To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Ebe Kartus, ACOC Representative

Subject: Transcription issues associated with the Production Statement (RDA 2.7)

ACOC thanks ALA for the Discussion paper. We also note that the discussions and outcomes of JSC/BL rep/1 may have an impact on the proposals in this paper.

ACOC discussed the recommendations proposed in the paper and agreed to the following:

1. Revise the guidelines of RDA so that all the sub-elements of the Production Statement (2.7) are recorded, not transcribed. **ACOC agrees**

2. Modify the Sources of Information for production information (2.7.1.2) to be simply "any source". **ACOC agrees**

3. To accommodate the transcription of production information appearing on the resource that has not been included in the recorded Production Statement, revise RDA 2.17.6, *Note on Production Statement* to allow such information to be accommodated. **ACOC feels that while there is a preference to record production information, there needs to be scope for transcription if it is appropriate to do so. Additionally, the supporting examples do not clearly illustrate the proposed changes.**

ACOC further discussed the Questions asked of the constituents and agreed to the following:

1. Does the JSC agree that requiring transcription of information from unpublished resources is not the most effective way of supporting the FRBR user tasks? **ACOC agrees**

2. Does the JSC agree that recording information related to the Production Statement and changing the sources of information hierarchy outweighs the benefits of consistency between the instructions for the Production, Publication, Distribution, and Manufacture Statements? **ACOC agrees**

3. Does the JSC agree that the revision proposal outlined by ALA should be undertaken? If so:
a) Should a revision of 2.7 include the removal of the sub-elements Parallel Place of Production (2.7.3) and Parallel Producer's Name (2.7.5) **ACOC agrees**
b) Should any of the elements listed under "Additional Considerations" above also be part of such a proposal? **ACOC feels this is substantial enough to warrant a separate proposal**

4. Does the JSC feel that recording production information as relationships (and potentially, publication, distribution, and manufacture information as well) is an idea that should be pursued? **ACOC would be interested in more information in the form of a discussion paper before providing a response**

In the potential changes listed in the Appendix, ACOC has the following comments:

In points 2 and 3 does the reference to the production statements from general guidelines on recording dates and numbers need to be removed? These instructions are about recording, not transcribing, and the general guidelines should still apply to unpublished resources. The only thing that potentially needs to change for unpublished resources is the requirement for "supplied dates" to indicate that the data has come from outside the resource. This could be managed with an "exception".

In point 7 deleting all paragraphs relating to transcription - Would it not be better to rework dot point a) in favour of "recording", rather than deleting it altogether? Might there not be situations where what is the on the resource is what you record in the element? And instead of just deleting b-d, replace them with a statement that links through to the notes elements, so that cataloguers know what to do with information that that is on the resource.