

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

**FROM:** Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC

**SUBJECT:** Transcription issues associated with the Production Statement (2.7)

---

The British Library welcomes the perspective on non-self describing resources offered by this paper. We agree with the general principles.

**Recommendation 1:**

*Revise the guidelines of RDA so that all the sub-elements of the Production Statement (2.7) are recorded not transcribed.*

The British Library agrees that the discussion paper makes a strong case for treating non-self-describing resources differently from resources which do self-describe. We therefore agree, that it makes sense to record these metadata with relation to the Product.

**Recommendation 2:**

*Modify the Sources of Information for production information (2.7.1.2) to be simply, "any source".*

Agree.

**Recommendation 3:**

*To accommodate the transcription of production information appearing on the resource that has not been included in the recorded Production Statement, revise RDA 2.17.6, Note on Production Statement to allow such information to be accommodated.*

Agree.

Questions

1. Does the JSC agree that requiring transcription of information from unpublished resources is not the most effective way of supporting the FRBR user tasks?

We agree, certainly in the case of resources that are not self-describing.

2. Does the JSC agree that recording information related to the Production Statement and changing the sources of information hierarchy outweighs the benefits of consistency between the instructions for the Production, Publication, Distribution, and Manufacture Statements?

We agree, the accurate representation of the resource carries greater weight than consistency of instructions.

3. Does the JSC agree that the revision proposal outlined by ALA should be undertaken? If so:

a) Should a revision of 2.7 include the removal of the sub-elements Parallel Place of Production (2.7.3) and Parallel Producer's Name (2.7.5)

Yes, these elements become moot if the information is not transcribed.

b) Should any of the elements listed under "Additional Considerations" above also be part of such a proposal?

We believe that further investigation may be necessary. While many unpublished items may not be self-describing in relation to their "production", this may be less often the case with regard to title and responsibility.

4. Does the JSC feel that recording production information as relationships (and potentially, publication, distribution, and manufacture information as well) is an idea that should be pursued?

We agree.