

**OLAC CAPC**  
**Moving Image Work-Level Records Task Force**  
**Report and Recommendations**  
**January 5, 2009**

**Part I: Moving Image Work Definition and Boundaries**  
**Part II: Core Attributes and Relationships**

**Task Force Members:**

Kelley McGrath (chair; subgroup 1 and 4 leader)  
Susannah Benedetti (subgroup 2)  
Karen Gorss Benko (subgroup 3)  
Lynne Bisko (subgroup 4)  
Greta de Groat (subgroup 1)  
Scott M. Dutkiewicz (subgroup 4)  
Ngoc-My Guidarelli (subgroup 2)  
Jeannette Ho (subgroup 2 leader)  
Nancy Lorimer (subgroup 1)  
Scott Piepenburg (subgroup 3)  
Thelma Ross (subgroup 3 leader)  
Walt Walker (subgroup 3)

**Advisors to the Task Force:**

David Miller  
Jay Weitz  
Martha Yee

**Introduction**

The Moving Image Work-Level Records Task Force of Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) was charged with investigating and making recommendations on issues related to FRBR-based work-level records for moving image materials, including, but not limited to:

- Identifying characteristics of moving image works (possibly with some indication of relative importance) that should be included in work-level records and creating operational definitions of these characteristics.
- Identifying potential sources of information about these characteristics and examining the reliability of these sources.
- Examining existing bibliographic records to identify places where work-level information might be recorded and investigating the possibility of extracting information from pools of existing bibliographic records to create provisional work-level records.

Due to the large nature of the task, after initial discussion, the task force split up into subgroups to work on different aspects of our charge. In addition, it quickly emerged that there was not complete consensus on the definition of a moving image work nor on where to draw the boundaries between moving image works. Therefore, an additional task, that of defining a moving image work and examining some test cases to see where boundaries might usefully be drawn, was added. After each subgroup completed its work, the task force as a whole discussed the results. This paper consists of our recommendations based on the work of the first two subgroups. Draft reports and recommendations based on the work of the second two subgroups are forthcoming. The tasks of each subgroup are listed below:

**Subgroup 1, Definition of moving image work**

- Write a definition of a moving image work.
- Identify boundary lines between works and also consider whether some moving images should be considered expressions of other works rather than works in their own right.
- Address a list of representative scenarios provided by the task force, as well as any others deemed relevant to create a useful and practical definition.

**Subgroup 2, Core attributes of moving image works**

- Come up with a list of potential attributes of moving image works (e.g., director, title, country of production, color) and identify a subset that should be considered “core” and added to moving image work records whenever possible with a reasonable amount of effort. This might involve seeing what research there might be as to what attributes users are interested in and also looking at what attributes are included (and how prominently) in resources like IMDB (Internet Movie Database, <http://www.imdb.com>), AMG (All Movie Guide, <http://www.allmovie.com>), or print reference sources.

Subgroups 3 and 4 worked with a limited list of representative data elements, although if the work is deemed useful it may be expanded to include a more comprehensive list of elements. The elements initially addressed are (1) original title; (2) original date; (3) director; (4) original language; (5) original aspect ratio.

**Subgroup 3, Operational definitions and potential sources for this information:**

- Supply operational definitions for each attribute that would be useful for catalogers trying to fill in this information (e.g., what does original year mean? Year of release? In what venue? Year filming is finished?).
- Consider what sources of data (both specific sources, such as IMDB, AMG or specific reference sources, or type of sources, such as reference books in general, video containers and other publisher-supplied information, personal websites, catalogers’ guesses) should be permitted for each attribute.
- Make an assessment of the relative reliability of potential sources or types of sources.

#### **Subgroup 4, Extracting work-level records from MARC manifestation records**

- Identify places in MARC manifestation-level bibliographic records where work-level information may be encoded.
- Examine a sample of MARC records to see how reliably this information might be extrapolated from existing records by automated means.

Although the task force attempted to define practical solutions that could be implemented with today's technology, we did not limit ourselves to things that can be implemented in our current record infrastructure. It is also not clear to us that future displays have to look like current displays, especially for feature films. Records for feature films often contain a large amount of information that is generally not displayed in a way that allows users to easily identify the information that they are interested in. Therefore, the task force's recommendations should not necessarily be judged by their suitability for use in the current environment. However, the task force has kept in mind the need to move from where we are now to where we would like to be.

