

MINUTES OF MAY 2023 MEETING
RDA Steering Committee
ALA Headquarters, Chicago
17-19 May 2023

Attending: Renate Behrens, RSC Chair
Charlene Chou, Wider Community Engagement Officer
Charlotte Christensen, Oceania representative
Ahava Cohen, Europe representative
Szabolcs Dancs, Translations Team Liaison Officer
Kathy Glennan, RSC Past Chair
James Hennelly, Director, ALA Digital Reference
Damian Iseminger, Technical Team Liaison Officer
Robert Maxwell, North America representative
Honor Moody, RDA Examples Editor
Elisa Sze, Education and Orientation Officer
John Trevor-Allen, Chair, RDA Board
Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary

Observers on

18 May only: Christian Aliverti, RSC Board Member for Europe.
Mikolaj Baj, Ulverscroft
Thomas Brenndorfer, Chair of the RDA Extent Working
Group
Gordon Dunsire, RSC Liaison to various international
bodies
Jessica Grzegorski, Newberry Library and Co-Chair of
RBMS RDA Editorial Group
Shawn King, University of Madison-Wisconsin Law
Library
Olivera Nastic, Belgrade City Library
Daniel Paradis, Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du
Québec
Amanda Ros, Texas A&M University
Jenny Wright, BDS

Table of Contents

Wednesday 17 May

- 374 Outcomes of the RDA Board Meeting and the Joint Meeting of the RDA Board and RSC
- 375 RSC Action Plan
- 376 Education and Training
- 377 Fast Tracks
- 378 End of day discussion and thank you from Chair

Thursday 18 May

- 379 Welcome, introductions, and clarification of process/participation
- 380 RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA
- 381 Soft-deprecated elements
- 382 Progress in the development of the RDA Toolkit's Community Resources area
- 383 Education and Training
- 384 Liaisons with other international cataloguing organizations
- 385 Wider Engagement
- 386 End of day discussion and thank you from Chair

Friday 19 May

- 387 RDA Toolkit Community Resources
- 388 July Meeting
- 389 October Meeting and RDA Satellite meetings
- 390 Thanks to Melissa Parent
- 391 Any Other Business (AOB) and end of day discussion
- 392 Review of meeting and thank you from Chair

Appendix

- 375 RSC Action Plan
- 380 RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

Restricted Appendix

- 380.3 Response from the Places Working Group

Executive Session 1

Wednesday 17 May

373 Catching up and review of past action items

373.1 The group reflected on their impressions of the Joint RDA Board RSC meeting.

373.2 All action items from January and earlier meetings have either been completed or are in progress.

373.3 James Hennelly demonstrated new display features in the RDA Toolkit development site.

374 Outcomes of the RDA Board Meeting and the Joint Meeting of the RDA Board and RSC. John Trevor-Allen shared key outcomes from the Board meeting.

375 RSC Action Plan

[RSC/Chair/2023/1](#) was published on 17 February on the understanding it would be reviewed in the light of the RDA Board's Strategic Plan shared at the Joint RDA Board / RSC meeting 16-17 May.

After a discussion of the issues raised at the Joint Board Meeting, the group decided to update the Action Plan at the July Meeting.

376 Education and Training: Discussion of future plans and possibility of extension of the Education and Orientation Officer role.

377 Fast Tracks.

378 End of day discussion and thank you from Chair. Renate Behrens thanked everyone for their contributions today and their commitment to the agreed action items.

Public Session

Thursday 18 May

379 Welcome, introductions, and clarification of process/participation.

Renate Behrens Welcomed everyone, including the observers. She explained how the meeting would work, and asked observers to make comments as well as questions in the Questions and

Answers facility on Zoom. This was monitored throughout, and Kathy Glennan introduced comments from the observers at appropriate points.

380 [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA](#)

The Chair offered thanks to the Places Working Group for this, its first proposal. Formal responses were received ahead of the meeting from the [Education and Orientation Officer](#), [EURIG](#), [NARDAC](#), [ORDAC](#), the [RDA Examples Editor](#), the [Translations Team Liaison Officer](#), the [Technical Working Group](#), and the [Widening Community Engagement Officer](#).

380.1 [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/summary](#) collates in tabular format the formal responses received by 9 May 2023, highlighting recommendations on which there is agreement and recommendations on which voting members of the RSC have raised comments or queries for discussion.

380.2 Damian Iseminger, who is an ex-officio member of the Places Working Group, provided an introduction to the proposal at the Chair's request.

380.3 [Response from the Places Working Group](#). The Places Working Group provided a response to comments and queries raised in the official responses to the proposal. Damian Iseminger talked the group through this response.

380.3 Recommendation 3. Damian Iseminger cautioned people to judge elements by their definition not their interpretation of the label. He spoke directly to the Law Library of Congress's comment contained in NARDAC's response. NARDAC agreed with this caution.

380.4 Recommendations 4 and 7. The meeting approved the suggestion to withdraw and prepare a proposal for the next RSC Meeting in July.

380.5 Recommendations 5 and 6. The Places Working Group is withdrawing these recommendations and will return in future with a discussion paper or proposal. Damian Iseminger answered questions from the RSC about Customary Law and about the representation of Rabbinical, Muslim and Church courts. However, these recommendations are being withdrawn because of issues concerning coverage and RDA semantics. He quoted a response from the Places Working Group: "Upon review, the Places Working Group agrees with the Technical Working Group that the elements proposed in Recommendations 5 and 6 inadvertently muddy the waters with regards to the semantics of RDA."

380.6 All other recommendations were approved. Renate Behrens thanked both the Places Working Group and the Technical Working Group for their input and cooperation and Damian Iseminger expressed his thanks to the Places Working Group and especially to their Chair for keeping the Group on task.

