

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
 From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
 Subject: Formal responses to RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev – Proposal to revise the element hierarchy for appellations of work groups

This document collates in tabular form the responses received from voting members of the RSC to RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev, viz.:

- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/EOO](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/EURIG](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/Examples Editor](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/NARDAC](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/ORDAC](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/TranslationsTLO](#)
- [RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/1/rev/WCEO](#)

Recommendation 1	Approved by 7: EOO , EURIG , Examples Editor , NARDAC , ORDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO .	
Recommendation 2	Approved by 7: EOO , EURIG , Examples Editor , NARDAC , ORDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO .	
Recommendation 3	Approved by 6: EOO , EURIG , Examples Editor , NARDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO . Clarification requested before approval by 1: ORDAC	Note 1: ORDAC raises a query about the form of wording used in Recommendations 3 and 4.
Recommendation 4	Approved by 6: EOO , EURIG , Examples Editor , NARDAC , TranslationsTLO , WCEO . Clarification requested before approval by 1: ORDAC	Note 1: ORDAC raises a query about the form of wording used in Recommendations 3 and 4.

Note 1

[ORDAC](#) raises the following query with regard to the form of wording used in Recommendations 3 and 4:

ORDAC would like clarification on recommendations 3 and 4 before approving them.

While the revised definition wording seems clear as proposed, it is not clear to ORDAC why it is beneficial to have these two definitions vary from the pattern set for the other authorized access point elements.

All of the existing authorized access point elements have definitions that fit one of two patterns:

<entity>: authorized access point for <entity> elements are defined as:

A nomen that is an access point for <entity> that is selected for preference in a specific vocabulary encoding scheme

<entity>: authorized access point for <entity> of elements are defined as:

A(n) <entity> that has an access point for <entity> that is selected for preference in a specific vocabulary encoding scheme

The words "*for work groups*" and "*to identify a work group*" respectively are present at the end of the work group element definitions, but the current definitions otherwise fit the same pattern as above.

In particular we are concerned that the changes being proposed in recommendations 3 and 4 shift the definition from permitting a value of an access point selected from a VES through to specifically requiring a value of authorized access point from a VES.

It is likely that in many implementations the value of <entity>: access point for <entity> selected from a VES would in fact be the authorised form, but if that is true for the element Work: authorized access point for work group then why would it not also be true for the definitions of other authorized access point elements? If this change in wording is approved, then ORDAC would expect to see consistency across these elements.