TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

SUBJECT: Revision of RDA 2.3.1.7 (Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements) and RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents). BL Response

___

British Library thanks CCC for these proposed clarifications. We have responded to each recommendation below.

1. Resolve potential contradiction between 2.3.1.7 and 2.3.2.6 by adding an "and" condition in 2.3.1.7: Agreed. There was strong support from Multiparts Team, who noted that this incorporates the LC/PCC PS (which we already follow) into RDA.
2. Creating exceptions in 2.3.1.7 for serials and integrating resources and television and radio programs: We do not believe that it is desirable to introduce exceptions based on carrier type. Many TV and Radio programmes will be covered by the exception for serials.
3. Add an exception with a reference to 2.3.1.7 following the second optional addition of 2.3.2.6. We also suggest splitting 2.3.2.6 into comprehensive and analytical instructions. Agreed.

During our discussion, it was suggested that an alternative approach would be to make the exception for serials the default position and to allow an optional omission to omit the common title when it is not required. This would be a more succinct approach.

2.3.1.7 Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements

If:

> the common title and the title of the part, section, or supplement are on the source of information,

then

<u>always record the common title followed by the title of the part, section, or supplement. Use a full stop to separate the common title from the title of the part, section, or supplement</u>

<u>Optional Omission</u>

<u>Omit the common title if the title of the part, section, or supplement is sufficient to identify that part, section, or supplement without also including the common title.</u>

We noted in passing that 6.27.2.2 is another instruction specific to particular carrier type, that should be reviewed.

EURIG discussed this proposal at the meeting on 19th September. The requirement to use a full stop as a delimiter in RDA was queried.

BNF requested that the same examples should be used to illustrate the comprehensive and analytical approaches as an aid to understanding.