TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

FROM: Barbara Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Revisions to *Categorization of content and carrier*

The Library of Congress thanks John Attig for starting this discussion and providing a starter revision to the text. Our response to his recommendations are included in this document and further comments on the draft of the revised "Categorization" document are provided in our response to that document (6JSC/RDA/Section 1/Categorization/Rev/LC response).

We suggest in future when numerous recommendations are being made that they be numbered for ease of citing them.   We have added numbering here.   We noticed that the "track changes" document of *Categorizations* perhaps would be better managed through a wiki or other means than the traditional methods of paper responses used by the JSC in the past.   The communal editing of the *Categorization* document is difficult via this paper method.

As declared in John's final recommendation, we strongly agree that the JSC needs to renew discussions on this topic with the contacts from the ONIX community in order to negotiate changes as soon as possible and preferably before they are officially registered on the Web.

1. Recommendation: The categorization document should be updated along the lines proposed in the following document. The details of the revisions are subject to constituency review.

LC response: We agree in general with specific suggestions noted here and in the response to the draft (6JSC/RDA/Section 1/Categorization/Rev./LC response).

2. Recommendation: The mapping of the RDA vocabularies to the RDA/ONIX Framework should be communicated to those working on the RDA Vocabulary registry, with the request that the mapping be incorporated into the registry.

LC response: We agree.

*3. Recommendation***:** Remove the RDA text and the Glossary from the Categorization document; revise the initial paragraphs as appropriate.

LC response: We agree.

1.   *Question: Does the JSC agree that "projector" is sufficiently broad?*

LC response: No, if we wish to continue to use the term to cover the broader range of

viewing devices, that should be explained in the intended scope.

2. Question: Does the JSC agree that the mapping of "volume" to the RDA/ONIX Housing Format value "not applicable" should be removed? Is the mapping otherwise adequate?

LC response: No.   Isn't this mixing different categories?   One is the carrier, the other is a housing (subtype of carrier?).   This again makes it clear that these issues should be re-discussed for the RDA/ONIX values with the representatives from the ONIX community.   We certainly should have those agreements with the ONIX community before having them "cast in stone" in a registry.

3. Question: …a value for "none of the above" should be proposed for addition to the values for the Storage Medium Format attribute…Does the JSC agree?

LC response: This points out that there is not a one-to-one mapping going on.   One should be allowed to declare a "Housing Format" or not that applies to the situation at hand – some volumes will have a housing (be bound) and others will not.   We observe that a "none of the above" only tells a user what it is not, so the catch-all term might be "other", but we should have a process to declare other categories rather than using such terms.

4. Recommendation: The revised mapping specifications, along with the extensions to the Framework that they incorporate, should be communicated to the JSC's partners in the RDA/ONIX initiative, with recommendations for continued work on implementation, refinement, and extension of the framework.

LC response: Absolutely!   As noted, "Recommendation #1 in the "Proposal for Implementing Recommendations on the RDA/ONIX Framework":

1. That the Framework for resource categorization set out in this document be tested by mapping RDA, ONIX, and other namespace-controlled value/code lists to it, and that the mapping be used to identify the need for any additional attributes or specified values."

Clearly, we have found several areas where the categorization does not work, and we need to negotiate changes with the ONIX community.