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1. **Statement of problem and objectives**

It has always been one of the main functions of the library catalogue to relate resources to other entities. Main and added entries express relationships between persons or organizations and the resources for which they are responsible, and other devices such as analytical added entries, uniform titles, linking entries, and series headings are all ways of expressing defined sets of relationships among resources themselves.

The relationship designators in RDA should be seen as an evolution of these devices. But where MARC captures a relatively limited set of relationships, largely those applicable to traditional library collections, the RDA relationship designators establish a framework to express a potentially much richer set of relationships. In addition, the linked data environment in which RDA relationship designators are intended to be implemented may eventually offer more powerful ways of handling relationships. For example, a future system may be able to recognize *dancer* as a kind of *performer*, a hierarchy that is implied in RDA but would not be recognized by most current systems.

The Task Group’s report covers relationships between resources and persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the resource (RDA Appendix I), and relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, and items (RDA Appendix J). The Task Group also reviewed Appendix K, concerning relationships among persons, families, and corporate bodies, but considered that most of the issues raised there are outside the scope and expertise of the present group. However, we made an observation regarding one significant coding issue.

In considering its charge, the Task Group identified two sets of needs that have to be met, one short-term and one longer-term. The first is the need to prepare a set of guidelines that will allow catalogers to apply relationship designators with confidence as libraries begin to transition to cataloging using RDA. The second concerns the need to establish a basis for the ongoing application, management and development of relationship vocabularies.

The Task Group sees its role not as providing definitive answers to all issues concerning the application of relationship designators, but as facilitating their adoption by providing a baseline for their initial implementation and then recommending steps for continuing development of best practices. The Task Group believes that finding best practice for recording relationships will be an evolutionary process. We expect that these guidelines and their accompanying examples will need to be augmented and adjusted in the light of further experience. In a number of areas we have recommended in the body of the report that specific issues be referred to other groups.
2. Short-term needs

2.1 To identify a set of relationships that PCC catalogers should record

The actual range of relationships that can be expressed in a bibliographic record is almost unlimited. RDA has few inbuilt constraints in this regard and little in the way of an established body of practice to follow. We need therefore to establish a baseline for community practice.

For relationships between a resource and persons, corporate bodies, or families associated with the resource, the Task Group has compiled a list of recommended relationship designators from RDA Appendix I for materials in various formats. We propose that relationship designators for creators be mandatory where the relevant access points are given.

For relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, and items, the Task Group proposes a set of guidelines and examples covering the application of RDA Appendix J relationship designators in the types of cases where related resources are most commonly specified under current practice.

In each case we offer these guidelines as a baseline for further development of PCC and community guidelines in the light of further experience. As RDA and its associated practices continue to develop, we believe it may eventually be both feasible and desirable to strengthen the requirements to include additional mandatory terms.

Experience with MARC relators suggests that specialist communities will be highly motivated users of relationship designators. The Task Group proposes that once a common set of guiding principles has been established, PCC should encourage specialist communities to develop relationship vocabularies and associated guidelines to meet needs identified within their own domains. These domains need not be format-specific. Law catalogers, for example, may have an interest in promoting the use of relationship designators such as plaintiff and defendant. Similarly, we recommend that PCC consider relationship designator issues when charging future groups working in relevant areas.

The charge for the Task Group asks that we address whether catalogers should use MARC relator codes or RDA relationship designators. We believe the most practical course is to adopt RDA relationship designators across the board. Our recommendation is that catalogers apply RDA relationship designators rather than MARC relator terms and codes in all new PCC cataloging, whether under RDA or AACR2, and when upgrading existing RDA or AACR2 records to PCC standards. A table of correspondences between MARC and RDA relators is given in Appendix E of this report.

2.2 To indicate a preferred method of recording resource-to-resource relationships in the current environment

RDA provides for several ways to record relationships among resources, using identifiers, authorized access points, or structured or unstructured descriptions. Because no single method is
necessarily well suited to all situations, and because pre-RDA practice observes a variety of conventions for different types of relationships, guidelines are needed on which method or methods to use in various cases.

The Task Group has sought to strike a balance in its recommendations between compatibility with existing practices and legacy MARC definitions on the one hand, and support on the other hand for sound practice based on RDA vocabularies and principles going forward.

To meet immediate needs, the report provides some general guidelines along with guidelines and examples to cover a range of specific cases. These guidelines and examples are provided to help catalogers make choices both among options offered in RDA and alternatives available in MARC. The examples given here should be regarded as illustrations only, and will need to be revised in the light of further work on referencing RDA entities, including the recommendations of the PCC Task Group on Access Points for Expressions.

