TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative  

LC’s response to the draft of revised Chapter 3 is presented in two parts: a section on topics in the cover letter to the draft, and a section on specific instructions given in the numeric order of those instructions.

Cover letter questions:

Punctuation within elements: LC has no strong opinion and will defer to the majority opinion.

Square brackets: LC reaffirms its earlier position (i.e., to explain the information as in “44 unnumbered pages” rather than say “[44 pages]”) and waits for other constituencies to respond.

Use of term “volume”: LC agrees.

Media type: If this element is optional and if clarification is given for the use of coding or terms, LC would not object to the inclusion of this element in RDA. LC is interested to see how this element could be mapped clearly to MARC 21.

Early printed resources: LC agrees to the revisions.

Cartographic materials: General comment on the use of “maps, etc.” LC’s understanding of its use in chapters 3 & 4 is that it is referring to two-dimensional cartographic images on sheets (a carrier, as discussed at the bottom of page 10 of the cover letter to the top of p. 11) rather than cartographic materials in general. If so, LC does not recommend substituting either the term “cartographic unit” or “logical unit” for “maps, etc.” If the term “maps, etc.” is to be used, however, a clear definition of its meaning is needed, including maps, diagrams, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views. The term “cartographic images” as defined in chapter 4 table 1 could be used instead, if the definition is not intended to include atlases but only map(s) etc. on sheets.
3.5.0.4: LC thinks that the dimensions should be those of the cassette, not of the uncut fiche in the cassette.

3.5.1.0: The application can be limited to maps, etc., on sheets, as long as references are made to the instructions for recording the dimensions of other cartographic materials: globes (3.5.0.4.1m.3), atlases (3.5.0.4.1n.1), models (3.5.0.4.1m.1), digital, etc.

3.5.1.1: LC recommends adding instructions to cover two or more maps on one sheet, as well as collections (sets) of maps. Current practice, which seems to satisfy our constituencies, is to record separately the dimensions of up to two differently sized maps and two differently sized sheets. LC notes that similar situations would also occur for still images. Suggested instructions with wording appropriate to maps is given below but could be generalized:

**Two maps on one sheet**
Record the height x width or diameter as described in 3.5.1.1.1 for both maps. Record the height and width of the sheet.

34 x 45 cm and 22 x 30 cm, sheet 47 x 80 cm

each 20 x 32 cm, sheet 60 x 70 cm

**More than two maps on one sheet**
Record the greatest height x width or diameter as described in 3.5.1.1.1 of all the maps on the sheets. Record the height and width of the sheet.

15 x 22 cm or smaller, sheet 84 x 62 cm

each 15 x 15 cm, sheet 103 x 54 cm

**More than two maps on two or more sheets**
Record the greatest height x width or diameter as described in 3.5.1.1.1 of all the maps on the sheets. Record the greatest height and width of the sheets.

88 x 62 cm or smaller, on sheets 101 x 78 cm or smaller

54 x 48 cm or smaller, on sheets 60 x 54 cm

3.5.2.0: LC agrees to expand this instruction to apply to other resources.

3.5.3.3: LC asks if the alternative at 3.5.0.3.2 applies here for notes at 3.5.3.3.2. LC’s expert on moving images says that the practice for videotape is to measure it only in playing time. There was strong support in the comments on the AMIM2 drafts for including duration for both film (except for silent film) and video and including footage
for film, not video. The following is from AMIM2 (2000): “Record in arabic numerals the running time of a film or video in minutes (rounded up to the nearest minute). For film, follow the running time with the length in feet... Optionally, record running time in minutes and seconds. Optionally, record either running time or footage for film.” If JSC accepts this wording for RDA, “arabic numerals” should be changed to “Western-style arabic numerals.”

3.12.0.3.1: LC recommends adding “colourized” to the list in 3.12.0.3.1 for colourized motion pictures and any other colourized manifestation. However, if “colourized” applies only to a motion picture, LC recommends instead adding an instruction about “colourized” to 3.12.0.5 to avoid cataloguers having to consider if the term is appropriate for another resource.

