

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Christine Frodl, DNB Representative
Subject: Revision of 9.8.1.3, 9.9.1.3, 9.10.1.3, 9.11.1.3, 10.5.1.3, 11.3.1.3, 11.13.1.3, 16.2.2.4, 16.2.2.9.2, B.1, B.11 to eliminate use of abbreviations for places

DNB thanks BL for this proposal. We agree with the proposal in general.

Changes 1.1-1.6:

Geographic names should be formed in an identical way, wherever they appear. This means that place names should always follow the rules in chapter 16, regardless of whether they appear e.g. as the place of birth of a person or the place of a conference.

This is a general principle which is quite natural in a linked authority file: In the German authority file GND, there are already links e.g. from the record for a person to the record for the place where he or she was born, or from the record for a conference to the town where it has taken place. This already results in identical forms for a place name wherever it is used.

We believe that the principle is also not in conflict with the German proposal for recording information about larger places as separate elements, e.g. in the form of a code (6JSC/DNB/2).

Therefore, we agree with the proposed deletion of the sentence "Abbreviate the names of countries, states, provinces, territories, etc., as instructed in appendix B (B.11), as applicable" in the chapters for which this has been proposed (changes 1.1-1.6).

We suggest that this should also be done in 6.5.1.3 Recording Place of Origin of the Work, which seems to have been overlooked.

Changes 1.7-1.10:

We agree to delete section B. 11.

For some countries, an abbreviated form is the one which will have to be determined as the preferred name according to the rules in 16.2.2. For example, according to German usage, the preferred name for the United States of America has been ascertained as "USA", therefore we do not agree with a general interdiction to use abbreviations.

1.7 Change: On page 9 it must read "Puerto Rico" instead of "Puerto Rica"

Change 2:

We agree with the proposed changes.

It should be noted that this will lead to subsequent adaptations of examples at other instructions, e.g. in the second examples box at 11.13.1.1. Here, the result would be double parentheses instead of a comma:

National and Household Food Security Workshop (2003 : Lusaka, (Zambia))

European Society for Neurochemistry. Meeting (11th : 1996 : Groningen, (Netherlands))

General remark:

Example at p.15 (Normandy): We think that using parentheses is a display topic. We regard it as not user-friendly to use parentheses, a comma might be clearer. Although there is agreement to this proposal, this does not affect our DNB proposal 6JSC/DNB/2.