

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative

**Subject: Issues deferred until after the first release of RDA**

---

ACOC has reviewed all of the deferred issues.

### **Priorities**

The following is a guide to how ACOC assigned priorities to the deferred issues:

#### **High**

Issues affecting core elements for all material types; issues affecting access points or controlled vocabularies; situations frequently encountered by cataloguers; omissions or inconsistencies in the instructions which might be easily resolved; and issues which have a high impact on end-users.

We hope that these issues could be addressed in the next 1-2 years.

#### **Medium**

Most internationalisation issues and issues related to compatibility with other standards (reduction in priority in recognition of the need to allow time for consultation); issues affecting non-core elements or less frequently used access points or instructions; usability issues whose priority should be determined after further experience with the online product.

We hope that these issues could be addressed in the next 2-4 years.

#### **Low**

Errors or omissions affecting uncommon situations and infrequently used instructions.

### **JSC Discussion**

JSC discussion has been noted as desirable where fundamental issues need to be resolved and/or where it would be helpful to the constituency developing the proposal to have a preliminary discussion. We have also noted briefly in brackets the nature of the discussion that needs to take place.

### **Proposals**

ACOC has noted only one instance where we have decided to put forward a proposal arising from an ACOC comment. We have also noted several instances where we would be happy to participate in a working group to address an issue. There may be additional instances where we would be prepared to prepare proposals for issues that the other JSC constituencies agree are high priority.

## Issues deferred until after the first release of RDA

### *Individual instructions*

---

#### RDA Chapter 1

#### **Change from single unit to multipart monograph**

Current RDA instruction number: 1.6.1

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

#### **Transcription of letters or words intended to be read more than once**

Current RDA instruction number: 1.7.7

AACR2 rule: 1.1B5

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Need to establish principle - is it acceptable for RDA to have rules for transcription or should RDA have a literal "take what you see" approach?).
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Ideally, all issues related to transcription should be dealt with in a single proposal, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ch 1 <i>Transcription of letters or words intended to be read more than once;</i></li> <li>Ch 2 <i>Transcription</i></li> <li>Ch 2 <i>Inaccuracies in the title of a serial or integrating resource</i></li> <li>Ch 2 <i>Introductory words)</i></li> </ul>

---

## **RDA Chapter 2**

### **Transcription**

Current RDA instruction number: Chapter 2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Need to establish principle - is it acceptable for RDA to have rules for transcription or should RDA have a literal "take what you see" approach?).
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Ideally, all issues related to transcription should be dealt with in a single proposal, including:  Ch 1 <i>Transcription of letters or words intended to be read more than once;</i> Ch 2 <i>Transcription</i> Ch 2 <i>Inaccuracies in the title of a serial or integrating resource</i> Ch 2 <i>Introductory words</i> )

### **Description of a multipart monograph or serial**

Current RDA instruction number: Chapter 2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	None (does not appear to be good practice)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Changes over time**

Current RDA instruction number: Chapter 2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (data about data. Relates to issue <i>Dates associated with an element</i> listed under "Multiple instructions")
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Preferred source of information and collective title

Current RDA instruction number: 2.2.2

### *ACOC reply*

*Priority:* High (Need to resolve contradiction in common situation)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's intention to put forward a proposal.

## Use of square brackets

Current RDA instruction number: 2.2.4

AACR2 rule: 1.0A4

### *ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Current instruction provides acceptable solution)  
*JSC discussion:* Desirable (need to confirm principle)  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Inaccuracies in the title of a serial or integrating resource

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.1.4

AACR2 rule: 12.1B1

### *ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency)  
*JSC discussion:* Desirable (1. Relationship with ISSN/ISBD. 2. Need to establish principle - is it acceptable for RDA to have rules for transcription or should RDA have a literal "take what you see" approach?).  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Ideally, all issues related to transcription should be dealt with in a single proposal, including:

*Ch 1 Transcription of letters or words intended to be read more than once;*

*Ch 2 Transcription*

*Ch 2 Inaccuracies in the title of a serial or integrating resource*

*Ch 2 Introductory words)*

## Names of persons, families, and corporate bodies

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.1.5

AACR2 rule: 1.1B2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

## Introductory words

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.1.6

AACR2 rule: 1.1B1

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium

*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Need to establish principle - is it acceptable for RDA to have rules for transcription or should RDA have a literal "take what you see" approach?).

