To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Margaret Stewart, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access – Full Draft – Review by the Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association and the National Library of Sweden

These are comments on the full draft of RDA received from the Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association and the National Library of Sweden.

Comments on the Final Draft of RDA

From *Svensk Biblioteksförenings kommitté för katalogisering* (The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association) together with the national bibliographic agency, *The National Library of Sweden*

Anders Cato
Chair of the Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Head of Cataloguing at the National Library of Sweden
Stockholm, 2009-02-01

General views on the RDA outline and the revision process

RDA means a big step forward and a move from the cataloguing rules being written mainly for printed catalogues, to the FRBR way of looking at the bibliographic universe. The Swedish Cataloguing Committee together with the National Library greatly appreciates this. In the final draft of RDA the structural change towards the FRBR view of the bibliographic universe has been more consistently carried out than in earlier drafts. Still, we anticipate that more needs needs to be done and look forward to a continuous integration process in future revisions of the RDA.

It is also a very important and much appreciated step forward that RDA includes rules both for authority work and relationships. We do think however, as already stated in our earlier comments, that the work with constructing rules for authority work and relationships should have been performed in a different way. The revision should have started with an analysis of which access points should have authorized or controlled forms, that is, which authority work and what coded information should be carried out in the cataloguing process. After that exercise, it would have been logical to turn to the navigational requirements that should be supported by the cataloguing process; which relationships that should be established. The decisions taken at these two stages of the revision inevitably affect the rules for description, so revising the descriptive rules should have been the last step.

The adaptation to other metadata models, that has been initialised in RDA is something we strongly approve of and we hope that this work will continue and be intensified even after the release of the first "version" of RDA,

On the whole, so far we are not happy with the handling of the review of this full draft. (Is it even correct to talk about a full draft when important parts of the code are not there yet?). We understand the difficulties with late revisions such as the music parts in chapter 6, but when a whole appendix has been changed (as is the case with appendix D), why was this not exchanged at constituency review page (http://www.rdaonline.org/constituencyreview/)? It is of course unfortunate that a main web page like this contains obsolete text. Regarding chapter 6 we also think that it could have been stated more clearly which parts of the chapter had been rewritten. The reading did become more complicated due to the fact that the documents that were needed to understand and evaluate RDA had been divided and placed at two

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

different web pages (even though information about what to read was in the cover letter).

As we all have seen this version of RDA is full of typos, missing spaces, incorrect references, and such. This fact makes the listing of about 10 such errors at the constituency review page seem rather unnecessary. The wiki, on the other hand, is a great idea. Only it should have been opened up to the public with the opportunity for JSC representatives and their nominees to validate/reject comments. Then the review respondents would not have had to create own lists, and compare them with the evolving wiki.

Different circumstances have interplayed in making the time for the WWR ultra-short, nine weeks that included a long international holiday. It is of course up to the JSC to judge which deadlines must be held and where you must speed up the work. But it has to be stated that the short period of time given to respond is a factor affecting the quality of our output. This is unfortunate given the international character and importance of the work.

Media, carrier and content type

We much appreciate the effort of splitting the GMD in media type, carrier type, and content type. The mess of different meanings and types of information that characterised the GMD sorely needed a look into. We hope that this eventually will lead to a better order in the MARC21 fields leader, 006, 007 and 008 or their future successors (for the sake of interoperability with non-RDA MARC records it would however probably be better to include this information in 336/337/338 during a transition period, as proposed in the latest MARBI draft). We cannot help but wonder whether the proposed terms and categories will be sufficient to fulfil user needs? Regardless of how we name the categories here, in our catalogue interfaces we will need to replace the appellations with more user-friendly words or icons.

We also note that, in comparing the RDA solution to this problem with the ISBD proposed area 0, the solutions are somewhat different and do not always very easily interact. It is of utmost importance that the JSC and the ISBD Review Group communicate with a clear intention to reach a common solution where neither part contradicts the other. This is something that we have stated in our comments on the ISBD area 0 proposal as well. In this context we would also like to say that we find the solution for content form in the ISBD proposal much appealing. The concept of form terms and accompanying qualifications seems useful and clear.

Recording and presenting data

In RDA there is a stated intent to separate the rules on how to record and how to present data (see 0.1 Guidelines on recording data – guidelines on presenting data). This is a separation not always kept up in the text. Especially the examples still contain a lot of ISBD punctuation, for example surrounding brackets, and when the alleged, system neutral presentation of examples is carried out it is often difficult to interpret.

When it comes to the use of brackets section 2.2.4 states that data taken from outside the primary source (that is the resource itself) shall be marked up in some

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

way; either with a note, with some form or coding or with standard ISBD brackets. However, when it comes to the examples, the brackets are almost always present (see for example "supplied dates" 1.9.2). Here we find the rules both too strict and too allowing. We think it would be far better to state that (in the current example) information should be given with brackets, and then allow for other, agency-specific, solutions. In the cataloguing rules we do not find it necessary to explain how the *meaning* of brackets should be communicated through coding, creative use of notes etc. System vendors are of course also free to use brackets (being a form of standardised coding themselves) as a way of generating text that explains their meaning to the end-user.

There are also other examples of punctuation slipping into the examples (semicolon between data elements in 7.22.1.5, comma in scale statement 7.25.1.3. See also 10.10.1.1 on dynasties).

Text bias
The overall impression is also that the text still has a strong print context bias. More work is needed to integrate many other material types as well.

Hebrew and Arabic text
Hebrew and other letters have been typed from the left to the right in many places, when they should have been recorded from the right to the left. Maybe this is just an error in the printed document that will be fixed in the online version?

Disposition and numbering
Several of those who have studied the draft have found it very hard to penetrate and difficult to navigate. Many references lead to dead ends, probably because paragraphs have been moved. We take it for granted that this will all be solved before the online product is released.

The disposition and numbering of RDA is sometimes very confusing. The confusion might be depending on the fact that RDA is intended as a web product, where the numbering needs not to be seen, but still it is hard to understand why some elements have been subordinated others or put equal to others that they are not equal to. See for example, 2.7.6.7 where resources of a specific kind are equalled to different principles.

We think it is a good idea that the rules start with the manifestation/item-level, and then go on to the work and expression. Though maybe it would have been better placing rules relating to the item (2.17—2.19) after the notes, as most of these relate to the manifestation?

We understand the intent with placing all rules pertaining to carrier in one place, but the resulting chapter 3 gets very hard to grasp and is sometimes extremely detailed.

Scope
We appreciate the extension of the rules to archival and museum resources and the clear demarcation between published and unpublished resources. We are not sure, however, that the adaptations will prove sufficient.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

The setup of the rules in core and optional elements is a good one. We appreciate the ambition to create a core level record replacing the fixed various levels that have existed until today. The decision-making in each bibliographic agency on which other, optional, rules to implement as well might however be hard work - and should also be synchronised between these agencies to as far extent as possible. If that is not done record exchange will not be as easy as it should be.

Alternatives and options

The rules not only give a lot of optionality concerning elements to include or not include. They also very often give the options of choosing between one or several alternative rules.

The great optionality is a general problem which does not serve to promote sharing of records. Why the reluctance to prescribe practices? Given the general possibility to reject different rules and create your own unique profile (workflows) we find it unnecessary to also give so many different choices throughout the cataloguing rules. The fact that the rules are loosened up, so that other communities can state that their way of cataloguing is also under the RDA umbrella, does not improve the real possibilities for data exchange. (See also *Workflows*)

Namespaces, modularity and language dependency

A great benefit with the new rules is the thorough analysis of elements resulting in a declaration of a namespace for RDA. In many cases however we feel that this important effort has not been completed, hindering the full draft from being modular enough. Controlled value lists, for example, must be authorised in some similar way. As we understand it there is an initiated effort (together with the DCMI) at doing something like this for the media, carrier, and content types, but why stop there?

