

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative
Subject: Levels of description, access, and authority control

General comments on the proposal

ACOC welcomes the ACOC representative's proposal to include in RDA revised rules concerning levels of description primarily based on FRBR, and to also incorporate new rules concerning levels of access and authority control. ACOC considers it important for RDA to treat the areas of access and authority in the same manner as description in this regard, in order to provide libraries and cooperatives with a comprehensive set of options from which they are able to fully define cataloguing levels.

ACOC also favours the approach of linking the levels with those found in FRBR and FRAR, especially given the general acceptance of the former as a theoretical basis for the new Part II of RDA. Finalisation of the levels for Part III may, however, need to wait until a full examination of the relationship between RDA and FRAR has been conducted.

ACOC considers that it may need to be made clearer whether the lists of elements refer just to the elements themselves, or to the rules for the elements. For example, would Date of publication include Date of production etc for unpublished resources?

ACOC considers this paper to be an excellent basis for the redevelopment of this rule type.

Comments on issues put forward in the paper (page 1)

ACOC addresses the issues outlined in the paper as below.

1. The provision of separate levels of description, access and authority control is deemed appropriate given their separate treatment in RDA, and given that there is a consistency in their binary construction (there is 'minimum' and 'standard' in each case).
2. The placement is considered appropriate.
3. The general instructions in 0.X appear clear (but need to be tested).
4. The number of levels is considered appropriate, given the preponderance of two levels in practice, and given that the third level of description of AACR was not so much a level as 'everything.' The revised labels also are preferred (minimum over first, standard over second), as being more informative.
5. The choice of related standards is sound, although additional standards could be usefully considered. In addition to the FRBR, FRAR, MLAR, and MARC21 comparison, as detailed in this paper, ACOC suggests that certain other level definitions could be usefully consulted, such as those used by OCLC, RLIN and BIBCO/NACO. The relationship between levels and related standards would seem, in general terms, appropriate.

6. The levels should indeed parallel the terminology and structure of Parts I, II and III of RDA.
7. The reference and general explanatory entries, in relation to authority control, should probably themselves be optional, and so need not be subject to level definitions.
8. For a fuller picture, ACOC would prefer that all possible elements covered by RDA be listed in Tables 1 and 2. Having said that, although the tables are very useful for the determination of the levels, they may not be required as part of RDA.

Comments on specific rules (as proposed)

1.4.1 Minimum level of description

Standard number. ACOC considers '(or alternative)' to be unclear.

Other technical details – this should be repeated, as for *Extent*

Some members of ACOC question the inclusion of elements that are qualified by 'if considered to be important', given that all elements can be included if considered important. Others support the inclusion of these elements as the attached footnotes give some limited guidance on what is to be considered important, and replace much longer footnotes in FRBR.

11.3.2 Standard level of access

c) iv) 'analytical'

21.3.1/2 Minimum/Standard level of authority control

See references and see also references – should all of these be made at both levels? Some guidance may be needed here.