TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Sally Strutt, British Library representative

SUBJECT: **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I – Constituency Review of December 2005 Draft**
     RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I – Constituency Review of January 2006 Draft of Chapter 3

The British Library has reviewed the December 2005 draft of RDA Part I and has the following general and specific comments. We have also reviewed 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3 and have no specific comments to make on that chapter at this time.

1. General comments

Our overall comment is thoroughly positive. We like the draft, we agree with the direction being taken and with the style and content. Also, we like the Introduction to Part I and find it much clearer than the initial approach to description as given in AACR2.

However, in reviewing the text we have found some drawbacks, which are more to do with attempting to review an online resource in paper format than with any fundamental problems with the textual content. It is extremely difficult to review the draft from the point of view of the ultimate RDA user, with the draft not yet in its intended Web-based form. Some of our constituency representatives were able to see a demonstration of how the Web-based product is likely to look, and this was enormously helpful. We attempted to bear this in mind throughout the review, but it is still too easy to fall into the trap of reading the draft as linear text, forgetting that complex concepts and rules are being expertly written in a way which will facilitate a particular kind of use. We commend the Editor for the skill with which he is accommodating many, sometimes apparently conflicting, requirements.

We feel it is crucial that the Web-based version of RDA is developed as soon as possible and at least in parallel with the production of textual drafts of each Part. We think that the resulting prototype should be made available to JSC constituencies and other communities during the course of its development, in order that future drafts of RDA can be reviewed in the environment in which RDA is intended to be used. This would make it much easier to both review the drafts and also provide meaningful comments which might benefit the RDA Project. (Our preference would be for a "rapid prototyping" scenario for development of the Web-based RDA, although we appreciate the difficulties in terms of costs with such an approach.).

Availability of prototypes of the Web-based RDA will also make the review of drafts much more appealing for other communities. At the moment, the text must appear daunting and in some cases off-putting to some of the communities with whom the RDA Project is

laudably aiming to engage. We see the discussions with other communities as crucial in the development of RDA and support anything that better enables such discussion.

Another general point we would like to make is that we are highly aware of the tight schedule for the RDA Project and the need to develop the rest of the resource content. We do not think the schedule should be held up in order to make substantial changes to the draft of Part I. If there are any significant errors or omissions noted now by the constituencies' review of this draft of Part I, and agreed by JSC as requiring action before RDA publication, we feel that these revisions should be allocated to the Editorial team to act on at an appropriate point in the Project schedule and that work on Parts II and III should not be held up by making further changes to Part I now. However, we recognise and in many cases concur with the many useful and valid points being made by those who have reviewed the Draft of Part I. We would hope that many of these points can be taken on board before publication, or at the very least retained for future implementation as appropriate.

This being our view, we have limited our specific comments to that area where the BL has traditionally shown close interest – comprehensive versus analytic description and impacts on the description of multiparts and series. We are only pointing out a few specific rules where we feel that greater clarity might be achieved.

Finally, we note that in generalising rules to enable them to be of relevance to as wide a set of communities as possible, some helpful specificity can be lost. For instance, the rules relevant to the archival community appeared to some of us a little half-hearted, seemingly acting largely as signposts to this community's more detailed guidance available outside RDA. It is difficult to strike the best balance, and perhaps when RDA is seen in the context of wider Web and online resources, the links between it and other standards will become, in effect, seamless and extremely helpful. But again, this underlines the need to be able to see RDA in its ultimate format and wider context. For the moment, we are happy to live with the rules as they are in the December 2005 draft, but bearing in mind this general point in terms of aiming for an appropriate balance between general and specific within RDA.

We are making no comments on examples at this stage, but we see the examples as an important element in RDA and await the results of the Examples Group's work with great interest.

2. Specific comments

Please see the following specific comments. Our chief concerns are:

- lack of an explicit reference to comprehensive description when a rule relates only to that level of description
- inclusion of some rules in 2.10 that appear to relate to the description of the series as a resource, rather than the recording of series information in description of a resource that is part of a series

- use of the phrase "the resource" in 2.10 (because it may be construed as "the series" rather than "the resource being described that is part of the series").

2.1.1.3 : Sources of information

2.1.1.3 No source of information identifying the resource as a whole

    b) Resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously
        …

        iii) a source of information on a part that serves as a unifying element for the resource, or a source of information on a container

---

We think this reads as "a source of information identifying the resource as a whole".
[Clarity]

2.5.0.5. and 2.12.1.4: Comprehensive vs. analytic description

These rules assume the cataloguer is describing the resource at the comprehensive level (1.1.4) and therefore do not apply (or are incorrect) if the cataloguer is describing the resource at the analytical level. We feel this should be made clear in the rules (as at 2.12.1.2 which makes reference to what to do "When describing only a single part"). [Consistency; Clarity]

2.5.0.5 Edition information relating to issues or parts

    ➢ *If the resource consists of multiple issues or parts, including accompanying material, and there is edition information relating to the whole as well as to parts, record only the edition information relating to the whole resource. Edition information relating to issues or parts may be recorded in a note (see 2.5.5.4)*

This rule would not apply when creating a part-level record. On a volume-level record the edition information recorded would be that relevant to the volume, not the whole resource.

