**To:**   Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**From:**  CC:DA Task Force to Review IFLA's Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model (Draft 2005-06-15)

**Re:**   Considerations re *Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model* (FRAR) and the drafting of *Resource Description and Access* and MARC coding

The concerns the task force expressed in its report of October 19, 2005, on *Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model* (FRAR) form the basis for this report.

## *Resource Description and Access*

To quote from our earlier report,

> The entity-attribute model produces is an approach found unsuitable and to produce results objectionable (e.g., Is it helpful to treat the status of an access point -- authorized vs. variant-- as an attribute and thus not acknowledge status in the diagrams? How are expression to expression relationships handled? How are serial publications and their title changes accommodated in the model?).

These objections suggest that *Resource Description and Access* should not incorporate an entity-attribute model and its attendant terminology.

The description of authority data creation must be written free of jargon (with glossary entries, if appropriate) and with sufficient examples to insure a shared understanding of its specifications. Attention should be paid to all types of authority data, including identification of works and series treatment information. To quote from our earlier report

> The approach taken in FRAR to identify a work is obscure and confusing. It has been misunderstood by many people in a variety of contexts. It is also not clear how one refers to one of these "combinations" in entity/attribute terminology. We request that a straightforward, more obvious statement than the sentence on p. 9 and p. 61 --
>
>> An access point may also be based on a combination of two names and/or identifiers, as in the case of a name/title access point representing a work that combines the name of the author with the name (i.e., the title) of the work.
>
> -- be provided prominently and that an example be added. We suggest the following example be added (at 6.4.4 on p. 46):
>
> *Authorized heading:*
>
>> Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1927. Symphonies no. 3, op. 55, E♭ major
>> *See reference tracing:*
>> < Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Eroica symphony

> Unique identification of a work/expression/manifestation typically requires the name of the creator in order to produce a unique, comprehensible name -- consider art and the number of "Madonna and Child" paintings not to mention the number titled "Untitled." Consider also music and its abundance of Etudes and Symphonies.

The extent to which *Resource Description and Access* will cover display considerations requires attention. Will there be an attempt to provide the flexibility that will allow different users to have different display forms for the same entity depending, for example, on age, language and script or cultural background?

What is the context in which *Resource Description and Access* is to reside? Libraries? Broader context, and if so, how is this broader context to be defined? Will *Resource Description and Access* acknowledge the renewed interest in authority data by other institutions working with cultural objects and similar work being performed in other sectors, e.g., Visual Resources Association's *Cataloguing Cultural Objects, Part 3: Authorities* or the Getty Vocabulary Program.

Should it be explicit that name changes over time for persons are usually handled differently than for corporate bodies? Are we to assume that persona comprehends fictitious names? Stage names? Assumed names?

The definition of the Family entity continues to be a somewhat contentions issue within the United States cataloging community, which seems to be divided into two camps: those who want to identify particular groups of related persons and those who want to identify all persons sharing a family name. For the first group, depending on the material being described, "family" may mean a single generation, a limited number of generations, or a very long time indeed; what is certain is that each "family" in this context is not to be assumed to have a monopoly on the family name; thus almost every family authorized heading will need to be qualified in some way to distinguish it from other families sharing the same name. The second group is content to use the same heading for all persons sharing more-or-less the same family name (usually treating different spellings as variants of the same name). The guidelines for family name subject headings in *Library of Congress Subject Headings* take the second approach, over the protests of archivists and genealogists who find such generalization totally inadequate. **By defining Family as a group of related persons, FRAR places itself firmly in the first camp, and the Names (not to mention the family-to-family relationships) that this approach suggests promise to be incredibly complex. Is this an approach that CC:DA wishes to support?**

The discussion of corporate bodies specifically includes musical groups. In the art community, there are groups of visual artists producing collective work. Examples of artistic duos and groups include: Gilbert & George; hobbypopMUSEUM, Atlas. These groups are not stylistic groups that are identified as subjects (e.g., Blaue Reiter, Eight, Nabis) but are artists acting collectively.

What constitutes a work may differ from one discipline to another. Is this a matter that CC:DA wishes to address? [Comment arose from the art community]

What is the Olympics if not an event? Events seem appropriate under some circumstances as corporate bodies?

