

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
FROM: John Attig, ALA representative
RE: *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, Part A – Constituency Review of
June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6–7

ALA finds these two chapters much improved from the December 2006 drafts. On the other hand, we continue to find these chapters difficult to understand and continue to find important conceptual problems (particularly in Chapter 7).

The comments below (particularly those on Chapter 7) repeat comments made by the ALA representative on the May 2007 draft. Some of the general comments were also made in the ALA response to the revised draft of Chapter 3.

General comments

Complexity of the instructions and the writing

ALA finds the instructions complex and difficult to understand. As we commented in the ALA response to the revised draft of Chapter 3, RDA reads like a stereotypical *system specification*. Given the development of RDA as a metadata schema, we accept that this may be what RDA needs to be at this time. However, this approach obscures the procedural aspects of the way in which a description (not to mention a catalog) is constructed. Catalogers need a cookbook that provides recipes for various dishes, not a comprehensive encyclopedia of culinary esoterica.

Stylistic issues

- a. *Layout of alternative and optional instructions:* The layout of alternative and optional instructions does not always make it clear to which instructions the alternative or option applies. This needs to be carefully checked in each case, and perhaps a different technique for presenting such instructions needs to be followed.
- b. *Numbering of alternatives, exceptions, etc.:* While we see the usefulness of numbering the actual instructions, the current practice leaves the captions such as “*Exception:*” appearing as the final line of the previous instruction. The caption needs to be visually a part of the instruction, and needs to be displayed whenever the alternative or exceptional instruction is displayed – and should **not** be displayed as part of the previous instruction.
- c. *Use of bullets:* With the new layout that uses a separate column for the numbers, we question the usefulness of the bullets, which are no longer at the left margin

and which typically add nothing to what is already implied by the captions. Note: This is not to argue that the categories of instructions identified in the bullet styles should not be used in the metadata to support search and customization.

Chapter 6

General comment

Required elements: First, there is a general sense (in both chapters) that the limited set of required elements, with all other elements being optional, provides insufficient guidance for determining an appropriate level of detail in the description. This insufficiency will no doubt be filled by national and international implementation guidelines; however, we feel that RDA itself ought to be more helpful in this regard.

Further, the required elements in Chapter 6 in particular are ambiguous. There does not seem to be any recognition that the required access point for the first-named creator or originating body is related to the required *primary relationship* in Chapter 7, which in turn is governed by the instructions for naming works in Chapter 13. Specifically, the first-named creator in many cases will be the preferred access point in the name of the work. The implication of the present draft is that these two access points are unrelated and are both required, but that seems redundant. Furthermore, there are places in which primary access point concepts appear in Chapter 6 (particularly the distinction between Creator and Other contributor – which often seems from the instructions and the examples to be the old main/added entry distinction). We are not sure how to resolve this, but would like to see this addressed in a more rigorous way.

Issues raised in the cover letter

Organization of Chapter 6

Chapter 6 and Chapter 13: ALA generally approves the decision to move the instructions for primary access points to Chapter 13. However, as noted above, the concepts have not been completely removed from the chapter, and this has caused some confusion.

Regrouping of instructions/examples reflecting FRBR group 1 and group 2 entities

ALA generally approves the decision to group the instructions and examples according to the FRBR group 1 entities.

Examples. The biggest problem with this decision is its effect on the examples, many of which include complete statements of responsibility that give names that do not fall within the scope of the particular instruction. It is confusing to see those names given in the explanations that follow the example, but not given as

access points because they are out of scope for a given instruction. We suggest that (a) the explanatory comments following the examples try to avoid including irrelevant information, and that (b) there be some more complete examples illustrating all of the access points that would be appropriate if all of the instructions in Chapter 6 were applied.

Repetition. Many reviewers expressed frustration at the widespread repetition of basic instructions in 6.3–6.6. There was no consensus about how to reduce the redundancy; we are hoping that the customized views in *RDA Online* will be easier to comprehend.

FRBR group 2 entities: From its title onward, Chapter 6 makes recurrent use of the phrase “persons, families, and corporate bodies”. Upon an initial reading, separate sections for creators (6.3.1) and for originating bodies (6.3.2) seemed incompletely to mirror this three-part division, with persons covered by 6.3.1, corporate bodies covered by 6.3.2, but no separate section for families. However, as we note below, we do not think that the distinction between 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 **should** be reduced to a distinction between persons and corporate bodies, and we do not even support making the distinction between creators and originating bodies. Further, the responsibility of families for works is sufficiently complicated that it **does** require specific guidelines in this chapter. At times the actions of families in being responsible for works are closer to the categories of corporate responsibility (i.e., “originating bodies”) than to those of individual persons. For example, the creation of family papers fits better under the instructions for corporate origination. Many of the constituencies replying to the Library of Congress’s family name proposal found the corporate body model more appropriate to families than the personal authorship model, and this fact should be reflected in the instructions for determining responsibility for an entry, as well in the formulation of access points for family names.

Removing the distinction between creators and collaborators: ALA welcomes the removal of the distinction between creators and collaborators, especially in relation to the elimination of the “rule of three.”

Removing this distinction has further implications relating to the distinctions presented among creators (6.3.1), originating bodies (6.3.2), and other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the work (6.3.4). These instructions still hint at the need to select a primary access point.

On the other hand, adding the examples for musical and art works has made section 6.3 unwieldy, although inclusion of those examples is critical to the removal of the special instructions. Use of more italicized subheadings for special categories would help.

Removal of specific instructions for academic disputations: ALA agrees that the removal of the specific instructions for academic disputations from Chapter 6 is appropriate. Such resources present no particular problems for selecting access points. The difficult question is that of selecting the primary access point, which we expect to

be addressed in Chapter 13. On the other hand, the examples (6.3.1.1.1, 5th example on p. 6-8 and 6.3.4.1.1, 4th example, p. 6-21) raise several problems. While both the praeses and the respondent contribute to the creation of the work, it is the praeses that is the primary access point because it is the praeses that set the topic, organization, and content of an academic disputation. Either both praeses and respondent should be treated as creators, or the examples should be reversed. Note: These examples again illustrate the continued presence of main entry concepts in this draft of Chapter 6.

Retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications (6.7–6.9): ALA cannot reach consensus on whether or not these sections should remain separate. Some reviewers believe that RDA should provide informed guidance rather than ignoring the distinctiveness of these types of literature or referring catalogers to specialist manuals. Placing these instructions in Chapter 6 would assist both general and specialist catalogers. Others feel that RDA should be a document containing general and overarching instructions, with instructions for specific genres in a specific manual or an appendix.

Designations of role

ALA appreciates the increased prominence of these instructions. We believe that designations of role are valuable both for modern works and for special collections, and should be encouraged more forcefully in RDA. We suggest that RDA include some guidance on when designating roles is particularly useful or important, as well as the use of role designations in documenting FRBR relationships.

Required access points

Many ALA reviewers disagree with the decision to change the terminology throughout RDA from “required if applicable” to “required”. They believe that an introductory statement defining “required” will not be apparent to catalogers applying instructions for particular elements.

ALA notes that making all access points optional in 6.7–6.9 does not follow the pattern in the earlier sections. In spite of the assertion that many of the access points for these works would represent neither the creator nor the originating body, these categories do occur in several of the examples. In those cases, the creator and/or originating body access point should be required.

