To: RDA Steering Committee

From: Bill Leonard, CCC Representative to RSC

Subject: Discussion paper: RDA and WGA treatment of aggregates

CCC thanks the Aggregates Working Group for further exploring the issues and challenges of treating aggregates in RDA. CCC respects and appreciates the difficulties of addressing modelling issues while the models are under scrutiny. This is an essential task that will lead to the proposals for new text to be added to RDA concerning the treatment of aggregating resources. CCC looks forward to a productive round of discussion of these issues.

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

CCC agrees that it is important to retain the distinction between the two types of relationships. They need to be defined clearly so that they are not confused. It is important to make the criteria for the distinction easy for cataloguers to understand.

CCC does not agree with the statement at the top of page 10:

> A new expression of an Aggregation Work can contain different contents than other expressions of the work.

When the content of an aggregation work changes, a new aggregation work is created.

Question 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?

CCC agrees to the intention of developing separate, distinct wording that explains and retains the distinction between the two types of relationships. We suggest looking at adding an "in case of doubt " instruction, su as "In case of doubt, treat as an aggregating work."

We also note that the IFLA LRM uses the term "aggregating work" not the "aggregation work." This term represents the idea of a work. An aggregation has a much more physical connotation inappropriate for this usage. The essence of an aggregating work is a plan. When that plan changes, there is a new work. The following is derived from a presentation on the IFLA LRM at CCC's recent meeting.

- An **aggregate *manifestation*** is a single *manifestation* embodying multiple distinct *expressions*
- One of the embodied *expressions* is an ***aggregating expression*** (expresses the ***aggregating work*** : selects and arranges *expressions* of other *works*)

Question 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?

Desspite its use in FRBRoo, the word "incorporate" connotes something physical so that seems inappropriate for works and expressions. Nevertheless, a new relationship element should be added at some later date. The Working Group may wish to monitor the development of LRM and consider whether the final LRM name for this relationship can be adopted or adapted for use as a label in RDA.

Question 4 - Can the RSC offer guidance on:

- **an appropriate label for this relationship element?**
- **where this relationship element would fit in the hierarchy of Expression relationships at RDA J.3?**

CCC is not in favour of re-scoping or re-naming any of the existing groupings in J.3. The most appropriate placement would be adjacent to, either preceding or following, J.3.4 Whole-Part Expression Relationships. Unfortunately, this will cause some re-numbering.

Question 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?

A short-cut relationship is not ideal if we are adhering to a strictly theoretical approach. A short-cut could mask the aggregating nature of the resource which does not serve to enlighten practitioners' of the underlying complexity. That complexity is at odds with a pragmatic approach. In this case, developing a short-cut is the best option but CCC does not agree with the proposed label. The relationship we would like to express is 'has a creator relationship to one of the works selected for aggregation' but that is a mouthful. CCC suggests a "contributing creator / contributing creator of" relationship pair.

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

CCC disagrees. Changing the content of an aggregating work produces a new aggregating work.