Some of the recommendations are intended to facilitate the transition to a post-MARC environment. The Task Group recommends that RDA relationship designators be coded explicitly wherever practicable. We propose that a relationship designator be given even when the MARC field definition already implies a relationship, and that we adopt coding practices that give access points for resources explicitly without requiring information to be inferred from other parts of the record. The Task Group believes that these practices will result in more consistent data that will be easier to manage, to implement, and to migrate to future environments.

The principle of coding RDA data explicitly is consistent with practices the cataloging community has adopted elsewhere, e.g., in assigning content/media/carrier designations even where MARC fixed fields and their appropriate codes are present.

2.3 To provide guidance on choice among relationship designators

RDA provides little guidance on choice of relationship designators beyond the definitions given. In some cases it can be unclear which of several available alternatives best suits a given case. This can happen in several distinct kinds of instances: where the definitions themselves are insufficiently distinct, where similar relationships are defined at different WEMI levels, and where designators are nested within a hierarchy. In this last case the question also arises whether the top-level element in such a hierarchy (such as publisher) is valid for use as a relationship designator.

Our report outlines some general principles to guide choice among available relationship designators, and gives default options to resolve difficult cases, including the option if necessary to assign element names or to omit relationship designators altogether.
3. Longer-term needs

3.1 To continue to identify and meet training needs for applying relationship designators

Relationship designators are still new to many catalogers, and it appears likely that RDA itself will continue to develop in this area. The Task Group recommends that PCC continue to monitor progress in this area and adapt its guidelines and training programs accordingly.

3.2 To develop a process to manage ongoing development of the RDA relationship designator lists

RDA introduces the concept of an open vocabulary for its relationship designators. The lists of relationship designators are conceived as controlled vocabularies, but ones to which cataloguers may add more or less freely. (The $i relationship information subfield in 7XX fields should not be confused with true free-text subfields such as 246 $i.) At the same time, there is a strong tradition of specialist communities maintaining their own relationship vocabularies. The need for a process to manage the development of the lists is made more urgent by the absence in MARC 1XX and 7XX of any way to identify a term's source vocabulary. The Task Group would support efforts to develop a MARC proposal to address this need, but we have not attempted to devise such a proposal for this report.

Section 5 of the report deals with vocabulary management issues and proposes a role for PCC catalogers and specialist communities in developing the vocabulary and endorses a process for approving submissions. It also includes a recommendation for the PCC to investigate the Open Metadata Registry as a potential future environment for managing RDA and related vocabularies and to collaborate with the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI) community in developing best practices. DCMI is building a framework for managing, extending, and sharing vocabularies in an open environment, and relationship designators are a promising area for collaboration.

3.3 To develop guidelines on how to reference related resources

Two things are needed to assert a relationship between two resources, a relationship designator and a means of referencing the related resource. In considering the former, it became evident to us that there are many unresolved issues surrounding the latter. From a FRBR standpoint current practices are often indeterminate both about what the entities are and how they are referenced.

We look forward to the report of the PCC Task Group for Access Points for Expressions, which will clarify many of the issues surrounding expression entities. However, there are broader issues that may remain to be addressed.

Potentially among these are issues arising from the need to reference FRBR entities using MARC, a pre-FRBR format. Loosely speaking, MARC tends to represent work- and expression-level
relationships using 700/710/711/730 added entries and manifestation- and item-level relationships using 76X-78X linking entry fields. But RDA relationships do not always map cleanly to MARC definitions. Two examples:

- The *Contains* relationship commonly depicted by a MARC 700 analytical added entry with a second indicator value of 2 is not specific to a WEMI entity.
- RDA defines *Translation of* as an expression-level relationship, but the MARC 765 field for translations is a linking entry field and does not have the subfield structure needed to fully specify an expression represented by an RDA authorized access point. A case could be made that best practice for RDA would be to deprecate 765 in favor of 700/710/711/730.

It can be expected that in a future metadata format, the nature of the relationship will be specified by the relationship designator alone or a URI representing the relationship designator. During the present transitional period, however, RDA entities and relationship designators still need to be reconciled with MARC definitions.

An important question we hope to see clarified in the longer term concerns the use of identifiers or other pointers such as system control numbers to reference related entities. Meanwhile, catalogers still lack a consistent set of conventions to guide the construction of most types of linking entry fields.

The Task Group recommends that PCC evaluate the need for additional guidelines on preferred techniques for referencing related entities once it has received the report of the PCC Task Group on Access Points for Expression. If necessary, PCC should consider charging a group to recommend guidelines on how to reference related resources in MARC and propose desiderata for doing so in a post-MARC environment.

