

PCC SCS comments on RDA Part A, chapters 6-7

submitted August 14, 2006, Paul J. Weiss, Chair, PCC SCS

Comments in red are the one I believe are the most significant. -- Paul

Overall comments

General

It remains impossible to give full feedback without the rest of the document, including the glossary.

It might be valuable to include a general discussion on gauging how much effort to exert to find information on relationships. This would be a place to basically say, "Don't go to the ends of the earth to figure out if this corporate body is part of that one". This section would help develop cataloger's judgement.

Organization and structure

The conceptual soundness and usability of RDA are being compromised by having the treatment of one concept being split up to various sections of RDA, where it is dealt with differently for no apparent reason other than tradition. This also makes training much lengthier and more difficult. The biggest example of this is whole/part relationships. These are now covered under comprehensive, analytical, and multilevel description (1.1.4, 1.2); series (2.10); common title/section title (2.3.0.7); contents list (4.7); and aggregate/component relationships (6.2), with little guidance on how to decide how to select the appropriate technique for particular situations.

The merging of the old Parts I and II seems reasonable, although the earlier 3-part structure seemed more logical. Just tagging chapters 6 and 7 on the end of Part A, however, exacerbates the problems of the logic and flow of the structure and organization of the first Part that we addressed in comments on chapter 1-6.

Some of the instructions in chapters 6 and 7 instruct on how to construct access points and citations: 6.1.3.0.3, 6.1.4.1-6.1.4.3, 7.2 (since selecting the primary access point is part of how to construct a citation). This all belongs in Part B. Part A should be limited to what to include in a bibliographic description/record, and how to record data that is not authority controlled.

Consider merging chapters 6 and 7, with the simple title "Relationships". Much of the content of 6.0-6.1 is the very similar to 7.0-7.1.

Move all instructions that relate to display or encoding to the appendices: 6.1.3.0.1 and 6.1.7.0.1 after "relationship".

Concepts

1.1.8.1 defines "citation" as "a form of reference used when citing a work, expression, manifestation, or item." This makes some sense; we need a brief way to identify a resource, formulated in a way that makes sense to users (as opposed to a "dumb" identifier). 1.1.7.4 defines "primary access point" as "an access point for a person, family, or corporate body, or a title, that is prescribed for use as the first element in a name-title or title access point for a work, expression, manifestation, or item." (The cover letter states that "Main and added entries have been replaced by the terms "Primary access point" and "Additional access point", implying that the RDA definition of "primary access point" is similar to the AACR2 definition of "main entry". To the contrary, AACR2 defines "main entry" as "The complete catalogue record of an item, presented in the form by which the entity is to be uniformly identified and cited. The main entry may include the tracing(s).") We are now questioning the value of the concept of "primary access point", with its inherently unwieldy definition. It seems that it is the citation for a resource that is indeed the resource's primary access point, not just the first part of it (that is, a name, when the citation consists of a name and a title). What do we get out of the concept of "primary access point" that we don't get from "citation", actually "citation of the resource"? Very little it seems. The cover letter states that "the concept of primary access point has been retained as it is needed to create bibliographic citations, and to collocate works,

expressions, etc in the online catalogue.” We believe we can satisfactorily instruct on determining citations without the need to refer to primary access points; collocation generally involves the whole citation, not just the name portion.

We are also now questioning the value of the concept of “access point”. For one thing, we’re coming to believe that it does not make sense for RDA to advise on indexing and searching. But more importantly, an access point no longer feels like a different “thing”. The “thing” is the related person/family/body, which can be expressed as a transcribed statement of responsibility and/or as term from a controlled vocabulary designed for searching. We think it makes much more sense to have our list of data elements, and say for each one whether it is to be transcribed, authority controlled, cataloger-written, etc. As more and more of the information community moves to the use of ontologies, we need to separate the concept of “data element” from that of instructions on how to supply the values of an element. We need to let go of past reification that no longer makes sense in our environment.

