TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the JSC

SUBJECT: RDA: Resource Description and Access – Constituency Review of Full Draft

ALA has (with difficulty) reviewed the full draft of RDA distributed for constituency review on November 17, 2008. Before making general and specific comments on RDA, as directed in the cover letter, we feel compelled to put on the record a few comments on the review process. We do not expect any action to be taken on these comments, but we believe that we have an obligation to reflect briefly on our frustration and what it means for the RDA project.

✓ The delays in releasing the full draft caused frustration and further damaged the credibility of the RDA project as a whole. The delays also resulted in a compressed schedule for reviewing the draft, which made it impossible for many interested people to do a thorough review and also made it necessary to compromise the quality of our comments, as we had insufficient time to explore issues and develop specific recommendations.

✓ The failure to issue the full draft in a pre-release version of the RDA software was another source of frustration, as reviewers were forced to consult a non-linear text as a linear document. Even more important, the constituency review of the full draft should have been a significant opportunity to market RDA to its target audience; in this, it can only be viewed as a failure. The anger and pain that was expressed in the comments that were received (and, for the most part, edited out of this response) were a testimony to the fact that the RDA project has once again succeeded in alienating important parts of its user community.

✓ The PDF files in which the full draft was finally issued were flawed documents, characterized by abundant typographical errors, faulty references, and a layout that obscured rather than supported the content. These features made it impossible to trust the integrity of the text presented: no reference could be trusted, even if the referenced instruction existed in the draft; any numbering error raised the possibility that instructions had been omitted. One comment noted "The first rule of migrating data to a new platform is to ensure that you can get the data back out of the new platform in no worse condition than it went in. … [The documents] are unworthy of the output of an organization that deems itself professional. They are an insult to the countless hours of effort exerted by a legion of reviewers to date." Indeed.

✓ All of these factors made the constituency review of the RDA draft a difficult and unpleasant experience. They not only adversely affected the quality of the review, but also call into question whatever credibility the RDA project has left.

1. General comments on RDA

ALA would like to make the following general comments. Most of them are not actionable, but again we believe that we have an obligation to present comments that reflect our assessment of RDA at this stage in its development. Comments begin with the most general and become more specific; some of the specific comments could in fact be acted upon by the JSC.

- ✓ ALA strongly supports the need to develop a new code, and agrees with the basic requirements for such a code: a standard for a digital environment in which data is stored in relational database structures, designed for manipulation through its structure rather than through visual parsing of data; a standard that is not constrained by encoding or presentation formats; a standard that is principled and adaptable. We therefore find many positive features in RDA: the re-organization of the instructions around a clearly-defined element set; the effort to support both current and forward-looking implementation scenarios; the application of the FRBR/FRAD data models, including the attributes, relationships, and user tasks; the emphasis on relationships among resources and entities; the greater emphasis on describing entities, as opposed to creating access points; the consistent specification of resource identifiers as an alternative to text strings for identifying entities; the effort to support international application of RDA outside of an English-language environment; and the decision to define a place for subject entities and relationships in the RDA structure. Finally, the collaborations with the ONIX and DCMI communities have already yielded what may turn out to be some of the most significant products of the RDA project.

- ✓ On the other hand, the instructions retain many of the arbitrary decisions inherited from AACR2, and the current reorganization now highlights how arbitrary many of those inherited decisions are. The result is a frustrating combination of a forward-looking structure with the retention of vast amounts of case law and arbitrary decisions from the past. The tension between good intentions and limited execution in this regard makes it difficult for RDA to support either continuity or advance. Catalogers of special types of resources, such as cartographic or moving-image resources, have become convinced that they have nothing to gain from RDA and much to lose; it fails to deal with the most pressing issues of cataloging these resources, while concealing the relevant instructions that do exist in a mass of unorganized and irrelevant detail.

- ✓ RDA fails to meet many of its objectives, but none more fatally than the objective of *clarity*: RDA is **not** "clear and written in plain English." In this context, we find it significant that it is suggested that catalogers should be guided through the text by following external Workflows. The sample Workflows appear largely to be focused simplifications of RDA instructions, including restatement in simpler and friendlier language; this is an admission that RDA needs to be rewritten, combined with a refusal to do so in the text itself.

- ✓ As ALA Representative, I ironically note a silver lining to the cloudy state of the text of RDA. Review of full draft provided a useful teaching opportunity; it was surprising how

many significant understandings of RDA objectives, methods, and previous decisions had escaped reviewers who have been continually engaged in the process since its inception. This does not speak well for the ease of understanding or use of RDA by catalogers less engaged in its development. During my compilation of this response, I created a blog to report on my decisions; it is filled with explanations of things that ought not to have been unclear.

✓ Internationalization remains an incompletely fulfilled promise of RDA, which is not fully consistent in its inclusion of both general and specific instructions relating to language and script. Furthermore, examples in non-Latin alphabets have not been sufficiently included, particularly in Section 1. If the JSC is willing to add them, we have provided a large number of such examples in Section 3 of this response.

✓ ALA supports the Library of Congress's preference for "transliteration" over "romanization" as the broader term; we suggest that a definition of "transliteration" be added to the Glossary.

✓ The alternatives and exceptions for early printed resources throughout RDA are heavily reliant on practices in European/Western languages and countries. These instructions should be qualified to allow the application of other guidelines accepted by the agency creating the data.

✓ ALA received a large number of comments from the Society of American Archivists that focused on how RDA might be applied to collection-level cataloging in an archival environment. These comments are not included below, as more formal proposals will need to be developed. However, we do recommend that there be an acknowledgment (in the General Introduction?) that RDA *at this time* may not be an appropriate standard for describing modern archives and manuscript collections. Inclusion of citations to more appropriate standards (*DACS* and comparable standards in other countries) would be helpful.

✓ ALA had hoped that footnotes would be technically impossible in the RDA products. Unfortunately, it seems that this hope, like so many others, was misplaced. Therefore, we once again urge that footnotes not be used. Those providing explanations or alternatives should be incorporated into the text. For those citing resources, a separate citation list should be created that can be linked to from the text when appropriate.

2. Specific comments

Please note that many of the comments below apply to more than a single instruction. If these cases, we have not usually repeated the comment, nor have we always identified all of the instructions to which the comment applies. Comments will often contain a sentence that says "This consideration also applies to …" We apologize for the lack of precision, but we did not have time to identify all the applicable instructions.

General Introduction

General comment: ALA reviewers were generally disappointed in the General Introduction, having been led to expect a conceptual and practical guide to bibliographic description. Although it is true that the revised structure of RDA does respond to many of our earlier concerns, more guidance will be required by catalogers and it is disappointing that RDA itself will not provide such guidance.

0.0, FRBR tasks: IME-ICC adds *navigate* as a task; we suggested that it be included here and in 0.4.2.1. Svenonius defines the task as "to navigate a bibliographic database (that is, to find works related to a given work by generalization, association, and aggregation; to find attributes related by equivalence, association, and hierarchy)".

0.4.1: Revise the second paragraph to include objectives as well as principles: "The IME-ICC draft *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* informs the cataloguing objectives and principles used throughout RDA." The IME-ICC statement does include objectives, and they do inform the objectives of RDA.

0.4.2.1: The IME-ICC draft includes *navigate* as one of five functions of the catalog. Consider adding it to this list (see 0.0 above).

0.4.2.1: Add *extensibility* as an objective; extensibility is referred to in 0.1 and 0.3 and should be included in the list of objectives.

0.4.3: The principles of *sufficiency*, *representation*, *accuracy*, and *uniformity* seem to be influenced by the discussion of these principles in Elaine Svenonius, *The Intellectual Foundations of Information Organization*, chapter 5, Principles of Description, p. 68-85. We suggest that a citation be included.

0.4.3.4, third paragraph: We suggest that this principle is inconsistent with the principle of *language preference* at 0.4.3.7, second paragraph (see below).

0.4.3.7, first paragraph: This statement only covers forms of name found in resources associated with the person, family, or corporate body, and cannot easily be applied to those associated with resources without language content. The statement also needs to mention forms of name found in appropriate reference sources.

*0.4.3.7, second paragraph: The first paragraph deals only with Group 2 entities, but the second paragraph deals with titles. Either the first paragraph needs to include a statement about preferred titles of works, or the second paragraph should be moved to 0.4.3.4, where the inconsistency with the third paragraph of that principle will become apparent.

0.5: The Glossary should be included in the structure. So, if is to be a formal part of RDA, should Appendix M, Complete Examples.

0.6: Note that all of the comments on 0.6 have been labeled as high priority, on the assumption that all issues relating to the core elements remain a priority.

*0.6.1: The description and rationale for the core elements needs to be revised in the light of *5JSC/Chair/15*. ALA had difficulty understanding what was intended. Although the word "required" appears frequently in core element statements, we do not think that the list should be

interpreted as a minimum set of elements that **must** be included when applicable in order for a record to qualify as following RDA. We eventually concluded that the core element label was a *certification stamp*, indicating that these elements (and the stated requirements) constitute a basic set of elements that should be *considered* for inclusion in any RDA record. There will be legitimate reasons not to include core elements in individual cases, just as there will be compelling reasons to include non-core elements in order to achieve RDA objectives. The core elements are a place to start and a benchmark against which to judge any RDA-based application guidelines.

*0.6.2: On the basis of the JSC's own rationale (*5JSC/Chair/15*) – which states that "RDA elements and relationships inherit the value assigned to FRBR attributes and relationships" (p. 3) – we find no justification for omitting Place of publication, which FRBR rates high for identifying a manifestation.

*0.6.3: Given that the preferred access point is not an element and therefore cannot be a core element, nevertheless, the preferred name of the creator should be a core element for identifying a work – probably with an acknowledgement that additional elements may be necessary in order to identify the person, family, or corporate body uniquely.

*0.6.7: The list needs to include "Access point representing the manifestation" and "Access point representing the item", even though RDA Section 2 does not currently provide instructions for them. Books have been written about the First Quarto of Hamlet (a manifestation) or the Isaiah Scroll (an item). Such subject access points need to be part of the conceptual structure of RDA.

0.10: The references to "specified elements" is unhelpfully vague. Is it accurate to say that the contrast is between the application in transcribed and recorded elements? If so, please use that language, with a reference to 1.7 for the conventions relating to transcription.

*0.11: This section addresses alternative vocabularies, which is important support for the internationalization of RDA. However, it does not explicitly state that all embedded vocabularies are controlled, but not closed, vocabularies, and that terms not yet in the vocabulary may be used if appropriate. We recall that such a general statement was to be included, rather than relying on the explicit inclusion of an escape clause in every case.

Section 1

Chapter 1, General Guidelines

1.1.3 [editorial]: The definition of integrating resource would be clearer if the positive condition were stated first: "… updates that are integrated into the whole and do not remain discrete".

*1.6.6.3: The concept of "re-basing" needs to be defined (both here and in the Glossary). One of our reviewers asked whether an online integrating resource can be rebased; he might have asked whether **every** iteration of an online integrating resource hasn't been "re-based". That interpretation would destroy the utility of the concept of integrating resources! We would like to see a definition of this concept, preferably one that connects it with the FRBR concept of a distinct manifestation.

