

**LIBRARY AND ARCHIVAL NAME
AUTHORITY DATA
THE POSSIBILITIES FOR FUNCTIONAL
INTEROPERABILITY**

MIRNA WILLER

Department of Information Sciences, University of Zadar, Croatia

ABSTRACT

This article explores the bi-directional relationship that existed between the library conceptual data model and the international archival standard for name authority data in the course of their development between 1996 and 2009, and the possible impact of that relationship on their functional interoperability. The method used is analytical analysis of the working documents of the two relevant working groups within the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA). The results of this analysis are then compared to standards documents published by both the library and the archival communities.

The IFLA working groups in question are the Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN (WG on MLAR and ISADN) and the Study Group on the Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR WG). The corpus used for the research comprises IFLA's *Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records* (MLAR) and the conceptual model *FRAD: Functional Requirements for Authority Data*, and ICA/CDS's name authority standard *ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archive Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families*, first and second edition.

In the conclusion the author argues that the communication between the library and archival communities was less fruitful at the level of recognizing the same data element set or adopting some elements from each other's documents, than it was at the level of recognizing the differences that should be borne in mind while building services based on the potential functional interoperability of library and archival authority data.

KEYWORDS

ICA/CDS: International Council on Archives Committee on Descriptive Standards, IFLA Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN (WG on MLAR and ISADN), IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR WG), *Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records* (MLAR), *ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archive Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families, Functional Requirements for Authority Data: a Conceptual model* (FRAD), functional interoperability

Introduction

By publishing its conceptual model for bibliographic data in 1998, the International Federation on Library Associations (IFLA) fulfilled one of its central roles in providing the international library community with the theoretical background for the future development of standardization activities and the promotion of bibliographic practices in changing technological, economic and social environments. The *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Study* (FRBR),¹ which was derived using the technique of entity analysis, identifies entities of interest to users of bibliographic records, the attributes of each entity, and the types of relationships that operate between entities.² The study defines three groups of entities which represent the key objects of interest to users:

The first group comprises the products of intellectual or artistic endeavour that are named or described in bibliographic records: *work*, *expression*, *manifestation*, and *item*. The second group comprises those entities responsible for the intellectual or artistic content, the physical production and dissemination, or the custodianship of such products: *person* and *corporate body*. The third group comprises an additional set of entities that serve as the subjects of intellectual or artistic endeavour: *concept*, *object*, *event*, and *place*.³

1 Functional requirements for bibliographic records: Final report / IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. München: K. G. Saur, 1998. Current text including amendments and corrections to date, available from: <http://www.ifla.org/en/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records>. [Cited: 2014-09-15]

2 Ibid., p. 3.

3 Ibid., p. 13.

However, the introduction to the study acknowledges that the model does not cover authority data and its syndetic, i.e., linking function, in the catalogue (See and See also references between authorized and variant, and related access points). The following quote from the introduction clearly explains the context and functionality of authority data in bibliographic systems:

It is important to note that the model developed for the study does not cover the extended range of attributes and relationships that are normally reflected in authority records. The model defines the entities that are the focus of authority records--persons, corporate bodies, concepts, etc.--and depicts the relationships between those entities and the entities described in the bibliographic record *per se*. The model also defines attributes of those entities to the extent that such attributes are typically reflected in the bibliographic record. But it does not analyse the additional data that are normally recorded in an authority record, nor does it analyse the relationships between and among those entities that are generally reflected in the syndetic apparatus of the catalogue. While it is recognized that an extended level of analysis would be necessary for a fully developed conceptual model, the terms of reference for the current study, with its focus on bibliographic data, as distinct from authority data, and the constraints of time available for the study, ruled out such an extended level of analysis. Nevertheless, the study group recognizes the need to extend the model at some future date to cover authority data.⁴

Parallel to the work on FRBR, IFLA's Office for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC) and International MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloguing) (UBCIM) started to analyse why authority data, i.e., authority records, were not a matter of current exchange between libraries, as was the case with bibliographic records. Authority data is defined as data that "represents the controlled access points and other information that institutions use to collocate works by a specific person, family, or corporate body, or the various editions of a title. Controlled access points include authorized forms and variant forms of name assembled by cataloguers to identify an entity."⁵ Two studies on the content and structure of national authority files and

4 Ibid., p. 4.

5 Functional requirements for authority data: a conceptual model. München: K.G. Saur, 2009. P. 1.

international cooperation in the field that were conducted by Marcelle Beaudiquez and Françoise Bourdon of France and published in 1991 and 1993 respectively showed that the failure of international cooperation in the field of authority data was due to the fact that the division of labour defined by the UBC⁶ had been tacitly ignored, and that there were gaps in regard to the definition of the typical content of authority records that were intended to be re-useable outside the context in which they were created.⁷ In order to study these issues further, the Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN (International Standard Authority Data Number) (WG on MLAR and ISADN) was created in 1996 under the auspices of IFLA UBCIM with the aims of analysing nine national authority formats as well as the IFLA UNIMARC authorities format, and preparing a list of *Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records*.

It was during the work on this document that the WG on MLAR and ISADN invited the parallel body within the archival community, the International Council on Archives' Committee on Descriptive Standards (ICA/CDS), to cooperate. This invitation was in accordance with decisions reached at the IFLA/ICA joint meeting on authority control held in Beijing, 1 September 1996 when ICA approved the final version of its own authority standard, the *International Standard Archive Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families* (ISAAR(CPF)). Both professional bodies recognized the need for "future communication and cooperation in the field of authority control."⁸ In the *Draft Beijing Agenda*, published subsequently in the *IFLA Journal*, the IFLA and ICA officers who met on the same day in Beijing recognized that over the years they had "developed a strong tradition of cooperation and exchange of information" and declared that they "share[d] a belief in a common set of ethical values". The seven areas of cooperation they defined to be of interest to this research included the following:

- 6 Anderson, Dorothy. *Universal Bibliographic Control: A long term policy – A plan for action*. Pullach/München: Verlag Dokumentation, 1974.
- 7 Beaudiquez, Marcelle; Françoise Bourdon. *Management and use of name authority files (personal names, corporate bodies and uniform titles): evaluation and prospects*. München: K.G. Saur, 1991; Bourdon, Françoise. *International cooperation in the field of authority data: an analytical study with recommendations*. München: K.G. Saur, 1993.
- 8 New IFLA Working Group on International Authority Control. / *IFLA Journal* 22, 4(1996), p. 318.

- “The impact of the convergence of technologies for the storage, retrieval and transmission of text, images and oral information
- Improved resource sharing mechanisms in order to bridge the widening gap between developed and developing library and archival communities. This also includes resource sharing in a national or regional context
- Cooperative efforts by IFLA and ICA to stimulate the development and implementation of international standards for electronic records, that will facilitate use of the Internet and improve access to holdings of archives and libraries [...]
- Exchange of views on user-oriented services in archives and libraries”.⁹

The aim of cooperation between the two standardizing bodies, the WG on MLAR and ISADN and ICA/CDS, was defined by ICA/CDS in the context of “ascertaining the compatibility and potential interoperability”¹⁰ of authority record structures, that is, analysing the potential for the functional interoperability of data from both sources which in turn meets the functional requirements of each standard. This analysis was done at the level of mapping data elements and their definitions that were perceived to align (i.e., the presence or absence of matching elements or element functions across the standards) or making a recommendation about the particular treatment of a data element (e.g., mandatory as opposed to optional). The functional interoperability of authority data from both sources was seen to be justified by both communities’ needs to share, re-use and/or link authentic and reliable name authority data that was professionally and intensively generated, in current descriptive systems, and to enhance resource discovery to meet the ever-growing expectations of users of such systems in the new internet environment.