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Ideally, all issues related to transcription should be dealt with in a single proposal, including:

*Ch 1 Transcription of letters or words intended to be read more than once;*

*Ch 2 Transcription*

*Ch 2 Inaccuracies in the title of a serial or integrating resource*

*Ch 2 Introductory words)*

## Use of full form of serial title over an acronym or initialism

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.2.5

AACR2 rule: 12.1B2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium

*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA comment that this has been resolved.

**Other title information for moving image resources**

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.4.6

AACR2 rule: 7.1E2

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Low*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Devised titles for music**

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.2.11.1 (2.3.11.4 in full draft)

AACR2 rule: 5.1B2

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium (Simplification, consistency)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Designation of edition**

Current RDA instruction number: 2.5.2

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium (Simplification)*Proposal:* ACOC will put forward a proposal.**Use of “issues or parts of a serial”**

Current RDA instruction number: 2.6.1.1

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Low (Proposed change would not substantially affect usability of RDA)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Use of “new series” and “second series”**

Current RDA instruction number: 2.12.10.4

AACR2 rule: 1.6H3

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Plates

Current RDA instruction number: 3.4.5.9

AACR2 rule: 2.5B9

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* High (Need to resolve contradiction; should be easy to resolve)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Recording extent of three-dimensional forms

Current RDA instruction number: 3.4.6.2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Address omission in controlled vocabulary for core element - no suitable term in the 3D list for equipment/device)

*JSC discussion:* Desirable (FRSAR progress/timeframe)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Base material and applied material for sound recordings

Current RDA instruction numbers: 3.6 and 3.7

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Address omission in non-core element/promote consistency)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Production method for sound recordings

Current RDA instruction number: 3.9

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Address omission in non-core element for specific material type/promote consistency)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Production method for manuscripts

Current RDA instruction number: 3.9.2.3

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Address omission in non-core element for specific material type/promote consistency)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Resolution of video images

Current RDA instruction number: 3.18.1.4 (3.18.1.3 in full draft)

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Address omission in non-core element for specific material type/promote consistency. We expect the JSC can resolve in a short timeframe as were close to agreement in March 2009.)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Encoding format

Current RDA instruction number: 3.19.3

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (see notes)
<i>Proposal:</i>	Request that LC, LAC or BL prepare proposal.
<i>Notes:</i>	As the UDFR project now looks like it will go ahead, ACOC would like the JSC to monitor it with the aim of linking out to it if appropriate. LC, LAC and BL are all involved in the project.
<i>From website:</i>	
<i>"In April 2009 the GDFR initiative joined forces with the UK National Archives' PRONOM registry initiative under a new name – the Unified Digital Formats Registry (UDFR). The UDFR will support the requirements and use cases compiled for GDFR and will be seeded with PRONOM's software and formats database."</i>	
<i>The new site is <a href="http://www.udfr.org/">http://www.udfr.org/</a>. It says "When the UDFR becomes operational in July 2011, it will have:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A publicly accessible web-based user interface that can be used to search, browse, display and download registry records</i></li> <li>• <i>An API for tools and services to query, retrieve and export registry records for use in local repositories or applications</i></li> <li>• <i>Ability to export information to DROID, a format identification tool created by TNA</i></li> <li>• <i>Automatic tracking of the history of registry information changes</i></li> </ul>	



- *Population of the registry with all of the PRONOM content*

### **Zoom factor/Enlargement ratio**

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Raised as consistency issue by Editor but no evidence of user/cataloguer requirement for this element)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

---

## **RDA Chapter 4**

### **Missing elements - 'obtaining' metadata**

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Scope of RDA and future development priorities)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC would be willing to participate in a working group.

### **URLs**

Current RDA instruction number: 4.6

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Address commonly occurring situation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (1. MARC compatibility. 2. Current instructions re URLs only cover the resource being described. Useful to discuss whether to address within the instructions for related resources, or within the instructions for <i>Recording attributes for ...</i> .
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC would be willing to participate in a working group.

---

## **RDA Chapter 5**

### **Other style manuals**

Current RDA instruction number: Chapter 5

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (also noted under ch 8)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

---

## **RDA Chapter 6**

### **Initial articles**

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistent application of principles)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Initial articles, encoding, affect on authority files). Like ALA, we would prefer a solution that involves the encoding conventions and would allow the data to be recorded as found.
<i>Proposal:</i>	Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?

