Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Office for Library Standards   18.09.2006

Comments on „RDA − Resource Description and Access : Part A, sections 3.2 (Media category), 3.3 (Type of carrier) and 4.2 (Content category)

Submitted by: Office for Library Standards, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
E-mail address: r.goempel@d-nb.de

A draft of "RDA − Resource Description and Access", Part A, sections 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 was made available by the Joint Steering Committee among the JSC working documents in August 2006 http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-parta-categorization.pdf, asking JSC constituencies to respond by 18 September 2006.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek would like to submit some comments which include comments received from the expert groups of the Committee for Library Standards although only JSC constituencies were asked to respond. Thank you in advance for considering the comments.

General comments:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek welcomes the goal to make the RDA elements for content category, media category and type of carrier compatible to the ONIX framework for resource categorization. The added mapping tables help to understand how RDA and ONIX elements fit together.

The draft aims at melding varied user interests. The approach to give prominence to the intermediation tool (i.e., the type of device intended to be used to enable the content of the resource to be perceived) was questioned in the expert groups, where prominence on the material was preferred.

We notice that RDA thus introduces a new categorization terminology, and believe that a compatibility and harmonization with ISBD terminology is necessary.

The relation between section 3.4 (Extent), 3.2 (Media category) and 3.3 (Type of carrier) is not addressed in the draft sections. In our opinion, it is necessary to explain the relation.

We suggest a clear separation between carrier and content.

We welcome that codes (in each section) are mentioned as an equal alternative.

Chapter 3 (Technical description), Section 3.2 Media Category *(optional)*

The Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (Draft, as of April 2006) calls for a general material designation as an *indispensable* access point. If both the categories proposed for content category (4.2) and media category (3.2) are made of as successors of the former general material designation, as explained in the introductory words "Levels of specificity", we would like to ask why both are optional and suggest to make them required elements.

3.2.0.2 Recording media category

We welcome the term "digital" instead of "electronic resource".
In the expert groups, a term "multi-media" is suggested because multi-media resources (on carriers and online) evolve into a special group which is not adequately characterized by adding several elements.

The term "unmediated" sounds strange. One of the most common publication types, printing, is subsumed here. As "stereographic" and "projected" are single and very specific terms, "unmediated" seems to be a very collective term.

We welcome that as many terms or codes as are applicable to a resource are recorded (if the alternative in 3.2.0.2.4 is not applied), so "audio" and "digital", e.g., might serve to characterize an audio disc.

Chapter 3 (Technical description), Section 3.3 Type of carrier *(required element)*

In our opinion, it is not sufficient to see the proposed RDA element for type of carrier and the element for extent (3.4) as independent as mentioned in the introductory words. We agree that 3.4 needs revisiting after decisions on 3.2 and 3.3 are made. Additionally, it is necessary to express the relation between the sections in the draft. The specific material designation is dealt with in section 3.4 (Extent).

"Unmediated carriers", again, seem to be a very collective term. We feel that it is strange to have no carrier term "paper" here, one of the most common types, not only in libraries.

The approach to include the technical device of use fails when it comes to audio carriers and digital carriers. Material and technics are not sufficient then because "audio disc", "computer disc" and "video disc" may all be a DVD, playable on a computer, and the "type of intermediation device" does not help to differentiate.

The German OCLC/PICA partners discussed a model in 2005 and argued for an approach to put the material itself and the form of storage first. Their approach includes "paper" (e.g., for books, atlases, cards, photos, posters), "analog" (e.g., for film cartridges, disks, slides) and "digital" (e.g., for discs, DVD videos, audio discs).

A differentiation of film material into "projected carriers" and "video carriers" was not regarded necessary by the experts because it requires a content check.

Chapter 4 (Content description), Section 4.2 Content category *(optional)*

4.2.0.2 Recording content category

The expert groups suggest that the term "three-dimensional moving image" should better be subsumed in the term "moving image".

4.2.1 Computer programs, datasets, etc.

Instead of listing computer programs and datasets under "other", we suggest a category "computer data and programs".

4.2.2 Cartographic content

The expert groups suggest to add an own term "cartographic" to 4.2.0.2 (Recording content category) instead of adding a qualifier.