To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Marg Stewart, CCC representative

Subject: **RDA: Resource Description and Access Sections 2-4, 9 – Constituency Review of December 2007 Draft**

CCC has reviewed the December 2007 Draft of RDA Sections 2-4, 9 and offers the following comments. Many of the comments are editorial in nature but as requested in the covering letter, all comments are provided in a single sequence.

General comments
- To avoid possible confusion with subject heading practice in the use of the term, CCC suggests using "sub-units" in place of "subdivision" throughout Sections 2 and 3 to replace the AACR2 term "subheading". The term "sub-unit" could be defined in the Glossary.
- CCC would like clarification of the scope of the "language preferred by the agency creating the data". Is it the language of the catalogue, or just any language, or both depending on the situation?
- We understand that guidance on punctuation within elements will be included in the instructions and appendix E will include guidance for punctuation between elements. Without this explanation, the way RDA is handling punctuation in these chapters appears very inconsistent.
- It is our understanding that agencies creating data for use in a different language or script may modify instructions that specify the use of an English-language term to reflect their own language or script preferences and replace the English-language terms specified in RDA. However, there are places in the instructions where *(or its equivalent in the language preferred by the agency creating the data)* appears after the specified English term (e.g., 9.5.0.7.3). In some instances, what may be adding to the confusion is a situation where subsequent instructions indicate using a preferred English form but the basic instruction is to prefer a form *in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.* See comments at 6.18.1—6.18.3; 6.20.0 (p. 6-81—6-87); 6.20.0.5.1; Preferred title for parts of the Bible at 6.29.7 (Cover letter- Agreed changes, p. 8); 6.29.7.3. 6.29.7; 9.5.0.4b.

Chapter 5
5.1.2.4 (p. 5-3): Suggest following addition to text:
>The term **variant title** refers to a title or form of title by which a work is known <u>or could be known</u> that differs from the title or form of title chosen as the preferred name for that work.

5.1.3.2 (p. 5-3): For clarity, suggest the following rewording:
>The term **access point** refers to a name, <u>title, name/title,</u> term, code, etc., under which information pertaining to a specific work will be found.

5.1.3.3 (p. 5-3): Suggest the following rewording:

The term **preferred access point** refers to an access point representing a work or expression that is constructed using the <u>preferred title for the work and, if applicable, the preferred access point for the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work</u>.

5.2.4 (p. 5-4), 2nd sentence: Since this is a principle, suggest replacing "recorded" with "treated" as follows:

Variant titles and variant forms of the title…should be <u>treated</u> as variant titles.

5.3.1 (p. 5-4): Add wording (as a footnote?) that for preferred titles for musical works consisting only of the name or names of one or more type or types of composition, the following elements are also to be included as a minimum, when applicable:

Medium of performance (for music)
Numeric designation (for music)
Key (for music)

5.3.3 (p. 5-5): *Medium of performance*, *numeric designation*, and *key* are attributes of musical works, not of musical expressions. They should not be listed as other identifying attributes of expressions.

5.5.1.1 (p. 5-6): It is not clear what is meant by "each subdivision of the title". Would it be titles such as those at 6.1.2.3 even though that terminology is not used there? Perhaps an example could be added illustrating this situation.

5.5.1.1a-5.5.1.1b (p. 5-6) *Editorial***:** For consistency (cf. 6.17.1.2a—6.17.1.2d), these instructions should be numbered: 5.5.1a—5.5.1b.

5.5.3 (p. 5-7): How do these instructions reconcile with the instructions at 1.7.3 in chapter 1?

5.5.3.1 (p. 5-7), 1st example: This example is more appropriate at 5.5.3.2.

5.5.4.1 (p. 5-7) *Editorial***:** Word missing; add as follows:

…unless the title for a work is to <u>be</u> accessed under…

Status of preferred access point at 5.8 (Cover letter, p. 6): We feel that only 3 of the values proposed are necessary (*fully established*, *provisional*, and *preliminary*). *Memorandum* is not required as it should not matter that there is no bibliographic record attached. It should be adequate just to use *fully established* in those cases.

5.9.0.3.1 (p. 5-10—5-11): Will the appendix on abbreviations include "standard" abbreviations to be used in annotations (i.e., notes) such as, *p.* for *page(s)*, *v.* or *vol.* for *volume(s)*, etc.?

5.9.0.3.3 (p. 5-11): Suggest following rewording:

Cite other sources consulted that provided no <u>useful information</u> in establishing the preferred title.

Chapter 6
Earlier comments on choice of "primary access point" (Cover letter, p. 7): The only CCC comment to June 2006 draft of Part A, chapter 7 that is relevant in the context of this draft is related to treaties between national governments at any level and/or a non-governmental

corporate body noted at the former 7.9.5.1.1 (June 2006 draft). Our comments relating to this issue are addressed at 6.23.1.14.

6.0.1.4 (p. 6-6): This instruction accommodates scenario two and scenario three database implementations but does not accommodate FRBR and scenario one where work records would exist for all works. While the instruction is useful in identifying the current purposes of preferred access points representing works and expressions, there needs to be some acknowledgement of the future direction.

6.1.1.2.1 (p. 6-8—6-9): The change in the preferred access point from *prominence* to *first named* should be included in the list of changes from AACR2. Would also like to suggest the addition of an example of a collaborative work that combines notated music and notated movement:

> Tudor, Antony, 1909-1987. Soirée musicale
> (*Choreography by Antony Tudor; music by Gioachino Rossini, arranged by Benjamin Britten; choreography notated in Labanotation by Ann Hutchinson Guest*)

6.1.1.2.2 (p. 6-9) and 6.1.1.3.2 (p. 6-10): How can a preferred access point representing the work include all creators/compilers?

6.1.1.2.4 (p. 6-10): Suggest that it might be clearer to reword as follows:

> For *serials* that are collaborative works, construct the preferred…

6.1.1.3.1 (p. 6-10): Is the "collective title" the "preferred title for the compilation" and if there is no "collective title" for the compilation, there is no "preferred title"? Should there be a link from "preferred title for the compilation" to the term "collective title" used at 6.1.1.3.4?