### **Conventional collective titles**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.2.2.10 (6.2.2.11 in full draft)

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency in primary access points)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Set direction for future proposals)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Form of work**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.3.1

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (As is a core element when used in access points to distinguish works)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (1. Relationship with FRBR. 2. Future development of controlled lists/vocabularies & potential for using established list)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Place of origin of the work**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.5

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Discuss requirement for inclusion of cultural area)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Content type

Current RDA instruction number: 6.9 (6.10 in full draft)

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Controlled vocabulary for core element)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Future development of controlled lists/vocabularies and relationship to ONIX)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Musical works

Current RDA instruction numbers: Chapter 6

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	We note ALA's intention to bring forward specific proposals.

## Laws, etc.," "Treaties, etc.," and "Protocols, etc."

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.19 (6.20 in full draft); 6.29.1.33

AACR2 rules: 25.15 and 25.16 (Laws, Treaties, etc.)

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Use of "etc." may be less problematic than proposed solutions)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Bible**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.23.2.5.

AACR2 rule: 25.18A

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Availability of subject expertise; system implications & retrievability)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Bible – Apocrypha**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.23.2.6; 6.23.2.9.4

AACR2 rules: 25.18A14; 25.18A5

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low/Medium (Infrequently used instruction)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Availability of subject expertise)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC notes ALA's intent to refer to other committees.

**Bible – Year**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.24.1.4

AACR2 rule: 25.18A13

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency in core element)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC notes ALA's intent to refer to other committees.

**Other distinguishing characteristics of the expression of a religious work**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.25.1.3

AACR2 rules: 25.18A11 and 25.18A12

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Availability of subject expertise)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC notes ALA's intent to refer to other committees.

**Bible – Version**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.25.1.4

AACR2 rule: 25.18A11

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC notes ALA's intent to refer to other committees.

**When Composer and Librettist are the same**

RDA instruction number: 6.27

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's comment re an MLA proposal.

**Use of "Lyrics" and "Texts"**

RDA instruction number: new 6.27.4.2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's comment re a MLA proposal.

**Reports of one court**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.29.1.21

AACR2 rule: 21.36A1

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency in less frequently used access points)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's comment re referring to AALL.

**Date of signing of a treaty**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.29.1.33, 6.29.3.2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* High (Consistency)  
*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Need to establish principle)  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Expressions of religious works**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.30.3

AACR2 rules: 25.18A10; 25.18A11; 25.18A12; 25.18A13

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Internationalisation)  
*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Potential for generalisation)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's intent to refer to other committees.

**Catholic liturgical works**

Current RDA instruction number: 6.30.3.5; 6.23.2.8

AACR2 rule: 25.20B1

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Resolve discrepancy between instruction & practice)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**RDA Chapter 7****Nature of the content**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Guidance to cataloguers; FRBR).
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Intended audience**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.7

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (end-user demand for this type of information; if suitable existing list is available may be quick fix)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Future development of controlled lists/vocabularies)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Type of illustrations**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.15

AACR2 rule: 2.5C

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Illustrative content**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.15

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Additional scale information**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.25.5.3, 2nd paragraph

AACR2 rule: 3.3B2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Other details of cartographic content**

Current RDA instruction number: 7.27.1.3

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low/Medium
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**RDA Chapter 8****Other style manual**

Current RDA instruction number: Chapter 8

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (also noted under Ch 5)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**Spacing of initials and acronyms**

Current RDA instruction number: 8.5.6

AACR2 rule: 24.1A

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistency)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

**RDA Chapter 9 Change of name**


---

 Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.7

AACR2 rule: 22.2C

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Progress after more experience with applying new instructions on personal name separate identities)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal, and notes ALA does not intend to offer one in near future.

**First part of the name is the surname**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.9

AACR2 rule: 22.4B2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points)

*JSC discussion:* Desirable (System implications)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal unless we are requested to do so on behalf of others in the region.

**Surname as first element**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.9

AACR2 rule: 22.5A1

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* High (Consistency in access points)

*JSC discussion:* Desirable (given recent JSC correspondence)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal, and notes ALA does not intend to pursue.

**Name that consists of a phrase/Additions to names**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.2.2.9; 9.2.2.22; 9.2.2.23

AACR2 rule: 22.11A; 22.11B; 22.15A;

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points; clarity)

*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's intention to produce a proposal.



