Executive Summary:

The PCC implementation of “Official RDA” will inevitably lead to the creation of non-RDA compliant Name Authority Records (NARs) in the LC Name Authority File (NAF). Questions around coding these entities in NARs prompted the creation of a PCC task group. One of the recommendations from that group’s final report was the creation of a new group to address the creation of an entity list for non-RDA compliant entities. The current task group was charged in July 2021 to address that recommendation and developed the definitions below for ten entities that may require non-RDA compliant PCC. Brief definitions (see Entity terms, scopes, and examples for more detail):

- **Person**: Identity presented as any individual; including individuals living or dead, fictional or non-fictional, pseudonymous (collective or singular), etc.
- **Corporate body**: Identity created by one or more individuals for use in a public activity (business, government, religion, performance, etc.). A single individual can only be considered a corporate body if the identity is used for business or legal purposes (e.g. incorporation to limit liability)
- **Family**: Identity presented as encompassing an open group of individuals related by birth, adoption, marriage, etc.
- **Spirit**: Identity presented as an immaterial individual communicating through a medium
- **Religious figure**: Identity presented as an individual from a sacred text or religious tradition
- **Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology**: Identity presented as an individual appearing in narratives that are significant to a cultural tradition and that are intended to convey meaning, etiology, origin stories, etc.
• **Named animal or plant:** Identity presented as belonging to an individual non-human animal or plant

• **Fictitious entity:** Identity known to be fictitious. Not limited to fictional characters in literature

• **Event:** Identity presented as an occurrence that is formally convened, directed toward a common goal, and which has a formal name, location (including online), date, and duration. This includes occurrences that are recurring and those that are canceled

• **Jurisdiction:** Named geographic area, populated or not, over which a legal body exercises authority or that is otherwise subject to laws or treaties

**Background and scope:**

The task group was charged in July 2021 to: identify and secure a platform to host the vocabulary as Linked Data, develop an outline of an initial vocabulary, and contact the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB) to determine interest in jointly developing an entity vocabulary for use with RDA (based on outline of initial vocabulary). The group was asked to include the nine entities identified in the Final Report of the PCC Task Group on Coding for Non-RDA Entities in NARs, consider including “event” and “jurisdiction” as additional entities, and provide a scope for each entity. The group reported to the PCC Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) and was chaired by SCS co-chair Elizabeth Miraglia. The group also included two members from the previous Task Group on Coding Non-RDA Entities in NARs and formally invited Reinhold Heuvelmann to join in order to ensure that we were working with the DNB from the start.

The group originally limited its discussion to entities for which a Name Authority Record (NAR) might be created and also confined its work to 11 entities, the 9 entities listed in the report from the preceding task group plus “jurisdiction” and “event.” In particular, the definition of a “person” had to be addressed since the definition in “Official RDA” will result in a number of non-RDA compliant NARs after implementation. Official RDA defines a person as “an agent who is an individual human being who lives or is assumed to have lived.” The NAF has thousands of NARs that do not meet these requirements, especially religious figures and those from legends, folklore, and mythology. In addition, this definition of a “person” has implications for others in the list. An RDA-compliant “corporate body,” for example, is comprised of RDA-compliant persons. So fictitious corporate bodies or corporate bodies comprised of non-human entities are no longer RDA-compliant. Since there is no desire to stop establishing these entities in the NAF and it is necessary for the PCC to create its own definitions of non-RDA compliant entities in order to distinguish them from entities that are RDA-compliant and be able to code them appropriately.

In addition, the group decided to roll the “conference” entity into “event,” resulting in 10 entity definitions. Similar to the work of the previous group, only agent-type entities were considered. The group did receive a request to consider the inclusion of the WEMI entities but decided that they were out of scope and that the RDA definitions for those elements would likely suffice for
catalogers. The group also opted to generate 3-letter codes to be used in the 075 $b field to further enhance machine processing of the data.

Some definitions required consultations and input from communities outside of the task group. In particular, “religious figure” and “figure from folklore, legend, or mythology” generated significant discussion and required that the group reach out to the American Theological Library Association and to consultants at the Xwi7xwa Library at the University of British Columbia.

Lastly, the group decided early on that one of our guiding principles would be the practical needs of catalogers and metadata specialists in their daily work. Drafting a vocabulary naturally generates deep, highly abstract discussions that are necessary for ensuring a thoughtful result but the group wanted to be sure that catalogers would be able to use the vocabulary in a relatively easy way and feel confident in their decisions. A few entities warrant more full discussion of their scopes, which appear below.

