LC-PCC Task Group on Aggregates in Beta RDA Toolkit

Final Report. Part 2: Aggregate Access Points

February 2021

Introduction to Part 2

The impetus for dividing the Task Group on Aggregates in Beta RDA Toolkit's report into two parts was a series of major changes to the guidelines for authorized access points in Beta RDA that took place in April 2020. While the TG had already drawn up some recommendations for AAPs for aggregates, we found that the changes required we start over. In addition to these RDA text changes, the TG has also taken into account the recent move on LC's part to use manifestation titles rather than conventional collective titles for incomplete collections of poetry, followed by PCC's announcement that it would perform a test of using manifestation titles for any incomplete collection of a single literary type, such as short stories or lyrics. This has since been extended to certain types of music conventional collective titles and is being explored for other types of literary forms by PCC.

Another obvious factor is that Beta RDA is now published as of December 15, 2020, and is called the Official RDA Toolkit (hereafter, simply "RDA" or "Official RDA"). Honoring their promise to the RSC, LC is publishing policy statements for the Official RDA Toolkit, based on existing practice, including those for authorized access points (AAPs). The TG has been informed by LC that these PSs will be going through multiple revisions (including moving parts to Metadata Guidance Documents, Metadata Application Profiles (MAPs), or a document describing a string encoding scheme), and as a moving target it is best to not take them into consideration or to quote them in this document.

While this report is titled "Aggregate Access Points," it explores in depth only three specific types of aggregate titles: 1. AAPs for complete works (or works of one type, medium, etc.) by one creator; 2. AAPs for incomplete compilations of works (or works of one type, medium, etc.) by one creator; 3. Translations of aggregating works.

Note about terminology: There is some confusion about how to refer to the "original" RDA of 2010 and its updates, the pre-release version of the current version of RDA, and the current version of RDA itself, especially when comparing the content of the three versions. This document adopts an internal terminology that is intended to differentiate among these versions. They are not intended to be official names, but are used only for the sake of clarity.

> **Original RDA**: RDA version originally published in 2010

> **Beta RDA:** RDA pre-release version provided in the RDA Toolkit until December 15, 2020

> **RDA or Official RDA**: RDA version released December 15, 2020

The Task Group charge, membership, and Part 1 of the final report are available on the [PCC website](#) under *Task Groups, 2019-*.

Factors influencing the Makeup of Preferred Titles and Authorized Access Points in RDA

Changes to Guidelines for Preferred Titles & Authorized Access Points (AAPs) in Beta RDA

Beta RDA originally laid out guidelines for the creation of preferred titles and access points of all types, including conventional collective titles and their use, as does Original RDA. This resulted in 3 major issues:

1. The makeup and use of access points as given in Beta RDA (and indeed Original RDA) are aimed primarily at the English-speaking cataloging community. This is perhaps not a big problem for PCC, but is certainly a problem for other cataloging communities who wish to use RDA.
2. For a cataloger to use the Beta RDA guidelines, a policy statement would be necessary for each option given (and there were a lot). This would be a laborious and often repetitious process that would not likely result in a document that is easy to use, even with filters.
3. For PCC to use the Beta RDA guidelines in a MARC environment, policy statements would also have to replicate Appendix E, which lays out syntax for AAP and, for PCC, a number of current LC-PCC PSs and parts of DCM Z1. Other communities would need to do the same for their own guidelines. How to include this in Beta RDA, and make it easily available as needed, was difficult to decide.

With these issues in mind, the RSC decided it would be better for each cataloging community to provide their own guidelines for AAP content and syntax outside of RDA. Beta RDA, and thus Official RDA, would then include only very basic guidelines. Because of this, many of the general guidelines for AAPs have been removed from RDA, although guidelines for special formats/content (legal works, musical works, official communications, religious works) have remained in place. The RSC, however, has recently released a briefing paper that suggests removal of these guidelines as well.[1]

The primary changes that took place that relate to aggregates are:

- The removal of any reference to conventional collective titles in the primary text
- Relocation of the lists "Terms for Collective Titles" and "Books of the Bible" to the Community Vocabularies tab

The options in Official RDA that allow one to apply community vocabularies and string encoding schemes are:

Entities > Work > Access Point for Work > Recording a structured description (51.93.25.46)

> Option (70.24.17.40): Use a vocabulary encoding scheme as a source of information. Record the form found in the vocabulary encoding scheme. Do not amend the values or punctuation.

---

[1] Iseminger, Damian. *Pseudo-Elements*. Briefing paper for January 2021 RSC meeting. http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/PseudoElements.pdf

Option ([64.71.24.30](#)): Construct an access point by applying a string encoding scheme to the values of one or more other elements.

General guidelines for the creation of authorized access points (as well as the access points and preferred titles that make up AAPs) are still provided in Official RDA.

The WE Lock

Official RDA, following IFLA LRM, makes the following statements in its overview of aggregating expressions and works:

> *Guidance > Aggregates > Aggregating Expression* ([88.69.69.51](#))
>
> An aggregating expression realizes the plan of an aggregating work to select and arrange expressions that are embodied by an aggregate.
>
> ...
>
> An aggregating expression realizes one and only one aggregating work.
>
> An aggregating expression that selects a set of expressions that is different from another aggregating expression must realize a different aggregating work.

These three statements summarize the WE lock already discussed in Part 1 of this document. The reason it is repeated here is that it brings up questions about how we identify works and thus formulate AAPs for some types of aggregates, particularly those aggregates that would formerly be identified with a conventional collective title (CCT).

This will be discussed in detail below for our CCTs, but a short summary is given here:

1. *Complete works and Complete works of one form or type*
   Generally, catalogers have thought of these as single works, and any differentiation has used a syntax for expression attributes, e.g., Works. 1924. This, however, no longer is valid in Official RDA--if a new compilation of complete works is published, using different expressions of those aggregated works, the aggregating work is a new work.

2. *Incomplete compilations of works or works of one form or type*
   While these works often shared an access point (Works. Selections), they have always been recognized as separate works. Cataloging practice has varied over time and in different communities whether to differentiate these access points.

3. *Translations*
   Translations of aggregate works are also treated as expressions of those works, e.g., Poems. French. But since by definition, the expressions being aggregated in the other-language work are different expressions, the translation becomes a new work.