Controlled terminology is now scattered over lists (see 3.2 and 3.3), tables (3.1) or as recommended standard words and phrases (see 2.3.11.6 "advertisement", 2.7.2.6 "Place of production not identified", 6.20.4.2.1 "Laws etc.", or the ever-present "approximately") which makes it difficult to grasp, synchronise and update. A central storage of controlled terminology would allow users around the world to relate their lists of words to the ones validated in RDA. It would also do much for the consistency of the cataloguing rules. In the current draft there is much confusion concerning recommended language. Sometimes it is stated that term lists from RDA should be used, sometimes the cataloguing agency is urged to use its own lists or at least terms in "the language preferred by the agency" (in the revised chapter 6 this is often stated, but also 11.2.2.19 refers to some words or "their equivalents in other languages"). When sometimes no direction at all is given (many occurrences, see for example 2.14.1.3), it can give the unfortunate impression that the rules are still too focused on the Anglo-American world. (Cf Appendix A according to which English is to be chosen if nothing else is stated. Rather than English this should be the preferred language of the agency.)

To have the controlled terms easily accessible and linkable would provide a technical solution to the 0.10.2 statement "Agencies creating data for use in a different language or script may modify such instructions to reflect their own language or script

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

preferences. Authorised translations of RDA will do likewise." To integrate external lists such as these should prove no difficulty for an online product as the RDA. Also it would allow for greater flexibility, and there would be less need for exceptions such as the one in 3.4.1.5 concerning "newly developed formats" not yet part of the list.

Glossary

As far as the glossary is concerned we were surprised to find that some of the definitions here are not the same as in the full text (see for example ”serial” in the table under 2.13.1.3, "cartographic dataset" and others in the table under 6.10.1.3). Every occurrence of a definition in the running text should be linked directly to the glossary. In an online product like RDA the glossary ought to be dynamic, gathering words that need explanation and their definition (plus see- and see also references) on the fly. The glossary should also be able to correspond with the defined words wherever in the text they may appear. Words should only be defined in one place, which serves to avoid redundancy and the risk of ambiguity that the current draft of RDA is facing.

The principle of representation

One of the guiding principles of RDA is said to be "taking what you get" and "the principle of representation". But often this "take what you get" is only one of three or four different solutions. It seems to be fully applicable only to digital resources. The possibility to choose seems to kill the prospect of record sharing (see above). We believe that the principle of “taking what you get” should be carried out with even greater consistency than it is in the current draft. The primary rule should prescribe an exact transcription of the resource as it is. The cataloguer should not need to worry about removing or adding spaces, punctuation or capital letters.

Workflows

When it comes to details and specific rules the differences between AACR2 and RDA are not that big. The workflows however allow the cataloguing agency to pick and choose from the smorgasbord that is the RDA (as long as the mandatory core elements are present), see also comments on *Alternatives and Options.*

We find the workflows very interesting but also almost too important for the content of the resulting records. Using cataloguer's judgement and the opportunity to choose is a defining feature of RDA. We fear that to be able to share records with other communities and cataloguing agencies it will not be enough to know that the records have been created using RDA. We also need to know which workflow has been applied.

Creators and contributors

We find the rules a bit confusing regarding relationships between the person etc. and the work/expression. Is it for example possible to record one person as the creator of a work and another as the creator of an expression of that same work? (See Joan Baez sings Dylan.) Could the difference between contributor/creator be stated more clearly? Here we think more examples could be useful.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

Access points

Some have questioned the definition of access points in the cataloguing rules. Are not all items of information recorded potential access points? In a well functioning library OPAC every single word and phrase make up an access point.

We need however to distinguish between controlled access points and other access points and we are very happy about the strong emphasis in RDA on authority work and the construction of controlled access points. It is the controlled access points that make up the order in the bibliographic universe and helps the user of the catalogue find exactly the resource he/she is looking for.

In most library catalogues a preferred access point is still very much needed, for shelving, making reference lists etc. But there are occurrences when the preferred access point only creates problems, e.g. when large amounts of different resources are being downloaded from different sources into the same database - and these downloaded resources use different preferred access points. A solution would then be to allow for the different access points in the system, and to link them all together through an authority record - and preferably also to take advantage of the potentials in modern techniques for open accessiblity and interconnection, such as the Semantic Web and Linked Data. In that case the authority records need to allow for the marking up of which access points are the preferred ones in each library system. Authority records could actually be automatically generated in the system and not until a primary access point is needed could that be marked up. This solution may still be in the future, but needs to be considered and further discussed. Is it not also very similar to the way the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) functions right now?

Abbreviations

In earlier comments we have objected to the abbreviation of American states. We still think that this will not do, unless abbreviations are also allowed for regions outside America. And here is also the risk of confusion. We do not want our end users to get the impression that we think that Callistratus of Aphidna, flourished 377-361 in British Columbia…

We also question the point of replacing p. (s. in Swedish) with pages or ca with approximately. This change is made to serve the user and make the information more easy to understand, but is it really so and is this not something that could be solved in the interfaces of our OPACs? We think that having all these characters in standard words and phrases will only increase the risk of making errors. We also fear that such long standard phrases in many cases will reduce the readability and set up unnecessary obstacles for the user's own evaluation process (the user may see only the standard phrase and not e.g. the actual number of pages)".

The use of symbols seems to be encouraged in RDA. But if an end user is expected to understand © (whilst not understanding p. and ca.), why then not also use * [star] and † [cross] for birth and death dates (2.11.13)?

Relations between bibliographic entities

When it comes to relationships between the bibliographic entities, we find it confusing that the rules can be read to say that these can be noted in one of two (or both)

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

directions. We think this is not the intent of the rules, as only some of these relationships are core elements. We think it would be useful to give a general recommendation to record the relationships only in one direction (the one most useful for automatic gathering and reuse of the data). The redundancy of double references is something our systems should be designed to rid us of.

Table of contents

The table of contents is far too big to be able to grasp. Presumably it will look very different in a web environment!

Rule-specific comments

0.4.3.4 The principle of representation
The definition "the name or form of name most commonly found in resources associated with that person…or a well-accepted name or form of name in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data". Do not these two options create too many choices? And do not the two options somewhat contradict each other?

0.4.3.8 Common usage or practice.
This paragraph refers the cataloguer to commonly know practise, but that must be given that the cataloguer is aware of that practise?

0.5 The definitions of section 1-2 are quite unspecific "most commonly used". Is that in accordance with the meaning of the FRBR report?

0.6 The relationship between 0.6 and 1.3 must be stated more clearly. As it is now we question the need of both.

0.6.1 The second paragraph mentions "a resource", something which is not mentioned in the following paragraphs. In the third paragraph the text again talks about "an entity associated with a resource". We suppose that it refers to the works-expressions-manifestations-items that the resource represents, but it could also be interpreted as other related entities.

0.6.2 Why no RDA hotlinks to the rules?

There is a strong bias to printed material in the parts on publishing, distribution etc. This could and should be expressed in a more general, all-inclusive, way, for example are broadcaster, production company, and date of creation for unpublished materials missing.

Identifier for the manifestation: Would it not be advisable to include all

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

easily available identifiers at core level to ensure absolute retrievability of the resource, and increase the possibilities to add to the record later on?