Attributes of relationships are an important aspect of well-formulated ER models, and more should be dealt with explicitly in chapters 6 and 7. (It is unfortunate that that the original FRBR document inaccurately treats some of these as attributes of the entities.) The original FRBR document also treats ternary relationships as two binary relationships. This is not uncommon when bringing a FRBR model of a database system into implementation, but is less powerful. (For example, an attribute of a ternary relationship needs to be duplicated when the model uses two binary relationships.) Examples:

- chronological relationship between a preceding resource and a successive resource

 - attribute = date of transition (which is included in the draft at 6.10.1.2.1a.2 and 6.10.2.2.1a.2)

- inherent creation relationship between a creator and a work

 - attributes = date of creation (which can be very different from the date of publication, and can be very important in literature and other fields); context within the creation occurred

- inherent realization relationship between a work, an expression, and a “realizer” (such as a work--translated expression--translator)

 - attributes = date of the realization

In the spirit of moving away from the concept of “note”, discontinue the use of word, including its various grammatical forms. The phrase “in the form of a note ...” can just be deleted. Change “make notes indicating”/“make a note(s) on”/“make notes on” to “indicate”, and “making an informal note(s)” to “indicating”. Reword “complete the note” as “complete the data element”. Replace “noting” with “recording”.

We applaud the categorization of options into three categories, with clearer and more consistently used terminology. With those changes, it is now unclear how they differ from “if considered important”. Are the three names options intended to be decided upon at an institutional level, while the if-considered-to-be-important instructions intended to be determined resource by resource? It is also unclear how to deal with options within the hierarchy of some sections. For example, 7.3 is labelled optional. 7.3.2 and 7.3.11 contains the phrase “if considered important”, while the other 7.3 subsections do not. Is that intended? If so, how should one interpret the parent section being optional with some subsections with no further optionality conditions while others do? It might be best to convert all “if considered important” phrases to one of the three formal option types. In any case, 0.1.7 needs to be updated. Expand the consistent labelling of options to all options; for example, 6.3.0.1.3 reads like an option, but it is not totally clear. Use some other more visible style than italics for identifying options.

Editorial

We are very concerned and frustrated irritated at the low level of editorial control that is being exerted on the drafts; it is a waste of our collective time to be slowed down in our reading by, and commenting on, many of the editorial problems raised below (such as contradictory text, consistency of terminology, sloppy use of FRBR terms, and circularity of definitions). These should not have appeared in the draft. We very much appreciate the

work that JSC and its staff are putting in, but if more effort were put to editing than coming up with verbose text or overly complex structures, we believe we would all benefit.

Again the lack of understanding of web document development is producing negative consequences. As one example, the cover memo states that “Text is repeated where needed to support a hyperlink reference structure and to allow individual instructions to be displayed on their own.” The negative impact of doing this (bloat, maintaining consistency in RDA over time, time-consuming to identify instructions that are not repeats) far outweighs the benefit.

We like the left column being devoted only to section numbers. Extend that to the artificially distinct hierarchy levels designated by a letter and a right parenthesis (such as at 6.2.1.2.1); in other words, move designators like “a)” to the section number margin as 6.2.1.2.1.a. Either give a period both before and after lettered levels of hierarchy or neither; instead of “6.7.1.2.1b.1”, give either “6.7.1.2.1.b.1” or “6.7.1.2.1b1”. Why are letters being used for certain section numbers? Consider either alternating between numbers and letters, or not using letters at all.

It is not clear what the intent is in using the imperative mood for some instructions, but the demonstrative mood (generally in the impersonal passive voice) for others. Generally stick to the imperative mood for instructions, and the demonstrative mood for facts.