Conventional Collective Titles vs. Collective Manifestation Titles

The removal of conventional collective titles from RDA is both a challenge and an opportunity for LC and PCC. It is a challenge in that, as described above, if we retain our practices, a whole new document is needed to combine instructions for vocabulary (string encoding schemes (SES), vocabulary encoding schemes (VES)), syntax, and other instructions. On the other hand, it is an opportunity for both LC and PCC to reflect on current practices, especially given current moves away from CCTs for incomplete poetry compilations and perhaps other literary forms as well.

In light of these changes, the Library of Congress is working on the premise that any detailed guidelines for string encoding schemes (SES) for preferred titles and AAPs, as well as any vocabularies associated with AAPS, will be part of a larger metadata guidance document that will live outside the RDA Toolkit. This will include all or parts of policy statements currently in the Toolkit that do not make it into Official RDA (e.g., examples, detailed text), DCM Z1, the MARC authority format, and specifically for title access points, any further necessary guidelines gleaned from Original RDA's Chapter 6 (Identifying Works and Expressions) and Appendix E (Record Syntaxes for Access Point Control). Last but not least, it will need to cover the use of collective manifestation titles vs. conventional collective titles.

Although the term "conventional collective title" has been removed from RDA, the term "collective title" is used in Official RDA to represent "a title of manifestation of an aggregate." It is unfortunate that the word "collective" appears in both terms. For consistency, and to emphasize the distinction between conventional collective title and collective title, the Official RDA term collective title will be referred to in this paper as "collective manifestation title."

Until lately, both LC and PCC have been very conservative in the use of collective manifestation titles for aggregates, whether complete works, complete works in a single form, or incomplete compilations. The guidelines that govern these collection aggregates come from Original RDA 6.2.2.10 (Recording the Preferred Title for a Compilation of Works by One Agent). The guidelines begin with this statement:

> If a compilation of works is commonly identified by a title or form of title in manifestations embodying that compilation or in reference sources, apply the instructions at 6.2.2.4–6.2.2.7.

> For other compilations, apply the instructions at 6.2.2.10.1–6.2.2.10.3, as applicable.

This is followed directly by the guidelines for: complete works (6.2.2.10.1); complete works in a single form (6.2.2.10.2), which simply state to use the CCT "Works" or a specific form from a provided list; and other compilations of 2 or more works (6.2.2.10.3), also often referred to as "incomplete" compilations.

The relationship between these guidelines and the general guideline for 6.2.2.10 is ambiguous. Are these intended to always be "other compilations" or can they be identified by a title as in "manifestations embodying that compilation" from 6.2.2.10? What if a creator had only one published complete works and that was called "A literary legacy" or some such? Catalogers, however, have leaned more toward the idea of these as separate from the general guideline.

In practice, all this has meant that both LC and PCC have leaned heavily toward using CCTs instead of collective manifestation titles. Some catalogers have tentatively experimented with collective manifestation titles in some cases over the past several years, for specific types of materials, but generally the community has stayed with CCTs.

In April 2020, the Library of Congress completed a successful six-month pilot that tested the use of the commonly identified titles for compilations of poetry by one agent, in lieu of applying the Alternative in Original RDA 6.2.2.10 to assign a conventional collective title in this situation. Two of the pilot's successes are streamlined workflows and cataloging efficiencies due to fewer authority records being created or maintained for conventional collective titles. LC has since adopted this policy for poetry. Not long after, the Music Division at LC announced it was moving toward using existing collective manifestation titles instead of "Works. Selections" in cataloging scores. Thus far, this has been welcomed for the most part by the music cataloging community.

The TG has taken these moves in LC and PCC into account in its suggestions and recommendations for the types of aggregates already being moved to the newer practice and explores pushing this new practice even further and looking at the consequences.

Use of collective manifestation titles vs. CCTs will be discussed further below for specific types of collection aggregates.

Qualifiers to AAPs for Aggregating works

Qualifiers for Differentiation

In creating an AAP, qualifiers are often necessary to distinguish otherwise identical access points. These additional attributes may be drawn from work elements or from representative expression elements, as listed in Official RDA under *Additional elements and designations in access points for work* (13.98.40.08). If PCC wishes to designate individual complete works, as opposed to the work group only, qualifiers need to be added.

There is a twist here when it comes to aggregates. Guidelines on representative expressions (96.74.07.38) for aggregates state the following:

> An aggregating work is realized by one and only one expression, the aggregating expression.

> An aggregating expression cannot function as a representative expression because the content of an aggregating expression is not the content of the expressions that are aggregated.

> Instead, the "representative" expressions of an aggregating work are the expressions that are aggregated, not the aggregating expression.

> The values of representative expression elements for an aggregating work are derived from one or more expressions that are aggregated.

In short, any representative expression qualifier must come from the aggregated expressions, not the aggregating expression.

This is not an issue if the qualifier is a work qualifier, such as date of work, but caution is necessary in using representative expression elements as qualifiers. Such qualifiers should apply to *all* the expressions being aggregated in order to be meaningful.

Agent Qualifiers

In Original RDA, AAPs that combined both a creator and a work were described as bringing together two access points. In Official RDA, however, the agent (creator) part of the AAP is described as being a qualifier of the preferred title. The basic guideline for an access point is:

> *Entities > Work > Access point for work > Additional elements and designations in access points for work* ([13.98.40.08](#))

> Include values for other elements or designations in an access point if required:
> - to distinguish the access point from a value of an access point for another entity
> - to assist in the identification of the entity
> - to conform to a *string encoding scheme*
>
>> Option [6] ([51.39.52.05](#)):
>> Include a value of Agent: authorized access point for agent for an agent who is associated with a work.

For an authorized access point, the guideline is:

> *Entities > Work > authorized access point for work > Additional elements for creator of work* ([46.05.92.21](#))

>> Option ([30.55.54.91](#)): Use a value of Agent: authorized access point for agent as a qualifier for an access point.

Thus an AAP for a single work, following current syntax for AAPs, would be:

> 100 1# $a Murakami, Haruki, $d 1949- $t Noruwei no mori

Adding a creator agent of work for an aggregate, however, is not as straightforward. An aggregating work has a creator who may or may not be the same agent as the creator of the works realized by the expressions being aggregated. The cataloger or searcher may or may not know that information. Because of this uncertainty, along with the fact that searchers are likely going to be looking for the creator of the aggregated works, rather than the creator of the aggregating work, it makes sense to use the creator of the aggregated works as the qualifier.

RDA does not explicitly specify *which* work is being referred to in the case of an aggregate, and we can make use of this ambiguity and the fact that the agent AAP is simply a qualifier here, to use the creator of the aggregated works in place of the creator of the aggregation. This is in line with current practice:

> 100 1# $a Murakami, Haruki, $d 1949- $t Works. $f 1990

> 100 1# $a Murakami, Haruki, $d 1949- $t Essays. $k Selections (2015)

Since this is not spelled out explicitly in Official RDA, this practice will require PCC documentation.

