TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative

SUBJECT: Issues deferred until after the first release of RDA: ALA decisions

On January 16, 2010, the Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access reviewed the list of "Issues deferred until after the first release of RDA" (*5JSC/Sec/6/Rev*). Discussion concentrated on the issues that ALA had raised in responses to RDA drafts. The Committee confirmed their continued interest in most of the issues raised and indicated their priority. Several issues were identified as high priorities for CCDA; a number of liaisons also indicated priorities for their groups. Upon publication of RDA this summer, these groups will begin to develop proposals on the high-priority issues.

Note that there are a number of very broad questions raised by some of the issues. For example, the question of how RDA should treat "data about data" needs to be resolved before some of the issues can be addressed; other issues involve the development of RDA instructions for subject elements and relationships. ALA suggests that the Joint Steering Committee discuss these issues and provide a general framework for addressing them before the constituencies attempt to develop proposals.

RDA Chapter 2

Preferred source of information and collective title [p. 3]

Current RDA instruction number: 2.2.2

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:
> 2.2.2: add an instruction dealing with cases in which the application of the instructions would lead to a preferred source of information that only gives the titles of individual contents but no collective title, whereas another source (such as a container) does give a collective title. Preference should be given to a source that gives a collective title.
>
> 2.2.4: There is an apparent conflict with categories a) and b) in that 2.2.2.1 states that accompanying material and containers **are** a part of the resource. In the case of containers, the present instruction introduces the concept of whether or not the container is "an integral part of the resource" which was not present in 2.2.2.1. We would prefer not to make this distinction, but to treat all containers the same. If accompanying material and containers are retained in 2.2.4, we suggest that the latter be given the higher priority. This is based on current practice for describing sound recordings, where the box for a compact disc would be given preference over the accompanying program notes; we anticipate that this order of preference would also work for other types of material.

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer consideration until after the first release (Lines 140 and 150).

> **ALA decision:** High priority. The Music Library Association and the Online Audio-visual Catalogers have volunteered to work on this in collaboration.

Names of persons, families, and corporate bodies [p. 4]

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.1.5
AACR2 rule: 1.1B2

Discussed at October 2007 meeting: consider when a grammatical connection makes a name an integral part of the title (5JSC/M/199.4. See also 5JSC/CILIP/5/ALA response).

> **ALA decision:** Low priority. We suspect that this is something that needs to be left to the cataloger's judgment.

Use of full form of serial title over an acronym or initialism [p. 4]

Current RDA instruction number: 2.3.2.5
AACR2 rule: 12.1B2

At the April 2007 meeting the JSC agreed to discuss with the ISSN and ISBD communities whether this exception can be removed. (5JSC/M/137.11.1)
Note: See 5JSC/Chair/13 series.

> **ALA decision:** This has been resolved. We pass on to the JSC the following message from the IFLA liaison to CC:DA:
>
> > As a bit of background, representatives of the JSC, IFLA's ISBD(S) Working Group (now represented by the ISBD Review Group), and the ISSN Network met in 2000 to reach a harmonization agreement on issues of common concern. The results of the meeting can be found at
> > http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/isbdrg/harmonization-meeting_2000.pdf
> >
> > In 2008 the ISBD Review Group contacted the ISSN Network and the JSC to see if the exception for continuing resources could be removed.
> >
> > In an email of 21 Oct. 2008 to Elena Escolano Rodríguez, chair of ISBD Review Group, and Marg Stewart, chair of the JSC, Alain Roucolle of the ISSN International Centre replied that the ISSN Network would continue to use the exception in the ISSN Manual, 5.2.1.3 <http://www.issn.org/2-23364-ISSN-Manual.php>
> >
> > On 12 Jan. 2009, Ms. Stewart wrote to Ms. Escolano Rodríguez that the JSC preferred to retain the exception in RDA (5JSC/Chair/13/Chair follow-up)
> >
> > The ISBD Review Group decided not to pursue the idea of removing the exception.
> >
> > John Hostage, representative from IFLA

RDA Chapter 6

Initial articles [p. 8]

Current RDA instruction number: 6.2.1.7
AACR2 rule: 25.2C

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 5.5.4. Here and elsewhere, ALA believes that the instruction to omit the initial article is a simplistic solution that conceals the point of the instruction. If the objective is to support sorting on the element following the article, then the instruction should be to encode the title so that the initial article is not used in sorting. Omitting the article as instructed is only one way to accomplish this, and it supports the desired sorting at the expense of other functionality, such as display of the title as found

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/CILIP response:
> CILIP again notes that the omission of initial articles can sometimes cause grammatical non-sense in inflected languages (e.g., E.T.A. Hoffman's *Der goldne Topf*: if "Der" were omitted, the phrase should grammatically read *Goldner Topf*).

