

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Marg Stewart, CCC representative

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access – Constituency Review of Full Draft

CCC has reviewed the full draft of RDA (dated Oct. 31, 2008) and offers the following comments. High priority items for discussion by JSC have been marked with an asterisk.

General comments:

CCC wishes to express its concern and disappointment that the full draft of RDA was not presented for review in a version of the online product. CCC acknowledges that RDA has not been designed to be reviewed in a linear fashion. Given that reviewers could only access the pdf formats, they could not fully evaluate the true "look and feel" of RDA, and have had to work through a lengthy, at times, seemingly repetitious text. Without the navigational features of an online product, it has been difficult to assess RDA as a whole.

It is evident in reviewing the instructions that RDA supports the three database implementation scenarios. While this is a key feature of RDA, it is also a potential source of confusion. CCC stresses that accompanying documentation that explains RDA's approach (e.g., Chair/14 - *Using RDA with bibliographic and authority records*) will be extremely valuable to assist with the transition and should be accessible via the online product as well as separately on the JSC Web site.

Examples in chapter 19 – it was felt that the proliferation of examples of the same type tends to obscure the purpose of the chapter.

Specific comments:

0.0: Suggest rewording to move the parenthetical as follows:

The data created using RDA to describe an entity (a person, family, corporate body, concept, etc.) associated with a resource are designed to assist users performing the following tasks:

In addition, the find task should read (i.e., remove "on" resources associated...):

find – i.e., to find information on that entity and resources associated with the entity

0.1: Suggest rewording 1st sentence: ...using ~~state-of-the-art~~ digital technologies...

Suggest rewording 2nd sentence: ...with newer developments...

0.3.2: 0.3.2 states that Acquisition information is out of scope for RDA, yet ch.4 is about Acquisition and Access; data elements 4.2.1 Terms of availability and 4.3.1.3 Contact information for publisher or distributor are to support acquisition by other libraries. What is really out of scope are the details of the holding institutions' acquisition of the item (source used, price paid, internal accounting data saved). For clarity, suggest rewording:

Attributes and relationships associated with the entities work, expression, manifestation, and item whose primary function is to support user tasks related to an institution's resource management are currently out of scope.

0.3.2: 4.0 Access: only remote electronic access (URL) and restrictions on use and access are covered in this chapter. The main elements to support access to non-electronic materials (holding institution, collection, call number/shelf location) are out of scope for RDA although this is not said explicitly in chapter 0.

***0.3.3:** 0.3.3 definition of person includes “human or non-human” individual. As the deferred issues document states, the working out of how such access points should be formulated, and what sources should be used (considering that the animals in question cannot indicate a preference for a form of name), are not included in the first release of RDA, so having this so prominently in an important definition will raise a lot of questions that cannot be answered. FRAD Dec. 2008 final draft does not have this in the definition of person, although there is an “includes” line in the text on this, and absolutely no other details. (See also 8.1.3, 18.1.2)

***0.6.2 and 1.3:** Suggest deleting the phrase “only statement of responsibility relating to the title proper is required”. It is not necessary because Statement of responsibility relating to title is defined as a statement associated with the title proper in the scope of that element at 2.4.2.1 .

***0.6.2 and 1.3:** At 3.4, extent is flagged as a core element “only if the resource is complete or if the total extent is known.” To be consistent, suggest this qualification be stated at 0.6.2 and 1.3.

0.6.2 and 1.3: Should a note be added to indicate that a *Devised title* is required when it is being supplied as the *Title proper*?

0.6.2 and 1.3: It should be made clear that the following elements:

Distributor's name
Date of distribution
Manufacturer's name
Date of manufacture

are required only when they are actually identified on the resource and not when they are supplied using a phrase like *distributor not identified*

0.6.3: The presentation of the core elements could benefit from the inclusion of a heading such as "Additions" to highlight elements and additions to elements with sub-headings for music, legal material, etc. This would avoid having a single list that mixes types of material. (See also 8.3)

***0.6.3:** CCC notes that *Medium of performance (for music)*, *Numeric designation (for music)* and *Key (for music)* should be required as additions in access points for musical works whenever the preferred title for the work consists solely of the name of a type, or two or more types of composition (see 6.28.1.11).

***0.6.3:** CCC also notes that *Signatory to a treaty, etc.* is always required.

0.6.4: The first six additional identifying elements pertain to persons; for clarity, suggest adding "of the person"

0.8: Similar to *Alternatives and Options*, should the designation *Exception* also be noted in the General Introduction?

0.9, (para. 5): Suggest removing reference to AACR and replace with "...prescribed in Appendix E."

0.10.5: Playing speeds for analog tapes are recorded in centimetres per second according to 3.16.4. However, an alternative provides for using inches per second. Suggest rewording:

Playing speeds are generally recorded either in metric units (e.g., meters per second) or in terms of revolutions per minute, frames per second, etc.
However, allowance is made for recording playing speeds for analog tapes in inches per second.

1.5.3 e): Suggest adding "an archive" to parallel 1.5.2.e).

***1.6.1.2, 1.6.2.2, 1.6.3.2:** RDA states that a new description should be created if there is a change in media type. This does not conform to the ISSN Network rules which stipulate the creation of a new description and a new ISSN assignment for a resource that has changed from CD ROM to PDF.

***1.7.3:** For agencies following the ISBD prescribed punctuation conventions provided in Appendix D, CCC feels that certain punctuation marks occurring

within an element on the source (for example, colon, slash or an equals sign) may be confused with ISBD punctuation. Could this be addressed?

