

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative

Subject: **A0 rules for what is being described, number of records, basis of description, sources; changes to A1.0 and A1.1B**

Related documents

5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ACOC response

5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response

Comments on the LC rationale and preliminary comments on the proposal

ACOC is generally supportive of a simplified style and approach as used in this proposal.

ACOC supports LC's first general principle, i.e. that the prescribed source for the description should be the resource as a whole. ACOC agrees with LC's analysis that the selection of the title proper needs to be unambiguous, and on that basis we accept using a prescribed priority order of sources for the selection of a title proper. However, we consider that principles-based guidance is still necessary when there are multiple sources (please see our comments under A1.1B2 c) below), and we note that other areas of the description are also significant for identification of the resource.

ACOC welcomes the proposal to limit the use of square brackets to information supplied from outside the resource, and the omission of square brackets for resources that normally require the data element to be supplied.

ACOC also agrees with the general process to be followed by the cataloguer that is outlined by LC under the heading "Organization of the proposed revision". We would like these steps to be made as clear as possible to the user of RDA. If this cannot be done using the order and layout of the text, it may useful to include a work flow diagram.

Re 'Incorporating A1.1B11 into proposed revision', please see our comments under A1.1B3 d).

Re 'Other changes in and an addition to provisions in Part I of Draft AACR3'. ACOC generally accepts these changes, with the exception of the final dot point. Please see our comments under A01.B third paragraph below.

Comments on the proposed revision

A0.1A What is being described

Footnotes 1 and 2: ACOC considers these footnotes to be too lengthy, and the text might be better placed in the body of the rule.

A01.B Number of records

Overall ACOC prefers the outline of the Editor's approach as given in *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1*, with the reservations as noted in *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ACOC response*.

Second paragraph: ACOC considers this paragraph to be misleading because a cataloguer can decide to make a separate description for each separately titled component part even if a resource

has a collective title (as per paragraph 4 of this rule). The issue of separate physical parts, or discrete units of content, is also absent.

Third paragraph: ACOC does not support the inclusion of ‘for multiple manifestations of a resource’ without any further clarification and guidance.

We note that the principle of creating a single record for each manifestation is well supported: it is included in the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* Section 2.1.1; most major databases, including the Australian National Bibliographic Database, prefer the use of a record for each manifestation; and it is supported by current cataloguing theory (see Svenonius *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*, p. 115 “... the conservative stand to maintain the traditional one-one relationship between documents and records is unassailable”). If the concept of a single record for multiple manifestations is introduced to *RDA*, the ramifications of choosing this option, e.g. limitations on record sharing, must be given.

Fourth paragraph: the phrase ‘by national bibliographies and those cataloguing agencies’ is unnecessary. Also, it is not clear the final sentence is needed, as this rule is about the number of records, not the arrangement of data elements.

A0.2. Basis of description

The appropriateness of incorporating definitions in the text of rules needs to be decided for *RDA* as a whole.

A0.3 Source of information for the data elements

Given the importance of the edition statement for identification, consideration could also be given to use the same priority order as is used for the title proper. The corresponding section 1.2.4 in *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response* is preferable to that given here.

A0.3A. “What resource” is somewhat obscure: does it mean the *type* of resource? How does this relate to the principle that “the prescribed source for the description is the resource as a whole”?

A0.3C2. It might be better to replace this final sentence with a more general one, e.g. “Do not use square brackets for resources that normally require the data element to be supplied.”.

A1.0E1. ACOC would prefer ‘treatment’ to ‘manipulating’ in this caption.

A1.1B2 More than one form and/or source of title

A couple of suggestions on layout and wording which do not affect the intent:

a), b) and c) need to appear in different font to make them stand out.

a) iii ‘and are not full form vs. acronym or initialism’ could be replaced by ‘and ii) does not apply”.

A1.1B2 c) Although supportive of achieving a simplified order of sources, ACOC would like an explanation of the rationale by which some resources have been singled out and given their own priority order of sources, while others have not. For example, why is there a difference in the priority order of sources for ‘Resources comprising pages, leaves etc.’ and ‘Single manuscripts’?

ACOC notes that for ‘Other resources’ this rule offers no guidance for situations where there is more than one title on the resource itself. Some principles-based guidance, such as that given in *5JSC/AACR3/I A1.0A2*, is needed especially for remote access digital resources. Such guidance

(i.e. to use ‘formally presented evidence’ and preferring the source with ‘the most complete information’) was previously given in AACR2 9.0B1.

A1.1B3 Title lacking

a) and b) What is the definition of ‘part’ used in these rules?

c) As noted in this response above at A0.3C2, it might be better to replace this final sentence with a more general one, e.g. “Do not use square brackets for resources that always require the data element to be supplied.”.

What does the phrase ‘if not already an integral part of the resource’ used in c) i) mean?

d) ACOC is generally supportive of the incorporation of A1.1B11, and of the points 1), 2) and 4). raised by LC under ‘Incorporating A1.1B11 into proposed revision’.

Although supportive of point 3), we do not consider that this has been achieved:

- It would be better to reword the references to practices in the archival community with phrases that suggest the principle behind the practice, and are therefore more easily applied to other situations, e.g. graphics. At present these references read either as afterthoughts, or as case law.
- We would also like JSC to consider the use of a note on the source of the title proper instead of the use of square brackets.
- The wording given in *5JSC/AACR3/I* under A1.1B11 is preferred as it gives more guidance on devising titles for single resources and collections.
- The suggestion (not implemented in this proposal) to eliminate rules for manuscript material would not be acceptable. Some institutions describe manuscript collections both bibliographically (and in the same catalogue as other resources) and archivally. RDA should continue to facilitate the bibliographic description of these resources.