

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** Conventional Collective Titles in RDA: a discussion paper

ALA thanks BL for this discussion paper, which builds on the issues raised by the 2014 proposal from the National Library of New Zealand, 6JSC/Chair/15/rev/2. ALA respondents continue to disagree about the value and purpose of recording conventional collective titles (CCTs). We offer the following comments on the discussion paper.

### ***General comment***

ALA observes that the use of CCTs is limited to aggregate works; thus, we recommend that the JSC forward these issues to the JSC Aggregates Working Group for further consideration.

### ***Pros and cons***

Within ALA, those in favor of removing instructions for conventional collective titles agree with BL's positions articulated in this discussion paper. Those against wholesale removal of these instructions see a potential role for ongoing use of CCTs, including: to support collocation; to identify "sets" of complete works or of complete works in a single form; to provide a collective title for a compilation of two or more works by a single creator – including translations (currently an Alternative to 6.2.2.10.3). For more details on ALA's views of the pros and cons of ceasing to use conventional collective titles, see [6JSC/Chair/15/rev/2/ALA response](#).

### ***Use for legal works***

See [6JSC/ALA/37](#), *Eliminating "Laws, etc." as a conventional collective title (RDA 6.19.2.5.1, 6.19.3.6, etc.)* for our proposal to address the remaining CCT for legal works.

### ***Use for musical works***

ALA recommends referring music-specific CCT issues to the JSC Music Working Group.

### ***What constitutes a "form"?***

ALA respondents do not agree with BL's assertion that "complete works" are a form of work. We do not believe that completeness is "a class or genre to which a work belongs" (RDA Glossary, "form of work"). That being said, we do see a value in being able to record completeness as an attribute of a compilation, perhaps as part of Chapter 7.

### ***How to decide when a work is "commonly known" by a title***

ALA agrees that the wording here continues to be problematic, since it is open to several different interpretations. However, we don't see the difference between applying this instruction to compilations or to individual works. Removing this part of 6.2.2.10 would not

change the need to identify the most commonly known title, which is inherent in identifying the preferred title (in both 6.2.2.4 and 6.2.2.5).