

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/3
18 September 2007

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access - Review by other rule makers of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7 - Germany

These are comments on the draft chapters 6-7 of RDA received from the Office for Library Standards of the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, and the expert groups of the Committee for Library Standards.

.



**Comments on „RDA – Resource Description and Access” - Part A,
Draft of Revised Chapters 6-7**

Submitted by: Office for Library Standards, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
E-mail address: r.goempel@d-nb.de

A revised draft of “RDA – Resource Description and Access”, Part A, chapters 6-7 was made available by the Joint Steering Committee among the JSC working documents in June 2007 <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-parta-ch6&7rev.pdf>. The JSC invited to comment the revised draft by September 17, 2007.

We appreciate this opportunity and thank for sharing the draft of the revised chapters 6 and 7 publicly world wide.

The expert groups of the Committee for Library Standards participated in commenting the draft of RDA Part A, revised chapters 6-7. Their comments are included in the joint comment submitted herewith by the Office for Library Standards of the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

GENERAL ISSUES

We welcome the decision to reverse the order of the chapters 6 and 7.

In chapter 7 resource identifiers could be used to record relationships between resources. We regard resource identifiers as access points, too (following FRAD). We suggest to add “identifiers” as access point identifiers for persons, families, and corporate bodies in chapter 6.

The draft of Part A, chapter 1 (as of December 2005) already included a core set of mandatory elements. The complete RDA draft scheduled for July 2008 should include a complete core set of mandatory elements, which would be very useful for application in many ways.

CHAPTER 6 (Persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource)

Organization of Chapter 6

We welcome that the instructions about the “primary access point” have been removed from Part A and will be transferred to Part B, chapter 13.

We welcome the organization of the sections 6.3 to 6.6 according to the FRBR group 1 entities: work, expression, manifestation, and item. This is a further step to reach interoperable rules and terminology.

We are looking forward how the FRBR work level will be defined for continuing resources. An IFLA FRBR review group discussed “super work” vs. “new work when a major title change occurs”. This question still needs resolving.

In our discussions, it was suggested to give more references between the RDA articles.

The JSC asked to indicate whether we agree with retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications. Instructions for musical works and art works are covered now by general instructions. Meanwhile instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications have been enlarged and differentiated in comparison to AACR2.

We observe that the instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications are “Anglo-American centred”. Some do not fit to our German legal system. We suggest to abandon

chapters 6.7 (Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with legal works), 6.8 (Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with religious works) and 6.9 (Access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with official communications) because these instructions should be covered as well by the general instructions on access points.

If the coverage of access points for musical works and art works was possible by general instructions, why should this not be possible for legal works, religious works, and official communications as well?

The instructions on primary access points are expected in Part B, chapter 13. We will give our comments on chapter 13 when the draft will be available at the end of the year.

We agree that access points (of persons, families, or corporate bodies) are generally labelled as optional, with exception of those access points which are a basic part of the “naming” of a work or expression (announced for Part B, chapter 13).

Nevertheless, we suggest to include a general advice that optional access points for an expression, manifestation, or item should be given whenever they are relevant for finding this entity.

Designations of role

We are pleased that the optional instructions for designation of role offer now the possibility of repeatability and of giving several roles to one access point. In our opinion these roles are important, for instance for retrieval. MARC 21 and ONIX, e. g., offer according lists, and roles and functions are an important topic in the discussion of other communities.

Harmonization is necessary. We look forward to commenting the announced discussion paper containing a controlled vocabulary of terms designating roles. We imagine a list either in alphabetic order or analogous to the structure of FRBR group 1 entities: work, expression, manifestation, and item and their corresponding roles.

We welcome the combined effort of JSC and DCMI to develop an RDA element vocabulary.

Required access points

We are pleased that the “rule of three” is cancelled. The opportunity of giving further access points will help user retrieval very much.

JSC decided to apply the terms “*required*” and “*optional*” and to drop “required if applicable”. In the former drafts of RDA access points were labelled as: *required - required if applicable - optional*. In the revised chapters 6 - 7 RDA just distinguishes between required or optional. This differs from the ISBD Consolidated Edition published in August 2007. ISBD uses the terms: *mandatory - conditional - optional*. In a note it is added: “Mandatory for most data elements indicates the element is mandatory if it is applicable for the resource”.

RDA and ISBD define “required” respectively “mandatory” differently from any format. If a format labels a data element as mandatory, this data element must be part of a data record, provable by a validation.

