

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Addition to “Other Agreements involving Jurisdictions”

CILIP welcomes ALA’s follow-up in this problematic area and we find most of the points put forward persuasive. The underlying theme seems to be that decisions can be made only within the context of a broader discussion on the naming of a work in RDA. So it is only reasonable to expect that a final decision on the specific points raised will have to depend on the outcome of such a discussion.

Addressing ALA’s points individually:

1. Whilst ALA’s general point is accepted, this is not a reason for avoiding any discussion of the content whilst awaiting a draft of ch. 13 (nor is ALA suggesting that). We hope that a preliminary decision will be made on this specific issue which can then be tested against ch. 13, when a draft appears (and revised, if appropriate).
2. CILIP agrees with the essential point concerning consistency.
3. ALA’s argument reads persuasively; as we have been unable to obtain input from specialists in this area, we are happy to accept ALA’s surrogacy on this matter. We have to accept the advice of experts that there might be problems trying to locate treaties by title, and that standard indexes and reference tools are organised by signatory, subject category, year and lastly by title.
4. Agree.
5. CILIP is less certain about this, and would wish to check carefully for consistency with general principles on naming of works when further RDA content is available.
6. Continue to agree these points.