381 Soft-deprecated elements. Damian Iseminger highlighted the soft-deprecated elements listed at [RDA Registry | Alignments](#). He referred us to the explanation on the Registry webpage: “These elements are considered as official elements of RDA and may still be used to describe RDA entities. These elements will be reviewed in the near-future by the RSC Technical Working Group to determine whether the elements will be retained or be permanently deprecated.” He stressed that there is one element that appears in the list that will be removed - “copyright date” which was a glitch in the search to create the list. To be clear, “copyright date” is not a soft-deprecated element.

381.1 A survey will be issued from the Technical Team Liaison Officer via the Regional Representatives. The aim is to launch this survey at the next meeting in July.

381.2 The meeting stressed that no elements will be deprecated at the moment. We currently wish to know where these elements are still being used or where continued use is anticipated. In lay terms, soft-deprecated elements can be viewed by the community as elements from Original RDA that were not useful in Official RDA that were retained to ease the transition. The meeting stressed that we are keen to hear the community’s use of these elements and do not wish to make decisions without input from the community.

381.3 Community Resources will always be available for communities who have a continued singular use of any particular soft-deprecated elements.

382 Progress in the development of the RDA Toolkit’s Community Resources area.

James Hennelly showed the development site that he and the web developers use to build new features on the RDA Toolkit. He demonstrated the current layout of the Community Resources area on the development site. It is currently organised in a way devised by James Hennelly as publisher. It is arranged by language communities at the top level. Also at the top level are several special topics.

James Hennelly reinforced the message that the content in Community Resources is not part of Official RDA. There are two levels of contributor: partner organizations, which have a formal agreement with RDA Toolkit and its copyright holders, and contributing organizations, which do not have licensed agreement with RDA Toolkit. Contributing organizations’ access will be using the same technology that is used to manage RDA subscriptions. Partner organizations have access to the RDA Toolkit’s Content Management System to create their pages. Contributing organizations will have access to an HTML form to create their pages. All Community Resources will be searchable through the communities. Partner organizations can create dita maps, and so they can create a specific view of the Toolkit for their Application Profiles.

382.3 Demonstration of potential change to the Guidance menus. Whilst in the Toolkit development site, James Hennelly showed the group the latest developments to provide an alternative view to the Guidance menus.

382.4 Demonstration of change in the display when scrolling. Jamie Hennelly also demonstrated the current state of the display when people scroll down a page in the Toolkit. (This feature is being developed in response to a request from the Policy Statement Writers). The meeting approved the implementation of this development for the July Toolkit release.

383 Education and Training

383.1 Elisa Sze highlighted her [report](#) and [webinar](#) for the benefit of observers, and provided a brief verbal update on her recent actions and current call for input from RDA community members. She asked Regional Representatives to take her findings back to their constituents. She is working on a handout that she can share with educators that they can use, based on the feedback from the webinar in terms of what they would find useful in a handout. 14 instructors reached out to Elisa following up on her offer to share the Application Profile and syllabus that Elisa uses in teaching in Toronto.

383.2 Renate Behrens asked if interested members of the Translations Working Group might be willing to translate Elisa's materials into other languages. Szabolcs Dancs agreed that this might be possible.

383.3 Current activities in the Regions. NARDAC shared that they are developing formal education programmes. ORDAC asked if there were any interviewees from the Oceania region already. Several educators were interviewed. EURIG shared that they had an intention to create a repository of teaching materials.

383.4 Charlene Chou shared examples of collaboration between Elisa Sze and her, and shared upcoming plans.

383.5 General discussion covered topics including the possibility of creating a repository for training materials and Application Profiles to be shared amongst the RDA community.

384 Liaisons with other international cataloguing organizations. Renate Behrens provided an overview for the benefit of observers, and a verbal update on latest developments.

385 Wider Engagement

385.1 Charlene Chou provided a verbal update on her latest activities. She also shared how useful it was for her to meet Rania Osman and Haliza Jailani in person and Catalina Zavala online in this week's Joint Meeting of the RDA Board and RSC.

385.2 In response to a question from the Past Chair, there was a discussion of progress towards having Latin American representation on the RSC.

386 End of day discussion and thank you from Chair

Executive Session 2

Friday 19 May

387 RDA Toolkit Community Resources

387.1 Update. Following on from yesterday's discussion ([Item 382](#)), James Hennelly outlined next steps.

387.1.1 Terminology. After discussion, it was decided that “Partner Organizations” and “Contributing Organizations” in the current draft on the development site will become “Community Resources Partners” and “Community Resources Contributors”.

387.2 Discussion of issue raised by NARDAC in the January meeting. In January's asynchronous meeting, NARDAC shared an issue that was not discussed. Robert Maxwell shared more detail on the issue. The Technical Team Liaison Officer provided an overview of previous decisions on the display of information about String Encoding Schemes (SES) in the RDA Toolkit. After discussion it was decided to charge a Working Group on SES and a potential chair was identified.

388 July Meeting. Renate Behrens confirmed the dates (10-13 July). Because of the volume of materials expected to be submitted, and the value the RSC places on feedback from the regions, the public meeting to discuss proposals will take place on Wednesday 2 August, 9pm-11pm (Frankfurt time: [consult the World Clock for the time in other areas](#)). Responses from the regions will be expected by 19 July 2023.

389 October Meeting and RDA Satellite meetings. James Hennelly and Renate Behrens laid out the requirements for organising the meeting in October.

390 Thanks to Melissa Parent for her service as Oceania Representative, March 2020-February 2023. Renate Behrens offered formal thanks to Melissa for her service. A collection will be held for a card and gift to be sent in October 2023.

391 Any Other Business (AOB) and end of day discussion

Secretary's note: AOB includes all other business discussed across all days of the Meeting. It has been collated here to preserve the coherence of section numbering between the agenda and the minutes.

