To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
Subject: Formal responses to RSC/ORDAC/2024/1 – [Proposal on] Dual-language naming of Corporate Body and Place

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

- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/EOO
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/EURIG
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/Examples Editor
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/NARDAC
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/TranslationsTLO
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/TTWG
- RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/WCEO

Recommendation 1	Approved by **1**: TTWG Approved with suggested edits by **4**: EOO, Examples Editor, NARDAC, WCEO Rejected by **2**: EURIG, TranslationsTLO	**Note 1**: EURIG, TranslationsTLO and EOO query whether existing RDA instructions already cover the instances raised by ORDAC in the proposal. **Note 2:** EURIG raises the issue of scripts. **Note 3:** NARDAC and EOO highlight difficulties cataloguers face in distinguishing a single name in multiple languages/scripts and multiple forms of a name in difference languages/scripts. **Note 4:** TranslationsTLO, NARDAC and the Examples Editor suggest a new heading under **preferred name of corporate body**. **Note 5:** NARDAC, the Examples Editor and the

		WCEO highlight that "single string" is potentially problematic. **Note 6**: NARDAC and the Examples Editor suggest the use of 'manifestations'. **Note 7:** NARDAC suggests that this new CONDITION be placed second under **preferred name of corporate body**. **Note 8:** Examples were assumed necessary by the Examples Editor and called for by EURIG and NARDAC. **Note13 (relevant to both recommendations):** NARDAC provides information from CCC regarding the impact of this proposal.
Recommendation 2	Approved by **2**: TTWG, WCEO Approved with suggested edits by **3**: EOO, Examples Editor, NARDAC Rejected by **2**: EURIG, TranslationsTLO	**Note 9:** EURIG, TranslationsTLO and EOO query whether existing RDA instructions already cover the instances raised by ORDAC in the proposal. **Note 10:** EURIG questions the scope of RDA with regard to natural phenomena. **Note 11:** NARDAC and EOO highlight difficulties **Note 12:** NARDAC provides a relevant example. **Note13 (relevant to both recommendations):** NARDAC provides information from CCC regarding the impact of this proposal.

Note 1

EURIG, the Translations Team Liaison Officer and the Education and Orientation Officer highlight OPTIONs at RDA 90.94.94.48 in **Corporate body: name of corporate body** to "Use any *source of information*. | Record the form found in the *source of information*" and at RDA 01.87.13.45 in **preferred name of corporate body** to "Record a value of Corporate body: name of corporate body". All three ask, as the EOO puts it, "if these two instructions would not already provide sufficient permission for a cataloguer to record a name that consists of a bilingual or multilingual value." As EURIG suggests, "If it is the feeling of the majority of the RSC that the general option to record a value is sufficient, EURIG would ask the Examples Editor and the [Examples] Working Group to add examples, including examples of dual+ language/script corporate names and placenames, to the option."

Note 2

EURIG raises further issues faced by those working in multilingual environments, noting that "issues having to do with scripts are not discussed. In addition, questions of when foreign loan words or names are considered a different language and when they have been sufficiently incorporated to be considered the same language as the rest of the corporate/place name have not been addressed." While voting to reject Recommendation 1, EURIG asks that if the majority of the RSC wish to deal with the issue raised in it, "the recommendations be rewritten to take into account issues of scripts and loan words as well as the explicit separation of singular and plural in the headings of **preferred name of corporate body**.

Note 3

NARDAC shares a comment from the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (CCC) that "Several CCC members highlighted the challenge in distinguishing between two forms of a name appearing together for convenience, as opposed to a dual-language form that reflects the body's intention to present it as a single name." They also share the Library of Congress's (LC) position – it "supports the proposal but is concerned with possible confusion for the cataloger to know when a name presented in two languages is supposed to represent parallel names (e.g. Canadian body names appearing side by side in French and English) and when it isn't (e.g. New Zealand names. Such confusion may rely on extra policy statements to solve." The EOO shares this concern, and suggests "that the 'Prerecording' instructions for the supertype **Corporate Body: name of corporate body** also be modified to provide a general list of values that may be considered for a name, including 'a name that consists of a value in two or more languages' (final working to be agreed upon by RSC) … Adding this 'Prerecording' instruction under **name of corporate body** would remind cataloguers that any value they do not select as the preferred name can potentially by recorded as a variant name. Moreover this addition would be consistent with the structure of the 'Prerecording' section found at **Person: name of person** and **Family: name of family**."

Note 4

One of the reasons that the Translations Team Liaison Officer rejects Recommendation 1 is that "Minimal amendment, as it is proposed, seems to be insufficient in this case." He suggests "a new heading should be added to the **preferred name of corporate body** element page referring to cases where a name of

a corporate body is handled as a single multilingual string." As well as the EEO's suggestion in **Note 3**, we have NARDAC's proposed new CONDITION and CONDITION OPTION at **Corporate body**:

> CONDITION
> A name is composed of a name repeated in two or more languages, with or without separating punctuation.
>
> > CONDITION OPTION
> > Record a value as it appears in manifestations.

NARDAC points out this is "rephrased to remove 'single string' and to reference 'manifestations'" (see **Note 5** and **Note 6**).

The RDA Examples Editor suggests a similar (but different) wording, again to be added as a new CONDITION and CONDITION OPTION in **Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body**:

> CONDITION
> A value of a name appears in two or more languages in manifestations.
>
> > CONDITION OPTION
> > Record a value as it appears in manifestations.

