To: RDA Steering Committee

From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative, and
                Bill Leonard, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing Representative

Subject: Discussion paper: Accompanying material in RDA

Related documents: 6JSC/ALA/40, Revision to RDA 3.1.4, *Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type* and RDA 3.4.1.3, *Recording Extent*, and constituency responses.

ABSTRACT

This discussion paper, developed by a joint ALA/CCC working group, examines the current definitions of and instructions for accompanying material in RDA. The group identified 7 issues which merit further investigation and discussion; each is presented in a separate section which includes an analysis and recommendations for future action.

BACKGROUND

The ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (CCC) have worked together on the preparation of this discussion paper. The joint CC:DA Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA and the CCC Working Group on Accompanying Material in RDA (hereafter referred to as the "Joint Working Group") was formed in January 2016 with a mandate to examine the current definitions of and instructions for accompanying material in RDA and to suggest further action. The Joint Working Group had the overall goal of developing a discussion paper to be presented to the RDA Steering Committee in time for discussion at ALA Annual, June 23-28, 2016 and discussion by the CCC via conference call in mid-June.

Thank you to the 12 Joint Working Group members who did an outstanding job of efficiently working together within a tight time frame. The Joint Working Group members and original 8-point mandate can be found at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=2603

METHODOLOGY

This is the first time that two RSC communities have formally collaborated to produce an RDA discussion paper. We hope that this will serve as a model for future co-operation in line with the internationalization of RDA. The process of working together functioned smoothly and our methodology included the following:

- Each community identified group members using their existing processes.
  - For CC:DA, this entailed asking for volunteers who met the required CC:DA task force membership criteria and creating a charge specific to ALA.
  - For CCC, this entailed a call for volunteers from the Committee.
- A co-chair was selected from each community; they communicated before the first meeting to discuss how this group of 12 people, spread across two countries and three time zones, could work together efficiently.
- The co-chairs designed a work process which included:
  - 5 meetings held via conference calls, supported by Libraries and Archives Canada, to facilitate and enhance active discussion. (Meetings were held March 11 to May 9, 2016). Both co-chairs felt that working by email was not an efficient use of time and should be avoided – it is particularly inefficient for detailed cataloguing discussions.
  - Structured meetings chaired by each country on an alternating basis. The co-chair running the meeting made sure that all participants had an opportunity to speak, kept discussions on track, and summarized key ideas and points of agreement at the end of each agenda item. The other co-chair took meeting minutes "live" directly into Google drive.
  - Use of Google drive to share documents, agendas and meeting minutes. Drafts of this discussion paper were written and reviewed in Google drive using the comment and suggested edits functions.
  - Timeline for discussion topics and completion of key tasks. Each working group member was required to sign up for a minimum of two discussion topics. Those individuals prepared discussion points and posted them to Google drive two business days before each meeting. They also led the discussion on their topic during the conference call. Two topics were discussed at each meeting.
  - Use of the spelling "cataloguing" which is used by the RSC.
  - Reviewing the group's recommendations in light of the draft FRBR-LRM to ensure consistency with that model.

For future working groups of any kind (e.g., joint community groups, RSC task and finish groups), the Joint Working Group recommends that the membership include a mix of experts from different sectors as RDA is intended to be used by a variety of metadata communities. The Joint Working Group was predominantly drawn from academic libraries.

ISSUES UNDER DISCUSSION

1. *Analyze how the choice of analytic vs. comprehensive description (see RDA 1.5) affects the treatment of accompanying material.*

Selection of comprehensive vs. analytical description is a fundamental starting point when cataloguing resources with accompanying material.

- When cataloguers decide on a **comprehensive description**, they describe the resource as a whole, regardless of carrier or mode of issuance.
- When cataloguers decide on an **analytical description**, they select one component to describe, with the other parts treated as related resources which can be referenced / linked in an unstructured or structured manner. An analytical description can describe more than one component of the whole.

The group determined that RDA does not require further elaboration of the instructions for type of description. The current text supports various options, which are applied at the local level.

However, to assist cataloguers who seek additional guidance about these different descriptive choices in relation to accompanying material, RDA communities may choose to develop one or more of the following:

- Accompanying material workflows in the Toolkit's Tools tab.
- Accompanying material best practice guide with a set of examples of records using both comprehensive and analytical descriptions. RDA offers many interesting choices for describing accompanying material, and these could be fully explored in a best practice guide with examples. This is an effective way to encourage cataloguers to be more adventurous with their descriptions of accompanying materials and certainly more practical than trying to include directions in RDA.
- Accompanying materials training content such as PowerPoint slides for cataloguers to use.
- An explanation of the underlying theory and principles that guide decision-making around accompanying material.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- To RDA communities: Develop additional guidance about the choices between comprehensive vs. analytical description in light of accompanying materials. This could include an accompanying materials workflows in the RDA Toolkit, or an RDA accompanying materials best practice guide with examples and training materials.

