

**TO:** Lori Robare, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**FROM:** Mark Scharff, chair, Task Force on Sources of Information

**SUBJECT:** Progress report for Annual 2012

## **Introduction**

The Task Force received this charge:

*The Task Force on Sources of Information (RDA 2.1 and 2.2) is charged to review the current instructions under RDA 2.1 Basis for Identification of the Resource and 2.2 Sources of Information to address previously identified concerns of MLA and OLAC and to adopt a more principled approach to instructions for sources of information that will work for all materials. The task force should review the MLA proposal CC:DA/MLA/2011/1 and the related committee discussion on the wiki and discussion list.*

*The task force should address these specific concerns:*

*From MLA: for a resource embodying multiple works, establishing a collective title as the preferred means for identifying a resource as a whole*

*From MLA: clarifying the status of the container and accompanying textual material as potential preferred sources*

*From OLAC: for a resource lacking a collective title with one predominant work, providing a means to treat the title of that work as the title proper (equivalent for AACR2 1.1G1)*

*From CC:DA discussion: simplifying the instructions for preferred sources and presenting them as broad principles, supported by examples*

*From JSC representative: ensuring that the approach works for all materials*

*The task force should present its report (including any revision to RDA it wishes to recommend) by Midwinter 2012.*

Task Force members:

Ann Copeland  
Greta de Groat  
Kathy Glennan  
Kelley McGrath  
John Myers  
Charles Pennell  
Mark Scharff, chair

In addition to its own discussions, the Task Force sought and received input from David Reser and Judy Kuhagen at the Library of Congress, and from John Attig. The Task Force has also incorporated comments from CC:DA discussion at Midwinter 2012.

## **Proposals**

The Task Force seems to have arrived at consensus on rewriting 2.2.2.1 to clarify that a publisher-issued container is to be considered part of a resource in a comprehensive description. That has been drafted as a proposal. The text is in Appendix A.

## **Other areas of the charge still being examined**

The press of time has not allowed for exhaustive recounting of ideas, and it's not possible to even guarantee that all proposals and drafts here represent our latest thoughts. Discussions have been fluid, and trying to sort through e-mail responses is challenging.

Appendices to the report contain working drafts of various sections of the instructions we have been looking at.

## **Basis for identification of resources issued in more than one part**

One fundamental question is whether this category of material is mutually exclusive with "resources issued in a single unit" (the category presented in 2.1.2.2). The Glossary definition of "Unit" is given "in the context of the extent element." Containers have traditionally not been mentioned in the extent area, and RDA includes them only if they are considered to be the unit, with their contents being treated as subunits (e.g. 3.4.1.11 for collections, 3.4.4.5 for still images in containers). So this raises several questions:

- 1) Outside of the situations named above, should a container that is not recorded in the extent area be considered a separate "part" of the resource (not to be confused with whether it is part of the resource)?
- 2) If three CDs are issued in a jewel case by the publisher, is each of the CDs a "part?" We think that is the understanding at present.
- 3) What is the status of material such as booklets or sheets that are contained within a publisher-issued container, such as a booklet within a CD jewel case lid, or laid into a jewel case?

Discussion in recent days reveals a difference of opinion over the answer to question 1 above. This needs to be settled for the sake of revising 2.1.2.3. Questions 2 and 3 seem to be answered "Yes" and "make the resource be in more than one part," respectively.

## **Basis for identification vs. preferred source**

There is clear agreement that a collective title is better understood to "identify a resource as a whole" than a string of titles of works or parts of a resource. There is less agreement on where to express this preference. The initial choice was as a sentence added to the first paragraph of 2.1.2.2. That version is reproduced in Appendix B. Some TF members are concerned that since

what we are trying to fix is a matter of preferring one source over another, a better place for this instruction would be in 2.2.3, which deals with situations where there is more than one source eligible to be the preferred source. A counterargument to that is that the current reference to “a source” in 2.1.2.2 could lead a cataloger to stop at the first eligible source and not even consider others as possible. If 2.2.3 isn’t consulted, then a CD surface bearing a non-collective title will be the preferred source without consideration of whether a collective title is available elsewhere in the resource. It was suggested that a statement could be added that if multiple sources of information met the “identify the resource as a whole” test, the cataloger should determine through application of 2.2.2.2–2.2.2.4 which would be the preferred source, then consult 2.2.3 to see if there was a condition that would trigger the choice of a different source of information as the preferred source. Presence of a collective title when the preferred source had a non-collective title would be one of those triggers.

