

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties

CCC thanks ALA and the American Association for Law Libraries for undertaking this thorough analysis of the current instructions for identifying treaties. Their paper provides background information essential to non-law cataloguers working with treaties. We agree with the well-considered revisions in this proposal with the modifications below.

6.19.2.7

CCC suggests that the instruction at 6.19.2.7 use “in this order” instead of “in this order of preference.” RDA uses “in this order” or “in order of preference” but not the formulation in this proposed sentence. CCC suggests this change to the proposed text of 6.19.2.7:

6.19.2.7 One Treaty

For a treaty or other agreement between two or more of the following:

- a) national governments
- b) international intergovernmental bodies
- c) the Holy See
- d) jurisdictions now below the national level but retaining treaty-making powers,

record as the preferred title (in this order of preference):

[remainder of proposed instruction unchanged]

6.29.1.20

CCC wonders whether the retention of the exception in 6.29.1.20 was an editorial error. This exception, as written, is redundant because this is already handled in 6.19.2.8.

6.29.1.20 Compilations of Treaties

[no change to ALA's proposed text of the main instruction]

Exception

~~If such a compilation has become known by a collective title, use that title as the authorized access point.~~

6.29.3.3

We also note a typo in the marked-up and clean copies of 6.29.3.3.

For a compilation of treaties between one party and two or more other parties, construct a variant access point for the one party by ~~combining~~ combining (in this order):