Treatment of Specific Types of Collection Aggregates

The above factors required the Task Group to rethink how we devise, or at least think about, certain AAPs and to suggest a number of choices on how both LC and PCC proceed in the future. The majority of the Task Group preferred what might be termed more "radical" choices, but understand that PoCo may prefer to start more conservatively. If so, we still strongly encourage PoCo to consider the recommended options for later implementation.

Complete works

Guidelines

Official RDA no longer contains general guidelines for AAPs for complete works; guidelines for *musical* complete works do still exist, but may be removed pending reaction to the briefing paper *Pseudo-Elements*. The music guideline is as follows:

> *Compilation of Complete Musical Works by One Composer* (98.84.51.15)
>
> Condition (04.26.50.41):
> A work that is a compilation of musical works by one composer consists of, or purports to be, the complete works of the composer.
>
> Option (24.83.62.39):
> Record the conventional collective title *Works.*
>
> Treat compilations that are complete at the time of publication as complete works.

This is changed very little from the general guideline from AACR2's Chapter 25:

> 25.8. Complete works
> Use the collective title *Works* for an item that consists of, or purports to be, the complete works of a person, including those that are complete at the time of publication.

which was then updated in language, but not content, in Original RDA:

> For music:
>
> 6.14.2.8.1. Record the conventional collective title *Works* as the preferred title for a compilation that consists of, or purports to be, the complete musical works of a composer. Treat compilations that are complete at the time of publication as complete works.
>
> And for general works:
>
> 6.2.2.10.1. Record the conventional collective title Works as the preferred title for a compilation of works that consists of, or purports to be, the complete works of an agent. Treat compilations that are complete at the time of publication as complete works.

Factors Affecting AAPs for Complete Works

The Diachronic aspect of Complete Works

A publication of complete works *may* be diachronic in nature when new scholarly editions are in the process of being published. The "diachronic" attribute refers to a plan for publication--that it is over time--not the fact that complete works are by necessity produced over a lifetime. The "Complete works" of music composers are notorious for this—the compilation of complete works may be published over the span of 30 or more years. It is the case, however, that a diachronic compilation of complete works has generally been considered to be "determinate," since any new works necessarily stop being created once a creator dies, as well as for practical reasons--we don't want to start a record for a compilation of complete works as a diachronic record, only to replace it with a static one on its completion. This resulted in our decision in Part 1 (in agreement with the Diachronic TG) to treat determinate diachronic works, such as complete works, as static works.

The Effect of the WE Lock

Since AACR2, catalogers have treated complete works, even if there are multiple publications that differ widely, as a single work. This stance has been referenced in recent PCC work, in fairly strong terms, both in the appendix of the Diachronics TG Report[2] and in the new FAQs for access points by the SCS. The origin of this seems to be from an LCRI to 25.8 which begins:

> The collective uniform title "Works" is used frequently enough to make it advisable to use additions for the purposes of making these collective titles distinct, of insuring that translations file after **editions** in the original language, and of distinguishing between two or more **editions** published in the same year. To achieve these objectives, apply the following when using "Works": …

While it should be noted that this LCRI was making recommendations based on filing rules rather than a data model such as FRBR or LRM, the use of the word "edition" seems to be the primary basis of the idea of a complete works being one work. This LCRI, however, did not make it into the RDA LC-PCC PSs, nor do the guidelines make any explicit statement about a complete works being a single work. Catalogers creating authority records still basically follow the LCRI and existing precedents in the catalog, even though the LCRI was not added to Original RDA. No other official documentation exists.

The discussion is moot, however, when it comes to Official RDA. In Official RDA, every aggregating work is, by definition, a new work, since it aggregates different expressions. This is particularly true in the case of complete works. Competing complete works by the same creator may contain not only different expressions for the same works, but also may contain different works, since attributions change and discoveries are made over time. Because an aggregating work is created through the aggregation of a set of expressions into a manifestation which then embodies the aggregating expression and work, all these differences create a new work. While the creator of the aggregating work may also be the creator

---

[2] LC-PCC Task Group on Diachronic Works in Beta RDA Toolkit. *Final Report*, January 24, 2020, p. 7; PCC Standing Committee on Standards. *FAQ on Authorized Access Points for Collection of Works by Individual Agents and Works of Unknown Responsibility that Purport to be by an Individual Agent,* p. 2.

of the aggregated works, more often than not this is not the case. Unless PCC wishes to take a stance counter to Official RDA, it needs to take these changes into account in the creation of AAPs.

The fact that each newly published complete works is a separate work does not preclude the use of the CCT *Works*. Official RDA has a particularly useful concept called the "work group" in which:

> A common appellation may be used to collocate distinct works with common characteristics as a *work group*. This device can be used to harmonize the results of applying different work boundaries by different agents who create the metadata.

Redefining the CCT *Works* as potentially representing a work group in the cases where multiple complete works for a creator exist would permit the term to be used much as it is currently, including differentiation for multiple complete works by a single creator, though possibly with some syntax adjustments.

If PCC wishes to continue using the CCT Works for complete works other than music, there will need to be a policy statement or other type of instruction, likely part of a larger document on AAPs, that defines its use. Usage will need to take into account that the WE lock defines each complete works compilation as a separate work. How we manage this is again a set of choices. With the WE lock, the AAP "Works" on its own would be equivalent to a "work group" (See *RDA Glossary*). A policy statement would need to state:

1. That the term "Works" is our term for a work group that comprises the putative complete works of a single creator, whether or not the compilation itself is complete at time of cataloging
2. That if we want to differentiate (and we seem to) individual complete works, how this is accomplished (attributes, punctuation, etc.)

Options for AAPs for Complete Works

There are a few possible ways of dealing with AAPs for complete works:

1. Given that there are no guidelines for complete works in Official RDA (barring music), PCC could choose to do away with the CCT *Works*. This could considerably simplify cataloger work, since authority records would only be necessary for breaking conflicts. Conflicts might be relatively common, however, since complete works tend to have very similar titles. A drawback is that there would not be collation among multiple complete works.

   Form an authorized access point for an aggregating work by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the agent who created the works realized by the expressions being aggregated.
   b. The collective manifestation title from the resource being cataloged
   c. If necessary for differentiation, the date of the manifestation. This is based on the option under *Entities > Work > Date of work > Prerecording > Condition: No specific date can be identified as the date the work was created* (42.32.98.34), which says "Treat the date of the earliest known manifestation embodying the work as a date of work." (43.08.03.65)

d. Enclose the qualifying date in parentheses.

