

5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9/Chair follow-up/1
13 March 2008

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access Sections 2-4, 9 – Review by other rule makers of December 2007 Draft – Norway

These are comments on the draft Sections 2-4 and 9 of RDA received from Norwegian Committee on Cataloguing.

RDA sections 2-4, 9 – Constituency Review of Dec. 2007 Draft

Comments from the Norwegian Committee on Cataloguing

March 13th 2008

First we want to say that we are happy that RDA has been better adopted to FRBR/FRAD.

We are quite disappointed in the definitions. They are spread around the whole set of rules and in documents for scope and principles. We think they should be collected in one area. The definitions are to a great extent circular and dysfunctional, as they are often dependant on each other. This makes them less helpful than they should have been.

From “Scope and principles” (5JSC/RDA/Scope/Rev/2):

“Access point control data

Access point control data are data (i.e., property/value pairs) that describe an entity (e.g., a person, family, or corporate body) represented by a controlled access point.”

Unless you also define “controlled access point” this is not a very useful definition. In Section 2 you have a definition of “Access point”. We suppose this is closely related to “Controlled access point”. Why not assemble all these concepts to one intelligible whole.

Long, twisted wordings which could be simplified without too much stress should have been revised before inviting comments. We admit that giving good comments to this draft is very time-consuming and confusing. We really want to contribute. We are considering a Norwegian translation, but this was really too much. We are also worried that working on a translation will reveal much more difficulties than we are able to see now.

A basic theoretical principle of AACR2 is the distinction between bibliographic description and access points (headings). They have their own separate functions in the catalogues and bibliographies. Is this distinction present in RDA? If so, it should be stated.

We have also followed the discussion on the RDA-L discussion list. We agree with those who say that new search methods like keyword searching obscures the concept of “access point”. It is contradictory to create rules for access points and at the same time leave it to the system vendors to define what and how to search bibliographic information

Exchange of bibliographic information and copycataloguing is more important than ever. In which direction will RDA influence re-use of bibliographic information? We hope re-use will be possible with little or no human intervention when we exchange records. We are particularly concerned about the high degree of optionality in the rules. Will also the lack of rules for searching influence the records in a direction where they will differ more than before? Will people (or systems) adapt the rules to the many different OPAC's and in this way create different local cataloguing "standards"?

We think it is difficult to see what these sections deal with. It should be more clear what are data for access points and what is information for the authority file only. Maybe we are not enough familiar

with FRAD yet, and as cataloguers we shall probably be more familiar. But if RDA shall be used by other metadata providers who are not familiar with authority control, this part of RDA must be difficult to understand.

Comments to each chapter of the draft

5.1.2 (and other places)

What's the difference between a "title" and a "form of title"? Or between a "name" and a "form of name"? Wouldn't it be sufficient to say only "title" and "name"?

5.2.1

d) understand why a particular title, or form of title, has been recorded as a preferred or variant name...

We don't understand this object or principle. How will you make the user understand WHY we, the cataloguers have chosen "Hamlet" and not "The tragicall historie of Hamle, Prince of Denmark"? And why is it important that they understand this? What's important is that they find the work and understand which work it is.

6.2.1.2 Title proper of the original edition

Criminal

(Preferred title for work issued in the United Kingdom as: The criminal.

Later issued in the United States as: The concrete jungle)

We find it unnecessary to remove the initial article from the preferred title.

8.2 Functional objectives and principles

"Use of "Subdivision"

The word "subdivision" has been used throughout Sections 2 and 3 to replace the AACR2 term "sub-heading".

We agree on the updated wording throughout these sections.

8.3.2 We think that the terminology used in isn't very clear. The rule itself use the wording 'additional identifying elements' but in the examples the wording 'other identifying attributes' are used. Further, 8.6.2 use the wording '...add to the preferred name an element or elements, such as a date, a place name, or other distinguishing term ...'. Again, in 8.12.0.3.2 the wording is "other identifying attributes".

We think all these rules are referinfg to 'attributes', not 'elements'. The wording of these rules should follow FRBR-terminology. The use of the word 'element' could be associated with the word 'entity' from FRBR and should not be used in conjunction with rules about 'attributes'.

8.5.5

"Agreed changes to AACR2 instructions

- AACR2 24.1A currently says: "Do not leave a space between a full stop, etc., and an initial following it." This rule is contrary to the existing practice of NACO libraries for personal names, which is to add spaces after the full stops. The current practice has been written into the instructions for personal names and families, and the provisions of 24.1A have been included in the instructions on corporate bodies (see RDA 8.5.5)."

