To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: High-level subject relationship in RDA

CCC discussed both 6JSC/TechnicalWG/3 and 6JSC/ALA/31 at its meeting September 19, 2014. CCC agrees with the recommendations in the working group's paper and offers some additional comments as follows. Even though the theoretical foundation might shift in the future with the consolidation of the FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD models, we agree with getting started on developing the subject chapters in RDA.

Recommendation 1 – Add a primary relationship element "Subject"
CCC agrees with adding a relationship element labelled "Subject" with the domain Work. This is fully consistent with FRBR/FRAD/FRSAD.

Recommendation 2 – Bring existing descriptive, i.e. subject, relationships into line with FRSAD
CCC agrees with this change which illustrates that works have subjects, in conformation with the FRBR/FRAD/FRSAD models. While looking at Table 4, CCC questioned whether the adjectives "describing" and "described" improved or hindered understanding. We would support the "description of" and "described in" definitions without the adjectives "describing" and "described."

Recommendation 3 – Add reference to published citation
CCC agrees with these changes even though we do not see this as a subject relationship. We agree with using distinctive terminology to emphasize the difference between descriptive relationships and "published descriptions."
Keeping in mind that we are linking surrogates for the works, not the works themselves, this recommendation touches on issues on another level. It could be said that this recommendation proposes a relationship between two surrogates for the same work, the published description or citation, and the bibliographic description. So far, relationships in RDA have stayed within the model. There is a general need to accommodate the possibility of establishing relationships between RDA descriptions of entities and descriptions of the same entity created according to other descriptive standards (Turabian, Strunk and White, CMOS, DC, Schema.org/Book, etc.), i.e., outside of the RDA data model. This is akin to the equivalence relationships in the MARC 21 Authority format 7XX fields. Similarly, there is a need for establishing relationships between descriptions created according to the English version of RDA, and those created according to other language versions of RDA.

Recommendation 4 – Develop a set of designators
CCC agrees with the development of a set of designators as shown in Table 6.

Recommendation 5 – Do not specify a range for new subject relationship designators
CCC agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 6
Not applicable. CCC agrees with recommendation number 2.