6.1.1.3.1a (p. 6-10): Suggest the following rewording to justify the wording at 6.1.1.3.3:

> a) the preferred access point for the compiler if considered the creator of the work, formulated according to the guidelines…

6.1.1.3.1 (p. 6-10), 2nd example: To avoid confusion with the AACR2 example, suggest the following replacements:

> Pedersen, Diana L. (Diana Lynn). Changing women, changing history
> (*A bibliography of the history of women in Canada compiled by Diana Pedersen*)
>
> Stork, Peter. Index of verb forms in Thucydides
> (*Index compiled by Peter Stork*)

6.1.1.3.2 (p. 6-10): The basic instruction on how to treat compilations with more than one compiler, i.e., choosing only the first named compiler, is missing. The *alternative* instruction could be eliminated if the instruction on multiple compilers was phrased as follows (cf. 6.1.1.4.2):

> If there is more than one compiler considered as the creator of the work, construct the preferred access point representing the work following the instructions on collaborative works given under 6.1.1.2.

6.1.1.3.4 (p. 6-11): We question what the preferred access point would be in such a situation.

6.1.1.4 (p. 6-11): CCC is concerned that the instruction for revisions at 6.1.1.4 would require the cataloguer to assess whether or not the nature or content of the original has been substantially

changed. This may not be feasible or possible. For this reason, CCC suggests the following rewording:

> If the work is an adaptation[3] <u>that substantially changes the nature and content of a previously existing work (e.g., a paraphrase, rewriting, adaptation for children, or version in a different literary form), or is a revision of a previously existing work,</u> and is presented as the work of the person, family, or body responsible for the adaptation or revision, construct the preferred access point representing the new work by combining (in this order):
> > *[rest of instruction not transcribed]*

6.1.1.4.1 (p. 6-11), 2nd example, *Editorial*: Add a space between *parody* and *by* in the explanatory text.

6.1.1.4.3 (p. 6-12): The use of the phrase "commonly cited by title" has been questioned. How does one arrive at this information?

6.1.1.4.4 (p. 6-12): Would like abridgements to be specifically addressed as follows:
> If the work is presented simply as an edition of the previously existing work <u>or, if the work is an abridgement of the previously existing work</u>, treat it as an expression of that work (i.e., use the preferred access point representing the previously existing work). If it is considered important for identification to name the particular expression, construct a preferred access point representing the expression as instructed under <u>6.1.3</u>.

6.1.1.5 (p. 6-12), caption, *Editorial*: Add a comma after "**etc.**"

6.1.1.6 (p. 6-13), caption: Suggest revising the caption to read:
> Works of uncertain or unknown origin <u>or from an unnamed group</u>

6.1.1.7.1 (p. 6-13—6-14): Suggest that the examples might be clearer if they were grouped in such a way that it is more obvious why the additions are necessary.

6.1.1.7.1 (p. 6-14): *Oxford economic papers (CD-ROM)* and *Oxford economic papers (Online)* are both examples of manifestations and should be deleted.

6.1.4.1.2, 6.1.4.2.2, 6.1.4.2.3: CCC finds the instruction very wordy and would welcome simplification. Unfortunately, CCC could not find a way to accomplish this.

6.1.4.1.3 (p. 6-18), *Editorial*: For consistency, add "variant" as follows:
> Make additions to the <u>variant</u> access point, if considered to be….

6.1.4.2.3 (p. 6-19), *Editorial*: For consistency, add "variant" as follows:
> Make additions to the <u>variant</u> access point, if considered to be….

6.1.4.3.2 (p. 6-19), *Editorial*: For consistency, add "variant" as follows:
> Make additions to the <u>variant</u> access point, if considered to be….

6.2.2.2.2 and 6.2.2.2.3 (p. 6-24): Given that the instructions at 6.2.2.2.1 refer to choosing "a well-established title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data as the preferred title", the instructions at 6.2.2.2.2 and 6.2.2.2.3 are at odds with that basic instruction. These two instructions should either be deleted or be revised as follows:

6.2.2.2.2
> If there is no such title <u>in the language preferred by the agency creating the data</u>, use the Latin title.

6.2.2.2.3
> If there is neither a well-established title <u>in the language preferred by the agency creating the data </u>nor a Latin title, choose the Greek title.

6.2.2.3 (p. 6-25): Query whether the AACR2 wording, i.e., "roman script" should be retained (instead of being replaced by "in the preferred script of the agency") in the caption and the instruction. The instruction would then read:
> If the original language of an anonymous work created before 1501 is written neither in Greek nor <u>in roman script</u>, choose as the preferred title an established title in the language and script preferred by the agency, if there is one.

6.2.3.1.2 (p. 6-25): Suggest that other title information given in the explanatory text is not necessary and should be deleted.

6.2.6.2 (p. 6-27): Specific instructions on punctuation have been given for parts of a musical work at 6.18.4.2d and 6.18.4.2e but there is nothing equivalent at the basic instructions.

6.2.6.3.2 (p. 6-28): We question what the preferred access point would be in such a situation.

6.2.6.3.3 (p. 2-28): CCC acknowledges that although this is a decision agreed by JSC, we would like to retain the ability to make the distinction between complete and incomplete works by using the term *Selections*. See also comment at 6.2.7.3.1. ***Editorial*:** "two or more" is repeated in the sentence.

6.2.7.3.1 (p. 6-29): Using phrases beginning with *Selected* creates collocation problems. CCC prefers to retain the AACR2 use of *Selections* in order to preserve collocation of complete and partial compilation of works.

6.3.0.1.1 (p. 6-31): Suggest following addition to text:
> A **variant title** is a title or form of title by which a work is known <u>or could be known</u> that differs from the title or form of title chosen as the preferred title.

6.3.0.3.2 (p. 6-31), footnote 4: Some confusion as to the difference between:

> **2.3.7.1.1:** A **variant title** is a title associated with a resource that differs from the title(s) recorded as the title proper, parallel title, alternative title, or other title information.
> **6.3.0.1.1:** A **variant title** is a title or form of title by which a work is known that differs from the title or form of title chosen as the preferred title.

Suggest changing the term at 6.3.0.1.1 to: **variant title for a work**.

Query whether the first sentence of the footnote is appropriate here (cf. 2.3.7.3 where such guidance is given as instructions rather than as a footnote).

See also comment at **6.19.0.3.2 (p. 6-78), footnote 20**.

6.3.2.3 (p. 6-34—6-35): Suggest including an example illustrating a numeric title spelled out:
> Three men and a baby

(*Preferred title recorded as:* 3 men and a baby)

6.3.2.3 (p. 6-34), 3rd example: Suggest adding a second variant title:
> Two towers
> 2 towers
>> (*Preferred title recorded as:* Lord of the rings. Two towers)

6.5.2.3.1 (p. 6-37—6-38): Suggest that the examples might be clearer if the *1960* and *2001* examples were grouped together; and the *1762* and *1965* examples were grouped together, rather than appearing as four separate examples.

