

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC  
**Subject:** RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A, Chapters 6-7 - Review by other rule makers of June 2006 Draft - France

These are comments on the draft chapters 6-7 of RDA received from the working group "Evolution de la description bibliographique" within AFNOR CG46/CN357.

Below is text from the covering email message:

---

Thank you very much for your tremendous work done on the RDA and for giving AFNOR the opportunity to take part in the international survey.

Please find attached the comments prepared by the AFNOR Group named "Evolution de la description bibliographique", chaired by Françoise Leresche, head of the Standards Office of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Comments deal with the aspects JSC asked reviewers to pay attention. Comments are presented following the order of the text, and in addition, we have mentioned and explained some discrepancies with the French rules, considering these precisions as a possible contribution to the future international cataloguing code.

We draw your special attention on the comments on the following paragraphs :

General (clarity & consistency) : chapter 6 globally

General (Consistency) : paragraph 7.0.1.

General : paragraphs 7.2.4. & 7.2.5.

Consistency : paragraph 7.2.4.2.1.

Discrepancy with French rules : paragraph 7.2.8.1.1.

Discrepancy with French rules : paragraph 7.2.8.5.

Consistency : paragraph 7.3

It seems to us that, when all the chapters of all the parts of RDA are available, it could be necessary to revise the global structure of the rules, and specially the location of the information devoted to relations. We have made some remarks in this direction in our comments.

## AFNOR CG46/CN357/GE6 "Evolution de la description bibliographique"

### French Comments on RDA, chapters 6 & 7

| Comment category   | Comment   |
|--|---|
| General  | <p>Except for some wording, the text is clear and should be relatively easy to translate into other languages.</p> <p>We appreciate the structuring of chapters 6 and 7 of RDA, which reflect a real effort of organization in order to be used online.</p> <p>The approach through data elements is excellent.</p> <p>We appreciate the organization which refers to two categories of relationships as stated in the FRBR:</p> <p>Relationships between entities of group 1 (chapter 6)</p> <p>Relationships between entities of group 1 and entities of group 2 (chapter 7).</p> <p>Nevertheless it seems there is sometimes a certain confusion : Part A of RDA should normally correspond to the bibliographical description of resources, therefore description of Manifestations (if we have correctly understood the aims of RDA).</p> <p>However certain relationships as indicated in chapter 6 belong to relationships Works/ Works or Works/Expressions and so should appear in authority records and should be treated in Part B of RDA.</p> <p>See detailed comments further.</p> |
| General (consistency)  | In the Part I (December 2005) there was already a chapter 6, named "Item-specific information". Does it disappear in Part A?  |
| General  | There should be more examples for types of documents other than printed material in the general rules.  |
| General (clarity)  | <p>Examples</p> <p>In this draft, comments cite the resource for which the access point is created, but lack explaining the cataloguing case in question: type of the described resource (as in draft 7.2.6.2.1. and 7.2.6.2.2), official status or not of the work (as for addresses of President, see examples under 7.2.1.2.1.), etc.</p>  |
| General  | It is often difficult to provide a relevant comment: as in a number of cases for choosing and constructing a uniform title, there is a cross reference to chapter 13 which does not exist yet.  |
| Alternative at 6.4.1.2 c) & 6.4.2.2 c) embedded description of related resources | <p>For which precise purpose is this Alternative proposed?</p> <p>Is it with the purpose of preparing a mapping from MARC records to XML as the solution "embedded description" is easier in XML than in MARC ?</p> <p>Is the Alternative « in parallel » intended for MARC formats in order to structure the data to make the mapping to XML easier ? Nevertheless this Alternative results in very heavy and not easily readable records when in MARC format.</p> <p>The criteria to use this Alternative should be clearly stated and moreover precise examples should be provided.</p> <p>In this current inexplicit context of use of this Alternative we are not in favour of extending it to other types of relationships. We think that multiplying codes presents a risk to multiply errors, as a record may have relationships with several other records.</p>  |
| 6.4 Source/ Reproduction et 6.5 Format / Format relationships                    | These two options should remain distinct as they are two different types of relationships. Combining the rules would be merely inducing confusion in the minds of the cataloguers.  |

