To: Kathy Glennan, Chair, RDA Steering Committee

CC: Renate Behrens, RSC Chair-Elect
               Linda Barnhart, RSC Secretary
               Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary-Elect

From: Honor Moody, RDA Examples Editor

Subject: Formal response to RSC/RSCSecretary/2022/2 - Proposal to correct the terms "multipart monograph" and "serial"

In general I support the recommendations, which are improvements over what is currently in the RDA Toolkit, and would agree with recommendations 1-5 as written if that is the RSC consensus. However, both the Technical Team Liaison Officer and the Translations Team Liaison Officer offer alternatives that would provide additional clarity, and I would prefer to see the RSC incorporate those alternatives in some form.

Recommendation 1: For Manifestation: note on issue or part or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation, amend the text to make implied conditions explicit and remove unnecessary subheadings.

I support the suggested text proposed by the Technical Team Liaison Officer, without the options provided for recording a Work: [data provenance element]. Including the data provenance options without changing the entity hierarchy for the element introduces an undesirable conflation of metadata that describes a resource and metadata that describes a metadata work.

Recommendation 2: For Manifestation: note on issue or part or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation, change the element label to note on issue or unit or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation, add an alternate label, and adjust the definition.

I agree with the Technical Working Group's analysis in *RSC/RSCSecretary/2022/2/TechnicalTLO Response* that Manifestation: note on issue or part or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation describes the provenance of a *metadata work*, and I see Work: *note on metadata work* as the most appropriate data provenance element.[1]

Due to the ongoing value of more detailed instructions for recording data provenance concerning the basis of description for multiple unit resources, I am not in favor of soft or hard deprecation in favor of one the existing elements, but would prefer to see the element note on issue or part or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation (as amended by the RSC) retained in a renamed form as a narrower element of Work: *metadata work,* Work: note on unit or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation.

---

[1] In reviewing Work: Source consulted I note that the MARC mappings only include fields from MARC 21 Authority, where I would have expected to see MARC 21 Bibliographic 510 included.

Element label (marked-up)	Change in definition	Current broader element	Proposed new broader element
~~Manifestation~~ Work: note on ~~issue or part~~ unit or iteration used as basis for identification of manifestation	A note that identifies a ~~part~~ unit or iteration that is used for the base description of a ~~multiunit~~ multiple unit or integrating manifestation	Manifestation: note on manifestation	Work: metadata work

Recommendation 3: For Manifestation: note on numbering of sequence, amend the text in five places to correct the terms "serial" and "part."

I support the suggested text proposed by the Technical Team Liaison Officer.

Recommendation 4: For Manifestation: note on statement of responsibility, amend the text to make implied conditions explicit and remove unnecessary subheadings.

I support the suggested text proposed by the Translations Team Liaison Officer

Recommendation 5: For Manifestation: title proper, amend the text to correct the term "serial."

I support the suggested text proposed by the Translations Team Liaison Officer

Recommendation 6: For Work: creator person of work, amend the text to correct the term "serial" and move the entire subsection to Prerecording.

I agree with the recommendation as written.

Recommendation 7: For Work: creator family of work, amend the text to correct the term "serial."

I agree with the recommendation as written.

Recommendation 8: For Work: frequency, amend the text to correct the terms "serial" and "part."

I support the suggested text proposed by the Technical Team Liaison Officer, including the need to update the element definition (this may have been an editorial oversight), and am including marked-up and clean copies of proposed change to the element scope and definition for clarity:

Marked-up version:

An interval at which a part work, issue, or iteration of a diachronic work is issued.

Clean version:

An interval at which a part work, issue, or iteration of a diachronic work is issued.

Recommendation 9: Add "Use for" references from "serial" to "multiple unit" to provide guidance to those looking for "serial" as a mode of issuance.

Disagree.

Due to the awkwardness of the language, I don't think this will assist the user expecting to find "serial" as a mode of issuance, and I think it is unlikely that anyone would look for either "serial, multiple unit" or "multiple unit serial", so these phrases are unnecessary as alternate terms in the glossary.