

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: John Attig, ALA representative

RE: *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, Part A – Constituency Review of March 2007 Draft of Chapter 3

ALA has reviewed the March 2007 Draft of RDA Chapter 3. We find it much improved over the previous draft. We acknowledge that the instructions for carrier description are the most complex in RDA. These instructions are also heavily invested with historical practices developed by different cataloging communities and carried forward from AACR2. We have mixed feelings about our inability to agree on significant simplifications of these instructions, as well as our inability to make them more consistent. However, we must admit that efforts to simplify these instructions and to reformulate them based on a set of general guidelines were not satisfactory. We therefore generally support the retention of many detailed and complex instructions in the initial release of RDA. We hope that the effort to achieve greater simplicity and consistency will continue in the future.

This response begins with some general comments on the draft, followed by specific responses to the issues raised in the cover letter, and then specific comments on individual instructions.

General comments

1. **FRBR user tasks:** The distinction between *identification* and *selection* is a subjective one. The boilerplate language “considered to be important for identification or selection” makes it clear that the same piece of data can be important for identification (when the user is looking for a resource that exhibits that attribute) or for selection (when the user is looking for a resource based on other attributes). For this reason, this distinction is not a very solid basis for the organization of chapters in RDA. ALA does not wish to reopen the organization of RDA, but we would like to point out that the scope of the chapters in Part I is going to be difficult to explain.
2. **Embedded vocabularies:** A key component of this chapter is the ubiquitous inclusion of embedded vocabularies. These vocabularies require a number of general comments.
 - a. *Use of pre-defined terminology:* The inclusion of so many embedded vocabularies might be taken to imply that cataloging consists of picking one or more terms from each applicable category. This is a gross misconception of the nature of cataloging. Bibliographic description is a kind of expository

writing; those skilled in its practice can accurately and concisely describe the features of anything collected by a library, archive, or museum, even if there are no specific instructions to cover the situation. This requires a great deal of flexibility in crafting the statements that we use to convey information to our users. The reduction of the art of cataloging to the selection of terms from lists makes this job more difficult (i) by restricting the terms we can use to describe the particular resource in a way that does not allow us to take advantage of the contextual significance of using certain terms, and (ii) by requiring that we separate the description of each attribute from that of other attributes, even when they are intimately related (for example, technically it is not valid in RDA to use the phrase “colour illustrations” because these are two different elements). This highly compartmentalized approach to cataloging does not assist catalogers in communicating information to users. Provision needs to be made for description as an informal narrative; it is not clear that RDA does this with sufficient regularity.

- b. *Lists of terms vs. lists of categories:*** The embedded vocabularies for Media Type, Carrier Type, and Content Type are distinct from the other embedded vocabularies in Chapter 3. While the other lists are simply lists of valid terms, these lists are based on an underlying framework that defines *categories* for which appropriate terms are included. The categories in RDA based on the RDA/ONIX Framework represent intersections of values for one or more Base Categories in the Framework. It is not possible to add additional *terms* to these embedded vocabularies **unless** these represent a *category* not yet represented in the list.
- c. *Embedded vocabularies as dynamic lists:*** One of the goals of the collaboration with the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative is to establish and register the embedded vocabularies. This has a number of important benefits. First, it allows for the development outside of RDA of richer display vocabularies that can be more useful to users for retrieval and selection than the terms specified for recording the values in RDA. Second, it allows the vocabularies to be maintained separately from the maintenance of the text of RDA, allowing terms to be proposed and approved for addition through an independent editorial process. This allows the vocabularies to be dynamic in ways that the text of RDA cannot be. If such a process were established, then RDA should reconsider the instructions about what to record when none of the specified terms applies. In this context, there is no virtue in recording “other”; an instruction to record a term in common use might be considered the first step in the process of extending the vocabulary – provided there is a way of capturing the “proposed” new term and of deciding whether it should be added.
- d. *Embedded vocabularies as closed lists:*** In the light of this vision of the dynamic nature of the embedded vocabularies, we see no reason why **any** of the lists should be closed. If the lists are dynamic, it should always be appropriate to use a new term for a new concept – assuming that this is part of

a process for extending the vocabulary and assuming that certain conventions are followed (particularly the conventions for defining *categories* rather than *terms* in the lists based on the RDA/ONIX Framework). Rather than including specifications for recording “other” – which is basically a failure to provide any useful information – RDA should state the conventions for the inclusion of terms or categories within the vocabulary and allow new terms to be used following those conventions.

- 3. Complexity of the rules and the writing:** ALA is concerned that each draft of any section of RDA seems to increase exponentially in size and complexity and to decrease exponentially in clarity and simplicity.

RDA reads like a stereotypical *system specification*. Given the development of RDA as a metadata schema, we accept that this may be what RDA needs to be at this time. However, the complexity of the element specifications is reaching the limits of practicality. While some of the complexity is simply carried forward from AACR, there is a large amount of text that results from the need to define formally the various element, element sub-types, and sub-elements. Such text may advance the utility of RDA as a metadata specification, but it makes it more difficult for catalogers to find the actual instructions they need to describe actual resources.

Although RDA needs to establish itself as a metadata schema, we must recognize that it will also need to be used by working catalogers who need to achieve a working understanding of how to create a description of the resources they have to catalog. Even when the result of applying RDA is no different from the result of applying AACR2, the text of RDA makes it very difficult for a cataloger to recognize that this is the case.

One of the problems is the concentration on specifications for individual elements. Such an approach obscures the procedural aspects of the way in which a description as a whole (not to mention a catalog as a whole) is constructed. Catalogers need a cookbook that provides recipes for various dishes, not an comprehensive encyclopedia of culinary esoterica.

Catalogers also need to rely on their judgement, as they will always encounter resources or features that have not been anticipated in RDA. The current text of RDA does not make it easy to find the principles that will guide that judgement.

It is possible that many of these difficulties will disappear when viewed in a customized view in the online version, and we look forward to being able to see RDA in an online prototype. However, it is not clear that any view of RDA instructions, no matter how specific, will be able to show both the relevant general and specific instructions – and give a clear understanding of which is which.

- 4. Arrangement of elements:** The rationale for the order of elements within this chapter is not intuitively obvious. If there is a logical order being followed, it

should be explained somewhere. If there is not strong justification for the order, then consider giving elements (and sub-elements and subordinate instructions within elements) in alphabetical order. Our impression is that the order is a carryover from the ISBD structure, and may no longer be justified. If, on the other hand, there is an implied order in which decisions need to be made (e.g., Carrier Type needs to be determined before Extent because the latter is derived in some sense from the former), then this should be explained in the text. There may need to be an overview in each chapter indicating how the different elements fit together within a bibliographic description and how the cataloger is expected to construct such a description. Note: This comment applies to Chapters 2, 4 and 5 as well; the logical order of elements in Chapters 6 and 7 is more apparent.

5. **Division of elements between Chapters 3 and 4:** ALA believes that the distinction between carrier and content is generally valid. However, we believe that a number of the elements (or at least some of the instructions for those elements) are more appropriate in the chapter dealing with the content (the attributes of the work or expression) rather than in the chapter dealing with the carrier. The elements concerned are:
- **Colour (3.12)**
 - **Sound characteristics (3.17)**
 - **Projection characteristics (3.18)**

Specific proposals will be found in our comments on these instructions.

6. Stylistic issues

- a. **Consistency of examples:** If examples are not to be prescriptive, then should they be consistent even in matters that are not specified in the instructions? ALA feels that it is appropriate for examples to be inconsistent, to show a variety of conventions in such matters – although we suspect that many will find such inconsistency confusing. We are unable, however, to suggest any other method that will convey that certain conventions (many of them well established practices) are not in fact prescriptive.
- b. **Spelling conventions:** ALA's most consistent reaction to the draft of this chapter was that we should not be required to use the British spelling of the word "colour"! We accept the conventions for spelling adopted for the **text** of RDA, but we would not want such conventions to be mandated for the **data** that we record in applying the instructions. This does, however, raise issues of consistency and internationalization. Is the convenience of the users of a particular catalog more important than the ability to retrieve data across catalogs? Does allowing data to be recorded in the spelling most familiar to the users of a particular catalog stand as a barrier to the use of that data internationally? RDA needs to address this issue directly. If it is determined that spelling need not be consistent, then examples should be included at 3.12 (Colour) and elsewhere to make this clear.

- c. ***Layout of alternative and optional instructions:*** The layout of alternative and optional instructions does not always make it clear to which instructions the alternative or option applies. This needs to be carefully checked in each case, and perhaps a different technique for presenting such instructions needs to be followed. See 3.4.0.10.3 for a particularly confusing case.
- d. ***Numbering of alternatives, exceptions, etc.:*** While we see the usefulness of numbering the actual instructions, the current practice leaves the caption “*Exception.*” appearing as the final line of the previous instruction. The caption needs to be visually a part of the instruction, and needs to be displayed whenever the alternative or exceptional instruction is displayed. Almost all of the ALA reviewers thought that this way an editorial oversight rather than an intended convention. This suggests that it is not the right convention.
- e. ***Lists and examples:*** When examples directly follow a list of terms (which is frequently the case with the embedded vocabularies in this chapter), the distinction between the two is not always clear. First, we see no need for an example that consists solely of one of the terms in the preceding list. Second, we would like to see more differentiation by layout or typography between the terms and the examples.
- f. ***Layout and numbering of tables:*** The tables of terms/categories for Media Type, Carrier Type, and Content Type should be laid out as formal tables, with quite distinctive typography. The tables should be numbered, probably within each chapter, so that the table following 3.2.0.2.2 would be Table 3.1. The placement of the tables should also be more closely related to the instructions; the table following 3.3.0.2.2, for examples, seems to be part of the alternative, rather than applying to 3.3.0.2 as a whole. Consider moving these three tables to an appendix.
- g. ***Use of bullets:*** With the new layout that uses a separate column for the numbers, we question the usefulness of the bullets, which are no longer at the left margin and which typically add nothing to what is already implied by the captions. Note: This is not to argue that the categories of instructions identified in the bullet styles should not be used in the metadata to support search and customization.
- h. ***Target of references:*** The intention of the JSC to make references at a consistent level of generality is not explained in the existing drafts and was the subject for some comments. Although it is true that the context of the specific instruction needs to be understood, it is also true that a reference to several pages of instructions, one line of which is relevant, is not very friendly. The policy should be applied flexibly, taking the individual case into consideration, rather than applied categorically and mechanically.
- i. ***Conditional instructions:*** A conditional clause should be introduced by “if” never by “when”.