| Comment category                | Comment  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| General (clarity & consistency) | <p>Chapter 6</p> <p>1)<br/>Typically, RDA chap. 6 allows cataloguers to choose between several alternative options or to combine them. In most cases, it would be useful to specify the context in which the various options proposed may apply, for the sake of consistency and keeping in mind data exchange and network cataloguing.</p> <p>2)<br/>Globally and for each type of relationship, there lacks an explanation on the cases :<br/>                     - when the choice is to give only a Citation, or only an Access point, or only an Embedded description, or only a Resource identifier, and<br/>                     - when and how to combine these elements.<br/>                     For each of the proposed solutions to record a relationship, it should be more than useful to provide a comment explaining in which case one or the other solution is the best: for example, the solution "access point" is sufficient if the relationship already appears in the description, at any place in the record, as in the example in 6.10.1.2.1b.1 where the relationship is clearly stated in Other title information.<br/>                     Dickens, Charles, 1812-1870. The mystery of Edwin Drood<br/>                     (<i>Resource described</i>: John Jasper's gatehouse : a sequel to the unfinished novel The mystery of Edwin Drood by Charles Dickens / by Edwin Harris)<br/>                     On the contrary, this solution cannot be used if nothing in the record shows to the user this relationship in an obvious way.<br/>                     To follow a link from a record is disappointing when the result seems to have no relation with the record: in this case the user could rightfully consider the catalogue to be in error.</p> <p>3)<br/>It should also be useful to show how the solutions proposed by RDA relate to the information elements as defined by ISBDs which are the international reference for the bibliographical description.<br/>                     In current RDA chapter 6 only the solution "informal reference" refers to what is ISBD area 7 "Note area".<br/>                     Notes may be written directly by the cataloguer (informal reference) or be generated from the other solutions. This should be formally stated, even if it obviously depends on local systems. It should enable to make a choice depending on local facilities in order to produce a complete record, explicit for the catalogue user.</p> <p>4)<br/>In addition, (in 6.1 particularly), it would be very useful to provide the same example treated according to the different solutions: "citation, access point, embedded description, informal reference, resource identifiers".</p> <p>5)<br/>Lack of examples made it difficult to understand the value of these different solutions.</p> |
| Clarity                         | <p>6.1.6.0.1<br/>Examples 3 and 4 are not understandable without a comment on the complete record: which type of relation is illustrated here?</p>   |
| Consistency                     | <p>6.1.7.0.1, example<br/><i>Continued by</i>: ISSN 0042-0328 = University of Western Australia law review<br/>For displaying such a note, the order prescribed by ISBD(CR) is "Key title = ISSN"</p>  |
| Consistency                     | <p>6.6.1.2.1a.1<br/>Last example seems not to follow the rule explained in 6.1.3.0.<br/>As written, it should be better placed under solution c) or d).</p>  |
| Consistency                     | <p>6.6.2 Derivative Work or Expression<br/>According to FRBR this type of relation should be expressed in an authority record and not in a bibliographic record.<br/>See also "Statement of international cataloguing principles" 6. Authority records, (<a href="http://www.ddb.de/standardisierung/pdf/statement_draft_apr2006.pdf">http://www.ddb.de/standardisierung/pdf/statement_draft_apr2006.pdf</a>)</p>  |