### **PART I: MOVING IMAGE WORK DEFINITION AND BOUNDARIES**

The Moving Image Work-Level Records Task Force attempted to come up with a definition of a moving image work and to provide recommendations for determining when a moving image becomes a new work and when a moving image is an expression of a non-moving image work. After much discussion, we reached few conclusions. The FRBR report itself acknowledges the difficulty of defining a work.

Because the notion of a *work* is abstract, it is difficult to define precise boundaries for the entity. The concept of what constitutes a *work* and where the line of demarcation lies between one *work* and another may in fact be viewed differently from one culture to another. Consequently the bibliographic conventions established by various cultures or national groups may differ in terms of the criteria they use for determining the boundaries between one *work* and another. (p. 17)

The book *Understanding FRBR* provides further examples of different emphases on work boundaries in different specialist communities, even within the Anglo-American cataloging tradition. Vellucci (in Taylor, p. 137) recaps the long-standing disagreement between film and video and music catalogers over main entry (and therefore work boundaries) for musical performances on film and video. In addition, it is instructive to contrast the emphasis on the physicality of the work and the uniqueness of closely-related works in the art and architecture chapter where “a preliminary drawing by Picasso for a particular painting is not an expression or manifestation of that work—it is a separate and distinct related work” (p. 103-104) with the music chapter where the emphasis is on the collocation and relationship of various expressions of what is considered a single work.

There have recently been some attempts to provide more practical interpretations of FRBR that may not follow orthodox, complete FRBR modeling. For example, Tarango attempts to “make FRBR fit the serials publishing reality” instead of insisting on creating

separate work, expression, and manifestation level records when these are not useful or practical to construct. He also introduces a new entity, the “work segment” (p. 1). Another example of a practical interpretation of FRBR is the “Definition of a FRBR-based Metadata Model for the Indiana University Variations3 Project.” The implementers of the Variations3 project found it beneficial to introduce four work attributes that are not included in the FRBR Report:

- language
- identifier
- place of composition
- genre/form/style

Of these, language is most pertinent to one problem we face with moving images where it seem to be useful and efficient to record the original or intended value of an attribute at the work level and the value of the particular variation in hand at the expression level. Their argument for including language at the work level as well as the expression level is that

Language does not appear at the Work level in the FRBR report, assuming that a textual work only achieves a specific language once it is fixed in an Expression. For musical works, however, any text present is a re-use of an existing text, even if written for use specifically in the musical Work. With this in mind, we consider the language of the text to be a part of the abstract Work, but also to record language at the Expression level, to accommodate translations. (Riley, p. 4)

Since this was written, the authors of FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data) have suggested adding original language as a FRBR work attribute. (p. 20)

We were inspired by these approaches and decided to try to redefine our task in more practical terms to see if we could reach a more useful conclusion. Therefore, rather than trying to come to a perfect, pure, theoretically-correct interpretation of FRBR we have chosen instead to attempt to define a practical interpretation built on the insights of FRBR that we believe will offer better access to information about moving image works sought by our users while also providing efficiency and economic benefits in creating and maintaining records.

We propose to define a record for moving images that would combine work-level characteristics with characteristics of the primary expression. For moving images, the primary or original expression is generally the form of the work at its first public release, public screening or broadcast. For works that have not been publicly distributed, the primary expression can be considered to be the intended expression, to the extent that it can be determined, or may have to be defined in some other way.

We believe that this approach provides two main benefits:

1. Film and video are often re-issued so there are economic and efficiency incentives for making it easy to re-use this data, especially since there is often extensive information that is common to all versions of a moving image.
2. We currently do a poor job of providing consistent and useful access to many parts of the subset of information that is common to all versions of a given moving image (e.g., original language, country of production, date of original release or broadcast), despite the fact that it is clear that users are interested in this information.

Although the proposed clumping of information does not exactly correspond to any orthodox FRBR entity, it does largely correspond to the types of information found in records for what are essentially FRBR-like moving image works in popular online databases, such as the Internet Movie Database and the All Movie Guide. This approach would allow us to provide better and more consistent access to information known to be of interest to users. For example, in current manifestation-level bibliographic records, the date of original release or broadcast is not consistently given and, when it is given, it is not in a form that is reliably useful for display or for computer manipulation or extraction.

