

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Marg Stewart, CCC representative  
**Subject: Change to RDA 7.24 and Glossary, Artistic and/or Technical Credit**

CCC has reviewed the revision proposals relating to 7.24 and Glossary for Artistic and/or Technical Credit and agrees with the general principles in the proposal to expand the definition of 7.24. CCC offers the following comments:

General comments:

CCC appreciates the concerns raised by the ALA Representative in Appendix II and agrees that JSC may wish to address the issues raised. In considering these comments, additional concerns emerged. CCC asks whether the problem is a situation of major credit vs. minor credit rather than artistic or technical credit. Some credits are at the work level while other credits are at the expression level. The examples in the proposed revision do not make the distinction between major and minor credits. Is the colorist of a graphic novel, for example, really an expression level credit? It is difficult to imagine a graphic novel without illustrations or lettering. One could argue that the majority of the involvement for moving image resources is at the work level, rather than the expression level. Can another expression of a moving image resource exist with a different costume designer? Would that not make it a different work altogether? Yes, these are minor credits, but they are minor work-level credits.

Specific comments:

1. Change “motion picture and video recording” to “resource”.

CCC agrees.

2. Delete the exclusionary phrase “other than as ...”; this phrase was necessary to distinguish between this element and Performer, Narrator, or Presenter (RDA 7.23).

CCC agrees if LC’s proposed wording is substituted, i.e. “if not recorded in another element”.

3. Instead, add the phrase “not recorded elsewhere in the description” (cf. RDA 7.27.1.3); this would not only distinguish this element from the Performer, Narrator, or Presenter element, but also from the Statement of Responsibility.

As noted above, CCC prefers LC’s proposed wording , i.e. “if not recorded in another element”.

4. Add the phrase “if they are considered to be important” (cf. RDA 7.23.1.3) in order to indicate that the element is optional and that cataloger judgment should determine whether any particular credit is recorded.

CCC agrees.

5. Finally, delete the sentence excluding persons making only a minor contribution; this should also be determined by cataloger judgment.

CCC agrees.

CCC questions the choice of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> examples under Audio resources given the MLA’s comments about the role of music producers and engineers in popular music. Given their significance, CCC wonders whether producers should be recorded in the statement of responsibility rather than in a note.

In addition, CCC proposes adding a reference to 7.23 at instruction 7.24.1.1

7.24.1.1      Scope

[...]

For instructions on recording performers, narrators, or presenters, see 7.23.

CCC suggests that the examples would be clearer if “resource described” notes were added.

Finally, CCC recommends using ISBD punctuation in the examples (i.e. space, semi-colon, space) to separate the roles and thus follow the ISBD provision at 7 Note area (Recommended punctuation) “Within notes it is recommended, where appropriate, that the prescribed punctuation of areas 1-6 be followed; for example, a title is separated from a statement of responsibility by a space, diagonal slash, space ( / )”. CCC wonders if that provision should also be added at Appendix D.1.2.8.