6.7.0.3.1 (p. 6-40), last two examples: The examples would be clearer if what constitutes the "other characteristic of the work" was clearly identified as the data that follows the colon since what precedes it is "form of the work". We also query whether punctuation instructions are necessary here.

Identifiers for works and expressions for musical works, etc. at 6.10 and 6.16 (Cover letter, p. 7): CCC suggests that numeric designations such as thematic index numbers, opus numbers and serial numbers should be required as identifiers for works at 6.10 if these designations are not already included in the preferred access point representing the work. We have nothing to add at 6.16.

6.11.0.3.2 (p. 6-44), *Editorial*: Delete "of" before "record only"; delete the full stop in b) after "…if there is one)"

6.11.0.3.2, Table 1 (p. 6-45), moving image, *Editorial*: Capitalize "earth"

6.13.0.4.1 (p. 6-48): Suggest listing the languages in alphabetical order to show that there is no preference given to English or is the order of the languages significant (i.e., English is listed first since "each volume includes text in English and two of the other languages")?

6.13.0.5.1 (p. 6-49), 3rd and 4th examples: For consistency, there should also be explanatory text to indicate the language of the original (cf. 1st and 2nd examples).

6.14.0.3.1 (p. 6-50), 1st –6th examples, *Editorial*: For consistency, the titles in the explanatory texts should not be in italics (cf. examples at 6.18.4.2).

6.15.0.1.1 (p. 6-51), *Editorial*: Suggest that either "e.g." or "etc." be used in parenthetical examples but not both. Prefer that "e.g." be used.

6.15.0.3.1 (p. 6-51), *Editorial*: Note the inconsistency of using only "etc." here in the parenthetical examples. Prefer that "e.g." be used.

6.16.0.1.1 (p.6-51), *Editorial*: Revise as follows (cf. 16.6.0.1):
> An **identifier for the expression** is a number or code uniquely associated with…

6.17.1 (p. 6-52), Contents, *Editorial*: Remove the extra line of spacing between 6.17.1.1 and 6.17.1.2.

6.17.1.2a (p. 6-54), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a) and b) (cf. 11.2.1.5f).

6.17.1.2b1 (p. 6-54), *Editorial***:** Correct the font of the beginning parenthesis of the explanatory text.

6.17.1.2d (p. 6-54), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.17.1.2d (p. 6-55), *Editorial***:** Example at sub-paragraph b), should the question mark appear after "amar"? If so, the question mark should also appear in the explanatory text to the example.

6.17.1.6 (p. 6-57): There appears to be inconsistency as to when punctuation instructions are given. Punctuation instructions to enclose in parentheses the title of the adaptation are given but not at other similar instructions that refer to additions (cf. 6.17.3.3.1).

6.17.1.6 (p. 6-57), 1st example: Not sure why the 1st example has been given. The examples should only illustrate the element specified in the preceding instruction.

6.17.1.10.2d (p. 6-60): It is odd to have a see reference to an instruction as part of an example although this does appear this way in AACR2 25.30B1d. Suggest that it be reworded as at 6.17.1.10.3c:

> d) the complexities of stating the medium are such that an arrangement by other identifying element or elements, such as thematic index number or opus number (see 6.21) would be more useful.

6.17.2.3.3 (p. 6-63): Same comment as at **6.2.6.3.3**.

6.17.3 (p. 6-64), Contents, *Editorial***:** Remove the extra line of spacing between 6.17.3.1 and 6.17.3.2.

6.17.3.0.1f (p. 6-64), *Editorial***:** Alignment of f) needs to be corrected; for consistency, add a full stop at the end of "(see 6.17.3.6)".

6.17.3.3 (p. 6-66): Should there be punctuation instructions regarding enclosing the term in parentheses here? Cf. comment at **6.17.1.6 (p. 6-57)**.

6.17.3.6.2 (p. 6-67): We question what the preferred access point would be in such a situation.

6.18.0.3.1 (p. 6-71): Is there an explanation of what … means at the end of the explanatory text regarding the titles of the resource described? Have the titles been abridged or just not completely transcribed or does it not matter?

6.18.0.3b (p. 6-71), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.18.0.4.2g (p. 6-72): This instruction states that "an initial article" is to be omitted from the title chosen as the preferred title. However, this instruction is redundant since 6.18.0.4.1 already refers to 5.5 which includes 5.5.4 Initial articles.

6.18.1—6.18.3 (p. 6-73): Given that the instructions at 6.18.1.1 are to "record the accepted form of name of the type of composition in the language preferred by the agency creating the data"

rather than the accepted English form of name, the specific instructions to use the terms *Duet*s (6.18.2) and *Trio sonatas* (6.18.3) appear to be at odds with the basic instruction. Unsure whether the addition of the following after the specified terms would address this situation:

> (or an equivalent term in the language preferred by the agency creating the data)

6.18.4.2.1 (p. 6-74), 1st sentence: Instruction should refer only to 6.18.0 as 6.18.1-6.18.3 do not apply to parts of musical works; reword as follows:

> Record the preferred title for a part of a musical work following the instructions given under <u>6.18.0</u>, as applicable.

6.18.4.2a (p. 6-74): Suggest that there be a reference to appendix B for abbreviations (cf. 6.16.0.3.2).

6.18.4.2d—6.18.4.2e (p. 6-75): Specific punctuation instructions are given for parts of a musical work. No such instructions appear at the general instructions at 6.2.6. This appears to be inconsistent.

6.18.5 (p. 6-76): Where is the scope of the term *collective title*?

6.18.5.2.1 (p. 6-76): Suggest the following rewording:

> For a <u>complete or partial</u> compilation containing musical works of various types for one broad medium <u>by a single composer</u>, record the designation of that medium as the collective title.

6.18.5.3.1 (p. 6-77): Suggest the following rewording:

> For a <u>complete or partial</u> compilation containing musical works of various types for one specific medium by a single composer, record a collective title generally descriptive of that medium.

6.18.5.4.1 (p. 6-77): Suggest the following rewording:

> For a <u>complete or partial</u> compilation containing musical works of one type by a single composer, record the name of that type as the collective title.

6.18.5.4.2 (p. 6-77): CCC notes that this instruction represents a change in practice from AACR2 given that it now applies to both complete and partial compilations. (The equivalent AACR2 rule applied only to partial compilations). We support this change since it will result in more meaningful access points for users (e.g., Sonatas, piano, no. 1-32 versus Sonatas, piano for Beethoven's complete piano sonatas).