1.7.3: We commend to your attention the statement on transcribing punctuation from DCRM(B), 0.3G1: "Follow modern punctuation conventions, using common sense in deciding whether to include the punctuation, omit it, replace it, or add punctuation not present". This language confirms that this particular set of rules for early printed resources does **not** require exact transcription of punctuation (although it is an option), whereas the general instructions in RDA **do**. We find this ironic. On the other hand, we suggest that the DCRM(B) rule is more informative than "Add punctuation as necessary for clarity" and might serve as a model for an expanded instruction.

*1.7.9: As a matter of principle, we dislike recording inaccuracies with no indication that they have been transcribed from the resource. Such inaccuracies will be dismissed by users as data-entry errors and not serve the task of identification. Furthermore, as a matter of principle, we feel that recording inaccuracies without corrections – or with the correction separated from the transcription in a different element – to be misleading.

1.8.1: The final paragraph on the treatment of numbers in transcribed elements gets lost following the list of elements to which 1.8.2-1.8.5 applies. Move this paragraph to the beginning of the instruction.

*1.8.1: It is unclear whether the instruction for early printed resources is an alternative or an exception. Can we have a consistent editorial policy on this?

1.8.5: In the interests of internationalization, the two paragraphs should be combined. The first paragraph simply states "the usage of the language" for English.

1.9.2: These instructions should more clearly distinguish between what is known and what is certain. An exact date may not be known, but it may be certain that it falls within a range of years. Considering all ranges to be probable is simply not correct. The question mark should reserved for cases of uncertainty about whether the date or dates fall within the range of years; when it is certain that they do, the question mark should not be used.

1.9.2.5, etc.: The use of the convention of a final *s* to identify both decades and centuries leaves the first decade of the century ambiguous; there seems to be no way to distinguish 2000s as a decade from 2000s as a century. Furthermore, we are not convinced that the formulation "21st century" should not be allowed.

Chapter 2, Identifying Manifestations and Items

*2.1: These instructions assume that there will always be an applicable source. We suggest adding a paragraph to 2.1.2.1 saying that when there are no applicable sources of information, the cataloger may supply the information (using the instruction on devised titles as an example).

2.2.2: There should be an instruction dealing with cases in which the application of the instructions would lead to a preferred source of information that only gives the titles of individual contents but no collective title, whereas another source (such as a container) does give a collective title. Preference should be given to a source that gives a collective title. Note that 2.3.2.10 [i.e. 2.3.2.6] addresses this question, but is limited to the case where the same source gives both the collective title and the titles of individual contents.

2.2.2.1, fourth paragraph: The instruction to treat accompanying material as part of the resource is contradicted by specific instructions such as 2.2.2.3 and 2.2.2.4. Add "unless instructed otherwise in 2.2.2.3-2.2.2.4".

2.2.2.2, exception for early printed resources: The use of the cover should be limited to covers issued with the resource, as covers were often added by a binder to individual copies after publication.

*2.2.4: There is an apparent conflict with categories a) and b) in that 2.2.2.1 states that accompanying material and containers **are** a part of the resource. In the case of containers, the present instruction introduces the concept of whether or not the container is "an integral part of the resource" which was not present in 2.2.2.1. We would prefer not to make this distinction, but to treat all containers the same. If accompanying material and containers are retained in 2.2.4, we suggest that the latter be given the higher priority. This is based on current practice for describing sound recordings, where the box for a compact disc would be given preference over the accompanying program notes; we anticipate that this order of preference would also work for other types of material.

2.3.2.1, second paragraph: The word "alternative" is used in two ways; furthermore, if the alternative title is part of the title proper, it cannot be joined to the title proper. Finally, it is not unusual to find alternative titles preceded by "that is" or its equivalent. We suggest

> An alternative title (i.e., title information preceded by *or*, or a similar linking word or phrase—e.g., *The tempest, or, The enchanted island*) is treated as part of the title proper.

2.3.2.11.3: Please add a reference to 6.1.3.3.2 for the changes needed to the description of the work when there are changes in title proper for an integrating resource.

2.3.6.1: Five out of the ten examples under 2.3.6.3 are variants for alternative versions of words or phrases in the title, e.g., "and" vs. "&", "twenty-first century" vs. "XXI century" which is covered by none of the categories in 2.3.6.1. An appropriate category should be added to the list.

2.3.7: The distinction made in the "core element" statement between earlier variants of the title proper and earlier variants of other title elements is not supported by the instruction for recording earlier variants in 2.3.7.3, second paragraph, and 2.3.7.4, both of which would seem to allow earlier variants of the title proper not to be recorded if they are not considered important. The same problem occurs with later variant titles in 2.3.8.

2.4.1.1, fourth-sixth paragraphs: Note that we have recommended changing the scope of 7.23 and 7.24; if approved, that would need to be reflected here.

2.4.1.2: The first paragraph is an incomplete summary of the instructions referred to in the second paragraph. We recommend deleting the first paragraph.

2.4.1.6: There should be provision for omitting some of the statements of responsibility when they are extensive – as is routinely the case with moving-image resources. Guidance on which statements may be omitted would be helpful, as would reference to the instructions to record the information in the elements for Cast (7.23) or Other contributors (7.24).

2.4.1.8: This instruction isn't at all helpful, as the title proper and/or other title information could arguably be considered "a noun or noun phrase [that] occurs in conjunction with a statement of responsibility".

2.4.1.10.3: Please add a reference to 6.1.3.3.1 for the changes needed to the description of the work when there are changes in the responsibility for an integrating resource.

2.5.1.2: We recommend that the references to specific instructions for further guidance be added to the list on p. 71 and the list on p. 72 deleted. The separation of the guidelines from the references is not helpful, and could lead to the "further guidance" being overlooked. We also note that there are minor discrepancies in the specifications in the list of guidelines and the specific instructions. Changing "use" to "prefer" in the list takes care of most of those discrepancies. Note that the same considerations apply to Numbering of serials (2.6.1.2).

2.6: There are no instructions applicable to numbering for the last issue/part of any sequence other than the first or last (e.g., if there are three sequences of numbering, there are no instructions for recording the last issue/part of the second sequence). For example: No. 1-no. 6 ; [2nd ser.], no. 1- ; -3rd ser., no. 104 ; 4th ser., no. 1- ; there is no instruction in RDA for "-3rd ser., no. 104". Instead of having 2.6.6-2.6.9, reword 2.6.2-2.6.3 to have them deal with first issue/part of each sequence of numbering, and reword 2.6.4-2.6.5 to have them deal with last issue/part of each sequence of numbering.

*2.6.1.1, second paragraph: This definition of numbering should be included in the Glossary. This description would be extremely useful in Chapter 6, especially in regard to recording numbers associated with naming musical works, and probably in other places as well. Inclusion in the Glossary would make the information available whenever it applies.

*2.6.1.2: It would be helpful to be able to take numeric and/or alphabetic and/or chronological designations from any source on the first issue or part, not just that source on the first issue or part that bears the title proper. Numbering and chronological designations are often given on a different source than the title.

2.6.1.4: Shouldn't there be a category d) for the numbering of the last issue or part under the new system.

2.6.3.3, alternative on p. 96 and 2.6.5.3, alternative on p. 100: Change "numbering" to "chronological designation".

2.6.6.3, 2.6.7.3, 2.6.8.3, and 2.6.9.3: We suggest the addition of an alternative to make a note instead, as is done in 2.6.3.3, 2.6.4.3, and 2.6.5.3.

2.7.1.2, etc.: In the source of information instructions, we suspect that the reference to 2.2.2 is for a description of what falls within "the resource". That is not at all clear from a casual reading of these instructions. Could the instructions in 2.2.2 that relate to the scope of "the resource" be identified and numbered as a group so that the references can be more precise? Note also that later in this chapter, the phrase "any source within the resource" [omitting "itself"] is used; as a general matter of style, we prefer to omit "itself" and similar words.

2.7.6.3 and 2.8.6.3: It is misleading to have fictitious or incorrect dates stand uncorrected in the date element, being corrected only in a note. This same consideration applies – but with lesser urgency – to fictitious or incorrect places and names.

2.8.1.5.1 and 2.8.1.5.2 [editorial]: "Annotation" vs. "note".

2.8.2.6.3: Change to "If the local place is unknown, but the country, state, province, etc., of publication is known, supply that name."

*2.8.3.1: Change "title proper" to "place of publication". Further, a place of publication is not a parallel place of publication when it is the **only** place of publication that appears, no matter what language it is in. Both of these considerations apply to all of the parallel production, publication, distribution, and manufacture elements.

*2.8.4.7: The instruction does not make it clear whether the name of the distributor is to be recorded as such or as the name of the publisher. If the former, we recommend that the instructions also allow recording of the name of the producer or manufacturer. This consideration probably applies to all instructions dealing with information not being identified.

2.8.6.4: It would be more consistent with the general instruction on recording numerals (1.8.2, referred to in 2.8.1.4) if the alternative were the instruction. In other words, an interpreted date should be given in this element, with the chronogram being given in a note. This consideration applies to all the instructions relating to chronograms.

2.9.4.4: Given that the element name already identified that this is a distributor's name, why would the optional addition of function be appropriate? In the case of relationship designators, RDA does not allowed this redundancy. This consideration probably applies to all the instructions on designations of function.

*2.12.8.2: The restrictions on sources of information and on recording ISSN of main series and subseries seem to be influenced by ISBD concerns. These limitations might apply when creating an ISBD description, but RDA generally avoids such instructions. We prefer that the ISSN be taken from any source, and that ISSNs for both main and subseries be recorded. If necessary, an optional omission might be included to support the ISBD restrictions.

2.12.9.3: As a general principle, we would prefer that incorrect information be corrected in the element in which it occurs, rather than making a separation between statements containing incorrect information transcribed from the resource and notes making the correction. In the case of series numbering, we acknowledge that it is more critical to include the corrected information in the access point.

*2.13: These instructions should include instructions on recording a change in mode of issuance. We would also like to see a reference to the instructions in 1.6 about when a change in mode of issuance requires a new description.

*2.13.1.3: It is not clear whether a collection containing multiple physical units falls under "single unit" or "multipart monograph". Neither seems to apply.

2.15.1.5: This instruction implies that the only case in which there would be multiple identifiers is when they identify the whole as well as parts. First, any given manifestation may have more

than one *type* of identifier: ISBN, ISMN, UPC, etc. Second, we routinely encounter cases in which there are ISBNs assigned for variants that we are treating as a single manifestation. Finally, we are not sure that this instruction as written is dealing with identifiers *for* the manifestation or identifiers *appearing on* the manifestation; the manifestation in question is either the whole or the parts but not both.

2.20.12: While we accept the change in terminology from "basis of the description" to "basis for identification", we would prefer not to inflict this terminology on the users of our catalogs (including staff). We urge that the examples continue to read "Description based on …"

*2.20.12.5: If a note should always be made, should this not be included as a core element?

Chapter 3, Describing Carriers

*3.3.1.2: It would help if this list were presented in tabular form, with the definitions, as in Media type (3.2).

*3.3.1.2, unmediated carriers: Add "object" to cover "realia" and other three-dimensional material. These should not be described as "other".

*3.3.1.2, video carriers: Add "videodisc".

3.4.1.7: Add a section for videodiscs with provision for recording the number of frames of still images on a videodisc (permitted as an option in AACR2 7.5B2).

```
1 videodisc (45,876 fr.)
```

3.4.1.7.7: The example gives "1 stereograph reel" but this term does not appear in the relevant section of 3.3.1.2. Either change the example to "stereograph disc" or add "stereograph reel" to 3.3.1.2.