Coordination with Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB)
The group was fortunate to have Reinhold Heuvelmann as a formal member in order to inform our own definitions. Many of the PCC entity definitions created by this task group borrow from those of the DNB, created and maintained for the “Integrated Authority File” (“Gemeinsame Normdatei”, GND). The group was charged to determine whether or not to develop a shared vocabulary with the DNB. Throughout the group’s discussion, it became clear that in many cases the GND and PCC have different conceptual models for various entities and that a fully joint vocabulary is not possible at this time. However, the PCC vocabulary was developed with an eye toward being able to map entities between the two and in particular to be able to identify where entities with similar labels are either not the same or have different scopes in different vocabularies.

Guidelines for using entity terms in 075 tags

Repeatability
One of the most critical aspects for the use of the 075 field is its repeatability. Catalogers are encouraged to use as many 075 fields as needed to describe the entity in the AAP. If multiple 075 terms are applicable, the field should be repeated instead of using multiple instances of 075 $a, even if all of the terms come from the same vocabulary. This is meant to improve machine processing and conversion to Linked Data in the future.

Field structure
The 075 field should be formed with the term from the PCC vocabulary in $a, the 3-letter code for the entity in $b, and the source vocabulary code in $2. For example:

075 _ _ $a Person $b per $2 [code]
Limits for use

The PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) recently voted to implement a single 040 $e code for NARs created after the implementation of the LRM-based RDA: “pccrda.” The code would cover both RDA compliant and non-compliant entities in order to reduce the number of 040 codes and in order to be in line with NDMSO requirements for staging the code. This new code means that without guidance for using additional vocabularies and distinguishing between RDA compliant and non-RDA compliant NARs, the 075 field becomes the sole method for doing so. In theory, that would then limit the use of 075 fields to non-RDA compliant NARs, which can confuse the applicability of this PCCENT vocabulary, some of whose definitions are broad enough to include RDA-compliant entities as well. (i.e., It is possible/reasonable to have 075 fields containing both the PCCENT vocabulary and the RDA-entity vocabulary when an entity is RDA-compliant, while **only** the PCCENT vocabulary should be used for non-RDA-compliant entities, which will inevitably cause confusion). The task group expressed concern over this limitation with regard to implementation. It is very likely that some catalogers will use the codes in RDA compliant NARs accidentally, so some cleanup may be needed. Some members also expressed concern that the new “pccrda” code may mean that catalogers don’t add 075 codes when they should, because the new code has “rda” in it. The group recommends that SCS develop guidance and best practices for the 075 that allow for its use in all NARs and also enable it to identify whether an NAR is RDA compliant.

Additional comments on specific entities

“Religious figure” and “Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology”

The task group dedicated several meetings to discussing the definitions for, and boundaries between, “religious figures” and those from “folklore, legend, or mythology.” Both of these entities present significant challenges in terms of historical usage, Western bias, power dynamics, and the current state of our authority files. The task group was fortunate to have several members with experience in both religious studies and the classification of folklore, legends, and mythologies. The group also recognized a need to consult with external stakeholders with additional expertise, including the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and the Xwi7xwa Library at the University of British Columbia. At the time of this report, the group has not received formal feedback from the Xwi7xwa Library but did receive some input from ATLA. The group would welcome feedback from the Xwi7xwa Library if and when they are able to provide it in the future.

The lines between religion and folklore/legend/mythology are blurry and often arbitrary. The group discussed at length whether the two entities should be combined or whether they should remain separate. Ultimately, the group opted to retain two distinct entities for several reasons. The primary reason was that our authority file already makes a distinction between these two types and combining them would likely create undue confusion and cleanup work for catalogers during the implementation of Official RDA. In addition, the current RDA guidelines also distinguish between the two types and include a very specific definition for a religious figure. In
addition, the DNB has also opted to not only keep these two entity types separate but has developed even more granular terms, including “Gott” for use with gods and goddesses. The group did decide to expand beyond the textual requirement in the current RDA guidelines to include “traditions” in order to attempt to address the fact that there are many religious figures that are not represented in what the West would consider a “text.” It is ultimately the responsibility of each cataloger to decide thoughtfully which of these categories could/should apply to entities that they are establishing and to examine their own biases and assumptions when assigning 075 codes, especially when working with materials with which they are less familiar.