| Comment category      | Comment   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Clarity               | 6.7.0.2.4 Alternative<br>Does this Alternative apply to one of the preceding indents or to all ?<br>If it applies to 6.7.0.2.3, renumber these two indents, as for example in 6.4.1.2.1c.1 and 6.4.1.2.1c.2.  |
| Clarity               | 6.7.1.2 It would be clearer to swap the examples between a) and b).<br>Point a) Citation, both examples show the relation in the title, so an access point is just needed. These examples should be placed in b).<br>On the contrary, Point b) Access point, the last example should be under Point a) Citation as the relation is not clearly expressed in the example.<br>See general comment above.  |
| Consistency           | 6.9 "Issued with" relationships<br>It should be useful to list to which types of publications this relation is applying: sections of serials, inserts/insets, others ?<br>In this current draft, the distinction between 6.9 "Issued with" relationships and 6.3 Element/element relationships and 6.7 Primary/adjunct relationships is not at all clear.   |
| Consistency           | 6.10.2.2.1a.1<br>The two first examples seem not to follow the rule explained in 6.1.3.0.<br>As written, they should be better placed under solution c) or d).  |
| Consistency           | 6.11 Additional instructions for music resources<br>According to FRBR this type of relation should be expressed in an authority record and not in a bibliographic record.<br>See also "Statement of international cataloguing principles" 6. Authority records, ( <a href="http://www.ddb.de/standardisierung/pdf/statement_draft_apr2006.pdf">http://www.ddb.de/standardisierung/pdf/statement_draft_apr2006.pdf</a> )   |
| Typo                  | 6.11.4.1.1, example<br>"Chézy" is missing after " / von H. v.   |
|                       |   |
| General               | In chapter 7, rules for film materials are missing. We suggest to add a sub-chapter dealing with films as it is done for musical works, art works etc.  |
| General (Consistency) | 7.0.1<br>The content of chapter 7 goes beyond the declared scope as the title access points (title proper or uniform title) are also treated there for the choice of primary access point.<br>In a general manner, title access points are not actually treated as such in this draft: they are scattered between chapters 7 (primary access point) and 6 (some relationships worded in the form of an access point are additional access points, for example in the case of a translation).<br>Nowhere in this draft is treated the relationship between the Manifestation (i.e. the resource described) and the Work or the Expression embodied in it – however it is really this type of relationship that is in question when a uniform title access point is created.<br>And what of the title proper of the Manifestation as an « additional access point » ? This is not mentioned |
| General               | 7.0.3<br>"It also includes a number of additional instructions that apply specifically to persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with musical works, art works, legal works, religious works, official communications, and academic works."<br>Why specific instructions for these categories of works and not for others?<br>Chapter 7 is either too detailed or not enough. It doesn't encompass all categories of works which need more precise instructions than the general guidelines, as cartographic works, films and video recordings, exhibition catalogues, etc.   |
| Consistency           | 7.1.2.1b.1<br>It should be useful to remind also that the statements of responsibility recorded from sources of information external to the resource are given in a note.   |

| Comment category                         | Comment   |
|--|---|
| Consistency                              | 7.1.3.1<br>A definition of “principal responsibility” is missing.<br>When is a person, family or corporate body considered to be principally responsible for the creation of a work? What are the criteria ?  |
| Consistency                              | 7.1.3.2<br><i>“Such access points typically represent those who have collaborated in or contributed to the creation or realization of the content of the resource— e.g., joint authors, compilers, editors, translators, illustrators (see 7.3)”.</i><br>It should be useful to add the performers to that list.<br>Generally speaking, this list of collaborators shows only collaborators for textual works. Add other examples for those who have collaborated in the creation or realisation of the content of non-textual works.   |
| Typo                                     | 7.1.3.3, last indent<br>Correct reference is 7.6.1 and not 7.1.6  |
| Consistency                              | 7.1.4.2.1<br>In the present wording, conditions i) and ii) are not in accordance with the ISSN rules that are the international rules to describe serials.<br>For serials, the primary access point is always the title (key title, uniform title or title proper).   |
| Clarity<br>Discrepancy with French rules | 7.2.1.2.1, examples<br>Roosevelt, Theodore<br><i>(Primary access point for: Address of President Roosevelt to the Deep Waterway Convention at Memphis, Tennessee, October 4, 1907)</i><br>Lincoln, Abraham<br><i>(Primary access point for: The second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln)</i><br>La Guardia, Fiorello H.<br><i>(Primary access point for: Non-citizen Americans in the war emergency / by Fiorello H. La Guardia, mayor. A radio address)</i><br>Pius XII, Pope<br><i>(Primary access point for: Science and the existence of God ; and, Science and philosophy : two addresses / Pope Pius XII)</i><br>These four examples need a more detailed comment to explain the difference with 7.11<br>According to French rules, also in the case of addresses, the primary access point is the corporate body, as the person acts (and speaks) in his/her official position; an additional access point is provided for the person (as in 7.11) |
| Clarity<br>Discrepancy with French rules | 7.2.1.2.1, examples<br>Dennis, John<br><i>(Primary access point for: A true character of Mr. Pope. Author uncertain; generally attributed to John Dennis)</i><br>Anthony, Edward<br><i>(Primary access point for: Portrait of Andrew Jackson. A daguerreotype once attributed to Mathew Brady but generally thought to be by Edward Anthony)</i><br>In France, in the case of work when the author is uncertain, the primary access point is the access point to the title, as an attribution can always be contested and changed. Added access point(s) are provided for the person(s) to whom the work has been attributed.   |
| Discrepancy with French rules            | 7.2.1.2.1, examples<br>Farmer, Philip José<br><i>(Primary access point for: The adventure of the peerless peer / by John H. Watson ; edited by Philip José Farmer. Written by Farmer as if by the fictitious Dr. Watson)</i><br>If no public source or source known to catalogue users enables to identify the hoax, an access point is made for Watson, John H. as any user may search under that name particularly in printed bibliography or catalogue.<br>If it is publicly ascertained that it is really a hoax, only a simple cross-reference from the name of the would-be author to the name of the actual author is made in the authority record   |

