

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative
Subject: Proposed revision of RDA 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3, Basis for Identification of the Resource

LC thanks ALA for undertaking the difficult task of revising these instructions—we are well aware that the application of the current instructions has been challenging.

Recommendation #1: Collective Titles: LC supports the recommendation.

Recommendation #2: Predominant Work: LC supports the recommendation.

Recommendation #3: Resources Issued in More Than One Part: LC supports the idea of modifying the categories in RDA 2.1.2.3, but would like to suggest some modifications. Our chief concern is that the categories as given do not seem mutually exclusive, which we believe was the intent (i.e., there is no instruction to prefer a priority order of categories). For example, without wording that indicates sequential numbering is not involved, category a) as given could be a serial and thereby pose a conflict with revised category c). Another possible area of confusion is with a) and b) -- the implication is that the latter is for a compilation of works, but this is not stated, so some have interpreted a) and b) as not mutually exclusive. We also had difficulties with the phrase “or if it has numbering that is not suitable for producing an ordered sequence” in category d) and would like to restore the earlier wording.

Proposed revisions:

2.1.2.2: We agree to the changes, but would like to add another “e.g.” statement to the end of the first sentence:

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a source with a collective title). [rest of ALA proposal unchanged]

2.1.2.3:

We agree to the change in the first paragraph.

Paragraphs a) and b): LC proposes to combine the paragraphs, and draw a clearer distinction with paragraph c).

a) If the resource is issued as a set that is unnumbered, or if the numbering is not considered significant (e.g., a compact disc set containing an opera; a kit), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole. See categories e) or f) if there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole.

Paragraph c): agree with the ALA rewording.

Paragraph d): LC reviewers had difficulty with the phrase “or if it has numbering that is not suitable for producing an ordered sequence” and preferred the original wording “concept of sequential issuing of parts is not applicable”

If the resource has unnumbered issues or parts, or if the concept of sequential issuing of parts is not applicable ~~it has numbering that is not suitable for producing an ordered sequence~~, choose a source of information identifying the issue or part with the earliest date of issue.

Paragraphs e) and f): agree with the ALA rewording.