To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Danskin BL Representative to the JSC

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

Thanks to John Attig for bringing these issues forward for consideration by JSC representatives. I have a general comment and answers to specific questions.

General Comment

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.

Singular and plural terms.

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

   No.

   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?

   No. The instruction is sufficient. The plural terms should not be explicitly added 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?

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

Implied vocabularies

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

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

Overlapping vocabularies.

   Question no. 5: Do you agree?

   I agree that it is not necessary to add an explicit list at 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?

> 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.

Order of terms.

> **Question no. 7:** Does the order matter? Should we rearrange the list at 7.20.1.3 in alphabetical order?

> 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.

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?

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.

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.

Alan Danskin
28/4/11