

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** RDA and FRBRoo treatment of aggregates

ALA thanks the Aggregates Working Group for this analysis of the RDA and FRBRoo treatment of aggregates. ALA reviewers had difficulty understanding this paper, since most are not familiar with FRBRoo. We were grateful for the accompanying graphs, which helped convey the modeling.

ALA has the following questions, inspired by the paper:

1. *Which version of FRBR will be the underlying model for RDA in the future: FRBRoo or FRBR-LRM?*

While we realize that these two versions of FRBR will be compatible with each other, we assume that FRBR-LRM will not contain the same level of complex modeling inherent in FRBRoo. If FRBR-LRM will be RDA's underlying model, we wonder how much of this analysis will need to be revisited once that document is accepted.

2. *How will the underlying model be incorporated into RDA instructions?*

It is our understanding that FRBRoo is not designed to be made visible to catalogers, let alone end users. How can RDA accommodate the benefits of this highly complex model without compromising the abilities of catalogers to understand and efficiently apply the instructions?

3. *What differences articulated in FRBRoo are useful to incorporate into RDA?*

ALA sees value in further exploration of including the varieties of expressions, although we agree with the Working Group that it may not be useful to model editorial modifications. In general, we believe RDA should be able to accommodate (but should not mandate) the more complex modeling. In certain environments, it might be valuable to identify Castle's introduction to Emma as a separate work (which it certainly is) — but most collections owning this manifestation product type will not want to do that.

4. *What universe is RDA trying to model?*

As noted in 6JSC/FictitiousWG/1/ALA response, we recommend that RDA focus on a bibliographic/archival universe, rather than the real universe. This viewpoint will drive what elements, attributes, and relationships are considered important to users.

5. *How much research/expertise is expected from those applying RDA instructions?*

The modeling in FRBRoo is intellectually satisfying. However, ALA does not believe that catalogers should be expected to perform the expert analysis required to determine

the exact kinds of differences between an original aggregate work and its revision, for example.

6. *What is the best way to model contributions to collaborative works?*

In the context of collaborative works, it is possible to consider individual contributions as separate works. However, in the case of systemic parts of works (FRBR 5.3.1.1), ALA does not endorse this approach. For example, it is difficult to intellectually separate the contributions associated with a motion picture, considering the lighting, costume design, set design, sound effects, acting, conducting, etc. as separate works within an aggregated whole. The experience of catalogers of moving image resources in particular suggests that these activities are not as separate and distinct as FRBRoo seems to require, but are rather performed collaboratively. Apart from this practical difficulty, we question the benefit of pursuing this level of analysis.

This perspective leads the majority of ALA respondents to question note [1] in Appendix A, Table 1, which suggests the need for a creator designator for an aggregate work with a self-contained expression to incorporate performances. On the other hand, those most familiar with cataloging moving image resources would welcome the opportunity to associate more roles at the work level, since that is a better reflection of both the complexity of these works and the world view that makes sense to the moving image community.

7. *In Table 1, what does “designer” mean? And, should the new designator suggested by “[2]” really be limited to visual works?*

ALA questions the assignment of “designer” to the term “recording engineer” in Table 1. Without a definition provided, we are uncertain if this is the proper term. In addition, we note that this is labeled with “[2]” – which is defined as applying only to visual works. This is also a problem in Table 4, with the term “musical director”. We suspect this new creator designator should have a broader scope.

Likewise, we wonder about the appropriateness of assigning “designer” to “editor of moving image work”. It is difficult to see how this type of contribution, which affects many aspects of the aggregate work, belongs in the same category as costume designer, lighting designer, etc.

8. *How can RDA support the most specific terms for the roles?*

ALA observes that there needs to be some way to compensate for the fact that the proposed roles at the work level will be less specific than the expression level roles. How does that work for the kind of modeling that presents the higher aggregate work along with the specific roles?