

To: John Myers, Chair, CC:DA  
From: Lori Robare, Chair, Task Force on the Review of Proposed ISBD Area 0  
Subject: Report of the Task Force on the Review of Proposed ISBD Area 0

On January 7, 2009, the Task Force was charged with reviewing the ISBD Area 0 proposal submitted by IFLA for worldwide review and presenting a report to CC:DA as the foundation for the reply to IFLA.

The charge further specifies:

“In its review and report, the Task Force should consider how well the proposal meets its intended purpose to improve bibliographic control and access to resources, particularly those in multiple formats and those published in more than one physical medium.

“Since the following standards are mentioned in the IFLA announcement as foundational to its work in developing the ISBD 0 proposal, the Task Force may wish to consider the consistency of the proposal with them: IME ICC; version 1.0 of the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization; and the current draft of Resource Description and Access (RDA) (particularly Chapter 3).

“The report of the Task Force is due to the Chair of CC:DA by January 20, 2009 for discussion at the ALA Mid-Winter Meeting. Reviewing agencies are asked to reply to IFLA by January 30, 2009.”

Members of the Task Force:

Lori Robare, Chair  
Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis  
Chamya P. Kincy  
Jeannette Ho  
Edward Swanson

## **General comments on the proposal**

The Task Force commends the ISBD Review Group for its efforts to improve bibliographic control and access to resources, particularly those in multiple formats and those published in more than one physical medium. We find the proposal successful overall in meeting its goals. We especially appreciate the effort to create an effective “early warning device” for users and to use terminology that is simple and succinct. The proposed Area 0 fulfills the aim of the IME ICC to avoid mixing the content of the resource with the presentation of the resource.

The Task Force has some questions, concerns, and suggested editorial changes which are outlined in this report. The section captions and/or numbers refer to the captions and/or numbers

used in the ISBD Area 0 draft proposal. Citations from the draft are indicated through the use of quotation marks. When changes have been recommended, italics are used to indicate additions and strikethrough for deletions.

### **Multiple content forms and media types**

In comparison to RDA 3.2.1.2 and 6.10.1.3 and RDA/ONIX section 2.3, the language of ISBD 0 encourages recording as many content forms and media types as applicable but allows the alternative to use “Multiform” and “Multimedia” where three or more forms or media types are applicable. Recording multiple content forms and media types should assist users in identifying and selecting resources, particularly with the use of machine manipulation of the data to focus and narrow searches.

The Task Force has some concern about the amount of detail that would be recorded in ISBD Area 0 if libraries follow the recommendation in section 0.1 of the proposal to “record as many terms as are applicable to the resource being described.” Would all terms be displayed to the user in this form? Can this level of detail be effective as an “early warning” device for users?

RDA and the *RDA/ONIX Framework* allow the alternative of recording only the category that applies to the predominant part of the resource (if there is one) or the ones that apply to the most substantive parts of the resource. Should this alternative also apply to ISBD Area 0? For instance, it may not always be necessary to record formats of accompanying materials if they are not considered crucial to the identification/selection of an item.

The Task Force does not find the use of “Multiform : Multimedia” very helpful to the user for a resource such as the final example in the “Examples illustrating ISBD Area 0” supplementary document. However, “Multiform” does seem useful for certain situations (e.g., educational kits) where there is no predominant format and too many physical units to be named succinctly in ISBD Area 0. However, in this context, the term “kit” seems more intuitive to users than “Multiform” (for example: “Kit : Multimedia” instead of “Multiform : Multimedia”).

### **MARC format**

The introduction to the draft notes that Area 0 is to be a “separate, unique, high-level component for recording in bibliographic records.”

In light of MARC Proposal No. 2009-01/2: *New content designation for RDA elements: Content type, Media Type, Carrier Type*, how would ISBD Area 0 fit into the MARC record? Would MARC need to create another field for ISBD 0? As the terms in 336 and 337 have similar wording, wouldn't this appear to be redundant?

Task Force members expressed some concern that we may lose one of the GMD's great benefits: allowing users to browse an OPAC's title list and immediately determine formats from the titles without needing to select each individual record. Our systems may need to rely upon other methods of communicating format to users in a title list display, such as the display of icons generated from MARC coding.

## Specific Comments

### 0 Content Form and Media Type Area

#### Introductory note, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

Suggest alternate wording for clarity and context:

*“The content form and media type area ~~is comprised of~~ **comprises** three elements, ~~namely,~~ **each taken from closed lists**: (1) ~~a term (or terms) derived from a closed list of **Content Form** categories~~ **the *Content Form***, one or more terms reflecting the fundamental form(s) in which the content of a resource is expressed; (2) ~~a the **Content Qualification**, derived from a closed list of subcategories,~~ **specifying the type, sensory nature, dimensionality, and/or presence or absence of motion for the resource being described**, and (3) ~~a closed list of the **Media Type** categories,~~ **indicating the type(s) of carrier used to convey the content of the resource.**”*

If the text is left as is, “is comprised of” at least needs to be changed to either “comprises” or “is composed of.”