There are, in fact, some work attributes given in the FRBR report which are similar to the types of attributes that we are proposing for the primary expression of a moving image work in that they do not necessarily apply to all expressions. The most obvious examples are medium of performance (musical work) and key (musical work), which are elements traditionally used to identify musical works and appear in many uniform titles. Medium of performance is defined as the medium “for which a musical *work* was originally intended” and key as the key “in which the *work* is originally composed.” (p. 35) Although values such as color and aspect ratio are not commonly used to identify moving image works, the value of such attributes for a particular expression is only completely meaningful in the context of the original or intended value.

From a practical standpoint, we would like to record this information only once, be able to share and re-use it effectively, and to store this information in such a way that it is easy to collectively enhance and correct it. This is most efficiently done with a record that includes both work-level information narrowly defined and information that is based on the primary expression of a work.

Through the use of application profiles, we hope that this approach will provide more flexibility in display and manipulation of moving image information and allow us to efficiently provide the information that we think users are most interested in without undermining interoperability with other materials found in library catalogs.

### **Moving Images of Performances of Previously Existing Works**

The question of how to treat moving image recordings of performances of previously existing works has been a vexing one for us. The traditional interpretation of performance

is that it is an expression of a work. This interpretation is strongly held by the music cataloging community and reflects the need to bring together and relate large numbers of variations, including both scores and recordings of performances, and the way that users of musical resources think about those objects.

On the other hand, the moving image cataloging community has traditionally held that visual recording of performances should have title main entry, which implies that the recording is a new work of mixed responsibility. The FRBR report states that “adaptations of a *work* from one literary or art form to another (e.g., dramatizations, adaptations from one medium of the graphic arts to another, etc.) are considered to represent new *works*,” which could be interpreted to mean that taking a play from a written text to a three-dimensional performance creates a new work. However, it seems to be widely held that this statement refers to such things as rewriting a novel as a play or turning a novel into a film, but not to performing a play. Miller and Le Boeuf (2005) make a strong argument that the creative and interpretive process involved in putting together a performance is significant and justifies treating them as new works.

Nevertheless, a performance of a previously existing work usually does remain tightly bound to that work in many ways and it is clear that patrons often want to access performances in the context of the original work. However, it seems to us that if the relationships between recordings of performances and original works are consistently recorded in a machine-comprehensible form, displays could be constructed that fulfill this need whether a performance is treated as a new work or as an expression. From the point of view of recording and reusing related clusters of information efficiently, it may be more useful to create separate work records for recordings of performances or to somehow develop multiple levels of expressions. The proposed object-oriented version of FRBR, FRBRoo, includes both a performance work, which was “designed to cover the sets of concepts that pertain to the elaboration of live performances and of performances that take place with the sole purpose of being recorded (e.g., in movies, studio recordings of music, etc.)” (Le Boeuf 2008) and a recording work, which is “intended to apply to sets of concepts that pertain to the elaboration of any kind of recording. The type of the thing recorded is not taken into consideration: it can be birdsong, the changing aspect of the Empire State Building over eight hours in an Andy Warhol movie, or anything” (Le Boeuf 2008). These new classes of works would seem to serve this purpose.

### **When to Create a New Work/Primary Expression Record for Moving Images**

We initially set out to determine whether certain typical, as well as some less common, representative examples of moving images would represent distinct works or expressions of other works. Since we have shifted our focus to the creation of practical work/primary expression (WPE) records, we have changed the emphasis of this part of our charge. The suggested situations, as well as some additional ones, are listed below, along with our assessment of the utility of handling them as separate, but related, WPE records or as expressions of a single WPE record.

The decision as to whether to handle something as a separate, but related WPE records or as a single WPE record with one or more expressions is based on a number of practical considerations. These include:

- Degree of commonality among versions. For example, the theatrical release and the director’s cut or the edited-for-airline-viewing version of movies generally share most characteristics in common.
- Extent to which there are primary and derivative versions where the derivative versions are expressions of the primary version
- Extent to which a new version can substitute for the original version

In general, we have attempted to make decisions in line with people’s likely perceptions. We also considered the efficiencies gained by recording information only once in a single WPE record. Where extensive information varies between different versions, it is probably more efficient to create separate (but perhaps linked in some way) WPE records. The list of test cases and our recommendations follow.