3.4.1.12.1: In the case of archival material, an analytical description may itself be a collection and therefore 3.4.1.11 should be included in the range of previous instructions that may be applied in describing extent in an analytical description.

*3.4.3.2: Terms for extent of notated music often need to be recorded in the plural. This instruction appears at 3.4.1.3. However, it is not clear from the present instruction that 3.4.1.3 applies; it doesn't help that all of the examples begin with "1". Consider repeating the instruction "Record the term in the singular or plural, as applicable" or otherwise make it clear that this provision of 3.4.1.3 applies here. Similarly, it would be helpful to clarify whether the option to omit the number of units (3.4.1.4) applies.

3.4.5.2, exception for early printed resources: Remove the sentence "If the resource is printed in pages but numbered as leaves, record the numbering as leaves"; this provision is identical to subinstruction b) in the general instruction.

3.4.5.2, exception for early printed resources: In order to apply this instruction to early printed resources in non-Latin scripts, it will be necessary to make an exception to the general instruction at 1.4 to record extent in the language and script preferred by the cataloging agency; presumably the extent for an early printed resource would be recorded in the script of the

resource. Furthermore, it is not clear whether "in the form presented" (3.4.5.4 and 3.4.5.8, exceptions for early printed resources) includes differences in script.

3.4.5.2, exception for updating loose-leafs: If a resource is updating, it is by definition not yet complete; it is therefore unclear why 3.4.1.10 should not apply to **all** updating loose-leafs. If that is true, then no instruction is needed here. If that is not true, then some explanation is needed at 3.4.1.10 that would allow the cataloger to apply 3.4.5.2.

3.4.5.11: Something is missing in the parenthetical phrase; we suggest "(e.g. books in the traditional East Asian style)". We also considered "binding" but "style" seems more appropriate when referring to the extent of a manifestation.

3.4.5.16: Instructions on recording number of bibliographic volumes and number of physical volumes are given in 3.22.2.8. By implication, all reference to "volumes" in 3.4.5.16 is to physical volumes. We would like to see this made explicit in 3.4.5.16, and we would like to see a reference made to 3.22.2.8.

3.4.5.19: It could be argued that this instruction applies only to loose-leafs that are complete, i.e., that are no longer updating (see a similar comment at 3.4.5.2 above). If that is true, it should be explicitly stated. If that is not true, then 3.4.1.10 needs to be clarified. In either case, a reference to 3.4.1.10 should be included here.

*3.5.1.4.10: The only Carrier Type term containing "roll" in 3.3.1.2 is "audio roll". There should be greater consistency between the terms used in extent and the categories used for the instructions on recording dimensions. We suspect that terms being used in 3.5 are candidates for addition to 3.3.1.2.

3.5.1.6, exception for notated music: The reference should be to 3.4.3.2. However, 3.4.3.2 references 7.20.1.3 where the actual list is given. We would prefer that the reference here be to 7.20.1.3, not 3.4.3.2.

*3.16.3.3: We suggest adding a new category for solid-state electrical storage, which does not seem to be covered by any of the existing terms. This is the type of memory used in flash drives, newer iPods (see http://ipod.about.com/od/ipodvscompetitors/a/flash_mp3_chart.htm), and probably Playaways. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flash_memory and http://electronics.howstuffworks.com/flash-memory.htm).

*3.19.4: The instructions on digital encoding were misplaced. They belong under 3.18, Video Characteristics, not 3.19, Digital File Characteristics.

Chapter 4, Providing Acquisition and Access Information

4.2.1.2: We see no justification for the specification of "brief" statements that appear several places in this section. Record as much information as is required to meet the needs of the cataloging agency.

4.6.1.4, second paragraph: We question the value of retaining a URL that no longer works, unless such URLs can help in finding archived versions of the resource. If it is retained for that reason, the obsolete URL should be labeled "No longer available at this address."

Section 2

Chapter 5, General Guidelines

<u>5.1.4</u>: Even in Section 2, access points are not limited to those representing works. Either use "work or expression" or "entity".

Chapter 6, Identifying Works and Expressions

<u>6.0 c)</u>: Works are not "issued", they are "created"; and they do not have titles proper. We prefer "Differentiating between two or more works with the same title"

<u>6.0</u>, last paragraph on p. 1: The last sentence might better go without saying, or be said in general in the General Introduction. We are not sure what is gained by repeating it here, other than to imply that this is not true for chapters that do not contain this statement.

<u>6.1.3.2.1</u>: Something seems to be missing; we suggest: "a change affecting the preferred access point representing a person, family, or corporate body that is used in constructing <u>the access point representing</u> the work".

*<u>6.1.3.3</u>: This wording caused reviewers to believe that RDA was reversing the basic principle regarding changes in integrating resources. However, if changes in responsibility or title are handled by revising the bibliographic/manifestation description, then that description will contain two distinct access points, each of which would be linked to a separate authority/work record – and the result is in fact an access point for a new work, as this instruction provides. However, this entire procedure seems stuck in scenario #2, and we would like to suggest an approach that points forward towards scenario #1. Rather than saying that changes in responsibility or title require the construction of an access point for a new work, RDA should say that the changes require revision of the preferred access point representing the work. This wording is more consistent with the treatment of integrating resources throughout RDA. The major difference is that the earlier information would be given as a variant access point in the authority/work record, rather than as an additional access point in the bibliographic/manifestation record; in scenario #2, this means a see reference rather than an added entry. We suggest the following revision of 6.1.3.3 (clean copy; revisions not marked):

6.1.3.3   Works Issues as Integrating Resources

For works issued as integrating resources, treat the changes described under 6.2.3.3.1 and 6.2.3.3.2 below as changes requiring the revision of the preferred access point representing the work.

6.1.3.3.1   Change in Responsibility for the work

If there is a change in responsibility, change the preferred access point representing the work to reflect responsibility for the work as presented in the later iteration (see 2.1). Use the former preferred access point as a variant access point for the work.

Consider changes in responsibility ... [no change in this instruction]

6.1.3.3.2   Change in the title proper

> If there is any change (major or minor) in the title proper, change the preferred access representing the work to reflect the title as presented in the later iteration (see 2.1). Use the former preferred access point as a variant access point for the work.

*6.2.2: There seems to be no applicable instruction for recording a preferred title or constructing a preferred access point for a resource with a title proper devised by the cataloger.

6.2.2.4: *5JSC/Sec/7*, p. 9, states that in RDA "the choice of the preferred title is based on the title of the resource first received"; we note, however, that it is increasingly common for publications from Asia to be issued in more than one language at the same time, it is not unlikely that both versions will be received by the cataloging agency at the same time.

6.2.2.11.2 and 6.2.2.11.3: The instruction at the end of 6.2.2.11.2 and that at the beginning of 6.2.2.11.3 both apply to incomplete compilations of works in a particular form, but they refer to different instruction numbers.

*6.2.2.11.3: It appears that the preferred title of an incomplete compilation of works by one person, family, or corporate body would be "Works. Selections". It also appears that "Selections" alone would never appear as the conventional collective title. We request confirmation that this was the JSC's intention. It strikes us as a change to current practice and a return to AACR1. ALA proposed a different instruction for musical works in our response to *5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up*, 6.15.1.12-6.15.1.16; we suggest adopting a similar instruction here.

6.2.3.3, exception, final sentence: We think that this sentence does not apply only to the exceptional case, and would like to see it given more prominence – perhaps as a separate paragraph before the Exception.

6.2.3.3, paragraphs 2 and 4 (those immediately before and after the Exception): We don't see the distinction between these two instructions and recommend that they be merged.

6.3-6.6, core element statements: Some reviewers were unclear as to whether all of these elements were required or only those that are needed to resolve the conflict in a given case. The reference to 6.27.1.9 suggests that the latter is intended; however, that reference is not included in 6.4-6.6. Please add the reference to those instructions.

*6.4.1.1 and 6.4.1.3: The scope instruction defines Date of Work as "(normally the year)" while 6.4.1.3 says to "Record the date of the work by giving the year or years alone." This appears to be a conflict and should be resolved.

***6.10: The absence from the text in the PDF of the centered heading "Other Identifying Attributes of Expressions" preceding 6.10 is seriously damaging. Some very astute reviewers thought that Content type terms applied to works and pointed out categories that could only apply to expressions. This is something that **must** be fixed. These captions need to appear in the text itself, not simply in the table of contents pane.

6.12.1.3: There doesn't seem to be any provision for differentiating between different expressions in the same language. We suspect that this is intended to be covered by 6.13.1.3; a reference to those instructions should be made here, and specific instructions on differentiating expressions in the same language (or at least an example) should be added to 6.13.1.3.

Adam Schiff raises an additional problem with 6.12.1.3:

> RDA says to record the language or languages of the expression using terms taken from ISO 639-2. I have found a situation for which the terms used in ISO 639-2 are inadequate. I was considering including an example of a sign language resource in the examples at 6.12.1.3 and/or 6.12.1.4. However, in ISO 639-2 there is just a single code (*sgn*) and term (*Sign Languages*) used for all sign languages. According to RDA, the term *Sign Languages* would have to be recorded for different expressions in American Sign Language, Australian Sign Language, French Sign Language, etc. This does not seem to allow the specificity that might be needed to distinguish expressions in different sign languages.

> Individual sign languages **are** included in ISO 639-3. ISO 639-3 extends the ISO 639-2 alpha-3 codes with an aim to cover all known natural languages. ISO 639-3 attempts to provide as complete an enumeration of languages as possible, including living, extinct, ancient, and constructed languages, whether major or minor, written or unwritten. The standard was published by ISO on February 5, 2007. If RDA were to change its instructions in 6.7.1.3 and 6.12.1.3 to specify using ISO 639-3 instead of 639-2, or to allow its use if ISO 639-2 wasn't sufficient, the problem with recording sign languages that I've described would no longer be a problem.

> The specific example that I wanted to use in 6.12.1.4 would have looked like this:

> ```
> Sign Languages          [using ISO 639-2]
> French sign language    [using ISO 639-3]
> French
> English
> ```
>   (*Resource described:* Sourds à l'image. *A video recording in French Sign Language with spoken French voiceover and English subtitles*)

Please confirm that the ISO 639-2 term *Sign Languages* must be used for all sign languages or revise to allow use of terms from ISO 639-3.

6.13: The reference to 6.15.3 is not appropriate for music resources; change the reference to 6.19.

6.14.1.3: The examples of the LCCNs for current "expression" authority records do not always follow the instructions that require recording other distinguishing characteristics to differentiate different expressions. In particular, the Beowulf example is an expression identifier only if that work had only been translated into English once – which plainly is not the case. In the current environment, examples of identifiers for expressions are difficult to find, but RDA should avoid examples that do not fully follow the instructions.

*6.21.1.1 and 6.21.3.3: The scope instruction defines Date of Work as "(normally the year)" while 6.21.3.3 says to "Record the date [of the signing of a treaty] in the form: year, name of the month, number of the day." This appears to be a conflict and should be resolved.

6.23.2.3-6.24.2.4: The references do not agree with the instructions referred to; specifically, the scope of 6.23.2.6, 6.23.2.7 are wrong, and the numbers 6.23.2.8-6.23.2.17 are incorrect.

6.23.2.6: When "sources" is used without an adjective, does it mean "reference sources" or does it include both manifestations of the works and reference sources? Because of the ambiguity, we would prefer that reference sources always be explicitly identified as such.