We note that in AACR2, the definition of “Coloured illustration” is “An illustration containing any colour; black, white, and shades of grey are not to be considered colours.”

The current draft of RDA chapter 3 ignores grey. The draft says that black and white are colors but then says to ignore those two colors for most materials. In RDA chapter 3 draft:

3.12.0.1.1: “Colour indicates the presence of colour(s), tone(s), etc., in the content of a resource.”
3.12.0.1.2: “Colour may also indicate the specific colour(s), tone(s), etc., (including black and white) present in the content of a resource.”
3.12.0.3.1: “If the content of the resource is in colours other than black and white, record the presence of colour using an appropriate term from the list below …”
3.12.0.4.1: “For a resource consisting of a still image(s) (other than cartographic) in black and white, record black and white. If the resource is in one or two other colours …”
3.12.0.5.1: “For a resource consisting of moving images (other than cartographic) in black and white, record black and white. If the resource is in colour …”
3.12.0.6.1: “If a three-dimensional form is in black and white, record black and white. If the form is in one or two other colours …”

Should these not be corrected to reflect the most recent update we agreed to for AACR2?

**Draft of chapter 3:**

General comment on examples for still images: Many of the examples, including many that were originally supplied by LC, represent resources more likely to be held by specialized libraries rather than by general libraries using RDA. LC is suggesting in specific comments below the replacement of such examples with more general-category examples (e.g., 3.4.0.3.1c.1).

3.0.1: Purpose and Scope. This definition is not helpful because it doesn’t explain what
a carrier is even though RDA’s use of the word “carrier” is made-up library jargon. Alternative language might be: “The elements in this chapter describe characteristics of the carrier of the resource. A carrier holds or stores information and can be thought of as the media, format, container, or housing.”

3.0.2: This definition is not helpful because it repeats words instead of explaining them. Alternative language: “The elements convey information that helps users select a resource based on the physical characteristics that meet their needs, including the basic type of carrier (e.g., online resource or computer disc) and such features as extent, dimensions, colour, and encoding format. Users may also rely on information about a carrier in order to identify a resource by distinguishing between resources with similar characteristics.”

3.1.2 and 3.1.3: LC doesn’t think the second instruction referencing ch. 7 is needed.

3.1.4.1: LC asks that a sentence be added, because 3.4.0.11.1c.1 refers to 3.1.4, but a reference is lacking to 3.4.0.11: “To describe a collection consisting of more than one carrier, see 3.4.0.11 or apply one of the methods below.”

3.1.5.2: LC recommends the addition of another example to clarify the scope of online resources: “1 online resource (1 image file)”

3.1.6.2a.1: Typo: reference should be to 3.21.0.3.1a.1.

3.1.6.2b.1: Typo: reference should be to 3.21.0.3.1b.1.

3.1.6.2b.1: We don’t think such a note would be important for selection, because the note would be describing an earlier iteration no longer available for selection unless it were archived.

3.2.0: LC notes that the perspective/wording of sub-instructions is inconsistent (device in 3.2.0.1.1, type of media in 3.2.0.2.1, and carrier in 3.2.0.2.3): LC does not have a suggestion for 3.2.0.1.1 but does recommend changing the wording of the other two instructions:

3.2.0.2.1: Record the media type(s) using one or more of the terms …

3.2.0.2.3: If none of the terms listed above apply to the resource being described, record other.

3.4.0.1.1: LC recommends the following rewording to reflect what is found in the element (more than just a numeral): “Extent reflects the number and type of units and/or subunits making up a resource.”

3.4.0.3: As noted in specific comments below for sub-instructions 1b.1 and 1d.3 below, including examples of some situations here with what is essentially just a reference to a later instruction causes confusion; some readers think RDA is only covering the
situations illustrated in the examples. LC suggests removing examples from all the “Exception” instructions here and in other parts of chapter 3.

