To: Kristin Lindlan, Chair, CC:DA

From: Ann Caldwell, Chair, Task Force on Rule 21.0D

Re: Interim Report (May 2003)

The Task Force on Rule 21.0 D was charged to undertake an examination of
AACR/LCRI 21.0D, an optional rule on designations of functions in headings. The Task
Force was asked to reconsider the need for an indication of relationships in headings
rather than relying on description for such information in light of recent discussion on the
Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) and relevant metadata
standards and, if appropriate, prepare rule revisions or recommend that the Library of
Congress modify its rule interpretation.

All work has been conducted via e-mail. A meeting is planned for the ALA annual
meeting in Toronto.

The Task Force began with some background reading, including "Data mining MARC to
find: FRBR?" by Knut Hegna and Eeva Murtomaa"
(http://folk.uio.no/knuthe/dok/frbr/datamining.pdf), a pre-publication copy of Ed
O'Neill's article "FRBR: Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records;
Application of the Entity-Relationship Model to Humphry Clinker", and a 1990 article by
Ed Glazier of RLG, "Secondary roles and designations of function in catalog records."

Several TF members then provided explicit instructions on searches that would
demonstrate how designations of function, or relator information is used by various
vendors. Martha Yee walked the group through searches that provided examples of how
the UCLA Film and Television Archive's implementation of DRA uses MARC delimiter
4 information. Likewise, Robert Maxwell of Brigham Young University showed
searches in their SIRSI system which has a relator index. . Others reported on how
relator information is (or isn't) handled in their OPACs.

Throughout our discussions it has become increasingly clear that the use of relator
information is system-dependent. With the changes in cataloging rules during the past 20
years (as summarized by Ed Glazier in the paper mentioned above) that have made the
use of relator information optional (or, as in the case of the LC Rule Interpretation to
21.0D, discontinued it in most cases), it is understandable that many online systems have
not placed a high priority upon handling this information in a usable manner.

Seeing the way that existing online catalogs deal with relator information raised the issue
of consistent assignment of this information. Members also raised the problem of
individuals performing multiple roles associated with one work and, in the case of sound

recordings, for example, individuals performing different functions on each of several works contained within a single sound recording.

At present, discussion among Task Force members is centered upon how relator terms can identify the relationships described within the FRBR model or, as one TF member described, "which FRBR group 1 entities can have what kinds of relationships with a FRBR group 1 entity (other than a subject relationship)." Recent interest in FRBR has led some system developers and researchers to look for a predictable place within the catalog record to find evidence of the relationships between a name as an access point on a bibliographic record and the group 1 entities (work, expression, manifestation) that the record describes.

The usefulness of a predictable place to identify these relationships is also useful outside of a strict FRBR context. Jennifer Bowen showed a successful application of this: a web page for the University of Rochester's media collection that allows searching for director. This is generated dynamically by using relator data from the MARC records in the institution's OPAC.

Because of the potential usefulness of relator information in these contexts, the Task Force will meet in Toronto to discuss possibilities for revising 21.0D in a way that will encourage catalogers to include designations of function in those situations when it is desirable to record the relationships between entities in a catalog record in a predictable manner. The group will also begin to look at other metadata standards (such as Qualified Dublin Core) that include coding of relationships.