Originating body

ALA had difficulty with both the terminology and the instructions for originating body. Many reviewers questioned the value of distinguishing a corporate creator from an originating body. While we agree that “originating body” more clearly indicates responsibility for the work than the terms “issuing body” and “authorizing body”, such originating bodies **are** creators. In general, ALA would prefer that the instructions under 6.3.2 be merged into the instructions for creators in 6.3.1.

Examples in Chapter 6

ALA reached no consensus about the form of examples.

We have no examples to suggest for 6.7.4.3.1, 6.7.4.4.1, or 6.8.3.1.

We recommend including non-English language and non-Roman script examples.

We find it disconcerting when examples break between pages; we hope that this can be avoided in a print product.

Comments on specific instructions

6.0 Purpose and scope

ALA would like to see a more explicit statement of this chapter's purpose, stating that these instructions identify which access points may be supplied for persons, families and corporate bodies associated with a resource, and noting explicitly that this chapter covers relationships between the resource being described and the FRBR group 2 entities.

6.0.2: ALA recommends rephrasing this instruction for greater correspondence with the FRBR user tasks:

Those relationships enable catalogue users to locate find and obtain resources associated with a particular person, family, or corporate body.

6.1 General guidelines on recording persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource

6.1.1.2: ALA recommends providing a definition of “prominently” either here or elsewhere in RDA. In addition, ALA recommends revising this instruction to clarify that a)– c) are in order of preference:

If the statements appearing on the preferred source of information in the resource being described are ambiguous or insufficient, use the following sources of information (in this order of preference):

[remainder unchanged]

6.1.1.3: ALA recommends revising this instruction to read:

For instructions ~~on reflecting~~ describing changes of responsibility for multipart monographs, serials, and integrating resources, see 6.1.3.

6.1.2: As a matter of editorial policy, should there be references to the chapters in Part B from this chapter? Given that the examples seem to follow the instructions for naming persons, etc., such references might be appropriate. As noted in our general comments, the relationship between the instructions in this chapter and Chapter 13 are particularly problematic.

6.1.2.1: ALA observes that, with the clause “using one or more of the following conventions,” this instruction allows for the use of an access point in lieu of

transcription (6.1.2.1a) and in the absence of a justifying note (6.1.2.1b). We have mixed feelings about both of these implications. We are aware that a decision has been made about the former; has a definite decision been made about the latter?

6.1.3.0.1: ALA recommends adding a reference to 2.4.2, Change in statement of responsibility [Dec. 2005 draft], in this instruction as follows:

For changes in responsibility that occur between parts of a multipart monograph, between issues or parts of a serial, or between iterations of an integrating resource (see 2.4.2), provide additional access points following the instructions given under 6.1.3.1, 6.1.3.2, and 6.1.3.3, respectively.

6.1.3.3.1: The word “additional” in this instruction is problematic, because it is very possible for a primary access point to change for an integrating resource. ALA recommends rewording this instruction as follows:

If a change in responsibility occurs between iterations of an integrating resource, provide ~~additional~~ access points for any persons, families or bodies associated with the current iteration, if considered important for access (see 6.3–6.5). Retain access points for previously responsible persons, families or bodies, if still considered important.

6.2 Designation of role

Because the following instructions rely on closed lists, either from Appendix X or from a standard list appropriate to the type of content or type of resource, ALA recommends adding guidance when an appropriate role designator cannot be found in either of these sources:

6.2.0.3. Use a term in common usage to designate a role when none of the terms in Appendix X or other standardized lists is appropriate.

6.2.0.1: ALA recommends adding examples for a family and a corporate body with their appropriate role designations. We also recommend using these designations in at least some of the other examples in Chapter 6. Suggested additional examples for this instruction:

Moldovan family, *collector*

Williams and Heintz Map Corporation, *printer*

6.3 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the work

ALA notes that no provisions paralleling AACR2 21.4C1 appear in Chapter 6. RDA needs to provide explicit guidance for the treatment of fictitious persons, families and corporate bodies, and for real and imaginary animals. We recommend modifying section 6.3.3 to include fictitious attributions.

6.3.0.2: We recommend moving the instruction relating to access points used with aggregate resources to section 6.1, as its own subsection (6.1.4).

6.3.1: ALA would like to see clarification of the requirements for access points for persons, etc., associated with works in an aggregate. It was suggested that the first

named creator of **each** work, as well as the first-named creator of the aggregate (if any) be required:

¹If there is more than one creator responsible for the work, only the access point for the creator commonly named first when citing the work is required. For aggregate resources, provide an access point for the first named creator of each individual work.

This may be going too far, but the decision should be made and documented.

ALA would prefer that the text of the footnote be moved into the body of the instructions so this important information will not be missed.

6.3.1.0: The definition of creator in this section includes families, and the Semple family papers example in 6.3.1.1.1 provides an instance of a family as a creator. However, the current definition of creator may not fully encompass the situation in this example, if the Semple family did not compile all of the papers in the collection or if the majority of those papers were created by non-family members. It is difficult to see how the instructions in 6.3.1.0 truly address the identification of a creator for this type of archival collection.

6.3.1.0.3: RDA needs additional guidance as to what does and does not qualify as a “new work,” perhaps with examples.

6.3.1.1.1: ALA observes that this section contains many examples, making it unwieldy. We recommend removing some of the examples conveying similar situations while adding additional examples for corporate body creators, perhaps relocating some of the examples from 6.3.2.1.1.

We also recommend including instructions and examples of resources that may not have a creator; moving image resources, for example, do not normally have “a creator commonly named when citing the work;” instead, these resources are usually cited by title.

When the examples in this section show multiple access points (p. 6-10 through 6-15), we recommend indicating the required access point, either by the use of a different font or with explanatory text.

6.3.2.0.1: ALA recommends adding an instruction for originating bodies that act as sponsors:

6.3.2.0.4 For corporate bodies responsible for sponsoring or supporting a work, see 6.3.4.

6.3.2.1.1: Please add an example of a hierarchical heading for a meeting, such as:

Association for Asian Studies. Meeting
(Access point representing the originating body for: Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Association for Asian Studies)

6.3.2.1.1, *Cartographic works ...*, 3rd example (p. 6-19): While the Federal Emergency Management Agency may be an appropriate access point for this resource, wouldn't the Georgia Geologic Survey more likely fill the role of the originating body here?

6.3.3 and 6.3.4: To be consistent with the rest of Chapter 6, the caption should be “persons, families, and corporate bodies”.

6.3.3.0.1: ALA suggests clarifying the criteria for “substantial authority” to indicate whether this type of information should come from reference sources or if being named on one or more of the manifestations would suffice.

6.3.3.1.1, 1st example: Dennis’s authorship of this work is not dubious or erroneous. Find a more appropriate example.

6.3.4.1.1: ALA believes that the Lindemans example on p. 6-21 is not appropriate in this instruction, since her role appears to match that of a creator. The example describes her as the “founder, main contributor, editor & webmaster” of a web site.

6.3.4.2.2: ALA recommends rephrasing this instruction as follows:

Exception:

6.3.4.0.3 For guidelines on providing access to persons, families, and corporate bodies who are the subject of a work, see X.X.

6.4 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the expression

The distinction between persons and bodies associated with the work and those associated with the expression is particularly difficult in the case of moving image resources. Typically the work is intended to be performed and recorded only once; the creation of the work and the expression are thoroughly intermingled. It is unclear why a production company is responsible for the work, while the director is only responsible for the expression. The instructions may need to contain some arbitrary guidelines for making this distinction, because a cataloger will not be able to make the distinction simply by applying the FRBR model.

