**Name of project:** WikiProject Books

**URL:** <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:WikiProject_Books>

**Summary (1-2 sentences):**

“The aim of the WikiProject Books is:

* to define a set of properties that can be used both by [book infoboxes](https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Special:MyLanguage/Wikidata:WikiProject_Infoboxes/works), Commons books templates, and [Wikisource](https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Special:MyLanguage/Wikidata:Wikisource).
* to map and import all relevant data that currently is spread in Commons, Wikipedia, and Wikisource.
* establish methods to interact with this data from different projects.”

**Discussion:**

1. **Background (a few words)**

The project has decided to use FRBR as the basis of their work and to essentially create two sets of properties concentrating on describing the “*work*” and the “*edition*”. The latter is understood as a combination of FRBR’s “*expression*” and “*manifestation*”, as the group found the boundary between these not easy enough to grasp.

This also goes along with the current view on books as represented in Wikimedia and Wikisource. While the first often falls back on the “*work*” view, “(i.e. the Bible, Pinocchio, Hamlet are regarded as "creative works", which have been embodied in several translation and editions and different media)”, the latter often uses a particular “*edition*” as its main “object” or “item”.

The page provides an extensive list of properties for both, “*work*” and “*edition*”, and then follows with:

* Interproject properties - only to be used with “*edition*” and providing relations to Wikimedia and Wikisource
* Qualifiers - for both, “*work*” and “*edition*”
* Exemplar properties - when a single copy of a book has become notable for some reason and therefore has its own Wikipedia page
* Manuscript properties - as single copies of literary works and hence to be distinguished from those
* Properties for periodical and collection of works

1. **What it does well (1-2 sentences)**

Using a well established domain model and mapping that with what exists in Wikimedia and Wikisource where it makes sense rather than trying to create something new altogether.

Also seems to have a broad participants/contributors base.

1. **Shortcomings (1-2 sentences)**

*[Don’t know FRBR in that detail to comment on suitability of all the properties chosen.]*

1. **Possible relation to archival description and structured archival data (1-2 sentences)**

Not sure, if the representation of archival records on Wikipedia would match the one of books, so not sure, if a similar approach would make sense. Might be something to consider in the context of the WikiProject Archival Description (<https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:WikiProject_Archival_Description>), although that concentrates on the higher levels of fonds and collections.