

**Music Library Association (MLA)/
Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)
RDA Test Group
Discussion Summary Part 3: Resolved Issues
5/20/11**

This section lists issues that came up during the MLA/OLAC RDA Test Group’s participation in the U.S. national libraries’ official RDA test for which we think there are objective, correct answers or for which we are confident that our consensus interpretation is non-controversial. We think this list will be useful to others because it is an organic list of the types of things that are likely to confuse catalogers who are new to RDA or who are grounded in AACR2. We have also incorporated some decisions that are not covered by RDA and for which the answers have to be sought in ISBD or MARC 21. This document summarizes the MLA/OLAC testers’ informal discussions. It does not constitute the formal position of either MLA or OLAC nor do all individual test participants necessarily agree with all the points made.

Contents

MLA/OLAC test participants	2
Test participants	2
Consultants	2
Testers from other sites who participated in the OLAC/MLA wiki and discussion list.....	2
Identifying an RDA/ISBD record.....	3
Transcription, ellipses, and marks of omission.....	3
Relator term punctuation	3
Qualifier and relationship designator are the same.....	3
Personal name headings and unknown dates.....	4
Multiple edition statements	4
Musical presentation statement (RDA 5.3)	4
Production statements	4
MARC FMus and RDA’s new definitions for scores	5
Dates in 260/008.....	5
MARC DtSt and moving images	6
Mechanics of recording content, medium and carrier.....	6
Centimeters and inches and ending punctuation in 300\$c.....	6
Series statements on e-reproductions	7
Form of musical notation.....	7

MLA/OLAC test participants

Test participants

Marcia Barrett (OLAC), University of Alabama
Nicholas Bennyhoff (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Vince Andrzejewski (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Edie Elliott (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Cheri Schuler-Faust (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
Linda Blair (MLA), Eastman School of Music
Robert Bothmann (OLAC), Minnesota State University, Mankato.
Sarah Cohen (MLA), Allen Music Library, Florida State University
 Keith Knop (MLA), Allen Music Library, Florida State University
Grace Fitzgerald (MLA), University of Iowa
Jean Harden (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
 Ralph Hartsock (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
 Mark McKnight (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
Jeannette Ho (OLAC), Texas A&M University
Mary Huismann (MLA), University of Minnesota
 Kristen Bergland (MLA), University of Minnesota
Damian Iseminger (MLA), New England Conservatory of Music
Darcy J. Nebergall (OLAC), King County Library System
Anchalee (Joy) Panigabutra-Roberts (OLAC), University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Karen Peters (MLA), UC Santa Barbara
Alan Ringwood (MLA), University of Texas at Austin
 Marjie Lawrence (MLA), University of Texas at Austin
Dana Tonkonow (OLAC), Central Connecticut State University
Hermine Vermeij (MLA), UCLA
Susan Wynne (OLAC), University of Wyoming

Consultants

Robert Freeborn (OLAC), Penn State University
Kathy Glennan (MLA), University of Maryland
Kelley McGrath (OLAC), University of Oregon (coordinator)
Mark Scharff (MLA), Washington University in St. Louis

Testers from other sites who participated in the OLAC/MLA wiki and discussion list

Felecia Clifton (OLAC), University of North Dakota
Greta de Groat (OLAC), Stanford University
Nancy Lorimer (MLA), Stanford University
Jennifer Eustis (OLAC), Northeastern University
Karen Griggs (OLAC), Brigham Young University
Marian Kelley (OLAC), Emory University

Identifying an RDA/ISBD record

When inputting an English language RDA record using ISBD punctuation, identify the record in the following ways:

Tag	Attribute(s)	Proposed LC practice
Leader/18	Descriptive cataloging form	Use value “i” (ISBD)
040 \$b	Language of cataloging	Give value “eng”
040 \$e	Description conventions	Give value “rda”

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDAtest/MARC21changes.doc>

Transcription, ellipses, and marks of omission

Transcribe ellipses as they appear on the item rather than substituting dashes (RDA 2.3.1.4 and 1.7.3)

“...taken at the flood” / Jonathan Darnborough

Relator term punctuation

Follow MARC documentation for punctuation for relator terms. There should be a comma after the name and before any relator terms unless the name ends with an open date, in which case the dash is not followed by a comma. Use a comma between relator terms. End the field with a period:

Smith, John, \$e composer.

Johnson, Julie, \$d 1945- \$e film director, \$e film producer.

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bdx00.html>

Qualifier and relationship designator are the same

One of our records had a translator about whom no specific information could be found. Some other people with the same name were already established in the authority file, however so she needed to be differentiated somehow. The obvious choice was to qualify by field of activity or profession. This looks odd when followed by a relationship designator for the same function, but appears to be legitimate.

700 Herzog, Elizabeth †c (Translator), †e translator.

Personal name headings and unknown dates

RDA 9.3 states that the element, Date Associated With a Person is a core element. Options include birth date (9.3.2), death date (9.3.3), and period of activity of the person (9.3.4). If a cataloger is unable to locate a birth or death date, does that mean that a period of activity must be included in the heading?

100 Halton, Rosalind, \$d active 20th/21st century

RDA 0.6.4 says “When recording data identifying a person, family, or corporate body, include as a minimum the elements listed below that are applicable and readily ascertainable,” which implies that if the information cannot be easily found, it does not need to be included. In addition, 9.3.4.1 (Period of activity of the person) is a core-if element and only required “when needed to distinguish a person from another person with the same name.” Therefore

100 Halton, Rosalind.

is sufficient. It would be helpful to have a reference back to RDA 0.6.4 in RDA 9.3 and other similar sections.

