

**To:** RDA Steering Committee

**From:** Ebe Kartus, ACOC Representative

**Subject:** Discussion paper: Accompanying material in RDA

ACOC thanks the joint ALA-CCC working group for this thorough analysis of the issues around accompanying material in RDA.

It is ACOC's view that resources containing "accompanying material" or that have "primary" and "secondary" components are in fact aggregates, and should be considered in that context. Therefore we suggest that the issues addressed in this paper be forwarded to the Aggregates Working Group to be evaluated in the context of their proposed models for Aggregates.

Having said this, ACOC reviewed the paper in detail and has the following comments on the issues raised.

**Issue 1: Analyze how the choice of analytic vs. comprehensive description (see RDA 1.5) affects the treatment of accompanying material.**

ACOC agrees that guidance on the choice between a comprehensive and analytic description would be useful but questions whether it is RSC's role to recommend this to RDA communities. Each organisation's approach to comprehensive vs. analytic description is influenced by a variety of factors, and the decision as to whether guidance is required should be made at the local level.

**Issue 2: Evaluate the definition of accompanying material in RDA 2.2.4.**

*The term "accompanying material" has outlived its usefulness. Suggest using "predominant" and "secondary" (or "subordinate") to express the idea.*

ACOC's response to this was mixed.

- If resources of this nature are considered as aggregates, then "accompanying material" is a redundant concept. However, even in the context of aggregates, it would be useful to be able to distinguish aggregates where the relationship between the component parts is a dependent relationship from those where it is not. We agree, however, that the current use of the term, particularly in Appendix J, does not make this distinction clear.
- ACOC agrees that "accompanying material" has come to be associated with a *physically* separate component, so it could be desirable to move away from the term for this reason. However, ACOC does not agree that RDA implies that physical separation is necessary.

ACOC cautiously agrees to the terms "Primary/Secondary" being used instead of "accompanying material" but would prefer the issue of terminology to be addressed in the context of treating this material as an aggregate.

*Make a clear distinction between the concept of a resource having primary/secondary parts and what is addressed by J.4.5, Accompanying Material Relationships.*

ACOC was not sure how this recommendation relates back to the discussion on page 4. The discussion recommends making a distinction between complimentary and

primary/secondary relationships, as defined in LRM-R22. This statement recommends distinguishing between primary/secondary relationships and the relationships expressed in J.4.5, which are not complimentary relationships in LRM terms (at the work level). They are *manifestation* relationships where there is *no content* relationship. ACOC believes that the placement and definition of “accompanying” relationships in Appendix J already makes this distinction clear. What confuses the issue is that the instructions in Chapters 2 and 3 (which are about describing manifestations) do not make a distinction between accompanying relationships that exist at a work/expression level (i.e. content relationships), and those that exist at manifestation/item level (i.e. issuing/binding relationships). This issue certainly needs to be addressed, but it is probably best tackled from the aggregates perspective.

With regard to the distinction made in the LRM-R22 scope statement between complimentary and primary/secondary relationships, there is potentially an argument for creating sub-elements in RDA for the two concepts. We suggest this be considered as part of the process of alignment of RDA with LRM. ACOC would also like to point out that while RDA accommodates “accompanying” relationships at all WEMI levels, LRM only has such a relationship at work level. Issued/bound with relationships do not seem to be addressed in the LRM.

*Evaluate the use of the interrelated terms such as 'unit', 'part', and 'component part'. Revise the definitions.*

ACOC is happy for these terms and their definitions and interrelationships to be reviewed but do not have an issue with the definitions as they currently are. We are not convinced the issue is with the definitions themselves. Rather we suspect that the understanding of these terms is affected by the fact that for so long accompanying material has been associated with *physical* separateness.

*To RDA Communities: include an accompanying materials flowchart in accompanying materials best practice guide to help cataloguers.*

See our response to **Issue 1**.

**Issue 3: Consider how to revise RDA to resolve inconsistencies in defining the 'resource itself' (see Mode of Issuance, Carrier Type, & Colour Content).**

*Delete parenthetical instruction 'or any accompanying material or container' throughout RDA.*

ACOC agrees that this phrase is probably not necessary.

*Evaluate the use of the terms 'resource' and 'the resource itself' to ensure that the different concepts are not conflated in the RDA text.*

ACOC agrees

**Issue 4: Consider accompanying material in relation to the Mode of Issuance (RDA 2.13.1.2): does the presence of accompanying material require describing the resource as a multipart monograph? If not, how can the carrier of the accompanying material be described?**

*Evaluate the relationship between mode of issuance and an analytic description of a single part.*

ACOC is unsure that mode of issuance is relevant to this discussion as we do not believe that RDA is requiring that resources with accompanying material be described as a multi-part monograph.

*Add examples to the definition of 'multi-part monograph' in Table 2.1 in RDA 2.13.1.3 to demonstrate that multi-part monograph includes logical units.*

ACOC does not think this is necessary because we do think the definition implies that the part suggests *physical* separation. Also, if resources with accompanying material, or multipart resources are considered as aggregates, whether the parts or physically separate or logically separate is immaterial.

However, we are happy for an example to be added if it is considered helpful.

**Issue 5: Investigate how RDA should distinguish between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph.**

Rather than considering accompanying material in relation to mode of issuance, ACOC considers this the more relevant issue. That is, it needs to be made clear that a resource with accompanying material is different from a resource issued in parts. However, although we agree to expanding the scope of 3.1.4 as suggested, we are not sure how this addresses the distinction between multi-part resources and resources with accompanying material.

**Issue 6: Investigate the distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material.**

*To RDA communities: develop a workflows aid or best practice guide.*

See our response to **Issue 1**.

**Issue 7: Consider how extent of accompanying material of the same carrier type should be recorded.**

ACOC supports the broadening and clarification of instructions and examples at 3.4.1.3 as suggested.