

PCC Task Group for Coding non-RDA Entities in NARs: Final Report

November 16, 2020

Contents

Executive summary	2
Recommendations	2
Charge, background, and scope	3
Purposes served by coding entity type	4
Purposes served by coding descriptive convention	4
Data model	5
Recommended terms for 075	6
Recommended coding for 040 \$e	6
Implementation issues	7
Platform for hosting vocabulary	7
Maintenance and development of the vocabulary (extensibility)	7
Collaboration with DNB	8
Training and documentation	8
Out of scope issues	9
Fictitious characters and pseudonyms	9
Shared pseudonyms	11
Descriptive conventions for non-RDA entities	11
Elements for non-agent entities	12
Division of the world	12
Legacy data	13
Examples	13
Appendix: Charge and roster	18

Executive summary

With the introduction of the LRM data model in the beta RDA Toolkit, it became necessary to distinguish RDA Agent and non-Agent entities in the LC Name Authority File. The PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) determined that 075 \$a in the MARC authority format could be used to record this distinction, and that it would also be necessary to designate a different descriptive convention in 040 \$e. PoCo charged the present Task Group to make recommendations for coding these subfields.

In considering its recommendations, the Task Group identified the core use cases that would need to be met, and evaluated several potential data models. An important concern was that the proposed vocabulary be simple to maintain and apply. These considerations led the Task Group to recommend a small set of terms reflecting categories that are given distinct treatment in cataloging practice.

Questions of attribution were explicitly left out of scope for this Task Group, and this report makes no recommendations on those issues. However, the coding of non-agent entities inevitably raises questions about how their relationships to works and agents are to be represented. To provide additional context for its recommendations, and to help inform future work that may be needed, the Task Group has included in this report a discussion of issues surrounding fictitious characters and pseudonyms.

Recommendations

1. Establish a PCC entity type vocabulary, with source code “pccent”, with the following terms:
 - Person
 - Corporate body
 - Family
 - Conference
 - Spirit
 - Religious figure
 - Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology
 - Named animal
 - Fictitious entity
2. Request that NDMSO host this vocabulary on id.loc.gov.
3. Assign responsibility for ongoing maintenance of the vocabulary to a suitable entity in LC or PCC.
4. Code NARs produced in accordance with PCC practice as 040 \$e pccmap. In addition, code NARs describing RDA Agent entities in accordance with post-3R RDA standards as 040 \$e rda3r.

5. Approach the German National Library (DNB) regarding a collaboration on an entity type vocabulary.

Charge, background, and scope

The PCC Task Group for Coding non-RDA Entities in NARs was charged by PoCo to address two issues that arose with changes to the RDA data model as a result of the 3R Toolkit redesign. PoCo had decided to continue its practice of establishing certain kinds of entities, such as fictitious entities and non-human personages, in the Name Authority File, even though they are no longer treated as agents in the post-3R version of RDA. Because these fictitious and non-human entities do not fall into the universe of entities described by RDA, it became necessary to find a way to distinguish these entities in NARs. The German National Library (DNB) had recently made a successful proposal for an 075 field to record entity type in the MARC authority format, and PoCo considered this field a logical place to make that distinction. There also arose the question of what descriptive conventions should be cited in the 040 \$e subfield of such records, since “rda” was no longer appropriate. The Task Group was asked to make recommendations for populating each of these subfields: 075 \$a and 040 \$e.¹

The Task Group’s report provides suggestions on how to code 075 and 040 \$e, and identifies some implementation issues that PCC will need to address. Although the charge explicitly excludes consideration of relationship elements as out of scope, this report nevertheless includes a section discussing the treatment of attribution as it applies to pseudonyms and fictitious entities. The Task Group considered that its recommendations would be more fully understood if this additional context were provided. For similar reasons this report also includes supplemental sections discussing other related issues such as the handling of legacy data, ambiguous entities, and the LC “division of the world”. Although many of the considerations raised in this report are potentially also relevant to the subject authority file, their application to subject authorities was not a problem the Task Group was asked to address.

The Task Group took the scope of its charge to be limited to agent-like entities to which attribution can be made. It did not consider issues concerning how to code entity type for other entities represented in NARs, in particular works and expressions. It may be noted, however, that some members of the PCC community have raised these issues as an area of concern, and PCC may wish to examine these questions in future.

¹ A third question that PoCo had been considering, concerning how to code name/title access points in which the name portion did not represent an RDA agent, was dropped from the charge once it became clear that RSC planned to move rules for string encoding schemes to an area governed by community practice.