An earlier concern was whether the instructions implicitly favored title as being the principal means of identifying a resource, and whether this needed to be made explicit if in fact were to be endorsed. The conclusion seems to be that there is no need to be more explicit.

A smaller proposal is to add a sentence to 2.2.2.1 to “Prefer a source in which the information is formally presented” rather than repeating it in multiple specific instructions. This suggestion is not reflected in any of the Appendices.

### **Title of predominant work as title proper**

One attempt to re-introduce the concept found in AACR2 1.1G1 was to add a paragraph to 2.1.2.2 to allow a source that identified a predominant or main work or content to be a qualifying source to identify the resource as a whole. It’s not clear whether this has been acceptable to the OLAC members of the TF. Proposals to incorporate a similar concept into 2.1.2.3 have been difficult. Another thought was to postpone any identification of a predominant work or part to 2.3.2.9, where recording one or more titles naming predominant parts or content would be allowed in lieu of recording a non-collective title. That alternative is found in the Addendum to Appendix B and in Appendix E.

### **Resources issued in more than one part (2.1.2.3)**

Substantial progress has been made on rewriting this section (a recent version can be found in Appendix C). The question about what role a container plays in putting a resource in this category still needs to be resolved (q.v.). There is still some dissatisfaction with condition c) (which corresponds to condition d) in the current RDA text). The proposal given here borrows the phrase “unifying element” from AACR2 in lieu of a “main part,” and there were questions about just what that meant.

### **Embedded metadata**

The Task Force addressed the overly-strong preference for embedded metadata in the current instruction. The goal of the revision is to favor “eye-readable” data over embedded metadata. This leads to a better outcome for many online resources and also has a positive impact on some tangible resources where embedded metadata would have been preferred over a container or

guide title. On the other hand, an objection was lodged to considering menu screens or home pages of websites “eye-readable” in the traditional sense of the phrase, since the data in those areas cannot be read without mediation. The Task Force considered revisions to 2.2.2.4, as well as comparable changes to 2.2.2.2 and 2.2.2.3; a late version of these revisions is in Appendix D.

### **Organization of the instructions**

As part of her work to identify problems with the instructions as currently written, Kelley McGrath developed flowcharts for choosing the preferred source of information for a [resource issued as a single unit](#) and for a [resource issued in multiple parts](#). One could consider whether the instructions would be better presented in a fashion that corresponded to the selections process, but that could be beyond the scope of this TF.

### **Future**

We recommend that the Task Force be authorized to continue its work toward completing work that can result in revision proposals, perhaps in time for the JSC fall meeting. We also recommend that we continue work on the other issues raised in this report, subject to guidance that CC:DA may offer and to points that come up during discussion at Annual 2012.

## Appendix A: Proposal to clarify the status of containers

**TO:** Lori Robare, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**FROM:** Mark Scharff, chair, Task Force on Sources of Information

**SUBJECT:** Revision Proposal for RDA 2.2.2.1 to clarify the status of container as part of a resource

The CC:DA Task Force on Sources of Information requests that CC:DA endorse the revisions outlined below and authorize the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee to present them at the next JSC meeting.

### Background and summary of recommendation

The Task Force received as part of its charge:

*From MLA: clarifying the status of the container and accompanying textual material as potential preferred sources*

*From JSC representative: ensuring that the approach works for all materials*

The Music Library Association offered a proposal to CC:DA at ALA Annual 2011 to revise the language of RDA 2.2.2.1 to make more explicit the role of a publisher-issued container as being part of a resource. CC:DA chose to appoint this Task Force to include a broader examination of the problems surrounding choosing a preferred source of information and what “identifies a resource as a whole,” among other things. Of the proposals expected to come out of this work, the current one is the most straightforward.