6.4.1: By making access points for all contributors optional, RDA fails to provide any guidance to institutions or to catalogers. This lack of guidance will more likely lead to inconsistency in records created in different institutions, with some organizations choosing to emphasize editors, while others provide access to translators, for example.

6.4.1.0.3: ALA recommends rephrasing this instruction to limit use of “etc.” as follows:

For expressions consisting of a primary work accompanied by commentary, ~~etc.~~, illustrations, additional musical parts, etc., the writers of ~~commentary, etc., illustrators, composers of additional parts, etc.,~~ the accompanying works are considered to be contributors.

6.4.1.1: ALA recommends including some non-English examples, such as:

Bandel, Jan-Frederik

(*Access point representing the editor for:* Tage des Lesens : Hubert Fichtes
Geschichte der Empfindlichkeit / herausgegeben von Jan-Frederik Bandel)

Clairvoye, Jean

(*Access point representing the translator for:* La théorie du roman / Georges
Lukacs ; traduit de l'allemand par Jean Clairvoye)

6.4.1.1.1: ALA recommends rephrasing the basic instruction from “Provide an access point(s) for a contributor.” to:

Provide access points for contributors.

6.4.1.1.1, *Editor, compiler, etc.:* Because this section does not address access points for editors who compile an aggregate resource, ALA recommends a reference to 6.3.1.0.3 for RDA users who might otherwise assume this section applies to all editors. We further recommend re-evaluating the examples with an eye to removing aggregates from this section, as they often contribute to the confusion between works and expressions. The problem examples include many under the “performer” heading.

6.4.1.1.1, *Writer of added commentary, etc.:* The example for Foreman, Lewis [etc.] on p. 6-25, while correct, does not represent common practice in music cataloging, especially in relation to sound recordings. A better example would be:

Wynberg, Simon

(*Access point representing the writer of added commentary for:* Concert works for
guitar / Giulio Regondi ; in reprints of the first editions with historical notes and a
commentary by Simon Wynberg)

6.4.1.1.1, *Translator:* Please add an example of a translator that is a corporate body, such as:

MAIK Nauka/Interperiodica Publishing

(*Access point representing the translator for:* Doklady. Biochemistry and
biophysics)

6.4.1.1.1, *Other contributor:* In the Brokeback Mountain example (p. 6-29 and 6-30), some of the names appearing in the example’s explanatory text presumably fit into the “other” category, yet they are not provided as access points in the example.

6.5 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the manifestation

6.5.0: For early printed resources, providing access to names associated with the manifestation, such as printers, publishers, booksellers, is especially important, but it is also problematic, because these roles were at times interchangeable. On the one hand, we would like to see appropriate examples included in 6.5.1 (“producer”), 6.5.2 (“publisher”), and 6.5.3 (“distributor”). On the other hand, catalogers might need to be directed to specialized manuals such as DCRM(B) in order to make these access points correctly.

6.5.1.0: Because of the multiple meanings of “producer” in the realm of resource description, this term may cause confusion when used in this instruction. ALA recommends adding a footnote warning not to confuse this term with the specific roles of motion picture and sound recording producers.

6.6 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the item

These instructions stipulate only three roles (owner, custodian, and finder) and do not contain any provision for “other” roles associated with the item. Examples of such roles for early printed resources might include binders or illustrators – these are not frequently known, but large bibliographic surveys of the binders of incunabula, for example, are underway. ALA recommends the adding an open-ended instruction dealing with “other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the item.”

6.6.4 Other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the item

OPTIONAL

6.6.4.0 Scope

6.6.4.0.1 Other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the item are those other than owners, custodians, or finders.

6.6.4.1 Providing access points for other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the item

6.6.4.1.1 Provide an access point(s) for other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the item if considered important.

[provide an example]

6.6.3: It is not clear that the use of “item” in this instruction follows the FRBR definition. ALA recommends utilizing a different term here, such as “article” or “object,” to lessen confusion.

6.7–6.9 Special instructions

ALA notes that the FRBRization of Chapter 6 breaks down in sections 6.7–6.9. The instructions are no longer organized by FRBR group 1 entity, and the clear structure delineating the roles of persons, families and corporate bodies no longer occurs.

6.7 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with legal works

6.7.0: The access points for legal resources should pattern the organization of the earlier sections of Chapter 6 as much as possible. Access points representing the originating body or the creator should be required. The optional access points could

apply to those responsible for an expression: editors, contributors, and other corporate bodies associated with the expression.

Because of the difficulty in organizing these instructions by FRBR group 1 entity, ALA recommends substituting the word “resources” for “works” throughout section 6.7.

6.7.1.1.1: Where the legal instructions parallel the general instructions, distinguishing between required and optional access points should be possible. ALA believes that the jurisdiction governed by a single law and the jurisdiction governed by a compilation of its laws should be required access points. The jurisdiction may not fit the definition of creator or even be an originating body, since in some cases a law may originate with another corporate body. However, an access point for the jurisdiction governed by the law or laws must be included in order to support the FRBR *find* and *identify* tasks.

6.7.1.4: The legislative body should not be optional; it is the originating body, and the work cannot be named without including it.

ALA recommends moving 6.7.4.4 to 6.7.1.4. All legislative bills require an access point for the appropriate legislative body, whether or not the bill happens to be a draft constitution.

6.7.2.1: The jurisdiction governed by the regulations should not be optional. Consider the first example: The Building Society (Fee) Regulations, 1976. Lacking the jurisdiction, the user would not be able to identify the place being governed.

6.7.3.1.1: The court governed by the rules should also be a required access point to allow the resource to be found and identified. In many cases the court could be considered the originating body or possibly the creator of its rules.

6.7.4.1: While the examples in this section show the body governed by the constitution within the title, the title can be generic. In order to find and identify this kind of resource, the body governed by a constitution should be a required access point. These would frequently be originating bodies.

6.7.4.4.1: ALA recommends combining this section with 6.7.1.4, as noted above. Because this situation occurs rarely, providing a separate instruction needlessly complicates the instructions.

6.7.5: ALA recommends simplifying this instruction, to provide an access point for **any** government or corporate body that is a signatory to a treaty or other formal agreement.

For bilateral treaties of all types, the signatories should be required access points. Reintroducing the distinction between bilateral and multilateral treaties would allow access points for the first to be required while optional for the second.

6.7.6.4: ALA recommends incorporating this instruction into 6.5.2.1, since publishers of legal resources should be treated as other publishers are treated.

6.7.7: This section illustrates the point made on page 5 of the cover letter for chapters 6 and 7. Court proceedings do not seem to fit either creator or originating body, and fitting them into the FRBR model may not be possible. This section is not well served by the organization of access point according to roles. The AACR2 method of organization that lists the type of resource, the primary access point and the additional access points is much clearer and easier to apply for court proceedings.

6.7.7.1: Several instructions in 6.7.7 provide for an access point for the first named person or body, perhaps a remnant of earlier instructions for providing a primary access point. This limitation is inconsistent with the rest of the chapter and should be eliminated. The instruction should be to provide an access point for the person or body if considered important. The specific instructions are: 6.7.7.1.3; 6.7.7.1.4, 6.7.7.3.3; 6.7.7.3.4; 6.7.7.4.3; 6.7.7.4.4.

6.7.7.5.3: The court is the originating body for its decisions. As such it should be a required access point, allowing the resource to be found and identified.

