

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative
Subject: Elimination of RDA treatment for 'names not conveying the idea of ...'

In general ACOC accepts that the changes proposed by the Library of Congress to eliminate treatment of 'names not conveying the idea of ...' will simplify the cataloguing process.

We are uncertain what effect the proposed changes have on the user of the catalogue. The addition of terms in these circumstances assists in the identification of the described entity. This requirement is not met if we remove the 11.13.1.2 instruction to add a suitable designation. The name of the element and/or the coding may be sufficient identification for the cataloguer, but it is of minimal assistance to the catalogue user. We suggest that user testing may be desirable before making this change.

In addition to this general concern, ACOC has the following comments on this proposal:

1. 0.6.4 [Core elements] Section 3: Recording Attributes of Person, Family, and Corporate body

No specific comments.

2. 8.3 Core elements

No specific comments.

3. 9.15 Field of Activity of the Person

No specific comments.

4. 9.16 Profession or Occupation

No specific comments.

5. 9.19.1.2 Title or Other Designation Associated with the Person

No specific comments.

6. 11.7 Other Designation Associated with the Corporate Body

No specific comments.

7. 11.7.1.4 Names not Conveying the Idea of a Corporate Body

8. 11.7.1.5 Type of Jurisdiction

No specific comments.

9. 11.7.1.6 Other Designation

The two 'Niagara' examples from 11.13.1.2 could be moved here.

10. 11.13.1.1 General Guidelines on Constructing Authorized Access Points to Represent Corporate Bodies

It is not clear why the two 'Fusion' examples have been deleted completely. Applying the suggested revised instructions we would expect them to be revised as follows:

Fusion (Brighton, England)
Fusion (Chichester, England)

It is not clear why the 'Elizabeth' example would be unchanged. Applying the suggested revised instructions we would expect it to be revised as follows:

Elizabeth (1846-1855)

11. 11.13.1.2 Addition to a Name not Conveying the Idea of a Corporate Body

The two 'Niagara' examples could be moved to 11.7.1.5 Other designation.

12. Renumbering 11.13.1.3-11.13.1.8

No specific comments.

13. 11.13.2.1 General Guidelines on Constructing Variant Access Points to Represent Corporate Bodies

These examples would need to be deleted. They would not be applicable under 11.7.1.5 Other designation as alternatively suggested.

14. E.1.1.1 Presentation of Access Points

No specific comments.

15. E.1.2.4 Access Points Representing Corporate Bodies

No specific comments.

16. Index entries

No specific comments.

17. Related examples

ACOC notes that there are indeed a number of examples under other instructions which would require changes to remove the additions currently specified under 11.13.1.2.