

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Providing greater flexibility in creating variant access points (RDA Chapters 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11)

Thanks to ALA for proposing changes to RDA to allow for greater flexibility in creating variant access points. In general, we agree with the proposal. Our response contains comments on the proposed changes, suggestions for additional simplification, suggestions for additional flexibility, and an appendix identify some additional inconsistencies.

Comments on Proposed Changes

Change #1 – Use “a title of the work” instead of “variant title for the work” in the following instructions:

- 5.1.4, 6th paragraph, b)
- 5.6, 2nd paragraph, b)
- 6.27.4.1, 3rd paragraph, b)
- 6.28.4.1, 2nd paragraph, b)
- 6.29.3.1, 2nd paragraph, b)
- 6.30.5.1, 2nd paragraph, b)
- 6.31.3.1, 2nd paragraph, b)

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #2 – Use “a title of a work (see 6.2.1)” instead of “a variant title for the work (see 6.2.3)” in the following instructions:

- 5.6, 1st paragraph
- 6.27.4.1, 2nd paragraph

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #3 – In 6.28.4.1, 1st paragraph: use “a title of a musical work (see 6.14.1)” instead of “a variant title for the work (see 6.14.3)”.

LC response: Agree in principle, but question whether the wording should instead refer to “a title of the work (see 6.14.3)” as there is no element “title of a musical work”. The instructions for the authorized access points usually use the element name “preferred title for the work” but then refer to the most appropriate instruction number (rather than a general instruction number). For example, 6.28.1.9 says, “Include additional elements in authorized access points if the preferred title for the work (see [6.14.2RDA](#)) consists”

Although this pattern is not entirely consistent, it is the dominant pattern in 6.28.1, 6.28.3, 6.30.1, 6.31.1, etc. Does the RSC wish to follow a consistent approach here?

Change #4 – In 6.29.3.1, 1st paragraph: use “a title of a legal work (see 6.19.1)” instead of “a variant title for the work (see 6.19.3)”.

LC response: Agree in principle, but the wording should refer to “a title of the work (see 6.19.1)” (rationale at response to Change #3).

Change #5 – In 6.30.5.1, 1st paragraph: use “a title of a religious work (see 6.23.1)” instead of “a variant title for the work (see 6.23.3)”.

LC response: Agree in principle, but the wording should refer to “a title of the work (see 6.23.1)” (rationale at response to Change #3).

Change #6 – In 6.31.3.1, 1st paragraph: use “a title of an official communication (see 6.26.1)” instead of “a variant title for the work (see 6.26.3)”.

LC response: Agree in principle, but the wording should refer to “a title of the work (see 6.26.1)” (rationale at response to Change #3).

Change #7 – In 8.7, 1st paragraph: use “a name of the person (see 9.2.1), a family (see 10.2.1), or corporate body (see 11.2.1)” instead of “a variant name for the person (see 9.2.3), family (see 10.2.3), or corporate body (see 11.2.3)”.

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #8 – In 9.19.2.1, 1st paragraph: use “a name of the person (see 9.2.1)” instead of “a variant name for the person (see 9.2.3)”.

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #9 – In 10.11.2.1, 1st paragraph: use “a name of the family (see 10.2.1)” instead of “a variant name for the family (see 10.2.3)”.

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #10 – In 11.13.2.1, 1st paragraph: use “a name of the corporate body (see 11.2.1)” instead of “a variant name for the corporate body (see 11.2.3)”.

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes.

Change #11 – Remove the word “variant” from the following instructions:

- 8.1.4, 4th paragraph
- 10.11.2.1, 2nd paragraph

LC response: Agree with the proposed changes, and note that the current text will change in the October 2016 release.

Change #12 – In the following instructions, modify the paragraph that gives guidance about adding to the variant access point, so that this wording is consistent throughout RDA. The clean copy of proposed revision reads: “Include additional elements in the variant access point as appropriate to differentiate it from other access points, or if considered important for identification.”

- 5.6, 3rd paragraph
- 6.27.4.1, 4th paragraph
- 6.27.4.3, 5th paragraph
- 6.27.4.4, 2nd paragraph
- 6.27.4.5, 3rd paragraph
- 6.28.4.1, 3rd paragraph
- 6.28.4.3, 3rd paragraph
- 6.28.4.4, 2nd paragraph
- 6.28.4.5, 3rd paragraph
- 6.29.3.4, 3rd paragraph
- 6.30.5.1, 3rd paragraph
- 6.30.5.2, 4th paragraph
- 6.30.5.3, 3rd paragraph
- 6.31.3.2, 3rd paragraph
- 8.7, 2nd paragraph
- 9.19.2.1, 2nd paragraph
- 10.11.2.1, 3rd paragraph
- 11.13.2.1, 2nd paragraph

LC response: Although we appreciate the efforts to create consistent instructions for additions to variant access points, we think that additional consistency would be desirable. The instructions proposed for **variant** access points will now refer to 1) the principle of differentiation/distinguishing, and 2) the functional objective of identification. However, the instructions for **authorized** access points generally refer only to differentiation/distinguishing and not “when considered important for identification.” We think the instructions for both authorized and variant access points should be similar in this regard, and hope that consistent wording can be used when appropriate. See the appendix below for examples of variant wording found in existing instructions in **authorized** access point instructions. Does the RSC wish to pursue additional changes for consistency?

