

## Background

At ALA Midwinter 2014, CC:DA discussed [CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2013/5, Date of Production and Date of Manufacture elements – should a priority order be provided to prefer data in the resource itself first?](#) One outcome of that discussion was to create a proposal to make the Date of Manufacture instructions parallel to those for Date of Publication and Date of Distribution ([CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2014/2](#)).

The question of how to handle Date of Production was deferred, because different principles apply to sources of information for *unpublished* resources. The present discussion paper argues that the emphasis on transcription is inappropriate for elements within the Production Statement. The paper proposes a revision to the Publication Statement so that all data therein is recorded as non-transcribed attributes.

## The Problem of Transcription for Unpublished Resources

In RDA, the Production Statement records information “relating to the inscription, fabrication, construction, etc. of a resource in an unpublished form.” Unpublished resources differ in several important respects from published resources. These differences suggest that different rules are needed for recording production information.

For *published* resources, creation is always a process that is separate from, and non-simultaneous with, publication, distribution, and manufacture. The creator is responsible for the work’s content; the publisher (etc.) is responsible for overseeing the embodiment of the manifestation and for issuing it to the public. Even when a resource is self-published, the publication process is distinct from the creation process.

A publisher routinely includes two types of descriptive information in a publication: information identifying the work (title, statement of responsibility), and information identifying the manifestation (where, when, and by whom the manifestation was embodied and issued). For the publisher, this information serves as a marketing tool; when the information is recorded in a catalog record, it supports the user tasks of finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining the publication. Consistent presentation of self-describing information in published resources underlies the reliance on transcription in library cataloging standards.

Transcription of information on a publication is a cost-effective method of describing the manifestation. Since it is supplied by the publisher, it can generally be relied upon as an accurate description of the resource. Even when the information is not accurate (e.g. intentionally or inadvertently mistaken statements of responsibility or fictitious imprints) its transcription enables users to distinguish between different manifestations of the same work or expression. For these reasons, it is logical for the resource itself to be the preferred source of information for published material.

*Unpublished* resources include archives, manuscripts (of varied content types), artwork, artifacts, and miscellaneous man-made objects or naturally occurring objects. These resources, which are very often “one of a kind” items or collections, are normally not self-describing. Basic information related to the work and creator is often not found on the item; information concerning its production is even less likely to appear on the resource. Since these resources are generally not

issued to the public for sale, there is no marketing motive for including this information on the resource. Moreover, production information would often be redundant, since creation and production are usually one and the same for unique items.

Transcription is not an effective way of communicating production information. Even when descriptive information appears on an unpublished resource, there is no guarantee that it was supplied by the creator or producer, as opposed to a later owner, dealer, or just someone who had access to the resource. Information appearing on the item is often illegible, incomplete, misleading, inaccurate, or recorded in an abbreviated or non-standard form; it is often difficult to deduce whether it refers to the creation, production, sale, or even subject matter depicted in the resource.

Since unpublished resources are usually unique objects, the information on the resource does not serve the secondary purpose of distinguishing between different manifestations. Users do not expect descriptions of unpublished resources to consist of a literal transcription of information from the item, and they do not rely on a description based on literal transcription to find, identify, select, or obtain the resource.

Cataloging standards for archives and museums instruct catalogers to devise descriptions for unpublished resources based on a combination of internal evidence, when present, and external sources. The latter may include housing and accompanying material, or published sources, such as finding aids, inventories, and catalogs. Information within the resource is not privileged over information in other sources when, in the cataloger's judgment, it does not provide a meaningful description. The cataloger may record the presence of this information, if this is judged to be helpful to users.

Currently RDA models the Production Statement along the same lines as the publication, distribution, and manufacture statements, treating it as a set of transcribed elements. While consistency within RDA is generally good, extending the practice of transcription to unique resources requires recording potentially inaccurate information appearing on the resource, or the extensive use of square brackets to indicate that the information came from outside the resource.

For unpublished resources, elements of description should always be primarily non-transcribed; the prescribed source of information should be "any source." The changes proposed below implement these principles.

### **Methods for Recording Production Information in RDA**

For production information, a cataloger might want to record the data in one of three forms:

1. As transcribed attributes (the current method prescribed by RDA)
2. As non-transcribed attributes
3. As relationships to other entities

The three methods are not mutually exclusive. In a single record, a cataloger could record information about place, agent, and/or date in all three forms, although in most circumstances this would exceed what it required to find or identify the resource.

