To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Dave Reser, LC Representative

Subject: Compilations of Works: Discussion Paper

LC thanks EURIG for raising several interesting questions related to aggregates. While we do see the need for some improvements in RDA that would make the instructions for compilations clearer, as stated in the LC response to 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/2, we are reluctant to put too much emphasis on IFLA's *Final Report of the Working Group on Aggregates* until we have a better understanding of the disposition of that report *vis a vis* the FR family of standards.

Comments on various aspects of the discussion paper, keyed to the numbering in the EURIG paper, are recorded below.

Compilations of Works: RDA's Approach

1.1.1 "Only the aggregating work is taken into account and identified"

LC response: We do not think this is an accurate description of RDA; while Chapter 6 is used to identify the aggregate work, RDA does call for identifying the component works as whole/part relationships in Chapter 25 (25.1.1.3).

1.1.2 "RDA does not specify the use of any qualifier after Selections, which implies that all distinct compilations of works by the same agent are implicitly regarded as one and the same aggregating work"

LC response: While LC itself has chosen, for now, to document a local policy whereby we do not distinguish different compilations of selections when following the alternative at 6.2.2.10.3, RDA itself does allow this. There is no restriction on using the additions specified at 6.27.1.9 in these cases ("Other distinguishing characteristic of a work" is an element used by some libraries to make these distinctions). Actual LC practice may change in the future, after discussion with our Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) colleagues. Agencies that truly want to distinguish all such compilations uniquely would be advised not to follow the alternative to identify the compilation collectively. We would also like to clarify the statement made about the LC-PCC PS—following the LC practice to identify the compilation collectively *does not* prohibit an agency from also identifying some or all of the works in the compilation individually; in fact, the LC practice in the LC-PCC PS for 25.1 strongly encourages identifying the parts of compilations.

1.3 "Compilers are regarded as related to the Expression"

LC response: As indicated in 6JSC/ACOC/7, RDA covers the two different types of 'compilers'—those that are creators, and those that are contributors. The use of the English term 'compiler' in resources can be misleading, requiring the cataloger to truly understand the context to determine the role.

EURIG's Proposal

LC is reluctant, at this time, to align RDA with IFLA's *Final Report of the Working Group on Aggregates*. We recognize that not all aspects of that report were universally accepted, and we do not have up-to-date knowledge about whether or how that report will impact the published edition of FRBR and the FR family of standards. We will be interested to hear about this topic at the JSC meeting.

1.1.1 "Optional addition" for the aggregated works in a compilation
> **LC response**: We already follow such a policy as indicated in the LC-PCC PS for 25.1. We do not think an "optional addition" is warranted in this instruction, as this should be covered by whole/part relationships in Chapter 25. We think a reference to Chapter 25 would be useful for an agency that would like to address the individual works in the compilation. We thank EURIG for this suggestion.

1.1.2 Identifying the aggregating work is particularly useful in some cases, notably when
> 1) The specific responsibility for the creation of the aggregating Work has to be recorded;
> 2) The aggregating Work has relationships with other works based on it;
> 3) The aggregating Work is the subject of other works.
> **LC response**: For 1), the EURIG group uses "creation" in a context that RDA does not—the creator of a compilation is the creator of the works in the compilation; we agree with 2) and 3)—these were the only cases where we supplied "identifying" information to such compilations under AACR2, and we may develop a similar policy in conjunction with the PCC for RDA. We follow the alternative so that we *can* identify the aggregated work for secondary entries.

1.2 New paragraph added to RDA (6.2.2.11?) for compilations by different agents
> **LC response**: Yes, this was a solution raised by CCC in 6JSC/ACOC/5/CCC response; we agree that this should be pursued and thank EURIG for this suggestion.

1.2.1 Optional addition (works in a compilation)
> **LC response**: We would prefer a reference to Chapter 25 over an optional addition, as these are whole/part relationships.

1.2.2 Optional addition (devising titles)
> **LC response**: We would prefer to see some flexibility for the types of characteristics to include in a devised title, and closer coordination with the Chapter 2 instructions on devised titles (2.3.2.11).

1.2.2 Questions to the JSC
> 1. Do you agree with this approach?
> **LC response**: In general, with notes above.
> 2. Should a controlled vocabulary be used for designating the form of the aggregated works and its subdivision?

LC response: It may be premature to do so in RDA; it is a topic under discussion in the PCC.

2. Variant title for a compilation

LC response: Yes, agree this is already covered by RDA.

3.1 Constructing authorized access points for a compilation of works by one creator.
a) The authorized access point representing the creator of the aggregated Works
b) The preferred title for the aggregating Work
c) The name of the creator of the compilation, if known, enclosed in parenthesis.

LC response: We do not believe that the aggregated work has two creators; the editor of the compilation is a contributor in RDA, not a creator. The name of the editor of the compilation may be used now under RDA 6.6 (Other distinguishing characteristic of the work), and be used as an addition to the access point per RDA 6.27.1.9. Note that it is only one of the possible additions at 6.27.1.9—it may not always be the *best* addition.

3.2 Constructing authorized access points for compilations by different agents

LC response: We do not agree that the compiler is a creator in this case.

4. Status of the compiler

LC response: We do not agree that the compiler is a creator for the aggregated works of other creators. The fact that the relationship of an editor of a compilation is treated as a contributor in RDA does not in any way suggest that the editor of a compilation is not important—many of the types of contributors (e.g., editors, translators) provide intellectual contributions, but we disagree that the contributions rise to the level of "creator". We would be interested in a discussion of whether they might be considered under RDA 19.3 (Other person, family, or corporate body associated with a work), with the relationship designator moved to I.2.2.