6JSC/LC/3/Chair follow-up/1
26 September 2011

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Danskin, Chair, JSC

Subject: 6JSC/LC/3: Elimination of RDA treatment for "names not conveying the idea of …"

The following comments have been received from the National Library of New Zealand.

To: Alan Danskin, Chair of the JSC

From: National Library of New Zealand

Subject: 6JSC/LC/3: Elimination of RDA treatment for "names not conveying the idea of…"

National Library of New Zealand sees the LC proposal as a simplification of the cataloguing process and supporting the need for disambiguation of names. However we are concerned about the apparent reliance on encoding formats and record displays as mechanisms for indicating the nature of an entity represented by a name, where the name alone does not supply this information.

We would like to see *Profession or occupation* and *Field of activity* retained as core elements for persons whose name consists of a phrase or appellation not conveying the idea of a person in RDA rules 0.6.4, 8.3, 9.15 and 9.16. In this respect we do not support the LC proposal. However we do support the proposed change to rule 9.19.1.2; that *Profession or occupation etc.* is no longer a *required addition* to the name of a person whose name consists of a phrase etc. that doesn't convey the idea of a person. We suggest that recording the Profession … and *Field of activity* means that this information is available to be used as an addition should it become necessary to distinguish between two persons of the same name.

We suggest the approach for corporate bodies should be the same as that for personal names. Information identifying the nature of the body be retained as a core element, but only used in the construction of an access point representing the body if there are two or more bodies with the same or similar names.

In summary:

Change 1 – no
Change 2 – no
Change 3 – no
Change 4 – no
Change 5 – yes
Change 6 – no
Change 7 – no
Change 8 – no
Change 9 - no
Change 10 – change examples as suggested by ACOC in *6JSC/LC/3/ACOC response (draft)*
Change 11 – yes
Change 12 - yes