

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to JSC
Subject: GMD/SMD Working Group: Proposal for Content and Carrier Terms in RDA

ACOC thanks the Working Group for their recommendations and the issues they have raised. The Working Group has made very good progress towards resolving the difficult issue of how to represent both content and carrier terms in RDA

In our discussion on this report ACOC has made the following assumptions:

- The broad carrier term would be used in RDA 3.2 Media category
- The specific carrier term would be used in RDA 3.3 Type of carrier
- The broad content term would be used in RDA 4.2 Type and form of content

We have one strong reservation about the report, which is that the suggested terms will not clearly and prominently indicate resources which are online.

Comments on Summary of Recommendations

1.1 Require one broad content term to designate the type and form of the resource.

ACOC supports the Group's recommendation to require a broad content term, and is generally supportive of the terms chosen by the Group.

ACOC has not reviewed the definitions of the terms given in Appendix A.

1.2 Convey specific content type information through scope notes; other descriptive notes; and genre, form, and subject access points.

ACOC tentatively supports the Group's recommendation.

1.3 Require one broad carrier term to designate the physical characteristics or media category using the following closed list.

Some ACOC members have questioned the value of using broad carrier terms in addition to specific carrier terms. For many types of content the carrier is implicit, and the specific carrier term will provide the information of most value to the user of the catalogue. This is an area where some usability testing might be useful.

ACOC rejects the use of a single term 'digital' to cover both physical and online resources. As noted above, we strongly suggest that the key distinction needed between categories of carriers is the one between resources which are online and those that are not.

ACOC has not reviewed the definitions of the terms given in Appendix B.

1.4 Require one ‘specific carrier’ type term.

ACOC supports the Group’s recommendation to require a specific carrier term.

ACOC recommends having one controlled list of specific carrier terms, and then allow for more specific uncontrolled description beyond that. ACOC noted that a controlled list is not possible for objects.

ACOC notes and strongly supports the use of the terms ‘book’ and ‘e-book’ as specific carrier terms. However, we have not reviewed each of the specific carrier terms given in Appendix B.

1.5 Offer the option to repeat the content and carrier type elements, as needed, to convey information effectively to end users.

ACOC agrees with the proposal to repeat these terms, noting that all aspects of the resource should be able to be represented.

1.6 Recommend that one broad content and one ‘specific carrier’ term display to end users

Although ACOC agrees that one broad content term and one specific carrier term should be mandatory, we consider that RDA should not determine displays.

Comments on Issues

6.1 Renaming the ‘Content’ Element

ACOC does not support the suggestion to consider renaming this element using any of the suggested terms.

6.2 Relationship Among the Carrier, Extent, and Other Technical Details Elements

ACOC’s understanding is that the specific carrier term will be used in creating the extent statement.

6.3 Distinguishing Levels of Broad and Specific Carriers

ACOC would prefer that the controlled lists did not extend beyond two levels.

6.4 Reviewing ‘Specific Carrier’ Vocabulary

ACOC agrees that a review of the specific carrier terms would be valuable.

6.5 Multiple Terms in Single or Repeatable Elements

ACOC considers that the order of the terms is not critical for user displays or for system matching.