| Comment category                         | Comment   |
|--|---|
| Clarity                                  | 7.2.1.3<br>Except in the case when the family as such is named as the creator of the work, there should be specified if an access point should be provided with the family name rather than with the name of each of its individual members, when more than 3 persons belonging to the same family are named on the sources of information  |
| Clarity<br>Discrepancy with French rules | 7.2.1.3.1, examples<br>Why is “family” not a qualifier? Considering it as a qualifier would allow providing an access to the family name in all languages. For example : Schneider (famille)  |
| Clarity                                  | 7.2.1.4<br>As there are a lot of examples, it would be clearer to split them up among the categories a), b), c), d) or e) they illustrate   |
| Clarity                                  | 7.2.1.4.1 c) iii<br>Specify that the exhibitions in question are exhibitions as Universal Exhibitions, and not art exhibitions in museums, etc.<br>For us, the current wording is confusing.  |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.1.4.1 c) iii<br>Delete the reference to 7.2.2 that is wrong (there is no definition of a corporate body under 7.2.2).<br>However, such a definition should be very useful to precisely define the boundaries between a corporate body and a collective pseudonym (see also 7.2.2.5.1).  |
| Discrepancy with French rules            | 7.2.1.4.4, examples<br>Committee on Court Practice and Procedure<br><i>(Primary access point for: Courts organization : twelfth interim report of the Committee on Court Practice and Procedure. – Dublin : Stationery Office.<br/>                     Committee established to investigate the operations of the courts and to recommend changes in practice, procedure, etc</i><br><br>Ordnance Survey<br><i>(Primary access point for: Watford : 2½ inch map / Ordnance Survey)</i><br><br>With only “Committee on Court Practice and Procedure” and “Ordnance Survey” as access points we are unable to identify the corporate body responsible for the resource. There should be an additional element (location) added to the name of the corporate body so that the access point enables to identify and select the resource. More than one committee on court practice... or more than one ordnance survey certainly exist.. |
| Typo                                     | 7.2.1.4.4, examples<br>Mutli-State Teacher Education Project<br><i>(Primary access point for: M-Step today : interim report of project activities. – Baltimore : Multi-State Teacher Education Project)</i><br>Correct “Mutli” in Multi   |
| Discrepancy with French rules            | 7.2.1.4.4, examples<br>Bon Homme Richard (Ship)<br><i>(Primary access point for: The log of the Bon Homme Richard)</i><br>Ships are not corporate bodies according to French rules  |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.2.0.1<br>The type of work under f) in the list is not specifically treated in chapter 7.2 : we would appreciate if a specific paragraph was devoted to this type of relationships<br><br>In France, if a Work results from a collaboration or exchange between a person and a corporate body, two cases are distinguished :<br>a) if the person does not belong to the corporate body, it is considered that this person has the same responsibility for creating the work as the corporate body (i.e principal responsibility); However in French standards, rules are not defined to choose which of the person or corporate body is the primary access point. At the BnF, in the Department in charge of official publications, the corporate body is  |