Here a harmonization of the number of terms and their definitions seems necessary. If a harmonization between a bibliographic standard and a format is not necessary because their functions are different, then at least the bibliographic standards should be in harmony.

Only the first creator or originating body is required (the first named or the one used for a citation?), the other parts of chapter 6 encompass optional elements. This – as well as alternative rules - calls for rule interpretations. But if several (probably differing) national rule interpretations emerge, the overall aim of increasing the international sharing of bibliographic and authority data and of creating an international cataloguing code, as expressed in the draft of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, might not be met.

To improve interoperability between several different national applications, we would welcome to provide more than just the minimal core set of required elements in the rules and to suggest other levels and their suggested elements.

In our expert group discussions, this was discussed controversially, as some experts and their institutions did not see a necessity to design further levels. Their arguments: It is sufficient to apply the core set, (expect the national libraries to apply the maximum set), and to make use of optional elements as the case arises, if deemed necessary. If the core set was met, the data exchange would not be impeded by any additional optional elements.

Counter-arguments: For the time being, several differing rule applications do exist in the regional library networks and institutions. Is it really sufficient to decide individually and non-consistently even in one institution?

We are very interested to learn how, e.g., the national libraries, OCLC, and CONSER will tackle rule interpretations and levels, especially those institutions which apply AACR2 rule interpretations for the time being.

Originating body (6.3.2)

We suggest to cancel chapter 6.3.2 because the term “originating body” is covered by the term “creator”.

RDA defines “originating body” as “a corporate body responsible for originating, issuing, or causing to be issued, a work ...”, but “creator” as “a person, family, or corporate body responsible for the creation of a work.”

The new term “originating body” is a successor of the former AACR2 term “emanating from one or more corporate bodies” [AACR2, Part II, 21.1B2] and rules which are retained in RDA.

The instructions have been placed in 6.3.2 to allow for use of issuing or authorizing corporate bodies as the first part of naming the work. Shall the rules on originating bodies apply independently of whether a personal authorship exists or not? We suspect that these instructions could override the rules about creators in chapter 6.3.1 and have an important effect on the primary access point rules in part B, chapter 13. In Germany, we have a tradition that a personal authorship generally precedes a corporate body authorship. We suggest to add in 6.3.2.0.1 the information that these rules do not apply to works with personal authorship.

6.3.2.0.1 “An originating body is a corporate body responsible for originating, issuing, or causing to be issued, a work [add: **without personal authorship**] that falls into one or more of the following categories: ...”

We acknowledge that the RDA approach to determine the responsibility for the resource takes much more regard of the intellectual content than we are used to in Germany. The German rules till now are much more aligned with formal elements of the source of information. Though we recognize partly a better intellectual approach, we suggest more general instructions and prefer to omit the specific criteria for considering a corporate body to have responsibility for a work. This function could as well be covered via access points and additions of roles.

If it was clearly stated that a creator could either be a person, family, or corporate body, it would be unnecessary to have special rules for originating bodies.

The glossary draft (as of September 20, 2005 (<http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/source/glossary-sep05.pdf>)) of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles draft (as of April 3, 2006) includes terms for creator, author, agent, and corporate body.

Extract of the glossary draft of terms of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles draft:

“**Creator** - An entity responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a work.
See also Author, Agent”

“**Author** - A creator responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a textual work. (Source: IME ICC)
See also Agent, Creator”

“**Agent** - A person (author, publisher, sculptor, editor, director, etc.) or a group (organization, corporation, library, orchestra, country, federation, etc.) that has a role in the lifecycle of a resource. (Source: DCMI Agents Working Group, working definition)
See also Author, Creator”

“**Corporate body** - An organization or group of persons and/or organisations that is identified by a particular name and that acts, or may act, as a unit. (Source: modified from FRANAR, FRBR)”

The Statement glossary term “creator” includes corporate bodies (without explicitly stating this; it can be derived from the reciprocal references from creator to author and agent and vice versa). The Statement chapter about choice of access points 5.1.1.1 “... In the case of corporate bodies as creators, access by corporate name ...” (http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/statement_draft_apr2006.pdf, p. 31) proves this fact, too.

The Statement of International Cataloguing Principles draft is an international basis for cataloguing codes. We see a different approach in RDA’s label “originating body” because this term is not mentioned in the Statement which uses instead the terms “corporate bodies as creators” (see above).