Issues raised in the cover letter

General issues

Alignment with FRBR

See our general comments on “FRBR user tasks” (no. 1 above) and “Division of elements between Chapters 3 and 4” (no. 5 above).

Use of prescribed terms and terms in lists

See our general comments on embedded vocabularies (no. 2 above).

Punctuation within elements, Category 1

In general, ALA prefers a general instruction to the creation of sub-elements.

Punctuation within elements, Category 2

There was no consensus within ALA on this question. There was some sentiment in favor of parsing elements into their components when they are logically distinct; on the other hand, there was also sentiment in favor of simple instructions for recording information in intelligible statements.

Punctuation within elements, Category 3

ALA supports the effort to minimize use of square brackets where the information *can* be conveyed explicitly. As a general principle, we prefer identification of the actual source of the information rather than a simple indication that it does not come from a prescribed source of information.

In the case of Chapter 3, the instructions cited in the cover letter all deal with recording the extent of textual resources. In this case, the most important factor is to provide sufficient information for identification of the resource being described. It would be possible to provide explicit statements about unnumbered leaves or pages, but this might easily become unwieldy in the case of early printed resources with many unnumbered pages scattered throughout the book. While it may be true that general users may not understand the use of square brackets, their use in a statement of extent is rather intuitive and is a convention readily understood by users to whom this information is important. Therefore, we do not feel strongly that the use of square brackets needs to be avoided in 3.4.4.2.4 (early printed resources) or that it can be avoided in 3.4.4.4.2 (corrections).

Use of abbreviations

ALA generally supports the reduction in the use of abbreviations on the grounds that the meaning of abbreviations is unlikely to be universal across user communities or over time. On the other hand, there was some concern about the cost of additional keystrokes (both time and accuracy) involved in recording full forms; the

inconsistency with current practice; the impact of inconsistent practice on searching; and the effect of any instructions on our ability to accept metadata from external sources without modification. This last concern suggests that the elimination of abbreviations from the Extent element might have unfortunate results.

In general, we are looking for a principled rationale for the use/non-use of abbreviations. We agree that abbreviations should be transcribed as found in transcribed elements, and that abbreviations should not be introduced into transcribed elements. We also agree that catalogers should not be required to decode abbreviations when copying information from a source. Beyond this, we believe that the rationale must be based on the principle of Common Usage, which would suggest that abbreviations should only be used in cases where it is clear that the abbreviation is at least as widely understood as the full form.

A comment from one reviewer is worth including here: This entire issue might be considered one of display. If user studies (do we *have* user studies?) indeed demonstrate that users of library OPACs are confused by the abbreviations in records, then automated systems are quite capable of displaying expanded versions of data stored as standard abbreviations. If our systems cannot do this, then our technology is failing us.

Examples

ALA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the examples. A few specific suggestions are included below. In general (and this comment applies even more strongly to other chapters in RDA), ALA would like to urge that a broader coverage in the examples, particularly with regard to the audience. For example, many instructions do not contain any examples that would be recognized by a cataloger in or a user of a public library.

ALA also appreciates the provision of the appendix of examples covering more than one element. We found those examples helpful when present, and frustrating when no example of a particular type of resource was provided. We note that there were a number of errors in these examples, and a number of additional elements that would have been helpful. It was also frustrating that the MARC 21 examples were based on currently-available content designation (see comment on the MARC 21 mapping). In spite of this, the examples in the appendix were extremely helpful, and we hope that such examples will be provided with subsequent RDA drafts.

MARC 21 mapping

While the MARC 21 mapping is useful in analyzing the draft, it is unfortunate that it is based on the current version of MARC 21, a version that is likely to change. It would have been useful at least to have identified those elements that have already been identified as issues for RDA implementation.

We wish to point out some difficulties associated with the mapping for one RDA element: 3.23 (Notes on item-specific carrier characteristics). First, the mapping to field 500 is incomplete; the recording of item-specific information in field 500 should

be accompanied by the inclusion of subfield \$5 to identify that the information *is* item-specific. Second, as noted in our comments on 3.23 below, item-specific information can take many forms, some of which may be recorded in other 5XX fields (again with the inclusion of subfield \$5). Finally, this mapping does not recognize that item-specific information may also be recorded in annotation subfields (\$z) in MARC 21 holdings fields (852, 863, etc.).

The difficulties above suggest that it may not be either possible or desirable to promulgate a mapping that results in a simple translation, without the possibility of alternative mappings or additional requirements. Although one of the ultimate goals of the MARC 21 mapping is a set of specifications for machine-processing data transformations, it may be necessary for an institution to make some choices before finalizing such a specification; RDA should not foreclose such alternatives by failing to acknowledge them.

Specific elements

Use of the term “volume”

ALA agrees with the use of “volume” rather than “book” as a carrier type. There are too many cases in which “book” is inappropriate as a carrier (serials, musical scores).

On the other hand, ALA is concerned about the ambiguity of the term “volume,” which may designate either a physical or an intellectual unit. There are specific instructions where it will be necessary to specify whether a physical or a bibliographic volume is being described.

Recording media type (3.2)

ALA recommends that Media Type be retained as an optional element in RDA, while recognizing that it may be of limited utility in supporting the *selection* task.

We agree with the Library of Congress that the categories under Carrier Type are much more useful for limiting a search or making a selection. However, the close alignment of the Media Type categories with the MARC 21 LDR/6 categories makes it difficult to argue that they have no utility, or that catalogers will not want to record them; as long as RDA records are encoded in MARC 21, these values will have to be recorded in LDR/6. Furthermore, ALA in general favors bringing MARC 21 content under the jurisdiction of the cataloging rules, as opposed to the encoding conventions.

One reviewer pointed out that Media Type corresponds to the FRBR attribute Form of Expression (an attribute of Expression), and questions whether this element does not overlap considerably with Content Type, and does not really belong in Chapter 3. The reviewer finds this mingling of Expression- and Manifestation-level attributes to be logically messy – just as the mingling of different logical attributes in the LDR/6 categories has always been messy in MARC 21.

Changes in carrier characteristics (3.21)

ALA looks forward to the further discussion by the JSC promised in the cover memo. This issue is particularly significant in relation to the instruction in 1.3, Changes requiring a new description. Pending that discussion, we note the following:

- a. The instructions at 3.21 apply only to the elements specified in 3.6–3.20, i.e., they do not cover changes in Media Type, Carrier Type, Extent, or Dimensions. This implies that changes in these elements would require a new description, which may not always be true.
- b. The instructions in 3.21 do not make the distinction referred to in the cover memo between changes to a continuing resource over time and differences exhibited between simultaneously-issued carriers. This distinction – which ALA has captured in the title of its publication *Differences Between, Changes Within* – is fundamental and needs to be covered explicitly in RDA 1.3.
- c. 3.21 covers both resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources; currently 1.3 only covers serials. All these instructions should cover the full range of resources that are subject to change.

Treatment of specific types of materials

Treatment of early printed resources

ALA agrees with the specific provisions included for early printed resources. However, we continue to be concerned about the scope of these instructions. The limitation to “early” and to “printed” resources is artificial. Many of these instructions are equally applicable to resources from modern fine presses and could in fact be useful for describing *any* resource where fuller or more precise description is desired. The revised *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials* rules are intended to be applicable broadly to materials in special collections that require this kind of detailed description. The scope of the exceptions in RDA should be similarly broad, allowing the cataloging agency to determine what materials in their collections should be described in this way.

ALA also believes that the word “printed” has been used ambiguously in the past. In some cases it has been used to mean textual and in others to mean produced by a printing process. We would like to see RDA avoid the use of this term whenever possible.

Treatment of cartographic materials

There is still some conceptual difficulty with the categories used.

First, *globes* are three-dimensional carriers, but the cartographic information is presented in the form of a two-dimensional graphic applied to the three-dimensional surface. When describing the carrier, it must be treated as a three-dimensional resource; however, cartographic notation is a combination of graphic and textual

information whether it is presented on a two-dimensional sheet or a three-dimensional object – or as a non-dimensional data file.

The term *map* should not be used as a general term for cartographic resources. A map is only one type of cartographic presentation. A map, view, section, etc., identifies the cartographic content. As a carrier term, *map* (and related terms) identifies the logical units that comprise the cartographic resource and which are to be named and counted in recording the Extent. Such units are **not** limited to cartographic resources on sheets of paper, but can include cartographic resources on slides, jigsaw puzzles, playing cards, fans, powder horns, scarves, neckties, umbrellas, scrolls, etc.). To eliminate the imprecision of using “map” or “map, etc.” as a generic term for cartographic carriers, we suggest using the term “cartographic unit” when referring to the carrier in Extent statements for cartographic resources.

