

5JSC/Chair/1/Rev/Chair follow-up
October 27, 2005

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC
Subject: First status report of RDA Examples Group

Attached is a status report from the RDA Examples Group.

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Denise Lim, Chair,
RDA Examples Group

Subject: Status report of RDA Examples Group

The RDA Examples Group (formerly AACR3 Examples Group) was asked to review all the examples which currently illustrate rules in AACR2 and to reassess them for publication in *RDA* (formerly AACR3). With the change in direction from the draft of Part I, AACR3, the work of the RDA Examples Group has not been able to progress beyond the initial stages. As expressed in the Status report of the CC:DA Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media, a clear sense of the specifics of *RDA* is needed.

Work of the Examples Group to date:

1. Methodology was established to review each example in AACR2 for accuracy and currency using tables that list each example in AACR2 by rule number.
2. For Part I, examples by chapter were assigned to members of the Examples Group for review.
3. Comments relevant to the examples appended to the JSC constituents' responses to draft of AACR3, Part 1 were forwarded to members of the Examples Group.
4. Verifying that the AACR2 examples are accurate and relevant to the AACR2 rules was completed as much as possible for chapters 1-13 of Part I.
5. Issues for consideration and resolution by the Examples Group were identified:
 - Number of examples to be given per rule
 - Balance of types of examples to be given per rule
 - Whether specific types of examples could/should be given before the rule addressing the form of the example has been given
 - Whether the same example could/should be used more than once to illustrate a different rule
 - How the examples will appear within the text (data recording) and in the appendix (data presentation) if that is the decision for the organization of *RDA*
 - Types of explanatory notes to be given, especially significant if ISBD punctuation is not used in the examples
 - With the generalization of the rules, when it would be necessary to give specific resource based examples at the general rule and when to indicate the type of resource as the example may not be self-evident
 - When a more up-to-date example is required
 - When it is appropriate to give other elements in the example, i.e., when does it elucidate and when does it confuse

While many of the issues identified for consideration and resolution by the Examples Group cannot be addressed until there is a basic text of *RDA* to respond to, it is also recognized that at this time additional guidance on some issues is required and, therefore, direction is requested from JSC.

Issues for which direction from JSC is requested:

- Could the Examples Group be given access to the drafts currently on the Work space so that they can begin consideration of the issues outlined in point 5 above?
- JSC has decided that data presentation be relegated to an appendix. If ISBD punctuation is not used in the examples, more explanatory text or use of tags would be required to clarify the examples, as an element in isolation often is not illustrative of the rule. In the *RDA – Editor’s draft (September 2005)* the approach of not using ISBD punctuation is illustrated in the examples. Some of the examples are rather awkward to interpret, in particular when the example includes several of the same element. Is this the style recommended by the JSC?

e.g.,

more than one statement of responsibility (12.3.0.6):

Jacques Offenbach
music adapted and arranged by Ronald Hanmer
new book and lyrics by Phil Park

Versus:

/ Jacques Offenbach ; music adapted and arranged by Ronald Hanmer ;
new book and lyrics by Phil Park

parallel statement of responsibility (12.4.2.4):

edited by Larry C. Lewis
rédigé par Larry C. Lewis

Versus:

2nd ed. / edited by Larry C. Lewis = 2e éd. / rédigé par Larry C. Lewis

sequence of numbering using both numeric and chronological designations (12.5.5):

Vol. 1, no. 1-v. 4, no. 3
(*First sequence of numeric designation*)
Jan. 1992-Mar. 1995
(*First sequence of chronological designation*)

Should appear as:

Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1992)-v. 4, no. 3 (Mar. 1995)

- To avoid some of the cumbersome explanatory notes and to ensure clarity, what does JSC think of the suggestion to state at the outset that ISBD punctuation is used in *RDA* examples (when appropriate/necessary) for illustrative purposes only?

e.g.,

statement of responsibility relating to edition (12.4.4.3):

with the assistance of Eleanor Gould Packard
(*Edition statement: Rev. ed. Statement of responsibility relating to the edition: with revisions, an introduction, and a chapter on writing by E.B. White. Statement relating to a named revision of an edition: 2nd ed.*)

Versus:

Rev. ed. / with revisions, an introduction, and a chapter on writing by
E.B. White, 2nd ed. / with the assistance of Eleanor Gould Packard

- Can provision of either notes or other elements, whichever is best or most practical, be used to illustrate the rule? Does JSC think consistency in this regard is necessary?
- The Editor has incorporated ISBD punctuation in some examples in the *Editor's draft*. Was this intentional?

e.g.,

12.2.1.6

Three notable stories

Contents list: Contents: Love and peril / the Marquis of Lorne – To be or not to be / Mrs. Alexander – The melancholy hussar / Thomas Hardy

12.3.0.8

[Musik von] Gottfried von Einem ; [Text von] Boris Blacher und Heinz von Cramer

12.4.2.3

introduction by J. Hillis Miller ; notes by Edward Mendelson

- Is the bulk of the examples to appear in a separate document?
- Does JSC agree to having examples appear in two places, i.e., the general rule as well as when the rule is “repeated” for the specific elements, e.g., 12.5.0.3, 3rd bullet and 12.9.6.3, 4th bullet? Is this redundancy acceptable?
- The Examples Group has not investigated the feasibility of links from the examples to relevant images (online version) and would like confirmation from JSC that this is something to be pursued by the Group.
- Proposed timeline:

Part I examples reviewed/added:	March 2006
Part II examples reviewed/added:	September 2006
Part III examples reviewed/added:	March 2007

I look forward to the responses from the JSC to these issues after the discussions at the October meeting in order to progress the work of the Examples Group.