

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to JSC  
**Subject:** **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A, Chapters 6-7.**

### **General comments**

ACOC has not reviewed the draft of these chapters against the objectives and principles in *5JSC/RDA/Objectives and Principles*, or those in the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*. However, we believe such a review is desirable.

### **Order of the chapters**

ACOC would generally prefer for the order of Chapters 6 and 7 to be reversed, that is, to consider access points for the resource being described before considering access points for related resources.

### **Introduction of instructions for encoding**

ACOC would like JSC to address the general question of whether the instructions in RDA should refer to encoding. It may be better for the individual instructions to say "Indicate ... by ...". A general instruction could also be given which says that, when the instructions say to indicate something, one way of achieving this is to use encoded values.

### **Access points**

ACOC welcomes the move away from the use of terms such as main and added entries, but considers that the draft does not yet fully reflect the fact that any element can act as an access point.

ACOC considers that further thought is needed on titles as access points. ACOC would like JSC to consider whether some of the Chapter 2 instructions on titles should be given here, as part of a section on 'Titles associated with a resource'.

### **Clarity**

The sentence structure used in instructions is often complex, and the sentences themselves often too long. ACOC would like long sentences (over 25 words) to be systematically evaluated to see if they could be re-worded, or made easier to understand through presentation (for example as dot points). Some examples and further comments on clarity are given below, with 'clarity' noted in parenthesis.

### **Comments on specific issues raised in the cover letter**

#### **Alternative at 6.4.1.2. c) and 6.4.2.2 c) Embedded descriptions of related resources**

ACOC generally supports the inclusion of this alternative. However, it is unclear to us whether the key difference between using this alternative and using an embedded

description is just a matter of display. Could an embedded description coded in a MARC 21 533 or 534 field be displayed to produce the same result?

#### **6.4 Source/reproduction and 6.5 Format/Format relationships.**

ACOC would prefer that these be retained as separate types of relationships.

#### **Special rules in AACR2 chapter 21**

ACOC supports the generalisation of instructions wherever possible, but has no specific proposals to offer.

#### **Chapter 6 comments**

Although *6.1.4 Access points for related resources* refers implicitly to the FRBR Group 1 entities, an explicit reference should be provided as part of the statement of Purpose and scope.

ACOC would like increased general guidance to be given on why relationships are recorded.

#### **Conventions used to record relationships between resources in 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.2-6.10 - General comment**

ACOC recommends that guidance be provided on when to use each of these conventions.

ACOC considers that there is considerable overlap between:

- a) citations and b) access points; and
- a) citations and c) embedded descriptions.

ACOC would prefer that the concept of citations be incorporated into the other two conventions at 6.1.2 and in all subsequent instructions.

Members of ACOC had difficulty with applying the concepts of 'access point' and 'citation', and would like JSC to consider both their use and definition.

#### **6.1.4 Access points for related resources**

ACOC would also like access points to give an indication of the nature of the relationship. This is provided for in the instructions for all of the other conventions, i.e. 6.1.3 for citations, 6.1.5 for embedded descriptions, 6.1.6 for informal references (implicitly) and 6.1.7 for resource identifiers).

#### **6.2-6.10 General comment**

ACOC notes that the same options for conventions are given under each of these relationships. We would prefer that a table or list be created for the types of relationships that need to be recorded, using the scope statements included in the draft as a starting point.

Consideration should also be given to using the categorisation of types of relationships in 6.2-6.10 as terms to indicate the nature of the relationship.

### **6.2.2 Aggregate resource**

The instruction re when not to provide an access point for a series is misplaced at 6.2.2.2.1b3, but should be given as part of instruction on determining if the resources belong to a series. A reference should be provided from 2.11 Series to this instruction.

ACOC would like the treatment of whole/part relationships within RDA to be systematically reviewed, as they are now covered in several different instructions.

### **6.8 Edition/Edition relationships**

The fact that this instruction refers only to simultaneously issued editions has caused some confusion. ACOC would like this instruction to explain why there isn't an explicit instruction for other types of editions, or to give an appropriate reference.

### **6.3.1 Related component**

6.3.1.2 c) The example given appears to be for an adjunct resource, and so would belong in 6.7.2.

## **Chapter 7 comments**

### **General comment re “persons, families and corporate bodies” (Clarity)**

It would be useful to have a single term to represent all of these entities, so that the phrase “person, family or corporate body” does not need constant repetition.

We agree with defining these entities separately for those instructions where a distinction needs to be made. However, the instructions which refer to all three entities would be easier to read if another phrase was used. ACOC has discussed several alternatives: “persons and groups”, “responsible entities” and “associated entities”. In general we would prefer the use of “persons and groups” as that phrase is easier to apprehend.

### **7.0 Purpose and scope**

It needs to be made clear that the scope of this chapter is restricted to the choice of access point, and that later chapters will cover the form of the access point.

Neither the title or the purpose and scope of this chapter mention titles; however, there are instruction related to titles given in the chapter.

### **7.1.2 Conventions used .... c) Controlled access points**

ACOC questions the use of the term ‘controlled’ at this point.

### **7.1.3 Primary and additional access points**

These instructions need to make it clearer which access points are provided for responsibility for the work, expression, manifestation and item. The second final sentence of 7.1.3.2 beginning “Additional ...” could usefully be given in a separately numbered paragraph.

