

5JSC/Chair/1/Rev/2/Chair follow-up/1
18 September 2006

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC
Subject: Interim report on examples in Part A, Chapters 6-7 of RDA

The attached report from the second RDA Examples Group will be discussed at the October 2006 meeting. The tables mentioned in the report are only available on the JSC Workspace.

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: RDA Examples Group for Part A, Chapters 6-7 and Part B
Subject: Interim report on examples in Part A, Chapters 6-7 of RDA

Introduction

The RDA Examples Group for Part A, Chapters 6-7 was formed in June 2006 with representatives from all of the JSC's four national constituents. Members of the group include:

Catherine Argus, *National Library of Australia*
John H. Bowman, *University College London*
Rachel Gagnon, *Library and Archives Canada*
Adam L. Schiff, *University of Washington* (Chair)
David Sommerfield, *Library of Congress*
Jay Weitz, *OCLC*
Kathy Winzer, *Stanford University*

The Group was charged with the following:

- Recommend principles for the inclusion of examples in RDA.
- Review all examples in AACR and make the following assessments:
 - Is each existing example necessary?
 - Is it up-to-date and the best illustration of the RDA instruction to which it pertains?
 - Would it be a better illustration of a different RDA instruction than that with which it is currently associated?
 - Are additional examples required?
- Undertake this review for the whole of RDA and provide new, revised or existing examples to be included as needed for each instruction in all parts of RDA.
- Consider any decisions on examples that have already been made by the Editor or the Consistency Task Force, and provide an example where the Editor has already indicated that a new example is required.

Methodology

Each member of the group was assigned one or more chapters in Part I of AACR2 and asked to review all the examples in the chapter(s) and identify all examples about relationships. The examples identified were transcribed into a wiki-based table created on the National Library of Australia website. Members were asked to review each example and record:

- the type of relationship(s) it embodied using the categories of relationships from Chapter 6 of RDA
- the RDA rule in which belongs if the example were to be included in RDA
- the RDA rule in which it is currently found, if present in the draft of Chapters 6-7
- is it necessary?
- is it up-to-date?
- is it the best illustration of the RDA rule?
- any comments they cared to make about the example

Each member of the group was assigned one or more sections of Chapter 21 in Part II of AACR2 and asked to record each example along with:

- the RDA rule(s) in which it belongs
- the RDA rule(s) it is currently found in the draft of Chapters 6-7
- is it necessary?
- is it up-to-date?
- is it the best illustration of the RDA rule?
- comments about the example

All of the examples in the current draft of Chapters 6 and 7 were transcribed into tables created based on the “Template for Review of RDA Examples” supplied to us by the Editor. For each example taken from AACR2, the person who reviewed that example was asked to verify the accuracy of the example and to recommend whether to retain the example as is, include a revised version of the example, or delete the example, and whether the example should be included in the concise edition. Each example was also categorized for the type of resource being described and the mode of issuance of the resource being described. Members were also asked to identify other examples for inclusion in RDA, whether from AACR2 or completely new. Members were encouraged to include up-to-date examples that represent the kinds of resources being cataloged today.

The group was provided with a compilation of comments related to examples that were submitted to CC:DA by various CC:DA members and liaisons. While we have not had the time to consider each and every comment, we have taken many of them into account, and had already identified some of the same issues ourselves. We also were able take into account some of the comments that the JSC received from other international agencies that were recently posted on the JSC website.

The work of verifying the accuracy of AACR2 examples to be included in RDA proved much more arduous than we could have imagined, and involved consulting various databases, retrieving materials from library shelves, and even requesting photocopies through interlibrary loan or from colleagues at other libraries. The task was made even more difficult by the short time frame we had for this interim report. We found numerous examples in AACR2 that were not accurate transcriptions of information appearing on a resource, or that had been changed to AACR2-ize them. In some

instances were not able to verify a resource at all. Many of the examples in AACR2 are truly old and obsolete, and while we have kept some that are good examples of a rule, we have also proposed deleting and replacing many of them in the name of having a code with more contemporary resonance.