### 3.4 To update legacy data

The Task Group believes relationship designators will prove useful to systems and users, but is concerned that a ‘critical mass’ of records containing relationship designators may be necessary before the benefit will be consistent across a catalog or discovery service. For example, if a search interface offers a facet or limit based on relationship designators but few records contain them, the user may be given a false impression that there are no records for a given composer because a relationship designator was not given. It is for this reason that the Task Group has recommended mandatory use for creators from RDA Appendix I, and strongly encourages others, in PCC records. It is our hope that legacy records may be enhanced to supply this information whenever possible using automated means, and encourages collaborative groups and bibliographic utilities to consider automated approaches that might supplement terms added by individual catalogers. Some conversion of existing MARC relator terms or codes may be possible, and it may also be possible to infer them from other data in the record in some, but not all, cases.
Updating legacy data is a large task that is beyond the scope of this report. However, several of our recommendations are intended to help prepare the way for this work. Our recommendations to give explicit and consistent coding of RDA relationships, and to develop a process to manage them as controlled terms, are intended in part to facilitate the transition to more fully RDA-compliant catalogs and eventually to post-MARC formats.

### 3.5 To identify use cases for relationship designators, and to introduce appropriate vocabulary and best practices for them

There are many current or future problems to which relationship designators offer potential solutions, and some of the most compelling use cases for relationship designators may be ones not limited to the contents of library catalogs. While these issues are beyond the immediate scope of this Task Group, we believe they warrant attention.

Our report includes a recommendation to PCC to include relationship designator issues when charging future groups working in relevant areas. The group also identified online collections as a promising use case for relationship designators and proposes that PCC appoint a Task Group to examine this area. Current methods for representing online collections have limitations that could be addressed through the use of relationship designators such as $e content provider.
4. Policy recommendations and guidelines

These guidelines should not be construed as requiring the inclusion of any access points or structured descriptions that the cataloger would not otherwise provide. Their primary intent is to guide catalogers on how and when to provide relationship designators in cases where access points or structured descriptions are given.

These guidelines apply to new PCC records, whether created under AACR2 or RDA, and also to existing records upgraded to PCC standard.

4.1 General guidelines for PCC catalogers applying RDA relationship designators

4.1.1 It is recommended that PCC catalogers use relationship designators from the RDA appendices unless they are cataloging according to specialist community guidelines that prescribe an alternative source vocabulary.

4.1.2 Within a hierarchy of relationship designators, prefer a specific term to a general one if it is easily determined. For example, use librettist rather than author for the creator of a libretto.

• If the list does not include a term for the relationship that needs to be described, devise an appropriate term and propose it for formal inclusion in the vocabulary following the mechanism laid out in Section 5 on vocabulary management. Provide applicable details such as the hierarchy the term belongs under, the WEMI entity it is associated with, or any MARC relator it is equivalent to. The term may be used pending approval.

• If you cannot ascertain a more specific relationship, assign the element term, e.g., Creator or Publisher. If the nature of the relationship cannot be ascertained even at a general level, do not assign a relationship designator.

4.1.3 When upgrading records to PCC standards, catalogers should evaluate existing relationship designators, MARC relator codes or terms and correct them if necessary and add relationship designators as appropriate.

4.1.4 Be careful to apply relationship designators in accordance with their definitions. For example, note the difference between editor and editor of compilation, or between artist and illustrator. If the definitions or hierarchies appear to be problematical, propose changes following the mechanism laid out in Section 5 on vocabulary management.

4.1.5 In general, it is not necessary to provide access points for related entities not named in the resource. However, other sources of information may be consulted to identify related entities and to determine the nature of their relationship to the resource.

4.2 Guidelines for RDA Appendix I relationship designators

For lists of relationship designators applicable to specific categories of material, see Appendix C of this report. A table of MARC relator terms and corresponding RDA relationship designators is provided for reference in Appendix E of this report.
4.2.1 Use RDA relationship designators rather than MARC relator terms or codes.

4.2.2 If you provide an access point for a creator, always include a relationship designator.

4.2.3 The use of relationship designators for other access points is encouraged.

4.2.4 If the same entity has multiple roles, generally prefer to use a repeating $e (or $j for X11 fields) rather than entering multiple iterations of the access point. For example, 100 1# $a Stone, Melicent, $e author $e illustrator is an acceptable construction. However, it is acceptable to use multiple iterations of the access point each with a single relationship designator.

4.2.5 Note that the relationship designators in RDA Appendix I may be applied to families and corporate bodies as well as to individuals.

4.3 Guidelines for RDA Appendix J relationship designators

For specific guidelines and examples dealing with frequently encountered types of resource-to-resource relationships, see Appendix D of this report.

4.3.1 The use of relationship designators for resource-to-resource relationships is encouraged.

4.3.2 If you wish to indicate a known relationship to a known resource, and the $i relationship information subfield is defined for the 7XX field you are using, provide a relationship designator. Do so even if the field coding otherwise already expresses a relationship.

4.3.3 Where multiple relationships exist, e.g., an abridged translation, provide separate access points each with a single relationship designator in a single $i subfield. Alternatively, identify one relationship as primary and record that relationship alone.

