To: RDA Steering Committee

From: Gordon Dunsire, Chair, RSC Technical Working Group

Subject: RDA 9.2: Addition of elements for Given name and Surname: Responses to RSC/TechnicalWG/2

Abstract

This document summarizes submitted responses to recommendations and proposed changes to RDA in RSC/TechnicalWG/2 (RDA 9.2: Addition of elements for Given name and Surname), and provides comments and additional information from the RSC Technical Working Group.

Introduction

The RSC Technical Working Group thanks the RDA communities for their helpful comments and suggestions relating to the recommendations and change proposals submitted as RSC/TechnicalWG/2.

Comments and additional information for each recommendation and proposal are given below.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The given name and surname elements should be treated in the RDA instructions as sub-elements of name of the person until further review of the impact of the LRM is undertaken.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The Working Group has no view on what the preferred labels of RDA elements and concepts should be, because the semantics of the data are provided by the definition and entity-relationship ontology of the FRBR, etc. models. The Working Group expects the requirements for clarity and readability to be taken into account, especially in the context of translations, when preferred labels are chosen.

The Working Group expects further review to investigate how element sub-types and sub-elements should be accommodated in the *Nomen* entity and *appellation* relationship of the LRM.

Recommendation 2: The surname and name of the family elements should be related only by instruction references, and not semantic relationships, until further review of the impact of the LRM is undertaken.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Add patronymic as a separate sub-element of name of the person to complement given name and surname.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The Working Group did not propose any new sub-elements for name of the person because it expects them to be covered by **Recommendation 4**.

The Working Group welcomes the proposal to add *matronymic* as a sub-element that forms a complementary pair with patronymic. The Working Group does not expect the outcomes of Recommendation 4 to break or rescind the basic utility or semantics of matronymic, and sees no reason to delay its addition to RDA with the amendments proposed by ALA.

Recommendation 4: Review the RDA accommodation of components of name of the person as distinct sub-elements of LRM Nomen, using IFLA's Names of Persons service as a source of data.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The reference to IFLA's Names of Persons service is in the context of semi-structured examples of world-wide data that can be used to categorize components of a Nomen that might be useful RDA sub-elements. The Working Group welcomes suggestions for other sources of exemplar data.

Change: Recommended revisions for RDA

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with the proposed changes.

The Working Group acknowledges the Western bias inherent in the concept of surname as it is currently applied in RDA. The cultural context of a Western surname (and forename) requires accommodation, but RDA uses the elements to accommodate data from other cultural contexts in inappropriate ways. The Working Group expects these issues to be taken into account if **Recommendation 4** is accepted.

The Working Group does not see a significant difference between "used as" and "functions as" in the definition of *surname*; the user is any agent that determines the content of the element, which is not confined to self-description. For example, the surname data of an immigrant may be determined by officials and bear no relationship to the name used by the individual for similar purposes in their home environment.

Similarly, the Working Group does not see any benefit in adding the "functions" clause to the definition of *given name*. The agent assigning the name is not specified in order to accommodate any name that functions as a given name.

In both cases, “functions” should be specified in the instructions, not the definition.

The Working Group agrees with the revision to 9.2.1.5.3 to remove the recording order of *surname*. It was an oversight that 6JSC/TechnicalWG/5 was not taken into account when cutting and moving the current RDA text.