To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Deborah Fritz, Chair, RSC Aggregates Working Group
Subject: RSC/AggregatesWG/1: Summary of responses

Abstract

This document summarizes RDA community responses to RSC/AggregatesWG/1 (Discussion paper: RDA and WGA treatment of aggregates) and provides comments and additional information from the RSC Aggregates Working Group.

Introduction

The RSC Aggregates Working Group thanks the RDA communities for their helpful responses to our discussion paper.

A summary of those responses, and our comments on them are provided below.

Issues under discussion

Identifying single Works vs. whole-part Works or Aggregation Works

1. **Does the RSC agree:** that it is important to retain the distinction between a whole-part work and an aggregation work?

   ACOC: Agree
   CCC: Agree
   Europe: Agree
   LC: Agree, in general
   ALA: Agree

   There is unanimous agreement that it is important to distinguish between a whole-part work and an aggregation work.

2. **Does the RSC agree**: that it would be useful to provide simple direct wording to enable a cataloguer to differentiate between a whole-part work vs. an aggregation work? The AWG thinks it might be useful if such wording could start with:
   - If a manifestation embodies multiple distinct expressions, and:
     - ..., then the manifestation embodies an Aggregation Work and Distinct Works
     - ..., then the manifestation embodies a whole-part Work and its parts.

   ACOC: Agree; no suggested wording
   CCC: Agree; suggests adding "In case of doubt, treat as an aggregating work"
   Europe: Agree; ""a whole-part work" can be regarded as being pre-conceived as such, whereas an aggregation work is "post-conceived". For example, Bleak house (which was originally issued serially in parts) was conceived as a whole by Charles Dickens before it was published"

LC: Agree; "We think, perhaps, the distinction between the two types is based on the intent of the creator(s) of the original works: was the "work" conceived by the creator(s) as a whole but broken into parts, or is it a compilation of "independent" works that are subsequently combined (by the original creator(s) or someone else)."
ALA: Agree; no suggested wording

AWG response*: The AWG agrees with the explanations provided by Europe and LC, and will continue to explore whether, and if so, how, an aggregation work that is embodied in a single manifestation might be described differently than a whole-part work that is embodied in a single manifestation. We also appreciate and will follow the suggestion to "when in doubt" treat a work as an aggregation work.*

Adding an Incorporated in / Incorporates relationship to RDA

3. **Does the RSC agree:** that an "incorporated in / Incorporates" relationship is useful for describing aggregates and a relationship element for it should be added, at some later date, to RDA?

    ACOC: Agree
    CCC: Agree we need a new element, but do not like the terms suggested; monitor LRM
    Europe: Agree
    LC: Yes, but must be clear and distinct
    ALA: Agree

    There is unanimous agreement that RDA should add a relationship element to indicate (when it is useful to do so) that an expression of an Aggregation Work incorporates distinct expressions of other works.

4. **Can the RSC offer guidance on:**
    - an appropriate label for this relationship element?

        ACOC: "incorporated in / incorporates" or "included in / includes"
        CCC: no suggestion
        Europe: satisfied with the label
        LC: "Aggregated in / Aggregation of"
        ALA: either "incorporated in / incorporates" or "aggregated in / aggregation of"; must clarify differences between this pair of designators and the existing "contained in (expression) / container of (expression)"

        Further discussion is needed, in order to choose an appropriate label for this relationship.

        AWG response: *It would be useful to get feedback from the FRBRoo and/or LRM groups about whether our proposed use of the terms "incorporated in / incorporates" is in line with their use of the terms.*

- where this relationship element would fit in the hierarchy of Expression relationships at RDA J.3?

    ACOC: new section of J.3
    CCC: adjacent to, either preceding or following, J.3.4
    Europe: Appendix J, preceding or following whole-part relationship
    LC: following whole-part
    ALA: new section of J.3

    There is unanimous agreement that this new relationship element requires a new section in RDA J.3.