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. We feel that this issue needs to be addressed by constituencies that use inflected languages. We would prefer a solution that involves the encoding conventions and would allow the data to be recorded as found.

Content type [p. 9]

Current RDA instruction number: 6.9 (6.10 in full draft)

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 6.11.0.3.3. ALA strongly recommends that the use of commonly-used terms be allowed when none of the terms in the list applies.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 74 (wiki Priority 5).
Comment in wiki from Editor: Compliance with the RDA/ONIX Framework requires the use of specified terms that are defined in relation to the attributes and values in the Framework. Status: Follow-up maintenance of agreed values with ONIX.

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. This comment is too general to act upon; specific instances will need to be proposed as changes to the RDA/ONIX Framework.

Musical works [p. 10]

Current RDA instruction numbers: Chapter 6

Continue working on the instructions for musical works.

-- Internationalize the approach to musical works in RDA so as to reduce, if not eliminate, Western bias.

-- Clarify the situations of music whose medium of performance, form, text, etc., is intended to change with each performance.

-- Clarify the approach to adaptations and arrangements and when modifications to a musical work results in a new work.

-- Confirm the status of "suites" in FRBR: parts of works as now in RDA or expressions?

-- 6.16.0.6.1 (in 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up) [6.16.1.6 in full draft]: Remove alternative terms from list.

-- Replace term "concerto-like works" with "concertos and concerto-like works."

JSC reference: Proposed by the LC representative February 2009. Note: more issues may be added to this list in the future.

> **ALA decision:** Medium/High priority. The Music Library Association proposes to work on the following specific instructions:
>   a)   6.14. Preferred title for musical works
>   b)   6.15: Large instrumental ensembles; sequence within medium of performance statements
>   c)   6.27–6.28: Access points for musical works; specifically, arrangers and adapters as creators of musical works, and the case in which the composer and librettist are the same person [see also below]
>
> Further, the Association for Recorded Sound Collections has identified these issues as priorities:
>   a)   Adaptations and arrangements
>   b)   Internationalization of approach to musical works

Bible – Apocrypha [p. 10]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.23.2.6; 6.23.2.9.4
AACR2 rules: 25.18A14; 25.18A5

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 6.29.2.1 We would also like to see the distinction between Apocryphal books (6.29.2) and the Old Testament Apocrypha (6.29.7.4) made explicit through references and language describing the difference. One respondent suggested that "Apocrypha" be treated as the preferred title of the group of writings that are the subject of 6.29.7.4, but that the writings referred to in 6.29.2 be characterized only as "non-canonical" (with appropriate identification of the canons from which they have been excluded).

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 399 (wiki Priority 5)

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. The issue is to be referred to the American Theological Library Association, Association of Jewish Libraries, and the Catholic Library Association.

Bible – Year [pp. 10/11]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.24.1.4
AACR2 rule: 25.18A13

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 6.32.0.4. There seems to be no reason to limit these guidelines to the Bible and parts of the Bible. The alternative seems a reasonable addition to the general instructions on date of expression (6.12); if this were done, 6.32 would not be required at all.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 422 (wiki Priority 2). From wiki discussion: Different results from instructions: 6.12: date or dates; 6.32: only earliest date. Also 6.12 says date of creation but 6.32 is date of publication.

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. The issue is to be referred to the American Theological Library Association, Association of Jewish Libraries, and the Catholic Library Association.

Other distinguishing characteristics of the expression of a religious work [p. 11]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.25.1.3
AACR2 rules: 25.18A11 and 25.18A12

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 6.31.0.3. We believe that there is no compelling reason to limit the guidelines in 6.31.0.4 to the Bible and parts of the Bible; if applicable, they could be extremely useful for all sacred scriptures.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 417 (wiki Priority 2)

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. The issue is to be referred to the American Theological Library Association, Association of Jewish Libraries, and the Catholic Library Association.