“Jurisdiction”

“Jurisdiction” is another entity that required lengthy discussion and deliberation. The legal definition of a jurisdiction often refers to the authority that a body has, rather than the geographic area over which it exercises that authority but that isn’t always the case.¹ In addition, the current RDA definition is clear that the RDA entity refers to a geographic area, rather than the power or authority granted to a given body. The task group once again focused its attention to how catalogers use and understand “jurisdiction” in their daily work and what the end result is in the NAF. For practical purposes, a jurisdiction is understood to be a geographic area rather than the intangible authority granted to a body over that area.

Entity terms, scopes, and examples*

Combining entities in an NAR: catalogers should use as many or as few codes in 075 fields (with a separate code in each 075) as necessary to describe the identity they are establishing in the NAF.

*Note that many of these examples are constructed to demonstrate the concepts outlined above. Many of them are currently compliant with “original RDA” but would not be compliant if established under the new rules.

Person [per]:

- Identity presented as any individual; including individuals living or dead, fictional or non-fictional, pseudonymous (collective or singular), etc.
- Note: also include an additional 075 for “Fictitious entity” for fictional individuals
- Note: see also Named animal or plant

Examples:

010 _ _ $a no2015040565
040 _ _ $a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Person $b per $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100 1_ $a Spock, $c Mr. (Fictitious character)

Tom Straw has written several novels using the name "Richard Castle."

Corporate body [cor]:

- Identity created by one or more individuals for use in a public activity (business, government, religion, performance, etc.)
- A single individual can only be considered a corporate body if the identity is used for business or legal purposes (e.g. incorporation to limit liability)

Examples:

```
010 _ _$a no2017155049
040 _ _ $a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Corporate body $b cor $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _$a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
110 2_$a Roarke Industries (Fictitious Firm)
```

```
010 _ _$a no2016125872
040 _ _ $a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Corporate body $b cor $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _$a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
```

2 Note that since this NAR refers to a real person, the 075 is omitted.
Family [fam]:
- Identity presented as encompassing an open group of individuals related by birth, adoption, marriage, etc.
  Example (note that this example was not drawn from an existing NAR):
  010_ _ $a [LCCN for naf] $z sh 00003525
  040_ _ $a XYZ $b eng $e pccrda
  075_ _ $a Family $b fam $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  075_ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  100_ _ Corleone family (Fictitious characters)

Spirit [spi]:
- Identity presented as an immaterial individual communicating through a medium
  Examples:
  010_ _ $a nb2015001427
  040_ _ $a Uk $b eng $e pccrda
  075_ _ $a Person $b per $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  075_ _ $a Spirit $b spi $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  100_ _ $a Bach, Johann Sebastian, $d 1685-1750 $c (Spirit)

Religious figure [rel]:
- Identity presented as an individual from a sacred text or religious tradition
  Examples:
  010_ _ $a n 2014010191 $z sh 85052667
  040_ _ $a DLC $b eng $e pccrda
  075_ _ $a Spirit $b spi $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  075_ _ $a Religious figure $b rel $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
  100_ _ $a Gabriel $c (Archangel)
  667_ _ $a DESCRIPTIVE USAGE: Valid for use for all works attributed to the Archangel Gabriel, including those described as "spirit communications" because the entity is an inherently spiritual being.
Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology [flm]:
- Identity presented as an individual appearing in narratives that are significant to a cultural tradition and that are intended to convey meaning, etiology, origin stories, etc.

Examples:

010 _ _ $a nb2015015087
040 _ _ $a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology $b flm $2 [source code tbd, pccess proposed in last report]
100_0_$a Robin Hood $c (Legendary character) (nb2015015087)
075 _ _$a Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology $b flm $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100_0_ $a Aegeus, $c King of Athens (Mythological character)

010 _ _$a no2014108652
040 _ _$a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology $b flm $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _$a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100_0_ $a Scheherazade, $c Queen, consort of Shahryar, King of Persia (Legendary character)

Named animal or plant [nap]:
- Identity presented as belonging to an individual non-human animal or plant
  Examples:

010 _ _$a no 2015024426
040 _ _$a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Named animal or plant $b nap $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100_0_ $a Koko $c (Gorilla), $d 1971-2018

010 _ _$a nb2014024705
040 _ _$a Uk $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Named animal or plant $b nap $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100_0_ $a Bob, $c the Railway Dog, $d approximately 1878-1895

010 _ _$a no 2013042861
040 _ _$a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _$a Named animal or plant $b nap $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _$a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100_1_ $a Stilton, Geronimo

010 _ _$a no 2017073205
040 _ _$a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
Fictitious entity [fic]:
- Identity known to be fictitious. Not limited to fictional characters in literature.

