To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: John Attig, ALA Representative to the JSC

Subject: Review of 6JSC/ALA Rep/3: Vocabularies: Extent terms. ALA Response.

This "response" is primarily a compilation of your responses into a single document, with a few ALA comments on those responses.

General Comments

BL: I am not sure whether it would be permissible to duplicate terms/definitions in the Open Metadata Registry for singular and plural forms, but I feel strongly we should not go down this path. To do so would lead to redundancy and ambiguity as a consequence would appear to be the generation of different URIs to identify the same thing.

LC: I greatly sympathize with wanting to make information available for machine use, but I also would like to keep the RDA content itself less cluttered.

ALA: Both CCC and LC raise the question of the relationship between the Registry and the content of the RDA Toolkit. From Diane, I have the impression that there are ALA Publishing is interested in pursuing this (although we should definitely confirm this with Troy). I agree with LC that this is a good idea because it allows maintenance of the lists to take place in a single environment and enforces consistency. If the vocabularies in RDA are linked to the Registry and the contents of the lists is derived automatically from the Registry, then it seems to me that we could still decide that a particular list (or even specific terms, such as the plural forms of extent terms) should reside only in the Registry, but that the terms that are listed in RDA would be derived from the Registry. Exactly how it would work is a matter of technical details that will have to be worked out; responsibility for maintaining the vocabularies is a question of governance that we probably need to start addressing.

Singular and plural terms.

Question no. 1: Should plural versions of the RDA terms be included in the Registry?

BL: No.
CCC: No.
CILIP: Yes, if needed for the correct labeling and processing of machine-readable data, else No.
LC: Yes, to support future machine manipulation.
ALA: Yes; my sense is that machine use of these terms would be enhanced by explicit inclusion of both singular and plural forms.
ALA: We do not have a consensus on this question.

Question no. 2: Should the plural terms be added explicitly to RDA or is the instruction to use plural forms sufficient to maintain consistency with the Registry?

BL: No. The instruction is sufficient. The plural terms should not be explicitly added to RDA.

CCC: No. The RDA instruction is sufficient.

CILIP: Plural terms in RDA itself would seem to be unnecessary if they were obtainable via a Toolkit link to the Registry. If and until this facility becomes available, the instructions to use plural forms in RDA are sufficient.

LC: "No" to adding plural terms explicitly to RDA. "Yes" to having RDA instructions refer wherever appropriate to the use of plural forms for consistency with the Registry. LC also recommends that the JSC and ALA Publishing explore extended functionality in the Toolkit to display information from the Registry to avoid the need of maintaining two separate lists. Users should also be able to indicate the language desired for display of the vocabularies.

ALA: We seem to have a consensus against adding the plural forms explicitly to RDA.

Definitions.

Question no. 3: Do you agree that we do not need separate definition of the singular and plural forms, either in the Registry or in the RDA Glossary?

BL: Agreed. Singular or plural is a requirement for human readability, it should not affect the underlying terms or definitions.

CCC: Agree.

CILIP: Agree that separate definitions of plural terms are not needed.

LC: "Agree" that the same definition can be used for both the singular and plural forms in the Registry but that the wording be given with each term in the Registry so that a definition is always available for a term. "Agree" that only one definition is needed in the RDA Glossary.

ALA: We seem to have a consensus that different definitions for singular and plural forms is not necessary (if the plural forms are included in the Registry, an issue on which we do **not** have a consensus).

Implied vocabularies. ... It would be possible to construct a list of valid terms covered by the instruction … in 3.4.1.3. … I'm inclined to think that adding this to the Registry, but not to RDA 3.4.1.3 is a reasonable compromise.

Question no. 4: Do you agree with my recommendation in the last sentence?

BL: RDA 3.4.1.3 seems quite clear and it is unnecessary to repeat the carrier type terms in the instructions.

CCC: I do not think that it is necessary to repeat the carrier terms at RDA 3.4.1.3; however, I do have a more general question. Are the publishers still contemplating using the Registry vocabularies to populate the vocabularies in the RDA Toolkit? If yes, shouldn't

the RDA vocabularies in the Registry align with what we want as RDA vocabularies in the RDA Toolkit?

CILIP: Agree with the recommendation in the last sentence to add terms to the Registry, but not to RDA 3.4.1.3.

