TO: Verena Schaffner, Chair EURIG

FROM: Barbara Tillett, Chair JSC

SUBJECT: Illustrative content and other augmentations: Discussion Paper. JSC Response

---

Dear Verena,

The JSC thanks EURIG for submitting this paper. The JSC discussed the paper at its meeting in Washington, on 6th November. Our response addresses each of the detailed proposals below, but the JSC is concerned not to put too much emphasis on IFLA's *Final Report of the Working Group on Aggregates* until we have a better understanding of how the recommendations of that report will be incorporated into the consolidated FR model.

1. Illustrative Content: RDA's Approach

The JSC believes that RDA correctly deals with illustrative content at the expression level, irrespective of whether the expression is part of an aggregate or not. However, we would certainly support further exploration of the concept of "Publication Expression" as declared in the FRBRoo model.

2. Drawbacks of Current RDA Provisions

The JSC notes that RDA makes provision for resources embodying more than one expression of the same work. This is covered by Chapter 26. The Library of Congress/PCC Policy Statements at 6.27.3 and 26.1 provide additional guidance for cataloguers, and we would be interested in EURIG's view on whether incorporating these, *mutatis mutandis,* into the instructions would improve the clarity of RDA.

In its response, Library of Congress also cited 6.27.1.6 (Commentary, Annotations, Illustrative Content, Etc. Added to a Previously Existing Work) as instructions which would benefit from further development.

Proposals

3.1 Liberate illustrations and other secondary content

RDA enables secondary content to be described in its own right and related to the primary content. However, the FRBR Review Group several years ago amended FRBR (as the FRBR Working Group on Aggregates report points out) to remind us that not all augmentations warrant distinct bibliographic identification. RDA, likewise, enables secondary content to be described in association with attributes of the primary content when warranted. Library of Congress'

response draws attention to the use of "details on…" to record such information, rather than creating a separate description.

3.2 Combine "primary" contents with "secondary" at the manifestation

RDA supports different methods by which relationships can be expressed, including structured and unstructured notes as well as authorized access points and identifiers. The JSC acknowledges (as noted above) that the chapters on these relationships should offer more explicit guidance, in addition to the examples.

Section 4

RDA 7.15 Illustrative content

The JSC does not believe it is desirable to move Illustrative content to Chapter 3. Chapter 3 is about the carrier, whereas even secondary expressions are part of the content of the resource. Illustrative content could be related to the manifestation following Chapters 24-28.

The JSC notes that the recommendation in 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/1 (Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA) to define a new element, Extent of Expression, was accepted by the JSC. This discussion paper emphasizes the significance of the clear separation of content and carrier, to provide greater clarity of description and to enable machine actionability, including collocation and disambiguation.

Move information relating to illustrators [etc.] from Chapter 20 to Chapter 21

In all cases, an illustrator is responsible for his or her own work. The determination about whether the role is that of a creator or a contributor depends on the relationship of the graphic content to the work. RDA rightly supports both approaches.