To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Dave Reser, LC Representative

Subject: Internationalization and RDA Appendix A Capitalization

Thanks to CCC for following-up on some of the issues raised in 6JSC/CCC/12, the arguments raised in the discussion paper are compelling. We offer the following comments.

1. An ideal structure for the language-specific instructions would be flexible, expansible, and provide a logical order in English as well as in translation.

1a. Develop a standard template which would be filled-in for each language.

> **LC response**: Many parallel sections, by language, would be one approach that could be taken, but we wonder if this is the only approach that should be considered. For example, the "template" could be for a category (e.g., A.11 Personal Names), with the practice for each language found under that category rather than grouping all language instructions for a single language together. Languages with the same practice may be grouped together for some categories, but separate for other categories where the practice would be different.

1b. Reducing the normative status of Appendix A.

> **LC response**: Depending on how it is applied, the Alternative at Appendix A.1 in essence already allows a cataloging agency to break with the normative status of Appendix A. The alternative may be the only approach for languages where there is not a single normative practice, as noted to be the case for French (as applied in France vs. Canada).

2. Review sections A.2 to A.9 to ensure that all RDA data elements that might require guidance are indeed covered.

> **LC response**: Agree, and possibly to re-structure by elements (this may avoid the problems of the CCC Fast Track).

3. Review language-specific instructions with experts from the languages involved to fill-in any gaps and update provisions to conform to current style.

> **LC response**: Agree that the review by experts would highlight missing or outdated instructions (e.g., the changes to German style manuals noted).

4. Form a working group to review the possibilities for restructuring Appendix A.

LC response: We're not sure what the best structure for such a group would be— it seems that a JSC Working Group might not be the best approach, given the large number of languages involved.   Experts on the RDA Toolkit itself would be needed to assure that possibilities for structuring revisions *in theory* are executable *in fact*. Toolkit designers may even have additional solutions that have not yet surfaced.

Additional Comments

A. **Structure of A.10-A.30:** The current structure and labeling of A.10-A.30 is confusing for Toolkit users. The title of A.10 makes it clear that it is for English language, but A.11-A.30 do not specify English in their titles. It is only when the cataloger reads this instruction at A.31 that the scope of the instructions in A.10-A.30 is clear: "For languages other than English, apply the guidelines for the capitalization of English at A.10 RDA –A.30 RDA unless a guideline at A.33 RDA – A.55 RDA instructs otherwise." Such an instruction belongs at the beginning of the range, not after it. Additionally, a cataloger must scan the entire language instruction in A.33-A.55 to determine if there is a different practice for any of the elements covered in A.10-A.30. As previously suggested in our response to 1.a, restructuring the appendix to more of an element-based structure rather than the hybrid of language and element would alleviate confusion about this range of instructions.

B. **A Historical Note:** Most of the RDA Appendix A comes from AACR2 Appendix A. Many of AACR2's Appendix A instructions seem to have been derived from *A manual of European languages for librarians* by C.G. Allen. This work was first published in 1978, and a second edition was published in 1999. It has the benefit of addressing two concerns raised by the CCC discussion paper: 1) it is specifically geared toward a cataloging context; 2) it is written for non-native speakers so it is easier for them to understand. We know that other works like this exist, and we suggest that if a working group is formed, they consider a doing a review of available publications such as these.