**Name of Standard:** IFLA Library Reference Model A Conceptual Model for Bibliographic Information [commonly called "LRM"]

**URL:** [**https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr-lrm/ifla-lrm-august-2017\_rev201712.pdf**](https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr-lrm/ifla-lrm-august-2017_rev201712.pdf)

**Related Resources: FRBR** [**https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr/frbr\_2008.pdf**](https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr/frbr_2008.pdf)

**Summary (1-2 sentences):** LRM presents a conceptual model of bibliographic [sic] data. It is based on FRBR but extends it to incorporate the related models for name and subject "authority data" FRAD and FRSAD.

**Discussion:**

1. **Background (a few words)**
2. **What kind of a standard is it? (Conceptual model, ontology, …)** Conceptual model, with extensive set of entities, attributes, and relationships. Entities start with LRM-E1, Res, "Any entity in the universe of discourse"—a super-superclass. The model is very generic when it comes to attributes.
3. **Who maintains this standard?** IFLA.
4. **How old is it?** From 2017, updated as of December 2017.
5. **What is its stated purpose and scope?** The scope is all bibliographic data, for all entities defined in the FR family of models. It is intended to be comprehensive and to be used as the basis for content standards, data models, and system development.
6. **Relation to Archival Description (1-2 sentences)**
   1. **expand on 1d** LRM comes from the library community and does not claim to extend to all heritage communities. However, the development of a common model cross-community is seen as a goal. Unlike FRBR, LRM has nothing specifically calling on archival principles. (FRBR at least mentioned "fond" as an example of an aggregate entity.) LRM does include "has part" and "is part of" relationships for Work, Expression, and Manifestation, and the concept of "aggregating work" which gets expressed and then embodied in an aggregate manifestation.
   2. **If archival description is outside the state purpose/scope, explain how it could be used for archival metadata** It's hard to say what's outside the purpose/scope of something so abstract. Is anything excluded from the definition of Item as "An object or objects carrying signs intended to convey intellectual or artistic content" for instance? That's very similar to RiC's definition of Record as "Linguistic, symbolic, or graphic information represented in any persistent form, on any durable carrier, by any method, by an Agent in the course of life or work events and Activities." The task might be to figure out if anything in archival description has not been modelled in LRM. After all, archival description deals with resources similar to those commonly described by libraries. Or even: What is archival description?
7. **What it does well (1-2 sentences)** LRM puts all resources into a single structure. It is comprehensive and self-contained and internally consistent.
8. **Shortcomings (1-2 sentences)** Some entities can be hard to grasp, like Nomen.
9. **Possible Impact on Structured Archival Data (2-5 sentences)** How is structured archival data different from structured library data? There's no obvious lack in LRM. LRM does not seem to have any way to express sequence, as in "original order."