

To: RDA Steering Committee  
From: Renate Behrens, Europe Region representative  
Subject: RDA and WGA treatment of aggregates

The EURIG Editorial Committee thanks RSC Aggregates Working Group for this discussion paper, with which we generally agree. Our comments on the specific recommendations follow below.

EURIG members and national committees submitted comments to the DNB wiki which were discussed by the Editorial Committee in series of web meetings during September.

EURIG strongly commends the achievement of the WG. From our point of view it is a very important piece of work, which reconciles the conflicting recommendations of the FRBR WG on Aggregates. It addresses issues that have been raised by EURIG and proposes a flexible solution to a complex problem.

Nevertheless, members raised a number of concerns and have additional comments:

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.
2. Communities whose first language is not English generally need more time to enable translation of papers.
3. The practicality of applying this complex model, particularly in smaller institutions has been questioned.
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.
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.
6. An outcome will be further changes to Appendices I and J, which will also affect the MARC mappings.
7. The proposed model may also be applicable to archival resources.

## Responses to questions raised in the paper

### 1. Does the RSC agree:

**that it is important to retain the distinction between a whole-part work and an aggregation work?**

EURIG agrees that this is an important distinction.

The following clarification may be of use: "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, but the "Fireside Dickens" a collection (aggregation) of Dickens' works, could only have been conceived retrospectively.

**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:

o..., then the manifestation embodies an Aggregation Work and Distinct Works

o ..., then the manifestation embodies a whole-part Work and its parts."

EURIG agrees

**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?**

EURIG considers the relationship "incorporated in / incorporates" necessary for describing aggregates in a correct way and we support the addition of a relationship element for it in RDA. We note that experiments with RIMMF have demonstrated the need for such a relationship to clearly distinguish between responsibility for creation of an aggregate and responsibility for creation of its contents.

**4. Can the RSC offer guidance on:**

- **an appropriate label for this relationship element?**

EURIG is satisfied with the proposed label "incorporated in / incorporates" although it was also suggested that RDA should retain the wording used by FRBRoo "is incorporated in / incorporates".

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

EURIG suggests the placing in Appendix J would ideally precede or follow whole-part relationship.

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?**

EURIG agrees: and notes that the need for such a relationship has been clearly demonstrated by experiments using RIMMF. However, further investigation in order to evaluate all the impacts of such a relationship on the description and identification of the Aggregation Work, specifically on the construction of the preferred access point for the Aggregation Work is recommended.

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?**

EURIG agrees, but some 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.

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

EURIG agrees