

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative
RE: *RDA: Resource Description and Access* Part A, Chapters 6-7. Constituency Review
of June 2006 Draft

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
RDA Development Issues	4
General Comments	6
Comments on RDA Part A, Addendum	7
Comments on Chapter 6	11
Comments on Chapter 7	31
Appendix: Bibliographic Relationships in RDA Chapter 6	59

Executive Summary

1. RDA Development Process

There is a growing crisis of confidence within ALA regarding the RDA development process and its ability to produce a viable standard. ALA believes that the current work on RDA can and should go forward successfully, but that the following changes are needed to shift the focus of the development process:

- I. Adopt a top-down development approach
- II. Revise the development timeline, allowing an opportunity to review RDA as a whole
- III. Provide additional support for the development of RDA
- IV. Do not use AACR2 alone as the source of ideas and practices for RDA
- V. Clarify the decision-making authority and responsibility.

2. “Additional Instructions” in Chapters 6 and 7

ALA would welcome the incorporation of the additional instructions in Chapter 6 (6.11–6.13) into the general instructions (see comments under 6.11–6.13 for specific issues related to this). However, we have significant concerns about doing the same for the additional instructions in Chapter 7 and therefore recommend that the additional instructions within 7.7–7.12 remain separate (see specific comments on 7.7)

3. Chapter 6 Relationship Taxonomy

ALA recommends that the existing relationship taxonomy in the draft of Chapter 6 be replaced by one based upon the taxonomy developed by Barbara Tillett, and the chapter reorganized accordingly. The chapter should also more thoroughly incorporate additional concepts from the FRBR model (see Appendix to the ALA response and also comments on Chapter 6).

In response to the JSC’s question in the cover letter to the draft, ALA recommends that 6.4 Source/Reproduction and 6.5 Format/Format relationships should remain as separate sections if the existing taxonomy is retained.

4. Chapter 6 Techniques for Recording Relationships

ALA recommends that RDA include more guidance on differentiating between the various techniques for recording relationships (e.g. between “citation and “embedded description”), and provide guidance on when the various techniques should be used. ALA also recommends that RDA emphasize the use of access points and authority records rather than recording relationships within bibliographic descriptions.

5. Primary Access Point

There is internal disagreement within ALA regarding whether or not the concept of primary access point is still viable. In general, though, ALA acknowledges the need to keep the concept for the near future. At the same time, however, we would like to see RDA move toward an emphasis upon work and expression identifiers so that these will be in place when systems can actually make appropriate use of these identifiers as a linking mechanism. In particular, we would like to see a close connection articulated in RDA between the selection of primary access point and the selection of the work identifier.

ALA recommends moving away from basing primary access on the presentation of information within a resource. The inconsistency that can result from this practice undermines the ability to create consistent work identifiers (see specific comments on 7.2.0.1.2b, 7.2.2.1.1)

6. Mixed Responsibility

Although there is a vocal minority within ALA who agrees that the concept of “principal responsibility” — properly defined — can cover all cases in which more than one party is responsible for the creation of a work, the consensus within ALA is that the same set of guidelines should **not** cover both cases in which the parties perform the same function (“shared responsibility” in AACR2) and cases in which the parties perform different functions (“mixed responsibility” in AACR2). ALA therefore proposes to limit 7.2.2 to works of shared responsibility and to reinstate guidelines for works of mixed responsibility in a subsequent section of Chapter 7 (see general comments on Chapter 7 and specific comments on 7.2.3).

7. Primary Access for Performances

The majority of ALA members would like to see 7.2.8 expanded to include a definition of “performance” that will allow these guidelines to apply to performances of dramatic works in addition to musical works, and to both sound and video recordings. Additional guidance will then be needed in RDA to define the levels of additional responsibility for other performances to determine under what circumstances a performance becomes a new work of mixed responsibility, as opposed to a performance of a pre-existing work.

8. Designations of Role

ALA recommends that RDA include a stronger statement in favor of the use of designations of role because of their vital role in fulfilling the FRBR-related functionalities of a catalogue (see comments at 7.6)

RDA Development Issues

There is a growing crisis of confidence within ALA regarding the RDA development process and its ability to produce a viable standard.

The development schedule for RDA was based on several underlying assumptions that have proven untrue.

- Drafts would be issued in a form close to that of the finished product;
- Volunteers, upon whom the success of the project depends, could handle the workload;
- There would be adequate editorial support to address structural development, textual drafting, textual revision, and proofing;
- AACR2 rules could seamlessly be integrated, without significant revision, into the new RDA structure.

ALA believes that none of these conditions are being met. Instead we find that:

- There remain issues of major and minor import within the structure and text of the drafts that have not been adequately resolved;
- Volunteers are increasingly overwhelmed by the volume and pace of the drafting work, which has exponentially increased as the volume of the drafts grows and the issues accumulate;
- There is more work than one person can reasonably handle, with the consequence that the editor's considerable skills and experience are being ill-used upon minutiae rather than larger tasks to which they are better suited;
- Significant thought and understanding is required to recast AACR2 rules drawn from ISBD principles into a 21st century FRBR context which is "significantly changed" from that of 30 odd years ago.

ALA believes that the current work on RDA can and should go forward successfully, but that changes are needed to shift the focus of the development process.

- I. Adopt a top-down development approach:** Deal with larger, overarching issues before addressing smaller, technical ones. Determine a clear and explicit scope for RDA in terms of whom it will serve, what resources it will address, and what types of metadata it will produce. Based on this, provide a better assessment of the existing Principles and Objectives, editing them as necessary to achieve the stated scope; establish priorities among competing principles and objectives. Finally, develop an intermediate level document consisting of a principled set of general guidelines. These will constitute a benchmark against which to evaluate specific instructions in terms of their appropriateness and whether they are of a general, specific, or special nature.
- II. Revise the development timeline, allowing an opportunity to review RDA as a whole:** Without access to the entire standard (including introductions, appendices, glossary, and examples), constituency reviewers are unable to assess its potential viability or its fulfillment of the objectives and principles. The development schedule must be

modified to allow for additional drafts as deemed necessary by the content developers and to provide constituencies the opportunity to review the standard in toto.

- III. Provide additional support for the development of RDA:** There are a number of tasks that need to be accomplished. These require different sets of skills, and need not be assigned to one person: (a) development of a high-level set of general principles or guidelines that provide the structure and logical basis for the specific guidelines; (b) creation of specific guidelines based on AACR2 rules and other sources; (c) editing of the text for stylistic clarity and consistency; (d) incorporation of revisions based on constituency comments and JSC decisions; (e) design of the products, both online and print. Reassess the role of the editor, allowing him to concentrate on the high-level conceptual tasks, and hire additional staff whose skills are appropriate to the remaining tasks.
- IV. Do not use AACR2 alone as the source of ideas and practices for RDA.** We draw attention to earlier work in the development of Dublin Core and its underlying abstract model, DACS and CCO, the work of Tillett and Smiraglia (among others) on bibliographic relationships, and conferences like the Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium as resources to further inform RDA, its development, and its instructions.
- V. Clarify the decision-making authority and responsibility:** Clarify the relative roles of the editor and the JSC. If authority for determining the content of RDA remains with the JSC, sufficient time and effort must be devoted to resolving the remaining issues regarding content. The viability of RDA as a standard depends on the resolution of problems raised during the constituency review.

The stakes are high. RDA cannot be treated as just a revision of the existing cataloguing code. At this critical juncture, it can be nothing less than the blueprint for the future role of cataloguing and metadata in libraries. RDA must be positioned both as an effective option in a suite of metadata structures and as a touchstone for the emergence of other metadata options. To that end, we strongly endorse the JSC's commitment to create RDA as a *new* standard, as well as the stated objective that RDA "should be amenable to adaptation by various communities to meet their specific needs." The stakes are high and this moment in time is right because, as the RDA Prospectus rightly indicates, "[d]igital technologies have significantly changed the environment in which libraries, archives, museums, and other information management organizations build and maintain the databases that describe and provide access to resources in their collections."

ALA feels that it is much more important to "get the content right" than to follow a schedule. We urge that the schedule be revised, and be flexible in its application. We further urge that the project plan be reconceived to give priority to the resolution of the larger issues, with sufficient time allowed for implementing decisions on those large issues. Finally, we urge that the formal constituency review take place when the entire standard can be assessed as a whole.

General Comments

Formatting, Wording Conventions, etc.

1. As we have commented previously regarding Chapters 1–5, ALA finds many of the definitions used within the chapters of RDA (including Chapters 6 and 7) to be needlessly circular.
2. ALA notes that the phrase “if considered to be important” is used frequently within elements that are already optional. Clarification is needed as to when this phrase is used and for what purpose. We are concerned that if it is used frequently, its absence for some optional guidelines will be confusing. ALA reviewers still regularly assumed that an instruction to record a certain element meant that it is required, even when the element is clearly labeled as an optional element.
3. While the addition of the labels “optional element”, etc. are a big improvement, RDA still needs to standardize where these designations appear in relation to the guidelines and subsections of guidelines. For example, 6.11.2.1 appears to be mandatory, but the conventions in 6.1.3–6.1.7 for recording relationships are optional

Terminology

1. ALA reviewers noted a significant amount of confusion based upon use of the term “citation” as both a controlled and an uncontrolled access point, as well as the somewhat haphazard use of the latter two terms within Chapters 6 and 7. See our specific comments on relevant guidelines in both chapters.
2. In Chapter 6, ALA finds the concepts of “citation” and “embedded description” to be very confusing, and requests clarification of the distinction (see comments on 6.1.2, etc.)
3. Both Chapters 6 and 7 would benefit from an increased use of FRBR terminology.

Comments on RDA Part A, Addendum

General Comments

ALA recommends stating definitions in a more direct, simple style, such as:

Work. A distinct intellectual or artistic creation (i.e., the intellectual or artistic content).

Specific comments on addendum to Chapter 1

1.1. ALA recommends that definitions of “authority control” and “transcription” be included.

1.1.5. Since these definitions are taken from FRBR, should that be referenced here?

1.1.5.3. There is no acknowledgement of cartographic notation in this definition. Cartographic notation includes both graphic and alpha-numeric notations. We request that this be incorporated.

1.1.5.6. We recommend transforming this into definitions of “aggregate” and “component”.

1.1.6. Since these definitions are taken from FRAR, should that be referenced here?

While we understand that it is desirable to keep the definitions in agreement with FRAR, we note the following deficiencies of the definitions:

1.1.6.2. Definition of Person. If the term “person” is an “individual,” can that be taken to mean a non-human “individual”? There are rare cases in which animals have performed responsible functions such as acting (the original Rin-Tin-Tin), painting (various elephants and primates), and the presence of signing primates raises the possibility of textual/linguistic participation in a work or expression (even in principle authorship seems unlikely). Computer programs can also be credited for creation (such as Racter, credited as the creator of “The policeman’s beard is half-constructed”). If a person can be a persona of a group, the category of person is obviously not confined to “natural persons” in the legal sense. We’ve had a special rule for spirit communications for years, and such cases should be included in this definition as well. ALA suggests that “persons” not be confined to human beings, and that cataloguers should be encouraged to use a common sense guideline for determining when this would be appropriate.

This definition also needs an example of a group that adopts an individual “persona”. A possibility would be “Carolyn Keene”, the attributed author of the Nancy Drew novels, which were actually written by several different people.

1.1.6.3. Definition of family. We recommend changing “legal status” to “affiliation”. Constituting families legally is a fairly recent development, is more prevalent in the US than the rest of the world, and still excludes many self-described families in the modern US.

1.1.6.4. Definition of corporate body. This instruction needs to be clarified to include events, conferences, and jurisdictions.

We note that this definition is less inclusive than the glossary entry in AACR2, and we prefer the AACR2 definition:

Corporate body: An organization or group of persons that is identified by a particular name and that acts, or may act, as an entity. Typical examples of corporate bodies are associations, institutions, business firms, nonprofit enterprises, governments, government agencies, religious bodies, local churches, and conferences.

1.1.7.2. While this definition is based on FRAR, that document also includes the following statement,

Note: For the purposes of this model, names and terms that are not controlled through an authority file are excluded from the definition of access point.

There is some confusion within ALA concerning the distinction between controlled access points and access points that are not controlled in RDA. Does the term “access point” in RDA include title access points, such as the title proper? If so, then it would seem to be at odds with the FRAR definition, given the note above.

If the definition of “access point” is retained, we propose rewording the definition as:

a name, term, code, etc., which is intended to be indexed and searchable.

1.1.7.4. Primary access point. We would prefer to see the concept of work identifier worked into the definition.

1.1.8.1. We propose changing the definition of “citation” to:

a minimal description of a work, expression, manifestation, or item that uniquely identifies it.

1.1.8.2. This information does not belong here, as it is not a definition or an example, but instructions on how to construct a citation. Suggest moving to Part B (or 7.2).

The phrase “in the form prescribed” is also unclear.

Specific comments on addendum to Chapter 3

3.22.0. Can this be folded into the five conventions for recording relationships in Chapter 6? Broadly speaking, this fits into the concept first outlined in 6.1.2.1.d) “providing an informal

reference to the related resource ...” (of course, those instructions would have to be modified slightly to accommodate this type of information).

We recommend that this be moved into 6.5, and that 6.5.0.1.1 be reworded to allow for format/format relationships involving different publishers.

Specific comments on addendum to Chapter 4

4.7. It is unclear what the relationship is between this section and 6.2.1 (Component resource).

In any case, this is a definite improvement over the last draft.

4.7.0.1.2. This instruction mentions “informal note(s).” What’s the difference between a formal and an informal note? We suggest revising the text to:

Apply the instructions given under 4.7 when indicating the contents of a resource.

4.7.0.3.2. It seems odd to have “optional addition” and “if such information is considered important” in the same instruction.

4.7.0.3.3. Delete “issued successively”. Just because a resource was issued simultaneously does not mean that the library or the cataloguer has it all at the time of creating the description.

Change “make notes on” to “indicate” and delete “indicate” later in the sentence.

Reword the last sentence to “Update as new parts become available”. We should encourage updating even if the holdings never become complete.

4.10. How do these instructions differ in concept from the bibliographic relationships presented in Chapter 6? The scope (4.10.0.1.2) specifically mentions “making an informal reference(s) to the bibliographic history of a resource,” while Chapter 6 (see 6.1.6.0.1) gives instructions to “Make an informal reference to the related resource in the form of a note ...”

We recommend folding the instructions for informal notes about bibliographic history into Chapter 6.

Throughout this section, we recommend changing “noting” to “recording” and “make notes on” to “record”.

4.10.0.1.1. Scope and definition of bibliographic history. This definition is awkward and unclear. “Derivation”, in particular, is abstract and unclear. What is the definition intended to convey?

4.10.0.1.3. Shorten this to “For other ... given in Chapter 6.”

4.10.0.3.1. Delete the last three examples; they have been properly copied to 6.1.6.0.1 and are no longer appropriate here.

Specific comments on addendum to Chapter 5

5.6. Section 6.3 has been moved to 5.6, where have the other sections in Chapter 6 been moved?

Currently the last instruction in chapter 5 is 5.3, and now 6.3 is becoming 5.6. What about 5.4 and 5.5?

Comments on Chapter 6

General Comments on Chapter 6

Organization of the chapter, terminology, formatting, etc.

ALA reviewers of Chapter 6 frequently expressed concerns that Chapter 6 is difficult to read and understand. There is a great amount of redundancy between sections, and, as we describe below, the use of terminology is confusing and, in some cases, inconsistent.

Along with a general amount of repetition, there is an excessive use of the phrase “access point” throughout Chapter 6. For example, it is used three times in 6.1.4.1.1:

If the related work is one for which the primary access point is the name of a person, family, or corporate body (see 7.2), construct the access point using that access point followed by the title of the work.

This requires a fair amount of re-reading in order to comprehend it.

ALA recommends that the generalized instructions about the five conventions used to record related resources appear only once in this chapter, instead of being repeated (with minor variations) under each rule number. The end result under each specific rule number would look something like the references in 6.11.0.2.1, 6.11.1.2.1, 6.11.2.1.1, 6.11.3.1.1, 6.11.4.1.1, 6.12.0.2.1, etc. The options or alternatives under specific relationships should be retained in the sections where they appear.

