

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative
Subject: Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements

ALA acknowledges and appreciates the work undertaken by the ACOC Representative to outline potential RDA data elements based on the document, *RDA and MARC 21: A Discussion Paper*, discussed at the October 2006 JSC meeting. ALA welcomes this opportunity to respond.

263 Projected Publication Date

ALA is inclined to agree with the LC recommendation *not* to include this data element in RDA. We agree that its availability in the MARC 21 bibliographic format and its current usage by the ISSN Centres and the CIP Program are valuable. However, including guidelines for its wider use in RDA may well lead to the non-authoritative information and increased workloads described in the LC response.

If JSC decides to add this data element to RDA, ALA has the following recommendations regarding the proposed text:

Placement of the guidelines: ALA prefers that Projected Publication Date be treated as a separate element, not as a type of publication date.

2.7.4.0.3.1: While LC recommends deleting the suggested *yyyymm* formatting of the data as a display issue, ALA believes that the intent of the MARC 21 standard is to provide a consistent way of recording the data so that it may be manipulated by machine (i.e., to generate reports, etc.). We recommend retaining the proposed RDA guidelines regarding formatting of the data in order to maintain consistency between MARC 21 and RDA.

2.7.4.0.3.2: The final sentence of this guideline tells catalogers to delete the Projected Publication Date data element once the resource is published. However, current ISSN Centre usage of this field prefers that *only* ISSN catalogers remove this data element in order to make use of it to generate internal reports. ALA therefore recommends this guideline be removed, allowing individual programs and constituencies using the data element to determine their own “best practices.”

507 Scale Note for Graphic Material

ALA agrees that “Scale of graphic content” and “Scale of cartographic content” should be kept separate, and even though the two RDA guidelines appear next to one another in the current draft, ALA would like “see also” references placed in each of the sections. This will further clarify for map catalogers and catalogers handling pictorial materials such as architectural drawings that scale data is treated according to its context.

4.13.0.1.1 There was some uncertainty among ALA members regarding the exact scope of this RDA element.

The MARC 21 definition of field 507 limits its use to architectural drawings and three-dimensional artifacts because those are the primary graphic (non-cartographic) resources for which scale is appropriate. The scale of an architectural drawing or model relates directly to a three-dimensional building or structure. Therefore the proposed scope statement is causing some confusion.

The current scope statement includes the phrase “ratio of an image to the image.” This image-to-image ratio is incorrect *if* RDA intends the scope of this element to parallel the MARC 21 scope (i.e., exclusively for architectural drawings and three-dimensional artifacts). If so, the ratio is between the image (i.e., the architectural drawing) *or* the model *and* the three-dimensional artifact (i.e., the building represented), not between two images.

On the other hand, some ALA members wondered if this element would also apply in cases where the cataloger may need to describe the scale ratio between two graphic images: for example, a resource description of an artist’s *copy* of an original painting by Picasso (e.g., *Les Femmes d’Alger* from 1906). If the cataloger wants to record the scale relationship of the copy to the original, wouldn’t a representation of scale be appropriate, and wouldn’t it involve an image-to-image ratio? Some of these image-to-image ratio concerns may also apply when cataloging the art reproductions held in some library collections. If that is indeed the intent, ALA recommends that the scope be defined accordingly – and the decision reported as an action item in the RDA/MARC 21 mapping.

ALA recommends that footnote 3 needs clarification. We were unable to find a definition of scale in the Getty Website referenced therein.

518 Date/Time and Place of an Event Note

ALA supports adding this data element to RDA.

Recommendation 1: This change would be an improvement over the current draft of 2.9.6.3, 3rd bullet, where the parenthetical information under the examples suggests

that recording such dates would not be done if the year of publication or distribution was the same as that of recording or production.

ALA notes the possibility of confusion between “Date/Time and Place of an Event” and the provisions in Chapter 4 for “Describing related content”. We note in particular the 14th example in the Dec. 2005 draft of 4.10.0.3,

Recording of speech given at the University of Kentucky
Academic Library Institute, Lexington, KY., May 24, 1984.

We recommend that this example be deleted if the new provisions are added.

As recommended by the ARLIS representative to CC:DA, we note that, in addition to recordings and performances, “Date/Time and Place of an Event” are extremely important for describing auction catalogs. These publications often have very weak (or multiple) titles and are most often retrieved by the date and place of the auction. Existing coding practices (the combination of the MARC 21 033 for retrieval and the 518 for display) work well, but it would be preferable if the RDA guideline and examples were not quite so media-specific. Could we at least add other examples to demonstrate that this data element has broader applications? For example:

Date of sale: January 4, 2003
Place of sale: New York

Recommendation 2: ALA agrees with the LC response that guidelines for recording this type of data may be more appropriate in specialist manuals such as *Cataloging Cultural Objects*.

524 Preferred Citation of Described Materials Note

ALA supports adding this data element to RDA and believes that the placement of the element in Chapter 2 is appropriate.

ALA notes the past difficulties constituencies have had with the term “citation” and hopes that the JSC will take steps necessary to clarify its usage either by defining its use within these guidelines narrowly, or finding an alternative term. We offer the following possible revision:

- A **preferred citation** is the form of reference to the resource recommended by the creator, publisher or custodian of the resource.