Bible – Version [p. 11]

Current RDA instruction number: 6.25.1.4
AACR2 rule: 25.18A11

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 6.31.0.4.1 and 6.31.0.4.2. We question whether the numerical limitations [e.g., to three or more languages or two translations, etc.] in these instructions are appropriate. In the case of number of languages, this would only apply to a single expression in three or more languages (each expression present in a manifestation being treated separately); we see no reason not to give the version in such a case. Similarly, in the case of translators, the limitation to record only one or two names seems arbitrary.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 418 (wiki Priority 2).

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. The issue is to be referred to the American Theological Library Association, Association of Jewish Libraries, and the Catholic Library Association.

When Composer and Librettist are the same [pp. 11/12]

RDA instruction number: 6.27

This issue was raised during the final edit for the first release:

For works where the composer and librettist are the same, the access point for the libretto and the opera will be the same, e.g.,

> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron

To make the access points distinctive, a distinguishing characteristic of the work is added in both cases (instruction 6.27.1.9 for the libretto and instruction 6.28.1.12 for the opera), e.g.,

> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron (Opera)
> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron (Libretto)

Following the new 6.27.4.2 the variant access for the Libretto would then be:

> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron (Opera). Libretto

The issue for consideration after the first release is whether qualification of the access point for the opera is desirable, as it would be a change from AACR2 naming practices. Such a change would affect all of Richard Wagner's operas, for example.

If the JSC decides not to qualify the access point for the opera, that would create a different issue of the variant access point for a libretto written by the composer being very similar to the authorized access point:

> Authorized access point:
> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron (Libretto)

> Variant access point:
> Schoenberg, Arnold, 1874-1951. Moses und Aron. Libretto

> **ALA decision:** Medium priority. The Music Library Association has volunteered to prepare a proposal.

Use of "Lyrics" and "Texts" [pp. 12/13]

RDA instruction number: new 6.27.4.2

During the final edit, Adam Schiff raised the following question about a new example:
John, Elton. Songs. Texts. Selections
Authorized access point for the compilation: Taupin, Bernie. Lyrics. Selections

In that example the term "Texts" is used in the variant access point, while the term "Lyrics" is used in the authorized access point. I don't understand why they would be different. Shouldn't "Lyrics" be used in both? It's not clear to me whether the two terms are equivalent. Are there instances where a text to a musical work that isn't a libretto would not be able to be called lyrics? If indeed they really have different meanings, then in 6.27.4.2.1 c) I would think Lyrics needs to be added.

Kathy Glennan provided some additional information:

I can see how we came up with the current example (the use of "texts" in the variant access point parallels AACR2 practice in creating the uniform title; using "lyrics" must have seemed more representational when we proposed the new authorized access point for Taupin).

In AACR2 practice, using "texts" as part of the uniform title for a selection of texts from Elton John's songs is relatively unambiguous, since he is known as a composer/performer. However, following RDA and using "texts" to represent a selection of song texts by someone primarily known as a writer creates more ambiguity -- texts of what? Presumably the author of the words wrote other works that could have this element as part of the authorized access point for a compilation. The use of "lyrics" is clearer, but I don't think that "texts" and "lyrics" are synonymous. The 3rd definition of "lyric" in the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music* says, "Lyrics [pl.]. The words of a popular song or number from a musical comedy." Thus, a compilation of poetry by Friedrich Ruckert used as song texts by Mahler would not include "lyrics" in the authorized access point. However, this raises a new question -- in that made-up example, would the authorized access point use "Poems" instead of "Texts"?

I would like to note that it was quite difficult to find the Elton John/Bernie Taupin example, which was part of the joint ALA/CCC proposals for Chapter 6. I specifically looked for a compilation of song texts by a single writer set by a single composer, and this was about all I found. Not surprisingly, it is much more common for a publication to compile song texts associated with a single composer than with a single writer.

The JSC Chair said that the issue would need to be dealt with after the first release.

> **ALA decision:** High priority. The Music Library Association has volunteered to prepare a proposal.

