

July 14, 2025

Page 1 of 2

To: RDA Steering Committee  
From: NARDAC  
Subject: Revision of two sets of condition and condition options for Corporate Body:  
variant access point for corporate body

NARDAC thanks the constituencies for their responses to RSC/NARDAC/2025/2 and would like to briefly discuss the points made by EURIG and ORDAC in [RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/EURIG](#) and [RSC/NARDAC/2025/2/ORDAC](#) respectively.

EURIG states that the "second [condition option] allows for the subordinate body to be added to the base access point for the higher body."

As we noted in the proposal, the second condition option is really only a particular case of the first condition option, and we think it would be better left for communities to address in policy statements. There was once a specific set of condition options that addressed EURIG's suggestion, but they were moved to Legacy community resources because they involved an SES (see [https://access.rdatoolkit.org/en-US\\_topic\\_glm\\_yv1\\_vpb](https://access.rdatoolkit.org/en-US_topic_glm_yv1_vpb)). NARDAC is not in favor of moving a similar instruction back into the main text.

ORDAC comments that "the existing Condition Option which talks about a value "that is recorded directly" is referring to a subordinate body where the string does not include reference to the higher body."

We do not agree with this reading of the text. Original RDA 11.2.3.3 (variant names for corporate bodies), the predecessor of the RDA language in NARDAC's proposal, uses the phrase "direct form": "Record as a variant name a direct form of the name if the preferred name is recorded as a subdivision of a higher or related body. Record only if the name might reasonably be searched in that variant form." Elsewhere in Original RDA for preferred or variant names (often in examples), "direct form" conveys the idea that an SES is not re-arranging or inverting the parts of a name. We believe that "direct order with no amendments" is about not using an SES to alter the name itself, or add anything before or after. This does not preclude that a candidate base access point will have the higher body as a natural part of the name.

July 14, 2025

Page 2 of 2

When a name of a subordinate body includes the name of the parent body (e.g., Friends of the Ellen Clarke Bertrand Library), it is recorded indirectly when it is recorded as a subdivision of the authorized access point for the parent body (e.g., Ellen Clarke Bertrand Library. Friends). It is recorded directly when the name is recorded as found, i.e. in direct order (e.g., Friends of the Ellen Clarke Bertrand Library). In these cases, the name of the parent body is not omitted because it is part of the name of the subordinate body. In our opinion, "direct order" means here the same thing as in the other instructions mentioned by ORDAC, i.e. that the string should not be rearranged. This is why we suggested reusing the phrase in this context.

We also reiterate that the existing instruction that we propose moving is about *recording a value* for the base variant access point and as such belongs in the section about forming a base variant access point. The situation is similar to that of names of corporate bodies which are recorded as found to form a base access point. We note that the instruction that addresses that situation uses similar wording to the one we are suggesting ("Record a name in direct order with no amendments") and is also located in a similar section, i.e. [Format of base access points for corporate body](#)

For these reasons, we do not agree with ORDAC's proposed change.