

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements

CILIP welcomes the principle behind these specific proposals – that there may be data elements or sub-elements already provided for in other metadata universes which are worth considering for inclusion in RDA – but hopes that JSC will not restrict its consideration (or the underlying mapping that led to the current proposal) solely to MARC 21.

263 Projected Publication Date

This proposed addition to RDA poses a number of problems; this response will concentrate on two of these.

Firstly, the suggested addition of an element covering the projected publication date of an as-yet-unpublished resource begs the question as to where else in RDA provision might be made for as-yet-unpublished resources (or ought to be - for the sake of consistency). CILIP's view is that RDA shouldn't venture into describing resources that don't exist – a philosopher's dream could well be a cataloguer's nightmare. Of course, it is perfectly legitimate to regard these resources as "unpublished", but then other aspects of the description would need to be overhauled too.

Secondly, what's the functional requirement here? Where does the provision of a projected publication date fit into the FRBR structure? CILIP wonders – assuming others see some value to providing the information that this proposal is suggesting be added to RDA – whether it would be better as a sub-element of date of publication, qualifying the latter. We don't believe this overcomes the philosophical issue, but as a facet of "date of publication" it would seem a more logical approach. Indeed, other types of resources (more often described/encoded using metadata schema other than MARC 21) require other types of dates beyond those already covered by RDA drafts and by the current proposal.

CILIP would rather that RDA didn't try to deal with as-yet-unpublished resources; but, if it does, then it should investigate other types of dates for which provision might need to be made and not address just this one in isolation.

507 Scale Note for Graphic Publication

CILIP would have preferred to see a general instruction covering all types of graphic content, both cartographic and non-cartographic. The problem with retaining separate

instructions for cartographic data is that this multi-layered approach sanctions an embedded application profile within RDA (a situation not unique to this element, perhaps).

Presumably the proposed instruction could be used for any manifestation that is a facsimile of another manifestation and where the scale proportions are recorded or can be determined. Is this intentional and/or desirable?

A better approach, CILIP feels, would be first to have instructions that cover “scale of graphic content” in the broadest sense, and then to provide specific instructions where there’s something to say about particular aspects one can obtain from the resource.

518 Date/Time and Place of an Event Note

Recommendation 1. In the case of events related in some way to the acts of (or associated with) publication, distribution, manufacture and production, CILIP agrees.

Recommendation 2. CILIP agrees to the recommendation that JSC should discuss this, but would like to propose that JSC tries to incorporate this aspect into as general an instruction as possible, rather than devising a specific new one (or, even worse, more than one).

524 Preferred Citation of Described Materials Note

This MARC 21 field seems to CILIP to be potentially problematic if transferred in more general terms to RDA. It seems almost to be an alternative metadata statement embedded with the existing metadata – metadata about itself, if you like.

It seems wrong for RDA to be sanctioning one particular view of the way something should or could be cited. It may just be that the usefulness of the original archival concept has been lost in the generalisation.

The provision of this element would seem to be of more benefit as part of the “obtain” function (which RDA does not currently regard as in scope) than to “identify”.

Whilst CILIP does not reject the introduction of this concept into RDA, it would prefer to see the concept of “authority” added to the instruction, rather than it being open to anyone to add their own preferred citation without justification or explanation.

CILIP would have liked to explore whether there was any possibility of providing generic examples to cover this concept rather than the provision of specific instructions, but was unable to find time to consider where, within the current drafts of RDA, such examples might best fit (if at all).