The main goal of this article, therefore, is to reconstruct the influences that the library element set and data model and the archival

9 Joint IFLA/ICA Meeting, Beijing, China, 1 September 1996. / IFLA Journal 22, 4(1996), pp. 319-320.

10 The Internal Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ICA) and the Essential Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records (IFLA): A Comparison and Report / Prepared by Dagmar Parer (with Adrian Cunningham) and Michael Fox of the International Council on Archives Committee on Descriptive Standards (ICA/CDS); Released and distributed electronically to the members of the ICA/CDS and the IFLA Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and the ISADN, 30 July 1998. Conclusions [filename: ICA-IFLA_CommentsonMLAR1998].

standard in the field of name authority data had upon each other in the course of their development, and to contemplate the possible impact of such influence on the functional interoperability of authority data in the two communities. The analysis covers the period from 1996, the year in which the IFLA WG on MLAR and ISADN was established, ISAAR(CPF) was published, and the IFLA/ICA meeting was held, and encompasses 2004 and 2009, the years of publication of the second edition of ISAAR(CPF) and the conceptual model for authority data, FRAD, respectively. The article first focuses on three documents exchanged between the two groups: the ICA/CDS comparison and report on the MLAR (1998), and the IFLA FRANAR WG's comments on the ISAAR(CPF) 1st (2001) and 2nd (2003) editions. The penultimate section, *Continuing the Dialogue*, reconstructs some of the issues related to the archival context analysed in the comment logs of the 1st and 2nd worldwide reviews of the FRAR (2005) and FRAD (2007) conceptual models. The documents referred to are those that were archived by the IFLA working groups, the Working Group on MLAR and ISADN and the Working Group on FRANAR.¹¹

The chronology table provided in the appendix traces the time-frame of particular working group activities, the documentation exchanged between the IFLA and ICA/CDS bodies during those activities, and, finally, the published documents that possibly were the result of mutual influence. To facilitate his/her orientation and understanding of the text that follows, the reader is advised to consult the table in the Appendix.

ICA/CDS's ISAAR(CPF) and IFLA's *Essential Data Elements*: a comparison of structure and content (July 1998)

In December 1997, IFLA WG on MLAR and ISADN issued a call for comments on its draft report *Essential Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records* and the ICA/CDS readily responded. The ICA/CDS invited two of its members, Michael Fox of the United States and Dagmar Parer of Australia to "prepare an analysis of the IFLA report with respect to the structure and content of the ICA's International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bod-

11 As a member of both working groups I am in possession of the digital archive, while my paper archive is stored at the National and University Library in Zagreb, Croatia. I would like to thank Glenn E. Patton of OCLC and the Chair of the FRANAR Working Group for his help in recovering some documents and elucidating some issues.

ies, Persons and Families, known as ISAAR(CPF).” The report was released and distributed electronically to the members of the ICA/CDS and the IFLA WG on MLAR and ISADN on 30 July 1998.¹²

The ICA/CDS report positions ISAAR(CPF)¹³ in relation to the complementary (and parent) General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)), and states that the “documentation about the creator of archival materials that is captured in records based on ISAAR(CPF) is comparable in some respects to library authority records”. The comparable difference refers to their function and extent: “Such ‘archival authority records’ differ from their bibliographic counterparts in the functional roles they play in the descriptive process and in the nature and the extent of the data they contain.” Using the FRBR-defined user tasks that bibliographic records need to support, the ICA/CDS report clarifies first the difference in the function of the authority records in the respective catalogue/finding aid. While in “traditional library systems, authority records exist to facilitate the creation of consistent and unique headings which, in turn, support the “find” and “identify” functions of the catalog”, they limit “the contents of their records to a listing of preferred and variant forms of the heading and the documentation necessary to establish the warrant for those choices”, and contribute “to the descriptive process only in an indirect manner- by providing an authoritative source for the headings carried in bibliographic records.” Additionally, “most catalogs do not present authority records directly to the user.”

This practice is in contrast with the archival authority records, which are an “integral part of descriptive systems, intended to be presented directly to the user in conjunction with data about the records themselves. The centrality of provenance as a defining characteristic of archival materials means that archival authority files must include substantive information about the creators of the records to support the ‘select’ as well as the ‘find’ and ‘identify’ functions of the catalog.” As to the content of the archival authority record, “in addition to establishing authoritative forms of headings, archival authority records

12 The International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ICA) and the Essential Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records (IFLA): A Comparison and Report. Op.cit.

13 ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families: Final ICA approved version / prepared by the Ad Hoc Commission on Descriptive Standards, Paris, France, 15-20 November 1995. Ottawa: The Secretariat of the ICA AD Hoc Commission on Descriptive Standards, 1996.

typically include extended biographical data about the individuals or the administrative history, legal status, functions and mandates, and administrative structure of the corporate bodies responsible for the associated documents.”¹⁴

The results of the comparative analysis of ISAAR(CPF) and the IFLA list of mandatory data elements were divided into four categories with numbered data elements from the table:

- (1) An EXACT or CLOSE match
 - 1.1 Identity Code/Record Identifier (No 4)
 - 3.3 Date entered on file (No 5)
 - 3.3 Date entered on file/Version Identifier (No 6) (*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, 5.4.6)
 - 3.2 Rules or Conventions/Descriptive Rules (No 10)
 - 1.2 Type of Archival Authority Record/Entity Category (No 14)
 - 1.3 Authority Entry/Authorised Heading (No 15)
 - 2.2.5 Nationality/Nationality of entity (No 16) *but possible interoperability problem
 - 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.3.3 Dates and Places of Existence/Time Period Associated with the Entity (No 17) * but possible interoperability problem
 - 1.5 Non-preferred Terms/Variant Forms of the Authorised Heading (No 18)
 - 1.6 Related Authority Entry/Related Authorised Heading (No 19)
 - 3.1 Archivist’s Note/Source Citation (No 20)
- (2) Some elements specified by IFLA that are not found in ISAAR(CPF) and inclusion of which into ISAAR(CPF) would increase compatibility
 - Record Status (No 1) (*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, 5.4.4)
 - Type of Record (No 2)
 - Encoding Level (No 3) (*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, 5.4.5)
 - (1.4) Language (No 7) (*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, 5.4.7)

¹⁴ The International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ICA) and the Essential Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records (IFLA): A Comparison and Report, op. cit. Archival Authority Records (chapter).

- Character Sets Present (No 8)
 - 1.1 Source Library/Agency for Record (No 12)
 - Differentiated or undifferentiated personal name (No 13)
- (3) Some elements specified by ISAAR(CPF) that are not found in IFLA and inclusion of which into IFLA would increase compatibility
- 1.1 Agency Making the Record Available (No 11) *currently only an optional element
- (4) Elements that are present in IFLA but are of negotiable value to ISAAR(CPF)
- Script of Cataloguing (No 9) (*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, 5.4.7)

Elements identified with “(*ISAAR(CPF)*, 2nd ed, x.x.x)” have been added to the original analysis result in order to show the direct impact of this comparison on the future design of the second edition of *ISAAR(CPF)*. The information elements have been numbered, for example 1.1., to help the reader to follow the text of the standard as well as the references to elements in the rest of this article.

The ICA/CDS’s report concludes with the following:

1. There are eleven areas that are a straight or close match between the two standards. For full interoperability, some elements will need to be matched more closely. For example, the IFLA Nationality of Entity is a separate element but its functional equivalent in *ISAAR(CPF)* is sub-element 2.2.5 in the Information Area.
2. The *ISAAR(CPF)* standard could be more precise in its differentiation of contextual and provenance information. In forthcoming *ISAAR(CPF)* reviews, it may be worth investigating the current placement of provenance information in the Information Area with the view of giving it greater prominence.
3. The IFLA proposal recommends that agencies responsible for authority records make their data available at this time for searching only and not for full computer to computer interchange. Archival information systems should be able to contribute to this process and creating agencies should consider participation by making their files accessible via the Internet.

4. The IFLA model does not adequately capture the provenance principles of the archival profession. To ensure full compatibility in the future between the two international authority record standards, the two groups may need to address and reconcile the archivist's need for extended information about provenance in the authority record and the librarian's emphasis on an economical method of headings control.

