

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

SUBJECT: Compilations of Works. British Library Response

British Library thanks EURIG for this discussion, which raises a number of questions and highlights the need for further clarification of this complex area. We think it would be premature to align RDA with the Final Report of the Working Group on Aggregates before FRBR has been revised.

1 1. Preferred title for a compilation

We would expect the aggregating work to be identified by a conventional collective title, if applicable. We think that the attributes added to the title should be limited to those necessary to identify the aggregating work. Other attributes can be recorded as elements or relationships of the aggregated work.

We are in favour of the use of controlled vocabularies for form and genre, although we do not think this should be mandatory.

What is the use case for recording the number of works? We can see that this could have value as an attribute of the Aggregate Work, but we do not think it should be recorded as part of the title.

We are in favour of more flexibility for agencies in determining how many (or how few) contained works are described.

RDA offers several ways in which relationships can be used to express the content of aggregate works.

2 Variant title for a compilation

Agreed. Already in RDA.

3 Construction of the preferred access point

We think that collocation is better served by assigning responsibly to the creator of the content.

4 Status of the compiler

RDA makes a distinction between Compilers (who are creators) and Editors of Compilation (who are contributors). RDA also makes a distinction between Editors and Editors of Compilation.

We take the view that Compilers are a distinct category of creators who should be separated from authors. The current scope of Compiler is limited to creating a new resource from raw data or facts.

We are sympathetic to the view that the process of creating an aggregate work may also produce a new work. However, not every aggregation could be characterised as resulting in a new intellectual or artistic creation. For every *Pin Ups* there is a *NOW THAT'S WHAT I CALL MUSIC #*. Should we be asking cataloguers to make this judgement? If so, what criteria should be used?

If such a decision were agreed, we recommend that the scope of Compiler be extended, rather than adding a new relationship designator.

We do not see a clear use case for distinguishing between an Editor and an Editor of Compilation. We would therefore be in favour of deprecating Editor of Compilation. If a work is a compilation, that is an attribute of the work and we see no value in duplicating this information in the relationship. We think this change would simplify the application of RDA for cataloguers, without impacting users.