ALA is concerned that the relationships outlined in Chapter 6 misleadingly appear to be called “elements” (e.g. “Optional element”) when the chapter actually defines elements used to *record* relationships. This distinction between “relationships” and “elements” needs to be more clearly defined in the wording of the chapter. We also suggest changing the title of this chapter to the more accurate: **Relationships with Other Resources**.

Generalization of additional instructions

ALA would be happy to see the additional instructions for music, art, and legal resources (6.11–6.13) folded into the general instructions: they are examples of relationships previously given in the chapter, instead of being new relationships. This will help dispel the impression of some reviewers that the general guidelines apply only textual materials. As we note below, some alteration of the general guidelines may be necessary (in addition to adding specific examples) to fully accommodate all of these relationships. We also note that if the sections of additional instructions are eliminated that the captions in the chapter should be revised to eliminate the word “general”.

Taxonomy

As ALA has indicated previously and in the attached Appendix, we propose that Chapter 6 be reconceived as a complete taxonomy of bibliographic relationships, using Tillett's taxonomy of bibliographic relationships and incorporating from FRBR concepts such as the concept of the relationships between the FRBR entities at all levels. While this likely will result in the need to develop content that is not currently present in AACR2, it would make the taxonomy complete. Without the proposed restructuring, there are many within ALA who feel the chapter is incomplete and would require an additional category of "Other." The chapter often doesn't use FRBR terminology and is also lacking guidelines that discuss the relationship between Manifestation and Work.

While we prefer that the chapter be reorganized, we have included specific comments on many of the guidelines as they appear in the draft, with the understanding that some of these specific comments will become moot if the chapter is reorganized.

Organization of relationships

No matter the taxonomy used, the relationships should be presented logically. ALA suggests that the Group 1 entity structure could be used as an organizing tool to group the relationships.

Complexity of relationships

This chapter does not provide a true picture of the types of relationships that exist among different resources. In reading through these instructions, all relationships are presented as linear, bi-directional, and could easily be interpreted as also having equal importance. By trying to define relationships in this way, RDA has oversimplified these complex relationships. ALA would like to see guidelines added to Chapter 6 to cover what to do when more than one relationship between two resources apply (for example, for a translation that is also a revised edition). We note Patrick Le Boeuf's conceptualization (*CCQ*, vol. 39, no. 3/4, p. 103–124) of a work at the center of a "solar system", with "galaxies" linking these work-centered relationships.

Handling of relationships

RDA needs to take a principled approach to addressing the existence of relationships. A general guideline defining relationship and listing the various ways to demonstrate a relationship (with the particular method to be used in any given case left up to the judgment of the cataloguer), together with examples of the various more specific types of relationships that are now rigidly enumerated, including some examples of complex combinations of relationships, would be a possible improvement to the current structure.

ALA would like to see the reference to an "access point" as a technique for recording a relationship emphasize that the access point is actually a work or expression identifier. One of the strengths of this technique is that it allows the demonstration of a one-to-many relationship (e.g., a work to its expressions/manifestations, an author to his or her works, a series to publications in the series, and so forth). Variant names, titles, terms, etc. for the "one" can be

stored once on the authority record for the “one” rather than repeated over and over on the “many.” Reviewed on its own, Chapter 6 seems to imply that demonstration of relationships should be on a many-to-many basis, rather than a one-to-many basis. In other words, it implies that every bibliographic record for an “edition” should refer to every other bibliographic record for an “edition” of the same work. Chapter 6 on its own suggests that the bibliographic record bears the brunt of conveying relationships, instead of relying on the catalogue itself to bring related works together. In current practice, the latter approach is how the majority of format/format or edition/edition relationships are conveyed to our catalogue users.

One way to make these two techniques clearer in RDA is to look at how other resource description communities view relationships. The CCO community has begun using the phrases “explicit” and “implicit” relationships, and the RDF folks use “strong” and “weak” relationships. Strong or explicit relationships are those that are explicitly coded and use resource identifiers to point from one record to another, while implicit or weak relationships are those that are created by the presence of the same string in multiple records so that a search brings all records together. In RDF, the idea that if item A is related explicitly to item B (strong) and item B is related explicitly to item C (strong), items A & C then can be said to have some type of weak (implicit) link between them and can be brought together programmatically and on-demand. When we talk about related resources in Chapter 6, we really only mean the explicit relationships. Implicit relationships are constructed through the primary/secondary access points, citations/uniform titles, subject headings, or the presence of the same strings in other elements across records. This type of relationship is a benefit of the controlled data. We need to find a way to tighten our semantics in this area, and also include within RDA a discussion of the nature of relationships, the various functions they serve, and principles for deciding what needs to be explicitly recorded and what does not. (See also the Appendix section on “Relative Importance of Relationships.”)

Reference to “Encoded values”

The chapter makes reference to using encoded values in a number of places, e.g. 6.1.3.0. This will be a method available for achieving many kinds of results in the catalogue, but we do not feel that it should be a part of the guidelines. It’s more a question of how a system implements recording the relationships.

Need for more FRBR terminology

ALA would like to see more FRBR terminology built into Chapter 6. For example, the Source/Derivative relationship definition mentions works or expressions (6.6.1.1, p. 6–20), but no FRBR terms are used for Source/Reproduction relationships (6.4.0.1.1, p. 6–14), although we would assume that these are different manifestations. There are many instances throughout Chapter 6 where FRBR terminology should be used explicitly within the relationship taxonomy.

Too many options

ALA is concerned that Chapter 6 presents too many options for recording relationships, and needs to offer specific guidance about when to apply the five conventions. Not all the methods for recording related resources presented in Chapter 6 will work for all levels of FRBR. For

example, using an embedded description seems to only make sense at the manifestation level. Yet the cataloguer is given no direction in this regard, and is led to believe that any or all methods are acceptable in all situations.

Although the options allow for a great deal of flexibility (which may be seen as essential given the wide audience that RDA is attempting to reach), that very flexibility will encourage the development of interpretation manuals at the national or cooperative program level in order to establish a “common ground” or “best practices” guideline. (For example, the options in 6.1.2.1 — which trickle down throughout the rest of Chapter 6 — are not equivalent in their functionality, depending on the context of the bibliographic description.)

We would like to see some structure imposed on this flexibility based on what aspects of cataloguing are really important to standardize. This would help to establish a common ground for sharing records between catalogues. If it is important to record a certain type of relationship in order to fulfill the functions of a catalogue, then we need to record that relationship. This may or may not also apply to which method is used to record the relationship.

AACR2 currently allows too many methods for recording relationships, and these methods are often too vague. The application of these various options presents a problem with trying to create FRBR catalogues, as it is difficult to tease out FRBR relationships from existing data. We are concerned that Chapter 6 of RDA does not improve this situation. While it tries to systematize the kinds of relationships and the methods of recording, it is basically describing current/past practices using new language, so the results don’t lead to an improvement on current rules. Trying to account for the variety of past practices is just muddying the waters.

It may help to clarify the problem to compare it to an application profile for an XML-based metadata standard. Such an application profile would include just one element for related resource, though it would be repeatable in a record. First there would be an attribute for the type of relation — such as `partOf`, `hasPart`, `isReplacedBy`, `Replaces`, etc. The most important point of this is that **the type of relationship itself would always be explicitly recorded in the same predictable way**. As Chapter 6 stands now, recording the nature of the relationship is not required for access points (6.1.4.0) and is required for resource identifiers only if they are used alone (6.1.7.0.1). Otherwise, the type of relationship could be found in a variety of places. In an ideal alternative, the related resource would be recorded in some consistent, unambiguous and machine-readable way. There could be subelements for resource identifier, main entry/title, publication information, etc. Incorporating elements of this approach into RDA would result in better data for better catalogues and help us move into the future. ALA strongly recommends that the JSC explore this approach further.

Need for additional guidance

ALA would like to see Chapter 6 include a statement of principles that would help cataloguers develop judgment regarding the amount of research expected to uncover relationships. This guidance might state generally to just record those relationships apparent from the resource itself. We note that this proposal seems to be in conflict with our comments regarding Chapter 7 proposing that RDA avoid determining the primary access point solely on the basis of the

presentation of data within a specific resource. However, we do not feel that the two need to necessarily be in conflict if the principles behind these guidelines (to achieve consistency in primary access point on the one hand while still providing cataloguers with a way to assess how much research to do) are well articulated.

ALA suggests that the JSC also discuss incorporating the following distinction into Chapter 6 to describe two general categories of relationships to provide a principled approach to this aspect of relationships:

- 1) Resources with components or supplements where a decision can be made regarding whether to catalogue them together on a single record or on separate records (e.g., aggregate vs. aggregate/component or component/component; primary/adjunct, and “issued with” relationships); and
- 2) Related titles where one must catalogue them separately and the cataloguer does not have the option of cataloguing on the same record (editions, derivatives, format/format, etc.).

It would help to have a statement or list at the beginning of Chapter 6 showing the relationship categories where a decision can be made whether to catalogue on single or separate records vs. the ones where it is not applicable.

Comments on Specific Guidelines in Chapter 6

6.0 Purpose and Scope. Some ALA members expressed concern that RDA will not be able to provide instructions to cataloguers for all the possible ways that resources can be related. There are likely to be related resources that don’t fit into the categories found in this chapter, especially if the current taxonomy is retained. We suggest providing an additional instruction here, along these lines:

6.0.4 If a cataloguer encounters related resources that do not fit into these general guidelines, he or she should use their judgment as to how best to provide access to and inform about these related resources.

6.0.1–6.0.2. The text is awkwardly and narrowly worded. We suggest rewording to:

This chapter covers relationships between the resource being described and other resources. Information about these relationships can help users find, identify, and select appropriate resources.

6.0.2. While RDA is not intended to cover subject relationships except perhaps in a very cursory way, the statement in 6.0.2 could provide an opportunity to mention subject relationships: an item could be about another item, e.g., a critical work about one of Shakespeare’s plays. It doesn’t make much sense for the chapter to be about all relationships *except* for subjects. 6.7 (which includes commentaries, indexes, etc.) is a good example of a part of this chapter that comes very close to describing subject relationships.

6.0.3. We suggest that wording be added here instructing specifically that guidelines for relationships in general are given in 6.1, and specific guidelines for the type of relationship or type of resource are given in 6.2–6.13.

6.1. We are glad to see information about recording relationships of any type. ALA would like to see the sections on specific relationships drastically reduced in length, as there is no need to repeat general instructions there.

6.1.1.1. ALA is happy to see the wording of this guideline to take information from any source.

6.1.2. The differences among the various methods of recording relationships are not at all clear. How do these relate to the techniques of providing an access point or including a description of the relationship? Many ALA reviewers expressed considerable confusion especially between the concepts of a “citation” and “embedded description”, which we will address further below. Definitions are essential, and examples may also be needed to clarify the distinction between these techniques.

6.1.2.2. The wording of this guideline is awkward. We also note that the word “may” implies that sometimes relationships are recorded reciprocally, sometimes not, and ALA would appreciate a brief discussion within RDA of when reciprocal recording is the usual practice, and when it is not. The following possible wording begins to address this concern:

Record information about the relationship in the descriptions of each resource in the relationship. *Optional omission:* Record such information only in the description of one of the resources.

6.1.2.3. ALA notes that this statement is relevant to many aspects of the encoding and storage of RDA data elements. Rather than mention these limitations here, we recommend deleting 6.1.2.3 and moving this text to a more general section, perhaps in Chapter 0, which states:

The range of conventions used to record bibliographic information may be limited by the format used to encode and store the data and/or the functionality of the system used to retrieve and display the data.

The text of 6.1.2.3 could then be replaced with text that discusses variables to consider when deciding which technique to use in particular situations.

6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7. Designating these elements as optional is inappropriate, since these are not data elements but rather techniques for recording relationships, and often only one technique would be used for a particular situation. We would prefer to designate which types of relationships are required or optional to record.

6.1.3, 6.1.5. As stated above, the concepts “citation” and “embedded description” are not at all distinct. A citation can be made to look like a partial embedded description if the alternative in 6.1.3.0.3 is followed to add elements such as statement of responsibility, edition, publisher, date of publication, and “any other element necessary to identify that expression, manifestation, or item”. At the same time, a partial embedded description can be made brief like a citation, since

RDA allows elements to be omitted. Are both concepts really the same thing, with varying degrees of fullness? What is the difference between the functions that they are intended to fulfill? Could the two concepts be merged? If they are substantively different, the instructions must be changed to clarify how.

6.1.3.0. A definition of *citation* needs to appear before the instructions to provide one.

ALA reviewers were confused about which sections of this guideline apply to controlled access points and which to uncontrolled. Most reviewers assumed that 6.1.3.0.1 and 6.1.3.0.2 referred to controlled access points while 6.1.3.0.3 applied to uncontrolled. Is this correct? This needs to be clarified.

6.1.3.0.1. These are actually two separate instructions: provide a citation; indicate a relationship. Should these be separate instructions? Is the latter required when one decides to provide a citation, or is it still optional?

ALA recommends removing any mention of technique and display, removing both the phrase “preceding the citation” and also the reference to an encoded value, which is also a mechanism for generating displays and thus should be beyond the purview of RDA. Suggested simplified wording:

Provide a citation for the related work, expression, manifestation, or item. Indicate the nature of the relationship.

6.1.3.0.2. 6.1.3.0.2 refers the reader to 6.1.4 for how to construct the citation. Then 6.1.3.0.3 provides an alternative. Shouldn't the 6.1.4 rules come before the alternative? Perhaps it could be moved to Part B.

We recommend either deleting the footnote or moving it to the Appendices. This is an implementation issue and does not belong within the text of RDA itself.

6.1.3.0.3. As noted above, the alternative option in this section sounds like a partial embedded description. If that's what it is, it might be helpful to identify it as such and include a reference to 6.1.5. If it is not the same thing, the difference should be explained.

Since this guideline is an alternative to 6.1.3.0.2, perhaps both 6.1.3.0.2 and 6.1.3.0.3 should be represented as subsets of 6.1.3.0.1, instead of all rules under 6.1.3.0 having the same hierarchy.

6.1.4.0.1. Delete the footnote (same argument as in 6.1.3.0.2).

6.1.4.1. Shouldn't all of the rules in this section refer to the appropriate rules in the yet-to-be seen Chapter 13?

This entire section would be strengthened and clarified if we incorporated the concept of “work identifiers”. The work identifier could then have additions to express elements associated with expressions, manifestations, and items as appropriate. The language here gets muddled when

dealing with resources entered under title and resources entered under a person or corporate body as creator.

6.1.4.1. It would be helpful to clarify that this is the definition of a “name-title access point” (vocabulary used without explanation below at 6.1.4.2.1). We recommend preserving much of the text, but adding paragraphing with new headings:

6.1.4.1 Access points for works

6.1.4.1.1 Name-title access points

[existing text of 6.1.4.1.1, with changes as noted below]

6.1.4.1.2 Title access points

[combine text of 6.1.4.1.2 and 6.1.4.1.3, as explained below]

6.1.4.1.1. At the end of this instruction, the concept of “the title of the work” should be clarified. Isn’t this a reference to the “uniform title” (or whatever the RDA terminology equivalent will be)? We also recommend incorporating the wording “add to the citation for the work ...” for clarity.

6.1.4.1.2–6.1.4.1.3. We recommend that this rule be combined with 6.1.4.1.3 for simplification and to reduce redundancy.

“As the citation” at the end of 6.1.4.1 2 seems not the same meaning as other uses of the term “citation” in this chapter. This inconsistency is one of the factors contributing to the difficulty that ALA reviewers had in understanding the concept of “citation”. In this instruction, “citation” is used as the term replacing “uniform title” because here it should instruct how to formulate the access point for the title rather than the “citation”.

We suggest changing the sentence of this new combined guideline to either “... use the title of the work as the access point” or “... use the title of the work *in* the citation.”

6.1.4.1.3. This guideline should at the very least refer back to 1.1.7.3 to the definition of “controlled access point.” We also note, however, that the word “controlled” implies to many cataloguers that the access point has been established in an authority record and is therefore “controlled”, as opposed to other access points that are not controlled. In this guideline, this distinction is a red herring. It is possible to “control” an access point by consulting the catalogue and making sure the access point matches already existing access points in the catalogue. The important point that should be brought out here is that if one chooses to express relationships through access points, the access points should be consistent in form within the database.

