## ISSUE 360: 360-LRMOO

General discussion:

TA mentioned that some of the classes in LRM –such as F20 Performance Work –are really marginal given the scope of the model, and their link to other useful concepts is not self-evident. Some of the concepts and the relations documented are of little significance to actual users of the model.

**HW**: TA committed to have produce the FRBR-LRM graphs by May. Also the CB should produce a clean document for FRBR-LRM which will essentially comprise of the numbers of classes and properties, –not their scope notes, . The model will be based on the mapping of LRMer to LRMoo.

A feedback from the sig is to precede the updating of the scope notes.

LRMer to LRMoo

**DECISIONS:**

1. **F19 Publication Work** will be excluded from the LRMoo model, it cannot be distinguished from an F28 Expression Creation.
2. **F20 Performance Work** will be excluded from the LRMoo model –its substance is captured by W1 Work (comment by TA)
3. **F21 Recording Work** will be excluded from the LRMoo model.
4. **F26 Recording** will be excluded from the LRMoo model.
5. **F3 Manifestation** will be included in the LRMoo model. MD should review the properties of E3
6. **F5 Item** will be included in the LRMoo model.
7. A mapping between LRM-E7 Person to CRMbase E21 Person has been made. **F10 Person** in LRMoo is a deprecated class, hence there should be a note to “Use E21 instead”.
8. **F11 Representative Manifestation Assignment** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition
9. **F42 Representative Expression Assignment** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition
10. **F43 Identifier Rule** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition
11. **F44 Bibliographic Agency** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition.
12. **F52 Name Use Activity** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition but it will be included in CRMsoc –see ISSUE 358 below.
13. **F51 Pursuit** will be excluded from the LRM-FRBRoo model definition but it will be included in CRMsoc –see ISSUE 358 below.
14. **CLPs should be reconsidered** (MD’s HW).Some of them are not even class properties, but simply duplicate CRM properties.
15. **Regarding the mapping of LRM-E3 Expression to F25 Performance Plan the sig proposed the following**:
16. F25 Performance Plan will be excluded from the LRMoo model,
17. affected property **R25 performed (was performed in) [D:F31 Perfomance , R: F25 Performance Plan]** will take Fxx Externalization (i.e. a new superclass to F2 Expression) as range, instead.
18. instead of a performance plan, the link of an instance of F31 Performance to a set of directions on how to perform it should be achieved through P33 used specific technique and E29 Design or Procedure instead (F31-P33-E29)
19. **R25 performed (was performed in) [D:F33 Performance, R: Expression]** **is not a subproperty of** P33 used specific technique (was used by) [D:E7 Activity, R:E29 Design or Procedure]
20. Fxx Externalization (superclass of F2 Expression) is to be introduced to the model. Fxx Externalization is to be linked to F31 Performance and F28 Expression Creation through an Rxx created. It was assigned to MD to write scope note.
21. Regarding the **handling of aggregation works and their derivatives** (such as translations) of aggregation works on the one hand **and serial works** on the other, MZ proposed that the continuity of the serialized work be achieved through the introduction of a new F5 Item level that is the sum of all issues of a periodical for instance.
MD proposed that each issue should be assigned its own expression and that the relation with the overall (serial) work should be captured through the collective expression (the sum of all expressions). In line with what was the practice in the PARTHENOS model, the identity of a collection that keeps changing over time could be cast in terms of the purpose the collection serves.
MZ suggested that a serial work cannot be treated on a par with an aggregation, given that the former is dynamic whereas the latter isn’t. In the case of an aggregation, the collection is put together at one point in time.

MD explained that in this case, the sum of the expressions creates a new work.

MZ mentioned that this seems to work OK but there are problems in borderline cases, like a translation of a collection.

MD proposed that this should be treated as an instance of an overall F1 Work, comprising of the translation of the aggregated expressions –but this work is not considered an aggregation in and of itself.

1. **F17 Aggregation Work will be excluded from the LRMoo model.**
2. The statement “F17 Aggregation Work may include additional original parts” found in the scope note should be integrated in the scope note for F1 Work (“F1 Work may include additional original parts.”)
3. A new property Rxx uses expression (an expression is used in) [D: F1 Work, R: F1 Work] is to be introduced in LRMoo. It portrays a relation between works (and their expressions), not parts thereof. It’s a subproperty of P148 has component (is component of) [D: E89 Propositional Object, R: P89 Propositional Object].
It is to be inferred by the new property Rxx incorporates external expression (see below) by a deduction rule when the F2 Expression (in the range of the property) is the expression of a complete work.
4. A new property Rxx incorporates external expression (external expression is incorporated in) [D: F2 Expression, R: F2 Expression] is to be introduced in LRMoo. The incorporated F2 Expression (R) can be a component of the overall F2 Expression (D), as are the otherwise unrelated short stories that are put together to make up a collection. Alternatively, the incorporated E2 Expression can have less symbolic specificity, despite having integrity in and of itself –like the lyrics of a song that extend over a large portion of the score, but are by no means a separate constituent thereof.