6JSC/ACOC/2/Chair follow-up/1
21 September 2011

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Danskin, Chair, JSC

Subject: 6JSC/ACOC/2: Revision of RDA 2.7.2.3, 2.8.2.3, 2.9.2.3, 2.10.2.3 Recording Place of Production [Publication, Distribution, Manufacture]

The following comments have been received from the National Library of New Zealand.

To: Alan Danskin, Chair of the JSC

From: National Library of New Zealand

Subject: 6JSC/ACOC/2: Revision of RDA 2.7.2.3, 2.8.2.3, 2.9.2.3, 2.10.2.3 Recording Place of Production [Publication, Distribution, Manufacture]

National Library of New Zealand generally supports the ACOC proposed revisions to this rule.

We noted that the larger jurisdiction is included

a) if it appears on the resource along with the local place
b) if the local place is not on the resource, but can be supplied ***and*** the larger jurisdiction *"is necessary for identification"* – RDA rule 2.7.2.6.1
c) the local place is unknown and the larger jurisdiction is known or probably known

The reason for being able to add a larger jurisdiction when the local place isn't on the resource, but not being able to do so when the local place is named is not at all clear to us. There seems to be a gap in the situations covered by the rule which the ACOC proposal addresses.

This raises another issue for us, and that is the need for the larger jurisdiction as a data element of some kind, not necessarily linked to the place of production, etc. element. At the moment country or state of publication is a MARC data element in the 008 fixed fields, but is not required by AACR2. If the larger jurisdiction is a data element that has value, should it be a core element for a manifestation?