***1.9.2.6:** Probable Decade, 1.9.2.9 Probable Century - "1900s" does not distinguish between a probable decade 1900-1909, or the probable century 1900-1999. Similarly, "2000s" could designate 2000-2009 or 2000-2099. In addition, adding an *s* to a date to record a probable decade or century does not work in other languages. In support of internationalization, CCC supports reverting to the AACR2 convention of recording probable dates.

***2.1.2.2:** It is not clear if a label on a sound recording, or a title page on a book, identifying only the individual contents of the resource would qualify as a "source of information identifying the resource as a whole." The cause of this uncertainty is the fact that the second paragraph seems to address only cases where the individual contents appear on separate sources. The example given is that of a videodisc with separate sources for each of the films contained in it and the instruction itself uses "sources of information" in the plural only ("treat the sources of information identifying its individual contents") as if the possibility of having the individual contents identified on a single source was not considered.

If a single source identifying the individual contents of a resource would not qualify as a "source of information identifying the resource as a whole," it would be helpful to add examples of sources in the first paragraph, e.g.:

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume, or a sound recording), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a container bearing a collective title as opposed to a label identifying the individual contents).

Adding an example and revising the second paragraph to mention the possibility of having the individual contents identified on a single source would also help clarify the ambiguity, e.g.:

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a single videodisc containing multiple feature films but with no source of information bearing a collective title identifying the resource as a whole, or a book with a title page listing individual titles but with no source of information bearing a collective title), treat the source or sources of information identifying its individual contents as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole.

If a single source identifying the individual contents of a resource would indeed qualify as a "source of information identifying the resource as a whole," then it means that one could never choose the container as a preferred source of information for a sound recording, even though it might bear a collective title when the label doesn't, which would prove very problematic. See comments at 2.2.2.3-2.2.2.4.

***2.1.2.3:** It is our understanding that a sound recording issued in multiple units (e.g., 3 discs issued in a single container) would be considered as a resource issued in more than one part. The instruction as written would have undesirable results in cases when the units are numbered but don't bear a collective title because the description would have to be made from the first part and would be incomplete because one could not invoke the provision to treat the sources identifying the individual parts as a collective source. Suggest rewording the last bullet at 2.1.2.3:

a source of information identifying the resource as a whole, if the concept of order of parts is not applicable or appropriate

***2.2.2.3-2.2.2.4:** If a single source identifying the individual contents of a resource, such as a label, qualifies as a "source of information identifying the resource as a whole," then it means that one could never choose the container as a preferred source of information for a resource covered by these instructions, even though it might bear a collective title when the label or the embedded metadata doesn't. A provision is needed to choose a source bearing a collective title if the label or the embedded metadata doesn't.

2.2.4: Suggest that the second paragraph (analytical description and accompanying material) and third paragraph (container) would be better placed under the general guidelines at 2.2.2.1.

***2.2.4:** To avoid potential confusion between accompanying material at 2.2.4 and 2.2.2.1, suggest rewording 2.2.4 a):

a) other material (e.g., a leaflet or an "about" file)

2.3.1.1: The distinction between 2.3 and 6.2 Title of the work is confusing, particularly since the scope statement in 2.3 uses the word "work", i.e.:

2.3.1.1 Scope

A title is a word, phrase, character, or group of characters that names a resource or a work contained in it.

Since chapter 2 provides instructions for identifying manifestations or items, the following rewording is suggested:

A title is a word, phrase or character, or group of characters that names a manifestation of a resource or a manifestation of a work contained in it.

2.3.2.8.1: Suggest rewording the first paragraph as follows to incorporate the notion of distinctive/non-distinctive title:

~~Type of Musical Composition~~, Medium of Performance, Key, etc.

If ~~omitting a music title consists only of the name or names of one or more type of composition, or the name or names of one or more type of composition and one or more of the following from the title proper:~~

- medium of performance
- key
- date of composition
- number

would result in a title that is not distinctive, treat all the elements together (in the order in which they appear on the source of information) as part of the title proper.

2.3.2.10 [2.3.2.6]: Suggest the following rewording given that, for an analytical description, the title of the content being described should not be dependent on that of the larger resource:

When preparing an analytical description for a resource that has a source of information for the title proper bearing both the title of the content being described and a collective title for the larger resource, record the title of the content being described as the title proper if the title of the content is not dependent on that of the larger resource.

2.3.3.4: This instruction is about cases when statements of medium of performance, key, date of composition, and/or number are in more than one language or script but the type of musical composition is not. Suggest correcting the caption and the examples to reflect this.

~~Type of Musical Composition~~, Medium of Performance, Key, etc.

For example:

~~Concerto~~, D major, for horn and orchestra

~~Concerto~~, ré majeur, pour cor et orchestre

Title proper: Concerto, D-Dur, für Horn und Orchester

2.3.6.1: Suggest that variant titles reflecting alternative spelling, form, etc. are stated explicitly in the instruction, perhaps within category c).

2.3.11.3 a): Suggest adding “collection” to the parenthetical statement.

2.3.11.3 (last para.): Instructs the cataloguer to make a note when the resource is of a type that would normally carry identifying information. The instruction at 2.20.2.3 does not limit the use of note to resources that would normally carry identifying information although this is the intent. Does the exception at 2.2.4 (last paragraph) need to be provided at 2.20.2.3? The 5th example at 2.20.2.3 should be removed to align with the exception at 2.2.4.

