

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/1  
14 September 2007

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC  
**Subject:** RDA: Resource Description and Access - Review by other rule makers of  
June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7 - Sweden

These are comments on the draft chapters 6-7 of RDA received from The National Library of Sweden and The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee.

.

## **Comments on the draft of RDA, chapter 6-7**

From the national bibliographic agency, *The National Library of Sweden*, together with *Svensk Biblioteksförnings kommitté för katalogisering* (The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee)

Anders Cato

### **General views**

The new chapters 6 and 7 have been thoroughly revised, but, just as when we received the same chapters for world wide review last year, we find it very difficult to read them when they are removed from the context to which they do belong, i.e. together with the part on the creation of headings and authority control.

As we said in our previous comment a year ago we do agree that it is far more important to put effort into adding access points and performing authority control than working with complicated rules on how to decide which should be the primary or secondary access point of a work. However, we cannot leave the discussion on access points out altogether. There is still a need to come to a decision on a primary access point, as it is needed to collocate works, expressions, making citations etc. It is also crucial to libraries that use alphabetic shelving for their open shelves. The rules should, however be kept as straightforward as possible. The effort of the cataloguer should be concentrated on making correct access points, not on deciding which one of them is the most important one. But at the end one of the access points, in many cases, needs to be made the primary one.

We still believe that some of the instructions given here on how to construct access points more suitably belong in the coming Part B of RDA.

We are hesitant as to whether the definitions of various terms fully follow the FRBR definitions. Have the use of all terms really been thoroughly gone through? Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish if what is meant is actually the work, the expression or the manifestation. The terminology should be brought to an even greater consistency with the FRBR model than it is in the present version. A glossary with all terms used explained is very much needed.

As with the earlier published chapters of RDA we consider the text to be a bit unnecessarily wordy and it could be kept shorter. The repetition of the same phrase in many subsequent paragraphs makes the reading hard and the usability of the rules questionable.

At the beginning of almost every chapter and sub-chapter there is the word “required” or “optional”. Can you really be as exact as to say whether something should be required or

not in a text as generally phrased as this? We propose the omitting of the words “required” and “optional” in most cases.

Last but not least: On reading these chapters one is almost given the impression that they are primarily written as part of instructions for rule-making bodies and not intended as rules themselves, at least not the way they look right now. Is it a deliberate action by the JSC to be as general as it has been in these chapters, or are we supposed to look upon them as the followers to AACR2?

## **Chapter-specific remarks**

### **Chapter 6**

On page 6 the constituencies are asked to indicate whether or not they agree with the treatment of Originating bodies at 6.3.2. We see no reason to disagree here.

6.3.0.2. The rule doesn't give any limitations as to how many access points should be given. Is that up to the rulemaking body to decide or will these stipulations come in a different chapter of RDA?

6.3.4.1.1. First example: Why is only an access point made for the first addressee? Why not for the second, F. S. Ellis? Is it because only the first addressee is mentioned in the main title? We think one should be generous and make access points for both.

6.4.1.1.1 Last example on page 6-29 – 6-30: Several access points are created, but which is the main entry? Or is this irrelevant in this chapter?  
Compare with film example "Miller, Wade" on page 6-10.

### **Chapter 7**

In the “Organization of Chapter 7” on page 6 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph it is stated “...have been replaced by the terms “name” and “describe”... Don't you mean “description”?

We agree with the rearrangement of the “additional” instructions for music resources etc.