**Part of the name treated as a surname**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.9.2

AACR2 rule: 22.5B1

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Persons known by a surname only**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.9.3

AACR2 rule: 22.15A

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Low (Consistency in access points, but infrequent situation)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Word or phrase included in the name**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.18

AACR2 rule: 22.8A1

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points, but infrequent situation)*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Changes to instructions affecting authority files)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.**Initial articles in phrases used as the names of persons**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.2.2.25; 9.2.2.26

AACR2 rule: 22.11D

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium (Consistency in access points; internationalisation)*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Initial articles, encoding, affect on authority files)*Proposal:* Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?**Language and script for Alternative linguistic form of name**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.3.9

*ACOC reply**Priority:* Medium*JSC discussion:* Desirable (Data about data)*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Other variant name**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.3.10

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Future development of relationships in RDA; FRAD)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Recording of month and day in date of birth**

Current RDA instruction number: 9.3.2.3

AACR2 rule: 22.17

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistency in access points)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Consistency with other standards)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Other persons of religious vocation/Saints**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.4.1.8, 9.6.1.4

AACR2 rules: 22.16D1 and 22.13A

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency in access points; but low usage of data element)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Field of Activity and Profession/Occupation**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.15 and 9.16

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistency/clarity)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Consistency with FRAD, other standards)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal, but notes that LC will pursue.

---

## **RDA Chapter 10**

### **Family names not based on surnames**

Current RDA instruction number: chapter 10

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Omission from instructions, but infrequent occurrence)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal unless we are requested to do so on behalf of affected Southeast Asian countries.

### **Estate or house names to distinguish names of families**

Current RDA instruction numbers: chapter 10, chapter 16

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Omission from instructions, but infrequent occurrence)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Controlled list of values for Type of family**

Current RDA instruction number: 10.3

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Omission from Glossary, but infrequent occurrence)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (controlled lists/vocabularies)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

---

## **RDA Chapter 11**

### **Separate instructions for government bodies and other corporate bodies**

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)  
*Proposal:* ACOC notes ALA's intention to submit a proposal as their highest priority.

### **Events**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.0

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Consistency with FRBR/FRSAR)  
*JSC discussion:* Desirable (FRBR/FRSAR)  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Ancient and international bodies**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.5.4

AACR2 rule: 24.3C2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Clarity, but infrequently used instruction)  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Autocephalous Patriarchates, Archdiocese, etc.**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.5.4

AACR2 rule: 24.3C3

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Minimizing unnecessary complexity, but infrequently used instruction)  
*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Initial articles

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.8

AACR2 rule: 24.5A1

### *ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Minimizing complexity)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Initial articles, encoding, affect on authority files)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Citations of honours

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.9

AACR2 rule: 24.5B1

### *ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Minimizing unnecessary complexity, but infrequently used instruction)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Terms indicating incorporation

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.10

AACR2 rule: 24.5C1-2

### *ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation; minimizing complexity)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (affect on authority files)
<i>Proposal:</i>	Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?

## Transliterated names for corporate bodies

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.12, 9.2.2.5

AACR2 rule: 24.1B, footnote 4, 22.3C2, footnote 4

### *ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (language & script)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Subordinate bodies**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.14

AACR2 rule: 24.13A

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal, but notes that LC may do so.

**Joint Committees**

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.16

AACR2 rule: 24.15B

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Ruling executive bodies**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC notes that ALA will put forward a proposal.

**Heads of state and Heads of government**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.21

AACR2 rules: 24.20B; 24.20C

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC notes that ALA will put forward a proposal.

**Subcommittees of the United States Congress**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.22.3

AACR2 rule: 24.21C

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Low (Minimising unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Qualifiers for courts**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.24.1

AACR2 rule: 24.23A1

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### **Armed forces**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.25.1

AACR2 rule: 24.24

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal, but may be willing to participate in a working group.

### **Change of name of jurisdiction**

Current RDA instruction number: 11.3.3.4

AACR2 rule: 24.4C4

*ACOC reply*

*Priority:* Medium (Minimizing unnecessary complexity)

*Proposal:* ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**RDA Chapter 16****Access points to represent places***ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistency in primary access points)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (FRSAR: Future scope of RDA; increasing importance of data about places)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Additional uses for place names**

Current RDA instruction number: 16.2.2.4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph

*ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	High (Omission; Consistency in primary access points)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Places in Australia, Canada, Malaysia, the United States, the U.S.S.R., or Yugoslavia**

Current RDA instruction number: 16.2.2.9

AACR2 rule: 23.4C1

*ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	High (Consistency in access points)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?

**Identifiers for places**

Current RDA instruction number: 16.3 (16.5 in full draft)

*ACOC reply*

<i>Priority:</i>	High (Correct omission; Consistency in access points)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (use of identifiers in RDA)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.



