

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

Thanks to Marg for compiling our thoughts on this topic and the corrections needed in RDA. The following are my responses and further suggestions.

1. Daniel Paradis, member of CCC, identified a discrepancy between the Element Set View and the RDA instructions for *undifferentiated name indicator*. In the Element Set View, *undifferentiated name indicator* is given as an attribute of person, family and corporate body. However, according to RDA instruction 8.11, *undifferentiated name indicator* applies only to persons.

This discrepancy was discussed by the JSC during its Nov. 15th teleconference. It was agreed that the Element Set View should be corrected to remove *undifferentiated name indicator* as an attribute of family and corporate body. It is further recommended that the element be renamed *undifferentiated personal name indicator*.

I agree.

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.

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

No, leave positioned as is (follow your “Alternative” below). The wording in 8.11 scope and instructions is only for personal names, so I think it should not matter if we leave it in chapter 8 rather than moving to chapter 9 with all the resulting renumbering.

- renumber current 9.19 instructions to 9.20.

Not needed if follow above suggestion. It should not matter that we have this information in chapter 8 rather than 9.

- change references from 9.19 to 9.20 throughout chapter 8 and chapter 9
- Same response as above – don’t change. Leave the information in chapter 8.

- 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).*

OK.

- 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.*

OK.

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

Yes, per above.

We can expect in the future to have changes that not only impact RDA but will ripple out to related documentation, so I'd prefer to establish an overall policy for future insertions and deletions soon. We could restructure RDA as it now stands to build in buffers, so it is more amenable to expansion, but that would have a very negative ripple effect on other related documentation. We could give up the linear flow and just add new information at the end of an existing area and allow gaps in the numbers when we need to remove something. Other better options?

It also occurs to me that we could have undifferentiated names for expressions, like the music practice of using a more "generic" authorized access point to collocate various expressions of a musical work rather than make the expression data more unique to the resource being described. Do we want to go down that path for expressions? Perhaps, consider adding wording (perhaps an alternative) at RDA 6.27.3, 6.28.3, etc., about not always differentiating one expression from another. Actually, in 6.28.3, there isn't an instruction that says to differentiate one arrangement from another or one vocal score from another; BYU has done so by adding the 6.27.3 instruction on top of the 6.28.3 instruction, but there isn't anything in 6.28.3 that says to do that for the categories of music expressions covered at 6.28.3.

BYU is also making the same additions in subfield \$s for literary expressions, because 6.27.3 does include the instruction to give "a term indicating another distinguishing characteristic of the expression." So, it is an inconsistency in RDA not to allow the same level of specificity for all resources. 6.29.2 for legal expressions sends the cataloger to the general instruction at 6.27.3. 6.30.3 has specialized additions for certain categories (akin to 6.28.3) but some of the specified additions are those in the general instruction at 6.27.3. So, the only constant is inconsistency. This result is due to continuing the current practice because the various constituencies were not convinced -- or not approached -- to change current practice to be consistent in the outcome.