To reduce confusion, perhaps reword the first sentence of what is now 6.1.4.1.3 to: “Use the primary access point for the work in the citation for that work.”

6.1.5. See our comments above (6.1.3, etc.) concerning the confusion between embedded descriptions and citations for related resources. It is not clear in what situation a cataloguer would use one technique rather than the other.

There is a feeling by some that the nature of “embedded descriptions” would allow this technique to be used as a means of following the “single record approach” for multiple versions, e.g. describing a microform or electronic version of a resource in the record for the original instead of in a separate record. Whether or not this is the intent, it seems to be inherent in the way that the options have been set up, and once RDA is implemented, it might then be up to local or cooperative guidelines to allow/disallow this application. See also our comments at 6.4.2.

6.1.5.0.1. As stated, this guideline gives minimal guidance. The layout of the example is particularly confusing. The rule refers to a “preceding word or phrase” and it is not clear in the example what those are: “Original version”? or “Appears in”? We suggest removing the word “preceding” and also deleting “or encoding” in the latter half of the sentence, for the reasons noted above. There is also inconsistency in wording regarding “encoding”. In this section, “encoding” is used, while in 6.1.3.0.1 and 6.1.7.0.1, “encoded value” is used. If instructions on encoding are retained, rephrase the instruction to read:

Embed a full or partial description of the related resource in the record for the resource being described, using a word or phrase or encoded value to indicate the nature of the relationship.

6.1.6. ALA wonders what the logic is behind calling these “informal references” instead of “notes”.

We propose the addition of an option c) that would allow for making an informal reference when a complete reference is not necessary. This has some overlap with the current “bibliographic history” rules. For example, this chapter should allow for the following type of note:

Issued also as a motion picture in 1980 by Clarity Productions.

We would appreciate clarification of what “encoded citation” means in footnote 3, and suggest moving this to the introduction instead of embedding the concept in the guidelines themselves. At the very least, we recommend moving the footnote to the main text, either here or at 6.1.2.

6.1.7.0.1. Remove the word “preceding”. The guideline shouldn’t presume that the text will precede the identifier.

ALA would like to see this instruction (as well as all the others on resource identifiers) more strongly encourage the use of identifiers when available. RDA should especially encourage the use of identifiers in a manner that can facilitate system processing, rather than recording the identifiers within a textual phrase.

Delete the final clause referring to an encoded value. It addresses a mechanism for generating displays.

6.2–6.10. We suggest deleting the 6.X.0.2 sections; they do not provide value. Any kind of “scope” data not already appearing in 6.X.0.1 should be moved there; anything else merely repeats the table of contents for the section.

Follow the lead of 6.3, 6.5, 6.8, and 6.9 for the other 6.X sections, by having only 6.X.1, not also 6.X.2, etc. What should be discussed is the relationship, for which it is not helpful to talk about each role of a resource separately.

In the 6.X.1.1.2 sections, we suggest bulleting the examples, rather than giving them in running text.

ALA suggests refocus the 6.X.1.2 sections on providing examples of the applicable relationships, and additional advice on which technique to use for the particular relationship, beyond what is stated in 6.1.2. The redundant text, such as that at 6.2.1.2.1a.1, should then be deleted.

The present text does not make it clear whether 6.2, 6.3, and/or 6.7 would cover accompanying material.

6.2. The distinction between contents notes and component/aggregate relationships is unclear. This either needs to be clarified or the instructions merged.

ALA reviewers were confused about which of the sections of this chapter apply in certain situations. For example:

- aggregate/component relationship and an “issued with” relationship (6.9). Where would CDs of compiled sound recordings fit in? Does determination of aggregate/component treatment (and the various levels of aggregate/component relationships) fall to cataloguer judgment?

What is the relationship between this section and 2.10 (Series)? Since series is a type of aggregate/component relationship, we wonder whether 2.10 should be somehow folded into 6.2.

6.2.0.1.1. We suggest simplifying the wording:

An aggregate/component relationship is a relationship between a resource that comprises two or more components and one or more of those components.

6.2.0.1.1–6.10.0.1.1. For each of these definitions of relationships, we suggest replacing the clause “is a relationship” with “exists.” For example, in 6.2.0.1.1:

An aggregate/component relationship exists between an ...

6.2.1. Change the heading to the more appropriate “Relationships with Component Resources”.

6.2.1.1.2. Change “journals, etc.” to “journals”.

Suggest changing to “independent parts of a resource” rather than “parts of a resource issued in two or more parts”, as physical parts do not necessarily correspond to intellectual parts.

6.2.1.1.2. “Component resources include ...” needs a digital example, i.e., individual images, texts, video, etc. in a digital collection. The last bit “and individual resources combined in a collection” covers it in sentiment, but the paragraph appears to be print-centric.

6.2.1.2.1. It is unclear what is meant by “as applicable”. We would prefer “as appropriate”.

6.2.1.2.1d.1. Should the two sub-paragraphs be labeled “1)” and “2)” instead of “a)” and “b)”, since they are part of a paragraph labeled as “d)”?

The instruction here limiting the making of contents notes to just the two conditions listed would be a major change from AACR2 and would serve to drastically reduce the times when a contents note could be made. In many or most situations where cataloguers currently make contents notes, the component resources could be identified using one or more of the conventions listed in 6.2.1.2.1 a) through c). Cataloguers use contents note as a convenient and succinct way of recording the components of a resource, and this option should be preserved, not limited. It is often not desirable or economically feasible to provide controlled access points or component part linking entries for each of the components of an edited volume. We suggest rewriting option d) so that its use is not predicated on a)–c) above it.

6.2.2. We recommend changing the caption to the more appropriate “Relationships with Aggregate Resources”.

6.2.2.2.1b.2–3. We question whether series-specific guidelines belong under 6.2.2.2, a section on “General guidelines”. There needs to be a further subsection dealing with series or, alternatively, there needs to be text here explaining that a series is the most likely and prevalent type of aggregate resource for which the access point convention would be used.

6.2.2.2.1b.2. RDA 2.10.6 (Numbering of series) does not have any option of not giving the numbering in the series statement (although 2.10.6.7b has an exception for serials, that is a different matter.). While we realize this is a carryover from AACR2 21.30L1, it seems odd here in 6.2.2.2.1b.2 to have the inclusion of series numbering in the access point be an **option**, especially in light of the general rearrangement of topics and rules in RDA. It would be more consistent to have the standard instruction be to give the numbering, with an option to omit it.

6.2.2.2.1b.2. Why does this option only exist in b, and not also a, and c–e?

6.2.2.2.1b.3 b). We question how a cataloguer would know that the numbering of a series represents stock control or to benefit from lower postal rates. Therefore, we recommend that b) be removed.

Should this definition include some mention of the series covered in this guideline being issued by commercial publishers? The current definition is too vague to indicate what really constitutes a “publisher’s series.”

6.2.2.2.1c. In the context of 6.2 for aggregate/component relationships, ALA reviewers wonder whether the techniques for multilevel description and embedded description are the same thing. This needs to be clarified.

6.3. How do these rules differ from those in 6.9, “issued with” relationships? (See also our comments at 6.9.)

6.3.0.1.2. The rule limits the relationship to “any two” components. If this guideline is needed at all (that seems doubtful; is there anything in 6.3.0.1.1 that would lead one to believe some types of aggregate resources shouldn’t get this treatment?) perhaps reword it as:

A component/component relationship may be used to reflect a relationship between any two or more components of any type of aggregate resource.

Otherwise consider deleting and changing 6.3.0.1.1 to accommodate more than two component resources.

6.3.0.1.3. As noted in 6.3.0.1.2, the use of “component/component relationship” to refer to a technique in this rule is odd. Perhaps reword as:

Recording a component/component relationship may be used as an alternative to recording the relationship between a component...

6.3.0.1.3 (and 6.2.0.2.3). RDA appears to have eliminated the requirement of only allowing “With” notes when the aggregate resource lacks a collective title. 6.3.0.1.3 says a component/component relationship can be recorded as an “alternative to recording the relationship between a component and the aggregate resource” when it is impractical to refer to the aggregate resource (e.g., when the aggregate resource lacks a collective title?). Yet it is not clear what other situations exist besides no collective title where it is “impractical” to refer to the aggregate. On the other hand, 6.2.0.2.3 says to follow component/component guidelines when the aggregate lacks a collective title, but makes no mention of other types of situations where this is appropriate. It might help to provide some examples to clarify if there are any situations where it is appropriate to apply component/component cataloguing even when a resource has a collective title. Also, even if it is basically understood that a component/component relationship is recorded when the decision has been made to catalogue each component on separate records (that is, it is not enough just to catalogue one component and record the relationship), it would probably be helpful to make this explicit the way AACR2 rules 1.7B21 and 1.1.G2 do.

6.3.0.2.2. What is the meaning of independent in this context; bibliographically independent or physically independent?

6.3.1. We are concerned that the terminology “related component” is imprecise and confusing, and may not be appropriate for resources in assembled collections. For assembled collections, the compilations are artificial in that the relationships are not innate but an artifact of the assembly of the collection.

6.3.1.1.2. Does this apply to both publisher-created “bound/filmed-withs” and locally created “bound/filmed-withs”? Or would publisher-created entities like this be considered “issued with” (addressed by 6.9) not “bound-with”? Clarification is needed in these instructions as they relate to one-of-a-kind “bound-with” relationships. How does this scope of a Related Component differ from 6.3.0.1.3 or 6.3.0.2.2?

6.3.1.2.1a.1. This is just the alternative citation format (which seems confusingly similar to embedded description).

6.4. Source/reproduction and 6.5 Format/Format relationships. See also the discussion of this topic in the Appendix, under Equivalence Relationships, which notes that these two sections (6.4 and 6.5) are not mutually exclusive. There is some mild support within ALA for combining the two sections, on the basis of the perceived overlap between the sections for resources that are available in more than one format from the same publisher. However, the majority of ALA members recommend that the two sections remain separate. The clarification of the handling of source/reproduction relationships as opposed to other format relationships is a useful one that should be maintained, and should be added to the general guidelines.

If the current organization of the chapter is maintained, we believe that it would be desirable to reverse the order, so that the section on “Format/format relationships” comes first, followed by the section on Source/Reproduction Relationships.

The sequence of terms in the caption and the definition of terms in 6.4.0.1.1 do not match. We suggest changing the text in 6.4.0.1.1 to:

A source/reproduction relationship is a relationship between the source from which a reproduction (i.e., facsimile, reprint, microform reproduction, digital reproduction, etc.) is made and the reproduction.

We suggest using the term “source” rather than “original”, as some reproductions are reproduced from other reproductions.

6.4.0.1.1. “i.e.” is incorrect here. Shouldn’t it be “e.g.”? We also recommend that “etc.” be deleted. The list of examples in parentheses is mostly text-based and should be broadened to include other kinds of reproductions (as in 6.4.2.1.2).

We suggest rewording to:

A source/reproduction relationship exists between a resource and a reproduction of it (e.g. a facsimile reprint, video reproduction, microform reproduction, digital reproduction) and the source from which the reproduction is made.

6.4.0.2.3. ALA recommends deleting the phrase “by the same publisher, etc.” as it is overly vague. We suggest replacing it with “...that are not reproductions”.

6.4.1 and 6.4.2. The names of these sections are confusing. We prefer the following:

6.4.1 REFERRING TO THE SOURCE OF A REPRODUCTION and
6.4.2 REFERRING TO A REPRODUCTION.

The other captions in this chapter would also benefit from being reworded in a similar manner.

6.4.1.1.1. What is meant by “... resource used to produce the reproduction”? The first thing that comes to mind is scanners and photocopiers. We recommend that the definition be reworded:

The source of a reproduction is the resource from which another resource is produced.

6.4.1.2.1c.1. It is unclear to ALA members how this differs from 6.4.1.2.1a.1.

6.4.1.2.1c.2. ALA members are intrigued by the alternative presented in this guideline, although most reviewers requested more clarification about what it actually entails, and it is unclear how this technique differs from embedded description in 6.4.1.2.1c.1.

- Can this technique also be used for compilations? Many videos and sound recordings are compilations of reproductions, and we would appreciate seeing examples of these.
- Can it be extended to other types of relationships? What would be the rationale for restricting it to just reproductions?
- What does “in parallel with” really mean? ALA members could not think of a metadata schema that could handle parallel structures such as this. We wonder whether a new set of data elements needs to be created for cataloguing a reproduction: title of source, publisher of source, etc.
- How might the alternative be applied if all of the parallel elements aren’t at hand or in reference sources?

We would also like to see explicit examples of how this alternative could be applied to cover multiple relationships.

There is inconsistency in wording: in this section, “encoding” is used, while in 6.1.3.0.1 and 6.1.7.0.1, “encoded value” is used. We also recommend changing “in parallel” to “in a parallel structure” for clarity, so that the revised guideline would read:

Alternative: Record individual elements of the description of the resource from which the reproduction was made in a parallel structure with the corresponding elements for the resource being described, using encoded value to indicate that the element applies to the related resource.

6.4.2. Earlier sections of RDA instruct cataloguers to base the description of reproductions on the reproduction itself and include a note for the original. However, this alternative appears to let libraries decide whether to do this or whether to use the record for the original and add a note (citation, embedded description, etc.) or access point about the reproduction. Alternatively, a

library can choose to enter parallel fields describing both the original and reproduction on the same record. Some librarians in the U.S. would like to use this to legitimize both the “single record technique” and the LCRI regarding cataloguing reproductions. Is this indeed the intent of the instructions, or are they only intended to reference other formats?

There are many additional questions about the implementation implications of this technique and what options it might allow cataloguing agencies pursue: would it be possible to label and group parts of the record that apply to the resource being described vs. the related resource (reproduction or original? Could parts of the record that a library may not want displayed potentially be suppressed in some system implementations (if the institution owns the original source, but not the reproduction, or the other way around?).

6.4.2 (and 6.5). While ALA prefers to keep 6.4 and 6.5 separate, we note that in the digital environment it is often difficult to determine which came first: the print or the online version. We propose adding a statement to both of these sections:

In case of doubt, treat as a format/format relationship.

The bigger concern, however, is how different a catalogue record would look if you apply 6.4 or 6.5 in cases of doubt.

6.4.2.1. This definition of reproduction probably needs to be moved earlier in the rules, someplace around 6.4.0. It’s important to know what is meant by source and what is meant by reproduction before starting to describe either one.

The definition of “reproduction” in 6.4.2.1 (and, presumably, in the glossary) also needs to be more specific. A clarification would be helpful:

A reproduction is a resource produced using a previously existing resource as its source **and intended to be used as a substitute for that resource.**

It is helpful to clearly differentiate reproduction from extracts and other derivative situations (covered by 6.6). The intention for the reproduction to function as a substitute may affect some cataloguing and policy decisions (e.g., it figures in the decision of whether serial reproductions, extracts, etc. are catalogued as serials or as monographs).

6.4.2.2.1. The captions were confusing to several reviewers, since 6.4.2 actually covers “Referring to a reproduction” rather than to reproductions themselves. We suggest that clarification be considered.

6.4.2.2.1c.2. See our comments above under 6.4.1.2.1c.2. This alternative needs to be clarified.

6.5. See our comments under 6.4 (and in the Appendix) regarding our recommendation to keep these two sections (6.4 and 6.5) separate.

6.5.0 (& related subrules). ALA recommends that these guidelines not be restricted to format relationships “issued by the same publisher, etc.” We request that the restriction be removed from 6.5.0.1.1, 6.5.0.2.1, 6.5.1.1.1 and 6.5.1.2.1.

We are also assuming that “different format” encompasses various versions of text (print, microform, electronic, etc.), rather than the relationship between a book and a book on tape, but this is not completely clear from the wording of the guidelines.

6.5.0.1.1. There is some confusion about what “encoding standards” means here. There will be many electronic books that fall into this category rather than source/reproduction. We suggest pulling this type of instruction out of the main part of RDA, and put anything we want to say about it in the introduction or the appendices.

