

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the JSC  
**Subject:** Representing date of works and expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper

ALA thanks EURIG for further exploring how to address various dates associated with works and expressions in RDA. We offer the following comments on the discussion paper.

***Creating a generic element “Chronological Information for Expression”:***

While ALA could support the creation of this element, we have the following concerns:

- The changes involved go beyond merely changing the element names/paragraph headings; revision of the text would be needed as well.
- We are not convinced that creating the “Nature of Date” sub-element under both “Preferred Chronological Information for Expression” and “Additional Chronological Information for Expression” would be acceptable from a data modeling standpoint. “Nature of Date” is data about data, and needs to be treated in a different manner from the usual element sub-types.
- We would prefer an approach that simply uses “Date of Expression” and “Date of Work.” The sub-element “Nature of Date” would explain what the date is about.
- We prefer retaining the term “date” in these element names rather than changing the term to “chronological”, since everything under these headings has to do with dates, and since “chronological” can also apply to an ordering of date and time information, which is not intended here.

***Defining date of work based on “terminus ante quem”:***

We do not agree with adding the Latin term “terminus ante quem” to RDA; instead we believe it would be sufficient to simply indicate that the date is cataloger-supplied. We also find this definition difficult to align with our understanding of what constitutes a date of creation; giving “the earliest date prior to which the work is assumed to have been created” seems to place the date of creation one day earlier than it should be.

***Additional date for work:***

ALA does not support identifying a date of an expression as a date of a work. This includes the date of the first performance, the realization of a revised expression, and the earliest known publication. These dates are at different levels in the FRBR model and should not be conflated. The date of publication is known through manifestations and does not need to be explicitly recorded as the date of the work unless that is the only way the date can be supplied.

Once new information is obtained that better defines the date of creation of a given work, that information should replace the date previously recorded as the date of creation, at least in terms of presenting actionable data. The outdated information could be retained as a cataloguer's note (see RDA 5.9).

***Nature of date for work:***

ALA has some concerns about adding the "date of conception" as the nature of a date. As noted elsewhere in the discussion paper, it is frequently difficult to identify dates of creation; it can only be more difficult to identify a date of conception. We note that FRBR defines "Date of the work" as either a single date or a range of dates, and RDA 6.4.1.1 can be interpreted to support that understanding. Thus it would be possible to consider the range of date of creation for Arma's Palette sonore to be 1925-1986.

***Responses to Questions (Section 2.3):***

1. Do you agree with this approach?  
Somewhat; see comments above.
2. Do you agree with the creation of these new elements of the work and the expression?  
Possibly; we believe that rewording should be considered. See comments above.
3. If so where should the sub-element "nature of date" go in RDA?  
It depends on the final structure. We have a preference for creating a specific sub-element for Work and Expression, with an eye toward clean data modeling.
4. Are there other sub-elements that should be included?  
Possibly an indication of primacy if multiple dates are applicable and recorded.
5. Are there cases where more than one type of date could be associated with an expression?  
Possibly, although this is difficult to reconcile with the FRBR model. If multiple types of dates are associated with an expression, RDA could at least provide guidance how to select the most relevant date.
6. Should one date be recorded or should all dates be recorded?  
We have not reached agreement on this point. Some have a preference for a single date (or a range of dates), while others would prefer the ability to record as many applicable dates as they can identify. Use cases would be helpful.
- 6a. Should they be recorded at the work or expression level?  
Date of work and date of expression should be differentiated as clearly as possible.
7. Is an explicit order of preference required for assigning dates?  
Yes; a series of use cases would be helpful in determining the preferred order. Additional dates to consider include: the year the work is registered for copyright; the year a moving image work is completed; date of first public release; the year or range of dates or

specific date during which the material that forms the basis of a moving image work is created.

8. What additional instructions are required?  
It will be necessary to determine core requirements.

***For the controlled vocabulary associated with “nature of date”:***

ALA supports the development of controlled vocabularies. However, such vocabularies cannot cover all cases, and an option to provide a concise description of the nature of the date should be included.

As we have further considered the list supplied here, we wonder if these are types of dates, or if they are really types of evidence on which the cataloger bases the date of the work or the expression. FRBR 4.2.3 (Date of Work) and 4.3.3 (Date of Expression) both refer to using the date of the first publication or release in the absence of an ascertainable date of creation of the work or of the expression. Thus dates relating to the first public performance or the publication of the earliest manifestation “stand in” for the actual date of creation of the work or expression and should not be explicitly modeled as a “date of work” or “date of expression.” We agree that including information about the nature of the date remains useful; however, we think it might be more appropriate to record this as an annotation on the basis or source of the dates recorded.