391.1 There was discussion of the Board's plan to investigate business models.

391.2 Development of Examples

391.3 Google Space. James Hennelly shared how to move our drives from the shared drive to our own ("My Drive").

391.4 Working Groups. Renate Behrens will be in touch with the chairs of the four Working Groups to express the RSC's thanks for their work so far, and to discuss next steps.

391.5 Discussion Paper on Indigenous Perspectives on Place. ORDAC expressed a willingness to prepare a discussion paper on this topic.

391.6 Redevelopment of the order of the Guidance menu. James Hennelly asked if Elisa Sze would be willing to take the lead on this.

391.7 Progress on ALA Publishing's books on RDA. At the request of the Past Chair James Hennelly provided an update on the status of ALA's offering.

391.8 Drupal sites. James Hennelly provided an update.

391.9 Thanks were expressed to Colleen Barbus and ALA for providing us with an [online archive via ALAIR](#), which we have started to populate and which is a vital resource for us.

392 Review of meeting and thank you from Chair. The meeting confirmed the value of face-to-face meetings. Renate Behrens offered thanks to ALA, James Hennelly and Jen Gongarek for their organising activities and to meeting attendees. As Past Chair, Kathy Glennan offered thanks to Renate Behrens for chairing the meeting.

Approved by the RSC
29 May 2023

Appendix

375 RSC Action Plan

RSC/Chair/2023/1
last updated: 16 February 2023

RSC Action Plan 2023-2025

Note

This Action Plan updates [RSC/Chair/2022/5 RSC Action Plan 2022-2024](#).

There will be a further update later in 2023, once the RDA Board has published its Strategic Plan.

Standing Tasks (done every year):

- Direct RDA development to ensure continued alignment with the governing objectives:
 - Responsiveness to user needs
 - Cost efficiency
 - Flexibility
 - Continuity
 - Internationalization
- Report yearly on progress toward internationalization of the standard
- Add and adjust examples
- Provide content updates of RDA for Toolkit releases
- Continue RDA editorial cleanup (both in the Registry and the CMS)
- Continue guidance chapter development
- Be responsive to user feedback
- Review membership and tasks of all RSC Working Groups, adjusting as needed
- Interact with RSC Working Groups, monitoring their progress and providing input as needed
- Act on submitted discussion papers or proposals
- Provide expertise and support for RDA communities
- Provide outreach to new communities as opportunities arise
- Update RSC operations documents and create additional procedural documents as needed

- Refine processes (for translations, for policy statement updating, for Registry updating, etc.)
- Be alert to developments with IFLA LRM, ICP review, IFLA MulDiCat, ISSN, ISBD, and Records in contexts-International Council on Archives (RiC-IAD) for their impact on RDA

2023

1 Develop RDA as a responsive and dynamic standard

- a. Offer support to communities interested in developing discussion papers and proposals
- b. Contribute to the development of the Strategic Plan for RDA 2023-2025
- c. Continue review of Community Resources area and communicate decisions to users
- d. Provide support for training for those transitioning to the official Toolkit
- e. Address placement, potential integration, and functionality of application profiles within the Toolkit
- f. First the Technical Working Group, then the RSC:
 - 1) Prepare new guidance chapter on collection level description
 - 2) Begin BIBFRAME mapping
 - 3) Review the concept of performance aggregates (amalgamation instructions)
- g. Begin planning for removal of soft deprecated elements
- h. Undertake a review to identify inconsistent language and use of terms
- i. Toolkit development goals that impact the RSC:
 - 1) Consolidate the RSC website with other related Drupal sites, including development of space for regional committees and better sharing of content
 - 2) Development of mapping tool
 - 3) Implement Community Resources access for both CMS users and non-CMS users

2 Increase the adoption of RDA

- a. Continue to support regional groups
- b. Investigate an affiliate RSC membership status for regions not yet represented on the RSC, with an eye toward moving those regions to full membership status
- c. Provide orientation and support for RSC Representative from Latin America and the Caribbean when appointed

3 Provide relevant governance

- a. Recruit or re-appoint individuals to the following RSC positions: RDA Examples Editor, Wider Community Engagement Officer
- b. Review existing protocols and assigned liaisons with other information standards groups, considering new alignment(s) with IFLA

2024

1 Develop RDA as a responsive and dynamic standard

- a. Together with the RDA Board, review the status of countdown clock and community implementations of RDA
- b. Continue review of Community resources area and communicate decisions to users
- c. Continue BIBFRAME mapping
- d. Continue planning for removal of soft deprecated elements
- e. Further the development of the Collective Agent entity by creating a working group
- f. Re-establish the Music Working Group
- g. Further develop Nomen and Timespan instructions
- h. Toolkit development goals that impact the RSC:
 - 1) Development of RDA templates

2 Increase the adoption of RDA

- a. Begin outreach to archival (or other) communities in collaboration with RDA Board, as appropriate

3 Provide relevant governance

- a. Recruit or re-appoint individuals to the following RSC positions: Technical Team Liaison Officer, Translations Team Liaison Officer

2025

1 Develop RDA as a responsive and dynamic standard

- a. If needed, review status of countdown clock and community implementations of RDA together with the RDA Board
- b. Begin executing plan for removal of soft deprecated elements

2 Increase the adoption of RDA

- a. Continue outreach to archival (or other) communities in collaboration with RDA Board, as appropriate

3 Provide relevant governance

- a. Establish new Archives Working Group
- b. Recruit or re-appoint individuals to the following RSC positions: Secretary, RDA Examples Editor, Wider Community Engagement Officer
- c. Recruit for RSC Chair-Elect

380 RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

Note: Original document posted to the [RSC website](#) and archived to [ALAIR](#).

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1

Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

Prepared by the Places Working Group for the May 2023 meeting of the RDA Steering Committee

Abstract

This proposal examines the treatment of jurisdiction as 'a place that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation enacted by a corporate body that is a government' in RDA and proposes changes RDA to harmonize this concept with elements related to corporate bodies that are governments and courts.