6.5.0.2. Recording format/format relationships. There needs to be a reference to the informal option in RDA 3.22.0.1.2. Suggested wording:

Apply the instructions given under 3.22 when making an informal reference(s) to another format(s) in which the content or partial content of a resource has been issued.

Another possibility would be to incorporate 3.22 here instead, as part of an expanded informal reference instruction at 6.5.1.2.1d.1.

6.5.1.2.1. We suggest changing the phrase “as applicable” at the end of the instruction to “as appropriate.”

6.5.1.2.1a.1–6.5.1.2.1e.1. These instructions are all filled with parenthetical plurals, which we would recommend deleting to make the text easier to read.

6.6. The sequence of terms in the caption and the definition of terms in 6.6.0.1.1 do not match. We suggest changing the text in 6.6.0.1.1 to

A source/derivative relationship is a relationship between the source on which another resource is based or from which it is extracted and the resulting derivative resource.

6.6.0.1.1. We recommend that this be broadened to include manifestations.

6.6.1 and 6.6.2. Again, the captions are confusing because they don’t exactly coincide with what is being described. We suggest changing them to the following:

6.6.1 REFERRING TO A SOURCE ... and

6.6.2 REFERRING TO A DERIVATIVE ...

6.6.1.1. It seems likely that relationships between works and expressions might be expressed differently in many cases. We recommend subdividing this section into how to deal with relationships between works and how to deal with relationships between expressions.

6.6.1.1.2. Sometimes translations are based on various editions or manifestations of a work. We suggest that this guideline should be expanded to include manifestations (and items).

6.6.2. The structure of the chapter is very confusing, especially in this area. This section describes the work; 6.6.1 deals with the source of the work. We suggest reversing 6.6.2 and 6.6.1.

6.6.2.1. We would prefer to see the definitions of roles in relationships placed with the definition of the relationship, in this case at 6.6.

6.6.2.2. There is some concern within ALA that with these guidelines to record relationships to other resources, we are no longer describing the resource in hand, so that these guidelines would be better suited for part 2 and the creation of authority records.

We propose rewording the caption to

General guidelines on recording source/derivative relationships

6.6.2.2.1a.1. Citation. We suggest rewording this to “Provide a citation for the source of the derivative work ...”.

6.7.0.1.1. We propose changing the text to:

A primary/adjunct relationship is a relationship between a primary resource and the adjuncts, supplements, indexes, commentaries or other resources that supplement or reference it.

This would read better, and also keeps the definitions of the terms in the same sequence as in the main caption (i.e., “Primary/adjunct relationships”).

6.7.0.2.4. This is really an alternative to 6.7.0.2.3 rather than to all of the guidelines under 6.7.0.2, and thus it should not share the same hierarchy in the rule numbering. It should instead be subordinate to 6.7.0.2.3. Alternatively, this could be moved to Chapter 1.

6.7.1 and 6.7.2. Suggest rewording the captions to:

6.7.1 REFERRING TO THE PRIMARY RESOURCE and 6.7.2 REFERRING TO AN ADJUNCT RESOURCE

6.7.1.2. Suggest that this caption be reworded to “General guidelines on referring to the primary resource.”

6.7.2.1.1. The word “references” is much too broad here. Bibliographies at the ends of book reference many other resources, but they are not adjunct resources. We suggest that the definition be reworded to make clear that an adjunct resource is intended to only be used with another resource.

6.8. This entire section creates problems with definitions and distinctions. As indicated in the Appendix, the relationships covered in this section are derivative relationships using Tillett’s taxonomy, as are those covered in 6.6.

ALA recommends that 6.8 be broadened to apply to other editions than those that are “simultaneously issued”. This wording is too restrictive, since different language editions may be published several years apart. We propose changing the wording of this scope section changed to:

An edition/edition relationship is a relationship between editions of a work that differ in partial contents and/or in language.

We also note that dropping the word “simultaneous” will require some rewording in captions and text throughout 6.8.

Edition/edition relationships may also appear or be interpreted as source/derivative and predecessor/successor relationships, so there should be references to 6.6 and 6.10, for clarity, assuming that the current taxonomy is retained.

6.8.0.2.1. We assume that this would include differences in editions of CDs (family-friendly vs. explicit lyrics).

6.8.1.1.1. Scope [of simultaneously issued edition]. The phrase “issued at the same time” is not clear. “In the same year” would be clearer since that is the common understanding of “at the same time” in current practice.

6.8.1.2.1. There is redundant usage of “simultaneously issued” here. Change the sentence to either

If the resource being described is one that is issued in two or more simultaneous editions ... *or*

If the resource being described is one that is issued simultaneously in two or more editions ...

6.9. The distinction between the component/component relationship and the “issued with” relationship is very confusing and appears to be arbitrary. How do “issued with” resources differ from components issued by an aggregate if the components were also published independently (6.3.0.1.3)? 6.3.1.1.2 says:

Related components include ... other separately issued resources bound with or otherwise assembled with the resource.

Meanwhile, 6.9.0.2.2 in the section on “issued with” relationships says:

For components of an aggregate resource, follow the guidelines on component/component relationships given in 6.3.

Do aggregate/component relationships only apply when the components were not published independently of the aggregate (e.g., book chapters)? Or does “issued with” only apply when the independent resources are not “bound together” physically on the same volume or disc but remain physically separate?

If the current taxonomy is retained, we suggest possibly merging 6.9 into 6.3 (component/component).

6.10.0.1.1. Suggest changing the text to:

A predecessor/successor relationship is a relationship wherein one resource (the predecessor) is continued, superseded, absorbed, etc. by another resource (the successor).

6.10.1.1.2, 6.10.2.1.2. The difference between “predecessor/successor” and “source/derivative” is not clear for successive editions. Because the rule here includes “different title” as a criterion, does that mean that there is a predecessor/successor relationship if the later edition changes title, but a source/derivative relationship if the later edition keeps the same title? (Same at 6.10.2.1.2.) The same relationship should exist whether the different editions are issued under a different title or under the same title.

To eliminate the confusion, we recommend saying explicitly that the source/derivative relationship excludes the predecessor/successor relationship and deleting the phrase “... issued under a different title” from these two guidelines. In any case, we would like to avoid the results of applying AACR2 26.2B and encourage the use of a citation to link the two expressions.

6.10.1.2.1a.2. For clarity, change “succeeding resource” to “resource being described”. We also recommend that this particular “optional addition” be made mandatory.

6.10.1.2.1a.3. RDA 6.10.2.2.1 already says to record the succeeding resource(s). This rule seems to imply that there’s an option to record only one of them, if there are two or more. This doesn’t make sense, and we recommend deleting it

6.11–6.13. In general, ALA is in favor of removing the majority of these guidelines and incorporating their examples into the earlier guidelines in this chapter. For example:

- 6.11.1–6.11.2, 6.11.4, 6.12.1, 6.13.1–6.13.2 are specific cases of the source/derivative relationship (6.6); move examples from these sections there.
- 6.11.3, 6.12.2: These are a bit more problematic since they are accompanying relationships using Tillett’s taxonomy and several of the sections in Chapter 6 include accompanying relationships. If the current taxonomy is retained, consider merging and generalizing these sections under a relationship called something like “Companion Relationships”, or merge into 6.7.

Some of the general guidelines may need to be expanded to incorporate the additional situations. For example, musical adaptations appear to fall under Source/Derivative relationships, but this is a stretch in certain specific situations, especially when one work is simply inspired by another or by several other works (e.g. potpourris based on themes from Strauss waltzes; works aping the musical style of a particular composer). Additional guidelines on recording work/work relationships also need to be developed (see Appendix).

Another solution that would allow incorporation of the additional guidelines into the general guidelines would be to group a few sections that are otherwise difficult to incorporate as subsections of one section entitled, “Relationships of Specific Types of Resources”.

If the additional guidelines are to be kept separate, we offer the following recommendations:

6.11.2.1. Because a musical adaptation is a new work (although a musical arrangement is not...), a reference should be added from this guideline to the appropriate sections in 6.6, to help music cataloguers with this distinction.

6.11.2.1.1. Suggest changing “adaptation of one other musical work” to “adaptation of another musical work”.

6.11.4. The word “dramatic” in the caption is too limiting. Music may be composed for other types of works, such as film documentaries, television game shows, etc. We suggest omitting “dramatic” from the heading, while retaining it in within the instructions in 6.11.4.1.1 (perhaps as part of a list of types, to include “incidental music”), since that comprises the bulk of the music that falls into this category.

6.12.0.2.2. (*editorial*) The references to 6.12.0.1 a) and b) seem to be referring to the phrases numbered 6.12.0.1.1 a) and b).

6.13.0. Responding to the JSC invitation to consider whether the special rules for legal resources could be integrated into the general rules, ALA (as advised by AALL) believes that the two types of relationships described in 6.13 can be integrated into the general rules. The two relationships are specific types of relationships covered in Chapter 6; see specifics below.

6.13.0.2.2. (*editorial*) The references to 6.13.0.1 a) and b) seem to be referring to the phrases numbered 6.13.0.1.1 a) and b).

6.13.1. ALA and AALL suggest that 6.13.1 “Law from which an administrative regulation is derived” be incorporated into 6.6, Source/derivative relationships. Section 6.6.1.1 Scope will then need to be expanded to specify this type of relationship, with examples included to illustrate the rule.

6.13.2. We propose that 6.13.2 “Treaty, etc. on which a general revision is based” be incorporated into 6.10, Predecessor/successor relationships. Revised treaties should be referenced within the rule with examples included to illustrate it.

Comments on Chapter 7

[Note: In our comments below (but not in our proposed changes to the text of RDA), we occasionally use the term “party” or “parties” to avoid having to repeat the phrase “person, family, or corporate body” multiple times.]

General Comments

FRBR entities

ALA would like to see more use made of the FRBR group 1 entities in the structure and terminology of the rules in Chapter 7. We provide an example, at 7.2.4–7.2.6, of how the use of the FRBR entities can be used to structure and simplify rules for modifications of previously existing works. This use of the FRBR entities should be made throughout this chapter.

Primary Access Points (7.2)

There is internal disagreement within ALA regarding whether or not the concept of primary access point is still viable. In general, though, ALA acknowledges the need to keep the concept for the near future. At the same time, however, we would like to see RDA move toward an emphasis upon work and expression identifiers so that these will be in place when systems can actually make appropriate use of these identifiers as a linking mechanism. In particular, we would like to see a close connection articulated in RDA between the selection of primary access point and the selection of the work identifier.

Assuming that the JSC decides to keep the concept of primary access within RDA, ALA recommends clearly articulating the functions of primary access points and the basic principles behind choosing them, and making the guidelines for selection of primary access point as simple to apply as possible.

We acknowledge that there are unavoidable conflicts between attempting to develop a simplified, principled approach to the instructions for selection of primary access point while still accommodating the citation practices of various specialist communities, which in some cases contradict each other. ALA would prefer to retain the citation practices of the specialist communities even when they do conflict with the general principles, however, so that the choice of primary access points will match user expectations as much as possible. This is of particular importance for works of mixed responsibility.

At some point in the future, it may be desirable to drop the concept of primary access and rely instead upon the use of role identifiers, so that each community could formulate its own guidelines for which access point would display as the primary relationship. However, we do not believe that the time has come to do this, although we hope that this may become more

feasible in the future. It therefore is important that RDA include an emphasis upon recording designations of roles.

In the meantime, additional simplification of the instructions for selection of primary access points could be achieved by simplifying the wording as much as possible and making them as accessible as possible to non-specialists.

Mixed responsibility (7.2.X)

There is a vocal minority within ALA that agrees with the editor that the concept of “principal responsibility” — properly defined — can cover all cases in which more than one party is responsible for the creation of a work. However, the consensus within ALA is that the same set of guidelines should **not** cover both cases in which the parties perform the same function (“shared responsibility” in AACR2) and cases in which the parties perform different functions (“mixed responsibility” in AACR2). ALA therefore proposes to limit 7.2.2 to works of shared responsibility and reinstate guidelines for works of mixed responsibility in a subsequent section of Chapter 7.

Works created by the collaboration of many parties performing many functions are inherently more complex than works in which all parties perform the same function. For one thing, the default guideline for selecting the primary access point is different. In the former case (mixed responsibility), the default is to use the title; in the latter case, the default (as we argue in the following section) is the first-named party. Separating these two categories simplifies the basic general guideline, and allows the exceptions to be dealt with in a principled manner.

We will not present actual text for a section on works of mixed responsibility, but the basic features of such guidelines would be:

- If responsibility for creating the work is attributed to persons, families or corporate bodies performing different function, use the title as the primary access point unless one of the following exceptions applies.
- **Exception #1.** If one and only one of the functions applies to the entire work embodied in the resource, apply 7.2.1-7.2.2 to the persons, families or corporate bodies performing that function to determine the primary access point.

Rationale: This is consistent with the principle that the primary access point is selected for the work embodied in the resource being described. In the case of a compilation, for example, the compiler has principal responsibility for the creation of the aggregate work. In the case of a sound recording of multiple works performed by the same performer(s), the performer(s) are responsible for the creation of the recording as a whole.

- **Exception #2.** If one of the functions is declared to take precedence over the other function(s), apply 7.2.1-7.2.2 to the persons, families or corporate bodies performing that function to determine the primary access point.

Rationale: This is a generalized version of what governs most of the special rules for works of mixed responsibilities, i.e., declaring that one function takes precedence over the others. Stating this as part of the general guideline provides a principled basis for these special rules. Note, however, that only functions relating to the creation of the work are considered here, not those relating to the realization of an expression; not all of the special rules make this distinction with sufficient clarity.

Application: The following are examples of some of the specific rules that establish a precedence of one function over another:

- Composer over author of text (RDA 7.7.1, AACR2 21.19)
- Composer of ballet music over choreographer, librettist, etc. (RDA 7.7.2, AACR2 21.20)
- Spirit communicator over medium (RDA 7.2.2, AACR2 21.26)
- Praeses over respondent (RDA 7.12.1, AACR2 21.27)
- Legislating body over jurisdiction for bills and drafts of legislation (RDA 7.9.1.4, AACR2 21.31B3)
- Administrative agency over jurisdiction for regulations that are not laws (RDA 7.9.2, AACR2 21.32A)
- Jurisdiction over administrative agency for regulations that are laws (RDA 7.9.1.3, AACR2 21.32B)
- Defendant over prosecutor or court for criminal cases (RDA 7.9.7.1, AACR2 21.36C1)
- Plaintiff over defendant or court for civil cases (RDA 7.9.7.2, AACR2 21.36C2)

Implications of this proposal: If this proposal is accepted, then section 7.2.3 on compilations could be deleted, because it falls under exception #1 above. This is particularly fortunate because the new section can be placed at 7.2.3 without having to renumber the subsequent instructions in 7.2. Because there would be a general rule for works of mixed responsibility, many of the guidelines additional instructions in 7.7–7.12 could be brought into the main sections of the chapter.

Rule of three (7.2.2)

The draft perpetuates a distinction between cases in which two or three parties have principal responsibility and cases in which more than three parties have principal responsibility. ALA recommends that this remaining aspect of the Rule of Three be eliminated in favor of choosing the first named party in all cases in which more than one party has principal responsibility.

Note: There are several aspects to the Rule of Three:

- a. *Statements of responsibility:* In Part A of RDA, only the statement of responsibility for the “person, family, or corporate body with principal responsibility” is required; there is no limitation of the number of persons, etc., that *may* be transcribed (although 2.4.0.5 does give an option to give only the first name when there are more than three).

- b. *Secondary access points for collaborators:* In Chapter 7 of RDA, secondary access points are *not* required elements; rule 7.3.1 places no limits on the number of secondary access points for collaborators that *may* be given.
- c. *Selection of the primary access point:* The Rule of Three is invoked in determining the selection of the primary access point. If there are two or three persons, etc., with primary responsibility, the first is chosen as the primary access point (7.2.2.3), but if there are more than three, the title is chosen as the primary access point (7.2.2.4).

The selection of the title as the primary access point when there are more than three parties responsible is carried forward from AACR2, in spite of a growing consensus that the Rule of Three is not useful. Citation practice for documents with more than three authors (e.g., scientific papers where such large-scale collaboration is the norm) suggests that users do *not* perceive that authorship becomes diffuse when widely shared; the priority of the first-named author seems to apply no matter how many collaborators there are.