**Features:**

1. Original feature film based on new script	New WPE
2. Feature film based on a novel	New WPE with link to novel
3. Feature film based on play	New WPE with link to play
4. Remake of existing feature film using same script	New WPE with link to original film; link to script if published separately

**Performances:**

5. Play stage performance	New WPE with link to play
6. Opera stage performance	New WPE with link to opera
7. Several nights of an opera stage performance edited into a single TV version	New WPE with link to opera
8. Symphony stage performance	New WPE with link to symphony
9. Ballet stage performance	New WPE with link to ballet choreographic work and musical work

10. Improvisational dance stage performance	New WPE with link to musical work and to choreographic work if applicable
11. Euripides' Medea play (DVD of professional performance in original Greek)	New WPE with link to play
12. Euripides' Medea play (DVD of professional performance of English translation)	New WPE with link to play (make link to specific English expression if known; otherwise link to play as work)
13. Medea adapted for a school play (DVD of performance)	New WPE with link to play (make link to specific English adaptation expression if known; otherwise link to play as work)
14. Medea (school play) shown as HD TV show	Same WPE as #13
15. Medea (school play) shown as streaming video	Same WPE as #13
16. Medea (school play) streaming video preserved on DCAM archival tape	Same WPE as #13

**Other scenarios:**

17. Animated film	New WPE
18. Documentary consisting of compilation of previously existing footage from different films with narration	New WPE
19. Instructional video on roof repair	New WPE
20. Reality TV show	New WPE
21. Lecture with video and audio versions	New WPE for video version
22. Film version of a stage musical which may be somewhat abridged but has most of the dialogue and music from the stage version	New WPE with link to musical (both musical work and libretto)



23. Film version of a stage musical which may or may not have most of the dialog and music from the stage version (it would take research to determine)	New WPE with link to musical (both musical work and libretto)
24. Film version of a stage musical which is known to have completely rewritten the book and added newly composed songs, retaining only one or two from the original score	New WPE with link showing that this is an adaptation of the original musical (link to both original musical work and libretto)
25. Video of musical-kinetic sculpture	New WPE; The sculpture would be the subject of the video and the MARC relator code \$4 dpc (depicted) would also be appropriate.

### Version Issues

<p>26. Early talkies that were filmed in multiple language versions, sometimes with different casts</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>The Spanish vs English versions of <i>Dracula</i>. The only thing they have in common is the sets (the Spanish crew worked at night—and even got to the end of shooting before the set was properly dressed and had to do without the requisite spider webs).</p> <p>The English and German versions of Garbo's <i>Anna Christie</i>. In this case Garbo is in both, though the rest of the cast and the directors differ. They are very different from each other, even in costuming and makeup.</p> <p>The German and English versions of <i>The Blue Angel</i> (not coincidentally with the same cast and director) are so close that on a practical level they could be</p>	<p>New WPE with link to related version for other language version(s).</p>
---	--

<p>considered expressions.</p> <p>The Spanish version of Laurel and Hardy's <i>Chickens Come Home</i> was surprisingly similar to the English version despite different actresses and a lengthy interlude with a fire-eater not in the English version.</p>	
<p>27. Film released simultaneously in multiple languages, e.g., <i>Coup de grâce</i> and <i>Fangschuss</i> (two records per AMIM, IMDB has one). The original film has a soundtrack in a mixture of French and German. It was presumably released with different language credits and the appropriate subtitles in each country, but the substance of the film remains the same.</p>	<p>Expression/version based on one WPE</p>
<p>28. European and American versions of a silent film, with the same personnel but made of different takes of the same scenes, usually but not always edited the same</p>	<p>Expression/version based on one WPE</p>
<p>29. Reconstructed version of a silent film that mixes pieces of the European and American versions</p>	<p>Expression/version based on one WPE</p>
<p>30. Film which has most of the same takes, but for certain scenes there are alternative takes for mature-rated theatrical and video and cleaner takes for television and airplane viewing</p>	<p>Expression/version based on existing WPE</p>
<p>31. Frame-by-frame Psycho remake</p>	<p>New WPE with link to original film</p>
<p>32. Foreign feature film dubbed and reedited with added sequences for the American market with actors not in the foreign version (e.g.,</p>	<p>Expression/version based on one WPE</p>

