

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** Location of a conference, etc.

ALA thanks LC for this proposal to offer greater flexibility in recording the place associated with a conference, etc. We generally agree with the proposal but offer the following comments and suggestions.

*Revision #1: delete the word “local” from 11.3.2.1 and the **Glossary***

Agree.

*Revision #2: Modify 11.3.2.3*

1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

Although ALA agrees with deleting the word “local”, we think that the name of the most specific applicable place should be recorded. This would guide the cataloger to recording the name of the local place unless it is unknown or not appropriate. Thus, we suggest modifying the 1st paragraph even further, to read:

Record the name of the ~~local~~ most specific place in which the conference, etc., was held by applying the basic instructions at **11.3.1**.

Addition of examples after 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

ALA generally agrees with the new examples. However, we offer the following suggestions:

- Move the example for “Selangor, Malaysia” after “Salzburg, Austria” so that all of the local place examples appear first.
- Update the example explanation for “Salzburg, Austria” to replace “event” with “festival”, since all of the other example explanations use more specific terms.
- Consider replacing the “Brazoria County, Tex.” example with one that does not have an associated local place. (The Brazoria County Fair is always held at the county fairgrounds in Angleton, Texas.) We believe the annual Burning Man festival, held in the Black Rock Desert of northern Nevada, would be a good example.

2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

ALA agrees to add “etc.”

Addition of examples after 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

ALA recommends adding the new examples at the end, rather than at the beginning of the example block. This way, the most common situations will be presented first.

Addition of Alternative:

Agree.

Modification of Exceptions:

General comment:

ALA recommends having a discussion about why this exception exists. Clearly it supports both the core element structure in Chapter 11 and the availability of these specific elements for use in authorized access points. However, are there significant reasons not to record the location of a conference, etc., along with an associated institution?

Specific comments:

- 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: While ALA agrees that adding the text to support multiple place names is useful, we do not believe that the phrase needs to repeat the word “place”. Instead, we think the phrase “place name or names” should suffice throughout.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph + alternative: ALA does not agree with adding text specific to recording institutions in 11.3.2.3. If this guidance is needed, and we are not convinced that it is, this belongs in 11.5.1.3, *Recording Associated Institutions*.

*Revision #3: Update core element explanation in 11.5*

ALA generally agrees, although as noted above, we recommend using the phrase “place name or names”. We also believe this phrase needs to appear four times in the core element statement instead of just two. The result would be:

Associated institution is a core element for conferences, etc., if the institution’s name provides better identification than the ~~local~~ place name or names or if the ~~local~~ place name or names is are unknown or cannot be readily determined. Associated institution is a core element for other corporate bodies if the institution’s name provides better identification than the ~~local~~ place name or names or if the ~~local~~ place name or names are is unknown or cannot be readily determined, and it is needed to distinguish the corporate body from another corporate body with the same name.

We observe that any agreed-upon rewording would also need to be made in 0.6.7, in the parenthetical explanation for “Associated institution”.

*Revision #4: Modify 11.13.1.8.1*

Changes in 1<sup>st</sup> example block:

ALA finds both of the proposed new examples problematic.

- For the first one, the location is ambiguous. We suspect that the Weltkongress für Matriarchatsforschung was held in the city of Luxembourg. If that is the case, the qualifier would be “Luxembourg, Luxembourg”. We prefer retaining the existing first example instead of adding this one.
- The Neshoba County Fair example raises the same concerns as the Brazoria County Fair we commented on above – it is held in a known location that can be identified below the

county level. Instead of this example, we recommend using the Burning Man festival example here as well.

Addition of 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

Agree.

Addition of Alternative:

Agree.

Note: the punctuation in the final example needs to be corrected. There should be a space after “8th”, and the comma before “Kenya” should be a semicolon.

Modification of Exceptions:

- 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: As mentioned above, ALA recommends using the phrase “place name or names” throughout. We also recommend closely following the language in the equivalent exception in 11.3.2.3. This would mean omitting the mention of place names in the first clause. These changes would result in the following (mark-up from current wording):

Add the name of the associated institution instead of the ~~local~~ place name or names if:  
the name of an associated institution (see 11.5) provides better identification ~~than the~~  
~~local place name~~

or

the ~~local~~ place name or names are is not known or cannot be readily determined

or

the place name or names cannot be readily determined.

- 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph + alternative: In concert with our comments on the equivalent text proposed for 11.3.2.3, ALA does not agree with adding text specific to recording institutions in 11.13.1.8.1. If this guidance is desired, it belongs in 11.13.1.4.

*Revision #5: Modify various examples*

ALA requests an explanation for the suggested removal of the expedition examples in this proposal.