6.19.0.3.2 (p. 6-78), footnote 20: Query whether there should be consistency with wording at footnote 4 at 6.3.0.3.2 (p. 6-31) that reads:

> For instructions on recording the title proper and other titles appearing on the manifestation see 2.3.1.

vs.

> However, create an additional access point under the title proper of the resource being catalogued (see 2.3.1).

6.19.2.3.1 (p. 6-80): In order to apply 6.19.0.3.4 and conform to the instructions in preceding sections (e.g., 6.18.0.4.2 and 6.17.1.11.1), the first example should be revised to read:

> Nouveaux quintetti, op. 45

(*Preferred title recorded as:* Quintets, oboe, violins, viola, violoncello, G. 431-436)

6.20 (p. 6-80), footnote 21: Medium of performance is required only when the preferred title for the work consists solely of the name of a type, or of two or more types, of composition. In other cases it may be used, but is not always required, to distinguish an access point representing a work from another access point. Suggest the following rewording:

> Medium of performance is required in the access point representing the work when the preferred title for the work consists solely of the name of a type, or of two or more types, of composition (see 6.17.1.10-6.17.1.12)

6.20.0 (p. 6-81—6-87): Suggest that the terms used in this whole section be looked at from an internationalization point of view. For example, the wording at 6.20.0.6.1 states using "a term in the language preferred by the agency creating the data whenever possible" whereas this is not stated at other instructions that specify using specific terms, e.g., 6.20.0.5, 6.20.0.7, 6.20.0.8.

6.20.0.5.1 (p. 6-82): Suggest rewording as follows:

> If the preferred title is *Trio(s)*, *Quartet(s)*, or *Quintet(s)*, (or an equivalent term in the language preferred by the agency creating the data,) and the work is for one of the following standard chamber music combinations, use the terms given in the column on the right (or an equivalent term in the language preferred by the agency creating the data):

6.20.0.6 (p. 6-83): Suggest that it might be clearer to follow the format at 3.16.0.3.1 such as the following:

> cello *or* violoncello
> cor anglais *or* English horn
> double bass
>   (*i.e., not* bass viol *or* contrabass)
> double bassoon *or* contrabassoon
> harpsichord
>   (*i.e., not* cembalo *or* virginal)
> etc.

6.20.0.7—6.20.0.8 (p. 6-84): See comment at **6.20.0.6 (p. 6-83)**.

6.21 (p. 6-87), footnote 22: Numeric designation is required only when the preferred title for the work consists solely of the name of a type, or of two or more types, of composition. In other cases, it may be used, but is not always required, to distinguish an access point representing a work from another access point.

6.22.0.3 (p. 6-89): See comment at **6.20.0 (p. 6-81—6-87)**.

6.23.1.0.4 (p. 6-91), *Editorial*: Delete "choose" and retain "construct" (both terms used in current instruction).

6.23.1.1.1 (p. 6-92), 1st example: Query why edition statement and publisher statements have been included here and not in other examples. This information does not seem to add anything to the understanding of the example.

Access points representing treaties, etc., between governments at 6.23.1.1.4 (Cover letter-Agreed changes, p. 9): Can see no reason why 6.23.1.14 and 6.23.1.15 cannot be combined. Both types are considered collaborative works and the instructions at 6.23.1.15 merely refer back to 6.23.1.14.

6.23.1.3.1 (p. 6-93), 1st example: Query why other title information and French parallel titles have been included here and not in the 2nd example. This information does not seem to enhance the understanding of the example.

6.23.1.11.1 (p. 6-96), Example: Query why publisher statement has been included.

6.23.1.14 (p. 6-98): The situation raised in 5JSC/CCC/1 has not been addressed in these instructions. The scenario was a treaty between two national governments (Canada and Nisga'a Nation) and one below the national level (British Columbia). The instructions at 6.23.1.14 do not include a government below the national level and the instructions at 6.23.1.17 refer only to **a** (i.e., not more than one) national level government. Suggest the following rewording at 6.23.1.14.1 (cf. 6.7.5.1 June 2007 draft):

> For a treaty or any other formal agreement <u>to which one or more national governments is a signatory,</u> construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):

6.23.1.19b (p. 6-102), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.23.1.20a—6.23.1.20b (p. 6-102—6-103), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should all be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.23.1.21a (p. 6-104), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.23.1.28 (p. 6-108): Query the relevance and necessity of the *At head of title* information in the example.

6.23.1.29a and 6.23.1.29b (p. 6-108—6-109), *Editorial***:** Sub-paragraphs should all be numbered instead of repeating a) and b).

6.23.1.29a (p. 6-108): Query the relevance and necessity of the *At head of title* information in the example.

6.23.1.29b (p. 6-109), *Editorial***:** In the example, should capitalization of the first instance of "commonwealth" in the preferred access point be the same as that in the explanatory text?

Use of the abbreviation "etc." in access points for collective titles at 6.24 (Cover letter, p. 7): These collective headings, "Laws, etc.", "Treaties, etc.", and "Protocols, etc." have been used for a long time in the cataloguing of legal resources and we do not really see the need to change their usage at this time. To minimize retrospective clean-up, we prefer to retain the *etc.*

6.24.2.2.1 (p. 6-115—6-116): Although it is both, *Treaties, etc.*, in this instance should be referred to as a "collective title" instead of a "preferred title". (Cf. 6.24.1.1a – *Laws, etc.* is considered a collective title for compilations).

6.25.0.1.1 (p. 6-116): Suggest the following addition to the text:
> A **variant title** is a title or form of title by which a work is known <u>or could be known</u> that differs from the title or form of title chosen as the preferred title.

6.26.1.3.1 (p. 6-121), *Editorial***:** In the 2nd example, the *Citation title*, "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007" should not be in italics (cf. 6.24.1.1.1a2, 1st example).

6.27.0.3.1 (p. 6-122): For consistency (cf. 6.2.3.1.14.1), suggest the wording be revised as follows:
> Record the name of a signatory to a treaty, etc., <u>formulated according to the instructions given under 11.1.1.</u>

Distinction between creeds, confessions of faith, accepted by one or more than one church or denominational body at 6.28.1.3 (Cover letter, p. 7): CCC prefers to retain the distinction between one and more than one body at 6.28.1.3.

6.28.1.3.2 (p. 6-125): The example *Augsburg Confession* belongs more appropriately at 6.28.1.3.1 as it is accepted by more than one denominational body, i.e., the collectivity of Lutheran churches.