The third option--recording relationships--is central to a discussion paper currently put forward by the British Library representative to the JSC. The BL paper suggests a significant revision of RDA

2.7-2.10 (and related elements) that would endeavor to make a cleaner distinction between data intended to *identify* and *find*. It proposes:

1. Replacing aggregate elements with a simple statement transcribed from the source;
2. Using relationships and other existing elements to support collocation; and
3. Proposing new elements/instructions to fill gaps.

For unpublished resources, the authors of the present paper see the usefulness of objectives 2 and 3 (above), agreeing that new elements to record the date in a controlled form and the place as relationship would, in some cases at least, improve the user's ability to *find* a resource. We would like to see RDA implement the new elements suggested. As the BL proposal notes, RDA has already established an element (21.2) to record Producer of Unpublished Resource as a related entity.

Even if the changes suggested by the BL discussion paper are incorporated into RDA, we will still need a means to record production information as *attributes* of a manifestation. While RDA currently enables a cataloger to record these attributes in both transcribed form (in 2.7) and non-transcribed form (in 2.17.6 Note on Production Statement) it allocates the elements of far greater prominence and granularity (2.7) to the method for recording the information in transcribed form. The emphasis is thus inverted from that which would offer greatest utility to the user. This inversion of emphasis is a clear concern within OPAC displays; it presents even greater problems when information is exported from a library system and repurposed in other contexts, such as digital collections, since core information, not explanatory notes, is usually what is extracted.

The relegation of non-transcribed production information to a note gives the data inadequate prominence. We understand the appeal of devoting 2.7 to transcribed production information so that it parallels the treatment of published resources in 2.8 - 2.10. Nonetheless, we think that the easiest way to enact the changes we desire is to convert the Production Statement (2.7) into a set of non-transcribed elements. *Transcribed* production data, along with any other details relating to production deemed useful, could be recorded in the Note on Production Statement.

This new approach for the Production Statement would require significant changes to the text of RDA. The following list represents the most obvious changes that would be necessary.

1. Remove Production Statement elements from the list of transcribed elements in 2.2.4.
2. Remove Production Statement elements from the list of elements in 1.4 Language and Script ("Record the following elements in the language and script in which they appear on the sources from which they are taken").
3. Within 2.7.1.2 Sources of Information, instruct "Take information from any source." This would parallel the instruction for Copyright Date.
4. Rework the following elements entirely:
  - a. 2.7.2.6 Place of Production Not Identified in the Resource
  - b. 2.7.4.7 No Producer Identified
  - c. 2.7.6.6 Date of Production Not Identified in a Single-Part Resource
5. Within 2.7, remove all paragraphs relating to transcription:
  - a. 2.7.1.4 Recording Production Statements: "Transcribe places of production and producers' names as they appear on the source of information (see 1.7)."
  - b. 2.7.2.3 Recording Place of Production: "If the place name as transcribed is known to be fictitious, or requires clarification, make a note giving the actual place name, etc. (see 2.17.6.3)."

- c. 2.7.4.3 Recording Producers' Names: "If the name as transcribed is known to be fictitious, or requires clarification, make a note giving the actual name, etc. (see 2.17.6.3)."
  - d. 2.7.6.4 Chronograms: "If the date of production as it appears on the source of information is in the form of a chronogram, transcribe the chronogram as it appears."
- Within 2.7, remove all sentences referring to 2.2.4:
- a. 2.7.2.3 Recording Place of Production, Optional Additions, 2nd paragraph, final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - b. 2.7.4.4 Statement of Function, Optional addition, final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - c. 2.7.6.3 Recording Date of Production, Optional Addition, final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - d. 2.7.6.4 Chronograms, Optional Addition, final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - e. 2.7.6.4 Chronograms, Alternative, final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - f. 2.7.6.7 Archival Resources and Collections, 2nd to last paragraph, remove final sentence: "If applicable, indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."
  - g. 2.7.6.7 Archival Resources and Collections, final paragraph, remove final sentence: "Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see 2.2.4)."