0.6.3   Links to chapters containing examples would be appreciated!

Is a preferred title always needed, even if the authors are different? Do we need to create different preferred titles for two books both named "Stockholm" even if they have different authors? (Compare 5.5. which can be read to mean that this is not needed. Please clarify!)

The list starting with "form of work", does this express a preferred order? In that case it should be more clearly expressed.

Language of expression should have an addition about "if applicable". The expression does not always have a language.

0.6.4   Why is "date of birth/death" so far down in the list? That is usually the element first added, even before title etc.
Why is "other designator" added, even when not needed?

There might in some countries be legal obstacles to adding all information required, above all for now living persons.

0.10.2   Third paragraph.
This prescription must be functionally integrated with the product RDA.
As always, we prefer ISO standards to be used.

0.10.4   Dates
We would definitely want to see more strict rules here concerning the recording of dates. A preferred ISO standard should be used. Institutions wanting to display the dates in another way can then do that, as long as the system can interpret the dates unambiguously.

0.10.5   Second paragraph. We would like to see the second sentence here removed. Agencies preferring another system of measure can have that automatically converted to in that case. Even playing speeds for analog tapes should be registered in cm per seconds.
Records must be internationally exchangeable.

0.11   Not only language codes should follow an ISO standard, but also country codes etc. ISO standards should always be preferred.

Are translations regarded as "substitute vocabulary encoding schemes"?

1.   In general we find the information given in chapter 1 very detailed. Could not some of it had been saved for the coming chapters?

1.1.3   Mode of issuance
Are these really the only possible issuance modes? What about

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

collections, analytical cataloguing?

1.2   Compare this list with the one in 0.4.3. This is the same but contains less "principles". How come?

1.3   The core elements listed are just a repetition of 0.6.2. Why?
The only extra information is the phrase "Include any additional… by the cataloguer" (See also comment under 0.6)

1.4   P. 7
Is the exception optional, or is it mandatory?
The rules given here are complicated, with alternatives, additions and exceptions that sometimes seem to lead to different results. Was that the intention of the rule?

1.5.1   Why include this paragraph when everything written in it is included in the following paragraphs?

1.7   Always prescribe exactly following the source. We are not in favour of the alternative rule. Catalogues are not local anymore. Information is shared and must therefore be structured in the same way in every catalogue.

1.7.1   What does "If data is derived from a digital source…" imply?

1.7.3   Transcribe exactly according to the source of information.

1.7.6   Transcribe exactly according to the source of information.

1.7.8   Transcribe exactly according to the source of information. Why abbreviate at all? Skip Appendix B!

1.7.9   ALWAYS make a note correcting the accuracy, even if the error is not considered important. Important cataloguer's time is saved, not lost, by noting this. As we share records, not doing so will force other cataloguers to check if the inaccuracy is an error in the record or not. If note is not used the old [sic.] code will still be needed.

1.8.2   The examples are given in the wrong order.

1.8.3   Transcribe exactly according to the source of information.

1.8.4   Second example should say 1961-1962

1.8.5   Transcribe exactly according to the source of information.

1.9   Are dates supposed to be typed in the bibliographic record according to the rules of the cataloguing agency or be automatically generated from recorded codes following an ISO standard? We would definitely prefer the latter.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

1.9.2.5ff   MARC tagging is much clearer. Is e.g. 1800s referring to uncertainty 1800-1899 or 1800-1809?

1.10   The focus is again very much on printed resources.
We are not in favour of the alternative. If the alternative stays, there should at least be a phrase describing the consequences of following in-house guidelines!

2.   General comments.
As a whole we consider the chapter far too long and complex. There should be ways of writing the information in a more easy-to-read, understandable way.

All the rules concerning resources in unpublished form should be merged into one place in this chapter.

2.1.2.3   Is the list set up in a preferred order? This should in that case be stated.

2.1.2.4   "A source of information identifying the current iteration of the resource as a whole" - Here an example is needed.

2.2   Very complicated rules for sources of information, particularly when it comes to non-book resources, cf. the IASA Cataloguing Rules, attached as an addendum at the end of this document with comments by Olle Johansson, National Library of Sweden.

2.2.2.2   "Sources in which the information is formally presented"
An example is needed here as well.

2.2.2.3   "Embedded metadata in textual form". This could be applicable also for resources under 2.2.2.2, e.g. JPEG pictures

2.2.2.4   We propose that you merge this paragraph with 2.2.2.3.

2.2.4   This list must be compared to other lists, such as the ones in 0.6.2 and 1.3, to become understandable. Is there no other alternative way of displaying this? E.g. using a matrix, hierarchical levels?

2.3.1.4   Is it not a bit unnecessary to have so many examples of other title information?

2.3.2.6   Wrong numbering. In RDA it is registered as 2.3.2.10.
Optional addition "either …or" Should one of the options be preferred?

2.3.2.9   We do not like the alternative. If the alternative is going to be used, then use it only for collections.

2.3.2.10   Again we find the optionality given here a bit confusing.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

2.4.1.5   The statement within brackets [and six others] is not easily transferable to other languages. Why not use a machine-readable code here instead? At least the ISBD punctuation (…) clearly translates to "information being left out".
More examples wanted.

2.4.1.6   This rule is not 100 % clear. Are all statements of responsibility supposed to be registered, also secondary statements? When you deal with film etc., this rule could lead to many statements having to be registered.
More examples wanted.

2.4.2.3   Statement of responsibility relating to title.
This paragraph sounds very much like the rules stated in Statement of responsibility. Is it really needed?

2.5.1.2   Each item, a-h, should have a link to its respective rule in RDA

2.5.1.4   Example "Director's cut". Cf 6.13.1.3
Do the two rules not contradict each other? Is the edition statement here parallel to expression in 6.13.1.3? A director's cut is normally not an edition statement, but is clearly a new expression.

2.5.2.1   *Version* should be included in the 3rd paragraph.

2.5.2.3   Is this not the same example list as in 2.5.1.4? Why register it in two places?
Why add something in brackets that the cataloguer cannot be sure of. The information will still be given in an "edition field" and presented as "Edition statement" in an OPAC, so the information will be clear anyway.

2.5.2.6   If the edition statement is part of the title proper it is not registered in any other way. Does this not complicate the extraction of the different FRBR levels?
Examples are needed.

2.5.6.3
2.5.6.4   Is *corr.* something that is abbreviated already in the resource??

2.6.3.3   Optional addition: Should not additions from other calendars be optional, if the cataloguing agency is not part of the world that uses the Gregorian or Julian calendar? As the rule is written up right now, it shows a bias towards using Gregorian/Julian calendars.

2.7   Production statement.
It could be emphasised that the rule only concerns unpublished resources to avoid confusion with production statements for motion pictures.
Broadcaster should be mentioned in this chapter.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

2.7.1.5.2 Are multiple 260-fields possible according to RDA?
If not, what does RDA prescribe?

2.7.2.3 Place of production.
Is this rule not somewhat contradicted by 2.7.2.6.1 where the larger jurisdiction is mentioned only if necessary for identification? Is not 2.7.2.6.1 (according to us a better rule) sufficient?

2.7.2.6.2 BC - we would like to see ALL abbreviations written out. No exception for states in the U.S.A.

2.7.4.4,
2.8.4.4 The statement of function should preferably be given in coded form

2.7.6.3 If the date is known to be false, but the correct date is not known, what action is required then? Cf 2.8.2.3 and 2.8.4.3.

2.7.6.7 Exact date should be registered, but no standard for dates is given.
Of course an ISO standard should be used, in this case ISO 8601

2.8 We find it "notable" that place of publication is optional.

2.8.2.6 *Place of publication not identified, Publisher not identified*
2.8.4.7 We find it a bit peculiar to write such a long phrase in English, a phrase that cannot easily be interpreted by a machine to another language. The code-like [S.l.] and [s.n.] can however be easily interpreted to something else in the language of the cataloguing agency. We would therefore propose to keep them as they are.