Specific questions for constituencies

3.5.0.4 Dimensions of carrier

Microfiche cassettes: ALA has done enough research to determine that the fiche are housed in the cassette and that the cassette itself is inserted into the reader. Therefore the instructions for recording dimensions in 3.5.0.4.1c.4 are correct.

3.5.1.0 Dimensions of maps, etc. – Application

ALA agrees.

3.5.1.1 Recording dimensions of maps, etc.

The instruction should allow for multiple dimensions, together with an indication of what each dimension applies to (“area” is not a very informative term in this context), but needs to define carefully the type of situation it covers, as most of the common situations (multiple sheets, map vs. sheet, folding) are covered by other instructions. We assume that this situation deals with multiple maps on the same sheet. In this case, the convention has been to record only two sets of dimensions; if there are more maps, only the dimensions of the largest is given, followed by “or smaller”.

3.5.2.0 Dimensions of still images – Application

ALA believes that the instruction should apply to still images on any flat medium, and that there occasions when this might be something other than a sheet.

3.5.3.3. Details of dimensions

ALA has no objections to the instruction as given, so long as the alternative instruction at 3.5.0.3.2 continues to allow an agency to use other units of measurement.

3.12.0.3.1 Recording colour

ALA argues elsewhere that colour is an attribute of the work or expression and therefore belongs in Chapter 4.

Given that, a manifestation that adds colour to a work intended to be realized in black and white or that reproduces in black and white a work intended to be realized in colour embodies an unfaithful or damaged expression of that work. The fact needs to be noted, and it needs to be made clear whether the “damage” applies to a manifestation as a whole or only to the copy being described.

Therefore, we prefer that the term used to indicate the presence of colour be “colour” rather than “coloured” (which implies that the colour has been added to the manifestation). We would also prefer not to record this information in an element that primarily reflects how the work was intended to be realized; instead, we would prefer to give this information in an annotation (3.12.1). The instructions should make clear the distinction between “colour” as a property of the work as intended, and “colourized” or “hand-coloured” as a property of the manifestation or item.

Finally, nowhere in RDA should there be anything that hints that a “colourized” manifestation can in any way be considered an equivalent manifestation.

Comments on specific instructions

3.0 Purpose and scope

The term “carrier” is obviously critical in this chapter. A definition of the term as it applies to RDA should be included here.

3.0.1: In order to be consistent with the goal to align RDA with FRBR terminology consider using “attributes” in place of “characteristics” in the first sentence of 3.0.1 and throughout this chapter.

3.0.2: We prefer “contained in or stored on the carrier” to “stored on.” Treating printed carriers (textual and visual) as storage devices will not be clear to most catalogers.

3.1 General guidelines

3.1.4.1a.1 and 3.1.4.1b.1: The first of these instructions uses the phrase “is not considered necessary” and the second “is desired”; the standard phrase in RDA is “considered to be important”. We recommend that 3.1.4.1a.1 be phrased “If a detailed description of the characteristics of the carriers is not considered to be important ...” and 3.1.4.1b.1 be phrased “If detailed description of the characteristics of each carrier is considered to be important ...” We are not sure that “of the characteristics” is needed in either instruction, but recommend that they be consistent.

3.1.4.1b.2: The examples are difficult to understand in the list format without captions. Using editorial comments to list the names of the respective elements is less

clear than captioning the examples; a distinction in the typography could be used to distinguish the element names from the data content.

3.1.5: The instruction does not refer to the recording of subunits, and the inclusion of subunits in the example is therefore confusing.

3.1.6: This instruction should make it clear whether it covers changes in carrier type as well as changes in carrier characteristics, and the reference to 3.6–3.20 may need to be to 3.2–3.20. There should also be an explicit statement that these instructions do not apply to simultaneous publication in multiple formats (3.1.2).

3.2 Media type

3.2.0.2: It is not clear whether the categories are to be mutually exclusive. In particular, audio and video media can often be played on a computer. In such cases, it would be possible to word the definitions so that audio and video media are excluded from the scope of computer media; or so that audio and video media exclude any media that can be played on a computer. Another alternative is to recognize that more than one category might apply if the media can be played by both an audio/video device and by a computer. This last alternative at least offers some support for performing the *identification* or *selection* tasks. On the other hand, virtually anything digital can be played on a computer, so that category might not be particularly useful. Consideration might also be given to designating a predominant category, but this would require (a) consensus on how this should be determined, and (b) explicit guidelines in RDA – or to setting an order of precedence among the categories in Table 1. Whatever is done (assuming that Media Type is retained), RDA should be explicit about how this element is to be recorded when categories appear to overlap.

Audio film reel: This is not the terminology used in the field of film studies; prefer “Sound track reel(s)” or “Sound track on reel(s).”

Computer: Does this category include computerized devices issued with the content pre-loaded? Examples are computer games, iPods, and Playaways. These cases do exist; the instructions here should make it clear whether these are computer media or are unmediated (because the resource is itself the intermediation tool). Although ALA feels that this is an important question, we have not expressed a preference; I suspect that we would probably prefer to treat these as computer media.

Projected: This is an artificial category in some ways, as digital images and video **can** be projected, either by an audio/video device or by a computer. Perhaps projected could be defined as materials that **must** be projected to be useable. Below (3.3.0.2) we suggest changing this category to “film media” (with the scope defined appropriately).

Unmediated: ALA sees no virtue in recording “unmediated” just so that this required element can always be present (unless the content of the element is to be recorded as a fixed-length code and *something* must be recorded). We would prefer to omit this element when no intermediation tool is required. We would certainly **not** want to display the term “unmediated” to our users.

3.2.0.2.3: ALA finds that recording “other” (except when something must be recorded in a fixed-length code) is not at all helpful. See our general comment above about embedded vocabularies as dynamic lists.

3.3 Carrier type

3.3.0.1: The scope statement would make more sense if the underlying categories from the RDA/ONIX framework were documented in RDA. The way in which Media Type and Carrier Type both use the RDA/ONIX category “Intermediation tool” in different ways isn’t clear from the scope statements, but can easily be explained using the tables in the RDA/ONIX base category specifications.

3.3.0.2: The layout of the table and the instructions is confusing; the table appears to be part of the alternative instruction. A layout similar to that in 3.2.0.2 works better. It is also important that both tables be numbered; we suggest that tables be numbered sequentially within the chapter, making this one Table 3.2.

3.3.0.2: The relationship between the categories in Carrier Type and the corresponding terms in the Extent statement is not always clear. While typically, one of the carrier terms is used to identify the unit in the Extent, but this is not always the case, and many instructions in 3.4 allow more flexibility of terminology, even when there is a basic instruction to use terms in 3.3.0.2.

Computer carriers: We note that the distinction between magnetic disks and optical discs has been dropped. We assume that this was intentional. We suspect that the distinction is still justified by usage, but do not feel strongly that it should be reinstated.

Projected carriers: The term for “Projected carriers” suggests anticipation of new technology, not carriers of projected content. The carriers are not projected, it is the content stored on the carrier that is designed to be projected. We would prefer “Projected image carriers” or “Film carriers” (defined to include transparencies). We also note that slides and transparencies **can** be viewed without the aid of a projection device, but merely illuminated with the aid of a viewer or light table. Presumably the point is that the content is **intended** to be projected rather than simply illuminated, but the possibility does exist.

Stereograph reel: It is ironic that the second word in the definition of this term is “disc”; would it be more accurate to call these “stereograph disc”? Is the term “stereograph reel” the commonly-used term?

Unmediated carriers: It is becoming common for the intermediation tool itself to be the resource described, with content preloaded. Examples include iPods and Playaways. This part of the list needs to be particularly susceptible to extension to cover unanticipated categories.

Unmediated carriers: Should not the list include categories of three-dimensional carriers? Otherwise, types such as “globe” and “model” need to be added to the list of unmediated carriers.

Roll: It is not completely clear whether a scroll should be treated as a roll. It seems to fit the definition of “roll,” but an explicit statement would be helpful. We also suggest that “scroll” may be the more commonly-used term, particularly for East Asian resources.

Volume: Footnote 6 requires that a volume must be “intended to be bound together to form a single unit” but does not require that it actually be so bound. When describing an item consisting of loose sheets, it is not always clear whether it was intended to be bound. We suggest that the footnote include an “in case of doubt” instruction.

Videocassette: We note that the category “videocassette” is far too imprecise to be useful in selecting resources; it must be used in combination with the Video Characteristics (3.19); the separation of this information into separate elements is not helpful. We suggest that the most helpful strategy here would be to combine these two elements (as well as the corresponding carrier units in the Extent statement), either by using the specific terms from 3.19.0.4 as Carrier Types or by allowing terms from 3.19.0.4 to be **added to** the terms in 3.3.0.2 with the Carrier Type element. Although we make this point specifically about video carriers, the same case could be made for other categories such as audio carriers and computer carriers.

Videodiscs: Although DVD videodiscs fit the definition of “videodisc,” in the public mind, a DVD is a DVD and a videodisc is an obsolete format for which nobody has players. If this terminology is what users will see – and so far we don’t have any other terminology to offer them – we should avoid using terms in ways that our users do not understand.

3.3.0.2.3: ALA finds that recording “other” just so that the element will always be included is not at all helpful (unless the content of this element is to be recorded as a fixed-length code and **something** has to be recorded). We would prefer to omit the element when none of the categories applies. On the other hand, as noted in our general comments, these lists (particularly the Media Type, Carrier Type, and Content Type) need to be treated as dynamic vocabularies, with provision to adding new categories; one of the ways to accomplish this is to allow for terms in common use to be recorded as an “unofficial” category when none of the “official” categories is applicable; these “unofficial” categories then become candidates for addition to the “official” vocabulary through a process yet to be determined. [Note that I am characterizing these elements as composed of *categories*, not of *terms*; it is important that the maintenance process maintain the underlying RDA/ONIX framework, and deal with new *categories*, not just with alternate terminology for existing categories.]

