**To:**        Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**From:**      Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

**Subject:**    **Levels of description, access, and authority control**


**General comment:**

We note that there is a disconnect between the terminology used for the requirements in the table and what is used in the rules. For example, the language in the tables is "recommend" but in the rules, the text reads, "include at least these elements," implying that the elements are mandatory or mandatory if applicable.

CCC offers the following comments on the **Issues**:

1. CCC supports the provision of separate levels for description, access, and authority control thereby allowing institutions greater flexibility to meet the needs of their own requirements.
2. CCC agrees with the placement of the levels in relation to the specific parts of *RDA*. Each part and its levels can be treated on its own and need not be directly related to the other parts. Placing all the levels of the three parts in one place would not convey this as well.
3. CCC recommends the removal of the section *Options* from the General instructions 0.X as it seems to be misplaced.
4. CCC agrees with the number of levels provided.
5. Seems o.k.
6. If the placement of the levels is with their respective parts in *RDA*, the terminology and structure should parallel those of *RDA*.
7. CCC believes that levels for the reference entry and the general explanatory entry are not required.
8. CCC feels that the tables provide a quick and easy means of determining which elements are recommended at each of the levels.

**Specific comments:**

- The term "minimum" has been used both when referring to the "set of elements" required at each level as well as when referring to a specific level. To avoid confusion, we suggest that *minimum* be used when referring to the <u>set of elements</u> and *minimal* be used consistently when referring to the <u>level</u> as is done in Table 1:

    **1.4. LEVELS OF DESCRIPTION**

    Part I provides rules for the creation of a comprehensive set of elements to describe all resources. This rule sets out a <u>minimum</u> set of elements for each of two levels of description.

    **1.4.1 <u>MINIMAL</u> LEVEL OF DESCRIPTION**

> The <u>minimal</u> level of description is based on those elements needed to
> support the FRBR user tasks…

- We suggest that many of the footnotes, other than footnotes referencing a source,
  could/should be incorporated into the text:
  1. Footnotes 6 and 11 could be included in the first bullet since no specifics are given as
     to which elements may be multiple, either in the listing or to a reference where such
     information may be found.
  2. Delete footnotes 7, 8, 14 and 15 and instead add "for identification" to the
     parenthetical statement (if considered to be important <u>for identification</u>)
  3. Additionally, the specificity of footnotes 12 and 13 does not seem to be appropriate
     here given that there are other elements where this condition might also be
     applicable, e.g., parallel publisher in the language of the catalogue (i.e., is including a
     parallel part of an element "important for identification"?); can it be any parallel title
     and not necessarily the first parallel title (AACR2 1.1D2)?  It appears that incomplete
     guidance is given here.
  4. Delete footnote16 as the parenthetical statement is sufficient.
  5. Delete footnote 17 and instead add "(if considered to be important)" after "source of
     acquisition/access".

### 1.4.1. Minimum level of description
- Under "Resource identifier," for consistency, suggest the following:
  > Other numbers associated with the resource (if considered <u>to be</u> important for
  > identification)

### 1.4.2. Standard level of description
- Under "Edition," "Edition statement" has been inadvertently omitted
- Under "Series statement": the first statement of responsibility relating to series is a
  recommended element but we query the appropriateness of the qualifier if the rule as in
  the current 1.6E1 (Transcribe statements of responsibility appearing in conjunction with
  the series title only if they are considered to be necessary for identification of the series)
  is retained.  There is inconsistency as to how much guidance is included in the levels of
  description section.  We also suggest the following:
  > First statement of responsibility relating to series (if considered to be important
  > for identification <u>of the series</u>)
- Under "Dimensions": we suggest deleting "for access" and rephrasing to "(if considered
  to be important)".

### 11.3.2. Standard level of access
- Under c) the following citations, iv): "nalytical" should read: "<u>a</u>nalytical"

### 21.3.2. Standard level of authority control
- We note that LAC guidelines as well as NACO guidelines do not meet the standard level
  of authority control, e.g., "biographical, historical, or other information about the entity"
  is not required.

### Table 2. Authority record levels
- ISADN is a recommended element in *RDA* but we note that it has not been implemented.