

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Christine Frodl, DNB Representative  
Subject: Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties

DNB thanks ALA for this proposal. DNB agrees with the proposal.

We have some amendments to the following suggested revisions:

Revision 1: Should not date of a legal work (RDA 6.20) be mentioned here?

Revision 2: Should not date of a legal work (RDA 6.20) be mentioned here?

Revision 5: Revision of RDA 6.19.2.7 a) refers to „legal literature“. What exactly is meant by the term literature in this context: reference works like *The Bluebook* (cited on page 4 on the bottom of the revision proposal)?

In general, we see a problem that the preferred title should be determined according to a reference source. As a compromise we would like to suggest formulating the instruction RDA 6.19.2.7 similar to RDA 6.19.2.2 which says: "Determine the title to be used as the preferred title for a legal work created after 1500 from resources embodying the work or from reference sources." This wording also would support compliance to the GND authority file.

Revision of RDA 6.19.2.7 c): What is meant by "other official designation"? Perhaps it would be also more practical to omit the word "official".

Example: Vertrag zwischen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik über die Herstellung der Einheit Deutschlands [official title of the treaty]

Einigungsvertrag [other official designation by which the treaty is known]

EinigVtr, EVertr, EV, EiV [other official designation by which the treaty is known]

See <http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/bundesrecht/einigvtr/gesamt.pdf>

Revision 6: The reference from RDA 6.2.2 to RDA 6.19.2 seems to be a loop.

Revision 9: Should not date of a legal work (RDA 6.20) be mentioned here?

We agree to this revision in general. However, it should be possible to make a distinction between signing of a treaty and adoption of a treaty (see also 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion 4). Especially in the case of multilateral treaties dates could deviate and could refer to a particular corporate body.

Revision to RDA 6.20.3 reads „treaty or a protocol to a treaty ...” – whereas RDA 6.29.1.15 reads "For a treaty, or any other formal agreement ...". We suggest correcting this inconsistency and also preferring the broader wording in RDA 6.29.1.15. But perhaps the restriction on „protocol” was intended? If that is the case, we would like to know what the reason was for that change.

Recording the date according to RDA 6.20.3.3 refers to Anglo-American use and differs from practice in European countries, for example. There are more instructions in RDA on the topic “recording the date” and we would recommend internationalizing those instructions. Also the written out form of the month is regarded as an obstacle for research and chronological sort sequence.

Revision 15: The two references for the international corporate bodies to RDA 6.29.1.16 are logical within RDA; however, there is only one reference from 6.29.1.16 to 6.29.1.15. Again this is a reference which is accurate but causes effort in applying the instructions.

Revision 19: There is a difference between the instructions for the variant access point (see proposal, page 29 at the top) which do not require a date, but within the appropriate examples a date is always given.

Question: Why do compilations do not obtain a date? When building a preferred access point, the date will be considered (see newly proposed wording at 6.29.1.33.2, Revision 18).

Question: Why there is no date required for bilateral treaties?

Revision 21: We agree to the deletion at RDA 19.2.1.1.1 vii) however, the corporate body that signs a treaty is still a corporate body related to the work and therefore must be mentioned in RDA 19.3.2. Also Appendix I should be adjusted accordingly.

Revision 22: See revision 21 above.

Further suggestions on date and place:

#### Date

According to this proposal *date of a treaty* is the relevant date, which is easily ascertainable. Further dates (the effective date, the date of going out of force, and also validity information) are relevant dates for resource description and access. Furthermore treaties may show multiple dates of signing. RDA should give an orientation, which dates belong to History of the Work (RDA 6.7) and Date of Work (RDA 6.4).

#### Place of signing a treaty

We suggest establishing a RDA element “Place of signing a treaty” according to RDA 6.5 “Place of origin of the work”.