To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative

Subject: Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Discussion Paper

LC thanks ALA for the extensive thought that has gone into this exercise.

Question 1 Addition of aspect-unit-quantity treatment of extent

In principle, LC agrees with the model of aspect-unit-quantity. We note that this may be easier to accomplish for some straightforward RDA elements (such as dimensions, and duration, and simple extent statements) while more difficult for complex extent statements (e.g., those at 3.4.5.8 (Complicated or Irregular Paging, Etc.)) or extent statements with subunits. We wonder if the 'quantity' might be more easily related to the 'carrier type' element directly rather than extent, given the possible complexity of some extent statements.

Question 2 Addition of extent of expression

We are intrigued by this concept, but we would like to see a more detailed explanation before responding. We recall the angst that was caused by the communities reviewing the original AACR3 draft which also included a cleaner break between manifestation and expression with regard to extent. The many exceptional categories in extent today stem from the original negative response. Perhaps the concepts will be more understandable/acceptable in today's environment?

Question 3 Implemention of aspect-unit-quantity treatment of extent

We agree with CCC's comments—"During a transition period and probably longer, RDA will need to support the unparsed traditional practice while also supporting the aspect-unit-quantity approach. Some users may wish to continue recording their own eye-readable strings while also recording each element separately. This decision depends upon the capability of local systems and local policies."

We have a slight preference for Option 2 in our current implementation scenario—we envision this more "as an alternative to, or in addition to" the eye-readable text strings.