    AWG response: *It will be useful to get feedback from Relationship Designators WG on where to fit this relationship element in the hierarchy of Expression relationships at RDA J.3.*

Adding *Creator of Content* relationships

5. **Does the RSC agree:** that a "Creator of Content / Creator of Content of" relationship is useful for adding short-cut access to an expression of an Aggregated Work when it does not seem necessary to describe distinct works and expressions separately, and that a relationship element for it should be added, at some later date, to RDA?

    ACOC: Agree, but "reservations about the label"
    CCC: uneasy about the short-cut; do not like the label; suggest "contributing creator / contributing creator of"
    Europe: Agree; more clarification on impact on description and AAP for the AW is needed
    LC: Yes; with more specific terms
    ALA: No (?)

Agreement was not unanimous about this issue.

AWG response*: The AWG agrees that:*
  - *further investigation is needed, in order to determine whether these short-cuts can be explained with sufficient clarity, and can be used to reliably infer the underlying "incorporated in / incorporates" aggregation relationships, as proposed*
  - *better labels are necessary for this relationship, at the "Creator" and "Other Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies Associated with a Work", and the "Contributor" top level relationships, and for their sub-properties*
  - *the AWG will need to work with the Relationship Designator WG and the RDA Dev Team to ensure that the proposed relationships are workable.*

Developing instructions for changes affecting the identification of an Aggregated Work

6. **Does the RSC agree:**
   - that the addition, deletion, or revision of an included expression in an aggregation Expression requires a new aggregation Expression, but not a new Aggregation Work, unless the entire concept of the Aggregation work has changed?

        ACOC: tentatively agree
        CCC: disagree: "Changing the content of an aggregating work produces a new aggregating work"
        Europe: Agree; "guidance should be provided to the cataloguer in order to determine when the amount of changes in the included expressions should result in a new Aggregation Work"
        LC: Yes; "it is likely a matter of "degree" of change"
        ALA: Agree

        Agreement was divided, about what level of change in the content of an Aggregation Work should result in a new Aggregation Work.

        ***AWG response:** The AWG looks for guidance from the RSC on this issue.*

   - that an instruction should be added to RDA somewhere to say this?

        ACOC: no new instruction needed
        CCC: no new instruction needed
        Europe: new instruction needed
        LC: new instructions will be needed
        ALA: no new instruction needed

        Agreement was divided, about whether a new instruction is needed.

        ***AWG response:** Given the difference of opinions on when a new Aggregation Work should be described, it seems that some sort of instruction about this might be necessary.*

Examples applying the AWG modeling of aggregates

Europe

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.

***AWG response:** The group thanks the Europe region for pointing out 6.28.1.5. We have added it to the list of RDA instructions related to aggregate resources that might need to be amended. We also acknowledge that further investigation needs to be carried out on the nature of FRBRoo*

F20 Performance Work, F25 Performance Plan, F31 Performance, F21 Recording Work and F26 Recording, and how they all relate to our modeling of aggregates.

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)".

AWG response: *We would appreciate clarification of this issue. Would it be possible for the EURIG Editorial Committee to provide a replacement diagram that illustrates the point?*

Impact on Cataloguers
Cataloguers will have to learn:
- how to distinguish between single works and whole-part or aggregation works
- not to call an augmentation of a primary work a new expression of that primary work—once 6.27.1.6 and any related instructions for music, etc., are amended

LC
We're not sure we understand the impact of the second bullet at this point, but note that there are changes proposed for 6.27.1.6 in RSC/LC/1.

AWG response: *It seems that the RSC/LC/1 paper, will continue to allow the current practice of relating a creator of added content to a new expression of the primary work in an aggregation. The AWG modeling of aggregates, would relate a creator of added content to the expression of the Aggregation Work, rather than to a new expression of one of the distinct works in the aggregation.*

Additional comments from RDA Communities

ACOC
No additional comments

CCC
No additional comments

Europe

1. This is a complex and detailed paper. There has been insufficient time for all members to review it in detail. This is a general point in relation to the RDA Development cycle that needs to be addressed. August and September are difficult months in which to convene representative meetings or to contact specialists.

   AWG response: We will welcome additional feedback as we continue our work.

