

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** Discussion paper: Hidden relationships in attributes (examples: RDA 9.4.1.4.2, 9.13, 10.6, 11.3, 16.2.2)

ALA thanks DNB for their analysis of hidden relationships in RDA.

We note that RDA follows the FRAD model for relationships modelled as attributes or parts of attributes in RDA 9.13, 10.6 and 11.3 (section 2.1 of the DNB paper), and 9.4.1.4.2, and 16.2.2 (section 2.2 of the DNB paper). These were defined as attributes and not relationships, although the FRAD *Final Report* states the model could be extended to treat such associations as relationships between defined entities.

Additionally, within the current structure of RDA, attributes recorded in Chapters 9, 10, 11, and 16 may be identified as “core” or “core if”. However, no instructions in Chapters 30–32 are core. If the JSC agrees to pursue this work, the status of core instructions in these relationship chapters needs to be revisited.

Although we support further exploration of these issues, we suggest waiting until the FRBR Review Group completes its work on consolidating the FR models before spending considerable effort on revising RDA in this regard. We believe that these changes should be made in the FR model before they are made in RDA, in order to maintain compatibility.

***Response to questions:***

- a) Does the JSC agree that the examples mention in 2.1 and 2.2 are cases of “hidden” relationships?

ALA response: Yes.

- b) Does the JSC agree that it would also be possible to model these and similar cases by making use of relationship element and relationship designators?

ALA response: Yes.

- c) Does the JSC agree that modelling these and similar cases as relationships might have a number of advantages?

ALA response: Yes; we find this compatible with our understanding of linked data. However, we believe it would be difficult to implement in MARC. We would also support developing the model further, to record particular attributes associated with a relationship, such as dates of affiliation.

d) Should this question be explored in more depth?

ALA response: Yes, although as noted above, it may be prudent to wait for the FR model consolidation.