Specific elements in chapter 6

6.0 Purpose and scope

6.0.2

We suggest to add “find” to the text:

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

6.1.1 Sources of information

6.1.1.1

Is the source of information here meant only to take the information on the responsibility for the resource or the person, family, or corporate body itself?

6.1.1.2

What does “ambiguous or insufficient to identify” mean - the responsibility for the resource or the person, family, or corporate body itself?

6.3.1 Creator

Although “creator” is labelled as required, the note on page 6-7 “If 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” makes the label less absolute. The restriction is so important that it should be part of the rule text.

We suggest to express clearly in the rule text that further access points for persons, families, or corporate bodies are optional without a limit.

The examples should make clear which access point is required and which ones are optional.

6.3.2 Originating body

We suggest to cancel chapter 6.3.2. The differentiation between “creator” and “originating body” is not clear.

If 6.3.2 is retained, the note on page 6-15 “If there is more than one originating body for the work, only the access point for the originating body commonly named first when citing the work is required” should be part of the rule text (this suggestion is analogous to our suggestion for the note in 6.3.1).

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

The question occurred whether the access points for producer, publisher, distributor are intended in a controlled authority form. The introductory text of RDA says: “The introduction to part A will make it clear that construction of the access points is to be done according to the instructions in part B.” Does this apply to producers etc., too?

As noted before, we suggest to cancel chapters 6.7 – 6.9. The following comments do only apply if JSC decides to retain these chapters.

6.7.1.3 Head of state, chief executive, or ruling executive body

There is a typo: “Reichspräsidenten” is a genitive of the noun “Reichspräsident”. The access point should record the nominative: “Germany. Reichspräsident”.

6.9.1 Corporate access point for the official issuing the communications

We welcome that the former draft rule is reworked so that access points for the official are only optional. We assume that the primary access point/citation will accordingly be the main title. A verification of this assumption will only be possible when the draft of chapter B has been published.

Examples in Chapter 6

We discussed the five alternative forms of presenting examples given by the Examples Group 2 and came to the conclusion that the form used now in the draft is preferable. We suggest to retain the form of examples given in chapter 6.

We did not reach a unanimous view if the designation of role should be given in the examples (knowing that the role is optional). The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek suggests to add the optional designation of role. Using the terms “creator” and “originating body” might be misunderstood as designations of role. As noted above, we suggest to cancel the term “originating body”.

The examples given always illustrate a special rule. We suggest to brand the access point illustrating a rule graphically (bold or italic, e.g.) and to include references to the examples which refer to other access points which are dealt with in other chapters, e.g.:

Suggestion for references:

6.3.1.1.1 One person responsible for the creation of the work

...

Beethoven, Ludwig van

*(Access point representing the creator for: Divertimento, op. 12, no.2 / L. van Beethoven
; transcribed for woodwind by George J. Trinkaus)*

The access point representing the transcriber of music see 6.4.1.

Accordingly for 6.4.1: Arranger, transcriber, etc., of music

Trinkaus, George J.

(Access point representing the transcriber for: Divertimento, op. 12, no.2 / L. van Beethoven ; transcribed for woodwind by George J. Trinkaus)

The access point representing creator see 6.3.1

CHAPTER 7 (Related resources)

Terminology

We appreciate the reduction of the former five conventions in the draft of chapter 6 (as of 2006) – citation, access point, embedded description, informal reference, and resource identifier – to record relationships between resources to now three conventions – name, describe, resource identifier.

In order to have a better comparison, it was suggested to illustrate the variants of recording relationships on the basis of one example (not using three different examples for three conventions, but one example).

Chapter 7 depicts relations, as well as chapter 6. Whereas chapter 6 depicts relations between persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource, chapter 7 depicts relations between resources. We note that the terminology used in chapters 6 and 7 differs. In chapter 6, the term “access point” is used persistently and the terms “related” or “relationship” are avoided. In chapter 7, the term “access point” appears once in chapter 7.1.2 (Conventions used to record relationships between resources. Unlike in chapter 6, 7.1.2 uses “controlled access point”. Is the difference of using “controlled” in chapter 7, but not in chapter 6, intended?

Does the differing terminology indicated that the handling of the relations depicted in chapters 6 and 7 will be done in different ways?

The phrasing „if considered important for access“ is used in chapter 6 several times in connection with the creation of access points. As this phrasing is not always used for optional access points, we would like to ask for the underlying valuation. If none such valuation is intended, we suggest to transfer this phrase to the general part of the access point rules in order to express that any access point labelled optional might be given if it is of importance for finding or access.

