

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative
Subject: **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A – Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7**

The ACOC response to these chapters has been organised as follows:

- General comments
- Chapter 6 general comments
- Chapter 6: Comments on changes noted in the cover letter
- Chapter 6: Comments on specific instructions
- Chapter 7 comments on changes noted in the cover letter
- Chapter 7: Comments on specific instructions

General Comments

Examples

ACOC appreciates the large number of examples provided, and considers that they will be very useful, especially for the initial period after RDA's release. However, in the online product it may be better to present fewer examples initially, with an option to expand the number of examples displayed if desired.

Where possible, ACOC would like examples based on the same resource to be given under different instructions as we believe this will help RDA users build up a stronger picture of how the instructions interrelate.

Writing style

ACOC would prefer to avoid the use of indefinite articles in constructions of the type:
a later part(s)
an appropriate term(s)

"A" and "an" are indefinite articles and are always singular. Pairing them with terms ending in "(s)" mixes plural and singular. This problem could be avoided by omitting the article altogether:

later part(s)
appropriate term(s)

Chapter 6 general comments

Use of 'families, persons and corporate bodies'.

ACOC would like the JSC to give serious consideration to finding a term to replace 'families, persons and corporate bodies' wherever that phrase appears. This would make a number of the instructions much easier to read and understand.

Our preferred replacement term would be "parties" because:

- (1) it is a single term, rather than a phrase (therefore preferable to persons and groups),
and
- (2) it is the term used in other relevant standards and projects:

International Standard Party Identifier (ISPI) (ISO Project 27729,
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/iso/tc46sc9/27729.htm>);
Interparty (<http://213.253.134.7/interparty/index.asp>).

We note that at present 'party' in the above refers only to persons and corporate bodies, but we do not see this as a barrier to adopting the term, and defining it within RDA to include families.

If 'parties' is not acceptable to the JSC, ACOC would like the JSC to consider the use of 'persons and groups' as an alternative to the longer 'families, persons and corporate bodies'.

Chapter 6: Comments on changes noted in the cover letter

Separate placement of the instructions on determining the primary access point

ACOC supports the separate placement of the instructions on determining the primary access point.

Grouping the instructions in Ch 6 under work, expression, manifestation, and item.

On the whole, ACOC found this method of grouping the instructions very logical and principles-based.

However, the FRBR concept "expression", and therefore also the concept of roles relating to the expression, continues to be difficult to understand and apply. Cataloguers will need assistance in understanding the definitions for creator and contributor at 6.3.1.0.1 and 6.4.1.0.1, what they imply, and at what level certain activities/roles fit within the FRBR structure.

Eliminating the distinction between creator and collaborator.

ACOC supports the JSC's decision to remove both the distinction between creators and collaborators, and the distinction between different types of collaborators. We consider this an important move towards having more principles-based instructions.

Generalising the instructions on musical works, art works and academic disputations.

ACOC supports the generalisation of instructions wherever possible.

Retaining separate instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications in 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9.

ACOC would prefer it if these instructions could be incorporated into the general instructions, but concede that this can be addressed after RDA's initial release.

Designations of role

ACOC supports the development of a controlled vocabulary for Designation of role.

Creator/originating body as required access point.

ACOC agrees with requiring these access points. Please also see our later comments under the instruction for originating bodies.

Originating body

ACOC accepts “originating body” however, please see our later comments under the instruction for originating bodies.

Examples in Chapter 6

ACOC supports JSC’s decision to keep the examples in the form of an access point.

Chapter 6: Comments on specific instructions

6.0.2 Purpose and scope (Consistency – FRBR)

ACOC would prefer that “locate” was replaced by the FRBR terms “find, identify, select, obtain”. (Given that the elements include access points for distributors and custodians we agree with the use of “associated with” instead of the FRBR “responsible for”.)

Those relationships enable catalogue users to ~~locate~~ find, identify, select or obtain resources associated with a particular person, family, or corporate body.

6.1.1.2 (Clarity)

Delete unnecessary wording:

If the statements appearing on the preferred source of information ~~in the resource being described~~ are ambiguous or insufficient, use the following sources of information:

6.1.2.1 (Clarity)

Give wording in the form of an instruction:

Record ~~the~~ names of persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource ~~are typically recorded~~ using one or more of the following conventions.

6.1.3

ACOC would prefer that *6.1.3 Change in responsibility* were moved to the end of the chapter, after the instructions on access points.

6.2 Designation of role.

As noted in our earlier comments on changes noted in the cover letter, ACOC supports the development of a controlled vocabulary for Designation of role.

6.3.1.1 “Person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating a new work based on a previously existing work”.

Providing it does not conflict with the overall editorial style, it may be helpful to provide a reference to Ch 7 Related Resources from this grouping of examples, otherwise some users may believe that the access point referred to is the only one needed in these cases.

