

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Referential relationships: RDA Chapter 24-28 and Appendix

CCC thanks the American Library Association for this proposal. CCC does not support the changes in this proposal.

There are fundamental problems with the analysis of rare material standard citations as relationships between the manifestation being described and another work/expression/manifestation/item. Such a citation does not express a real relationship between a manifestation and a manifestation (or expression) of the reference source. These citations are notes containing a pointer to the metadata created to some other descriptive standard, not necessarily RDA. This proposal is attempting to create a linkage between the metadata of the bibliographic description we are working on, to another source of metadata, the description in a reference source. We cannot ascribe equal status to the external metadata while remaining within the FRBR model. Linkages between metadata created according to different descriptive standards are outside the scope of RDA. CCC certainly sympathizes with the desire to create linkages between metadata descriptions of the same entity, e.g., between an RDA description of a manifestation in a catalogue, and a DC description in a repository; between an RDA description created using the English version of RDA and an RDA description created using French RDA both describing the same resource; between an RDA description and some previous (generally authoritative) source of metadata (the specialized book catalogues of rare materials, ESTC, Canadiana, NUC, etc.). The proposal is trying to explain that both sets of metadata refer to the same resource (manifestation), as a way of appealing to an external system for objective identification.

The proposed function is one of relating metadata to metadata. This is not an FRBR function. We agree that this is a useful function, but it is not appropriate to artificially fit it into RDA. FRBR has never had cross-WEMI relationships other than the primary ones. It is difficult to see how these entities can have such relationships and no justification was given.

The definition of a new element for Location within a larger resource is problematic for this intended use: the citing resource does not actually contain the resource being described, only alternate metadata describing it. Location is not relevant for any of the other relationships because they are defined at the same level. The definition proposed in 24.7.1.1 does not clarify that this applies only to rare materials citations. It uses the general term component. Any cataloguer coming to this without a rare books background will be likely to inappropriately apply this elsewhere, such as to poems in anthologies, translations issued in omnibus volumes, etc.