6.8 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with religious works

6.8.0: Because of the difficulty in organizing these instructions by FRBR group 1 entity, ALA recommends substituting the word “resources” for “works” throughout section 6.8.

6.8.1: ALA notes that the caption for this instruction includes “corporate bodies” although no instructions or examples address corporate bodies here. We recommend either providing an example for the corporate body or renaming the instruction.

6.8.1.1: Because these are special cases of 6.3.1.1 and 6.4.1.1, ALA recommends incorporating these instructions there.

6.8.1.1.1: ALA recommends removing the Isaiah example and substituting a less controversial, more straightforward example.

6.8.1.2.1: Because this is a special case of 6.3.1.1, ALA recommends incorporating this instruction there.

6.8.1.3.1: Because this is a special case of 6.4.1.1, ALA recommends incorporating this instruction there.

6.8.2.1.1: The phrasing of this instruction implies the addition of access points beyond those suggested by the resource being described. Wording more like that in 6.8.3.1.1 would help clarify the situation.

6.9 Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with official communications

6.9.0.1: ALA recommends changing the instruction of 6.9.0.1a as follows:

- a) official communications by heads of state, heads of government, ~~or~~ heads of international bodies, governors of dependent or occupied territories, or

other officials (e.g., a message to a legislature, a proclamation, an executive order other than one covered by 6.7.1)

6.9.3.1: Because this is a special case of 6.4.1.1, ALA recommends incorporating this instruction there.

Chapter 7

General comments

The following includes comments from Robert Maxwell, a CC:DA member. Bob compiled the analysis of various taxonomies of relationships that was included in the ALA response to the December 2006 draft of this chapter. He is also the author of a book on FRBR to be published by ALA this fall.

Wording

ALA is particularly concerned about the wording in this chapter. Chapter 7 is difficult to read and understand, and is repetitive and needlessly convoluted. Many wondered if the chapter could ever be used independently by inexperienced catalogers. Even experienced catalogers found the language challenging. The phraseology and terminology used is clumsy and complex, and difficult even for those catalogers familiar with FRBR concepts and Barbara Tillett's relationships taxonomy. One reader commented that he thought catalogers would need a derivative work in order to decipher Chapter 7.

Definitions

The definitions of the relationships all begin "A xxx relationship is a relationship between ..." We suggest instead beginning "A xxx relationship exists between ..." The definitions that apply to all of the group 1 entities are made more complex by listing them. We would prefer to use the term "entity" in this chapter to refer generally to any or all of the group 1 entities and to explain this at the beginning of the chapter.

We continue to be concerned that many of the scope instructions within Chapter 7 use the term itself as the defining verb (see 7.8.101, 7.8.3.0.1, 7.8.4.0.1, 7.9.1.0.1, 7.9.2.0.1, etc.). Such definitions are not helpful.

RDA and FRBR

There are some difficulties with the use of FRBR concepts in this chapter.

1. **"Work embodied in a manifestation":** Technically there is no direct relationship in the FRBR model between manifestation and work; it is always a manifestation of an expression of a work. However, we suspect there are pragmatic reasons for avoiding the more unwieldy language, and that the instructions reference the expression in this chapter only when it is a question of a

relationship to a **particular** expression of the work, but do not do so when the relationship is to **any** or **all** expressions of the work. If this is the intention, the instructions need to acknowledge this as a simplification of the FRBR model.

On the other hand, many ALA reviews would prefer that RDA, rather than watering down FRBR, as the current version does, follow FRBR more rigorously, but state a default position that catalogers may fall back on when the exact facts (i.e., which expression) are unknown.

One way to approach such a fallback position would be to include instructions to reference the specific expression if known, but to reference the first expression if the specific expression is not known (e.g., a translation of a novel that has come out in more than one edition).

If this approach is taken, many element names and instructions will need to be revised.

2. **“Work (or expression)”**: This phrase appears frequently, as does “manifestation (or item)”, which leads to an imprecise reflection of the FRBR relationships. There are practical reasons for this: the relationship may be to any expression of the work or to an unidentifiable expression of the work. This needs to be made clear, rather than using language that implies that work and expression are interchangeable concepts. The point is that sometimes the relationship is to a particular expression of the work and sometimes it to the work itself.
3. **Work-to-work relationships**: Many of the relationships defined here are treated in FRBR as work-to-work or work-to-expression relationships. The current draft of RDA does not deconstruct the description of the “resource”; all relationships are defined as existing between the “resource” and one or more of the group 1 entities. One of the prices we pay for attempting to support all three of the RDA implementation scenarios is that we cannot assume that there will be work or expression descriptions that can be linked or that work and expression names will be controlled in authority records where the links could be made. All that we can assume is that we have descriptions of the resource (presumably describing work, expression, manifestation, and even item); this leaves many of the relationships incompletely or ambiguously defined in terms of the FRBR model. We do not have specific proposals to deal with this difficulty, but it does make this chapter more difficult to understand than a “pure” application of the model would be.
4. **Equivalence of manifestations and items**: See discussion under 7.4 below.
5. **Derivative relationships**: See discussion under 7.5 below.
6. **Descriptive relationships**: See discussion under 7.6 below.
7. **Sequential relationships**: See discussion under 7.9 below.
8. **Related relationships**: There are some relationships that are very closely related to each other, in that more than one type of relationships seems applicable to the same set of resources. In a rigorous application of the model, this should not happen.

For example, there is a relationship between the *whole-part* relationship and the *accompanying* relationship: the relationship between parts could be described as an accompanying relationship, at least when the parts can be considered as distinct works, as in the case of literary works in an anthology. Whether it is advisable to treat the parts in this way is questionable in most cases, but it does seem that the concept is applicable. Further, not all accompanying relationships are between parts, as there is not always an actual work that can be characterized as the whole.

There is also a relationship between the *accompanying* relationship and the *sequential* relationship: if the accompanying resources bear any sort of sequential designations, then it would seem that a sequential relationship is applicable. Should that be an explicit guideline: if two resources have numbering or chronological designations, the relationship should be treated as sequential and not as accompanying?

Finally, a careful distinction needs to be made between a *sequential* relationship and a *derivative* relationship. A revised edition may bear some sort of sequential relationship to its predecessor, but should probably be treated as a derivative work (RDA and AACR2 come to mind!) or as a derivative expression of the same work. A relationship described as “superseding” is also most likely to be a derivative relationship, even if there is some sort of sequential relationship involved.

Required vs. Optional elements

Although concern was stronger on this issue for Chapter 6, ALA is also concerned about the optionality of nearly all the elements in Chapter 7. The draft consists almost exclusively of optional guidelines. This is made even more chaotic by allowing multiple conventions for expressing the optional relationships. There is insufficient provision of guidance for determining an appropriate level of detail. Specific guidelines will have to be established by national or international application decisions or left to individual institutions or catalogers. ALA is concerned about the effect of this on the ability of institutions to share bibliographic descriptions, as well as the lack of direction for catalogers in RDA itself.

Linking

Linked records: We would like to see the linked record convention more widely available in Chapter 7. In particular, it is the most common convention for indicating sequential relationships. Is there any reason why it could not be allowed for **any** type of relationship?

Implementation scenarios: The language in the chapter tries to be neutral about the RDA implementation scenarios, i.e., whether works and expressions are represented by records and (if so) what type of records. However, if we can assume the ultimate scenario, and have records for each of the FRBR group 1 entities, then linked records and access points would always be a possibility and could operate in a more rigorous

way. As long as we are unable to make this assumption – but are aware of its possibility – the language in this chapter will either be complicated or ambiguous. We are not suggesting any action based on these observations, but simply want to share with you that we had difficulty reading many of these instructions while keeping three different implementation scenarios in mind.

