

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Chair follow-up/2  
28 August 2006

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC  
**Subject:** RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A, Chapters 6-7 - Review  
by other rule makers of June 2006 Draft - Spain

These are comments on the draft chapters 6-7 of RDA received from the National Library of Spain.

**To: JSC**

**From: Elena Escolano Rodríguez, representative from National Library of Spain**

### **Comments on RDA chapters 6-7**

About the two specific issues invitation to comment on:

- Alternative at 6.4.1.2.1c2 and 6.4.2.2.1.c2: Are not clear, it would be needed an example.
- About combining 6.4 Source/Reproduction and 6.5 Format/Format: The source/reproduction relationship can also exist although there is not change of format so it could be inconsistent to combine them.

Other comments:

- Clarity: In general, it is not clearly established the organization of types of relationships, could not be arranged according to the first group of FRBR? For example it could be simplified joining the same relationships under the same epigraph, although there would be a mention to the specific needs. I mean in 6.11 for musical works is addressing the adaptations that are also addressed in 6.6 source/derivative relationship, the same happens in 6.12. Issued with relationship also should be clarified.
- Consistency: As general in this chapter the relationships are to a level of work, expression, manifestation, but in the bibliographic records the relationships should be the specifics for manifestation.
- Clarity, and consistency: It should be made references to other chapters more frequently, as for example is in 6.1.3 that makes the reference to 4.10.
- Consistency and clarity: 6.1 is declared as “optional element”, so it should not be mentioned this characteristic in 6.1.3, 6.1.4, etc. as it is not necessary or it should be mentioned in all and taken out from 6.1, and I realize that in 6.1.2 is not mentioned. The reciprocity should be high recommendable but also optional.
- Clarity: It is not clear if an accompanying material is a component resource, a related resource or adjunct resource relationship, as there are examples in 6.2.1.21a1, 6.3.1.2.1c1 , but also accompanying material is cited in 6.7.0.2.3 as adjunct component.
- Consistency: 6.7.1.2 does not address the situation when the title is not expressive so the relationship is established implicitly in the “title.title” and there is no need or citation, only would need the resource identifiers for relating the resources. But this should be explicit.
- Clarity: in chapter 7 it would be convenient to make a mention to 2.4, as in 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2.1 is mixing information in description and notes.
- Consistency: 7.1.4.1 We do not think is consistent that the access point are not modified in a multipart monograph when this is completed. And more when the record is going to be modified to say that as recommended in 4.7.0.3.3
- Clarity: As 7.2.0.1 title is “Original works” the next point 7.2.0.2 Compilations...seems not to have same consideration, and in compilations can be original works.
- Error: In 7.3.1.2 example is missing John Howard access point, that is cited in the mention of responsibility.

- Consistency: In 7.2.1.4 it is said the cases in which a corporate body will be the primary access point, among them the works related with internal policies. In 7.9.2.1.1 it is being said that the primary access point in administrative regulations promulgated by government agencies will be by these ones. But it could be a contradiction between this two rules in the case of administrative regulations of institutions that are promulgated by a different government agency, that should be clarified. For example, the regulations of National Library are promulgated by the Minister of Culture, according to RDA the access point should be by the Minister of Culture? Or how should we use the rules?
- Consistency: We realize that 7.10.3.1.2 is the same coming from AACR2, by we comment his for its consideration. According to this rule the arrangement of the works is not as specific as would be recommendable. And we think this rule is inconsistent with 7.2.1.4.1