Example:
100 0# Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Tutte le opere

If collocation is still desired, such as for a browse list, PCC could potentially use the CCT as a variant title in an authority record. As a 4XX no differentiation is necessary and would act in a collocating function for the individual titles. This would clearly result in the need for many more authority records, but given their simplicity, a machine method for their creation might be possible.

100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Tutte le opere
400 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works

100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Opere
400 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works

2. Form an authorized access point for an aggregating work by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the agent who created the works realized by the expressions being aggregated.
   b. The preferred title *Works* for the aggregating work group.
   c. If necessary for differentiation, the date of the manifestation. This is based on the option under *Entities > Work > Date of work > Prerecording > Condition: No specific date can be identified as the date the work was created* ([42.32.98.34](42.32.98.34)), which says "Treat the date of the earliest known manifestation embodying the work as a date of work." ([43.08.03.65](43.08.03.65))
   d. Enclose the date in parentheses, since this is a work attribute.

      Example:
      100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works (1894)
      400 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Tutte le opere

   e. Provide representative expression qualifiers (e.g., language), either following a period (to show it is an expression element) or, breaking with current syntax, within the same parentheses, separating out each value by a space-colon-space. For more about language qualifiers, see "Translations" below.

      100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works (1894 : English translation)

3. Simply state in a string encoding scheme what an AAP for a complete works should be with no reference to work/representative expressions or anything else LRM or RDA. The SES would state the following:

Form an AAP for the aggregating work representing the complete works of one creator by combining the following in the order given:

a. The authorized access point for the creator of the expressions being aggregated.
b. The preferred title *Works* for the aggregating work group.
c. Provide the date of the aggregating work inferred from the date (or starting date) of the manifestation.
d. Provide any other elements common to the aggregated expressions as necessary for disambiguation, e.g., language.
e. Separate out each element with a period-space OR enclose qualifiers in parentheses and separate by space-colon-space (whichever PCC prefers).

> *Examples:*
> 100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works. $f 1894
> OR
> 100 0# $a Dante Alighieri, $d 1265-1321. $t Works (1894)
>
> 100 1# $a Miyamoto, Musashi, $d 1584-1645. $t Works. $d 2018. $l English
> OR
> 100 1 # $a Miyamoto, Musashi, $d 1584-1645. $t Works (2018 : English)
> OR
> 100 1# $a Miyamoto, Musashi, $d 1584-1645. $t Works. (2018 : English translation)[3]

We might also consider being more consistent in our AAPs, providing a date whether or not it is used for differentiation. So instead of:

> 100 0# $a Abdul Majid, $d 1892-1977. $t Works
> 400 0# $a Abdul Majid, $d 1892-1977. $t Kulliyāt-i Mājidī

it would be:

> 100 0# $a Abdul Majid, $d 1892-1977. $t Works. $f 2013
> 400 0# $a Abdul Majid, $d 1892-1977. $t Kulliyāt-i Mājidī

This option would mean including syntax information that is currently part of Appendix E in a policy statement, along with more specific information for complete works. It also removes from consideration any semantic meaning buried implicitly in that punctuation. This solution, while very similar to option 2 (especially if the attributes are included in parentheses) has the virtue of simplicity with no handwringing over punctuation or semantic meaning once the initial policy statement is written.

---

[3] See *Translations* section below for further discussion of translations of complete works.

Task Group Recommendation: The Task Group mostly prefers option 3. More than most types of aggregates, complete works seem to be less likely to be known by their manifestation title, so a more generic, collocating title seems appropriate. Also, given that most complete works are titled "Complete works" or "Works" in various languages, the possibility of having to differentiate collective titles under option 1 seems high, which may end up causing more work for catalogers, while not really aiding access.

The Task Group also recommends that the CCT option for complete musical works be followed according to NACO Music Project (NMP) preferences in tandem with option 3. Choice of qualifiers should be left to the music community to decide.

Complete works in a single form or medium

Factors Affecting AAPs for Complete Works in a single form or medium

The factors affecting complete works in a single form (or a single medium for music) are generally the same as those for complete works as given above, and will not be repeated here.

Guidelines

Official RDA no longer contains general guidelines for AAPs for complete works in a single form. Again, equivalent guidelines for *music* do still exist. There are two sets of music guidelines:

> *Compilation of complete works of one composer in one broad or specific medium* ([74.40.55.51](#))
>> Condition ([82.55.12.13](#)):
>> A work that is a compilation of works consists of, or purports to be, all of the works of a composer for one broad or specific medium.
>>
>> The works are not of a single type of composition.
>>
>>> Option ([77.04.61.32](#)):
>>> Record a conventional collective title that is generally descriptive of the original medium.

> *Complete works of a single type of composition for one specific medium or various media* ([96.45.05.32](#))
>> Condition ([69.75.94.57](#)):
>> A work that is a compilation of works consists of, or purports to be, all of the works of a composer for one broad or specific medium.
>>
>> The works are of a single type of composition.
>>
>>> Option ([19.29.72.50](#)):
>>> Record a title of the type.

The terms for collective literary titles from Original RDA 6.2.2.10.2 (Complete works in a single form) are now located under the Community Vocabularies section of RDA under *Community resources > Community vocabularies > Terms in specific languages > Terms in English for collective titles*, with the guidance "These conventional collective titles are intended for use as values of Work: preferred title of work."

Options for AAPs for Complete Works in One Form or Medium

Other than the use of community vocabularies discussed above, all the discussion of complete works applies, as do the suggested options. The TG recommends that the option chosen for complete works also be applied to complete works in a single form or medium. If a CCT option is chosen, the term *Works* will be replaced with a relevant term from the Terms for collective titles, with the option to choose a new term if none is applicable as in the current PS.

Examples:

> 100 1# $a Ceyappirakācam, Pā. $t Short stories

> 100 1# $a Torre, Josefina de la. $t Poems

> 100 0# $a Einar Már Guðmundsson. $t Poems. $f 2002
> OR
> 100 0# $a Einar Már Guðmundsson. $t Poems (2002)

While the example uses a date of work as a qualifier to the CCT, it may make better sense to use other qualifiers for some types of materials, such as sound recordings.

