

## Response to PlacesWG Proposal from the Technical Working Group

Prepared by Damian Iseminger from comments by Gordon Dunsire

### Categorization of Entities

The discussion of 2014 Recommendations 3 and 4 concerning ‘type of corporate body’ and the use of a scope note to categorize the types is imbalanced.

As 2014 recommendation 3 points out, ‘type of corporate body’ has been implemented in RDA as ‘category of corporate body’ and carries general instructions for using a vocabulary encoding scheme (VES), but does not recommend a VES. 2014 recommendation 4 recommended adding a scope note.

The ‘category’ elements for entities in RDA are a direct implementation of the LRM attribute E1-A1 Category. The RSC has, on several occasions, discussed the utility of having VES’s for categorization of entities, but has ultimately decided against that approach, preferring instead for this to be a community affair.

Including categorizations in the scope notes for the ‘category’ elements would thus contradict the RSC’s position concerning categorization of entities, so in truth, 2014 recommendation 4 has been superseded. The Toolkit instead chooses to handle needed categorizations (such as those found in conditions and options) by using the Prerecording sections of the entity pages. See the long lists in Prerecording on the Work entity page

This approach for Corporate Body was recommended during the 3R project, but was ultimately not done because of the need to refine Collective Agent, i.e. determining which kinds of agents were better treated as collective agents or as corporate bodies, which the RSC decided was not needed at that stage of development. The RSC may wish to revisit this decision.

If the RSC does not wish to do so, a paragraph could be added to the guidance for Corporate Body, stating that corporate body refers to governments, religious bodies, etc.

This kind of guidance could also be added to the Prerecording section of Places indicating the kinds of places being referred to in the Toolkit.

### Jurisdiction Governed

The scenarios discussed in the build up to 2023 Recommendations 4-7 (between a law and the place that it is applicable to and between a law and the government that it is applicable to), are not best accommodated by the solutions put forward by the Places Working Group.

Western cataloging practice has generally accommodated this kind of information as ‘coverage.’ It can be broadly described, as it is in Dublin Core, as the spatial or temporal topic of a resource, the spatial applicability of a resource, or the jurisdiction under which a resource is relevant.

This is a problem, because ‘coverage’ is both broader than subject and also overlaps with the entity model. In order to retain semantic coherency in the element set, the Toolkit intentionally avoids the concept of coverage as defined above, but fulfills the functional requirement of the concept by the use of the ‘subject’ elements.

The RSC has intentionally limited the scope of the subject elements to the broadest level. The recommendations of the Places Working Group thus inadvertently introduces a refinement of the subject elements, and should be avoided.

The functional requirement for coverage may also be accommodated through the use of shortcut elements. While the 3R project identified several elements that were shortcuts, the RSC has decided that new shortcut elements should not be introduced into the Toolkit. Instead, the RSC has stated that Community Resources should accommodate these types of elements. If there is sufficient uptake of a community element, it could be introduced into base RDA.

The Places Working Group in its discussion does make the case for the utility of an element like 'jurisdiction governed,' because it is useful to have an element that relates a government to the place it governs. Instead of deprecating the current element as is recommended, it would be best to retain the element and revise the label to something like 'place governed' to remove the ambiguity associated with the word jurisdiction.

### Suggestions for Revision

Based on the above discussion, the Technical Working Group would recommend the following:

1. Add guidance to the Toolkit page for the entity Place that states what the term 'place' refers to, after necessary analysis is done.
2. Encourage communities to use Community Resources to implement category vocabularies that may be used with the category elements.
3. Relabel 'jurisdiction governed' to 'place governed' and clean up its definition, but retain its current semantics.
4. Add shortcut elements to Community Resources to accommodate a law and the place that it is applicable to and between a law and the government that it is applicable to. Monitor usage of the shortcut and determine if it should be implemented in base RDA.
5. Carry out further investigation of the semantics of 'coverage' in RDA.