3.4 Extent

This is a very long sequence of instructions for this element. It is unfortunate that the label “Required” and the footnote that clarifies what is required appear only once at the outset. Perhaps there is a way for the online version to repeat the label and footnote when displaying sub-instructions. Alternatively, is there a possibility that the label and footnote could be repeated at the head of major subsections?

3.4.0.3.1: Not all of the units recorded in the Extent element are physical, as is recognized in 3.4.0.1.2. The basic instruction at 3.4.0.3.1 should say “number of physical or logical units ...”

3.4.0.3.1: RDA assumes that the term identifying units will be singular or plural depending on the number, but this is nowhere stated explicitly. Consider making this explicit.

3.4.0.3.1, exceptions: The brief summary of the instructions for each exception, along with examples, adds needlessly to the text here. A simply caption, plus the reference to the relevant instructions, should be sufficient.

Exceptions:

For Cartographic resources, see 3.4.1.

For Notated music, see 3.4.2.

[etc.]

3.4.0.3.1d: If these summary instructions are retained in 3.4.0.3, then there are some exceptions that ought to be acknowledged, such as that for updating loose-leaf materials (3.4.0.10.4). However, our preference is to give here only a simple reference to the complete instructions for each category, rather than trying to summarize.

3.4.0.3.1d: It is not clear whether scrolls and resources consisting of a single long sheet accordion-folded into panels should be considered as single volumes or as single sheets. In either case, specific instructions and examples should be included. These are traditional Asian formats; the community has not expressed a preference, but requests guidance.

3.4.0.3.1d.1: We suggest removal of the word “accompanying” from “with or without accompanying illustrations” since this implies the presence of accompanying material.

3.4.0.3.1d.2: See the comment on “portfolio” and “case” at 3.4.3.1.

3.4.0.3.1d.3, 2nd example: This exemplifies an instruction not encountered until further in the text (in this case, square brackets). This is one of the problems with including examples and summary instructions here; again, we would prefer that the examples be included only with the complete instruction in 3.4.1–3.4.12.

3.4.0.4: Sometimes it’s not practical to count the number of units. Catalogers should have the same option provided in 3.4.0.5.3 to omit the number.

3.4.0.5: The instruction allows “various pieces” when number of units cannot be ascertained or approximated. However, there are cases in which the type of unit is known; we would like to see this instruction allow for “various” with the name of the unit, e.g., “various slides”.

3.4.0.5.1: ALA would like to see the instruction to use a term in common usage in these cases repeated for all of the embedded vocabularies in 3.4. See our general

comments on embedded vocabularies as closed lists. We would also like to see a wider variety of examples (which would be most appropriate in the context of specific lists of terms).

3.4.0.6: How “identical” does the content need to be? What if the only difference is the presence/absence of a title page or prefatory material or documentation?

3.4.0.7: ALA would like to see a basic general instruction on recording subunits of the sort given for extent at 3.4.0.3.1. We also suggest that consideration be given to moving the instructions on recording subunits for particular categories to the relevant sections (3.4.1–3.4.12), leaving only simple references here. This would parallel what is done with the basic extent statement at 3.4.0.3, and would bring together the treatment units and subunits for each category. ALA would also support the sort of generalization of these instructions suggested by CCC.

3.4.0.7: If the recording of extent is required, then is the recording of subunits also required? ALA would like to suggest some flexibility here, expressed in language such as “Specify the number of subunits as applicable and if readily ascertainable and considered to be important for identification and selection.” The ability to determine the number and nature of the subunits will differ with types of carriers, as will the importance of recording the information. It would also be helpful to separate the identification and the counting of the subunits; sometimes the type of subunit is important, but the number may not be. There also needs to be a general provision (comparable to 3.4.0.5) for dealing with carriers containing many different types of subunits.

3.4.0.7.1a.1, example: Please correct the example; there is no way 184 remote-sensing images fit on 1 computer disc! “10 computer discs (184 remote-sensing images)”

3.4.0.7.1e.1–2: According to these instructions, the example at 3.1.5.2 would not be valid, i.e., one could not record “text file” as a type of subunit. We are not sure that the scope of these two instructions needs to be so distinct; we could see allowing either the recording of number of pages, etc., or the number of “text files”.

3.4.0.7.1e.1: We would like to see a more complicated example for notated music, showing an online resource containing scores and parts; it is not clear from the instruction whether to apply 3.4.2.1.2a.1 (Resource containing a set of parts) or 3.4.2.1.2b.1 (Resource consisting of a score and part(s) in a single physical unit).

3.4.0.7.1e.2: If one were cataloging a video that was available in more than one version (e.g., high vs. low bandwidth or streaming vs. downloadable) in separate files in the same online resource, it doesn’t seem to make sense to record the extent as “1 online resource (2 video files)” if the user is realistically expected to select only **one** version of the video to watch. Since it is really the same video with multiple options for accessing its content, details about the number and types of files might possibly be better recorded in other elements of the description.

3.4.0.7.1e.2: Is RDA focusing on cataloging the actual files in these examples, or is it focusing on cataloging the web sites or online services that happen to include the

files? In the Extent, it appears to treat the web page as the main resource being cataloged while treating the files as subunits. Is it equally legitimate to describe the files themselves? RDA doesn't clearly address cases when the file **is** the primary unit being cataloged, and not a subunit of a larger resource.

3.4.0.7.1e.2: With online resources, one doesn't usually know what type of files or how many files are included. This instruction should include the proviso "when readily ascertainable and considered to be important".

3.4.0.10.3: This is an example of layout that does not clearly indicate the scope of the alternatives and options (see general comment no. 6c above). Does the optional addition apply to all resources not yet complete or just when applying the alternative?

3.4.0.10.3: Add: "For serials, see also 3.4.4.15.1a.1." (The referenced instruction says to record the number of bibliographic volumes instead of physical volumes.)

3.4.0.10.3: The "optional addition" here is actually an instruction to apply the basic instruction. Furthermore, according to footnote 7, this is a requirement, rather than an option. In fact, this instruction doesn't belong in a section on "Resource not yet complete" as it applies to completed resources. We suggest that a better way be found to deal with this sort of revision made to an existing description based on changes in the resource over time.

3.4.0.10.4: ALA believes that this instruction should not apply to all resources housed in a loose-leaf binder, but only to **updating** loose-leaves. Furthermore, it is unclear from this instruction whether we are to retain "loose-leaf" when the integrating resource ceases to update. We would like to see a definition of loose-leaf in the Glossary. Note: If the intent **is** to apply this instruction to all resources issued in a loose-leaf binder, even if they are complete as issued, then the instruction does not belong in a section on "Resource not yet complete."

3.4.0.11.1a.1: It is unclear whether this instruction would allow the use of a more-specific term if it would be appropriate, e.g. "300 slides" or "500 vocal scores"?

3.4.0.11.1b.1: Please give an explanation after each example.

3.4.0.12.1b.1: We suggest including a DVD example, as analytic descriptions are often appropriate for this type of carrier.

3.4.1.1.1: See our general comment about embedded vocabularies as closed lists. In this case, there are often more specific terms that apply, such as digital orthophoto quadrangle; use such specific terminology should be allowed and (as warranted) should be incorporated into the vocabulary.

3.4.1.1.3: Only a few of the terms in the lists under 3.4.3.1 and 3.4.5.1 are really applicable here: postcard from 3.4.3.1 and jigsaw puzzle from 3.4.5.1. "Wall charts" as given in the example, would never be used for a cartographic resource. Instead, as noted above, there should be an option to use an appropriate term to designate the type of unit.

3.4.2.0: Two of the sub-instructions refer to microforms, leaving it unclear which applies or how both apply. We think it is possible that the order of the instructions should be changed. Doesn't the reference to "other media" refer back to 3.4.0.1? And isn't 3.4.0.2 an alternative that would be applicable only for "other media"? We suggest that 3.4.0.3 precede 3.4.0.2. We also suggest that 3.4.0.2 be explicitly labeled as an alternative, but that it may need to be moved to follow the instruction to which it is an alternative (perhaps 3.1.3.1).

3.4.2.0.3: We find this reference back to 3.4.0 singularly unhelpful. We would prefer an explicit instruction, something like "For resources consisting of notated music in other media (e.g., microforms), follow the instructions in the section of 3.4.0 appropriate for that type of carrier."

3.4.2.0.3: The online resource example in 3.4.0.7.1e.1 implies that the number of scores could appear in parentheses after the number of microfilm reels. However, nothing about microfilm reels appears in 3.4.0. This again suggests that the example is illustrating 3.4.2.0.2 as well as 3.4.2.0.3 and that the order of these instructions should be reversed.

3.4.2.1.1: We question whether the instruction relating to the order of categories is necessary or appropriate.

3.4.2.1.1: ALA asks the JSC to reconsider the removal of "miniature score" from the list. This is an important distinction for users of notated music resources; it is the functional equivalent of the Font Size element (RDA 3.14) for textual resources. We strongly urge that this category be restored, using either "miniature score" or "study score" as the preferred term. If the latter term is acceptable, the Music Library Association would agree to propose a definition for the Glossary.

3.4.2.1.1: See ALA's general comments about the embedded vocabularies as closed lists. In general, we would like to see an instruction parallel to 3.4.3.1.3 to allow for the use of other terms. This will be particularly important, as we understand that 3.4.2.2 is being deleted as part of the decision on *5JSC/ALA/4*.