There continues to be far too much explicit referencing, that just clutters up the document. In the web version of RDA, sections such as 6.1.2.1 are better with just hyperlinks, and a you-are-here hierarchy (probably above, to the left or right of the text pane). In the print version, the contents piece under the section header is far more useful,

Generally do not add levels of hierarchy when there is only one child element. For example, in 6.1.3, we see no benefit to creating 6.1.3.0, when there is no 6.1.3.1; the header is unneeded, and the level does not provide useful parallelism to other sections. Also, this unnecessarily lengthens section numbers. Instead, just elevate the 6.1.3.0.X sections one level to 6.1.3.X. If these single-child hierarchical levels are kept, at least eliminate the contents listing of one element.

As with the draft of the earlier chapters, these chapters are overly wordy, compromising readability, usability, and training. Delete sections that only repeat or summarize other text, or that otherwise do not provide value.

It is unclear why the term “multilevel description” from chapters 1-5 has generally become “embedded description” in chapters 6-7. Select one term and use it consistently. Also evaluate the verb “embed”.

The phrase “controlled access point” is used only one time in each of the two chapters. However, in several places, the phrase “access point” is used when the context suggests that “controlled access point” is the intended meaning, such as the header vs. the text at 7.1.2.1c.1.

Chapter 6

General

Change the title to the more accurate: Relationships with Other Resources.

The chapter should have two main parts (in this order): what relationships should be recorded, and how to do that recording.

Add a section paralleling 7.6. Include some such designations in the examples of access points; for example, at 6.2.1.2.1b.1, “includes: Johnson, Eva. Murras”.

6.0.1-6.0.2

Combine these two sections.

The text is awkwardly and narrowly worded. Reword as: This chapter covers relationships between the resource being described and other resources. Information about these relationships can help users find, identify, and select appropriate resources.

6.0.3

Delete this unneeded section.

6.1

We are glad to see information about recording relationships of any type. The sections on specific relationships should be able to be drastically reduced in length; do not repeat general instructions there.

6.1.2, 7.1.2

Make these sections more parallel in structure and wording.

6.1.2.1

It would be helpful to have examples for these.

6.1.2.2

Strengthen this by rewording as: Record information about the relationship in the descriptions of each resource in the relationship. Optional omission: Record such information only in the description of one of the resources.

Add text giving the option, when there is no record/description for the related resource, of creating a description for that related resource. This would assumedly be fairly minimal, and could be identified in a way similar to the use of 008/33 (Level of establishment) in the authority format. We find such records useful in the authority context, and they would be useful in the bibliographic context as well.

6.1.2.3

Replace this unuseful section with text that discusses variable to consider when deciding which technique to use in particular situations.

6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7

Designating these elements as optional is inappropriate, since these are more techniques than elements, and often only one technique would be used for a particular situation. It might instead be desirable to designate which types of relationships are required or optional.

6.1.3

Delete this section, which is only arbitrarily distinct from 6.1.4, as the presence of 6.1.3.0.2 shows.

6.1.3.0.3

This section is too vague.

6.1.5-6.1.7

These should be merged, as they really just differ on completeness. This title of the combined section could be “Descriptions of Related Resources”. Avoid the use of the awkward “informal reference”.

6.1.6.0.1

Move at least the if clause (and its footnote, which should be main text rather than a footnote) to 6.1.2.

6.2-6.10

Delete the 6.X.0.2 sections; they do not provide value.

Follow the lead of 6.3, 6.5, 6.8, and 6.9 for the other 6.X sections, by having only 6.X.1, not also 6.X.2, etc. What should be discussed is the relationship, for which it is not helpful to talk about each role of a resource separately.

In the 6.X.1.1.2 sections, bullet the examples, rather than giving them in running text.

Refocus the 6.X.1.2 sections on providing examples of the applicable relationships, and additional advice on which technique to use for the particular relationship, beyond what is stated in 6.1.2. Delete all the redundant text, such as that at 6.2.1.2.1a.1.

It is unclear whether accompanying material is covered by 6.2, 6.3, and/or 6.7, which give contradictory instructions.

