

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative

Subject: Revision to : Categorization of content and carrier

Thank you to John Attig for starting JSC's discussion on the much-needed revisions to this document. This response is in two parts:

1. Responses to the specific issues raised
2. Comment on the proposed draft.

1. Responses to the specific issues raised

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 ACOC 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 ACOC rep agrees with this recommendation. Should the RDA/ONIX Framework including the definitions also be incorporated as a separate tool in the RDA Toolkit?

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

The ACOC rep agrees with this recommendation

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

The ACOC rep notes the revised RDA/ONIX definition offered by BL, i.e. "An optical device containing a light source and lens system, for projecting an image on a screen or other surface." and prefers that definition.

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

Given the RDA definition of volume it would appear that either "binding" or "not applicable" may be valid values. Further discussion is needed to differentiate terms so that only one value for Housing format is appropriate in each case.

1.6 Question: Does the JSC agree (that a value for “none of the above” should be proposed for addition to the values for the Storage Medium Format attribute.)

The definition of Storage Medium Format, i.e. “The physical form of the material on which the content of the resource is stored.” seems to be applicable therefore a category for “other” or “none of the above” should be added. It should be possible to add additional specific values to Storage Medium Format over time with the agreement on the ONIX community. However, we will need to avoid overlap with RDA’s Base Material.

1.7 Recommendation: 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 ACOC rep agrees with this recommendation.

2. Comments on the proposed draft

Alignment with the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization

Para on qualified categories:

It would helpful to have an explanation of the addition “or categories constructed by using values of attributes for which there are no primary values specified in the Framework to qualify an RDA/ONIX Base Category).” and/or some examples of where this applies.

Use of Proposed:

The word “proposed’ is used several times in this section, presumably to cover instances where the JSC has made changes after August 2006 that have not yet been taken to the ONIX community for discussion. This could be made clearer in this document.

Terminology

2nd para:

The first sentence requires re-wording for readability.

Tables

In reviewing this document I have assumed that the changes made to these tables do not introduce any new changes but simply and accurately reflect JSC’s decisions to date. If we are to re-visit any of these decisions then the normal JSC process of putting forward proposals should be employed.