2.8.4.7
2.8.6.6 Here the text talks about unpublished resources, but could not this be mentioned earlier in 2.8 at a more general level? Cf 2.9.6.6, where unpublished resources and date of distribution is mentioned.

2.8.6.4 Earlier in RDA there was another rule concerning chronograms not saying exactly the same as this.

2.10.1.4 Here it states clearly that manufacturer should be included. Is that not a bit unnecessary? This is already recorded in the list of core elements.

2.12.8 Why is not the ISSN-L (Linking ISSN) included somewhere in RDA. This must truly be a standard supporting FRBR and should be encouraged to use!
Why is ISSN of series not a core element? Why not allow the ISSN to be taken from any source?

2.13.1.3 The columns should have headings to make their content clearer.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

2.15.1.4 The ISRC example belongs to expression 6.14.
A 13 digit ISMN should be included as an example.
A video number should also be included. They were not present in AACR2, but are now frequently used.

2.15.1.5 What if there are several correct identifiers (or several "expressions" of the same identifier) for the manifestation, e.g. ISBN-10 and ISBN-13, EAN etc. Cf. 2.16.1.7

2.15.2 Why keep music rules separate?
This rule should be included in 2.15.1.4

2.20.2.3 Notes on original title, previous titles etc.
This is too important to register just in a note. It should be recorded as a controlled statement.
Regarding the optional omission (to record the source) perhaps from the end user's perspective this has no relevance, but this does not apply when it comes to the bibliographic work and possibilities to identify the resource. A cataloguer's note on the source is always valuable.

2.20.5.3 "Make a note … if this information is not recorded as part of numbering of serials element." As 2.6 is a core element it seems to us that this note should never need to be given?!

3 As stated in our general comments we are happy with the fact that the old confusion within the GBD is now gone. But will these new types, in combination, allow us to extract from the catalogue what we really want? We believe that MARC might have some troubles adapting to Chapter 3.

The lists in chapter 3 need to be expanded considerably, particularly when it comes to non printed material, such as images, three-dimensional forms etc. Many terms are still lacking. Maybe the JSC needs to cooperate more with the museum and archival communities here to make a good product also for other institutions than libraries?

3.2 The term "Media Type" is a bit strange to us. Do we not actually mean "Intermediation type" or "Intermediation device"?

3.2.1.2 This is the only table with a heading "Table 3.1". How come? All tables should be clearly named, preferably in a way so that they cannot get mixed up with rules.

The word "computer" here is a bit strange to us. It is not really in the same category as the other words. However we understand the intention: something designed for use with a computer.

Where do we put e.g. objects here? Unmediated carriers?

The term "unmediated carriers" is also very difficult - at least in our

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

language. And it might lead to misunderstandings, especially for media like braille, where the users actually are looking for resources that might be categorised as "mediated".

The Swedish Library of Talking Books and braille has forwarded a comment about the term "unmediated" (which of course also applies to its use in ISBD area 0). They find the word hard to understand, and at best a bit ambiguous as they, and their equivalents in other countries, has as main task the production of "accessible media" designed for readers who cannot assimilate printed text. For example, to describe braille as unmediated could cause confusion as it is exactly the "mediated" character ("mediated" in the meaning "made accessible") that makes the resource interesting to the end user. They propose that the list of media types is extended.

The qualifier "tactile" is too general when talking about braille books according to the Swedish Library of Talking Books and braille. There are sometimes tactile images inside the braille books as well.

Lists are not complete, in the examples there are terms that are not on them, e.g. "videodisc"

3.4   In the instructions on recording extent we find the rules and accompanying examples not always clear. "Extent" is the number of units and/or subunits. "Unit" is a physical or logical constituent of a resource (e.g., a volume, audiocassette, film reel, or a map or digital file), whilst "Subunit" is a physical or logical subdivision of a unit (e.g., a page of a volume, a frame of a microfiche, or a record in a digital file).

The examples seem to mix these concepts, making it unclear which should be considered the unit and which the subunit:
3 microfiche (1 score (118 pages))
1 online resource (1 program file : 96 statements)
1 atlas (3 volumes)
1 atlas (1 volume (various pagings))

3.4.4.2   This appears to be a list of mixed terms of production methods and function and/or form of the material. It needs to be worked through thoroughly.

3.5   Is it not a bit of redundancy to record dimensions that are standard for a specific carrier type?

3.5.1.6   The examples look different. In one example you have "24-28 cm", in the next "150 to 210 cm". Is it really up to the cataloguer to decide whether to use "-" or "to"?

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

3.8.1.3   Recording mounts.
           No list is included here and it is really wanted. It is very important for
           people involved in digitisation.

3.14.1.2   Why are the terms in "form of print" just added in the running text and not
           as a term list, like it is usually done in RDA?

3.19   We take it for granted that the various lists within this chapter are to be
           looked upon as *examples* of different types, formats etc., not as
           exhaustive.

4.2.1.2   Use ISO-standards for abbreviations of currencies!

4.6   Add URN as a valid address of a remote resource.

5.1.4   The first meaning of the paragraph should be "The *access* point, preferred
           access…"

5.2   Representation.
           Should not something be said already here, as an alternative at least,
           about the language being used, and preferred, in the catalogue?

6.1.3.3.2 This chapter should be clearer about the fact that this has to do with *any
           change*, and that also the title of the work changes in this case.
           It could be clearer if this does not imply a new work, but only a change in
           the existing title.

6.2   Is it really necessary to give so much information in this chapter before
           reaching the paragraphs on construction of access points?

6.2.1.3   The note "When those guidelines refer to an appendix..." is stated many
           times in Chapter 6. Is it really needed to repeat it everywhere? Is it not
           obvious?

6.2.1.7   Initial articles.
           We do NOT agree to the omission of initial articles. This might work fairly
           well in the English language, but does not do so in many other languages.
           We do understand that this rule is due to shortcomings in American library
           systems. In the rest of the world we have been able to handle initial articles
           in titles since the 1970s.
           If this set of rules is intended for international use then the rule of omission
           of initial articles should just be an alternative - with a clear intention to have
           the alternative rule removed as soon as possible.

6.2.2.2   The division of works created before and after 1500 is very text-centred.

6.2.2.4   "Choose the title proper of the first resource received as the preferred title."
           Here a note is needed in the record to indicate why this specific title was

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

used. And why not use the first resource in the country of the cataloguing agency?
Actually the most common thing is that the original title stays as it was created. The best known title only applies to a few cases.

6.2.2.6 Anonymous Classics must be mentioned as a preferred source to use.

6.2.2.11 We are a bit amazed that the word *conventional title* has found its way back into the rules…

6.2.3.4 Alternative linguistic form as variant titles for the work. Do not most titles have an alternative linguistic form? Does this imply that every work title have potential variant titles in all the world's languages?

We take it for granted that most variant forms automatically become extra added entries in our library systems.

Why not link all access points together through e.g. Linked Data and/or by using URI or other ID-numbers?

6.3.1.3 Why is there no term list for this paragraph?
Some examples are really hard to grasp, especially when the form is written as it is separated from the rest of its title, e.g. the two Ocean's eleven-examples.

6.4 An example where you add an exact date should be added,
e.g. 2009-01-23

6.5 Why is country given for all countries except the U.S.A. and Canada? Are the rules still primarily for North America?