Purposes served by coding entity type

Because the MARC Authority Format provides limited semantics in the 100, 110, and 111 for agents (individual name, family name, corporate name, meeting name, places as jurisdictions), coding the entity type in the 075 enables the cataloger to be more specific when identifying the type of entity. A MARC tag alone cannot indicate whether an entity is human or animal, or if it is real or fictitious. This information would be helpful for catalogers deciding which instructions to consult for constructing headings and also for decisions on property and field usage. For example, an appropriate entity type code can flag entities as eligible or ineligible for RDA agency (and consequently for use with RDA elements). In more advanced editing environments this coding could potentially drive templating and user interface features. This added entity type coding would also facilitate retrieval of authorities in specific categories, thus supporting quality assurance and helping to avoid inconsistency in application. For similar reasons, it can also be useful for discovery environments if indexed and displayed in addition to the entity's heading. Looking ahead, coding entity types explicitly will be advantageous in a post-MARC environment where MARC tags will not be present to indicate the type of entity.

Purposes served by coding descriptive convention

MARC21 Authority Format code 040 \$e, Description conventions, is for "Information specifying the description rules used in formulating the heading and reference structure." The value used enables catalogers to compare relevant fields to the rules being cited to determine whether the metadata is in compliance with its stated goal. Description conventions evolve over time, and in some cases the 040 \$e code may guide the cataloger in updating metadata that has become obsolete in relation to its expressed standard.

Where catalog management involves separate indexing or display treatment for metadata created under specific rules, the description conventions code can be useful for batch management of record data. Indexing especially can involve sensitivity to the particulars of string encoding schemes. When the 040 \$e code or term identifies a string encoding scheme as part of the descriptive conventions used in relevant fields, its information may be valuable for automated interpretation of the metadata.

The Task Group notes that the continued use of the existing value of "rda" in 040 \$e is insufficient for two reasons. First, as RDA defers string encoding scheme choices to RDA's cataloging communities, identifying the description conventions of an RDA cataloging community will become necessary. It may be noted that since the introduction of RDA, LCNAF records have been coded "z" in 008/10, indicating that the rules for construction of the 1XX access point are named in 040 \$e. Second, in the case of PCC's decision to establish certain personified non-RDA entities in the LC-NACO Authority File (LCNAF), it is not appropriate to use code 040 \$e rda to specify the description conventions being used, since RDA does not

provide guidance for describing such entities. More than a string encoding scheme is needed from a description convention to guide the formulation of 4XX and 5XX references and other attributes for personified non-RDA entities. The actual creation of description conventions for establishing personified non-RDA entities will need to be pursued as part of the PCC's policy work for post-3R RDA implementation, and is out of scope for this Task Group.

The relationship between the descriptive convention code in 040 \$e and the entity type in 075 warrants careful consideration. In some discussions of how 040 \$e might be coded for authorities representing entities not covered by RDA, examples have been offered of codes that imply particular kinds of non-RDA entities, such as "nhp" for non-human personages. However, the Task Group considers it preferable to rely on 075 coding to convey the entity type and 040 \$e to indicate compliance with a given set of description conventions. As noted elsewhere in this report, the Task Group recommends coding for 040 \$e to indicate both compliance with PCC conventions and with RDA.

Data model

The model used to design the proposed entity type vocabulary strives to provide added semantics beyond what the MARC authority format currently provides. Rather than rely on the 100, 110, and 111 fields implying persons, corporate bodies, and meeting types respectively, the entity types in the 075 allow the cataloger to assert explicitly the type of entity the record describes. The model is intended to support cataloging use cases rather than to support granular description of the entities in question. An important principle in designing this vocabulary is therefore to limit the entity types to a shallow list of the known high-level entity types catalogers face in everyday cataloging; again, these terms would serve to direct the cataloger to descriptive rules for that specific entity type. The final design strategy for the vocabulary is that rather than pre-coordinate every possible type (fictitious person, fictitious animal, etc.), more specific types can be built using multiple type assertions, e.g. separate terms for Person and Fictitious Entity can be used together for a fictitious person. This approach permits the vocabulary to remain simple in design and flexible in application.

The Task Group considered, but ultimately rejected, the direct use of RDA entity types in this PCC entity type vocabulary. Using RDA directly would necessitate defining a complementary vocabulary in contradistinction to RDA. In addition, remaining within an RDA model would raise the question of how to treat entities, such as conferences, that PCC may wish to recognize but are not explicitly defined in RDA. The proposed solution allows the PCC vocabulary to remain simple and self-sufficient. Values can be mapped selectively to RDA as required. For example, a non-fictitious family can be mapped to the relevant subclass of RDA Agent. Because alignment with RDA is achieved solely through mapping, this model would be relatively unaffected by future changes in RDA.