Principles for Inclusion of Examples

The group recommends the following principles for inclusion of examples in RDA:

- Examples should not state more than the rule they illustrate. As much as possible, the examples should be illustrations only; if there are rules where the examples are more than illustrations, a note should be made such as "do it as shown below" which indicates that in these specific instances, examples are prescriptive
- A variety of types of resources should be used for examples, including modes of issuance and type of resource.
- Whenever possible, examples should be verifiable in one of the national library databases or in a bibliographic utility such as OCLC
- Minimize or eliminate the use of made-up examples; if it is difficult (or impossible) to find an example based on an actual resource to illustrate a particular rule, then perhaps that rule is not necessary

Form of access point used in examples is an additional principle that needs to be resolved. Should it be supported by a name authority record or not? In the issues section below, we recommend that authorized forms of access points be used whenever they are established, but we know that this is an issue the JSC will need to discuss and decide upon.

Abbreviations in Examples

We believe that abbreviations should be avoided in examples except where they are transcribed or prescribed by the rules. We would prefer to see consistency here. Notes are now searchable by keyword in many online catalogues and databases, and consistency in how they are entered is likely to be helpful to both general users and to cataloguers conducting searches. If abbreviations may be used, we suggest limiting them to the ones prescribed in the rules for other areas of description such as the edition elements and the publication, distribution, etc. elements.

Issues and Questions

In the course of carrying out our work, we have identified a number of issues and questions that we wish to call to the attention of the JSC and the Editor or that we feel require a decision or some guidance on before we can complete our work.

1. **General comments on examples.** We have been working from the draft of RDA Chapters 6 and 7 that is dated 20 June 2006 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7). Undoubtedly after the JSC meeting in October 2006 there will be changes made to the

rules and to the arrangement of these chapters based on feedback from constituencies and others, including our task group. We are aware of proposals by LC regarding Bible uniform titles (5JSC/LC/8) and international treaties and agreements (5JSC/LC/5/Rev), and by ACOC regarding URLs (5JSC/ACOC/1). We have reviewed and supplied examples for the rules as currently drafted, knowing that they may require revision by us or the Editor once the outcomes of the October JSC meeting are known. We have, however, included URLs as resource identifiers in some of our suggested new examples. When recording types of carriers, we have tried to incorporate the terms proposed by the Editor in 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization, but these examples will probably need further scrutinizing later. In addition, examples may need further alteration to bring them into accord with RDA conventions for recording statements of responsibility (particularly if changes are made to 2.4.0.3 and 2.4.3), unknown places of publication or publishers, copyright dates, bracketing of supplied dates, abbreviations in notes, etc., once these issues are firmly settled.

2. **Number of examples.** In some instances, we have probably supplied more examples than are needed, but we have done this with the intention of providing the Editor a wider selection of good examples from which to choose. We are mindful of the comments we read often in feedback to CC:DA asking for more examples, particularly for types of resources that are not adequately represented either in AACR2 or the current draft of RDA. We agree with the comments in the report of the first Examples Group from April 2006: “The Group feels that no fixed number of examples could be applied and that the number depended on the instruction itself. Some require more, e.g., when the text covers multiple types of resources or if examples in various formats or different modes of issuing are appropriate.”

We have added a variety of new corporate name examples to 7.2.1.4.4, which we believe will be helpful to cataloguers. However, we have some concern about the long list of examples, and we are aware from comments submitted to CC:DA that this may be an issue. We think a solution to the issue is to break up the list based on the categories given in 7.2.1.4.1. One could either give the appropriate examples after each category in 7.2.1.4.1, or one could break up the list in 7.2.1.4.4 into subrules 7.2.1.4.4a, 7.2.1.4.4b, etc., based on the same categories in 7.2.1.4.1. We also note that it may be possible to eliminate 7.2.1.4.4 entirely and move the examples, preferably categorized as we have suggested, to 7.2.1.4.2. We can provide the Editor with the appropriate category of work that each example illustrates if he wishes us to do so.

