

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Canadian Committee on Cataloguing  
**Subject:** **RDA Part I Internationalization**

CCC has reviewed the revised proposal on internationalization that incorporates the decisions made at the April 2006 JSC meeting and offers the following comments:

#### **General comments**

- Without the benefit of knowing how the editor intends to define the terms, *transcribe* and *record*, it is difficult to analyze all the proposed revisions.
- Since the use of square brackets was discussed at the April JSC meeting (5JSC/M/76.6), we assume that further consideration of the use of square brackets will also be covered when information is *added*.

#### **Specific comments to proposed revisions**

##### **A. Proposed revision of 1.5**

**1.5, first option:** The use of the term “add” is ambiguous. We feel that in this instance one is creating an *additional* element and this can be confused with the bullet following where one is *adding to* an element.

**1.5, second bullet:** Suggest that it might be clearer to create a separate bullet for the second sentence as follows:

When adding to an element in the list above, record the addition in the language and script of the other data in the element unless the instructions for a specific element indicate otherwise.

*Optionally*, record the addition(s) in the language and script preferred by the agency preparing the description.

When supplying a missing data element, record the missing data element in the most appropriate language and script.

**1.5, last bullet (before Exception):** “romanization,” should read: transliteration.

##### **B. Proposed revision of 1.6.2**

**1.6.2:** Given that this is a subsection of **1.6 Transcription**, there needs to be a clarification of the use of the term “transcription”. Alternatively, 1.6 could be entitled **Transcription and Recording of Elements**

The addition of “edition statement” and “statement relating to a named revision of an edition” to the first paragraph (elements for transcription) entails a revision of the option directed to early printed resources as follows:

*Optionally*, for early printed resources, transcribe numbers expressed as numerals or as words appearing in a date of publication, distribution, etc., in the form in which they appear on the source of information.

With the addition of edition statement to bullet one, the examples under the option will also need to be transferred or deleted.

**E. Proposed revision of 1.6.2.3, etc.**

**1.6.2.4 and 1.6.2.5:** These two instructions should also be re-examined in light of the distinction between *transcribe* and *record*.

**F. Proposed revision of 2.2.2**

**2.2.2:** Being an officially bilingual country, we prefer to retain paragraph iv) as is and to add the option to “apply the priority order of languages preferred by the agency preparing the description” as noted in the parenthetical statement on p. 6.

**G. Proposed revision of 2.5.1.3**

**2.5.1.3:** We agree that it is not necessary to include “if considered to be important” in the instruction.

**H. Proposed revision of 2.6.0.3**

**2.6.0.3:** Since this instruction is no longer transcription, 2.6.0.3 should be renamed, i.e., Recording numbering. Also suggest collapsing the first two paragraphs into one as follows:

Record numbering in Western-style arabic numerals, substituting 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).

**I. Proposed revision of 2.6.3**

**2.6.3:** Suggest “supply” be used in place of “record” in the second sentence. Cf. 2.6.5.

**J. Proposed revision of 2.6.5**

**2.6.5:** We prefer to retain and revise as follows: “(or its equivalent in the language and script of the title proper)”.

**K. Proposed revision of 2.9.0.3**

**2.9.0.3:** Agree with LC note. Since this instruction is no longer transcription, 2.9.0.3 should be renamed, e.g., Recording date of publication, distribution, etc. Suggest that the order of option a) and b) be reversed. Are fictitious dates addressed here? Adding or substituting information “in the script” does not necessarily imply correcting a date.

**P. Proposed revision of 3.5.0.4**

CCC feels that the reference to a “common system of measurement “ for a given type of carrier retains an Anglo-American bias. Measuring the diameter of a compact disc in inches may be

common in the U.S., but not in countries where the metric system is the only one in use or where the imperial system has never been used in the past.<sup>1</sup>

Simply adding an option to use the system of measurement preferred by the cataloguing agency is not sufficient to remove the Anglo-American focus. Since we use only the metric system in Canada, what would be more neutral and more appealing to us would be to discard the concept of a “common system of measurement”. Instructions at 3.5.0.3 where measurements are to be given in inches could be reworded to allow measurements to be given in *either* metric units or inches, e.g.:

Videodiscs                      Record the diameter in inches.

to read:

Videodiscs                      Record the diameter in centimetres or in inches.

Instructions where measurements are to be given in inches with an option to use metric units could be reworded as follows, e.g.:

Computer cassettes            Record the length x height of the face of the cassette in inches, to the next 1/8 inch up.  
*Optionally*, record the dimensions in centimetres to the next whole centimetre up.

to read:

Computer cassettes            Record the length x height of the face of the cassette in centimetres to the next whole centimetre up or, in inches to the next 1/8 inch up.

It would appear from the RDA table at 3.5.0.3 that the predominant system of measurement is the more universal metric system. So, another approach would be to reword the instructions to always give measurements in metric units and to add an option to use inches where the instructions now indicate that measurements are to be given in inches only or where there is an option to use metric units.

Either way, the 1st paragraph of rule 3.5.0.4 and the following examples would no longer be necessary. The 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet could be incorporated at 3.5.0.3; the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet could be revised and also incorporated at 3.5.0.3 as follows:

Record dimensions expressed in centimetres to the next whole centimetre up (e.g., if the height measures 17.2 centimetres, record *18 cm*).

Record dimensions expressed in inches in fractions of an inch.

---

<sup>1</sup> This might be especially true for those carriers whose dimensions are defined in metric units in their standard technical specifications, e.g. the standard sizes of a “3.5-inch” floppy disk and of a compact disc are actually defined as 90 mm and 120 mm respectively.

The final bullet at 3.5.0.4 could be a separate set of instructions.

JSC agreement to either of the CCC proposals would also entail a rewording of the instructions at 3.6.5.5. Playing speed.

If JSC does not agree with any of the CCC proposed changes to 3.5.0.4 outlined above and decides to retain 3.5.0.4. Measurements, CCC suggests that it be moved to precede the tables at 3.5.0.3.

**Q. Proposed revision of 7.8.5.1**

We have reservations on the proposed revisions to 7.9.5.1—7.9.5.3 as they entail more than just “internationalization”. The suggested change affects choice of primary access point for all treaties at the national and international level but not at any other level.