Recommended terms for 075

The Task Group recommends the following list of terms for use in 075 \$a. The list should remain fairly stable and it is not expected to expand greatly in the foreseeable future.²

It will be necessary to establish a code for use in 075 \$2. The Task Group suggests “pccent” for this code.

- Person
- Corporate body
- Family
- Conference
- Spirit
- Religious figure
- Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology
- Named animal
- Fictitious entity

The Task Group also considered “Event” and “Jurisdiction” as potential additional terms for the vocabulary, but decided to omit them since the relevant agent entities can be inferred from MARC coding. However, in a non-MARC environment it may be advantageous to code them explicitly.

Recommended coding for 040 \$e

The Task Group recommends that “pccmap” be added to the MARC list of description convention codes. This code would indicate records constructed according to PCC descriptive conventions, which is to say the body of LC-PCC metadata documentation that is under development for the post-3R RDA. This documentation covers the conventions guiding the formulation of authorized access points, but is not restricted to those alone. The Task Group observes that the code needs to be associated with a string encoding scheme and ideally needs to be associated with a codified description convention. Creating a code specific for non-human entities would not be sufficient because the descriptive convention codes will cover more than non-human entities. Although it could be regarded as implicit that all records in the authority file are coded according to LC PCC conventions, the explicit use of a specific code would provide two significant advantages. It would provide additional contextual data to accompany PCC data in environments where data from multiple sources coexist, and it would allow for the possibility of pointing to different versions of PCC conventions as practices evolve over time.

² It would also be possible to provide a code corresponding to each of these entities for use in 075 \$b. The Task Group did not pursue this possibility. However, the German National Library’s entity vocabularies define such codes and this may be an area to explore should PCC pursue a collaboration.

For records that do conform to the RDA content standard it will be necessary to code this conformance explicitly as well, using a second occurrence of 040 \$e. The Task Group recommends a new code to signal versioning of PCC cataloging practice under the new 3R RDA rules. (See the section on legacy data below.) Given concerns about consistent branding of the RDA product, the process of deciding on a code should include approaching the RSC to explain the PCC's interest in having a new code and present them with options to see if they have a preference. Should PCC choose to introduce its own code, the Task Group recommends "rda3r". This code would be consistent with the way the RSC communicates about the 3R project, in which "RDA content (in both the Toolkit and in the RDA Registry) has been edited to bring it in compliance with the [IFLA Library Reference Model](#) (LRM)".³ The existing "rda" code would be left in existing records (unless redescribed) but retired from use in NACO records created after the cutover date.

Implementation issues

Platform for hosting vocabulary

Once the entity type vocabulary is approved and finalized, PoCo may approach LC's Network Development & MARC Standards Office (NDMSO) to request that the vocabulary be included in the MARC Standards value lists: <http://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/> and on <https://id.loc.gov/>. These appear to be logical places for the vocabulary to reside, given that LC has minted and is hosting a wide range of vocabularies for use by the LC/PCC cataloging community on these sites. The availability of the PCC entity type vocabulary on id.loc.gov would also make it possible to assign URIs and provide them in the 075 field. Although PCC will retain editorial control of the list, PoCo should be aware that NDMSO prefers to avoid hosting a vocabulary that will be subject to frequent updates.

Maintenance and development of the vocabulary (extensibility)

In practice, the Task Group expects that the entity type vocabulary will be a stable list with a clear and limited scope to support cataloger practice with corresponding instructions for general entity types. This will mean that unless glaring omissions are found in this list, there should not be many additions or changes. Nevertheless, any vocabulary that is capable of expansion or that may stand in need of occasional revision should have a body tasked with its ongoing maintenance, and the Task Group recommends that PCC identify a group for this purpose.

The 075 vocabulary is not intended to cover all possible types of entities that might have works attributed to them. For more granular "tagging" of entities there is the possibility of adding additional terms from existing vocabularies. For example, LCSH is sometimes used for this purpose, although linked data allows us a wide range of additional options. These can be accommodated in the MARC Authority format in a separate occurrence of the 075 field, or

³ <http://rda-rsc.org/node/551#09>

through the 368 field provisions for other attributes for the person or corporate body. The PCC should also consider alternative approaches such as recording such data externally to the NAF, for example in an appropriately linked Wikidata entry.

