

**To:** RDA Steering Committee  
**From:** Dave Reser, LC Representative  
**Subject:** Discussion paper: Accompanying material in RDA

Congratulations to the joint working group for the fine analysis provided, and for a model for a cross-community joint venture that will be useful in the future. We note that some of the future work proposed may have an impact on the work of the RSC Aggregates Working Group.

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

**LC response:** We agree with the working group's analysis.

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

**LC response:** We agree with the group that the phrase "accompanying material" has likely outlived its usefulness as a term, and that terms such as "predominant" and "secondary" would be more useful. The group may also wish to look at the *ISBD Guidelines for the application of the ISBDs to the description of Component Parts* (available at <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/component-parts.pdf>) for additional vocabulary possibilities. We continue to see the need to define the two separate concepts in RDA, 1) current concept of "accompanying material" of physical resources as used in chapters 2-3, and 2) the concept of related works, expressions, manifestations, and items in chapters 25-28 and appendix J. We hope that any definitions that evolve respect this distinction, thus we are not comfortable with the group's proposed "working definition" which seems to mix the two concepts between the first and second sentence. The first sentence is a good start for defining the context in chapters 2-3, although we note that the concept of "comprehensive description" should be included in the definition; there is no concept of "accompanying material" in an analytic description other than as a relationship.

RDA also has the concept of "supplementary content" and "primary content" in instructions in Chapter 7 that might need to be reviewed in the context of any changes here as well.

We agree that there are additional adjustments needed for other terms used in RDA, and feel that these changes complement the overall work on glossary and vocabulary terms.

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

**LC response:** We agree that further clarification would be useful between RDA's use of "resource" and "resource itself," and that simplification of some "source of information" instructions could be made. For source instructions that do not require a hierarchical "in

this order” approach, it may be possible to simplify even further, such as “Take evidence from any source” rather than merely removing the parenthetical “(or on any accompanying material or container)”.

- 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?**

**LC response:** We agree that the current relationship between “mode of issuance” and the type of description desired (comprehensive vs. analytical) could be misinterpreted. Including the concept of type of description in the instructions at 2.13 should solve this problem.

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

**LC response:** We agree that the instructions at 3.1.4 and 3.4.1.3 should be adjusted to allow for describing predominant and secondary carriers separately, even when they have the same carrier type.

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

**LC response:** We agree with the analysis.

- 7. Consider how extent of accompanying material of the same carrier type should be recorded: when is the extent recorded as a single statement (such as “2 volumes”) and when it should be in separate statements (such as “XX pages ...” and 1 [name of secondary carrier] (XX pages))”? How should RDA be revised to support these various options?**

**LC response:** We agree that the instructions should provide for additional flexibility if parts of the resource are deemed predominant or secondary. We look forward to additional proposals.