*6.23.2.8: Delete "For Jewish liturgical works, follow the instructions under 6.23.2.7." Those instructions now appear further on in 6.23.2.8 (p. 109) and the instruction intrudes between two paragraphs about Catholic liturgical works.

6.23.2.9.3: There should be a footnote naming books that fall under the Epistles of Paul.

*6.23.9.7: The decision to use "Selections" to identify incomplete compilations should be applied to parts of the Bible – indeed, throughout RDA.

*6.23.2.16 (from Adam Schiff): There is a discrepancy between what is in RDA (which follows AACR2) and what is in the LC/NACO Authority File for some of the parts of the Jaina Agama. The instruction in RDA lists the six components as [diacritics omitted]:

> Anga
> Upanga
> Prakirnaka
> Cheda
> Mula
> Culika

Instead of *Cheda* the LC/NACO Authority File gives *Chedasutta* as the preferred name for the part. Instead of *Mula* the LC/NACO Authority File gives *Mulasutta* as the preferred name for the part. *Culika* isn't established in the LC/NACO Authority File. There is one record in OCLC that uses that form, and another (from National Library of Australia) that uses *Culikasutta*.

One of the principles the examples groups have used are that whenever possible the examples should correspond to authorized forms of access points in the LC/NACO or other authority files. In this case, we have two names that RDA says to use that don't match what LC and other libraries use, and another name that may not be in the correct form.

Please charge someone familiar with the Jain canon to determine if the correct form of name for the parts of the Jain canon. Based on this, both RDA and the LC/NACO records should be revised as appropriate.

*6.27.1.4: The concept of compiler as creator is a difficult one to apply. The best guidance appears in the third paragraph under 19.2.1.1. Please add a reference to that instruction wherever the concept of compiler as creator appears in RDA.

*6.27.1.5: This provision reads that, if a corporate body is responsible for an adaptation/revision of a previously existing work substantially changing the nature/content of the work and if the adaptation/revision is presented as the work of that body, a preferred access point is constructed in a form: [Corporate Body]+[Title]. It is not clear from the instruction that such a corporate body must qualify as the *creator* of the new work as this is specified in 19.2.1.1. A reference to that instruction would clarify this considerably. The same consideration applies to commentaries (6.27.1.6).

6.27.2.2: This instruction should be reconciled with 6.28.2.2.1 as proposed in *5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up*.

6.27.3: The Schoenberg example on p. 165 will need to be re-evaluated once a final decision is made about whether or not librettos are to be treated as independent works (to be dealt with in *5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up*). This example is unusual because Schoenberg wrote both the music and the libretto. If an example of a libretto is desired, we recommend using a more typical case, such as an English translation of the libretto (by Carlo Da Ponte) for Mozart's *Nozze di Figaro* and placing that example in 6.27.4 as a variant access point representing an expression: the preferred access point for the libretto would be under Da Ponte and the variant access point would be under Mozart.

6.27.4.1, second paragraph: The provision of a variant access point for the preferred title alone should be a matter of cataloger's judgment. There will be cases in which such a title is not at all helpful: "Act III", "Prelude", "Essays", "Annual Report". This is a case where adding "if considered important" would be very helpful. The same consideration applies in the case of part titles in 6.27.4.2 (middle of p. 170).

Chapter 7, Describing Content

General comment: ALA found the coherence of this chapter questionable, primarily because of the apparent lack of rationale for the sequence of elements. We suggest that an attempt be made to move the generally-applicable elements to the beginning of the chapter, and then group together the elements that deal with (for example) cartographic resources.

7.11.3.3: The instructions should allow for a range of capture dates (which is quite common in sound recording compilations).

7.12.1.1, second paragraph: We believe that the reference to 3.21 for recording programming language is an error for 3.20, Equipment and system requirements. However, 3.20 does not explicitly address the issue of programming language. Furthermore, programming language expressed as a software requirement specifies the need for an appropriate compiler (or whatever) for the programming language in question; this would not address the simple identification of the language in which a program is written.

7.17.1.3, Three-dimensional forms: This instruction (as in instructions under Still images) should add ", (other than cartographic)," before "record the presence …". The current practice for cartographic materials is **not** to use "black and white" for any format of cartographic resources.

7.20: These terms are also used in recording extent of notated music (3.4.3). We would prefer to see them included as part of that set of instructions in Chapter 3. At the least, a reference to 3.4.3 should be included here.

7.20.1.3: In practice, these terms may be either singular or plural. In this and similar instructions, it would be helpful if the use of plural forms were authorized.

7.21.1.2: Medium of performance information should be allowed from any source; remove "within the resource" from the end of this instruction.

*7.21.1.3, final paragraph (top of p. 38): There is a ghost of the pervasive numerology of AACR2 in the "rule of eleven". ALA (and MLA) support the removal of this limitation. In practice, limits may be needed, but this should be an application decision.

*7.23-7.24: Clarify the scope. First, we are not convinced that Performer, Narrator, and/or Presenter (7.23) should be limited to musical-dramatic works or that Artistic and/or Technical Credits (7.24) should be limited to motion pictures and videorecordings. We also suspect that the concept of *artistic* credits could encompass Performers, Narrators and/or Presenters. Consider merging these elements – or at least making them applicable to the same types of resources. If the distinction is maintained, we suggest that commentators belong in 7.23 rather than 7.24.

7.25.1.4: For consistency with other RDA chapters change "one image, map, etc." to "one cartographic unit" in the first paragraph and change "main images, maps, etc." to "cartographic units" in the second paragraph. Please avoid any use of "… map, etc." in RDA.

7.25.1.5: For consistency with other RDA chapters change "one image, map, etc." to "one cartographic unit".

Section 3

Chapter 8, General Guidelines

8.9.1.3: Shouldn't these dates (as others) be recorded according to the provisions in Appendix H? Similar instructions make reference to Appendix H.

8.9.1.3: In the case of personal names, shouldn't the date of usage be recorded also for variant names associated with name changes?

*8.13.1.1, etc.: We question whether the Cataloguer's Note would be limited to access points, and not extended to all attributes of the entity being described.

Chapter 9, Identifying Persons

9.2.2.5.2: It is not clear which specific instruction(s) under 9.2 are being referred to at the bottom of p. 7.

9.2.2.9, instruction at bottom of p. 24: The instruction consists of references to other instructions; it is unnecessary and inappropriate to include examples. The examples in the instructions referred to are sufficient.

9.2.2.10: The second paragraph is redundant with 9.2.2.10.1, second paragraph.

9.2.2.13: The instructions in the second paragraph are not about surnames of members of royal houses. Perhaps it would be better to make this a reference to 9.2.2.20.

9.2.2.14: The phrase "proper name in a title of nobility" does not clearly exclude the word(s) denoting rank, which in many contexts are considered to be proper names.

*9.3.2.3: The instruction to record month and day *when name is identical to that of another* is more appropriate in instructions on the inclusion of dates in an access point; there is no reason for such a restriction when recording the date element. This is one example of a quite common situation in the current text of RDA, and ALA suggests that all such artificial limitations be moved to the instructions on constructing access points.

9.3.4.1, second paragraph: Change "Date of death" to "Period of activity" or "Dates of activity".

9.6.1.4: Although the construction of the access point for popes, emperors, empresses, kings, or queens does not call for the use of *Saint*, that limitation need not prevent a cataloger from recording that information in this element. Again, we would prefer that this instruction appear *only* in the instructions on constructing access points.

*9.15 and 9.16: The distinction between Field of Activity and Profession/Occupation is not sufficiently clear. Our sense is that a Field of Activity is one that a person engages in apart from his or her Profession or Occupation. We suggest adding this language to the scope of Field of Activity. We also suggest that the section on Profession or Occupation come before the section on Field of Activity.

9.19.1.1, second paragraph (middle of p. 95): The phrase "in this order" could be interpreted either as the sequence within the access point or as the order of preference for considering the additions. If this instruction is intended to specify the sequence, that word should be used instead of "order".

*We also note that this paragraph and those that follow present a confusing sequence of overlapping ranges of instructions. We suggest simplifying this by (a) expanding the reference in the paragraph in the middle of p. 95 to "9.19.1.2-9.19.1.7, and (b) moving the instructions that relate to specific additions to the instructions in 9.19.1.2-9.19.1.7 that deal with the particular addition in question.

9.19.1.5: The instruction seems to indicate that one would add (for example) "flourished" but not the date(s) of activity. Perhaps "… add the period of activity (see 9.3.4) together with a term indicating that the date(s) indicate a period of activity."

9.19.1.6-9.19.1.7: The sequence of these two instructions does not match the sequence of 9.15-9.16. We believe that in both cases, Profession or Occupation (9.16) should precede Field of Activity (9.15).

9.19.2.1: Some of the examples (i.e., those for Kings and Emperors as Saints) are not justified by the instructions at 9.6.1.4. We argued there that the limitation should only apply to access points, but (given their inclusion in these examples), perhaps the limitation should be deleted completely.

9.19.2.1, second paragraph (p. 103): If it is intended that variant access points should be unique, then distinguishing variant access points should be one of the reasons for making additions.

Chapter 11, Identifying Corporate Bodies

11.2.2.19-11.2.2.22: RDA instruction 19.2.1.1 f) ii) states that creators include corporate bodies responsible for decrees of a head of state, chief executive, or ruling executive body. There is an example of a ruling executive body as a creator in instruction 19.2.1.3 on page 23 of the current chapter 19 draft:

    Peru. Junta Militar de Gobierno (1948-1956).

While there are instructions in chapter 11 for formulating access points for heads of state and chief executive (11.2.2.19 Type 9 and 11.2.2.21), there are no instructions for how to formulate the access point for a ruling executive body. This is an omission carried over from AACR2 that needs to be rectified. RDA should have instructions on how to record the name of a ruling executive body. Below is the proposed text for these instructions.

1. In 11.2.2.19 Government Bodies Recorded Subordinately, add an additional type (probably should go between current types 5 and 6):

> TYPE X. A ruling executive body (see also 11.2.2.22).
>
>   Argentina. Junta Militar
>   Gambia. Armed Forces Provisional Ruling Council
>   Honduras. Junta Militar de Gobierno
>   Nigeria. Supreme Military Council
>   Peru. Gobierno Revolucionario de las Fuerzas Armadas
>   Thailand. Khana Patiwat

2. Add a new instruction between the current 11.2.2.21 Government Officials and 11.2.2.22 Legislative Bodies and renumber all subsequent instructions.

11.2.2.22   Ruling Executive Bodies

> Record the name of a ruling executive body (e.g., a military junta) as a subdivision of the preferred access point for the jurisdiction over which it rules.
>
>   Argentina. Junta Militar
>   El Salvador. Junta Revolucionaria de Gobierno
>   Ghana. Armed Forces Revolutionary Council
>   Nicaragua. Junta de Gobierno de Reconstrucción Nacional
>   Sierra Leone. National Provisional Ruling Council
>   Somalia. Golaha Sare ee Kacaanka
>   Thailand. Khana Patiwat
>   Venezuela. Junta Militar de Gobierno
>
> If necessary for identification, add, in parentheses, the inclusive years of rule of the body.
>
>   Chile. Junta de Gobierno (1813)
>   Chile. Junta de Gobierno (1973-1990)

As an alternative, include these within the scope of TYPE 9: A head of state, head of government, or other ruling executive body.

11.2.2.10: Change "oriental language" to "East Asian language". This reflects ALA's long-standing desire to avoid use of the term "oriental", which is considered pejorative by some.