Collaboration with DNB

The Task Group with generous help from Reinhold Heuvelmann and his colleague Esther Scheven at the German National Library (DNB) reviewed the use currently made of this field by DNB. The DNB approach accords with the approach recommended by the PCC Task Group in two respects and diverges from it in one. It accords with the Task Group's recommendations in establishing a vocabulary outside of RDA, and as far as the Task Group has been able to determine, in avoiding the use of coding that implies type-specific description conventions. On the other hand, the Task Group notes that the DNB entity types are defined within a hierarchy with both broad types and more specific types for categorizing entities -- something the PCC Task Group's model deliberately avoids. The Task Group's correspondence with the DNB also confirmed that some of their entity categories reflect historical practice in their communities.

In response to the interim report of this Task Group, some PoCo members suggested that this 075 entity type vocabulary might become a joint venture between PCC and the German National Library (DNB). After discussing this idea further, PoCo agreed to investigate the possibility of collaborating with the DNB on this project, in order to promote the internationalization of cataloging standards. The response of the DNB to this proposal may have an effect on the way PCC implements the vocabulary, and the recommendations in this report may be subject to change.

Training and documentation

If the recommendations of this Task Group are implemented, catalogers will need documentation and training on how to apply the 075 entity type and 040 \$e descriptive convention codes in the NAF. Some existing PCC documentation will need to be revised in the light of the recommendations in this report. They include but are not limited to the LC-PCC policy statements, PCC RDA Metadata documentation, DCM Z1, NACO participants manual, and NACO training workshop slides.

Although creation of training documentation is outside the scope of this Task Group's charge, the sample instructions below are given here as an example of what may be needed.

Sample instructions

1. In the 075 \$a field, assign one or more terms from the following list if applicable to the entity being described.

- Person
- Corporate body

- Family
- Conference
- Spirit
- Religious figure
- Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology
- Named animal
- Fictitious entity

2. If the entity is fictitious, assign the following term:

Fictitious entity

If in doubt, omit the Fictitious entity designation.

3. Assign 040 \$e pccmap to indicate that the authority has been constructed according to PCC practice.

4. If the entity meets the definition of an RDA agent, also assign 040 \$e rda3r. If in doubt, omit the \$e rda3r designation.

Out of scope issues

Fictitious characters and pseudonyms

Pseudonyms raise many issues that are beyond the scope of this Task Group. However, the Task Group's discussions of how to apply the 075 entity type vocabularies to actual examples gave rise to questions on the treatment of NARs for fictional or non-human entities that may also be considered pseudonyms. Some observations are shared here to prompt future discussions. Some aspects of existing NACO practice may warrant reconsideration or elaboration in the light of changes to RDA. In particular, the Task Group suggests that a closer examination of the treatment of attributions at the level of the work or expression would clarify many of the issues surrounding pseudonyms and non-agent entities.

Current LC/PCC practice allows for the creation of NARs for entities whose names are pseudonymous with *see* or *see also* references added as appropriate. If an author only writes under a pseudonym, per A1.1 of the [LC-PCC FAQ](#) on persons who use pseudonyms, the pseudonym is established in the 100 field and a *see* reference is added because the real person's name is known. If the person also writes under their own name or under an additional pseudonym, each named creator identity can be established and linked with 500 *see also* references.

Things are more complicated when the pseudonym in question is itself the name of a fictitious entity or non-human entity. Two conflicting identities come into play--that of the fictitious or non-

human entity, and that of the human creator. The Guidance for [Nomen and Appellations](#) says, “A nomen is distinguished by both its associated RDA entity and its nomen string; a variation in either indicates a new nomen.” The nomen for an RDA person entity cannot also be the nomen for a non-RDA fictitious entity. The user is more likely to associate the nomen in this case with the fictitious entity, not a pseudonymous creator. Likewise, the application of an 075 with entity type “Fictitious entity” to the NAR for a pseudonymous RDA person seems inappropriate. Two entities, the fictitious entity as well as the RDA person entity, cannot be represented on the same NAR.

The [Beta Toolkit](#) Guidance section on Fictitious and Non-human Appellations distinguishes between these two cases. Referencing both, it states “*Do not use a fictitious or false appellation as the basis of an access point.*” However, it offers distinct options for dealing with the relationship to the appellation of a fictitious entity versus the relationship to the appellation of a non-human entity. The options in RDA regard the former as a pseudonym for an agent and regard the latter as the object of a WEMI “Related entity of ...” element. When the appellation is essentially an alternate name for an RDA agent, it is a pseudonym of the agent and potentially an alternate identity for the agent. But when the statement of responsibility references a fictitious entity, an entity independent of the agent, the second option offered in the Guidance section is more appropriate. The option for non-human entities--to be related to the WEMI resource as a “related entity of” the WEMI resource--offers better semantics for fictitious entities than the treatment of such fictitious entity names as RDA persons’ pseudonyms.