6.3.2 Originating body.

ACOC would prefer that corporate bodies were covered by the general instruction for creators.

Some members of ACOC consider that the general instruction at 6.3.1 should apply as written and that no special guidelines for corporate bodies are needed. Others would prefer that the provisions at 6.3.2 formed part of the 6.3.1 guidance regarding when a corporate body is considered to have created a work.

If JSC decide to keep this as a separate instruction, ACOC would like the principle behind this instruction to be clearly stated.

6.3.3.0.1 (Clarity)

Revise as follows:

A person, family, or corporate body to whom a work has been dubiously or erroneously attributed is one for whom there is, or once was, substantial authority for ~~designating~~ him/her/it their designation as the creator of the work.

6.4.1 Contributor

Some members of ACOC found the term “contributor” to be confusing. One definition of contributor is “one who contributes articles to a newspaper, magazine or other joint literary work”¹. That definition fits better with the RDA definition of “creator”. It was also thought to be confusing that both terms (creator and contributor) are also used in Dublin Core, but defined more broadly.

Other members of ACOC were comfortable with the use of these terms, given that their meaning is defined in RDA, and given the difficulty in finding another more suitable term for contributor.

6.7, 6.8 and 6.9 Instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications.

As noted in our earlier comments on changes noted in the cover letter, ACOC would prefer it if these instructions could be incorporated into the general instructions, but concede that this can be addressed after RDA’s initial release.

Chapter 7 comments on changes noted in the cover letter

Structure of chapter using relationship types

ACOC supports JSC’s decision to use relationship types to structure this chapter, subdivided by the FRBR entity.

Explicit FRBR “primary” relationships.

ACOC tentatively supports JSC’s decision to include a section on FRBR “primary” relationships, as suggested by ALA. Please also see our later comments at 7.3.1.

Conventions used to reference a related resource.

ACOC considers that the revised conventions are more readily understandable, and easier to relate to current practice, than those used in the June 2006 draft. However, please also see our later comments under 7.1.2 and 7.3.

Generalising instructions on music resources, art resources, and legal resources.

ACOC supports the generalisation of instructions wherever possible.

Designations of relationship

ACOC supports the development of a controlled vocabulary for Designation of relationship.

¹ Macquarie Dictionary. 2nd ed.

Shared characteristics

ACOC considers that shared characteristics are implicit in the description and do not constitute a bibliographic relationship.

Required relationships

ACOC agrees that the relationship to a work/expression should be a required access point. It is an essential requirement to meet FRBR user tasks. Requiring this relationship is also essential to address the long standing problem of multiple versions.

Chapter 7: Comments on specific instructions

7.0.2 (Consistency –FRBR)

Should the following sentence be revised to refer to include the FRBR concept?

The elements ~~convey information directing~~ enable catalogue users to navigate to related resources that may be relevant to their needs.

7.0.3 (Consistency).

Give the following sentence in a separate bullet (paralleling the equivalent chapter 6 instruction):

Guidelines and instructions on formulating access points for use in naming a related work, expression, manifestation, or item are covered in chapter 13.

7.0.4

ACOC considers that shared characteristics are implicit in the description and do not constitute a bibliographic relationship. Therefore we do not consider that this instruction is required. However, we are willing to retain it if other constituencies consider that it will assist the cataloguer.

7.1.2 and 7.3

The current conventions for recording relationships under 7.1.2 and 7.3 are very similar and directly parallel one another, i.e.

Providing a resource identifier	Identifiers linking ...
Naming the related resource	Controlled access point naming ...
Describing the related resource	Composite description

It would be preferable if the conventions for recording relationships were the same regardless of whether the relationship being recorded is a primary relationship or one of the types given under 7.4-7.9. Then the conventions could be given once only, and the wording throughout made consistent.

7.1.2

ACOC suggests several revisions to the 7.1.2 instructions. ACOC recognises that, if accepted, the changes suggested below would require changes to subsequent instructions. A complete clean copy of all the suggested revisions follows the individual suggestions.

7.1.2.1 (Clarity)

Revise as follows to give the same level of detail for each convention (further detail can be given in the referenced instruction):

Relationships between resources may be recorded using one or more of the following conventions:

- a) providing a resource identifier for the related resource (see 7.1.3)
- b) naming the related resource ~~in the form prescribed as the controlled access point representing the related work, expression, manifestation, or item (see 7.1.4)~~
- c) describing the related resource (see 7.1.5)

7.1.2.2 (Clarity)

Revise as follows:

Relationships between resources may be recorded reciprocally (i.e., a ~~relationship to a related resource~~ recorded in both the record for the resource being described, ~~may be paralleled by a corresponding relationship to the resource being described~~ recorded and in the record for the related resource).

