

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

SUBJECT: Change to RDA 7.24 and Glossary, Artistic and/or Technical Credit.

BL thanks ALA for the revised proposal and agrees with the changes proposed with the suggestions made in the LC response. BL's comments on the specific issues raised by ALA in 6JSC/ALA/4/rev follow below.

Issues involving instructions

1.

Because Artistic and/or Technical Credit is an attribute of the Expression, it is suggested at #7 below that the examples should only include credits relating to the expression of the work. This suggests that 7.24.1.1 might need some revision as well. "Moving image resource" is clearly a content term, but "sound recording" and perhaps "multimedia resource" are not. For sound recording, the Content Type term is "performed music", but I suggest that "audio resource" might be better. There are no Content Type terms for mixed content, so I think that "multimedia resource" might be the best we can do. If the JSC agrees to change "sound recording" to "audio resource", I suggest that the entire phrase be worded as "an audio, moving image, or multimedia resource". Does JSC agree?

BL agrees with the analysis. BL agrees with the proposal to change "sound recording" to "audio resource"; BL agrees with LC and CCC that "resources" would be a better choice than "multimedia resource", which is not otherwise used.

2

The JSC preferred the phrase "if not recorded in another element" to "not recorded elsewhere in the description". The latter phrase is also used at 7.27.1.3. Should this instruction also be changed? On the other hand, there are two issues that should be noted:

- 2a. RDA 0.7 seems to draw a distinction between elements and access points. It seems to me that "not recorded elsewhere in the description" covers access points, but "not recorded in another element" does not. Is this a distinction worth making? If so, I would think that the latter phrase should be used in 7.24; if a name is recorded in an access point, this should not mean that it would not be recorded in the Credits element.
- 2b. Looking at 7.24.1.3, I believe that the instruction might read better if the word "if" and the preceding comma were not included:

BL We agree with LC that the condition that it is not recorded in another element should be removed.

3.

1. CCC proposed adding a reference to 7.23 at 7.24.1.1; I suggest that a reciprocal reference to 7.24 be added at 7.23.1.1. Does JSC agree?

For instructions on recording artistic and/or technical credits, see [7.24](#).

BL Agree.

4.

- LC proposed revising the reference at 2.4.1.1. Their rewording breaks the parallel with other references at 2.4.1.1. I suggest that we retain the parallel, but reword based on the revised scope of 7.24:

For statements identifying persons who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource, see [7.24](#).

BL Agree, but prefer generalising to “resource” rather than listing specific types.

5

RDA 7.24.1.3 includes the sentence “Precede each name or group of names with a statement of function.” The comparable instruction at 7.23.1.3 says “For performers of music, indicate the medium in which each performs.” Is it necessary for Artistic and/or Technical Credits that the statement of function come before the name? If not, I suggest “Include a statement of function with each name or group of names.” Does JSC agree?

BL Agree. RDA does not need to specify the order in which this information should be recorded.

Issues involving examples:

6

Adam Schiff recommends that we include the first and second of the moving image examples included in the LC response, but not the third (the new examples are highlighted in yellow in the clean copy below). He feels that we don’t need both and that the corporate body is much more obvious in the second than in the third example. Does JSC agree? Are there other example that you wish to delete? There are certainly a large number of moving image examples, and I’m not sure that they all raise unique situations.

BL. We do not have strong views on examples for moving images and do not have any recommendations for deletion. We agree with Adam's proposal regarding the third example.

7

This element is an attribute of the expression and therefore credits relating to either the work or the manifestation are out of scope.

7a. Adam feels that "directory of photography" (which is a relationship designator associated with the work) is out of scope. Does JSC agree to delete such statements?

BL. We would rather retain the example pending comprehensive review of the issue of responsibility.

7b. "Producer" is also a relationship designator associated with the work; Adam suggests that both record producers and executive producers fit the definition and are therefore out of scope for this element. I agree about executive producers, but am not so sure about record producers. This may require more discussion and might best be deferred to the investigation of the larger issues that ALA was invited to undertake. In the meantime, I suggest that we remove any statements relating to producers from these examples. Does JSC agree?

BL. We would rather retain the example pending comprehensive review of the issue of responsibility.

7c. Relationship designators for various sorts of editors are all associated with the expression – yet in the case of some resources (e.g., books) we record these in statements of responsibility rather than credits. I believe that this is one of the larger issues that will need to be resolved, but that statements relating to editors may be retained in these examples? Does JSC agree?

BL agrees to retain the example pending comprehensive review of the issue of responsibility.

8

Adam recommends that we include explanatory notes for all the examples. Rather than using "Resource described: [title]" – which may not help to identify the type of resource – he recommends a statement such as "Artistic and/or technical credits [or simply Credits] for a 'type of resource'". Given that this element is an attribute of the Expression, he suggests that we use the Content Type term to indicate type of resource; this would be "performed music" (for the sound recordings), "moving image resource" and "multimedia resource" (?). I suggested earlier using "audio resource" rather than "performed music" in the definition of the element. What is your preference? [Note: These notes are included in the revised text below, using "Credits for an audio resource", etc.]

BL we are not convinced that the explanatory notes are necessary and recommend that they be deleted.

Alan