

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: John Attig, ALA Representative
Subject: Revision of RDA 6.27.1.2 and RDA 6.27.1.3; now: Proposed 19.2.1.1.3

ALA agrees (with the exception noted below) that the revision incorporates the decisions of the JSC on 2 November 2011.

The final (fourth) paragraph of RDA 19.2.1.1.3 seems to be the opposite of what we believe is intended. The ACOC response lays out the options for correcting this error. Under the circumstances here (as in the preceding paragraph), it is necessary that either the conditional clause or the instruction be stated negatively. We believe that in both cases, it is preferable to begin with the positive statement and to give a negative instruction. Therefore, we believe that the first sentence of the final paragraph should read:

If it is **likely** that the serial would continue without that person's or family's responsibility for the serial, do not consider the person or family to be the creator.

ALA agrees that it is pertinent to mention information about the publisher as a factor in deciding whether a person or family is the creator, for the reasons stated by LC.

Finally, we offer the following comment from Kevin Randall on the implications of placing this instruction in Chapter 19 (text in brackets are my editorial rewrites and comments):

A problem I see with this proposal is that it is mixing two different matters:

- a) determining the authorized access point for a serial (chapter 6); and
- b) determining who/what is eligible to be designated as a creator of a serial (chapter 19).

The first limits what resources get a personal name [or family name] as part of the authorized access point. The second limits the relationships between names and resources. Saying that a person [or family] isn't a creator immediately eliminates the possibility of using one of the relationship designators in Appendix I.2.1.

[In the case of Corporate bodies considered to be creators (RDA 19.2.1.1.1), RDA is not simply saying that other corporate bodies are not included in the authorized access point, it is saying that other corporate bodies are not to be considered to be related to a work as creator. Do we really want to say that persons that do not meet the criteria in 19.2.1.1.3 (e.g., authors of parts of a serial) are not creators? And if they are not, what is their relationship to the serial?]

I was thinking of the types of serials that [under AACR2] get personal name entries, whether added or main. These are usually writers, editors, compilers, and artists of some sort. ... Some of these would be associated with the resource at the work level, some at the expression level ... [If we want to associate persons that do not qualify as creators under 19.2.1.1.3 with the work, they would need to be treated as “Other persons associated with a work” (RDA 19.3) and appropriate relationship designators would need to be added to Appendix I.]

This is just a philosophically weird area. On the one hand, you could say that the creative activity a person does is the same whether the work is a monograph or a serial — the nature of the person, the nature of the resource, and the nature of the relationship between the two, are the same regardless of mode of issuance. On the other hand, if you make the assumption that a resource has the likelihood of continuing without the involvement of the original person(s), then that does perhaps change the nature of the relationship: that person is no longer creator of the **resource** but of a **part** of the resource [although the creator element in general does apply to parts of works, as well as to whole works; that is in fact the basis for the exception being proposed at 19.2.1.1.3.]

This question raises issues that were not discussed by the JSC. We offer them for consideration. If the JSC agrees that this revision fails to provide an answer to the question “What is a creator who is not a creator?” then perhaps there is more work to do — although not necessarily as part of the present revision.