Comments on „RDA – Resource Description and Access : Part A, chapter 6 & 7

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

A draft of "RDA – Resource Description and Access", Part A, chapters 6 and 7 was made available by the Joint Steering Committee in June 2006 **http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftch6-7.html** together with public announcements and invitations to comment.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek welcomes this opportunity and wishes to express its thanks for sharing the draft of chapters 6 and 7 again publicly world wide, together with a revised prospectus and working documents of the JSC. The expert groups of the Committee for Library Standards were invited to participate in commenting the draft of RDA Part A, chapters 6 and 7. They, too, appreciate JSC's openness to receive and consider comments from non-JSC constituencies.

General comments:

We welcome the announcement in "notes on specific aspects of the draft" to include a single listing in chapter 1 of all elements in part A which are designated as "required element" and "element required if applicable".

However, as many elements are defined to be optional, we suspect that there will be need of additional arrangements for the particular application areas. To improve interoperability, we would welcome to provide not only one minimal core set in the rules, but to provide different levels of core sets, for instance minimal, ordinary, national level or other categories. That would facilitate a consistent application of the rules.

We welcome the new RDA approach to abolish the strict separation between descriptive elements and elements serving as access points that lead JSC to combine the formerly planned part I and II into a part A. But we still miss an access point "title" meaning the title of the resource in hand, and those access points for data elements from the bibliographic description which should be made searchable. Will these rules be included in part B?

We strongly support to lead a broader discussion on the scope of RDA and on the inclusion of subject access points and relationships.

Chapter 6 deals with related resources. Will the relations between persons, families, corporate bodies be covered in part B? Will part B give a detailed description of the data model and advice how to record the relations between the FRBR entities, how to distinguish the entities and which entities should be represented by authority records/data? Chapter 6 and 7 do not yet answer these questions.

We suggest to add rules that cover the question "when is something a new work / expression". These decisions have consequences not only on relations, but also on the question "what is described and interconnected".

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek was asked to include the question if indexing rules will be part of RDA.

Chapter 6. Related resources

The relationships covered in chapter 6 follow the FRBR relationships between works, expressions, manifestations and items, but are expressed as relationships between resources. It would be helpful if the underlying concept and the underlying structure were layed open.

We notice that the abstract FRBR terms are not easily understood, but think that "resource" needs an explanation insofar as to which entity it does refer to. The differentiation between work, expression, manifestation, or item is made in 6.1.3 (providing citations for related resources) and 6.1.4 (access points for works, for expressions, for manifestations and items), but in the following paragraphs the term "resource" prevails.

Looking at the definition in chapter 1 (1.1.1), we see that "resource" is used as a generic term for the entity "that forms the center of focus for a resource description." In chapter 6, in many cases it is not clear for which entity the term resource is used, for a work, an expression or a manifestation, e.g. in 6.2.3: aggregate resource, where the "pairing" resource component is defined as to include individual works; or in 6.10.1: preceding resource, where the pairing resource: succeeding resource is defined as a product of the merger or split of other resources, or a later edition of a work issued under another title. Does "resource" in these cases mean the work or the manifestation level, or none of them? The relationship stays ambiguous without determining which entities are meant.

FRBR chapter 5.3 (Other relationships between group 1 entities) includes relationships between group 1 entities
- work to work
- expression to expression
- expression to work
- manifestation to manifestation
- manifestation to item
- item to item

We would approve of following FRBR and providing rules to record the relationships and establish access points according to the entities defined in FRBR.

The whole chapter 6 encompasses optional elements, and the conventions ("one or more") given first in 6.1.2 open further options. This calls for rule interpretations for users, 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, will not be met. We discussed if there are some relations that are regarded as so important that they should get a label "mandatory if applicable", e. g. former/later relations for continuing resources.

6.1.2 Conventions used to record relationships between resources
(see also comments on addendum, definitions 1.1.7 and 1.1.8)

Five conventions (citation, access point, embedded description, informal reference, resource identifier) are mentioned, of which "one or more" may be used. We have the notion that these conventions contain what is "found on the market". We do not fully understand the exact differences and would welcome a guideline in which case which convention should be followed.

The only difference in the definitions of a) and b) (citation and access point) seems to be that the access point can be searched and found. Both may consist of the same data elements. What makes the one a citation and the other an access point?