Some examples may help illustrate this distinction. There are cases where persons creating works ascribe them to fictitious and non-human entities: Kermit the Frog and Geronimo Stilton, a fictional frog and a fictional mouse; Millie (Dog), Barbara Bush’s dog and purported author of *Millie's book*. It can be difficult to know where to draw the line between “non-human entity” and “fictitious appellation.”

The character Richard Castle, a fictional detective and mystery writer appearing in the television series “Castle” and portrayed by the actor Nathan Fillion, became the purported author of a series of detective novels. The real identity of the author (person Tom Straw) was only revealed five years after the first novel was published. In order to accommodate this situation, two authority records were created in the authority file: one for the fictitious character, “Castle, Richard (Fictitious character)” (n 2018063788) and one for the pseudonym of Tom Straw, “Castle, Richard” (n 2013015842). But in this case, Tom Straw is writing as the fictitious character Richard Castle; he doesn’t coincidentally share a nomen string with the fictitious character. Rather, his “pseudonym” is inherently linked to the persona of the fictional character. It would be clearer to have one NAR for this character (codified in 075 as “Fictitious entity”) with elements associating the works attributed in statements of responsibility to the fictitious Richard Castle to both author Tom Straw and and to Castle. The question is how to express the two different relationships.

Shared pseudonyms

LC-PCC policy has been to regard persons who singly or together create distinct bodies of work under a separate name as having two identities, one real and one pseudonymous, both of which may be established in the LCNAF (see [LC-PCC FAQ on persons using pseudonyms](#)). This basic practice is not inconsistent with the Beta RDA Toolkit. While the Beta RDA states in the Entity Boundary section on Person entities that the physical characteristics of a person are an “absolute boundary,” i.e., that two physical persons cannot be treated as a single person entity, it also offers the option of considering a difference in the element “Person: field of activity of person” as an entity boundary. If LC-PCC chooses to regard the creation of distinct bodies of work as a difference in field of activity, then two person entities can be established even when they represent a single physical person. This is in line with current practice.

Shared pseudonyms are more problematic. While one person can have two identities under RDA, two persons cannot be regarded as a single person entity. One option for LC-PCC would be to define shared pseudonyms as a subtype of Collective Agent. The Collective Agent entity is defined in the Beta RDA as “an agent who is a gathering or organization of two or more persons that bears a particular name and that is capable of acting as an agent.” Currently the two subtypes of collective agent defined in RDA are Corporate Body and Family. The utility of defining shared pseudonymous identities as a third type of collective agent would be the option of specifying a string encoding scheme appropriate for personal names as the preferred string encoding scheme for authorized and variant access points for the new entity subtype. The justification would be that shared pseudonyms present to users as personal names, even though they do not represent an RDA Person. Such a treatment of shared pseudonyms would be a community extension of RDA, but would not appear to contradict any RDA instructions, and would enable the continuation of existing MARC practice for shared pseudonyms with minimal disruption.

Descriptive conventions for non-RDA entities

The Task Group discussed what developing description conventions for specific types of non-RDA entities could entail. Metadata attributes and relationships can be relevant to describing an entity in service of making it findable and identifiable and relating it to other entities. Some examples:

- Fictitious characters can have fictitious biographies involving birth date and place, field of activity, occupation, gender, typical setting, etc. Fictitious characters usually also have a creator and may have an owner under copyright and trademark law. Fictitious characters may be associated with a work or representative expression.
- Non-human figures from religious traditions usually have a significant relationship to a religion or culture. Some figures have special relationships, e.g., the relationship between Mars or Ares and war. Guidance may be needed on whether and how to express a figure’s relationship to chronological dates.

- Named animals can have a species or breed by which they are identified, and owners. Named animals may be associated with a work or representative expression.

Deciding whether and how to develop description conventions for specific types of non-RDA entities established in LCNAF or broadly for all non-RDA entities is well beyond the Task Group's charge. In some cases, descriptions in external linked data sources such as Wikidata might be judged sufficient for identifying the non-RDA entity and providing an IRI to represent them. The Task Group notes that this development work on description conventions could be significant, especially if it extends to declaring new types of attributes and relationships for describing these entities.

Elements for non-agent entities

The body of the Task Group's report addresses the coding and instructions needed to accommodate fictitious and non-human entities broadly defined in LCNAF. At the same time, the Task Group foresees issues with the use of these entities in relation to works. PCC has determined that the name of a work, specifically the authorized access point, can include the name of a non-RDA agent entity as a matter of community choice without contradicting the Beta RDA. However, more thought needs to be given to how the relationship between a work and a non-RDA entity--not just the AAP for the work--can be expressed.