Reports of one court [pp. 13/14]

Current RDA instruction number: 6.29.1.21
AACR2 rule: 21.36A1

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

6.23.1.20. Based on recommendations from the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), ALA believes that the instructions for court reports are in need of revision. They reflect historical practice that would be very difficult for contemporary catalogers to follow, since it requires knowledge of the "accepted legal citation practice in the country where the court is located." Whether or not the reports are issued by or under the authority of the court is also difficult to determine (the same publisher may be authorized in some years and not authorized in other

years). We believe that the court should always be the primary access point, since reports are the decisions of the court, and the decisions are created by the court. AALL made this recommendation in response to the call in 2005 for revision to the rules for special materials in Chapter 21 of AACR2. We propose the following substitution for the current 6.23.1.20 (the remainder of the instruction would be deleted):

6.23.1.20	**Reports of one court**

6.23.1.20.1	➢ For law reports of one court, construct the preferred access point representing the work ~~as instructed below~~ <u>by combining:</u>
	
	    a) the preferred access point for the court, formulated according to the instructions given under <u>11.1.1</u>
	    b) the preferred title for the reports, formulated according to the instructions given under <u>6.24</u>.

On the other hand, ALA is sympathetic to the significance of this change and would support a decision to retain the instructions in the current draft and revisit the issue after the initial release of RDA.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 372 (wiki Priority 2)

> **ALA decision:** Referred to the American Association of Law Libraries for action.

Date of signing of a treaty [p. 14]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.29.1.33, 6.29.3.2

During the final edit, Adam Schiff raised the following issue:

> 6.29.1.33 says on p. 245: "If the access point for a compilation of treaties, etc., is constructed using the collective name for the treaties, etc. ... add the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing (see 6.21.3)." and on p. 247: "If the access point for a single treaty is constructed using the name by which the treaty is known, add the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing (see 6.21.3)."
>
> And 6.29.3.2 also has an instruction to add to the title for a treaty, etc. the year of signing (I also note it does not say "year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing" like the instructions above do)
>
> When you go to 6.21.3, there is no provision to record just a year by itself for the date of signing of a treaty. 6.21.3.3 says to record the date in the form: year, name of month, number of the day. If only a year is needed in either authorized or variant access points, can it be pulled out of 6.21.3.3? Or does there need to be an exception of some sort to record just a year in that element? There will be many instances where the complete date of signing is used in the authorized access point but only the year in some of the variant access points.

The Editor sent the following response to the Editorial Team:

> My response would be that in this case, as in others, what gets added in an authorized or variant access point may differ from what is recorded in the RDA element that corresponds to that addition, simply because the idiosyncrasies of access point construction have been retained in the

RDA guidelines on constructing access points, whereas an attempt has been made to normalize the way an element is recorded as an element per se. I really don't think we can try to accommodate all of those idiosyncrasies by adding exceptions to the instructions on recording elements. Certainly not at this stage, anyway.

If you agree, I will leave the instructions as they are and assume that any manipulation or suppression of the data recorded in an RDA element would be done by the cataloguer, or by a program, when that element is used as an addition in an access point and the instructions on constructing the access point differ from what is recorded in the corresponding element.

JSC may want to add this to a list of issues to be addressed after the first release.

> **ALA decision:** High priority, but this is a particular instance of the more general question relating to data to be recorded in an element vs. data to be included in an access point. ALA prefers to await some general guidance from the JSC as to how to deal with the general issue before preparing specific proposals.

Expressions of religious works [p. 15]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 6.30.3
AACR2 rules: 25.18A10; 25.18A11; 25.18A12; 25.18A13

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 6.28.3. ALA suggests that it would be useful to generalize these instructions to include all sacred scriptures. One respondent indicated that his institution has had to adapt these instructions to cover the Book of Mormon and its various expressions, and notes that this work has all the characteristics of the Bible (complex publication history, multiple expressions in innumerable languages, facsimile reproductions, etc.); it is surely not unique among non-Biblical sacred scriptures in this regard.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 392 (wiki Priority 2)

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. The issue is to be referred to the American Theological Library Association, Association of Jewish Libraries, and the Catholic Library Association.