11.2.2.30: Change the caption to "Subordinate Religious Bodies".

*11.2.3.3: The concept of multiple identities for corporate bodies (as opposed to persons) is new in RDA and is difficult to understand. Further explanation is needed. What is the difference between a separate identity and a name change?

11.2.3.4, instruction on p. 73 and 11.2.3.5, instruction at bottom of p. 74: ALA believes that the requirements for sharing data are more important and more relevant than the requirements for access in a particular catalog. After all, users of RDA will work in the context of a variety of catalogs. The important thing is to allow for all possible variations as either preferred or variant names.

11.2.3.6, instruction on p. 78: As in the previous comment, we don't think that the affect on access should be relevant; we suggest the following simplification; comparable wording should be used for the paragraph on p. 79.

> If the name recorded as the preferred names begins with or contains a number expressed as a numeral, record the form with the number expressed as a word as a variant name.

11.2.3.6, second paragraph, the example "27 Knygos": The Arabic numeral form is an important variant that does not seem to be authorized by the instruction; an instruction should be added to address variant forms under Arabic numerals when the number is expressed as a non-Arabic numeral needs to be created.

*11.3.2.3: We see a contradiction between the exception on p. 86 and the instruction at 11.5.1.3 to record the name of an associated institution in the form and language as the preferred name for the institution. The contradiction also exists with 11.12.1.8.

Section 4

16.2.2.2, 16.2.2.6: The best resources for verifying the form of place names are likely to be online databases. The use of the word "published" – particularly in the absence of a definition in the Glossary – invites confusion about the status of such resources. Either delete the word "published" or give a definition that makes it clear that online resources are published.

Section 5

17.11: The phrase "item of the manifestation" is a perversion of the English language, and is precisely why "copy" is preferable to "item" as the name of this entity.

17.11.1.3: We question whether a call number is an appropriate identifier for an item. The same call number may be assigned to multiple copies within a library. Only the control number of the item record or the barcode number are truly item identifiers.

Section 6

18.1.2: The definition of "person" doesn't match the definition in Chapter 29 and the Glossary. Both of these include "or non-human".

*18.5: There are no instructions about recording a relationship designator when the appropriate term is not in Appendix I. We would like to see an instruction that allows the use of terms not in the Appendix.

*18.5.1.1.1, etc.: There is something missing in these instructions. The relationships in question are between the persons, families, or corporate bodies and … what? Presumably, "and the resource being described." Furthermore, we suggest the use of the singular; any given relationship is between a single person, etc., and the resource.

Section 8

24.4.3: The instruction is captioned "Description of the Related Work, Expression, Manifestation, or Item", but the actual text covers only manifestations and items. Change the caption.

*25.1.1.3: A music plate or publisher's number may be used as an identifier, but only in association with the name of the publisher.

Section 9

*31.1, Related family: An instruction needs to be added to deal with relationship designators; based on comparable instructions in chapters 30 and 32, we suggest: "Record an appropriate relationship designator (see 29.5) in conjunction with the identifier and/or preferred access point representing the related family to indicate explicitly the nature of the relationship."

Appendices

Appendix A

A.48: "Serbo-Croatian" is no longer politically correct. Change to "Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian."

Appendix D

D.2.1: For some elements (5.2.1 and all the notes) there is no indication of how to punctuate subsequent instances of a data element in the same field. This should be addressed specifically.

D.3.1, 1st paragraph: $0-$8 are not all control subfields. For example, $4 is relator code, which might arguably have an RDA counterpart.

D.3.1: Both date of work and date of expression are shown mapping to subfield $f; subfield $f has traditionally been used for date of manifestation; date of work/expression is typically not subfielded. We suspect that following the convention stated here, rather than our traditional practice, will cause mapping and verification errors. [comment also applies to Appendix E]

D.3.1: "Selections" needs to be added to the table, mapping to subfield $k in appropriate fields.

*D.3.1: Field 256 has not been used in practice for some time; the relevant rules were removed from Chapter 9 of AACR2. We question the wisdom of resuming use of this field; we need a different mapping (perhaps new elements) for File type and File size.

D.3.1: 6.2.3 and 3.16.43 map to 300; 3.16.8.3 currently maps to 300 for sound recordings and 538 for moving images. Similarly 3.19.3.3 maps to 300 for audio and text formats but to 538 for video formats. It does not seem to be desirable to split this, as different tagging and mapping for different formats will cause problems. 3.19.3.3 should also map to the 300 for online video (Real video, MPEG-4, Quicktime). This would make this section consistent with the streaming video example in Appendix M, which does record encoding format in the 300 field. File type (3.19.2) Transmission speed (3.19.6) could also map to 300.

D.3.1: The mapping shows 7.22 duration mapping to 306, but the examples in Appendix M use field 300 for duration. Which is correct? And to what extent should the mapping support the requirements for ISBD display?

*D.3.1: Field 400 represents an obsolete practice that goes against the grain of RDA's separation of descriptive elements and access elements. This field should not be mapped to RDA.

D.3.1: 3.16.9.3, 3.18, 3.19.4 should map to 538. It's not clear where 3.19.5 should map. Our impression was that 3.16.9.3 (Special Playback Characteristics) is considered physical description, and it only appears in 538 when notes are being combined (which is not supported by RDA).

Appendix E

*E.2: Unlike the ISBD presentation in Appendix D, the AACR2 presentation of access points will presumably not be updated. This preserves a traditional practice, with no possibility of evolving to meet future needs.

E.2.2.5: Provision needs to be made for "Selections" as part of the access point for a work or expression.

E.2.2.5: "Enclose the year of signing of a treaty, etc., in parentheses." Actually the entire date should be enclosed in parentheses, not just the year, e.g. "(1876 September 13)" not "(1876) September 13" – which is what the instructions imply.

*E.3.1: Both date of work and date of expression are shown mapping to subfield $f; subfield $f has traditionally been used for date of manifestation; date of work/expression is typically not subfielded. We suspect that following the convention stated here, rather than our traditional practice, will cause mapping and verification errors.

E.3.1: "Selections" should be mapped to subfield $k.

Appendix G

Under Germany and Sweden, the implication is that titles of nobility would not be recorded even for pre-1918 persons who held such titles. Is that correct?

Appendix H

For the record, ALA continues to prefer "C.E." and "B.C.E." over "A.D." and "B.C."

H.2, tables: We do not find the tables useful or easy to understand; we are not sure that this is the information that a cataloger needs in order to convert Julian to Gregorian years.

Appendix I

General comments

ALA would like to see a complete alphabetical listing of terms.

Specific comments on existing terms

I.2.1, architect: Architects may also render buildings of the past, or even buildings that never existed in drawings, models, etc. (e.g., the Parthenon, the Pharos of Alexandria, etc.). The phrase "to show how a building, etc. will look when completed" is too limiting.

I.2.1, lyricist: In a "book musical," there are three primary roles – composer, author of the "book" (the dialogue) and the lyricist (who writes the words to the songs). The last two functions are not always performed by the same person. "Lyricist" has usually described a writer who directly collaborates with a composer, but it can apply to the author of words subsequently set to music. The following wording is inelegant, but does address the issues: "An author of the words of a non-dramatic musical work, or of the sung portions of a dramatic work containing dialogue written by another person; use either for collaborator with a composer, or authors of texts subsequently set to music." In addition, we note that *New Grove 2* defines oratorio as "An extended musical setting of a sacred text made up of dramatic, narrative and contemplative elements." In this light, we question whether an oratorio should be characterized as a non-dramatic work.

I.2.2, defendant: This definition should also include the use of the term as described under "respondent" in Section I.2.1.

*I.2.2, film producer, radio producer, television producer: We suggest removing the phrase "... assuring commercial success" from these definitions; not all such expressions have any commercial intent. Furthermore, we are not convinced that distinguishing between film, television, and video roles is useful or important. [Note that in the streaming video example in Appendix M, the relationships "film director" and "film producer" were assigned to entities associated with a television program, apparently illustrating the difficulties of applying these categories correctly.]

I.3.1, singer: We prefer the MARC relator term "vocalist".

I.5.2, annotator and inscriber: The definitions do not distinguish these roles. If there is a distinction to be made, we believe it lies in defining **inscriber** as "A person who has written a statement of dedication or gift on an item."

Missing terms

I.2.1: We suggest adding terms relevant to archival collections; specifically, we suggest the addition of **collector**.

I.3.1?: We suggest adding **calligrapher** to the list. It is unclear whether this role pertains to the expression of a calligraphic work, the manifestation, or a particular item; perhaps all three should be provided.

I.4.1: We suggest adding **electrotyper** and **stereotyper**.

I.4.2 and/or 3: We suggest adding **bookseller**. A common role with early printed resources, the bookseller sometimes functions as publisher, sometimes as distributor; we suggest adding the term to both lists.

Appendix J

General comments

*The text in this appendix should be reviewed and rewritten as necessary to make sure that the entity in the definition clearly refers to the correct entity for the related work, etc.

Reviewers were confused by the use/non-use of prepositions, and wished that the terms could more explicitly indicate the direction of the relationship.

Specific comments

Note from the ALA Rep: There were clearly many copy-and-paste errors in the appendix, as well as definitions that point in the wrong direction. I haven't time or energy to sort these out, so I have simply included the comments. However, I have not included comments that are applicable to more than one level; e.g., if a comment is made in the related work section, it should be assumed that it may apply in the related expression section. I apologize for the amount of editorial work that still needs to be done on this Appendix.

J2.2, musical variations based on (work): Suggested revision: "A musical work from which melodic, thematic, or harmonic material is taken to form a discrete theme, which is repeated one or more times with subsequent modifications."

J2.2, parody of (work): Suggested revision: "A work whose style or content is imitated in the resource being described for comic effect."

J2.2, remake of (work): Suggested revision: "A motion picture used as the basis for a new motion picture." Whether or not the persons/bodies associated with the remake are new is irrelevant.

J2.2, abstract (work): Change "abbreviated" to "abbreviates" in the definition.

J2.2, screenplay for the motion picture (work): The work in the phrase is a motion picture, not a screenplay. The definition is written the wrong way around; this is also a problem for the entries for "screenplay …" and "script …".

*J.2.4 and J.3.4, cadenza composed for, libretto for, cadenza and libretto: CCC objected to treating cadenzas and librettos as parts of a musical work. ALA agrees; these terms and definitions should be removed from this section. It is less clear where they belong. According to *5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up*, they would be treated as related works; again ALA agrees. But are they derivative works/expressions or augmenting works/expressions (as CCC proposes)? Note that librettos are already included in J.2.2 and J.3.2 as derivative works/expressions.

The case of cadenzas is particularly difficult. Since a cadenza might be written by a different person from the composer of the larger work, and in fact usually is, it might be considered to have an accompanying work relationship to the larger composition. On the other hand, cadenzas composed by the composer of the larger work could have a whole-part relationship to the larger work; cadenzas composed by other composer could have an accompanying work relationship.

J.2.5, catalogue (work) and catalogue of (work): The definition seem to have been reversed.

J.2.5: A reciprocal for "illustrations for (work)" may be needed for the "augmented by (work)" section.

J.2.6, continues (work): Change definition to: "A work that is continued by the content of the resource being described." See also comment under "Supersedes".

J.2.6, continues in part (work): Change definition to: "A work that is continued in part by the content of the resource being described." See also comment under "Supersedes".

J.2.6, prequel (work): Change definition to: "A later appearing work whose narrative is extends backwards in time from the narrative of the earlier appearing work."