3.4.2.1.2: We would like to see an example showing 1 score + 1 part, with pagination given for each.

3.4.2.1.2b.2: We are not in favor of this alternative. We cannot imagine a case where the presence of parts would **not** be important for identification or selection.

3.4.2.2: In the second example, it is unclear why "pages" is included within the brackets. If this example is retained and if the use of brackets in this case is retained (both questionable), we believe that it should be "1 table book ([50] pages)".

3.4.3: The scope of the instructions for still images may be problematic. The definition of still image at 4.2.0.2.2 seems to exclude text, yet some of the categories included under 3.4.3 (such as flash cards and activity cards) are often partially or primarily textual. Does 3.4.3 apply only to those carriers that are **not** textual? Or does the definition of still image as a Content Type have no relevance to the use of the same term in Chapter 3? Similarly, the distinction between still images and three-

dimensional forms is not always clear; are activity cards still images and card games three-dimensional forms? What is the rationale for making this distinction?

3.4.3.1.1: The list mixes terms that represent techniques or actions with terms indicating the products of applying those techniques or actions. Although in most cases, the term can apply to both, this may not always be true. Is this a conceptual problem?

3.4.3.1.1: This section contains a mixture of image types (photographs, drawing, technical drawing) and carrier types (flash card, activity card, chart, poster).

3.4.3.1.1, “Icon”: This term can have multiple meanings; it is not clear which is intended here. Even more significant, there is no way to avoid misinterpretation of the term by users.

3.4.3.1.1, “Collage”: A collage is most often associated with the specific technique, rather than being considered a distinct type of carrier in its own right.

3.4.3.1.3: ALA strongly prefers instructions of this sort (see also 4.8.0.7.2 and 4.9.0.3.3) to instructions to give “other” or “unspecified” (see 3.2.0.2.3, 3.2.0.2.4, 3.3.0.2.3, 3.3.0.2.4, etc.). See our general comments above about the dynamic nature of these embedded vocabularies.

3.4.3.4.1: The distinction between a portfolio and a case is not clear in RDA; in the absence of definitions, we question whether the distinction is necessary. Note: the same distinction also appears at 3.4.4.14.1.

3.4.4.0.3 and 3.4.4.0.4 both apply to microform reproductions of text, but the relationship is not clear; is 3.4.4.0.4 logically prior to 3.4.4.0.3? It is also unclear how the instructions in 3.4.0 (which instructions?) should be applied; consider expanding 3.4.4.0.4.

3.4.4.1.1: We would argue that this formulation, brought forward from AACR2, can lead to misleading and unnecessarily convoluted extent statements such as that seen in the first example of 3.4.4.4.2. There is often a conflict between how leaves are printed and how they are numbered. Because the extent statement includes the number of leaves or pages, it is much simpler to record how the resource is numbered and explain how it is printed (if different) in the Layout element. We recommend that this instruction be changed.

3.4.4.1.1e: This instruction should include “columns” as instructions to use “columns” appear in both 3.4.4.2.1 and 3.4.4.7.1.

3.4.4.1.2: We would like to see additional guidance; the following language used in DCRM(B) 5B1.1: “account for every leaf in the volume as issued by the publisher, including leaves of text, leaves of plates, and blank leaves, but excluding leaves added as part of the binding and the binding itself.” This would alert catalogers who are possibly unfamiliar with early books that leaves might have been added by the binder and, if so (and if discernable), these should not be included in the statement of extent as blank leaves.

3.4.4.2: We support the elimination of square brackets in numbering sequences and the use of “unnumbered” instead. However, we would like to see some complex examples that test the feasibility of this practice. The following is a not unusual 16th-century example (using brackets): [8], 148, [4], 74, [3] leaves.

3.4.4.2.5: This is another case where 3.4.4.2.5 might easily be seen as an exception for early printed resources.

3.4.4.2.6: This instruction should be applied only when the advertisements are clearly integral to the publication, i.e. “when they are included in the same pagination sequence as the text; or are printed on the pages of an initial or final gathering also containing leaves or pages of text; or are printed on a separate gathering in a publication that is continuously signed” [DCRM(B) 5B5]

3.4.4.4.2: The first example is confusing; the most intelligible way to describe this situation is “48 leaves” combined with the information that the leaves are “printed on both sides.” This is a case where it makes little sense to describe the extent in terms of how the leaves are printed (as instructed under 3.4.4.1.1), rather than how they are numbered. We recommended above changing the instruction at 3.4.4.2; if that is not done, consider treating this situation as an exception to 3.4.4.1.1 a).

3.4.4.5: Incomplete resources are not confined to text. Generalize these instructions to all types of carriers which are issued or published in an incomplete state, making it impossible to give an accurate description. [Martha Yee has argued that the concept of a damaged resource should be applied to colourized motion pictures, black and white issues of colour films, full screen issues of widescreen films, or monophonic issues of stereophonic sound.)] The instructions should also clearly distinguish between carriers that are issued incomplete or damaged (i.e., an incomplete or damaged expression or manifestation) and those that are incomplete or damaged copies (items).

Furthermore, we argue that the addition of “(incomplete)” is not a satisfactory replacement for the “179+ p.” formulation of AACR2. A description can be based on an item that is incomplete, yet be a “complete” description, e.g., a 20-page score lacking p. 5-8. “(Incomplete)” does not in itself convey that the last numbered page(s) are missing.

3.4.4.5.2: There are some unnecessary inconsistencies of language between 3.4.4.5.1 and 3.4.4.5.2. The use of “item” in the latter instruction assumes that this is a damaged item rather than a damaged expression or manifestation; no such assumption is made in 3.4.4.5.1; the two should be consistent. In addition, the phrase “and the extent of the complete volume cannot be ascertained” is missing in 3.4.4.5.2.

3.4.4.7 and 3.4.4.11: Does this instruction (and RDA in general) use “paging” to refer to the numbering of pages, leaves or columns? Do we need to add “etc.” to show that the instruction is not limited to resources with numbered pages?

3.4.4.7.2: We suggest: “Record the paging in the form and sequence presented.”

3.4.4.8.1: It is not always clear what sub-instructions within a required element are required. In the case of plates, we would prefer not to require recording unnumbered plates that are not a substantial part of the resource.

3.4.4.8.1: The instructions omit what may be the most important criterion for recording plates: plates must form separate sequences apart from the numbering of the resource as a whole. If the plates are implicitly or explicitly part of the pagination of the resource as a whole, then the number of pages or leaves of plates is not recorded in the extent statement.

3.4.4.8.1: The examples illustrate the use of square brackets for the number of unnumbered plates; yet there are no such instructions. This instruction needs to address both the number of plates (a count) and how they are numbered (by leaf, by page, not at all). The latter can be done explicitly, using “unnumbered” in most cases.

3.4.4.8.3: Guidance is needed for resources that are a mixture of numbered and unnumbered, and 3.4.4.8.3 could be revised to include this case. Example: 230 p., [10] p. of plates, 6 leaves of plates. It is only if all of the plates are unnumbered that you pick one term (pages or leaves) to describe them. We suggest: “For early printed resources, if the leaves and pages of plates are numbered, or a mixture of numbered and unnumbered, record each sequence ...”

3.4.4.9.2: Rephrase the instruction to parallel 3.4.4.13.2a.1. This would clarify that this instruction applies to multiple sheets/leaves and would specifically state not to use “folded” in the description for notated music.

3.4.4.10.1: Change “traditional oriental format” to “traditional East Asian format”. This format should also be explained in a note; add a reference to 3.4.6.11 and include an example there.

3.4.4.13.2b.1: It is not clear whether this instruction applies to Buddhist sutras which usually consist of a long sheet folded in accordion style and mounted with covers. If such carriers are covered by this instruction, then the caption should not be limited to “early printed resources” but to all “printed resources with folded panels”. [See also comment at 3.4.0.3.1d.]

3.4.4.13.2b.1: This instruction, taken from DCRM(B), presents itself as an exception for “early printed resources”, but the situation is more complex. 3.4.4.13.2 is for sheets intended to be read when **folded**. DCRM(B)’s approach to such sheets differs from RDA’s approach: “For a normally imposed single-folded (i.e., 4-page) sheet, record the statement of extent in the same manner as for a volume. Apply this rule even if only one of the four pages is printed.” The DCRM(B) rule (5B14.2) that has been adopted for 3.4.4.13.2b.1 is actually one of two rules meant to apply to sheets that are intended to be read **unfolded** (or a combination of both folded and unfolded). It represents the more complicated of the two DCRM(B) rules. The simpler DCRM(B) rule (5B14.1; quoted below) for sheets intended to be read **unfolded** (whether issued folded or unfolded) produces descriptions such as “1 sheet (2 pages)”. So, the problem here is twofold: (a) RDA has no instruction for recording subunits (pages) for single sheets intended to be read unfolded; and (b) the exception

for early printed resources is not really an exception for 3.4.4.13.2b.1; it is a totally different situation; the exceptional practices for early printed materials are not well-represented.

DCRM(B) 5B14.1. For a publication consisting of a single sheet designed to be used unfolded (whether issued folded or unfolded), add a statement of pagination based on the number of pages printed, not counting blanks

5B14.2. For a publication consisting of a single sheet folded into multiple panels, include in parentheses a count of the number of physical panels on one side of the sheet when unfolded. Include both blank panels and panels containing text or illustrations in the count. Enclose the number in square brackets. Provide details of the sheet's layout (including the numbering of the panels) in a note, if considered important.

