

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to JSC  
**Subject:** **Categorization of content and carrier**

***Related documents:***

5JSC/Chair/10 RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorisation  
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up GMD/SMD Working Group : proposal for content and carrier terms in RDA and responses

**General comments**

ACOC requests that the JSC to release a draft of the whole of Chapter 3 for constituency review which includes both these instructions, and appropriate examples. We believe this will be necessary to allow proper evaluation of the categories and the instructions. By itself, the practical aspect of devising examples will reveal whether the categorisations and the instructions for extent are workable.

ACOC considers that ongoing consultation with the MARC community on what is being proposed is critical.

ACOC would also like to see further analysis of the compatibility of these categorisations with those used in other resource description communities. The RDA/ONIX framework from which this categorisation has been derived may have a bias towards published resources. Further examination of the framework in relation to unpublished and online resources would be worthwhile.

*Comments that apply to several instructions*

ACOC would prefer that RDA provide comprehensive categorisations, and as far as possible remove the need for the use of the 'other' category provided at 3.2.0.2.2, 3.3.0.2.2, and 4.2.0.2.2.

**Objectives**

ACOC generally supports these objectives for the categorisation, and we have made specific comments on how well the objectives have been achieved below.

**Levels of specificity**

Please see ACOC's comments below at 3.3 *Type of carrier*.

**Relationship between Type of carrier and Extent**

ACOC notes that both Extent and Type of carrier are required elements, and that this will result in repetition of data. A possible solution to this might be to have a single element for the carrier, and to treat the number of units as a separate sub-element.

ACOC notes that the reason given for needing separate elements is that the instructions under 3.4 do not always refer to 3.3. As noted in 5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/ACOC response we consider that the current organisation of this chapter is unworkable, and we would prefer a single list.

## **Terminology**

ACOC appreciates that this framework allows for the questions of categorisation and terminology to be effectively separated – at least for the purposes of recording the data. ACOC supports the flexibility to make decisions about the labelling and display of these categories which is inherent in this approach.

Most libraries are likely to use the terms suggested, and so these need to be as understandable as possible.

### **3.2 Media category**

As noted in *5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/ACOC response*, not all of ACOC's members are convinced of the need for this layer of categorisation. ACOC notes that the specific type of carrier will provide the information of most value to users, although Media category may well be useful to database administrators, etc.

Currently the media category terms may be inferred from the carrier terms and thus the value in providing both is questionable. If however, as we suggest below, more specific carrier terms are adopted, the media terms list can be used by systems as the first step in filtering result sets, for example in determining whether a DVD is video or audio.

#### *Comments on specific categories:*

- ACOC notes that there is no longer a clear distinction between carriers (and IntermediationTools) for audio, video and digital resources. For example, the same DVD may be played using a computer with a DVD drive or a DVD player. The categorisation must address this change in the technological environment.
- In addition, ACOC notes that 'unmediated' is a concept that will be easy for the cataloguer to use and apply, but will offer little information to the user.

### **3.3 Type of carrier**

ACOC is very concerned that the categories given here will not be specific enough to be useful to users of the catalogue. A large number of the terms given are either (a) for uncommon or obsolete carriers, or (b) at too general a level to be of real use to the user.

We are not convinced that the additional level of specificity will be covered adequately by other RDA elements such as production method, medium, digital characteristics and other characteristics of videorecordings as suggested under 'Levels of specificity'. In any case we would prefer that this information not be dispersed in the description, as the full technical description will rarely be included in a results set display of the description.

ACOC would prefer that the specific carrier, not the type of carrier should be recorded. The aim of including the carrier element in the description is a practical one, and ACOC's preference is for using terms that are understandable to users, rather than providing terms for theoretically logical categories. We suggest that the list of

specific carrier terms given in Appendix B of the 5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up *GMD/SMD Working Group* be the basis for a list of terms to be used in the Extent.

*Comments on specific categories:*

The list of terms given under 'unmediated carriers' does not include a term which is suitable for serials/serial issues, and neither is this type of physical carrier addressed by the instructions in 3.4.

**4.2 Content category**

ACOC believes that 4.2 Content category should be a mandatory element.

ACOC considers that the content categories included in the draft are logically defined, and the labels given are appropriate and understandable.

ACOC recognises that content categories may be used in access points for works and expressions. We have not evaluated the categories given in relation to this function, but suggest this be explored further with Part B.

*Comments on specific categories:*

ACOC would prefer that the terms given under 4.2.1, i.e. computer program and computer dataset, be included with the other content categories in 4.2.0.2.1.

The instruction for cartographic content should be either given as part of the general instruction, or a reference provided from the general instruction to this specific instruction.

A further term (e.g. Sounds or Sound) should be added to the content categories for sound which is neither spoken word nor performed music (e.g. sound effects). This would have the following values: Character: Other; SensoryMode: Hearing; Image Dimensionality and Image movement: Not applicable.

Further terms for choreographic notation, mathematical notation and numerical data should be considered. In these cases it is not clear which value for the attribute 'Character' in the *RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorisation* would apply, and so this might point to a need for further evaluation of that attribute.