

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
 From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
 Subject: Formal responses to RSC/NARDAC/2025/3 – Inconsistency in the transcribed manifestation elements related to source of information

This document collates in tabular form the responses received from voting members of the RSC to [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3](#), viz.:

- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/ALyC](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/EOO](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/EURIG](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/ExamplesEditor](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/ORDAC](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/TTLO](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/TranslationsTLO](#)
- [RSC/NARDAC/2025/3/WCEO](#)

Recommendation 1	Approved by 5: ALyC, EOO, EURIG, ExamplesEditor, TranslationsTLO Rejected by 3: ORDAC, TTLO, WCEO	Note 1: Total number of respondents: 8 Note 2: The Technical Working Group rejects this proposal. Note 3: Issues with soft-deprecated terms highlighted by EOO, EURIG, ExamplesEditor Note 4: EOO points out the advantages to teaching and learning Note 5: EURIG raises the question about the extent to which cataloguers must internalize guidance documents Note 6: EURIG queries the core principle quoted by NARDAC in their proposal
------------------	---	--

		Note 7: ORDAC raises three issues that may lead to proposals
Recommendation 2	Approved by 5: ALyC, EOO, EURIG, ExamplesEditor, TranslationsTLO Rejected by 3: ORDAC, TTLO, WCEO	Note 1: Total number of respondents: 8 Note 2: The Technical Working Group rejects this proposal. Note 3: Issues with soft-deprecated terms highlighted by EOO, EURIG Note 4: EOO points out the advantages to teaching and learning Note 5: EURIG raises the question about the extent to which cataloguers must internalize guidance documents Note 6: EURIG queries the core principle quoted by NARDAC in their proposal Note 7: ORDAC raises three issues that may lead to proposals

Note 1: Responses were received from all 8 voting members of the RSC. As the proposer, Robert Maxwell is non-voting for this proposal.

Note 2: [TTLO](#) rejects this proposal and sets out reasons which are worth reading in full. Due to the current US Government shutdown, it was not possible to contact the former TTLO, whom we assume was consulted at an earlier stage of this proposal, but the current TTLO and the rest of the Technical Working Group came to it fresh when the Secretary published this proposal. We assume that this is a one-off situation. **Given the Technical Working Group's response, the Secretary suggests that the**

RSC treat the proposal as a Discussion Paper, and then indicates a route forwards for NARDAC, taking into account the feedback received in the responses.

Note 3: Issues with soft-deprecated terms highlighted by [EEO](#): “My understanding is that the RSC has not typically dedicated its effort to updating the softdeprecated element pages, given the possibility that some of those elements may be harddeprecated in the future. Since the Technical Team is currently examining the issue of softdeprecated elements, I would defer to general consensus among RSC on whether the softdeprecated element pages should be updated as part of these recommendations.”

[EURIG](#) further states: “As several of the elements under discussion are soft-deprecated elements, if any of the proposal is approved there should also be recommendations about whether to update the relevant pages for the reasons mentioned in the proposal or hold off, in keeping with previous RSC decisions.” It also highlights that “the Decisions document should clearly explain what choice has been made and what impact that choice will have going forward.” The Secretary notes this assertion.

[ExamplesEditor](#) notes the issue with soft-deprecated terms, and states that “if NARDAC’s proposal is approved, I support making revisions across the board, including to soft-deprecated elements.”

Note 4: [EEO](#) points out the advantages to teaching of learning of pattern recognition: “From a teaching perspective, it is better to have a precise, unambiguous, and consistent location within each element page where the same type of policy statement can be found, than to have the same types of policy statements located in different sections across different element pages.”

Note 5: [EURIG](#) raises a fundamental question: “The proposal does touch on a fundamental issue with the Toolkit – how much is it hoped that users will have internalized the guidance documents/inherited options before working with specific element pages and how much should the Toolkit be built to accommodate quick look ups of information?”

Note 6: [EURIG](#) queries the core principle quoted by NARDAC in their proposal: “The Background section holds up an ideal “ease and efficiency in cataloging.” While this is an admirable ideal, it is not an objective or principle of RDA, as defined in the Guidance chapters. The closest objective is “Cost efficiency,” which is quite different. Proposals, no matter how welcome, should not be justified by ideals outside RDA.”

Note 7: [ORDAC](#) raises three issues that may lead to proposals. These are worth reading in full. As ORDAC has a new representative and a full handover has not been possible for health reasons, the Secretary suggests that if the RSC thinks these proposals are worth pursuing, a Rapid Action Group is formed to support the new ORDAC representative in writing these proposals. The Secretary suggests that this group should consist of herself, the Technical Team Liaison Officer, the Examples

Editor, the incoming Chair Elect and the longest serving Regional Representative, the EURIG representative. Other new members of the RSC (the ALyC Representative, the incoming WCEO and the incoming NARDAC representative) may like to be included so they can gain see how proposals are put together in practice.