To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Poulter, CILIP Representative

Subject: Date of signing a treaty (6.29.1.33, 6.29.3.3)

Summary and Recommendations

Rules 6.29.1.33 and 6.29.3.3 both refer to Rule 6.20.3 to build entries for treaties by adding just the year, yet rule 6.20.3 allows adding "year, name of the month, number of the day".

Make no change to the rules as this is a minor inconsistency.

Rationale

During the final edit, Adam Schiff raised the following issue:

"6.29.1.33 says on p.140: "If the access point for a compilation of treaties, etc., is constructed using the collective name for the treaties, etc. ... add the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing (see 6.20.3)." and on p. 140: "If the access point for a single treaty is constructed using the name by which the treaty is known, add the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing (see 6.20.3).

And 6.29.3.3 also has an instruction to add to the title for a treaty, etc. the year of signing (I also note it does not say "year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing" like the instructions above do)

When you go to 6.20.3, there is no provision to record just a year by itself for the date of signing of a treaty. 6.20.3.3 says to record the date in the form: year, name of month, number of the day. If only a year is needed in either authorized or variant access points, can it be pulled out of 6.20.3.3? Or does there need to be an exception of some sort to record just a year in that element? There will be many instances where the complete date of signing is used in the authorized access point but only the year in some of the variant access points."

There seems no reason why a year alone should not be added, even if a full date is known, if it is sufficient for purpose and can be identified as a year in the data recorded. This latter requirement could be an issue if data storage is not sufficiently 'atomic'.