In answering the vital question "can archivists adopt the IFLA model on authority records as theirs," the answer is YES, but with certain conditions.¹⁵

The final version of the IFLA document, *Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records* (MLAR), was published in 1998.¹⁶ The analysis of the comparison of the final version of MLAR with the ISAAR(CPF) and ICA/CDS's recommendations to IFLA shows the following:

1. Referring to the recommendations in the ICA/CDS Comparison table:
 - 1.1. Agency Making the Record Available (No 11): defined as a mandatory element in MLAR
 - 1.2. Type of Archival Authority Record/Entity Category (No 14): in the Comparison table the recommendation is to make the element mandatory; it was defined as mandatory in MLAR with a note that it should be recommended as an addition to UNIMARC, as part of the Record Label [done]¹⁷
 - 1.3. Nationality/Nationality of entity (No 16) *but possible interoperability problem: MLAR added a note to recommend addition of a field for recording nationality of an entity to the UNIMARC Authorities format [done].
2. Referring to the comments from the ICA/CDS Conclusion:
 - 1.1. (3.) The IFLA proposal recommends that agencies responsible for authority records should make their data available at this time for searching only: this provision was partly re-defined

15 Ibid.

16 Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records: Report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN. [Frankfurt/Main]: IFLA Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme, 1998. Available at: <http://archive.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-2/mlar.htm> [cited: 2014-09-15]

17 UNIMARC Manual: Authorities Format. 2nd revised and enlarged ed. München: K. G. Saur, 2001.

in MLAR with the proposal “that each National Bibliographic Agency (NBA) make its authority files available over the Internet within two or three years”; however, the restriction to “read-only” access to such files remained unchanged

- 1.2. (4.) The IFLA model does not adequately capture the provenance principles of the archival profession... groups may need to address and reconcile the archivist’s need for extended information about provenance: the list of mandatory elements was extended in MLAR to include a list of “highly recommended” data elements; these are:
 - 1.1.1. Biographical, Historical, or Other Information about the Entity: with a note to recommend addition of a field for recording biographical, etc., information to the UNIMARC Authorities format[done]
 - 1.1.2. General notes
 - 1.1.3. Source Data not Found: this element was not included in the draft which was analysed by ICA/CDS, so no comment from ICA/CDS could have been expected.¹⁸
3. Other issues discussed in MLAR that are relevant to the topic and further development of authority data standards:
 - 1.1. Nationality: MLAR lists this element as mandatory, or at least “highly recommended”, but is aware, as was ICA/CDS, of the possibility of an interoperability problem, and that future work is needed “to explore the provision of a code for nationality”
 - 1.2. MLAR considers the issue of whether the data element is mandatory or optional in relation to or depending on whether it is used for “exchange” of authority records or for “sharing”, that is, enabling records “only to be viewed online or in a ‘snapshot’ (a view frozen in time)”; the elements which are not considered mandatory for records viewed online are ‘Record status’, ‘Date entered on file’ and ‘Version identifier’
 - 1.3. ISADN: International Standard Authority Data Number is to be made a mandatory element in the future when it is developed

18 However, UNIMARC Authorities Format defined the field 815 Source data not found already in its first edition, 1991.

- 1.4. IFLA goal of Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC): MLAR states that “requiring everyone to use the same form for headings globally is not practical” primarily in view of user requirements; therefore it “recognizes the importance of allowing the preservation of national or rule-based differences in authorized forms for headings... that best meet the language and cultural needs of particular institution’s users”.

The second comment (3.1.2) was tied to the development of technology as perceived at the time but was not irrelevant for future considerations, and the third (3.1.3) was redefined in the course of time.¹⁹ Stating these four comments (under 3.) the WG on MLAR and ISADN in effect laid foundations for the paradigm shift in the field of authority data in the library community.²⁰ Here, I would only add the subsequent introduction of the term “authorized heading/access point” that succeeded the term “uniform heading” as the central concept of the UBC (based on considerations in 3.4), and the relevance that was given to the ‘Descriptive Rules’ and the ‘Source Library/ Agency for the Record’ mandatory elements. These elements, relating to the national/local/specific community practices and requirements to meet specific user needs, govern and give authentication to the form of authorized or preferred data elements in the authority record representing a particular entity, as well as to other data elements contained within it. This aspect of conceptualizing authority data was subsequently fully developed in the FRAD conceptual model, but is worth mentioning here because it extends the mentioned function of interoperability for the purpose of exchange and sharing authority data between the two communities to the concept of linking authority records or data describing the same entity from different sources and different community requirements, whether they be of library, archival or some other provenance.

19 IFLA abandoned the concept of ISADN, but promoted the use of ISO ISNI: ISO 27729: 2012: Information and documentation - International standard name identifier (ISNI). Geneva: ISO, 2012; see also: MacEwan, Andrew; Anila Angjeli; Janifer Gatenby. The International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI): The Evolving Future of Name Authority Control. // *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 51, 1/3 (2013), 55-71.

20 See for example: Willer, Mirna. Name Authority Control Paradigm Shift in the Network Environment. // *Frameworks for ICT Policy: Government, Social and Legal Issues* / edited by Esharenana E. Adomi. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2010. Str. 182-205. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-61692-012-8.ch012; Structures of Corporate Name Headings by Working Group on the Revision of FSCCH and Compiled and introduced by Ton Heijligers. Final Report - November 2000. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/publications/structures-of-corporate-name-headings> [cited: 2014-09-15]

IFLA FRANAR WG on ICA/CDS's ISAAR(CPF), 1st edition (July 2001)

The IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR WG) was established in April 1999, immediately after the publication of the MLAR document, but more importantly, after the publication of the FRBR final study report, that is, the bibliographic conceptual model. As already mentioned, the FRBR model did not cover authority data and its syndetic function in the catalogue, so the three terms of reference for the FRANAR WG were defined as follows:

- 1) To define functional requirements of authority records, continuing the work that the “Functional requirements of bibliographic records” for bibliographic systems initiated;
- 2) To study the feasibility of an International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN) [...];
- 3) To serve as the official IFLA liaison to and work with other interested groups concerning authority files: <indecs> (Interoperability of Data in E-Commerce Systems), ICA/CDS (International Council on Archives Committee on Descriptive Standards; later, International Council on Archives Committee on Best Practices and Professional Standards), ISO/TC46 for international numbering and descriptive standards, CERL (Consortium of European Research Libraries), etc.²¹

Work on design of the conceptual model continued until December 2008 when the final report, *Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model (FRAD)*, was prepared for publication in 2009.

21 Functional requirements for authority data: a conceptual model / edited by Glenn E. Patton; IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR); Final Report, December 2008, Approved by the Standing Committees of the IFLA Cataloguing Section and IFLA Classification and Indexing Section, March 2009. München: K.G. Saur, 2009. P. 7. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-authority-data>; See also: FRAD Errata (2011) <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frad/FRADerrata2011.pdf> [cited: 2014-09-15]

In the meantime, in 2000 the ICA/CDS started the revision of ISAAR(CPF). Its work was completed in October 2003 and the second edition published in 2004.²² On 26 December 2000 the ICA/CDS made the draft revised ISAAR(CPF) available for review by the international archival community and other cognate international organizations, inviting them to submit comments by a deadline of 31 July 2001.²³

The FRANAR WG received the announcement and responded to the call. The document *ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (1996 edition): Comments for the Revision of ISAAR(CPF)* was prepared by Finnish Eeva Murtomaa, assisted by American Barbara B. Tillett, and dated July 2001.²⁴ It includes an introductory section in the form of Overall Comments. General and Specific comments sections are followed by two appendices: *A Comparison of Terminology* with glossary and definitions, and a *List Of Mandatory Data Elements For Internationally Shared Authority Data Of IFLA MLAR Report (1998) Compared With ISAAR(CPF) (1996) Elements*. Although the latter document introduces some considerations influenced by current developments of concepts in the field, it should be viewed as a response to the ICA/CDS's ISAAR(CPF)/IFLA Comparison and Report document, since in this case ISAAR(CPF) is being analysed from the MLAR perspective. It should be noted that such a methodology is recommended in metadata model or schema mapping or alignment exercises as it can pinpoint the issues from each point of view, thus enriching the understanding of each standard or document in question and enabling eventual revision of alignments.