LC: "Yes" to adding the terms (in singular and plural forms) from the Carrier type vocabulary to Extent in the Registry. "No" to adding those terms to RDA 3.4.1.3. The recommendation in the response to question no. 2 also applies here.

ALA: I think we agree on including a vocabulary based on the instructions at 3.4.1.3 in the Registry.

Overlapping vocabularies.

Question no. 5: Do you agree?

BL: I agree that it is not necessary to add an explicit list at 3.4.3.2.

CCC: Agree that it is not necessary to add an explicit list at 3.4.3.2. However, the question concerning alignment of the Registry vocabularies and RDA vocabularies is relevant here. (see question 4 response)

CILIP: Agree that it is not necessary to add an explicit list at 3.4.3.

LC: "Yes" to allowing the overlap. LC does recommend adding an explicit list to RDA 3.4.3.2; see the LC response to question no. 7. The recommendation in the response to question no. 2 also applies here.

ALA: I think we all agree not to add a list of terms to 3.4.3.2.

Fragments of extent statements. I recommend that we create combined terms where appropriate and add them to the registry; we may need to modify the instructions in RDA 3.4.5, but we should try to avoid this if the instructions are clear that the combined term is to be recorded. For the remaining fragments, I recommend that we leave these as "new-proposed" until we see whether ALA will propose a different structure for this element.

Question no. 6: Do you agree with these recommendations?

BL: Agreed, but "approximately" is different from the other fragments, including incomplete. It is information about the accuracy of metadata, rather than information about the resource. "Approximately" has a wider relevance than Extent of Text.

CCC: My preference is to defer this pending the results of the CC:DA Task Force.

CILIP: Wait until CC:DA Task Force reports before making a decision.

LC: "No." LC recommends not taking any actions until the CC:DA Task Force addresses the overall issues.

ALA: Most respondents want to await the recommendations of the CC:DA Task Force. My interpretation of this is that the "fragment" terms in the Registry should remain in the "New-Proposed" status, but that the rest can be "Published".

Order of terms.

> **Question no. 7:** Does the order matter? Should we rearrange the list at 7.20.1.3 in alphabetical order?
>
> **BL:** The order follows AACR2 (mutatis mutandis). The Editor's guide does not give any instruction regarding ordering of entries in a list. An alphabetic arrangement implies that users are already familiar with the terms they are looking for. In this case moving from the general to the specific appears more helpful.
> **CCC:** I would prefer to leave the list at 7.20.1.3 as is.
> **CILIP:** Yes, since having all lists in alphabetical order seems logical and more amenable for machine processing.
> **LC:** When RDA 3.4.3.2 refers to the list in 7.20.1.3, it says "If the resource consists of more than one type of unit, record the number of each applicable type in the order listed under 7.20.1.3." (The intent of "in the order listed ..." is to maintain the practice used by at least the U.S. music catalogers.) If a list is included at 3.4.3.2 rather than referring to the list in 7.20.1.3, it could be given at 3.4.3.2 in the order now at 7.20.1.3; then, the list at 7.20.1.3 could be given in alphabetical order when it used for that element.
> **ALA:** I think that LC has given the rationale that justifies the order of terms in 7.20.1.3. Most of the responses (except CILIP) do not favour any change.

Hierarchy of Format of Notated Music terms. In the RDA Glossary, the entry under "Score" includes cross-references to all the other Format of Notated Music terms.

> **Question no. 8:** Does this imply a hierarchy? Should the Glossary make a distinction between broader, narrower, and related terms? Should we try to build a hierarchy for this vocabulary either in the Registry, the list at RDA 7.20.1.3 or both?
> **BL:** The relationships are more complex than a simple hierarchy. The defining attribute of score (in RDA) is that it should represent all the sounds of a work. By this definition, table book, choir book and study score overlap with score and are not narrower terms.
> **BL:** I think we would have to see a clear value in making more specific relationships in the glossary. I think the priority should be to record the terms that we need for this vocabulary and defer the analysis of the complex relationships.
> **CCC:** I don't think we need to address this at this time.
> **CILIP:** Would prefer to maintain simple flat lists.
> **LC:** "No" to all three questions.
> **ALA:** There seems to be agreement that (a) this is not a simple hierarchy, and (b) explicit hierarchical organization of this list is not desired.