To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Dave Reser, LC Representative

Subject: Transcription of punctuation and symbols (1.7.3, 1.7.5)

We agree with CCC that the issues raised for 1.7.3 and 1.7.5 are already covered by 1.7.1 , 1st Alternative, since an agency could provide guidelines for replacing punctuation and symbols found on the source of information in its "in-house guidelines." In fact, we think introducing Alternatives at 1.7.3 and 1.7.5 when 2 Alternatives already cover 1.7.2-1.7.9 might make things more confusing for the Toolkit user.

We also think that some of CCC's examples are made confusing by the choice to use ISBD punctuation when the punctuation found in the resource is similar to ISBD—the punctuation in the source is not inherently confusing. Thus, our first preference is not to accept CCC/16's proposed changes to 1.7.3 and 1.7.5.

However, if other JSC members would like to accept CCC's proposal, LC can accept Change #1 with the modifications listed below. For Change #2, we did not find the arguments compelling, and our rationale is explained below.

Change #1: Recommended revisions for 1.7.3

<u>Comment 1:</u>
Remove "and/or the spaces preceding or following the punctuation" in the first sentence of the Alternative because 1.7.1 is about punctuation not spacing. RDA is silent on spacing between words, punctuation and words, etc. The only instruction on spacing in Chapter 1 is 1.7.6 for initialisms and acronyms.

<u>Comment 2:</u>
Move the second sentence in the Alternative "Make a note to indicate…" after the example box.

Change #2: Recommended revisions for 1.7.3
We did not find this argument as compelling—we did not see how the example used "significantly hindered clarity" nor could we think of an example where this would happen that would not violate the spirit of 1.7.9 to transcribe inaccuracies. For example, if a statement of responsibility read "lyrics by 50$" instead of "lyrics by 50¢", we think CCC's Alternative puts us in conflict with 1.7.9, which says to transcribe "lyrics by 50$" and make a note per 2.17. In fact, substituting a symbol might cause a lack of identification or it might negate the creator or publisher's intent. For example, what the cataloger thought was an" unclear use of symbols" in the title is actually a valid mathematical expression in base 7 and was intentional for this book about number bases:

       3x4-1=11

Title appears on source of information as: 3+4+1=11

We note that CCC's proposed alternative only offers the option of omitting the symbol or replacing it with another symbol or sign of punctuation. So this example, which we think does not result in a loss of clarity if transcribed as found, would not be allowed by CCC's proposal:

Ode to joy

Title appears on the source of information as: ☺de to joy