the original <i>Godzilla</i> )	
33. Feature film with the original soundtrack removed and dubbed with dialogue which has little or nothing to do with the original dialog and changes the plot (e.g., <i>What's up Tiger Lily?</i> , in which Woody Allen uses dubbed dialogue to spoof a Japanese action film or the Firesign Theater DVD entitled <i>Hot Shorts</i> in which new dialogue is put to episodes of old movie serials, e.g., <i>Spy Smasher</i> becomes <i>Revenge of the Non-Smokers</i> )	New WPE with link to original moving image work. In most cases, changes in soundtracks are either translations or commentary and do not make a new work. However, in this case, the new plot presented in the soundtrack fits the FRBR criterion of “significant degree of independent intellectual or artistic effort” and therefore should be considered a new work. Most works of this sort are parodies, which are explicitly defined in the FRBR report as new works (p. 18).
34. English language dubbed version of a French live action feature	Expression of a WPE for the French language film
35. Dubbed version of an animated film (e.g. Miyazaki’s <i>Spirited Away</i> with well-known English-speaking voice actors)	Expression of a WPE for the Japanese language film. In cases with well-known voice actors doing the dubbing, it is desirable to include these names in an expression-level record. In most cases, the dubbing voices are unknown/uncredited and unlikely to be important to users.
36. <i>Silents Please</i> , a 1960s television show that edited silent films to fit a 30-minute time slot and screened with new narration (including both the narrative and commentary) and a host	Each episode is an abridged expression with new narration of a WPE for the original silent film; the series as a whole is a new aggregate work
37. Film reconstruction of a lost film using the original screenplay/scenario and stills	Expression of the lost WPE because it is a moving image and intended as a surrogate for the original

### Related Non-Moving Image Materials

38. Libretto to an opera or musical published separately	Out of scope
39. Screenplay of a film published	Out of scope

separately	
40. Music from the film arranged into an orchestral suite	Out of scope
41. Music from the film on a soundtrack album of the cues	Out of scope
42. "Soundtrack album" consisting of preexisting records that were used on the film soundtrack	Out of scope
43. Set of film stills or lobby cards from a film	Out of scope
44. Single film still	Out of scope
45. Picture book of film stills with the screenplay or scenario so that one has the narrative of the film with stills of some of the visuals	Out of scope

## **PART II: CORE ATTRIBUTES AND RELATIONSHIPS FOR MOVING IMAGE WPE RECORDS**

The task force has compiled a list of potential attributes (original title, color, etc.) and relationships or roles (directors, producers, television series, etc.) for moving image work/primary expression records and identifying a subset of "core" attributes and relationships that should be added to such work/primary expression records whenever possible and applicable. This is intended as a desirable minimum standard. Attributes and relationships not identified as "core" were categorized as recommended or optional.

The task force scanned the literature to identify moving image data elements that were valued the most highly by library users and examined which elements were displayed prominently in moving image-related reference tools, such as the Internet Movie Database and the All Movie Guide. The task force also examined which data elements were required in the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Core standard for moving images (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/coremim.html>), and which ones were required in OCLC's standard for records coded at the full level (<http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/default.shtm>). In addition, we examined several documents, including a Library of Congress memo on "Designation of Roles in RDA" (5JSC/LC/11, <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/docs/5lc11.pdf>), the OLAC CAPC RDA Task Force's response to this memo (which formed the basis of the task force's list of roles), and an appendix containing ALA's response to the LC memo (5JSC/LC/11/ALA response, <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/docs/5lc10->

[alaresp.pdf](#)). We also looked at the elements included in MIC (Moving Image Collection Core Metadata, [http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/text/how/unioncat\\_registry\\_table\\_04\\_23.htm](http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/text/how/unioncat_registry_table_04_23.htm)) and PBCore (Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary Project, [http://www.pbcore.org/PBCore/PBCore\\_by\\_QuickIndex.html](http://www.pbcore.org/PBCore/PBCore_by_QuickIndex.html)) metadata.

The most contentious part of the task force discussion on this topic revolved around the list of roles for entities responsible for the creation of moving image works. The first role that people usually associate with moving images is that of the director. However, the role of director is far more important for some types of works (e.g., feature films) than for some other types of moving images. For example, in television, producers are often more important than directors. In some cases, the director is unknown or the work does not have a director. The task force was unable to identify a single role or set of roles that we felt should be core for *all* moving images. We have therefore concluded that it is desirable wherever possible to identify one or more main creators of a moving image work, but that the type of creators identified will vary from work to work. We have provided a list of commonly-occurring roles, as well as examples of the roles that might be considered central for a variety of types of moving images. We have also included a brief list of commonly-occurring work-to-work relationships.