6.2.1

Change the heading to the more appropriate “Relationships with Component Resources”.

6.2.1.1.2

Change “journals, etc.” to “journals”.

Delete “parts of a resource issued in two or more parts”, as physical parts do not necessarily correspond to intellectual parts.

Consider adding “chapters with different authors in edited scholarly books”.

6.2.1.2.1

It is unclear what is meant by “as applicable”.

6.2.2

Change the heading to the more appropriate “Relationships with Aggregate Resources”.

6.2.2.2.1b.2

Without a glossary definition for “series”, we cannot fully evaluate this section. Why does this option only exist in b, and not also a, and c-e?

6.2.2.2.1b.3

Move to 2.10, and make optional.

6.3

Delete this whole section. This relationship is already built in via the inherent realization, embodiment, and exemplification relationships, and therefore is already recorded in the citation.

6.3.0.1.3

Delete this option. A “stub” description for the aggregate resource is preferable, as it decreases maintenance and increases consistency.

6.3.1

Change “related component” to the more specific “sibling component”.

6.4-6.5

It is unclear why the JSC is thinking is about possibly merging these sections, as stated in the cover letter.

6.4

Merge into 6.6 (not, as suggested in the cover letter, into 6.5), as the source/reproduction relationship is just an example of the source/derivative relationship.

It makes a lot of sense to use “source” rather than “original”, as some reproductions are reproduced from other reproductions.

6.4.1.2.1c.1

It is unclear how this differs from 6.4.1.2.1a.1.

6.4.1.2.1c.2

It is unclear how this differs from 6.4.1.2.1c.1.

6.4.2.1

This is a ridiculously poor definition of “reproduction”. Use one of the definitions from other cataloging standards or tools.

6.5

Delete this whole section. This relationship is already built in via the inherent embodiment relationship, and therefore is already recorded in the citation.

6.6.0.1.1

Broaden this to include manifestations.

6.7

Consider changing “primary” to “independent” and “adjunct” to dependent”.

6.7.0.2.4

Move to chapter 1.

6.7.1.2.1b.1

It is not clear how the second example fits here.

6.7.2.1.1

The word “references” is much too broad here. Bibliographies at the ends of book reference many other resources, but they are no adjunct resources. Reword the definition along the line of: a resource that is intended to only be used with another resource.

6.8

Delete this whole section. This relationship is already built in via the inherent realization relationship, and therefore is already recorded in the citation.

6.9

The wording in this section shows how ridiculous this concept is. Merge this into 6.2.

6.10

Consider changing the header to “Chronological Relationships”.

The definitions of “preceding resource” and “succeeding resource” are circular, which is totally inappropriate. Either give useful definition, or view that we are using these with their dictionary definitions, and don’t give definitions.

6.10.1.1.2, 6.10.2.1.2

Delete “issued under a different title”. That implies that an earlier/later edition with the same title is not a preceding/succeeding resource, which contradicts the definitions (such as they are) of “preceding resource” and “succeeding resource”, and is inappropriately restrictive.

6.11-6.13

Remove these sections, incorporating their examples and some of its ideas elsewhere. 6.11.1-6.11.2, 6.12.1, 6.13.1-6.13.2:

These are just specific cases of the source/derivative relationship (6.6); move examples of these sections there. 6.11.3, 6.11.4, 6.12.2: Merge and generalize these sections to a relationship called something like “Companion Relationships”, or merge into 6.7; include also teacher’s manuals and laboratory manuals for textbooks.

If any sections like these remain, bring them all together as subsections of one section entitled “Relationships of Specific Types of Resources”.

Chapter 7

General

Change the title to the more accurate: Relationships with Persons,

As with chapter 6, this chapter should have two main parts (in this order): what relationships should be recorded, and how to do that recording.