RDA Chapter 7

Type of illustrations [p. 16]

Current RDA instruction number: 7.15
AACR2 rule: 2.5C

From 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapter 3/Rev/ALA response:
4.9 Illustrative content

Ironically, the scope statement in 4.9.0.1 does not limit illustrations to graphic images; audio and video clips might be considered to "illustrate" an audio or video lecture, for example. Should this element be limited to the sort of graphic illustrative matter typically appearing in printed texts (which was the origin of this element in AACR chapter 2) or should a broader approach to illustrative matter be taken? If the scope is to be narrow, the definition in 4.9.0.1 needs to be revised.

Discussed at April 2008 meeting (5JSC/M/239.34). There is no limitation on the scope of the element, but ALA may wish to extend the list at 7.15.1.3 after the first release.

> **ALA decision:** Low priority. The issue is to be referred to the Online Audio-visual Catalogers for consideration.

RDA Chapter 8

Spacing of initials and acronyms [p. 17]
Current RDA instruction number: 8.5.6
AACR2 rule: 24.1A

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 8.5.5. ALA sees no compelling for reason for RDA to follow the current AACR2 approach of having separate conventions for personal vs. corporate names when it comes to spacing of initials and acronyms. Although we are not convinced that such spacing issues matter, we recommend a consistent approach. We have no strong preference between the alternatives.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 464 (wiki Priority 2)

> **ALA decision:** Defer. Although we don't like the inconsistency, the current instructions yield the desired results for indexing and sorting. Additional testing is needed, in the hope that improved machine processing may resolve the issue.

RDA Chapter 9

Change of name [p. 17]
Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.7
AACR2 rule: 22.2C

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 9.2.3. There is considerable support within ALA for adopting the same instruction regarding change of name as applies to corporate bodies. This is particularly true because of the instructions at 9.2.4 to treat variations of name as separate identities.

This instruction should explicitly address the issue of a person's change of name once they have established an identity under an earlier name (cf. 11.2.1.5a.1 footnote 6). This suggests that in practice the distinction between a change of name and separate identities may not be sustainable.

Discussed at April 2008 meeting (5JSC/M/240.6), the JSC agreed that this issue could be pursued by ALA after the first release.

ALA decision: Medium priority. Although ALA would prefer to simplify the instruction and make it consistent, it is not clear which practice we would prefer to change. This needs further consideration.

Surname as first element [p. 18]

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.2.9
AACR2 rule: 22.5A1

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 9.2.5.1.3. Many ALA respondents felt that the need to determine an initial element in the name for sorting purposes was the result of limitations on our encoding schemas. They feel that this is an opportunity to define data elements with sufficient granularity to support a variety of sorting and display options.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 531 and 532 (wiki Priority 2). From status column for line 532: Preferred name of person as a single element (forename, surname, etc., not defined as separate elements or sub-elements). Defer issue until after first release.

ALA decision: No priority assigned. ALA is not interested in pursuing this issue at this time.

Name that consists of a phrase/Additions to names [p. 18]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.2.2.9; 9.2.2.22; 9.2.2.23
AACR2 rule: 22.11A; 22.11B; 22.15A;

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 9.2.5.4, 9.2.18.2 and 9.2.19.2. The distinction between these situations has never been clear. Making the distinction violates the principles of Consistency and Common usage. ALA urges that these cases be treated the same; we prefer to record the name in direct order.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 538 (wiki Priority 2)

ALA decision: Medium priority. ALA will develop a proposal.

Language and script for Alternative linguistic form of name [p. 20]

Current RDA instruction number: 9.2.3.9

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 9.3.6. ALA recommends that here and in the similar sections for other types of entities the language or script should be recorded. That would allow a computer to select those that are appropriate for a given user. This would be *data about data*, and may need to be added to a list to be developed after the initial release of RDA.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 614 (wiki Priority 2). Comment in wiki from Editor: Encoding script for a literal value may be a problem for RDF-compliant schema.

> **ALA decision:** High priority. However, ALA believes that a general approach to the "data about data" question needs to be developed by the JSC before it is fruitful to develop proposals on specific issues. ALA suggests that the JSC consider timing and guidelines for such a general approach.

Recording of month and day in date of birth [p. 20]

Current RDA instruction number: 9.3.2.3
AACR2 rule: 22.17

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:

> 9.3.2.3: No reason to limit recording of month and day to when the name is identical to that of another. Move all such artificial limitations to the instructions on constructing access points.

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer consideration until after the first release (Line 785). It was noted that there are problems with removing the restriction because use of the elements in access points.