Finally, as the task force is proposing a definition for moving image work/primary expression records that combines work-level characteristics with characteristics of the primary expression, many attributes below may describe the primary expression, rather than the work in a strict sense, when this concept is applicable. For example, the attributes duration, color, aspect ratio, sound format, “sound or silent”, etc. may reflect characteristics of the expression that was originally broadcast on television or released in theaters, as opposed to expressions released at a later date (e.g., director’s cut, unrated version later released on DVD, dubbed version of a movie with scenes edited out, colorized versions, etc.).

The task force does not intend to imply that characteristics of the primary expression that may vary in later expressions, such as original color or original language, should only be recorded in the work/primary expression record. Clearly the value(s) that apply to the particular manifestation in hand also need to be recorded and displayed to users in the context of their original value(s). The question of meaningful inheritance of these types of values has also been raised. We think that it works in a similar way to some other elements already listed in FRBR at the work level, such as musical key, which is defined as the key of the original composition and which can vary in later expressions. Although later expression- or manifestation-level records do not always inherit the value of the primary expression, they do inherit the fact that this element has this original or intended value and it is this that we are trying to represent in the work/primary expression record.

Although some characteristics of the primary expression, such as color or presence or absence of sound, are more concrete than what many associate with FRBR works, the task force believes that when people conceive of “works” they will create, they almost always have a rudimentary idea of expression in mind. To take an over-used example, it’s

quite implausible that Shakespeare suddenly thought “uh, uh, uh, how about something called Hamlet?”, rather than “Eureka! A drama about Hamlet.” In Shakespeare’s case, that would mean a drama about Hamlet in English. At the most basic creative level—the level where the rudimentary concept whacks the creator on the side of the head—the primary expression is already implicitly present. So although, in FRBR, separating the notion of “work” is valuable in terms of the ground base of authority file structures, or something similar in terms of data structures, it’s not necessarily that real in terms of the creative process. Color can be a very important part of the creative conception of a moving image. For example, the 1960s Czech New Wave film *Limonádový Joe aneb Koňská Opera* (*Lemonade Joe*) was filmed in black and white and then tinted in various colors, which were intended to fit the mood of the scene or have some other symbolic significance.

In some ways, the moving image creation process is hard to reconcile with the FRBR abstract work model as there usually isn’t one abstract notion in one or two people’s heads to hang on to as moving images are generally very much a collaborative effort. It’s difficult to say where the abstract work is before it’s realized,

It was also considered appropriate to address live performances captured on video or film using this model, as they combine characteristics of the original work being performed (musical score, written play, etc.) with those of the primary moving image expression (the actual performance as it was intended to be broadcast on television or released on film or video).

### **Core Attributes and Relationships**

- Title
  - Title Type (e.g., stand-alone work, episode, series, unknown)
- Date
  - Date Type (e.g., production, release, broadcast, unknown)
- Primary Creator(s) and Contributor(s)

After much discussion, we could not agree on specific role(s) that would always be primary for all types of moving images. We therefore recommend that the determination of primary role(s) be left to cataloger’s judgment. However, we have provided a list of common roles as well as some examples of various types of moving images works with suggested primary roles for guidance (p. 16-20 below). If possible, at least one creator should be given for every moving image work, but there are works that have no known creator(s) or for which identifying creator(s) is impractical.

  - Role(s) associated with Creators and Contributors
  - Authority [for form of name] (e.g., NACO authority file, AACR2-compatible form, but not in national authority file, transcribed from manifestation, none)

- Identifier (repeatable with the option to identify a primary identifier)
  - Identifier Source
- Work(s) that WPE is based on or is a performance of
  - Relation Type
- Creator(s) of works that WPE is based on or is a performance of
  - Role(s) associated with Creators of these related works
- Work(s) that WPE forms part of (e.g., television series)
 

Core for fiction television series and recommended for other types of works

  - Relation Type
- Form/Genre
  - Form/Genre Source (e.g., LCSH, MIGFG, local list, no controlled vocabulary used)
- Summary/Description
- Color/B&W/Mixed
- Sound/Silent
- Duration (core for moving images with sound; for silent films optionally give number of reels or other measurement of length of original film)