3. **Reciprocal relationships.** There were repeated comments from CC:DA members that, since relationships may be recorded reciprocally, they would like to see more examples of this in the examples. We have provided more examples showing the recording of reciprocal relationships, and more examples showing primary and additional access points for the same resource.
4. **Unpublished to published relationship.** We have at least one relationship that was not easy to fit into the current categories. Specifically, we found examples in rule

4.7B9 of AACR2 of “unpublished/published” relationships, i.e., the relationship between a manuscript and its published expression or manifestation:

Published as: *The life of George Romney*. London : T. Payne, 1809

Published in: *Poetry : a magazine of verse*. Vol. 59 (1942). p. 295-308

Examples such as these should be included in RDA. We have placed them at 6.6.2.2.1a.1 in the “source/derivative” examples. However, this is an uneasy fit. If these examples do belong here, we feel that the scope of this rule needs to explicitly include this type of relationship. If they do not belong here, we do not see any other place to currently put them. One published version of a manuscript may indeed be derivative of that manuscript, if in the course of preparing it for publication it is revised or altered in any way, but another may be published word for word (e.g., a poem that is typeset and published from a manuscript without alteration) and thus do not seem to us to be derivative at all.

5. **Multiple relationships.** We have also found examples that embody more than one kind of relationship. Consider, for example, a facsimile publication of a manuscript. This exhibits both the “unpublished/published” relationship and the “source/reproduction” relationship. A printed guide to a microform collection that is issued with the collection might be treated by some cataloguers as accompanying material (“issued with” relationship or perhaps “component/component”) or it might be considered a “primary/adjunct” relationship, particularly if the cataloguer chooses to catalog it separately. We note that "With:" appears in the RDA draft of Chapter 6 in several places under different relationships.

Other resources characterize themselves as both adaptations and abridgements or as updates, enlargements, *and* translations. Such examples are difficult to place in the rules.

We also found that the exact nature of the relationships of some of the examples in AACR2 is not clear, and we have tried not to use such examples in RDA. Nevertheless, perhaps RDA needs to provide guidance on recording types of relationships that are not covered in the rules or that embody multiple relationship types.

6. **Overlap of chapters.** We have some concern about overlap between rules in Chapters 4 (Content Description) and 6 (Related Resources). For example, there are rules and examples in both chapters for recording component resources, adjunct resources (e.g., indexes and finding aids), and other related content/resources. It may well be better to combine these rules to reduce redundancy and confusion. We have added numerous examples of contents notes in 6.2.1.2.1c.1 and 6.2.1.2.1d.1 that we believe will be useful, but we are still confused ourselves about the differences between embedded descriptions and informal notes, particularly as they pertain to component parts, and about when contents notes belong in chapter 4 versus chapter 6. We trust that the JSC and Editor will review our suggestions and move them to the

appropriate place if we have not got this right. We think other cataloguers will also be confused and urge that this be clarified for all, although perhaps having examples in all the right places (and none of the wrong places) will help greatly.

7. **Mode of issuance for collections.** We do not believe that we can characterize manuscript and archival collections as having a mode of issuance. None of the options (single part, simultaneous parts, successive parts, and integrating) seem applicable to collections that are assembled by a collector or agency. We have left the mode of issuance column in the examples tables blank for such resources.
8. **Concise edition.** As the first Examples Group reported in April, our characterization of examples suitable for the concise edition is necessarily preliminary and will need to be revisited once criteria for inclusion in the concise edition are available.
9. **Resources in multiple formats.** We discussed the issue that many resources are being issued simultaneously in multiple formats, e.g. printed text and online PDF, and also that many resources previously only available in analog formats are being digitized. If a resource is available in both analog and digital, how should that resource be characterized as to type of resource? Should we choose just one of the manifestations and record the type of resource for that, or could all the manifestations be coded, to enable users searching RDA to retrieve more examples that are appropriate to their search? We have noted in our comments in the tables when we are aware that a resource in one format is also available in another (usually, when a print text example is also issued in PDF). In some cases we have deliberately chosen a digital manifestation over an analog one, just so that users searching for such examples will find them. Of course, we have also sought out digital-only examples to include.
10. **Resource characterizations.** After consulting with the Editor, we have characterized the type of resource and mode of issuance only for the resource being described, rather than also for the related resource embodied in the example. They are not always the same (e.g., a print serial that becomes an online integrating resource; an accompanying DVD video to an audio CD set). We wondered whether it would be possible to encode for both, since users might like to search for examples of notes related to online integrating resources and would not retrieve an example for which the resource being described is a print serial. However, the Editor informed us that he does not think it will be possible to code for both and we have limited the information in the tables to the resource described.
11. **Initial articles.** The issue of whether to record initial articles in citations and access points was discussed. The issue also came up on the RDA discussion list. We have retained initial articles in the draft examples, but note that this is one place where the rules and actual standard cataloguing practices are not in accord. The rules should acknowledge this in some way--perhaps in Part B? We also note that there are examples of access points that do not include an initial article that probably should if RDA truly is to be consistent, e.g., Netherlands rather than The Netherlands at