7.1.2.3

ACOC found this instruction difficult to understand without also referring to the explanation given on p. 7 of the cover letter. At first we drafted a revision which included more information and guidance on when to apply each of the conventions, but found that this was difficult to do without referring to specific types of database (e.g. flat file and relational), and making the resulting instruction long and unwieldy. (Although we abandoned this option, for JSC's information we have included that draft of 7.1.3 at the end of this response to show how this would have looked).

Most cataloguers will not know enough about the functionality of the system(s) used to store, retrieve and display the data they create to make meaningful choices between these conventions. In addition, we felt that this instruction should be revised to be more prescriptive about which of these conventions to use in libraries to facilitate record sharing.

The revised instruction below instructs that, in most circumstances, the related resource should be named *and* a resource identifier provided. The combination of naming the related resource and requiring the use of a resource identifier (where available) will provide sufficient identification and linking in library systems.

Clean copy of all proposed changes to 7.1.2

- 7.1.2 RANGE OF CONVENTIONS USED TO RECORD RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RESOURCES**
- 7.1.2.1 Relationships between resources may be recorded using one or more of the following conventions:
- a) providing a resource identifier for the related resource (see 7.1.3)
 - b) naming the related resource (see 7.1.4)
 - c) describing the related resource (see 7.1.5)
- 7.1.2.2 To facilitate record sharing in library catalogues and databases, apply these conventions as follows:
- a) name the related resource in the form prescribed as the controlled access point

- i) If insufficient information is known about the related resource to name it in a controlled access point, describe the related resource instead.
- ii) If the relationship is complex and/or requires explanation, describe the related resource in addition to naming the related resource.

b) and, provide a resource identifier if available

7.1.2.3 Relationships between resources may be recorded reciprocally (i.e., recorded in both the record for the resource being described, and in the record for the related resource).

7.1.5 Describing related resources

If ACOC's suggestion for the revision of 7.1.2 is accepted, parts of the guidance previously given under this instruction will be covered there. ACOC would also prefer that these instructions referred to descriptions without further specifying structured or unstructured descriptions.

Each of the examples given under this instruction in the draft do not appear to be appropriate, either under the existing instructions, or under ACOC's proposed revision. It is also not clear how resources that are related through having previously been part of the same collection are to be handled in RDA.

Related materials providing visual documentation of racially segregated facilities may be found in the following collections in this repository: Birmingham Project Photographs and Common Bonds Project Photographs
(The related resources appear to have a subject relationship only.)

Harold C. Conklin's map manuscripts, personal papers, and field notes are held at Yale University Library
(The related resources appear to have a subject relationship only; alternatively they may be related by having previously been part of the same collection.)

Motion picture films and sound and video recordings transferred to Library of Congress Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division
(The related resources are related by having previously been part of the same collection.)

Original version: A map of Virginia and Maryland / F. Lamb Sculp. - [London] : Sold by Thomas Basset and Richard Criswell, [1676-?]. - Appears in John Speed's The theatre of the Empire of Great Britain, 1676
(The related resources would be covered by a name and identifier under the revised instructions)

Facsimile of: 2nd ed., rev. - London : Routledge, 1877
(The related resources would be covered by a name and identifier under the revised instructions)

Continues in part: Journal de physique, and replaces the supplement to Journal de physique called: Revue de physique appliquée
(The related resources would be covered by a name and identifier under the revised instructions)

The example retained in the revised instruction below is also doubtful, as the resources are presumably related by having previously been part of the same collection. However, it may well be that the example fits the criteria in 7.1.2.2a.ii and insufficient information is known to name the related resource.

Clean copy of revised 7.1.5

7.1.5.0 General guidelines on describing related resources

7.1.5.0.1 Describe the related resource.

Original letters in the collection of the Watkinson Library, Trinity College, Hartford, CT

7.1.5.0.2 Record a designation of relationship in conjunction with the description of the related resource to indicate the nature of the relationship between the resource described and the referenced resource (see 7.2).

7.1.5.1 (Clarity)

If this instruction is retained, clarification of “the same structure” would be helpful, for example:

Provide a full or partial description of the related resource using the same structure (i.e. the same elements in the same order) that is used for the resource being described.

7.2 Designation of relationship.

As noted in our earlier comments on changes noted in the cover letter, ACOC supports the development of a controlled vocabulary for designation of relationship.

7.3.0.1.1 b) (Clarity)

Delete unnecessary wording:

b) the relationship between an expression of a work and a manifestation that embodies that expression ~~of the work~~

7.3.0.2.2 (Clarity)

Delete unnecessary wording:

Record the relationship between an expression of a work and a manifestation that embodies that expression ~~of the work~~ following the guidelines given under 7.3.2.