| Comment category                         | Comment   |
|--|---|
|  | always chosen as the primary access point in order to collocate resources related to the corporate body - the publications of corporate bodies prove to be difficult to trace and the life of a corporate body is longer than that of a person<br>b) if the person belongs to the corporate body it is considered that this person is a simply a draftsman and therefore an additional access point is always used for this person.   |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.2.3<br>It should be useful to list the principal cases corresponding to this rule.<br>For example: correspondence (ex 4), interviews (ex 9), book in which the text and the illustration are of the same importance (ex 5), comic strip, etc.<br>There is no rule for comic strip in the present draft. In France, the creator of the text and the creator of the images are considered being on the same level of responsibility on the Work: Therefore the primary access point for a comic strip is the name of the first named on the prescribed sources of information.  |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.2.3.1 examples<br>Harrison, Benjamin<br><i>(Primary access point for: The correspondence between Benjamin Harrison and James G. Blaine, 1882-1893)</i><br><br>Woodbury, Charles J.<br><i>(Primary access point for: Talks with Ralph Waldo Emerson / by Charles J. Woodbury)</i><br>There is a discrepancy between these two examples:<br>The second example does not illustrate the rule given in 7.2.2.3.1, that states "use the access point for the first named of those persons, families, or bodies as the primary access point"; it should be "Emerson, Ralph Waldo" as primary access point.<br>If the name of a person transcribed as a statement of responsibility prevails over the name pertaining to the title, the rule should be clearly stated. |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.2.4.1 examples<br>Vertebrate palaeontology of Australasia<br><i>(Primary access point for: Vertebrate palaeontology of Australasia / editors: P. Vickers-Rich, J.M. Monaghan, R.F. Baird &amp; T.H. Rich ; with the assistance of E.M. Thompson &amp; C. Williams)</i><br>This example is not relevant, because there is no principal responsibility for creating the work, as the persons named in the statement of responsibility are editors   |
| Typo                                     | 7.2.2.4.1 example<br>"Moyen Âge" needs capital initial letters  |
| Consistency                              | 7.2.2.4.1 examples<br>The last two examples do not illustrate the rule  |
| General                                  | 7.2.2.5.1<br>This paragraph refers to the difficult question of collective pseudonyms and of their definition in regard to that of corporate bodies. Will this question be completely treated in Part B?<br>At the first IME-ICC held in Frankfurt, the working group on corporate bodies "proposed to prepare a paper on an international level listing different forms of pseudonyms and proposing their treatment as a personal name or a corporate body and giving proposals how to handle references."<br>Will the conclusions of this working group be taken into account in RDA?   |
| Clarity                                  | 7.2.3.2<br>"collective title" is not used in the same meaning than in ISBDs   |
| Clarity<br>Discrepancy with French rules | 7.2.3.2.1 examples<br>Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta<br><i>(Primary access point for: Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta. Contains decrees of councils from the 1st Council of Nicaea to the 1<sup>st</sup> Vatican Council)</i><br>Codex canonum ecclesiae universae<br><i>(Primary access point for: Codex canonum ecclesiae universae = The canons of the first four general councils of the church, and those of the early local Greek synods : in Greek, with Latin and revised English translations ... / with notes selected by William Lambert)</i><br>Add a comment to clearly explain the choice made. According to French rules, the primary access point for these records is Catholic Church   |