2. *Evaluate the definition of accompanying material in RDA 2.2.4.*

After evaluating the current definitions of accompanying material both in RDA 2.2.4 and in Appendix J, the Joint Working Group identified the need to have a consistent working definition of accompanying material. The group agreed that "predominance" and "multiple component parts" are defining aspects of accompanying materials. From J.2.5 (Accompanying Work Relationships) it is clear that the *relationship* determines the treatment of accompanying material. Complicating matters is the fact that accompanying material is not always physically

separate and may be on the same carrier as the predominant part. During discussion, the alternative terms "augmented material" or "augmenting material" were suggested for parts in a resource intended to be used together.

For the purposes of the discussion, the group agreed on a working definition:

Accompanying material is a secondary part of a resource that contains multiple component parts, which may or may not be physically separate. The relationship is meant to be an augmentation of the predominant work.

The group observes that FRBR-LRM includes a work-to-work relationship, accompanies / complements (LRM-R22). Although this is presented as a single relationship, the scope notes distinguish between a complementary relationship, where the two works add value to each other, and an accompanying relationship, where one work is secondary to the other. The Joint Working Group recommends separating these into two distinct relationships in RDA. Such a division of relationships would also affect the description of manifestations with accompanying material, the primary focus of this discussion paper.

The Joint Working Group devised an accompanying materials flowchart (see Appendix) to represent a cataloguer's decision making process. The flowchart starts with the statement "*You have a resource (manifestation) which contains multiple component parts, which may or may not be physically separate*"….

The Joint Working Group observed that the idea of "accompanying material" came from AACR2 and ISBD, and has likely outlived its usefulness as a term. Using "predominant" and "secondary" (or possibly "subordinate") in RDA would provide a clearer focus for the choices affecting the description of these resources, although it would also remove the "physically separate" focus associated with this term in ISBD..

The Joint Working Group identified the following interrelated terms which may be used in ways which do not quite match their definitions, resulting in confusion:
- Unit
  - Physical constituent (RDA 3.4.1.1, RDA Glossary, "unit")
  - Physical unit ("a constituent of a tangible resource…" RDA Glossary)
  - Logical constituent (RDA 3.4.1.1, RDA Glossary, "unit")
  - Logical unit ("a constituent of an intangible resource…" RDA Glossary)
  - Part ("a formal component unit", RDA Glossary)
  - Component part ("a discrete unit of intellectual content within a larger resource", RDA Glossary)
- Tangible vs. intangible entities (RDA 1.1.2, 18.1.3)

Summary: recommendations for future action
- Because the Joint Working Group believes that the term "accompanying material" has outlived its usefulness, we suggest using "predominant" and "secondary" (or "subordinate") to express the idea of what we currently call accompanying material.
- Make a clear distinction between the concept of a resource having primary/secondary parts and what is addressed by J.4.5, Accompanying Manifestation Relationships.
- Evaluate the use of the interrelated terms such as "unit," "part," and "component part." Revise the definitions for these concepts.
- To RDA communities: Promote the increased use of accompanying material relationship designators as these offer increased flexibility when describing accompanying material. For example, use accompanying material relationship designators in examples in an accompanying materials best practice guide.
- To RDA communities: Include an accompanying materials flowchart in accompanying materials best practice guide to help cataloguers.

3. Consider how to revise RDA to resolve inconsistencies in defining the "resource itself" (see Mode of Issuance, Carrier Type, & Colour Content).

RDA currently uses the phrase "the resource itself" 153 times; 54 of those occurrences also include the parenthetical phrase "or on any accompanying material or container". The inclusion of the parenthetical phrase supports both comprehensive descriptions, where components are considered part of the "resource itself", and analytical descriptions, where accompanying material is considered outside the resource itself.

For example, see *Sources of Information* for Carrier Type (RDA 3.3.1.2):
> Use evidence presented by the resource itself (or on any accompanying material or container) as the basis for recording carrier type. Take additional evidence from any source.

Because all of these instructions include the sentence "Take additional evidence from any source.", there appears to be no reason to include the parenthetical, especially since its presence causes confusion. For comprehensive descriptions, the accompanying material is already considered part of the resource (RDA 2.2.2.1). For analytical descriptions, the accompanying material can simply be considered "any source".

The Joint Working Group further recommends an assessment of the differences between the terms "the resource itself" and "resource". These refer to two different things in RDA. The revised Glossary has the following entry for resource:
> A work, expression, manifestation or item. A resource can be an individual entity, an aggregate, or a component of such an entity. It can be a tangible or intangible entity.