> **ALA decision:** High priority, but this is a particular instance of the more general question relating to data to be recorded in an element vs. data to be included in an access point. ALA prefers to await some general guidance from the JSC as to how to deal with the general issue before preparing specific proposals.

Field of Activity and Profession/Occupation [p. 21]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 9.15 and 9.16

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:

> 9.15 and 9.16: The distinction between Field of Activity and Profession/Occupation is not sufficiently clear. Our sense is that a Field of Activity is one that a person engages in apart from his or her Profession or Occupation. We suggest adding this language to the scope of Field of Activity. We also suggest that the section on Profession or Occupation come before the section on Field of Activity.

Proposed by the LC representative February 2009:

> 9.15: Merge Field of activity of the person with Profession or occupation (9.16).

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer consideration until after the first release and to consult with FRAD (line 792).

> **ALA decision:** Medium priority. We note that LC intends to pursue this issue, and defer to them.

RDA Chapter 10

Family names not based on surnames [p. 21/22]

Current RDA instruction number: chapter 10

From 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1:
> In 5JSC/LC/6/ALA response "5. Naming conventions" ALA noted**:**
>
> "Naming conventions vary among different cultures and time periods. ALA recommends that the proposed rules be expanded to address how to construct family names in the following situations: places in which surnames are not used (e.g., Iceland and much of Southeast Asia) and places in which surnames are used but family members do not necessarily share the same surname (e.g., in ancient Scottish and modern American families, the wife may keep her family name after marriage rather than take her husband's family name; in Sweden, when patronymics were in use, surnames changed from generation to generation). "
>
> *The JSC will need to consider whether the general instructions on choosing the preferred name provide sufficient guidance in these situations, or whether specific instructions are required.*

Note: Decision to defer made at October 2007 meeting (5JSC/M/184.13.1)

> **ALA decision:** Low priority. ALA prefers to defer to other constituencies that are more directly affected by this issue.

Estate or house names to distinguish names of families [p. 22]

Current RDA instruction numbers: chapter 10, chapter 16

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 10.6.0.3.1. ALA notes that estate or house names might also be useful for English gentry and minor European nobility (e.g., "The Park Hill Smiths : a family history for an Australian family." The number of Smith families in Australia or even Queensland is immense).

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 720 (wiki Priority 2). Discussed at conference call 28 August 2008: "The JSC agreed to add this to the list for consideration after the first release of RDA. Estate or house names would best be handled by a reference to chapter 16, but chapter 16 does not currently cover locations such as these."

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. ALA prefers to defer to other constituencies that are more directly affected by this issue.

RDA Chapter 11

Separate instructions for government bodies and other corporate bodies [p. 22/23]

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> Chapter 11
> General comment. Having separate instructions for government bodies and other corporate bodies introduces both redundancy and complexity. Although the distinction is carried forward from AACR2, ALA believes that it is time to eliminate the distinction and to merge these two groups of instructions. If there is interest in pursuing this recommendation, ALA is willing to make a proposal.

Discussed at April 2008 meeting (5JSC/M/240.12), the JSC agreed that this issue could be pursued by ALA after the first release.

> **ALA decision:** High priority. ALA will prepare a proposal; this is our highest priority.

Terms indicating incorporation [p. 24]

Current RDA instruction number: 11.2.2.10
AACR2 rule: 24.5C1-2

From the cover letter for 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9:

> AACR2 24.5C2 (RDA 11.2.0.8.2) requires transposition of corporate names that include an adjectival term or abbreviation indicating incorporation at the beginning of the name. However, there is a question as to whether agencies cataloguing in languages other than English would transpose such terms. The JSC wants to re-consider both this instruction and 24.5C1 (RDA 11.2.0.8.1), which says to remove such terms unless integral to the name.

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:

> 11.2.0.8.1. One respondent recommended changing the AACR2 rule and always including terms of incorporation, because of foreign language terms not always known or understood to be terms of incorporation.

