

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Ebe Kartus, ACOC Representative
Subject: Subject Relationship Element in RDA Chapter 23

ACOC thanks ALA for this proposal to add a high-level subject relationship element. ACOC is supportive of efforts to incorporate subject into RDA.

Recommendation 1: The Subject relationship entity

ACOC supports this recommendation. However, we suggest that “concept”, “object”, “event”, and “place” be referenced in the chapter scope given that they are FRBR entities.

Recommendation 2: Name of the relationship element

ACOC supports this recommendation. However, we do not consider it necessary to use “subject of work” in some instructions instead of “subject”.

Recommendation 3: Definition

ACOC supports the proposed definition.

Recommendation 4: Core requirement

- a) Should Subject remain a core element in RDA?

ACOC supports retaining subject as a core element. However, we suggest that the proposed 23.3 could be simplified for clarity.

- b) Should “at least one subject relationship element” be required?

ACOC supports this recommendation.

- c) When a work has multiple subjects, what should be required?

ACOC does not support giving guidance on the requirements for works with multiple subjects. We believe that the treatment of multiple subjects will vary depending on the particular subject system being used. We therefore suggest that the sentences in parentheses in the proposed 23.3 be omitted.

- d) When recording a subject relationship element, should the authorised access point be required?

ACOC supports this recommendation. However, we suggest that the inclusion of more complex examples in 23.4.1.3 would be desirable.

- e) Must terms, codes, identifiers, etc. be recorded following the specifications of some authoritative subject system?

ACOC supports this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: Techniques for recording the subject relationship element

ACOC supports this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: Additional elements in Chapter 23

ACOC supports this recommendation.

Recommendation 7: Relationship designators

ACOC generally supports this recommendation. However we believe that the inverses of these relationships should be included for consistency and against future use case scenarios.

Recommendation 8: Genre/form

ACOC agrees with this recommendation.