To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Kevin Marsh, ACOC Representative

Subject: Colour Content (RDA 7.17)

ACOC thanks ALA for this proposal. We welcome the proposed removal of inconsistent treatments of colour content across different types of resource and consolidation of the instructions. However, we have reservations about some of the recommendations.

ACOC does not support the use of a controlled vocabulary for colour-related terms, because of the associated development and maintenance obligations, and thus prefers Option 1 for the revised text. We suggest the readability of Option 1, however, might be improved by the removal of headings at 7.17.1.3.1, 7.17.1.3.2, 7.17.1.3.3, 7.17.1.3.4, 7.17.1.3.5, following the approach taken in Option 2.

ACOC does not support the introduction of variant spellings ("colour" vs. "color") into the text at 7.17. We consider that the issue of alternative English-language spellings is adequately covered by the Objectives and Principles Governing Resource Description and Access (0.4.3.7), and that the examples in use illustrate this.

ACOC disagrees with ALA's preferred treatment of tinting and toning. We consider these are more appropriately treated under Production Method, and would welcome further discussion of this issue by the JSC.

ACOC notes that some of the proposed additions to the RDA glossary terms are problematic, e.g., black and white are not technically "colours" but make sense as such in particular contexts, and the notion of "shades of black" appears tautological, and would welcome further discussion to clarify such definitions.