TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

SUBJECT: Subject Relationship Element in RDA Chapter 23

The British Library thanks ALA for this proposal.

Recommendation 1: The Subject Relationship Entity

We support the proposal to define the subject relationship in Chapter 23

Recommendation 2: Name of the Relationship Entity

We agree with the recommendation to name the new entity, Subject.

Recommendation 3: Definition

We agree with the definition

Recommendation 4: Core Requirement

a) Should subject remain a core requirement in RDA?

We agree that Subject should be a core requirement, but this should not override the provisions of the subject system being applied.

b) Should “at least one subject relationship element” be required?

We agree with the proposed modification. We note however, that the core is always the floor not the ceiling.

c) When a work has multiple subjects, what should be required?

RDA should offer only general guidance about the nature of the relationship between a Work and the Subject or Subjects.

d) When recording a subject relationship element, should an authorized access point be required?

Definitely not.

e) Must terms, codes, identifiers, etc., be recorded following the specifications of some authoritative system?
We agree that the use of authoritative schemes should be encouraged, but we think “identifiable” is a less subjective and more readily verifiable criterion than “authoritative”. Identifiable is used in 0.12 in relation to vocabulary encoding schemes.

**Recommendation 5: Techniques for recording the subject relationship element**

We agree that instructions on appropriate techniques for recoding subject relationship elements will be required. Action will also be required on notes related to subject of the resource.