In addition, for consistency with other instructions, CCC suggests that the last paragraph of 2.3.11.3 read:

If the resource is of a type that would normally carry identifying information, (e.g., a published book), indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself as instructed under 2.2.4.

2.3.11.7: Suggest rewording:

...or a collection of ~~resources~~ ...

2.4.1.4: CCC does not think it is practical to **transcribe** statements of responsibility when they are taken from outside of the resource.

2.4.1.4: Suggest that clarification be added to indicate that statements that are taken from the resource are recorded only if they are formally presented.

***2.4.3.1:** The current definition could imply that any statement of responsibility in a language or script that differs from the language and script of the title proper would be a parallel statement of responsibility. Suggest the following rewording:

A parallel statement or responsibility relating to title is a statement of responsibility relating to title (see 2.4.2.1) in a language or script that differs from that of the title proper or differs from the statement that appears first.

Similar clarification is suggested for all the parallel elements (e.g., parallel designation of edition, parallel statement of responsibility relating to the edition, etc.)

***2.5.2.1:** Suggest adding:

g) a particular voice range or music format for notated music

This will assist cataloguers, and especially generalists, who may not have an intuitive notion that a musical format statement qualifies as an edition statement. It will also help to clarify that voice range (e.g., High voice) for vocal music is considered an edition statement.

2.6.2.2, 2.6.3.2, 2.6.8.2, 2.6.9.2: suggest the following rewording for b):

b) another source on the first issue or part within the resource itself (see 2.2.2)

2.6.4.2, 2.6.5.2, 2.6.6.2, 2.6.7.2: suggest the following rewording for b):

b) another source on the last issue or part within the resource itself (see 2.2.2)

2.7.6.6: The first paragraph indicates that when the date of production is not identified, the date or approximate date should be supplied. However, the last paragraph at 2.7.6.5 states that if the date or dates cannot be approximated, a date of production should not be recorded.

2.7.6.7, 4th para.: Suggest rewording:

If the date is uncertain or cannot be determined, estimate ...

2.9.4.4: Suggest that (*other than solely publishing*) should be deleted.

***2.9.6 and 2.10.6:** RDA provides for identifying copyright dates and optionally allows for adding a statement of function for distributors. CCC suggests that RDA provide a way of identifying dates of distribution and dates of manufacture when they are recorded as a substitute for the date of publication.

2.10.1.4 (second para.): suggest the following rewording:

...and/or if neither the date of publication nor copyright date nor date of distribution is identified

2.12.9.2: The sources of information for Numbering Within Series are limited to those within the resource while the sources of information for Title Proper of Series include those outside the resource. Suggest that the sources of information for Numbering Within Series be changed to align with the sources of information for Title Proper of Series.

2.13.1.3: An archival resource would be considered a single logical resource but is not intangible. Suggest that the scope of single unit as a mode of issuance encompass an archival resource.

***2.15.1.4:** Suggest that an *Exception* be added to indicate that for publishers' numbers for sound recordings, the identifier is preceded by the brand or trade name associated with it rather than the name of the agency responsible for assigning the identifier.

***2.15.1.4 (2nd para.) :** For notated music, preceding the identifier with the name of the agency, etc. responsible for assigning the identifier has not been considered necessary. Identifying the agency responsible for assigning plate numbers could become complicated because music publishers reprint music originally published by other publishers without touching the plate numbers. In such cases, the question would arise as to which publisher is responsible for assigning the number, the original publisher or the one reusing the number? We suggest that an exception be added for notated music.

2.15.1.7: It is not clear that *Optional Addition* has been used consistently. For example, at 2.15.1.7, the second paragraph states "If the resource has only one

identifier, add the type of binding if is considered to be important.” This has not been flagged as *Optional Addition*; however, at 4.2.1.2, the instruction “When the terms of availability need qualification, record one briefly” is considered an *Optional Addition*.

***2.15.1.7:** Suggest that Qualification be an *Optional addition*. For music numbers it is not always appropriate or practical to add a qualification (for example, a score containing a collection of songs might bear a different plate number for each song).

2.20.7.1: It is not clear that notes on copyright dates are covered as 2.11.1.3 indicates. Suggest rewording:

...or date of publication, or copyright date, or information...

3.1.4: Third paragraph refers to 27.1 for instructions on recording information relating to the carrier for accompanying material but there are no explicit instructions at 27.1

***3.3.1.2:** CCC does not agree with the deletion of videodisc and would like to see it reinstated. We do not agree with ALA that it is an obsolete term. “Videodisc” also occurs in various instructions in RDA (e.g., 2.1.2.2, 3.4.1.12.2, 3.5.1.4.4, 3.18.2.3, 3.19.4.1, 3.22.2.10).

3.4.1.11: Suggest that the caption and instruction be revised to include an archival resource; i.e. Comprehensive Description of an Archival Resource or a Collection

3.4.1.11.1: Suggest rewording:

...containers or volumes. ~~in the collection~~

3.4.1.11.2: The notion of storage space is not applicable to archival resources. Suggest that the caption be changed to Linear Extent of Units so that it is applicable to archival resources as well as other collections.

3.4.1.11.3: Suggest rewording:

Record the extent of each type of resource ~~in the collection~~ by ...

3.4.3.2: Contrary to ISBD, RDA does not treat additional scores, parts, etc., as accompanying material. This means that punctuation instructions can’t be provided by ISBD when the specific material designation comprises different units (e.g., 1 score + 1 condensed score + 20 parts).

