

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative
Subject: Chapters 12-16, 23, 33-37 (Group 3 entities and “subject”)

General comments

ACOC thanks LC for providing this discussion paper on adding content to the Placeholder chapters in RDA. We appreciate LC’s willingness to begin what we expect will be a lengthy process to incorporate this additional content.

We have some concerns about starting this work before the FRBR Review Group has been able to progress the integration of FRSAR into the FRBR/FRAD model. Nevertheless we hope that by beginning these discussions within the JSC now we might be able to contribute to that process. Our comments are given in that context and in the hope that we can minimise any divergence from FRSAR.

We share LC’s assumption that the instructions will provide basic guidance and refer out to more specialised manuals, thesauri and subject heading lists.

Suggested Process for Adding Content to RDA

a. Add definitions for these additional entities (Concept, Object, and Event) following FRBR

ACOC agrees to add definitions for Concept, Object, and Event to RDA.

b. Add Attributes and Relationships at a general level for each of the new entities

ACOC agrees to add definitions for Attributes and Relationships at a general level for each of the new entities to RDA. However we note that the types of attributes in FRSAD are not aligned with the types of attributes normally covered by RDA. Instead they are mostly data about data rather than data about the entity.

c. Add “Constructing Authorized Access Points” for manifestations and items, but leave access points for concepts to subject systems.

ACOC affirms that constructing access points for each of the entities in FRBR/FRAD Group 1 (Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item) and Group 2 (Person, Family, Corporate Body) should be covered in RDA. At present only manifestations and items lack guidelines for constructing access points and we agree that such instructions should be added. It may be that changes are

required to Sections 1 and 2 to make it clearer that the guidelines for constructing access points for the Group 1 and Group 2 entities can be used for subject access.

For items, recognize manuscripts as objects (as opposed to the works contained in the manuscripts) that need to be named as the subject of other works.

ACOC is uncertain what is being proposed.

d. Follow the instructions now given for the attributes and construction of access points for conferences, etc., and move them to events; remove the instructions treating conferences, etc. as corporate bodies.

ACOC considers that the proceedings of a conference should be considered to have been written by the conference as a collective entity. Therefore treatment of conference within RDA needs to allow for them to be both the creators and the subject of works. Within the current FRBR/FRAD model and also within the structure of RDA we expect that these may need to be treated both within Chapter 10 as Corporate bodies and within Chapter 15 as Events.

As well as seeking further discussion of this issue with the FRBR Review Group we would welcome input to this discussion from the international cataloguing community more generally, as we understand that there are differing practices with regard to conferences and corporate bodies.

e. Continue discussions about Items/Objects and Events/Expressions and Subjects of expressions to see if there is consensus on a direction for those to share with the FRBR Review Group.

ACOC agrees that the issue of items as objects needs to be examined in conjunction with the FRBR Review Group and would be pleased if the JSC was able to make a proposal to that group.

ACOC is unsure what is being proposed with regard to *Events/Expressions* or *Subjects of expressions*. However, please also see our response to #1 below.

f. LC will provide completed chapters following the model shown here for Related concepts.

Noted.

#1. Do we wish to declare for RDA that subjects exist only at the work level or may we allow subjects of expressions?

ACOC considers that works have subjects and that this attribute is inherited by the expressions and manifestations that derive from that work.

ACOC would appreciate further clarification of LC's questions.

#2. Should object be expanded to include item and perhaps not require the work/expression/manifestation entities in inherent relationships to such objects/items?

ACOC believes that the issue of items as objects needs to be addressed in conjunction with the FRBR Review Group.

Clearly the bibliographic 'item' is a subclass of the 'object' entity. However, within the bibliographic universe, it does not seem unreasonable to give bibliographic items special treatment. One of the reasons for such special treatment would be the ability to show their relationship with the other Group 1 entities.

#3. Should we consider events as expressions, if we already consider performances as expressions?