| Comment category              | Comment   |
|-------------------------------|---|
|                               | <p>The Ethiopic Didascalia<br/> <i>(Primary access point for: The Ethiopic Didascalia, or, The Ethiopic version of the Apostolical constitutions received in the Church of Abyssinia)</i></p> <p>According to French rules, the primary access point for this record is an uniform title.</p> <p>What surprises us much is the fact that RDA proposes the title proper as the primary access point whereas the current LC Catalog shows a uniform title as the primary access point. Therefore there is no discrepancy now between LC cataloguing rules and those of BnF or BL..</p> <p><b>LC Control No</b> 37012157<br/> <b>Uniform Title</b> <u>Apostolic constitutions. Ethiopic.</u><br/> <b>Main Title</b> The Ethiopic Didascalia or, The Ethiopic version of the Apostolical Constitutions received in the Church of Abyssinia ; with an English translation / edited and translated by Thomas Pell Platt.<br/> <b>Related Titles</b> <u>Apostolic constitutions. English.</u><br/> <u>Apostolic constitutions. Ethiopic version. English.</u><br/> <b>Notes</b> Original text in Ethiopic (Ge'ez); with translation and introduction in English; texts also in Greek and Arabic</p> <p><b>BL record</b><br/> <b>Uniform Title</b> <u>Apostolic constitutions. English &amp; Ethiopic.</u><br/> <b>Main Title</b> The Ethiopic Didascalia or, The Ethiopic version of the Apostolical Constitutions received in the Church of Abyssinia ; with an English translation / edited and translated by Thomas Pell Platt.<br/> <b>Notes</b> Original text in Ethiopic (Ge'ez); with translation and introduction in English; texts also in Greek and Arabic</p> |
| General                       | <p>7.2.4 &amp; 7.2.5</p> <p>In this draft a choice has been made to generally consider adaptations and revisions as new Works according to FRBR, and abridgments and translations as Expressions according to FRBR.</p> <p>It is a clarification we can understand, but is this in accordance with the work done by the IFLA FRBR working group on Expression?</p>  |
| Consistency                   | <p>7.2.4.2.1</p> <p>What are the criteria to determine if there are or not substantial changes in the nature and content of the Work?</p> <p>In the phrase "principal responsibility is attributed to the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the adaptation", who "attributes" the principal responsibility? On which basis?</p> <p>On the basis of the intellectual analysis of the Work ?</p> <p>On the basis of the material presentation on the resource?</p> <p>The presentation of the resource can be different from a Manifestation to another (the adapter can appear or not on the prescribed source of information) and this can be prejudicial to the collocation of the Works adapted by the same adapter.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.2.4.2.1, example</p> <p>Gottfried, von Strassburg<br/> <i>(Primary access point for: Tristan / Gottfried von Strassburg ; translated ... With the surviving fragments of the Tristan of Thomas, newly translated .... Both works are versions of the Tristan story)</i></p> <p>For versions of "Tristan" that have an identified author (as Béroul, Thomas or Gottfried von Strassburg, etc.), in the BnF catalogue, the primary access point is an "author/uniform title" access point, for example: Gottfried von Strassburg. [Tristan]</p> <p>For the present example, in the BnF catalogue the primary access point would be the primary access point for the first work, i.e. Gottfried von Strassburg. [Tristan]</p> <p>An additional access point would be provided in the same manner for the second Work, i.e. Thomas (11..-11..,auteur d'une version de Tristan). [Tristan].</p>   |

| Comment category              | Comment   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Consistency                   | <p>7.2.6.1.1</p> <p>“...use the access point prescribed as the primary access point for the previously existing work as the primary access point, <b>unless the work is presented</b> as the work of the commentator, biographer, etc.</p> <p>It seems that this draft considers the material presentation of the resource more important than the actual intellectual responsibility on the Work embodied in the Manifestation ; this rule is an inconsistent one and leads to an inconsistent treatment of the same Work in catalogues (see our identical comment on adaptations under 7.2.4.2.1.)</p>  |
| Clarity                       | <p>7.2.6.2 examples</p> <p>Add a comment to the last example under 7.2.6.2.1 and to the last example under 7.2.6.2.2 to explain the difference in the choice of the primary access point between these two examples that are very similar.</p>  |
| Clarity                       | <p>7.2.6.2.2</p> <p>Averroës</p> <p><i>(Primary access point for: Averrois Cordubensis Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis De anima libros. Includes a Latin text of De anima)</i></p> <p>It should be most necessary to specify that an additional access point is to be provided for Aristotelis “De anima libros” (see . 6.2.1.2.1b.1, b) Access point)</p>   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.2.7.2.2</p> <p>When the attribution is likely, the title should be kept as primary access point as the attribution may change according to the state of research.</p> <p>Example: “Chronicon ex chronicis” has long been attributed to Florence of Worcester, but now it is attributed to John of Worcester.</p>   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.2.7.3.1</p> <p>At the BnF, we do create a primary access point to the “asteronyme” for ancient books</p>   |
| Consistency                   | <p>7.2.7.4.1</p> <p>In which case can a family be “unknown” ?</p> <p>If the responsibility for creating the work is unknown, it is difficult to distinguish if the responsibility is that of a person, of a family or of a corporate body !</p>   |
| Clarity                       | <p>7.2.7.5.1</p> <p>Give an example of an unknown corporate body.</p> <p>The two examples illustrate the case of an unnamed group.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.2.8.1.1</p> <p>According to French rules, in some cases, the primary access point can be the performer, even if the level of creative responsibility of the performer(s) doesn’t entail responsibility for adaptation, improvisation, etc. For example, for songs, variety or light music, when the performer is more famous than the author of the music</p> <p>See also 7.2.8.5</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.2.8.5</p> <p>According to French rules, the performer is always used as the primary access point for the resource, if the unity of the resource is given by the performer. For example, in the case of recitals.</p> <p>So, in the examples listed under a), French cataloguers use the title of the resource as the primary access point only in the last example.</p>  |
| Consistency                   | <p>7.3</p> <p>All additional access points for collaborators and contributors are optional.</p> <p>This point calls for several remarks</p> <p>1) According to this rule, when in a resource, 2 or 3 authors have the same level of responsibility , only the first named is a mandatory access point and other name(s) can have no access point at all: this is most surprising and even arbitrary: it surely will not help users of catalogues to retrieve resources !</p> <p>2) in this code referring to FRBR and in a time when FRBR are intended to be implemented in catalogues in order to make retrieval and display of results easier, it is rather surprising that the access points related to Expressions are optional considering that it is by using these access points that different Expressions of a same Work may be distinguished.</p> |

