.

16) Other business

If *Records in Context* (archival model) goes out for another formal review, the FRBR RG should prepare a formal response.

17) Adjournment

**Appendix A –List of participants Business meetings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Institution** | **Country** | **Status** | **Mtg 1/2** |
| Akbari Daryan, Saeedeh | National Library and Archives of Iran | Iran  | corresponding member (new) | 2 |
| Annemark, Eva-Karin | National Library of Sweden | Sweden | observer | 1 |
| Aymonin, David | ABES | France | observer | 1 |
| Behrens, Renate  | Deutsche Nationalbibliothek | Germany | observer | 2 |
| Boulet, Vincent | Bibliothèque nationale de France | France | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Drobíková, Barbora | Charles University | Czech Republic | member | 1 + 2 |
| Dunsire, Gordon | Independent | UK | member and RSC liaison | 1 + 2 |
| Escolano, Elena | Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness. Library | Spain | corresponding member | 1 + 2 |
| Gentili-Tedeschi, Massimo | Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico | Italy | member | 1 + 2 |
| Goldberga, Anita | National Library of Latvia | Latvia | member (new) | 1 + 2 |
| Guerrini, Mauro | University of Florence | Italy | observer | 1 |
| Kavčič, Irena | National and University Library of Slovenia | Slovenia | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Leresche, Françoise | Bibliothèque nationale de France | France | ISBD Review Group liaison | 1 + 2 |
| Lundborg, Viktoria | National Library of Sweden | Sweden | observer | 1 |
| Mazic, Gordana | IZUM - Institut of Information Science Maribor | Slovenia | observer | 1 + 2 |
| McCallum, Sally | Library of Congress | USA | observer | 2 |
| McGarry, Dorothy | Retired from the University of California, Los Angeles | USA | observer | 2 |
| Muñoz Gómez, Alejandra | Library of Congress Chile | Chile | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Murtomaa, Eeva | Retired from theNational Library of Finland  | Finland | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Oliver, Chris | University of Ottawa | Canada | Chair of RG | 1 + 2 |
| Oury, Clément | ISSN International Centre | France | ISSN liaison | 1 + 2 |
| Pusa, Tatja | National Library of Finland | Finland | observer | 2 |
| Riva, Pat | Concordia University | Canada | Chair of Consolidation Editorial Group | 1 + 2 |
| Roche, Melanie | Bibliothèque nationale de France | France | member (new) | 1 + 2 |
| Rogina, Anka | Maribor Public Library | Slovenia | observer | 1 |
| Säfström, Miriam | National Library of Sweden | Sweden | observer | 1  |
| Salaba, Athena | Kent State University | USA | member | 1 + 2 |
| Sandblom-Laamanen, Katarina | National Library of Sweden | Sweden | observer | 1 |
| Santos, Ricardo | National Library of Spain | Spain | observer | 1 |
| Seppälä, Marja Liisa | National Library of Finland | Finland | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Śniezko, Leszek | NUKAT Centre | Poland | observer | 1 |
| Synnermark, Katarina | National Library of Sweden | Sweden | observer | 1 |
| Vilkki-Eriksson, Kiti | National Library of Finland | Finland | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Weitz, Jay | OCLC | USA | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Willer, Mirna | University of Zadar | Croatia | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Wright, Jenny | Bibliographic Data Services Ltd. | Great Britain | observer | 1 + 2 |
| Žumer, Maja | University of Ljubljana | Slovenia | member of Consolidation Editorial Group | 1 + 2 |

**Appendix B: copy of activities report**



**IFLA Cataloguing Section
FRBR Review Group**

**Report of activities**

**2016-2017**

***Review Group Meetings in the official WLIC Programme***

Thanks to the Committee on Standards for spearheading this initiative to make the standards Review Groups more visible. After discussion at the business meetings during WLIC 2016, the Review Groups confirmed that they wanted information about their meetings included in the programme so that observers could easily find the meetings and attend.

***IFLA Library Reference Model***

In the past year, the work on the consolidated model was completed and the model was named IFLA Library Reference Model. The final draft and supporting documentation were submitted to the Committee on Standards on April 18th, 2017.

