

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Gordon Dunsire, Chair, RSC Technical Working Group
Subject: RDA models for provenance data: Responses to RSC/TechnicalWG/1

Abstract

This document summarizes submitted responses to recommendations and proposed changes to RDA in RSC/TechnicalWG/1 (RDA models for provenance data), and provides comments and additional information from the RSC Technical Working Group.

Introduction

The RSC Technical Working Group thanks the RDA communities for their helpful comments and suggestions relating to the recommendations and change proposals submitted as RSC/TechnicalWG/1.

Comments and additional information for each recommendation and proposal are given below.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Further development of date of usage, scope of usage, status of identification, and undifferentiated name indicator should be considered as part of the development of the LRM Nomen entity in RDA.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The RDA element *undifferentiated name indicator* can be modelled as an element of LRM *Nomen*; for example:

- Nomen1 has-literal-string "RDA Steering Committee".
- Nomen1 has-undifferentiated-name-indicator "undifferentiated".

Alternatively:

- Nomen1 has-undifferentiated-name-indicator "True".

The RDA element *status of identification* can be modelled as an element of LRM *Nomen*; for example:

- Nomen has-literal-string "RDA Steering Committee".
- Nomen has-status-of-identification "provisional".

Alternatively:

- Nomen has-status-of-identification
<http://rdaregistry.info/termList/statIdentification/1002> .

The Technical Working Group notes that assigning values relative to a specific authority control system or other vocabulary encoding scheme is not in the current scope of the RDA instructions. It is therefore possible to assign two different values of *status of identification* to the same Nomen; the Nomen may be provisional in one scheme, and fully established in another.

The removal of status of identification as an LRM element has no impact on RDA. Most of the current RDA elements are refinements of the very high-level LRM elements, with no direct, that is, equivalent, mapping. The simplest mapping will be element sub-type, or sub-property in RDF. More complicated mappings involving sub-elements may be necessary if every current RDA element is retained, or desirable to benefit from the LRM.

Relating a value to a specific authority vocabulary can be modelled in the same way as provenance data, by reifying an *RDA data statement*:

- {Nomen has-entry-in-scheme "LCNAF"} has-undifferentiated-name-indicator "True".
- {Nomen has-entry-in-scheme "Staff List"} has-undifferentiated-name-indicator "False".

Recommendation 2: Generalize the scope of application of cataloguer's note and source consulted to any RDA element and provide contextual guidance on applicability to specific elements.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

The RDA Technical Working Group thinks that the distinction between public and non-public is out of scope for RDA; how RDA data is used in applications is a decision for the application. The Working Group recognizes that specialized provenance elements may be required by specific RDA communities, but in the future these are likely to include, for example, archive, museum, and developer communities as well as library cataloguers.

The Working Group expects guidance on the context of provenance elements to be developed if Recommendation 4 is accepted. The guidance should take into account the intended audience of provenance data.

The overlap between meta-elements and RDA *note on ...* elements was analysed in 6JSC/TechnicalWG/2 (Note and related elements in RDA). The RSC Chair and Secretary have an ongoing action to complete the separation of meta-element data from auxiliary data contained in notes; the meta-element "notes" are to be distinguished as RDA *note about ...* elements. The Working Group expects this work to be absorbed into the future development of RDA meta-elements for provenance data.

RDA meta-elements can be refined with element sub-types or generalized with super-types like any other RDA element.

Reification using an *RDA data statement* can be recursive:

- DataStatement1 has-triple <ManifestationWheat has-publication-statement “ ... 1850”>.
- DataStatement1 has-cataloguer’s-note “Ostensibly published in 1850 ...”.
- DataStatement2 has-triple < DataStatement1 has-cataloguer’s-note “Ostensibly published in 1850 ...”>
- DateStatement2 has-source-consulted ManifestationWheat.

This forms a closed loop in this particular example. The source information is implicit in the triple of DataStatement1: the manifestation is the source of information for publication statement (this is more explicit in the LRM).