In the Overall Comments section one can read that the goal of "our comments and suggestions is to support the international

- 22 ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families / prepared by the ICA Committee on Descriptive Standards – Adopted Canberra, Australia, 27-30 October 2003. 2nd ed. Paris: International Council on Archives, 2004. Available at: <http://www.ica.org/10203/standards/isaar-cpf-international-standard-archival-authority-record-for-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-2nd-edition.html> ; [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR\(CPF\)2ed.pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR(CPF)2ed.pdf) [Cited: 2014-09-15]
- 23 Ibid., p. 5.
- 24 ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (1996 edition). Comments for the Revision of ISAAR(CPF) / prepared by Eeva Murtomaa, assisted by Barbara B. Tillett on behalf of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records, FRANAR, Helsinki July, 2001 [filenames: 1_ISAAR(CPF), 1_APPENDIX A2, 1_Appendix B]

exchange and sharing of authority information between libraries and archives. In that light, common definitions for “core level” name authority elements for archives, libraries, and even for museums would be hig[h]ly desirable”. To this end, a call or a proposal is added for a joint meeting of specialists of the three communities to “work towards a high level of interoperability”. This objective of the document is further elaborated in the General Comments section. It discusses, in the manner of recommendations, issues that have already been recognized in the ICA/CDS Report and MLAR document, but adding to it the views from the newly published second edition of IFLA’s *Guidelines for Authority Records and References*²⁵ (GARR). This edition (published earlier in 2001) of the guidelines that had first been published in 1984, was enlarged and updated with the latest concepts promoted by the MLAR such as “authorized access point” instead of the “uniform heading”, the principle that intends to preserve differences in authorized forms to meet user requirements. Definitions coming from MLAR and FRBR are added too. The recommendations from the General Comments section are the following:

- to facilitate international sharing and exchange of authority information;
- to allow the preservation of national or rule-based differences in authorized forms for headings to be used in catalogues that best meet the language and cultural needs of the users;
- to define essential elements (a core set) for national and international sharing; and
- to assure compatibility between data in MARC records and non-MARC metadata.

The last recommendation was not the focus of ICA/CDS interest and hence was not considered in the document. In other words, ISAAR(CPF) is concerned with the content, not the carrier or container, that is, the record format or scheme for the transmission of data. It must be mentioned here that the concept of the authority record persisted quite a long way into the development of the FRANAR model, thus showing librarians’ focus on or preoccupation with

25 Guidelines for Authority Records and References / revised by the IFLA Working Group on GARE revision. 2nd ed. München: K.G. Saur, 2001.

the technological solutions of the time. The concept was eventually dropped in favour of the concept of modelling data.²⁶

The General Comments section contains two additional sets of recommendations. The first one deals with *Entities Being Authorised*, in which ICA/CDS is called to consider for possible inclusion in ISAAR(CPF) other types of entities such as “conferences, concepts, events, bibliographic entities, objects” that were not adopted in the standard’s 2nd edition. The second set of recommendations discusses *Functions and Linking Structures*. In these, the FRANAR WG suggests “clarifying the functions of authority records and relationships between not only the authority entities and the archival documents (or library materials) described, but also among the forms of names presented in the authority record”. Much of the ICA/CDS Comparison and Report document is cited here, especially the conclusions regarding the issues which the new revised standard should consider. It should be mentioned here that the FRANAR model (as it was named then) was still very much in the development phase at the time, and particularly still very much in discussions about the relationship between “the authority entities and the archival documents (or library materials) described”, as well as about terminology. FRANAR WG’s invitation to ICA/CDS to consider, for example, “the relationships among the controlled names, variant names, related names, and the controlled entities” therefore reveals the state of the shifting ground within the FRANAR WG from which the comment was made, as it looked towards modelling data rather than the records that populate the “authorities” universe.²⁷

26 Although this issue was discussed in the context of the ISADN, it is worth citing the following as evidence of the change of the focus: the Group “places more importance on the potential sharing of the intellectual aspects on authority data rather than the exchange of physical authority records”. See: Patton, Glenn. *FRANAR: A conceptual model for authority data. // Authority control in organizing and accessing information: Definition and international experience / edited by Arlene G. Taylor and Barbara B. Tillet*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Information Press, 2004. Pp. 91-104, 95. DOI 10.1300/J104v38n03_09; pre-publication version available at: http://www.sba.unifi.it/ac/relazioni/patton_eng.pdf [cited: 2014-09-15], p. 4.

27 In terms of library systems and their design, which much influenced thinking of the time, the reference is made here to bibliographic and authority files or databases, whether integrated or separate. The first version of the FRANAR model – *NAME AND TITLE AUTHORITIES: A Strawman Model. Prepared by Tom Delsey For the IFLA UBCIM WG on FRANAR, Draft 2002-01-18*, however, treated authority information as separate entities [filename: FRANAR-Draft_2002-01-18]

Appendix A: *Comparison of Terminology* is a particularly valuable document evidencing the state of the art of the time. It comprises of 24 pages and provides 82 terms with their definitions as well as sporadic illustrative comments taken from five sources: GARR, ICA/CDS Working Group (Comparison and Report document), ISAAR(CPF), ISAD(G) and MLAR. The term *Related heading* has been chosen as an example to show the comparison of definitions and point to the issues they raise (Table 1).

Related heading

GARR: **Related heading.** One of two or more authorised headings for different entities that are bibliographically related.

ICA Working Group (1998): key 19: [ISAAR(CPF)]1.6. Related authority entry/entries-to link this authority record to other authority records, *as see* also reference. [IFLA] Related authorised heading-text of other authorised names related to the entity described (excludes parallel headings in other language, scripts). [ICA/CDS comment] **“There is a match.”**

ISAAR(CPF): 1.6 **Related authority entry/entries** to link authority record to other authority records by, for example, a *see* also reference. Record the authority entry record according to the national or international conventions or rules used by the agency that created the record. Specify in 3.2 which rules have been used.
2.1.8 Relationships: corporate bodies may have a variety of relationships with other corporate bodies, families and/or individuals. Two important aspects of information to record are the kinds of relationship and the relevant date(s).

MLAR: **Related heading.** One or two or more uniform headings, each of which is bibliographically related to the other(s).

TABLE 1.

Excerpt from *Appendix A: Comparison of Terminology* of the FRANAR WG comments for the revision of ISAAR(CPF), July 2001 [additions in square brackets by M.W.]

A closer analysis of this comparison – specifically of the ICA/CDS comment “**There is a match**” which, one might assume from the bold type in which it was printed, was endorsed by the FRANAR WG commentators as welcome news, shows significant differences in the concept of what it is that is being linked: headings, entities or records. While GARR considers Related heading as a mechanism for linking “representations” – authorized headings of bibliographically related yet different entities, MLAR falls short of this position, with putting into relationship (only) different “representations” – uniform headings. ICA/CDS’s comment on the matching between ISAAR(CPF) and MLAR’s definitions draws attention to the fact that MLAR’s definition “excludes parallel headings in other language, scripts” as related headings. ISAAR(CPF), however, defines the related authority entry/entries in the context of the link between authority records, specifying, very importantly indeed, that the authority entry record should be created “according to the national or international conventions or rules used by the agency that created the record”. Although this cannot be considered as part of the definition, because it is a rule for a procedure, it clearly points to the expressed need of the archival standards body to link authority data to the rules and the agency using those rules in creating a record. The same requirement was already present in the first drafts of the FRANAR model in the form of defining *rules* and *agency* as entities and their relationships to the entity *controlled access point*. These relationships, defined in the FRANAR (second) *Draft of 2002-07-30* remained unrevised until the final version of FRAD, i.e., *controlled access point* is governed by *rules*, *rules* are applied by *agency*, and *controlled access point* is created/modified/issued by *agency*. The only difference from the final version is the deletion of the “is issued by” part of the relationship name, although this is mentioned in the examples of instances of the attribute Name of agency.

