

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Jennifer Bowen, ALA representative
RE: *RDA* Part 1 Internationalization

ALA appreciates LC's further work towards internationalization on *RDA* Part A. In this response, we suggest some more revisions and further issues to discuss within other JSC constituencies. Specific comments on each proposed rule are followed by general comments.

General Comments

Issues regarding numerals/dates. ALA supports JSC's decision to use Western-style Arabic numerals as the default for major numeric elements (with option to use other numerals, of course). However, LC's proposed revisions of 1.6.2, 2.6.0.3, and 2.9.0.3 do not seem to work correctly because these instructions contradict each other. We believe that stating straightforwardly a preference for Western-style Arabic numerals in 1.6.2.1 would simplify all the related instructions such as 2.6.0.3 and 2.9.0.3. See the specific comments below for more detail.

Language for the mathematical data for cartographic materials. This document does not address the issue of language for the mathematical data for cartographic materials. These include the language of the term "Scale" (4.13.0.3. and 4.13.3), and the language of the coordinate hemisphere indicators, N, S, E, and W (4.15.0.3). Even though some non-English speaking countries use "Scale", many use the equivalent in their language. The language of the coordinate hemisphere indicators tends to be in each country's own language. Thus, ALA suggests adding "or its equivalent in other languages and/or scripts" at the end of the 2nd sentence of 4.13.0.3, at the end of the 1st sentence of 4.13.3, and after "W, E, N, or S" in the 2nd sentence of the 2nd paragraph of 4.15.0.3. We also recommend that other *RDA* guidelines that prescribe exact wording be reexamined.

Multi-script languages. It is a minor point, but because some languages, such as Japanese and Korean, use more than one script, ALA recommends the wording "the language and script(s)" (i.e., adding the optional 's').

Specific Comments

A. Proposed revision of 1.5

1.5. Language and script of the description

1. 2nd bullet: There are two different instructions in this one bullet. ALA recommends separating into two bullets. Also "the most appropriate language and script" can be

confusing and will likely cause inconsistency in records. Since the option below it provides cataloguing agencies with language options, it might be better to provide a more specific instruction based on other elements in the record, for example.

2. 3rd bullet: It is the practice right now in the U.S. JACKPHY community, and spreading into Cyrillic as well, to provide both the original script and also the transliterated form in parallel fields for other elements, such as notes. In fact, the wording “in the language(s) and script(s)” suggests there are no restrictions on multiple languages and scripts for all of the “other elements”. We would like to preserve the option to do both for other elements the same as for the elements listed under the 1st bullet.
3. 4th bullet and exception: Here, the non-preferred word “Romanization” has crept in. Also this particular exception does not make much sense under the last bullet. We suggest combining these two as an exception under the current 3rd bullet.

ALA’s suggested wording of 2nd-4th bullets of 1.5

[ALA revisions highlighted in gray]

- When adding to an element in the list ~~Record interpolations into the elements listed above,~~ record the addition in the language and script(s) of the other data in the element unless the instructions for a specific element indicate otherwise.
 - ◇ Optionally, record the additions in the language and script(s) preferred by the agency preparing the description.
- When supplying a missing data element in the list, record the additional element in the most appropriate language and script(s) based on other elements in the record.
- Record all other elements (including notes) in the language(s) and script(s) preferred by the agency preparing the description.

Exception:

Record a name, title or quotation incorporated into notes in the language(s) and script(s) in which it appears on the source from which it is taken.

- ◇ Optionally, substitute a name, title or quotation originally in nonroman scripts in a transliterated form.

B-E. Proposed revision of 1.6.2

1.6.2. Numbers expressed as numerals or as words

1. 2nd bullet: Since the original 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.2.2 are deleted in this new proposal, 1.6.2.3-1.6.2.6 ~~1.6.2.5~~ should be renumbered as 1.6.2.1-1.6.2.3.

2. ALA believes that all transcribed data elements/sub elements should be listed under the 1st bullet and the other elements/sub elements under the second bullet to clarify how to record numbers. The former includes: publisher, distributor, etc.; place of publication, distribution, etc.; and series. The latter includes notes.

1.6.2.1. Script of Numerals

1. While the proposed text itself is workable, it would not properly co-exist with proposed rules 2.6.0.3 or 2.9.0.3, which instruct cataloguers to record numbering/the date of publication, distribution, etc., in Western-style Arabic numerals. 1.6.2 and 1.6.2.1 instruct one way, but 2.6.0.3 and 2.9.0.3 instruct another way. ALA believes this will be too confusing in practice.
2. Considering the responses from the other JSC constituencies and the non-JSC countries contributed during the last draft review, we now generally believe that Western-style Arabic numerals have become the *de facto* universal standard. Thus, it seems more international in scope to use Western-style Arabic for recording numeric information, as long as LC's proposed option to add or substitute other numerals is retained.
3. The option under 1.6.2.1.(originally 1.6.2.3) is now included in 1.6.2. We suggest deleting this option.

