

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

**Subject: Priority order for additions to authorized access points representing a person
(Revision of RDA 9.19)**

CCC thanks the British Library for exploring this issue. CCC cautiously supports this proposal and provides thoughts about the effects of this change elsewhere in 9.19 as well as at 10.11 and 11.13. We do not support ALA's response requesting that dates be given priority over other elements. The composition and order of elements in authorized access points can become a policy determined by agencies and co-operative organizations. This would allow cataloguers' judgment to be employed to determine which addition will most effectively identify the person. The best addition might not always be the date.

Both 0.6 and 8.3 give agencies the choice whether to record core elements as elements and/or as part of the access point. Any preference for one addition over another in 9.19 runs contrary to the liberty already provided in RDA. Agencies, or co-operative organizations, can decide upon their own policies for the composition of authorized access points.

In CCC's discussions we pondered whether retaining instructions in 9.19 that prescribe the position of one element relative to another (9.19.1.2.1, 9.19.1.2.2, 9.19.1.2.3, 9.19.1.2.4, 9.19.1.2.5, 9.19.1.2.6, 9.19.1.4 Option, 9.19.2.3) is consistent with the spirit of 6JSC/BL/20. An effort to remove the priority order from 9.19 could be cause to examine those instructions as well as 10.11 and 11.13.

Consideration could be given as to whether titles of royalty, titles of nobility and titles of religious rank are truly additions to names or are they in some sense part of the name. We also note that 9.19.1.2 is not like the other additions. In short, we realize that while 9.19 is not perfect, changes made here have far-reaching impacts on authority files and catalogues.