

# Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/LC response

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA DATE: Sept. 11, 2007

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Addition to "Other Agreements involving Jurisdictions"

LC continues to support the recommendation, agreed to by JSC members other than ALA at the April 2007 meeting, to name a treaty by using its title proper or preferred title (5JSC/LC/5/Rev, section Q). Access via the signatories would be included in the description for a treaty.

LC does agree that exact titles of treaties may not be known or used when searching for a particular treaty; the same is true for the titles of many other resources (e.g., monographic series and non-analyzable serials with generic titles, serials having multiple minor title changes over time) but such realities have not called for naming those works in ways other than their titles proper or preferred titles. Instead, access points for responsible bodies are included in the descriptions so that users who don't know the exact title can search via corporate bodies they do know.

Comments on ALA's points in its follow-up document:

1. LC assumes the JSC will discuss the decisions about naming the work at its October 2007 meeting when considering the CILIP rep/1 document and when reviewing the Editor's revised draft of chapter 13.

2. Until the JSC discusses the various situations for naming the work at its October 2007 meeting, it cannot be known if there will be a single instruction for naming all works (probably not likely due to the past practices for applying different conventions for certain categories of works) or if there will be a basic instruction for most works with exceptions and/or alternatives for certain categories.

3. LC repeats its argument that a weak title is not unique to bilateral treaties. LC also notes that a decision has not been made about elements added to the title proper to create the preferred title.

4. LC repeats its support for its original recommendation.

5. LC waits for the discussion of ALA's introduction of the concept of the focus of a compilation when considering the basic instructions for naming all works during the

October 2007 meeting.

6. LC thanks ALA for its agreement. However, LC wonders why ALA doesn't have the same concerns about the quality of the title proper of a multilateral treaty (only difference might be the presence of the name of one more country) as it has about the title proper of a bilateral treaty.