3.4.4.14: Traditional East Asian books often consist of one or more volumes housed in one case. The current practice is to record the number of volumes in the physical description and the number of cases in a note. For a resource consisting of multiple volumes in a single case, does 3.4.4.14 apply or 3.4.4.15? Please determine which instruction applies and include appropriate instructions and examples, e.g., "1 case (4 volumes)".

3.4.4.14.1: The distinction between a portfolio and a case is not clear in RDA; in the absence of definitions, we question whether the distinction is necessary.

3.4.4.15.1: We recommend an exception for notated music be added, referring to the specific instructions for notated music. This is needed because RDA considers a score & part set to be multiple volumes, but they won't really be described as specified in 3.4.4.15.

3.4.4.15.1a.1: We recommend adding "rather than the number of physical volumes" following "the number of bibliographic volumes"; these categories can only be understood if an explicit contrast is made. We also recommend changing the caption to "Completed serials" in order to avoid a conflict between this exception and the exception for "Resource[s] not yet complete".

3.4.4.15.1b.1: This instruction should definitely be coded so that it will be included in a view of RDA customized for Serials.

3.4.4.19: Traditional East Asian books often consist of several volumes housed in several cases. The current practice is to record the number of volumes in the physical description and the number of cases in a note. Will this instruction apply to this type of resource? If so, an explanation and example should be provided. If 3.4.4.15 applies instead, an explanation and example should be provided there. We suggest the following example: "2 cases (8 volumes)".

3.4.6: We would like to see an example of an online resource made up of multiple versions of the same file in different formats, such as downloadable and streaming versions of a videorecording.

3.4.6.4: In the caption, "not to be continued" is a bit confusing; would it be possible to say "which has ceased publication"?

3.4.6.4: Typically, this note is made for multipart monographs, but not for serials, because the numbering of the last issue is usually recorded. This practice should probably continue. Since the element is optional, it may not be necessary to give an explicit guideline, but we would prefer that this sort of preferred practice be included in RDA, rather than in a separate application guideline. We suggest the following text:

Exception: For serials, omit the note if the last issue has been recorded (see 2.6.4) or a note has been given about ending numbering (see 2.6.7.3).

3.4.6.9.1, 1st example: Standard practice for the register of signatures is to use the comma only between two sequences of signatures that are otherwise indistinguishable, e.g. A-Z⁸, A-M⁸. The standard is Philip Gaskell's *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford, 1972).

3.4.6.9.1, 2nd example: The example does not illustrate this instruction; “b” is the initial of the artist who created the woodcuts. The specific leaves are cited just to give the location of the woodcuts. This is one of the ambiguities of the terms “signature” or “signed”.

3.5 Dimensions

3.5.0.1.3: We see no point in listing all these permutations; we suggest instead: “Dimensions may comprise various combinations of height, width, length, depth, gauge, or diameter.”

3.5.0.1.3: Note that this instruction contains an example of non-ISBD “prescribed” punctuation.

3.5.0.4.1i: The tape itself is the carrier, while the reel is more like a container. Tape may be stored on a reel of any diameter so long as the width is the same. We suggest that only the width of the tape be recorded for audio tape and computer tape reels (as is done for film, videotape, and microfilm).

3.5.0.4.1j.1: The implication is that the concept of roll is limited to film. This ignores scrolls, which do meet the Glossary definition of a roll. How should the dimensions of scrolls be recorded? Where should those instructions appear in 3.5.0.4?

3.5.0.4.1k.1: ALA supports the revision suggested by CCC; the distinction between folded sheets designed to be read in pages and folded sheets designed to be read unfolded is an important one (see our comments at 3.4.4.13.2b.1).

3.5.0.4.1k.1: Delete the sixth example (the wall chart); wall charts are a type of still image and would follow the instructions under 3.5.2.

3.5.0.4.1m.1: We suggest that cartographic models follow the default instructions in 3.5.0.4.1m4, leaving globes as the only exception — although we would suggest that there may be other spherical objects for which the measurement of the diameter is the only reasonable choice.

3.5.0.4.1n.5: We recommend adding “if considered important for identification and selection” to the instruction.

3.5.0.6: There is no obvious mechanism for associating a particular set of dimensions with the particular carrier to which it applies. This is an example of an internal relationship between instances of RDA elements that needs to be captured in some way. It would be very unfortunate if this can only be captured in the encoding and not in the RDA data itself; these internal relationships are an important aspect of the description of a bibliographic resource.

3.5.0.6.3: The status of this instruction is unclear. Is it part of the exception for manuscripts or is it a second general instruction parallel to 3.5.0.6.1?

3.5.0.6.4: If 3.5.0.6.3 applies to all types of material, then the alternative instruction needs to cover the full range of ways in which dimensions are recorded. In other words, the alternative should not assume that both height and width are recorded. Suggested wording: “If the carriers are all of two sizes, record [the dimensions of?] both. If they are of more than two sizes, record the largest dimension(s) followed by ‘or smaller’ ” and add an example that gives only the height: “32 cm or smaller”.

3.5.0.7: Guidance should be given about “nested” containers; for example, the Master Music reissue of the Hanssler Bach set (OCLC #65519873) is 171 CDs + 2 CD-ROM's, in 44 jewel cases, the whole issued in 2 cardboard containers. There should be some indication that dimensions of various layers of packaging may be given (with proper identification) as appropriate.

3.5.1: The instructions for recording the dimensions of maps, etc. deal only with the case of simple carriers, i.e., the counterpart of 3.5.0.4; the additional instructions dealing with multiple carriers, containers, etc. in 3.5.0.5–3.5.0.8 are also applicable to cartographic carriers; 3.5.1 should at least include a reference to these additional instructions and at most the counterpart of these instructions. Some these cases are very typical situations, such as a map on a folded sheet (3.5.1.5), folded into a cover (which would presumably be treated as a container under 3.5.0.5).

3.5.1.1.1: The instructions do not seem to recognize the possibility that the resource contains more than one cartographic unit. To allow for dimensions of multiple cartographic units to be recorded, either add a section or change beginning of 3.5.1.1.1 to “Record the dimensions of each map, etc. ...”

3.5.1.3.1: Since it is possible to mount each physically separate part of the map without connecting them into a whole, perhaps the last sentence would be clearer if changed to “If the cartographic units have been assembled and mounted together, record the dimensions of the whole cartographic unit alone.”

3.5.1.4.1: The phrase “the sheet on which it is imposed” is not clear; “imposed” is a term applicable only to letterpress printing. Returning to the AACR2 statement “the sheet on which it is printed” would be appropriate unless this is an attempt to include manuscript cartographic resources; if that is the case, we suggest “the sheet on which it is presented”.

3.5.2.1: One important measurement of a digital still image is that measured in pixels. We would like to see this alternative included.

3.5.2.2: This instruction would be clearer if (like AACR2) it included language referring to the image exclusive of frame or mounting. The present wording contains the appropriate instructions, but will not be as readily recognized as applicable.

3.5.3.3.2: It is logically inconsistent to treat playing time as a content characteristic, but film length as a carrier characteristic, since the latter can be mathematically translated into the former. Consider placing the instructions for these two elements in the same chapter and recognizing their relationship.

3.6 Base material

It would be very helpful if there was some indication of the categories of carriers for which this element is likely to be applicable. This would assist catalogers in finding relevant instructions and would also discourage catalogers from hunting among elements that are not applicable. This is particularly true in cases where a concept of rather narrow application (base material is a concept most typically applied to original art works) is being generalized to some degree.

3.6.0.1: It would be much clearer to define this as the physical material of which the carrier is made. Is that accurate?

3.6.0.3: Quite often the cataloger has no way of knowing what the base material is; in such cases, should “if known” be added to “if considered to be important”?

This element seems like a logical place to record that a book is printed on alkaline paper. Should “alkaline paper” be added as a choice in the list of base materials? This question is an example both of the point made above about what types of carriers this instruction is intended to cover, as well as of the point made throughout our comments on the undesirability of closed lists of terms.

3.6.0.4: This instruction should apply to photo negatives.

3.7 Applied material

As with Base Material, it would be very helpful if there were some indication of the categories of carriers for which this element is likely to be applicable.

3.7.0.1.1: Change the phrase “record the content” to “create the content”. The former sounds too much like an RDA instruction rather than a description of applied material.

3.7.0.3 and 3.7.0.4: These lists are unlikely to be complete. We would prefer that the terms be treated as examples and not as a closed vocabulary.

3.8 Mount

Change to “Mounting”; what is being described is the material upon which a resource is mounted. This is not an appropriate use of the word “mount”.

3.8.1: We feel that the distinction between a statement (3.8.0.3) and an annotation (3.8.1) is particularly unclear for this element. The examples of the latter seem to be

describing the mounting is ways that are not substantially different from those in 3.8.0.3. Either the examples are misleading or there really isn't a distinction here.

3.9 Production method

It appears that Production Method and Generation are mutually exclusive. If that is the intention, it should be clearly stated.

3.9.0.3.1: This should not be a closed list. For example, cartographic resources are often produced as brownline or blackline prints. We prefer that the terms be treated as examples, not as a closed vocabulary.

3.9.0.4: The difference between a printout and a typescript is difficult to maintain with today's technology. Modern theses are, in fact, printouts, although they may look like traditional typescripts.

3.9.0.4.2. Once again, this should not be a closed list. For example, we note that "mimeographs" is an applicable category not included in the list.

3.9.0.5: From the examples, it appears that "plate copy" and "press braille" are equivalent terms. This should be made clear in the list of terms.

3.10 Generation

3.10.0.3: The list of categories to which this element applies is arbitrarily limited. We would argue that the concept of generation could also apply to still images such as prints or photographs. We would like to suggest that this instruction be more open-ended, rather than limited to the categories specified in 3.10.0.4–8.

