

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Danskin, BL Representative

Subject: Priority order of additions to authorized access points representing a person (9.19.1.1, 9.19.1.5, 9.19.1.6)

BL thanks LC for its proposed revision to priority order of the additions to authorised access points representing a person.

BL strongly agrees with the proposal, with the following comments.

We suggest that the examples illustrate different practices, including the use of “active” following LCPS for 9.19.1.1 Giving Dates for Persons.

We think that it is possible that situations could arise where it is necessary to disambiguate more than 2 individuals with the same name. This is particularly the case for individuals who were active in the early modern period. In those situations it may be necessary to use both a term indicating period of activity and a term indicating profession or occupation. We therefore suggest a change to the proposed wording of 9.19.1.5 and 9.19.1.6

If none of the elements specified under [9.19.1.3 RDA](#) (date of birth and/or death) or [9.19.1.4 RDA](#) (fuller form of name) is available to distinguish one access point from another, **add a term** indicating period of activity of the person (see [9.3.4 RDA](#)) or a term indicating the class of persons engaged in the profession or occupation of the person (see 9.16). **If a single term is not sufficient for disambiguation, add both terms.**

9.19.1.6

If none of the elements specified under [9.19.1.3 RDA](#) (date of birth and/or death); or [9.19.1.4 RDA](#) (fuller form of name); or [9.19.1.5 RDA](#) (period of activity of the person) is available to distinguish one access point from another, **add a term** indicating the class of persons engaged in the profession or occupation of the person (see [9.16 RDA](#)) ^{2012/01} or a period of activity of the person (see 9.3.4). **a single term is not sufficient for disambiguation, add both terms**

BL notes that in discussion with EURIG concern was expressed about relaxing the instruction specifying the order of additions to the preferred name. BNF commented that a prescribed order promotes consistency within the catalogue and is easier to apply.

BL takes the view that, as the additions mandated by 9.19.1.5 and 9.19.1.6 are permitted only when date of birth/death or fuller form of name are not available, the impact is negligible and outweighed by additional flexibility.