4.3.4 Except in the case of sequential work or expression relationships and equivalent manifestation relationships for serials, it is not necessary to provide reciprocal relationship fields. In general, use the relationships given for the situations described below in Appendix D in preference to their reciprocols.

4.3.5 Catalogers may add a 7XX field with a relationship designator referring to a specific related resource even if a 130 or 240 field is already present implying that they are versions of the same work.

4.3.6 If there is reason to believe that the resource being cataloged is related to another resource, but the resource in question cannot be identified (e.g., in the case of an expression that is believed to be a translation but the original is unknown), give the information in a note.

4.3.7 When constructing a reference to a related resource sharing the same principally responsible creator as the resource being described, use a 700/710/711/730 author-title entry explicitly naming the creator in its $a rather than a 740 title entry with an implied relationship to the 1XX in the same record.
4.3.8 For unstructured descriptions it is not necessary to indicate the WEMI level at which the relationship is asserted.

4.4 Note on RDA Appendix K relationship designators

The Task Group considered the issues raised by Appendix K on relationships among persons, corporate bodies, and families to be largely beyond its scope. However, we noted that a key issue considered elsewhere in our report also emerges here: whether catalogers should continue to use relationships defined in MARC (here coded in $w of reference fields in authority records) or adopt RDA relationship designators given in $i. We believe it is strongly preferable that $i relationship designators be used in preference to older style $w codes. We recommend that a task group be formed to consider the issues raised by Appendix K in greater detail.
5. Vocabulary management for relationship designators in RDA
Appendices I and J

5.1 Establishing new RDA relationship designators
The Task Group endorses the JSC fast track process as a channel for individual PCC catalogers applying RDA relationship designators to propose new terms for inclusion in the RDA appendices and recommending changes to the definitions of existing terms. Catalogers from PCC institutions should funnel new relationship designators and any proposed changes to existing terms (including their hierarchies and definitions) through the chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards (PCC SCS). The chair of PCC SCS will work with the PCC representative to CC:DA to present the terms to the ALA representative to the JSC.

The Task Group proposes that SCS be given responsibility to communicate JSC-approved new terms to the catalogers who proposed them. If a proposal is not accepted, reasons should be provided.

The process is as follows:
1. Contact the JSC representative for your constituency.
2. The JSC representative collects proposed additions and changes to the relationship designator list and shares them with the JSC.
3. Using the fast track process, new terms should usually be decided upon within three weeks.
4. If approved, the JSC secretary includes the additions and changes in updates for the next release of RDA.

One further possibility for collecting terms outside of the RDA list is charge a PCC task force to collect such terms. The task force could evaluate lists of relationship or relator terms used by other communities, and recommend terms from those lists which would be valuable to include in the RDA lists. If the task force wanted to recommend an entire list for inclusion in RDA, that list could possibly go through the normal (not fast track) RDA revision process. The evaluation process will need to take into account intellectual property issues.

Specialist communities wishing to add to the RDA relationship designator vocabularies may establish their own methods for vetting new relationship designators from their communities and submitting those terms to the JSC.

5.2 Using RDA relationship designators
If PCC catalogers wish to use a term not in the RDA appendices, they may do so, and they should also submit the term to PCC SCS for inclusion in RDA. The task group also recommends that a process be established for informing proposers when terms have been approved for use. It is the responsibility of individual catalogers to change records as needed if new designators they submitted are not approved for use.

When upgrading records to PCC standards, catalogers using RDA relationship designators should evaluate existing MARC relator terms and codes and RDA relationship designators. If a designator is not in the RDA appendices, the cataloger should either propose the term via PCC SCS, or delete or replace the term if it has been used inaccurately.
5.3 Alternative platform for vocabulary management

The relationship designators from the RDA appendices are also available via the Open Metadata Registry (OMR), although not yet in a ‘published’ status pending discussions with the JSC and the RDA publishers. In the future, especially as the library community moves beyond the MARC format, the OMR could provide an informal and expedited process for adding new relationship designators to the vocabulary.

A suggested process for new relationship terms using the OMR might involve:

- Using URIs for new terms instead of text strings.
- Using text mining mechanisms to pull text strings for new designators from the data.
- Using this process to keep track of alternate forms of terms, as well as to propose new terms. This would be helpful when a new term is actually a reference to an existing term.

The OMR also will offer the possibility of mapping between existing vocabularies. The time frame for initial rollout of this functionality is late 2012 to early 2013. PCC could recommend a list of vocabularies that should be valid in PCC records and create application profiles for those vocabularies. The Task Group recommends that PCC cooperate with the DCMI community on best practices for vocabulary management.
Appendix A: RDA implementation dependencies

A.1 Implementation strategy and timeline

While it is not possible at this point to lay out an implementation plan in detail, we can lay out some of the steps that need to be taken, in rough order, in order to implement the coding of relationship designators as part of PCC cataloging.