J.2.6, merger of (work): Change definition to: "Two or more works which came together to form the new resource being described."

J.2.6, separated from (work): Change definition to: "A work that spun off part of its content into the separate resource being described."

J.2.6, supersedes (work): Remove the sentence that begins "For serials, …" This is a pre-AACR2 convention; numbering has long since ceased being considered a relevant criterion in determining the terminology used to describe relationships between earlier and later titles of serials.

J.2.6, succeeded by (work) section: The terms in this section need to have "by" added before "(work)" and the definitions need to be revised:

absorbed in part by (work): "The work that incorporates content that partially continues the resource being described."

continued by (work): Remove "and numbering" from the definition.

continued in part by (work): Remove "and numbering" from the definition.

prequel (work): "An earlier appearing work whose narrative is extended backwards in time by the later appearing work."

merged with (work): "One of two or more works that came together to form a new work."

separated from (work): This entry should be removed. It is already in the "preceded by" category. The converse of "separated from" is usually handled as "continued in part by". – Randall 12/9/08

superseded by (work): Remove the sentence that begins "For serials, …" (see above).

superseded in part by (work): Remove the sentence that begins "For serials, …" (see above).

J.2.6, succeeded by (work) section: The following terms should be added:

absorbed by (work): "The work that incorporates content continuing the resource being described."

split into (work): "Two or more later works resulting from a split of the resource being described."

J.2.6, separated from (work): This entry should be removed. The reciprocal of "separated from" is usually handled as "continued in part by".

J.3.2, expanded version of (expression): Suggested revision: "An expression of a work used as the basis for a work that enlarges upon the content of the source work."

J.3.5, augmented by (work): Change the caption to "augmented by (expression)".

J.3.5, illustrations for (expression): The definition points in the wrong direction. Suggested revision: "An expression of a work that is augmented by a resource comprising pictorial content designed to elucidate or decorate that expression."

J.3.6, preceded by (expression) and succeeded by (expression): As with the corresponding section for related works, there are copy-and-paste errors, as well as terms and definitions that point in the wrong direction. These sections should be checked against all of the comments under J.2.6.

J.4.2, electronic reproduction (manifestation) and digital transfer (manifestation): These categories are not distinct in practice. An analogue resource reproduced in a digital format results in a resource that is **both** an electronic reproduction and a digital transfer.

J.4.2, reprint of: Change the definition to: "A manifestation used as the basis for a reissue with the same content."

J.4.2, digital transfer of (manifestation): Change the definition to: "A manifestation used as the basis for a transfer from an analog format to a digital one, or from one digital format to another."

J.4.5: Consider adding a category for "digitized with" for titles have been digitized in a single digital file; this would parallel "filmed with," and similar relationships.

J.5.2, digital transfer of (item): Change the definition to: "An item used as the basis for a transfer from an analog format to a digital one, or from one digital format to another."

Appendix K

General comments

*ALA would like to see this Appendix (along with Appendices I and J) included in the initial release of RDA. However, we are aware that significant work – both editorial and substantive – needs to be done before these Appendices are ready for release. The main problem (other than the editorial errors in Appendix J) seems to be a lack of consistency in approach, granularity, and development of hierarchy. If these cannot be resolved, we suggest that these Appendices be labeled as provisional. The possibility of a separate editorial group for relationship designators is worth considering, so long as this can fit into the time available. Note also that the relationship designators are among the vocabularies being registered in collaboration with the DC-RDA group, and will likely be included in the schemas that will be available through the RDA online product; this exercise may therefore have its own scheduling and dependency issues.

ALA prefers the use of the indefinite article in the definitions (as is done in Appendix J).

*Most of the terms can apply to all three types of entities, yet this has not always been done.

*Although relationships are supposed to be reciprocal, this has not always been done. For example, the term "employer" is used for "the corporate body that employs the person". This works fine for commercial corporate bodies, and corresponds to "employee" in K.2.3. But what about corresponding relationship terms for the other "person" terms in K.2.3? What about the relationship between a non-commercial corporate body and its members?

Appendix M

General comments

ALA finds that the Complete Examples are not complete, either in the scope of the examples offered or in the completeness of the individual examples. There are no examples for cartographic materials or archival collections. Visual materials come in a wide variety of manifestations and warrant wider coverage in the appendix; for instance: a digital video that contains more than one version in different file formats (one streaming, one downloadable) (and with particular attention to how the physical description is recorded); a standard CD-ROM; a digital reproduction of a monographic text; and a kit made up of multiple content and carrier types, none of which are predominant. We also recommend that an example record for a motion picture uniform title be added to the set of authority records.

With respect to completeness of the individual examples, the most widely noticed issue was the failure to provide relationship designators to many of the names (Munro and Seligman under Audio Recording – Book; Taylor under Book 1; European Conference on Encoded Archival Description and Content under Book 2).

The coded marking "*" and "++" were not intuitive. A legend should be provided to explain them.

Comments on specific examples

Audio recording – Music

The hybrid nature of this disc is not clearly stated; in fact, there is no indication that it can be played in a regular compact disc player. Reviewers have been sufficiently confused by this example as to wonder if it was a CD-ROM with audio files.

We are confused why there are two identical instances of the Copyright Date element but no indication of a phonogram copyright date. Given the nature of copyright information associated with sound recordings, we presume that the appropriate content here would be a single instance of 2.11, containing "℗2004". The corresponding change also needs to be made to the MARC coding for this example, changing field 260 $c from "©2004, ©2004" to "℗2004".

Streaming video

This example for streaming video doesn't contain any technical details about the file, such as transmission speed or file size.

The title of the streaming video conflicts with other works of the same name (a 1943 motion picture and 1960 television program). Therefore, according to 0.6.3, access point for the work requires the addition of other attributes of the work to break the conflict. Minimally it should have: For whom the bell tolls (Television program : 2000).

The example illustrates the use of "film director" and "film producer" as relationship designators for entities associated with a television program. In Appendix I.2.2, television directors and television producers listed separately. The examples should use the correct designators.

Video Recording

The example fails to record the year or place of production, both of which are extremely important elements for this medium. There may be only one year's difference between the date of original production and the copyright date of the manifestation, but it is crucial in distinguishing this from other versions. We would prefer that the original date always be included for moving image works.

The example notes that the film is a remake, although the resulting note is confusing (was the screenplay written in 1974 and not produced? Or produced in an unidentified year? Or is it the remake of a 1974 movie? What was the title of that movie?). Researching the matter reveals an entry in the Internet Movie Database showing that the previous movie was called Black Christmas. The same source also shows the title of the present film as Black X-mas. This raises a number of questions and concerns:

- The current title seems similar enough to the previous title to warrant work information at least for purposes of differentiation (though we believe it should have it in any case).
- Since the previous version was not a motion picture, does that mean we are not permitted to use it as a qualifier, which would make it merely: Black X-mas (2006)?
- Or may we record what we actually need and make it: Black X-mas (Motion picture : 2006 : Canada and United States).

- The access point also needs to identify the language of the expressions (both French and English).

The example does not show whether it is NTSC or PAL (3.18.3.3) or whether it is region-coded. ALA feels that this is important, as a user may not be able to use the item if the broadcast standard or region coding are incompatible with their equipment. One might surmise that this is a NTSC region 1 DVD. Since records are shared internationally, however, we do not believe that this is good practice for the future.

Web Site – Integrating Resource

The example does not record the source of the title, as is done in the streaming video example.

Authority Records – Work 2 (p. 80-81)

Form of work (6.3) is required only when needed to differentiate a work from another work with the same title, which is not the case here. It also seems redundant to apply in this case, since the preferred title is "quintets" and the form is "quintet". This is an instance when RDA haphazardly veers between calling for explicit recording of data previously inferred from context and retaining those omissions, presumably in the interest of legacy data.

This example would also be more helpful if it were to include the construction of a preferred access point.

Glossary

General comments

*The policy to include Glossary definitions for all the elements, sub-elements, and element sub-types – as well as definitions of many terms in embedded vocabularies – inflates the Glossary to the point where it is difficult to consult effectively. This is compounded by a lack of cross references (see below). Although it is necessary and important to include definitions of all the elements and values in the DC-RDA vocabularies, it is unclear whether they need to be included in the Glossary. An alternative might be to tag the Scope instructions (where all the elements are defined) so that they can be searched as "definitions". Another possibility is to define general categories of elements whose names begin with the same term; for example, define "Identifier" and not all the various "Identifier for …" terms.

*There are very few variant terms in the Glossary; it is unclear whether keyword access in the online product will be an adequate substitute (i.e., that variant terms have been included in the definitions of the preferred terms). In any case, navigation in a printed product is difficult without the inclusion of reference from variants.

Comments on specific terms

Access Point: We prefer the more straightforward definition found in the IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles draft: "A name, term, code, etc. through which bibliographic or authority data is searched and identified."

Analytical Description: Delete "that describes": "A description of a part …"

Archival Resource: We resubmit the following suggested revision proposed in 2005 by the Society of American Archivists: "A collection of resources not published, distributed, or produced together but assembled by a library, a cataloguing agency, a previous owner, a dealer, etc., or created and/or accumulated and used by a particular person, family, or corporate body in the course of that creator's activities and functions." The rationale for this revision is to clarify that the definition includes what archivists refer to as "fonds".

Atlas: We noted in 2005 that the current definition is not restricted to cartographic atlases, but might be interpreted to include medical or other scientific atlases. We believe that the definition **should** be limited to cartographic atlases.

Braille: We suggest that the definition begin: "Tactile material intended …"

*Captioning: The phrase "speech and other audible information" seems to indicate that the captions are audible! Furthermore, captions may present non-audible features of the resource ("described video") and are not always "in the language of the audio content." The Glossary definition should also clarify whether captions and subtitles are the same.

Card: It is unfortunate that the definition needs to invoke size; cards can be rather large.

Cartridge: This category is not limited to computer media; it can include audio or video cartridges, and may house tape as well as discs or chips.

Chart: The two sentences appear to be quite separate definitions. Such definitions should be separated and/or numbered.

Collection: ALA supports the following suggested revision from the Society of American Archivists: "A group of resources not published, distributed, or produced together but assembled by a library, a cataloguing agency, a previous owner, a dealer, etc., or created and/or accumulated and used by a particular person, family, or corporate body in the course of that creator's activities and functions."

Component Part: We suggest: "A discrete unit of intellectual or artistic content within a larger resource."

Comprehensive Description: Begin: "A description of the resource …" The first example needs more explanation: "(e.g., a map issued in two or more discrete parts, …"

*Computer: The definition is limited to use as a Media Type; even within the first sentence of this definition, "computer" is used to mean equipment. We should either make two definitions, since RDA uses the word in (at least) two ways, or do something more blatant to indicate that we are only defining the term as it is used in Media Type. In fact, it might be useful to include an indication (phrase or code or icon) to indicate that the term being defined is an element, a sub-element, an element sub-type, or a value.

Computer disc/disk: One of the longstanding debates during maintenance of AACR2 was discussion about whether there was in fact a distinction between "disc" and "disk." Although we do **not** want to revive those debates, we do note that the text uses "disc" while the Glossary uses "disk" – which is clearly incorrect.

Conference: The two sentences are in fact separate definitions and should be separated or numbered.

Copyright Date: Other dates are found under "Date of …". Either rename this element or make a reference from "Date of Copyright."