One option for expressing this relationship would be to implement the use of the Beta RDA element Work: related entity of work in such cases. While one cannot assert that a fictitious or non-human entity has an RDA Agent relationship to a work, one can assert that it is a related entity. RDA asserts no range constraint on this element, so using it to express the relationship between a work and a non-agent entity would not contradict RDA. If more specificity is desired, LC-PCC could declare "attributed entity of work" as a refinement of the RDA element as part of its application profile and policy statements. The relationship could be stated explicitly on MARC bibliographic records with the use of X00 \$i or \$4 (when the field represents the non-agent entity and not the work) and on MARC authority records with the use of 500 \$w r \$i or \$4. Alternatively, the existing MARC Relator term Attributed name [att] could be used in \$e/\$4 to express the proposed refinement of the RDA element. When not expressed, such coding options could be considered implicit when the authority record at issue is for a non-agent entity.

Division of the world

In order to identify what entities needed to be accounted for in this entity type vocabulary, the Task Group analyzed instruction sheet H 405 of the Subject Headings Manual. This instruction sheet divides ambiguous entities into two categories: those that should be established in the Name Authority File according to descriptive cataloging conventions, and those that should be established in LCSH according to subject cataloging conventions. The analysis performed by the Task Group revealed many inconsistencies in the way entities are assigned to the NAF or to LCSH, as well as inconsistencies in the way the instructions are applied. For example, H 405

assigns Country clubs and Recreation districts to the NAF; but it also says Resorts, Golf courses, and Recreation areas should reside in LCSH. A search of the NAF and LCSH reveals that specific resorts, golf courses, and recreation areas have been established in both databases. At some future date, PCC may want to consider establishing a task group similar to the 1995 PCC Task Group on Name Versus Subject Authorities, to complete the work of clarifying the division between LCSH and the NAF.

Legacy data

Legacy data is an issue that this Task Group can foresee causing particular confusion during the move from RDA to post-3R RDA. The NAF contains records created using various descriptive cataloging rules, all of which are defined using a specific code in the 008/10 or in combination with the 040 \$e coding. The fact that NARs were created under past practice does not preclude their use as references or access points in current cataloging practice (except when clearly noted via 667 notes for subject or descriptive usage). However, names for fictitious and non-human entities that were established in the NAF under RDA (and encoded 040 \$e rda) will no longer be considered entities within the RDA3R model; thus, it is necessary to distinguish those that were created under RDA and those that will be created under the new model. The adoption of a new \$e that references new RDA will prevent the need to identify and correct (through the application of the new 075 entity types and new 040 \$e coding) those records created under past practices, as well as prevent confusion about variations in descriptive encoding practices for these entities.

Examples

Some of the examples below have been adapted from Amanda Sprochi's *RDA New Concepts Series: Fictitious and Non-Human Personages*.

Koko the Gorilla - animal, painter

Bib record: OCLC#952712674

245 00 Koko : \$b the gorilla who talks / \$c a BBC production with PBS ; producer, Bridget Appleby ; filmed and directed by Jonathan Taylor.

7000 Koko \$c (Gorilla), \$d 1971-2018, \$e on-screen participant.

Authority record:

010 no2015024426 \$z sh 85072813

040 \$e pccmap

046 \$f 1971-07-04 \$g 2018-06-19 \$2 edtf

075 \$a Named animal \$2 pccent

1000 Koko \$c (Gorilla), \$d 1971-2018

368 \$c Gorilla \$2 lcsch

Geronimo Stilton - pseudonym, fictitious character, animal

Bib record: LCCN 2020275308

1001 Stilton, Geronimo, \$e author.

24514The Hawaiian heist / \$c Geronimo Stilton ; illustrations by Danilo Loizedda, Antonio Campo, and Daria Cerchi ; translated by Anna Pizzelli.

Authority record:

010 no2013042861 \$z sh2005002661

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Fictitious entity \$a Named animal \$2 pccent

1001 Stilton, Geronimo

368 \$c Fictitious characters \$c Mice \$2 lcsh

374 Newspaper editors \$a Authors \$2 lcsh

375 Males \$2 lcdgt

4001 Stilton, Geronimo \$c (Fictitious character)

5001 \$a Dami, Elisabetta

Dr John Watson (from Sherlock Holmes) - shared pseudonym of unknown number of authors, fictitious character

Bib record: LCCN 78022811

1001 Watson, John H. \$c (Fictitious character), \$e author.

24510Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Holmes / \$c by John H. Watson ; as edited by Loren D. Estleman.

