

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

**From:** Gordon Dunsire, CILIP Representative

**Subject:** Revision of RDA 3.19.3 for video encoding formats and addition of a new element for optical disc characteristics

CILIP thanks ALA for its proposed revision.

CILIP does not agree with the proposal.

CILIP welcomes the proposal to amend terms in the Video Format vocabulary to reflect official names, but would like to see further development of the vocabulary to improve consistency and coherency.

CILIP is unsure of the implications of “the data elements in this category refer to specific application formats”. The category is a sub-category of the RDA/ONIX Framework carrier attribute EncodingFormat, which is defined as “A schema, standard, etc., used to encode the content of a resource”. This is a different attribute than “IntermediationTool”, which is the basis for the RDA carrier type categories such as “computer carriers” and “video carriers”. The Framework notes “User defined sub-values may be used to identify a specific type, brand, model, release, etc., of an intermediation tool”.

CILIP suggests that RDA can better accommodate the rationale of the paper by developing sub-values of the intermediation tool vocabulary within the RDA/ONIX Framework, directly or via the RDA Media Type vocabulary (which is based on the intermediation tool vocabulary).

CILIP does not agree that the term “video” needs to be applied as proposed: the terms are in a vocabulary with “video” in its name.

For example, the term “Blu-ray video” searched in Google shows that “video” is not used in formal references; rather, it should be “Blu-ray”. This would also make it more coherent with “QuickTime”, which is preferred in formal references to “QuickTime video”. Another example is “HD-DVD video”: Wikipedia has this as “HD DVD video”, and says “HD DVD video can be encoded using VC-1, AVC, or MPEG-2”. The Wikipedia entry on Flash video

states “There are two different video file formats known as Flash Video: FLV and F4V ... F4V file format is based on the ISO base media file format and is starting with Flash Player 9 update 3 ... Both formats are supported in Adobe Flash Player”. CILIPS asks if “Blu-ray 3D”, which requires different playback software, is intended to be covered by “Blu-ray video”.

This further suggests that the granularity of the terms in the Video Format vocabulary should be reviewed with the aim of improving consistency.

CILIP has more general concerns about the categorization of RDA encoding formats, including the statement that “Some formats (e.g., XML) apply to more than one category”. This suggests the need for more hierarchy in the categories.

CILIP recognizes the need for better distinction of optical disc carriers, but has concerns about the proposed element for Optical Disc Characteristic. It appears to be an aggregated statement composed of sub-elements for Optical Disc Storage Medium and Optical Disc Recording Type, but there is no indication of how the sub-elements are delimited in the statement; that is, there are no examples with ISBD punctuation. This inhibits machine-actionability.

Also, the sub-elements are not represented such. If these are not sub-elements, then machine-actionable alignment of the proposed vocabularies with neither the RDA element set nor the RDA/ONIX Framework is straightforward. Optical Disc Storage Medium should be a vocabulary of sub-values of the Framework StorageMediumFormat “disc”, and should be much narrower in scope than the proposed definition, relating only to the physical layout of pits, etc. Other aspects of the definition, such as laser wavelength, are properly associated with the Framework’s IntermediationTool attribute. Optical Disc Recording Type conflates multiple Framework attributes. For example, recordable discs which use a dye to infix the content are associated with the Framework’s AppliedMaterial (the dye), FixationMethod (heating), and FixationTool (laser of a specified wavelength).