Let us return for a moment to the ICA/CDS comment that parallel headings are excluded from MLAR’s related heading relationship. Both communities distinguish between related and parallel relationships, but treat them somewhat differently. A parallel heading is treated in MLAR and GARR as an authorized heading, but GARR adds to it the provision of multiple official languages: “An alternative, authorised form of the authorised heading for the same entity, formulated according to different rules or alternative languages (when there are two or more official languages).” ICAAR(CPF), however, treats parallel

headings, or entries only in the case of these being “in other language or script form(s)” (1.4 Parallel Entry/Entries), with the provision that “where this is not the case, a name in another language or script may be treated as a non-preferred term.”

The treatment of a parallel heading as a non-preferred term was and has been general practice in countries “when there are *no* two or more official languages”, and as such was described in the FRANAR/FRAD model as an alternative practice. However, the treatment of the authorized heading for the same entity as a parallel one in the case that it is “formulated according to different rules” introduced by GARR has been specified in FRAD as a separate relationship type to the Parallel language and Alternate script relationships. That is, it is specified as a Different rules relationship between *controlled access point* entities. Similarly, the second edition of ISAAR(CPF) does not change the definition of Parallel forms of name, but adds a new type of form of name: 5.1.4 Standardized forms of name according to other rules. The definition of the element is followed by a provision: “This can facilitate the sharing of authority records between different professional communities.”

APPENDIX B: *List Of Mandatory Data Elements For Internationally Shared Authority Data Of IFLA MLAR Report (1998) Compared With ISAAR(CPF) (1996) Elements* is a mapping whose direction starts with the bibliographic point of view, that is from UNIMARC authorities format to ISAAR(CPF) elements. Since the comparison is based on UNIMARC data elements it includes elements of the Record Label of the format, as in the MLAR document, with the addition of coding repeatable and not repeatable elements. The latter, however does not seem to have any relevance to the mapping. One would expect that the mapping would shed some new light on the comparison of elements done by ICA/CDS, but it does not.

As was already mentioned, ISAAR(CPF) is not concerned with the carrier of the data, i.e., the format, (in this case UNIMARC), however, this document lists several coded data elements of the Record Identification (Record Label), one of which is recognized as matching the ISAAR(CPF) element. The match is, alas, wrongly attributed. Namely, UNIMARC Type of record is mapped to ISAAR: Authority control area, 1.2 Type of Archival Authority Record (No 14), instead to the Entity Category element, the mapping that was correctly achieved in the ICA/CDS document. Similarly, the Source citation element in the ICA/

CDS document is mapped to the 3.1 Archivist's Note (20), identified correctly as UNIMARC field 810 in the MLAR document, whereas in this list it is incorrectly mapped to UNIMARC 3xx Notes Block.

In conclusion, the FRANAR WG response to the ICA/CDS call for comments on the ISAAR(CPF) first edition can be said to accord with the issues recognized in the ICA/CDS document as specific to each community and that might have an impact upon the level of interoperability. Moreover, the response brought attention to the terminology and definition of concepts in the field of authority data in both communities. However, as the FRANAR WG based its comments on the GARR and MLAR documents, since they were using these to develop the FRAD conceptual model, the comments should be considered as work in progress.

IFLA FRANAR WG on ISAAR(CPF), draft, 2nd edition November 2002 (July 2003)

The FRANAR WG closely followed the revision process of the ISAAR(CPF) 2nd edition either formally through representatives of their member organisations in ICA/CDS or informally via professional networking. This can be discerned from the minutes of the group's regular meetings. At the meeting that took place in London, 9-10 May 2002,²⁸ the liaison to the ICA/CDS Eeva Murtomaa reported on the items on the agenda of the next meeting of the ICA/CDS that would be held in Madrid from 12-16 June 2002. One item on the agenda was the new edition of ISAAR(CPF). The representative of FRANAR was invited to attend that meeting. Murtomaa further reported that the original call for comments on the 1st edition suggested that only minor revisions would be made, and that the committee received some 18 responses from around the world. The proposals to revise the ISAAR structure based on EAC (Encoded Archival Context) were recognized as relating to the identity-, description-, relationship-, related archival materials and other resources-, and control areas. A draft of the revised edition was planned to be completed by the end of 2002 and would be mounted on the ICA/CDS web site for an open review period of 6 months closing in May 2003.

28 FINAL DRAFT, 2002 June 10, Minutes of the meeting of the FRANAR Working Group, May 9-10, 2002, British Library, Saint Pancras, Meeting called by: Glenn Patton, Chair [filename: London Minutes revised]

The announcement of the worldwide review of the ISAAR(CPF) draft 2nd edition of November 2002 was made at the FRANAR WG's meeting in Zagreb, May 2003.²⁹ Murtomaa reported again that the new draft revision of ISAAR(CPF) was available on the ICA web site with July 15th as the deadline for comments, and that the final approval of the standard was expected in 2004.³⁰ Françoise Bourdon reported that the French AFNOR Working Group on Metadata for Authorities was reviewing the standard, and that they could provide the FRANAR WG with a draft for the members to add their comments. The final version of the FRANAR WG comments of 15 July 2003 builds on the AFNOR text as well as comments on the first version of the FRANAR WG's text made by Canadian Tom Delsey, consultant to the FRANAR WG.³¹ The review of the text that follows includes reference to Delsey's comments as they explicitly refer to the specific requirements of the archival community.

A comment is selected from the 8-page document with the purpose of describing the issues of potential interoperability of data between the two communities, but also of drawing attention to the potential impact that the FRANAR WG comments could have had on the revision of ISAAR(CPF). The comment in question is the reference to the introductory section *I. Scope and purpose*, specifically the reference to 1.7 and 1.8 in which the similarity between archival and library authority records is being described. The FRANAR WG's final proposed change to the wording in the draft text includes Delsey's intervention, emphasizing that only their "primary function" can point to the similarity. The comment runs as follows:

1.7. The ISSAR[*sic*](CPF) draft states that "*Archival authority records are similar to library authority records in as much as both forms of authority record need to support the creation of standardized access points in descriptions.*" Several FRANAR working group members think that could be more precisely expressed as follows:

29 FRANAR Working Group, National & University Library, Zagreb, May 22 - 24, 2003[filename: Zagreb minutes]

30 The only available live link to the call for comments is archived in the Internet Archive by the Wayback Machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030504114003/http://www.hmc.gov.uk/icacds/eng/standardsISAAR2.htm>; the same is the case with the text at: [http://web.archive.org/web/20040620173520/http://www.hmc.gov.uk/icacds/eng/ISAAR\(CPF\)2.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/20040620173520/http://www.hmc.gov.uk/icacds/eng/ISAAR(CPF)2.pdf)

31 Comments from Tom Delsey; re: IFLA Working Group on FRANAR Comments on the ICA-ISAAR(CPF) Draft second edition, [8 July 2003] [filename: ISAAR(CPF)-Delsey comments]

“Archival authority records are similar to library authority records in that a primary function of both is to ensure consistency in the form of access points used in descriptions.”

The argument following this proposal again takes into account Delsey’s view that there are many differences between the two authority records, but not to the full extent. The archival authority records, according to FRANAR WG’s comment,

“go much further than library authority records in “describing” the entities they refer to than do library authority records, in large part because another of their primary purposes is to enable users “to understand the context underlying the creation and use of archives and records so that they can better interpret their meaning and significance” (section 1.9).

Furthermore, “a more practical goal would be to increase the potential for the two communities to derive information (including authorized and variant forms of headings, where feasible) from one another’s authority files”. To this end, what is needed is “a clearer understanding of the purpose and content of the authority records created by the two communities, and well articulated structures for the recording and communication of authority data”. Although the FRANAR WG finds that the purpose and content are clearly stated in the draft, it does not consider that the same is the case with the structure:

“we are not so convinced that the current draft provides a well articulated structure for the recording and communication of archival authority data that would support the derivation of useful data from archival files by the library community.”