If access points are defined as any name, term etc. under which a resource may be found, why giving the access point the structured form of a citation? Should there be a definition for "access points in structured form"? Or does chapter 6 mean "controlled access points"? - Why are

access points defined in such a restrictive way; aren't the conventions in c) and e) (embedded description and resource identifier) only alternative forms of access points, too? In Germany, we are used to use record identifiers as access points, and we easily could imagine to expand not only the name of the related resource but also additional elements or embed the bibliographic record as a whole (for instance, in an XML environment).

6.1.2.2 We welcome that relationships may be recorded reciprocally.

6.1.3. Citations for related resources

The term "citation", one of the five possible conventions for recording relationships, is defined in the addendum to part A-1 (1.1.8), where two forms of construction are given (name-title or title access point; title proper followed by the statements of responsibility). Will chapter 13 as outlined in the prospectus provide detailed rules how to construct a citation (13.1) and how to make additions to citations (13.3)? Will "citation" in chapter 13 be a concept for headings for works and expressions and a successor model of a uniform title?

6.1.3.0 General guidelines on providing citations for related resources

6.1.3.0.1 lists work, expression, manifestion, or item in the same clause. 6.1.4 differentiates works, expressions, manifestations and items in three clauses. Why is 6.1.3 not differentiated into different clauses?

Are the words or phrases that precede the citation prescribed terms or individually chosen terms?

6.1.2.0.2 starts with "construct the citation", but refers to 6.1.4 (access points for related resources). Two footnotes to these chapters allow either to generate a citation from an (encoded) access point for the related resource or to generate an access point from a citation (if the citation is recorded in a prescribed access point form).

This makes it difficult to differentiate between 6.1.2.1 a) providing a citation for the related resource and 6.1.2.1 b) providing an access point for the related resource.

Is a citation "one form" which serves all different purposes? We suggest to explain the citation concept further in the draft. We support to offer rules for citations in RDA, but note that citation rules as given, e.g., in ISO 690 differ from RDA citations.

6.1.4 Access points for related resources

We suggest to use a designation for the type of relationship.

6.1.4.1 Access points for works
6.1.4.2 Access points for expressions
6.1.4.3 Access points for manifestations and items

Does 6.1.4.1.2 imply that controlled access points will not be established for expressions? Examples for expression and manifestation level relationship access points should include additional data elements from these levels (announced for 13.3.X).

6.1.5 Embedded descriptions of related resources

The possibilities of embedding descriptions of related resources will probably vary from system to system. If a full description is chosen in favour of a partial description (6.1.5.0.1), what is the advantage in comparison to a link, using an identifier or identification number?

6.1.7 Resource identifiers for related resources

To provide a resource identifier is one of the possible conventions for recording relationships between resources. We suggest to add "record identification numbers" as a possible linking method. Record identification numbers are not yet included in the definition given in 2.12.

6.2. Aggregate/component relationships

The rules apply to an analytic description. Therefore we suggest to add in 6.2.0.2 (Recording aggregate/component relationships) a reference to 1.2.2 (Type of description, Analytical description).

Chapter 1.2 uses the term "parts". Is a difference to "component" intented and will this be explained in the term definitions? If no difference is intended, we suggest to use the same term.

Though the chapter is entitled aggregate/component relationships, component rules come first. We suggest to give the aggregate rules first instead.

An exact determination whether something is an aggregate or a component might be more difficult than it sounds first because it depends on the valuation of content. (We agree to 6.7.0.2.3 that accompanying material issued together with a primary component is recorded not as an adjunct resource, but as accompanying material, following 3.7.)
Can a component resource - as part of an aggregate – at the same time be an aggregate resource in regard to other components?

6.4. Source/reproduction relationships
6.5 Format/format relationships

The JSC especially invited comments on whether it would be desirable to combine these two sections to further simplify the instructions.

A difference in the definitions in 6.4.0.1.1 and 6.5.0.1.1 is that source/reproduction relationships are not limited to the same publisher, whereas format/format relationships are narrowed down to the same publisher. In an online environment, it may be difficult to discern whether a digital format is a reproduction of a source or something independent from a source.

The tendency of discussions in the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek was to leave the chapters separate, but we note that very often in practice a clear distinction between the relationship types might not be possible. The members of the expert groups are in favour of having two separate chapters, too.

6.8 Edition/edition relationships
6.8.0.1 Scope

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek would like to ask why an edition/edition relationship is narrowed down to simultaneously issued editions.