### **Recommended Attributes and Relationships**

- Variant Title
- Language (strongly recommended for most fictional and artistic works)
- Country of Origin (strongly recommended for most fictional and artistic works)
- Aspect ratio
- Awards
- Audience appropriateness (MPAA rating, parental guide/flags)
- Subjects
  - Subjects (corporate bodies)
  - Subjects (events)
  - Subjects (geographic areas)
  - Subjects (individuals)
  - Subjects (settings for fictional or dramatic works)
  - Subjects (time periods)
  - Subjects (topical)
- Characters portrayed (fictional and dramatic works)
- Contents note

- Identifiers for or links to manifestations if these can be established (OCLC#, ISBN, publisher's numbers)
- Related work(s), such as television series
  - Relation Type

### **Optional Attributes and Relationships**

- Intended audience (grade level, age of interest, etc.)
- Filming location (often more important for live performances)
- Sound format
  - Number of channels (e.g., stereo., mono., etc.)
  - Compression technique (e.g., Dolby Digital Surround Ex)
  - Other details (e.g., THX, a high-fidelity sound reproduction standard)
- Links to reviews
- Source of data

We hope to expand source of data to apply to each element or relationship so that catalogers can document the source of their information. This is particularly important for work-level data where the item-in-hand cannot always be considered the final authority.

Particular constituencies may wish to include additional data elements not considered by the task force at this time.

### **Commonly-Occurring Relationships**

- Work(s) that WPE is based on (used for moving images adapted from novels, plays, etc.)
- Work(s) that WPE is a performance of (used for recordings of live stage performances of dance, music, plays, etc.)
- Work(s) that WPE forms part of (e.g., television series, other types of series)
- Work(s) that WPE has a sequential relationship with (e.g., sequels, prequels, relationship between sequential episodes of TV series)

### **Commonly-Occurring Roles**

Actor/Actress

Animator

Art director/Production designer

Broadcaster (original network, e.g., ABC, CNN, and/or station, e.g., WGBH, where moving image was originally broadcast)

Cameraperson

Choreographer

Chorusmaster

Comedian/Comedy group

Commentator



Composer  
Conductor  
Consultant/Advisor  
Contributor  
Corporate body sponsor or host of conference  
Costume designer  
Dancer (including individual dancers as well as dance companies)  
Director (for film, television, video, etc.; see also stage director)  
Director of photography/Cinematographer/Videographer  
Editor (of film or video)  
Executive producer  
Filmmaker  
Host  
Institution responsible for work's production or that hosted an event (e.g., a University that produced a video or museum that hosted an event)  
Interviewee  
Interviewer  
Lecturer  
Librettist  
Lighting designer  
Lyricist  
Moderator  
Musical director  
Musician (e.g., vocalists, instrumentalists, performing groups, etc.)  
Narrator  
On-screen presenter (A person appearing on screen in nonfiction moving image materials or introductions to fiction moving image materials to provide contextual or background information. Use when a more specific term, e.g., narrator or host, is either not applicable or not desired.) *See also* Presenter.  
Panelist  
Performers/Performing groups (those not listed elsewhere or when it is not possible or desired to specify)  
Performing animal (individual, named animal, not a character name)  
Person or body bringing the action  
Person or body prosecuted  
Presenter (A person, family, or corporate body mentioned in an “X presents” credit for moving image materials and who is probably associated with production, finance, or distribution in some way. In the early years of film production, this was often used as a vanity credit. [AMIM]) *See also* On-screen presenter.  
Producer  
Production company  
Project coordinator  
Puppeteer  
Puppetmaker  
Reporter  
Reviewer

Screenwriter/Writer  
Set designer  
Sound editor  
Special effects designer  
Stage director  
Story originator (“Original story by...”)  
Storyteller  
Teacher/Instructor  
Television series creator  
Videorecording engineer  
Voice actors/actresses for animated films

Some roles associated with moving images may be appropriate at other FRBR levels in addition to or instead of being included in work-primary expression records. For example, expressions may also have film or video editors and restorer is a credit that is only appropriate at the expression level.

### **Selected Examples of Types of Moving Image Works and Relevant Core Roles and Relationships**

These are meant to be representative examples and are not definitive nor exhaustive. In most cases it is desirable to include additional roles, but we have tried to identify the core roles usually associated with various types of works. We recommend following the spirit of the PCC recommendation for added entries, which says to “[u]se judgment in assessing each item and assign a complement of added entries that covers the primary relationships associated with the manifestation of which the item is a part. The inclusion and importance of added entries are intended to reflect individual cataloger's judgment and/or local institutional policy.” (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/core2002.html>)

In some instances, not all roles listed in the examples are equally important or applicable for all works of a given type and judgment should be used. For example, the production company of an animated film may be very important if it is Disney or Pixar and less important or inapplicable for a low-budget or one-person production.