The fourth paragraph of RDA 2.2.2.1 currently reads:

Treat a container such as a box in which a game or kit is issued as part of the resource itself. Treat a container that is not issued as part of the resource (e.g., a box or case made by the owner) as a source outside the resource itself.

We presume the instruction’s intent is to make the provenance of the container (i.e. from the entity issuing the resource vs. from another source) the determinant for considering it part of a resource. The distinction is made in the negative, however (“a container that is not issued as part of the resource” and the examples of containers issued as part of the resource itself are relatively esoteric and suggest a narrow application of the principle.

The instruction for accompanying material in 2.2.2.1, third paragraph, posits the material’s status vis-à-vis the resource as a function of the level of description being prepared (comprehensive vs. analytical), where in the former level of description, the accompanying material is considered to be part of the resource. Task Force members thought it would be helpful to make this distinction more explicit in 2.2.4, a). The corresponding distinction for containers is made in point b); the Task Force would propose a slight change in wording to make it parallel with 2.2.2.1.

## 1. RDA 2.2.2.1, fourth paragraph

### Proposed revisions:

Treat a container issued by the publishing body (such as a box in which a game or kit is issued or a clamshell box containing compact discs in individual jewel cases or cardboard sleeves) as part of the resource itself. Treat a container that is not issued as part of the resource (e.g., a box or case made by the owner) as a source outside the resource itself.

### Clean copy:

Treat a container issued by the publishing body (such as a box in which a game or kit is issued or a clamshell box containing compact discs in individual jewel cases or cardboard sleeves) as part of the resource itself. Treat a container that is not issued as part of the resource (e.g., a box or case made by the owner) as a source outside the resource itself.

## 2. RDA 2.2.4

### Proposed revisions:

#### 2.2.4 Other Sources of Information

If information required to identify the resource does not appear on a source forming part of the resource itself (see [2.2.2.1](#)), take it from one of the following sources (in order of preference):

- a) accompanying material (e.g., a leaflet, an "about" file) when preparing an analytical description
- b) a container that is not issued as part of the resource itself (e.g., a box, or case made by the owner)
- c) other published descriptions of the resource
- d) any other available source (e.g., a reference source).

*[remainder of instruction omitted; no change]*

### Clean copy:

#### 2.2.4 Other Sources of Information

If information required to identify the resource does not appear on a source forming part of the resource itself (see [2.2.2.1](#)), take it from one of the following sources (in order of preference):

- a) accompanying material (e.g., a leaflet, an "about" file) when preparing an analytical description

- b) a container that is not issued as part of the resource itself (e.g., a box or case made by the owner)
- c) other published descriptions of the resource
- d) any other available source (e.g., a reference source).

*[remainder of instruction omitted; no change]*

## Appendix B: Draft proposal for revision of RDA 2.1.2.2

**TO:** Lori Robare, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**FROM:** Mark Scharff, chair, Task Force on Sources of Information

**SUBJECT:** Revision Proposal for RDA 2.1.2.2 (Resource Issued as a Single Unit)

The CC:DA Task Force on Sources of Information requests that CC:DA endorse the revisions outlined below and authorize the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee to present them at the next JSC meeting.

### Background and summary of recommendation

The Task Force received as part of its charge:

*From MLA: for a resource embodying multiple works, establishing a collective title as the preferred means for identifying a resource as a whole*

*From OLAC: for a resource lacking a collective title with one predominant work, providing a means to treat the title of that work as the title proper (equivalent for AACR2 1.1G1)*

The Music Library Association offered a proposal to CC:DA at ALA Annual 2011 that included a proposal to revise RDA 2.1.2.2 to express a preference for a source bearing a collective title as “identifying the resource as a whole.” CC:DA chose to appoint this Task Force to include a broader examination of the problems surrounding choosing a preferred source of information and what “identifies a resource as a whole.” This proposal attempts that.

RDA 2.1.2.2 currently reads:

#### **2.1.2.2 Resource Issued as a Single Unit**

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole.