6.6.1.3 Is not "Old-Saxon poem" form?

6.8 The examples here are very long! Why not link to information given elsewhere instead, e.g. dbpedia, Wikipedia. Should cataloguers really be encouraged to this type of encyclopedical efforts?

6.10 Why is not the same order being used as in 0.6?
The examples in Appendix M have not been updated according to the instructions in 6.10.

We might be a bit more in favour of the proposed ISBD division of content type. It is more hierarchical and easy to follow. In any case the two different definitions must be unified. Most important: all information must be able to express in coded form. Once it is coded it is up to the cataloguing institution or OPAC to decide how that information is displayed.

Tactile music should be *tactile notated music*

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

6.10.1.3   No table is named *Table 6.1.* But we suppose it is the table following the text?

6.12   Language of Expression should state "if applicable".

6.12.1.4   How is an expression with a choice of languages treated? E.g. a DVD-Video with a choice of languages?
Is there no limitation at all to the number of pages being given? That can result in a lot of languages for some media types.

6.13.1.3   Cf our comments on 2.5.1.4

6.14   ISRC should be included. Cf our comments on 2.15.1.4

6.14.1.3   The LC control number is registered differently in the two examples

6.15.1.3.4 We find the expression "with the same non-distinctive title" somewhat peculiar. We would actually have preferred the old formulation from the now removed 6.15.1.4.4 "titles ... that include the name of a type of composition".
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

6.16.0.3.2 Text from AACR2, 25.30B1, p. 523: "Record the medium of performance specifically, but do not record more than three elements ..." – is nowhere to be found. Why?
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

6.16.0.6.5 Is it really a good thing to propose this change? Cf. AACR2 "record *keyboard instrument*. Is that rule not just as good?
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

6.16.0.9.2 Is it not strange to have an example of clarinets (2) here, when the rule on recording more than one instrument does not appear until 6.16.0.14?

6.16.0.13.1 Examples under a) accordion/violin/choral instrument and under b) *melody instrument/piano* should not be given here according to Exception under 6.16.0.13.3 b)
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

6.16.0.13.2 and 6.16.0.13.3 should change places, cf AACR2 25.30B11 a)
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

6.16.0.13.3 a) could be better phrased - are not all works intended for voices and/or instruments? It is however, the exact same phrasing as in AACR2 25.30B11 a)
Don't the two rules 6.16.0.13.3 and 6.16.0.13.1 somewhat contradict each other?
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

6.20.5.3 Footnote 18
Does not this footnote appertain to manifestations?

6.21.3.3 Is this an alternative way of recording dates?

6.23.2.6 Apocryphal books should be treated according to 6.2.2.5 Exception
"*choose as the preferred title an established title in the language preferred
by the agency*". The apocrypha of the New Testament should be treated as
a unit when they are published together, compare the treatment of the *Nag
Hammadi scriptures*, and the *Book of the Dead*.
(Specific comment from the specialist on Biblical literature at the National
Library of Sweden)

6.23.2.9 As we have stated in earlier comments, we would prefer keeping the
information about which testament a book of the Bible belongs to. Also, we
see no real point in not using the well-established abbreviations for the Old
and New Testament. If American states keep their abbreviations, then why
not keep them as well for the old and new testaments?

6.25.1.4 Footnotes.
"…in its narrow sense of a translation". Why then not call it "translation"?
Also applies to 6.30.3.2

6.27.1.2 Collaborative works: preferred access point for two or more
persons/families/corporate bodies responsible. See the alternative where
all are mentioned (very different options)?! Is this not going back to some
very old catalogue rules? This is how we catalogued in Sweden long
before AACR2. These instructions also differ from the ones on constructing
preferred access points for the manifestation, how come?

6.27.1.2.8 "First in the first resource received"
Actually one could make the choice almost up to the cataloguer's
judgement instead. In any case a note is needed to indicate why a specific
form was selected.

6.27.1.5 In the exception the phrase "is commonly cited by title" seems very vague.
This must be better specified.

6.27.1.6 In the paragraph there are two alternatives **a,** and **c**. Is there a **b** missing?
Otherwise **c** should be transformed to **b**.

6.27.1.7 When a person has many different identities it would seem more logical to
use the identity used on the original/first resource embodying the work
rather than the one "most frequently used".

6.27.4.2 Extremely heavy paragraphs. Could they not be expressed somewhat
lighter, for example by using bulleted lists? Also applies to: 6.27.4.3,
6.30.5.1, 6.30.5.2, 6.30.5.3, 6.31.3.2

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

6.27.4.4   Why add motion picture in the Blade runner examples? Is not the edition statement enough to distinguish between the expressions?

6.28.1.6.2 Why does this not come already under preferred title?
(Specific comment from the Swedish Music Group)

7.   Describing content.
What is this actually - just the leftovers from the catalogue record once everything else had been FRBRised? In any case we do think that it could have been better structured.

7.7   Intended audience.
RDA prescribes the use of intended audience when this information is important for identification or for selecting. How decide when this information is needed for selecting? The information about intended audience is valuable not only to distinguish between different works or expressions, but also has a value for works and expressions that are unique. This information is, for example, very valuable for a national bibliographic agency that needs to register statistics about different kinds of literature, in this case literature intended for a specific audience. Would not a list of approved of terms be useful, a list from which national bibliographic agencies, and others could select which terms would be needed for their purposes? Note that each country (corresponding) may need their own specific lists, not only for terminology reasons but also to assign correct scope for nationally defined groups (e.g. for teaching media).

7.10   Summarisation of the content.
Could the definition of this paragraph not be made clearer? Is not content the same as a summary of work + expression, i.e. work (=plot)?
The last example on p. 15 is of an item, is it not?

7.11   Place and date of capture, compare IASA rules; Place, date and circumstance of recording.

7.12   Language of the content, should be "if applicable".
Again, compare with a DVD-Video with a choice of languages. Should all be recorded?

7.12.1.3   Language of the content should be expressed by using coded information instead, not through written notes. It limits the usability and leads to redundancy.

7.13.4.3   More terms are needed in this list
Is not braille at manifestation level?

7.13.4.4   Proposed new example: Contains braille applicated in original printed book

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

7.17
7.18   Do these two paragraphs belong to the manifestation or the expression?

7.22   We note that duration is considered something describing the content
            rather than the extent. Should it be like that?
            Playing time is a difficult subject for moving images, since films are shown
            with 24 fps and videos with 25 fps. The playing time is longer for the film
            shown at cinemas than the video that you watch at home or see on TV. In
            other words: different manifestations of the same work/expression can
            have different durations.

7.23-24   Performer etc., artistic credits.
            Why is this recorded here and not in chapter 8?
            Compare also the IASA rules 7.B7. Do production companies belong here?

8.2   Have this objectives and principles been thoroughly compared to the ones
            in ICP?

8.3   Explanation to "undifferentiated name" is lacking.

8.11   In this paragraph it is stated that an "undifferentiated name indicator"
            should be added to each person, family, or institution that cannot be
            distinguished from another person, family or institution. How will this
            function in practise? How can a cataloguer be sure that two works written
            by someone with the same or similar name are or are not by the same
            person? Is it not enough to imply that, e.g. all personal names without any
            addition, such as year of birth, are undifferentiated? And can you ever be
            sure that a name is 100 % unique before you have added a unique
            identifier to the name?

9-11   The chapters on identifying persons, families and corporate bodies contain
            much repeated information when it comes to choosing names and
            constructing access points. Although this fact will perhaps not be as
            obvious in the online product we think these chapters would benefit from a
            clearer structure

9.2.2.5.3   Impossible to see what is alternative and what is instruction - the line in the
            margin is missing.

