

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: RDF representation of RDA relationship designators, Appendix 5: Issues relating to minor changes in the RDA Toolkit

CCC acknowledges the careful work of the CILIP representative in preparing these recommendations for updating the RDA Appendices.

Recommendations 1-4, 6-8, 11-12, 14

CCC agrees.

Recommendation 5 Make the specific designator definitions identified in Appendix J more consistent through the Fast-Track process

CCC agrees with the principle of revising definitions but urges some caution. Some of the designators represent complex situations where revision of the definition could change the underlying assumptions of that particular designator.

CCC notes that “merged with ... to form ...” is at least a tri-partite relationship. It is not clear from this recommendation how each side of the polygon of relationships will be represented. A reciprocal “mergee to mergee” relationship could be used between the merged entities but this becomes very complex as the number of merged entities increases. Assuming the inverse of “merged to form” is “formed by the merger of” will the entity produced by the merger have multiple relationships, where right now there is one?

Recommendation 9 – Add test to RDA Toolkit Appendix K to indicate pairs of inverse properties

CCC agrees and notes the dependency of 6JSC/ALA/25 on JSC’s decision on 6JSC/CILIP/rep/3/Appendix 5.

Recommendation 10

CCC agrees that ambiguous relationship designators should be made specific.

Recommendation 13 Add missing inverse designators to Appendix K

CCC agrees and feels this is the minimum of what must be done.

Recommendations 15

CCC favours the use of indefinite articles in the labels of relationship designators instead of omitting the article. The omission of the article is a somewhat elliptical construction used only in some styles of English. The inconsistency of the use of the article causes translators concern as they try to discern the reason for the distinction, and to try to adopt awkward constructions to reproduce a distinction which isn’t really a distinction at all in English.

Recommendation 16

CCC hesitates to agree to the recommendation without seeing the changes. We suggest that the word ‘resource’ could be replaced by ‘manifestation’ in both cases.