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a single videodisc containing multiple feature films but with no source of information identifying the resource as a whole), treat the sources of information identifying its individual contents as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole.

The instruction in the first paragraph omits an important fact — it is *data* in a source of information that serves to identify a resource, not the source itself. (Some resources do not have a source of information bearing identifying data, but that situation is dealt with in RDA 2.2.2.4). That data might consist of a collective title, or of a series of titles identifying its individual contents. Because AACR2 is organized by format of material, it can provide rules for

identifying a chief source of information that favor sources bearing a collective title over those that bear titles of individual contents (e.g. 6.0B1 for sound recordings, 9.0B1 for computer files) for materials whose publication conventions would invoke such situations. For comprehensive descriptions, the instruction above requires the cataloger to prefer the source of information as named in 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.3, and 2.2.2.4 if it bears titles of individual contents that “add up” to the contents of the resource as a whole, even if another source bears a collective title. Considering the principle of Representation as a foundation for cataloging (“data should reflect the resource’s representation of itself”) (cf. RDA 1.2), it seems that in most if not all circumstances, a collective title better satisfies this principle from a producer and user standpoint than a non-collective title does. The proposal adds an example of a resource that embodies multiple works to illustrate its application.

The principle of Representation also undergirds the other proposal in this document—to allow a source of information bearing the title of the “main content” of a resource issued as a single unit to be chosen as the preferred source of information for a comprehensive description, in lieu of recording titles from individual sources of information for the contents of the resource. OLAC’s interest in this change is to deal with resources that contain a “main work” such as a feature film but additionally other works related to the main work, such as trailers, interviews, outtakes, and the like. AACR2 1.1G1 allowed the “predominant work” to be named as the title proper, and the additional works to be named in a contents note rather than having their titles become part of a non-collective title. This squares with how resource producers and users view such resources. RDA 2.1.2.3, d) contains a provision to choose a source of information identifying a “main part” when no source identifies the resource as a whole, but the instruction pertains to resources issued in more than one part.

## **Proposed revision:**

### **2.1.2.2 Resource Issued as a Single Unit**

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole. If the resource embodies multiple works (e.g., a compact disc embodying multiple works), prefer a source that bears a collective title.

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole, but one source bears a title identifying a main or predominant work or content (e.g., a single videodisc containing a feature film along with trailers, outtakes, interviews, or other material related to the feature film), consider that source to identify the resource as a whole.

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole and no source bears a title identifying a main or predominant work or content (e.g., a single videodisc containing multiple feature films but with no source of information identifying the resource as a whole), treat the sources of information identifying its individual contents as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole.

## Clean copy:

### 2.1.2.2 Resource Issued as a Single Unit

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole. If the resource embodies multiple works (e.g., a compact disc embodying multiple works), prefer a source that bears a collective title.

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole, but one source bears a title identifying a main or predominant work or content (e.g., a single videodisc containing a feature film along with trailers, outtakes, interviews, or other material related to the feature film), consider that source to identify the resource as a whole.

If there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole and no source bears a title identifying a main or predominant work or content (e.g., a single videodisc containing multiple feature films but with no source of information identifying the resource as a whole), treat the sources of information identifying its individual contents as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole.

## Addendum: Alternative treatment of collective titles in 2.2.3

Assuming removal of reference to collective title above to 2.2.3, a suggested addition to 2.1.2.2 to avoid selecting non-collective title on a traditionally-preferred source without considering presence of other sources that could bear a collective title:

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued as a single unit (e.g., a textbook in one volume), choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole. If there is more than one source identifying the resource as a whole, apply the instructions on preferred sources (see 2.2.2.2–2.2.2.4) and related instructions on selection of a title proper (see 2.3.2.3–2.3.2.6, 2.3.2.9, [and new instruction to be proposed]) to select a single source of information.

Revision to add instructions for collective titles to 2.2.3:

### 2.2.3 More Than One Preferred Source of Information

If there is more than one source of information that qualifies as the preferred source of information for that resource (as specified under [2.2.2](#)), use as the preferred source of information the first occurring of those sources, unless one of the conditions under [2.2.3.1](#) (different languages or scripts), [2.2.3.2](#) (different dates) or [2.2.3.3](#) (sources of information for the reproduction and the original), or [2.2.3.4](#) (a list of titles and a collective title) applies.