For materials such as unedited footage, amateur films, or non-commercial or archival materials it may be helpful to consult *AMIM* and archival practices.

- Documentary  
Director(s) or filmmaker(s)
- Fiction feature or short  
Director(s)  
Lead cast member(s)  
Creator(s) of work(s) on which the moving image is based (e.g., novels, plays, stage musicals)  
Link to work(s) on which the moving image is based

- Fiction TV series episode
  - Executive producer(s) or television series creator(s)
  - Lead cast member(s)
  - Link to TV series work(s) of which the episode is part
  
- Animation
  - Animator(s)
  - Director(s)
  - Lead voice actor(s)
  - Production company or companies
  
- Educational/ Industrial
  - Production company or companies
  - Institutional/educational sponsor(s) of production
  - Host(s)/Narrator(s)
  - Director(s)
  - Screenwriter(s)/Writer(s)
  - Consultant(s)/Advisor(s)
  
- Instructional
  - Instructor(s)
  
- Live performance
 

Generally, include such information as name(s) of primary performers and the primary creator(s) of works being performed, as well as links to the work(s) being performed.

  - Dance
    - Choreographer(s)
    - Primary dancer(s) and/or dance company or companies
    - Link to choreographic work(s)
    - Link to musical work(s) and composer(s) of musical work(s), when applicable
  
  - Music
    - Composer(s)
    - Primary performer(s) and/or performing group(s)
    - Conductor(s)
    - Link to musical work(s)

- Dramatic music (e.g., operas, musicals)
  - Primary performer(s) and/or performing group(s)
  - Stage director(s)
  - Director(s) (for film, television, video, etc.)
  - Composer(s)
  - Librettist(s)
  - Link to musical work(s)
- Drama
  - Stage director(s)
  - Director(s) (for film, television, video, etc.)
  - Primary performer(s) and/or performing group(s)
  - Author(s) of dramatic work(s)
  - Link to textual dramatic work(s)
- Stand-up comedy
  - Comedian(s) and/or comedy group(s)
- News
  - Reporter(s)
  - Producer(s)
  - Broadcaster (network, e.g., ABC, CNN)
- Interview
  - Interviewee(s)
  - Interviewer(s)
- Lecture/Presentation
  - Lecturer(s)
- Travelogue
  - Host(s) or narrator(s)
  - Director(s)
- Panel discussion
  - Moderator(s)
  - Panel members

## **References**

IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records.  
*Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Report*. As amended  
 and corrected through February 2008. The Hague, Netherlands: International

- Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 2008.  
[http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr\\_2008.pdf](http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr_2008.pdf)
- IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR). *Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model*. Draft 2007-04-01. The Hague, Netherlands: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 2007. <http://www.ifla.org/VII/d4/FRANAR-ConceptualModel-2ndReview.pdf>
- International Working Group on FRBR and CIDOC CRM Harmonisation. FRBR object-oriented definition and mapping to FRBR<sub>ER</sub>. Version 0.9 draft. 2008.  
[http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/docs/frbr\\_oo/frbr\\_docs/FRBR\\_oo\\_V0.9.pdf](http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/docs/frbr_oo/frbr_docs/FRBR_oo_V0.9.pdf)
- Le Boeuf, Patrick. "Responses to the comments on FRBRoo [from the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonization Group]." E-mail to Kelley McGrath. 1 Aug., 2008.
- Miller, David and Patrick Le Boeuf. "'Such Stuff as Dreams are Made on': How does FRBR Fit Performing Arts?" *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 39.3/4 (2005): 151-78.
- Riley, Jenn, Caitlin Hunter, Chris Colvard, and Alex Berry. "Definition of a FRBR-based Metadata Model for the Indiana University Variations3 Project." Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2007.  
<http://www.dlib.indiana.edu/projects/variations3/docs/v3FRBRreport.pdf>
- Tarango, Adolfo. "FRBR for Serials: Rounding the Square to Fit the Peg." 2008.  
<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/FRBR-for-serials.pdf>
- Taylor, Arlene G., ed. *Understanding FRBR: What It Is and How It Will Affect Our Retrieval Tools*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2007.