

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative
Subject: Internationalization and RDA Appendix A Capitalization: Discussion Paper

ALA thanks CCC for this discussion paper which details problems with the current structure of Appendix A. We agree that these guidelines/instructions need to be more responsive and flexible and that they need to better accommodate languages other than English.

We offer the following comments on CCC's discussion points:

1. An ideal structure of the language specific instructions would be flexible, expandible and provide a logical order in English as well as in translation.

While we agree with this premise and concur that having these guidelines/instructions close at hand is useful for catalogers, we wonder if retaining this guidance in Appendix A is the best approach. Because capitalization practice does not affect the FRBR/FRAD user tasks, various JSC constituencies and the Appendices Working Group have previously questioned the inclusion of Appendix A in RDA. Would it be possible to take an approach that utilizes the Toolkit's Tools tab, creating a well-developed language tool instead? We see this as similar to the approach proposed for books and groups of books in the Bible in 6JSC/LC/31.

If Appendix A is retained, we wonder if it would be possible to offer flexibility so that the language of the cataloging agency (French for example) would take the place of the English sections (A.10-A.30). English then would become an exception for these agencies and be moved where it would belong in the list of other languages. We recognize that this could be difficult and would likely require renumbering of other portions of Appendix A.

1a. Develop a standard template which would be filled in for each language.

While it would be nice to have a common template for each language, this could result in a very lengthy appendix. Different languages present different issues, such as the capitalization of nouns in German, so variations will still exist even with a standard template.

We believe that it makes sense to group similar languages together (e.g., Scandinavian, Romance, Slavic), rather than creating separate but identical guidelines/instructions for each.

1b. Reducing the normative status of Appendix A.

A.1, *General Guideline*, has an alternative to use in-house guidelines or a published style manual in lieu of Appendix A. Thus, ALA reviewers believe that the status of Appendix A is already below the "strict rule" level.

2. ***Review sections A.2 to A.9 to ensure that all RDA data elements that might require guidance are indeed covered.***

ALA supports this review.

3. ***Review language-specific instructions with experts from the languages involved to fill-in any gaps and update provisions to conform to current style.***

While ALA undertook a review of RDA in relation to the latest edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style*, we note that the approved modifications involved minor editorial changes to RDA and related documentation. A major change, regarding capitalization of hyphenated compounds (see 6JSC/ALA/22), was not accepted.

4. ***Form a working group to review the possibilities for restructuring Appendix A.***

ALA agrees that work should continue on this effort and thanks CCC for offering to take the lead on further pursuing its development.