

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Consideration of proposals from the ISBD Review Group

CILIP's overriding concern – and one which transcends its responses to the specific questions raised in 5JSC/Chair/13 – is that the spirit of cooperation and harmonization so strongly reflected in the outcomes of the 2000 meeting of the JSC, the ISBD Working Group and the ISSN Network be maintained. In our view it would be a great mistake for any changes to be made which cannot be agreed to by all parties.

In response to the specific questions raised we offer the following:

1. We note that this exception sets serials apart from any other material and that it already conflicts with AACR2's instruction to "transcribe the title proper exactly as to wording, order and spelling". But it must have been introduced to meet a particular need. On the one hand, CILIP's preference would be to remove the exception – because it *is* an exception – so that transcription results in the same title proper for a serial as it would for any other resource. But we note, on the other, that the ISSN Network has already indicated its opposition to this change and this opposition, in our view, is more important than any particular view we might hold on this issue. If the exception were to remain, then there may be something to be said for making that exception the *general* rule for transcription of the title so as to ensure consistency between all material types.
2. It is unfortunate that the original comment forwarded from the ISBD Review Group did not elaborate on the nature of the problem, other than referring to "the difficulty of counting words" in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. CILIP has been unaware of such a difficulty, but whether this is because nobody has thought to raise it or because it is not universally regarded as a problem cannot easily be determined. If the Review Group can demonstrate that this is a problem in clear need of resolution, then CILIP would recommend that clarification of the specifics be sought (is the problem, for example, identical in all these languages?) and that experts from the affected communities be invited to comment on them and to recommend a way forward. This may be best done under the auspices of the Review Group (an IFLA body).