> 100 1# $a Kabalevsky, Dmitry Borisovich, $d 1904-1987. $t Piano, orchestra music

could be qualified as:

> 100 1# $a Kabalevsky, Dmitry Borisovich, $d 1904-1987. $t Piano, orchestra music (2012)

But it might be more user-friendly to instead use the name of the piano soloist as a qualifier:

> 100 1# $a Kabalevsky, Dmitry Borisovich, $d 1904-1987. $t Piano, orchestra music (Korstick)

> 100 1# $a Dvořák, Antonín, $d 1841-1904. $t Piano music (Poroshyna)[4]

Incomplete Compilations

Guidelines

As with complete works, Official RDA no longer contains general guidelines for AAPs for incomplete compilations by a single creator. Guidelines for incomplete compilations of *musical* and *religious* works do still exist.

---

[4] This second example is actually from a series authority record, since it covers a multi-volume set.

Factors Affecting AAPs for Incomplete Compilations

"*Works. Selections*" is a ubiquitous CCT used in AAPs in the NAF and in bibliographic records (where it is often not supported by an authority record). Such authority records that exist may refer to multiple works, both by the FRBR and LRM definitions, since in many cases, the actual works whose expressions are being aggregated may differ partially or completely. The primary use of this CCT is to collate various aggregating works that aggregate a wide variety of expressions; there is no implication that the CCT indicates a single work as with the CCT *Works*. In fact, the recent *FAQ on Authorized Access Points for Collection of Works by Individual Agents and Works of Unknown Responsibility that Purport to be by an Individual Agent* published by the Standing Committee on Standards states that "the assumption is that they contain different works."[5]

As with complete compilations, the term *Works* may be replaced with terms for specific forms or mediums when appropriate (e.g., "Poems. Selections"; "Piano music. Selections").

Conventional Collective Title vs. Collective Manifestation Title

As mentioned above, the PS instructs catalogers to use the CCT "*Works. Selections"* instead of, or in addition to, providing access to the individual works. In practice, this means that the CCT has been used almost exclusively over any collective manifestation title. This has resulted in large numbers of aggregates having the CCT as their title. It is particularly common in music cataloging, especially for sound recordings featuring the music of a single composer. For some often-recorded or very prolific composers, the CCT becomes virtually useless because it refers to so many different possible compilations.

Some catalogers have added qualifiers to the *Works. Selections* CCT to disambiguate it from others. Chosen terms include collective manifestation titles, dates of publication, editors, and other terms. The recent *FAQ on Authorized Access Points for Collection of Works by Individual Agents and Works of Unknown Responsibility that Purport to be by an Individual Agent* published by the Standing Committee on Standards looks to normalize the addition of qualifiers and what qualifiers to use. This document has been met with some pushback, particularly from the music community, where disambiguating the CCT is not accepted practice, and not practical given the number of additional authority records it would require.

In contrast, there have been moves in the cataloging community to move away from the frequent use of "*Works. Selections"* ("*Poems. Selections," etc.)* CCTs when there is a collective manifestation title available. LC began the trend, experimenting with and then applying the collective manifestation title rather than "*Poems. Selections*" for incomplete poetry compilations. Likewise, the Music Division at LC announced it was moving toward using collective manifestation titles instead of "Works. Selections" in cataloging music scores. In response, PCC is conducting a feasibility study to use collective manifestation titles for partial collections of literary forms by one agent.

In general, the TG applauds the general trend away from relying entirely on information-poor CCTs when a better alternative might be available. Given the de-emphasis on CCTs in RDA, this seems to be an

---

[5] *FAQ*, p. 3.

appropriate time to explore applying the use of collective manifestation titles in place of the CCT wherever possible.

In thinking through a possible transition, PCC will need to take into account the needs of various cataloging communities. It does need to be pointed out that while LC book catalogers are concentrating on removing the CCT for incomplete compilations (specifically poetry), LC Music is concentrating on the more general "Works. Selections" while preferring to retain form-specific CCTs such as "Songs. Selections," at least at this point. While both literary and music examples are included below, the TG suggests that any changes be reviewed by the affected communities before any decision is made. There will also remain a need for the CCT or its equivalent for use with incomplete compilations that do *not* have a collective title.

This specific change in practice (or lack thereof) is not affected by the WE lock since we never claimed that every "Works. Selections" by the same creator was the same work. As with the CCT "Works," the CCT "Works. Selections" can be considered as representing a "work group," and if we continue to use it, will need to be qualified to indicate individual aggregating works. Given that many communities do not currently qualify the AP, this could greatly increase the amount of required authority work. Using collective manifestation titles, when present, would reduce this additional work.

Agent who creates the works vs. Agent who creates the expressions

Earlier in this report, the TG formalized the practice of using the addition of the agent who creates the works realized by the expressions that are aggregated as a qualifier for the preferred title in creating an AAP, rather than the creator of the aggregating work. In the case of some aggregations, another possible option might be preferable. Instead of using the creator of the aggregated works as a qualifier, one might instead use the creator of the aggregated *expressions*.

The primary use case for this would be when each of the aggregated expressions has the same creator agent of expression, but the works being aggregated may or may not have the same creator agent of work, and the creator of the expressions is either heavily emphasized on the resource or simply better known. This happens perhaps most often in the case of popular sound recordings where performers are often better known than the composer of the works being performed.

For example:

> 100 1# $a Hodgson, Roger, $e composer, $e lyricist.
> 245 10 $a Crisis? What crisis? / $c Supertramp ; all selections written by Roger Hodgson and Richard Davis
> 710 2# $a Supertramp (Musical group), $e performer.

> 100 1# $a Fogerty, John, $d 1945- $e composer, $e arranger.
> 245 10 $a Creedence Clearwater Revival 1969 / $c all compositions written or arranged by J.C. Fogerty.
> 710 2# #a Creedence Clearwater Revival (Musical group), $e performer.

> 245 10 $a Kiri!
> 246 1# $i Title on container: $a Kiri! : her greatest hits live
> 246 1$ $i Title on container verso: $a Dame Kiri Te Kanawa's 50th birthday concert at the Royal

Albert Hall, 10 March 1994

505 0# *[Works by Charpentier, Korngold, Mozart, R. Strauss, Puccini, etc.]*

700 1# $a Te Kanawa, Kiri, $e performer.

would become:

110 2# Supertramp (Musical group)

245 10 $a Crisis? What crisis? / $c Supertramp ; all selections written by Roger Hodgson and Richard Davis

700 1# $a Hodgson, Roger, $e composer, $e lyricist.

110 2# $a Creedence Clearwater Revival (Musical group), $e performer.

