To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative

Subject: Revision of RDA 11.2.2: Heads of State and Heads of Government

LC thanks ALA for this revision and offers the following responses to the discussion topics:

a. Regarding generic vs. gender-specific terms, ACOC offered additional language, but we believe that this was based on the assumption that the name was being recorded in the language of the jurisdiction. LC, on the other hand, strongly preferred generic terms for the title of the office. The third paragraph of the revised 11.2.2.21.1 does this. Does JSC agree?

LC agrees.

b. In the third paragraph of the revised 11.2.2.21.1 ("If the title varies …"), John Hostage asks whether the instruction should read "If the title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data varies …" because the title in the official language of the jurisdiction may not vary. It seems to me that the first paragraph of 11.2.2.21.1 makes it clear that the title is recorded in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, and that it is unnecessary to repeat this in subsequent instructions. Does JSC agree?

LC feels it is not necessary to add more words, so we agree with Attig.

c. In the same paragraph, John noted that it is often difficult to determine the title for a head of government, particularly as the resource being described is likely to contain the title only in the official language of the jurisdiction. The literal English translation of *Bundeskanzler* and *Bundeskanzlerin* is *Federal Chancellor*, and that English equivalent is used on the official website (http://www.bundeskanzlerin.de/Webs/BK/En/homepage/home.html); *Chancellor* is often used as a short form, but literary warrant for that might be more difficult to find. My sense is that this is an application issue, and that RDA need not provide further guidance on how to determine the equivalent in another language. Does JSC agree?

LC agrees.

d. ACOC suggested using an English example for the titles that vary with the gender of the incumbent, and suggested the heading for the current British monarch. My original intention was to include the following headings for both a king (George I), a queen (Elizabeth II), and a joint incumbent (William and Mary):

Great Britain. Sovereign (1714–1727 : George I)

United Kingdom. Sovereign (1952– : Elizabeth II)

England and Wales. Sovereign (1689–1694 : William and Mary)

Unfortunately, Adam Schiff informs me, because of complications in the implementation of headings for Great Britain and the United Kingdom in the NACO authority file, the Examples Group — with JSC approval — determined not to include examples for these jurisdictions in RDA. Although I believe that this situation ought to be resolved, I have also avoided the issue, by using the examples of Charles II as King of Scotland, and Mary Stuart as Queen of Scotland; I believe that the heading for William and Mary may be used. Which headings does JSC wish to include in the third paragraph of 11.2.2.21.1?

LC would prefer fewer examples here, and we feel the England and Wales example is not needed. We are doing an LC Policy Statement (LCPS) to indicate continued use of Great Britain, following BL's preference.

e. It was not clear from the JSC discussion whether the preferred name for ruling executive bodies (proposed RDA 11.2.2.21.2) should be recorded in the language preferred by the agency creating the data or in the official language of the jurisdiction. Because of the variety of designations for ruling executive bodies and the lack of commonly-used generic terms, we are recommending that the name be recorded in the official language of the jurisdiction. Does JSC agree? If not, what English equivalents would you recommend for the examples given in 11.2.2.21.2?

LC agrees to be consistent with other corporate bodies in using the language of jurisdiction.