### 0.1 Content Form

#### Consistency with other standards:

At first glance, “Content Form” does not conform to RDA, but it, along with the “Specification of Type” group in the “Content Qualification” section (0.1.2) seems to cover all of the possibilities listed in RDA 6.10.1.3, except with more granularity. Some RDA phrases like “cartographic tactile image” and “computer dataset” are broken out into various categories in ISBD 0, making the conceptual distinction among content form, content qualification, and media type more readily perceived in the display. For instance, RDA’s unformatted phrase “Cartographic tactile image” is more readily perceived as a content form (Image) specified by content qualification subcategories “Cartographic” and “Tactile” when viewed as “Image (Cartographic ; Tactile).” Likewise, RDA’s “Computer dataset” is more readily understood as a content form (Dataset) viewed through a specific media type, “Electronic,” when viewed as “Dataset : Electronic.”

Compared to the *RDA/ONIX Framework*, ISBD Area 0’s content form terms seem to relate, in part to the “Character” primary values under the *Framework’s* BaseContentCategories (pg. A-1 and Appendix C).

- “Image” and “Music” are in both standards.
- RDA/ONIX’s “Language” is fleshed out into “Text” and “Spoken Word” in ISBD 0.
- ISBD 0’s “Sound” falls under the generic category of “Other” in RDA/ONIX.
- ISBD 0’s “Dataset” and “Program” seem to address the 3rd recommendation in RDA/ONIX (p. 6) “that consideration be given to defining a subset of agreed values for Form/Genre to be used by both RDA and ONIX to construct QualifiedContentCategories for ... computer resources (e.g., computer data, computer program).” However, rather

than making “Dataset” and “Program” categories qualified by “computer resources,” ISBD 0 makes them content forms mediated by computer (or “Electronic”) resources.

- “Movement” (not to be confused with ImageMovement) seems to be lacking in the *RDA/ONIX Framework*, although it is covered in RDA 6.10.1.3.

The only term found in neither RDA nor RDA/ONIX is “Object,” unless this is meant to substitute for RDA 6.10.1.3’s “Form”—as in “three-dimensional form” and “cartographic tactile three-dimensional form.” If so, ISBD 0’s preference for the term “Object” could be due, in part, to addressing RDA/ONIX’s 3rd recommendation (p. 6) that “cartographic resources” qualify “images” and “*objects*.”

## **p. 2, first paragraph**

“Terms from the following list ~~should be~~ *are* given in the language and script chosen by the cataloguing agency...”

## **p. 2, Image**

A suggestion was made to break down “Image” into separate content terms, “Moving image” and “Still image.” These terms are closer to the natural language of library users, so they may be more comprehensible and effective as an “early warning device” about format than “Image (Moving)” and “Image (Still).” For example:

“Moving image : Video” instead of “Image (Moving) : Video”

“Still image (Tactile) : Unmediated” instead of “Image (Still ; Tactile) : Unmediated”

We note that there is a similar breakdown of audio categories into different content forms for “Sound,” “Spoken word,” and “Music.”

The Task Force was split on this idea, with some members preferring the conceptual distinction that is achieved with the use of “Image (Moving)” and “Image (Still)” and the consistency in having specification of motion as part of the content qualification, along with other specifications (type, sensory, and dimensionality).

## **p. 2, Dataset**

~~Includes~~ *Examples include* numeric data, environmental data, etc. ...”

~~Excludes~~ *Excluded are* digitally recorded music [*see* music], ~~or~~ language [*see* spoken word], ~~or~~ sounds [*see* sound], ~~or~~ computer-reproduced images [*see* images] ~~or~~ *and* text [*see* text].”

## **p. 2, Program**

~~Includes~~ *Examples include* operating systems, applications software, etc.” (Note: strike “s” in “applications”)

### **p. 3, Sound**

Consider using the term “Sounds,” which implies non-speech, non-musical sounds, rather than “Sound,” which seems more generic. “Sounds : Audio” might be more indicative of what the user will be accessing than “Sound : Audio.” RDA 6.10.1.3 has “Sounds.”

## **0.1.2 Content Qualification**

### **Consistency with other standards**

ISBD Area 0’s “Sensory Specification,” “Specification of Dimensionality,” and “Specification of Motion” conform to RDA/ONIX’s “SensoryMode,” “ImageDimensionality,” and “ImageMovement” categories (pg. A-2 and Appendix C), respectively. “Specification of Dimensionality” and “Specification of Motion” are also found in various “un-granularized” combinations in RDA 6.10.1.3. The only category unique to ISBD 0 is “Specification of Type,” which seems to be a catchall category for leftover elements that convey two unrelated concepts: “Cartographic” and “Notated” vs. “Performed.” However, it all seems to work out when constructing the elements as evidenced in the “Examples illustrating ISBD Area 0” supplementary document, even if they are not conceptually related.

Inclusion of “Cartographic” as a content qualifier seems to address RDA/ONIX’s third recommendation (p. 6) “that consideration be given to defining a subset of agreed values for Form/Genre to be used by both RDA and ONIX to construct QualifiedContentCategories for cartographic resources (e.g., cartographic image, cartographic object). . . .”