LC also asks if only 3.4.0.3.1 will be coded for the Concise view. Or will 3.4.1, 2.4.2, etc. (the instructions referred to in 3.4.0.3.1 Exceptions) also be coded for the Concise view?

3.4.0.3.1b.1: LC notes that the second example doesn’t illustrate the instruction because “24 parts” isn’t followed by the number of pages. If examples are retained (see 3.4.0.3 comment above), LC recommends replacing the second example with “1 choir book (240 pages)”.

3.4.0.3.1c.1: So that example is more representative of a general collection, LC recommends changing example “1 drawing” to “1 poster”

3.4.0.3.1d.3: The instruction here to give the number of volumes, etc., followed by the number of pages, etc., in parentheses seems to be contradicted by the instructions in 3.4.4.15.1 and 3.4.4.17.1 (only number of volumes) with optional addition in 3.4.4.17.2 to add pages and optional omission in 3.4.4.16.2 to omit paging for continuously paged volumes. LC suggests revising 3.4.0.3.1d.3 just to refer to the later instructions: “For a resource consisting of more than one volume, sheet, portfolio, or case, see 3.4.4.15-3.4.4.19” and delete the examples.

3.4.0.5.4: LC suggests that 3.22.0.3 for system requirements might not be the best instruction for addressing trade names. Perhaps trade names could be included in 3.4.6.11.1. Possible example: “Kodak Photo Disk”.

3.4.0.7: Because 3.4.0.8 addresses the situation of the number of subunits not being ascertainable and because 3.4.0.9.4 is an optional omission not to give subunits, modify 3.4.0.7 to add concepts of “if ascertainable” and “according to policy of the cataloguing agency.”

3.4.0.10: LC notes overlap between this instruction and parts of 3.4.4.15, 3.4.4.16-3.4.4.19. If 3.4.0.10 is for resources not yet complete and 3.4.4.15-3.4.4.19 is for complete resources, then there shouldn’t be references back and forth between them.

3.4.0.10.3: Does this optional addition apply to 3.4.0.10.1 and to 3.4.0.10.2?

3.4.0.10.4: The instruction here is a change from AACR2 chapter 12 rule (the addition of “loose-leaf” occurs only for “updating loose-leafs”). LC agrees with the change because the context here is format and not mode of issuance.

3.4.0.11.1a.1: LC recommends changing the middle example to confirm that words other than items and volumes can be used as extent. Suggested replacement: “approximately 400 postcards”.

3.4.0.11.1b.2: Shouldn’t the reference to appendix B appear earlier in chapter 3 or not at all because use of abbreviations is covered in chapter 1?
3.4.1.3: Is the preference for terms in 3.4.3.1. and in 3.4.5.1 appropriate when 3.4.3.1.3 and 3.4.5.1.3 allow other terms?

3.4.0.12.1: LC recommends deleting words “or other.”

3.4.2.1.2a.1: LC notes that there continues to be confusion with the use of the term “Exceptions” in RDA. Many readers understand that term to mean that RDA says the situations are exceptional (i.e., not normal situations); some understand the term in its pejorative sense. This specific situation of a resource consisting of a score and a set of parts is a very common situation. It is not clear to some music catalogers that the RDA exceptions are really amplifications of the preceding instruction.

LC asks if the term, “Exceptions,” just can be deleted here. It doesn’t have its own instruction number and so can’t be referred to in any general way in training, etc. LC recommends that the use of the term be re-examined to see if its use elsewhere in RDA adds value or could be omitted. (For example, in 3.12.0.3.1, the instructions after the “Exceptions” term are really pointers to detailed instructions elsewhere.)

LC also asks about the coding of “Exceptions” for the Concise view. If the instruction at 3.4.2.1.2a.1 isn’t coded for the Concise view, this basic instruction for a very common situation will be lacking.

3.4.4.1.1: The instruction in e) contradicts 3.4.4.2.1 which allows “1 volume (unpaged).” Perhaps e) should just refer to 3.4.4.2.

3.4.4.16.2: The wording “resource issued in successive parts” should be changed to “multipart monographs and serials.”