This view is based on Delsey’s comment that the authority records substantially differ from each other in structure and content because “the archival community has no internationally agreed principles for the establishment of authorized headings,” which is provided for in the library community by GARR, UNIMARC/Authorities, and the FRANAR model. That is why Delsey proposes to the FRANAR WG that “if [it] wishes to convey a message to the archival community about compatibility and potential for cross-sector sharing of authority data, I think it should be framed in those terms rather than in terms of common authority files.”

Still another Delsey's comment, but one that was not taken into account in finalizing the response to ICA/CDS, was on the nature of the entity that the authority records describe. Delsey says:

“the entities associated with library authority records differ from those associated with archival authority records in that the former are bibliographic constructs and reflect specific library practice, whereas the latter will tend to be “real” individuals and legal entities.”

At the time of writing these comments, Delsey was preparing a new version of the model – *Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records: A Conceptual Model*, Draft 2003-07-15 for the FRANAR WG. As its title suggests, this version of FRANAR was still considered to be modelling “authority records”, and, at the same time, considerable parts of the text were devoted to describing the “Authority Files in a Library Context” as in chapter 3, and “Authority Data Transfer” as in chapter 8 in which the archival field is discussed. This version was subsequently revised and, as Draft 2003-12-18, was sent for initial review by relevant IFLA committees.³² The subsequent revision of the text took place in the second half of the 2004 and a new version was produced as Draft 2004-11-15. By then the second version of ISAAR(CPF) had already been published. Both of the chapters remained unchanged and as such were part of the Draft 2005-06-15, distributed for the first worldwide review.

The discussion about different treatment of entities in authority records produced by libraries and archives is considered in a wider context that includes publishers (represented by the <indecs> model), museums and rights management organizations. Here Delsey, who as the consultant also prepared this text, further explicates the difference in conceptualizing entities in the two fields:

The foremost of those complicating factors [potential for cross-sector sharing of authority data] is the nature of the entities that are associated with the names and identifiers around which library authority files are centred. As already noted, those entities (*person, family, corporate body, work*, etc.) are bibliographic in nature (i.e., they reflect concepts and constructs that are integral to library cat-

32 On 2 January 2004 Glenn Patton, Chair of the FRANAR WG informed the relevant IFLA committees that the *Functional Requirements for Authority Records* was ready for their comments before worldwide review planned for „later this year“; the deadline for comments was 2 April 2004 [filename: franar initial review].

aloguing practice). Although the authority files created by archives, for example, centre on entities referred to as persons, families, and corporate bodies, it is unlikely that those entity types as defined in an archival context would parallel directly the similarly named entities in the library model. Concepts reflecting the cataloguing practices of libraries, such as “bibliographic identity”, are unlikely to have a direct parallel in archival practices. Hence, in an archival context, it is unlikely that one individual would be recognized as two or more persons, as may be the case in a library context.³³

This example suggests that mapping the bibliographic entities to authority data created by other fields, such as to models and practices developed by publishers, archives, museums and rights management organizations points to complexities that should not be overlooked and/or underestimated. Indeed, Delsey goes on to argue that:

“the potential for asymmetric relationships between the entities on which library authority records are centred and those on which records created in other sectors are centred. Where those asymmetric relationships exist, there is, in turn, the potential for assuming that a specific instance of an entity recognized in one sector is the same as a specific instance of a similar entity recognized in another sector when in fact it is not.”³⁴

He provides the following example for such an asymmetric relationship is the treatment of names of corporate bodies in the archive field:

For example, an authority record created in the archival sector for a corporate body (using the legal name of the body as an authorized form) may be identified as a “match” by a library creating an authority record for that body. However, the archival authority record is likely to have been created for use with all documents associated with that body throughout the course of its existence as a legal entity. The library, on the other hand, may require two or more records, each representing the body during the specific period at which it used a particular form of name (not necessarily its legal name) to identify itself in its publications. In that case, while the archival authority record may contain information that may

33 Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model. IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR). Draft 2005-06-15, p. 54 [filename: FRANAR-Conceptual Model (12) (2)].

34 Ibid., p. 56.

be useful to the library in creating its own authority records, the archival authority record per se will not be directly transferable to the library's authority file. Because the entity on which the archival authority record is centred is not in fact the same as any one of the two or more entities on which the library's authority records would be centred, no assumptions can be made about the applicability of information contained in the archival authority record to the entities represented in the library's authority file. The authorized form established for the archival authority record may or may not be directly transferable to one of the library authority records, depending on whether or not the form and structure of the authorized form is consistent with the rules governing authorized forms created for the library authority file. The content and form of an information note in the archival authority record outlining the history of the corporate body may be in a form suitable for use in one or more of the corresponding library authority records, but the note may well have to be reworked. Some or all of the variant forms for the body as given in the archival authority record may be relevant to one or more of the corresponding library authority records. However, they would have to be sorted through to determine which would form the basis of authorized forms (linked by see also references) for the various records required for the library's authority file and which would be appropriate as variant forms in each of those records.³⁵

Neither chapter 3 nor chapter 8 survived to witness the final version of the FRAD conceptual model published in 2009. Nor did ISAAR(CPF) change the proposed wording in its 1.7, which was in the 2nd edition numbered 1.8., nor did it accept the change of the wording in 1.9 from "a much wider set" to "a different set of requirements" as proposed: "Archival authority records, however, need to support a much wider set of requirements than is the case with library authority records." The remaining part of 1.9 refers to the fact that "archival authority records go much further and usually will contain much more information than library authority records" due to their function of "documenting information about records creators and the context of records creation", but do not mention the entity mapping or even the potential for asymmetric relationships that exist in the concept of entities.

35 Ibid.

The discussion about this focal point and how it should guide further conversation between the two communities was officially moved to the archival community in October 2003 for consideration, and was, therefore, lost to the reader of FRAD.³⁶

Continuing the Dialogue

Continuing the Dialogue is the subject of the document that Glenn Patton, Chair of the FRANAR WG, sent to Australian Adrian Cunningham, Secretary of the ICA Committee on Descriptive Standards, on 23 October 2003.³⁷ This letter was sent in the wake of the adoption of the second edition of ISAAR(CPF) by the Committee on Descriptive Standards in Canberra, Australia, 27-30 October 2003. In it, Patton refers to ICA/CDS's response to the FRANAR WG's comments on the exposure draft of the ISAAR(CPF), 2nd ed., in which they "expressed an interest in our suggestion that it might be possible to develop some sort of a common statement for archives and libraries on authority records". To this end, the letter consists of the already mentioned section prepared by Delsey for the FRANAR WG on the "Cross-Sector Sharing of Authority Data", and this is followed by a suggestion as to how the two communities might explore some of the issues they had already recognized. It proposes working on the update of the mapping of the two sets of elements of MLAR with ISAAR(CPF), 1st edition prepared by ICA/CDS by the FRANAR draft that was to be "shortly issued" for wider review, and ISAAR(CPF), 2nd edition. Patton ends the letter by saying that the FRANAR WG "will be happy to share [FRANAR draft] with you so that you can see how we have mapped various entities and their attributes to the user tasks that we have identified. That could then be the basis of further discussion about how we might map the two sets of elements to each other to attain a common set of elements usable (and useful) to both communities."

The dialogue, however, did not continue: ISAAR(CPF) was published the next year, while the FRANAR WG was preparing the first

36 The argument for not including the two chapters in the final version of the FRAD conceptual model was, as already mentioned, primarily to get rid of the explicit library context, and subsequently its reference to other communities. Also, the text was considered to be more explicative of the situation--didactic in a way--and as such there was no place for it in the type of the document which laid out the design of a conceptual model.

37 2003 October 23; TO: Adrian Cunningham, Secretary, ICA Committee on Descriptive Standards, FROM: Glenn Patton, Chair, IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records, SUBJECT: Continuing the Dialogue [filename: FRANAR ISAAR-CPF].

and then the second call for worldwide review of its model in 2005 and 2007 respectively.