Background

[6JSC/TechnicalWG/4](#) concerning court and jurisdiction in RDA was submitted to the RSC in August 2014 and was accepted in principle at the November 2014 RSC meeting. The current iteration of the Places Working Group has reviewed the recommendations in [6JSC/TechnicalWG/4](#) in the context of the post-3R Toolkit in order to determine if the recommendations have been implemented and where further revision of RDA is required.

This proposal is organized by the 2014 recommendations.

Recommendations

2014 Recommendation 1

Replace the term "political jurisdiction" in RDA with "political body" or a similar term, and the term "religious jurisdiction" in RDA with "religious body" or a similar term.

Status: Implemented.

The March 2023 release of RDA Toolkit defines *jurisdiction* as 'A place that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation enacted by a corporate body that is a government.' The term *government* is defined as 'A totality of executive, legislative, and judicial corporate bodies exercising power over a jurisdiction.'

All instances of 'religious jurisdiction' in base RDA have been replaced with 'religious body.' Other instances of the term 'religious jurisdiction' are found in the Community refinements area of Community resources. Revisions to Community resources are out of scope.

Based on the above, the Places Working Group has concluded that 2014 Recommendation 1 has been implemented in RDA.

2014 Recommendation 2

Replace references in the RDA instructions to the unqualified term "jurisdiction" with a specific term chosen from "political body", "religious body", "territorial jurisdiction", "ecclesiastical jurisdiction", or similar terms, or other general terms established in RDA such as "place", as indicated in Table 1.

Status: Partially implemented.

In most areas of RDA, the terms of *jurisdiction* and *government* are used as they are defined in the Glossary. However there are a few places in RDA that still have confusing usage.

2023 Recommendation 1: Revise element definitions and instructions across RDA to clarify the distinction between a *jurisdiction* and a *government*.

For ease, each change is presented on a separate page.

2023 Recommendation 1A

date of establishment. Recording an unstructured description. [Condition/Option 1](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a joint administration by two or more governments who claim ~~jurisdiction~~
governance over the same place.

Clean version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a joint administration by two or more governments who claim governance over the same place.

2023 Recommendation 1B

date of termination. Recording an unstructured description. [Condition/Option 1](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a joint administration by two or more governments who claim ~~jurisdiction~~
governance over the same place.

Clean version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a joint administration by two or more governments who claim governance over the same place.

2023 Recommendation 1C

field of activity of corporate body

Definition and scope

Marked-up version

A field of endeavor, area of competence, or responsibility, ~~jurisdiction, etc.~~, in which a corporate body is engaged.

Clean version

A field of endeavor, area of competence, or responsibility in which a corporate body is engaged.

2023 Recommendation 1D

preferred name of corporate body. Different names or forms of name for the same corporate body.
Conventional name. Governments. [Condition/Option 1](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a government.

A corporate body has an official name and a name of a place over which it exercises ~~jurisdiction~~
governance.

A value of Corporate Body: [name of corporate body](#) is an official name of a government that is not in
common use.

CONDITION OPTION

Record a value of Place: [name of place](#) of a jurisdiction.

Clean version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a government.

A corporate body has an official name and a name of a place over which it exercises governance.

A value of Corporate Body: [name of corporate body](#) is an official name of a government that is not in
common use.

CONDITION OPTION

Record a value of Place: [name of place](#) of a jurisdiction.

2023 Recommendation 1E

preferred name of corporate body. Different names or forms of name for the same corporate body.
Conventional name. Governments. [Condition/Option 2](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a government.

A corporate body has an official name and a name of a place over which it exercises ~~jurisdiction~~
governance.

A value of Corporate Body: [name of corporate body](#) is an official name of a government that is in
common use.

CONDITION OPTION

Record an official name

Clean version

CONDITION

A corporate body is a government.

A corporate body has an official name and a name of a place over which it exercises governance.

A value of Corporate Body: [name of corporate body](#) is an official name of a government that is in
common use.

CONDITION OPTION

Record an official name.

2023 Recommendation 1F

preferred name of place. Recording an unstructured description. Different names for the same place. Two or more names appear in sources. [Condition/Option 1](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

Two or more names of place appear in sources of information.

CONDITION OPTION

Record a ~~preferred name of place~~ from (in this order of preference):

1. the form of the name found in a gazetteer or another source of information in a language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata
2. the form of the name found in a gazetteer or another source of information issued in the jurisdiction in which the place is located in the official language or languages ~~of that jurisdiction~~ of the government of the jurisdiction.

Clean version

CONDITION

Two or more names of place appear in sources of information.

CONDITION OPTION

Record (in this order of preference):

1. the form of the name found in a gazetteer or another source of information in a language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata
2. the form of the name found in a gazetteer or another source of information issued in the jurisdiction in which the place is located in the official language or languages of the government of the jurisdiction.

2023 Recommendation 1G

preferred name of place. Recording an unstructured description. Different names for the same place. Language. [Condition/Option 1](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A name of place is in two or more languages.

CONDITION OPTION

Record (in this order of preference):

1. the form of the name in a language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata, if there is one in general use.
2. the form of the name in the official language of the ~~jurisdiction~~ government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

Clean version

CONDITION

A name of place is in two or more languages.

CONDITION OPTION

Record (in this order of preference):

1. the form of the name in a language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata, if there is one in general use.
2. the form of the name in the official language of the government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

2023 Recommendation 1H

preferred name of place. Recording an unstructured description. Different names for the same place. Language. [Condition/Option 3](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

A value of a name is in a language that is preferred by an agent who creates the metadata.

A name of place is the name of a government ~~that has jurisdiction over the place~~ of the jurisdiction.

CONDITION OPTION

Record that form of name.

Clean version

CONDITION

A value of a name is in a language that is preferred by an agent who creates the metadata.

