

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative
Subject: **Revision of RDA 2.5.1.4, Recording Edition Statement**

CCC thanks ALA for this proposal but we are persuaded by the argument in ACOC's response *6JSC/ALA/10/ACOC response*. We do not support the revision of 2.5.1.4 because we wish to retain the current distinction in the instructions between statements extracted from non-preferred sources and those devised by cataloguers to justify a new record. CCC suggests that the Examples Group consider moving some of the examples included in this proposal to 6.12 Distinguishing Characteristics of an Expression.

However if the proposal is approved, we note that the last word in the first sentence of the proposed *Optional addition* should be changed from "selection" to "access" in order to be consistent with similar instructions in RDA chapter 2.

Proposed revision:

2.5.1.4 Recording Edition Statements

[...]

Optional Addition

If a resource lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other editions, supply an edition statement in the language and script of the title proper, if it is considered to be important for identification or ~~selection~~ access. Indicate that the information was taken from a resource outside the resource itself as instructed under 2.2.4.

[Examples]