6.28.3.4.3 (p. 6-133): CCC notes that there is a discrepancy between AACR2 (25.20B1)/RDA (6.28.3.4.3 and 6.29.5.2.1) and present practice. Is it time to reconcile this discrepancy? We recommend that a review of the instructions and examples be considered.

Preferred titles for parts of the Bible at 6.29.7 (Cover letter-Agreed changes, p. 8): Query re "internationalization" terminology. According to 6.29.1—6.29.4, the preferred title is the title commonly identified in reference sources in the language preferred by the agency creating the data. However, at 6.29.7.1.1, the instruction is to use *Old Testament* – Is this an example of when *other language preferred by cataloguing agency* is not specifically mentioned in the instructions because 6.29.1 applies? If so, how does one get to the relationship between the two instructions?

6.29.5.2.1 (p. 6-140): See comment at 6.28.3.4.3.

6.29.7.3.1 (p. 6-141): In the interest of internationalization, should similar wording as at 6.29.10.3 (p. 6-145) be used here?
> Record the name of the book of the Bible in the language preferred by the agency creating the data.

Chapter 8
8.1.1.2 (p. 8-3): In order to address joint pseudonyms comprised of more than two people, suggest the following:
> The term **person** refers to an individual or to an identity established by an individual (either alone or in collaboration with <u>one or more other individuals</u>).

8.2.4 (p. 8-4), 2nd sentence: Since this is a principle, suggest replacing "recorded" with "treated" as follows:
> Other names and other forms of the name that are found in resources…should be <u>treated</u> as variant names.

8.2.5 (p. 8-4): Language and script should not always be linked issues; an agency may need to transliterate certain scripts, but not necessarily modify data as to language (particularly if the script is not changed). For example, an agency cataloguing in French may need to transliterate non-roman scripts using transliteration schemes appropriate to French, but will not "translate" English-language personal names into French. *Editorial*, **2nd sentence:** Delete the first instance of "preferred" to read:

> However, if the original language and script is not the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data…

8.4.1 (p. 8-5): What is the relationship between this instruction and the one at 8.2.5?

8.5.2.2 (p. 8-7): To encompass a number expressed as a word, suggest the following change:

> For instructions on recording an ordinal number as a designation associated with the name of a conference, congress, meeting, etc., see 11.1.1.8.

8.5.3.2 (p. 8-7): Delete this instruction as it is not needed. The instruction at 8.5.3.1 should cover all situations.

8.6.2 (p. 8-9): Query whether the references should be to 9.1.1.2, 10.1.1.2 and 11.1.1.2 respectively.

8.7.2 (p. 8-9): Query whether the references should be to 9.1.1.2 and 10.1.1.2 respectively.

Status of preferred access point at 8.10 (Cover letter, p. 9): We feel that only 3 of the values proposed are necessary (*fully established*, *provisional*, and *preliminary*). *Memorandum* is not required as it should not matter that there is no bibliographic record attached. It should be adequate just to use *fully established* in those cases.

8.12.0.3.3 (p. 8-13): Suggest following rewording:

> Cite other sources consulted that provided no useful information in establishing the preferred title.

8.13.0.3.1 (p. 8-15), penultimate example, *Editorial*: Delete full stop at end of example.

8.13.0.3.2 (p. 8-15), penultimate example, *Editorial*: Delete full stop at end of example.

8.13.0.3.2 (p. 8-15), last example: Suggest changing "flip-flops" to "fluctuates".

Chapter 9
9.0.1.1 (p. 9-4), footnote 1: In order to address joint pseudonyms comprised of more than two people, suggest the following:

> *Person*, as used in this chapter, refers to an individual or to an identity established by an individual (either alone or in collaboration with one or more other individuals).

9.1.1.1.1 (p. 9-5): Examples should reflect only the element addressed by the instructions. As these instructions refer to the "preferred name for the person" and not the form, the examples should not be in a constructed form.

9.1.1.1.2 (p. 9-5): Suggest that "in the order listed" be deleted from this instruction as it is not clear whether the order refers to the preferred order of choice of additions or the order of additions to the preferred access point:

> Make additions to the name as instructed under <u>9.1.1.2-9.1.1.4</u>, as applicable.

The order of the additions to access points at 9.1.1.2-9.1.1.4 is already reflected in the instructions:
1. the additions at 9.1.1.2 are added if applicable;
2. the fuller form of name at 9.1.1.4 are added if dates do not distinguish (i.e., implying that the addition of dates is preferable to fuller form of name).

9.1.1.2.1 (p. 9-6): Can the field of activity of a person not be an addition to the access point representing a person, i.e., should 9.16 also be referenced? "Anglo-Norman poet" can only be given as "poet"? See Cover letter, p. 11, last bullet of *Agreed changes to AACR2 instructions* in response to this issue.

9.1.1.3.1 (p. 9-7), examples: The inclusion of "born" and "died" in the examples is a display issue. However, given that birth date and death date are separate elements at 9.4, are these examples correct as they appear?

9.1.2.1.1 and 9.1.2.1.2 (p. 9-8—9-9): Is there a distinction between the explanatory texts in the two sets of instructions?

> *Form recorded as preferred name*

vs.

> *Form recorded as preferred access point*

9.1.2.1.1 (p. 9-8): Suggest replacing the second example with either of the following as it is possible that the example might be conceived as having a typographical error:

> Morris, James, 1926-
>   (*Later name recorded as preferred name:* Morris, Jan, 1926-)
>
> Villers-Sidani, Marie-Éva de, 1945-
>   (*Later name recorded as preferred name:* Villers, Marie-Éva de, 1945-)

9.1.2.1.2 (p. 9-9), last example: This example seems to be more appropriate at 9.1.2.1.1 as it does not illustrate any of the additions given under 9.1.1.2-9.1.1.4.

Internationalization of RDA for additional titles of nobility, terms of rank, etc. at appendix G, 9.2, 9.5, etc. (Cover letter, p. 10): We have no suggestions.

9.2.1.1.1 (p. 9-12): For consistency, suggest that it is not necessary to repeat as explanatory text, the *most common form*, since the example itself reflects the instructions of using the most common form.

9.2.4.1 (p. 9-19): Suggest that the examples might be clearer if the separate identities of the same individual were grouped together.

9.2.5.1.1 (p. 9-22): For consistency (cf. 9.2.5.3.2), suggest deleting 9.2.5.1.1c and give general instructions to see appendix F for additional instructions on Thai names.

9.2.5.1.3 (p. 9-22): Suggest that a reference be made at the end of the last sentence:
> If the name consists only of a surname, record the surname alone (see 9.2.5.4).

