ACOC thanks the ALA representative for preparing this revision and supports the approach being undertaken.

The incorporated changes are largely agreed to and supported; although as with ACOC’s response to 6JSC/CILIP/3/rev, the ACOC representative feels that LC’s response to 6JSC/ALA/4/rev provides significant suggestions and textual enhancement.

The following comments pertain to ALA’s proposed revision.

**Issues involving instructions**
1. The use of the term “resource” is preferred
2. ACOC has no strong view on the matter raised in 2a; the removal of the word “if” and the comma in 2b is supported – but an alternative and syntactically simpler wording may be

   “…if they are not recorded in another element, and if they are considered to be important”

3. Inclusion of a reciprocal reference is supported
4. The rewording is supported – and it is preferred that “resource” (as suggested in 1.) be used
5. The rewording is supported – it is not necessary that the statement of function comes before the name

**Issues involving examples**
6. The recommendation is not supported – the examples are illustrative and are not required to cover or raise all unique situations
7. The deletion suggested in 7a is not supported – there appears to be a larger issue here and the matter requires fuller consideration; the removal suggested in 7b is not supported – as again, there appears to be a larger issue here requiring fuller consideration; the retention suggested in 7c is supported – as the larger issue here requires fuller consideration
8. The recommendation is not supported – the naming of the examples is not found to be helpful, and the preference is that they be removed.

Lastly, a (very) minor question – an ampersand is used in the example:

Edited & special effects by You Oughta Be in Pixels; production design by Paula Dal Santo; director of photography, Luis Molina Robinson; music by Mark Oates

Is this used in preference to the word “and”?