

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC Representative to the JSC
Subject: Review of 6JSC/ALA Rep/3: Vocabularies: Extent terms.

Singular and plural terms.

Question no. 1: Should plural versions of the RDA terms be included in the Registry?

Yes, if machine use of these terms would be enhanced by explicit inclusion of both singular and plural forms.

Question no. 2: Should the plural terms be added explicitly to RDA or is the instruction to use plural forms sufficient to maintain consistency with the Registry?

No. The instruction is sufficient. The plural terms should not be explicitly added to RDA.

Definitions.

Question no. 3: Do you agree that we do not need separate definition of the singular and plural forms, either in the Registry or in the RDA Glossary?

Different definitions for singular and plural forms are not necessary. If required we could give the Glossary term like this: "Atlas (Atlases)" followed by the term defined in the singular.

Implied vocabularies.

Question no. 4: Do you agree with my recommendation in the last sentence?

Agree to add the terms (in singular and plural forms) from the Carrier type vocabulary to Extent in the Registry. Agree no need to add those terms to RDA 3.4.1.3.

Overlapping vocabularies.

Question no. 5: Do you agree?

Would prefer to add list to 3.4.3.2.

Fragments of extent statements.

Question no. 6: Do you agree with these recommendations?

Prefer to defer this pending the results of the CC:DA Task Force.

Order of terms.

Question no. 7: Does the order matter? Should we rearrange the list at 7.20.1.3 in alphabetical order?

The order in 7.20.1.3 is deliberate – alphabetical order was considered and rejected by JSC previously. Note LC's explanation of the rationale.

Hierarchy of Format of Notated Music terms. In the RDA Glossary, the entry under "Score" includes cross-references to all the other Format of Notated Music terms.

Question no. 8: Does this imply a hierarchy? Should the Glossary make a distinction between broader, narrower, and related terms? Should we try to build a hierarchy for this vocabulary either in the Registry, the list at RDA 7.20.1.3 or both?

Not a priority unless we can see a clear value in making more specific relationships in the glossary, and there is a group available to work on this.