9.2.19.1 (p. 9-37), *Editorial***:** Change "consists" to: consisting.

9.3.2.3 (p. 9-41), 3rd example: Suggest revising as follows:
> Ratzinger, Josef
> (*Name used in religion recorded as preferred name:* Benedict XVI)

9.3.6.2 (p. 9-44): A name that has been transliterated by the agency can also be a source of information even though it is not taken from the resource. See wording at 10.3.0.3.3: "Record as a variant name a form of name used by a family, or found in reference sources, or resulting from a different transliteration of the name, that differs from the form recorded as the preferred name for that family."

9.3.7.3 (p. 9-47), *Family name of saint***, 2nd example:** Delete the "e" at the end of "Bernarde" as follows:
> Soubirous, Marie-Bernard
> (*Name as saint recorded as preferred name:* Bernadette)

9.4.2.3 (p. 9-54—9-55): For consistency, suggest that instructions equivalent to 9.4.1.3.2 be given for death dates.

9.4.2.3.2 (p. 9-55): For consistency (cf. 9.4.1.3.3), suggest the following rewording:
> If a deceased person's actual, probable, or approximate year of death is unknown, record *unknown*.

9.4.3.3.1 (p. 9-55): Would it be appropriate to give an example using the term "flourished"?

9.5.0.1.1 (p. 9-56), *Editorial***:** Correct font size "of address for a person of religious vocation"

9.5.0.4b (p. 9-57) and 9.5.0.4c2, b) (p. 9-58): It is still not clear when *(or the equivalent in the language preferred by the agency)* is given in the instructions when a specified term has been used in the instructions. This phrase does not follow the term *consort of* (9.5.0.4b.1) but does follow *Prince-Bishop*, *Prince-Archbishop*, *Archbishop and Elector*, etc. (9.5.0.7.3). **Editorial:** The use of square brackets in these instructions do not seem to conform to RDA style and could be changed to parentheses.

9.6.0.3.1 (p. 9-62): Suggest the following rewording for clarity (i.e., delete "all" as it is not clear what it is referring to):
> a) the fuller form of the inverted part of the name (forenames, etc.), including unused forenames, and/or initial that are not part of the preferred name

Gender in identifying persons at 9.8 (Cover letter, p. 10): The values *male*, *female*, and *other*, are adequate. We would prefer using *not identified* instead of "not known".

9.9—9.12 (p. 9-64—9-68): Is the form of the place name important here? Is it necessary to refer to chapter 16? What about the use of abbreviations, i.e., a reference to appendix B? Cf. 11.4.0.3.

9.16 (p. 9-70): It appears that the *field of activity of the person* cannot be part of the preferred name but *profession or occupation* can be but only if the person's name consists of a phrase or appellation not conveying the idea of a person (9.1.1.2.1e). If that is the case, in the first example at 9.16.0.3.1, the preferred name of the person would only be *Thomas (Poet)*and not *Thomas (Anglo-Norman poet)*. Is that the intent? Apparently that is the intent according to Cover letter, p. 11, final bullet of ***Agreed changes to AACR2 instructions*** (see also comment at **9.1.1.2.1**).

Identifiers for persons at 9.19 (Cover letter, p. 9): We question whether an agency assigned identifier can be considered *prescribed* (9.19.0.3.1). In addition, we feel that any identifier would need to include an indication of the assigning agency. We suggest that 9.19.0.3.2 be collapsed into 9.19.0.3.1 as follows:
> Record the identifier for the person. Precede the identifier with the name or an identification of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier, if readily ascertainable, using abbreviations as instructed in appendix B.

9.19.0.1.1 (p. 9-74), *Editorial***:** Revise as follows (cf. 16.6.0.1):
> An **identifier for the person** is a number or code uniquely associated with a person…

Chapter 10
General comments: CCC would like to reiterate its enthusiastic support for the inclusion of the chapter on identifying families in RDA. The chapter is logical, thorough, and the multiple references to instructions in other chapters ensure consistency within the standard.

10.1.1.1.2 (p. 10-3): Suggest that "in the order listed" be deleted from this instruction as it is not clear whether the order refers to the order of choice of additions or to the order of additions to the preferred access point. The instructions at 10.1.1.4 and 10.1.1.5 could be revised to reflect the preferred order of additions. We would also like to suggest that a more general type of addition be given as a possibility. The instructions would then read as follows (examples have not been transcribed):

> **10.1.1.1.2 (p. 10-3):** Revise as follows:
> > Make additions to the name as instructed under <u>10.1.1.2-10.1.1.**6**</u>, as applicable<u>.</u>
> > > [example not transcribed]

> **10.1.1.4 (p. 10-4):** Revise as follows (cf. 9.1.1.4):
> > If a date or dates associated with the family (see <u>10.5</u>) are not available to distinguish one access point from another, add the name of a place associated with the family (see <u>10.6</u>), if necessary, to distinguish one access point from another.
> > > [examples not transcribed]

> **10.1.1.5 (p. 10-4):** Revise as follows (cf. 9.1.1.4):
> > If a date or dates, or a name of a place, associated with the family are not available to distinguish one access point from another, add the name of a prominent member of the family (see <u>10.7</u>) if necessary, to distinguish one access point from another.
> > > [examples not transcribed]

> **10.1.1.6 (NEW):** Add new instruction as follows:

If neither dates, place, nor prominent member of the family are available to distinguish one access point from another, add a suitable brief term, if necessary, to distinguish one access point from another.

Hart (Family : Eagle clan)

Hart (Family : Wolf clan)

10.2.0.2.1c, footnote 3 (p. 10-6): Footnote 3 is not necessary as it is covered by footnote 2 at 10.0.2.1. Similar instructions at 9.0.2.2.1c and 11.2.0.2.1c do not have footnotes.

Recording type of family at 10.4.0.3 (Cover letter, p. 12): We have no further terms to suggest.

10.4.0.3.1 (p. 10-12): For consistency (cf. 11.6.0.3.1), delete " a term indicating" and reword as follows:

Record the type of family using an appropriate term from the list below.

Additionally it is not clear how these terms are capitalized when they are an addition to the preferred name, e.g., (Family).

10.6.0.3 (p. 10-14): Is the form of the place name important here? Is it necessary to refer to chapter 16? What about the use of abbreviations, i.e., a reference to appendix B? Cf. 11.4.0.3.

10.8.0.3 (p. 10-16): Is there a particular form to be followed here? Should there be a reference to chapter 9?

