

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Kevin Marsh, ACOC Representative
Subject: Proposed revision of RDA 2.1.22 and 2.1.2.3, Basis for Identification of the Resource

ACOC thanks ALA for this proposal to revise RDA 2.1.22 and 2.1.2.3, Basis for Identification of the Resource. We support the proposal in general.

Recommendation 1: Collective Titles, and Recommendation 2: Predominant Work, are fully supported. Recommendation 3: Resources Issued in More Than One Part is supported with the following caveat.

We consider the wording in the 5th dot point of the recommendation to be unclear. The proposed wording of 'or their numbering is not considered *significant*' (ACOC's emphasis) doesn't provide guidance on what is required to be done. What does the cataloguer need to do when they come up against this phrase in the instructions?

The wording seems to imply that there is some sort of numbering and the cataloguer then needs to decide, whether it is significant or not. A more useful phrase here may be 'or the numbering does not help to establish an order, ignore it'.

If this additional change is supported the proposed new category b) would read:

- b) If the resource is issued as a set and the component pieces are either unnumbered or their numbering is not considered significant, the numbering does not help to establish an order, ignore the numbering, and choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole, preferring a source that bears a collective title.

Clean copy:

- b) If the resource is issued as a set and the component pieces are either unnumbered or the numbering does not help to establish an order, ignore the numbering, and choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole, preferring a source that bears a collective title.