9.2.2.6   "…clearly most commonly known"
            Is that a very easy-to-take decision? Will this not very much be up to the
            cataloguer to decide?

9.2.2.26   Phrase naming another work by the person.
            It would be advisable to add that this phrase should be complemented by a
            link to the other work.

9.2.3.7   The two examples with Proulx and McShane should be in paragraph
            9.2.3.10 instead. They are not earlier names.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

9.3.2.3 ISO standards for recording dates should be used here and not a phrase written in the cataloguer's language. A controlled form of date can be transferred to any language at display. This applies to 9.3.3 also of course.

9.5 Which is the relationship between fuller form of name and variant name? Are they not very close?

9.13 Affiliation.
Could not this be expressed in the form of a link to a corporate body?

9.19.1.5 A standard phrase would be preferable here - or a way of coding the information to make it easily translatable to other languages.

9.19.1.6 We suppose that the additions added to Big Hand and PSK-13 are not because they conflict with others by the same name, but because it would otherwise not be clear that the name referred to a person ("a prase not conveying the idea of a person").

10.2.2.7 We suppose that resources associated with the old name of a family will still be associated with that old name?

10.6.1.3 The link to a prominent member of the family should be expressed through some kind of relation. Information about the prominent member's role in the family should also be given.

10.7.1 Should not information about from when a hereditary title is associated with a family be given?

11.2.2.7 Why is the usage of spaces in acronyms in names of institutions differing from that of personal names?

11.2.2.23 "If English is not an official language..."
Why one rule for English, and then another rule for all other languages?

11.2.2.24.1We appreciate the fact that American states in this chapter have been written out in full and have not only been given as abbreviations. But is it really intentional?

11.2.3.5 Are these variant forms really needed in a digital environment and a computerised catalogue of the 21st century?

11.5 Why not say "Related Institution" instead?

17.5 There is no recommendation regarding which direction the relationship should take (this also applies to 17.6, 17.7, 17.8 (core), 17.9, 17.10, 17.22 and 17.12)

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

19	The typography of the whole chapter is a bit peculiar.
	P. 13 Example "The quitter": We only consider the two first mentioned qualified enough to eget preferred access points. Is there any particular reason in RDA why all are considered equally important?
	P. 25 Example Kosovo: (Republic): is that not a bit premature. The new country has not been recognized everywhere yet.
	P. 30 Example Clinton: Why make two entries for the president, both in his function as president and as private person? In this case he acts solely as president.
	P. 38 Example Lithuania and German occupation: Remeikis should have an access point as well.
19.2.1.3.1	Example p. 7, Hines, Earl: Why is he a creator associated with a work (and not expression)? Cf example Chapter 20, p. 10: Ruiz, Adrian
20	The examples of musical recordings have been mixed up between the two chapters 19 and 20. They need to be gone through and reorganised.
D	We would like to se those elements belonging to the core set of elements marked up here.
D.2.1	The examples contain a General Material Designation (GMD). This has also been removed from the ISBD now and should be excluded from the examples.
D, p14	How come 033 and 037 #f and #g are N/A?
D, p15	055 and 060 are registered as N/A, but can they not exist for the item? Does the same apply to 083, but then for the work?
D, p38	Is this not another expression primarily?
M	Content type not updated according to 6.10 (se e.g. p.21 "moving image")
	Extent should use terminology from Carrier type (see e.g. p.5 "CD")
	Two copyright dates given in example (p.5)?! Referring to audio and computer accessible content? Does this really align with 2.11.1.3 ("record only the latest")?!
	P. 25 Video recording example compared with p. 2 Audio recording book example. Creator on p. 2 is the same as the person being registered in 100, but on p. 25 it is 700. How come?
E.2.2.2	This whole paragraph is just a repetition of information already stated elsewhere.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

Glossary

Some definitions missing (Broadcast standard, Data type, File type, Object type, Regional encoding, Representation of cartographic images, Transmission speed, Three-dimensional moving image). (It has already been noted in the cover letter and the wiki that many words in the RDA that should be defined are still missing in the Glossary)

Some other words that should have been entries in the Glossary, but are also are: Technical credits, Narrator, Presenter). Many see/see also-"arrows" are missing.

"Computer": we find the definition confusing

Language of a person: "the language ... when writing" is that really what is meant. The person could write in a different language than he/she uses for thinking!

Preferred access point: "the standardised access point": Is this really the full explanation?

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

Typos and incorrect references in RDA

The following comments are (most often) stated as RDA rule number:paragraph:row (for example "1.1.2:4:1" RDA number 1.1.2, first row in fourth paragraph). When needed sometimes also page and/or other information is given (for example 2.6.3.3, p95, last paragraph).
From our list we have excluded (many!) errors reported on the wiki (https://wiki.nla.gov.au/display/RDATE/RDA+text+errors+home+page) as of 30 January 2009, unless we feel we have something to add to the identified error.

GENERAL

In our reading we have not checked the references and below we report only the ones obviously incorrect. The great amount of these makes us worry about the online product. It is paramount that the references are present and correct (and pointing to the right level!) for the functionality of an online RDA. Some other general comments:

- Many RDA hotlinks/hyperlinks missing (some noted below). Sometimes missing spaces before RDA hotlinks (many in Appendix F). Sometimes there seems to be extra spaces after the RDA hotlink, which causes errors in following rows (see for example 2.19.1.3:1:3, 2.20.9.4.1:1:3, 3.4.4.2, p33, sixth paragraph, second row, etc.). RDA hotlinks missing all through Appendix D (probably because this was given as addendum).
- In our main comments we note that punctuation is often given in the examples, which we feel is against the intent of RDA not to state how information should be presented. Below we have not noted all occurrences of punctuation, but see for example square brackets in 2.10.2.6.1, p155, third example and 2.10.2.6.4, first example.
- Term lists are sometimes given with bullets, and sometimes not.
- Lists of for example sources given in order of preference are sometimes given ordered abc (see 9.2.2.2), sometimes i, ii, iii and sometimes without any ordering mark at all.
- In spite of the rule in 8.5.6 many examples of names containing initials lack spaces after full stops (see for example 9.2.2.5.1, fourth example "I.C. McIlwaine", 9.2.2.5.3, p15, second example "A.N. Scriabin", 9.2.2.8:2:1 "J.I.M. Stewart" et cetera). Some of these are noted in the wiki.
- Chapter 19 was very hard to read because of missing spaces between words. For this chapter we have not noted the separate errors below, the chapter requires a total proof-reading.
- Many double spaces in document, especially in examples and chapter 3.
- Often wrong typeface/bold/italics in examples (some, but not all noted below). Some new rows missing.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