7.9.5.1.1, Book of Mormon and Koran rather than The Book of Mormon and The Koran at 7.10.1.1.1. We think the JSC needs to decide when initial articles should be retained in examples of access points and when they may be omitted.

12. **ISBD and explanatory text.** We are in agreement that ISBD formatting should be used in the parenthetical explanations. We think this aids in comprehending the examples in the notes, and it is certainly more succinct than some other options. Instead of repeating *Example follows ISBD specifications for presentation* after each example, we suggest putting a general note at the beginning of Chapters 6 and 7 that explanatory text follows ISBD specifications.

13. **Confusion interpreting 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.2.** There is some confusion on our part on how to interpret the instructions in 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.2. When there are instructions that address “more than one person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating the work,” is the cataloguer to consider the *total* number of persons, families, and corporate bodies responsible, or is the cataloguer to count the number of persons, *or* families, *or* corporate bodies responsible? This makes a difference where examples should go. To illustrate the problem consider these examples:

Roman and pre-Roman glass in the Royal Ontario Museum : a catalogue / John W. Hayes

Paradise now / collective creation of the Living Theatre ; written down by Judith Malina and Julian Beck

The Royal Society International Geophysical Year Antarctic Expedition : Halley Bay, Coats Land, Falkland Islands Dependencies, 1955-1959 / general editor, David Brunt

Sketch map to illustrate the exploration of the Swedish Antarctic Expedition, 1902-3 ; Sketch map showing the track of the Swedish Antarctic Expedition / by O. Nordenskiöld & S.A. Duse

In each of these examples, there is only *one* corporate body responsible, but there are more than one total number of entities responsible. Do these examples belong under 7.2.1.4.4 (where the first two examples above appear in the draft rules and where we have tentatively kept them, along with several new examples), or should they be moved into 7.2.2 because there is more than one person, family, and corporate body *in toto* responsible? We have added some examples into 7.2.2 rules showing more than one corporate body or family responsible, but we need guidance on where to place examples where there is a single corporate body *plus* other non-corporate entities responsible.

14. **Motion pictures, television programs, and other videorecordings.** We do not feel that the current draft adequately addresses where and how motion pictures, television programs, and other videorecordings fit in the rules. We have inferred that generally these resources belong in 7.2.2.4, based on the assumption that most of them have more than three persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible, and

therefore the title is chosen as the primary access point. However, it is easy to find many examples of resources where principal responsibility is attributed to less than four entities. A strict application of the rules in 7.2 could lead some cataloguers to choosing a person, family, or corporate body as primary access point for these resources. Consider for example the following transcriptions of information from actual resources:

The circus : a comedy / written, directed, and produced by Charlie Chaplin

The circus : a comedy / Charles Chaplin Productions ; written, directed, produced by Charlie Chaplin. A day's pleasure / First National ; written, directed, produced by Charlie Chaplin

Lord Jim / Columbia Pictures ; a film by Richard Brooks ; written for the screen and directed by Richard Brooks