3.4.5.5: suggest deleting “when only alternate pages are numbered” in the instruction because a resource with this characteristic would now be described in terms of leaves per 3.4.5.2 c) and the numbering would not be misleading. The first example, which illustrates such a case, would also need to be deleted.

***3.4.5.14:** We would like a clarification on the application of this instruction. Would a piece of sheet music consisting of one folded sheet designed to form 4 pages be described as *1 score (1 folded sheet (4 pages))* or simply as *1 score (4 pages)*? If the latter, shouldn't RDA provide for an exception?

3.5.1.6: Last sentence of paragraph on unbound texts should read: If the ~~manuscript~~ text is kept folded ...

3.6.1.3 (last paragraph) vs. 3.7.1.3, 3.8.1.3 etc.

Record **additional** details of ... vs. Record details of

3.16.1.3: *medium* (see 3.16.3.3) should be added to the list.

***3.16.2:** This element confuses two different concepts under the same label of "Type of recording", i.e. the method of encoding for playback and the method originally used to capture the sound. In this instruction, the latter is to be recorded as details of the former, which is incorrect since it doesn't apply to the method used for playback and is therefore outside the scope of the element.

We suggest renaming the element "Type of encoding" and creating a separate element that would be named "Type of recording" and whose scope would be the method originally used to capture the sound (e.g. acoustical recording, analog recording, digital recording).

3.18.1.3: it was agreed to add resolution as an element sub-type

3.19.1.3: *regional encoding* (see 3.19.4.3) should be added to the list.

4.3.1.1 (3rd para.): Suggest rewording:

...includes the name, address, etc., of the ~~archival~~ repository that holds the resource.

***6.2.1.6:** It is not clear why the instructions for recording accents and other diacritical marks differ from the instructions at 1.7.4. It is suggested that the instructions at 1.7.4 be reworked for inclusion at 6.2.1.6.

***6.2.2.4:** Although the instruction "If no title in the original language is established as being the one by which the work is best known, or in case of doubt, choose the title proper of the original edition (see 2.3.2) as the preferred title" leads the cataloguer to choose the title proper of the manifestation as the title of the work, neither the wording of the instruction nor the examples make it clear that the title proper of the manifestation is the title of the work for a significant number of resources.

6.2.3.3 (third para.): This instruction is provided as an *Exception* but should it be flagged as such?

6.15.3.3, 6.20.5.3 [6.20.3.3], 6.23.3.3, 6.26.3.3: We question the need to repeat the second and third paragraphs. The reference back to 6.2.1 [6.2.3] appears to be sufficient.

6.20.5.4 [6.20.3.4]: Suggest that the Canada Labor Code example be deleted.

6.21: Suggest changing element name and instruction at 6.21.1.1 to Date of Legal Work and Basic Instructions on Recording Date of Legal Work.

***6.21.3:** Suggest that the *Signatory to a treaty* is always required and not just when needed to differentiate one work from another work with the same title.

***6.27.1.4:** The examples illustrating preferred access point representing the work when the compiler is considered the creator are problematic. Can the work titled *Select documents on Japanese war crimes and Japanese biological warfare, 1934-2006* be considered a compilation of works when it is essentially a list of documents (120 pages out of ca 170 pages)? Given that the compiler could be considered the creator of the work, the example should be moved to 6.27.1.2 (Works created by One Person, Family, or Corporate Body).

It is not clear how the other two examples fit under “compilations of works” given that they are compilations of source material.

6.27.1.5: Suggest rewording the *Exception* to avoid the use of “commonly cited title”:

If the person, family or corporate body responsible for the adaptation or revision is unknown, construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred title for the adaptation or revision, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.15.2.

6.27.4.1 (third para.): The instruction in the first paragraph (and definition of variant access point at 5.1.4) indicates that the basis for a variant access point is the variant title for the work; however, the instruction in the third paragraph states “...construct a variant access point using only the preferred title for the work.”

***6.29.1.15:** The situation raised in 5JSC/CCC/1 has not been addressed. The scenario was a treaty between two national governments (Canada and Nisga’a Nation) and one below the national level (British Columbia). The instructions at 6.29.1.15 do not include a government below the national level:

For a treaty or any other formal agreement to which one or more national governments is a signatory, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order):

7.7.1.3: The parenthetical statement is not necessary given that the information (*e.g., if the resource is designed for use by persons with disabilities*) is already covered in the scope.

***7.11.3:** The instruction to record the date of capture as year, month, day and time will not work in an international context.

***7.11.3:** Recording information on date of capture as an element will be problematic for complex situations. Suggest an additional instruction as follows:

7.11.3.3.4 Details of date and place of capture

Record details of the place and date of capture if they are considered to be important for identification and access.

For example:

The 1st, 4th, 5th, and 7th works recorded at Williams College in Nov. 2002, June 2004, and May 2005; the 2nd work recorded at Infinity Studio, Madrid, Spain, June 2004; the 3rd work recorded at the Hopkins Center of Dartmouth College, May 2, 2003; the 6th work recorded at Dream Studios, Milwaukee, Feb. 2003.

7.13.3.3: Since neumes can be used in chants other than Christian (*e.g., Buddhist chant of India*) and that plainsong has a specific Christian meaning, replace *plainsong notation* with *neumatic notation*.

7.20.1.3: Suggest that “close score” be added to the list of terms.

8.1.3: For consistency, the same definition of name should be used throughout RDA. (See also 10.2.1.1)

8.3: For clarity, suggest that the core elements be grouped by entity.

