To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, Chair, JSC

Subject: RDA: Resource Description and Access - Review by other rule makers of
      March 2007 Draft of Chapter 3 - Sweden

These are comments on the draft chapter 3 of RDA received from The National Library
of Sweden and The Swedish National Archive of Recorded Sound and Moving Images,
together with The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee.
.

Comments on the draft of RDA, chapter 3

From the national bibliographic agency, *The National Library of Sweden* and *The Swedish National Archive of Recorded Sound and Moving Images*, together with *Svensk Biblioteksförenings kommitté för katalogisering* (The Swedish Library Association, Cataloguing Committee)

Anders Cato
25. June 2007

General views

It is clear to the Committee that the new Chapter 3 aims at more clearly distinguishing between Media type, Content type and Carrier type. This very well reflects the development within MARC21 and also within other bibliographic formats outside the library community (e.g. ONIX). In the different lists of various types in the RDA draft the three aspects seem to intertwine however, as for example are some physical attributes also attributed to *Content*, as e.g. the case when a publication exists in a tactile version. Some of the *Media type* attributes are quite unspecific making them very difficult to interpret and follow, while other attributes are very specific. The General Material Designation (GMD) of today's cataloguing rules mixes the attributes for carriers and content. The point of departure has been the wish to define in an easy manner carrier and content types that the user wishes to distinguish between. In RDA the GMD is replaced by the more strict *Media type*. The general nature of *Media type*, however, makes it difficult to use in practice. Compared to Swedish practice *Media type* reflects a higher level of abstraction.

It is worth contemplating which of the new terms will be applicable also for other sets of rules, e.g. the ISBD family.

Even though the rules of RDA are supposed to be expressible in other formats than MARC21 it is inevitable that a revision of one set of rules also leads to the revision of another. In MARC21 many of the attributes for *Media, Content* and *Carrier types* can be expressed through codes in coded fields. In appendix 2 where the components of the chapter are mapped to MARC21 many elements do not make out a clean match however. The sets of rules that are applied by RDA usually tend to be more specific than the ones applied by MARC21. This is a problem and it is our hope that this revision of the rules will also lead to more clear rules and rule interpretations in MARC21.

How are the parts of the text that pertain to a specific problem of cataloguing going to be recovered? How does one easily find rules pertaining to a specific problem? As with earlier drafts we would like to stress the difficulty in judging a product that is intended for the web, but so far does not exist on the web.

Specific comments for each part of Chapter 3

The draft of Chapter 3 contains many instructions saying that a rule is optional. Does this mean that if several of these are applied the thorough level of description of this chapter will no longer be valid?

3.4.0.7.1.e.1
With reference to 3.4.2 why are not "3 scores" mentioned with number of pages as well in the second example? Why should online resources be described on a more superficial level?

3.4.4.2.4
The second example "8, vii, approximately 300, 73 pages" does not appear very clear to us. Why not just approximately 400 pages? We also find it a bit unnecessary not to abbreviate the words that in most cases always are abbreviated, like *approximately* and *pages*.

3.19.1 & 3.20.1
The draft contains some instructions on notes that we really do not believe should be in this chapter, e.g. 3.19.1 and 3.20.1

3.20
This whole chapter is "optional" according to the instructions. How can "digital file characteristics" be optional? How are the underlying instructions related to each other? Is 3.20.0 compulsory if one has chosen to use 3.20, but 3.20.1 optional even if 3.20 is used? There probably is consistency here, but it is very easy to be misled.

3.20.0.5
Some modern formats are lacking in the list, e.g. Blu-ray disc.

3.20.1.3
The note given here on "identification and selection" should be given also in 3.22.0.3

4.12.0.3.2
The first and third examples are the same. One of them could be removed.

Specific questions

Answers to the specific questions put in the accompanying letter:

- 3.2: "digital" replaced by "computer": OK for us.
- 3.3: "digital carriers" replaced by "computer carriers", "book" replaced by "volume": OK for us.
- 4.2: "notated movement": OK for us
- 3.2: Recording media type: We believe that the Media type should remain included as an element in RDA.
- 3.12.0.3.1: Recording color: Yes, the term "colorized" should be added to the list of terms.

Specific comments from the Swedish National Archive of Recorded Sound and Moving Images

The biggest concerns of the Archive with this draft are with the media types "computer" (3.2), "carrier type" (3.3) and "digital file characteristics" (3.20).

Instead of placing all digital files under the media type *computer*, we would prefer audio files to be placed under *audio*, video files under *video*, etc.

We believe that under 3.3 the carrier type "file" should be included, i.e. *audio file* under "Audio Carriers", v*ideo file* under "Video carriers" etc, instead of placing all digital files under 3.20 "Digital file characteristics".

With the proposed division an unwanted clash between content (sound, video) and recording device (computer) and carrier (digital files) is created.

A sound file in mp3 format according to the suggested model would be described like this:

Media type	computer
Digital file characteristics	audio file
Encoding format	MP3

A sound file in mp3 format according to the rules of the Swedish National Archive of Sound and Recorded Images is described like this:

Media type	audio
Carrier type	audio file
Digital file characteristics, encoding format	MP3

N.B.: What the Swedish National Archive of Sound and Recorded Images means by the term "file" in this context are files existing in a mass storage system, or on a web site, not mp3 files burnt to a CD, nor files on published resources like CD's or DVD's.