To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative  

Subject: Representing Dates of Works and Expressions in RDA: discussion paper

CCC thanks the European RDA Users Interest Group (EURIG) for developing a follow-up paper to the 2012 proposal on the date of expression 6JSC/EURIG/2. CCC looks forward to a future proposal and offers these responses to EURIG’s questions.

Questions:
1. CCC feels that the proposed structure is more complex than necessary. A simpler revision would result in a tidier structure. The existing scope statements in 6.4 and 6.10 could be revised to specify that the “preferred” information is the default. The proposal could define a new sub-element in 6.4 Nature of date of work and a new sub-element in 6.10 Nature of date of expression. When “alternative” information is recorded, that could be specified in the appropriate nature of the date sub-element.
2. We agree with establishing “chronological information for expression” and “chronological information for work” with the qualifications given below.
3. CCC does not agree with the proposed name of the sub-elements. Each should have a distinct name. Define the new sub-elements as Nature of date of work and Nature of date of expression or possibly Details of date of work and Details of date of expression.
4. Nothing additional is evident at the present time.
5. The suggested elements may be superfluous, but EURIG could consider including them in the proposal.
6. EURIG could propose to make one instance core. Subsequent dates could be subject to a “core if” situation. Otherwise, the decision to record subsequent instances is a local policy decision.
7. If a “Core If” situation is developed, explicit instructions will be required. Instructions covering the use of these dates as additions would require scrutiny.

The list of date types proposed in 6JSC/EURIG/2 would need to be included in a future proposal. As a rule of thumb, this list should not duplicate dates already established in RDA.