

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Kevin Marsh, ACOC Representative

Subject: Representing date of works and expressions in RDA: discussion paper

ACOC thanks EURIG for this discussion paper. We are broadly supportive of intention of making explicit the source of date recorded for Works and Expressions and for allowing for the inclusion of additional date information. We would welcome a more detailed proposal.

In response to the specific questions raised:

1. We agree broadly with the approach, but question the necessity of introducing an extra level of hierarchy for Additional Dates.
2. Yes, we agree with creation of the new elements for work and expression.
3. We suggest that the sub-element "Nature of Date" should be included under both Work and Expression, but that in fact it should be split into "Nature of Date of Work" and "Nature of Date of Expression" in order to preserve the logical distinction.
4. No other sub-elements are obviously required.
5. We consider it is more likely that multiple dates will be associated with Expression than with Work. Several of the examples given as Additional Dates for Work appear to relate to Expressions. We are uncomfortable with the terms "Chronological Information for Expression", "Chronological Information for Work", as the term "chronological" is at odds with the terminology of date elements elsewhere in RDA and with the proposed core element statements. "Date Information of Work", "Date Information of Expression" might be preferable, if this hierarchical level of description is in fact required.
6. We consider one date should be recorded as core if known; other dates should be Optional Additions.
7. We suggest dates should be recorded in chronological order.
8. Further guidelines on the Preferred Date would be useful.

For the controlled vocabulary, we believe that broader consultation on the sufficiency of the list should be undertaken before a formal proposal is put forward, and that the list should also be reviewed if the Nature of Date sub-element is divided as suggested above. The arrangement by content type does not seem essential, and indeed seems to require unnecessary duplication.

We note that the paper uses the Latin term *terminus ad quem*. We consider that this should be replaced by an appropriate English-language term in any proposed amendment to the RDA text.