To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I - Review by other rule
makers of December 2005 Draft - Spain

These are comments on the draft Part I of RDA received from Biblioteca Nacional de
España.

We want to congratulate you for the work done.

We want to contribute with few some comments.

First and general:
We like this structure as we consider it clearer. Especially we think chapter 1 is very useful as it is differentiated the treatment of resources depending on its mode of issuance and also is clarifying the part on Types of description. We appreciate the treatment of Multipart resources through all part I.

But as general comments
- We miss more examples in ISBDs to understand better the rule, as we as librarians are used to ISBDs punctuation.
- In Purpose and Scope where are referred the resources according to medium, content and manner of the release, we miss the reference to physical format.
- For more clarity: as RDA does not prescribe any order of recording and presentation we miss a brief guidance or a recommendation of recording data elements that are related to other data elements closer to them. As example what solution would be when there are resources without collective title and titles are recording and different statements of responsibilities; or several publisher's names and places.
- We do not see appropriate the rules that mix information of authority control to be given in a bibliographic record, as for example in 2.4.3.1 2.4.3.8, 2.10.1.4
- We think is less clear the change in the criteria of choice to "sequence or layout", with this wording does not seem clear which criteria should be followed first. And if the layout is going to be the second option then we think it would not be coherent with the principle of representation.

Specific comments:
- Specificity: In 1.1.2 Mode of issuance it would be clearer to differentiate the four following types: unit, multipart monograph, serial and integrating resources.
- For more clarity: we would appreciate the definition of "unit" as in 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 is different treatment.
- In 2.3.2.2. we do not think is coherent to take parallel titles from any source of the resource, taking into account that for other title information it should be taken from the source of the title proper.
- We think is more coherence and specific the physical description as it was before, and establish 1 v. (22 p.) in coherence with other materials description. We think there is not coherence between:
  3.4.3.2 (6 maps on 1 sheet) and
  3.4.4.1 3 CD-ROMs (XV p., 450 maps)