Date of Promulgation of a Law, etc.: We suggest defining "promulgation."

Devised Title: We suggest a reference from or mention of "Supplied Title."

Duration: Consider adding "or movement" at the end of the second sentence; one would assume that performance time would be relevant to such resources.

Earlier Variant Title: Rather than "… that differs from that on the current iteration," we suggest that "… that no longer appears on the current iteration" is clearer.

Early Printed Resources: The scope of this category is still unclear. As written, it seems to be limited to letterpress printing, and to exclude graphic printing processes such as engraving. And technically, the hand press was a machine.

Finding Aid: We suggest that the definition mention archival resources and collections, as these are the most common resources for which finding aids are created.

Formally presented: Begin the definition with a noun, either "Data" or "Information".

*Identifier for …: We suggest that a general definition of "Identifier" be given; The Glossary of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles gives "A number, code, word, phrase, logo, device, etc. that is associated with an entity, and serves to differentiate that entity from other entities within the domain in which the identifier is assigned." If there were a general definition of the term "Identifier," the other definitions could be simplified considerably.

Issue: This is not the only definition of "issue" in the cataloging world; it is used in 2.5.2.1 as one of the terms that indicate an Edition Statement. It has a specialized meaning in the world of early printed resources. The AACR2 Glossary included a definition of this meaning of "issue."

Key Title: We would suggest this addition: "The unique name assigned to a continuing resource by an ISSN registration agency." This would clarify the scope of the element. We would like to see this term introduced likewise in other definitions that apply to serials and integrating resources, and the addition of a definition of Continuing Resource (see below).

Later Variant Title: We suggest revising the final phrase to read: "… a later issue or part of a serial or multipart monograph that differs from or was not present on the first or earliest issue or part."

Manifestation: We reiterate our desire to clarify the definition for manifestation by stating that physical embodiments may include "intangible resources".

Microopaque: Because "Card" has been defined in the RDA Glossary, consider revising this definition to read: "A card bearing a number of microimages in a two-dimensional array."

Running Title: The restriction to titles to the top or bottom of page layouts seems arbitrary. Consider rephrasing this entry as: "A title, or abbreviated title, repeated on each page or leaf of a resource."

Section: There are two definitions here, and they should be numbered. In fact, the definition of "Map Section" refers to "Section (2)".

Serial: We suggest revising definition to begin "A continuing resource issued …" This helps to clarify the scope of the element.

Tactile Image: The significance of the phrase "in two dimensions" is unclear, and contrary to fact. Any raised image intended to be perceived through touch is in three dimensions.

Missing terms

Chronogram: used in 2.7.6.4.

Colophon: used at 2.2.2.2, etc.

*Continuing Resource: ALA believes that the concept of "Continuing Resource" assists users in understanding Mode of Issuance. We believe that the term should be defined in the Glossary. Proposed definition: "Resources issued over time." Furthermore, the definitions of Serials Integrating Resources should include "continuing" in their definitions.

*Controlled Access Point: We suggest adding this entry with the definition: "An access point recorded in an authority record. Controlled Access Points include both Preferred Access Points and Variant Access Points." Include a *see also* reference to "Preferred Access Point" and "Variant Access Point."

Cover: Used at 2.2.2.2, etc.

Entity: The term "Entity" is used throughout the RDA Glossary but no definition is provided. We suggest using the definition in the IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles Glossary.

Given Name: used 9.2.2.5.2, etc.

Meridian: Used in 7.4.2.1 and in Glossary definition of "Longitude."

*Numbering: Use the definition of what RDA means by numbering that appears in 2.6.1.1, second paragraph.

*Publish or Published: This is a long-standing need. The concept is fundamental to many decisions made in following RDA, but there are many ambiguities. A definition would be helpful.

State: Used in 2.5.2.1.

3. Comments on examples

General comments

The layout of the examples, their grouping into what at least one reviewer called "bubbles", and the inconsistent use of group captions such as "different scripts", "different languages", and "transliterations" made it difficult to consult the examples.

The Council on East Asian Libraries submitted extensive recommendations for the addition of CJK examples. These are included below, should the JSC decide to authorize their inclusion.

Comments on specific example or groups of examples (including suggestions for additional examples)

1.7.9: Add:

> 兩晉南朝琅邪王氏傳奇
> (邪 xie typo for 琊 ya)

2.3.3.3: Add:

> 快乐学日語
> Title proper: 日本語を楽しく学ぶ

2.3.6: Add:

> ブラザー [Title on disc label]
> Title proper recorded as: Brother

2.3.7.3, 1st example: If the earlier title appears on "issues", then it is a serial, not an integrating resource. An earlier variation of the title proper would not be recorded for a serial unless we go to latest entry for minor changes. This example should be deleted or the word "issues" should be changed to "iterations".

2.3.9.3: Add:

> Nihongo bumpou

2.3.11.3: Add:

> 滿鐵逐次刊行物．撫順炭礦

2.4.1.4: Add:

> Official scientific journal of the European Society of Agricultural Engineers
> [OCLC #48215461]

2.4.1.5: In the instructions on recording statements naming more than one person, under Optional Omission (p. 63), the second should finish with something more descriptive than "[summary of omission]".

2.4.2.3: Add:

Centralblatt für die gesammte Unterrichts-Verwaltung in Preussen / herausgegeben in dem Ministerium der Geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medizinal-Angelegenheiten [OCLC #19213886]

2.5.1.4: This is a transcribed element. Per Appendix B.4, transcribed elements are not abbreviated. Several examples here are not in compliance with Appendix B.4.

2.5.1.4, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

初版

초판

北京第1版

2.5.2.6: Consider adding an example illustrating a "Designation of Edition Integral to Title Proper".

2.5.6.3, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

修訂版
Designation of edition: 北京第2版

2.6.1.4, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

創刊号

2.6.3.3, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

昭和51年9月 [September 1976]

2.8.2.3, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

서울특별시

上海

東京

中華民國臺灣省臺北市

浪華

2.8.4.3, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

少年儿童出版社

大東文化大学東洋研究所

松村九兵衛

평양 출판사

2.8.6.3: In the "Heisei Gannen [1889]" (top of p. 133), "Gannen" is a number expressed as a word (1.8.3). In addition, calendar conversion is incorrect. It should instead read: "Heisei 1 [1989] –"

<u>2.8.6.3</u>, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

```
民國 28 [1939]
[to be paired with Minguo 28 [1939]]
```

```
平成 9 [1997]
```

```
단기 4291 [1958]
```

<u>2.12.2.3</u>, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

國語國文學資料씨리즈

日本古典全書

少数民族民间文学丛书

<u>2.12.2.4</u>: The fact that resources in the series are mainly in English is not relevant here. The instruction says to apply 2.3.2.4, which says to choose a title in the predominant language of the **resource** itself, not the predominant language of all the resources in the series. So if "Mercury series" is chosen over "Collection Mercure", it should be because the monograph being cataloged is in English, not because most other monographs in the series are in English.

<u>2.12.16.3</u>, 2nd example. The example is backwards. If the main series has ISSN 0826-6875 and the ISSN of the main series is supposed to be omitted when recording the ISSN of a subseries, the ISSN recorded should be 0316-1854, not 0826-6875.

<u>2.15.1.4</u>: Consider adding commercial barcode examples:

夕凪の街 桜の国 (OCLC: 268995459):
Barcode on DVD: 4933364611499

鏡獅子(OCLC: 64393716):
Barcode on DVD: 4988105026278

Note: The examples of identifier provided here is JAN code, a 13 digit number consists of 2 digit country code + 10 item number + check digit (possibly UPC barcode) on a DVD item.

<u>2.15.2</u>, examples for sound recordings:

ARC Music: EUCD 2103

Universal/Platina Entertainment: 476 166-8

角頭音樂: TCM-200310
Jiao tou yin yue: TCM-200310

安徽文化音像出版社:
Anhui wen hua yin xiang chu ban she:
GH-245
GH-245-1--GH-245-2
Note: Publisher no.: GH-245-1--GH-245-2 (on container: GH-245).
(Numbers for the set and for each CD individually)

Wind Records:
CB-19
TCD-5031--TCD-5032
Note: Wind Records: CB-19 (TCD-5031--TCD-5032).
(Numbers for the set and for each CD individually)

Shōgakukan: STZ 13--STZ 23

YBM 서울음반: SRCD-1591
YBM Sōul Ūmban: SRCD-1591

2.15.2, examples for video recordings:

Bandai Visual: BCBJ-3086
(Publisher and distributor)

Criterion Collection: CC1752D
(Publisher's number)

VAP Video:
VPBT-15911 (DVD-Box set)
VPBT-15246 (one individual in the set)
(Publisher's number on box set and individual)

广州俏佳人文化传播有限公司: DE1341
Guangzhou qiao jia ren wen hua chuan bo you xian gong si: DE1341
(Distributor's number)

九洲音像出版公司: AD164
Jiu Zhou yin xiang chu ban gong si: AD164
广东中凯文化发展有限公司: MDA80815
Guangdong zhong kai wen hua fa zhan you xian gong si: MDA80815
(the first is publisher and the second is distributor's numbers on the same item)

대경DVD: DKV-6449
Taegyŏng DVD: DKV-6449
(Publisher's number)

목란비데오: MV-1982
Mongnan Pideo: MV-1982
(Publisher's number)

2.15.2, examples for combinations of sound and video recordings:

Wind Records:
CB-111
TCD-5048
WDVD-004
Note: Wind Records: CB-111 (TCD-5048, WDVD-004).
(Publisher's numbers for the set and for each disc individually)

2.15.2 /2.15.1.4: Consider also the addition of examples where the original language and script for describe the name of the agencies, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier is recorded. The following three, English form, romanization form, and Japanese form, refer to the same agency. While some publishers/manufacturers in East Asia have English forms of their companies' names but others not, there may be inconsistency in describing agencies' names. Some libraries use both the original language and romanization as in九洲音像.

This refers to the publisher's name recorded in MARC 028 subfield $b.

Examples of publisher/distributor's name in more than one form or more than one language/script

Japan

バンダイ ビジュアル: BCBJ-3086 [original language]
Bandai Bijuaru: BCBJ-3086   [romanization]
Bandai Visual: BCBJ-3086   [English form]

株式会社バップ: VPBT-15911
Kabushiki Kaisha Vappu: VPBT-15911
VAP Video: VPBT-15911

Taiwan

風潮有聲出版有限公司: TCD-5048   [original language]
Feng chao you sheng chu ban you xian gong si: TCD-5048   [romanization]
Wind Records: TCD-5048   [English form]

滾石唱片: ROD5198-4
Gun shi chang pian: ROD5198-4
Rock Records: ROD5198-4

角頭音樂: TCM-200310
Jiao tou yin yue: TCM-200310
Taiwan Colors Music Co.: TCM-200310

華納國際音樂股份有限公司: 0927-44248-2
Hua na guo ji yin yue gu fen you xian gong si: 0927-44248-2
Warner Music (or Warner Music Taiwan): 0927-44248-2
(Example of international publisher/distributor who has branch in Taiwan)

Hong Kong

亞洲影帶出版社有限公司: AVPASIA101
Yazhou ying dai chu ban she you xian gong si: AVPASIA101
Asia Video Publishing Co.: AVPASIA101

China (distributor)

广东中凯文化发展有限公司: MDA10105
Guangdong zhong kai wen hua fa zhan you xian gong si: MDA10105
中凯文化 (short form or brand name or label name): MDA10105
Zhong kai wen hua: MDA10105
Zoke Culture (English form for label or brand name): MDA10105

<u>2.20.3.6</u>: Consider adding an additional example, using a multipart monograph, to illustrate "Notes on changes in statement of responsibility".