I love Lucy. Complete second season / Desilu Productions Inc. ; CBS Television

The Simpsons. Fourth season / Gracie Films ; created by Matt Groening ; executive producer, James L. Brooks

Is it desirable or intended that cataloguers use something other than the title as the primary access point for these resources? Should the title *always* be used as the primary access point for moving image resources, or are there cases where it *is* appropriate to use a person, family, or corporate body as primary access point? One can certainly imagine student films in which only one, two, or three persons are truly principally responsible, and one has only to peruse the YouTube website (<http://www.youtube.com>) to find videos created solely by one person. Whether the moving image is strictly documentary rather than creative may also need to be taken into account. For example, we have included an example at 7.2.1.2.1 of a streaming video file of a lecture presented at the U.S. National Institutes of Health. The camera shows the lecturer being introduced by someone else and then coming to the podium and giving his lecture. The PowerPoint slides that were being projected behind the speaker are also shown. It seems logical to us that in a case like this the lecturer is principally responsible and should be used as the primary access point.

One particular type of resource for which there is much confusion about how to catalog and which rules to apply are music videos and operas, ballets, musicals, and other music performances on video. Music cataloguers might wish to use the composer as the primary access point for an opera or ballet performance on video, while audiovisual and generalist cataloguers might prefer to use the title as primary access point, because of the diffuse nature of responsibility generally understood to be involved in the creation of a film or video. Are both approaches correct within the rules? Do we want to allow two different descriptions of the same resource based on the background or preference of the cataloguer or where they look in the rules? Such a result makes citing these resources very problematic and potentially inconsistent in bibliographic descriptions.

Another question that needs answering is whether it matters if the video is a recording of a stage performance from the perspective of an audience member versus a film adaptation, perhaps moved off of the stage into a more “real” space, perhaps with additions to the libretto, rearrangement of scenes, etc.? In other words, when do we have a different work, rather than a different expression? How far away does one have to move from a score to no longer use the composer as primary access point?

To illustrate the difficulties in applying the rules for performances to videorecordings and films, consider the example that we added at 7.2.8.2.1:

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756-1791

(Primary access point for: Trollflöjten = The magic flute / Sveriges Radio A.B. production ; produced, directed, and written by Ingmar Bergman. A film adaptation of Mozart's opera Die Zauberflöte)

Because this is a performance of a single work, we have (tentatively) put this example at 7.2.8.2.1, with Mozart as primary access point. A cataloguer might consider this an adaptation by Bergman of Mozart’s work (we realize Bergman is not a *musical* adapter in the sense generally understood by music cataloguers) and start at 7.7.3, instead. Category d) at 7.7.3.1 (“any other distinct alteration of another musical work”) might allow them to use Bergman as the primary access point. If, however, the cataloguer starts at 7.2.8.0.2, which provides a reference to 7.7.3, the instruction there is written only in terms of *performers* as adapters. Bergman probably does not qualify as a *performer*, even though he most assuredly is an adapter of Mozart’s work. Therefore, if 7.7.3 is not actually intended to apply in this case, the cataloguer could conclude that Mozart should be used as the primary access point.

Another way to get to 7.7.3 and to using Bergman as the primary access is to start at 7.2.4 (“Adaptations and Revisions of Previously Existing Works”), which definitely applies in this case. There is a reference at 7.2.4.0.3 to 7.7.3 for adaptations of works. This route bypasses the restriction found in 7.2.8.0.2 limiting 7.7.3 to performers. And if a cataloguer doesn’t see the reference at 7.2.4.0.3 and simply applies the rule at 7.2.4.2.1, they might arrive at Bergman as primary access point.

Based on the scenarios outlined so far, a cataloguer could arrive at Mozart or Bergman as the primary access point. However, if a cataloguer decides that principal responsibility for creating the work is attributed to more than three persons, families, or corporate bodies, then 7.2.2.4.1 would direct them to use the title as primary access point. In the example above, only two entities are recorded in the statement of responsibility; even if we count Mozart as also principally responsible, that still is only three. (We could get to four entities if we include Emanuel Schikaneder, the librettist, even though he isn’t mentioned prominently, if at all.) Therefore, can the title be used as the primary access point for this resource? And if not title, which person or corporate body should be used?