A name of place is the name of a government of the jurisdiction.

CONDITION OPTION

Record that form of name.

2023 Recommendation 1J

preferred name of place. Recording an unstructured description. Different names for the same place. Language. [Condition/Option 4](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

No form of a name of place that is in general use is in a language preferred by the agent creating the data.

A government of a jurisdiction has one official language.

CONDITION OPTION

Record the form of name in the official language of the government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

Clean version

CONDITION

No form of a name of place that is in general use is in a language preferred by the agent creating the data.

A government of a jurisdiction has one official language.

CONDITION OPTION

Record the form of name in the official language of the government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

2023 Recommendation 1K

preferred name of place. Recording an unstructured description. Different names for the same place. Language. [Condition/Option 5](#)

Marked-up version

CONDITION

No form of a name of place that is in general use is in a language preferred by the agent creating the data.

A government of a jurisdiction has two or more official languages.

CONDITION OPTION

Record the form of name that appears most frequently in sources in a language preferred by the agent who creates the data.

Clean version

CONDITION

No form of a name of place that is in general use is in a language preferred by the agent creating the data.

A government of a jurisdiction has two or more official languages.

CONDITION OPTION

Record the form of name that appears most frequently in sources in a language preferred by the agent who creates the data.

2014 Recommendations 3 and 4

Encourage the use of a vocabulary encoding scheme for the RDA element Type of Corporate Body but do not specify a scheme.

AND

Add a definition for the RDA element Type of Corporate Body. A scope note should be added to clarify the inclusion of political body, religious body, and court.

Status: Partially implemented

The post-3R Toolkit has the element Corporate Body: [category of corporate body](#) with the definition 'A type to which a corporate body belongs.' The instructions for the element allow for the use of a VES, but a scheme is not specified, as was recommended in 2014 recommendation 3.

No scope note is present, contrary to the 2014 recommendation. However no other 'category' element in RDA includes a scope note; the Places Working Group believes that in the context of jurisdictions and governments a scope note is not needed.

2014 Recommendation 5

Add a definition for the RDA element Type of jurisdiction. A scope note should be added to clarify the inclusion of territorial jurisdiction and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Status: Partially implemented, but with substantial modification.

This recommendation was implemented in 3R as Corporate Body: [category of corporate body](#). It should be noted that the original analysis for 'type of jurisdiction' indicate that this would be a categorization element for the Place entity. However discussion at the meeting where the proposal was discussed indicated that this element was actually applicable to the type of government that governs a jurisdiction, not as a further refinement of a jurisdiction as a place.

The recommendation for the scope note is no longer applicable.

2014 Recommendation 6

Add a definition and scope note for the RDA term "jurisdiction" to the RDA Glossary. The definition should indicate that a jurisdiction is a place.

Status: Implemented.

2014 Recommendation 7

Add a definition and scope note for the RDA term "court" to the RDA Glossary. The definition should indicate that a court is a corporate body.

Status: Not implemented.

2023 Recommendation 2: Propose a glossary term and definition for the concept 'court.'

court: A corporate body that has legal authority to adjudicate disputes and administer justice.

A court may include a tribunal, a court of first instance, a court of last resort, a court of limited jurisdiction, appellate, civil, constitutional, criminal, district, juvenile, international, military, or religious courts.

2014 Recommendation 8

Amend the definitions of the relationship designators appellant, appellee, enacting jurisdiction and jurisdiction governed. Amend the label of the relationship designator enacting jurisdiction.

Status: Partially implemented.

The definitions for Work: [appellant person](#), Work: [appellant corporate body](#), and their inverses have been revised in accordance with the 2014 recommendation.

The definitions for Work: [appellee person](#), Work: [appellee corporate body](#), and their inverses have been revised in accordance with the 2014 recommendation.

The recommendations for revising the element name Work: [enacting jurisdiction](#) and its inverse has not been implemented in RDA.

2023 Recommendation 3: Revise the element name for Work: [enacting jurisdiction](#) to 'enacting government' and Corporate Body: [enacting jurisdiction of](#) to 'enacting government of.'

Marked-up version

enacting ~~jurisdiction~~ government

Definition and Scope

A corporate body who is a government enacting a work that is a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation.

enacting ~~jurisdiction~~ government of

Definition and Scope

A work that is a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation enacted by a corporate body who is a government.

Clean version

enacting government

Definition and Scope

A corporate body who is a government enacting a work that is a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation.

enacting government of

Definition and Scope

A work that is a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation enacted by a corporate body who is a government.

[end]

The definition and element names for 'jurisdiction governed' present special problems and are discussed below.

Jurisdiction governed

Laws and regulations are enacted by governments, but those laws and regulations may only be applicable to the governance of certain jurisdictions. For example, a law passed by the United States Government might only be applicable to the governance of the jurisdiction Puerto Rico.

The pre-3R Toolkit attempted to provide a relationship that would describe the applicability of a law to a jurisdiction, named 'jurisdiction governed.' However its placement in appendix I.2.2, other agents associated with a work, suggested that the relationship was between the law (a work) and the government of the jurisdiction. The definition of **jurisdiction governed** 'A jurisdiction governed by a law, regulation, etc., that was enacted by another jurisdiction,' in the context of how *jurisdiction* and *government* are defined in official RDA, it should be read as 'A corporate body that is a government that is governed by a law, regulation, etc., that was enacted by another government.'

We believe that part of the confusion with the applicability of a law is because of the naming conventions for governments that are provided for in RDA. A government may have a conventional name that is the name of a place. However, while a government and a place may share name values that are identical in their language and script, the two entities themselves are disjoint: one is a government and the other is a place:

Corporate Body A has appellation of corporate body "United States" .

Place A has appellation of place "United States" .

