

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Dave Reser, LC Representative  
**Subject:** ISBD Review Group response to JSC response to the two Discussion papers from the ISBD review group

LC thanks the ISBD Review Group for the additional information they have provided, and acknowledge that some of the comments may need additional discussion at the JSC meeting.

We have these comments to offer on the sections of the document labeled “Review of the Appendix D.1”:

General: comment from ISBD RG on the scope of Appendix D was made before the re-worded version of Appendix D was published.

1. Do not agree with the suggestion to re-align D.1.1 to be from RDA to ISBD. It is a useful map for those who know ISBD to find (and link to) the appropriate RDA instruction, and quickly find the required ISBD punctuation.
2. While the ISBD RG suggestion may be accurate, we would need more discussion and understanding on how the suggested application profile would substitute for the information in the appendix.
3. We think much of the value in the D.1.1 map is the linking mechanism in the RDA toolkit from the ISBD areas/elements to the closely aligned section of the text in RDA. We recognize that the RDA D.1.1 map and ISBD A.3 outline are quite similar, although neither fully identifies the ISBD punctuation instructions that are sometimes embedded only in instructions in ISBD. Some of these omissions are noted in ISBD A.3.1 (e.g., the outline does not show all instances of the equals sign for parallel elements), but some are not (e.g., the addition of a full address in parentheses following a place of publication described in ISBD 4.1.9). The ISBD A.3 information about “repeatability” may not always align with RDA decisions/instructions. We note the specific problem mentioned with regard to the D.1.2 instructions and the challenges of adequately describing complex punctuation patterns in a simplified text, but we believe this section of the appendix is by far the most valuable (see separate comments on Appendix D itself).
4. Agree that RDA D.1.3 does not provide a great deal of useful information, and agree that a link to ISBD may be a useful substitution provided that the concerns expressed by ALA are mitigated.
5. Agree with the suggestion to move Appendix D to an openly accessible area of the RDA Toolkit, if this can be done easily.