To: RDA Steering Committee

From: ORDAC

Subject: Proposal on Dual-language naming of Corporate Body and Place

#### **Abstract**

This document updates <a href="RSC/ORDAC/2024/1">RSC/ORDAC/2024/1</a>, which was discussed at the April 2024 RSC Meeting (<a href="RSC/Minutes/456-468">RSC/Minutes/456-468</a> Item 462) and in two meetings of a Rapid Action Group consisting of the three Regional Representatives, Wider Community Engagement Officer (WCEO), Examples Editor, Translations Team Liaison Officer and invited experts. Examples from RSC/ORDAC/2024/1 were added to the RDA Toolkit in its July 2024 release (<a href="RSC/Minutes/469-482">RSC/ORDAC/2024/1</a> were added to the RDA Toolkit in its July 2024 release (<a href="RSC/Minutes/469-482">RSC/Minutes/469-482</a> Item 470.2.1), and further examples, covering examples in multiple scripts, will be included in future Toolkit releases. If (a) proposal(s) for multiple scripts is / are required in future, they will be presented by the WCEO and / or Europe Representative and / or another interested party. RSC/ORDAC/2024/1/rev is being presented for discussion at the November meeting of the RSC.

#### **Notes on revision**

Following consultation and discussion at the April RSC meeting, a Rapid Action Working Group was formed to further discuss two issues arising from the original proposal.

One issue was the acknowledgement that cataloguers in some descriptive communities have a very similar problem with changes in script within a single recognised value of name of place or corporate body; this is outside the scope of the ORDAC paper and will be handled in separate papers in the future.

The other issue is whether the recommended location of the option is problematic. It was pointed out that once the option is located under a condition for parallel language it is implicitly recognised as two values, so it would be better to have this located elsewhere on the page. This revised version of the proposal makes a new recommendation in terms of placement and wording of the option for Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body to avoid this unnecessary confusion.

#### Introduction

ORDAC presents this paper to resolve an issue of where a string for a name contains words from two or more languages but is not intended to be interpreted as parallel language values. The recommendations proposed make no changes to existing options for parallel language values, but simply add an additional option to two element pages allowing descriptive communities to select this value for use as a single value where it is appropriate to their context.

## **Impact statements**

Impact of proposed changes on users

Policy writers will need to consider policies in relation to the new options. Translators will need to translate the new text. 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.

*Impact of proposed changes on cataloguers* 

New options to consider when recording a value for two elements, but cataloguers can choose not to make use of the new options.

Impact of proposed changes on legacy data

There is no requirement to adjust legacy data to follow the new options.

Impact of proposed changes on RDA

No impact foreseen.

### **Proposal**

#### **Corporate Body names**

In New Zealand it is common for corporate bodies to have a dual-language name. This is a situation where the name containing words from two languages forms a single string to represent the corporate body entity. There is usually no punctuation used to separate the language terms.

#### examples:

Oranga Tamariki Ministry for Children Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

While the corporate body is recognisable if only part of the name is given (e.g. Oranga Tamariki), the name is commonly formally presented as a single string.

#### Examples

In the July 2024 release, some examples of dual-language names were added to the Toolkit at existing options.

At Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body under Recording an unstructured description <u>Option</u> the third example is for *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga*. This is valid to remain where it is, as an example of an institution already choosing to treat this as a single value of the element Place: name of place.

The recommendation is to cover situations where this choice has not already been made and further examples will be provided at the new option if the proposal is accepted.

# Recommendation 1: Add a new Condition and Condition Option to <u>Corporate Body:</u> <u>preferred name of corporate body</u>

Add a new condition directly under the heading Names of corporate body in two or more languages.

Marked-up copy

#### Names of corporate body in two or more languages

#### **CONDITION**

A value of a name consists of words in two or more languages

#### **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a value as a single string as it appears on the source of information

#### **CONDITION**

A value of a name appears in two or more languages in manifestations.

A corporate body has only one value of Corporate Body: <u>language of corporate body</u>.

. . .

Clean copy

#### Names of corporate body in two or more languages

#### **CONDITION**

A value of a name consists of words in two or more languages

#### CONDITION OPTION

Record a value as a single string as it appears on the source of information

#### **CONDITION**

A value of a name appears in two or more languages in manifestations.

A corporate body has only one value of Corporate Body: language of corporate body.

. . .

#### **Placenames**

The same issue arises for <u>placenames</u>, and this is noted to occur <u>in other countries</u> as well. The official languages of the jurisdiction notwithstanding, there are times when a dual name is given preference in reference sources such as gazetteers. In this case the names are frequently presented separated by punctuation in those reference sources.

examples:

Uluru / Ayers Rock (Australia)

Aoraki / Mount Cook (New Zealand)

Again, the location is recognisable if only one part of the name is used (e.g. Uluru) but the officially recognised form is the dual language form so when the dual-language form is seen on resources it is reasonable to consider it to be a single string rather than two separate strings representing the same value in different languages.

There are other examples where there are widely understood alternatives (e.g. Ōtautahi vs Christchurch) which are used to describe the same place but are used intentionally as language equivalents of each other for a given context even though they may not in fact reflect the same geographic boundaries. This latter situation is already adequately covered by existing options to select a language form of a name of place.

Within the Toolkit there is already a heading for Language. The new Condition and Condition Option could be placed directly under this. The existing conditions use the phrasing "a name of place is in two or more languages" but this is ambiguous and the Condition Options reflect parallel language situations where only one of the language values will be selected as the preferred name value. ORDAC recommends making use of "consists of" wording seen elsewhere in the Toolkit which indicates that a single value is being discussed.

#### **Examples**

In the July 2024 release, some examples of dual-language names were added to the Toolkit at existing options.

At Place: preferred name of place under Recording an unstructured description Option the fourth example is for *Uluru/Ayers Rock*. This is valid to remain where it is, as an example of an institution already choosing to treat this as a single value of the element Place: name of place.

The recommendation is to cover situations where this choice has not already been made and further examples will be provided at the new option if the proposal is accepted.

Additionally, at Place: preferred name of place under the heading Two or more names appear in sources <u>Condition Option</u> the second example is *Aoraki/Mount Cook*. This is an example of a situation where there are differing values of Place: name of place for the same place, and makes use of the gazetteer value as instructed by the Condition Option wording, and is a valid example where it is.

# Recommendation 2: Add a new Condition and Condition Option for Place: preferred name of place

Add a new condition directly under the heading <u>Language</u>, preceding the <u>Condition</u> *A name of place is in two or more languages*.

Marked-up copy

#### Language

#### **CONDITION**

A name of place consists of words in two or more languages

### **CONDITION OPTION**

Record a value as a single string as it appears on the source of information

CONDITION
A name of place is in two or more languages.
Clean copy
Language
CONDITION
CONDITION
A name of place consists of words in two or more languages
CONDITION OPTION
Record a value as a single string as it appears on the source of information
CONDITION
A name of place is in two or more languages.

# **Summary of recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:** Add a new Condition and Condition Option to Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body

**Recommendation 2:** Add a new Condition and Condition Option for Place: preferred name of place