0.5, p11, last in section	Appendix M missing in the list of RDA sections
2.3.4.5, first example	"[" in heading, "]" in first row. Square brackets should not be given in examples, if these are not to state anything about how the information can be presented.
2.6.2.2 - 2.6.9.2	The order between these sections is perhaps not clear enough
2.9.4.7:2	The first paragraph is repeated as first sentence in the second paragraph.
2.9.4.7:2:3	RDA hyperlink missing
2.10.1.2:2:1	Incorrect reference? Should be "2.3.2.2"?!
2.10.4.7:1:2	Extra space before "."
2.10.6.7:1:2	Space missing ".For"
2.12.1.1:5:3	Extra ")"
2.12.1.6.2:1:4	Space missing ".Make"
2.12.4.3, examples	Unclear examples. What does the resource look like?
2.12.10.4, example	Unclear example?
2.12.11.3:1:2	Extra "]"
2.12.11.3, examples	Examples could be clearer
2.13.1.3:table	No heading for table?! This comment applies to all tables in RDA (except 3.1!).
2.13.1.3:table, third entry	Tab stop missing
2.15.1.1:2:5-7	Nonsense rows
2.19.1.4, example	Example could be clearer
2.20.2.4, second example	Type grade last word
2.20.7.5.3, examples	Examples could be clearer
3.4.1.7.4:1:4	"3.4.3" -> "3.4.2"
3.4.3.1:1:1	"3.4.3.3-3.4.2.2" [sic]??
3.4.3.1:2:2	Incorrect reference? (cartographic)?
3.4.5.3, p38, third paragraph, second row	RDA hotlink missing
3.5.3.3:1:5	Extra "g" before "("
3.6.1.3, p76, first paragraph, fifth row	"3.6.1.4" -> "3.6.2"? (there is no 3.6.1.4)
3.6.2.3:2:1	Type grade
3.7.1.3, p80, first paragraph, third row	"3.7.1.4" -> "3.7.2"
3.9.1.3, p84, third paragraph, third row	"3.9.1.4" -> "3.9.2"
3.9.1.3, p84, third paragraph, fifth row	"3.9.1.5" -> "3.9.3"
3.11.1.3:5:3	"3.11.1.4" -> "3.11.2.3"
3.16.2.3, p105 examples	Are the examples really ok?!
3.17.1.1:3-5:2	Incorrect references 3.12, 3.16. "3.15" -> "3.16"
3.18.1.1:3-5:2	Incorrect references 3.12, 3.16. "3.15" -> "3.16"

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

3.18.1.3, p117, first paragraph, third row	There is no "3.18.4"
3.18.2.1:2:2	RDA hotlink missing
4.6.1.3:4:2	RDA hotlink missing
5.1.1:1:1	RDA hotlink missing
5.1.1:1:1	spaces missing "andvariant", "pointare"
5.2:2:1	"works and expressions" should not be in italics
5.2:4-5:1	Spaces missing after first "."
5.4:3:2	RDA hotlink should be before "."
6.1.3.1, p3, first paragraph	List should be numbered a-b, not i-ii
6.1.3.3.1:3:5	Extra RDA hotlink
6.2.1.9:1:2	RDA hotlink looks strange
6.2.2.5, p13, first example	Last row should not be bold
6.2.2.7, p17, fourth paragraph, third row	"Manuscript" should be in italics
6.2.3.4, p27, second example	First row should be bold
6.2.3.4, p29	"Different Transliteration" should be bold
6.2.3.5, p30, third row	"Three men and a baby" wrong typegrade
6.3:1:2	"See" missing before RDA number and hotlink
6.8.1.3, second example	Type face and grade in whole example
6.9.1.3:1:2	"responsibile" - > "responsible"
6.10.1.3, p48 "tactile music"	Shouldn´t "tactile music" read "tactile notated music"? See also general remarks
6.20.1:3:1-2	"6.16.2" -> "6.20.4", RDA hotlink missing. "6.16.3" -> "6.20.5", RDA hotlink missing
6.20.2:2:2	RDA hotlink missing
6.20.5.4, first and second example	First row should be bold
6.23.2.9.3, p113, footnotes	There should not be parantheses in the footnotes
6.27.1.4:3:2	Incorrect reference (6.15.2)
6.27.1.6:1:1	The list now reads a) c). Is b) missing? If not, the c) should be changed to a b).
6.27.1.7:1:2	RDA hotlink missing
6.27.1.9, p159, first example, seventh row	Double ")"
6.27.2.2, p160, fourth row	RDA hotlink missing
6.27.2.2, p161, last paragraph, third row	Extra RDA hotlink
6.28.1.6.3 (addendum), p45: second row	"orc" -> "or"
6.29.1.20.1:1:5	Extra RDA hotlink
6.29.1.30:1:2-3	Either add RDA hotlink or just write "below"
6.29.1.32:1:2	Extra RDA hotlink
6.30.2.2, p263, "exception"	Typography: paragraphs should be marked with line along the side (on this page, and the

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

	following?)
6.30.3.1:1:5	Extra RDA hotlink
6.30.5.3:1:5	Extra RDA hotlink
7.4.1.3, p4, second paragraph, second row	Space missing before reference
7.17.1.3:3-6:3	Incorrect references. Should be 7.17.1.5 -> 7.17.2?! RDA hotlink also missing here. 7.17.1.6 -> 7.17.3? 7.17.1.7 -> 7.17.4? 7.17.1.8 -> 7.17.5?
7.17.2.3	The example seems to come too early in the text
7.24.4.3:1:5	RDA hotlink missing
8.4:1:1-2	Wrong format for paragraph.
8.5.2:1:2	RDA hotlink looks strange
8.5.7:1:2	RDA hotlink looks strange
9.2.2.1:1:1	""preferred name for the person" should be bold, not in italics
9.2.2.5.3:1:footnote	Footnote in wrong place, should come right before examples
9.2.2.9:4:2	Double RDA hotlink, looks strange
9.2.2.9.2, p26, second paragraph, second row	Extra space before RDA hotlink
9.2.2.10:3:2	Extra RDA hotlink given within brackets?!
9.4.1.4:1:1	"given" -> "given in", why are references not given as "9.4.1.4.1-9.4.1.4.3 RDA"?
9.6.1.2:1:2	Extra space before "."
10.2.1.2:2:2	"10.2.2.2.2" -> "10.2.2.2"
10.2.1.3 - 10.2.2	The heading "Name" seems to represent a new kind of typography for headings?! (noted in wiki)
10.2.2.8:3:1-5	There must be a way to express this paragraph in a simpler way
10.2.3.5:1:1	"10.6" -> "10.7"
10.8.1.3, p 15, second paragraph, second row	Space missing before reference "see10.3"
10.10.2.1:3:2	RDA hotlink missing
11.0.4.1:4:1	"Corporate body" should be in italics
11.2.2.5.4	This RDA rule includes two abc-sequences, i.e. there are two 11.2.2.5.4a etc.
11.2.2.13:3-4	References and RDA hotlinks missing. Should be 11.2.2.19 and 11.2.2.30?!
11.2.2.14:1:2	"11.2.2.18" -> "11.2.2.19"?
11.2.2.18:1:3	RDA hotlink missing
11.2.2.18, p35, second paragraph, third row	"11.2.3-11.2.2.16" [sic] ?!
11.2.2.30:heading	"Subordinate Bodies" -> "Subordinate Religious Bodies"?
11.3.1.2:1:2	Space missing "bodyfrom"
11.6.1.3:1:2	"11.7.1.4-11.4.1.8" [sic]?!
11.7.1.3:1:3-4	No hyperlink?!
16.2.2.8:1:2	RDA hotlink missing
16.2.3.6, p17, second	Wrong type grade