Singular and plural entities

A more careful distinction needs to be made between relationships that must be expressed as one-to-many or many-to-one and those that have multiple relationships. In most cases in Chapter 7 it seems unnecessary to use plural forms (much less the dreaded “(s)” construction), when it is quite possible to treat the relationship as existing between two singular entities. If an entity is related to more than one related entity, one really has multiple relationships, and there is nothing in RDA that either requires or forbids indicating such multiple relationships. If it is true that all relationships are expressed as one-to-one relationships, this should be made explicit in the instructions, and the need to use multiple instances to express more complex relationships should be acknowledged (and given in examples).

Examples

ALA notes that the examples of access points for works and expressions (and possibly for manifestations and/or items) will need to be reviewed once the rules for naming works and expressions in Chapters 13–19 have been finalized.

Final general comment

This chapter offers a multitude of possibilities, most of them characterized as options or alternatives. One aspect of this complexity is the list of conventions for expressing each relationship. Another is the reciprocal nature of most relationships. This chapter offers too many possibilities and too little guidance about when it is appropriate to make certain choices. While RDA should not become a set of application guidelines, a bit more guidance would be welcome. To take the last example, would it be possible to identify relationships (such as at least some sequential relationships) where it is important that they be reciprocal? Would it be possible in other cases to identify which of the reciprocal relationships is most significant or most practical to supply?

Issues raised in the cover letter

Organization of Chapter 7

The organization of chapter 7 according to the taxonomy developed by Barbara Tillett and the FRBR group 1 entities is intellectually impressive but not yet clearly relevant to the process of cataloging specific resources. We wish to emphasize that the JSC

should strive to make RDA not simply an erudite application of the FRBR model, but also useful for catalogers.

It would be helpful to include in chapter 7 Tillett's visual diagrams of bibliographic relationships, since this chapter is based on her taxonomy of relationships. Visual images would go a long way to clarify the concepts in this chapter.

Designations of relationship

We would like to see RDA's treatment of the recording and designation of relationships (as well as its treatment of roles) contain more guidance about the value of such information in particular situations, rather than simply being an undifferentiated "option."

Comments on specific instructions

7.1 General guidelines on recording relationships between resources

7.1.2.2: The parenthetical phrase is confusing. We suggest rewording as: "(i.e., each relationship having a note or access point in the description of one resource may have a parallel note or access point in the description of the related resource.)".

7.1.2.3: This point is also made at 7.3.0.3, but not elsewhere. If this point does not in fact go without saying, it should be stated generally in the General Introduction (as it applies generally throughout RDA).

7.1.3–7.1.5: The instructions in 7.1.3.0.2, 7.1.4.0.2 and 7.1.5.0.2 talk about recording a designation of the relationship for all but the unstructured description given in 7.1.5.2. This information might be better placed in 7.1.2 along with other general information about recording relationships, with a reference from there to 7.2. We also suggest adding the following sentence to 7.1.2:

If the relationship is complex and requires more explanation than can be achieved through the use of a designation of relationship, provide also an unstructured description to explain fully the relationship.

7.1.4.0.1, examples, *Related expression*: It should be noted for the record that "Goncourt, Edmond de. Frères Zemganno. English" does not in fact identify a "particular expression of a work". It is a collective name for all the English-language expressions. This is a matter to be discussed in connection with Chapter 13, but we would hope that what is required in Chapter 7 will in fact be supported in Chapter 13 (or vice versa).

7.1.4.0.2: We note that the designation of relationship is not included in the examples here or, for the most part, under each of the relationships. We suggest that more routine inclusion of the designation in the examples in this chapter will both promote their use and make the examples clearer.

7.1.5.0.1: Why is "either" included in the guideline? All other instances of this format seem to use only "or". [editorial]

7.1.5.1: Since “structured description” is an unfamiliar concept, it needs to be defined.

7.1.5.1.1, examples: It is unclear how much “formality” may be required to make a description “structured”. Are there specific elements that are required? Does it have anything to do with ISBD display conventions? Should the combination of two or more resources in a single note make the description unstructured (e.g., 7.9.2.1.1c.1)? Further clarification would be helpful.

In most of the chapter, the structured descriptions include material beyond the title and statement of responsibility, such as place of publication, publisher, date, physical description, etc. ALA is not convinced that manifestation-level information is appropriate when describing a related work or expression.

Would it be a good idea to label these structured examples as ISBD?

7.1.5.2.1, 3rd example: This example is less a description of related resources and more a statement about the location of the related material. This sort of comment applies to many examples in Chapter 7, and suggests that one of the criteria of an unstructured description is that it can mix information relating to different elements. If that is the intention, we are not sure that this is consistent with the principles of well-formed metadata.

We would also find “manuscript maps” more accurate than “map manuscripts”.

7.2 Designation of relationship

Many ALA reviewers had difficulty understanding this element; for example, some suggested that the phrase “relator term” be used instead of “designation of relationship,” apparently not seeing a distinction between this element in Chapter 7 and the designation of role in Chapter 6. This discussion of relationship designators and their importance needs to be expanded and clarified.

We can see how recording the nature of the relationships of these works and expressions to one another will be similar to recording the role the FRBR group 2 entities have with the FRBR group 1 entities. However there is one important distinction. Individual persons or corporate bodies may simultaneously share more than one relationship to a resource description. For example, an individual may simultaneously be a contributor to *and* an illustrator of a particular expression of a work, and also have been a previous owner of a specific item exemplifying the manifestation embodying that expression. According to the examples at 6.2.0.1, multiple roles will be recorded as needed with each entity. When it comes to the relationships between resources described in Chapter 7, on the other hand, each is intended to be mutually exclusive. These points should be made explicitly early in Chapter 7.

7.2.0.2: ALA is not convinced that all terms taken from sources other than appendix X need to have their source explicitly identified.

7.2.0: The use of “term(s)” should be unnecessary, not only because “term” can cover multiple instances of the element, but also because only one relationship should obtain between the resource and a given related entity.

7.3 Primary relationships

ALA prefers that this be named “inherent relationships” rather than “primary relationships.” This is the term used by Tillett; it is more descriptive of the nature of the relationships; and it avoids ambiguity with other uses of the word “primary” in this chapter.

7.3.0.1.1: Consider rewording as follows: “Primary relationships exist between a work, expression, manifestation, and item and are implicit in the FRBR definitions of those entities.” We also suggest revising the bullets here with the exact phraseology used in FRBR (i.e., “A Work is realized through an Expression”, etc.).

7.3.0.2.2: As with 7.3.0.1.1b, There is no need to mention the work here. “Record the relationship between an expression and a manifestation that embodies it following the guidelines ...” [same change should be made at 7.3.0.1.1b]

7.3.1 Relationship between a work and an expression of the work

7.3.1.0.1a.1, example: The ISWC is an identifier for “musical works, not their manifestations, objects, or expressions” (see <http://www.iswc.org/iswc/en/html/FAQA.html>). It is unclear how this can link a work with an *expression*.

The instruction refers to the “record for the work” and the “record for the expression.” Elsewhere in RDA, we take particular care not to assume one of the RDA implementation scenarios (see our general comment above). We suspect that the term here should be “description” instead of “record”.