| Comment category              | Comment  |
|-------------------------------|--|
|                               | <p>This is indeed a lack of consistency...<br/>           3) it will be necessary in the prospect of an international cataloguing code to define more precise rules on access points according to the different types of libraries, cataloguing agencies, other systems of information management organization, etc. and their level of bibliographical responsibility upon the records.<br/>           If not, national choices will be made; that will prove an obstacle to the development of exchanges of bibliographical information and also to a joint searching in catalogues of more than one country.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.3.1.2<br/>           1<sup>st</sup> example : According to French rules, no access point is created for persons (or corporate bodies) that share the same relationship (role) with the resource described, when they are more than three. However an optional additional access point can be provided: it is the name of the first named person or corporate body.<br/>           2<sup>nd</sup> example : According to French rules no access point is provided for collaborators of a person who doesn't have principal responsibility in the creation of the work (as the director of publication)</p>   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.3.6<br/>           According to French rules, performers are not always additional access points. In some cases, the performer is the primary access point.</p>   |
| Clarity                       | <p>7.3.7.1<br/>           Add a comment to the example to specify that an other additional access point is normally provided for the second author.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.3.11<br/>           According to French rules, when the relationship between a person or a corporate body and the work is that of a subject, no access point such as a responsibility access point is provided, because there is no intellectual responsibility for creating the work.<br/>           Such access points are provided using "uniform conventional heading" (see AFNOR Z 44-061, § 3.2), that are structured access points for Festschrift, exhibition, etc.<br/>           The primary access point for the 2<sup>nd</sup> example would be :<br/>           [Mélanges. Brook, Barry S.]<br/>           The primary access point for the 3<sup>rd</sup> example would be :<br/>           [Exposition. Saint Paul (Min.), Minnesota Museum of Art, <i>date</i>]</p> |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.7.8.1 &amp; 7.7.8.2.<br/>           According to French rules, in every case the primary access point for librettos is always the access point for the librettist.<br/>           An additional access point is provided for the composer.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.8.1.2<br/>           According to French rules, the primary access point is the access point for the writer in the two cases, as the artist has not made the selection of the art works reproduced in the work described.<br/>           A subject access point is provided for the artist whose work is reproduced.</p>  |
| Clarity                       | <p>7.9.1.5<br/>           "certain medieval laws" : this wording is vague. It needs to be explained in more detail</p>   |
| Consistency                   | <p>7.9.1.5, examples<br/>           Edictum Diocletiani<br/>           This uniform title is not correct as it is incomplete : it does not allow a precise identification of this particular edict as Diocletianus promulgated several edicts. In the present case, the uniform title should be the complete title of the edict: "Edictum de pretiis rerum venalium" and the title without Diocletian's name is sufficient to identify this edict.<br/><br/>           Hammurabi's Code : the uniform title that appears in LC catalogue is « Code of Hammurabi »</p>  |