3.4.4.20: Because this instruction is only a reference, LC recommends moving the instructions in 3.4.0.6 to 3.4.4.20 and deleting 3.4.0.6.

3.4.5.2.3: Does this option apply only to 3.4.5.2.2 or also to 3.4.5.2.1? LC also doesn’t understand why giving a note is labeled as an optional addition instead of just being an instruction.

3.4.6.10.1: LC is confused by this example. It would be helpful if the explanation indicated what had been given in the extent element.

3.5.0.4.1c.3/3.5.0.4.1i.3: LC notes that the second example in each instruction lacks information on gauge as required by the second sentence in paragraph.

3.5.0.4.1k.1: For clarification, LC suggests rewording the first sentence to begin “For sheets other than maps, etc., and still images, record the height …”

3.5.0.6.6: Typo: “3.1.4b” should be “3.1.4.1b.1”
3.5.0.8.1a.1: In caption and in instruction, change “resource issued in successive parts” to “multipart monographs and serials.” Applies to other “change” instructions in the chapter.

3.5.0.8.1a.2: Typo: Reference should be to 3.5.3.4.1a.1.

3.5.0.8.1b.1: Typo: Reference should be to 3.5.3.4.1b.1.

3.5.1.1.1: Is it necessary to specify giving measurements in centimeters when that is the general instruction in 3.5.0.3.1?

3.5.1.1.2: LC suggests adding “printed” to wording: “For early printed and manuscript sheet maps…”

3.5.2.0.2 and 3.5.2.0.3: Shouldn’t these two instructions be reversed? Current 3.5.2.0.3 is about sheets as is 3.5.2.0.1.

3.5.2.1.1: Is it necessary to specify giving measurements in centimeters when that is the general instruction in 3.5.0.3.1?

3.5.2.2.1: LC recommends removing the example “6 cm in diameter, plate mark 8 x 7 cm, on sheet 24 x 17” because RDA doesn’t give enough guidance on what a plate mark, etc., is to help people construct such a detailed technical description. It is better to leave that kind of specialized description to specialized manuals.

Also, LC recommends adding the word “image” to the first example to be explicit about what both dimensions refer to. The remaining example would then appear as follows:

“image 20 x 31 cm, on sheet 42 x 50 cm”

3.6.0.3.2/3.6.0.4: LC recommends giving the instruction for microfilm, microfiche, and motion picture film in 3.6.0.3 instead of in a separate instruction. LC notes that this same situation of only one exception with a separate instruction occurs in other parts of chapter 3 (e.g., 3.7.0.3)

LC notes that the possibility of any other term (3.6.0.3.3) is lacking in 3.6.0.4.

3.7.0.3: LC suggests that “pencil” is a production method and “graphite” or “lead” is the applied material. (See CCO use of “pen” as a technique and “ink” as the material, 3.2.2.2.3.)

3.7.1.3.1: LC recommends keeping only the example “Collage of photographic prints…” The other examples would be written by catalogers who would need a lot more guidance than RDA provides to construct such specialized, technical descriptions. (Such guidance would be specialized library manuals for rare materials or in CCO.)
3.10.1.3.1: LC suggests the following example:

“copy print”
(Generation of a photographic print)

3.11.0.4.1: LC suggests deleting this instruction because there are only two terms and those terms are included in the next two specific instructions.

3.11.0.4.2: LC suggests removing the word “printed” as there is no reason that manuscript maps (cartographic images) can’t use the term “both sides.” LC also recommends changing one of the examples to refer to a manuscript map.

3.11.0.5, caption and instruction: LC recommends changing term from “tactile music” to “tactile notated music” to be consistent with “notated music” terminology elsewhere.

3.12.0.3.5: Because LC assumes the optional addition applies to 3.12.0.3.1 and not to 3.12.0.3.4, LC recommends that the option be moved to a position preceding 3.12.0.3.2. LC notes that other options (e.g., 3.4.0.7.1e.3 and 3.4.0.9.4) have their own numbering.