7.3.1.0.1b.1: The access point names “both the work and the expression” because (when we get to Chapter 13) we expect to find that names of expressions are formulated by adding elements to the name of the work. We don’t see that the present instruction needs to anticipate how expressions will be named; the important point is that the access point names the expression of the work. In the example, note again that this string does not name an expression, but all Lao-English bilingual expressions of the Constitution, with any Lao translation. And once we get to Chapter 13, we will have some negative things to say about access points that name more than one expression of a work; the Lao translation and the English original are two distinct expressions of the work.

7.3.1.0.1c.1: A composite description is not one of the options given in 7.1.2.1 as a method for recording a relationship. We do not understand the deviations from 7.1.2.1 that are present in 7.3.

This instruction uses language that differs from that for other instructions for composite descriptions. We suggest that they be consistent and simplified:

Prepare a composite description that concatenates elements identifying the work and the expression in a single description.

This instruction provides insufficient guidance on which aspects of the composite description identify the work and which the expression.

The example is singularly confusing; given that it is broken between two pages, it is not even clear whether there are two examples or one. It is not obvious that the two parts relate to the same resource. We suggest using a different example.

7.3.2 Relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation

As noted above, ALA is concerned about relating a manifestation directly to a work. The relationship here should be between manifestations and expressions.

7.3.2.0.1a.1: In the example, the LCCN identifies a manifestation, not an expression, as stated in the explanatory note. Identifiers for manifestations of a particular expression of a work are **not** identifiers of the expression itself, and it is unwise to suggest using them as such.

7.3.2.0.1c.1: This instruction uses language that differs from that of other instructions for composite descriptions. We suggest that they be consistent and simplified:

Prepare a composite description that concatenates elements identifying the work, expression, and manifestation in a single description.

7.3.2.0.1c.1, example: In this example the publisher should read “Gallimard” not “Callimard.” [typo]

7.3.3 Relationship between an item and a manifestation exemplified by the item

We believe that the intention was that Chapter 13 include instructions about access points for manifestations and items. If that is true and since at least one of the RDA implementation scenarios calls for records for manifestations and items, it is unclear why there is no provision in 7.3.3 for the use of a controlled access point.

7.3.3.0.1bc.1: The number should be 7.3.3.0.1.b1 [typo].

RDA offers little guidance on the form that a composite description should take. This is particularly true when item-level information is included. Presumably, since item information is being concatenated with the manifestation data, the identity of the copy should be made explicit within its expected context.

7.3.2.0.1c.1: This instruction uses language that differs from that of other instructions for composite descriptions. We suggest that they be consistent and simplified:

Prepare a composite description that concatenates elements identifying the work, expression, manifestation, and/or item in a single description.

7.4 Equivalence relationships

This section appears to be dealing with two general classes of the equivalence relationship: the *reproduction* relationship (i.e., a relationship wherein one resource is

a reproduction of the other resource), and the *other-format* relationship (i.e., a relationship wherein two or more manifestations embody the same expression, and none of the manifestations is typically regarded as a reproduction of another manifestation). The former class would include microfilm and digital reproductions, print facsimiles, etc. The latter class would include resources such as regular print and large print editions; PDF and HTML versions of an electronic resource; DVD, HD DVD and Blu-Ray versions of a videorecording; etc. The major difference is that, for reproductions, one can distinguish between the original/source and the reproduction. The previous draft of this chapter made this distinction explicit in both instructions and examples; ALA would like to see this restored.

7.4.0.1: The wording of this instruction implies that an equivalence relationship can exist between a manifestation and a specific item that exemplifies that same manifestation. Such a relationship would be a *primary*, not an *equivalence* relationship. ALA suggests that the instruction be reworded to clarify that such an equivalence relationship is between a manifestation and an item exemplifying a different manifestation:

An equivalence relationship exists between two manifestations embodying the same expression of a work, or between an item exemplifying one manifestation and a later manifestation that reproduces that item.

7.4.1 Equivalent manifestation

7.4.1.0.3: The distinction between 7.4.1.0.2 and 7.4.1.0.3 was not sufficiently clear to some ALA reviewers. We think we understand the distinction (see first paragraph under 7.4 above), but this explanation is not clearly stated in the scope instructions.

7.4.1.1b.1, example: ALA notes that the example is confusing because it looks deceptively like the way in which U.S. libraries describe reproductions. Last year's draft of the chapter showed much more clearly which type of note to apply when the resource being described was the reproduction vs. when the resource described was the original source from which the reproduction was made. For instance, it said that if the resource described was a reproduction, the note would say "Facsimile of..." or "Reproduction of ..." If the resource described was the source of a reproduction the note would say "Reproduced as..." or "Microfilm reproduction:..." Such explicit instructions are missing in the current revised chapter 7. It is especially puzzling how section 7.4.1.1c.1 appears to include a mixture of examples that would appear on the record for the reproduction ("Facsimile of..."), as well as ones that would appear on the record for the original ("Reproduced as...", "Microfilm reproduction...").

7.4.2 Equivalent item

In the instructions for this element, the ambiguity of the phrase "resource being described" is particularly unhelpful.

7.4.2.0.1: Our comments above about the definition at 7.4.0.1 are also applicable here.

7.4.2.1, examples: It is not clear how or why some of the examples would not also fit the guidelines for equivalent manifestations. Most of the examples in this instruction seem to be equivalent manifestations rather than equivalent items. According to FRBR, section 5.3.6, Item-to-Item Relationships, p. 80, “The reproduction relationship states that one particular item has been derived in some way from another item. As with manifestation, there can be varying levels of fidelity of the reproduction to the original item. Unlike the replication of manifestations, however, which in some cases will result in a change in the type of carrier, the replication of one item from another always results in an item of the same physical characteristics as the original.”

7.5 Derivative relationships

Although the definition in 7.5.0.1.1 allows that the derived resource to be either a new expression or a new work, it is not obvious that a modification includes something that can be a new work, such as screenplays, free translations, paraphrases, etc. (see 7.5.1.0.2). This is also demonstrated in several of the examples in 7.5.1.1.1b.1, which include parodies, variations on a theme, a musical based on a novel, a remake of a movie, etc. Tillett’s relationships make this clearer, and this amplification of what constitutes “derivative relationships” should appear in this section.

Robert Maxwell argues that the source of a derivative relationship is always one or more *expressions* of a work, not the work itself. “If I translate Homer’s *Iliad* into English, I am translating one of the Greek *expressions*, not the *work*. If I translate Pope’s English translation of the *Iliad* into French, I am creating a derivative *expression* whose source is Pope’s English *expression*. If I write a second edition of a book, I am not producing a derivative expression from the *work*, but from an *expression* (the first edition). If I take Jane Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice* and turn it into a comic book I am producing a derivative *work* whose source is a particular *expression* or *expressions* of the Austen’s *work*. (If I just produced my comic book from some amorphous impression I have of *Pride and Prejudice* in my own mind, I’d say I wasn’t producing a derivative work at all, since it was based not on Austen’s work, but on some abstract entity in my brain that was something like the work. Perhaps that impression in my mind derives from having seen two or three movie versions – then my new work derives from those works expressions. Perhaps the impression derives from having read the novel in high school. Then the new work derives from that expression, the expression in the novel I read.)”

So the basic situation in this section is: An *expression* may be the source either of another *expression* of the same *work* or of another (derivative) *work*. Suggested rewording of 7.5.0.1.1:

A derivative relationship exists between an expression of a work and a modification based on that expression.