Authority record:

010 no2014068518 \$z sh 92004671

040 \$e pccmap

046 \$f 1852 \$v Encyclopædia Britannica online, May 15, 2014

046 \$f 1853~ \$2 edtf \$v Wikipedia, May 15, 2014

075 \$a Person \$a Fictitious entity \$2 pccent

1001 Watson, John H. \$c (Fictitious character)

368 \$c Fictitious characters \$2 lcsh

4000 Doctor Watson \$c (Fictitious character)

5001 \$w nnc \$a Meyer, Nicholas

5001 \$w nnc \$a Little, John A. \$d 1945-

663 Pseudonym used by multiple persons, for works of authors written under their own or other names, search also under \$b Meyer, Nicholas ; \$b Little, John A., 1945-

Asta the Dog - animal, actor

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Named animal \$2 pccent

100 0_ Asta \$c (Dog)

368 \$c Dogs \$2 lcsh

Amp - fictitious character, non-human

010 nb2016010361

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Fictitious entity \$2 pccent

1000 Amp \$c (Fictitious character)

368 \$c Fictitious characters \$2 lcsh

670 Ohm vs. Amp, [2014]: \$b back cover (Amp is a four-inch-tall alien scout)

Kermit the Frog - fictitious character, animal, pseudonym

Bib record: LCCN 2006923865

1000 Kermit, \$c the Frog.

24510Before you leap : \$b a frog's-eye view of life's greatest lessons / \$c by Kermit the Frog.

Authority record:

010 no2013055922 \$z sh2002006616

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Fictitious entity \$a Named animal \$2 pccent

1000 Kermit, \$c the Frog

374 Actors \$a Singers \$a Theatrical producers and directors \$2 lcsh

375 male

4000 Kermit \$c (Fictitious character)

Franchezzo (Spirit) - spirit

Bib record: LCCN 32021776

1000 Franchezzo \$c (Spirit)

24512A wanderer in the spirit lands / \$c by Franchezzo ; transcribed by A. Farnese.

7001 Farnese, A.

Authority record:

010 n 94045432

040 \$e pccmap \$e rda3r

075 \$a Spirit \$2 pccent

1000 Franchezzo \$c (Spirit)

368 \$c Spirits \$2 lcsh

670 A wanderer in the spirit lands, c1993: \$b t.p. (Franchezzo) p. iii (soul of young Italian man who lived and died in late 1800s) p. iv (wrote through medium A. Farnese in 1896 in London)

Gabriel (Archangel) - spirit

Bib record: OCLC# 873460984 (pcc)

1001 Manitar, Olivier, \$d 1964- \$e author.

24512L'archange Gabriel : \$b biographie : l'histoire incroyable du père fondateur de toutes les religions / \$c Olivier Manitar.

7000 Gabriel \$c (Archangel), \$e author.

Bib record: OCLC# 307907369 (AACR2)

1001 Gabriel \$c (Archangel)

24514The Gabriel messages : \$b compassionate wisdom for the 21st century / \$c from the Archangel Gabriel ; [transcribed by] Shanta Gabriel.

7001 Gabriel, Shanta.

Authority record:

010 n 2014010191 \$z sh 85052667

040 \$e pccmap \$e rda3r

075 \$a Spirit \$2 pccent

1000 Gabriel \$c (Archangel)

368 \$c Archangels \$2 lcsh

667 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.

Simon Murphy - person

010 nb2014016125

040 \$e pccmap \$e rda3r

075 \$a Person \$2 pccent

1001 Murphy, Simon \$c (Female impersonator)

370 \$c England \$f London (England) \$2 naf

374 Punk rock musicians \$a Female impersonators \$2 lcsh

4000 Mona \$c (Female impersonator)

Thor - religious figure

010 no2014096254 \$z sh 92002570

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Religious figure \$2 pccent

1000 Thor \$c (Norse deity)

368 \$c Norse deity

368 \$c Gods, Norse \$2 lcsh

4000 Þórr \$c (Norse deity)

Robin Hood - figure from folklore, legend, or mythology

010 nb2015015087 \$z sh 85114612

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Figure from folklore, legend, or mythology \$2 pccent

1000 Robin Hood \$c (Legendary character)

368 \$c Legendary character

370 \$c Great Britain \$2 naf

670 Robin Hood, 2012: \$b p.6-7 (outlaw; early ballads and stories place him in the north of England: in Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire)

Conference

Bib record: LCCN 2007940850

1112 European-Japanese Joint Conference for Cerebral Stroke Surgery \$n (3rd : \$d 2006 : \$c Zurich, Switzerland)

24510 Changing aspects in stroke surgery : \$b aneurysms, dissections and Moyamoya angiopathy / \$c edited by Yasuhiro Yonekawa [and others].

