

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Representing date of works and expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper

LC thanks EURIG for continuing the discussion on dates of works and expressions. While the approach outlined in this discussion paper is preferable to that identified in 6JSC/EURIG/2, we still have our doubts as to the necessity for the added complexity.

Element Sub-Types, Sub-Elements, and Statements

It is unclear from the paper whether EURIG is proposing a “statement” for the date of works (composed of a date and a nature of date)? The use of sub-elements in RDA seems to be limited to statements (as well as two elements in chapter 7 that essentially become statements as well—Dissertation or thesis information and Place and date of capture).

2.3 Questions:

1. Do you agree with this approach?

LC response: the approach leaves many questions in our minds as to how exactly the information about dates would be incorporated into the RDA element set, recorded by catalogers, and whether other elements already in RDA might satisfy the use cases.

2. Do you agree with the creation of these new elements of the work and the expression?

LC response: we’re not sure the complexity is warranted. Has EURIG considered an approach such as treating “Additional date for expression” as a “Variant date of expression” to distinguish it from the Date of expression, without the need for the extra elements and element sub-types? Or, if there truly are different types of dates of expressions and works that can be ‘typed’ on their own, wouldn’t it be better to add them explicitly (like dates of publication, distribution, manufacture, etc., as dates of manifestation)? We note that many of the use cases may be satisfied in other ways, such as the “Cataloger’s note” in RDA 5.9 to justify the cataloger’s choice among dates (when there was a choice), or “History of the work” in RDA 6.7 to explain other chronological context, or “Note on expression” in RDA 7.29 to describe other chronological context from the expression perspective (we note that this instruction may need some additional work to accomplish this, as it seems somewhat limited now to changes in expressions over time). While these other options would not support machine manipulation, we do not believe a convincing “use case” has been made (e.g., that a composer had an ‘idea’ to compose something, but didn’t actually do it for 60 years, does not seem like valuable machine-actionable information).

3. If so, where should the sub-element “nature of date” go in RDA? There appear to be 2 options:

- a. Repeated in each element sub-type
- b. Described once, as is common to the two element sub-types for both Work and Expression.

LC response: We would be interested in further discussion of EURIG's intent—see above about element sub-types, sub-elements, and statements. We're not sure of the impact of these options on the RDA data model.

4. Are there other sub-elements that should be included?

LC response: No.

5. Are there cases where more than one type of date could be associated with one expression? Should the sub-type "Additional Chronological Information for Expression" be kept, as it may be found redundant with information given at the Work level?

LC response: Agree that this sub-type may not be necessary.

6. Should one date be recorded or should all dates be recorded? At the Work level? At the Expression level?

LC response: We think that a single date of work and a single date of expression are all that is necessary. Any additional dates can be explained in other elements.

7. Is an explicit order of preference required for assigning dates?

LC response: If different 'types' are to be developed and standardized, then, yes, there would have to be a preference. This seems very difficult to accomplish across a broad range of resources (we note that the ALA proposal on Treaties identified many different types of dates of treaties alone).

8. What additional instructions are required?

LC response: We would prefer to see connections made to 5.9, 6.7, and development of 7.29 instead.

For the controlled vocabulary associated with "Nature of date," to be established with different specialist communities,

1. Is the arrangement by content type necessary?

LC response: Yes, or something very similar

2. Is the list of date types proposed in 6JSC/EURIG/2 sufficient?

LC response: We doubt that the various communities would find the list sufficient, and note that it does not include "date of work" types (and many of the date of work types mentioned in the proposals, are surely expression attributes). This seems as though it would be very challenging.