In our examination of the official Toolkit, the semantics of either of the scenarios (A law applicable to a place or A law applicable to a government of a place) are not present. Instead the relationship has been redefined so that it is relating a government to a jurisdiction (a place) that is governed by a different government. There is currently not a specific relationship between a law and the place that the law is applicable to or between a law and the government to which the law is applicable.

To sum up, three sets of relationships are needed in RDA:

1. between a law and the place that it is applicable to.
2. between a law and the government that it is applicable to.
3. between a government and the place it governs.

Because the relationship designator in original Toolkit **jurisdiction governed** was between a law and a government identified using a place name as a conventional name, we believe that current RDA element Corporate Body: [jurisdiction governed](#) and its inverse should be redefined to cover set 1. Because this re-definition would involve a change of domain, it will be necessary to deprecate the current elements and re-establish them with domains of Work and Place.

In order to cover sets 2 and 3, new elements and inverses will need to be proposed.

2024 Recommendation 4: Deprecate the elements Corporate Body: [jurisdiction governed](#) and Place: [jurisdiction governed of](#).

2023 Recommendation 5: Add elements for Work: jurisdiction governed and Place: jurisdiction governed of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the place it is applicable to.

Clean version only

jurisdiction governed: A place that is a jurisdiction that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation.

jurisdiction governed of: A work that is law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation, that governs a jurisdiction.

2023 Recommendation 6: Add elements for Work: applicable government and Corporate Body: applicable government of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the government that it is applicable to.

Clean version only

applicable government: A corporate body that is a government that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation.

applicable government of: A work that is law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation that governs a government.

2023 Recommendation 7: Add elements for Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction and Place: governing jurisdiction of, in order to relate a corporate body that is a government to the place that it governs.

Clean version only

governing jurisdiction: A place that is governed by a government.

governing jurisdiction of: A corporate body that is a government that governs a jurisdiction.

Impact

2023 Recommendations 1-2 are minor changes that are proposed for the sake of clarity and will have little to no impact on current cataloging practices.

2023 Recommendation 3, while only a change in label name, may require a significant amount of changes in library catalogs. A search of the Library of Congress online catalog on April 21, 2023 for 'enacting jurisdiction' reveals it has been used over 6,000 times.

2023 Recommendation 4-7 will have an impact as well, but only with regards to how the legacy Toolkit relationship designator of 'jurisdiction governed' was applied. A search of the Library of Congress online catalog on April 21, 2023, reveals 13 instances of the legacy Toolkit designator being used, and in all cases it is relating a law to a corporate body that is a government. In these cases, the proposed element 'applicable government' would be the appropriate replacement.

Summary of Recommendations

2023 Recommendation 1: Revise element definitions and instructions across RDA to clarify the distinction between a *jurisdiction* and a *government*.

2023 Recommendation 2: Propose a glossary term and definition for the concept 'court.'

2023 Recommendation 3: Revise the element name for Work: [enacting jurisdiction](#) to 'enacting government' and Corporate Body: [enacting jurisdiction of](#) to 'enacting government of.'

2024 Recommendation 4: Deprecate the elements Corporate Body: [jurisdiction governed](#) and Place: [jurisdiction governed of](#).

2023 Recommendation 5: Add elements for Work: jurisdiction governed and Place: jurisdiction governed of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the place it is applicable to.

2023 Recommendation 6: Add elements for Work: applicable government and Corporate Body: applicable government of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the government that it is applicable to.

2023 Recommendation 7: Add elements for Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction and Place: governing jurisdiction of, in order to relate a corporate body that is a government to the place that it governs.

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/EOO response
3 May 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee

Cc: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary

From: Elisa Sze, Education and Orientation Officer

Subject: Response to: PlacesWG/2023/1

Thank you to the Places Working Group for their effort and thoroughness in reviewing the implementation status of the recommendations originating from 6JSC/TechnicalWG/4 and bringing forward this proposal.

2023 Recommendation 1:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 2:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 3:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 4:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 5:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 6:

Approve

2023 Recommendation 7: Add elements for Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction and Place: governing jurisdiction of, in order to relate a corporate body that is a government to the place that it governs.

Approve in principle. I also reviewed this proposal in my separate role on the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. That committee is suggesting clearer labels, “jurisdiction of government” (instead of “governing jurisdiction”) and “government of jurisdiction” (instead of “governing jurisdiction of”), which I support.

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/EURIG response
May 2, 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Ahava Cohen, Europe representative
Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 – Jurisdictions, Governments,
and Courts in RDA

2014 Recommendations

As these are more statements than recommendations at this time, EURIG thanks the members of the WG for their work in reviewing the old recommendations against the Official Toolkit.

2023 Recommendation 1A

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1B

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1C

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1D

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1E

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1F

Approve, with question

Condition option 2's wording may be confusing for Toolkit users as there are many categories of government but only a subset has the power to set an official language. Are official languages inheritable from larger corporate bodies or is "official language" in this context the equivalent of "language of corporate body"?

2023 Recommendation 1G

Approve, with suggestion

Condition Option 2 uses "the official language". It is unclear in this recommendation what would happen if the government of the jurisdiction had more than one official language and none were the language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata. In many other places in the Toolkit the indefinite, rather than the definite, article was used to anticipate such situations.

Suggested rewording:

2. the form of the name in an official language of the language of the government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

2023 Recommendation 1H

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1I

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1J

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1K

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1I

Approve

2023 Recommendation 2

Approve

2023 Recommendation 3

Approve

2023 Recommendations 4-7: General comment

EURIG believes these recommended changes would benefit from examples and from consideration of condition/option sets which may be required for the new elements.

2023 Recommendation 4

Approve, with comment

There is a condition/option set referring to "appellation of place" in the element to be deprecated. As nowhere in the 2023 recommendations is "appellation of place" it should be

determined where, if anywhere the condition/option pair should be relocated to before deprecation.