2. Communities whose first language is not English generally need more time to enable translation of papers.

   AWG response: We agree that translation of such a complex and detailed paper as ours must be very difficult, and the timeframe for responses to papers is very short.

3. The practicality of applying this complex model, particularly in smaller institutions has been questioned.

   AWG response: It will be one of our goals to make it clear and understandable how different levels of application can be accommodated.

4. There is concern that this could result in increased costs. RSC may like to consider whether a follow-on task may be to evaluate the challenges and costs of implementation.

   AWG response: We agree that there are many implications and challenges involved in thinking about aggregates at the level of complexity that our model will allow.

5. We recommend that RSC reviews the definition of I 2.1 *compiler* in light of the research carried out by the WG. It is clear that for many of the examples the current definition restricting the scope to data or information rather than content is too prescriptive. We also think that there may be implications for 19.2.1.1.1.

   AWG response: We acknowledge that the definition of I.2.1 compiler will need clarification, as will many of the definitions in Appendix I. We have added 19.2.1.1.1 to our list of instructions for review.

6. An outcome will be further changes to Appendices I and J, which will also affect the MARC mappings.

   AWG response: We agree

7. The proposed model may also be applicable to archival resources

   AWG response: We agree

LC

1. Figures 1, 2, and 4 show an "Expression" box pointing to "Aggregation Work"; shouldn't this box really be labelled "Aggregation Expression" or "Aggregation Work Expression"? Note the use of "AWE" in Appendix B examples.

   AWG response: Although we used the label "AWE" in the diagrams provided for the examples, we did so only for the sake of brevity. We were reluctant to coin a new term: "Aggregation Work Expression", and consciously used the phrases "expression of a Work", "expression of an Aggregation Work", "expression of distinct works", instead.

2. With the Working Group's concept of "compiler" of an Aggregation Work, would the compiler be used in the authorized access point of the aggregation work?

   AWG response: Yes, the name of a known compiler of an aggregation work would be used in a Name/Title AAP for the aggregation work (for as long as we continue to provided Name/Title AAP for works).

3. In the Appendix B examples with shaded AW/AWE, is it the opinion of the Working Group that the aggregation as a whole would not be needed for other relationships (e.g., as a subject relationship)? Or is that just the 'cost' of choosing that option?

   AWG response: Choosing not to identify and describe an Aggregation Work indicates that a cataloguer decided it was not sufficiently important (in their opinion) to merit that level of description. If an Aggregation Work is important and identifiable enough to be the subject of another work, then it would need to be identified and described, even if that was carried out after-the-fact.

4. Example #5, Option 3 (page 9 of Appendices): the Working Group indicates that because the title of the AW is the same as the title of the predominant content, it will need to be qualified to distinguish it. Is that really the case, since one of the works is identified through a creator and the other isn't?

   AWG response: You are correct; we will amend the wording for that option. However, we do need to qualify the title of an Aggregation Work (with no known compiler) when another Aggregation Work with the same title and no known compiler is added, e.g., "Emma (Blythe)" and "Emma (Kinsley : Castle)". The AWG realizes that we will have to conduct further investigations into the components for AAPs for these situations.

ALA

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

   In our response to 6JSC/AggregatesWG/1, ALA asked the above question, and it remains unanswered. We wonder why the Working Group did not consult the draft FRBR-LRM as part of its comprehensive review of this topic.

   AWG response: We were instructed not to reference the draft FRBR-LRM because it was still a draft. However, we did consult extensively with Pat Riva, co-author of the 2016-02-21 draft of the "FRBR-Library Reference Model", on most of the "Issues" that we outlined in our paper.

   Having taken a closer look at these two models and how they address aggregates, we note a significant difference. FRBRoo uses the Publication Expression (F24) to serve as the focus for all of the relationships associated with an aggregation work, while FRBR-LRM relies instead on relationships to the manifestation.