It should be mentioned, though, that the liaison with the archival community did continue³⁸ and its presence was shown to be very much alive both in the FRAR document, and in the comments received during its reviews. The impact of the several years of direct cooperation is evidenced by the fact that the 2005 draft lists attributes for entities and their definitions which are derived “from an examination of data identified and/or defined in FRBR, GARR, *UNIMARC/Authorities, Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records* (MLAR), as well as in the *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families* (ISAAR(CPF)). Other models, such as *Encoded Archival Context*, have emerged more recently and have not been fully evaluated.”³⁹ The same reference to the archival standard and model was retained in the 2007 draft of FRAR released with the 2nd call for worldwide review except for the rewording of the reference to the EAC: “This may be a topic for future investigation.”

The excerpts that follow are taken from the comment log of the first worldwide review.⁴⁰ CC:DA,⁴¹ for example, criticized the “library” bias of the section 3 Authority files in a Library Context: “What is described are also the actions of publishers of periodical indexes, museum curators describing their collections, archivists and others describing cultural materials”; this issue was resolved by moving section 3 to the end of the document and combining it with the “library-specific” appendices. In addition, CC:DA drew attention to the definition of the entity Family stating that it “continues to be a somewhat contentious issue within the United States cataloging community, which seems to be divided into two camps: those who want to identify particular groups of related persons and those who want to identify all persons sharing a family name. [...]The guidelines for family name subject headings in *Library of Congress Subject Headings* take the second approach, over the

38 Adrian Cunningham’s email to Glenn E. Patton on August 3, 2005: A. Cunningham, upon receiving information about the first worldwide review of *Functional Requirements for Authority Records* (FRAR), posted the announcement on the ICA listserv. No comments were received from ICA/CDS or archival community.

39 FRANAR-Conceptual Model (12) (2), p. 17.

40 FRANAR Comment Log, World-wide Review, Comment Period Ending 2005-10-28, Comments on Specific Pages [filename: Comment log worldwide review specific-decisions].

41 CC:DA: American Library Association ALCTS CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

protests of archivists and genealogists who find such generalization totally inadequate. By defining Family as a group of related persons, FRAR places itself firmly in the first camp, and the Names (not to mention the family-to-family relationships) that this approach suggests promise to be incredibly complex.” The action taken by the FRANAR WG was that: “The WG recognizes the truth of these comments but will retain the entity because of its need by other communities”. The University of Washington specifically commented on the text in 8. Authority Data Transfer. They held the opinion that:

There is an implicit bias against sharing authority data outside of the library sector in this part of the report. We found it somewhat misleading to use <indec> as a test case and to imply that everything else must be more difficult. The structure and practices of archival authority data are closer to library structures and practices than <indec>. We agree that all of the problems with archival data described on page 56 are true. However, they are in principle no more difficult to overcome than the problems libraries face with intra-sector sharing of data between countries with differing rules.

The action of the FRANAR WG was “Do nothing” – and thus, section 8 remained in the new draft of the model titled *Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model*, Draft, 2007-04-01.⁴² However, the comment from the Library of Congress that the text “Singles out the <indec> model, but should also indicate knowledge of other models such as CIDOC (museum community), EAC (archival community), CCO (museum and other cultural object collections communities)” was agreed by the FRANAR WG to add clarity to the text.

The 2007 draft was sent for its second worldwide review with comments due by July 15, 2007.⁴³ The log file of this review⁴⁴ shows again the CC:DA recommendation for broadening the scope of the model beyond the library sector, with the following arguments being made:

42 Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model. IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR). Draft 2007-04-01 [filename: FRANAR-Conceptual Model (20)].

43 Invitation to: 2nd World-Wide Review of Functional Requirements for Authority Data Comments due by July 15, 2007 [filename: cover for 2nd worldwide review]

44 FRANAR Comment Log, 2nd World-wide Review, Comment Period Ending 2007-07-15 [filename: Comment log 2nd worldwide review].

The insistence on restricting the scope of this report to the library community seems to deny the reality of today's globally connected and networked world. The 2005 CC:DA FRAR task force pointed out that IFLA's own name would appear to condone a broader scope (i.e., International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions). This, coupled with the fact that numerous other cultural institutions such as museums and archives have the same need for authority data and authority control as libraries, provides a strong argument for making this document as accessible as possible to multiple communities. To say nothing of the need for authority control and consistency within the massive electronic databases represented by the Internet.

The same was voiced by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, while the National Library of Australia made a reference to the EAC:

[we] greatly encourage the group to look more closely at the *Encoded Archival Context* (EAC) before finalising the FRAD conceptual model. We note that that standard includes many data elements that might need to be considered in this model. We also note that EAC's future development would benefit from having a conceptual model as its basis. Some collaborative work is likely to have benefits for both groups. For information: the National Library of Australia is intending to use EAC as the data model for our People Australia service.

The final version of the FRAD model does not mention EAC even in the Attributes section as is the case with the previous drafts, nor does it include the proposed standards derived from ISAAR(CPF) which were under development at the time: *ISAF* (*International Standard on Activities / Functions of corporate bodies*) and *ISIAH* (*International Standard for Institutions with archival holdings*).

In this log file one can read various other comments that recommend extending the model to meet the needs of the archival community, such as addition of the attributes "Genealogy" (different from History of family, source: ISAAR(CPF)); "internal organisation" (source ISAAR(CPF)) (both comments from France⁴⁵); "Custodian" (attribute (or will custodian be a "role" for the relationships between a Group 2 entity and the item?)); and the attributes related to "Provenance": Custodial history and Immediate source of acquisition (both

45 French Working Group of Experts on Authority Data.

comments from LC). These proposals were not accepted in the final version of FRAD.

Still another comment worth mentioning relates to the Corporate Body to Corporate Body hierarchical relationship. The 2007 draft defines an additional sequential relationship between instances of corporate bodies. The comment in question came from the French Working Group of Experts on Authority Data:

The archivists think that it is advisable to envisage a generic “associated with” type of relationship (besides hierarchical ones) in cases when it is difficult to precisely define the nature of the relationship. This is particularly useful in the relationships between corporate bodies.

The final version does not take this into account, and defines the relationship types as: predecessor/successor relationship, separation relationship, amalgamation relationship, subordinate relationship, sequential relationship, and other types of relationship.

Conclusion

In conclusion, one could argue that the communication between the library and archival communities was less fruitful at the level of recognizing the same data element set or adopting some elements from each other’s documents, than it was at the level of recognizing the differences to bear in mind while building services based on the potential functional interoperability of library and archival authority data. The reconstruction discussed in this paper of the influences that the archival and library working groups had on each other’s work while developing their respective standards – the ISAAR(CPF) and the conceptual model FRAD – between 1996 and 2009, is based on the analytical analyses of their documentation. This documentation points to the following areas that might be the subject of further consideration:

- (1) Data elements
 - a. ICA/CDS: to ensure full future compatibility between the two international authority record standards, both groups may need to address and reconcile the archivist’s need for extended information about provenance in the authority record and the librarian’s emphasis on an economical method of access point control.

- b. IFLA/FRANAR WG: to allow the preservation of national or rule-based differences in authorized forms for access points to be used in catalogues that best meet the language and cultural needs of the users; and to define essential elements (a core set) for national and international sharing.
 - c. FRAR/FRAD (2005/2007): working drafts list attributes for entities and their definitions which are derived also from the (ISAAR(CPF) but were not included in the 2009 published edition of FRAD; similarly the drafts mention taking *Encoded Archival Context* (EAC) into consideration, but this was deleted from the published edition.
- (2) Entities and their relationships
- a. FRANAR WG: “the entities associated with library authority records differ from those associated with archival authority records in that the former are bibliographic constructs and reflect specific library practice, whereas the latter will tend to be “real” individuals and legal entities”; [there is] “the potential for asymmetric relationships between the entities on which library authority records are centred and those on which records created in other sectors [archives] are centred. Where those asymmetric relationships exist, there is, in turn, the potential for assuming that a specific instance of an entity recognized in one sector is the same as a specific instance of a similar entity recognized in another sector when in fact it is not.”
 - b. Log files of the 1st and 2nd worldview review of FRAR/FRAD: criticized the “library” bias of the section 3 Authority files in a Library Context, and noted “an implicit bias against sharing authority data outside of the library sector in this part of the report”, referring to section 8. Authority Data Transfer; proposals to add attributes and/or relationship of the archival context were not addressed.
- (3) Terminology and definition of concepts – the FRANAR WG based its comments on the GARR and MLAR documents, which it was using in developing the FRAD conceptual model. However, the FRAD was still work in progress at the time and subsequently evolved.