On the other hand, we cannot always identify the particular expression that was the source for the derivative. In this case, we can either establish a relationship to the source work or we can establish as a default that the source is the first expression of the source work; 7.5.0.2 should include instructions to deal with this.

7.5.2 Derivative work (or expression)

7.5.2.1.1a.1, example: We would consider the teacher's edition an *augmenting* work (7.8.1). A less ambiguous example would be preferable.

7.5.2.1.1c.1, 3rd example of unstructured descriptions: In the "resource described" portion of the 3rd example of unstructured descriptions, "Inside America's" has a quotation mark instead of an apostrophe before the "s". [typo]

7.6 Descriptive relationships

The name of this relationship is unfortunate in the light of RDA's frequent use of phrases such as "resource being described" or "describing a resource" or the cataloger's "description" of a resource. This ambiguity results in language such as "Describe the described entity" (7.6.1.1c.1). It might be useful to reconsider the usage of "describe" and "description" *throughout* RDA, which seems to be cataloger jargon for "create a record" or "record" (verb) and "record" (noun). This would have a twofold benefit: (1) it would remove another piece of jargon from the guidelines; (2) it would make section 7.6 much easier to write.

Robert Maxwell argues that the describing entity would always be a separate *work*. The act of describing is not a modification, it is a new creative act. Therefore, the describing entity would always be a work distinct from the described entity, but it might be necessary or appropriate to express a relationship to a particular expression of the describing work (e.g., the different editions of Wing's *Short-title Catalogue*). The instructions in 7.6 need to make it clear that this is the relevance of the inclusion of "(or expression)".

7.6.0.1.1: In the light of the previous comment, we suggest this rewording:

A descriptive relationship exists between a work that describes a specific work, expression, manifestation, or item and the work that it describes.

7.6.0.2.2: Since both 7.6.0.2.2 and 7.6.0.2.3 point to the same solution (7.6.2) there is no reason why there need to be separate instructions.

7.6.1 Described entity

This is the only relationship in Chapter 7 to use "entity" in its name. Yet there are other cases in which any of the FRBR group 1 entities might be under consideration where this terminology is not used. We would like to see a consistent approach to this issue.

7.7 Whole-part relationships

The organization of this section would be clearer if it paralleled that suggested in the definition and gave separate sections for work, expression, manifestation, and item, each subdivided into sub-instructions for the two reciprocal relationships:

- 7.7.0 General guidelines
- 7.7.1.1 The work to its parts
- 7.7.1.2 Parts to their work
- 7.7.2.1 The expression to its parts
- 7.7.2.2 Parts to their expression
- 7.7.3.1 The manifestation to its parts
- 7.7.3.2 Parts to their manifestation
- 7.7.4.1 The item to its parts
- 7.7.4.2 Parts to their item

On the other hand, some ALA reviewers noted that there does not appear to be any difference in the treatment of whole-part relationships in RDA that is dependent on whether the relationship treats works, expressions, manifestations, or items, and so one member suggested the following structure for consideration:

7.7.0.2 **Recording whole-part relationships**

- 7.7.0.2.1 Record the relationship between the work, expression, manifestation, or item embodied in the resource being described and the whole (larger) work, expression, manifestation, or item of which it is a part following the guidelines given under 7.7.1.
- 7.7.0.2.2 Record the relationship between the whole (larger) work, expression, manifestation, or item embodied in the resource being described and a part of the work, expression, manifestation, or item following the guidelines given under 7.7.2.

7.7.1 **WHOLE RESOURCE**

7.7.1.0 **Scope**

- 7.7.1.0.1 A whole resource is a larger work, expression, manifestation, or item of which the resource being described is a part.
- 7.7.1.0.2 Whole resources include collective or aggregate works or expressions such as works divided into sections or parts, series, serials, etc.; and aggregate manifestations or items such as multipart resources, kits, etc.

7.7.1.1 **Referencing a whole resource**

- 7.7.1.1.1 Record the relationship between the resource being described and the whole (larger) resource of which it is a part using one or more of the following conventions, as applicable.

7.7.1.1.1a.1 **a) Resource identifier for the whole resource**

Provide a resource identifier for the whole resource following the general guidelines given under 7.1.3.

7.7.1.1.1b.1 **b) Naming the whole resource**

Name the whole resource following the general guidelines given under 7.1.4.

- 7.7.1.1.1b.2 *Optional addition.* If the whole resource is a series, record the numeric or other designation within the series for the resource being described.

7.7.1.1.1c.1 **c) Describing the whole resource**

Describe the whole resource following the general guidelines given under 7.1.5.

7.7.2 **PART OF A RESOURCE**

7.7.2.0 **Scope**

7.7.2.0.1 A part of a resource is a discrete component of the whole (larger) resource being described.

7.7.2.0.2 Parts of resources include discrete components such as subseries, and individual poems, stories, or essays in a collection or anthology; and individual volumes within a multi-volume set or serial, the components of a kit, etc.

7.7.2.1 **Referencing a part of a resource**

7.7.2.1.1 Record the relationship between the resource being described and a part of the resource using one or more of the following conventions, as applicable.

7.7.2.1.1a.1 **a) Resource identifier for the part**

Provide a resource identifier for the part following the general guidelines given under 7.1.3.

7.7.2.1.1b.1 **b) Naming the part**

Name the part following the general guidelines given under 7.1.4.

7.7.2.1.1c.1 **c) Describing the part**

Describe the part following the general guidelines given under 7.1.5.

7.7.2.1.1c.2 *Optional addition.* Include statements of responsibility not recorded in the statement of responsibility element, extent, playing time, or other descriptive data for the contents listed if such information is considered important.

7.7.1 Whole work (or expression)

7.7.1.0.2: Whole works also include *non*-collective, *non*-aggregate works that are divided into sections: for example, Books 1–4 of Homer’s *Odyssey* are called “The Telemachy.” “Works divided into sections or parts” are given here as an example of collective or aggregate works, but they are not necessarily (or even usually) so. Additionally, the last phrase in this instruction is confusing; we suggest:

Whole works include collective or aggregate works such as series, serials, anthologies, etc. They also include single works divided into sections or parts.

7.7.1.1b.1: ALA members do not understand the difference between the example listed here for Mary Farquharson papers related to the incarceration of Japanese Americans ... and the example in 7.7.3.1.1c.1 for [seated man on a rooftop]. What

makes one of these an example of describing a whole expression and the other an example of describing a whole manifestation?

7.7.1.1.1b.1, *series example*: This is not a series, but a serial with some special issues having distinctive titles. Current practice is to note on the record for the journal: “Some no. called special issue may have distinctive titles.” It would be helpful to keep this as an example of a journal with special issues and add an example of an actual monographic series.

7.7.1.1.1b.2: ALA members feel that recording a numeric or other designation of a series should **not** be optional. If describing the resource in hand remains a significant aim of RDA, the cataloger needs to describe the resource fully and unambiguously. If the series statement includes a designation, it needs to be recorded.

The second example is not a clean statement of a single relationships; it refers to both the whole-part and the original-reproduction relationship. In the RDA metadata schema, don't we need to keep these relationships separate? Is there a succinct and intelligible way to do that in this case?

7.7.2 Part of a work (or expression)

7.7.2.0.2: ALA recommends that “individual volumes of a serial” be added to this list, and that some mention of sound and videorecordings that consist of a collection of individual works.

7.7.2.1.1a.1: The example is technically correct, but a plate number as a resource identifier is generally meaningless without including the name of the publisher.

7.7.2.1.1b.1: Is there a distinction between “contains” and “includes” in the labels preceding the examples?