Multiple edition statements

Separate multiple edition statements with a comma per ISBD.

250 Vocal score, Updated edition.

Musical presentation statement (RDA 5.3)

Statements such as vocal score or piano score are considered to be musical presentation statements in ISBD. However, in RDA this concept does not exist. Instead, such statements are to be recorded as a designation of edition (RDA 2.5.2). This will allow similar information to be transcribed in a consistent place and allows the recording of statements of responsibility associated with vocal scores, etc. as statements of responsibility relating to the edition. RDA 7.20 (Format of notated music) provides a controlled list of terms for musical presentation (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/5sec7rev.pdf>, Changes to AACR2 Instructions). RDA 2.5.2 says that an edition may be designated when there is a change in content or a change in format or physical presentation.

Production statements

In RDA 2.7 place of production, producer and date of production refer to unpublished works and should not be confused with film production.

MARC FMus and RDA's new definitions for scores

In RDA piano music is considered to be a score so 300 \$a should say "1 score (20 pages)" rather than AACR2's "20 pages of music." MARC coding is independent of RDA and 008 form of music (FMus) should still be coded as "z" for "music in other than score form" per the current MARC definition rather than "a" for score. It may be desirable to have a MARBI proposal to modify this.

Dates in 260/008

It's better to supply a probable date of publication with a copyright date than to spell out "date of publication not identified." LCPS says to "always give a copyright date for a single-part monograph if found on the resource. Generally ignore copyright renewal dates for works first copyrighted before 1978. If the copyright dates vary, give the latest copyright date."

260 \$c [2003], c2003

Code in 008 as DtSt t 2003, 2003

Date of publication is a core element so it is always necessary to give at least "date of publication not identified." Date of distribution is core-if so if you don't have a date of publication, you have to put something in date of distribution. It appeared to us that this applies even if the data for the date of distribution is only "date of distribution not identified" as given in the following example. However, LC is interpreting this differently. Please see the "Copyright Place" section in part 2.

260 †c [date of publication not identified], [date of distribution not identified], ©1952
†g (2009)

One of the testers tried repeating \$c so that the publication date and copyright date are in different subfields. 260 \$c is repeatable in the MARC format, but the fine print specifies that "Multiple adjacent publication dates such as a date of publication and copyright date are recorded in a single subfield \$c."

260 †c [1966], †c ©1966.

Remember that the treatment of unknown and supplied dates (RDA 1.9) is different. For example:

DtSt q Dates 1940, 1970
260 †c [between 1940 and 1970?]

Per LC, 008 coding for not before... and not after... dates should be as follows:

DtSt q Dates 1935, uuuu
260 ‡c [not before 1935]

For a musical recording with an estimated publication of 2010, a phonogram date of 2010 on the container and a recording date of 2008. Use p in DtSt with the recording date in Date 2 because it comes before t in the table of precedence (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd008a.html>).

DtSt p Dates, 2010, 2008
260 ‡c [2010], ©2010.
518 ‡o Recorded ‡d 2008 July 12-13 ‡p Herkulesaal, München.

MARC DtSt and moving images

Current practice for moving images is to code DtSt as “s” (single date rather than “p” for both date of publication and date of production) for a DVD with significant bonus features as a work whose content differs significantly from the original motion picture. Since this is a MARC coding issue, it doesn’t change with RDA.

Mechanics of recording content, medium and carrier

For 336-338, use \$2 rdacarrier, rdamedia and rdacontent. Forms such as \$2 marccarrier have been made obsolete (see <http://www.mail-archive.com/rda-l@listserv.lac-bac.gc.ca/msg03528.html>) Use only the terms from RDA.

According to the LC guidance for MARC encoding during the test (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cps0/RDAtest/training2word8.doc>), use only terms in \$a. Do not use \$b codes.

Centimeters and inches and ending punctuation in 300\$c

4 3/4 in. [abbreviate inches; always ends in period]
18 cm [if no series]
18 cm. [if followed by series statement]

It was not clear to us how to reconcile this with the MARC input conventions for field 300, but we have since heard that there are plans to update the MARC documentation.

Punctuation - Field 300 ends with a period if there is a 4XX in the record; otherwise it ends with a period unless another mark of punctuation or a closing parenthesis is present. See also subfield descriptions for punctuation information. (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd300.html>)

Series statements on e-reproductions

Series statements for the original series that appear on reproductions do not need to be distinguished from the original series based on format, e.g., it's not necessary to qualify the series heading with (Online).

According to LCPS 6.27.1.9:

Republications. When a serial/series/multipart monograph is republished or reproduced (as a text, as a microform, as large print, as a braille edition, as a digitized reproduction, etc.), do not create a separate SAR to distinguish one of these republications from the original. Use the authorized access point for the original for any republication.

Form of musical notation

Form of musical notation can go in 546\$b by itself rather than 500.

546 ꞑb Staff notation.

Contents notes and “contains:” label

RDA 25.1.1.3 talks about recording related works. In the set of examples labeled Structured Description of a Related Work, the fourth example is a contents note, preceded by “Contains:” (minus the quotes). The LCPS to that rule says to use the appropriate 1st indicator in 505 to generate the label specifying the character of the content. So despite the fact that the RDA example uses the label “contains,” continue to use the labels available in the MARC format.