The whole issue of works that may be manifested or realized in performance (be it a “simple” reading of a book as an audiobook, a performance of a string quartet, the

staging of an opera, the filming of a play or dance, or the full production of a motion picture) is one that RDA addresses inadequately. We hope that consideration of this one case, even if not the best example of an adaptation, illustrates the complexity and difficulties that cataloguers will have to deal with under the current draft of rules. The rules should, as much as possible, lead to consistent results when the same resource is catalogued by different cataloguers. While we have added examples in various places that may help illustrate to cataloguers our interpretation of the rules as applied to moving image resources, we feel that RDA needs to better address all kinds of moving images, as well as performances, with or without visual elements, of all types of musical (and choreographic) works.

15. **Anonymous adaptations.** We note that the draft omitted an example from AACR2 21.10 of how to enter an anonymous adaptation:

The pilgrim's progress : for the young . . .
(Adapted by an unknown person from John Bunyan's work)
 Main entry under title
 Added entry (name-title) under the heading for Bunyan

We feel that an example such as this is needed, but it is not clear from RDA rules 7.2.4.2.1 and 7.2.4.2.2 whether the primary access point for this resource would be the title as it is in AACR2 or Bunyan, as seems to be called for by 7.2.4.2.2. We put this example at 7.2.4.2.1 and showed the primary access point as title, but the text of the rule may need revising if this is truly the intended and correct place for this example. In this example, the issue is not that there is doubt about whether the adaptation meets the criteria in 7.2.4.2.1, but that while it meets the criteria, the principal responsibility for the adaptation is unattributed or unknown. There may also be confusion in a case like this as to whether 7.2.7.3 applies (unknown person responsible).

16. **“Prominently.”** We are unsure whether there is any need to include the text about whether a person or corporate body is named prominently that are included in some of the examples at 7.2.8.3.1 and 7.2.8.5.1a.1. We are not sure if prominence has any relevance anymore in the context of these rules. If prominence is no longer a factor in determining the primary access points in these cases, then we suggest that this part of the explanatory text for the examples in question be removed.
17. **Access points for earlier iterations.** There is no provision with 7.3 to provide additional access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with earlier iterations of an integrating resource. Rule 7.3.8 covers only later iterations of an integrating resource. We think that there needs to be something in the rules illustrating the inclusion of additional access points for earlier iterations. This is particularly important for the cases where the primary access point is changed because of a change found in the current iteration. Some examples that could go into such a rule include:

Del Negro, John T.

Levenson, Harvey S.

(Additional access points for co-authors of an earlier iteration of: Depreciation handbook : with tax planning / by Bruce K. Benesh and M. Kevin Bryant. Access point for Benesh used as primary access point for latest iteration)

Eckstrom, Lawrence J.

Szczepanski, Steven Z.

(Additional access points for authors of earlier iterations of: Eckstrom's licensing in foreign and domestic operations. Primary access point for latest iteration is title)

International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management

(Additional access point for earlier iterations of: WorldFish Center : [website]. Access point for WorldFish Center used as primary access point for latest iteration; the Center and website changed its name from International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management)

Albrecht, Jean

(Additional access point for editor and compiler of an earlier iteration of: Trail planning, construction & maintenance / Philip Herold, editor and compiler)

Centre d'information arabe scandinave

(Additional access point for issuing body of an earlier iteration of: Encyclopaedia of the Orient. -- [Bergen, Norway?] : LexicOrient, [1996]-)

Free Software Foundation (Cambridge, Mass.)

