To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Alan Danskin, United Kingdom Representative  

The British Library and CILIP thank ALA’s Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3 for this thorough exploration of the issues. The paper was discussed by the CILIP/BL Committee on RDA at its meeting on 10th September. Our responses to the questions and recommendations contained in the paper follow below.

Questions

1. Should RDA contain a super-property for Measurement which may apply to all WEMI entities?

The question of super-properties should be referred to the Technical Working Group. Concern was expressed that the property may not be applicable to all entities or, even if it is, may not be used within the context of RDA. For example, how would we measure a Work? Number of derivatives? Quality of reviews? Would we want to record height or weight of a person?

   a) Should RDA contain a two-path approach, for both machine- and human-generated data?

   Yes.

2. Should the instructions for Extent (of the Carrier) be refocused to treat volumes and their subunits in the same manner as other carriers?

   Yes.

3. Should a separate set of instructions be developed for Pagination and Foliation? If so, should they be placed in Chapter 2 or Chapter 3?

   Yes. Chapter 2, because they identify the resource, whereas extent supports selection.

4. For recording the dimensions of still images and cartographic resources, should the distinction between the dimensions of the sheet and the pictorial area be made using values for Part Measured? Or should the dimensions of the pictorial area be treated as an attributed of content (in Chapter 7)?

   This question provoked considerable discussion. The dimensions of the image were considered to be significant for selection based on the content. However, it was argued that the size of the image is not an attribute of the expression, therefore if this distinction is considered important, it should be recorded in Part Measured.

   5. When should Extent of the Content be core?

   Core is assigned to those elements that are considered to be most important in fulfilling the FRBR user tasks. Extent of the Content will enable the user to choose between similar expressions (SELECT). Core status would therefore be appropriate for those resources where the absence of extent would be a barrier to selection. We are not certain that this would be specific to certain
types of content. If Extent of Content is ever to be considered a core element, we suggest the following limitations on scope: “...core element only if the resource is complete, or the total extent is known, and it is considered important for selection.”

a) Does it make sense to move Units and Sets of Units with Identical Content (currently RDA 3.4.1.6) to Chapter 7?

This question provoked a similar discussion to Q4. On balance, it was agreed that the number of units belongs in Chapter 3. The fact that the units are identical could be recorded as note/detail on the Part Measured.

b) Should a term other than “item” be used in these instructions? If so, what should it be?

Yes, a term other than “item” must be used. The best suggestion we have come up with is “component”.

6. Should the instructions for Duration make a distinction between the actual duration (for resources with a temporal dimension) and the intended duration (for resources with a stated performance time)?

Yes.

7. Is the syntax used for sub-elements in the examples acceptable? Is there a better way to present the examples?

We did not have time to consider this and are happy to defer to Examples Editor.

8. How great is the concern about the ability to migrate legacy data to the new structure?

It is always a concern, but we cannot allow the past to shackle the future direction, particularly in this context, where we are endeavouring to free library metadata from the limitations of superseded technologies.