To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Note and related elements in RDA

CCC thanks the Technical Working Group for further exploring the issues around meta-elements. CCC agrees with recommendation 1 but not with 2 and 3. CCC agrees in part to recommendation 4. CCC agrees in principle with recommendation 5 but notes there are impacts not mentioned in this proposal.

Recommendation 1: Add explicit elements for each Details on ... instruction
CCC agrees with the addition of the Registry elements listed in Table 1 (as will be amended by the adoption of other proposals such as BL/16) for the Details on elements. We agree that these are real elements, and not notes.

Recommendation 2 and 3: Treatment of Note on Issue, Part, or Iteration used ...., Note on Title, Note on Series Statement as meta-elements
CCC does agree that Note on Issue, Part, or Iteration used as the Basis for Identification of the Resource is by definition meta-information. We agree to the treatment of this note as per recommendations 2 and 3. It is actually an element and not a note on another element.

CCC does not agree with the recommended blanket treatment of other "note on" notes.
Some notes are meta-information (any note that says where the data recorded in the corresponding element was found, or correcting an inaccuracy from a source) and others are not -- they are just giving actual information that is not suitable for recording within the appropriate element. Meta-information notes are recorded, at some time, for just about any of the manifestation level attributes that are normally transcribed, not just for the Title or the Series statement. The note on edition statement that says "Edition statement from jacket" (see figure 4) is as much meta-information as "Title from cover."

There are other "note on" notes that are not meta-information, but actual instances of the information. The selection of examples in RDA is not exhaustive. Perhaps more examples could be added to demonstrate that "note on" notes show these three uses: note on (element); note on source of element; and other information not recorded in the element. CCC does not agree with splitting all of the "note on" notes into sub-types.

As for the observation by the Working Group that not all of the RDA instructions for "note on" elements relate back to its root element. This appears to have been a simple oversight.

Recommendation 4: Other Note on ... elements
CCC agrees that some of the "note on" notes do conform to the model in figure 3.

Recommendation 5: Change the names of elements as in Table 4
Changing the element names changes them from being notes, to being ordinary attributes. This would require more editing in the related instructions. For example, the scope of 3.22.1.1 is named "Basic Instructions on ***Making Notes*** on Item-Specific Carrier Characteristics." *[emphasis added]*

CCC does see that the names of some “notes on” notes includes the corresponding element name, and others do not. This alters the formal modelling characteristics of the two types.

CCC hesitates over the “note about” formulation. It will be a challenge to preserve the distinction between “note on” and “note about” in translation.