

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Compilations of works: discussion paper

CCC thanks the European RDA Users Interest Group (EURIG) for investigating the issues around the treatment of compilations of works in RDA. We consider RDA's alignment with FRBR to be an on-going process of revision. As FRBR evolves, RDA will need to adjust to stay in alignment. RDA was developed before the Working Group on Aggregates was initiated, so it makes sense that a re-examination may be necessary in light of this new theoretical work.

While this is a small issue, it bears clarification. The discussion paper suggests that RDA does not specify qualifiers after the conventional collective title *Selections*. As demonstrated in module 6 of the NACO training, <http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/naco-RDA/index.html> RDA does consider different compilations to be distinct aggregate works. Attributes such as date of work, another distinguishing characteristic of work, etc., can be used to differentiate the aggregate works as elements, and/or as parts of access points (see 6.27.1.9). Even though RDA does say that the instructions for works also cover aggregate works, more examples of aggregate works could be added, especially at 6.27.1.9.

EURIG refers to RDA instruction 0.6.5 which states "If more than one work is embodied in the manifestation, only the predominant or first-named work manifested is required." An alternative is provided at RDA instruction 6.2.2.10.3 to record the preferred titles for each of the works in the compilation. There is no need for RDA to explicitly mention local policy statements. That would be a burdensome and unnecessary precedent. RDA does not assume the presence of local policy statements and it should not be incumbent upon RDA users to develop the same.

CCC offers these general comments regarding the discussion paper.

1. The JSC constituencies were asked whether we agree with a particular approach, but the situation is more complex than simple agreement could indicate. The suggested approach involves changes to the data model underlying RDA as well as to the RDA instructions themselves. These revisions could be a starting point for future changes. However, at the same time, RDA's alignment with FRBR needs to be checked to ensure that other changes are not required to maintain a logically consistent model, such as deciding whether one needs to add the concept and definition of an "aggregating work" and an "aggregate manifestation," and how to do it. It would also be desirable to enable flexibility allowing the current approach and EURIG's proposed approach to co-exist. We would caution the interest group against the use of the word "rule" in future discussion papers.

A controlled vocabulary for designating the form of an aggregating work and its subdivisions would be desirable, but it should not be a closed list.

2. A variant title for a compilation is already provided for at RDA instruction 6.2.3.5.

3.1. RDA instruction 6.27.1.9 already has provision for this.

3.2. It would be interesting to further explore the ramifications of considering aggregators and editors as creators. Indeed, consideration could be given to the role of performers as aggregators of compilations of musical works by different composers. In EURIG's discussions at 3.2 and 4 there seem to be two views.

The proposal in 3.2 seems to indicate that the one who aggregates the work is not at the same level as an author because the authorized access point is constructed differently. But 4 then introduces the idea of “creator of the compilation” as a relationship designator for the category of creators. There would need to be exploration of the status of the compiler and whether there is justification for constructing access points differently for one class of creator versus another.

4. Some compilers are already treated as creators in RDA see instruction 19.2.1.1. An appropriate relationship designator is necessary.