The EURIG Editorial Committee thanks RSC Aggregates Working Group for this discussion paper. We have received the following comments in relation to the examples.

Example 10

The example shows a relationship between the performer and the work. However the relationship appears to be “adaptor”, following the provisions of 6.28.1.5, rather than performer. A performer can be responsible for an adaptation, but at present RDA does not provide a relationship between performer and work.

Example 11

In the examples, we agree with the treatment of a single work with augmentations, as illustrated by Ex. 5 option 3, where the Aggregation Work and its Expression is described with relationships (access points) to the creator of the augmentations and the “incorporates” relationship to the expression of the predominant content (which is a single work).

We have received a comment that the same treatment should be applied in the case of an aggregation work with augmentation, as illustrated by Ex. 11 option 2. The EURIG Editorial Committee has not had time to review this in depth and so we refer the issue back to the Working Group for its consideration.

In the schema, the whole Aggregation Work and its Expression (including the augmentation) is collapsed with the Aggregation Work which corresponds to the main part of the resource and its own Expression. This is not consistent with the treatment of single works with augmentations, and it is incorrect to reuse the Aggregation Work which corresponds to the main part of the resource in another publication, with other augmentations. It has been proposed that this should be amended, as the AWG model for aggregates mention (p.5) that:

"A distinct Work is a Work whose expression is compiled in the Expression of an Aggregation Work; a distinct Work can be:

O A single Work
O A whole-part Work
O An other Aggregation Work (FRBRoo subclass F17)".