- (4) Sharing/deriving authority data
- a. ISAAR(CPF), 2nd ed.: a new type of form of name was added--5.1.4 Standardized forms of name according to other rules—with a provision: “This can facilitate the sharing of authority records between different professional communities.”
 - b. FRANAR WG: “a more practical goal would be to increase the potential for the two communities to derive information (including authorized and variant forms of headings, where feasible) from one another’s authority files; [what is needed is] a clearer understanding of the purpose and content of the authority records created by the two communities, and well articulated structures for the recording and communication of authority data”.

References

- Anderson, Dorothy. *Universal Bibliographic Control: A long term policy – A plan for action*. Pullach/München: Verlag Dokumentation, 1974.
- Beaudiquez, Marcelle; Françoise Bourdon. *Management and use of name authority files (personal names, corporate bodies and uniform titles): evaluation and prospects*. München: K.G. Saur, 1991.
- Bourdon, Françoise. *International cooperation in the field of authority data: an analytical study with recommendations*. München: K.G. Saur, 1993.
- Functional requirements for authority data: a conceptual model / edited by Glenn E. Patton; IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR); Final Report, December 2008, Approved by the Standing Committees of the IFLA Cataloguing Section and IFLA Classification and Indexing Section, March 2009. München: K.G. Saur, 2009. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-authority-data>; See also: FRAD Errata (2011) <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frad/FRADerrata2011.pdf> [cited: 2014-09-15]
- Functional requirements for bibliographic records: final report / IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. München: K. G. Saur, 1998. Current text including amendments and corrections to date. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/en/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records> [cited: 2014-09-15]
- Guidelines for Authority Records and References / revised by the IFLA Working Group on GARE revision. 2nd ed. München: K.G. Saur, 2001.
- The Internal Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ICA) and the Essential Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records (IFLA): A Comparison and Report / Prepared by Dagmar Parer (with Adrian Cunningham) and Michael Fox of the International Council on Archives Committee on Descriptive Standards (ICA/CDS); Released and distributed electronically to the members of the ICA/CDS and the IFLA

- Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and the ISADN, 30 July 1998 [filename: ICA-IFLA_CommentsonMLAR1998]
- ISAAR(CPF): International Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families: Final ICA approved version / prepared by the Ad Hoc Commission on Descriptive Standards, Paris, France, 15-20 November 1995. Ottawa: The Secretariat of the ICA Ad Hoc Commission on Descriptive Standards, 1996.
- ISAAR(CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families / prepared by the ICA Committee on Descriptive Standards – Adopted Canberra, Australia, 27-30 October 2003. 2nd ed. Paris: International Council on Archives, 2004. Available at: <http://www.ica.org/10203/standards/isaar-cpf-international-standard-archival-authority-record-for-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-2nd-edition.html>; [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR\(CPF\)2ed.pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR(CPF)2ed.pdf) [cited: 2014-09-15]
- ISO ISNI: ISO 27729: 2012: Information and documentation - International standard name identifier (ISNI). Geneva, ISO, 2012. Available at: http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail?csnumber=44292 [cited: 2014-09-15]
- Joint IFLA/ICA Meeting, Beijing, China, 1 September 1996. / IFLA Journal 22, 4(1996), pp. 319-320.
- MacEwan, Andrew; Anila Angjeli; Janifer Gatenby. The International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI): The Evolving Future of Name Authority Control. // *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 51, 1/3 (2013), 55-71.
- Mandatory Data Elements for Internationally Shared Resource Authority Records: Report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN. [Frankfurt/Main]: IFLA Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme, 1998. Available at: <http://archive.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-2/mlar.htm> [cited: 2014-09-15]
- New IFLA Working Group on International Authority Control. / IFLA Journal 22, 4(1996), p. 318.
- Patton, Glenn. FRANAR: A conceptual model for authority data. // *Authority control in organizing and accessing information: Definition and international experience* / edited by Arlene G. Taylor and Barbara B. Tillett. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Information Press, 2004. Pp. 91-104, 95. DOI 10.1300/J104v38n03_09; pre-publication version at: http://www.sba.unifi.it/ac/relazioni/patton_eng.pdf [cited: 2014-09-15]
- Structures of Corporate Name Headings by Working Group on the Revision of FSCH and Compiled and introduced by Ton Heijligers. Final Report - November 2000. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/publications/structures-of-corporate-name-headings> [cited: 2014-09-15]
- UNIMARC Manual: Authorities Format. 2nd revised and enlarged ed. München: K. G. Saur, 2001.
- Willer, Mirna. Name Authority Control Paradigm Shift in the Network Environment. // *Frameworks for ICT Policy: Government, Social and Legal Issues* / edited by Esharenana E. Adomi. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2010. Str. 182-205. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-61692-012-8.ch012.

AUTORIZIRANI PODACI ZA IMENA KNJIŽNIČNE I ARHIVISTIČKE ZAJEDNICE MOGUĆNOST FUNKCIONALNE INTEROPERABILNOSTI

Sažetak

Rad istražuje konceptualni model podataka knjižnične zajednice i arhivistički standard u području autoriziranih podataka za imena s ciljem da se rekonstruira međusobni utjecaj tokom njihova razvoja u razdoblju od 1996. do 2009., a koji bi mogao imati posljedice na funkcionalnu interoperabilnost podataka dviju zajednica. U radu se koristi analitička analiza radnih dokumenata dviju IFLA-inih radnih grupa, čiji se rezultati uspoređuju s objavljenim dokumentima knjižnične i arhivističke zajednice.

IFLA-ine radne grupe su Radna grupa za minimalnu razinu autoriziranih zapisa i ISADN i Studijska grupa za uvjete za funkcionalnost autoriziranih zapisa i obrojčivanje, dok proučavani korpus čine IFLA-ini dokumenti *Obvezni elementi podataka za međunarodnu razmjenu autoriziranih zapisa* i konceptualni model *Uvjeti za funkcionalnost autoriziranih podataka (FRAD)*, te 1. i 2. izdanje standarda Međunarodnog arhivskog vijeća *Međunarodna norma arhivističkog normiranog zapisa za pravne i fizičke osobe te obitelji (ISAAR(CPF))*.

U zaključku se iznosi mišljenje da je komunikacija između knjižnične i arhivističke zajednice bila plodnija, na razini prepoznavanja razlika o kojima se mora voditi računa pri izgradnji usluga temeljenih na funkcionalnoj interoperabilnosti knjižničnih i arhivističkih autoriziranih podataka nego li na razini prepoznavanja istih elemenata podataka ili prihvaćanja pojedinih elemenata od druge zajednice.

Gljučne riječi: Međunarodno arhivsko vijeće, Odbor za opisne norme, IFLA-ina Radna grupa za minimalnu razinu autoriziranih zapisa i ISADN, IFLA-ina Studijska grupa za uvjete za funkcionalnost autoriziranih zapisa i obrojčivanje, *Obvezni elementi podataka za međunarodnu razmjenu autoriziranih zapisa*, *Uvjeti za funkcionalnost autoriziranih podataka (FRAD)*, *Međunarodna norma arhivističkog normiranog zapisa za pravne i fizičke osobe te obitelji (ISAAR(CPF))*, funkcionalna interoperabilnost