- PoCo first needs to decide whether the recommended core relationship designators are mandatory or optional.
- If some relationship designators are mandatory, should there be an official start date or should libraries begin to code them when they begin to create RDA bibliographic records?
- PoCo needs to consider whether any mandatory relationship designators should be coded on new or existing AACR2 records or have the decision to code them be optional.
- If PoCo accepts the recommendation that RDA relationship designators be applied to AACR2 as well as RDA records, the PCC Hybrid Records Task Group should be notified.
- The Task Group report and any decisions made by PoCo should be widely shared.
- Training material about relationship designators and their application should be created by the PCC Standing Committee on Training. BSR and CSR documentation will need to be updated.
- A mechanism for the addition of new terms should be put into place.
- Guidelines for the evaluation of uncontrolled terms are needed.
- Charge a group to review the recommendations and examples given in this report relating to RDA Appendix J in the light of the recommendations of the PCC Task Group on Access Points for Expressions. Initiate a further review after the CC:DA group on instructions for relationship designators releases its report.

A.2 Additional proposals for consideration

The Task Group’s investigation of relationship designators raised a wide range of related issues and possible further steps that PCC may wish to consider acting on.

A.2.1 Encourage domain communities, including others not represented here, e.g., law catalogers, to develop lists of preferred relationship designators. These domains need not be format-specific.

A.2.2 When forming future PCC groups working in relevant areas, include in their charges the task of identifying use cases for relationship designators, developing guidelines for when and how to reference related entities, and proposing any new relationship designators that may be needed.

A.2.3 Charge a PCC group to evaluate relationship designator terms that are used by specialist communities but are not currently in the RDA appendices.

A.2.4 Charge the Task Group on RDA Training Materials to continue to develop examples for training purposes.
A.2.5 Refer issues concerning sequential relationships to the continuing resources community.

A.2.6 Charge a group to make recommendations concerning Appendix K on relationships among persons, families, and corporate bodies.

A.2.7 Undertake a review of OCLC and other available data on usage of relationship designators after the first year of implementation and survey libraries and specialist cataloging communities on extent of adoption and obstacles encountered. Reevaluate guidelines in the light of the information gathered and consider issues requiring further work.

A.2.8 Charge a group to investigate potential approaches to enhancing or converting legacy data, including automated and manual methods, and consideration of policy issues that such changes would raise.

A.2.9 Charge a group to investigate the use of relationship designators for online collections. Its charge should encompass both relationship designators for corporate bodies such as content providers and the aggregations themselves, such as those currently coded as host item entries. The charge should also include consideration of any needed elaboration or clarification of the provider-neutral guidelines.

A.2.10 Charge a group to recommend guidelines for referencing related resources in MARC and propose desiderata for doing so in a post-MARC environment.

A.2.11 Cooperate with the DCMI community on best practices for establishing new relationship designator terms.
Appendix B: Revision of PCC RDA Frequently Asked Questions

While there are several mentions of Relationship Designators in the FAQs (PCC transition: 1.3, 1.5; Policy decisions: 5.2; RDA in bib rec: 3.1, 3.3), the only one that we feel our work affects is Policy decision 5.2. The italicized section below is a proposed answer.

5.2 Are there PCC policy decisions on applying RDA options and choosing or recommending among those options?

PCC policy decisions are being developed.

The PCC RDA Decisions Needed Task Group prioritized the decisions needed for implementation of RDA by the PCC and assigned appropriate groups to make recommendations for decisions and options.

The PCC Relationship Designator Guidelines Task Group has proposed guidelines with the primary intent to guide catalogers on how and when to provide relationship designators in cases where access points are given. These guidelines should not be construed as requiring the inclusion of any access points that the cataloger would not otherwise provide. Please see the Task Group’s full report for more detail.
Appendix C: Recommended relationship designators for specific categories of material

These lists are the outcome of an initial round of consultation with specialist communities on a basic set of relationship designators that they would regard as desirable. They are offered here both as a resource for catalogers and as a basis for continuing work on developing best practice.

Relationship designators for creators are marked with an asterisk.