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/BL response:

> 11.2.0.8.1-2
> Terms of incorporation.
> There seems no compelling reason to omit terms of incorporation from the names of corporate bodies. The abbreviation is usually associated with the company name. However, defining a specific element or sub-element would enable greater flexibility in display. Including the term of incorporation in the name, may result in changes to access points when terms of incorporation change, as they did for PLCs in the UK in 1980 and Ireland in 1983.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 776 (wiki Priority 2). Discussed at October 2007 meeting (5JSC/M/185.6.1)

ALA decision: Low priority. ALA prefers to defer to other constituencies on this issue.

Transliterated names for corporate bodies [p. 24/25]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.12, 9.2.2.5
AACR2 rule: 24.1B, footnote 4, 22.3C2, footnote 4

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 11.2.0.10.2. It is not clear if any criteria for predominant usage should apply to the choice of transliterated names for corporate bodies. ALA suggests that the instructions for corporate body names at 11.2.0.10.2 be consistent with those for personal names at 9.3.1.3b

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 784 (wiki Priority 2). Discussed at conference call 28 August 2008: "The JSC decided to retain the current instructions (from AACR2), as the instructions on language should also be considered."

ALA decision: Medium priority. ALA prefers to defer for more general discussion of issues relating to language and script.

Subordinate bodies [p. 25]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.14
AACR2 rule: 24.13A

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 11.2.3.2. Some ALA commentators suggested the need for a list of terms fitting Types 1 and 2; knowing the appropriate terms in various languages is necessary for consistent application. Such lists are currently provided in an LCRI 24.13 Type 2.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 803 (wiki Priority 5). From wiki: "note that LC and others have indicated desire to revise subordinate bodies after first release. (Also note only some languages represented in LCRI.)"

ALA decision: High priority. We note that LC intends to pursue this issue, and defer to them.

Ruling executive bodies

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:
> While there are instructions in chapter 11 for formulating access points for heads of state and chief executives (11.2.2.19 Type 9 and 11.2.2.21), there are no instructions for how to formulate the access point for a ruling executive body. This is an omission carried over from AACR2 that

needs to be rectified. RDA should have instructions on how to record the names of a ruling executive body. Below is the proposed text for these instructions.

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC acknowledged there is a gap and agreed that it was willing to consider a formal proposal after first release (line 827).

> **ALA decision:** High priority. The existing proposal (drafted by Adam Schiff) will need to be evaluated in terms of the "Heads of state and Heads of government" issue; otherwise, the proposal is ready to submit.

Heads of state and Heads of government [p. 26]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.21
AACR2 rules: 24.20B; 24.20C

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 11.2.7.2 and 11.2.7.3. Although AACR2 included separate rules for recording the titles of Heads of state and Heads of government, the principle behind this distinction is unclear. ALA recommends that the instructions for these two kinds of officials be consistent, particularly regarding choice of language; we prefer the language of the jurisdiction. ALA would even support combining the two instructions, and some commentators would support merging all of the instructions for officials.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 818 (wiki Priority 2)

> **ALA decision:** High priority. ALA will develop a proposal.

Subcommittees of the United States Congress [p. 26]

Current RDA instruction numbers: 11.2.2.22.3
AACR2 rule: 24.21C
From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 11.2.8.3. ALA does not believe that this "exception" for subcommittees of the United States Congress is appropriate. Either all subcommittees should be treated in this way, or all subcommittees should be named following 11.2.8.1.

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/CCC response:
> 11.2.8.3—11.2.8.4 (p. 11-46): We do not feel that these instructions are necessary and suggest that they be deleted.

JSC reference: December 2007 draft response table: Line 821 (wiki Priority 4). Discussed at conference call 28 August 2008: "The JSC decided to retain the instruction (now at 11.2.1.22c) as it is used by the Library of Congress, and preferred names created following the instruction will be included in shared records. To add to the post first release list: the possible extension of the instruction to other countries."

> **ALA decision:** Not a priority. As this instruction exists to meet the needs of the Library of Congress, we will defer to LC on this issue.

RDA Chapter 16

Access points to represent places [p. 27]

Consider whether to expand RDA chapter 16 beyond the scope of AACR2 chapter 23, to cover access points for places *per se* (not just place names used in access points for corporate bodies). Discussed at October 2007 meeting (5JSC/M/186.3.1).