Consider changing the phrase “person, family, or corporate body” to “group 2 entity”, which is shorter and better shows conceptual unity. Otherwise, there are many cases (such as at 7.2.7.1.1) where the phrase needs to be changed to “person(s), family(ies), or corporate body(ies)”.

7.0.1-7.0.2

Combine these two sections.

The text is awkwardly and narrowly worded. Reword as: This chapter covers relationships between the resource being described and other resources. Information about these relationships can help users find, identify, and select appropriate resources.

7.0.3

Delete this unneeded section.

7.1.1

Make this parallel to 6.1.1: one sentence that allows any source.

7.1.2.1

Use the same wording as 6.1.2.1. The phrase “are typically recorded” is unclear. When should the cataloger do something that is atypical, and what would that be?

7.1.2.1a

Move 2.4 here.

7.1.2.1b

Merge with a.

Delete “informally”.

Change “association” to “relationship”.

7.1.2.1c

Add a reference to part B.

7.1.3

Delete this section; see above general comments for rationale.

7.1.3.3

Delete; this already more appropriately placed at 7.1.2.1a.3 and in chapter 2.

7.1.4.1-7.1.4.3

Merge into a single section, and follow 7.1.4.3 as the model for all modes of issuance. That is, for all resources (monographs, serials, and integrating resources) put current information foremost in each data element, making earlier data secondary, and do not instruct to create a new description under any of the four reasons listed in 7.1.4.2.1. This will put RDA more in alignment with how the broader information community deals with this issue, and, we would venture to guess, with most users’ perspectives as well.

7.2

If this section is not moved to part B, at least make it chapter 8. Logically, the relationships have to be figured out first. Only then can the primary access point be selected, or the citation be constructed.

Recast from constructing primary access points to constructing citations; see the above general comments for rationale.

Emphasize the value in having a standardized citation, rather than on worrying about which name to use in one. In other words, what is truly valuable is a standard way of representing a resource in a brief form, not, in the end, which name we use before the title, or even whether we use a name or not.

The use of FRBR terminology in this section is sloppy. For example, in 7.2.0.3, FRBR considers revisions to be new expressions of the same work, while this RDA draft refers to them as new works. In no way would a “person, family, or corporate body responsible for the ... revision” be viewed “as having principal responsibility for the work”; rather such a person, family, or corporate body would have principal responsibility for the expression. It would seem that this section should be titled something like “New Expressions of Existing Works”. Another example is the discussion of adaptations and revisions. The misuse of terminology is at a level where we cannot fully evaluate 7.2, because it is not clear what some portions of the text are supposed to mean.

Following the current sensible approach to examples (0.1.9), actual headings should not be given the examples in this section. This section is about choice not form of the access point. Continue AACR2’s practice in chapter 21.

Consider changing the header to: Primary Relationships with Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies.

7.2.0

This section would greatly benefit from some general statements of principle before getting into the details. Do we generally prefer an entity responsible for the work over an entity responsibility for the expression, and an entity responsible for the expression over an entity responsible for the manifestation? When do we have a different principle?

7.2.0.1-7.2.0.2

Remember that works can be aggregate. So a resource can be an original compilation of original works. Then both of these sections apply, which does not seem to be the intent.

7.2.0.1

A definition of “original” would be helpful. It is not clear what the term is meant to encompass. Works that are not based on/derived from some other work? Should the header be “Expressions of Original Works”? Or “Original Expressions of Works”? If the resource being cataloged is a compilation, and either this particular set of component works has not been previously compiled, or the resource contains new text, like a biography, criticism, or historical context, the resource is a new work. Are such resources intended to be within the scope of 7.2.0.1?

7.2.0.2

Delete this section. Compilations then would be covered under other sections. An edited collection of original articles would fall in 7.2.0.1, and would be entered under the editor, who is the person who is principally responsible for creating the (aggregate) work. This will put RDA more in alignment with how the broader information community deals with this issue, and with most users’ perspectives as well.