C.1 General textual resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>author*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>compiler*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>degree granting institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>issuing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>sponsoring body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>editor of compilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>illustrator¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>writer of added commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.2 Cartographic materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>cartographer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>compiler*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>artist*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>designer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>issuing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>draftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td>engraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td>lithographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td>printer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ LC-PCC PS for I.3.1 states that the relationship designator *illustrator* should be applied to access points for illustrators of resources intended for children.
### C.3 Audiovisual material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>filmmaker*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>author*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>director of photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>film producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>production company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>editor of moving image work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>composer (expression)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>animator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.2</td>
<td>broadcaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.2</td>
<td>film distributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full list of relationship designators applicable to audiovisual material is available at: [http://pccrelationshipdesignatortg.pbworks.com/w/page/59552950/AV%20Relationship%20Designators%20(Core%20and%20Full)](http://pccrelationshipdesignatortg.pbworks.com/w/page/59552950/AV%20Relationship%20Designators%20(Core%20and%20Full))

### C.4 Music

The MLA Bibliographic Control Committee recommended a set of relationship designators from RDA Appendix J as well as RDA Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>RDA Appendix I term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>composer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>librettist*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>lyricist*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>arranger of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>recordist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>RDA Appendix J term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>J.2.2</td>
<td>adaptation of (work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>J.2.5</td>
<td>cadenza composed for (work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A full list of relationship designators applicable to music is available at:
http://pccrelationshipdesignatortg.pbworks.com/Music-Relationship-Designators-%28Core-and-
Full-lists%29

C.5 Rare books and manuscripts

The RBMS Controlled Vocabularies subcommittee maintains its own list of relationship designators which is available at
http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/controlled_vocabularies/relators/alphabetical_list.htm. Below is a selection of terms common to both vocabularies showing the RBMS scope note.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEMI entity</th>
<th>RDA rule</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>RBMS scope note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>artist*</td>
<td>Use for the entity responsible for conceiving, and perhaps also implementing, an original graphic design or work of art. Prefer &quot;illustrator&quot; for book illustrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td>compiler*</td>
<td>Use for the entity responsible for producing a work or publication by selecting and putting together material from the works of various persons or bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>contributor</td>
<td>Use for an entity responsible for contributing to a larger work, such as a monographic anthology, serial publication, or other compilation of individual works. Do not use for an entity whose sole function in relation to a work is editor, author, compiler, or translator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>editor</td>
<td>Use for the entity responsible for preparing for publication a work not primarily his/her/its own, such as by elucidating text, adding introductory or other critical matter, or technically directing an editorial staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>illustrator</td>
<td>Use for the entity responsible for conceiving, and perhaps also implementing, a design or illustration, usually to accompany a written text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td>translator</td>
<td>Use for person who renders a text from one language into another, or from an older form of a language into the modern form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td>engraver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td>printer</td>
<td>Use for printer of texts, whether from type or plates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>I.4.2/21.3.1.1</td>
<td>publisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>I.5.2</td>
<td>binder&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>I.5.2</td>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Use for the entity responsible for bringing together material from various sources, which has been arranged, described, and cataloged as a collection. The collector is neither the creator of the material nor the entity to whom manuscripts in the collection may have been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>I.5.1</td>
<td>donor</td>
<td>Use for the entity who donates a book, manuscript, etc., to the present owner; donors to previous owners are designated as former owner or inscriber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>I.5.1</td>
<td>former owner</td>
<td>Use for an entity that previously owned an item. For an entity giving the item to the present owner, use &quot;donor.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> In RBMS usage the relationship designator *binder* may apply at either the item or the manifestation level.
Appendix D: Guidelines for resource-to-resource relationships: cases and examples

These guidelines and examples are provided to help catalogers apply relationship designators in commonly encountered scenarios. They are not intended to be comprehensive and should be reviewed periodically in the light of further developments and experience. The recommendations of the PCC Task Group on Access Points for Expressions will have an immediate bearing on several of the cases presented here and these are marked with an asterisk. Item relationships are not covered here, since methods for dealing with them are highly local or system- or domain-specific in nature.

D.1 Compilations and contents

If providing access points rather than, or in addition to, a 505 table of contents field for compilations or contents (e.g., to provide chapter-level access for a book), normally use 700/710/711/730 $i Contains (work): with a second indicator value of 2. Provide notes as needed for additional context.

Use Contains (expression) only in cases where a specific expression needs to be referenced, e.g., where a compilation includes translations, or where (as in the example below) a publication contains a specific version of a computer program.

Similarly, use Contains (manifestation) only when a specific manifestation has to be referenced, e.g., a volume that includes a facsimile of a significant document. Contains (manifestation) should be used in conjunction with a structured description.

Example: General
245 00 $a Three plays about crime and criminals / $c edited with introduction by George Freedley.
700 12 $i Contains (work): $a Kesselring, Joseph,$d 1902-1967.$t Arsenic and old lace.

Example: Specific expression
245 14 $a The language of first-order logic : $b including the Mackintosh program Tarski’s world 4.0 / $c Jon Barwise & John Etchemendy.
250 ## $a Third edition, revised and expanded.
264 #1 $a Stanford, California : $b Center for the Study of Language and Information, $c 1993.
300 ## $a xiv, 313 pages ; $c 23 cm + $e 1 computer disc (1 program file).
730 02 $a Tarski’s world. $f 1993.*
D.2 Revisions and later editions

Later edition, no change of title proper or principal responsibility
Provide an edition statement, but do not supply an additional access point.