9.0, footnote 2: The definition of person should be the same throughout RDA.

11.2.2.5.2: Suggest changing the Alternative to read:

Choose a form in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data.

11.2.2.5.4: To be consistent with the text of the instruction, suggest that the footnote be reworded:

...choose the name found most commonly in periodical and articles in the language preferred by the cataloguing agency as the preferred name.

11.2.2.5.4: Suggest changing the caption from Local Churches to Local Places of Worship.

11.2.3.7.1: The text should be deleted as it is redundant.

11.3.2.3: Question whether the example Pacific Harbour International Hotel is appropriate. It is not clear that providing the name of the hotel provides better identification than a local place name. This example also appears at 11.12.1.8.

***11.5:** The note under *Associated Institution* states that an “associated institution is required for conferences, etc., if the institution’s name is commonly associated with the name of the conference, etc.” No examples of conferences are given at this instruction. How does *Associated Institution* for conferences relate to the exception given at 11.3.2 (Location of conference, etc.)? The exception enables one to record the name of an institution, etc., instead of local place name if it provides better identification. See also 11.12.1.4 and exception at 11.12.1.8.

***11.12.1.8:** It is not clear why some of the examples (Gapapaiwa Writers’ Workshop, World Series, etc.) do not include the location of a conference, etc.

18.1.2: The definition of person should be the same throughout RDA. For example, a different definition is provided at 29.1.2.

24.1.3 (fifth para.): Given that the item relationships are both item-to-item and item-to-manifestation, suggest following rewording:

The term related item refers to an item related to the manifestation or item being described (e.g., an item used as the basis for a microform reproduction).

Appendix A

There is no provision to justify the capitalization of phrases like *producer not identified*, *Place of publication not identified* and *date of manufacture not identified*. In addition, there is no guidance regarding the capitalization of the statement of function when recorded as part of the publisher’s name.

***A.48** Serbo-Croatian has been carried over from AACR2. However, the reality is that there never was a language “Serbo-Croatian.” With the demise of Yugoslavia, the term “Serbo-Croatian” followed suit. Croatian re-affirmed its

name as the standard language of Croatia, while Serbian is the official name of the language spoken in Serbia. It is, therefore, suggested that a new heading for Croatian be inserted in the appropriate sequence and the current heading be revised to Serbian (Cyrillic and Roman). Since Croatian and Serbian share the same rules for capitalization, a note should be added under Serbian to “Apply the guidelines on Croatian given under A.XX.

It is further suggested that because many of the examples are outdated, contemporary examples are proposed below:

A.47.1.2. Replace the term *srpskohrvatski jezik* with *hrvatski jezik*.

A.47.2.1. Replace *Trg žrtava fašizma* with *Trg hrvatskih velikana*, followed by a new example, *Ulica braće Radića*.

A.47.4.1. Replace *Jugoslovenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti* with *Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti*. Add a new example before *Udruženje književnika Srbije: Društvo hrvatskih književnika*.

A.47.5.1. Replace *predsednik Tito* with: *predsjednik Tuđman*. Replace *kralj Georg* with *kralj Tomislav*.

A.47.8.1. Add a new example preceding *oktobarska revolucija: ilirski pokret*. Replace *boj na Mišaru* with *bitka kod Siska*.

***A.3.2:** The music exception contradicts A.28 as far as key is concerned. For key, the pitch name should be capitalized according to the guidelines given under A.10-A.53, as applicable to the language involved (e.g., A major but la mineur).

Appendix C

C.1 Suggest rewording: articles for names in the languages”

Appendix D

***D.2.1:** The following elements are missing under 7. Note area:

7.11.2 Place of capture

7.11.3 Date of capture

***D.2.2.9:** Might be the place to explain that multiple qualifications to the same standard number are presented in a single set of parentheses separated by colons. (US : v.1 : pbk.) vs (Germany : v.1 : pbk.) and all the other variations. This is an area where the AACR2 punctuation pattern is actually not clearly spelled out in ISBD.

D.2.2.1 : Part of the original ISBD instruction is missing. Add the following at the end of the first paragraph:

, in which case the full stop, space, dash, space may be replaced by a full stop given at the end of the preceding area.

***D.2.2.4.2**: Unsure about the relevance of including Music Format Statement. This element no longer has an exact equivalent in RDA now that what is music format statement in ISBD is treated as edition information in RDA.

D.2.2.5: Provisions regarding parallel information are missing.

***D.2.2.6**: Contrary to AACR2 and RDA, ISBD treats additional scores, parts, etc., as accompanying material. This means that ISBD doesn't provide punctuation instructions when the specific material designation comprises different units (e.g., 1 score + 1 condensed score + 20 parts), except for multimedia resources, that is.

D.3: Needs to be revised to changes to RDA elements and MARC 21 coding.

***D.3.1 (field 254)**: Given that RDA considers musical presentation statements as edition statements, we don't support mapping field 254 to elements 2.5.2-2.5.9.

D.3.1 (field 300, p. D-22): Duration (7.22) is missing under \$a Extent. Digital file characteristics (3.19) is missing under \$b Other physical details.

Appendix E

E.2.1: Under Uniform titles, the comma separating the designation from the title for part is missing. Under Additions to uniform titles, the period preceding General material designation is missing. For Selections, N/A is no longer true.

E.2.1: For Sketches, under Additions to uniform titles for music, replace the parentheses with a period, per 5JSC/ LC/12/LC follow-up.

