To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative

LC agrees to the proposed changes. Although we originally found the reference from an instruction about “two or more parts” (6.14.2.7.2) to an instruction on “one part” (6.2.2.9.1) to be a bit awkward, we appreciate that it seems to be the best solution pending a more thorough review of Chapter 6.

We thank CCC for incorporating our suggestions about replacing “expression” with “parts of the work” at 6.28.2.3 from 6JSC/LC/rep 2. Our current proposal, 6JSC/LC/20, includes suggested revisions to 6.28.2.3 on pages 4-5. If 6JSC/CCC/7 is approved, that would take precedence over the changes suggested to 6.28.2.3 in 6JSC/LC/20. The main differences between LC’s and CCC’s proposed revisions to 6.28.2.3 are 1) LC’s proposal was limited to the Alternative; 2) CCC’s proposal removes the phrase “unnumbered or non-consecutively numbered parts of a work” from the Alternative; and 3) CCC’s proposal adds some examples and changes others. LC has no objection to any of these suggested revisions.

When reviewing CCC’s proposed changes to 6.14.2.8.3-6.14.2.8.5, we noticed the disparity between the treatment of lists of conventional collective titles between these sections and 6.2.2.10.2. For clarity and consistency, LC asks the JSC if the terms in the examples boxes in 6.14.2.8.3-6.14.2.8.5 should be removed in favor of a list of terms in the instruction itself as in 6.2.2.10.2, with the additional instruction, “If none of the above is appropriate, record an appropriate specific collective title.” These terms could then have glossary definitions, which we think is preferable to defining terms in explanations of examples as is currently done for Choral music and Vocal music at 6.14.2.8.3. We note that in its recent review of the reworded Chapter 6, the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee also commented on the problem of mixing instructions and vocabulary definitions with examples in 6.14.2.8.3.