To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Simplification of RDA 2.7-2.10

CCC discussed this discussion paper and 6JSC/ALA/31 at its meeting on September 19, 2014. There was a mixed reaction to the possibility of splitting the functions of the data in RDA elements 2.7-2.10.

The instructions as presented in the two scenarios in this discussion paper are insufficient to support the daily work of cataloguers.
It is also unclear how the core requirement will be dealt with when we transcribe whole, unparsed issuance statements. Presently, only the first place associated with the publisher is core. Will all of the places listed be transcribed as part of the issuance statement?
Will cataloguers be transcribing everything that looks like an issuance statement found on the resource including the publisher name with the logo on the cover, the various bits and pieces on the verso and details in fine print in the colophon?
The discussion explored the use of relationships between the manifestation and the producer, publisher, distributor and manufacturer entities, to support the 'find' user task. This in itself merits an evaluation of the the value of cataloguers' creating and maintaining these relationships. Treatment of the PPDM as agents and entities would be benefitted by the explicit inclusion of relationship designators in I.4.
The impact of these changes on serials, integrating resources and multi-part monographs is to be considered also. It is questionable whether there is any value in comparing and transcribing issuance statements that vary slightly from part to part, or issue to issue.
If one of these scenarios moves forward to a proposal, we suspect the instructions would need to be much longer than suggested in this discussion paper.

4.4 Place and Date in RDA
CCC members who attended the August 22, 2014 meeting of the FRBR Review Group provided more insight on the work of the RG as it relates to this proposal. The Review Group discussed both place and timespan entities. The result of that discussion is the proposed retention of the Place entity without restricting it to only the Group 3 entities. This would allow the publishing, etc., agent to be linked to a place in a relationship. In future meetings, the Review Group will consider the timespan entity (Dates are the appellations of Times according to various calendars and systems). The handling of events and change over time are features of the CIDOC CRM/FRBRoo model that are not shared with FRBR. In future discussions, it is hoped the group will consider whether it is possible to include time as an entity in an entity-relationship model.

Questions

1. CCC prefers neither scenario. CCC did not dismiss scenario B outright in consideration of the arguments in favour of scenario B in section 5 of the paper. Whether this is the correct time to make this change is debatable, i.e., CCC remains unconvinced that the situation justifies such a major change. Publication statements are rarely presented in a logical and consistent fashion. The issues of publication information presented on different sources of information on a resource will withstand scenario B. Maintaining granularity is seen by CCC as vital and valuable in fulfilling the user tasks.

2. Yes, CCC supports further work on the entities Place and Timespan and hopes this can be coordinated with the work of the FRBR Review Group. It is anticipated that the FRBR consolidation will lead to an accommodation of the entities option in the long run.
3. Some produced resources are self-describing so it would be possible to transcribe an issuance statement. If the instructions are to be re-written and re-grouped, the first group could address transcription of information from resources that are self-describing. This could be followed by instructions for devising publication, manufacture and distribution data for non-self-describing resources.
4. It is unclear what is meant by simplification in this question. The implication of these changes would be to move RDA away from ISBD which should be undertaken carefully and only with sufficient justification. The ISBD Review Group is, itself, beginning to realize that aggregate 'statements' consisting of sub-elements are artificial constructs of cataloguing rules. Both JSC and the ISBD Review Group, are anticipating a world of relationships between entities, and CCC prefers that JSC moves be co-ordinated with the ISBD RG.
5. Agree with defining sub-types of date of manifestation. Obviously, there is an implication for the existing element copyright date RDA 2.11.
   Care must be taken to be sure that when we refer to dates in the context of archival resources, we only refer to the dates of manifestation not to dates of coverage.
6. a) If scenario B is preferred, yes, issuance is an understandable term
   b) Generally, moving further away from ISBD deserves careful consideration. Continuing to apply ISBD terminology to elements that are clearly not ISBD-conformant would be misleading, so our answer to this question is no.

CCC commends BL for exploring this situation and for developing these scenarios. This was surely difficult to satisfy transcription and representation, give consideration to the use of relationships between the resource and the PPDM entities, while at the same time making the data elements in chapter 2 more findable as separately recorded data elements.