   LC also asks if the distinction between instructions for manifestations and for items (e.g., this optional addition) should be made explicit in chapter 3 as has been done in other chapters.

3.14.0.3: LC notes that this instruction has a closed list in 3.14.0.3.1 and lacks the “If none of the terms listed above …” wording present in other instructions. LC recommends adding the “If none of the terms …” wording to allow for other possibilities (“clear print” is another possibility discussed recently in Autocat messages).

3.15.1.3.1: LC recommends replacing the example because glass is the base material.

3.16.0.1.2: LC notes that there isn’t an instruction in 3.16.0 to give only a specific ratio even though this instruction says to express it as a range and/or as a specific ratio.

3.17.0.6: Should there be an instruction about using another term if the terms for groove width and groove pitch are not appropriate?

4.2.0.2: Seeing the table in this instruction labeled as Table 1 raises the issue of naming the tables in one sequence of numbering to make their names unique. May want to have a separate listing of tables in the table of contents or in the index. Another possibility would be to use the instruction number as the name of the table (e.g., “Table for 4.2.0.2”); doing so would confirm that the table applies to the whole instruction and not to the alternative under which it appears.

   Definition of “cartographic content” should include the concept of imaginary places (included in AACR2 glossary entry); also see LC’s comment for the Glossary below.

   Spoken word: Because this term can connote performance genres, LC suggests
adding “interviews” and “oral histories” to the “e.g.” list.

4.9.0.3.2: LC asks if this should be an alternative as well as an optional addition.

4.12.1.4.1: LC is confused by this example of a note. It would be helpful if the explanation indicated what had been given in the duration element. The information in the example is the same as that in 3.4.6.10 but in different order. Would someone think both notes should be given?

Glossary:

General comments:

Several terms are in adjectival form but the definitions begin with a noun: Audio (media), cartographic (content), digital (media), microscopic (media), online (digital resource), stereographic (media), unmediated (media). LC suggests changing the term to include the noun. Also, should “media” be “medium”?

Several definitions use wording “open reel” (audio film reel, audiotape reel, computer tape reel, microfilm reel, videotape reel). There is an entry for “reel” but not for “open reel.”

Will there be references between separate-word and compound-word entries? Such would be especially helpful when some terms beginning with the same word are compounds and others are not: e.g., audio disc vs. audiocassette; film cartridge vs. filmstrip.

Cartographic: LC recommends revising the definition to encompass maps of imaginary places (included in AACR2 glossary entry). Suggested revision: “Content representing, graphically or in three dimensions, the whole or part of the Earth, celestial bodies, or imagined places at any scale.”

Disc: Seeing this entry/definition, which doesn’t specify how the data is encoded, causes us to think that the distinction in AACR2 between “disc” and “disk” is no longer going to be made. True? If so, LC missed the decision or was the change part of the ONIX discussion?

Film cartridge, Film cassette, Film reel, Microfiche cassette, Microfilm cartridge, Microfilm cassette, Microfilm reel, Videotape reel: These all include “a length of film” wording that duplicates the same wording in the definition of Cartridge, Cassette, Reel. LC suggests deleting that repetitive wording. Not included in definition for Video cartridge and Videocassette.

Filmslip: This definition doesn’t include “cut from a roll” which is present in the definition of Microfilm slip.

Notated movement, Notated music: LC suggests not using “notational” within the definition; otherwise, the only “defining” happening in these definitions is information
about the intent to be perceived visually.

Roll: Does this definition cover more than piano rolls? LC doubts anyone would call a “wire spool” a “roll.”

Sheet: Is “usually rectangular in shape” necessary? LC suggests deleting it.

Video cartridge, Videocassette, Video tape: Do these definitions need wording “with or without sound” as given for Videodisc?

Videodisc: LC suggests rewording to be more consistent with other definitions: “A disc containing video signals, with or without sound.”

Volume: LC suggests rewording to solve problems we still see in the definition (also, whether it is trimmed or not doesn’t seem pertinent): “One or more sheets intended to constitute a single unit, most often fastened or encased together.”