

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:** Bill Leonard, CCC representative

**Subject: Treatment of Subjects in RDA**

During its meeting on September 20, 2013, CCC gave consideration to 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/2 and 6JSC/Chair/8 as they present different options for the accommodation of instructions for subjects and classification in RDA. CCC is providing responses to the recommendations in this discussion paper for future reference. While some members of CCC have a preference for the approach offered in 6JSC/Chair/8 as a whole, there was consensus that we wait for the report on FRBR consolidation before making changes to RDA sections 7 and 10. The “Report from the FRBR Review Group mid-year meeting” in the June 2012 *SCAT newsletter* provides background to this response.

<http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/scatn/scat-news-37.pdf>

### **1. General approach to subjects in RDA:**

Our understanding is that it was never intended for RDA to integrate specific subject systems. That cannot and should not happen. These chapters should contain general guidelines and principles regarding subject systems and the process of subject analysis. We are reminded that FRBR includes a subject relationship making it incumbent upon RDA to provide similar accommodation in order to remain aligned with FRBR.

### **2. Choice of model:**

CCC agrees that it is logical to align with the FRSAD model since RDA is already aligned with FRBR and FRAD. We note, however, that the upcoming FRBR consolidation could result in viewing the FRBR group 3 entities as an example of a specific implementation. CCC urges JSC not to pursue any changes until the consolidated model has been issued and approved.

### **3. Terminology:**

CCC notes that the Greek term *thema* and the Latin term *nomen* were chosen by the IFLA working group after long and careful consideration. The working group chose these terms over “subject” and “name of subject” deliberately. *Thema* was intentionally defined more broadly than the word subject to allow for future consolidation allowing for both about-ness and of-ness. These terms are similar to the FRBR Group 1 names work, expression, manifestation and item, in that they were never intended for display to the public.

### **4. User tasks: add user tasks to RDA 0.0**

#### **User tasks: extend “explore” to FRBR groups 1 and 2**

CCC notes that the five user tasks, find, identify, select, obtain, and explore were included in the draft consolidation report of the FRBR Review Group. CCC agrees with documenting the FRSAD user tasks in RDA 0.0. Any entity can be a *thema* so FRBR groups 1 and 2 are automatically included.

### **5. Entities:**

CCC does not agree with the recommendation to have only one subject entity. CCC prefers the structure presented in 6JSC/CHAIR/8. CCC sees *nomen* and *thema* as separate entities. While it might be convenient to treat one as an attribute of the other, the abstract model treats them separately.

**6. The primary Subject relationship:**

CCC agrees with the assertion that the primary subject relationship is between the work and *thema* entities.

**7. Subject vs. genre/form:**

Following the original FRBR model, genre and form have already been included in RDA as the Form of Work, Media Type and Carrier Type. CCC does not agree with the suggestion that JSC contact the FRBR Review Group about genre and form.

**8. Subject chapters in RDA:**

**9. Events:**

**10. Places:**

As stated previously, CCC prefers the model presented in 6JSC/Chair/8.

**11. Attributes of the Subject entity:**

CCC does not agree with treating nomen as an attribute, or with defining attributes of attributes. We are reminded that nomen is defined as a superclass of the FRAD entities name, identifier and controlled access point.

**12. Access points:**

This section has overlooked that classification schemes are legitimate means of providing subject access.

**13. Relationships:**

CCC prefers mentioning in RDA the possibility that some subject or classification systems may employ some or all these relationships. The relationships should be described only in a high-level way.