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

paragraph, row 2-6	
17.1.2:1:1	"terms" and "and" should not be in italics (partly reported on wiki)
17.4.2.2:2:3	RDA hotlink missing
18.5.1.3:1:2	RDA hotlink missing
18.6:2:6	"2.20.7" -> "2.20.9"
19	Missing spaces all through chapter (especially in 19.2.1.1 and 19.3.1.3), many - but not all - reported on the wiki
19.0:1:2	Wrong format on line between "work-creators"
19.1.2:1:2	Extra RDA hotlink
19.1.2:2:4	Extra RDA hotlink
19.2.1.1, p3, middle of page	RDA hotlink missing
19.2.1.1, p4, last row before 19.2.1.2	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3:1:3	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3.2:1:4	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3.2.1:1:1	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3.2.1, p40, first row	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3.2.6:1:6	RDA hotlink missing
19.3.3:1:4	Extra RDA hotlink
19.3.3.1:2:1	Extra RDA hotlink
20.0:1:3	Wrong format on line "expression-editors"
21.0:1:2	Wrong format on line after "manifestation"
21.1.2:1:2	RDA hotlink missing
21.1.2:2:4	RDA hotlink missing
21.4.1.2:1:2	RDA hotlink missing - in the wiki "code ref as ref" is noted. Perhaps same meaning?
21.4.1.3:1:4	RDA hotlink missing (as above)
24.5.1.3, p7, fourth paragraph	Wrong type grade
24.6.1.3:1:5	Double reference
24.6.1.3, p10, last example	Typography; missing frame
31.1.1.3:1:3	RDA hotlink missing
A.8:1	Extra spaces all through section
A.28:4:1	Reference looks strange
B.5.4	"B9" -> "B.9"
B.11:2:2	RDA hotlink missing
B.11:3:2	"Table 1" should be bold, not in italics. RDA hotlink missing
C.1	Spaces missing all through C.1
C.1:1:1	Two RDA hotlinks missing
D	RDA hotlinks missing all through D
D.2.2.8:1:1	"or" should be in italics
E.1:1:2-3	Type grade wrong.
E.2.2.5, p13, fifth and sixth row to last	Should not "by" in "arranged by" be in italics? Should not "score" in "Vocal score" and "Chorus

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

	score" also be in italics?
F	Wrong type grades for certain rows all through section.
F.3.1.2, p5, second paragraph, second row	Full stop should come after RDA hotlink, not before
I.2.1, p2 "compiler"	Full stop should come after RDA hotlink, not before.
GLOSSARY	Some lines between definitions missing, some too short (see Projected/Projection characteristics).
Glossary: Artistic...	"ad" -> "and"
Glossary: Audio cartridge	"and" -> "an"
Glossary: Audiotape	"magetic" -> "magnetic"
Glossary: Base material for microfilm...	"and" in entry, "or" in definition?!
Glossary: Chronological ... part of first sequence	First row in entry should be bold
Glossary: Computer dataset	Space missing "form.For"
Glossary: Condensed score	The definition has the glossary' s only "Used for"-reference.
Glossary: Latitude	No references to "Longitude", "Longitude and latitude"?!
Glossary: Longitude	No references to "Latitude", "Longitude and latitude"?!
Glossary: Longitude and latitude	No references to "Longitude", "Latitude"?!
Glossary: Map section	The reference looks strange. Indeed there are two different definitions of "section", but these are not numbered
Glossary: Other person ... associated with an item	Word missing in the definition. "custodians with" -> "custodians associated with"
Glossary: Prefered [sic] name for the corporate body	"Prefered" -> "Preferred" in entry
Glossary: Score	"Do not confuse with Part" - this information should perhaps be given also in the definition of Part?!
Glossary: Strings...	The definition ends with left-behind citation mark.
Glossary: Three-dimensional...	Tab stop before last word in entry
Glossary: Work manifested	"A work" -> "The work"

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

Addendum

2. Identifying manifestations and items

2.2.2. RDA, Resources consisting of moving images
2.2.2.4 RDA, Other resources

Comment from Olle Johansson, National Library of Sweden:

Very complicated rules.

Compare with *IASA Cataloguing Rules, 0. Preliminary notes*:

0.A.   **Sources of information**

0.A.1.   **General rule**
A suitable basis for the description of sound recordings, videos and interactive multimedia can usually be found in the accompanying documentation and container packaging. This information is usually fuller than that which can be accommodated on the relatively small area of the label or, depending on the medium, other normally designated 'chief' source of information.

Also, information printed on labels and on accompanying documentation or containers is sometimes inaccurate. Where resources permit it is recommended that cataloguers should check information on older published items against extant scholarship, e.g. discographies (see also 0.F).

Moreover, in the case of unpublished and broadcast material, the best written information about content may not be available from written information on/in the item itself, or its accompanying documentation or container. Resources such as field notes, contents listings, interview summaries or transcripts, correspondence, broadcast programme schedules (published) or programme documentation (privileged information held by the broadcaster), as well as the audiovisual content of the item itself may be required to develop a description. For this reason, the terms 'chief' and 'prescribed' sources of information are not used in these rules.

0.A.1.1.   **Sources of information for Areas 1-3, 6 and corresponding areas in Analytic and multilevel description (Chapter 9)**

Expanded from AACR2 1.0A1, 1.0A2, 1.1A2
Take information recorded in these areas, and corresponding areas in Analytic and multilevel description, from:

- the item itself (including any permanently affixed labels, or title frames);

- accompanying textual material (e.g. cassette insert, CD slick, inlay or booklet, recording/project accompanying documentation such as

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

correspondence, donor agreements, recordist's worksheets, script, transcript, cue sheet);

- a container that is an original part of the item (e.g. sound cartridge, videocassette, sleeve, container for video); or from

- a secondary source such as reference or research works, a publisher's or distributor's brochure, broadcast programme schedule, abstract, index or other available finding aid, container which is not an original part of the item (e.g. a film can used to store a reel of film, tape box for storing audio tape), or the audiovisual content of the item itself.

If the information is taken from a secondary source, cite the source in a note, if appropriate (see 7.B.3).

Note: Title and performers from audio announcement

Note: Title and script writer from radio script. Performers and characters from back announcement on recording

Note: Title, performers and series from audition. Opening and closing theme and announcements missing. Assumed to be an episode of the radio serial "Dr Paul"

Note: Title from sleeve

Note: Description from field notes

Based on FIAF 0.3.8, 0.4

Enclose information in square brackets *only* when it is not available from any of the above sources of information, and where it is supplied by the archive or cataloguing agency on the basis that the information:
    is known, *or*
    is at least probable, *and/or*
    in the case of title information, has been devised in the absence of a title in the sources of information, and/or constructed from available or known information.

Where this information is uncertain give a question mark after it.

Title: [Shark attack described by teenage male victim]

Title: [Clavichord? music]

2.3.1.2 RDA, Sources of information
2.3.2.2 RDA, Sources of information

Comment from Olle Johansson:

Very complicated rules.

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association
Kungl. biblioteket - National Library of Sweden
Comments on the Final Draft of RDA
2009-02-01

Compare with *IASA Cataloguing Rules, 1. Title and statement of responsibility area:*

1.A.2.   Sources of information
Expanded from AACR2 1.0A1, 1.0A2, 1.1A2
Take information recorded in this area from:

- the item itself (including any permanently affixed labels, or title frames);

- accompanying textual material (e.g. cassette insert, CD slick, inlay or booklet, recording/project accompanying documentation such as correspondence, donor agreements, recordist's worksheets, script, transcript, cue sheet);

- a container that is an original part of the item (e.g. sound cartridge, videocassette, sleeve, container for video); or from

- a secondary source such as reference or research works, a publisher's or distributor's brochure, broadcast programme schedule, abstract, index or other available finding aid, container which is not an original part of the item (e.g. a film can used to store a reel of film, tape box for storing audio tape), or the audiovisual content of the item itself.

If the information is taken from a secondary source, cite the source in a note, if appropriate (see 7.B.3).

Based on FIAF 0.3.8, 0.4
Enclose information in square brackets *only* when it is not available from any of the above sources of information, and where it is supplied by the archive or cataloguing agency on the basis that the information:
is known, *or*
is at least probable, *and/or*
in the case of title information, has been devised in the absence of a title in the sources of information, and/or constructed from available or known information.

Where this information is uncertain give a question mark after it.