## Other Specific Comments from Committee Members

In his initial comments, John Attig writes, October 3, 2005:

> There is material in the FRAR model to justify recommending some significant additions or changes to both RDA and to the MARC Authorities format. I hope that we can begin that process in our report.

John has prepared a table comparing the FRAR attributes with AACR2, RDA, and MARC 21; see Appendix A.

Martha Yee sent a list of comments that are appended to this document as Appendix B.

Helen Schmierer believes that it is premature on the basis of *Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model* (FRAR) without indication of its final form to propose changes to MARC21, which in any event is supposed to encode data more than create it.  Our more and perhaps most pressing task vis a vis authority data is to put our energies to seeing that a cogent description of the data and the process are incorporated into *Resource Description and Access.*

# Appendix A

The following table was compiled by John Attig. It presents a preliminary comparison of the FRAR attributes with AACR2, RDA, and MARC 21.

The first column lists all the attributes from section 5 of the FRAR draft. The next three columns indicate whether there is a rule for the attribute in AACR2 and RDA and whether there is explicit content designation in MARC 21 Authorities format; the final column is for notes.

The table should be considered an rough example of the kind of analysis that CC:DA may wish to undertake when  the FRAR document has been finalized.

| | AACR2 | MARC | RDA | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5.1 Attributes of a Person** | | | | |
| Dates of person | YES | X00d | YES | |
| Title of person | YES | X00c | YES | |
| Other designation associated with the person | YES | X00c | YES | |
| Gender* | NO | NO | | |
| Place of birth* | NO | NO | | Sometimes recorded in 670 |
| Place of death* | NO | NO | | Sometimes recorded in 670 |
| Country* | NO+ | NO | | |
| Place of residence* | NO | NO | | |
| Affiliation* | NO | X00u | | Sometimes recorded in 670 |
| Address | NO | NO | | Sometimes recorded in 670 |
| Language of person* | NO+ | NO | | |
| Field of activity* | NO | NO | | Sometimes recorded in 670, particularly for nonunique names |
| Profession/occupation* | NO | NO | | Sometimes recorded in 670, particularly for nonunique names |
| Biography/History | NO | 545[B] | | Sometimes recorded in 670 |
| | | | | |
| **5.1 Attributes of a Family** | | | | |
| Type of family | NO | NO | | |
| Dates of family | NO | NO | | |
| Places associated with family | NO | NO | | |
| History of family | NO | 545[B] | | |

| 5.3 Attributes of a Corporate Body | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Place associated with the corporate body | YES? | X10a, X11c | | Usually used for conferences |
| Date associated with the corporate body | YES? | X11d,f | | Usually used for conferences |
| Other designation associated with the corporate body | NO? | | | |
| Type of corporate body* | NO? | NO | | |
| Location of headquarters* | NO | NO | | |
| Language of the corporate body* | NO | NO | | |
| Address* | NO | NO | | |
| Field of activity* | NO | NO | | |
| History* | NO | 545[B] | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.4 Attributes of a Work** | | | | |
| Form of work | YES? | 245h? | YES? | |
| Date of the work | YES | X00d,f | | |
| Other distinguishing characteristic | YES | — | | |
| Medium of performance | YES | X00m | | |
| Numeric designation | YES | X00n | | |
| Key | YES | X00r | | |
| Place of origin of the work* | NO | NO | | |
| Original language of the work* | NO | NO | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.5 Attributes of an Expression** | | | | |
| Form of expression | YES? | 245h[B] | YES? | |
| Date of expression | YES? | XXXf[?] | YES? | |
| Language of expression | YES | XXXl | YES? | |
| Other distinguishing characteristic | YES | — | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.6 Attributes of a Manifestation** | | | | |
| Edition/issue designation | YES? | 250; X00s | | |
| Place of publication/distribution | YES | 260a | | |
| Publisher/distributor | YES | 260b | | |
| Date of publication/distribution | YES | 260c | | |
| Form of carrier | YES | 300a? | | |
| Numbering | YES | 362 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5.7 Attributes of an Item** | | | | |
| Location of item* | NO | 852 | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.8 Attributes of a Concept** | | | | |
| Type of concept* | N/A | NO? | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.9 Attributes of an Object** | | | | |
| Type of object* | N/A | NO? | | |
| Date of production* | N/A | 260c | | |
| Place of production* | N/A | 260a | | |
| Producer/fabricator* | N/A | 260b | | |
| Physical medium | N/A | 300a,b | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.10 Attributes of an Event** | | | | |
| Date associated with the event | N/A | X11d | | |
| Place associated with the event | N/A | X11c | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.11 Attributes of a Place** | | | | |
| Coordinates* | NO | 255c | | Recorded in 670 in authority records |
| Other geographical information* | NO | 255 | | Recorded in 670 in authority records |
| | | | | |
| **5.12 Attributes of a Name** | | | | |
| Forename | YES | X00a+ | YES | |
| Surname | YES | X00a+ | | |
| Number | YES | X00b | | |
| Title/term of address | YES | X00c | | |
| Other parts of a personal name | NO | NO | | |
| Corporate name | YES | X10a,b | | |
| Trade name | NO | NO | | |
| Title | YES | XXXt | | |
| Scope of usage | ??? | 6?? | | Notes |
| Dates of usage | ??? | 6?? | | Notes |
| Language of name | NO | NO | | |
| Script of name | NO | NO | | |
| Transliteration scheme of name | NO | NO | | |
| | | | | |