E.2.1: Under See references from variant titles for works, the comma separating the designation from the title for part is missing. Under Additions to uniform titles, the period preceding General material designation is missing. For Selections, N/A is no longer true.

E.2.1: For Sketches, under Additions to uniform titles for music, replace the parentheses with a period, per 5JSC/ LC/12/LC follow-up.

E.2.1: Under See also references from uniform titles for related works, the comma separating the designation from the title for part is missing. Under Additions to uniform titles, the period preceding General material designation is missing. For Selections, N/A is no longer true. For Sketches, under Additions to uniform titles for music, replace the parentheses with a period, per 5JSC/ LC/12/LC follow-up.

E.2.2.5: Add instructions to

- separate designation from title of part with a comma
- precede the term Selections by a full stop and a space

E.2.2.5: Reword: Precede ~~Enclose~~ the term Sketches by a full stop and a space. ~~in parentheses.~~

E.3.1: 400, 410 and 411, \$t Title of work should also map to 6.2.3 Variant title for the work

Appendix I

radio producer and *television producer* are included at I.2.2 and are defined as taking responsibility for the business aspects of a radio or television program. However, we note that radio producers and television producers can also have a creative role. We suggest therefore the addition of *radio producer* and *television producer* at I.2.1:

radio producer – A person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating a radio program.

television producer – A person, family, or corporate body responsible for creating a television program.

arranger of music: Reword as follows:

...the original composition ~~composer~~ remains essentially unchanged.

CCC questions whether some of the roles under I.3.1 should be in work level (I.2.2): *art director, composer of music for sound film, production designer?*

Appendix J

General comments:

This section is hard to use and follow. It is hard to remember the directionality of the relationship designator (it is relating the access point to the resource in the body of the description). Most of the relationships covered are naturally defined in reciprocal pairs, yet the presentation in a single long list obscures the pairing and contributes to the potential confusion. Maybe an additional presentation in chart form (one chart for work and expression relationships, another for manifestation and item relationships) would clear up the confusion and draw the parallels to the cataloguer's attention.

As most of the work-to-work relationships can be recorded either at the work level or at the level of the specific expressions of those works that are involved, depending on the detail desired and the information available, most of the relationships in J.2 have already been covered in J.1. This adds to the length of the

list and again this presentation obscures this pattern. And as a result relationships that do not reappear in both levels (such as prequel, sequel at work level) tend to get lost in the list. In J.2.2 it is particularly unclear that some of the relationships (revised as, translated as) must apply between different expressions of a single work, while most of the relationships in the list apply between expressions of different works. This is an important factor in correct application of the designators.

Specific comments:

***J.2.2:** Add the following relationship designators, taken from J.2.4 and edited as needed. These need to be added even if the suggestion to delete them from J.2.4 is not accepted because Appendix J must accommodate cases when librettos are published separately than the work they are related to.

Under based on:

libretto (work)

A work that provides ~~comprising~~ the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio.

Under derivative work:

libretto for (work)

A musical work such as an opera or other work for the musical stage ~~concerto, or an oratorio~~, that uses the ~~contains a vocal~~ text of the source work.

***J.2.2**, libretto based on: Reword as follows:

A work used as the basis for the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio.

***J.2.2**, musical arrangement: Arrangements are expressions, not works; it is incorrect to include them in J.2 among work-work relationships. The Canadian Association of Music Libraries (CAML) also notes that the reciprocal relationship is missing.

***J.2.2**, musical setting of : Reword as follows:

A work that provides the text for a non-dramatic musical work, except for oratorios.

***J.2.2**, basis for libretto: Reword as follows:

A work that comprises the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio, based on the source work.

***J.2.2**, musical setting: Reword as follows:

A non-dramatic, musical work, except for oratorios, that uses the text for the source work.

***J.2.4**: CAML strongly objects to include cadenzas and librettos in the category of whole-part work relationships. Although cadenzas are composed to be performed as part of musical works, they are treated in chapter 6 as separate works, with their own preferred access points, not as parts of the works they are related to. To be consistent, cadenzas should be moved under accompanying work relationships, where they belong more appropriately, especially considering that they are often published on their own.

As for librettos, it is true that they are a systemic part of a musical work when they are published as a part of that work (e.g., in a score or in a recording). As such, the access point for the libretto would not be different than that of the musical work. There would therefore be no need to make an access point for the libretto and, consequently, to identify the relationship. This would also contradict the fact that musical works with text are treated as collaborative works, not as an aggregate of two works, i.e. the music and the text. CAML also notes that “musical setting” and the reciprocal relationship, for non-dramatic works, are not included, which is inconsistent. CAML therefore requests that librettos be moved under derivative work relationships.

***J.2.5**: Add the following relationship designators, taken from J.2.4 and edited as needed. These need to be added even if our suggestion to delete them from J.2.4 is not accepted because Appendix J must accommodate cases when cadenzas are published separately than the work they are related to.

Under augmented by:

cadenza (work)

A musical work comprising an ornamental passage for a soloist, added to a musical work such as a concerto, either by the same or a different composer ~~of the larger work or by another composer~~.

Under augmentation of:

cadenza composed for (work)

A musical work such as a concerto for which ~~that contains~~ an ornamental passage for a soloist has been composed, either by the same or a different composer ~~of the larger work or by another composer~~.

J.3.2, musical arrangement of : CAML queries in which circumstances this relationship would be used since no access point is made for the original work

when describing the arrangement (the preferred access point for the work is used with arranged).