F. Proposed revision of 2.2.2

2.2.2. More than one preferred source of information

1. There is a typo: "once" should instead read: "one" in the first sentence in the first bullet.
2. ALA acknowledges LC's effort to make citations for works uniform around the world, regardless of language of cataloguing agency. On the other hand, many within ALA like the option mentioned in the note, to apply each agency's preferred order of the languages. There is also disagreement within ALA regarding the language list: some prefer to retain it as the last resort, but the others think the list is overly biased.
3. We believe that the "first" occurring of the source does not always provide a clear solution, such as for a "tête-beche" situation, or some Asian materials, which could have title pages on both sides with no predominant language. LCRI 1.0A3 adds the element of choosing the chief source based on the language or script of the issuing body. This is more helpful for these situations. We propose adding language or script of the issuing body to the list of decision criteria for preferred sources.

G. Proposed revision of 2.5.1.3

2.5.1.3 Recording edition statements

JSC has decided that “Edition” is a transcribed element. In response to LC’s question regarding inclusion of the optional phrase “if considered to be important”, some of us would like to leave the matter to cataloguer’s judgment and to have an option to transcribe “as is” without supplying accompanying words. However, not everyone within ALA agrees with this, and would like to hear from the other constituencies.

H. Proposed revision of 2.6.0.3

2.6.0.3. Transcription

1. For the sake of consistency in the revised text, ALA recommends changing the header to “Recording numbering” as well.
2. We understand that JSC and LC’s intention is to move the general Roman numerals instruction (originally 1.6.2.1.) to individual instruction here in 2.6.0.3. as noted in the “status of progress”. However, deleting the reference to the general guidance to entire 1.6 in the first bullet means cutting off the other two important instructions, especially the ones relating transcribe numbering, namely Inclusive numbers (renumbered as 1.6.2.2.) and Ordinal numerals (renumbered as 1.6.2.3.). Since we are also suggesting the use of Western-style Arabic numerals in the renumbered 1.6.2.1., which does not contradict 2.6.0.3., we suggest reinstating the reference: “following the general guidelines on transcription given under 1.6”.
3. With the above suggestion in mind, we further suggest making the second bullet an exception under the first bullet because the situation seems to cover only one specific exception. In addition, the reference back to 1.6, which includes 1.6.2.1, covers the option under the second bullet.

ALA’s suggested wording of 2.6.0.3 [ALA revisions highlighted in gray]

2.6.0.3. ~~Transcription~~Recording numbering

- ~~Transcribe~~ Record numbering in Western-style arabic numerals as it appears on the source of information, following the general guidelines on transcription given under 1.6.

[examples]

Exception:

Record numbering using roman numerals if they are used on the source of information to distinguish the volume from the number in the series numbering, and using all Western-style Arabic numerals makes the statement less clear.

~~➤ Substitute Western style arabic numerals for roman numerals unless the substitution makes the statement less clear (e.g., when roman and Western style arabic numerals are used in conjunction to distinguish the volume from the number in the series numbering).~~

~~◊ *Optionally, add or substitute numerals preferred by the agency preparing the description.*~~

I. Proposed revision of 2.6.3

2.6.3. No designation on first issue or part

ALA suggests the LC's change "and script" to "and script(s)".

J. Proposed revision of 2.6.5

2.6.5. New sequence of numbering

ALA members do not all agree about this issue. On the one hand, some still support the current proposed revision without any addition, while others agree with LC's intention in the original LC/5 proposal to add more clear instruction regarding "another appropriate term". Thus, ALA concurs with LC on the need to hear from the other constituencies about this.

K. Proposed revision of 2.9.0.3

2.9.0.3. Transcription

1. For the sake of consistency in the revised text, ALA recommends changing the header to "Recording the date of publication, distribution, etc." as well.
2. As we stated in the comment on 2.6.0.3 above, deleting the reference to the general guidance to entire 1.6 in the first bullet means cutting off the other two important instructions, especially those regarding transcribed dates, namely Inclusive numbers (renumbered as 1.6.2.2.) and Ordinal numerals (renumbered as 1.6.2.3.). Since we are also suggesting the use of Western-style Arabic numerals in the renumbered 1.6.2.1, which does not contradict 2.9.0.3., we suggest reinstating the reference: "following the general guidelines on transcription given under 1.6".
3. We believe that the instruction regarding fictitious dates (and maybe erroneous dates as well) still needs to be in the option.

L. Proposed revision of 2.9.0.4

ALA has no comment for this proposal.

M. Proposed revision of 2.10.6.4

2.10.6.3. Recording numbering within series

ALA notes that there is no mention of this instruction, which relates to numbers, in the LC proposal. Its omission from the LC/5/Rev proposal suggests that we would purely transcribe numbering within series from the source, which could include roman numerals and script of numerals. We would appreciate confirmation from the JSC that numbering within series will be a recorded rather than a transcribed element, and that instructions regarding recording numbering in Western-style arabic numerals for numbering within series will appear here (or be referred to here) as well as at 2.6.0.3 for numbering in general.