It should also be noted that the selection of primary access point does not raise the productivity/cost issues that might apply in the case of statements of responsibility or secondary access points. In fact we argue that a simpler, more consistent rule is justified by both the principles of Parsimony and User Convenience.

ALA therefore proposes that the first-named person, family or corporate body be selected as the primary access point whenever primary responsibility is shared by two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies performing the same function. Specific text for this revision is given below at 7.2.2.

Performances: scope of 7.2.8

The draft of Chapter 7 reflects the compromise position agreed to by the Music Library Association (MusLA) and the Association for Recorded Sound Archives (ARSC) and proposed by ALA in *5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ALA response*. This approach provides instructions for performances, and allows performers who have creative responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc. to be assigned as the primary access point since they have responsibility for a new work in addition to responsibility for the expression (the performance). The current provision in the RDA guidelines will result in fewer cases of a performer being given primary access, a result that many within ALA are still uncomfortable with. However, this is at least a principled compromise, and one that ALA can live with.

While ALA members continue to support the move to this more principled approach, we also remained concerned that this guideline will be more difficult for cataloguers to apply than the pragmatic approach given in AACR2. ALA had recommended an “in case of doubt” provision that would help to alleviate cataloguer indecision about how to apply this guideline. This “in case of doubt” clause does not appear in the draft of Chapter 7, and we recommend that it be added at 7.2.8.0.3, as well as at 7.2.0.5.1:

In case of doubt concerning the level of creative responsibility of a person or corporate body performing a previously-existing work, use the primary access point for the previously-existing work as the primary access point for the resource.

When we made the above recommendation regarding *5JSC/Chair/5*, ALA also expressed concern for avoiding the use of imprecise terminology within RDA. In *5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ALA response*, we noted MusLA's suggestion for using the terms "musical artist" and "musical event" to encompass artistic contributions, as opposed to "performer" and "performance", which imply that a previously-existing work is being performed (which is not always the case). Using the terms "musical artist" and "musical event" would also require the definition of new terminology for non-musical events. While this approach has not been addressed in the current draft, ALA now notes the confusion that has resulted as a result of not having a more precise definition of "performance". The terms "performer" and "performance" are very imprecise: how do they extend beyond musical events?

The majority of ALA members would like to see 7.2.8 expanded to apply to performances of dramatic works in addition to musical works, as noted above in our comments under 7.2.0.5.1. The guidelines also need to clearly state that they apply to both sound and video recordings, as reviewers in ALA were confused about this issue. We do note, however, that support within ALA for extending the scope of 7.2.8 beyond musical performances is not universal! Once again it seems that an attempt to come up with a high-level instruction or principle to govern these guidelines may potentially result in choices of primary access point for various communities that are at odds with user expectations in one or more of those communities. It would seem that the only high-level principles that could be applied to the guidelines for determination of primary access point that would please all communities would be to define the principle of "giving users what they expect to see" or "providing guidelines that are easy to apply", rather than to attempt a principled approach based on FRBR.

If the JSC decides to expand the scope of the instructions at 7.2.8, additional guidance will be needed to define the levels of additional responsibility for other performances regarding what would make the performance a new work of mixed responsibility, especially for video recordings of performances, and to allow these resources to continue to be assigned primary access under title as they are under AACR2. The fact that a pre-existing work is performed within a resource is not enough of a justification in itself for considering the resource as a whole to be an expression of the pre-existing work: additional creative input into the resource will often justify the resource being considered a new work of mixed responsibility. It seems reasonable to consider performance of previously existing works (however that is defined) to be a subset of "adaptations, revisions and other modifications of previously existing works," but a performance that creates a new work should be a subset of new works of mixed responsibility.

The above is a very complex issue; true analysis of the relationships between an original text and a video version, for example, could require extensive research. For example, at what point does a film adaptation of Hamlet become a new work of mixed responsibility, as opposed to a filmed performance of a pre-existing work? How would such guidelines work for videos of orchestral performances, choral concerts, operas, rock concerts (or music videos), ballets, or modern dance? At what point would adaptation by the non-performers (such as the director) create a

new work of mixed responsibility rather than a new expression? Other problematic examples include a music video juxtaposing concert footage with footage of the performers performing actions staged for the camera and various other images, vs. a music video that contains no “live concert” footage but was all performed staged for the camera. Part of resolving this issue requires deciding just how much cataloguer judgment is useful in these situations. A cataloguer may have fewer reasons to consider a video recording of a work intended for performance (such as a play, opera, or symphony) a “new work” than video recordings inspired by a book (say, some feature films).

ALA notes that expanding 7.2.8 to include video performances would move away from the AACR2 practice of selecting the primary access point the same way for all moving image material (mixed responsibility = new work = main entry under title). The current AACR2 solution is more pragmatic than principled, or at least preferring one principle (consistency in treatment by format) over another (consistency in treatment by content). If RDA is to treat video performances of previously-existing works in the same manner that sound recordings of such performances are treated, ALA strongly recommends that specialist communities related to motion picture cataloguing (such as OLAC and AMIA) continue to be consulted in order to develop principled guidelines (for video performances in particular) that are based upon a clear definition of “performance” and that are also easy for cataloguers to apply.

Specific Comments

7.0.2. We suggest removing the word “catalogue” from this guideline since we are trying to appeal to a broader audience.

7.1.1. ALA recommends making this parallel to 6.1.1: just one sentence that allows taking information from any available source.

If the recommendation above is not followed, ALA notes that the wording of this guideline will also depend upon decisions made for 2.2.1 regarding defining preferred source of information.

7.1.1.2a. ALA notes that the JSC decided at the April 2006 meeting that a definition of “appearing prominently” is not needed within RDA because the use of the term “prominently” now matches the English language dictionary definition. However, ALA notes that the word is no longer being used in the same sense it had in AACR2, and this may lead to considerable confusion. Since “prominently” can’t have the same meaning in AACR2 (“a formal statement found in one of the prescribed sources of information for areas 1 & 2”), ALA recommends one the following approaches

- either make an exception to the glossary policy in this case and add a definition to the glossary:

Prominent. In reference to statements about the resource being described: found in the preferred source of information (2.2.1) for the description of the resource, or in a formal statement on the container or accompanying material.

- delete the phrase “prominently named” and substitute the phrase “named in a formal statement” or
- simply delete the phrase and rely on cataloguer judgment.

7.1.1.2c. If the current wording is retained, we suggest changing “other sources” to “any other source.”

7.1.2. This section is repetitive of the concepts covered in Chapter 2, and we wonder why there is a need to cover elements transcribed from the resource here as well. The section seems to be primarily a hook to refer the user back to sections of Chapter 2.

7.1.2.1. We recommend using the same wording as 6.1.2.1: “may be recorded”. The phrase “are typically recorded” is unclear. When should the cataloguer do something that is atypical, and what would that be?

7.1.2.1b. We suggest deleting the word “informally”. Several reviewers found it confusing here, as they did in Chapter 6. It is not clear whether or not “notes” are the same thing as “Informal References” in Chapter 6. We also recommend changing “association” to “relationship” in this instruction. Should the heading for this section be reworded to “Informal Information”, since we are making the concept of “Notes” more narrowly defined?

We suggest moving the “(e.g. ...)” example to be an explanatory note to the existing example rather than including it in the text of the instruction.

7.1.2.1c. We suggest adding a reference to part B.

7.1.2.1c.1. The abrupt introduction of the term “Controlled access points” here rather than just “access point”, which is used in most of Chapter 6, is very confusing. At some point (possibly here), RDA needs to specifically address the difference between these two concepts.

If this particular instruction is indeed about *controlled* access points, the instruction and corresponding example should state: “The name of a person, family, or corporate body associated with the resource may be recorded as a *controlled* access point” and refer to instructions in later chapters for how to record the form of controlled access points.

7.1.2.1c.2. While we have otherwise argued that RDA should not explicitly include references to encoding, we are concerned that the current wording of this instruction seems unnecessarily to preclude the use of coded information instead of a term. One possible rewording for this guideline follows:

A designation of the role played by the person, family or corporate body in relation to the resource may be added to the access point (see 7.6)

7.1.3.1–7.1.3.2. These guidelines are quite wordy and difficult to follow. We propose rewording them as follows:

7.1.3.1 Multiple persons, families and corporate bodies are often associated with a resource. Assign as the primary access point the person, family, or corporate body considered principally responsible for creating the work described (see 7.2). Follow 7.2.0.1.2 when principal responsibility cannot be determined.

7.1.3.2 Assign as additional access points other persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the resource.

7.1.3.3. Assuming that this guideline is specifically referring to controlled access points (would you ever add a designation of role to an uncontrolled access point?), this should be clarified, and there should be a reference to the appropriate section in Part B about determining the form of controlled access points. The parenthetical at the end of 7.1.3.3 instructs users to see 7.1.6; we believe this should instead point to 7.6 since there is no instruction 7.1.6 in Chapter 7.

See also our comment under 7.6 below; ALA recommends that RDA include a stronger wording directing cataloguers to supply designations of role because of their potential importance in fulfilling the FRBR functions of the catalogue.

7.1.4.1.1. Here, and elsewhere in the chapter, instructions are given regarding when to make a new description. Our thinking is that this is inappropriate here. Rather, the wording should be changed to give the instruction that when a new description is not required, do “x”. For example, we recommend that the two sentences be collapsed, rewording this bullet to read:

If a change in responsibility occurs between the parts of a multipart monograph that does not require a new description, retain the existing access point(s) appropriate to the first or earliest part.

ALA also proposes an additional paragraph for this instruction, or perhaps a new instruction between 7.1.4.1.1 and 7.1.4.1.2:

If the description for the multipart monograph was not based on the first part, and the description is being revised to reflect an earlier part than that previously used as the basis of the description, choose a new primary access point if necessary, following the guidelines in 7.2.

Alternatively, it might be preferable to have a list of conditions such as those in 7.1.4.2.1. For multipart monographs, this is only an issue when “backing up” the description when a later piece was originally used for cataloguing.

7.1.4.1.2. ALA proposes the following revised wording:

Provide additional access points for any other persons, families, or bodies associated with earlier/later part(s), if considered important (see 7.3.8).

ALA notes the confusion that results by not always using the word “corporate” preceding “bodies”, as is done in other places in the text (e.g., 7.3.8.1 and 7.3.9.1.). If consistent use of the word “corporate” is desired, it should also be added to the text in 7.1.4.2.2 and 7.1.4.3.2. In any case, we request that there be consistent use of the terminology one way or the other.

7.1.4.2.1. ALA reviewers found the sub-instructions here to be redundant and confusing. We also wonder why they have roman numerals and not lower case alphabetic characters as in 7.1.1.2. We suggest simplifying and recombining as follows:

7.1.4.2.1. When a change occurs between the issues of a serial, create a new description if:

- a) a corporate body name used in the primary access point changes; or
- b) a person, family, or corporate body whose name is used in the primary access point ceases to be responsible (see 13.3.X).

7.1.4.2.2. ALA proposes the following revised wording:

Provide additional access points for any other persons, families or bodies associated with earlier/later issue(s) or part(s), if considered important (see 7.3.8).

7.1.4.3.1. Consider making the final sentence into a new optional instruction. We note the same problem here as for 7.1.4.1.1 where the instruction on when to make a new description is inappropriately included.

Since a new description is not going to be made for an integrating resource, regardless of the presence or absence of the conditions in 7.1.4.2, reference to that instruction is unnecessary. But if the reference is kept, shouldn't it be a reference specifically to 7.1.4.2.1 instead? This would be simpler if the first two sentences were changed to:

If a change in responsibility occurs between iterations of an integrating resource, do not create a new description. Instead, change the primary access point to reflect the responsibility for the latest iteration.

In parallel with our comments on 7.1.4.1.1, we disagree with including the instruction “do not create a new description”, since instructions on when to make a new description are covered elsewhere in RDA; instead reword to:

If a change in responsibility occurs between iterations of an integrating resource that does not require a new description, change the primary access point to reflect the responsibility for the latest iteration.

7.2. Primary access point

General issues. ALA recommends that several general points about the selection of the primary access point be clarified within the text of RDA.

1. ALA believes strongly (as indicated in our general comments on primary access points above) that the selection of the primary access point should be treated as part of the process of constructing a work identifier. In fact, some ALA reviewers proposed that the guidelines for selecting the primary access belong in Chapter 13, Access points for works, in Part B of RDA.

2. ALA would like the basic guideline for selecting the primary access point to make it blatantly clear that the primary access point is selected on the basis of responsibility for **creation of the work embodied in the resource being described**. It should also be clear that access points (citations?) for expressions and for manifestations are based on the access point for the work. This would be much simpler if these rules were in Chapter 13 as suggested above.
3. Many ALA reviewers were not comfortable with basing the selection of the primary access point on *attributions* or *presentations*, i.e., statements of responsibility in individual manifestations. To some extent this is unavoidable, and AACR2 also provides similar rules. However, these are the rules in AACR2 that led, for example, to inconsistent main entries for editions of a work because of a change in the order of the authors on the title page. If the selection of the main entry is part of the process of creating a consistent, normalized work identifier, then the selection of the main entry needs to be subject to the same process of resolving variations and conflicts that exists in the rules for selecting the title portion of the work identifier. The possibility that the selection of the primary access point may not be consistent with applying the guidelines to the resource being described needs to be recognized prominently in those guidelines. For example, the instruction to select the party named first (7.2.2.3) needs to include the possibility that the selection will be governed by the order of names on a different manifestation of the work. In any case, we feel that the guidelines as given in the draft are open to the charge that decisions relating to identifying the *work* appear to rely too much on statements appearing in a particular *manifestation*.

The organization of this section could be tightened. The basic decisions given in 7.2.0.1–7.2.0.6 are repeated and expanded upon in 7.2.1–7.2.8, and it would be useful if these sections were merged. Because of the current organization of the draft, some of our comments appear under 7.2.0 and some under 7.2.1–7.2.8, and some in both places.

Throughout the guidelines on primary access, the common wording is “use as the primary access point.” ALA suggests that a more active verb be employed, either “select” or “choose” (as in the caption for 7.2.0).

7.2. “Principal responsibility”. This section makes extensive use of the concept of principal responsibility, but no operational definition of this term is provided. We suggest the addition of a general statement at 7.2.0.1 (subsequent guidelines renumbered) that principal responsibility for creating a work should be interpreted in the light of:

- responsibility for the whole work
- responsibility for the primary component of an aggregate work
- responsibility for the bulk of component works within an aggregate work
- responsibility for work(s) that existed previous to the current work

7.2.0. There seem to be cracks in 7.2.0, into which many resources might fall. Would a typical serial (collection of articles) be covered by considered an original work (7.2.0.1) or a compilation of works by different parties (7.2.0.2)? For example, *Journal of Corporate Body A*

(which calls itself an official organ of that body) might be considered to be “created” by the corporate body, in which case it seems that 7.2.0.1 would apply. But, since it consists of separate articles, etc. by different persons/bodies, 7.2.0.2 would seem to apply. The scopes of the subsections of 7.2.0 are neither mutually exclusive nor jointly exhaustive. They either need to be made that way, or RDA needs to give instruction on what to do when a resource fits zero or multiple categories. In the case of resources issued as serials, ALA’s preference would be for 7.2.0.2, 7.2.0.3, and 7.2.0.4 to clearly instruct that serials be treated as original works.

To generalize, a work can be an aggregate, so a resource can be an original compilation of original works. It needs to be made clear that the decisions regarding the primary access point need to be made for the resource as a whole, based on the Type of Description chosen in applying RDA 1.2 — i.e., the selection of a primary access point needs to be based on the principal responsibility for creating the aggregate work if the resource being described is an aggregate.

7.2.0.1.1. We recommend that this guideline be reworded to parallel the wording of 7.2.0.1.2:

If only one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work embodied in the resource, use that person, family, or corporate body as the primary access point.

7.2.0.1.2. See our recommendation for eliminating the Rule of Three at 7.2.2 below.

7.2.0.2. The concept of “compilation” is not fully explicated. If the word “compilation” is used in RDA in the same sense that “collection” is used in AACR2 Chapter 21, this will need significant clarification either here or in the glossary.