ACOC would like clarification of this idea as the connection between performances as expressions and events as expressions is not obvious to us. We would not like to proceed with this suggestion unless the rationale for it is clear and JSC has reached agreement.

#4. Do we want to include time as an entity?

ACOC understands that time can be conceived of either as an entity in its own right, or as an attribute of the other entities. ACOC would appreciate discussion of these possibilities and of the pros and cons of each option.

Impact of Adding Subject Relationships to RDA

#5. There will be an impact on chapters 18/19-22, 24/25, 29, and Appendices I, J, and K that will need reworking to provide for subject relationships (and/or add another appendix for subject relationship designators) and possibly their instructions on "Source."

ACOC agrees.

#6. Source will also need to be examined for chapters 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, and 11 for the Group 1 and Group 2 entities when used as subjects.

ACOC agrees. A number of changes may be required to Sections 1 and 2 to make it clearer that the guidelines for the Group 1 and Group 2 entities are also relevant for subject access.

#7. RDA as a general instruction set may just suggest following its own guidance on those entities regardless of their use or relationships, or may wish to allow use of thesauri/subject heading lists/classification schemes/etc. when such entities are used as subjects of works.

Given that it is common practice to use separate guidance at present, RDA needs to at least make provision for the continued use of such guidance.

#8. There needs to be a re-examination of “core-ness” with regard to all of the entities when they are in the “role” of the subject of a work.

ACOC agrees.

#9. We also will need to add examples for explanatory references in Appendix E (E.1.3.4).

ACOC agrees.

#10. We need to return to “Constructing access points” for manifestations and items, so that they may be used as subjects.

Please see our comments under 'c' above. ACOC welcomes discussion of this issue.

#11. We should consider adding Time, as that is often controlled in library environments (for example \$y Chronological subdivisions in the 6XX (subject) fields of the MARC 21 format, as used in Library of Congress Subject headings (LCSH)).

See our comments under #4 above.

#12. We need to review the impact of work needed for appendix K --mentioned under Related Concept below.

Noted.

#13. We need to add information to appendix J descriptive relationships that can also be considered subject relationships and add content or a placeholder in appendix K for relationships between concept and concept.

Noted.

#14. We need to add general information about the subject relationship between Group 2 entities and works in chapter 18 and perhaps in ch. 19-22.

Noted.

#15. We need to write general instructions for chapter 23 (General Guidelines on Recording the Subject of a Work).

Noted.

II. Possible Content for the “Identifying” Chapters

A. Concept (RDA Chapter 13)

ACOC agrees in principle with the inclusion of Scope, Attributes (term, variant term, and identifier), and relationships. We would like to discuss the exclusion of choice and form of access points.

B. Object (RDA Chapter 14)

ACOC agrees in principle with the inclusion of Scope, Attributes (term, variant term, and identifier), relationships, and choice and form of access points.

As noted under #2 and ‘e’ above, ACOC agrees that the issue of items as objects needs to be examined in conjunction with the FRBR Review Group and would be pleased if the JSC was able to make a proposal to that group. Clearly the bibliographic ‘item’ is a subclass of the ‘object’ entity. However, within the bibliographic universe, it does not seem unreasonable to give bibliographic items special treatment.

Consultation with the museum community may be useful.

C Event (RDA Chapter 15)

ACOC agrees in principle with the inclusion of Scope, Attributes (term, variant term, and identifier), relationships, and choice and form of access points. We suggest that consultation with the galleries and museums sector may be useful when developing instructions for the naming of events.

D. Place (RDA Chapter 16)

ACOC agrees in principle with the inclusion of Scope, Attributes (term, variant term, and identifier), relationships, and choice and form of access points.

E. Time

As noted under #4 above, ACOC understands that time can be conceived of either as an entity in its own right, or as an attribute of the other entities. ACOC would appreciate discussion of these possibilities and of the pros and cons of each option in the context of the bibliographic universe.