2023 Recommendation 5

Approve

2023 Recommendation 6

Approve

2023 Recommendation 7

Approve

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/NARDAC response
3 May 2023

To: **Renate Behrens**, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary

From: Robert L. Maxwell, NARDAC representative to RDA Steering Committee

Subject: Response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - [Proposal on] Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA, prepared by the Places Working Group.

NARDAC generally supports this proposal but has a few questions, particularly about Recommendation 7, as well as some editorial suggestions. Because of the short turnaround time given for this response NARDAC is unable to formulate a position on some of the comments reproduced below, including the general comments at the end from LC.

Before speaking to specific recommendations, NARDAC passes along the following concerns from LC Law Cataloging and LC Law Library for consideration by RSC and the WG.

“The proposal appears to assume that [RDA is] working exclusively with modern governments for whom all laws are enacted by a formal legislative process, and ignores systems (historic and contemporary) in which governance involves customary law. This is problematic even in discussing modern English-speaking countries whose legal systems include elements of customary law, and breaks down totally when considering jurisdictions based on customary structures and laws, which also includes most religious jurisdictions. Even if RDA was limited to collections of Euro-centric and USA-centric resources this would be a problem, but the Law Library of Congress intensively collects materials from all countries, cultures, and time periods, and as such the definition would be seriously flawed.”

NARDAC agrees that the proposal may have ignored its effect on customary law and recommends that the WG examine this issue more carefully.

2023 Recommendation 1A

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1B

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1C

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1D

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1E

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1F

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1G

Approve with comment/suggestion

Editorial note based on RDA language elsewhere:

CONDITION OPTION

Record (in this order of preference):

1. the form of the name in a language preferred by the agent who creates the metadata, if there is one in general use.
2. the form of the name in ~~the~~ **an** official language of the government of the jurisdiction in which the place is located.

2023 Recommendation 1H

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1J

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1K

Approve

2023 Recommendation 2 (definition of court)

Approve in principle with comment/suggestion

Normally, in element definitions and scope notes, the singular is used in enumerations. When the enumeration lists examples of what the element can be, the verb "may" is not used, even when the enumeration is not intended to be comprehensive.

For consistency, the definition should read:

court: A corporate body that has legal authority to adjudicate disputes and administer justice.

A court includes a tribunal, a court of first instance, a court of last resort, a court of limited jurisdiction, an appellate, civil, constitutional, criminal, district, juvenile, international, military, or religious court.

If RSC is amenable to the above change, another NARDAC member also suggests that rather than listing the most important courts at the end, the second paragraph could read instead:

A court includes an appellate, civil, constitutional, criminal, district, juvenile, international, military, or religious court, a tribunal, a court of first instance, a court of last resort, a court of limited jurisdiction.

The LC Law Library suggests adding “wellness” and “traditional” to the list of types of courts.

2023 Recommendation 3

Approve with comment

LC Law Library points out that changing “enacting jurisdiction” to “enacting government” may make the relationship element unsuitable for customary law.

2023 Recommendation 4

Approve

2023 Recommendation 5

Approve

2023 Recommendation 6

Approve

2023 Recommendation 7

Approve in principle with comments/questions

Add elements for Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction and Place: governing jurisdiction of, in order to relate a corporate body that is a government to the place that it governs.

Clean version only

governing jurisdiction: A place that is governed by a government.

governing jurisdiction of: A corporate body that is a government that governs a jurisdiction.

Comment/Question: Does this mean that we need to start creating two descriptions (authority records) for (e.g.) United States? Since they have the same preferred name, will authorized access points for one or both have to be qualified to distinguish them? If there is to be a relationship recorded between a “governing jurisdiction” and a place, there need to be two entities to relate (i.e., two descriptions). The

implication of the proposal is that every jurisdiction (to use original RDA's language) will need two descriptions, one for the governing jurisdiction (e.g., King County, Washington; Seattle, Washington) and one for the place it governs (King County, Washington; Seattle, Washington).

NARDAC is not necessarily opposed to this, but it seems a major change; one which, however, may be necessary, perhaps even overdue.

Comment on the name of the elements proposed in Recommendation 7: a NARDAC member suggests that the new element names may be clearer as:

Corporate Body: jurisdiction of government

and

Place: government of jurisdiction

Rather than

Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction

and

Place: governing jurisdiction of

The suggested naming is similar to the first pair (Recommendation 5), which points to a jurisdiction as a place (with the phrase "jurisdiction governed"). The phrase "governing jurisdiction" feels like it is the place that is doing the governing.

General comments from LC that pertain to more than one recommendation

LC RDA project team points out a minor issue that RDA Glossary definitions seem to usually prefer "A corporate body who ..." rather than "A corporate body that ...". Yet the proposal favors "A corporate body that ..." in the definitions for its new glossary term on p. 14 ("court: A corporate body that has legal authority to adjudicate disputes and administer justice ...") and its two new elements on p. 16 ("applicable government: A corporate body that is a government that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation" and "governing jurisdiction of: A corporate body that is a government that governs a jurisdiction"). The LC commenter personally favors using that, but to make it more consistent with the rest of RDA, the proposal may need to consider changing "that" to "who".

The LC Law Library comments: It would be more efficient to keep the current term "jurisdiction" and we suggest modifying the definition of jurisdiction: "a place that is governed by a law, regulation, constitution, court rule, or other legislation enacted by a corporate body **that is a government**", either deleting "that is a government" or adding the phrase, "or traditional community body".

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/ORDAC response

3 May 2023

To: RDA Steering Committee

From: Charlotte Christensen, ORDAC representative

Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 - Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

In general ORDAC supports the recommendations.

We have specific concerns about the understanding of place and ownership in a broader sense than this working group's scope. Indigenous communities have connections to place that are not necessarily the same as legal ownership or governance in the western sense. The conversations about how this should be represented are developing in countries like Australia and New Zealand, as well as in other places around the world, and we have a general feeling that there is more work to be done on the Place entity as a whole in relation to reflecting indigenous understandings in order to meet RSC and RDA Board's stated internationalisation goals. This work could well impact on the definitions discussed here, as well as adding conditions and options to element pages.

