

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: EURIG
Subject: Priority order of additions to authorized access points representing a person (9.19.1.1, 9.19.1.5, 9.19.1.6)

EURIG thanks LC for this proposal to revise the instructions affecting the priority order of additions to authorized access points representing a person.

We have some reservations concerning the proposed changes.

We think it is better for consistency if the cataloguer considers always in the same order the different criteria for distinguishing different persons.

We would prefer to change the present order and to give the profession or occupation of the person (9.16 RDA), if known, *before* the period of activity of the person (see 9.3.4 RDA). It seems more logical, as the period of activity is in close relationship with the profession or occupation.

We are in favour of having the possibility to record more than one addition to authorized access points representing a person, even if it is not necessary for distinguishing different persons, if it is of interest for the end user.

Although principles state that additions should be kept at a minimum, just for uniquely identify the entity, we think that we serve better our users' needs by including both (or more, for that purpose) additions, at least in some cases, although one addition is enough to differentiate homonyms.

Example: Smith, John, Musician, flourished 1705

The core concept of disambiguation would need a broader discussion.

If the biographical dates are the most objective and international way for differentiating homonyms, the addition of the profession or occupation could allow for displaying the data to the end users in a more convenient way. The way Wikipedia handles disambiguation (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Bradley_%28disambiguation%29 for an example) may be used to fuel our thinking.