3.10.0.5: It is not clear that all of these terms in fact identify a generation of a digital resource. In particular, we would argue that a thumbnail is another version, not a generation. The same may apply to "view" and "examination".

3.11 Layout

3.11.0.3.1: Editorial: "Record the layout of the resource ..."

There are some other typical cases, other than those shown in the examples. We suggest adding examples of a double-sided DVD disc and of still images other than flipcharts.

3.11.0.4.1: The scope of instructions for "map(s), etc." is problematic. This particular instruction would **not** be applied to atlases.

3.12 Colour

Location of these instructions: The scope note clearly states that "colour indicates the presence of colour(s), tone(s), etc. in the *content* of a resource" [italics supplied]. This suggests that this element belongs in Chapter 4. Colour is a fundamental characteristic of artistic intent and should be considered primarily as an attribute of the work (whether intended to show colour) and the expression (the particular colours used); a change in the basic colour scheme should be considered an indication of a

distinct expression – or (occasionally) as a change made after the resource is issued to a particular item or group of items. Purists would argue that the addition of colour to a work conceived in black and white, or the removal of colour from a work conceived in colour, constitutes an imperfect or damaged expression of those works; at the very least, it should be treated as a distinct expression. Therefore, we recommend that the instructions on Colour be moved to Chapter 4, although perhaps some of the annotations describing the technical characteristics of the colour (e.g., “Technicolor” in 3.12.1.3.1) should remain in Chapter 3.

Contents and arrangement: The arrangement of the sub-instructions here does not seem significant. We would prefer that 3.12.0.4–3.12.0.8 be arranged in alphabetical order. We also suggest the addition of a section for cartographic resources, to contain the instruction which we suggest below should be moved from 3.12.0.3.1. “For cartographic resources, disregard coloured matter outside the border of a cartographic unit.”

3.12.0.1. The instructions do not differentiate between colours and shades or tints. What conclusion should be drawn? Is a grayscale image considered to be black and white? Is an image in white and shades of green to be considered a two-colour image? A statement somewhere in 3.12 that shades and tints are not considered separate colours for purposes of these instructions would be helpful.

3.12.0.3: It is our assumption that the instructions in Chapter 3 cover characteristics of the manifestation as issued, as well as characteristics of the item either as issued or as subsequently modified. Because colouring is something that is likely to apply to either the manifestation or the item, these instructions should deal directly with this. First, the instructions should call for a clear indication when the information applies to the item being described. Second, when it is not clear whether the information applies to all copies of a manifestation, the default instruction should be to record it as item-specific. Third, a distinction should be made between the colour of the resource as issued and any modifications made subsequent to issue (“coloured,” “colourized,” “hand-coloured,” etc.). Finally, because the word “coloured” suggests the act of adding colour, we strongly urge that this term **not** be used to describe resources as issued; use “colour” instead.

3.12.0.3.1: The final sentence derives from an AACR2 rule that applies only to cartographic resources. We think that this instruction *only* makes sense in the case of cartographic resources, where the resource being described is limited to the cartographic content; this is the justification for ignoring matter outside of the [cartographic] content of the resource. For other types of resources, colour should always be recorded.

3.12.0.3.5: This is a particularly confusing example of the ambiguous layout of options and exceptions. The layout suggests that the optional addition is applicable only to the exception “for resources for persons with visual impairments,” although the optional addition seems to be applicable to all resources – and should be numbered. As noted in our general comments, the layout of options and exceptions needs to represent in a clearer manner the scope and relationships of the various

instructions. In this particular case, it might be best to move the exceptions to the end of 3.12.0.3 *after* the optional addition and the reference to annotations (3.12.0.3.6).

3.12.0.4: As these instructions can apply to expression, manifestation, or item, the recording of colour added to a manifestation or item needs to be supported: “Hand-coloured” or “Hand-tinted”. The instructions should call for an indication of whether the resource was issued with the colouring or was added after issue, and whether the colouring applies to the manifestation or the item, with a default assumption that it applies to the item unless there is evidence to the contrary.

3.12.0.4.1: Since there are currently no separate instructions, the restriction of the instructions on still images to those “(other than cartographic)” is unfortunate. We would like to see these instructions extended to cartographic resources.

In the second sentence, the phrase “one or two other colors” presumably refers to colours other than black or white. Is that restriction necessary? Might it not be appropriate to record that the image is in blue and white or red and black?

3.12.0.4 needs to contain an instruction comparable to 3.12.0.5.2 to deal with resources that contain both black and white and colour images.

3.12.0.5.1: The instructions need to be clarified. The first sentence applies to resources **only** in black and white; the second sentence applies to resources **only** in colour; and 3.12.0.5.2 applies to resources that contain both black and white and colour sequences.

3.12.0.7: This instruction need not be limited to resources designed for persons with visual impairments, but might be recorded for any resource. We recommend moving this instruction to be part of 3.12.1.3 (details of color) to be recorded “if considered important for identification or selection.”

3.12.1.3.2: We do not believe that broadcast standard and color are related, and suggest deleting this instruction.

3.13 Foliation

Terminology: The terminology here is confused. The instructions seem to cover two different concepts. From *ABC for book collectors*, 8th ed.:

Foliated, Foliation: Foliation is the numbering of leaves (see Leaf), as opposed to Pagination, which is the numbering of pages.

Format: In bibliographical contexts it is used to indicate the structure of a volume in terms of the number of times the original printed sheet has been folded to form its constituent leaves ...

This element deals primarily with recording the bibliographic format as defined above. It is **not** correct to call this foliation.

On the other hand, 3.13.1.3.1 uses foliation correctly as defined above (at least, the examples illustrate information about the foliation, i.e., how the resource is numbered). This information does not really belong with instructions about the

bibliographic format; it really belongs in 3.4.4.6 (annotations on extent for textual resources); there should be instructions there about recording errors in numbering that would apply to numbering of pages, leaves, or columns, not just to numbering of leaves.

3.13.0.3.1: The “terms” listed apply to the Western bookmaking tradition. There should be an instruction allowing other formats to be recorded, and some non-Roman examples should be included.

3.14 Font size

We wonder if this element could be generalized to cover other situations in which text or images are presented in different sizes. For example, a miniature score seems to be comparable to a large-print edition. This element might be combined with Reduction ratio (for the special cases in which it is known which is the “original” and the exact ratio of the reduction).

3.15 Polarity

3.15.0.1 Scope: These instructions should be applicable to any images, not just to those on film. For example, polarity is relevant for remote-sensing images, photostats, or other reproduced images.

3.15.1.3 Details of polarity: These examples include information that technically belongs in other elements; for example, “glass photonegative” gives information about base material or mount as well as polarity. We suspect that it will be difficult to find “pure” examples of polarity that say anything other than “positive” or “negative”.

3.17 Sound characteristics

Location of these instructions: ALA feels that the presence or absence of sound is an attribute of the work (or at least of the expression), and thus belongs in Chapter 4. On the other hand, the details of how the sound is recorded for playback are attributes of the carrier and belong in Chapter 3. In this case, we propose the addition of an element in Chapter 4 to indicate whether sound is part of the intended content of the resource; these instructions should also call for recording deliberate modifications of that original intent (e.g., a silent film with an added musical sound track).

Digital sound: It is not clear how the sound characteristics specified in these instructions are related to the digital encoding format (3.20.0.5). In fact, the most common sound characteristics recorded for contemporary resources are the encoding formats listed in 3.20.0.5; it is unfortunate that the instructions on sound characteristics do not include this information except through a rather cryptic reference at 3.17.0.1.3.

3.17.0.4: ALA agrees with the CCC suggestion to change the caption and definition of this sub-element.

3.17.0.4: The four terms represent two different attributes and are therefore not mutually exclusive. “Analog” and “digital” relate to the nature of the encoding, while “magnetic” and “optical” relate to the nature of the carrier. Both analog and digital sound may be recorded on magnetic media. This suggests that these are two distinct element subtypes, both of which need to be recorded in order to describe the resource completely – or that composite terms “Digital, optical” and “Digital, magnetic” and “Analog, magnetic” may be needed. ALA believes that the former approach (separate subtypes) is preferable.

3.17.0.10 Special playback characteristics: In videos, we seldom know the flavor of Dolby, so “Dolby” by itself should be on the list, as well as LPCM.

3.18 Projection characteristics

Location of these instructions: ALA feels that at least some projection characteristics are attributes of the expression (content) and not of the manifestation (carrier), and thus belong in Chapter 4. Specifically, we argue that Presentation format (3.18.0.4) should be an element in Chapter 4. The shape of the image that is intended to be projected onto the screen is part of the fundamental visual design of the work. Projection speed, on the other hand, is an attribute of the manifestation and should be an element in Chapter 3. Annotations would be required for both Presentation format and Projection speed.

Terminology: The term “projection” is used for both visual and cartographic resources. In each case, the terminology should be clear as to which type of projection is under consideration. Here, we suggest “Projection characteristics for visual resources”.

3.18.0.4: Some of the terms for Presentation Format relate to the aspect ratio. While these terms are included here, there is no provision for a detailed specification of the aspect ratio. Furthermore, aspect ratio applies both to motion pictures (3.18) and to videorecordings (3.19). [We would in fact argue that aspect ratios identify different expressions of a moving-image work.] We would suggest that aspect ratio be treated consistently for all types of moving-image content in Chapter 4. These instructions should also call for annotation on the original presentation format when the format has been changed.

The comment above may in fact apply to all the Presentation Format types; they would seem to be aspects of the content which would be applicable both to film and to video manifestations. If Presentation Format is moved to Chapter 4 as we suggest, then it should be applicable to all types of moving-image content.

