

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

SUBJECT: RDF representation of RDA relationship designators: a follow-up discussion paper. British Library Response.

The British Library greatly appreciates the detailed and thoughtful analysis presented in this report. We support the recommendations made by the CILIP representative

We have also separately approved the Fast Track changes recommended in Appendix 5.

Specific recommendations are:

1. Use the FRBR/FRAD-derived definition for the RDA class Agent.

Agree.

2. Seek the views of linked data communities on preferences for generic terminology in the unconstrained property definitions.

Agree. We are not convinced that it is desirable to constrain the properties through the specific terms, such as bibliographic agent, bibliographic resource.

The dcterms and foaf definitions of Agent are very broad:

dcterms: Agent. Definition: A resource that acts or has the power to act. Comment: Examples of Agent include person, organization, and software agent.

foaf: Agent. Definition: An agent (e.g. a person, group, software or physical artifact). /.../
The Agent class is the class of agents, things that do stuff.

We are not clear what the use case is for an intermediate level between these and the constrained RDA property.

3. Accept the current choice of definitions of unconstrained properties where there are necessary differences in the phrasing of definitions of the constrained originals, in order to publish the properties, but review in due course.

Agree

4. Develop definitions for high-level categories of designator in RDA Toolkit Appendix J, from which RDF property definitions can be derived, or develop RDF definitions directly.

Agree

5. Represent inverse properties based on RDA Toolkit Appendix I in a different element set to the original properties by using a separate sub-domain for the URIs, to improve clarity.

Agree

6. Use the specified design patterns for the labels and definitions of properties based on RDA Toolkit relationship designators.

Agree

7. Continue to monitor the need for value vocabulary representations of the RDA Toolkit relationship elements and designators.

Agree

8. Improve the presentation of the relationship between relationship elements and relationship designators in the RDA Toolkit.

Agree

9. Advocate the use of URIs and labels for unconstrained RDA properties based on RDA Toolkit relationship elements and designators for metadata which is not FRBRized.

Agree

10. Encourage further discussion on the issue of "cataloguer-friendly" and "use-friendly" labels in metadata based on the FRBR/FRAD models.

Agree. This issue also arises in relation to Extent of Expression, element proposed by ALA.

11. Publish an RDF representation of the alignment between RDA Toolkit Appendix I and MARC relators using the **MARC relator property sub-property of RDA designator property** mapping pattern, dependent on acceptance of the definitions of the unconstrained RDA properties, to improve utility.

Agree

12. Develop liaison with the Library of Congress Network Development and MARC Standards Office to improve interoperability between the RDA designators and MARC relators.

Agree