<u>2.20.4.3</u>: Add:

Original set consisted of 71 vols., published 1846-1880, reissued in several editions [OCLC 2499812, where all editions are cataloged on one serial record]

<u>2.20.4.5</u>: Consider adding an example under the main text to illustrate "Notes on changes in edition statement".

<u>2.20.7.5</u>: Consider adding an example illustrating "Changes in publication statement" for a multipart monograph.

<u>3.21.2.3</u>, examples after the first paragraph: Add:

LC set has "反町弘文莊納" stamped on inside case
LC set has "... 天明乙巳 [1785] ..." written with brush on colophon page

<u>3.22.2.9</u>, examples after the second paragraph: Add:

Within single border (23.0 x 16.3 cm.); text in 11 vertical lines

<u>3.22.4.4</u>: Consider adding examples illustrating "Change in dimensions of manifestation".

<u>3.22.6.3</u>: Consider adding examples illustrating "Change in carrier characteristics".

<u>6.2.1.5</u>, examples on p. 5: Add:

二十四の瞳 [Nijūshi no hitomi]

<u>6.2.2.10.1</u>, p. 19: Add:

夕霧
Part of 紫式部's Genji monogatari (源氏物語)

<u>6.2.2.5</u>: The examples would be more helpful if they indicated which condition among a), b), or c) they were applying.

<u>6.2.3.4</u>, first set, last example. In the example for "Kodix Vaticanus Graecus", the terminology "Codex Vaticanus Graecus", in the annotation to this example, is not the repository's designation (see 6.2.2.7). The repository, and everyone else, refers to this manuscript series as "Vat. Gr.", so the preferred title should be "Manuscript. Vat. Gr. 1171".

6.2.3.4, second group: Add:

> Different script
>
> > 般若心経
> > Japanese transliterated form recorded as preferred title: Hannya shingyō

6.2.3.5: Add:

> > 上下5000年
> > 上下五〇〇〇年
> > Preferred title recorded as:　上下五千年
>
> > 1001夜
> > Preferred title recorded as:　一千零一夜
> > (Note: this is Chinese translation of: Arabian nights. Another Chinese translation title: 天方夜谭. This example can be used also under 6.2.3.4 Alternative Linguistic Form of Title for the Work)
>
> > 李仁榮全集
> > Preferred title recorded as:　鶴山李仁榮全集
>
> > 日本美術用語辞典
> > Preferred title recorded as:　和英対照日本美術用語辞典

6.23.3.4: Reorganize these examples like those at 6.2.3.4.

6.27.3: Not all of the examples represent "a particular expression". For example, there could be multiple English translations of Freres Zemganno.

6.27.3, Moses und Aron example. Given the proposed changes in treating librettos, perhaps this example should be removed or at least flagged for re-assessment after the proposed changes are resolved. A preferable alternative illustrating a libretto would be an English translation of Nozze di Figaro (composer, Mozart; librettist Da Ponte) and putting that example (with essentially the AACR2 access point) in 6.27.4 as a variant access point representing a work or expression. (The libretto as a work would be entered under Da Ponte; the variant access point would be Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756-1791. Nozze di Figaro. Libretto. English.)

6.27.4.1, after first example on p. 167: Add

> > Pan, Huanglong, 1945-
> > 台灣風情畫
> > Formosa landscapes
> > Preferred access point for the work: Pan, Huanglong, 1945- Taiwan feng qing gua

7.12.1.3: Add:

> > In Polish; tables of contents and summaries in Polish, Russian and English
> > [OCLC #1777958]

7.19.1.3: The example and the instruction spell "wide screen" differently. Further, the explanatory text in the example "Resource includes both versions" is not clear to which of the preceding examples it applies.

7.19.1.3: With further input from moving-image experts, ALA recommends that "fullscreen" be defined as an aspect ratio less than 1.5:1 and that "widescreen" be defined as an aspect ratio of 1.5:1 or greater. The aspect ratio for "fullscreen" should not be characterized as standard; this was based on the typical television monitor, which surely will no longer be typical with the advent of high-definition.

8.13.1: Add:

> Prefers that Chinese form of name be used in bib. records for items in Chinese and that Lee, James Z. be used as heading in records for items in English. (from Lee, James Z., 1952- LCCN n 96080631)

> For works of this author entered under other names, search also under Ye, Shan or Wang, C.H. (Ching-hsien), 1940-) (from Yang, Mu, 1940- LCCN n 81069280)

> Works by this author are entered under the name used in the item. For a listing of other names used by this author, search also under Yang, Mu, 1940- (from Ye, Shan LCCN n 81071768)

> Works by this author are entered under the name used in the item. For a listing of other names used by this author, search also under Yang, Mu, 1940- (from Wang, C.H. (Ching-hsien), 1940- LCCN n 98097575)

> Dōshisha Eigakkō, est. Nov. 1875 (from LCCN n 79095562)

9.2.2.5.3: Greek typography does not always supply rough-breathing marks, but to follow 8.5.4 and the Homer/Ὅμηρος example below, one should be supplied over the omicron in "ὁ Μέγας".

9.2.2.5.3 b), examples Li An (p. 12) and Ang Lee (p. 14): There is a director whose name is established as "Lee, Ang, 1954- ." Users of RDA aware of this director will believe the examples misrepresent the instruction. A further note should be added to clarify that the examples are referring to the Chinese author Li An.

9.2.2.5.3 b), example Yi Sung-man: The example does not well illustrate the subinstruction b), as his name is established in English language reference sources as "Syngman Rhee". A better example is

> Cho Man-sik
> Name appears in original script as: 조만식

9.2.2.8: Add Chinese examples using 衛斯理 (Wei Sili), 原振俠(Yuan Zhenxia) and 倪匡 (Ni Kuang)

> 倪匡 [Ni Kuang]
> Real name for most of his works

> 衛斯理 [Wei Sili]
> Pseudonym used by 倪匡 in one of his series

原振俠　[Yuan Zhenxia]
Pseudonym used by 倪匡 in one of his series

<u>9.2.2.8</u>, exception (22-23):

Lu Xun
not Zhou Shuren

<u>9.2.3.10</u>: No example illustrates what may be the most common type of difference in fullness: the presence vs. absence of a middle name or initial.

<u>11.2.2.5.2</u>: Add after the first example on p. 7:

Mongolyn Burkhany Shashny Urlakhuĭ Ukhaany Dėėd Surguul´
(romanization of Монголын Бурханы Шашны Урлахуй Ухааны Дээд Сургууль)
not Mongolian Institute of Buddhist Art
not Monggol Pulgyo Misul Taehak
not 몽골불교미술대학
not 몽골佛敎美術大學

<u>11.2.2.5.4</u>: The example for "Ordo Templi Orientis" does not make it clear why option c) is applied here. An explanation that "no name in the language preferred by the agency predominates" would be helpful in that case.

<u>11.2.2.10</u>, first group of examples on p. 20:

K'ria P'ikch'yŏsŭ (Chu)
not (Chu) K'oria P'ikch'yŏsŭ
['Chu' here means Ltd.]

Samsŏng Chŏnja (LCCN n 85022222)
not Samsŏng Chŏnja Chusik Hoesa

<u>11.2.2.10</u>: Add other Japanese and Korean examples to illustrate the instruction "Omit an initial word or phrase in an oriental language indicating the private character of a corporate body (e.g., Shiritsu, Si li), unless the word or phrase is an integral part of the name."

Dong hai da xue
not Si li Dong hai da xue

Kōchi Gakugei Kōtō Gakkō (LCCN nr 93026096)
not Shiritsu Kōchi Gakugei Kōtō Gakkō

Hakusai Byōin (LCCN n 2004123900)
not Shiritsu Hakusai Byōin

Taehan Pulgyo Chinhŭngwŏn
not Chaedan Pŏbin Taehan Pulgyo Chinhŭngwŏn (OCLC# 39256723)
but Shiritsu Daigaku Toshokan Kyōkai
but Sarip Hakkyo Kyowŏn Yŏn'gŭm Kwalli Kongdan (Korea)

11.2.2.13: If the Harvard Law School example is not entered subordinately because it lacks the "University" component of Harvard University, explanatory text should be added to explain this.

11.2.2.14, Type 2, 3rd bubble The "but" counter examples look like they should be Type 1 (in the first instance) and Type 6 (in the remainder) subordinate bodies. Either the instructions need to be better articulated so that the existence of these counter examples here make sense, or the examples need to be moved to the other Types.

11.2.2.21.2: Add:

> Korea (South). Kungmu Ch'ongnisil

11.2.2.22: Consider adding an English language example that does not use "Legislature":

> Massachusetts. General Court

11.2.2.25.1: Add:

> Korea (South). Yukkun. Sadan, Che 1. Y'ndae, 11

11.2.2.26 : Add in second group:

> Korea (South). Taesagwan (U.S.)

11.2.3.6: Add the Korean variant for "United Nations" under the third example in the first group:

> Kukche Yŏnhap

> Di zhi kuang chan bu di zhi li xue yan jiu suo (China)

11.2.3.6, second paragraph: The example "27 Knygos" does not illustrate the instruction as written. The example should provide the Russian word equivalent for 27. The Arabic numeral form is an important variant however.

11.2.3.7.1: It is not clear why "Department" should be abbreviated in "United States. Dept. of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. National Economy and History Branch. Agricultural and Rural History Section".

11.12.1.3: Add:

> Hyŏndae Sahoe Yŏn'guso (Korea)

16.2.2.7, p. 6: Add:

> Ih Ju Meng
> Name changed to: Ordos Shi

16.2.3.6: Add:

> 서울 (Korea)
> Sŏul (Korea)
> English language form recorded as preferred name: Seoul (Korea)

呼和浩特
Huhehaote
English language form recorded as preferred name: Hohhot

伊克昭盟
Yikezhao Meng
English language form recorded as preferred name: Ih Ju Meng

16.2.3.7: The relationship between the two examples pertaining to "Albania" under 16.2.3.7 is not clear. Some explanation would be helpful.

19.2: An example of a corporate body for an annual report would be helpful, not just archives of corporate bodies.

19.3.1.3: It would be helpful to show the preferred access points representing the work, i.e. of the creator(s), as well as others.

19.3.1.3, "Salzburger Festspiele" (top of p. 36): The access point should be constructed, per RDA 11.12.1.8, c) as "Salzburger Festspiele (Salzburg, Austria)"

19.3.1.3, "Brokeback Mountain" (middle of p. 37): ALA acknowledges the benefit of providing an example that illustrates a situation where not all persons recorded in the record will receive access points. However, it would be good form to mention in the text that this example reflects choices made by a particular agency.

19.3.1.3: Consider adding an example with "prepared by"; many serials prepared by a person or corporate subbody.

A.38.4: The contraposition of the example "Son éminence" with "Sa Majesté le roi de France" is confusing. Shouldn't these be "Son Éminence, Sa Majesté le roi de France," or less likely, "Son éminence, Sa majesté le roi de France"?

D.2.2.1, Addenda, second example: It is not clear why this example is preceded by "but". Both examples simply follow the provision to "enclose each in its own set of square brackets."

4. Typographical errors

Comments on typographical errors were entered in the wiki.