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> Chapter 16. General comment on the scope of the chapter. Place names have always been a problem in cataloging because generally the same name identifies both the geographic area itself and the corporate entity with jurisdictional or administrative responsibility for the geographic area. This issue relates not only to place names identifying governments at all levels, but also to many other corporate bodies that control a geographic area, such as a university campus, an airport, an amusement park, a cemetery, etc.
>
> The development of RDA presents an opportunity to resolve this issue. ALA would welcome an effort to expand the scope of the chapter to deal with all geospatially-defined entities. The availability of a single comprehensive set of instructions on place names would fill a long-standing need. It would also provide a context in which to resolve the issue described above, probably through the provision of an elements (data about data) that would identify the appropriate usage of the place name.

Discussed at April 2008 meeting (5JSC/M/241.2), agreed to defer.

> **ALA decision:** Defer. This needs to be considered in the context of expansion of RDA to deal with subject elements and relationships. ALA would prefer to have some general guidance from the JSC before embarking on this; ALA also needs to consider whether its constituencies need to be expanded to deal with subject cataloging issues.

RDA Appendices and Glossary

Appendix K – Relationship designators: Relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies [p. 31]

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:
> Most of the terms can apply to all three types of entities, yet this has not always been done. Although relationships are supposed to be reciprocal, this has not always been done.

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer consideration until after the first release (Lines 1097 and 1098).

> **ALA decision:** Defer. Appendix K is still provisional, and ALA prefers to await further work by the JSC before pursuing this ourselves.

RDA Glossary [p. 31]

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:
> Computer: Make clear that defining as Media Type. In fact, it might be useful to include an indication (phrase or code or icon) to indicate that the term being defined is an element, a sub-element, an element sub-type, or a value.

At the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer consideration until after the first release (Line 1141).

> **ALA decision:** Defer. There are quite general issues regarding the source of links to the Glossary in the RDA Toolkit.

Multiple instructions

Non-Latin Script examples [p. 32]

From 5JSC/RDA/Full draft/ALA response:
> Internationalization remains an incompletely fulfilled promise of RDA, which is not fully consistent in its inclusion of both general and specific instructions relating to language and script. Furthermore, examples in non-Latin alphabets have not been sufficiently included, particularly in Section 1.

After the March 2009 meeting the JSC agreed to defer systematic inclusion of Non-Latin script examples until after the first release.

> **ALA decision:** Low priority. ALA agrees that there needs to be a balance among languages and scripts in the examples. We will need to organize partnerships with various ALA units that have expertise in non-Latin alphabets. ALA does hope to address this issue eventually.

Dates associated with an element [p. 34]

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response:
> 9.12. If this element is retained rather than indicating as relationship to a place (see General comment on "Entities as elements"), the element should include associated dates. ALA also suggests that the repeatable sub-element Geographic level. This allows for clear structure of multiple levels of place for multiple residences.

From 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/LC response:
>9.12-9.17: LC recommends adding an instruction about giving the time span if the information changes over time.

After the April 2008 meeting, the JSC discussed the inclusion of dates with the following elements:

>9.11 Place of residence
>9.12 Address of the person
>9.13 Affiliation
>9.14 Language of the person
>9.15 Field of activity of the person
>9.16 Profession or occupation
>10.5 Place associated with the family

The JSC decided against including dates with these elements for the first release because this would result in divergence with FRAD and would mean than the elements were no longer "clean". The JSC agreed to consider the issue further after the first release and to also consider these issues:

(1) Addition of dates associated with Place ... and Address ... related to corporate bodies (comparable to actions for chapters 9 and 10).
(2) Revision of Change of name (now 11.2.2) for those situations when Place ... is part of the preferred access point (now 11.1.1.3) and that place changes; RDA lacks guidance for such a situation.

> **ALA decision:** Low priority. However, ALA believes that a general approach to the "data about data" question needs to be developed by the JSC before it is fruitful to develop proposals on specific issues. ALA suggests that the JSC consider timing and guidelines for such a general approach.

Archival cataloguing and Museum practice

At the April 2007 meeting the JSC agreed to pursue reconciliation with principles used in archival cataloguing and museum practice (5JSC/M/151.4.1). Note: see "Type of family" and "Finding of objects" above.

> **ALA decision:** No priority assigned. ALA has no representation from the museum community and relies on the liaison from the Society of American Archivists to advise on archival cataloguing issues. ALA will not take an active role at this time, but is always open to considering proposals and concerns put forward by SAA.