"The resource itself" appears to be a subset of "resource", and is likely applicable only to the manifestation or item level. However, this is not defined in RDA. Specifically, the uses of this phrase in 7.25.3.2 and 7.29.2.2 should be evaluated.

The group observes that the section on carrier type already contains language concerning "predominant" and "substantial" parts of a resource which may be used as a model for future rewording.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- Delete the parenthetical instruction "or on any accompanying material or container" throughout RDA.
- Evaluate the use of the terms "resource" and "the resource itself" to ensure that these different concepts are not conflated in the RDA text.

4. *Consider accompanying material in relation to the Mode of Issuance (RDA 2.13.1.2): does the presence of accompanying material require describing the resource as a multipart monograph? If not, how can the carrier of the accompanying material be described?*

The Joint Working Group believes that further investigation should be undertaken into the connection between mode of issuance and the type of description used. For an analytical description, it makes little sense to name the mode of issuance as "multipart monograph" if only a single component is being described. However, this appears to be what RDA currently instructs.

The current concept of "accompanying material" can be applied to both carrier (physically separate) and content (intellectually separate). Any future revision to RDA should make clear distinctions between these two situations.

The RDA Glossary definition of a multipart monograph implies that the parts are physically separate. The Joint Working Group discussed a number of examples where the accompanying material is subordinate to the main content but is not physically separate. For example, a single DVD may contain the movie, along with other content such as trailers, interviews, "making of" documentary, etc. Depending on how cataloguers interpret "logical unit" in relation to DVDs, it could be difficult to clearly delineate the differences between accompanying carriers and accompanying content in such a case.

The group observes that serials and integrating resources can have accompanying material as well. For example:

> **Serials** include supplements or indexes to a journal. For example, according to Wikipedia, the print serial *Guitar World* "began selling some issues of the magazine with CD-ROMs containing video lessons, gear demonstrations and other self-produced and third-party content." (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guitar_World)

Integrating resources: *Integrating Resources: A Cataloging Manual* (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/irman.pdf) gives several examples of accompanying material, such as: a CD-ROM accompanied by supplementary pamphlets, unnumbered newsletter, and a reference file (page 69); a print manual accompanying an online integrating resource (page 86); and an updating loose-leaf with CD-ROM (page 130).

Finally, analytical descriptions that identify more than one component part may make distinctions between predominant and accompanying parts. The group recognizes that public libraries often have to circulate complex multipart resources separately, while making decisions about predominant and accompanying parts. For example, a multipart DVD set of a season of a TV show may come with a booklet that applies to the entire set.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- Evaluate the relationship between mode of issuance and an analytical description of a single component part.
- Add examples to the definition of "multipart monograph" in Table 2.1 in RDA 2.13.1.3 to demonstrate that a multipart monograph includes logical units.
- Consider how identifying predominant and accompanying parts can contribute to the analytical descriptions of multipart resources.

5. ***Investigate how RDA should distinguish between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph.***

The Joint Working Group evaluated how RDA distinguishes between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph. Comparing the RDA Glossary definition of *multipart monograph* against the group's working definition of *accompanying materials*, we agreed that these definitions and instructions remain distinct from one another.

However, the restriction in RDA 3.1.4 to "resources consisting of more than one carrier type" means that RDA lacks guidance for describing predominant and secondary parts which have the same carrier type. The group recommends revising 3.1.4 to accommodate all types of accompanying material. In addition, we suggest adding an example that shows a multipart monograph with accompanying material. See the examples in Issue #7 for potential examples. If changes are made here, supporting changes will be needed in 3.4.1.3. (See Issue #7.)

Overall, we agreed that the distinction between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph is largely up to cataloguer's judgment, and is often made before the cataloguer even consults RDA.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- Adjust RDA 3.1.4 to be more general, allowing cataloguers to describe the extent of predominant and secondary carriers separately, even when they have the same carrier type.
- Add examples to 3.1.4 and/or 3.4.1.3 to demonstrate the broadened instruction.

6. **Investigate the distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material.**

The Joint Working Group could not find a well-defined distinction within RDA between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material and concluded that this is a distinction without a difference.

RDA does not currently address the idea of "predominance" for accompanying materials. Although Appendix J.4.5 (Accompanying Manifestation Relationships) provides a definition of *accompanied by*, this appears to be a different concept:

> *accompanied by* (manifestation) A manifestation issued with another manifestation, without any relationship to its content. Reciprocal relationship: *accompanied by* (manifestation)

The Joint Working Group feels that the distinction between predominant and non-predominant (or secondary) carriers is important when first dealing with a resource and determining what it is and how to handle its description, including answering the question of if it even needs to be described at all.