7.2.0.3.1

Delete “is represented as” here and elsewhere. By principle we should be creating citations based on facts, not representation. Now most of the time, the representation is all we have, and we assume it to be true, and that’s fine. But when we know that there is misrepresentation, our duty is to record the truth (and perhaps _also_ the misrepresentation) so our users will succeed to the highest degree in finding and identifying useful resources. This is another area where our traditions are out of step with how the broader information community deals with this issue, and with most users’ perspectives as well.

7.2.1.0.1

Reword the unnecessarily complex and misleading middle part of the sentence as: “ ... under 7.2.1 to works that fall ...”.

7.2.1.1.1

De-footnote the footnote; it is not ancillary text, but primary instruction. Make it 7.2.1.1.2. As in AACR2, “originate” is not a clear verb here; either give further explanation, or find a different verb. The footnote seems to contradict 7.2.2.3 and 7.2.2.4. Alternatively, delete the footnote text altogether and rely on cataloger judgement to determine primary responsibility.

7.2.1.2.1

This conflicts with 7.1.1.1 and 7.2.0.3.1.

The Dennis and Anthony examples contradict 7.2.0.4.1.

The Physician example conflicts with 7.2.7.3.

7.2.1.3

Consider broadening the concept to include other informal groups of affiliated persons, like riots and mobs, “unnamed” conferences and expeditions, artist and writer schools and movements, etc., under the rubric of “Informal Groups”.

7.2.1.4

Due to the footnote at 7.2.1.1.1, move to become 7.2.1.2, renumbering current 7.2.1.2-7.2.1.3.

7.2.1.4.1

Change the text to match that of 7.2.1.2.1 and 7.2.1.3.1. In other words, do away with our complex rules on corporate body main entry, and treat corporate bodies the same way as persons. This will vastly reduce training and cataloging time, and will put RDA more in alignment with how the broader information community deals with this issue, and, we would venture to guess, with most users' perspectives as well.

7.2.1.4.2

Delete this unnecessary section.

7.2.1.4.4

The examples here are misplaced; they belong in 7.2.1.4.1.

I'm assuming that putting "nd" in superscript in the Army Materials Technology Conference is a typo, not a change in practice.

It has always been odd for us to consider vessels as corporate bodies, as they do not fit the definition, and are not generally considered to be so by non-library staff. Either change the definition, include them in the broadening of "family" to informal group, create a new category for them, or stop considering them as group 2 entities.

7.2.2.0.1

It is dangerous to assume that we have covered all possibilities of types resources with multiple responsible entities. reword to show that these are just examples of main types.

7.2.2.1

This is already covered at 7.2.0.1.2, so delete.

7.2.2.3-7.2.2.4

If "primary access point" is retained, merge these two sections. The distinction between resources with two or three responsible entities vs. four or more seems arbitrary, and unhelpful. Just go with title, or first-named responsible entity, for all resources with multiple responsible entities.

7.2.2.3.1

The current wording would produce different primary access points for a manifestation with two responsible parties, and a republication of the same expression with the two names in reverse order. The selection of the primary access point for both manifestations should be the same.

The Woodbury example does not comply with the instruction.

7.2.2.3.2

Delete this redundant section.

7.2.2.4.1

In the second, third, and fifth examples, principle responsibility is attributed--to the person(s) with overall responsibility: the editor, compilers, and interviewers, respectively. Correct and move these examples to 7.2.2.2.1 (second example) or 7.2.2.3.1 (third and fifth example).

7.2.2.4.2-7.2.2.4.3

Delete these redundant sections.

7.2.3

See comments on 7.2.0.2 above.

7.2.3.0.1

It is unclear what “independent works” means.

The purpose of a) and b) is unclear.

7.2.4.2.1

The first example does not seem to follow from the instruction.

7.2.5.0.1, 7.2.5.1.1

The two sections conflict with each other.

7.2.5.3.1

It is not clear how the inclusion of “previously existing” is supposed to change the meaning of this section.

