As you know (cf. Monique Hulvey’s presentation - CERL Workshop in Antwerp last September), confronted to the development of individual provenances databases in France, the French library community organized itself into an informal working group in June 2013. This group is composed of both university libraries and public librairies which are not run by the same administrations and do not belong to the same networks. Interoperability is at the heart of this project, and we hope to continue to draw it in close collaboration with the CERL Provenance working group, thanks to Monique Hulvey’s helpful contribution.

We had the chance to bring forth online our first recommendations (open access), thanks to the BiblioPat website: http://www.bibliopat.fr/provenances/provenances-des-collections-aide-a-la-description-et-au-signalement.

BiblioPat is a young association; we can say it’s the French heritage libraries association.
For this round-table, we have chosen to identify 2 main questions.

- Which provenance data?
- Which levels of interoperability?
Our first question is: Which provenance data? This was an important part of our meetings. We thought that we have to pay attention to 4 levels of information (cf. the slide). On BiblioPat website, recommendations are developed for those 4 parts. These 4 facets seem to be obvious. But the results of our survey (2013) show it’s not.

Comments:
- By possessor we mean person or institution
- We can add genre, profession, biographical notes, etc.
- We can also say as you know that a former owner has often several kinds of marks
- We have to remind the importance of unidentified marks and so, the importance of the image(s)
- We had to link the first 3 data with the item where the marks are encountered (with the localization of the mark or provenance evidence in the book)

All of this should be completed by the relevant littérature, illustration metadata (our working group didn’t discuss about that yet), etc...
In a database project, we have to structure these 4 facets (cf. the slide).

Those associations are present into bibliographic records (field of copy description / indexation) or into authority records.
Then, levels of interoperability is the second part of this presentation.
I made a little exercise, I hope the result (= the table on the slide) is not too complicated.
We can considered these levels like different steps, in a complementary way.
I identified 4 examples about interoperability issues in federating Provenance information (cf. slide). For each type I tried to define what we have & what do we need (considered overall the French context).

Comments:
- 1st : « common frame of reference ». CT = CERL Thesaurus. Terminology with SKOS is also a common frame of reference, in another way (cf. the 2d presentation).
- 2d : For the « lowest common denominator », we realize that the Dublin Core description is not really pertinent (most of information don’t concerned provenance data)
In the 2 first cases : we can find several copies of possessor’s name
- 3rd : « to harmonize the structure » : maybe also languages
- 4th : we have still so many questions ... but I hope some answers tomorrow during the meeting.

In France, at that time, our working group has applied for funding with the « Equipex Biblissima » in order to prepare the next step of this endeavor. We are expecting about developing a common tool.