Examples:

010 _ _ $a nb2016009465
040 _ _ $a Uk $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _ $a Corporate body $b cor $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
110 2_ $a Monster High (Fictitious school)

010 _ _ $a no2013055922 $z sh2002006616
040 _ _ $a MnManS $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100 0_ $a Kermit, $c the Frog

010 _ _ $a nb2016010361
040 _ _ $a Uk $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100 0_ $a Amp $c (Fictitious character)
670 _ [..] $b (Amp is a four-inch-tall alien scout)

010 _ _ $a no 2013042861
040 _ _ $a CU-S $b eng $e pccrda
075 _ _ $a Named animal or plant $b [code] $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
075 _ _ $a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
100 1_ $a Stilton, Geronimo
Event [eve]:
- Identity presented as an occurrence that is formally convened, directed toward a common goal, and which has a formal name, location (including online), date, and duration. This includes occurrences that are recurring and those that are cancelled.

Examples (note that these examples were not drawn from existing NARs):

- 010 _ _a [ ]
- 040 _ _a XYZ $b eng $e pccrda
- 075 _ _a Event $b [eve] $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 075 _ _a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 111 2 _ _a Hunger Games

- 010 _ _a [LCCN]
- 040 _ _a XYZ $b eng $e pccrda
- 075 _ _a Event $b [eve] $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 075 _ _a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 111 2 _ _a United Federation of Planets Meeting $n (1st : $d 2161 : $c San Francisco, California)

Jurisdiction [jur]:
- Named geographic area, populated or not, over which a legal body exercises authority or that is otherwise subject to laws or treaties.

Examples (similar to Event, these examples do not come from existing NARs):

- 010 _ _a [LCCN for naf] $z sh 97008445
- 040 _ _a Uk $b eng $e pccrda
- 075 _ _a Jurisdiction $b jur $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 075 _ _a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 151 _ _a Avalon (Legendary place)

- 010 _ _a [LCCN for naf] $z sh2021003854
- 040 _ _a CSdS $b eng $e pccrda
- 075 _ _a Jurisdiction $b jur $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 075 _ _a Fictitious entity $b fic $2 [source code tbd, pccent proposed in last report]
- 151 _ _a Gotham City (Imaginary place)
Conclusion and next steps:
Pinning down definitions for various conceptual entities proved both engaging and challenging, especially given that one of our goals was to balance the needs of daily cataloging work with a desire to address some problematic terms and definitions in historical descriptive standards. The group recognizes that many of the new definitions draw on current and previous rules and therefore still carry some of the weight of historical practices with them. As noted above, delineating between religion and “folklore, legend, or mythology” was particularly challenging and the final definitions were intentionally left somewhat ambiguous. The group felt strongly that this is an area for cataloger judgment and the repeatability of the 075 also allows for both terms to be assigned to a single entity if desired.

The task group would advise PoCo to gather feedback on how the 040 single code works with the implementation of Official RDA, particularly as it relates to the use and addition of 075 fields in NARs.

The task group would also like to ask PoCo to formally adopt the “pccent” source code that was proposed by the previous task group for use in $2 of the 075.

The group would recommend that the Standing Committee on Standards develop best practices and guidelines for the use of 075 fields in NARs, including those that are RDA-compliant.

Lastly, the list in this report is intended to be as closed as possible in order to limit the number of edits that need to be made by NDMSO. The task group recognizes that additional entities may need to be considered in the future but hopes that the current list can serve the PCC community for the long term.

Appendix:
The Task Group on Developing a PCC Entities Vocabulary is charged with the following:
● Identify and secure a platform to host the vocabulary as Linked Data
● Develop an outline of an initial vocabulary
  o Include the 9 entities identified in the Final Report of the PCC Task Group on Coding for Non-RDA Entities in NARs
  o Consider including Event and Jurisdiction as additional entities
  o Provide a scope for each entity
● Contact the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek to determine interest in jointly developing an entity vocabulary for use with RDA (based on outline of initial vocabulary)
Roster:
Elizabeth Miraglia (UC San Diego), chair
Ed Jones (National University)
Everett Allgood (NYU)
Leigh Billings (University of Michigan)
Steven Michael Folsom (Cornell)
Anna Slawek (University of Toronto)
Reinhold Heuvelmann (DNB)