To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Renate Behrens, Europe Region representative
Subject: RDA models for relationship data

The EURIG Editorial Committee thanks RSC Relationship Designators Working Group for this proposal, which we fundamentally agree.

EURIG members' and national committees' comments were collated on the DNB wiki and discussed by the EURIG Editorial Committee in a series of voice conferences during September.

Nevertheless, members raised a number of concerns on the process in relation to such complex documents:

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. The governance changes have introduced a further level of review which exacerbates this issue.
3. Communities whose first language is not English generally need more time to enable translation of papers.
4. The changes to Appendix J will have a substantial impact on MARC mappings.
5. The Proposal refers to the FRBR-LRM (IFLA-LRM) which is not published yet. We think we have to wait for a reliable version of the IFLA-LRM.

General comments

We agree fundamentally with the approach described in this proposal.

We recommend this as the beginning of a discussion, in which there is time to consider the paper's impact on practical cataloguing (resources etc.) and the consequences for the RDA translation and national and supra-national policy statements. Therefore, we would prefer to treat the paper as a discussion paper, not as a proposal. We propose that the recommendations are divided up into several work packages to separate practical instructions from theoretical discussion.

Impacts for subject cataloguing have to be discussed in our expert groups.

Principally we strongly recommend to reflect about non-language-dependent solutions. Already now we have a very heterogeneous situation in our catalogues. With language-dependent relationship data an international data exchange is nearly impossible. Also in a multilingual environment it would be easier to work with codes and identifiers (and not with text strings).

Specific comments

	Recommendation	Comment
1	Recommendation 1	We agree
2	Add designators for subject-related Person, Family, and Corporate Body entities to Appendix M.	We agree
3	Add cross-entity designators for items that are reproduced as manifestations to Appendix J.	Majority view: Option 1 is preferred. It seems more logical to include the terms at 5.2 than to add a new section at 5.6. The alternative labels were preferred to the parenthetical qualifiers, but neither was liked. It was noted in discussion, that these labels are mainly for disambiguation and are not intended for public display.
4	Add reciprocal designators for cross-entity PFC to WEMI designators to RDA Toolkit.	We agree
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.	We agree
6	The RSC Relationship Designators Working 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.	We agree