

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/4  
18 September 2007

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC  
**Subject:** RDA: Resource Description and Access - Review by other rule makers of  
June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7 - Spain

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

**To: JSC**

**To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA**

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

**Comments on RDA chapters 6-7**

**Date: September 17, 2007**

About the two specific issues invitation to comment on:

- Retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works, and official communications- It is necessary special instructions for these kind of works, but as it is now they are mixing access points that should be required with access points that can be optional in the chapters 6.7-6.9. It should be better they would be recorded in 6.3.2 also, as they have to have “required” access points, and leave the “optional” access points for these works in 6.7 to 6.9. The treatment of these works is different depending on culture conventions, and in RDA now is a Anglo-American point of view, is this the reason why the access point are optional?
- About the treatment of Originating bodies at 6.3.2 that essentially continues the same except for legal and religious works that have been removed. We don't agree with it. It does not adapt to the Paris Principles, and as a consequence not to the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles in which is being said: “... replace and broaden the Paris Principles from just textual works to all types of materials and from just the choice and form of entry to all aspects of the bibliographic and authority records...” We agree with retaining the detailed instructions for legal works, religious works and official communications, where some access points should be “required”.
- The legal works, religious works and official communications are precisely the clear examples of originating body works. They are the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body (govern), even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer which will give official communications. Why is not “required” this access points?. Taking into account the previous comment, this will separate the Anglo-American cataloguing from the rest of the world. Has been considered the VIAF project consequences if there is not an access point required?
- About examples presentation, it is clear as it is, but as the access points are normalized, are according to a set of conventions, and also presents the disadvantage of being obsolete in a future.

General comment:

The chapter 6 is related the access points, required or optional. But it is difficult to evaluate it without regard to Part B, chapter 13. As here it is addressed some access points that in our opinion should be “primary” access points. Even, some of these access points we consider “primary” here are under a caption title valued as “optional”, so if they are going to be mentioned in the chapter 13, then would not be consistent? This can be deduced in the example in p. 7.3.1.0 b) in relationship to 6.7.4.1 first example that is included in “optional”

Other comments:

- Consistency and clarity: example in p. 6-9 Henning, Edward B. (Access point representing the creator... why then it is the information related to the area of publishing and distributing that there is not in other examples?)
- Consistency with the cover letter: in the cover letter p. 4 it is being said that distinction between creators and collaborators have been removed. In p. 6-11, example of Poole, Einar G. there is access points for the two first creators, but there is not for the contributors that really are collaborators, as they are not contributors as defined in 6.4.1.0. The same happens with the example in p. 6-14 of “This dynamic planet”. In these examples, if there is a differentiation in the responsibility (more or less grade of responsibility) to have access point, this should be explained anywhere as it is not clear.
- Consistency: Some examples from 6.3.4, that is considered “optional”, should be moved to 6.3.2 originating body: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia example in which the description clearly establishes it is the originating of the work, so the access point should be required. The same happens with the following example Illinois. Institute of Environmental Quality. There are doubts on the next two, as the sponsoring responsibilities can be from only economic responsibilities to originating ones.
- Consistency: As explained before, it not seems consistent that 6.7.1 to 6.7.5 be optional or at least not all the cases. The laws, rules, regulations etc. are, as their name said, the documents that rule the administrative policies, procedures, etc. of a territory, so they also could be seen as applying the stipulation of originating body 6.3.2.0.1 a). Here there is much difference in the responsibility between a jurisdiction governed by a law, regulation, etc. than an issuing body; meanwhile the second could be optional access point, the first should be required.
- Consistency?: We are aware that it is consistent under the AngloAmerican point of view, but in 6.7.7.6 is it not the “representing the judge delivering the charge” referring to a official acting on behalf of a body or judicial power on a jurisdiction?. Should not be the access point for the body? The judge is a person in the capacity of an officer. It is clearly the opposite situation to 6.7.7.6.2 that refers to an “opinion” of the judge that, certainly, is personal.
- Clarity: as general comment, it seems not clear that first appears the stipulation that order to provide access point... as in 6.8.0, and then in 6.8.1 it is being said that is optional. This also happens in 6.5.0 and 6.7.0. It would be clearer if in General guidelines also were said the optional condition, more taking into account that is going to be a web-based product.
- Consistency: In p. 6-60, the example where appears this access point Cyprus (Archdiocese). Although this is referring with the form of the access point, does it mean a change that will be in the form? that it will be accepted religious jurisdictions. If so, we are very happy with it. Anyway there is inconsistency

between this example and the next following that continues under the Catholic Church, and also with example in p.6-62 Catholic Church. Archdiocese of St. Paul and Mineapolis...

- Clarity: 7.1.3.0.1 the wording. It is not clear if with this stipulation is allowing to provide an identifier and not to name or describe the resource to which this identifier refers. If it is so, it would not be clear enough the reference in spite of recording the designation of relationship.
- Consistency and clarity: as mentioned before with regard other stipulations, it is not clear if in 7.1.5.0.2 it is being recommended or ordered to record the designation of relationship..., and after in 7.2 it is being said that is optional.