Revised editions involving change of title proper
Give the preferred title for the expression in hand in 130 or 240.

Example:

100 1# $a Hawkins, Walter L. $q (Walter Lee), $d 1949- $e author
240 10 $a African American generals and flag officers.$f2007*
245 10 $a Black American military leaders : $b a biographical dictionary / $c Walter L. Hawkins.

Optionally, also give a 700/710/711/730 field with the authorized access point for the expression the resource is derived from if it is considered important to reference that specific expression. Supply the relationship designator Revision of (expression). Provide notes as needed for additional context.

700 1# $i Revision of (expression): $a Hawkins, Walter L. $q (Walter Lee), $d 1949- $t African American generals and flag officers. $f1993.*

Revised editions involving change of principal responsibility
Use Based on (work) in 700/710/711/730 $i. Provide notes as needed for additional context.

Example:
Conflict of laws, second edition, by John O’Brien, is a revised edition of Conflict of laws by Raymond Smith.

100 1# $a O’Brien, John, $c LL.M. $e author.
245 10 $a Conflict of laws / $c John O’Brien.
250 ## $a Second edition.
700 1# $i Based on (work): $a Smith, Raymond, $d -1995.$t Conflict of laws.

Published revisions of theses
If substantially still the same work as the original, provide a note without giving an additional access point.

D.3 Adaptations, abridgements, etc.

In general, select an appropriate term from the list under Based on (work) (J.2.2) and use it in 700/710/711/730 $i.

However, use terms from the Based on (expression) list when you need to refer to a specific expression.

**Example: General**

*Kes / by Lawrence Till [a play adapted from Barry Hines’ A kestrel for a knave]*

700 1# $i Dramatization of (work): $a Hines, Barry, $d 1939- $t Kestrel for a knave.

**Example: Abridgement of specific expression**


700 1# $i Abridgement of (expression): $a Dewey, Melvil, $d 1851-1931. $t Dewey decimal classification and relative index.$sEdition 22.*

D. 4 Translations

If referencing the source expression in a 700/710/711/730 field, use the Translation of relationship. Do not use Free translation of (work) or Free translation of (expression) except in cases where the translation departs sufficiently from the original to result in a new work.

For parallel texts, give the authorized access point in a 700/710/711/730 field with the relationship designator Contains (expression).

**Example: General**

100 1# $a DiCamillo, Kate, $e author
240 10 $a Tiger rising. $l Estonian*
245 10 $a Tiiger virgub / $c Kate DiCamillo ; tolkinud Leelo Mèarjamaa.
700 1# $i Translation of: $a DiCamillo, Kate. $t Tiger rising.*

**Example: Parallel texts**

100 1# $a Macken, JoAnn Early, $d 1953- $e author
245 10 $a Mail carrier = $b El cartero / $c JoAnn Early Macken.
246 31 $a Cartero
546 ## $a English and Spanish.
700 12 $i Contains (expression): $a Macken, JoAnn Early, $d 1953- $t Mail carrier.*
700 12 $i Contains (expression): $a Macken, JoAnn Early, $d 1953- $t Mail carrier. $l Spanish.*

---

3 Adapted from LC training materials developed by Les Hawkins and Hien Nguyen.
D. 5 Commentaries or guides
Generally reference the work that is the subject of a commentary or guide by naming it in a 6XX field rather than by using a 7XX field with a relationship designator.

Example
Don Quixote : notes / by Marianne Sturman [in Cliff’s notes series]
600 10 $a Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de, $d 1547-1616. $t Don Quixote $x Examinations $v Study guides.

D. 6 Supplements and other companion publications
In general, use the most appropriate term you can find from the Augmentation of (work) list under J.2.5 and use it in 700/710/711/730 $i.

However, if the resource in hand is clearly intended to supplement or accompany a specific expression, select a relationship designator from the Accompanying expression list under J.3.5 to use in 700/710/711/730.

Example: General
700 1# $i Supplement to (work): $a Drake, Richard L. $q(Richard Lee), $d 1950- $t Gray's anatomy for students.

Example: Accompanies specific expression
Study guide to accompany Life, the science of biology, fifth edition, Purves, Orians, Heller, and Sadava / prepared by Job C. Glase, Jerry A. Waldvogel.
700 1# $i Guide to (expression): $a Purves, William K., $d 1934- $t Life, the science of biology. $s Fifth edition.*

D. 7 Reproductions, alternative formats, simultaneous publications4
For reproductions and other related manifestations apply LC-PCC PS 27.1 and LC-PCC PS 27.1.1.3.

