

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Marg Stewart, CCC representative
Subject: Change to *RDA* 7.24 and Glossary, Artistic and/or Technical Credit

CCC thanks the ALA representative for incorporating the suggestions from Glasgow and offers the following comments.

Issues involving instructions:

1. Because Artistic and/or Technical Credit is an attribute of the Expression, it is suggested at #7 below that the examples should only include credits relating to the expression of the work. This suggests that 7.24.1.1 might need some revision as well. “Moving image resource” is clearly a content term, but “sound recording” and perhaps “multimedia resource” are not. For sound recording, the Content Type term is “performed music”, but I suggest that “audio resource” might be better. There are no Content Type terms for mixed content, so I think that “multimedia resource” might be the best we can do. If the JSC agrees to change “sound recording” to “audio resource”, I suggest that the entire phrase be worded as “an audio, moving image, or multimedia resource”. Does JSC agree?

CCC supports the proposal to change “sound recording” to “audio resource”. CCC is concerned about the use of the word “multimedia” since it only occurs in one example and is not part of the vocabulary used in RDA instructions and guidelines. CCC agrees with LC’s suggestion in 6JSC/ALA/4/Rev/LC response to change the phrase to from “an audio, moving image, or multimedia resource” to “of a resource”, which would address this concern.

2. The JSC preferred the phrase “if not recorded in another element” to “not recorded elsewhere in the description”. The latter phrase is also used at 7.27.1.3. Should this instruction also be changed? On the other hand, there are two issues that should be noted:

Yes. CCC thinks that the instruction at 7.27.1.3 should also be changed to “not recorded in another element”.

- 2b. Looking at 7.24.1.3, I believe that the instruction might read better if the word “if” and the preceding comma were not included:

Record the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource, if not recorded in another element, if they are considered to be important.

Does JSC agree?

CCC offers the following wording:

Option 1. (if the phrase “moving image resource, audio resource or multimedia resource” is used)

Record the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, ~~sound recording~~ audio resource, or multimedia resource, ~~if not recorded in another element, if they are considered to be important~~ if they are not recorded in another element and are considered to be important.

Option 1. Clean Copy

Record the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, audio resource, or multimedia resource if they are not recorded in another element and are considered to be important.

Option 2. (if the phrase “of a resource” is used)

Record the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a ~~moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource,~~ ~~if not recorded in another element, if they are considered to be important~~ resource if they are not recorded in another element and are considered to be important.

Option 2. Clean Copy

Record the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a resource if they are not recorded in another element and are considered to be important.

3. CCC proposed adding a reference to 7.23 at 7.24.1.1; I suggest that a reciprocal reference to 7.24 be added at 7.23.1.1. Does JSC agree?

For instructions on recording artistic and/or technical credits, see [7.24](#).

CCC agrees.

4. LC proposed revising the reference at 2.4.1.1. Their rewording breaks the parallel with other references at 2.4.1.1. I suggest that we retain the parallel, but reword based on the revised scope of 7.24:

For statements identifying persons who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource, see [7.24](#).

CCC agrees, but prefers “audio resource” to “sound recording” or, alternatively, “resource” instead of “moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource”. CCC wonders, for the sake of consistency, if the preceding reference at 2.4.1.1 should also be changed: “For statements identifying performers, narrators, and/or presenters in a moving image resource, see 7.23.”

5. RDA 7.24.1.3 includes the sentence “Precede each name or group of names with a statement of function.” The comparable instruction at 7.23.1.3 says “For performers of music, indicate the medium in which each performs.” Is it necessary for Artistic and/or Technical Credits that the statement of function come before the name? If not, I suggest “Include a statement of function with each name or group of names.” Does JSC agree?

CCC agrees.

Issues involving examples:

6. Adam Schiff recommends that we include the first and second of the moving image examples included in the LC response, but not the third (the new examples are highlighted in yellow in the clean copy below). He feels that we don’t need both and that the corporate body is much more obvious in the second than in the third example. Does JSC agree? Are there other example that you wish to delete? There are certainly a large number of moving image examples, and I’m not sure that they all raise unique situations.

CCC agrees.

7. This element is an attribute of the expression and therefore credits relating to either the work or the manifestation are out of scope.

7a. Adam feels that “directory of photography” (which is a relationship designator associated with the work) is out of scope. Does JSC agree to delete such statements?

CCC agrees, and notes a small typo in the proposal. “Directory of photography” should be “director”.

7b. “Producer” is also a relationship designator associated with the work; Adam suggests that both record producers and executive producers fit the definition and are therefore out of scope for this element. I agree about executive producers, but am not so sure about record producers. This may require more

discussion and might best be deferred to the investigation of the larger issues that ALA was invited to undertake. In the meantime, I suggest that we remove any statements relating to producers from these examples. Does JSC agree?

No. CCC prefers to leave the examples for now, until the discussion and investigation of the larger issues has taken place. It needs to be made clear where statements of responsibility that we no longer include here should actually go, which could mean revising examples under the statement of responsibility element.

7c. Relationship designators for various sorts of editors are all associated with the expression – yet in the case of some resources (e.g., books) we record these in statements of responsibility rather than credits. I believe that this is one of the larger issues that will need to be resolved, but that statements relating to editors may be retained in these examples? Does JSC agree?

CCC believes that 7c requires more investigation.

8. Adam recommends that we include explanatory notes for all the examples. Rather than using “Resource described: [title]” – which may not help to identify the type of resource – he recommends a statement such as “Artistic and/or technical credits [or simply Credits] for a ‘type of resource’”. Given that this element is an attribute of the Expression, he suggests that we use the Content Type term to indicate type of resource; this would be “performed music” (for the sound recordings), “moving image resource” and “multimedia resource” (?). I suggested earlier using “audio resource” rather than “performed music” in the definition of the element. What is your preference? [Note: These notes are included in the revised text below, using “Credits for an audio resource”, etc.]

CCC agrees and prefers “audio resource”.