

**To:** RDA Steering Committee

**From:** Bill Leonard, CCC Representative to RSC

**Subject: Providing greater flexibility in creating variant access points (RDA Chapters 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11)**

CCC thanks ALA for this examination and comparison of the instructions for variant access points. CCC agrees with the intent of the changes but not with all of the specific changes.

**Changes 1-6 – Use “a title of the work” instead of “variant title for the work”**

CCC disagrees and offers a counter-proposal.

CCC is not convinced of the need to use the super-element ‘title’ in these instructions. Ultimately, the variant access point is built using one of the two specific sub-types, which should be named specifically. CCC offers this formulation of 6.27.4.1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as a pattern to be followed in the instructions impacted by these proposed changes:

Use a variant title for the work (see [6.2.3 RDA](#)) or the preferred title for the work (see [6.2.2 RDA](#)) as the basis for a variant access point.

CCC also notes that the word variant was not double underlined in the third paragraph of the marked up version of 5.6 (page 5).

**Changes 7-10 – Remove “variant” from 6.31.3.1, 8.7, 9.19.2.1, 10.11.2.1 and 22.13.2.1**

CCC disagrees and offers a counter-proposal.

CCC is not convinced of the need to use the super-element. Ultimately, the variant access point is built using one of the two specific sub-types, which should be named specifically. CCC offers these three examples of wording that names both sub-types.

9.19.2.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

When constructing a variant access point to represent a person, use a variant name for the person (see [9.2.3 RDA](#)) or the preferred name for the person (see [9.2.2 RDA](#)), as the basis for the access point.

10.11.2.1 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

When constructing a variant access point to represent a family, use a variant name for the family (see [10.2.3 RDA](#)) or the preferred name for the family (see [10.2.2 RDA](#)), as the basis for a variant access point.

11.13.2.1 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

When constructing a variant access point to represent a corporate body, use a variant name for the corporate body (see [11.2.3 RDA](#)) or the preferred name for the corporate body (see 11.2.2 RDA), as the basis for a variant access point.

**Change 11 – Remove “variant” from 8.1.4, 10.11.2.1**

CCC disagrees with the change to 8.1.4 and offers a counter-proposal.

8.1.4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence

A variant access point representing a person, family, or corporate body is constructed using a variant name, or the preferred name, for that person, family, or corporate body.

CCC agrees with the change to 10.11.2.1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**Change 12 – Consistent wording for “Include additional elements ...”**

CCC agrees with most of the changes.

If the new text is added at 11.1.2.1 it will require variant access points for corporate bodies to be differentiated from other access points. Currently, we do not require that acronyms for corporate bodies used as variant access points to be differentiated. The impact of changing 11.1.2.1 is greater than simply editorial and should be deliberately discussed. Since the wording in 11.1.2.1 cannot be changed, the wording in 8.7 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph cannot be changed either.

**Change 13 – Add the “Include additional elements ...” paragraph**

CCC agrees with these changes.

**Change 14 – Change to authorized access point for the work**

CCC agrees.

**Change 15 – Change the wording in the explanatory text of examples**

CCC generally agrees but defers to the RSC Examples Editor.