6.9 "Issued with" relationships

Compared with 6.3 (component/component relationships), 6.3.1.1.1 (Scope: related content), "issued with" applies only to independent resources issued together. Why is this difference still important? The modes of treatment as given in 6.3.1.2 and 6.9.1.2 do not differ. If the difference is important, it would be helpful to explain further what makes a relationship an "issued with" and what makes it a component relationship.

6.10 Predecessor/successor relationships

Following the definitions in 6.10.1.1.2 and 6.10.2.1.2, a predecessor/successor relationship is only recorded when the title differs. What about editions with the same title?

6.11 Additional instructions for music resources

Where is the "boarder" that defines when something is a new work, a new creation?

6.12 Additional instructions for art resources

The examples given in this chapter include only two-dimensional objects. We suggest to say explicitly that the rules apply to three-dimensional objects as well as to two-dimensional objects.

❖ **Chapter 7. Persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource**

Only primary access point (7.2) ist mandatory, the other parts of chapter 7 encompass optional elements. This again calls for rule interpretations for users, 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, will not be met.

In chapter 7, rules for film materials are missing. We suggest to add a sub-chapter like for music, art works etc., that deals with films. Is a director or the screen-play writer or the producer the person "considered to be of primary importance"? If 7.2.2.4 applies to film materials, additional access point options should be given.

7.0 Purpose and scope

7.0.1 indicates that the elements covered in this chapter are used to record persons, families and corporate bodies. Does this chapter intend to provide rules for recording relationships between persons, corporate bodies and resources or to provide rules for transcribing elements?

6.1.2 indicates conventions how to record relationships between resources. In chapter 7 there is no equivalent rule. Why not? There should be the same options as in 6.1.2.1. (Though persons, families, and corporate bodies may not have a resource identifier there exist other identifiers to identify the person, family, and corporate body in the library context.)

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

7.1.1 Sources of information

7.1.1.1 1 Is the source of information in this chapter meant only to take information on the person's, corporate body's, family's responsibility for the resource, or is it meant, too, as a source of information on the person, corporate body, or family itself?

7.1.1.2 "If the statements appearing on the preferred source of information in the resource being described are ambiguous or insufficient …" – does this mean ambiguous or insufficient to identify the person or to identify the persons's responsibility for the resource?

7.1.2 Conventions used to record persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource

Does a) mean to make an access point which is not controlled or does a) and b) indicate pure unsearchable text?

7.1.2.1c.1 Though c) bears the caption "Controlled access point" the text only refers to "access points". Which of both is meant? Furthermore, we suggest to make an addition to c) that controlled access points may not only "be recorded as an [controlled] access point", but also as a link to an authority record.

7.1.2.1c.2 Why does the formulation differ from that in 7.6? Shouldn't it be possible to define the role by labels other than a term, e.g. codes or field numbers?
We would like to note that role informations will not be interchangeable if they are not assigned consistently, and we would welcome some guidance to be included in the rule.

7.1.3. Primary and additional access points

A definition of principal responsibility is missing.

In 7.1.3.3, the see-reference should point to 7.6.1 (transposed digits in the draft: 7.1.6).

7.2 Primary access point

We suggest to include an explanatory statement about the function of a primary access point.

In an online environment, the only argument for a primary access point is that we need a common citation form for the resource to be used in index lists, short lists, print-outs, textual references and presentation formats. But there should be alternative possibilities to create other presentation forms according to the needs of special applications, special user needs and unclear main responsibilities. That might be, for instance, the case with performances, multimedia resources. There might be different views on "primary" responsibility. For retrieval purposes, other combinations than fixed name/title combinations are useful which may be derived form elements which are held separately.

We propose to define the "primary access point" as the entry element of a common citation form and the title as the name of the work/expression/manifestation/item.

7.2.0.1 Original works

We propose to cancel the "rule of three" for creators (persons, families, and corporate bodies). If one or more entities have primary responsibility, the principally responsible or first named should get the primary access point (and others additional access points optionally). We assume that the old restriction on three does not fulfill its purpose any longer. The cancellation of the rule of three would make several rules dispensable that rely on this restriction. The opportunity of giving further access points might help user retrieval.

Proposal for 7.2.0.1:

7.2.0.1.1 [unchanged; draft]
7.2.0.1.2 If more than one person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work, use as the primary access point the access point for the one represented as being principally responsible or named first.

In 7.2.0.1.2c), we understand the "no" to apply to one, two, three (in a sense of "neither … nor").

