To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Machine-Actionable Data Elements for Measurements, Extent of the Carrier, Pagination and Foliation, Dimensions, Extent of the Content, and Duration – Discussion Paper (2015)

CCC thanks the American Library Association for this prescient discussion. CCC supports the overall direction of the paper and appreciates the considerable careful analysis that has been applied to these issues. CCC offers the following comments to inform future discussion.

Question 1
We note that "measurement" applies nicely to expression, manifestation and item, but not to work, particularly with the proposed definition. Possibly "measurement" could be generalized in RDA as if it were an attribute of the "res" entity in the proposed FRBR LRM, allowing RDA to have a single series of general instructions for measurement for expressions, manifestations, and items. The measurement of other entities (agents, nomens) is not of interest within RDA.
Yes, RDA should pursue a two-path approach for machine- and human-generated data. We prefer not creating more use of "and/or" in RDA. Recording the machine-generated data could be the main instruction with an alternative to record human-generated data.

Question 2
Consistency of the approach for measurement is the desired outcome. Measurements of columns, pages and leaves should be seen as sub-units of volumes. Volumes are themselves sub-units of cases or portfolios.

Question 3
Yes, the separate instructions for pagination and foliation should be developed; the separate instructions belong in chapter 2 as this is most like transcribed information which is associated with the manifestation but CCC is not convinced the instruction as proposed has the best name. This measurement could be seen as a transciption of the stated pagination and foliation, i.e., Pagination and Foliation Statement, or, Transcribed Pagination and Foliation.
It may be useful to reconsider conflating pagination and foliation into a single definition, itself covering leaves, pages and columns. When we are told at z.1.4.1, 2nd a) and c) to "record the pagination" we cannot be certain what it intended.

Question 4
Thinking of this as a work within a work situation, i.e., aggregate, may be useful.

Question 5
No, Extent of the Content should not be core. It is desirable information in some cases, but it should not be mandatory.
   a) We would consider making this practice obsolete.
   b) No, we do not agree with re-using a well-established term in FRBR and elsewhere in RDA to mean something else. Item (content) is not a good solution. Adding another definition to "part" could provide a solution. We note that the paper already uses the phrase "analytical description of a part."

Question 6
The proposed distinction might not be clear. The explanation of the difference as given in question 6 could be added to the definition.

Question 7
Defer to the Examples Editor.

Question 8
The pat answer to this question is that the future is longer than the past. Migration of legacy data is of concern, but some aspects might be solved algorithmically.

Additional comments:
The statement on page 7 that the task group decided to opt for the alternative view of aggregates expressed in Appendix B of the Aggregates Working Group final report is of concern. That view is at odds with the direction of the consolidated FR model, i.e. FRBR LRM.

The proposed measurements chapter could stand to be tightened up to reduce circularity, to remove repetitive references, revise references to point to specific instructions.

The use of "each" as a measurement qualifier in 3.4.1.9 has a profound effect on the total measurement. A machine-readable approach, one assumes, would take a consistent, structural approach to handling sub-units following best practices for the description of aggregates.

Page 67+, z.1.4.1 and z.1.4.3 use both single unit and single volume, so consistency is preferable.
In z.1.4.2 the option from 3.4.5.3 a) has been removed. Recording "unnumbered pages" or "unnumbered leaves" is preferable to simply recording "unpaged."
In z.1.4.15 the instructions for loose-leaf could be better developed.

At z.1.4.5 the conjunction "but" is introduced into an If/Then construction. If/Then constructions only work when multiple conditions are linked by the same conjunction. In this case, the "but" conjunction can be changed to "and" with no change in meaning.

Under 3.4.1.7.11 pages of plates are considered carrier extent sub-units, but this may not be appropriate as, by definition, a page of plates is recognized due to it not being part of a sequence of pagination or foliation, which is a different element from the Extent of Carrier element

The width of tape and film is sometimes referred to as "width" and other times as "gauge" suggesting that the two terms may be used interchangeably. Perhaps this is a good time to introduce a consistent use of this terminology.

In some cases the syntax is carefully chosen so that, in English, the string form of a measurement can be seen to be easily generated from the sub-elements. This may not work out as well in translation, particularly in languages with different word order than English, and also in languages with grammatical gender agreement. This may mean that is it less important to arrange the sub-elements so that machine-generated display strings can be built from them.