Related manifestation is an LC core element for reproductions. LC-PCC PS 27.1 states:
*The term “reproduction” is being used in its broadest sense to include all resources formerly identified as reproductions, republications, reprints, reissues, facsimiles, etc., that still represent equivalent content between an original resource and a reproduction of that original.*

4 Adapted from LC training materials developed by Les Hawkins and Hien Nguyen
In general, use a relationship designator from the *Equivalent manifestation* list (J.4.2). Use 776 for different formats; use 775 if the related manifestation is in the same format. Give reciprocal relationships for serials.

Use equivalent item relationships (J.5.2) only if the reproduction is intended to represent a particular copy.

If a bibliographic record or other detailed information about the original is not available, give instead a bibliographic history note with as much information as you have in a MARC 500 field.

**Example: Equivalent content in different formats**

245 00 $a Health statistics for elementary-school children.
264 #1 $a Baltimore : $b Johns Hopkins University, $c 2009-
300 ## $a volumes ; $c 27 cm
776 08 $i Also issued as: $t Health statistics for elementary-school children $d Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University, $c 2009- $h CD-ROMs ; 4 3/4 in. $w (OCoLC)123456789

**Example: Reproduction**

100 1# $a Ringwalt, J. Luther $q (John Luther), $e author
245 10 $a Anecdotes of General Ulysses S. Grant / $c J. Luther Ringwalt.
300 ## $a 1 microfilm reel (118 pages) ; $c 35 mm
776 08 $i Reproduction of (manifestation): $a Ringwalt, J. Luther (John Luther) $t Anecdotes of General Ulysses S. Grant $d Philadelphia : J.B. Lippincott Company, 1886 $h 118 p. ; 18 cm. $n Call number of original: E672.R58 $w (DLC) 10032685

**D. 8 Accompanying material**

For resources with accompanying material described on the same record, apply LC-PCC PS 3.1.4 and follow the examples given there.

**D. 9 Preceding/succeeding titles**

Continue for the present to use 780/785 without relationship designators. The TG recommends referring issues concerning sequential relationships to the continuing resources community.

**D.10 Series**

Continue to use 490/8XX without relationship designator. $i is not defined for MARC series fields.

**D.11 Special issues of journals**

Use an unstructured description in a note field in conjunction with the 7XX or 4XX/8XX entry. Do not use $i Special issue of: in conjunction with a 730 field, since RDA defines *Special issue of* as a manifestation-level relationship.
Example: Journal title given in 730
245 04 $a The anatomy of chemical Holland.
264 #1 $a [Burnierstraat] : $b [Koninklijke Nederlandse Chemische Vereniging], $c [1970]
300 ## $a 71 pages : $b illustrations ; $c 29 cm
500 ## $a Special issue of Chemisch weekblad.
730 0# $a Chemisch weekblad.

Example: Journal title given in 830
245 00 $a American labor films / $c guest editor, Thomas Brandon.
264 #1 $a New York : $b Film Library Information Council, $c 1979.
300 ## $a 112 pages : $b illustrations ; $c 23 cm.
490 1# $a Film library quarterly, $x 0015-1327 ; $v v. 12, no. 2/3
500 ## $a Special issue of Film library quarterly, v. 12, no. 2/3.
700 1$# $a Brandon, Thomas, $e editor of compilation.
830 #0 $a Film library quarterly ; $v v. 12, no. 2/3.
Appendix E: Table of MARC and RDA relators

A list of MARC relator codes and their closest RDA equivalents is provided here as a resource for catalogers and others implementing RDA relationship designators.

http://pccrelationshipdesignatortg.pbworks.com/w/file/57911454/relationship_designators.xlsx

Appendix F: Example of relator codes implemented in a current discovery interface

To illustrate one type of functionality that will be possible with relationship designators, below is an excerpt of a MARC record from a video recording using the analogous MARC relator codes in 7XX fields. By using relator codes, facets for Actor, Production studio, Director, Producer, Performer can be built. This type of information can be highly useful in a specialized catalog.

700 1# $a Zagar, Jeremiah. $4 drt
700 1# $a Yaches, Jeremy. $4 pro
700 1# $a Zagar, Isaiah, $d 1939- $4 act
700 1# $a Zagar, Julia. $4 act
700 2# $a Efterklang (Musical group) $4 prf
700 2# $a Herzliya Films (Firm) $4 pro
700 2# $a HBO Documentary Films. $4 pro
700 2# $a International Film Circuit (Firm) $4 pro
700 2# $a Red Light Films (Firm) $4 pro
700 2# $a Books (Musical group) $4 prf
700 2# $a IndiePix (Firm) $4 dst

The full record and associated facets can be seen here:

http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/vcat(record.html?id=VCAT_5405433&rotation=0&detail=staff
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