7.2.0.5 Performances

When is a level of creative responsibility reached that entitles a performer to be the primary access point? The rule is part of the general rules. Does it apply to every thinkable performance? Will "performance" be defined in the glossary?

7.2.1.1 General guideline

We think that the rule in the footnote to this paragraph is too important to be given in a footnote. What is the reason for this sequence? We would prefer first to take the person as the author of the work into consideration, according to the strong position of the person in German and European copyright law. In contrast to this opinion, the German Union Catalogue for Serials, the Zeitschriftendatenbank, agrees to the intention of the footnote to consider, if the work originates from a corporate body, the use of a primary access point for a corporate body first before considering the use of a primary access point for a person or family.

7.2.1.4 One corporate body responsible for creating the work

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 fear that it might be associated with more "manual" efforts and we are not sure whether the approach will be sustainable in a network environment with an automatic harvesting of metadata.

The definition of corporate body which is part of the addendum to part A-1 (1.1.6.4) does not cover conferences, expeditions, and events. The reference in 7.2.1.4.1.c) iii) points to a definition in 7.2.2 which (till now) isn't there.
What does the last sentence in 7.2.1.4.1.c) iii) mean? Does it mean that the conference must have a name (but this would be part of the definition) or that the name must be quoted in the resource (but the name could already be there)?

Which groups are meant in 7.2.1.4.1.d), does the rule apply to groups like music, cabaret, theater groups which write their own performance programs? Why is such a rule for a corporate body included, whereas a comparable rule for a person or family is not included in 7.2.1.2 (one

person responsible for creating the work) and 7.2.1.3 (one family responsible for creating the work)?

7.2.1.4.5 The German Union Catalogue for Serials, the Zeitschriftendatenbank, suggests to add an adequate treatment for continuing resources because the "in case of doubt" rule does not fit well for continuing resources:

Proposal:
In case of doubt whether the primary access point should be under the corporate body or title, choose the corporate body as primary access point, if the title is generic. If the title is distinctive, use the title of the work as the primary access point.

7.2.2 More than one person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating the work
7.2.2.1 General guideline

In 7.2.2.1.1c), we understand the "no" to apply to one, two, three (in a sense of "neither … nor").

7.2.2.3 Two or three persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible
7.2.2.4 More than three persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible
See 7.2.0.1: We propose to cancel the "rule of three".

7.2.2.5 Two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies using a shared pseudonym

Is "Beggarstaff Brothers" an example for a person, a family or a corporate body using a shared pseudonym? (see also comments on 1.1.6)

We expect rules for pseudonyms to follow in part B and will comment on them when part B is available. It is important then to include rules on how the primary access point is decided upon and in which cases personas are to be differentiated. Will a definition of "pseudonym" be given in the glossary?

7.2.3. Compilations of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies
7.2.3.0 Scope

Whereas 6.2.0.1.1 contains a definition of "aggregate", a definion of "compilation" is missing here.

The expert groups suggest to apply a formal approach on compilations: Use a "creator" as a primary access point, when the main title page does not name single works. Do not do research on whether authors given on the main title page are authors of the whole or just authors of discernable contributions.

7.2.6 Previously existing works with added commentary, illustrations, etc.
7.2.6.2 Works with added commentary, criticism, biographical matter, etc.

What happens in the case when the title of the manifestation differs from that of the work? How does the citation access point for the manifestation look like?

7.2.8 Performances

Aren't performances sometimes works on their own? How is a "level of creative responsibility" judged upon? We would appreciate some guidance in which cases. Which agents (roles) would then be chosen for the primary access point?

7.3.6 Performers

What is a principal performer and is their number restricted?

7.3.11 Other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with the content of the resource

With the restriction "unless the relationship between the person, etc., and the work is purely that of a subject", the possibility for older monographic publications slips of giving additional access points for persons identified elsewhere outside the resource, e.g. in reference sources.

7.6 Designation of role

We suggest to offer the possibility of repeatibility and of giving several roles, e.g. if a person is composer and interpreter as well. Standard lists mentioned in 7.6.2 should include a role "mixed responsibility" if a non-ambiguous allocation is not possible. Will standard lists be added to RDA?

7.7 Additional instructions for musical works

Symphonies are not explicitly mentioned, do the general guidelines in 7.2 apply to them (according to 7.7.0.1.3)?
We suggest to add lists for form and category of musical works to the RDA and the preferred . catalogues raisonnés which are used for the uniform titles of musical works.

