

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Bill Leonard, CCC Representative to RSC
Subject: **RDA models for relationship data**

CCC thanks the Relationship Working Group for this discussion of the accommodation of relationships between instances of different entities. CCC views this paper as a preliminary discussion paper and does not support all of the recommendations at this time. RDA's complex of instructions is founded on the model and definitions. Proposals for revision of definitions and/or the model must take into consideration the subsequent impact on the instructions.

Recommendation 1 – Generalize the Related ... entity elements.

CCC could eventually support these changes in a logical and planned roll-out. It will be necessary to consider whether the existing instructions, section scope statements, and examples in those sections still make sense after these changes.

Recommendation 2 – Add designators for subject-related *Person, Family, and Corporate Body* entities to Appendix M.

CCC agrees with these changes but this might be better solved once *res* is part of the model.

Recommendation 3 – Add cross-entity designators for items that are reproduced as manifestations to Appendix J.

CCC agrees with the existence of a relationship for a reproduction of an item into a manifestation but we dislike the relationship designator term that results from applying the new template.

Recommendation 4 – Add reciprocal designators for cross-entity PFC to WEMI designators to RDA Toolkit

CCC is of the opinion that finding a general solution for cross-entity relationships is a red herring. RDA is meant to be schema-independent. Any changes proposed for these sections must function independently of the limitations of a particular modelling theory. CCC is greatly concerned that the proposed designators are furthering a pattern of opacity and unintelligibility that offers no assistance to the reader, cataloguers and clients alike. The continuing pattern of obscurity built into the relationship designators is in opposition to the principle of internationalization. The relationship designators should be structured according to a clear syntax, independent of English, unambiguous to the reader and straightforward to translate.

CCC does agree that all relationships have reciprocals.

CCC does not agree with the label template on page 15.

Recommendation 5 – Consider other arrangements of relationship elements and designators ...

CCC supports finding a more efficient way to arrange, store and search the growing array of designators. However, when the designators are arranged by domains and ranges, there is a concern about the loss of the context. While it is not perfect, and the context is not always helpful, the current structure is better-suited for situations where the cataloguer does not already know the preferred designator. The hierarchical arrangement provides context in the understanding of the scope and limits of particular designators. Arrangement of the designators must satisfy the needs of the practitioners.

It is unfortunate that the thinking about the arrangement and display of designators is constrained by the assumption that there can only be one solution, and that solution must translate to the printed page. CCC looks forward to a technological solution that will offer users the ability to choose different arrangements of designators according to their needs and preferences.

Recommendation 6 – Complete review of designator labels by the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group

CCC agrees that such a review will be necessary at some time, but not until larger issues have been resolved and clarified.

The sustainability of the current designator system should also be examined. Indeed, the RSC dedicates a significant amount of its time and effort into the evaluation of requests for new designators. Proposals for alternative maintenance systems for the designators, not necessarily in the toolkit, might be a solution.