[2.2.3.1–2.2.3.3 omitted; no change]

**2.2.3.4 Preferred Sources of Information with a List of Titles and a Collective Title**

If the resource contains separate sources of information, one which lists the titles of the individual contents and one that gives a collective title, use as the preferred source of information the source with the collective title.

## Appendix C: Draft proposal for revision of RDA 2.1.2.3

### 2.1.2.3 Resource Issued in More Than One Part

When preparing a comprehensive description for a resource issued in more than one part (e.g., a series of scientific treatises, a periodical, a compact disc set), choose one of the following, as appropriate, as the basis for identifying the resource as a whole:

- a) ~~If the issues or parts are sequentially numbered~~ For sequentially-issued resources that are sequentially numbered and issued in order, choose a source of information identifying the lowest numbered issue or part available.
- b) ~~If the issues or parts are unnumbered or not sequentially numbered~~ For sequentially-issued resources that are unnumbered, or are sequentially numbered but not issued in order, choose a source of information identifying the issue or part with the earliest date of issue.
- c) ~~If the concept of sequential issuing in parts is not applicable (e.g., a kit) choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole; otherwise, treat the sources identifying the individual parts as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole. For simultaneously-issued resources where one part is the unifying element for the resource, choose a source of information identifying that part.~~
- d) ~~If the resource is one to which the concept of ordered parts is not applicable, and there is no source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a set of locally produced videodiscs with no source of information identifying the set as a whole), choose a source of information identifying the main part, if there is one part that can be considered the main part of the resource. Otherwise, treat the sources identifying the individual parts as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole. For simultaneously-issued resources where no part predominates, choose a source of information identifying the resource as a whole (e.g., a container issued by the publisher, the part that gives the most information), if available.~~

If no single source of information identifies the resource as a whole and the resource has sequential numbering, choose a source of information identifying the lowest numbered part available.

If no single source of information identifies the resource as a whole and the resource does not have sequential numbering, treat the sources identifying the individual parts as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole.

If the identification of a resource with ~~ordered~~ sequentially-numbered parts is not based on the first issue or part, make a note identifying the issue or part used as the basis for identification of the resource (see [2.20.13.3](#)).

For sources of information for numbering identifying the last issue or part of a serial (or the first or last issue in a separate sequence of numbering), see [2.6.1.2](#).

For sources of information for date of production, publication, distribution, and/or manufacture of the last issue or part of a multipart monograph or serial, see [2.7.6.2](#), [2.8.6.2](#), [2.9.6.2](#), and [2.10.6.2](#), respectively.

## Appendix D: Draft proposal for revision of RDA 2.2.2.2–2.2.2.4 (principally for dealing with embedded metadata)

### 2.2.2.2 Resources Consisting of One or More Pages, Leaves, Sheets, or Cards (or Images of One or More Pages, Leaves, Sheets, or Cards)

If the resource consists of:

- a) one or more pages, leaves, sheets, or cards (e.g., a book, an issue of a periodical, a poster, a series of sheet maps, a set of flashcards)

**or**

- b) images of one or more pages, leaves, sheets, or cards (e.g., a microform reproduction of a musical score, a PDF file of a text, microform reproductions of a set of sheet maps, a JPEG image of a photograph)

use the title page, title sheet, or title card (or image thereof) as the preferred source of information.

#### **Alternative**

If the resource consists of microform or computer images of one or more pages, leaves, sheets, or cards, use an eye-readable label bearing a title that is permanently printed on or affixed to the resource in preference to the image of the title page, title sheet, or title card.

If the resource lacks a title page, title sheet, or title card (or image thereof), use as the preferred source of information the first of the following sources that bears a title:

- a) a cover (or an image of a cover)
- b) a caption (or an image of a caption)
- c) a masthead (or an image of a masthead)
- d) a colophon (or an image of a colophon).

