

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: *RDA Part I Internationalization*

CILIP appreciates the work that LC has done on revising and extending its original proposal.

For the most part CILIP has no comments to make on individual aspects of the proposal. Where no such comments are offered it should be read as meaning that CILIP supports the revisions proposed.

A. Proposed revision of 1.5

CILIP repeats its proposal from the response to 5JSC/LC/5 to omit “data” from the option following the first paragraph, on grounds of consistency:

Optionally, add or substitute the ~~data~~-element(s) in a transliterated form.

Apart from a single use of “data element” in the first paragraph of 1.1, the compound term does not appear in the current drafts of chapters 1-7.

B. Proposed revision of 1.6.2

CILIP continues to question whether the removal of a provision that provided some consistency to the recording of edition statement data is the way forward. Our feeling is that this works *against* internationalization, because it requires users to know what, for example, *pedwerydd* means.

E. Proposed revision of 1.6.2.3 and renumbering as 1.6.2.1

CILIP remains unaware of sensitivity surrounding the term “vernacular”, since RDA usage seems to be in line with dictionary definitions, but is prepared to accept the change.

Is the option in this proposal intended to provide for the substitution of roman numerals by some other system? If so, then CILIP questions whether what have sometimes been termed “Western style Arabic numerals” are actually covered by the revised version of this option, since they share the same script as Roman numerals.

K. Proposed revision of 2.9.0.3

Presumably each of the paragraphs a)-c) are themselves separate options?

P. Proposed revision of 3.5.0.4

CILIP does not support the addition of the option proposed by LC, feeling that the need for consistency should prevail at this point.

However, in passing, CILIP is also unsure that this first paragraph of 3.5.0.4 (with or without LC's proposed option) is needed at all. It would seem, from the January 2006 text of chapter 3 at least, as if 3.5.0.3 and the subsequent instructions to which it links (e.g. 3.5.1.1) give explicit instructions on the system of measurement to be used for all carrier types. If this is the case, then the need for a general instruction is unclear.

R. Proposed revision of 7.9.5.4 (renumbered as 7.9.5.3)

CILIP wonders whether these special rules concerning the Holy See are needed at all, or whether they could either be generalised or folded into other rules. Without understanding why these currently exist as special rules CILIP is unable to come to any definite conclusion, but this may be a point worth pursuing further