| **5.13 Attributes of an Identifier** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of identifier | NO | Tag | | |
| Identifier string | NO | $a | | |
| Suffix | NO | — | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.14 Attributes of an Access Point** | | | | |
| Type of access point | ??? | Tag | | |
| Status of access point | ??? | Tag | | |
| Designated usage of access point | ??? | 008 | | |
| Undifferentiated access point | ??? | 008 | | |
| Language of base access point | NO | ??? | | |
| Language of cataloguing | NO | 040b | | |
| Script of base access point | NO | ??? | | |
| Script of cataloguing | NO | NO? | | |
| Transliteration scheme of base access point | NO | NO? | | |
| Transliteration scheme of cataloguing | NO | NO? | | |
| Source of access point | NO | 670 | | |
| Base access point | YES | Various | | |
| Additions | YES | Various | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.15 Attributes of Rules** | | | | |
| Citation for rules | NO | 008 | | |
| Rules identifier | NO | NO | | |
| | | | | |
| **5.16 Attributes of an Agency** | | | | |
| Name of agency | NO | NO | | |
| Agency identifier | NO | 040a | | |
| Location of agency | NO | NO? | | |
| | | | | |

# Appendix B

Martha Yee comments (in email of 31 October 2005)

Here are some of my concerns for RDA:

1. I hope that RDA will continue to support the choice of a preferred form of name for every entity (person, corporate body or work) that has variant names, to ensure that catalog users will be guaranteed the ability to see a given entity listed only once any time the user's search has resulted in a list of multiple entities.

2. I hope that RDA will explore the possibility of letting users identify themselves as to language and script preference, and then letting that preference determine what the language and script of the preferred form for that user will be.

3. I hope that RDA will not try to make uniform titles bear the whole burden of differentiating expressions for users, given that the entire bibliographic description was designed to identify, describe and characterize differences between expressions.

4. I hope that the development of RDA will give us an opportunity to question whether or not change of name is really change of identity in the minds of catalog users who seek persons who use pseudonyms, corporate bodies that have had minor name changes, and works such as revised editions and serials.

5. I hope that RDA will not lose sight of the value of the name-title work identifier for providing a unique work identifier that is immediately recognizable to users whenever a work appears in a list of many other works.

6. I hope that RDA will explore the possibility of letting catalog users find authors, corporate bodies and works of interest to them by doing subject searches on authority records.

7. I hope that RDA will try to encourage the movement of variant title information out of bibliographic records (title added entry fields) and into work authority records.

8. I hope that RDA will encourage and enable the designers of catalogs to ensure that all searches include searches for variant forms of name in authority records.

9. I hope that RDA will encourage and enable the designers of catalogs to allow users to seek particular works using any variant of author name or title, instead of the current catalog designs that assume that all users are seeking a particular manifestation of a particular expression of a work (and are capable of designing a search that will retrieve it).