245 10 $a Creedence Clearwater Revival 1969 / $c all compositions written or arranged by J.C. Fogerty.

700 1# #a Fogerty, John, $d 1945- $e composer, $e arranger.

100 1# $a Te Kanawa, Kiri, $e performer.

245 10 $a Kiri!

246 1# $i Title on container: $a Kiri! : her greatest hits live

246 1$ $i Title on container verso: $a Dame Kiri Te Kanawa's 50th birthday concert at the Royal Albert Hall, 10 March 1994

505 0# *[Works by Charpentier, Korngold, Mozart, R. Strauss, Puccini, etc.]*

While this option is not in Official RDA (it was removed in April 2020 as part of the general removal of string encoding schemes and community vocabularies), it does not seem to go against RDA in general, though it would have to be part of PCC documentation if adopted.

The understanding of the TG is that this option is sought by music catalogers. Implementation would require best practices developed by the communities interested in this option and will not be further discussed in this report, except as a recommendation to explore the option further with the appropriate communities.

Options for AAPs for Incomplete Compilations

The choices we have here for incomplete compilations, either in one or more than one form or type, follow. In deciding on a method, the TG would like to clarify that different decisions are possible for the more general "*Works. Selections*" than for "*Poems. Selections*," etc.

1. Use "*Works. Selections*" ("*Poems. Selections*," etc.) for all incomplete compilations.

   Form an AAP for the incomplete compilation by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the agent who created the works realized by the expressions being aggregated.

b. The CCT "*Works. Selections*" ("*Poems. Selections*," etc.) for the aggregating work. Do *not* disambiguate. For translation information, see below under *Translations*.

c. Provide collective manifestation titles for individuals collections as variant titles.

100 1# $a Nakamura, Tōichi, $d 1915-1969. $t Works. $k Selections
400 1# $a Nakamura, Tōichi, $d 1915-1969. $t Watakushi to kenchiku, tanka
[collection of poems & essays]

100 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, $d 1881-1973. $t Works. $k Selections
400 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, $d 1881-1973. $t Picasso in New Delhi, India
400 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, $d 1881-1973. $t Picasso.mania
400 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, $d 1881-1973. $t ¡Picasso!
400 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, $d 1881-1973. $t Picasso e le sue passioni
This is an actual NAR.

100 1# Applebaum, Mark. $t Works. $k Selections
400 1# Applebaum, Mark. $t Catfish (Compilation)
In the actual NAR, Catfish only appears in the 670

100 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Works. $k Selections
400 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Opera liturgica et poetica
The actual NAR is Works. $k Selections (Opera liturgica et poetica)

100 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Short stories. $k Selections
400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Stories of your life and others
400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Exhalation
This is an actual NAR.

This option fully retains current practice for most in PCC but does not follow the recent *FAQ*.

This option is also the one most unfriendly to a linked data environment. If this model is followed, multiple aggregating works that aggregate wildly disparate expressions would have the same label, and unless we change how URIs are assigned in the authority file, all would receive the same URI. This would create irreconcilable modeling issues. For this reason, the TG does not support this option.

2. Use "*Works. Selections*" ("*Poems. Selections,"* etc.) for all incomplete compilations. Disambiguate individual aggregating works from one another. Form an AAP for the incomplete compilation by combining the following:

a. The authorized access point for the agent who created the works realized by the expressions being aggregated.

b. The CCT "*Works. Selections*" ("*Poems. Selections*," etc.) for the aggregating work.

c. Add a value of a work element to differentiate, e.g., a date of work as inferred from the date of publication of the aggregate manifestation OR some other element from an SES chosen by PCC & LC.

f. Add a variant title for the specific collective manifestation title.

> 100 1# $a Applebaum, Mark. $t Works. $k Selections (2003)
> 400 1# $a Applebaum, Mark. $t Catfish (Compilation)

> 100 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, 1881-1973. $t Works. $k Selections (1997)
> 400 1# $a Picasso, Pablo, 1881-1973. $t Picasso und die Photographie
> *This is an actual NAR*

> 100 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Short stories. $k Selections (2002)
> 400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Stories of your life and others
> *This is an actual NAR, even though it contradicts the one in option 1, above.*

While examples currently exist in the NAF (see below) and are supported by the recent *FAQ* for current use, disambiguation by collective manifestation title does not fit into any of the options in Official RDA. While the aggregate manifestation does embody an (that is, the only) expression, the collective manifestation title is not a *representative* expression element (*see* 34.54.44.78) that can be used to qualify an access point for a work. As noted above, in RDA, there is no actual representative expression of an aggregating work. Thus, representative expression elements qualifying an aggregating work must come from one or more of the expressions being aggregated. PCC & LC would need to create an SES that directs catalogers to use the collective manifestation title; this would be outside of RDA guidelines. Examples of this currently in the NAF include:

> 100 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Short stories. $k Selections (Exhalation)
> 400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Exhalation

> 100 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Works. $k Selections (Opera liturgica et poetica)
> 400 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Opera liturgica et poetica

This option retains an alternate current practice found in the authority file. Again, it would require instructions covering both terms and syntax, since this possibility is not covered within Official RDA. The parentheses used above indicate a different work per Appendix E, which is consistent with Official RDA. This practice is more linked-data friendly, since each compilation has a different URI. Its usefulness to a library user, however, is questionable--dates are only useful for disambiguation if they are generally known, and adding full titles puts into question why we have the "Works. Selections" part in the first place.

Any instructions for this method would thus need to be very clear. There is already evidence of confusion in differentiating this CCT in the authority file. This has been addressed lately by the SCS as mentioned above. For example, here are five existing authorized access points in the LC/NACO Authority File that demonstrate the inconsistent application of instructions for conventional collective titles for selections from one creator's works:

> 100 1# $a Lovecraft, H. P. $q (Howard Phillips), $d 1890-1937. $t Works. $k Selections. $f 2014
> 100 1# $a Lovecraft, H. P. $q (Howard Phillips), $d 1890-1937. $t Works. $k Selections (2015)
> 100 1# $a Lovecraft, H. P. $q (Howard Phillips), $d 1890-1937. $t Works. $k Selections (Borrás)
> 100 1# $a Lovecraft, H. P. $q (Howard Phillips), $d 1890-1937. $t Works. $k Selections. $l French. $f 2014
> 100 1# $a Lovecraft, H. P. $q (Howard Phillips), $d 1890-1937. $t Works. $k Selections. $l German. $f 2013 $s (Festa Verlag)