We agree that the provisions of AACR2 24.1A have been included in the instructions on corporate bodies (RDA 8.5.5), but we find it odd to have another provision for persons and families.

8.8 ‘Scope of usage’ and **8.9** ‘Date of usage’ seems to relate only to ‘preferred name of a particular identity’. Is this right? Could it not be appropriate in some cases to record such information also to a variant name?

8.10 Status of preferred access point

“The definition for this element is based on that found in FRAD. The values at 5.8.0.3.1 and 8.10.0.3.1 are the same as those in the MARC 21 Authority format, field 008, character position 33 - Level of establishment.

Comment is requested on whether these values are adequate.”

We agree that these values are adequate.

8.11.0 Here another wording is used. The rule here says ‘Basic instructions on recording an undifferentiated name indicator. A ‘name indicator’ is also an attribute here, but this wording is perhaps OK since this attribute is assigned, not an attribute that is derived from or associated with the entity itself?

8.12.0.3.3: It is unfamiliar to us to cite a source which gives no information, but it might be more useful if it is marked that no information was found.

9.0.2.3 This sentence is too long and difficult to read. Would it help to insert a comma after ‘... than one language form’ ?

9.2.2.1 (etc.) We think it is unfortunate to start an instruction with the exceptions.

9.2.5.1.3

“RDA instructions requiring further review by the JSC

• AACR2 rule 22.4B2 (RDA) contains this provision: *“If the first element is a surname, follow it by a comma.” This means that a name such as “Chiang Kai-shek” where “Chiang” is the surname is recorded as “Chiang, Kai-shek.” The JSC will consider whether to remove the instruction on use of a comma for such names.”*

We support this proposition.

9.2.6.5.1 Two of the examples are apparently in conflict with 9.2.6.6b: Flemming Quist Møller is Danish and Herman Smitt Ingebretsen was Norwegian. However, in the Norwegian translation of AACR2 we have changed these rules concerning Swedish and Danish names: for Swedish names we record the first part as the first element, and for Danish names the first part IF the second part is ‘Møller’ or ending with ‘-sen’ (= -son).

9.3.0.3, 10.3.0.3 and 11.3.0.3

“Agreed changes to AACR2 instructions

The instruction at AACR2 26.1H has been omitted from RDA 9.3.0.3, 10.3.0.3 and 11.3.0.3 because it is too prescriptive: “Do not make a reference if the reference is so similar to a heading (name and/or title) or to another reference as to be unnecessary.” “

We agree upon the decision to omit this instruction

9.8 Gender

“Is the list of values at 9.8.0.3.1 adequate?”

Yes, it is adequate. We are content with this new element, because we need it in the Norwegian National Bibliography for statistical reasons.

11.1.1.2-11.1.18 The headline says: ‘Additions to access points representing corporate bodies’. Isn’t this wrong? Should the wording here be something like ‘Additions to the names representing corporate bodies to make access points’? Our understanding of the definitions and rules are that a name +

additions (attributes) make an access point (preferred or variant). Therefore, you never add something to an access point. You add something to a name to make an access point.

11.2.5 These are rules for recording the name of a state or local unit of a political party in the United States. To provide these rules seems very US-centric? The same applies to **11.2.8.3**. Or is the idea that special rules for other specific domains/countries also shall be addressed by the rules later?

11.2.6.1.3 The wording is heavy to read. We don't understand what you are trying to say here. The rule reads: 'Record the name of the body in the form of a subdivision of the preferred access point for the government as a variant name'. And should it not be 'Record the name of the body in the form of a subdivision of the preferred access point for the government as a **variant access point**'?

11.2.6.3.2 The wording is also very "heavy".

In **11.3.2.3.2**, **11.3.2.3.3** there are rules that are based on a given catalogue and the possibilities in this catalogue to different types of access. RDA is a content standard. Should RDA address the possibilities in a given OPAC or the lack of such possibilities? Isn't that 'out of the scope' for RDA? On the other side, these rules would benefit the users.

11.4.1 and **11.4.2**. It should be clearer stated that the place should be recorded as an attribute to the name of the body.

11.6.0.3 mentions four appropriate terms for recording the type of corporate body. Why only four? This list of types of corporate bodies is strange because under 11.7 you are permitted to record other designations associated with corporate bodies, and 11.7 is a required rule (required, if applicable?). 11.6.0.3 might be incorporated into 11.7 without a specific list of appropriate terms.

11.4 The headline above is 'other identifying attributes'. These attributes are in the form of an addition to a name to generate an access point. But from 11.10 on, in the rest of the chapter, such attributes are recorded in the form of a note, not an addition to a name. The attributes are no longer used in the creation of access points. Maybe this difference should be addressed in the rules?