Identifiers for families at 10.10 (Cover letter, p. 9): We question whether an agency assigned identifier can be considered *prescribed* (10.10.0.3.1). In addition, we feel that any identifier would need to include an indication of the assigning agency. We suggest that 10.10.0.3.2 be collapsed into 10.10.0.3.1 as follows:

Record the identifier for the family. Precede the identifier with the name or an identification of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier, if readily ascertainable, using abbreviations as instructed in appendix B.

10.10.0.1.1 (p. 10-18), *Editorial***:** Revise as follows (cf. 16.6.0.1):

An **identifier for the family** is a number or code uniquely associated with a family…

Chapter 11
11.0.2.2 (p. 11-3): A name that has been transliterated by the agency can also be a source of information even though it is not taken from the resource. See wording at 10.3.0.3.3: "Record as a variant name a form of name used by a family, or found in reference sources, or resulting from a different transliteration of the name, that differs from the form recorded as the preferred name for that family."

11.1.1.1.2 (p. 11-5): "in the order listed" is not necessary since each instruction at 11.1.1.2-11.1.1.8 already identifies the situations for which the addition should be made; revise as follows:

Make additions to the name as instructed under 11.1.1.2-11.1.1.8, as applicable.

11.1.1.2.1 (p. 11-5): Does *add* mean that the addition (designation) is to be given in parentheses? Additionally when more than one addition (designation) is given, instructions on punctuation

used to separate the additions are required. Not all affected instructions in chapter 11 have been identified as lacking instructions.

Suggest adding "and script" as follows:
> If the preferred name for the body…add a suitable designation in the language <u>and script</u> preferred by the…

11.1.1.3.2 (p. 11-7), explanatory text of examples: What follows the semi-colon merely repeats the instruction, suggest that the explanatory text be simplified to: *No conflict*.

11.1.1.3.2 (p. 11-7), last example: This example seems to be more appropriate at 11.1.1.2.1 as it is not clear how the addition of the place associated with the body assists in understanding the nature of the body.

11.1.1.3.5 and 11.1.1.3.6 (p. 11-8): Both instructions are to add "place". A station consisting solely or principally of call letters would not include the name of the place. Suggest the instructions be combined as follows:
> Add the name of the place in which a radio or television station is located unless the name of the place is an integral part of the name of the station.

Query whether a see reference to 11.7.0.4.2 should be added here as well.

11.1.1.7 (p. 11-10): For consistency, suggest that the instruction read:
> <u>add</u> an appropriate general designation (see <u>11.7.0.8</u>).

11.1.1.8 (p. 11-11): Suggest that a see reference to 11.2.0.9 also be given at a).

11.1.1.8.1 (p. 11-12), last example: Query the use of two separate sets of parentheses for the two designations.

11.1.1.8.3 (p. 11-12): Suggest always including location in the preferred access point for a conference regardless of whether the location is in the name of the conference itself. Always adding the location of the conference would be more standard and eliminate an exception, as well as clearly recording the conference location as an element sub-type. Suggest that this instruction be deleted.

11.2.0.6.1 (p. 11-17): To eliminate the term *file*; suggest following rewording as at 5.5.4.1:
> Omit an initial article (<u>see appendix C</u>) unless the access point is to <u>be accessed</u> under <u>that</u> article (e.g., a corporate name…)

11.2.0.6.2 (p. 11-17): The *alternative* instruction is no longer necessary now that the basic instruction is to omit the initial article.

11.2.0.7.1 (p. 11-17): The only examples of this instruction are Russian bodies (also in AACR2 at 24.5B1). Does this situation only occur with Russian bodies? It might be helpful to include either an explanatory text of the terms or, if appropriate, give an English example.

11.2.0.9.1 (p. 11-19): The relationship between this instruction and 11.1.1.8 is not clear.

11.2.1.1.1 (p. 11-20): Suggest that "as well" at the end of the sentence is unnecessary and can be deleted.

11.2.1.5.1 (p. 11-23), 1ˢᵗ example, *Editorial*: "not" should be in italics.

11.2.1.5b (p. 11-24): Specific punctuation instructions have been given here but not consistently elsewhere, see 11.1.1, etc.

11.2.1.5a (p. 11-24), footnote 6: The English bias should be removed from the second sentence as follows:

> If it is necessary to create an access point for a diplomatic conference that has no formal name…choose the name found most commonly in periodical articles and newspaper accounts in the language preferred by the agency creating the data as the preferred name.

11.2.1.5c (p. 11-25), *Editorial*: Sub-paragraphs should be numbered instead of repeating a), b) and c).

11.2.1.5c (p. 11-25), 1ˢᵗ—3ʳᵈ examples, *Editorial*: Line spacing is not consistent between the first and second lines of "*not*".

11.2.1.5c (p. 11-25), 9ᵗʰ and 10ᵗʰ examples, *Editorial*: "not" should be in italics.

11.2.1.5d (p. 11-26), 2ⁿᵈ example, *Editorial*: Line spacing between the two lines of "*not*" is not consistent.

11.2.1.5e.3 (p. 11-27), 2ⁿᵈ and 3ʳᵈ examples: These examples do not illustrate conferences with specific names as well as general names in a series of conferences; rather they illustrate selecting a distinctive brief form of name (see 11.2.1.1.4). This follows through to 11.3.4.3.1. The existing example in AACR2 24.3F2 and 26.3A2 (*Symposium on Protein Metabolism* rather than *Nutrition Symposium*) is an appropriate example.

11.2.3.2.5 (p. 11-31), 3ʳᵈ and 4ᵗʰ examples, *Editorial*: The 4ᵗʰ example is a duplicate of the 3ʳᵈ example.

11.2.4.3 (p. 11-34): Both LC and LAC have issued rule interpretations to extend this instruction to joint government bodies. We suggest that this situation be covered as a separate instruction at 11.2.6 or a reference be made from 11.2.6 to 11.2.4.3.

11.2.5 (p. 11-34—11-35): Is this instruction needed? We do not think that it is necessary and suggest that it be deleted.

11.2.6.2.5 (p. 11-38), 2ⁿᵈ example: Add (Vt.) to the example to read:
> Governor's Cost Control Council (Vt.)

11.2.7.2.1 (p. 11-41): For consistency (cf. 11.2.17.3), suggest that the last sentence read as follows:
> Record the title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data if there is an equivalent term in that language.

11.2.7.5.1 (p. 11-44) 2nd and 5th examples, *Editorial*: The 5th example is a duplicate of the 2nd example.