ALA is proposing elsewhere to eliminate the separate rule for compilations. See the comment on Mixed Responsibility in the general comments on Chapter 7 above and at 7.2.3 below.

7.2.0.3. FRBR terminology should be used more explicitly and more rigorously in this section. See a specific proposal at 7.2.4–7.2.6 below.

7.2.0.5. The concept of “performance” needs to be more clearly defined within RDA. See our comments below under 7.2.8 for Performances.

7.2.0.5.1. See our comments under 7.2.8 regarding expanding the scope of that guideline. To accommodate those changes, we propose changing the wording here to something like:

For performances of musical and dramatic works, use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the work performed as the primary access point, unless the level of creative responsibility of the performer(s) entails responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc. (see 7.2.8)

Music specialists within ALA recommend an additional sentence to clarify this for musical events:

Creative responsibility, such as adaptation, improvisation or substantial re-composition, goes well beyond the responsibility associated with performing a previously existing work.

If ALA’s proposal to add dramatic works is accepted, we note that the concept of “creative responsibility” for performances of dramatic works will need additional consideration and clarification as well.

7.2.0.6 We propose adding a general guideline here as follows, to address our concerns at 7.2.2.3.1:

For a manifestation of an expression that has already appeared in another manifestation (for example, a republication), use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing manifestation.

[Add example giving two manifestations of the same expression that has two authors; one manifestation lists Author A first; the other manifestation lists Author B first]

7.2.1.1.1 footnote. If the instruction in this footnote is kept, we believe that it is critical information that should be included in the rule itself rather than in a footnote. We suggest that it either be placed in 7.2.1.0.1 as amplification, or as 7.2.1.1.2. There also seems to be a contradiction between the footnote and 7.2.2.3 and 7.2.2.4.

As in AACR2, “originate” is not a clear verb here; either give further explanation, or find a different verb. Another possibility worth discussing would be to delete the footnote text altogether and rely on cataloguer judgment to determine primary responsibility.

7.2.1.2. Several of the examples here illustrate situations that are separately and more explicitly covered later within Chapter 7, such as works by unknown, fictitious and erroneously attributed authors. Rather than making implicit reference to other rules by examples, such reference should explicitly be made within the instruction, such as: see 7.2.7.3 for works for which the person responsible is unknown and 7.3.9.1 for works erroneously attributed to particular persons.

ALA acknowledges that it is important for the RDA guidelines to use the term *work* to refer to both a composite work as well as to the works that comprise the compilation. We note, however, that this distinction may be potentially confusing to users of RDA. The wording that is ultimately used to describe this distinction must be as clear as possible in this regard.

The rules use “emanating” and “originating” interchangeably without making clear what is meant (see also our comment about the footnote for 7.2.1.1.1).

7.2.1.3. We’re very happy to see the addition of families as creators in accord with DACS, and glad to see harmonization of this aspect of determining creators.

At the same time, it would be very helpful to clarify when a family is a “family” and when it is a “corporate body” (e.g., “the singing Apple Family” is treated as a corporate body for a recording

of their performances; “the Boddy family” is treated as a family for a newsletter of the family history).

7.2.1.4. Because of the placement of the footnote at 7.2.1.1.1, consider moving it to become 7.2.1.2, renumbering the current 7.2.1.2–7.2.1.3.

7.2.1.4.1. ALA is happy to see that e) regarding responsible corporate bodies for cartographic works is present in RDA. We suggest that this instruction could also be broadened beyond cartographic resources.

Based upon comments from PCC/CONSER, ALA recommends that the instructions in RDA 7.2.1.4.1 be simplified. We would prefer leaving up to cataloguer’s judgment whether a corporate body is responsible for creating a work, rather than having the instructions spelled out in such detail. While a simplification of this rule would most likely result in more serial titles with corporate body as the primary access point, this would be a positive change, especially for generic titles. It would also save time, as cataloguers currently spend too much time reading and re-reading AACR2 21.1B2 when they are the least bit unsure of the application of this rule.

One possibility would be to eliminate many of the distinctions in 7.2.1.4.1 and add an “in case of doubt” instruction to (7.2.1.4.2?) stating that if the title is distinctive, to use the title as the primary access point; if the title is generic, i.e., if the title consists solely of words indicating type of resource and/or periodicity of resource, choose the corporate body as the primary access point.

Another approach to simplification would be to add back in the **reverse** of the exception clause given in AACR2 21.1.B2 that was NOT included in RDA 7.2.1.4.1:

In case of doubt about whether a work falls into one or more of these categories, treat it as if it does.

(rather than “treat it as if it does not”, as in AACR2).

7.2.1.4.1(c)(iii). The see reference to 7.2.2 doesn’t make sense, since Corporate Body is defined at 1.1.6.4, not 7.2.2.

7.2.1.4.2. Consider deleting this unnecessary section. It could easily be explicitly included within 7.2.1.4.1.

7.2.1.4.3–7.2.1.4.4. These two instructions actually represent see references and need to be moved elsewhere — perhaps into 7.2.1.0 following 7.2.1.0.3. Presented as they are before the examples illustrating 7.2.1.4.1, they are distracting and confusing.

7.2.1.4.5. We suggest that this rather important “in case of doubt” clause should appear at the end of the text of 7.2.1.4.1 rather than at the end of the examples.

7.2.2. More than one person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating the work

As noted in the General Comments on Chapter 7 above, ALA proposes (a) to limit 7.2.2 to works of shared responsibility, and (b) to eliminate the Rule of Three. We propose the following revised text:

7.2.2	MORE THAN ONE PERSON, FAMILY, OR CORPORATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE WORK
7.2.2.0	Scope
7.2.2.0.1	<p>➤ Apply the guidelines given under 7.2.2 to works that fall into one or more of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) works produced by the collaboration of two or more persons or families performing the same functionb) works for which different persons or families have prepared separate contributionsc) works consisting of an exchange between two or more persons or families (e.g., correspondence, debates, interviews, spirit communications)d) works falling into one or more of the categories listed in 7.2.1.4 that originate from two or more corporate bodiese) works listed in a)-c) above that also contain contributions originating from one or more corporate bodiesf) works resulting from a collaboration or exchange between a person or family and a corporate body.
7.2.2.0.2	For collaborations between a composer and a lyricist, librettist, choreographer, etc., see 7.7.1–7.7.2.
7.2.2.0.3	For academic disputations, see 7.12.1.
7.2.2.1	General guideline
7.2.2.1.1	<p>➤ If more than one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work, use as the primary access point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the access point for the one represented as being principally responsible (see 7.2.2.2)<i>or</i> b) the access point for the one named first (if two or three persons, families, or corporate bodies are represented as being principally responsible) (see 7.2.2.3)<i>or</i> c) the title (if no one, two, or three persons, families, or corporate bodies are represented as being principally responsible) (see 7.2.2.4).

7.2.2.2 One person, family, or corporate body principally responsible

- 7.2.2.2.1 ➤ If more than one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work, but principal responsibility is attributed to one of them, use the access point for that person, family, or body as the primary access point.
- 7.2.2.2.2 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for collaborators, see 7.3.1.

7.2.2.3 Two or ~~three more~~ persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible

- 7.2.2.3.1 ➤ If principal responsibility for creating the work is attributed to two or ~~three more~~ persons, families, or corporate bodies, use the access point for the first named of those persons, families, or bodies as the primary access point.
- 7.2.2.3.2 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for collaborators, see 7.3.1.

~~7.2.2.4 More than three persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible~~

- ~~7.2.2.4.1 ➤ If principal responsibility for creating the work is attributed to more than three persons, families, or corporate bodies, use the title of the work as the primary access point.~~
- ~~7.2.2.4.2 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for collaborators, see 7.3.1.~~
- 7.2.2.3.3 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for compilers, editors, etc., see 7.3.2.

7.2.2.4 Two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies using a shared pseudonym

- 7.2.2.4.1 ➤ If the work is the product of two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies collaborating under a single pseudonym, use the access point for that pseudonym as the primary access point.

Other specific comments on 7.2.2 guidelines

7.2.2.0.1. The list seems to be too long. It could be shortened by deleting e) and f), and revising a)–c), to make the following complete list:

- a) works produced by the collaboration of two or more persons, families, and/or corporate bodies
- b) works for which different persons, families, and/or corporate bodies have prepared separate contributions

- c) works consisting of an exchange between two or more persons, families, and/or corporate bodies (e.g., correspondence, debates, interviews, spirit communications)
- d) works falling into one or more of the categories listed in 7.2.1.4 that originate from two or more corporate bodies

It is perhaps naive to assume that we have covered all possibilities of types resources with multiple responsible entities. We suggest also rewording to show that these are just examples of the most common types.

7.2.2.3–7.2.2.4. There should be a reference at 7.2.2.3 and 7.2.2.4 referring to 7.2.1.4, in order to show what kind of works qualify for corporate body as primary access point.

7.2.2.4.1. While not necessarily advocating additional case-based guidelines, some ALA members are nevertheless concerned that the absence of guidelines specifically addressing access points for interviews (which are addressed only by implication in the examples) will be problematic for RDA users. This would be a case of mixed responsibility if that ALA proposal is accepted.

7.2.3. If the ALA proposal relating to works of mixed responsibility is accepted and if it is agreed that the primary access point for a compilation should be based on principal responsibility for the compilation as a whole, then this entire section can be brought under general rules. ALA supports such a solution, and specifically supports choosing the compiler as the primary access point for a compilation.

See also ALA's comments under 7.2.8 (specifically 7.2.8.5.1a.1) for Performances, regarding the implications for considering a compiler to have primary responsibility for a compilation as a composite work. This has the advantage of providing principled justification for giving primary access to the principal performer of a recording that contains performances of multiple works, which is what most catalogue users would expect to see.

7.2.3. If separate rules for compilations are retained, then we note that the concept of compilation is not well defined (see 7.2.0.2 above and the following specific comments).

7.2.3.0.1. It is unclear what “independent works” means. Would the FRBR term “autonomous works” be better?

7.2.3.1.1. For clarity, it would be useful to reword the first sentence:

... use the collective title as the primary access point.

7.2.3.3.1. Compilation without a collective title. This instruction is wordy and could be clearer. Suggested rewording:

If the compilation falls into one of the categories listed under 7.2.3.0 but lacks a collective title, use the primary access point for the first work in the resource.

7.2.4. Adaptations and revisions of previously existing works

7.2.5. Other modifications of previously existing works

7.2.5. Previously existing works with added commentary, illustrations, etc.

ALA has recommended generally that the relation of the rules in Chapter 7 to the FRBR group 1 entities be made more explicit. 7.2.4–7.2.6 is a perfect example of how this might be done.

In the current draft, it is not clear from either the captions or from the wording whether RDA considers revisions to be new expressions of the same work or to be new works. Language such as “the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the adaptation or revision is represented as having principal responsibility for the work” seems to be saying that a revision (expression) can be a work — which we find conceptually confusing. What this rule is really saying is that certain sorts of modification result in a new work. This should be stated explicitly, and the FRBR group 1 entities should in fact be used to organize the rules for modifications.

In the proposed text below, the principal distinction is made between modifications that result in a new work (7.2.4) and modifications that result in new expressions of an existing work (7.2.5). We believe that these general guidelines for modifications cover 7.2.6 as well as 7.2.4 and 7.2.5, (and possibly 7.2.8 as well; language is included in the scope notes below in order to show that even performances *might* be brought under these very general guidelines).

This proposal also suggests that the various types of modifications that fall into each category be handled as part of the Scope rule. If this is done, then the general guideline becomes very simple indeed. We feel that this is an elegant alternative to the complicated set of guidelines presented in this section of the draft. [Note: Corresponding changes would need to be made in 7.2.0.3.]

7.2.4 MODIFICATIONS OF PREVIOUSLY EXISTING WORKS THAT RESULT IN A NEW WORK

Contents

- 7.2.4.0 Scope
- 7.2.4.1 General guideline

7.2.4.0 Scope

- 7.2.4.0.1 ➤ Apply the guidelines given under 7.2.4 to works that fall into one or more of the following categories:
 - a) adaptations that substantially change the nature and content of that work
 - b) revisions, enlargements, updates, etc., of a previously existing work, when the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the previously existing work is no longer represented as being responsible (e.g., when the person, etc., responsible for the original is named only in the title proper and some other person, etc., is named as being principally responsible in the statement of responsibility or in the statement of responsibility relating to the edition)
 - c) works comprising a previously existing work to which another person, family, or corporate body has added commentary, interpretation, biographical or critical matter, etc., when the preferred sources of information present it as a commentary, etc., on the previously existing work
 - d) performances in which the level of creative responsibility of the performer(s) entails responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc.
- 7.2.4.0.2 For musical works that include words, see 7.7.1.
- 7.2.4.0.3 For arrangements, transcriptions, etc., of musical works, see 7.7.3-7.7.5.
- 7.2.4.0.4 For reproductions and adaptations of art works, see 7.8.1-7.8.2.

7.2.4.1 General guideline

- 7.2.4.1.1 ➤ Use the access point for the person, family or corporate body to whom principal responsibility for the modification is attributed as the primary access point.
- 7.2.4.1.2 ➤ Use a citation, an access point, or other convention to identify the work modified (see 6.6.1).

7.2.5 MODIFICATIONS OF PREVIOUSLY EXISTING WORKS THAT RESULT IN A NEW EXPRESSION

Contents

- 7.2.5.0 Scope
- 7.2.5.1 General guideline

7.2.5.0 Scope

- 7.2.5.0.1 ➤ Apply the guidelines given under 8.1.5 to works that fall into one or more of the following categories:
 - a) abridged versions of, or extracts from, a previously existing work
 - b) translations of a previously existing work
 - c) revisions, enlargements, updates, etc., of a previously existing work, when the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the previously existing work is represented as being responsible for the revision
 - d) works comprising a previously existing work to which another person, family, or corporate body has added commentary, interpretation, biographical or critical matter, etc., when the preferred sources of information present it as an edition of the previously existing work
 - e) performances of a previously existing work unless the level of creative responsibility of the performer(s) entails responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc.
- 7.2.5.0.2 For musical settings of texts, etc., see 7.7.1.
- 7.2.5.0.3 For arrangements, transcriptions, etc., of musical works, see 7.7.3–7.7.5.
- 7.2.5.0.4 For reproductions and adaptations of art works, see 7.8.1–7.8.2.

7.2.5.1. General guideline

- 7.2.5.1.1 ➤ Use the access point for the person, family or corporate body that to whom principal responsibility for the previously existing work is attributed as the primary access point.
- 7.2.5.1.2 ➤ Provide additional access point(s) for the persons, families, or bodies responsible for the modification (see 7.3).

Other comments on 7.2.4–7.2.6

7.2.4.1.1 and 7.2.4.3.1. There are two conditions specified. While there is an instruction as to what to do when both conditions are met, there is no provision as to what is instructed when the first condition is met but the second one is not. In other words, what should be done if the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the adaptation or revision is not represented as having principal responsibility for the work? We suggest adding another general guideline to cover this possibility.

7.2.4.2.2. If our proposal above is not accepted, we suggest that 7.2.4.2.2 be revised to cover both adaptations and revisions and moved under 7.2.4.1 General guidelines. If this is done, we suggest changing the numbering to 7.2.4.1.2 and revising to read:

In case of doubt about whether the adaptation or revision meets the criteria set out above, use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing work as the primary access point for the adaptation or revision.

or:

In case of doubt about whether the adaptation or revision meets the criteria set out above or when the criteria are not fully met, use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing work as the primary access point for the adaptation or revision.

This change would also require renumbering 7.2.4.1.2– 7.2.4.1.3.

7.2.5.1.1. General guidelines. The terminology of Chapter 7 becomes particularly strained at the end of this guideline.

... use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing work as the primary access point.

Our proposal for 7.2.4–7.2.5 above provides one way of simplifying this language. Even if our proposed revision is not accepted, the grammatical confusion of instructions like this needs to be addressed.

We also suggest that the references for adaptations (7.2.4.2) and revisions (7.2.4.3) are actually part of the scope of 7.5 and belong somewhere in 5.2.0.

7.2.6. If our proposed revision of the rules for modifications of works is not accepted, we make the following comments on the draft guidelines.

