RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/summary 9 July 2025 Page 1 of 4

To:Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering CommitteeFrom:Anne Welsh, RSC SecretarySubject:Formal responses to RSC/NARDAC/2025/2 – Proposal on numerals<br/>associated with given names

This document collates in tabular form the responses received from voting members of the RSC to <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2</u>, *viz*.:

- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/EOO</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/EURIG</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/ExamplesEditor</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/ORDAC</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/TranslationsTLO</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/TTLO</u>
- <u>RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/WCEO</u>

Recommendation 1	Approved by 6: EOO, ExamplesEditor, ORDAC, TranslationsTLO, TTLO, WCEO Partially approved with suggested amendments by 1: EURIG	Note 1: Total number of respondents: 7 Note 2: <u>EURIG</u> approves moving the first condition option set, <i>but not the</i> <i>second</i> .
Recommendation 2	Approved by <b>5</b> : <u>EOO</u> , <u>ExamplesEditor</u> , <u>TranslationsTLO</u> , <u>TTLO</u> , <u>WCEO</u> Partially approved with suggested amendments by <b>2</b> : <u>EURIG</u> , <u>ORDAC</u>	Note 1: Total number of respondents: 7 Note 3: EURIG states that for the <i>first</i> condition option, NARDAC's proposed wording and move could be made, but that the second condition option set is not relevant. Note 4: Having said it would partially approve NARDAC's suggestion, EURIG states that it would <i>prefer</i> a completely

	different way of dealing with the issue.
	Note 5: <u>ORDAC</u> suggests alternative wording.

**Note 1:** Although the Latin America and the Caribbean Representative is attending the July Meeting, and is a voting member, the Latin America and the Caribbean RDA Group (RDA ALyC) itself was not established in time to discuss

RSC/NARDAC/2025/2 and submit a formal response. Therefore, the total number of respondents in the summary document it 7 but the total number of voting members of the RSC recorded in the minutes at the end of full discussion will be 8.

**Note 2:** <u>EURIG</u> approves of moving the first condition option set *but not the second*. So in terms of this Recommendation (to delete the two condition options), it would approve:

Marked-up copy only:

### RDA 83.33.73.96

### **CONDITION**

A value of Corporate Body: <u>authorized access point for corporate body</u> includes:

- 1. a value of Corporate Body: <u>authorized access point for corporate body</u> for a higher or related body
- 2. a value that is based on Corporate Body: <u>preferred name of corporate body</u> of a subordinate body.

#### **CONDITION OPTION**

Include a value that is based on Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body that is recorded directly.

Record only if the name might reasonably by searched in that variant form.

**Note 3:** <u>EURIG</u> states that for the *first* condition option, NARDAC's proposed wording and move could be made, but that the second condition option set is not relevant.

The RSC Secretary interprets this to mean that having deleted the condition option set out at Note 2 in this summary, the resulting text covering from the place the first condition option set would move through to the end of the second condition option set would be:

Marked-up copy only:

## **RDA 27.35.52.19** Format of base variant access points for corporate body

Apply the general instructions at Corporate Body: <u>access point for corporate body</u>. <u>Format of base access points for corporate body</u>.

#### **CONDITION**

<u>A value of Corporate Body: authorized access point for corporate body is for a corporate body that is subordinate or related to a higher or related corporate body.</u>

<u>A value of Corporate Body: authorized access point for corporate body begins with</u> <u>a value of Corporate Body: authorized access point for corporate body for a higher</u> <u>or related corporate body.</u>

# **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a name of a subordinate or related corporate body in direct order with no amendments.

# Additional elements and designations in variant access points for corporate body

Include values for other elements or designations in an access point if required:

- to distinguish the access point from a value of an access point for another entity
- to assist in the identification of the entity
- to conform to a *string encoding scheme*

### **OPTION**

Apply the instructions at Corporate Body: <u>authorized access point for corporate</u> <u>body</u>. <u>Additional elements and designations in authorized access points for</u> <u>corporate body</u>.

### CONDITION

A value of Corporate Body: <u>authorized access point for corporate body</u> includes:

- 1. a value of Corporate Body: <u>authorized access point for corporate body</u> for a higher or related body
- 2. a value that is based on Corporate Body: **preferred name of corporate body** for a subordinate body that does not suggest subordination.

# **CONDITION OPTION**

Include a value of Corporate Body: **preferred name of corporate body** for a subordinate body whose name does not suggest subordination directly.

**Note 4:** Having said it would partially approve NARDAC's suggestion, <u>EURIG</u> states that it would *prefer* a completely different way of dealing with the issue:

"However, if there are to be changes, then we would propose that 'variant access point for corporate body' have the same condition and condition option block as 'RDA: Authorized access point for corporate body: General guidelines for constructing authorized access points for subordinate or related corporate bodies'." The RSC Secretary notes that the linked section of the RDA Toolkit is inaccurate, but takes it to mean:

RDA 83.31.80.93

#### CONDITION

A corporate body is subordinate or related to a higher or related corporate body.

A value of Corporate Body: <u>name of corporate body</u> belongs to <u>Types of names</u> <u>that indicate a subordinate corporate body</u> or the type of corporate body belongs to <u>Types of subordinate bodies</u>.

#### **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a value of a name of a subordinate or related body that omits a name of a higher or related corporate body.

### **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a value of a name of a subordinate or related body that includes a name of a higher or related corporate body if required for clarity.

As she will not be present at the Public Session at which this is discussed, the RSC Secretary asks whether what is wanted is to repeat this text, or to link to it, given that the style of the page being edited is, as can be seen from the extensive quotations included here, to refer to the appropriate section of Corporate Body: <u>access point for corporate body</u>?

**Note 5:** <u>ORDAC</u> does not like that the phrase "direct order" is used in two different ways in RDA. See their response for their lengthy discussion of this. In order to remove this wording, they suggest an alternative.

Mark up shows difference from NARDAC's suggested wording:

### **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a name of a subordinate or related corporate body in direct order with no amendments excluding a value of Corporate Body: authorized access point for corporate body for a higher or related corporate body.