In other cases, it will usually be sufficient to use a single data statement:

- DataStatement1 has-triple <Manifestation1 has-place-of-publication “Edinburgh”>.
- DataStatement1 has-cataloguer’s-note “Place inferred from address postal code”>.
- DataStatement1 has-source-consulted “Postcode gazetteer. Post Office, 1972”.
- DataStatement2 has-triple <Manifestation1 has-place-of-publication “Glasgow”>.
- DataStatement2 has-cataloguer’s-note “Place identified in major reference sources.”>.
- DataStatement2 has-source-consulted “Works of A.N. Author”>.

Recommendation 3: Consider creating the meta-elements transcription note, transcription source, and transcription rules when introducing separate elements for transcriptions.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

An individual transcribed element is an *RDA data statement*. RDA meta-elements, including transcription note, etc. are applicable to an individual data statement or set of data statements (*RDA data set*), or both, depending on the application. The Working Group expects guidance on practical restrictions in applying meta-elements to be developed if Recommendation 4 is accepted. This would include, for example, the restriction of transcription meta-elements to situations where transcription can occur, such as LRM manifestation statements.

There are no mandatory elements in RDA, and therefore no requirement for any particular provenance to be recorded, including the source of information as the title page for LRM manifestation statements. The Working Group has no view on how provenance data is captured; the Working Group believes this is a matter for local policies and applications.

Recommendation 4: Develop general guidance on recording provenance data and using RDA meta-elements.

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with this recommendation.

Change 1: Recommended new instructions at RDA 0.13-0.14

Comments and additional information

There is general agreement with the proposed changes.

See the comments on **Recommendation 2** on the issue of overlap with *notes ...* elements.

The Working Group does not intend that the form of citation should be prescribed. The misleading uniformity of examples is an issue for consideration by the RDA Examples Editor.

The Working Group regards any location for the new instructions to be temporary until the RSC assess the overall impact of the LRM and the Toolkit reorganization project. The Working Group does not recommend delaying these changes for this reason, and believes making the changes now will inform the decision on final location of provenance instructions within the instruction numbering system.

The Working Group has no objection to the wording amendments proposed by the ALA community. The Working Group disagrees with the incorporation of the optional additions in the main instructions at 0.13.1.3 because it narrows the scope and utility of the element too much. A "source consulted" is a form of related entity. An element sub-type can be added to RDA for a specific citation within a larger source consulted. Specific citation order, etc. can be specified as a syntax encoding scheme in an application profile; the ALA requirements are best served by regarding the source consulted as an Expression/Work in its own right, and applying the 4-fold path accordingly.

Change 2a: Recommended revisions for referencing RDA 0.13-0.14: wording in introductory chapters

Comments and additional information

There is a clear preference for version 2a.

There is no clear preference for version 2a1 or 2a2.

The Working Group retains a preference for version 2a1. The Working Group expects cataloguer's judgement to be applied to issues of applicability and context.

The Working Group welcomes the proposal to remove the "identifying" and "descriptive" qualifiers of "attribute". It simplifies and generalizes the instruction. A revised text is proposed below.

The Working Group recommends that appropriate editorial changes are made elsewhere in RDA for consistency and simplicity.

This includes the definitions of *cataloguer's note* and *source consulted*. Revised definitions are proposed below.

The removal of 18.6 is consistent with the ***Recommendation 2 responses and additional information*** above. This change can be delayed until proposed text, etc. for distinguishing *notes on ...* elements, *notes about ...* elements, and meta-elements is available.

Version 2a1: General wording

Comments and additional information

The revised proposed text is:

For citing a resource used in determining an attribute or relationship, see source consulted (0.13)

For making an annotation that clarifies the selection and recording of an attribute or relationship, see cataloguer's note (0.14).

The proposed revisions to meta-element definitions is:

cataloguer's note: An annotation that clarifies the selection and recording of identifying attributes, relationships, ~~data~~, or access points for the entity.

source consulted: A resource used in determining the name, title, or other identifying attributes of an entity, or in determining the relationship between entities.

The Working Group recommends a further review of the definition of *cataloguer's note* to determine if "access points" should be removed from the definition.

Version 2a2: Contextualized wording

Comments and additional information

The only difference in wording, if the qualification of "attribute" is removed, is the specification of the relevant entities. This is consistent with the specification of entities in nearly every other sub-instruction in the section, but therefore is redundant.

Change 2b: Recommended revisions for referencing RDA 0.13-0.14: wording for each element

Comments and additional information

There is a clear preference against this approach.