7.3.1 Relationship between a work and an expression of a work

ACOC request that the JSC discuss the appropriate placement of this instruction, given that the JSC has said that Part A relates to bibliographic records (records for manifestations).

As part of this, ACOC further suggests that the JSC discuss the relationship between the structure of RDA and bibliographic, authority and holdings records. If we maintain the distinction between the two parts (i.e. Part A=Bibliographic records, Part B=Authority records), are we locking RDA into either “Scenario 2: Linked bibliographic and authority

records” or “Scenario 3: ‘Flat file’ database structure (no links) “as described in 5JSC/Editor/2 RDA Database Implementation Scenarios?”

7.3.2

As noted in our earlier comments on changes noted in the cover letter, ACOC agrees that the relationship to a work/expression should be a required access point. It is an essential requirement to meet FRBR user tasks. Requiring this relationship is also essential to address the issue of multiple versions.

7.4.2.0

ACOC found the scope statement “an equivalent item is a specific item reproduced by the resource being described” difficult to understand on its own. The wording at 7.4.0.1.1 i.e. “between a manifestation and the specific item reproduced by that manifestation” conveys this concept more clearly. We would like the JSC to explore alternatives for wording the scope note.

7.6.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

Revise as follows:

A **descriptive relationship** is a relationship between a work (or expression) ~~that describes another~~ and the work, expression, manifestation, or item ~~and the entity~~ that it describes.

7.6.1.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

Revise as follows:

A **described entity** is a work, expression, manifestation, or item described ~~by the work (or expression) embodied~~ in the resource being described.

7.6.2.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

ACOC found the following definition difficult to read, but is unable to offer a suggestion for improvement:

A **describing work (or expression)** is a work (or expression) that describes the work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described, or that describes the resource itself (i.e., as a manifestation or item).

7.7.0.1.1 (Clarity-definition)

Revise as follows:

A **whole-part relationship** is a relationship between a whole work, expression, manifestation, or item and a part of that work, expression, manifestation, or item.

7.7.1.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

The definition of “A whole work (or expression)” is awkward.

A **whole work (or expression)** is a larger work (or expression) that includes the work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described ~~is part of~~.

Consider also replacing “larger” with “complete or entire”.

7.7.2.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

Having defined “whole work (or expression)” previously, would it be better to use that term in this definition?

A **part of a work (or expression)** is a discrete component of the ~~larger~~ whole work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described.

7.8.1.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

It would be preferable to avoid the use of “augments” in the definition of “Augmenting work”.

An **augmenting work (or expression)** is a work (or expression) that ~~augments~~ adds to the content of the work (or expression) embodied in the resource being described.

7.9.0.1 (Clarity-definition)

It might be preferable to clarify this to further explain precede and succeed, e.g.

A **sequential relationship** is a relationship between a work or expression and another work or expression that precedes or succeeds it (e.g. earlier or later in time; before or after in a narrative).

7.9.1.0 (Clarity-definition)

It may be helpful to add the term “prequel” to the scope of this section, given the popularity of this term in literature, music, films and games.

Please see explanation under 7.1.2.3 above: the instructions given below are *not preferred* but have been included to assist the JSC in evaluating the alternative proposed above.

7.1.3 CHOICE OF CONVENTIONS USED TO RECORD RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RESOURCES

The conventions chosen to record relationships may be influenced by a number of factors:

a) the structure of the database in which the relationship information is stored, and the functionality of the system used to retrieve and display the data.

- i. describing the related resource is preferred if the record is stored in a flat file database structure with no links between records.
- ii. naming the related resource in the form prescribed as the controlled access point may be preferred if the record is stored in a database with linked bibliographic and authority records, especially where those links are actionable in the user interface.
- iii. providing a resource identifier may be preferred if the record is stored in a relational or object oriented database, especially where the information from the linked records is presented to the user when the record is displayed in the user interface.

For example, if a resource identifier can function as an actionable link between records for the related resources, then a resource identifier alone may provide sufficient navigation. If the resource identifier serves simply to reference a related resource, it may be preferable to provide a controlled access point or description of the related resource to assist the user to find and identify the related resource.

b) the presence or absence of a record for the related resource in the same catalogue or database, and/or the ability to link to resources outside the catalogue or database.

For example, a resource identifier may be sufficient to reference a related resource which is represented by a record in the same catalogue or database, whereas a controlled access point or description of the related resource may be needed to assist the user to find and identify the related resource in an external catalogue or database.

c) the availability of information about the related resource.

For example, if the related resource does not have a resource identifier, and insufficient information is known about the related resource to name it in a controlled access point, then a description of the resource would be necessary.

d) the need to highlight specific information about the related resource.

For example, if the relationship is complex or the nature of the <add example>

To facilitate record sharing in library catalogues and databases, use name the related resource in the form prescribed as the controlled access point or describe the resource, and provide a resource identifier if available.