3. Use an existing collective manifestation title for the incomplete compilation as the preferred title.

   Form an AAP for the incomplete compilation by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the agent who created the works realized by the expressions being aggregated.
   b. The collective manifestation title of the aggregate manifestation
      If there is no collective manifestation title, either use:
      i. the CCT "*Works. Selections*" with an appropriate qualifier
         OR
      ii. Combine the non-collective titles to create a collective title
   c. Add a value of a representative expression element to differentiate if necessary OR an element from an SES chosen by PCC & LC. (Here, the term (Compilation) is used)
   d. If the collocating function of the CCT is desired, add the CCT to the 4XX of an authority record (see Works. Option no. 4 above)

   > 100 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Opera liturgica et poetica
   > 400 0# $a Adémar, $c de Chabannes, $d 988-1034. $t Works. $k Selections

   > 100 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Stories of your life and others
   > 400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Works. $k Selections

   > 100 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Exhalation (Compilation)
   > 400 1# $a Chiang, Ted. $t Works. $k Selections

100 1# $a Applebaum, Mark. $t Catfish (Compilation)
400 1# $a Applebaum, Mark. $t Works. $k Selections

100 1# $a Akhmatova, Anna Andreevna, $d 1889-1966. $t Seventy-five poems
400 1# $a Akhmatova, Anna Andreevna, $d 1889-1966. $t 75 poems
400 1# $a Akhmatova, Anna Andreevna, $d 1889-1966. $t Poems. $k Selections

100 1# $a Debussy, Claude, $d 1862-1928. $t Works for piano four hands and two pianos
400 1# $a Debussy, Claude, $d 1862-1928. $t Works. $k Selections

The last two examples suggest that if this method is adopted there may possibly be specific exceptions to using collective manifestation titles, such as those that simply combine a number and a form (75 poems) or *Works* or a form plus a medium (Works for piano four hands). This would be a decision built off the first, more general, decision.

A potential example of an AAP for an incomplete compilation lacking a collective manifestation title could be:

100 1# $a Lennon, John, $d 1940-1980. $t Hey Jude ; Revolution

Using a collective manifestation title would likely reduce the number of authority records required. There would, however, need to be guidance about adding qualifiers (and thus authority records) if the collective manifestation title of the compilation were the same as a single work/expression within that compilation (or elsewhere), such as in the Chiang and Applebaum examples above. A drawback would be that the use of collective manifestation titles would result in the loss of any utility offered by the CCT in collating such compilations. The addition of the 4XX with a CCT in the authority record could recover that function if PCC wanted to maintain that collation, in what the TG feels could be a more user-friendly manner if successfully implemented.

Task Group Recommendations

1. The Task Group primarily supports option 3, without (b.ii) or (d) unless a way to automatically create authority records of this type is developed. This involves the least amount of manual authority work while still being linked data friendly. Guidelines need to be developed to:
1) differentiate collective manifestation titles and individual works with the same name within the compilation; 2) treat works without collective manifestation titles; and 3) cover any possible exceptions such as the Akhmatova and Debussy examples above.

2. The Task Group also recommends that PCC work with the music and other interested communities to explore the use of creators of aggregated expressions (such as performers, etc.) combined with manifestation titles in AAPs.

Translations

Beyond the basic conventional collective titles such as "*Works*" and "*Works. Selections*," aggregates with content made up of translated expressions, whether with a CCT or a distinctive title, also are affected by the WE lock. Again, since a translation is a new expression, the aggregating work/expression is aggregating different expressions and there is a new expression and work. This is particularly confusing in relation to our current treatment of aggregate translations and the continuing treatment of translations of individual works.

In Original RDA we would create an access point for the translation by recording the title of the work in the original language followed by the language of translation:

> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 240 10 $a Canciones y poemas para niños. $l English
> 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.

(The alternative AAP "Poems. Selections" is addressed in the previous section.)

In Official RDA, the aggregating work is a new work, and thus the preferred title is the title of the translation. The original language expression is a related expression, and therefore can be recorded in a 7XX field:[6]

> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 240 10 $a Cricket sings *(not actually required as it is the same as 245, but here for emphasis)*
> 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / $c Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.
> 700 1# $i translation of/related work of work: $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936. $t Canciones y poemas para niños.

It is not certain whether the relationship "translation of" applies here, because the aggregating work is a plan, not the content, and thus does not really translate anything. Official RDA defines the element "*translation of*" as follows:

> An expression of a work that is translated, i.e., the text expressed in a language different from that of an original work.

Because of this uncertainty, the more generic "*work: related work of work*" is provided as an alternative. A policy statement would be necessary to define the relationship as a translation or related work.

This model has some major strengths:

1. It respects the WE lock in that it favors collective manifestation titles as found on the specific translation in hand and treats it as a new work, rather than as an expression of the original language work.

---

[6] It may also be indicated in the 765 field which is specific to translations. This field, however, records a manifestation, and often the specific manifestation being translated is not known.

2. Providing a link to the original language work emphasizes modeling the relationship, rather than relying on a text string to imply a relationship. This works well in a linked data environment.

On the down side, two issues arise out of this:

1. Because every translation would require two individual related name/title headings, the need for the secondary work AAP in both bibliographic files and authority files (when necessary) increases cataloger work. In the bib file, this could be moderated by permitting a 7XX that is not supported by an AAP if there are no possible cross references, as is currently permitted for some access points. It is more of an issue in the authority file, where both the title of the translation and the title of the original would need authority records in order to be linked.

2. A more difficult issue is that of how translations of aggregates appear together with individual works that are translations in a catalog. According to current practice (and permitted in Official RDA), translations of individual works still may be given AAPs based on the original work, since a translation of an individual work is an expression of that work. The AAP would, in current practice, be in the form [Work]. $l [Language]. If we put together our aggregate Lorca work in a browse list with a single Lorca work, it would look like this:

> García Lorca, Federico, 1898-1936. Cricket sings
> García Lorca, Federico, 1898-1936. Casa de Bernarda Alba. English

It is not that obvious to a user why the two titles are treated differently. How are they to know that the first is an aggregate and the second an individual work? The titles do not tell us the difference.

There are three possibilities in dealing with aggregations of translated aggregated expressions, all with some drawbacks:

1. Retain current PCC practice.

   Form an AAP for the aggregating expression by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the creator of the expressions being aggregated.
   b. The preferred title of the original language expression.
   c. Add a value of the language of the translated aggregated expressions as specified in an SES written by PCC & LC.