The distinction between commentaries on a law and annotated editions of the law is sometimes difficult to make and results in some titles being scattered within a catalogue. ALA, on the recommendation of AALL, proposes that commentaries and annotated editions of a law use the law as the primary access, with additional access for commentators, editors, etc. This would remove the need to determine how the particular resource is presenting itself.

We also suggest that this simplified guideline be expanded to include all resources and not just laws, as shown below. The changes below include deleting the final phrase from 7.2.6.1.1 and deleting 7.2.6.2 and 7.2.6.3. In the following text, some of the revisions are highlighted; some examples have been omitted, and additional examples for laws have been proposed.

7.2.6 PREVIOUSLY EXISTING WORKS WITH ADDED COMMENTARY, ILLUSTRATIONS, ETC.

7.2.6.0 Scope

- 7.2.6.0.1 Apply the guidelines given under 7.2.6 to works that fall into one or more of the following categories:
- a) works with added commentary, **annotations**, criticism, biographical matter, etc. (see 7.2.6.2)
 - b) works with added illustrations (see 7.2.6.3)
- 7.2.6.0.2 For works of collaboration between a writer, composer, etc., and an artist, follow the instructions given under 7.2.2.
- 7.2.6.0.3 For musical works with added accompaniments, added parts, etc., see 7.7.5.
- 7.2.6.0.4 For reproductions of art works with accompanying text, see 7.8.1.2.

7.2.6.1 General guideline

- 7.2.6.1.1 **➤** If the work comprises a previously existing work with added commentary, **annotations**, criticism, biographical matter, illustrations, etc., use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing work as the primary access point, **unless the work is presented as the work of the commentator, biographer, etc.**

Bible

(Primary access point for: The interpreter's Bible : the Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard versions with general articles and introduction, exegesis, exposition for each book of the Bible)

Germany (Federal Republic)

(Primary access point for: Bundesbaugesetz : mit Kommentar / H. Knaup, H. Ingenstau)

Sedgwick, Catharine M.

(Primary access point for: Life and letters of Catharine M. Sedgwick / edited by Mary E. Dewey)

Aristotle

(Primary access point for: Averrois Cordubensis Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis De anima libros. Includes a Latin text of De anima)

United States

(Primary access point for: The Federal Expropriation Act : a commentary / by Eric C.E. Todd. Includes the text of the act)

Ford E. B.

(Primary access point for: British butterflies / by E.B. Ford ; with ... colour plates by Paxton Chadwick)

- 7.2.6.1.2 **➤** For guidelines on using a citation, an access point, or other convention to record the work to which the commentary refers, see 6.7.1.

- 7.2.6.1.3 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for commentators, etc., see 7.3.3.
- 7.2.6.1.4 ➤ For guidelines and instructions on providing additional access points for illustrators see 7.3.5.

7.2.4.2.1. The decision regarding when a modification in fact creates a new work is one of the most difficult that cataloguers must make. Although we are not sure how much guidance is possible on this question, one of our reviewers did suggest the following (based on the text in the draft, not the proposed text above):

If the work is an adaptation of a previously existing work that substantially changes the nature and content of that work, use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the adaptation as the primary access point.

7.2.7.3–7.2.7.5. We suggest that 7.2.7.3, 7.2.7.4, and 7.2.7.5 might be collapsed into a single rule for “Works of unknown origin”, similar to 7.2.7.2, and so eliminate some needless repetition. In any case, with unknown responsibility, one also doesn’t know whether the responsible party is a person, family, or corporate body.

7.2.8 Performances. ALA recommends changing the header of this section to “Recordings of Performances”, since performances per se are not resources.

Many of the subsections under 7.2.8 need to include the subinstructions at 7.2.8.2.2 and 7.2.8.2.3. We suggest placing those instructions following 7.2.8.0.2 so that they do not need to be repeated at each subinstruction.

7.2.8.5.1a.1. Compilation with a collective title. ALA notes that the wording here is unnecessarily confusing, since the instruction appears always to result in the title as the primary access point. We also note that this is not a desirable result when the responsibility for the performance is one corporate body that fits under 7.2.1.4.1d (responsibility goes beyond performance); this guideline should refer back to that earlier guideline.

If the guideline is retained, it could be simplified to simply say,

... use the collective title as the primary access point ...

7.2.8.6. Consider the possibility of moving these rules to be a subset of 7.2.7.2.

7.3. Additional Access Points. 7.3 states that this is an optional element. However, there is no indication, once the option is taken, whether there is (or can be) a limit on the number of additional access points made. The implication seems to be (because it is not stated otherwise) that if the cataloguer is going to give additional access points, then any and all applicable should be given. To eliminate any confusion, ALA recommends adding text at 0.1.7 to cover all situations where the “how many” question may arise.

ALA is concerned that the phrase “prominently named in the resource described or in reference sources” used throughout this section will not be followed by other segments of the information

and cultural heritage communities. We suggest it be included in an application profile for libraries, otherwise made optional, or omitted.

7.3.0. We suggest adding a new first section on scope, perhaps modeled on the scope statements used in Chapter 6, and giving definitions of “collaborator” and “contributor”.

7.3.0.1. We suggest deleting the introductory clause. It does not seem appropriate for RDA to tell its users how to do their work. Some cataloguers figure out all the access points they’ll provide before selecting the main entry, which is perfectly fine.

7.3.1–7.3.7. ALA notes that breaking out 7.3.1 thru 7.3.7 into individual guidelines highlights the bias toward textual resources in this section and also adds a lot of perhaps-unnecessary duplication in the text. It would seem that these sections could be merged, with specific types of contributors given in a list.

7.3.1.1–7.3.1.2. Collaborators. These guidelines could be reduced to just:

Provide additional access points for prominently named persons, families, or corporate bodies that have collaborated in the creation of the work and have not been chosen as the primary access point.

7.3.2.2. We would like to see this instruction stated explicitly as an exception to 7.3.2.1 (i.e., “Exception: For serials ...”). Also, we are not comfortable with including integrating resources with serials in this treatment. Editors are usually more important bibliographically for integrating resources than they are for serials, and as a general rule should be provided an access point.

This is the only place where the phrase “if considered important” is preceded by “only”. It is unclear if that word changes the instruction, and if so, how. We would recommend deleting it.

7.3.3.1, 7.3.4.1, 7.3.5. These guidelines are all much clearer than their counterparts in AACR2.

7.3.6.1. We suggest adding “conductor” to the listing in the instruction; currently this is only clarified as a principal performer through the final example.

We also suggest dropping the term “principal” from this guideline. With current RDA restrictions on performers as primary access point, it does not seem to be needed, and seems curious used in conjunction with “prominently.”

7.3.7–7.3.11. These sections could be consolidated to make the guidelines more concise and easy to follow. Consolidate them to read:

7.3.7 OTHER CONTRIBUTORS AND ENTITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONTENT OF THE RESOURCE

- 7.3.7.1 ➤ Provide additional access points for the following contributors:
- a) interviewers, moderators, etc.
 - b) producers, directors, animators, etc., of motion pictures and videorecordings
 - c) persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with later parts of a multipart monograph (see 7.1.4.1), later parts of issues of a serial (see 7.1.4.2), or later iterations of an integrating resource (see 7.1.4.3).
 - d) persons, families, or corporate bodies to whom the work embodied in the resource described has been attributed. Such cases include a person to whom a work is known to be erroneously or fictitiously attributed, unless he or she is not a real person.
 - e) a sponsoring body, issuing body, etc., prominently named in the resource being described or associated with the work in reliable reference sources. For corporate bodies functioning solely as publishers, distributors, producers, or manufacturers, see 7.4.
 - f) a person, family, or corporate body having a relationship to a work not treated in 7.3.1–7.3.7, if considered to be important, unless the relationship between the person, etc., and the work is purely that of a subject.

7.3.8. We suggest changing the header to “... Associated with Later Parts and Issues, or Earlier Iterations” to be consistent with 7.1.4.3.

7.3.8.1. ALA recommends that guidance also be given for the situation where information is found regarding persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with EARLIER parts, issues, or iterations (the original description has been based on a later issue/part/iteration than the one now in hand), as follows.

7.3.8.1 Provide additional access points for persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with earlier/later parts of a multipart monograph (see 7.1.4.1), earlier/later parts of issues of a serial (see 7.1.4.2), or earlier/later iterations of an integrating resource (see 7.1.4.3).

7.3.9. We recommend adding wording to this to instruct the cataloguer to “Indicate that the relationship is attributed”.

7.3.10.1. We recommend deleting the phrase “being described”.

7.3.11.1. Change “work” to “work or expression”.

7.4. If this section retains its current scope, make the scope (manifestations) explicit.

7.5. If this section retains its current scope, make the scope (items) explicit. It would also be useful to either provide a discussion of the concept of provenance here or refer to one elsewhere in RDA.

7.6. ALA recommends that RDA include a stronger statement directing cataloguers to use designations of role because of their vital role in fulfilling the FRBR-related functionalities of a catalogue.

7.6.2. “Use standard lists appropriate to the type of content as the source designations”? ALA suggests that it would be useful to have the RDA web version point to some of these lists, such as the MARC relator codes and perhaps others as well. It would also be helpful to require the source of the designation to be recorded.

We also suggest adding “of role” to the end of the sentence.

7.7–7.12. While there is some support within ALA to reorganize Chapter 7 in order to incorporate Sections 7.7, 7.8, and 7.10 into 7.2, support for this is not universal. Rather than endorse relocating only those instructions that everyone in ALA could agree could be merged into the general guidelines (which might lead to an inconsistent result), we have not proposed specific ways that this reorganization could be accomplished. We also note that merging the additional guidelines into 7.2 would require adding sections to 7.2 to provide spots for those additional instructions that do not have a counterpart earlier in the chapter, and some wording in the general instructions might also need alteration to incorporate the additional guidelines.

7.7. It is difficult to evaluate this section without seeing whether or not RDA is changing the definition of a musical work. It appears that in RDA musical works include cadenzas and librettos since they are included within this section of the guidelines. This would be a change from the AACR2 definition of “musical work”.

7.7.1.1. It would be useful to have more guidance concerning works that contain both dramatic and musical aspects (such as judging which aspect is predominant, and if in doubt, not to consider it a musical work). This would help to more clearly differentiate works of music from works which contain music.

7.7.1.2.1c.1. Delete the final clause of the sentence reading “as the primary access point for the compilation of excerpts.”

7.7.2. Suggest changing “musical settings for ballets, etc.” to “musical settings for choreography”.

7.7.3. Since “adaptation” and “arrangement” are distinct concepts, the use of the word “arrangements” in the instructions for “adaptations” (see 7.7.3.1.a & 7.7.3.1.b) is inappropriate.

7.7.3.1. The instruction from AACR2 21.18C1 b) “a paraphrase of various works or of the general style of another composer” is missing from this section. It is also not really covered by instructions a)–d) here and should be added.

7.7.3.1a. Even though the language is carried over from AACR2 21.18A1, we have some concern that in RDA the use of quotation marks might cause cataloguer to assume that the application of this guideline is limited to works so explicitly described. We recommend that the quotation marks be removed so that the guideline more clearly covers what to do for “work[s] merely based on other music” (AACR2 21.18C1)

7.7.3.3. Should this instruction appear elsewhere, perhaps at 7.7.0.1.1? Its placement here seems odd, falling between the instructions for adaptations and arrangements.

7.7.4.2. The wording of 7.7.3.1 would seem to offer more opportunities for entry under adaptor for “arrangements” of folk music, since most such works involve incorporation of new material that goes beyond added accompaniment, and changes to harmony and musical style. But the “Michael row the boat ashore” example in 7.7.4.2 would seem to indicate otherwise. There is not enough information about James Burt’s contribution to the resource to judge whether it actually illustrates this particular guideline. ALA recommends revising this guideline as follows to clarify the relationship between it and 7.7.3.1:

If the original composer is unknown, use the title as the primary access point for the arrangement, etc. unless it falls into one of the categories in 7.7.3.1

7.7.7.1. ALA recommends that the term “score” in this guideline be replaced by the term “music” since this guideline is not intending to refer to the musical format of the manifestation but to the musical work itself. Also, the phrase “dramatic work or works” needs clarification: is it intended to include film music?

7.7.8.1. This guideline relies on the examples to set forth the condition that the resource makes reference to its musical setting, rather than stating things plainly in the wording of the guideline. To clarify this, we suggest adding “published with reference to its musical setting” preceding the first comma in the 1st sentence.

7.7.8.3. Librettos. This guideline is for a compilation of librettos by one composer. What if more than one composer is involved? What if they are selections from one or more than one composer? There are provisions for this situation in other guidelines, and we would like to see them added here as well.

7.8.0.1.2. This instruction continues the confusion caused by LCRI 21.1B2 of treating exhibition catalogues of works that are owned by a particular museum differently from those catalogues of items that are temporarily in custody. In many exhibition catalogues it is often not readily apparent whether the items of an exhibition are owned by or are on loan to the institution. Trying to determine that and therefore choose the access point accordingly is problematic. The choice of access points should be handled the same way across all exhibition catalogues.

7.8.1.1. While we approve of RDA containing guidelines about determining the primary access point for reproductions of art works, ALA would also like to see equivalent guidelines for determining the primary access point for reproductions in general.

7.9.1.3. ALA suggests adding the following at the end of this instruction, i.e., after (see 7.9.1.1 and 7.9.1.2): “If unable to determine if the regulation is a law, treat it as a regulation (see 7.9.2.1).”

We also suggest changing the caption of 7.9.1.3 to: Statutory regulations, orders, ordinances, etc.

7.9.1.3.1. Administrative Regulations that are Laws. To clarify the concept covered by this guideline, we recommend changing the wording of this instruction and including another country:

For administrative regulations, rules, orders, ordinances, etc., i.e., agency regulations or delegated legislation having the force of law (as is the case in the United Kingdom, Canada, and German states), use the access point appropriate to the regulations as laws as the primary access point (see 7.9.1.1 and 7.9.1.2).

7.9.2. A list of jurisdictions that have administrative regulations promulgated by government agencies would be helpful here, with an “in case of doubt” provision for countries not included. A comprehensive list is probably not possible, although the cataloguing resource *Cataloging Legal Literature* has a table showing the status of regulations for a number of countries. We suggest that RDA possibly refer to this table.

7.9.2.1. The essential distinction in this instruction from 7.9.1.3 is that it applies to regulations that are **not** laws, but this is not expressed in the instruction itself, only in the heading at 7.9.2, which is separated from the text by a table of contents and another heading. Even regulations that are laws can be promulgated by a government agency. We recommend clarifying this in the heading for this guideline, i.e., add “... that are not laws” to the heading for this section.

7.9.4.2. ALA questions why all constitutions, charters, etc. do not have the body governed by the constitution, etc., as primary access point, regardless of whether or not it is a law. If the principle is that the primary access point should be the body responsible for the content, then the jurisdiction enacting the law should be the primary access point. However, laws enacted by one jurisdiction to govern another do not follow this principle, that is, the jurisdiction being governed by the law is the primary access point. Since that is the case, the body being governed should be the primary access point whether or not it is a law.

7.9.5.1. Please see ALA’s response to *5JSC/LC/5/Rev* for our comment on this guideline.

7.9.5.2.2. The wording “the other governments” is incorrect, since the primary access point is the title. We suggest taking out “other” and change to: “Provide additional access points for the governments that are signatories to the treaty.”

7.9.5.5. This could be simplified by having all other agreements involving jurisdictions follow 7.2.2.

7.9.5.5.1. Shouldn’t the references be to 7.2.2.3 and 7.2.2.4?

7.9.5.5.4. Shouldn’t the first reference be to 7.2.2.3?

7.9.6.1. ALA, in consultation with the American Association of Law Libraries, continues to believe that the guidelines for court reports can be simplified. The principle is that primary access is provided for the party responsible for a resource. What makes a law report important is the court that decides a case, and it is that court that holds the authority of the decision. Whether the court is the Supreme Court of the United States, the Federal Court of Canada, or the Privy Council, the court making the decision is the author of the decision, whether or not the decision is published by the court in an official version or by a commercial publisher that is not an official version. The cataloguer should not need to determine if a law report is official or not. Rather the primary access should always be the court.