2.12.1.4 Qualification

    …

    If standard numbers for parts of the resource are recorded (see 2.12.1.2), follow each number with the designation of the part to which it applies.

        [Examples omitted]

Although reference to rule 2.12.1.2 is made here and that rule gives instructions for cataloguing at both the comprehensive and part level, rule 2.12.1.4 only applies if cataloguing

at the comprehensive level. If cataloguing at the part level you would not qualify the ISBN with the volume number because the record only represents that volume.

2.10. Series:

Rule 1.6 and associated sub-rules in AACR2 relate to the "Series Area". They are instructions for recording series statements on the bibliographic record for a resource that is part of a series. Rule 2.10 and associated sub-rules of RDA should parallel these instructions. The new set of rules is less clear, however, because the term "resource" is ambiguous (does it refer to the series, or the resource that is part of the series?) and some rules only apply when making a comprehensive description for the series itself. In addition, where rules relate to changes over time, there is no explicit reference to comprehensive description of the "multi part" resource. [Clarity]

2.10.0.5. Change in series information

➢ *Record a change in series information as follows:*

a) **Resource issued in successive parts**
   …
b) **Integrating resource**
   …
For changes indicating that the resource belongs to more than one series, follow the instructions in 2.10.8

Rules addressing change only apply to comprehensive descriptions of resources published over time (e.g. multiparts). These rules do not apply when making analytic descriptions. The headings should be qualified to indicate this:

2.10.0.5. Change in series information

➢ *Record a change in series information as follows:*

a) *Resource issued in successive parts (<u>comprehensive description</u>)*
   …

b) *Integrating resource (<u>comprehensive description</u>)*
   …

For changes indicating that the resource belongs to more than one series, follow the instructions in 2.10.8

2.10.1. TITLE PROPER OF SERIES

2.10.1.1   Definition

o   *The **title proper of a series** is the chief title of a series to which the resource belongs (i.e., the title normally used when citing the series)*

Use of the phrase "the resource" is ambiguous here. A series is both a resource in itself and "a grouping" for other resources. Since a series is composed of multiple resources, and to make clear that this is not a reference to the series as a resource, we suggest the following amendment options:

---

o   *The **title proper of a series** is the chief title of a series to which ~~the~~ <u>a</u> resource belongs (i.e., the title normally used when citing the series)*

Or,

---

o   *The **title proper of a series** is the chief title of a series ~~to which the a resource belongs~~ (i.e., the title normally used when citing the series)*

2.10.1.2.   Sources of information

➢   *Take the title proper of the series from the series title page*
➢   *If there is no series title page, take the title proper of the series from the preferred source of information as specified in 2.2.1.*

2.2.1 is used for selecting the source of information when describing a resource. In this instance, the cataloguer is not describing the series as a resource; they are describing a resource that is part of the series (e.g. a monograph). It is therefore inappropriate to direct the user to 2.2.1. The preferred source of information for a series, if there is no series title page, is the monograph title page (i.e. the title page for the resource that is part of the series). It is not clear how reference to 2.2.1 would enable a cataloguer to determine this. Reference to "resource" at 2.2.1 in this context is ambiguous.

➢   *If there is no title proper of the series on the preferred source of information, take it from another source **within the resource itself**.* [BL emphasis]

Which resource does this refer to? The series or the monograph? Also with the fourth bullet point:

➢   *If there is no title proper of the series **within the resource itself,** [BL emphasis] take it from one of the other sources of information specified in 2.2.3.*

Ambiguous use of "resource":

> *2.10.1.3 Recording the title proper of the series*
>
> ➤ *If **the resource**[BL emphasis] is issued in a series, record the title proper of the series following the basic instructions on recording titles (se 2.3.0)*

Replace "the resource" with "a resource":

> ➤ *If <u>a resource</u> is issued in a series, record the title proper of the series following the basic instructions on recording titles (se 2.3.0)*

> ➤ *If the title of the series includes numbering as an integral part of the title, transcribe the numbering as part of the title proper of the series.*
>
>   *[Examples not transcribed]*
>
> ***Exception***
> *If **the resource** being described comprises two or more issues or parts, and numbering that is an integral part of the title proper of the series differs from issue to issue or part to part, omit the numbering from the title proper of the series, replacing it by the mark of omission. Record the numbering as numbering within the series (see 2.10.6).*

The phrase "the resource" is ambiguous and the rule only applies to comprehensive descriptions. It relates principally to multiparts published over time where a collected set record is created. Proposed wording:

> ***Exception***
> ~~*If the resource being described comprises two or more issues or parts,*~~ <u>*When making a comprehensive description of a multipart monograph or serial where*</u> ~~*and*~~ *numbering that is an integral part of the title proper of the series differs from issue to issue or part to part, omit the numbering from the title proper of the series, replacing it by the mark of omission. Record the numbering as numbering within the series (see 2.10.6).*

> *2.10.1.4 Title of series in more than one form*
>
> ➤ *If different forms of the title of the series (other than parallel titles) appear, record, if applicable, the title appearing on the series title page as the title proper of the series, following the instructions in 2.3.1.4. Otherwise, record the most prominent form of the series title. Record the other form(s) in a note if they are considered to be important for identifying **the resource**. [BL emphasis]*

"The resource" in this instance seems to relate to the series, not the resource that is part of the series. Giving variant forms of the series title in a note in order to identify "the resource" would not seem appropriate on a record describing a different resource (e.g. a monograph that is part of the series). Notes giving variant forms of title (and related access points) would only occur on the bibliographic (or authority) record describing that resource. We suggest that this rule is removed from section 2.10 because it relates to the description of a series as a resource, not to the "series area" of the description of a resource that is part of a series.

2.10.2. PARALLEL TITLE OF SERIES

2.10.2.1. Definition

> A **parallel title of a series** is the title proper of a series to which the resource belongs in another language or script

---

Ambiguous use of "resource." Delete "to which the resource belongs":

2.10.2.1. Definition

> A **parallel title of a series** is the title proper of a series ~~to which the resource belongs~~ in another language or script.

2.10.3.1. : Delete "to which the resource belongs".

2.10.4.1: Delete "to which the resource belongs".

2.10.5.2 : Ambiguous use of "the resource".

2.10.6.2 : Ambiguous use of "the resource".

2.10.6.7.   Separately numbered issues or parts

> *When describing a resource comprising two or more issues or parts, record numbering within series as follows.*

a) *Multipart monographs*
   If simultaneously issued parts of a multipart resource are separately numbered within a series, record the first and the last numbers, separated by a hyphen, if the numbering is continuous. Otherwise, record all the numbers.

   [Examples not transcribed]

b) *Serials*

   …

The rule only applies when making a comprehensive description of a multipart monograph. It also applies to successively issued parts as well as simultaneously issued parts of a multipart. Proposed wording:

2.10.6.7 Separately numbered issues or parts

> *When ~~describing~~ <u>making a comprehensive description</u> of a resource comprising two or more issues or parts, record numbering within series as follows.*

a) ***Multipart monographs***
If ~~simultaneously issued~~ <u>the</u> parts of a multipart resource are separately numbered within a series, record the first and the last numbers, separated by a hyphen, if the numbering is continuous. Otherwise, record all the numbers.

> *[Examples not transcribed]*

b) ***Serials***

> *…*

2.10.7.2. Sources of information : Ambiguous use of "the resource".

2.10.7.3. Title proper of subseries : Ambiguous use of "the resource".

2.10.8 Resource in more than one series

> *The information relating to one series, or series and subseries, constitutes one set of series information. If the resource belongs to two or more series and/or two or more series and subseries, record each set of series information separately following the instructions in 2.10.1-2.10.7.*

> *[Examples not transcribed]*

> *If parts of the resource belong to different series and this relationship cannot be stated clearly in the series element, record details of the series in a note (see 2.10.9.4).*

Ambiguous use of "resource". Delete from the heading and replace the definite article with the indefinite article in the main text:

2.10.8 ~~Resource in~~ <u>M</u>ore than one series

> *The information relating to one series, or series and subseries, constitutes one set of series information. If ~~the~~ <u>a</u> resource belongs to two or more series and/or two or more series and subseries, record each set of series information separately following the instructions in 2.10.1-2.10.7.*

> *[Examples not transcribed]*

> *If parts of ~~the~~ <u>a</u> resource belong to different series and this relationship cannot be stated clearly in the series element, record details of the series in a note (see 2.10.9.4).*

2.10.9. NOTES ON SERIES INFORMATION

…

2.10.9.2   Sources of information

➢ *Take information for a note on series from any source either within the resource or from outside the resource.*

Ambiguous use of "resource". Proposed wording:

2.10.9.2 Sources of information

➢ *Take information for a note on series from any source either within the resource <u>being described</u> or from outside the resource.*

2.10.9.3. Complex series information :

Rule only applies if making a comprehensive description of a multipart or serial. Add the qualifier "*<u>When making a comprehensive description of a multipart monograph or serial</u> make notes on information …*"

2.10.9.4. Change in series information :

Rule only applies when making a comprehensive description. Qualify each heading at a) and b) with *"<u>(comprehensive description)</u>"*.