11.2.8.3—11.2.8.4 (p. 11-46): We do not feel that these instructions are necessary and suggest that they be deleted.

11.2.12.3 (p. 11-51), 1st sentence: To account for the second example, suggest the following (cf. 11.2.17.2):

> If the access point is for a consulate or other local office, add the name of the city in which it is located before the name of the country or other jurisdiction to which it is accredited.

11.2.14.2 (p. 11-52): Is it necessary to specify "Catholic Church" in this instruction or can it be generalized? See 11.2.14.3 where the generic term "religious body" is used.

11.3.1.3.1, (p. 11-59), last example: Suggest deleting the first variant name since it is only an expanded form of the ampersand that is already covered in the second variant form. Note that the last example at 11.3.1.3.2 does not give two variant forms, i.e., one for "Mount" and another for "Company"; instead they are combined in the one variant form.

11.3.2.3 (p. 11-60), *Editorial*: Is it correct to use the term "initialisms" (in the plural form) as only the singular form has been used at 16.3.2.2.1 (p. 16-12)?

11.3.4.3.1 General name of a conference, etc. (p. 11-64), 2nd and 3rd examples: These examples are not appropriate here; as they illustrate selecting a distinctive brief form of name requiring the expanded form as a variant under 11.3.1.3.1. See also comment at **11.2.1.5e.3**.

11.4.1 (p. 11-67): Query if the online product will address link between 11.1.1.8 and 11.4.1 or should there also be a see reference to 11.1.1.8? Is location, etc., considered to be a part of the preferred name of a conference?

11.5.0.1.1 (p. 11-71), *Editorial*: Add a comma after "etc."

11.7.0.5.2 and 11.7.0.5.3 (p. 11-78): Is there a distinction between the use of "add" and "record" between two instructions? Note that related examples appear at 11.1.1.7.1 where the term "record" is used.

11.7.0.7.1 (p. 11-79): Not sure that it is clear in what form the ordinal numeral is to be recorded. For example, if the preferred name of the conference appears as: *First International Conference on Georgian Psalmody*, how does one arrive at "1st"? Or, can it be given as "first"? Neither 8.5.2, 11.1.1.8, or 11.7.7.0.7 address this issue. Would it be more correct to change "ordinal numeral" to "ordinal number"? In AACR2, C.3A (*Arabic numerals vs. numbers expressed as words*), conference headings are given as an exception not to retain numbers expressed as words (24.7B2 refers to C.8A to use 1st, 2nd , etc.). This reference is lacking in RDA.

Identifiers for corporate bodies at 11.12 (Cover letter, p. 9): We question whether an agency assigned identifier can be considered *prescribed* (11.12.0.3.1). In addition, we feel that any identifier would need to include an indication of the assigning agency. We suggest that 11.12.0.3.2 be collapsed into 11.12.0.3.1 as follows:

Record the identifier for the corporate body. Precede the identifier with the name or an identification of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier, if readily ascertainable, using abbreviations as instructed in appendix B.

11.12.0.1.1 (p. 11-84), *Editorial***:** Revise as follows (cf. 16.6.0.1):
An **identifier for the corporate body** is a number or code uniquely associated with a corporate body…

Chapter 16
Chapter 16, Scope of chapter (Cover letter, p. 12): Instructions regarding the use of abbreviations for additions to place names needs to be addressed (including a reference to appendix B?).

16.2.0.1.1 (p. 16-3): Instructions at 16.2.0.1 indicate that "a place name is used as the name of a government, etc., (see 11.2.1.5d), as an addition to the name of a corporate body (see 11.1.1.3), as an addition to a conference name (see 11.1.1.8), or when recording a place associated with a corporate body (see 11.4). Place is also referenced in chapter 10 at 10.6 and should be included at 16.2.0.1.1.

16.2.0.5 (p. 16-4): Query whether these instructions should also appear in chapters, 10 and 11.

16.2.1.1 (p. 16-5), 1st to 4th examples, *Editorial***:** The font of "*not*" needs to be changed.

16.2.1.3 and 16.2.1.4 (p. 16-5—16-6), *Editorial***:** The font of "*not*" needs to be changed.

16.2.2.1 (p. 16-6): Are there very many "other relevant instructions in chapter 11"? Is 11.4.2.4 (p. 11-70) the most relevant and maybe should be identified specifically here?

16.2.5.1.1 (p. 16-8): Suggest all three examples be deleted as they are already listed as part of the instructions.

16.3.2.2 (p. 16-2), *Editorial***:** Acronyms do not apply; revise text (see also comment at **11.3.2.3 (p. 11-60)**)) to read:
Take initialism and abbreviated forms from any source.

Identifiers for places at 16.6 (Cover letter, p. 13): We question whether an agency assigned identifier can be considered *prescribed* (16.6.0.3.1). In addition, we feel that any identifier would need to include an indication of the assigning agency. We suggest that 16.6.0.3.2 be collapsed into 16.6.0.3.1 as follows:
 Record the identifier for the place. Precede the identifier with the name or an identification of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier, if readily ascertainable, using abbreviations as instructed in appendix B.

16.6.0.3.2 (p. 16-18), *Editorial***:** This instruction appears twice.

Chapter 29
29.1.1.2 (p. 29-2): In order to address joint pseudonyms comprised of more than two people, suggest the following:
The term **person** refers to an individual or to an identity established by an individual (either alone or in collaboration with one or more other individuals).

29.3.2 (p. 29-4): These lists should be consistent with those found at 8.3.2 as the elements given under persons and under corporate bodies differ both in the elements given and in the order in which they are presented.

29.4.1 (p. 29-4), *Editorial***:** Delete the comma after the first instance of "corporate body".

Chapter 30
30.1.0.3b (p. 30-3), penultimate example: Suggest *musical group* replace *corporate body* in the explanatory text.

30.2.0.3.1 (p. 3-4), *Editorial***:** Delete full stop at the end of the example.

Chapter 32
32.1.0.3b (p. 32-3), 4ᵗʰ and 5ᵗʰ examples, *Editorial***:** For consistency, suggest explanatory text read:
    (*Preferred access point representing the <u>corporate</u> body related to:…*)

32.2.0.3.1, (p. 32-4), 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ examples, *Editorial***:** Delete full stop at the end of the examples.

Appendix F
F.6.1.2.2 (p. F-10), *Editorial***:** The see reference, <u>9.3.8</u> does not exist; should it be to 9.3.7?

F.6.1.3.1 (p. F-10), *Editorial***:** Adjust the alignment of the text of c).