#### **Exception**

**Early printed resources.** If an early printed resource (or a reproduction thereof) lacks a title page, title sheet, or title card (or image thereof), use as the preferred source of information the first of the following sources that bears a title:

- a) a colophon (or an image of a colophon)
- b) a cover issued by the publisher (or an image of a that cover)
- c) a caption (or an image of a caption)

If none of the sources listed above bears a title, use as the preferred source of information another source within the resource that bears a title, giving preference to a source in which the information is formally presented.

If the resource does not contain any of the sources specified above, use as the preferred source of information another source forming part of the resource itself, including embedded metadata in a textual form that contains a title if that metadata is readily accessible, giving preference to sources in which the information is eye-readable and formally presented.

**Alternative**

Use embedded metadata in textual form that contains a title (e.g., metadata embedded in a PDF or JPG image file).

**2.2.2.3 Resources Consisting of Moving Images**

If the resource consists of moving images (e.g., a film reel, a videodisc, a video game, an MPEG video file), use ~~the title frame or frames, or title screen or screens~~; as the preferred source of information the first of the following sources that bears a title:

- a) the title frame or frames, or title screen or screens

**Alternative**

Use an eye-readable label bearing a title that is permanently printed on or affixed to the resource (excluding accompanying textual material or a container) in preference to the title frame or frames, or title screen or screens.

~~If the resource does not contain a title frame or title screen, use as the preferred source of information, as applicable:~~

***either***

- b) ~~a label bearing a title that is permanently printed on or affixed to the resource, excluding accompanying textual material or a container (e.g., a label on a videodisc)~~

***or***

- ~~c) embedded metadata in textual form that contains a title (e.g., metadata embedded in an MPEG video file).~~

- c) one of the following as applicable:

- 1) for a comprehensive description, a publisher-supplied container or accompanying material, giving preference to sources in which the information is formally presented

**or**

- 2) a home page, menu page, disc menu or similar source, giving preference to sources in which the information is formally presented

If the resource contains neither a title frame or title screen nor a source of information falling into category b) or c) above, use as the preferred source of information another source forming part of the resource itself, including embedded metadata in a textual form that contains a title if that metadata is readily accessible, giving preference to sources in which the information is eye-readable and formally presented.

### **Alternative**

Use embedded metadata in textual form that contains a title (e.g., metadata embedded in an MPEG video file).

#### **2.2.2.4 Other Resources**

For a resource other than one covered under [2.2.2.2-2.2.2.3](#), use as the preferred source of information, ~~as applicable~~ the first of the following sources that bears a title:

#### ***either***

- a) ~~a label bearing a title that is permanently printed on or affixed to the resource, excluding accompanying textual material or a container (e.g., a label on an audio CD, or a model)~~

#### ***or***

- ~~b) embedded metadata in textual form that contains a title (e.g., metadata embedded in an MP3 audio file):~~  
one of the following, as applicable:

- 1) for a comprehensive description, a publisher-supplied container or accompanying material, giving preference to sources in which the information is formally presented

#### **or**

- 2) a home page, menu page, disc menu or similar source, giving preference to sources in which the information is formally presented

If the resource does not contain a source of information falling into either category a) or b) above, use as the preferred source of information another source forming part of the resource itself, including embedded metadata in a textual form that contains a title if that metadata is readily accessible, giving preference to sources in which the information is formally presented.

**Alternative**

Use embedded metadata in textual form that contains a title (e.g., metadata embedded in an MP3 audio file).

## Appendix E: Draft proposal for addition to RDA 2.3.2.9

### 2.3.2.9 Resource Lacking a Collective Title

[existing instruction unchanged; add:]

If one or more of the titles of the individual parts identify the predominant part(s) of the resource, record the titles of the predominant part(s) as the title proper of the resource

**either**

- a) as they appear on the source of information for the resource as a whole

**or**

- b) in the order in which they appear in the resource if the sources of information identifying the individual parts are being treated as a collective source of information for the resource as a whole (see [2.1.2](#)).

Record the titles of the other individual parts as the titles proper of related manifestations (see [27.1](#)), if considered to be important.