### **Order of terms**

When multiple content qualification terms are present, does the order matter? The order of content qualification terms in the examples reflects the order in which they are listed in Section 0.1.2. They also happen to be in alphabetical order. Which one is governing the order: the order of appearance in the list or alphabetical order? Or is there any prescribed order at all?

### **p. 4, Specification of Type: Notated**

Replace semicolons in definition with commas: “(e.g., music, dance, staging)”

### **p. 4, Sensory Specification**

3<sup>rd</sup> line of definition: “other than one ~~which~~ *that* would . . .”

It would be helpful to provide guidance on when Sensory Specification terms are applied. “Visual” could be applied to many resources (any print resource, video, etc.) as could “Aural” (any sound recording). According to paragraph one of 0.1.2, Content Qualification sub-categories are “mandatory as applicable to the resource being described,” yet the examples show Sensory Specification terms in only two cases (“Tactile” and “Olfactory”).

## Comments on the relationship between Content Form terms and Content Qualification terms

### Syntax

More explicit guidance would be useful on the distinction between a single content term with multiple content qualifiers, as drawn from the examples:

“Image (Cartographic : Tactile)”

as opposed to the same content term repeated with individual qualifiers:

“Music (Notated). Music (Performed)”

It is our understanding that the distinction is due to the number of units or expressions contained in the resource. In these examples, a single tactile map has multiple content qualifiers for a single term, but a CD-ROM containing separate units or expressions (notated music and performed music) requires separate content terms with qualifiers. It would be helpful to make this explicit.

### Content term “Movement” and its qualifiers

There is an issue with consistency of instructions relating to the content term “Movement.” According to the definition and scope statement, the term excludes moving images. How then would a dance video be described? “Movement (Performed) : Video” apparently is not allowed. Yet the scope note under “Performed” says “includes recorded performances of music or movement.” We wonder how a recorded performance of movement can be experienced any other way than through a “moving image” (or video), and how a dance video would in fact be described.

### Content term “Music” and its qualifiers

It would be helpful to have an example of how a video of a live musical performance would be described. The content term “Music” does not have instructions to exclude moving images, as does “Movement.” The content qualifier “Performed” applies to music. Is “Music (Performed) : Video” correct for a video of a live musical performance? If so, it seems odd that “Movement (Performed) : Video” would not be allowed for a video of a dance performance.

## 0.2 Media Type

### Consistency with other standards

The list of “Media Type Terms” has the greatest conformity to both standards, particularly the list in Table 3.1 of RDA Section 3.2.1.2, with a few changes:

- The term “Electronic” is used in lieu of RDA’s “computer.”
- ISBD 0 has an added note on the type of resource to which each Media Type term refers, which is largely redundant (e.g. “Audio” → For Audio player-enabled resources), but

helpful for “Electronic” which clarifies that the term is “for computer-enabled resources.”

- The definition for “Microform” lacks the phrase “not readable to the human eye,” found in RDA. Is this an oversight or a deliberate omission?
- Under “Unmediated,” the scope note spells out the “content” referred to in RDA as “text, music notation, images, forms, etc.” and adds the clarification that “(h)uman-produced artefacts and naturally occurring entities are likewise considered unmediated resources.”

The list of “Media Type” terms also conforms conceptually to the *RDA/ONIX Framework*’s primary values for IntermediationTool (pg. B-5 and Appendix D), but with the terminology altered either slightly (“Microscopic” vs. “microscope”) or significantly (“Video” vs. “audiovisual player”; “Unmediated” vs. “not required”). Also, ISBD Area 0’s scope notes are more elaborate than RDA/ONIX.

## General

Why are carrier types not included in ISBD Area 0? Users are very interested in this information as an “early warning device” in addition to the information now conveyed in the GMD.

## Order of terms

When multiple media type terms are present, should they be in alphabetical order?

### p. 5, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence

“Alternatively, for resources ~~comprised of~~ *comprising* mixed media...”

### p. 5, Electronic

The Task Force agrees with the use of the term “Electronic” rather than “Computer” (the RDA term), since it is generally more intuitive (though we are not sure that it is clear in all cases; does “Music : Electronic” convey the idea of a music website?). It would be helpful to be able to distinguish between resources that are accessed remotely vs. directly accessed resources with a tangible carrier, since they are very different kinds of resources.

Definition and Scope: has the distinction between “discs” and “disks” been dropped?

### p. 6, Unmediated

While we understand that this term can be useful, particularly in the context of the *RDA/ONIX Framework* (in which a primary value must be specified for every attribute, such as IntermediationTool), we would hope it would not be displayed to users. It would be confusing to point out the lack of a need for an intermediation device.

## Examples

### p. 1, Example of website

Content Form: ~~dataset~~ *text*

**p. 2, Example of a resource ~~comprised of~~ *comprising* multiple forms of content and types of media** (Note: strike comma after “content”)

## **Conclusion**

The Task Force appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the draft of Proposed Area 0.