

**TO:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**FROM:** Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC  
**SUBJECT:** Subject Relationship Element in RDA Chapter 23

---

The British Library thanks ALA for this proposal.

**Recommendation 1: The Subject Relationship Entity**

We support the proposal to define the subject relationship in Chapter 23

**Recommendation 2: Name of the Relationship Entity**

We agree with the recommendation to name the new entity, Subject.

**Recommendation 3: Definition**

We agree with the definition

**Recommendation 4: Core Requirement**

*a) Should subject remain a core requirement in RDA?*

We agree that Subject should be a core requirement, but this should not override the provisions of the subject system being applied.

*b) Should "at least one subject relationship element" be required?*

We agree with the proposed modification. We note however, that the core is always the floor not the ceiling.

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

RDA should offer only general guidance about the nature of the relationship between a Work and the Subject or Subjects.

*d) When recording a subject relationship element, should an authorized access point be required?*

Definitely not.

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

We agree that the use of authoritative schemes should be encouraged, but we think “identifiable” is a less subjective and more readily verifiable criterion than “authoritative”. Identifiable is used in 0.12 in relation to vocabulary encoding schemes.

**Recommendation 5: Techniques for recording the subject relationship element**

We agree that instructions on appropriate techniques for recoding subject relationship elements will be required. Action will also be required on notes related to subject of the resource.