7.2.6.0.1

Consider generalizing the scope.

7.2.6.1.2-7.2.6.2

Delete these redundant sections.

7.2.7.1.1

First instruct to use cataloger judgement, then resort to only title.

7.2.7.2.3

Delete this redundant section.

7.2.7.3-7.2.7.5

Merge these sections. Much of the time with unknown responsibility, one also doesn't know whether the responsible is a person, family, or corporate body.

7.2.8

Delete this entire section. In the end, it does not seem that a cataloging description would be different with or without this section (and 7.2.0.5). Move examples to other sections.

If this section is retained, change the header to “Recordings of Performances”. Performances per se are not resources.

Considering adding to the scope of this section exhibition catalogs, which, like performances, document an event.

7.2.8.0

Define “performance”.

7.2.8.0.2

Delete this unnecessary section.

7.2.8.1.1

This section does not appear to have been thought through. It is not clear how to apply this instruction to recordings of some non-musical performances. For a feature film, what is the “work performed”? The screenplay? The director's vision? It would seem that this might be resolved by a notion of “responsibility for

the whole” or “overarching responsibility” (other possible modifiers of “responsibility”: overall, lead, chief, controlling, oversight, cardinal, inclusive, comprehensive, foremost, head).

7.2.8.3.1

Delete “none of whom are prominently named” in the Dylan example, as it is irrelevant to the point at hand.

7.2.8.5.1a.1

Change to preferring the performer. This will put RDA more in alignment with how the broader information community deals with this issue, and with most users’ perspectives as well.

Delete “not prominently named” in the third example and “prominently named” in the last example, as they are irrelevant to the point at hand.

7.3-7.5

It is unclear why 7.3 covers both works and expressions, whereas the other two sections cover just one group 1 entity type. Either separate works and expression into separate sections, or, better yet, combine all these sections since there does not seem to be a good reason to treat the different group 1 entities differently.

7.3

If this section retains its current scope, make the scope (works and expressions) explicit. Change the phrase “additional access points for collaborators and contributors” to “other relationships between works and expressions and persons, families, and corporate bodies”.

Delete “prominently named ... reference sources” throughout this section. The first part is not going to be followed by other segments of the information and cultural heritage communities, and should be relegated to an application profile for libraries or some subset thereof, or made optional. The second part is not and will not be followed fully; it should be made optional. Also, the clause as a whole conflicts with 7.1.1.

7.3.0

Make a new first section on scope.

7.3.0.1

Delete the introductory clause. It does not seem appropriate for RDA to tell its users how to do their work. Some catalogers figure out all the access points they’ll provide before selecting the main entry, which is perfectly fine.

7.3.0.5

Delete this redundant section.

7.3.1-7.3.7

It would seem that these sections could be merged, since much of the text is identical or similar. The specific types of contributors could be given in a list.

7.3.2.1

Since the scope of this section appears to be monographs, state it explicitly, as does the next section.

7.3.2.2

This is the only place where the phrase “if considered important” is preceded by “only”. It is unclear if that word changes the instruction, and if so, how. We would recommend deleting it.

7.3.8

Change the header to “...Associated with Later Parts and Issues, or Earlier Iterations” to conform with 7.1.4.3.

7.3.8.1

Change “later iterations” to “earlier iterations” to conform with 7.1.4.3.

7.3.9

Also instruct the cataloger to indicate in the description the fact that the relationship is attributed.

7.3.11.1

Change “work” to “work or expression”.

It would be helpful to include in the instruction some examples of these other relationships, such as festschrift honoree.

Move the first example to 7.3.1, and the third example to 7.5 (this is a relationship between items and the museum).

7.4

If this section retains its current scope, make the scope (manifestations) explicit.

7.4.0.1

Paralleling 7.3.11.1, broaden this to: “Provide an additional access point for a person, family, or corporate body having a relationship to a manifestation, if considered important.”