**RDA Chapter 19****Corporate bodies as creators**

Current RDA instruction number: 19.2.1.1

AACR2 rule: 21.1B2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Minimise unnecessary complexity and inconsistency for both cataloguers and end-users)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC may be willing to put forward a proposal.

**Jurisdiction governed and Issuing agency**

Current RDA instruction number: 19.3.2.2

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Minimising unnecessary complexity, but infrequently used instructions)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**RDA Appendices****Appendix A – Capitalization****Appendix as a whole**

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Scope of RDA)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

**Unusual capitalization**

A.2.1

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low
<i>Proposal:</i>	Defer until question of the appendix as a whole is settled.

## Appendix B – Abbreviations

### Language scope

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Is there potential for a proposal outside the JSC?

### B.11 Names of Certain Countries, States, Provinces, Territories, etc.

Consider removal of abbreviations for certain countries, states, provinces, territories, etc. (April 2008 meeting 5JSC/M/258.5.10)

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency; Clarity of resulting descriptions)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Appendix C – Initial articles

### Additions

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Need for instructions on initial articles)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Dialects

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Infrequently occurring situation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Appendix F – Additional instructions on names of persons

AACR2 rules 22.21-28; 22.9A1; 22.9B1; 22.7A; 22.5D1

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Potential to remove Appendix prior to RDA implementation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Internationalisation, relationship to other standards)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Appendix G – Titles of Nobility, terms of rank

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation, but infrequent occurrence)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?

## Appendix H – Dates in the Christian calendar

AACR2 rule: 22.17A

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Is there potential for a proposal from outside the JSC?

## Appendix J - Relationship designators: Relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, and items

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency with other standards)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (FRSAD)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

## Appendix K – Relationship designators: Relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies

<i>ACOC reply</i>	
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Consistency)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (removing provisional status of appendix)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

---

**RDA Glossary**

Computer

*ACOC reply**Priority:*

Medium

*JSC discussion:*

Desirable (mapping to other standards)

*Proposal:*

ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

## Multiple instructions

### Instructions on sources of information

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (Reducing complexity)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. Suggest test usability first.

### Repetition of text in instructions

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Priority for suggestions on RDA writing style)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC suggests that we postpone while waiting for user feedback on the online product.

### Repetition of element name

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Priority for suggestions on RDA writing style)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC suggests that we postpone while waiting for user feedback on the online product.

### Non-Latin Script examples

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Internationalisation, any technical barriers to inclusion)
<i>Proposal:</i>	Is there potential for involvement of others outside the JSC, or for formation of a working group to address this?

### Use of ISO standards

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	High (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation, relationship to other standards)
<i>Proposal:</i>	Is there potential for involvement of others outside the JSC?

### Finding of objects

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Longer term issue)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (RDA scope, relationship to other standards. See issue <i>Archival cataloguing and Museum practice</i> under Multiple Instructions)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC would be willing to participate in a working group to look at this issue.

### Definition of “expression”

Current RDA instruction numbers: 1.1.5, 5.1.2, Glossary

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Address omission, but infrequently used instruction)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Relationship with FRBR)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Access points for manifestations and items

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Addresses omission in instructions with potential for medium level usage)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Dates associated with an element

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Data structure)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Data about data. Relates to Ch 2 issue <i>Changes over time</i> )
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Legal works (various chapters)

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (low impact on cataloguers/users)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Simplification of special rules in AACR2 chapters 22-26

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low (low chance of success in short term)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal.

### Gap analysis with encoding standards

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (MARC) Low (other standards)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Yes
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC would be willing to revisit earlier proposals and put forward new proposals for additional MARC elements if warranted.

### Archival cataloguing and Museum practice

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Longer term issue but may need to initiate process now)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (RDA scope, relationship to other standards)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC would be willing to participate in a working group to look at this issue.

### Review Chair follow-ups to 5JSC/RDA/Full draft

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium (Internationalisation)
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (internationalisation)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. We would welcome proposals from other countries and rule-making bodies.

### IEEE LOM

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Low
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (relationship to other standards, need to prioritise other standards for collaboration)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal

### Complete examples

	<i>ACOC reply</i>
<i>Priority:</i>	Medium
<i>JSC discussion:</i>	Desirable (Display formats in which to offer examples)
<i>Proposal:</i>	ACOC does not intend to put forward a proposal. We note with appreciation the efforts of other constituencies to date in developing the range of full examples available.