Change #13 – In the following instructions, add the missing (and now revised) paragraph: “Include additional elements in the variant access point as appropriate to

differentiate it from other access points, or if considered important for identification.

Apply the instructions at 6.27.1.9, as applicable.”

- 6.29.3.1, as new 3rd paragraph; also add supporting example
- 6.31.3.1, as new 3rd paragraph; also add supporting example

LC response: Agree.

Change #14 – In 6.28.4.1, 2nd paragraph, change “authorized access point for a work” to “authorized access point for the work”, to match all of the other paragraphs with this phrasing in Chapter 6.

LC response: Agree (note that the markup in the proposal did not indicate this change).

Change #15 – Add/modify/delete examples:

- 6.27.4.1, 3rd example box
- 6.28.4.1, 3rd example box, 4th example box
- 6.31.3.1, move 1st example box to follow 1st paragraph; create new example box (example to be determined) after 2nd paragraph
- 9.19.2.1, 2nd example box
- 11.13.2.1., 2nd example box

LC response: Defer to the Examples Editor for these changes.

Possible Simplification

This proposal has highlighted the repetition of instructions for the construction of authorized and variant access points. We suggest that the paragraphs in 5.1.4 that represent instructions be deleted, as 5.1 should be limited to terminology. We further suggest that the instructions at 5.5 and 5.6 also be removed, and replaced with references to the appropriate instructions in Chapter 6. Trying to maintain the same instructions in various places has proven to be difficult, and should be avoided unless necessary.

Suggestions for Additional Flexibility

1. As noted in the Justification section of this proposal, the paragraph “Construct additional variant access points if considered important for access” is used to justify a variety of constructions for variant access points. We note that this paragraph is not found at 6.31.3.2 (Variant Access Point Representing an Expression of an Official Communication), although it is present in the instructions for variant access points for expressions of general works, musical works, legal works, and religious works. We think the addition would be appropriate at 6.31.3.2.

2. This proposal highlights the many instructions where variant titles may be used in variant access points, but the instructions at 6.2.3.3 for recording variant titles is more restrictive than necessary. For example, a cataloger may want to record a variant title “Three men and a baby” for the preferred title “3 men and a baby” even if the spelled-out form is not found on a manifestation or a reference source. If the RSC agrees, LC would be willing to provide a Fast Track Plus to provide greater flexibility at 6.2.3.3.

3. This proposal provides greater flexibility for recording the title portion of a variant access point for a work, but does not create additional flexibility for recording the name portion of a variant access point for a work. While the standard instructions in chapters 5 and 6 refer to using “the authorized access point representing a person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work, if appropriate” when constructing a variant access point, it may be useful in limited situations to provide a variant form for the person, family, or corporate body in the variant access point. It is likely that an agency may choose to limit the application of such flexibility to certain situations. For example, if transliterated forms of preferred names are used in authorized access points, a variant access point for a work representing a variant title in non-Latin script may be more understandable to users if the name portion uses a non-Latin script form as well.

Preferred access point:

Huang, Tao, 1980- Zhongguo jin rong fa lu zhi du bian qian guo cheng zhong de fa yuan jue se

Allowed variant access point:

Huang, Tao, 1980- 中国金融法律制度变迁过程中的法院角色

Not allowed variant access point:

黄韬, 1980- 中国金融法律制度变迁过程中的法院角色

4. In the instructions for variant access points for expressions of works, the “variant of an addition” is specifically mentioned (see 6.27.4.5, 6.29.3.4, and 6.31.3.2), but the concept of variants of an addition are not specifically mentioned in the variant access point instructions for persons, families, or corporate bodies. Does the RSC wish to make the instructions consistent?

Appendix

As noted in the LC response to Change #12, the wording used in the instructions for additions to authorized access points vary in their wording and purpose. Here are a few examples:

5.5, 3rd paragraph (authorized access point):

If two or more works are represented by the same or similar access points, include one or more additional identifying elements in the access point representing the work (such as form of work, date, place of origin, or other distinguishing characteristic). [No mention of “important for identification”]

6.27.1.1, 3rd paragraph (authorized access points):

Include additional elements specified at 6.27.1.9 if they are needed to distinguish the access point representing the work from an access point representing a person, family, or corporate body. [No mention of “important for identification”]

6.27.1.9, 1st paragraph (Authorized access points):

Include additional elements in authorized access points if needed to distinguish the access point for a work:

from one that is the same or similar but represents a different work

or

from one that represents a person, family, corporate body, or place.

6.31.1.1, 2nd paragraph (authorized access points)

Include additional elements in the authorized access points, as required.

8.6, 2nd paragraph (authorized access points)

If two or more persons, families, or corporate bodies have the same or similar names, include one or more additional identifying elements in the access point representing the person, family, or corporate body. Apply the following instructions, as applicable: [No mention of “important for identification”]