

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC Representative to the JSC
Subject: Undifferentiated name indicator: discrepancy between RDA Element Set View and RDA instructions

Following are my responses to the CCC rep proposal, along with some additional responses to issues raised in *6JSC/CCC rep/1/LC rep response* and *6JSC/CCC rep/1/ALA rep response*.

1. Correct the Element Set View to remove undifferentiated name indicator as an attribute of family and corporate body, and rename the element undifferentiated personal name indicator.

I agree to make these changes to the element set view to remove the discrepancy between it and the instructions.

2. In addition, changes are required to RDA instructions to align with the element set:

• change the name of the element to undifferentiated personal name indicator (at RDA instruction and glossary)

I agree to make this change to the RDA instructions so that the name of the element matches its coverage.

• move the instructions pertaining to undifferentiated name indicator which currently exist at 8.11 to a new instruction 9.19.

• renumber current 9.19 instructions to 9.20.

• change references from 9.19 to 9.20 throughout chapter 8 and chapter 9

• delete last paragraph of 8.6; i.e., If none of the specified additions can be readily ascertained, designate the name as an undifferentiated name (see 8.11).

• delete last paragraph of 10.10.1.1; i.e., If no suitable addition is available, use the same access point for all families with the same name.

Alternatively, to avoid the disruption of renumbering and correcting references, the current instructions could remain at 8.11.

I would prefer the alternative as it is the least disruptive option in the short term, given that there are unresolved issues in relation to this element. When those issues are resolved the element should be placed as appropriate, i.e. in chapter 9 if it is only to be applied to personal names, or in chapters 8, 9, 10, 11 if its use is to be expanded.

Although RDA has new elements which make it less likely that access points will remain undifferentiated, there will remain times when differentiation is not possible. In these cases the option to indicate that the access point is undifferentiated is valuable to the cataloguer, and may at times even have value to catalogue users.

Also, in the future it may also be possible for systems to use this element to identify names for searching against bibliographic data and/or other sources for names, and returning information which would allow differentiation to occur.

I would also therefore appreciate a proposal to allow the use of this indicator for families and corporate bodies.

Issues raised in *6JSC/CCC rep/1/LC rep response* and *6JSC/CCC rep/1/ALA rep response*

- **Undifferentiated access points for expressions**

I note that *6JSC/CCC rep/1/LC rep response* also suggests using an undifferentiated name for expressions, but in that case it would be used when a conscious decision was made not to further differentiate. This raises questions of whether the access point is identifying a distinct abstract thing, the expression, or whether it is simply a useful collective title for manifestations sharing certain characteristics.

We need to explore these issues and the appropriateness of using an undifferentiated name indicator in these circumstances; therefore I would welcome a formal LC proposal to allow constituency discussion.

- **Overall policy on future insertions**

I agree that this issue needs discussion, and welcome the suggestion by the ALA rep regarding persistent citation.

- **Procedures for updating related documents**

I agree with the ALA rep suggestion to document this.

- **Application of the undifferentiated personal name indicator**

I would welcome a formal ALA proposal on this matter to allow constituency discussion.