(Additional access point for publisher of an earlier iteration of: Wikipedia : the free encyclopedia. -- [Cambridge, Mass.?] : Wikimedia Foundation)

Records of rare birds found in Oregon

(Additional access point for title of an earlier iteration of: The records of the Oregon Bird Records Committee)

Canada's official geographic names Web site

Canadian geographical names

(Additional access points for titles of earlier iterations of: Geographical names of Canada / Natural Resources Canada, Earth Sciences Sector, Mapping Services Branch = Toponymie du Canada / Ressources naturelles Canada, Secteur des sciences de la terre, Direction des services cartographiques)

18. **Role designations.** We have included some suggested examples to illustrate the option at 7.6 of adding designation(s) of role to access points. We feel that some examples of how to do this would be helpful. The designations are, in practice, often provided in a coded form, and cataloguers may also expect to see examples illustrating this, such as:

700 1_ Allen, Woody. \$4 act \$4 aus \$4 drt

Perhaps an example that includes coded role designators could be included in the Appendix E?

The JSC may also wish to consider compiling a list of established standard lists of designator terms and codes and making that available on the JSC website, perhaps with a link from 7.6.2. The lists that come to mind easily are the:

MARC Code List: Relator Codes
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/>

Relator Terms (from ACRL RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee)
<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/relators.html>

Relator Terms for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloging (also from ACRL RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee, in a different expression)
<http://library.osu.edu/sites/users/russell.363/RBMS%20Thesauri/Relators/Alphabetical%20List.htm>

19. **Suggested revision to 7.7.1.2.1d.1.** Our music experts suggest that 7.7.1.2.1d.1 be changed from “Single song” to “Single excerpt” and that the rule be written with that in mind. This would parallel 7.7.1.2.1c.1, which is called “Compilation of excerpts.”
20. **Religious works.** We do not feel that we have sufficient expertise in our group to fully evaluate the examples in 7.10 (“Additional Instructions for Religious Works”). We are also concerned that many of the examples here are very old, often represented in bibliographic utilities by pre-AACR2 records, and we would like to replace them with appropriate, more recent examples. We request that the JSC consider appointing an additional member of our group with expertise cataloguing theological resources. We note also that there were comments submitted to CC:DA calling for the inclusion of more examples representing non-Judeo-Christian religious works. We have suggested a few new examples as a result of these comments, but having an expert in this area would be a great help here as well. Such an expert will also be especially helpful when we begin reviewing the draft of Part B.
21. **Separation of primary access point examples from additional access point examples.** Members of the group have concerns about the separation of examples showing primary access point from those showing additional access points. In AACR2 Chapter 21, both the main entry and the added entries were presented for each example. The format of RDA has rendered some of these same examples much less clear to cataloguers. In particular, we find many the legal examples to be confusing when only the primary access point is shown. For a bilateral treaty it makes no sense at all to show one and not the other. We would like the JSC to discuss whether the decision to separate primary and additional access points is the best way to present many of the examples in Chapter 7.

Related to this issue, we also note a lack of consistency in the current examples in Chapter 7, as some of the examples for additional access points (such as those at 7.3.1.1) also give the primary access point, while others (such as at 7.3.4.1 and 7.3.7.1 of the draft) do not. Does the JSC wish to have explanatory text for examples be

consistent throughout? Perhaps such conformity is not needed, but we would like some guidance.

22. **Access points--controlled or not controlled?** We note that there is much inconsistency in the draft as to whether access points and citations are presented in their controlled form or not. It is a concern to us that in some examples additions to names have been included (e.g., Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616 at 6.1.4.01; Davis, Jack, 1917-2000 at 6.2.1.2.1b.1; Police (Musical group), Symposium on Talc (1973 : Washington, D.C.), and numerous other examples at 7.2.1.4.4; Parker, Theodore (Spirit) at 7.2.2.3.1; Turner, C. (Charles) at 7.8.2.1; Chihuahua (Mexico : State) at 7.9.1.1.1), but in most examples they have not been. Some corporate bodies are presented in a subordinate form, probably for comprehensibility (e.g., Canada. Treasury Board at 7.9.5.5.4; United States. Congress (70th, 1st session : 1927-1928). Senate at 7.9.1.4.1).

We recommend that there be a consistent standard agreed upon for presentation of access point examples in Chapters 6 and 7. Two options would be an authorized form or the form found in the resource being described. We prefer the first option and have provided the authorized form of name and title in all examples for which we could determine it. We used the form found in the LC/NACO Authority File. If the JSC decides not to include additions to names and titles, it will be fairly simple to remove these additions from the examples that have them. We also followed current practice by separating initials in personal name headings with a space. We hope that Part B of RDA will make this practice compulsory.