7.5

If this section retains its current scope, make the scope (items) explicit.

Is it not important to discuss the concept of provenance?

7.6.2

We appreciate the broadness of this instruction, but different types of content may have in their standard lists different terms for the same role, which goes against the principles of authority control. At least require the source of the term be recorded.

7.7-7.12

Some parts of these sections (such as 7.7.1.3 and 7.7.8.1) do not differ from the instructions in 7.0-7.6, and should be deleted. All of these sections do have “Additional” in their titles. Move useful examples to the appropriate earlier sections.

It is not clear what the rationale was in determining what types of situations get covered in 7.2-7.6 vs. 7.7-7.12. This will make the document harder to use.

7.7

Apparently RDA is changing the definition of “musical work” from AACR2, since cadenzas and librettos were not included in the definition of musical work there. Without seeing this new definition, we cannot fully evaluate this section.

Many places in this section a role noun (such as “composer” in 7.7.1.1.1) should be given in the optional-plural form (“composer(s)”).

7.7.0.2

Delete this redundant section. The title of 7.7 already includes the word “additional”.

7.7.2

Change “musical settings for ballets, etc.” to “musical settings for choreography”; make concomitant changes.

Addendum for chapters 1-5

General

Give definitions in the more direct, simple style, such as: “work. a distinct intellectual or artistic creation (i.e., the intellectual or artistic content).”

1.1.5.6

Transform this into definitions of “aggregate” and “component”.

1.1.6

What about other types of creators: animals (like that elephant who paints) and computer programs (such as Racter, credited as the creator of "The policeman's beard is half-constructed")?

1.1.6.2

Although this definition is pretty good, it does not seem to encompass spirits, which chapter 7 implies. It does, however seem to appropriately include "fictitious" authors, such as Amos of the children's book "Ben and me".

1.1.6.3

Change “legal status” to “affiliation”. Constituting families legally is a fairly recent development, is more prevalent in the US than the rest of the world, and still excludes many self-described families in the modern USA.

1.1.7

Without seeing Part B, we cannot fully evaluate this section.

Delete this section; see above general comment for rationale.

1.1.7.2

If “access point” is retained, reword the outmoded definition as: “a name, term, code, etc., which is intended to indexed and searchable”.

1.1.7.3

If we do get rid of “access point”, change this section to a definition of “authority control”. Also add definitions for “transcription” and other general techniques.

1.1.7.4

Delete this section; see above general comments for rationale.

1.1.7.5

Delete this unneeded section.

1.1.8.1

Change the definition of “citation” to “a minimal description of a work, expression, manifestation, or item that uniquely identifies it”.

1.1.8.2

This information does not belong here, as it is not a definition or an example, but instructions on how to construct a citation. Move to Part B (or 7.2).

It is unclear what “in the form prescribed” refers to.

Chapter 2

This reorganization makes sense.

3.22

Incorporate this into 6.3/6.5, or broaden and move to somewhere in 6.0-6.1.

4.7

This is a definite improvement over the last draft.

4.7.0.1.1

This seems to be to be standard English, so it may not be needed.

4.7.0.3.1-4.7.0.3.2

Combine and reword as: “Describe the contents of the resource, either selectively or fully, if such a description is considered important, using elements considered to be important.”

4.7.0.3.3

Delete “issued successively,”. Just because a resource was issued simultaneously does not mean that the library or the cataloger has it all at time of description.

Change “make notes on” to “indicate” and delete “indicate” later in the sentence.

Reword the last sentence to “Update as new parts become available”. We should encourage updating even if the holdings never become complete.

4.10

This is about relationships; incorporate into chapter 6.

Throughout this section, change “noting” to “recording” and “make notes on” to “record”.

4.10.0.1.1

This definition is quite awkward and unclear. What is it intended to convey?

4.10.0.1.3

Shorten this to “For other ... given in chapter 6.”