**TO**:  Verena Schaffner, Chair EURIG

**FROM**:  Barbara Tillett, Chair JSC

**SUBJECT:** Compilations of Works: Discussion Paper. JSC Response

_____

Dear Verena,

The JSC thanks EURIG for investigating issues around compilations of works.  The alignment of RDA and FRBR is an important issue for both communities and we really appreciate the work that has gone into this paper and the excellent examples.

The approach proposed by EURIG would involve changes not only to RDA instructions, but also to the underlying data model and JSC is concerned not to put too much emphasis on IFLA's *Final Report of the Working Group on Aggregates* until we have a better understanding of how the recommendations of that report will be incorporated into the consolidated FR model.   JSC discussed the EURIG paper at its meeting in Washington, on 6th November.  Our response addresses each of the detailed proposals below.

JSC would like to clarify that RDA does consider different compilations to be distinct aggregate works.  Attributes such as date of work, can be used to differentiate the aggregate works as elements, and/or as parts of access points (see 6.27.1.9).  Even though RDA does say that the instructions for works also cover aggregate works, more examples of aggregate works could be added, especially at 6.27.1.9 to make this clearer.

JSC also notes that although the core requirement is to record only the predominant or first named work (RDA 0.6.5), the alternative instruction at 6.2.2.10.3 makes provision for recording the preferred title for each contained work.


## Proposals

## 1. Preferred title for a compilation

*1.1.1  "Optional addition" for the aggregated works in a compilation*

JSC thanks EURIG for bringing this to our attention. An optional addition is not required, as this is already covered in Chapter 25 Related Works. JSC thinks this could be made clearer by provision of a reference to Chapter 25, at 6.2.2.10.

*1.1.2 Identifying the aggregating work*

In RDA an aggregating Work may be related to other Works, including derivative Works, based on the aggregating Work, and descriptive Works, about the aggregating Work. However, RDA does not use "creator" in the context of aggregating works. In RDA, the creator of a compilation is the creator of its contained works.

*1.2 Addition of an instruction (6.2.2.11) to cover compilations of Works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies.*

JSC agrees that such an addition would be useful and thanks EURIG for the suggestion. JSC notes that CCC also suggested the addition of a new instruction at 6.2.2.11 (see 6JSC/ACOC/5/CCC response). JSC will now pursue this issue.

As, discussed under 1.1.1 above, JSC prefers the addition of a reference to Chapter 25 rather than an optional addition. JSC would also prefer a less prescriptive approach to formulation of the devised title, using the instructions on devised titles in Chapter 2 as a guide.

## Questions to the JSC:

1. Do you agree with this approach?
   JSC believes that most of EURIG's requirements are already supported by RDA. Therefore we do not believe fundamental changes to the model or instructions are warranted. JSC acknowledges that this is a complex area and RDA would benefit from further clarification by provision of references and the addition of instructions to cover compilations of works by different authors with no collective title.

2. Should a controlled vocabulary be used for designating the form of the aggregated works?

RDA 6.3 Form of Work does not currently require the use of a controlled vocabulary; however a controlled vocabulary may be used if an agency chooses to do so. As noted in 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/3/LC Response, development of a vocabulary for form is being discussed by PCC.

## 2 Variant title for a compilation

Creation of variant titles for compilations is covered by RDA 6.2.3 Variant Title for the Work

## 3 Construction of the preferred access point

As already noted above, the RDA model assigns principal responsibility for compilations to the creators of the content, not to the aggregator.  The name of person, family or corporate body responsible for the compilation may be included in the preferred access point if necessary to distinguish it from another work of the same title or similar title, or an access point for a person, family, corporate body or place (6.27.1.9).

## 4 Status of the compiler

EURIG recommended that JSC should delete "Editor of Compilation" and replace it with a new relationship designator, "Creator of Compilation".  JSC discussed this question in conjunction with 6JSC/ACOC/07.  JSC considered whether the scope of the existing relationship designator "Compiler" should be extended to satisfy EURIG's recommendation.  JSC decided not to do so at this time because it is not convinced that aggregation of existing works warrants treatment as a creator.  However, JSC acknowledges that the distinction between "Editor" and "Editor of Compilation" is not particularly clear and does not serve any obvious user requirement.  JSC therefore decided to extend the definition of "Editor" to encompass "compilation" and to deprecate "Editor of Compilation".  These changes will be issued in the April 2014 Update.

## 5. Description of the    aggregated works

This area of change is based on the IFLA Working Group's report, and JSC considers the discussion premature; the assertion that an aggregate is a manifestation has not been formally accepted.