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

**From:**   Dave Reser, LC Representative

**Subject:**   Treatment of Subjects in RDA


Thanks to ALA (both CC:DA and SAC) for the considerations offered in this proposal. We agree with the general direction, recognizing the early nature of the discussion paper, and offer specific comments on each of the basic recommendations below.


**Recommendations**


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

*LC response*: Agree.


**2.  Choice of model**

*LC response*: Agree with the suggestion to adopt the FRSAD approach with a single subject entity, incorporating FRBR Group 1 and Group 2, recognizing that it doesn't follow FRSAD exactly (which can be explained in Chapter 0). Agree with the suggestion that RDA should put as few constraints as possible on the ability of subject systems to define their own structure and content.


**3. Terminology**

*LC response*: Agree.


**4. User tasks**

*LC response*: Generally agree, interested in seeing how the FR model reconciliation plays out.


**5. Entities**

*LC response*: Agree.


**6.  The primary Subject relationship**

*LC response*: Agree that it is difficult to see a use case that associates the subject relationship with an entity other than work.  The case cited (change in subject scope between editions) does not seem compelling to us in light of RDA 6.27.1.5 (substantial changes to nature and content of a work results in a new work).

### 7. Subject vs. genre/form

*LC response:* We note that the IFLA Classification & Indexing section is pursuing activities related to genre/form and would prefer to see how this develops (we see no urgent need at this point). We note that "Form of work" and "Target Audience" (two other "is-ness" attributes mentioned in FRSAD as 'out of scope') are already represented in RDA; and that 0.12 allows external vocabularies to be used for elements such as "Form of work".

### 8. Subject chapters in RDA

*LC response*: Generally agree. We would be interested in the opinions of others on whether unused chapters (e.g., 14-15) should be left as unused in such a model, or re-numbered (we prefer not to re-number other chapters). It may be too early to tell, exactly, pending further development of the design.

### 9. Events

*LC response*: Agree.

### 10. Places

*LC response*: Find the suggestion interesting, but too early to declare a preferred approach (noting other development work related to places in other proposals and discussion papers).

### 11. Attributes of the subject entity

*LC response*: Would like to see more discussion of the concept of "attribute of attribute" introduced here, and whether some of the attributes of "Name of subject" are in fact attributes of "Subject".

**Type of subject**: can see the possible advantages for mapping to other schemes.

**Scope note**: agree.

**Name of subject**: agree that typical 'preferred' and 'variant' construct used for other RDA entities seems reasonable.

**Type of name of subject**: would be interested to see whether "identifier" could be separated as an attribute of subject (i.e., we're not sure we see the need for different identifiers for both preferred and variant name of subjects). The "controlled name" aspect may be better reflected in a typical "constructing an authorized access point for a subject" instruction rather than an attribute itself.

**Scheme:** would be interested to see if this could be an attribute of the "Subject" entity

**Source consulted**: would be interested to see if this could be an attribute of the "Subject" entity in Chapter 12 (similar to 8.12 and elsewhere in RDA).

**Representation of name**: agree that it may not be necessary in RDA, but do wonder if some distinction may need to be made between subject systems that use "terms" as preferred names vs. other notations (e.g., classification numbers).

**Language of name**: Agree probably not necessary in RDA.

**Script of name**: Agree probably not necessary in RDA.

**Script conversion**: Agree probably not necessary in RDA.

**Form of name**: Agree probably not necessary in RDA.

**Time validity of name:** RDA does have an element in Chapter 8 (8.9 Date of usage) that seems to be similar to the FRSAD intent; we can see a possible use.

**Audience**: Agree that this is distinct from RDA 7.7, and may not be applicable in the RDA context.

**Status of identification:** RDA does have an element in Chapter 8 (8.10 Status of identification) that seems to be similar to the FRSAD intent; we can see a possible use.

We think it is premature to declare which attributes should be considered core in RDA.

## 12. Access points

*LC response*: Agree that it may depend on the particular subject system (or systems) adopted by an agency. Since authorized or variant access points would not be a requirement in RDA, we don't see a particular reason to avoid them for subjects, in RDA, but are interested in seeing how this develops.

## 13. Relationships

*LC response*: Agree that **thema** to **thema** relationships could be handled in a very general way in RDA Chapter 33.