The group's discussion of this topic helped inform the recommendations in Issue #2.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- To RDA communities: Develop a workflows aid or best practice guideline which could be included in the RDA Toolkit to guide a cataloguer through several questions to help determine what type of material the cataloguer holds in hand.

7. **Consider how extent of accompanying material of the same carrier type should be recorded: when is the extent recorded as a single statement (such as "2 volumes") and when it should be in separate statements (such as "XX pages …" and 1 [name of secondary carrier] (XX pages)")? How should RDA be revised to support these various options?**

Overall, the Joint Working Group felt that RDA provides sufficient instructions to allow the cataloguer to choose the description that best fits the resource: a collective description that records extent as a single statement vs. creating multiple extent statements for separate carriers. However, the Joint Working Group suggests making these choices clearer in RDA.

First, the Joint Working Group suggests expanding RDA 3.4.1.3 to encompass describing resources with accompanying material that has the *same* carrier type as the predominant part. This is related to Issue #5. The if/then paragraph in this instruction currently only addresses different carrier types. By broadening this text, cataloguers will have more flexibility to describe the extent of the resource in a way that best fits the circumstances.

Second, to support the broadened instruction, the Joint Working Group recommends replacing several examples in RDA 3.4.1.3 to show resources with more than one unit with the same carrier type. The final two columns in the examples below include the application of 3.4.1.3 Alternative b, to use an alternative term for the carrier preferred by the agency preparing the description.

Resource	Described as Single carrier	Described as multiple carriers of the same type	ISBD
Multi-volume set with separate index volume	8 volumes	7 volumes 1 volume (62 pages)	7 volumes + 1 volume (62 pages)
DVD set; 1 DVD contains bonus clips	3 videodiscs	2 videodiscs 1 videodisc	2 videodiscs + 1 videodisc
eBook with supplemental file	2 online resources	1 online resource (xi, 324 pages) 1 online resource (1 video file)	1 online resource (xi, 324 pages) + 1 online resource (1 video file)
CD-ROM set (video presentation + PDF of slides)	2 computer discs	1 computer disc (1 video file) 1 computer disc (30 pages)	1 computer disc (1 video file) + 1 computer disc (30 pages)

Summary: recommendations for future action
- Provide clarity in RDA by adding (or altering existing) instructions in 3.4.1.3 for recording accompanying material with the same carrier type as its predominant part.
- Add several examples to 3.4.1.3 to demonstrate this instruction.

DEFERRED ISSUE

Provide additional guidelines, where appropriate, for bilingual publications with accompanying material to support Canada's identity as a bilingual country.

The CCC Working Group was specifically asked to investigate this issue. However, after some discussion, the CCC members decided that the need for such guidelines is primarily a local policy decision and did not need to be included in this discussion paper

However, during our review of this topic, members of the Joint Working Group wondered if this issue would be of interest to other national libraries which have multilingual resources and users. CCC would be willing to work with others (such as the National Library of Catalonia, the National Library of Wales, the National Library of New Zealand, the National Library of Israel, and the Royal Library of Belgium) on this topic in the future.

We are looking forward to further technological developments that facilitate description of resources and delivery of services in a multilingual setting.

CONCLUSION

The Joint Working Group agreed that the cataloguer usually decides if a resource has accompanying material and, if so, what part is predominant and what part is secondary before even consulting RDA. RDA can be improved to help cataloguers in making description decisions by:

- Creating or clarifying definitions and usage for terms such as predominant and secondary carriers, unit, and part;
- Expanding several strategic instructions to allow description for accompanying materials with the same carrier; and
- Adding new examples to several instructions that demonstrate how the revised instructions can be applied to our expanding universe of materials.

We believe that by focusing on changes that allow for broader applications of the current instructions, we are best serving the expanding universe of carrier types, the upcoming changes in standards and conceptual models, and the continuing need for flexibility on behalf of the cataloguer.

As noted above, the Joint Working Group believes it is time to retire the term "accompanying material." As we look beyond our current standards of MARC 21 and ISBD, other terms may be more compatible with the modelling of the future. While some favored the terms "augmentations" or "augmenting materials", these choices may continue to conflate content and carriers. Using "predominant" and "secondary" (or "subordinate") and specifying "carrier" should alleviate this problem. A change in terminology also provides the potential for connections with the work being done by other RSC Working Groups, particularly the Aggregates Working Group.

Finally, the Joint Working Group recommends that RDA communities (including interested members of the Joint Working Group) develop further guidance regarding the description of accompanying materials, including creating workflow charts, best practices, etc.

APPENDIX

Decision-making process for cataloguing a resource with multiple component parts: