To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Dave Reser, LC Representative

Subject: Additional instructions in Chapter 27 for Structured Descriptions of the
"Contained in" and "Container of" Relationships

In our discussion of this proposal, we noted that this proposal overlaps with issues raised in 6JSC/TechnicalWG/6 and 6JSC/ALA/45. We feel that the issues raised by 6JSC/TechnicalWG/6 should be addressed by the JSC before consideration of this specific proposal because 6JSC/TechnicalWG/6 discusses an overarching approach to relationships.

Although the subject line of 6JSC/ALA/41 implies that it is limited to a specific relationship within Chapter 27, this proposal provides broad revisions to Chapters 24-28. ALA presents several bullets under the title "Instructions for Contents Notes" that seem be conclusions/recommendations beyond that specific area so we have responded to them in what we think is the overall context of the statements. We have provided numbering to the unnumbered bullets to assist with commenting (the numbers correspond to the position of the bullet in ALA's proposal, e.g., Conclusion 1 below corresponds to ALA's first bullet about the "contained in/container of" relationship, and Conclusion 7 refers to ALA's seventh overall bullet, which is the first one in the section called "General Instructions on Recording Relationships").

Conclusion 1:

We disagree with ALA's conclusion that the "contained in/container of" relationships are "most effectively conveyed as related manifestations." We believe this example, combining authorized access points with relationship designators, effectively characterizes the relationship between the aggregate work and the individual works:

Container of: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. The fellowship of the ring

Container of: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. The two towers

Container of: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. The return of the king

Work described: Tolkien, J. R. R. (John Ronald Reuel), 1892-1973. Lord of the rings

We certainly believe that this same relationship is also useful at the manifestation level using the structured description technique. However, we disagree with ALA's suggestion to add very specific instructions to 27.1.1.3 (see Change 4 of the proposal) to record such a relationship. We feel such instructions would be appropriate for an agency's policy statements or an application profile but not an international standard like RDA. Additionally, we think this relationship is no more or less important than any other

relationship in Appendix J so we see no reason to provide such explicit instructions for one relationship, which may lead RDA users to erroneously conclude that the whole-part relationship type is more important than the sequential relationship type.

Conclusion 2:

The reciprocal relationship "contained in" is already accommodated by Chapter 27, and there are 2 examples of this relationship in the 2nd examples box of 27.1.1.3. As we said in Conclusion 1, we see no need to single out this relationship for additional instructions.

Conclusion 3:

ALA says they recommend a "significant change from the practices that seem to inform the current examples in Chapter 24-28." We interpreted this to mean that ALA believes that a structured description of the related expression should be constructed ONLY using expression elements from chapters 6-7. In 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3/LC response, we suggested that ALA consider these issues:

> 1) Consider whether wording should be added to explain that structured descriptions are not really used to describe another work or expression, they in fact are used to provide a structured description of a manifestation that *embodies* the related work or expression. In other words, the examples in RDA show the related work, as manifested in a particular resource, and the user could then obtain the manifestation that contains the work/expression they are interested in. This approach would borrow some wording from Chapter 17 primary relationship concept "…the relationship between a work and a manifestation that embodies that work."

> 2) It seems unlikely to us that limiting structured descriptions at a work (or expression) level to only work (or expression) attributes would be very useful to the user. If there is a desire to use structured descriptions in such a limited way, then perhaps the technique of using structured descriptions for works and expressions should not even be offered as a possibility in RDA—rely only on the identifier, authorized access point, or unstructured description technique at those entity levels. Our preference is for the approach in 1) above.

According to the minutes of the 2013 JSC meeting (see 6JSC/M/446.5 and 6JSC/446.7) the JSC was agreeable to LC's suggestion 1) above and ALA was to form a task force to develop a proposal based on that approach. However, that is not the approach that has been adopted in this proposal for 25.1.1.3.3 and 26.1.1.1.3. So we assume that ALA abandoned that approach. If so, the structured description for work, expression, and item will be of limited usefulness. These are three examples of what structured descriptions would look like for each of those entities:

> Work (if limited only to the attributes of the work entity)
> *Sequel:* Scarlett — 1991 — Library of Congress control number: no3000000000
> Resource described: Gone with the wind. Structured description of the related work using preferred title, date of work, and identifier

Expression (if limited only to the attributes of the expression entity)
Abridged as: 2000 — Concise — English
Resource described: 1996 — English. Structured description using date of expression, other distinguishing characteristic of the expression, and language of expression

Item (if limited only to the attributes of the item entity)
Bound with: Library of Congress barcode number 00012307962 — Library of Congress copy signed by Senator Kate James
Resource described: Library of Congress barcode number 00012307962 – Library of Congress copy cropped with slight loss of text

We believe that the above changes are what ALA means in their comment that the examples need to be reviewed and updated by the Examples Editor because they do not follow the instructions.

Conclusion 4: LC believes that RDA should not require specific elements to be part of a structured description for a manifestation. Highly specific requirements could make it difficult for international adoptees of RDA that have varying practices for recording these entities.

Conclusion 5: LC agrees with ALA that recording work or expression elements in description of a related manifestation might be helpful, i.e., not limiting the description to manifestation elements. We do not agree that this should practice should be limited to "contents notes" for manifestations or to only one entity in Chapters 25-28. Structured descriptions for work, expression, and item providing elements from other WEMI entities is essential to make this data meaningful to users.

Conclusion 6: LC agrees with ALA that the "contents note" is a description of a relationship. However, we feel this is adequately covered by RDA and further instructions on this one relationship should be left to agency decisions.

Conclusion 7: We believe that decisions made about 6JSC/TechnicalWG/6 will inform whether the separately numbered "structured" and unstructured" instructions in Chapters 24-28 should be developed. In the current mark-up provided by ALA, they seem to create new instructions needlessly.

Conclusion 8: We can agree to ALA's suggestion to delete instructions in 24.4.3 about "present the data in the order specified by a recognized display standard." We do not feel strongly about retaining or deleting them.

Conclusion 9: We do not agree with ALA's proposed revision to repeat instructions in chapters 25-28 that is essentially the same as what is in chapter 24. This seems to increase the length of instructions without benefit to the Toolkit user. For examples, the instructions proposed for recording identifiers in chapters 25-28 are essentially the same as those in 24.4, which is referred to in 25.1.1.3, etc. If ALA's intention is to repeat the instructions for each entity, then there seems to be no purpose to retaining chapter 24 in ALA's proposal.

We ask the JSC to consider whether it still agrees with the same approach to these chapters presented in 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3/LC response to explore structured relationships as a type of composite description (17.4.2.3). If so, this proposal should not be approved.