

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:** Bill Leonard, CCC representative

**Subject: Simplification of RDA 2.7 – 2.10. Follow up**

CCC thanks the British Library for the exploration of simplification of 2.7 to 2.10 following up on discussion at the 2014 JSC meeting. CCC cautiously supports the direction of this paper but cautions that it may be prudent to wait for the final model resulting from the FRBR LRM development process. The LRM is still subject to worldwide review which could result in more rounds of review and revision before the final publication.

Having said that, CCC members understand that the proposed LRM proposes to treat the manifestation statement as an element intended to be used to record statements on self-identifying resources. A possible impact will result in the distinction between attributes and relationships, once the new entities place and timespan have been established. Relationships would be used to link a manifestation to the place of publication, publisher name and date of publication, etc. It may not be necessary to additionally define elements for the PPDM place, PPDM name and the PPDM date. Relationship designators could be utilized to elaborate the specific characterization or function (is place of publication of; published in place; is name of publisher; publisher's name; is date of publication; published date (the nomen of timespan), etc.; specific function). We recognize that this might compromise the four-fold path for relationships. This will finally enable the separation of the task of recording the statement found on the resource, and the task of recording data that can be reliably employed in searching and linking. In other words, this will hopefully alleviate the problems caused by demanding that current imprint statements serve both tasks.

CCC advises that any changes to 2.7 to 2.10 should be informed by the final FRBR LRM, anticipated to be approved in the coming years. We note that chapter 2 is not the correct place to record relationships. Indeed, if and when RDA has chapters for the description of place and timespan, PPDM elements in chapter 2 will be redundant. We also prefer that RDA should respect core status of elements designated as essential access points in the International Cataloguing Principles.

CCC offers these specific comments on the discussion paper.

There was concern expressed by CCC members on the choice of the word colophon for unpublished resources.

3.6.1.3 (Recording the copyright symbol): Copyright and phonogram copyright dates are two different types of dates, identified by their respective symbol. Recording the symbol is currently necessary since both types of dates are recorded in the same RDA element, therefore the current or proposed metadata element is not specific enough to distinguish between the two. CCC can support removing the requirement to record the symbol only if a separate element is created for phonogram copyright date. This comment is notwithstanding the earlier comments on the development of a timespan element.