For now, given that we recognise this would be a piece of work requiring extensive consultation, ORDAC is willing to support the recommendations done by the existing Working Group and will look to developing a discussion paper to begin the conversations required.

Recommendation 1

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 3

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 4

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 5

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 6

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

Recommendation 7

ORDAC approves of this recommendation.

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/RDA Examples Editor response
04 May 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Honor Moody, RDA Examples Editor
Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1, Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

The RDA Examples Editor thanks the Places Working Group for their work and this proposal.

2023 Recommendation 1: Revise element definitions and instructions across RDA to clarify the distinction between a *jurisdiction* and a *government*.

Approve.

2023 Recommendation 2: Propose a glossary term and definition for the concept ‘court.’

Approve.

2023 Recommendation 3: Revise the element name for Work: [enacting jurisdiction](#) to ‘enacting government’ and Corporate Body: [enacting jurisdiction of](#) to ‘enacting government of.’

Approve.

2024 Recommendation 4: Deprecate the elements Corporate Body: [jurisdiction governed](#) and Place: [jurisdiction governed of](#).

Approve.

2023 Recommendation 5: Add elements for Work: jurisdiction governed and Place: jurisdiction governed of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the place it is applicable to.

Approve.

2023 Recommendation 6: Add elements for Work: applicable government and Corporate Body: applicable government of, in order to relate a work that is a law to the government that it is applicable to.

Approve.

2023 Recommendation 7: Add elements for Corporate Body: governing jurisdiction and Place: governing jurisdiction of, in order to relate a corporate body that is a government to the place that it governs.

Approve.

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/TranslationsTLO
3 May, 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Szabolcs Dancs, Translations Team Liaison Officer
Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 – Jurisdictions,
Governments, and Courts in RDA

General remark

I approve the proposal, it makes the concept of 'jurisdiction' much clearer. (However, for example, the Hungarian translation won't be affected.)

2014 Recommendations

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1A

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1B

Approve

2023 Recommendation 1C
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1D
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1E
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1F
Approve

23 Recommendation 1G
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1H
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1I
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1J
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1K
Approve

2023 Recommendation 1I
Approve

2023 Recommendation 2
Approve

2023 Recommendation 3
Approve

2023 Recommendation 4
Approve

2023 Recommendation 5
Approve

2023 Recommendation 6

Approve

2023 Recommendation 7

Approve

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/TTWG Response
16 May 2023

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.

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/WCEO response
May 3, 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Charlene Chou, WCEO
Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 – Jurisdictions,
Governments, and Courts in RDA

2023 Recommendation 1

Approve

2023 Recommendation 2

Approve

2023 Recommendation 3

Approve

2023 Recommendation 4

Approve

2023 Recommendation 5

Approve

2023 Recommendation 6

Approve

2023 Recommendation 7

Approve

General comments

I support these recommendations to clarify the distinction between a jurisdiction and a government and to revise related instructions and definitions, especially for English terms. On the other hand, other languages vary. Some languages may have their specific terms or some countries may have their own definitions or structures. I agree with recommendation 1F to record (in this order of preference) for names in more than one language, and hope to see more options when technology supports multilingual discovery platforms for libraries.

380.1 RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/summary

RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/summary
Last updated: 9 May 2023

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
Subject: Formal response to RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1 – Jurisdictions, Governments, and Courts in RDA

This document collates in tabular response the responses received from voting members of the RSC to the first proposal from the Jurisdictions/Places Working Group, *viz.*:

- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/EOO response](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/EURIG response](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/NARDAC response](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/ORDAC response](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/RDA Examples Editor response](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/TranslationsTLO](#)
- [RSC/PlacesWG/2023/1/WCEO response](#)

The Technical Team Liaison Officer is not obligated to offer a formal response, because he is one of the co-authors of the proposal. However, he will raise some issues raised by a member of the Technical Team either at the meeting on 18 May or before then. If we receive information from him before the meeting, I will update this summary document accordingly.

Note 1: [ORDAC](#) approves all the recommendations but raises an important issue about the broader understanding of place and ownership. They suggest they will work to develop a discussion paper on this topic.

Note 2: The Library of Congress expressed concerns about the approach, which [NARDAC has passed on](#) for consideration. In particular, it states that “It would be more efficient to keep the term ‘jurisdiction’” and offers a redefinition of the term.

Note 3: The [WCEO](#) approves the recommendations but highlights the cultural and linguistic specificity of differing approaches to the concept of jurisdiction. The [Translations TLO](#) similarly approves the recommendations but points out that not all languages will be impacted, giving the specific example of Hungarian.

Recommendation 1A	Approve	
-------------------	---------	--

Recommendation 1B	Approve	
Recommendation 1C	Approve	
Recommendation 1D	Approve	
Recommendation 1E	Approve	
Recommendation 1F		EURIG approves, but with a query on wording
Recommendation 1G		EURIG approves, but with suggestion on wording; NARDAC approves, but with a suggestion on wording that differs from EURIG 's
Recommendation 1H	Approve	
Recommendation 1I	Approve	
Recommendation 1J	Approve	
Recommendation 1K	Approve	
Recommendation 1L	Approve	
Recommendation 2		NARDAC approves, but with a suggestion
Recommendation 3		NARDAC approves, but with a suggestion
Recommendation 4		EURIG approves, with a comment that requires discussion; also requests examples and a consideration of condition option sets.
Recommendation 5	Approve	EURIG requests examples and a consideration of condition option sets.
Recommendation 6	Approve	EURIG requests examples and a consideration of condition option sets.
Recommendation 7		EURIG requests examples and a consideration of condition option sets; NARDAC raises several points for discussion