In the 19th century and earlier, courts did not publish their decisions. Reporters would transcribe the decisions of the court and publish them. We recognize that citation practice until the 20th century was to use the reporter as primary access point, and primary access for reporter is acceptable if that is how the reports are known. The shift away from citing court reports by reporter began when the official “Law Reports” series started in England in 1865. Around the same time, American court reports began to be known by titles like “U.S. reports” or “New York reports” rather than by the name of the reporter. The reporter has the role of transcriber and compiler, and is not an author. Particularly for modern resources (20th century and later) we recommend that the reporter should be an additional access point, with the court as primary access point.

7.9.6.1.1b.1. Reports Ascribed to Reporters by Name. It would be helpful to give the citation for one or more authoritative citation reference tools here, such as *The blue book: a uniform system of citation*.

7.9.6.2. ALA suggests that reports of more than one court should be entered under title. These are collections of decisions from multiple courts, compiled by someone. For these we suggest that the names of the courts, editors, reporters, etc. should be additional access points.

7.9.7.3. ALA suggests that indictments can be included under 7.9.7.1.

7.10–7.11. Additional instructions for religious works. ALA would welcome additional non-Judeo-Christian examples or proposals for additional guidelines for these sections of RDA.

7.10.3.0.2. Scope [of liturgical works]. In 7.10.3.1.3 there is instruction about what to do when there is a single passage of scripture used. However, in cases where there are multiple passages, there is no instruction about whether to add a secondary access point for “Bible”. We suggest that guidance be added for this.

7.12. The caption is misleading. What is the definition of “academic work”? Does it include the work issued by a university press? We recommend returning to the caption “Academic Disputations” as used in AACR2 21.27.

7.12.1.2. This is a case of mixed responsibility. If general rules for works of mixed responsibility are added to RDA, they should reference this rule.

APPENDIX

Bibliographic Relationships in RDA Chapter 6

prepared by

Robert L. Maxwell, CC:DA Voting Member
Brigham Young University

RDA Chapter 6, new to the code, is extremely important because it embodies the very core of FRBR, relationships between entities. Or at least it should. Oddly, although the concept of relationships is emphasized, there is little or no reference to FRBR and FRBR concepts appear to be missing. Before considering FRBR, however, the taxonomy of Chapter 6 needs to be discussed.

Taxonomy

In 1989 Barbara B. Tillett completed a dissertation at UCLA entitled “Bibliographic Relationships: Toward a Conceptual Structure of Bibliographic Information used in Cataloging.” This dissertation, summarized in a series of articles in *Library Resources & Technical Services*, had as its outcome a full taxonomy of bibliographic relationships. This taxonomy has been fleshed out since 1989, but Tillett’s findings have served as the basis of further research in the area and her terminology for the relationships has become standard in the profession.

ALA was pleased to see Chapter 6 in RDA, “Related Resources,” but was puzzled to see that the chapter, while describing most of the same relationships as those described in Tillett’s and others’ work, used different terminology and seemed incomplete. We recommend that Tillett’s basic taxonomy be followed, both in structure and in terminology, since these appear to have become standard.

According to Tillett, “taxonomic principles require categories to be mutually exclusive and totally exhaustive” (Apr. 1991, p. 153). The categories in the RDA Chapter 6 draft are neither mutually exclusive nor totally exhaustive. On the other hand, Tillett’s research purports to have developed a taxonomy that is both, and further research by others, while extending her model, do not contradict this assertion.

Tillett offers the following definition of “bibliographic relationship” which might be useful in the development of Chapter 6: “A bibliographic relationship is an association between two or more bibliographic items or works” (Apr. 1991, p. 150). This seems so basic as to go without saying, but it is the fundamental principle underlying RDA Chapter 6, which gives guidelines for recording such relationships. One important concept embodied in this definition (and later developed in FRBR) is that relationships hold within a single work (Tillett’s “bibliographic items”, FRBR’s Group 1 entities) as well as between different works. Both relationships within

works and relationships between works are dealt with in RDA Chapter 6, but this important distinction is never clarified.

Tillett's mutually exclusive and totally exhaustive categories are as follows (Apr. 1991, p. 156):

4. Equivalence relationships
5. Derivative relationships
3. Descriptive relationships
4. Whole-part relationships
5. Accompanying relationships
6. Sequential relationships
7. Shared characteristic relationships

These seven categories remain standard (see Vellucci 1998, p. 110–111; Tillett 2001, p. 19–20). It would seem wise for the text of Chapter 6 to be based on them instead of trying to reinvent categories.

Equivalence relationships “hold between exact copies of the same manifestation of a work, or between an original item and reproductions of it, so long as the intellectual content and authorship are preserved” (this definition and those that follow come from Tillett Apr. 1991, Vellucci 1998, and Tillett 2001, which are essentially the same). This category includes copies, facsimiles, microforms, and digital reproductions. Categories in current Chapter 6 that are or include equivalence relationships are 6.4, “source/reproduction relationships;” and many resources covered in 6.5 “format/format relationships,” which are “relationship[s] between resources ... containing the same content in different formats.” To the extent that “format/format” includes facsimile reproductions (e.g. between paper and digital), 6.4 and 6.5 are not mutually exclusive; some “format/format” relationships are also “source/reproduction” relationships. 6.5 as it now stands also includes some relationships that are not equivalence relationships (i.e., not “exact copies.”). These would, instead, be instances of the derivative relationship.

Derivative relationships “hold between a bibliographic work and a modification based on the work,” including versions of the same work (editions, revisions, translations, summaries, abstracts, digests), adaptations/modifications (new works), changes of genre (also under current cataloguing theory considered new works), and other new works based on the style or thematic content of the work. This relationship is covered in RDA 6.6, “source/derivative relationships,” and 6.8 “edition/edition relationships.” Again, 6.6 and 6.8 are not mutually exclusive (both apparently include translations), and they both in fact cover the same type of relationship. Neither 6.6 nor 6.8 explicitly cover changes of genre or relationships with “new works based on the style or thematic content of the work,” but presumably these subcategories are included. Most of the relationships described in 6.11 (special instances of music relationships), 6.12 (special instances of art relationships), and 6.13 (special instances of law relationships) are derivative relationships (relationships between works that are based on the style or thematic content of other works).

Descriptive relationships “hold between a bibliographic entity and a description, criticism, evaluation, or review of that entity.” This includes the relationship between a work and a review of the work, and that between the work and annotations, commentaries, etc. It appears that at least some of the relationships contemplated in RDA 6.7, “primary/adjunct relationships” are descriptive relationships (see 6.7.1.1, commentaries). In Tillett’s taxonomy indexes and concordances, also included in RDA 6.7, do not exemplify descriptive relationships, but accompanying. (This point might be debatable.) It is not clear that teacher’s guides or supplements always or even usually have a descriptive relationship to the works they supplement. These would more likely exemplify accompanying relationships. Since descriptive relationships also have a subject dimension, they might not be fully worked out in RDA (although it has been recommended that RDA at least acknowledge subject relationships).

Whole-part relationships “hold between a bibliographic entity and a component part of the entity.” This includes relationships between the whole and the parts of anthologies, collections, series, etc. RDA 6.2 (“aggregate/component relationships”) covers whole-part relationships.

While discussing whole-part relationships, Tillett also discusses “part-to-part” relationships (2001, p. 25), which seem to be related concepts, as apparently envisaged in the sequencing of RDA 6.2 (aggregate/component) and 6.3 (component/component). Tillett points out, however, that part-to-part relationships exemplify different types of relationships from the whole-part relationship, either sequential (e.g., the relationship between individual parts of a serial) or accompanying (e.g., between parts of a kit, or poems in an anthology).

Accompanying relationships “hold between bibliographic entities and their accompanying materials.” The relationship between entities that accompany each other may be predominate/subordinate (as between a text and a supplement) or equal (between texts in an anthology, or parts of a kit). RDA 6.3 (“component/component relationships”), part of 6.7 (“primary/adjunct relationships” — indexes and concordances), 6.9 (“issued with’ relationships”), 6.11.3 (the relationship of a cadenza to its concerto), and 6.12.2 (the relationship between a work and its illustrations) are instances of accompanying relationships. Note, however, that a component/component relationship (6.3) might instead be an instance of a sequential relationship if the relationship between the parts is chronological.

Sequential relationships “hold between bibliographic entities that continue or precede one another.” This includes successive titles of a serial, sequels/prequels, and parts of a numbered series. RDA 6.10 relationships (“predecessor/successor relationships”) are sequential. So are some component/component relationships (RDA 6.3).

Shared characteristic relationships “hold between bibliographic entities that are not otherwise related but coincidentally have a common author, title, subject, or other characteristic.” These are not covered at all in RDA Chapter 6, but need to be since searches based on shared characteristics are probably the most common searches made in current OPACs, making the shared characteristic relationship the most commonly sought-after relationship by library users. It would be well for the cataloguing rules to acknowledge this fact and provide for it. The shared characteristic relationship is the fundamental principle underlying authority work, for example, enabling catalogue users to find materials based on the shared characteristic of author, title, or

subject. Most other types of keyword searching and search limiting (by language, country of publication, etc.) also depend on a shared characteristic relationship.

This comparison of RDA Chapter 6 with the standard taxonomy of bibliographic relationships has shown that the six of Tillett’s seven categories are covered, but with overlap between the RDA categories (i.e., they are not mutually exclusive), and the omission of one category (i.e., RDA’s categories are not exhaustive). To summarize:

<u>RDA</u>	<u>Standard Taxonomy</u>
6.2 Aggregate/component	Whole-part
6.3 Component/component	Accompanying, Sequential
6.4 Source/reproduction	Equivalence
6.5 Format/format	Equivalence, Derivative
6.6 Source/derivative	Derivative
6.7 Primary/adjunct	Descriptive, Accompanying
6.8 Edition/edition	Derivative
6.9 Issued with	Accompanying
6.10 Predecessor/successor	Sequential
6.11 (Music)	Derivative (6.11.1–2, 4), Accompanying (6.11.3)
6.12 (Art)	Derivative (6.12.1), Accompanying (6.12.2)
6.13 (Law)	Derivative
Not in RDA	Shared characteristic

We recommend that Chapter 6 be restructured based on the seven standard categories. Their names are not only the commonly-known terms used to refer to these relationships in the library profession, but they are also comprehensible to people outside the profession. Some of the choices of terms for RDA seem confusing and difficult to understand (e.g., “aggregate/component,” “primary/adjunct”). The standard taxonomy has been worked out over the course of nearly two decades, and is systematic and comprehensive. Their use would at the same time simplify the chapter and make it easier to learn and understand. It would also make it easier to translate.

FRBR

RDA Chapter 6, although apparently based on a FRBR principle, seems strangely devoid of FRBR concepts. Two concepts in particular would seem to be particularly important, the concept of relationships between the FRBR entities, particularly between the Group 1 entities (FRBR 5.2) and the concept of the relative importance of various types of relationships (FRBR 5.3.1).

Relationships between Group 1 and other entities

FRBR 5.2.1 discusses the need to link the work to its expression(s), the expression to its manifestation(s), and the manifestation to its item(s). If ever there were an opportunity for RDA to “FRBRize” the code, this is it, and yet these linkages and the relationships between Group 1 entities are not even mentioned in Chapter 6.

FRBR 5.2.1 discusses both vertical relationships (e.g., that between the work and its expression(s)), and horizontal or sibling relationships (e.g., that between various expressions of a work). These horizontal or sibling relationships, in the Tillett taxonomy, are either equivalence relationships if at the manifestation level (the Bach example on p. 59) or derivative relationships if at the expression level (the Dickens example on p. 59).

FRBR 5.3.1 deals with work-to-work relationships, the type of relationship (though unacknowledged) covered by most of the sections of RDA Chapter 6. The relationships expressed in Table 5.1 can all be given in terms of the Tillett taxonomy:

<u>FRBR</u>	<u>Tillett</u>
Successor	Sequential
Supplement	Accompanying or Descriptive
Complement	Accompanying
Summarization	Derivative
Adaptation	Derivative
Transformation	Derivative
Imitation	Derivative

Whole-part relationships at the work level are dealt with in 5.3.1.1. Further details about relationships between expressions and those between manifestations follow. It would seem important for RDA to take all of this into account.

Absent from FRBR Chapter 5, as from RDA Chapter 6, is any discussion of shared-characteristic relationships.

FRBR 5.2.2 deals with relationships between Group 2 entities and Group 1 entities. This is currently outside the scope of RDA Chapter 6 (Related *Resources*) but the concepts are closely interrelated and thus are dealt with in the same section of FRBR. The JSC might consider consolidating all types of relationships in a chapter entitled “Bibliographic Relationships” which could cover all the FRBR relationships.

Relative Importance of Relationships

FRBR 5.3.1 makes a convincing case that not all relationships are equally important. Specifically, FRBR makes a distinction between “referential” and “autonomous” works. “A referential work is one that is so closely connected to the other work in the relationship that it has little value outside the context of that other work. An autonomous work is one that does not require reference to the other work in the relationship in order to be useful or understood.” FRBR claims that it is more important to provide links between records for works that have a referential relationship to each other than those with autonomous relationships, because “meaningful use of [referential works] is highly dependent on the content of the other work.” Knowing about the relationships between autonomous works is useful, says FRBR, but not essential to the understanding of either work and so is less critical.

One of the shortcomings of Chapter 6 is that no meaningful guidance is given to the cataloguer as to which, if any, of the linking techniques should be used to express relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, or items, and between works and other works. The chapter is presented as though all choices are equally valid. But if, as FRBR insists, some relationships are more important than others to users of the catalogue, this concept should be reflected in the code. For which relationships is it very important to make links in some way? For which is it less important? Are particular types of linkages more important than others in a given context? Users of the code need to be given some guidance or at least advice.

Will it make a difference?

A legitimate question is whether or not FRBRizing Chapter 6 and standardizing its taxonomy to the Tillett categories would make a difference to the results of applying the guidelines in Chapter 6. It seems likely that it would in some cases. In the first place discussion of the relative importance of various relationships would influence cataloguer decisions both as to whether to make a link and what type of link to make.

Additionally, full acknowledgement of FRBR concepts and use of the Tillett taxonomy would clarify exactly what is being related, again influencing the choice of linking technique. For example, equivalence relationships hold for resources that are the same work and same expression, but different manifestations. In a FRBRized catalogue these relationships might be expressed by linkages within the system itself. In a traditional catalogue these relationships might be expressed only implicitly (e.g. by the fact that the principal access point and the title are the same, probably not a very satisfactory method) or explicitly (e.g. by a note expressing the details about a reproduction). Derivative relationships between expressions of the same work might be expressed through use of uniform titles/work citations. On the other hand, the linkage of a derivative relationship between different works might more appropriately be expressed through the use of a uniform title/work citation as a related work access point.

Incorporation of FRBR and the Tillett taxonomy would also greatly simplify Chapter 6. ALA has also suggested removing the repetition of the linking techniques from each section describing a relationship type. This would also greatly simplify the chapter, and would also give the opportunity to emphasize certain linking techniques over others within the context of a given relationship type if appropriate.

Bibliography

- Tillett, Barbara B. "Bibliographic Relationships." In *Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge*, edited by Carol A. Bean and Rebecca Green, 19–35. Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- . "Bibliographic Relationships: An Empirical Study of the LC Machine-Readable Records." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 36, no. 2 (Apr. 1992): 162–88.
- . *Bibliographic Relationships: Toward a Conceptual Structure of Bibliographic Information Used in Cataloging*. Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA, 1989.

- . “The History of Linking Devices.” *Library Resources & Technical Services* v. 36, no. 1 (Jan. 1992): 23–36.
- . “A Summary of the Treatment of Bibliographic Relationships in Cataloging Rules” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 35, no. 4 (Oct. 1991): 393–405.
- . “A Taxonomy of Bibliographic Relationships.” *Library Resources and Technical Services* 35, no. 2 (Apr. 1991): 150–58.
- Vellucci, Sherry. “Bibliographic Relationships.” In International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR. *The Principles and Future of AACR: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, October 23–25, 1997*, edited by Jean Weihs, 105–146. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1998. Paper also available at http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/300/jsc_aacr/bib_rel/r-bibrel.pdf and http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/300/jsc_aacr/bib_rel2/r-bib.pdf [bibliography]