   AWG response: We noted that FRBRoo describes both a Publication Work and Expression and an Aggregation Work and Expression, specifically gives modeling for incorporating the aggregated expressions in the expression of the Aggregation Work (see FRBRoo section 2.1.1, page 21). As we showed in our 1st example of Appendix B of our paper (RSC/AggregatesWG/1/Appendices, page 2), we suggest that RDA should continue collapsing FRBRoo to ignore Publication Work and Expression, as we outlined in our paper from last year: "6JSC/AggregatesWG/1".

   We are hopeful that FRBR-LRM will add the possibility of using the "incorporated in / incorporates" relationships in their final report.

   The Working Group has taken a third path, which combines these two different perspectives, allowing for relationships to be expressed at both the Expression and Manifestation levels. Although this offers flexibility, we are not convinced that this is an appropriate approach to modeling. In addition, it does not align with FRBR-LRM. We do not know how much of a problem this represents in moving RDA forward once LRM is finalized.

   AWG response: We are aware that we probably need some guidance on our approach to modeling.

2. Should RDA always treat creators of aggregate collections of expressions the same way?

   As noted above, we think there are reasons for RDA to continue the current practice of creating an AAP for a compilation based on whether the works are all by the same creator or not.

   AWG response: One of the things that we discussed internally was the benefit of making it clear to the user of the library catalog when a new work that is linked to an Agent is actually a new work vs. a new compilation in which a previously released work has been newly included. Certainly, if a creator of the contents, himself, does the selection and arrangement of the contents of a compilation of his works, then he should be the creator of the compilation, but even then, it seems useful to indicate that the compilation is one thing and the contents are another.

We are also trying to eliminate as many exceptions as possible, in order to simplify application of the (admittedly complex) model; therefore, we would not support saying something like: "the creator of an Aggregation Work is the compiler (the agent responsible for the selection and arrangement) except when all of the works in the aggregation are by a single creator".

We think that the three different types of aggregates detailed in the draft FRBR-LRM should come into play when considering the path forward:
- Aggregate Collections of Expressions
- Aggregates Resulting from Augmentation
- Aggregates of Parallel Expressions

AWG response: When we applied the AWG modeling of aggregates to examples of the different types listed above, the results were the same, so we were not sure that these distinctions served a useful purpose.

In relation to that final category, members of the music community noted that these also arise in relation to notated music (e.g., vocal scores of operas presented in both the original language and a translation). An aggregate of parallel expressions is another situation where identifying the aggregation work would almost never be useful from an end user perspective.

AWG response: We think that some users might find it useful to be able to tell when more than one language expression of a single work is provided in a single manifestation. It seems that this would be useful even in the example provided (a vocal score of an opera presented in two languages); it certainly seems that it would be useful when the purpose of including the two languages is to present them side-by-side. We believe that it should be up to the cataloguer to decide when it might be useful to identify the Aggregation Work.

3. Should new terminology introduced into RDA relating to the WEMI stack come from FRBRoo?

   Some ALA commenters were confused by the Working Group's introduction of "Distinct Work" and "Single Work" in relation to aggregating works. We wonder if terminology that is already in FRBRoo should be used instead. Are these truly different types of works that FRBRoo has not already accounted for?

   AWG response: We were unable to find comparable terminology for these terms in FRBRoo, but we tried to be careful to give them as "distinct Work" and "single Work", intending to simply indicate which of the works we were referring to at any given time. It is possible that "single Work" could be a type of "Individual Work", but we would need further guidance from the FRBRoo Group about this.

4. How should RDA take into account choices surrounding describing primary and secondary content?

   Having a clear approach to describing and providing access to primary (or predominant) and secondary content is critical in identifying the path forward for RDA and aggregates, especially since different cataloguing agencies will make different decisions based on their own users. Clarity on this

topic will also help with the necessary decision-making about which relationship designators currently under "contributor" in Appendix I should be moved or renamed.

See RSC/ALA-CCC/Discussion

AWG response: We agree that it is critical to have a clear approach to describing and providing access to all content in an aggregation, but we are not convinced that a distinction between primary and secondary content is useful.

We agree that the designators currently under "contributor" in Appendix I must be examined to determine which should be moved or renamed, but we are not sure how the distinction between primary and secondary content relates to that decision-making.