***J.3.2**, libretto based on: Reword as follows:

An expression of a work used as the basis for the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio.

***J.3.2**, musical setting of: Rewords as follows:

An expression of a work that provides the text for a non-dramatic musical work, except for oratorios.

***J.3.2**, basis for libretto: Reword as follows:

An expression of a work that comprises the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio, based on the source work.

***J.3.2**, musical setting (p. 12): Rewords as follows:

A non-dramatic musical work, except for oratorios, that uses the text of the source work.

J.3.2, musical arrangement: CAML queries in which circumstances this relationship would be used since no access point is made for the original work when describing the arrangement (the preferred access point for the work is used with arranged).

***J.2.4**: CAML strongly objects the inclusion of cadenzas and librettos in the category of whole-part expression relationships (see our comments at J.2.4).

***J.3.2**: Add the following relationship designators, taken from J.3.4 and edited as needed. These need to be added even if our suggestion to delete them from J.3.4 is not accepted because Appendix J must accommodate cases when librettos are published separately than the expression they are related to.

Under based on:

libretto (expression)

An expression of a work that provides ~~comprising~~ the text of an opera or other work for the musical stage, or an oratorio.

Under derivative expression:

libretto for (expression)

An expression of a musical work such as an opera or other work for the musical stage ~~concerto~~, or an oratorio, that uses the ~~contains~~ ~~a vocal~~ text of the source work.

J.3.5, augmented by (work): Should read augmented by (expression).

***J.3.5**: Add the following relationship designators, taken from J.3.4 and edited as needed. These need to be added even if the suggestion to delete them from J.3.4 is not accepted because Appendix J must accommodate cases when cadenzas are published separately than the expression they are related to.

Under augmented by:

cadenza (expression)

An expression of a musical work comprising an ornamental passage for a soloist, added to a musical work such as a concerto, either by the same or a different composer ~~of the larger work or by another composer.~~

Under augmentation of:

cadenza composed for (work)

An expression of a musical work such as a concerto for which that contains an ornamental passage for a soloist has been composed, either by the same or a different composer ~~of the larger work or by another composer.~~

Appendix M

p. 1: Encoding format (3.19.3) is missing

p. 5: The second occurrence of Copyright date appears to be redundant.

p. 15: Unsure about the 530 field. Adding a url makes it an additional physical form available note but the statement preceding the url refers also to the printed version of the journal. Would be less ambiguous if \$u was omitted and the tag changed to 500, General note.

*p. 81: Including the opus number in addition to the thematic index number contradicts 6.17.1.3.3, which prescribes to “record the [thematic index] number in the absence of, or in preference to, a serial number and/or opus number.”

p.24: The participant and performer note should be tagged as field 511 instead of field 518.

Glossary

Archival Resource: The Canadian Committee on Archival Description suggests deleting “organically” from the first sentence. In addition, suggest deleting the third sentence “It may also be a collection...”.

*We note that definitions for Arrangement and Adaptation are not included but one for Transcription is. We hope that this situation is going to be corrected since the concepts of arrangement and adaptation for musical works are far more important in RDA than that of Transcription.

*Add a definition for Non-Distinctive Title as follows:

In the context of musical works, a title that consists only of the name or names of one or more types of musical composition. The title of a work that is definitely not a work of the type normally designated by the term is however considered distinctive (e.g., Requiem, when the work is for solo violoncello). A title that consists of two words that are each the name of a type of composition is considered distinctive if the combination of the words produces a distinctive title (e.g., Fantaisie-impromptu, Humoresque-bagatelles). Other titles (including those that consist of such terms plus an additional word or words, e.g., Chamber concerto, Double concerto, Konzertstück, Little suite) are considered to be distinctive.

Cartridge: Since the cartridge is defined as a computer carrier, without a reference to other types of cartridges (e.g., audio cartridge, film cartridge), shouldn't the entry be Computer Cartridge? Also, the definition omits to mention that a computer cartridge can house computer tape as well.

Case: Seems to cover only printed or manuscript resources because of its reference to bound and unbound resources. Reword to include other resources that can be contained in a case such as audio discs, videocassettes, etc.

*Chorus score: A work whose accompaniment has been arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or has been omitted can't be said to be a chorus score if it doesn't contain solo voices. The presence or absence of words is not relevant to the definition and needs not be addressed. Reword the definition as follows, for consistency with the definition of Vocal Score:

A score of a work for solo voices and chorus showing only the parts for chorus, at least in those portions of the work in which the chorus sings.
~~The music and words for the chorus from a work that includes instruments and possibly solo voice(s), in which~~ with the instrumental accompaniment ~~has been~~ arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or omitted.

Finding aid: suggest changing definition as follows:

A descriptive tool enabling access to a resource.

*Graphic notation: By excluding only staff notation, the definition seems to imply that other musical notations such as mensural notation, letter notation, etc., are considered graphic notation.

*Key: Reword as follows:

The set of pitch relationships that establishes the tonal centre, or principal tonal centre, of a single pitch class as a tonal centre for a musical work.

Manuscript: Can an inscription be written? Not all copies are made to be submitted for publication either. Reword as follows:

In general, a text, ~~inscription~~, music score, map, etc., written entirely by hand or inscribed, or the handwritten or typescript copy of a creator's work ~~as submitted for publication, before printing~~.

*Plainsong Notation: Since neumes can be used in chants other than Christian (e.g., Buddhist chant of India) and that plainsong has a specific Christian meaning, we recommend replacing the term with Neumatic Notation.

