

To: RDA Steering Committee
 From: Renate Behrens, Europe Region representative
 Subject: Accompanying material in RDA

EURIG - Editorial Committee thanks ALA for this discussion paper.

EURIG members and national committees submitted comments to the DNB wiki which were discussed by the Editorial Committee in series of web meetings during September.

General remarks

We generally agree with the recommendations to clarify this area, and we agree that more work is needed. The definition of accompanying material is welcome.

Some aspects are missing and have to be elaborated more in detail. For example there is a need for a more precisely definition of "predominant" and "secondary". As well as a distinction between "accompanying material" and "compilations" is necessary. Furthermore there is a need in the German-speaking community for the definition of the hierarchical description.

Some concern was expressed that the recommendations fall between two stools: in AACR2 this provided an efficiency by which the presence of a component could be noted without full analytical description. The recommendations don't provide a clear justification for this approach in RDA/FRBR terms, although we think that the four fold path approach may help with this.

Specific responses

	Recommendation	Comment
1	To RDA communities: Develop additional guidance about the choices between comprehensive vs. analytical description in light of accompanying materials. This could include an accompanying materials workflows in the RDA Toolkit, or an RDA accompanying materials best practice guide with examples and training materials.	Agree: although it is already open to communities to do this through the workflows.
2	Because the Joint Working Group believes that the term "accompanying material" has outlived its usefulness, we suggest using "predominant" and "secondary" (or "subordinate") to express the idea of what we currently call accompanying material.	Disagree: "accompanying material" is not actually defined, but it expresses a relationship between items or components of a resource. We are not persuaded that a simple textual substitution is sufficient. More work is needed to determine the scope of this relationship: does it only relate to the manifestation (the original intention)?

		Or does it, also relate to the work/expression? This is clearly implied by the proposed workflow and reference to augmentations.
3	Make a clear distinction between the concept of a resource having primary/secondary parts and what is addressed by J.4.5, Accompanying Manifestation Relationships	Agree: this is an important distinction.
4	Evaluate the use of the interrelated terms such as "unit," "part," and "component part." Revise the definitions for these concepts.	Agree
5	To RDA communities: Promote the increased use of accompanying material relationship designators as these offer increased flexibility when describing accompanying material. For example, use accompanying material relationship designators in examples in an accompanying materials best practice guide.	Agree
6	To RDA communities: Include an accompanying materials flowchart in accompanying materials best practice guide to help cataloguers.	Agree
7	Delete the parenthetical instruction "or on any accompanying material or container" throughout RDA.	Agree
8	Evaluate the use of the terms "resource" and "the resource itself" to ensure that these different concepts are not conflated in the RDA text.	Agree
9	Evaluate the relationship between mode of issuance and an analytical description of a single component part.	Agree
10	Add examples to the definition of "multipart monograph" in Table 2.1 in RDA 2.13.1.3 to demonstrate that a multipart monograph includes logical units.	Agree in principle
11	Consider how identifying predominant and accompanying parts can contribute to the analytical descriptions of multipart resources.	Agree
12	Adjust RDA 3.1.4 to be more general, allowing cataloguers to describe the extent of predominant and secondary carriers separately, even when they have the same carrier type.	Agree
13	Add examples to 3.1.4 and/or 3.4.1.3 to demonstrate the broadened instruction.	Agree in principle

14	To RDA communities: Develop a workflows aid or best practice guideline which could be included in the RDA Toolkit to guide a cataloguer through several questions to help determine what type of material the cataloguer holds in hand.	Agree: this could be a future task for the group.
15	Provide clarity in RDA by adding (or altering existing) instructions in 3.4.1.3 for recording accompanying material with the same carrier type as its predominant part.	Agree
16	Add several examples to 3.4.1.3 to demonstrate this instruction.	Agree