

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Gordon Dunsire, CILIP Representative

Subject: Revision of RDA 2.5.2.1, 2.5.2.2 Designation of Edition, addition in Chapter 2 of a core element for Format of Notated Music Statement, revision of affected chapters in RDA (0.6.2, Core Elements - Section 1: Recording Attributes of Manifestation and Item; 1.3, Core Elements; 1.4, Language and Script; 2.2.4, Other Sources of Information; 2.20 Note on Manifestation or Item; 18.6, Note on Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies Associated with a Resource; Appendix A; Glossary).

CILIP thanks IAML for its proposed revision.

CILIP does not agree with the proposal.

CILIP thinks the proposal statement “The concepts of edition and of music presentation are extremely different, the second being a different layout of basically the same content, to respond to specific needs of users (performers, conductors, scholars or other)” is incorrect in the context of RDA. CILIP thinks the concept of “edition” in RDA is intended to include format of notated music. CILIP thinks the interpretation of the FRBR statement on edition or issue designation is too narrow; the word “normally” allows for the exception of a single manifestation edition or format of notated music designation.

CILIP asks JSC to clarify this in the RDA instructions. CILIP notes that there is no glossary entry for “edition”, although the word appears several times in the definitions of other glossary entries. CILIP thinks the current wording of RDA will continue to be misinterpreted.

CILIP suggests that the requirement for a separate element for format of notated music statement can be met by treating it as a sub-type of the RDA element Edition Statement.