*Projected: Add and three-dimensional images at the end of the definition.

*Recording Medium: References to Reduced Score and Condensed Score added seemingly by mistake.

*Type of Musical Composition: Revise as follows:

~~A The name of a type of composition, as distinguished from a distinctive title, is considered to be the name of a form, the name of a genre, or a generic term used frequently by different composers (e.g., capriccio, concerto, intermezzo, Magnificat, mass, movement, muziek, nocturne, requiem, Stück, symphony, suite, Te Deum, trio sonata). Other titles (including those that consist of such terms plus an additional word or words, e.g., chamber concerto, Konzertstück, little suite) are considered to be distinctive.~~

Clean copy:

Type of Musical Composition

A form, a genre, or a generic term used frequently by different composers (e.g., capriccio, concerto, intermezzo, Magnificat, mass, movement, muziek, nocturne, requiem, Stück, symphony, suite, Te Deum, trio sonata).

*Type of Recording: Rename as Type of Encoding (see comment at 3.16.2).

Typescript: Not all copies are made to be submitted for publication. Reword as follows:

A creator's original typewritten copy of a work ~~in the form in which it is submitted for publication~~, or a typewritten copy of the original commissioned by the creator or publisher, as opposed to a manuscript written by hand.

*Vocal Score: The possibility that the accompaniment can be omitted is not mentioned. Revise as follows:

A score showing all vocal parts, with accompaniment arranged for one or two keyboard instruments or with accompaniment omitted.

Examples

2.3.11.3: Suggest moving the example “Photograph of Theodore Roosevelt” to 2.3.11.7 to illustrate a devised title for an archival resource.

2.10.6.7: suggest additional example under Optional Addition:

1914- 1939, predominant 1914-1918

2.17.1.3: The second example should be deleted as it does not illustrate custodial history.

2.8.4.4: It would be helpful to give an example where the statement of function was retained rather than one where it was omitted (e.g., In Kommission by O. Harrassowitz).

*2.15.2.3: The Nimbus example is for a sound recording whereas the element is restricted to notated music. The name of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier that is required per 2.15.1.4, is missing for the other two examples. Qualifications prescribed by 2.15.1.7 are also missing.

*2.15.3.3: The name of the agency, etc., responsible for assigning the identifier that is required per 2.15.1.4, is missing for all the examples. Qualifications prescribed by 2.15.1.7 are also missing for the last three examples.

3.1.4: Example incorrect. It should read:

computer disc
audio disc
study prints
folded sheet

3.4.1.7.4: Example should read: 3 microfiches (1 score (118 pages)) (plural mark and ending parenthesis are missing).

3.4.1.11.1: Suggest additional example: 6 boxes

3.4.1.11.2: Suggest removing some examples following Optional Addition as they are similar.

*3.4.5.5: Delete the first example, which is inappropriate (see our comment at 3.4.5.5).

3.4.5.9: 2nd and 3rd examples seem to contradict the rest of the instruction which says to disregard unnumbered sequences of plates that are not substantial or referred to in a note. 12 unnumbered leaves of plates and 1 unnumbered leaf of plates do not seem substantial enough to be recorded. Replace with examples showing a substantial sequence of unnumbered pages or leaves of plates.

3.16.4.3: Correct third example:

33 $\frac{1}{3}$ rpm

45 ~~$\frac{1}{3}$~~ rpm

4.4.1.3: Suggest additional example:

Films in off-site storage; advance notice is required for access.

7.9.2: Insert space between “Ph.” and “D” and between “M.” and “Arch.”

7.19.1.3: Shouldn't “wide screen” be spelled in one word, as in the first example on p. 35?

*19.2.1.3: The “Rogers, Robert Bruce, 1907” and “Friedlander, Martin” examples contradict the exception at 6.27.1.3 for motion pictures, etc.

*19.2.1.3: We query if the “Nils-Bertil Dahlander Quartet, Paul Hindberg Quintet” is an example of an adaptation (per 6.28.1.3) rather than a work resulting from the collective activity of a performing group.

19.2.1.3: under Works recording the collective thought of the body, suggest replacing the Parti québécois example with:

Green Party of Canada

Preferred access point for the creator for: Green Party of Canada 2004
election platform : someday is now

20.2.1.3: Add missing statements of responsibility in the following examples:

Baez, Joan

Preferred access point representing the performer for: Any day now : songs of Bob Dylan / Joan Baez. **Sung by** *Joan Baez*

James, Tommy

Preferred access point representing the performer for: The best of Lennon and McCartney / Tommy James. **Songs by John Lennon and Paul McCartney sung by Tommy James**

Chieftains

**Preferred access point representing the performer for: Bonaparte's retreat /
the Chieftains. Folk tunes and songs by various composers performed by the
band The Chieftains**

The "Chieftains" and "Blind Boys of Alabama" examples are examples of works resulting from the collective activity of performing groups and should be moved under 19.2.1.3.

We query if the following examples should not be treated as examples of performances involving substantial creative responsibility on the part of the performers per 6.28.1.6 d) and moved under chapter 19.2.1.3 as well.

- James, Tommy

- Elling, Kurt
- Hobgood, Laurence
- Amster, Rob
- Raynor, Michael

- Winehouse, Amy

- Dion, Céline
- Anastacia, 1968-
- Cher, 1946-
- Shakira
- Dixie Chicks (Musical group)
- Nicks, Stevie

*25.2.1.3: The example is incorrect since all the parts should be entered under either Schoenberg or all the composers, per 6.27.1.3.