   > 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
   > 240 10 $a Canciones y poemas para niños. $l English
   > 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / $c Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.
   >
   > 100 1# $a Altan, Çetin, $d 1927- $t Plays. $f 2002. $l English
   >
   > 100 1# $a Cafaggi, Vitor, $d 1978- $t Works. $k Selections. $l English

This has the advantage of being the same treatment as translations of individual works. It does conflict however with Official RDA, because, by LRM standards, this is a new work, but the MARC coding suggests it is an expression of a work.

2. Retain current PCC practice, but treat language as a value of representative expression.

Form an AAP for the aggregating expression by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the creator of the works being aggregated.
   b. The preferred title of the original language expression.
   c. Add a value of the language of the representative expressions being aggregated as specified in Beta RDA
   d. If further differentiation is wanted in order to make the string unique, add further qualifiers.

The result of this seemingly minor change would mean the language of the translation would be within parentheses rather than following a period as a representative expression attribute of a work.

> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 240 10 $a Canciones y poemas para niños (English) *or perhaps* (English translation)
> 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / $c Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.

This reflects the WE lock closely in that it provides an AAP for a separate work, but still requires an idiosyncratic AAP in using the title of the original work, something that would require a policy statement. The punctuation change is minor, but will likely cause a certain amount of confusion.

Another option might be to be more explicit in the AAP that it is an English translation, as shown in the alternative in the example above. This would require specific instructions on the part of LC & PCC since the attribute would no longer be from a controlled vocabulary.

If this option is chosen, it might be advantageous to have a 7XX field stating the translation relationship as given in option 3 below. This would make this option more linked data friendly in that it explicitly states the relationship between the original and the translation.

3. Respecting the WE lock, and embracing the use of existing collective manifestation titles in AAPs, use the collective manifestation title of the translation as the AAP.

Form an AAP for the incomplete compilation by combining the following:

   a. The authorized access point for the creator of the expressions being aggregated.
   b. The preferred title of the translation as derived from the collective manifestation title.

c. Add either:
    i. A value of representative expression common to the aggregated works
       OR
    ii. An element from an SES chosen by PCC & LC
    if required to differentiate from another work/expression
d. Add a 7XX with $i *translation of* OR $i *has related work* for the original language expression.

> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 240 10 $a Cricket sings *(not actually required as it is the same as 245, but here for emphasis)*
> 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / $c Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.
> 700 1# $i translation of/related work of work: $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936. $t Canciones y poemas para niños.

The benefits of this option include: respect for the WE lock; the relationship is stated explicitly, rather than relying on an interpretation of a text string, making it much more linked data friendly. Drawbacks include potentially more authority work and the possible perception of inconsistency in relation to translations of individual works.

This option is user friendly and the most linked data friendly option, and the TG encourages PCC to consider it, either now or for the future. Even if the AAP option is not adopted, the TG suggests PCC consider the regular addition of the 7XX $i *translation of* relationship in all translations.

Task Group Recommendations:

The Task Group recommends adopting either option 2 or 3. Even if PCC decides on option 2 for immediate use (and addresses the fact that it contradicts Official RDA), the Task Group suggests that option 3 be considered further as we move closer to adopting linked data. If option 2 is chosen, the Task Group suggests adding the relationship with the original work in the 7XX field.

Translations--Further Thoughts for Future Consideration

The TG feels that the perceived inconsistency between translations of aggregates and translations of individual works in forming AAPs in option 3 may be a major stumbling block for some, even if it best adheres to the Official RDA model, would work best in a linked data environment, and in many cases may be more user-friendly if the translation title is better known than the original.

Instead of retaining current practices with aggregates (or the variation given in Option 2), it is worth considering translations as a whole, and whether PCC should in fact change the practice for individual translations to fit that of aggregates. This would remove the inconsistency between individual works and aggregates (a split that is not always obvious to a user) and further embraces adoption of existing manifestation titles and emphasizing explicit relationships over strings. Also, treating individuals and aggregates the same way removes any issues in determining whether something is an aggregate work or

an individual work, something that is not always clear. Drawbacks include a major change from current practice and loss of collocation with the original work. This last could be possibly be mitigated by including the current form of access point in the 4XX of an authority record:

> 1XX $a [Creator]. $t [Title of translation] *(whether an aggregate or an individual work)*
> 4XX $a [Creator]. $t [Title of original work]. $l [Language of translation]
> 500 $i translation of: $a [Creator]. $t [Title of original work]
>
> *Aggregate manifestation*
>
> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 245 14 $a The cricket sings : $b poems and songs for children / $c Federico García Lorca ; translated by Will Kirkland.
> 700 1# $i translation of/related work of work: $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936. $t Canciones y poemas para niños.
>
>
> *Individual manifestation*
>
> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 245 14 $a The house of Bernarda Alba / $c from the original work by Federico by García Lorca; translated by Rona Munro.
> 700 1# $i translation of/related work of work: $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936. $t Casa de Bernarda Alba.
>
> *Manifestation that has been treated as both an aggregate and an individual work by catalogers*
>
> 100 1# $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936.
> 245 14 $a Poem of the deep song / Federico García Lorca ; translated by Ralph Angel.
> 700 1# $i translation of/related work of work: $a García Lorca, Federico, $d 1898-1936. $t Poema del cante jondo.

The TG would like to emphasize that this section is intended for future consideration only, not for any immediate change on the adoption of Official RDA.

Authority Records for Works and Expressions—More Thoughts to consider

Neither the Original RDA nor Official RDA makes a distinction between bibliographic records and authority records. Authorized access points are mentioned in both versions of RDA; however, PCC policies on creation and maintenance of authority records for works and expressions are relegated to the LC-PCC PS only. Many of the recommendations in this report may promote a discussion of the need for the creation and maintenance of authority records for works and expressions in the future, and whether traditional PCC authority work for works and expressions may benefit from a complete overhaul. Is traditional PCC authority work necessary for works and expressions to fulfill the recommendations in this report? Perhaps more importantly, is traditional PCC authority work relevant in

a linked data environment, where titles are represented by URIs, and not divisible component parts? Can bibliographic records continue to be authenticated as "pcc" if access points for works or expressions are considered "authorized" without the support of an authority record? Could PCC consider a different paradigm in which authorized access points for works and expressions are created as MARC bibliographic records, enabling a much less problematic conversion of MARC data to BIBFRAME? The PCC has endorsed BIBFRAME as the replacement for MARC. Isn't the future more important than the past?

If we plan to retain authority records for works and expressions into the future in LC NAF, the Task Group would also like to recommend that PCC encourage the development of robust tools that significantly streamline the creation of authority data in NAF.