

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/ACOC rep/2/LC response

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR DATE: Mar. 9, 2007
FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative
SUBJECT: Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements

LC has discussed the four proposed data elements and gives its comments below.

MARC 263 field/RDA 2.7.4 Projected Date of Publication

LC doesn't recommend adding this data element to *RDA*. Although its use is restricted to a limited number of programs (e.g., ISSN centres, Cataloging-in-Publication programs), we anticipate that many others would add this data element based on non-authoritative information or would contact the programs asking them to modify the date based on such information, creating added work for all concerned.

We would suggest this element be eliminated from RDA. However, if JSC decides to add this data element to *RDA*, the following changes be made in the proposed text:

- Data elements for a projected date of manufacture, production, etc., should also be added.
- 2.7.4.0.2.1: To fit the scope statement, the wording should be expanded to reflect authoritative information: “Take the projected date of publication from ~~any source~~ information supplied by the publisher.” We don't agree it should come from anywhere.
- 2.7.4.0.3.1: LC recommends deleting “, in the form yyyy- -or yyyy~~mm~~” because *RDA* shouldn't prescribe display.
- 2.7.4.0.3.2: This instruction should be given in a separate “Change in projected date of publication” provision.

MARC 507 field/RDA 4.13. Scale of Graphic Content

LC agrees to the addition of this data element.

MARC field 518 Date/Time and Place of an Event Note

Recommendation 1: LC agrees to the use of a general note for such information. However, LC doesn't use the coded MARC field 033 due to the amount of time needed to give such specific information.

Recommendation 2: LC prefers that cataloguers be referred to specialist manuals (e.g., *Cataloguing Cultural Objects*) for guidance when describing such objects. **Do not include instructions in RDA.**

MARC field 524/RDA 2.13 Preferred Citation

We have concerns about expanding the scope beyond that found in MARC, because there will be overlap between this data element and the information given now in MARC field 210 (Abbreviated title); titles given in field 210 can be those copied from resources (e.g., issues of serials).

LC agrees to the addition of a data element for a preferred citation. However, we would suggest either the scope of this element be changed to reflect the scope in MARC, or, if JSC decides to keep the expanded scope, the following changes be made in the proposed text:

- The word "citation" is as problematic here as it was when used as the term for one of the techniques to note relationships. We do not have an alternative to propose.
- 2.13.0.1.1: To fit the scope statement, the wording should be expanded to reflect authoritative information: "Take information on preferred citations from any available source that indicates it is the preferred form."
- 2.13.0.3.1: Because the scope has been expanded, LC suggests that the information recorded also indicate whose citation is being given (i.e., that of creator or publisher or custodian). (Or, see the next suggestion.)
- Instruction on giving a note about this data element is lacking. Perhaps the note could be the identification of whose citation is being given.
- Examples in 2.13.0.3.1: The Fletcher example is for a dissertation; dissertations are covered in *RDA* chapter 4. The last example could be misunderstood as telling the user to go to that Web site to determine how to cite the page; we suggest changing the introductory caption to wording such as "Cite this page as:" or "Cite as:" Alternatively, such captions may or may not be part of the "element," but could be considered display constants; we need a convention for indicating display constants in examples.