

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Dave Reser, LC Representative  
**Subject:** Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA: Discussion Paper (2013)

LC thanks ALA for its continuing research into this issue.

## Recommendations and Questions for Discussion

### 1. Extent of Expression

***Recommendation:***

Add Extent of Expression to the RDA element set and consider making it core when the extent is readily ascertainable and considered important for identification or selection.

***LC response:*** As indicated in our response to 6JSC/ALA/17, we are somewhat intrigued by this concept, but are still not much further along in understanding how this would actually play out in RDA. Given the fact that the task group recommends renewed work on the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization, it seems premature to recommend any action in RDA at this time, especially for an element that may have a “core” requirement. The criteria for ‘core-ness’ (readily ascertainable and considered important for identification or selection) are more likely criteria for including the element, not criteria for a core requirement. The use cases seemed highly specialized or difficult to determine, and may be relevant to a different metadata model (e.g., technical metadata) rather than a general bibliographic description model.

***Question:***

Should values for Extent of Expression be based upon the RDA vocabulary for Content Type?

***LC response:*** Given that the only examples to illustrate extent of the expression (p. 4 of the discussion paper) are also labeled by the task group as “decidedly unsatisfactory,” we think it is premature to reach this conclusion.

### 2. Extent of Item

***Recommendation:***

Add Extent of Item to the RDA element set, to parallel Extent of Manifestation and the proposed Extent of Expression.

***LC response:*** We do not see any compelling need based on this discussion paper. It was noted in the paper that FRBR does not include extent as an attribute of

item, but also notes some areas where information about a particular item can be recorded in RDA (3.21, 3.22). We note that FRBR does have an attribute (4.5.6) “Condition of the Item” that seems to correspond to some of the desired information. We were not convinced by the presented “use cases” of the need for Extent of Item in RDA.

***Question:***

Should an identical machine-actionable model be established for all three of these extent elements?

***LC response:*** Premature.

### **3. RDA/ONIX Framework**

***Recommendation:***

Extend the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization, in order to flesh out fuller sets of types for content and carrier.

***Questions:***

- a. Should the RDA vocabularies for Content Type (RDA 6.9) and Carrier Type (RDA 3.3) be extended in order to establish more user-friendly terms for extents of expression and manifestation?
- b. If so, should a *separate group* be charged to develop draft category tables, vocabulary values, and label construction patterns for RDA categorization terms?

***LC response:*** We do not feel comfortable enough in our knowledge of the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization work to comment on this recommendation, but look forward to the discussion at the meeting.

### **4. Aspect-Unit-Quantity Model**

***Recommendation:***

Modify the Aspect-Unit-Quantity (AUQ) model, as presented below, to accommodate complex extent data.

***LC response:*** We are concerned that the complexities introduced may not be worth any added value in machine manipulation