ACOC notes that the approach to primary responsibility follows the AACR2/MARC model, where, even if principal responsibility is shared, only one entity is chosen as the primary access point. ACOC would like JSC to discuss whether all entities sharing principal responsibility could be given a designation indicating this, and any entities given secondary responsibility be given a different designation. If this were

combined with the ability to record an order for the responsible entities, then it would be possible to accommodate joint authorship and a range of citation styles.

### **7.1.3.3**

The reference should be to 7.6.1 not 7.1.6.

### **7.1.4.1, 7.1.4.2, 7.1.4.3 and 7.3.8** Additional access points for later parts ... monograph

These instructions say to provide additional access points “if considered to be important”. ACOC considers that guidance should be given on when to consider it important.

## **7.2 Primary access point**

Although 7.1.3.1 provides some explanation of the concept of primary access points, an expansion of that information needs to be given here. ACOC would like additional guidance to be given, including information on the conceptual background to the use of primary access points, and on how these access points are used in resource descriptions and by systems.

### **7.2.0.1 Original works**

ACOC would prefer to treat the situations b) and c) the same, i.e. if there is more than one entity represented as principally responsible, use the one named first.

### **7.2.0.3 Modifications of previously existing works.**

This instruction should be prefaced by some explanatory text which relates it to the FRBR levels of work and expression. The text should explain that the cataloguer needs to determine whether the modification of a previously existing work has resulted in a new work or expression. The text should also explain that when a new work or expression is created, principal responsibility needs to be re-assessed.

## **7.2.1**

### **7.2.1.1 Footnote**

ACOC considers that the information given in the footnote should be incorporated in the instruction.

However, ACOC would prefer that ‘creating the work’ be defined in such a way as to encompass the activities mentioned under 7.2.1.4. This would then mean that the three instructions, 7.2.1.2, 7.2.1.3 and 7.2.1.4, could be combined into a single instruction for when one entity is responsible.

**7.2.1.4.1 c) iii)** reference to 7.2.2 is not correct.

### **7.2.2.3 Two or three persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible**

### **7.2.2.4 More than three persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible**

ACOC would prefer to treat the situations in these two instructions the same, i.e. if there is more than one entity represented as principally responsible, use the one named first.

#### **7.2.4 Adaptations and revisions of previously existing works**

#### **7.2.5 Other modifications of previously existing works**

#### **7.2.6 Previously existing works with added commentary, illustrations, etc.**

See our comments under *7.2.0.3 Modifications of previously existing works above*.

#### **7.2.7 Works of uncertain or unknown origin**

ACOC would prefer that the instructions under 7.2.7.3-7.2.7.5, where responsibility is unknown, be provided as a single instruction “If the entity responsible for creating the work is unknown, use the title as the primary access point.”

#### **7.2.8.1 General guideline for Performances (Suggested re-wording for Clarity)**

“If the resource comprises a performance, generally use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the work performed as the primary access point. ~~If, unless~~ the level of creative responsibility of the performer(s) entails responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc., either ~~in which case~~ follow

- the instructions on adaptations of non-musical works given under 7.2.4, or
- the instructions on adaptations of musical works given under 7.7.3, as appropriate.”

#### **7.2.8.5.1a1 a) Compilation with a collection title (Suggested re-wording for Clarity)**

“If the performance is of a compilation of works with ~~by different persons, families, or corporate bodies and has~~ a collective title, use the title access point prescribed as the primary access point ~~for the works as a compilation of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies as the primary access point~~ (see 7.2.3.2).”

#### **7.3 Additional access points for collaborators and contributors**

ACOC considers that these instructions should explicitly provide for access points for others sharing principle responsibility.

#### **7.3.1 Collaborators (Suggested re-wording for Clarity)**

“~~If the primary access point is for one of two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies collaborating in the creation of a work,~~ Provide additional access points for the other collaborators prominently named in the resource being described or associated with the work in reference sources.”

#### **7.3.1.2**

With the changes suggested above for 7.3.1, this instruction would not be required.

There is an error in the example: “Van de Ven, John Howard”

#### **7.6 Designation of role**

Please also see our comments on designating primary and secondary responsibility under *7.1.3 Primary and additional access points* above.

ACOC notes that RDA is intended to be a content standard. Although we recognise that the earlier decision to refer to ‘standard lists’ in this instruction was a pragmatic

one, we would like JSC to discuss whether RDA should include the terms to be used as designations of role in this standard. The standard list which will most commonly be used is MARC Code List: Relator Codes -- Term Sequence (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/relaterm.html>) or its code equivalent. However, it does not seem appropriate to refer to a data encoding standard to supply values for a content standard.

## **Additions to 1.1 Terminology**

### **1.1.6 Person, family and corporate body**

As noted above, it would be useful to have, in addition, a single term to represent all of these entities, so that the phrase “person, family or corporate body” does not need constant repetition in the instructions.

#### **1.1.6.4 Corporate body**

ACOC would like JSC to consider replacing the term “corporate body” with the term “organisation” or a similar common term, and to giving a definition for the term chosen which clarifies its meaning within RDA.

ACOC would like the definition to make it clear that conferences, expeditions, events, etc. are covered, as are performing groups, etc., rather than just provide this information in the body of the instruction at 7.2.1.4.

### **1.1.8 Citation**

ACOC members found this term confusing. If the concept of citation is retained, it would require a more distinct and workable definition.

In addition, as noted above under *Conventions used to record relationships between resources in 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.2-6.10 - General comment*, we do not consider it to be useful in terms of the conventions used to record relationships.