

European BIBFRAME Workshop

*The perception of BIBFRAME from
the francophone world*

Julie Toussaint



Contact: Julie-toussaint@hotmail.com



LinkedIn: [Julie Toussaint](#)

Presentation and methodology

- End-of-study dissertation
- Primary sources (quantitative et qualitative)
 - Tweets → 16
 - Facebook Posts → 1
 - Interviews → 14
 - Blog post → 7

Positives arguments

- BF = Real stockage format
 - Has a very clear image of the successor of MARC
- BF is not only for libraries
 - Interesting for libraries with very diversified collections (KBR in Belgium)
- BF is based on the web standards



Negatif argument

- **BF is too simple**
 - Authorities
 - For BF 1.0 work -> instance
 - The new instance « item » in BF 2.0 is not enough
- **Lack of interoperability with RDA**
 - BF not based on FRBR
 - RDA Registry as an alternative?
 - Create a vocabulary based on IFLA-LRM still a possibility
- **Not international enough**
 - In the communication
 - More about MARC21 than MARC
 - BF doesn't take care enough of other standards (RDA, FRBR)

Conclusion

- BF has not yet conquered the francophone world
 - Negative arguments were more present in the corpus
 - Even if it has arguments
 - Sometimes not even known by the libraries
- Need a better communication around the model (its evolution and its arguments) and more concrete applications (implementations)



Questions