| Comment category              | Comment  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Clarity                       | 7.9.1.5.1<br>If the preferred access point for primary access point is a uniform title (as it appears from a)), it should be stated explicitly in the rule and in the comments on the examples.  |
| Clarity                       | 7.9.1.5.1, last indent<br>There is no example to illustrate this rule. Proposal :<br>[Leges palatinae (latin). 1994]<br>Primary access point for : Leges Palatinae / James III, King of Majorca ; pref. of Joan Domenge i Mesquida.<br>Additional access points :<br>Jaume III, King of Majorca, 1315-1349<br>Domenge i Mesquida, Joan (1965-.... )  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | 7.9.7.7<br>According to French rules and to the BnF practice, the primary access point for court records of one party is a constructed entry formed with a conventional title [Factum], followed by the name of the party and date if any.<br>Ex.: [Factum. André, Esprit (médecin). 1610]<br>An additional access point is provided for the lawyer.   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | 7.10.1.1.1, example<br>Bible. O.T. Psalms LI<br>( <i>Primary access point for</i> : Miserere mei, Deus : Psalm LI : the morning prayer (Day 10) of the Church of England)<br>The present example shows a <b>liturgical</b> use of the Psalms which are not in this case identical to the Biblical text. The access point should not be Bible and the example should be placed in 7.1.3. Liturgical works   |
| Clarity                       | 7.10.1.2.1<br>Why not complete by using either "harmony" or "adaptation"?<br>Why are the concordances which are more frequently issued not dealt with?   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | 7.10.2.2 & 7.10.2.1<br>The (uniform) title should be used in every case as it is very difficult to determine if "another church or denominational body" is the only one to refer to this confession of faith.<br>Ex : Westminster confession of faith  |
| Consistency                   | 7.10.3.1.1<br>The access point for the Church is not sufficient, particularly in the case of the Catholic Church. In order to collocate liturgical works of the same category, a uniform title such as missal, etc. is necessary.<br>For the Latin rite, refer to the IFLA document « List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church », 2e ed rev., 1981<br>Moreover, how to distinguish between the Latin rites and Oriental rites in the Catholic Church if the only access is "Catholic Church" without any other precision? |
| Discrepancy with French rules | 7.10.3.1.1, examples<br>All the access points for the liturgical texts of the Catholic Church should be completed with the Uniform titles listed in IFLA list "List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church »<br><br>According to French rules, the primary access point is the uniform title for the liturgical book concerned.  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | 7.10.3.1.2<br>According to the IFLA list « List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church », Foreword, p. viii (b), the particular body within the Church is an additional element to the uniform title as the primary access point.<br>Ex : Missale (Milano), Rituale (Ordo Fratrum Minorum)<br>French rules are in accordance with the IFLA list.   |

| Comment category              | Comment  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.10.3.1.3<br/>We disagree (cf 7.10.1.1)<br/>According to the IFLA list « List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church », p.15, 53), there is an uniform title for the liturgical use of Psalms “arranged as recited in the Divine Office” (this order differs from the Biblical order). French rules are in accordance with the IFLA list.</p>  |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.10.3.2.1<br/>Why the precision “in the original language” ?<br/>According to French rules, the primary access point is the uniform title.<br/>The primary function of a Uniform Title is to collocate the different editorial versions of the same Work : it is better to collocate the different versions of the same Work by using a Uniform title as primary access point than to scatter them under different national churches entries. The research will prove easier for the catalogue users.<br/>In the example the Orthodox patriarchate of Bulgaria is only editor of « Trebnik », therefore it should appear only as an additional access point.</p> |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.10.3.3.2<br/>Why not apply to Jewish liturgical works the same logic as that defined for the Catholic Church in the IFLA document « List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin rites of the Catholic Church » ?<br/>We follow this logic in France where the use of a particular body is treated as an additional element to the Uniform Title, for example: Rituel de prières (rite séfaraïte)</p>   |
| Discrepancy with French rules | <p>7.11.1.1 et 7.11.3.1<br/>We never use such headings which are not defined in the IFLA document “Form and structure of corporate headings”.<br/>According to French rules, the primary access point would be : Name of the corporate body, followed by [Acts] and by the date(s) of promulgation. An additional access point is provided for the person.</p>   |
| Consistency                   | <p>7.12.1.1, example<br/>Schurzfleischio, Samuele<br/>(<i>Primary access point for</i>: Principium Mosellae Ausonii, ad disputandum publice propositum / praeside Conrado Samuele Schurzfleischio ; respondente M. Godefrido Kupfender)<br/>The form of the primary access point is incorrect as it takes the name in the form in which it appears in the statement of responsibility (ablative case in Latin).<br/>The access point should be “Schurzfleisch, Conrad Samuel”. If the Latin form is to be preferred, use at least the nominative case.</p>   |