

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Illustrative content and other augmentations: Discussion paper

LC thanks EURIG for raising questions regarding illustrative content and other augmentations. As stated in the LC response to 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/3, 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.

1. Illustrative content: RDA's approach

LC response: We agree that RDA allows the cataloger to decide whether they are dealing with a compilation of works (e.g., a textual work and an illustrative work), or whether the illustrations are providing contributions to an expression. RDA supports artists as creators (Chapter 19) and as contributors (Chapter 20) based on these decisions. When both works are treated as a compilation, RDA does allow for relating the two works using Chapter 25, and also provides for recording relationship designators to link the works (e.g., J.2.5 "complemented by").

2. Drawbacks of Current RDA's Provisions

LC response: The EURIG discussion indicates that RDA does not seem to have provisions for resources embodying more than one expression of the same work. We note that this happens quite frequently, and is covered by RDA Chapter 26 (we have policy statements at both 6.27.3 and 26.1 to instruct catalogers to bring out these relationships in their cataloging).

3. Proposals

LC response: We are not convinced by EURIG's argument that the augmentative illustrations are relevant to the manifestation level. We don't necessarily agree that the choice of illustrative content is any more a 'publication' phenomena than other 'contributor' enhancements (the work of editors, translators, etc.). As EURIG notes, the FRBR Aggregates report correctly indicates that not all augmentations warrant distinct bibliographic identification—in our own practice, this is reflected by the "practical" trumping the "theoretical," with the cataloger left to judge which approach should be followed. We would encourage EURIG to consider, as LC does, that some augmentations are more practically added as "details on" information, rather than developing separate "expression" entities in all cases.

We do note that RDA could use some work to make some of this information clearer; for example, a critical instruction for this concept 6.27.1.6 (Commentary, Annotations, Illustrative Content, Etc., Added to a Previously Existing Work) could use some

development—we have added a policy statement at this instruction to make clear that even the cases covered by that instruction may still in fact be treated as compilations of different works.

4. Consequences on RDA's organization

LC response: We will be interested in the discussion at the JSC meeting on the suggestions to move some attributes from Chapter 7 to Chapter 3, but our initial reaction is that this is not necessary.