To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: New Chapter 3 elements for Optical Disc Data Storage Format and Optical Disc Recording Method

CCC thanks the American Library Association for this proposal. CCC cautiously supports the changes in this proposal with some suggestions.

The CCC representative's recollection of the discussion of 6JSC/ALA/16 includes the intent that specialist communities would take the initiative to develop and maintain their own specialized vocabularies external to RDA. Such a scenario takes advantage of the specialist knowledge in those communities without demanding the scrutiny of the reviewers in the JSC constituencies.

We note that the PREMIS Data Dictionary for Preservation Metadata, a specialist metadata schema, did not include specialized vocabularies within its standard for the storageMedium element.
http://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/v3/premis-3-0-datadictionary-only.pdf
Page 10:

> **Technical metadata:** Technical metadata describes the physical rather than intellectual characteristics of digital objects. Detailed, format-specific technical metadata is clearly necessary for implementing most preservation strategies, but the group had neither the time nor the expertise to tackle format-specific technical metadata for various types of digital files. Therefore, it restricted the technical metadata included in the Data Dictionary to the semantic units it believed apply to objects in all formats. Further development of technical metadata is left to format experts. An extensibility mechanism is provided by including the semantic unit *objectCharacteristicsExtension*, which may be used with an external technical metadata scheme.

> **Media details**: The working group did not attempt to define metadata for detailed documentation of media. For example, PREMIS defines a semantic unit for identifying the medium on which an object is stored. A preservation repository will probably want to know more detailed information about the media employed. If the repository stores data on DVDs, for example, it may need to know the specific technical characteristics of the specific DVD units, such as manufacturer, dye material, and dye thickness. PREMIS leaves the definition of metadata for describing media characteristics to specialists in these areas.

We also note that the Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary Project has developed a list for physical instantiation element but they have not gone to the level of detail proposed by OLAC.
http://pbcore.org/pbcoreinstantiation/instantiationphysical/

The PREMIS Data Dictionary also refers to a vocabulary establised in id.loc.gov for storage medium. This vocabulary has also not developed the encoding format and storage medium to the extent currently proposed.
http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/preservation/storageMedium.html

The PREMIS, PBcore and LC Storage Medium lists do not go into as much detail as proposed by OLAC raising the question of whether this level of detail is truly required in RDA, whether the fine distinctions will be widely understood and correctly implemented.

This behooves the question, if communities of preservation specialists have chosen not to develop specialized vocabularies in their specialist metadata schemae, why should specialized preservation vocabularies be added to the general description RDA? Is the utility of RDA data improved if RDA descriptions are not compatible with data created using other schemae, when other communities might have drawn the distinction between encoding format, storage medium and production method differently?

Change no. 1
CCC notes the similarities between the proposed vocabulary for optical disc storage format and the existing list for encoding format RDA 3.19 could possibly be confusing for generalist cataloguers.
CCC prefers that the optical disc data storage format instruction be added as a new section in 3.19. Given that the new instruction reflects the "data" storage format (not the physical format) it is within the scope of 3.19. Otherwise, the new instruction could be worked into 3.20 Equipment and System Requirements, given that the intent is to inform users of specific equipment requirements. CCC does not agree with renumbering the current 3.22.

Change no. 2
CCC generally agrees but requests that the list of exceptions be given in alphabetical order. CCC does not agree with the structure that places the choice of "burned" or "stamped" as the main instruction, with the detailed list of specific types of burned discs as an alternative. Given the admission that it is unusual to develop a vocabulary for an alternative CCC suggests developing only one list containing "stamped" and all of the sub-types of burned discs. There is no need to include the term "burned."
CCC does not agree with developing a controlled vocabulary for an optional addition.

Change no. 3
CCC is reluctant to support the addition of a long list of new terms to the glossary. LAC staff involved in the translation of changes to the glossary have noticed wide inconsistencies in the style and structure of the current definitions. Ideally, a terminology specialist should be engaged to scrutinize, and standardize the style and structure of all existing and new definitions in the RDA glossary.
Short of that happening soon, CCC suggests the following:

Blu-ray
Do not specify the storage size.

Burned disc
If the CCC response to change no. 2 is accepted, this definition will not be required. Otherwise, CCC prefers using "writeable once" instead of "record once."

stamped disc
The final sentence can be replaced by references.