We do have some concerns about the fact that authorized headings change over time, and that this could lead to headings being out of synch between RDA and the NAF. This is already the case with AACR2 and we do not see a better alternative to using a standard authorized form when access points are given. A note could be included in RDA that access points were used in their authorized form as of a certain date, and that they may have changed since then. Alternatively, should the JSC accept our recommendation, perhaps a mechanism can be set up to track changes to authorized headings that have been used as access points in RDA. For example, an authority vendor, or perhaps a bibliographic utility like OCLC, could be given a list of authority records for access points used in RDA and could report any changes in authorized forms to the JSC.

23. **Arrangement of examples in Chapter 7.** Last, but certainly not least, we wish to comment on the arrangement for the examples in Chapter 7. We discussed, but did not reach consensus on, the change in presentation of the examples from AACR2 Chapter 21 to RDA Chapter 7. We all agree that the emphasis and *raison d'être* of Chapter 7 should be the *choice* of primary and additional access points, not the *form* of them. Some of us feel that the current draft places too much emphasis on the forms of the names themselves, and that that should be left to Part B. It does make logical sense that cataloguers must first choose what they will use as the primary and additional access points, and then go to an authority file to see if that name is already

established or to the instructions in Part B to determine how to establish that name. These are different processes, even if in practice they tend to coalesce, particularly for experienced cataloguers. Nevertheless, the Examples Group did not reach a consensus on whether to recommend going back to the presentation form found in AACR2 or staying with the form in RDA. No doubt the JSC will be receiving much comment on this issue from the various constituencies. However, should the JSC decide to keep the style of the current draft, we do recommend that the names presented be in full authorized form if available.

Tables of Examples

Appended to this report are tables of the examples found in Chapters 6 and 7, along with our recommendations for corrections, substitutions, deletions, and additions. The tables have been filled out according to the “Template for Review of RDA Examples” created by the Editor. The comments column identifies the Examples Group member(s) who reviewed the example, along with any comments and questions for Group members or for the JSC and Editor.

Members of Examples Group Part A, Chapters 6-7 and Part B

Adam L. Schiff, Chair

Principal Cataloger
University of Washington Libraries
Box 352900
Seattle, WA 98195-2900
USA
Phone: +1-206-543-8409
Fax: +1-206-685-8782
Email: aschiff@u.washington.edu

Catherine Argus

Manager
Special Materials Cataloguing, Standards & Training
National Library of Australia
Canberra, ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61-2-6262-1044
Fax: +61-2-6273-4322
Email: cargus@nla.gov.au

John H. Bowman

Program Director for Library & Information Studies
School of Library, Archive & Information Studies
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

UK

Phone: +44-20-7679-2479

Fax: +44-20-7383-0557

Email: j.bowman@ucl.ac.uk

Rachel Gagnon

Cataloguing Librarian

Music Team

Library and Archives Canada

395 Wellington Street

Ottawa, ON K1A 0N4

CANADA

Phone: +1-819-994- 6899

Fax: +1-819-953- 0291

Email: rachel.gagnon@lac-bac.gc.ca

David Sommerfield

Library of Congress

101 Independence Avenue SE

LS/SMCD/MSRII

Washington DC 20540-4374

USA

Phone: +1-202-707-1926

Fax: +1-202-707-7161

Email: dsom@loc.gov

Jay Weitz

OCLC Online Computer Library Center

Senior Consulting Database Specialist

MC 139

6565 Frantz Road

Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395

USA

Phone: +1-614-764-6156

Fax: +1-614-718-7195

Email: JAY_WEITZ@OCLC.ORG

Kathy Winzer

Catalog Librarian

Robert Crown Law Library

Stanford University

Stanford, CA 94305-8612

USA

Phone: +1- 650-723-0343

Fax : +1-650-723-8657

Email: kwinzer@stanford.edu