2.10.6.4. Numeric and /or alphabetic designation in more than one language or script

ALA has no comment for this proposal.

N. Proposed revision of current 2.10.6.4 and renumbering as 2.10.6.5

2.10.6.5. Chronological designation

1. This instruction refers to 2.6.2.3 (Chronological designation of regular numbering), which further refers to 2.6.0.3. The proposed 2.6.0.3 instructs “Record numbering in Western-style Arabic numerals”. However, the general instruction of 2.10.6.3 Recording numbering within series in the same 2.10.6. section instructs “record the numbering ... as it appears on the source of information” and also further refers to 1.6, which instructs basically the same (meaning not substitute Western-style Arabic numerals). Although ALA supports the proposed addition of the referral to 2.6.2.3 itself, the contradicted instructions of these referred sections need to be reconsidered. See our suggestions in 1.6.2.1. and 2.6.0.3., and the comments on 2.10.6.3.
2. The original draft wording seems redundant. We prefer to make it simply: “If the resource has both a numeric and/or alphabetic designation and a chronological designation, record both ~~the numeric and/or alphabetic designation and the chronological designation~~ (see 2.6.2.3). A date of publication, distribution, etc., is not a chronological designation”

O. Proposed revision of current 2.10.6.5 and renumbering as 2.10.6.6

2.10.6.6. New sequence of numbering

ALA still supports the current proposed revision without any addition. However, we concur with LC on the need to hear from the other constituencies about this.

P. Proposed revision of 3.5.0.4

ALA has no comment for this proposal.

Q. Proposed revision of 7.9.5.1, deletion of 7.9.5.2, and revision of 7.9.5.3

7.9.5.1. Treaties, etc., between two or more national governments

7.9.5.2. Agreements contracted by international intergovernmental bodies (Renumbered)

1. Upon the recommendation of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), ALA does not support the proposed revision of 7.9.5.1, calling for the title to be the primary access point for all treaties. We recognize the need to remove the preference for English alphabetic order, but we believe that this result can be achieved in a way consistent with the description of other types of resources.
2. In addition, the current breakdown of treaties in 7.9.5 does not reflect the resources, which are either bilateral (between 2 countries) or multilateral (between 3 or more countries). We recommend that the terminology of the material be reflected in RDA.
3. Bilateral treaties have two authors, and they share responsibility for the existence of the treaty; that is, each government has to sign the treaty. Bilateral treaties in the various treaty indexes are listed under the name of the country. While bilateral treaties tend to have long titles and often begin with meaningless terms, their titles would generally include the two governments signing the treaty. An example:

Exchange of Notes constituting an Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America on the Torso Rotation Experiment (with Memorandum of Understanding)

Since only two parties are involved, we recommend that the first named government be the primary access point and an additional access point should be given for the other country for bilateral treaties. We realize that the same treaty may be issued by different countries with the order of names reversed, although this does not seem to happen very often. This problem will need to be solved by the creation of an authority record for the treaty using the first instance as the authorized access point, with headings for the other relevant languages and countries added as cross references.

4. Multilateral treaties are signed by three or more countries. We agree that the primary access point for these should be the name of the treaty as recorded in a controlled form.
5. By the name of the treaty, we mean the “preferred title for the treaty”, not simply the title proper of the resource in hand. Treaties may be issued in more than one language, and a controlled access point is needed to allow identification of the resource.

6. We understand that additional access points are considered optional under 7.9.0.2. However, the direction in the current 7.9.5.2.2: “Provide additional access points for the governments that are signatories to the treaties” implies that the additional access points are mandatory. Since a treaty may have hundreds of signatories, members of the AALL committee have suggested two ways that might underscore that these added access points are optional:
 - a. Optionally provide additional access points for other governments that are signatories to the treaty.
 - b. Provide additional access points for other governments that are signatories to the treaty, if considered to be important.

ALA proposes the following reorganization of the instructions to address the problem in the current draft, of calling for the primary access point to be determined by English alphabetic order (clean copy only):

7.9.5 Treaties, international agreements, etc.

7.9.5.1 Treaties, etc. between two governments

7.9.5.1.1 For a treaty, or any other formal agreement between two national governments, use as the primary access point the first named country in the name of the treaty.

7.9.5.2 Multilateral treaties

7.9.5.2.1 For a treaty between 3 or more countries, enter under the name of the treaty.

7.9.5.2.2 Provide additional access points for signatories if desired.

7.9.5.2.3 If the treaty is a product of an international conference, provided an additional access point for the conference.

R. Proposed revision of 7.9.5.4 (renumbered as 7.9.5.3)

7.9.5.3. Agreements contracted by the Holy See

ALA also would like to recommend the same principle above to use the first-named national government or the other political jurisdiction as the primary access point.