

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Gordon Dunsire, Chair, RSC Relationship Designators Working Group
Subject: RDA models for relationship data: Responses to RSC/RelationshipWG/1

Abstract

This document summarizes submitted responses to recommendations and proposed changes to RDA in RSC/RelationshipWG/1 (RDA models for provenance data), and provides comments and additional information from the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group and the RSC Technical Working Group.

Introduction

The RSC Relationship Designators Working Group and RSC Technical Working Group thank the RDA communities for their helpful comments and suggestions relating to the recommendations and change proposals submitted as RSC/RelationshipWG/1.

Comments and additional information for each recommendation and proposal are given below.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Generalize the *Related...* entity elements to cover all RDA current and future entities as specified in Appendix 1.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

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

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The RSC Technical Working Group notes that the RDA element *name of the family* is identified in RSC/TechnicalWG/2 (RDA 9.2: Addition of elements for Given name and Surname) as having overlap with the proposed *surname* element. Both are associated with the LRM entity Nomen. It is likely that the LCSH “family name” is also associated with Nomen. This has no impact on the entity Family itself. The Technical Working Group assumes that any new RDA entities such as Nomen will be given specific designators for subject relationships in the same way.

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

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation. There is no consensus on placement within Appendix J.

Recommendation 4: Add reciprocal designators for cross-entity PFC to WEMI designators in the Toolkit.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: Consider other arrangements of relationship elements and designators and their associated instructions in RDA Toolkit, including tables and thesaurus architectures with navigable broader/narrower and see/see also cross-references, and consider re-organizing the basic layout of designators to reflect Table 5.

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: The RSC Relationship Designators Group should undertake a complete review of designator labels in the context of the proposed matrix of high-level relationship elements in Recommendation 1 and the potential for different displays and layouts of the designations in Recommendation 5, in collaboration with the RDA Development Team.

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

Change 1: Revision of 24.1.3 and 29.1.3

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with the proposed changes.

The use of "... being described." In 29.1.3 is intentional. The phrase is used in reference to the source entity or domain of the designator, not the related target entity or range. The designator is used as part of the description of the source entity, not the identification of the source entity.

Change 2: Revision of Appendix M

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with the proposed changes, but no consensus on the designator labels.

The Working Group thanks ALA for catching the typos in M.2.7 and M.2.8; these were the result of an incomplete copy edit.

Change 3: Revisions to Appendix J

There is no consensus on the options.

Appendix 3:

The phrase “of another manifestation” may be needed in the new “manifestation reproduction of item” designator definition to clarify ambiguity in the English term “reproduction”.

The Working Group thanks ALA for catching the typo in “reproduction of (item) (manifestation)”.

The Working Group supports a review of the definition of “reprinted as”.

Additional comments

The RSC Technical Working Group notes that the provision of unambiguous labels for RDA relationship elements and designators is required for RDA applications that do not use linked data. Unique identification is provided by the Uniform Resource Identifier in linked data applications, and the labels do not have to meet this requirement.

The MARC 21 bibliographic format does not accommodate the direct identification of any entity type, including RDA/FRBR entities.

RDA users who need to identify the type of the FRBR entity being described in a MARC 21 record or the type of a related FRBR entity have the choice of using the designator URI or the unique label. The label itself does not have to indicate the domain (type of entity being described) or range (type of related entity) because those data are available from RDA Reference in the form of RDF domains and ranges.

RDA users who do not need to identify the FRBR entities in a MARC 21 record are advised to use the unconstrained versions of relationship designators provided in the RDA Unconstrained element set. These have no domains or ranges, and their labels and definitions use the general entities “resource” and “agent”.

The RDA instructions provide some guidance using non-RDA labels in X.1 of the designator appendices: “If none of the terms listed in this appendix is appropriate or sufficiently specific, use another concise term to indicate the nature of the relationship.”

The Technical Working Group suggests that RSC consider combining this with the more general guidance at RDA 0.12: “When RDA instructions specify recording a name or a term in an element, the data may be recorded using any suitable vocabulary encoding scheme (e.g., a country code from ISO 3166 for a place), provided the scheme is identified.” There is no technical reason why relationships between RDA entities must use the RDA designators, and common guidance on the use of alternate vocabulary encoding schemes and relationship schemes would support the generalized infrastructure for RDA Reference and local extensions. Alternative vocabularies must be compatible with the semantics of the RDA entities.

The RSC Relationship Designators Working Group was not able to make any significant progress during 2016 in formulating a decision framework for adding new designators. The Working Group thinks it is necessary to clarify the overall approach to relationships and

designators within the current and post-LRM RDA entity “matrix” so that those issues do not obscure a complex discussion. Some of the basic components of that discussion are described in “From Complex Reality to Formal Description: Bibliographic Relationships and Problems of Operationalization in RDA” by Henrik Wallheim, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, Volume 54, no. 7, 2016.