

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the JSC

SUBJECT: RDA: Resource Description and Access sections 2-4 and 9: Constituency review of December 2007 draft: additional comments

Some comments were inadvertently omitted from the ALA response dated March 28, 2008. With apologies, they are included below.

► **11.0.1.1, footnote 1.** There needs to be a place other than a footnote for a formal definition of the entity that is the focus of the chapter; if a definition is given prominently for every element in RDA, then surely there should be an equally prominent definition for the entities. The “Purpose and scope” should *first* give such a definition, and *then* describe the nature of the guidelines and instructions included in the chapter.

11.0.2.1 point c). It is not clear why the phrase “other sources (including reference sources)” needs to include the parenthetical phrase, much less the definition given in the footnote. The mention of sources should not need to distinguish reference sources, and that the sources deal with a corporate body in this context can surely go without saying. ALA recommends “other sources” or “any other source”.

11.1.1.3.2 and 11.1.1.4.2. The addition of a place name does not seem to relate to any “understanding of the nature or purpose of the body”. Rather, it assists in the *identification* of the body. ALA suggests the following change to 11.1.1.3.2, with a comparable change to 11.1.1.4.2:

Optional addition. Add the name of the place associated with the body if the addition assists in the ~~understanding of the nature or purpose~~ identification of the body.

11.1.1.3.4. It is not clear how specific the name should be in identifying the place in which the entity is located. For example, in the example “Bharatiya Temple of Lansing”, is the location “clear from the name itself” when in fact there are places named Lansing in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, or New York? It might be more helpful to use the name of a larger jurisdiction in this case, e.g., “Bharatiya Temple of Lansing (Mich.)”. However, this particular example is problematic in itself, since the temple is actually located in Haslett, Michigan; so the access point should be “Bharatiya Temple of Lansing (Haslett, Mich.)”.

11.1.1.4. AACR2 rule 24.4C5 included the instruction: “Give the name of the institution in the form and language used for it as a heading.” ALA suggests that 11.1.1.4 include such an instruction, e.g., “Record the name of the institution in the same form used as a preferred access point for that institution.”

11.1.1.4.1. This instruction is essentially the same as AACR2 24.4C5. However, while traditional practice has been to exercise cataloguer judgment on choice of qualifier, a deficiency in the old rule’s wording is carried over into RDA. 11.1.1.3.7 says “If the name of an institution ... provides better identification ...” while 11.1.1.4.1 says nothing about better identification; the

AACR2 rule implies cataloguer judgment, but the RDA instruction seems more prescriptive. ALA suggests encouraging cataloger judgment by the following change:

Add the name of an institution instead of the local place name (see [11.1.1.3](#)) if the institution's name is commonly associated with the name of the body (see [11.7.0.6](#)) and such an addition is needed to distinguish would provide a more meaningful distinction between access points for two or more bodies that have the same name, or names so similar that they may be confused.

11.1.1.5.1. The instruction as stated does not appear to allow for use of dates instead of place or associated institution in a case where either place or institution would be sufficient for distinction but date(s) would provide better identification (see [11.1.1.3.7](#)). ALA suggests the following rewording:

If the name has been used by two or more bodies, add a date or dates associated with the body (see [11.5.2–11.5.3](#)) if the bodies ~~that~~ cannot be distinguished by place (see [11.1.1.3](#)) or associated institution (see [11.1.1.4](#)), ~~add a date or dates associated with the body (see [11.5.2–11.5.3](#))~~ or if the date provides better identification than the place or institution.

11.1.1.8. ALA is not convinced that it is necessary to use “conferences, etc.” There ought to be a definition of the term that could state what types of events are covered by the term “conference”, thus eliminating the need for the “etc.” This should apply throughout Chapter 11.

11.1.1.8.1. The instruction seems to imply that a date and a location must be included in the access point, whether or not they can be determined; we suggest adding “if known” to the instruction relating to those elements. Also, the referenced instruction for recording the location of the conference ([11.4.1](#)) seems to require a local place name, thus excluding names of institutions. This is a change from the instruction in AACR2 24.7B4 to give “the name of the local place or other location (institution, etc.) in which the conference, etc., was held.” There are instances where the name of an institution is more meaningful than the place, or where an institution name appears on the resource but no place name can be found. Catalogers should not be required to do research on where an institution is located in order to construct the access point for a conference. ALA recommends that this provision of AACR2 be reinstated here and in [11.4.1](#). The recommended rewording of points b) and c) of [11.1.1.8.1](#) would be:

- b) the date of the conference, ~~etc.~~ if known (see [11.5.1](#))
- c) the location of the conference, ~~etc.~~ (local place or institution, etc.), if known (see [11.4.1](#)).

11.1.1.8.3. ALA notes an inconsistency in treatment of dates vs. places in access points for conferences. If a date is a part of the name, it is repeated as an additional element; but if a place name is a part of the name, it is not used as an additional element. Furthermore, the form of the place name found within the name of the conference may not correspond to the form of name prescribed in chapter 16, and the place name may be in a foreign language that is not familiar to the user. What is a user to make of the apparent lack of consistency between the access points “International Conference on Idiotypes and Diseases (1986 : Venice, Italy)” and “Biennale di Venezia (51st : 2005)”, or between “Expo 2000 (2000 : Hannover, Germany)” and (hypothetical, yet clearly possible) “Venezia 2006 (2006)”? ALA recommends that [11.1.1.8.3](#) be deleted. If the instruction is retained, ALA recommends that it be reworded for clarity:

If the location is part of the name of the conference, ~~etc.~~, do not add it as an additional element recording the location of the conference.