

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

SUBJECT: Rule revision proposals relating to technical description of digital media

CILIP has found it difficult to review this document. With so much work still ongoing in connection with chapter 3, the likely context isn't always certain and the end result sometimes far from clear. However, CILIP is generally supportive of the objectives outlined by ALA.

General recommendation on extent (3.4). CILIP notes that ALA is suggesting that treating file format, size and duration as independent elements within the technical description would be "an equally valid approach". So far as file format is concerned, CILIP believes that this would be a far preferable route to consider. CILIP does not believe that format is an aspect of extent.

The classification of these additional elements is also likely to impact on display. CILIP agrees with ALA's observation that these attributes are significant factors for users in selecting a manifestation. Whatever solution is finally adopted needs to allow system designers etc. the freedom to choose which aspects to highlight to users. Some CILIP members, for example, would have preferred some way of elevating the fact that a resource was available as a PDF to precede the number and type of subunits. Treating them as independent elements would be more supportive of such a preference.

3.4.0.11. File size. If the proposed 3.4.0.10 were retained, then both file format and file size are then to be recorded "following the number of units". It is unclear, if both are present (which they will usually be), which should come first. Additionally, there seems to be little practical difference between this instruction and that at 3.4.4.1.

3.6.13.9. Other technical details of digital resources. Although only tangential to ALA's proposal, CILIP wonders whether information about the particular version of the software used in creating a digital object (e.g. Word 2000) is expected to be recorded here? Other possibilities seem to include 3.6.12 (if ALA's proposal to delete this were not approved by JSC) and ALA's proposed new 3.4.0.10. It may be that there is no need for specific wording in the relevant instructions to be included, and that a suitable example will suffice.

3.9.0.4. System requirements for a digital resource. CILIP particularly welcomes this aspect of ALA's proposals, even though the first sentence seems to add nothing meaningful to what is expressed in the second (in this case saying the same thing twice might be no bad thing). In the second sentence, the third "for" is redundant.

Examples. CILIP had collected a number of observations about the examples included in the paper under review. In view of the likelihood that there may be significant changes to at least some of ALA's proposals, and that some of these examples may end up losing their *raison d'être*, these have not been submitted at this time but will be made available to the Examples Group should the need arise..