To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: **Revision of 0.6 Core Elements**

CCC appreciates the effort to reduce redundancy and thanks the British Library for undertaking this examination of core element specifications. CCC does not support this proposal and wishes to provide the following comments.

In our experience training novice and experienced cataloguers, the comprehensive listing of RDA core elements is a well-used feature of the RDA Toolkit. The comprehensive listing will need to be maintained and made accessible as part of the RDA Toolkit no matter whether it is located in 0.6 or in the Resources tab. The suggested automatic generation of the listing will apply to the English listing, but CCC asks whether the listing of core elements in the languages of the translations of RDA can be generated automatically also? In other words, are the French element names (and German, Spanish, etc.) included in the OMR?

CCC is of the opinion that retaining the comprehensive listing in RDA itself is the surest guarantee that the listing will be available in the translated versions. This is also the most appropriate place for the listing in the printed versions, i.e., English, French, etc.

If this proposal goes ahead, CCC agrees with the suggestion in ALA's response to add references from the subsets of core elements at 1.3, 5.3, etc.

CCC provides these responses to points raised in the Issues to be Resolved section.

Renaming 0.6
Only two instructions of the current 0.6 do not specifically cover Core Elements, 0.6.8 and 0.6.9. It could be argued that these instructions are in scope because they say there are no core elements in these sections. If this proposal proceeds, perhaps it would simplest to delete 0.6.8 and 0.6.9.

Is it necessary to list the core elements in the introduction?
The proposal incorrectly states that the core elements are listed in every chapter. They are generally given in the first chapter of each section, specifically at 1.3, 5.3, 8.3, 17.3 and 18.3. CCC prefers that the comprehensive listing of core elements is retained in the introduction, as well as in each section.

If not in the introduction, then where?
CCC prefers that the listing remains in the introduction. Otherwise, it would be best placed in the free area of the Toolkit.

Refer to the RDA element set as unconstrained elements in the introduction
If this proposal proceeds, CCC agrees to the inclusion of a reference to the RDA element set published as unconstrained elements in the introduction. CCC questions whether comparable accommodation can be provided to users of the print versions of RDA, i.e., English, French, German, etc.

0.6.3 Cardinality

If this proposal proceeds, CCC suggests alternate wording to better reflect the style already in use elsewhere in RDA, e.g. 0.6.1.

Instances of an element can be recorded as often as required. Only one instance of a core element is required. Subsequent instances are optional.

0.6.4 Conformance
The sentence regarding recording elements separately, as part of an access point, or as both, is used several times in the current introduction. If this proposal proceeds, that will be eliminated from the introduction. The fourth paragraph of the proposed 0.6.4 conformance section already covers a different choice to be made by agencies. CCC suggests the addition of a sentence preceding the fourth paragraph as follows, if this proposal proceeds. The proposed sentence expresses the intent of the deleted sentence in a style consistent with 0.6.4.

0.6.4 Conformance

As a minimum, a resource description for a work, expression, manifestation, or item should include all the core elements that are applicable and readily ascertainable. The description should also include any additional elements that are required in a particular case to differentiate the resource from one or more other resources with similar identifying information.

A description of an entity associated with a resource should include all the core elements that are applicable and readily ascertainable. The description should also include any additional elements that are required in a particular case to differentiate the entity from one or more other entities with the same name or title.

The agency responsible for creating the data may choose to record the elements as separate elements, as parts of the access point representing the entity, or as both.

The inclusion of other specific elements or subsequent instances of these elements is optional. The agency responsible for creating the data may choose:

a) to establish policies and guidelines on levels of description and authority control to be applied either generally or to specific categories of resources and other entities

or

b) to leave decisions on the level of detail to the judgment of the cataloguer or the individual creating the data.