

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Marg Stewart, CCC representative

Subject: **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A – Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7**

CCC has completed its review of the June 2007 Draft of chapters 6-7 and offers the following comments:

Background – Changes in this Draft

Chapter 6

Organization of Chapter 6

CCC agrees with retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications for now. The specific instructions within RDA facilitate consistency in application and internationalization.

Originating body

CCC agrees with the term “originating body”. Specific comments are included below at 6.3.2.

Examples

Chapter 6

CCC prefers option 3 as this form does not bring in the form of the name in the access point.

Other considerations discussed at CCC include the following:

- Bold the access point in the *resource described* statement to highlight the specific access point(s) referred to since not all access points applicable to the example are given, e.g., access point for illustrator is not given under creator instructions.
- Where possible, it would be good to repeat the same example under different instructions, e.g., 6.3.1.1.1 (p. 6-10) Zim/Gabrielson example: add at 6.4.1.1.1 (p. 6-25):
Irving, James Gordon
(*Access point representing the illustrator for: Birds : a guide to the most familiar American birds / by Herbert S. Zim and Ira N. Gabrielson ; illustrated by James Gordon Irving*)
- Where possible, add the specific role of the creator when naming the access point, e.g., 6.3.1.1.1 (p. 6-8):
Brahms, Johannes
(*Access point representing the composer for: Symphony no. 4, E minor, for orchestra, op. 98 / by Johannes Brahms. A score*)
- Always include the type of resource in the explanatory text as often the access points given are reflective of the type of resource, e.g., sound recording vs. text.
- Have more consistency with the explanatory texts of the examples.
- Number the captions of the category types under 6.3.1.1.1, 6.3.2.1.1, etc.

- Further enhancements after the first release of RDA could include:
 1. hypertext linking from an example at a specific instruction to the full example
 2. keyword searching on the same example to see how it has been used as an illustration at various instructions throughout RDA.

Specific comments

Where CCC had the same comment as LC, we have indicated our agreement with LC.

6.0.3: Add sentence:

Guidelines and instructions on formulating access points for use in naming a related work, expression, manifestation, or item are covered in chapter 13.

6.1.2.1a (p. 6-4): Paragraph a) does not take into account that the name of a person, family, or corporate body associated with a resource may be recorded as information taken from the resource itself without being transcribed as part of the statement of responsibility. Suggest revising the text to read (revision underlined):

The name of a person, family, or corporate body associated with the content of the resource may be transcribed as part of a statement of responsibility (see 2.4) or recorded elsewhere as part of the description.

6.3.1.1.1 (p. 6-8), 3rd example (Burden): Agree LC.

6.3.1.1.1 (p. 6-11), 4th example (Holiday): Agree LC.

6.3.1.1.1 (p. 6-13), 6th example (Copland): Since the example includes references to the creators of the settings, costumes and choreography, this example could be thought of as a videorecording. It would be easier to interpret if it included an indication that the resource is a score.

6.3.2.0.1 (p. 6-15): CCC sees some merit in moving “originating body” to 6.3.1 and treating them as creators as LC suggests. CCC feels, however, that this needs to be looked at in the context of naming of work (chapter 13). CCC notes that “issuing” should be removed from the scope of originating body since “issuing” is associated with the manifestation.

With regard to LC’s comment at 6.3.2, CCC prefers to retain the AACR2 21.1B2 concept in RDA.

6.3.2.1.1 (p. 6-19), 2nd example (Eurovision): The example would be easier to interpret if it included an indication that the resource is a sound recording.

6.4.1.1.1 (p. 6-15), add “Burden” example: Agree LC.

6.7.1.1: Agree LC.

6.7.1.5 (LC comment): In response to the LC comment, CCC does not feel that there needs to be a new RDA element for “Issuing body of law”.

6.7.7 (p. 6-49, etc.): CCC notes that the majority of the examples at these instructions are U.S. based. CCC will forward Canadian examples to the Canadian rep on the Examples Group for Part A, Chapters 6-7 and Part B.

Chapter 7:

7.3.0.1.1 (p. 7-7): CCC had difficulty with the wording of a), b), and c) and, after considering various rewordings, recommends that a), b), and c) be deleted.

7.3.1 (p. 7-8): CCC is inclined to support LC's recommendation to delete 7.3.1 pending a review of Part B. A concern was raised that, at 7.3.1, the relationship between a work and an expression is considered "optional" whereas, at 7.3.2, the relationship between a manifestation and a work (or expression) is considered "required".

7.3.2 (p. 7-9): CCC recommends that the caption be changed to:

Relationship between a manifestation and a work (or expression) embodied in the manifestation

7.3.2.0.1c (p. 7-9): Typo: "Callimard" should read "Gallimard"; "lu par Bernard Giraudeau" should not be included in the statement of responsibility as he is the performer and should only appear in an annotation (cf. 2.4.0.4.3). CCC notes that it is not clear in RDA (chapter 2) whether this date should be given as a phonogram date () or as a copyright date (©).

7.5.0.1.1 (p. 7-15): Suggest rephrasing the definition as follows:

A **derivative relationship** is a relationship between a work (or expression) that is a modification of another work (or expression) and the entity from which it was derived.

7.5.1.1.1b (p. 7-16), 5th example: Suggest adding an indication that the resource is a periodical to explain why the designation of relationship "*English edition of*" was used instead of "*Translation of*".

7.6.2.1.1a (p. 7-22): CCC notes that it would be useful to illustrate a reference to a published bibliography using common citation form but is unsure where such an example should go, e.g.,

References: ESTC (CD-ROM, 2003 ed.) T60996

7.7.1.1.1b (p. 7-25): CCC feels that the series numbering should be included when referencing a whole work (or expression).

7.9.1.1.1a: (p. 7-40): Add "*Continues:*" as follows (cf. example at 7.9.2.1.1a):

Continues: ISSN 1043-7479 = Arctic & Antarctic regions

(Resource described: PolarInfo. ISSN provided in conjunction with the key title for the preceding work)