Note 5
NARDAC points out that "The term 'single string' is not used elsewhere in Base RDA" and "recommend[s] rephrasing rather than adding this new phrase." Their rewording is contained in **Note 4**. The RDA Examples Editor has approved of ORDAC's Recommendation 1 with two suggested revisions, the first of which is to "Omit 'as a single string' … The instruction to record the value as it appears implies that it will be recorded as a single string if presented that way in manifestations." Her suggested wording is contained in **Note 4**. The WCEO agrees with the omission of "as a single string".

Note 6
The RDA Examples Editor's second suggested revision of ORDAC Recommendation 1is to "Replace 'source of information' in [the] Condition Option with 'manifestations' to mirror [the] language in the Condition. Her suggested wording is contained in **Note 4**. NARDAC also made this amendment (see **Note 4**) and their suggested wording is contained in **Note 4**.

Note 7
NARDAC shared CCC's comment that "There appears to be growing interest in establishing names that use forms in two languages in Canada, perhaps more so with place names … In Canada, dual language forms are common, but these are often not intended to be single name (examples: Canada Revenue Agency / Agence du revenu du Canada; Huron, Lake / Lac Huron)." They also shared ALA's comment that there are "Canadian names that might be considered dual-language names, e.g. 'Postes Canada Post'. Based on the frequency with which they encounter parallel names and

dual-language names, NARDAC suggested that the new CONDITION/OPTION included here at **Note 4** be "given as the second condition, rather than directly under **preferred name of corporate body**, since the more usual case is that the corporate body appears in two or more languages in manifestation but its preferred name is in a single language."

Note 8
As agreed at the RSC's October 2023 meeting, all proposals are now checked by the RDA Examples Editor. She is expecting to add examples, from RSC/ORDAC/2024/1 itself and from the official responses, and from the Example Working Group's standard work. In her formal response she makes explicit mention of the need for examples to "further illustrate the instruction" in Recommendation 1. While rejecting RSC/ORDAC/2024/1, EURIG asks that if it is accepted on a majority vote of the RSC, "the Examples Editor and the Working Group … add examples, including examples of dual+ language/script corporate names and place names, to the option" (see **Note 2** above). NARDAC's response includes specific examples:

> **Parallel versions of single-language name:**
>
> Canada Revenue Agency / Agence du revenue du Canada
>
> **Dual-language name:**
>
> Postes Canada Post

Note 9
In the same vein as **Note 1**, EURIG, the Translations Team Liaison Officer and the Education and Orientation Officer query whether existing RDA instructions already cover the instances raised by ORDAC in the proposal. The Translations TLO puts it most strongly, in terms of both Recommendations, stating that if existing instructions cover the cases raised by ORDAC, this "would make the proposal irrelevant." The EOO helpfully points to the specific instructions that may cover the case raised for places, asking "ORDAC to clarify … [w]hether the Option at #78.13.84 under **Place: name of place** ('Use any source of information. Record the form found in the source of information') in combination with the Option at #10.74.78.31 under **Place: preferred name of place** ('Record a value of Place: name of place') provides sufficient permission for a cataloguer to record a bilingual or multilingual value for a name of place."

Note 10
Based on the examples provided in RSC/ORDAC/2024/1, EURIG poses the question, "Are names of mountains, rivers and other 'natural phenomena' in scope for RDA? In many cataloging traditions names of natural places are part of subjects and thus seem to be out of scope."

Note 11
Similarly to the points raised at **Notes 3 and 4** for Recommendation 1, in responding to Recommendation 2, the EOO "ask[s] ORDAC to clarify … If the 'Prerecording'

instructions for **Place: name of place** can also be modified to provide a general list of values that may be considered for a name of place." NARDAC provides suggested rewording:

> CONDITION
> A name is composed of a name repeated in two or more languages, with or without separating punctuation.
>
> > CONDITION OPTION
> > Record the form of name as it appears in sources of information.

The RDA Examples Editor provides the same rewording of the CONDITION OPTION.

Note 12
NARDAC provides an example of parallel language versions of a single name:

> Huron, Lake / Lac Huron

(but see **Note 10** above).

Note 13 (relevant to both recommendations)
As the RSC recently reintroduced the requirement for explicit impact statements in proposals, it seems important to highlight feedback from CCC via NARDAC:

> *Impact on access points and variant names*
>
> CCC disagrees with the statement in the proposal under *Impact of proposed changes on users*: "End users of descriptions applying the new options will see values that incorporate the whole string, but as these are not access points it is likely to have little impact on the user experience."
>
> Since preferred names form a base access point, policy makers will need to think carefully about how they could affect access points.
>
> Policy makers would also need to anticipate variant access points that, for example, could rotate the names in the two languages, as in this hypothetical example:
>
> > Oranga Tamariki Ministry for Children
> >
> > to
> >
> > Ministry for Children Oranga Tamariki
>
> Policies in this case would logically need to be attached to an *existing* instruction in the **Access point for place** and **Access point for corporate body** elements:

CONDITION
A value of a name includes separate words, phrases, or other
components.

CONDITION OPTION
Record a value that rotates one or more words, phrases, or other
components of a name to the front, followed by some or all of
the remainder of the name.

Whi;e policy makers need to consider variant access points, there is also the
possibility of variant names in dual languages already appearing on resources.