010 n 2014187353

040 \$e pccmap \$e rda3r

046 \$s 2006 \$t 2006 \$2 edtf

075 \$a Conference \$2 pccent

1112 European-Japanese Joint Conference for Cerebral Stroke Surgery \$n (3rd : \$d 2006 : \$c Zurich, Switzerland)

670 Changing aspects in stroke surgery, c2008: \$b pref. (3rd European Japanese Joint Conference for Cerebral Stroke Surgery)

670 Trends in neurovascular interventions, 2014: \$b p. v (The third meeting was held in Zurich in 2006)

Richard Castle - fictional character from television show, pseudonym of one author. Includes speculative use of new elements to represent relationships between agents and fictitious entities

010 n 2013015842

040 \$e pccmap

075 \$a Person \$a Fictitious entity \$2 pccent

1001 Castle, Richard

375 Males \$2 lcdgt

5001 \$w r \$i Creator:* \$a Straw, Tom

5001 \$w r \$i Portrayed by:* \$a Fillion, Nathan

670 Storm front, 2013: \$b ECIP t.p. (Richard Castle)

670 Tom Straw (Website), viewed on Nov. 2, 2018: \$b home (Tom Straw; first mystery novel The trigger episode published in 2007; has written 7 crime novels as "Richard Castle"; also wrote Buzz killer under his own name)

670 Mystery scene, viewed on Nov. 5, 2018: \$b (Tom Straw wrote 7 Nikki Heat novels under the name Richard Castle; the novels were a tie-in to the TV series Castle, featuring the mystery writer character Richard Castle; the actor Nathan Fillion appeared at book signings but said he was not the author when asked)

*In the above example, the relationship designators *Creator* and *Portrayed by* are conjectural. They were created by Task Group members to illustrate how the relationships of these persons to this fictitious entity *could* be characterized.

Appendix: Charge and roster

PCC Task Group on coding for non-RDA entities in NARs

Background:

The PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) has decided for its implementation of the post-3R RDA Toolkit that responsibility for resources may be attributed to non-human personages, and that these may be represented by NARs. Non-human personages will also continue to be established as NARs for subject use. However, because such entities are not agents under RDA, the NARs cannot be coded as RDA records.⁴

POCo identified two issues arising from this policy:

- How to code description convention (MARC 040 \$e) for such records
- How to code type of entity (MARC 075) for such entities

Charge:

The Task Group is charged to:

- Propose a new MARC descriptive conventions source code for the 040 \$e subfield in the authority format to indicate that a record is a PCC record, but not an RDA record.⁵
- Evaluate options for an authorized vocabulary for entity type that can be used in the 075 and be included as an approved vocabulary in the MARC documentation. The Task Group should consider existing vocabularies such as the DNB entity types,⁶ and may consider devising a new vocabulary if necessary.

Attribution to non-RDA entities raises the further question of what elements to use with them. This is an important question, but is out of scope for this Task Group.

The Task Group will consult with the Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) and other stakeholders as appropriate. The SCS co-chairs will keep PoCo apprised of the Task Group's progress and will bring its recommendations to PoCo for final discussion and approval.

⁴ Authorized access points for works and expressions may be constructed using names for non-RDA entities. The question initially arose whether such access points qualified as RDA. However, under the new approach proposed by RSC in a recent discussion paper, string encoding schemes are now a question of community practice, and RDA itself places no restrictions on the value of an access point. For this reason the Task Group has not been asked to address this question.

⁵ Although the charge concerns a descriptive conventions source code for authorities, PoCo may also consult Task Group members about coding descriptive conventions in PCC bibliographic records. This may happen either during its term of activity or at a later date.

⁶ See Integrated authority file (Gemeinsame Normdatei, GND), general type and Integrated authority file (Gemeinsame Normdatei, GND), specific type.

Time Frame:

Date charged: July 22, 2020

Date preliminary report due: August 30, 2020

Date final report due: November 15, 2020

Reports to:

PCC Standing Committee on Standards

Roster:

Leigh Billings (U Mich)

Chew Chiat Naun (Harvard, co-chair)

Steven Folsom (Cornell)

Stephen Hearn (U Minnesota)

Veronica Ranieri (LC representative, co-chair)

Yang Wang (Princeton)

John Zagas (RDA/MARC Working Group representative)

Final Report Transmittal & Tracking Sheet:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1erhG8phPXCHk8x3_pXJWAx09uffPQlil/edit