Is a parallel edition falling under 7.4 (Equivalence relationships) or under 7.5 (Derivative relationships)?

Designations of relationship

We look forward to commenting the announced discussion paper containing a controlled vocabulary of terms designating relationships in RDA. We imagine a list either in alphabetic order or analogous to the structure of FRBR group 1 entities: work, expression, manifestation, and item and their corresponding relationships, according to the list of terms designating roles of chapter 6.

We welcome the combined effort of JSC and DCMI to develop an RDA element vocabulary.

The designations of relationship given in the examples of 7.2 are introductory phrases which tell something about the nature of the relation between two (or more) works, expressions, manifestations, and/or items. The relationship might be expressed either in terms, through roles, or even special format fields.

The designations of relationship generally are optional in the draft. We annotate that the nature of a relation could hardly be identified if the designation is missing. The examples given in chapter 7 clarify that some relations might be misunderstood without a designation. Furthermore, even if the designation of relationship is clearly stated, the character of the related resource – whether it is a work, expression, manifestation or item - is not recognizable immediately.

Required relationships

In chapter 7, only the relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation is labelled as “required”. This is seen as sufficient.

Specific elements in chapter 7

Terminology

In chapter 6 the term “access point” is used generally as a means of search and retrieval for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the work, the expression, the manifestation, and the item. In chapter 7 we see a differing terminology.

Extract of chapter 7:

7.0.1 “The elements covered in this chapter identify resources that are related to the resource being described.”

7.0.3 “... Guidelines and instructions on formulating access points for use in naming a related work ... are covered in chapter 13.”

We regard related resources as access points, too, according to FRAD and suggest to use the term “access point” generally in the instructions of chapter 7, too.

We propose a higher consistency in using the phrase “access point” in all chapters of the RDA, as well in the chapters 1 - 5.

In chapter 7 often the term “resource” is mentioned. We suggest to replace that word by the FRBR group 1 entities work, expression, manifestation, or item wherever possible. If “resource” is meant as an umbrella term, we agree that for the sake of better legibility “resource” might be used, but suggest to add “resource” and its definition to the glossary.

7.1.2. Conventions used to record relationships between resources

7.1.2.2 “Relationships between resources may be recorded reciprocally ...”

This instruction enables to connect entities reciprocally, if desired, but to record relationships between resources just in one direction, too.

7.1.3 Resource identifiers for related resources

This chapter does not characterize identifiers for related resources as access points, unlike “naming related resources”. So, it is not clearly said that resource identifiers are access points, too. The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek suggests to do so. In the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles draft identifiers are included in the list of indispensable access points (chapter 7.1.2.1). Identifiers are indeed controlled access points.

Our expert groups members preferred to regard resource identifiers in connection with chapter 7 as an attribute of an entity and a means of linking, not as an independent entity.

7.1.3.0.1 “Provide a resource identifier (see 2.13) for the related resource, either in conjunction with or as a substitute for naming or describing the related resource.”

Which version should be used in what cases?

7.2 Designation of relationship

We suggest to regard relationships as entities, too, which are represented by an identifier, a name, a structured description and/or an unstructured description. The designation in textual form would be an attribute to the relation. We suggest to make clear that there are several possibilities of expressing a designation itself, for example by an identifier. This is important for search and retrieval based on the nature of a relationship in combination with other access points.

7.4.1.0.3

“Equivalent manifestations also include manifestations embodying the same expression of a work as the resource being described issued in a different format (e.g., large print).”

We suggest to include the examples of the former draft 6.5.1.1.1 (as of June 2006) into the above text: “[e.g.] in a different medium, physical form, type size, encoding standard”.

7.5.1.1 Referencing a source work (or expression)

The last example of 7.5.1.1.1b.1 (“Based on: Star trek, Deep Space Nine”) does not clearly indicate that two different titles are given and only separated by a comma. If the example follows a display format, this should be stated, preferably in an introductory part of RDA.

7.7.1.1 Referencing a whole work (or expression)

b) Naming the whole work (or expression)

If the larger work is a series, we prefer the optional addition 7.7.1.1.1b.2 to record the numeric or other designation within the series of a work (or expression).

Examples in Chapter 7

A number of examples are shown with added designations of relationship, meanwhile several examples do not contain a designation. We prefer a consistent form of examples with designations. The designations could be marked as optional in the examples.

Glossary

We suggest to add terms and definitions to the glossary:

Access point

Resource

Work

Expression

Manifestation

Item