The list is again incomplete. One additional type that has been suggested is “Anamorphic widescreen”.

In our experience, “widescreen” is usually given as a single word.

3.18.1.3.1: We suggest the following example: “Disney Digital 3-D”

3.19 Video characteristics

Film and video: Some of the provisions of 3.19 really deal with the moving-image content and not the video carrier. As suggested above, Presentation Format (including Aspect Ratio as a major component) should be an element in Chapter 4. If that is done, then some of the instructions in 3.19 should be moved to that instruction.

3.19.0.4: The list of format types is incomplete. Among the obvious missing types are Blu-Ray and the various flavors of DVD video such as DVD-R, +R, HD-DVD. The distinction between video format (3.19.0.4) and file type (3.20.0.5) is unclear; it seems the types listed above are the videodisc counterpart of the videotape types listed in 3.19.0.4, and seem to be appropriate here.

3.19.0.4: An indication of the relation of digital formats to the formats listed would be helpful in the formats list. For example, Digital Betacam should be listed either as a subset of Betacam, or as a separate format.

3.19.0.4: It would be helpful to have an instruction in the case where the exact format of (for example) a DVD is not known.

3.19.1.3: ALA suggests including an example for recording aspect ratio, and for recording that a video is in “widescreen” or letterboxed format. This is extremely important to the identification and selection of videorecordings.

3.20 Digital file characteristics

3.20.0.4: It seems redundant to record file type when RDA has already instructed us to record this information as a subunit under “Extent”. The instruction in this section might be revised to say to include file type only if it hasn’t been recorded elsewhere in the record.

3.20.0.5: This list is clearly incomplete. We note, for example, that the *Content Standards for Digital Geo-spatial Metadata* lists more than 30 encoding formats for cartographic images alone. “GIS” is **not** an image encoding format; the encoding format would be something like “Arc/info”. “PDF” can be used to encode any type of file and listing it only under text seems misleading. “JPEG200” should definitely be listed under image encoding formats. Under video encoding formats, “MPEG-4” should not be the only MPEG format on the list.

3.20.0.6: Provision should be made for variations within a complex resource. For example, a downloadable audiobook may vary in size according to the sound quality of the file chosen. Should all choices be reflected in one statement, perhaps in an inclusive file size (5-25 MB)? Then specific information regarding the relationship of file sizes to sound quality could be given in a general note.

3.20.0.8: Only raster encodes images. Vector encodes cartographic *data* that can be used to produce cartographic images.

3.20.0.8, examples: The layout of the examples is confusing and unhelpful; we suggest that the captions be treated as part of the example (distinguished by typography from the data content) rather than as editorial comments.

3.20.1.3: If it is appropriate to use this element to specify whether a video or audio file is streaming or downloadable, please make this explicit and include examples.

3.21 Notes on changes in carrier characteristics

See our comments under the “Issues raised in the cover letter” above.

3.21.0.3.1a.1: The reference to 3.6–3.20 should be to 3.2–3.20, since changes in Media type, Carrier type, Extent, and Dimensions might also require annotation.

3.22 Notes on equipment and system requirements

3.22.0.1.2: The wording could be greatly simplified; we suggest: “Equipment and system requirements include requirements describing the intermediation devices necessary to view, play, or run the resource.” The point about application to both analog and digital resources should be a separate instruction (3.22.0.1.3): “Equipment and system requirements are applicable to either analog or digital resources.”

3.22.0.3.1, examples: Why do the systems examples all start with the phrase “system requirements”? Prefacing the systems requirements note with this phrase is not in the instructions and the examples should not imply that it is required.

3.22.0.3.1, final examples: The current direction within the Program for Cooperative Cataloging and the shared cataloging environment is to simplify system requirement notes as much as possible. We suggest that the last three examples (and the one listed under the alternative instruction) suggest a level of detail that we do not wish to encourage.

3.22.0.3.2: What is this instruction an alternative to? It seems to be one specific way in which these annotations may be recorded; in other words, applying 3.22.0.3.2 is a valid application of 3.22.0.3.1. This is **not** really an alternative.

3.23 Notes on item-specific carrier characteristics

It is unfortunate that the granularity of elements used to describe a manifestation is lost when describing an item. Ideally, we would like to see the FRBR Type 1 entity be an attribute of every RDA element. In the present state of the RDA element set, this would probably require adding item-level equivalents to all the elements in Chapter 3 – which does not seem justified. However, we do note that MARC 21 does allow item-specific data to be recorded in a variety of different fields depending on the type of data being recorded.

3.23.0.1.1 and 3.23.0.1.2: To align RDA more closely with FRBR, consider using the phrase “the specific copy or *exemplar* of a resource” instead of “the specific copy or *instance* of a resource”.

3.23.0.3.1: ALA agrees with CILIP that the institution whose copy is being described should be identified in the note, either using a convention such as the MARC 21 subfield \$5 or in the text of the note.

3.23.0.3.2: In RDA we usually use “cataloguing agency” rather than “library”.

3.23.1.1: ALA endorses the rewording suggested by CILIP.

Addendum to RDA Part A – Chapter 4

4.2 Content type

4.2.0.1.1: The scope statement is very dense and tries to capture the base categories from the RDA/ONIX Framework. If that is important (and we suspect it ought to be), consider including the framework as an appendix to RDA. If that is done, the significance of the categories referred to in this scope statement can be made clear.

4.2.0.1.1, 2nd sentence: See comment on the definition of “image” in the Glossary.

4.2.0.2.1 Recording content type: There was some sentiment within ALA for making the alternative instruction the basic instruction, with the instruction to record all types presented as an alternative to be applied when no part predominates or can be considered the most substantial. However, there was stronger sentiment for simplifying the instructions by deleting both the second sentence of 4.2.0.2.1 and the alternative instruction – in other words, a simple instruction to record one or more of the terms.

Table 1: The position of the table makes it appear to be a part of 4.2.0.2.2, rather than applying to both the basic instruction and the alternative. The layout should more clearly indicate the relationship of the table to the preceding instructions or the list of terms should be moved to an appendix.

Cartographic image: Add “atlas” in the list of examples, to eliminate any confusion as to the category for atlases.

Cartographic moving image: *Editorial comment:* Capitalize “Earth”. Although AACR2 Appendix A27A may not be carried forward in RDA, the practice recommended there is still valid: *Earth* should be capitalized when used at the name of the planet.

Cartographic three-dimensional form and Three-dimensional form: See also the comment on the definition of “Three-dimensional form” in the Glossary.

Moving image: This term should be “Two-dimensional moving image” to keep it parallel with “Three-dimensional moving image.”

4.2.0.2.3: As noted with regard to other lists, ALA does not find it useful to record “other” when none of the terms applies. We would prefer that a term in common usage be recorded, and that such terms be considered candidates for expansion of the vocabulary. See our general comments on embedded vocabularies as closed lists.

4.9 Illustrative content

Ironically, the scope statement in 4.9.0.1 does not limit illustrations to graphic images; audio and video clips might be considered to “illustrate” an audio or video lecture, for example. Should this element be limited to the sort of graphic illustrative

matter typically appearing in printed texts (which was the origin of this element in AACR chapter 2) or should a broader approach to illustrative matter be taken? If the scope is to be narrow, the definition in 4.9.0.1 needs to be revised.

4.9.0.3.2: Consider adding “graphs” to the list of types of illustrative content. ALA also agrees with CILIP that “illuminations” and “plates” should be removed from the list.

4.9.1.3.1, example: The example contains both information about the illustration and about colour. We think as a matter of principle annotations should be limited to a single element. If that is true, then we suspect that this case requires two notes, even if this is less clear than the single note in the example.

4.12 Duration

4.12.0.3: ALA continues to recommend that the use of the W3C DTF encoding format be prescribed (or at least encouraged) for this element. This format promotes the conversion and use of data for display, allows searching by time ranges, and supports internationalization and interoperability.

4.12.0.3: Add an instruction for recording playing time, etc., when the time stated on the resource is known to differ substantially from actual time.

4.12.0.3 and 4.12.1.3.1, examples: The examples show different ways of dealing with times over one hour and of recording minutes and seconds. Based on our general comment above, we assume that this is an indication that a consistent format is not required. In the absence of an instruction to use the W3C DTF format (which we recommend above), we support allowing a variety of valid recording conventions for this element.

4.12.1.3.2: Please include an example of durations included in a contents note.

Glossary

General comment

Suggestion for enhanced content for RDA Online: Consider linking some of the definitions to images depicting the carrier being defined.

Comments on specific definitions

Cartridge: Definition 3 could apply to a jewel case, which we suspect is not intended; the definition needs to convey the permanence of the casing and the way in which the cartridge is used. Perhaps “A casing in which one or more computer discs or chips are permanently housed; used by inserting the entire casing into the relevant computerized device.”

Computer dataset: The definition does not differentiate a dataset from any other computer file. In this case, it may be necessary to define this category negatively.

Image: This definition is inconsistent with 4.2.0.1.1, 2nd sentence, which implies that images are not always two dimensional.

Moving image: The definition is awkward; we suggest “Content expressed through two-dimensional images intended to be perceived as moving.”

Projection: Projection is not a type of media, but the process of projecting; the terms used in 3.2 and 3.3 are “Projected” and “Projected media”.

Roll: See our comment under 3.3.0.2.2 above.

Three-dimensional form: The definition does not capture the essence of this category; the pages of a book can also be “perceived visually from more than one side,” while a hologram has only one side. In this case, it might not be possible to avoid including “... in three-dimensions” in the definition.