A serial example or two would be helpful:

One issue each year includes: AMWA annual freelance directory.
[OCLC no. 15239050]

Includes separately paged newsletter: PPO perspectives. [OCLC no. 22920052]

7.7.2.1.1c: ALA suggests that an “optional addition” similar to that at 7.7.4.1.1c.2 be included here.

7.7.4 Part of a manifestation (or item)

It is difficult to come up with examples of manifestation- and item-level whole-part relationships, and the examples in this draft are all at the work- or expression-level. A manifestation-level example might include the relationship between a multi-volume works and its individual volumes, or between a book and its pages (even chapters would be work- or expression-level). The only item-level we can think of would be between a locally-bound volume and the items bound therein – and that (we believe) is to be treated as an accompanying relationship. This suggests that these categories might not be particularly valuable, even though technically feasible.

7.7.4.0.2: It would be helpful to add “issues of a serial” to this subsection.

7.7.4.1.1a.1: The example is confusing. What is the “part of the manifestation” being referenced here? The ISMN is specifically for the title “Neues vom Tage”, as is the series if the numbering “... Band I, 7” is included. Is the larger work just Hindemith’s *Samtliche Werke* in this case? Perhaps a more straightforward example would be better.

7.7.4.1.1c.1: Although the use of designations of relationship are not specified for structured and unstructured descriptions, the examples might be clearer if appropriate language identifying the type of relationship were used in the text of the description; if that is done, some such instruction might be added to 7.2.

7.7.4.1.1c.2: The list is confusing. Consider using semicolons to separate names of elements. Also consider capitalizing the first word in the names of the relationships.
Editorial question: Do we routinely capitalize names of elements in RDA?

7.8 Accompanying relationships

7.8.0.1.2: Part-to-part relationships are mentioned in the context of both accompanying relationships and of sequential relationships (at 7.9.0.1.2). The status of the part-to-part relationship is unclear. One of Tillett’s major points is that the relationships in the taxonomy must be mutually exclusive and exhaustive. To say that there is yet another (unlisted?) part-to-part relationship, and that this relationship can be either an accompanying or a sequential relationship, implies that the relationships defined in RDA are neither mutually exclusive, nor exhaustive. The language about the relationship between parts needs to be handled more carefully if it is to be retained.

On the other hand, there does exist a relationship between the parts in a whole-part relationship. This relationship between parts is an accompanying relationship unless the parts are numbered, in which case it is a sequential relationship. If RDA does refer to the relationship between parts, this distinction should be explicit.

7.8.0.2: As noted below, the accompanying relationship will always be a work-to-work relationship. RDA needs to find a way to acknowledge this in the scope instructions.

7.8.1 Augmenting work (or expression)

Some ALA reviewers had problems with the term “augmenting” work. To the extent that “augment” is commonly defined as “to make something greater in size, extent, or quantity,” it would be difficult to assign this term to indexes, catalogs, and perhaps concordances.

The augmenting entity and the primary entity are always distinct *works*, not *expressions* of the same work. The augmenting entity can apply either to a source work or to a source expression, but the new entity will likely always be a new *work*, not another expression of an existing work. For instance, if an index to an existing entity is created, it will be a new work (an index to a particular expression of a

different work, the newly-created index). If another expression of that first work is produced that includes an index with the new expression, that will just be a different expression, not an “augmenting” expression, since the new entity will contain what the first expression contained plus the index – i.e., the new expression taken as a whole does not augment the original expression. So the instructions should be talking about “augmenting works” not “augmenting works or expressions”. We suggest removing “(or expression)” throughout this section. The only relevance of expression in these instructions is when the relationship must be with a particular expression of that work. It would be helpful if that were stated explicitly.

7.8.2 Primary work (or expression)

The use of the term “primary” in this case invites confusion with 7.3, Primary relationships. This is another reason to rename the latter “inherent relationships.”

7.8.2.0.1: In the *definition*, this can be treated explicitly as a work-to-work relationships, omitting the problematic reference to “the work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described”:

A primary work or expression is a work or expression that is augmented by another work.

7.8.2.1.1b.1: A straightforward serial example would be helpful:

Supplement to: Journal of clinical psychology.

7.8.3 Complementary work (or expression)

7.8.3.0.1: It would be useful at these and other scope statements to have classic examples (e.g., from Shakespeare, Hemingway, Beethoven, Mercator, USGS, National Geographic) that help to clarify the definitions.

7.8.3.1.1c.1, 2nd example: The example includes information about mounting that has nothing to do with the relationship being exemplified; the examples, even of unstructured data, should respect the scope of the element in question.

7.8.4 Accompanying manifestation (or item)

The definition of “accompanying manifestation or item” is that it is “a manifestation (or item) that accompanies the resource being described” and that they are either issued with the resource without having any relationship to its content, or they were not issued together but bound together. However, sometimes separate resources can be issued together that don’t neatly fit those criteria. An example is a set of movies that were issued as sequels, issued together in the same DVD container. Since they have a relationship (sequential), it does not fit the definition of “accompanying”. Does that mean there would not still be a note saying “Issued also in a case with ...”? Perhaps the definition of “accompanying” needs to be expanded to include separate manifestations that are published together within a single physical item (such as a disc), volume, or container, regardless of whether they have any relationship to each other’s content.

7.8.4.0.2: The definitions should maintain the mutual exclusivity between the relationship types; a given pair of resources should have only one type of relationship (per the Tillett taxonomy). We suggest rewording this definition to accomplish this:

Accompanying manifestations include those that are simply issued with the resource being described, without any other type of relationship to it.

7.8.4.0.3: Similarly, accompanying items are those that “have been bound with ... but were not issued together, and do not have any other type of relationship to each other.” For example, issues of a numbered monographic series (or a serial) are not “issued together” but they might well be bound together by the owner. These would have a sequential relationship to each other, not accompanying, even though bound.

7.9 Sequential relationships

Manifestations and items can also have sequential relationships, although these might not be bibliographically interesting. For example, the pages in a book would have a manifestation-level sequential relationship to each other. Items in the item-level accompanying relationship described in 7.8.4.0.3 might instead have a sequential relationship if they are numbered: consider a multi-volume set of bound pamphlets wherein each volume is numbered; within a given volume the pamphlets may have an item-level accompanying relationship to each other, but the volumes taken as a whole have an item-level (because they’re locally bound) sequential relationship to each other. Is there a compelling need to *exclude* such relationships from RDA?

7.9.0.1.1: ALA suggests the following wording:

A sequential relationship exists between a work, expression, manifestation or item and another work, expression, manifestation or item that precedes or succeeds it.

7.9.0.2.2: The word “following” is used in two different senses: “according to” and “succeeding”. We suggest rewording as follows:

Record the relationship between the resource being described and the succeeding resource according to the guidelines given under 7.9.2.

7.9.1.1.1c.1, examples: How is the example “Merger of: British abstracts ...” an example of an unstructured description, while the example “Supersedes: The action plan ...” is an example of a structured description? This is a good example of ALA’s uncertainty about the working difference between structured and unstructured descriptions.

7.9.2.0.2: Superseding works, at least for monographs [e.g. a revised edition, which “supersedes” the earlier edition] do not have a sequential relationship to each other. Rather, the superseding work would have a derivative relationship to the superseded work (usually it would be a new expression).

Since the sequential relationship can apply to all FRBR primary entities, it might be useful to have a couple of “includes” examples for manifestation and item.