During WLIC 2016, at the second RG business meeting, the Consolidation Editorial Group presented a revised version of the model, a revision that responded to comments received during the world-wide review. The presentation focused on the changes that the CEG was suggesting and that would be discussed and finalized at the all-day meeting at the end of WLIC 2016 (August 19th). Observers were welcomed, and this meeting had a record attendance due to the widespread interest in the model as it approached completion. There were 18 observers.

Persons who indicated an interest to observe the all-day meeting at the end of WLIC 2016 were given the documents ahead of time so that they would be able to follow and engage with the discussion and decision process.

The all-day meeting at the end of WLIC 2016 was an energetic meeting with Review Group members sharing the sense that the model was almost completed. The feedback from the world-wide review had not raised any critical issues that required remodelling. In reviewing the comments received, there were no objections to the model itself. There had been places where people had misunderstood or misinterpreted parts of the model and so explanatory texts, scope notes and examples were carefully reviewed. The RG discussed and decided on all the changes proposed by the CEG. There were also some additional suggestions, ideas for examples, etc.

Pat Riva, chair of the CEG, wrote an update article for the December issue of the Metadata Newsletter (pages 11-12) <https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/classification-and-indexing/ifla_metadata_newsletter_dec2016.pdf>. As mentioned in the article, a new draft that incorporated the August 19th changes was circulated to the RG during the fall of 2016 for final comments. After this step, a new clean draft was prepared and sent to the chairs of the Standing Committees of Cataloguing, Bibliography and Subject Analysis and Access in December 2016.​ After this step, the CEG prepared the final draft of the model, resolving the last issues, and dealing with details of formatting the tables. Documents submitted to the Committee on Standards on April 18th included: the definition of the model, the IFLA Standards approval form, a summary of changes since the world-wide review, explanations of recurring issues, and a summary of responses from the world-wide review.

On June 20th, the CEG and Chair of the Review Group received word that the standard was approved pending changes to the title. However, the title is already in usage in the modelling and metadata communities. The CEG prepared a response and we are waiting to hear the Committee on Standards decision after reading the arguments prepared in support of the existing title.

Even before official endorsement as an IFLA standard, there is a lot of interest in IFLA LRM. The RDA community has embarked on a major RDA redesign project (the 3R Project) and a significant part of the work is alignment with LRM (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/ImplementationLRMinRDA>). CEG members are receiving requests for LRM talks from many different countries. It is affirming to see the global interest in this model even before official publication.

Due to the interest in LRM, it was important to disseminate the latest version of LRM to keep the global community up-to-date on the final version, and to stop people referencing the earlier 2016 draft that is now superseded. The final draft, as submitted for approval, was posted on the RG’s website at the same time that it was submitted for approval: <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11412>

***FRBROO***

**Official IFLA standard**

FRBROO version 2.4 is now an official IFLA standard. The change in title that we approved at the WLIC 2016 business meeting was approved by the Committee on Standards. The standard was then endorsed by the Professional Committee in December 2016. With the intervening holidays, the FRBR Review Group did not hear the good news until early 2017.

Before FRBROO could be published on the IFLA website, the Professional Committee asked for its release to be accompanied by explanatory text in plain language. In consultation with the IFLA Professional Officer, the Chair prepared a text for the website that explains what FRBROO is, the relationship between library and museum conceptual models, and the purpose of FRBROO. (current text at website <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11240>). With the webmaster, Agnese Galeffi, we made some changes to make FRBROO visible in the navigation menu, and a few other small changes for consistency and accuracy. Looking at the website in detail brought out the need to review the website.

**Working Group on FRBR/CRM Dialogue**

With FRBROO now an official IFLA standard, it is important to note that the work on FRBROO takes place primarily in this Working Group, with the Review Group approving and commenting on the work prepared by the WG. The WG has a variant name at the CIDOC CRM website, and it is useful to know the variant name because the minutes are posted on the CIDOC CRM website: FRBR-CIDOC CRM Harmonization (<http://www.cidoc-crm.org/minutes>).

It is important that the FRBR Review Group continues to provide support for this work. The FRBR Review Group is very fortunate to have three highly committed representatives on this essential Working Group. The CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group meets several times a year and always includes harmonization with FRBROO as part of its agenda. Over the past years, Patrick LeBoeuf, Maja Žumer and Pat Riva have consistently devoted hours and resources to maintaining this key relationship with the CIDOC CRM community and have carried forward the challenging work of dialogue to develop and advance the FRBROO model. They are already engaged in the next phase of the work for this WG.