The RDA draft favours the composer as the primary responsible person for the primary access point. The existing German descriptive code for musical works, RAK-Musik, regards the interpreter as primary responsible when the material is dominated by an interpreter, e.g. in rock, pop, jazz music. It is suggested to introduce this into RDA.

7.8 Additional instructions for art works

The former AACR2 chapter 10 "three-dimensional artefacts and realia" covered more objects (e. g. a chair, a paperweight) of the museum and archive communities. This type of "three-dimensional" objects is not yet covered by RDA.

7.8.1 Reproductions of art works
7.8.1.2 With accompanying texts

The differentiation between 7.8.1.2.a) and b) might be difficult to apply, but we approve of providing an additional access point for the artist (a.2) or for the writer of the text (b.2).

7.8.2 Adaptations of art works

The text refers only to "graphic arts". We suggest to include paintings and sculptures because many graphics are adaptions of paintings and sculptures. Sculptures, graphics, craftwork and paintings should be treated alike.

7.9 Additional instructions for legal works

Are these rules meant for special libraries, archives and documentation centres for legal materials? The rules from 7.9.3 to 7.9.7 seem to us very sophisticated and not applicable for the juristic unschooled cataloguers. We would associate them much more with subject than with descriptive cataloguing.
The rules (7.9.3-7.9.7) are based mainly on Anglo-American law and thus, of course, do not acknowledge European law (or German law) with the same comprehensiveness. We suggest to add options for legal works emanating from other law systems.

The Bavarian Library Network and the Gemeinsamer Bibliotheksverbund (GBV) disapprove of corporate bodies as primary access points and suggest to use the title as the primary access point and to give additional access points for the corporate body/bodies.

7.10. Additional instructions for religious works

We approve of the intention adressed in JSC working papers which are publicly available to incorpate a global perspective within the new code. The working papers include proposed changes which are not yet part of the RDA draft.

The Bavarian Library Network and the Gemeinsamer Bibliotheksverbund (GBV) disapprove of corporate bodies as primary access points for religious works and suggest to use the title as the primary access point and to give additional access points for the corporate body/bodies.

7.10.3 Liturgical works

Will liturgical works of other religions than Christian and Jewish ones (for example Asian religions or Muslim religions) be ruled under the general instructions on liturgical works?

The stipulation to choose the primary acces point depending on the church or denomination calls for specific knowledge.

7.11 Additional instructions for official communications
7.11.1 Communications of a single official

Does 7.11.1.1 apply, too, if the body for the official is not mentioned in the main source of information?

If the person already has an access point in the record for the corporate body, why provide another additional access point for the person (7.11.1.2)?

7.12.1. Academic disputations

We suggest to concede that an additional access point for a person designated as an opponent may be provided if given on the preferred source of information.

Addendum to RDA part A – chapters 1 to 5

1.1.6 Person, family, and corporate body

The definitions do not clearly say what makes an entity a family and what makes an entity a corporate body.

When the name of an entity includes the word "family", is it then clearly a family, but not a corporate body?
Example: Kelly Family

Is a term referring to siblings of importance to judge if it is a family or a corporate body?
Examples: Olsen Brothers (= Jorgen & Nils); Sister Sledge (= quartet of siblings)

No term:
Examples: Alfons and Aloys Kontarsky; The Carpenters (= siblings)
A combination of "duo", "trio" and a family name:
Examples: Duo Seitz (= father and daughter); Jackson Five

Other examples include the word "family" or a term referring to siblings, but the members are not related:
Examples: Doobie Brothers; Familie Silly (another name for the band Silly)

1.1.6.4. The definition of corporate body does not cover conferences, expeditions, and events.

1.1.7 Access point

Especially "primary access point" has a connection to citation (the primary access point may be a part of a citation). This could be addressed in the definition.

1.1.7 differentiates "access point" as a superordinate concept, "controlled access point", "primary access point" and "additional access point". Whenever possible, the exact term should be used in the rules (see, e.g., comment on 7.1.2.1c.1).

1.1.8 Citation

The definition of citation does not refer to the definition of access point (1.1.7), although the footnotes on pages 6-4 and 6-5 clearly indicate a possible connection:

"A citation may be generated from an access point for the related resource if the access point is encoded to indicate the nature of the relationship."
"An access point may be generated from a citation if the citation is recorded in the form prescribed for use as an access point."