## EXAMPLES

*Note: In the following examples, fields shaded gray reflect elements that are not required. In some cases, it would be logical for the cataloger to omit data (for place or name) recorded in the examples.*

### **Drawing attributed to Pellegrino Tibaldi** (Puria di Valsolda 1527-1596 Milan)

16th century

Inscribed on a tablet held by putto, in red chalk, "AMOR DEI"; on verso at upper center, in pen and black ink, "Michel Angli: Bona Rotta"; just below, in red chalk, "Michel Angli. B.F. / Roma"; at lower right, in black chalk, various numbers.

	Transcribed	Recorded
Place	Roma	Place of production not identified
Name of Prod.	Michel Angli: Bona Rotta	Pellegrino Tibaldi
Date	between 1500 and 1599?	between 1500 and 1599?
Note on Production Stmt.	Attributed to Pellegrino Tibaldi.	Inscribed on verso at upper center, in pen and black ink, "Michel Angli: Bona Rotta"; just below, in red chalk, "Michel Angli. B.F. / Roma".

*Comment: The erroneous inscriptions are clearly intended as statements of creation/production. As such, RDA requires that the Production Statement is based on the data therein. Corrections must be recorded in the Note on Production Statement. See: 2.7.2.3, 2.7.4.3, and 2.7.6.3.*

**Tooled case created by bookbinder Julia P. Wightman for holding a set of Beatrix Potter books**

New York, 1960.

Note: Lid is signed: "19JPW60"

	Transcribed	Recorded
Place	[New York]	New York
Name	JPW	Julia P. Wightman
Date	1960	1960
Note on Production Stmt.	Lid is signed: "19JPW60".	Lid is signed: "19JPW60".

**Ellen Fenton Diaries of Travels to Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1854-1862.**

The collection comprises diaries of Ellen Fenton chronicling her summer family vacations to Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1854-1862. Written primarily at Boulogne-sur-Mer, with a few entries written in London (or *en route*). Volume 1 bears an inscription with a strong sense of production information: "Mrs. Fenton / Haven Green House / Ealing / London".

	Transcribed	Recorded
Place	Haven Green House, Ealing, London  or  London	Boulogne-sur-Mer  or  Boulogne-sur-Mer London
Name	Mrs. Fenton	Ellen Fenton
Date	1854-1862	1854-1862
Note on Production Stmt.	The diaries were written primarily in Boulogne-sur-Mer.	Volume 1 is inscribed: "Mrs. Fenton, Haven Green House, Ealing, London." The diaries were written primarily in Boulogne-sur-Mer.

**Silver mug made for the christening of Thomas Gilchrist, 1812 or 1813**

The mug bears the following hallmarks: an unidentified maker's mark comprised of the letter 'S' alone; the leopard's head mark of origin, indicating manufacture in London; the date letter 'R', indicating manufacture in the year 1812-1813.

	Transcribed	Recorded
Place	[London]	London
Name	S	producer not identified
Date	R [1812-1813]	1812-1813
Note on Production Stmt.	The mug bears the following hallmarks: an unidentified maker's mark comprised of the letter 'S' alone; the leopard's head mark of origin, indicating manufacture in London; the date letter 'R', indicating manufacture in the year 1812-1813.	The mug bears the following hallmarks: an unidentified maker's mark comprised of the letter 'S' alone; the leopard's head mark of origin, indicating manufacture in London; the date letter 'R', indicating manufacture in the year 1812-1813.

*Comment: The leopard's head mark, indicating manufacture in London, is a symbol that cannot be reproduced with the facilities available. Transcribing it as "[London]" would be in the spirit of other examples given in the LC-PCC PS for 1.7.5.*

**Autograph letter describing the battle and British surrender at Yorktown, Virginia**

Note: Place of writing given as "Camp before York."

	Transcribed	Recorded
Place of Prod.	Camp before York	Near Yorktown, Virginia  Or  Yorktown, Virginia
Note on Production Stmt.	Written near Yorktown, Virginia.	Place of writing given as "Camp before York."

**Autograph letter, 1730**

Note: Date appears in autograph letter as 1703, but letter is signed using correspondent's married name; date of marriage was 1730.

	Transcribed	Recorded
Date of Prod.	1703	1730?
Note on Production Stmt.	Date appears in autograph letter as 1703, but letter is signed using correspondent's married name; date of marriage was 1730.	Date appears in autograph letter as 1703, but letter is signed using correspondent's married name; date of marriage was 1730.