**Next steps**

At the most recent meeting of the Working Group on FRBR/CRM Dialogue in April 2017, new work was begun. The meeting took place in Heraklion, Crete. The meeting began with an update on the final version of LRM as submitted for approval to IFLA, and a progress report on the approval process. The WG then discussed the need to begin work on version 3 of FRBROO, the version that will align with LRM. There was even talk whether the new version should properly be called LRMOO. The group immediately embarked on substantive work, and started looking at classes that could be deprecated, assessing how LRM allows for streamlining the current FRBROO, assessing the new LRM entities and how they relate to CRM-FRBROO classes. The work on this new version was launched at this meeting, but there will be a lot of work to do this year, focusing on the October and January meetings.

***RG Website***

In preparation for publishing FRBROO version 2.4 as an official IFLA standard, IFLA had asked for some changes to website text. Some changes were done quickly to prevent delays in publishing FRBROO. But this work showed how many parts of our website are out of date and need revising. This will be an agenda item for the WLIC 2017 business meeting.

***Namespaces***

For the FRBR Review Group, namespaces are a critical issue because our standards need to be accessible both as documents formatted for humans and as vocabularies in trusted namespaces that computers can reliably access and use. An ongoing concern has been the creation and maintenance of a reliable namespace infrastructure for our standards and our concern dovetails with that of other IFLA standards groups, especially the ISBD Review Group. Though not a new concern, this year there was a renewed effort to present the issue and possible solutions to the Governing Board. The GB approval is necessary because a reliable infrastructure has costs involved (both initial and ongoing). The Committee on Standards and LIDATEC prepared a proposal with input as well from the Chairs of the two Review Groups. The proposal provides explanatory background, clarifies the situation, and then lays out the risks and the options, concluding with a recommendation. When Governing Board meets on August 18th, the intention is that this proposal will be on the agenda.

***Translations***

**FRSAD**

In March 2017, an Arabic translation of FRSAD was added to the IFLA website. The translation is by Fatema Mamdouh Zakzouk of Cairo University. The translation was completed in 2016.

<https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frsad/frsad-final-report-ar.pdf> There are now seven translations of FRSAD.

**LRM**

In December 2016, there was a request for permission to translate the draft version of IFLA LRM into German even before the model has been officially endorsed. Until LRM is endorsed, there are no official forms yet to permit translations. So it cannot be an official translation until the model is an official IFLA standard. But translation is a lengthy piece of work and the Chairs of the Review Group and of the Consolidation Editorial Group appreciated the desire to start work as soon as possible, with the understanding that it would be a working draft used for internal purposes by a committee/working group.

It is known that other groups have also worked on unofficial translations to support internal discussions of the model.

***Distribution List***

The [frbr@infoserv.inist.fr](http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/info/frbr) list currently has 716 subscribers, a small decrease from last year’s number (732). The net effect of activity is 16 less subscribers, but in reality there were a number of additions and deletions throughout the year. However, as noted before, since 2011/2012, there has been a steady decline in the number of subscribers, though this year is less of a change than previous years.

***FRBR Review Group on Facebook***

The RG has its own page on Facebook. It went live in December 2016. One of the RG members, Barbora Drobíková, a professor at the Charles University in Prague, asked her students to analyze social networks and come up with a recommendation for the best place to have a social network profile for the FRBR Review Group. They recommended Facebook and, after consultation with the RG Chair, proceeded to set-up the page. The aim was to have a place for discussion, conversations, and also a place to post links to new documents, make announcements and post photographs. In Barbora’s words:

The aim of the FB page is to promote our work and to enable to post short news about our group and especially about models and their development. The page is visible for non-FB-users too. Registered users can add comments to particular piece of news or they can add a question/comment to our page. The button "learn more" links directly to the IFLA FRBR RG web page. Our FB short username is "@ifla.frbr" to be in harmony with other IFLA sections/groups promoting their work via FB. There is a menu offering further information about our group.

The Facebook presence acts as a complement to the IFLA website presence.

 Prepared by: Chris Oliver

Chair of the FRBR Review Group

July 2017