

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Alan Poulter, CILIP rep. to JSC

Subject: Revision to: Categorization of content and carrier RDA

The CILIP Rep thanks John Attig for raising important issues. My response is in two parts:

- 1) Response to the specific issues raised in 6JSC/ALA/Rep/1
- 2) Comments on the Revised Draft

Part 1: Response to the specific issues raised in 6JSC/ALA/Rep/1

- 1.1) Recommendation: The categorization document should be updated along the lines proposed in the following document. The details of the revisions are subject to constituency review.**

The CILIP Rep agrees with this recommendation.

- 1.2) Recommendation: The mapping of the RDA vocabularies to the RDA/ONIX Framework should be communicated to those working on the RDA Vocabulary registry, with the request that the mapping be incorporated into the registry.**

The CILIP Rep agrees with this recommendation.

- 1.3) Recommendation: Remove the RDA text and the Glossary from the Categorization document; revise the initial paragraphs as appropriate.**

The CILIP Rep agrees with this recommendation.

1.4) Projector. Question: Does the JSC agree that "projector" is sufficiently broad?

The CILIP rep agrees with LC that the existing definition is not sufficiently broad and suggests that the revised definition, proposed by the BL, removing the suggestion that the image to be projected requires a 'holder', broadens the definition adequately.

1.5) Volume. Question: Does the JSC agree that the mapping of 'volume' to RDA/ONIX Housing Format value 'not applicable' should be removed? Is the mapping otherwise adequate?

The CILIP rep agrees that it should be removed. More work on definitions is needed so that volumes and sheets can be better distinguished.

1.6) Object. Question: This suggests that a value for 'none of the above' should be proposed for addition to the values for the Storage Medium Format attribute? Does the JSC agree?

The CILIP rep disagrees. If the only value for Object as a Housing format is going to be 'Not Applicable', is it premature to introduce it?

1.7) Recommendations: The revised mapping specifications, along with the extensions to the Framework that they incorporate, should be communicated to the JSC's partners in the RDA/ONIX initiative, with recommendations for continued work on implementation, refinement and extension of the Framework.

The CILIP rep agrees that more work on the RDA/ONIX Framework is needed and a framework for this work needs to be established.

Part 2: Comments on the proposed draft

2.1) Page 6: RDA Media Type

The CILIP rep is inclined to agree with LC's comment (b7) regarding this table. Digital media (video, sound, text etc) are all identical: patterns of bytes on a medium, interpreted as 'media' by software. Any computing device with sound and video cards, with the right software, can play any digital media. Analogue media (video cassettes, cassette tapes etc) are all different in both device and recording formats. Nothing can play every format in any one medium, let alone them all. Thus I prefer 'Digital' as the Media Type and 'Computer' as the Carrier, as this represents the openness of digital media and their single playing device.

However, 'Computer' seems an ever more old-fashioned term, as computers turn into small, portable devices. Maybe 'Digital Device' as a Carrier might be a better pairing with 'Digital' as a Media Type?

It makes no sense to link 'audio' with 'audio player' but 'video' with 'computer' and not 'video player'. Video still exists in quantity for analogue formats like VHS. I assume this is a mistake.

2.2) Page 7: RDA Carrier Type

The CILIP rep is inclined to agree with the LC comment (b9) on this table regarding Playaways. There is a class of digital device which uses proprietary software and formats to isolate its content from the native universality of digital content. Another example would be Amazon's 'Kindle'. Devices like this will need enumerating as Intermediation Tools.
