To: ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
From: Elyssa Gould, Chair, Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA
Subject: Report from the Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA

Charge

The CC:DA Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA was charged to work with the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to investigate definitions of and instructions for accompanying material in RDA, and specifically to:

1. Analyze how the choice of analytic vs. comprehensive description (see RDA 2.2.2.1) affects the treatment of accompanying material.
2. Evaluate the definition of accompanying material in RDA 2.2.4.
3. Consider how to revise RDA to resolve inconsistencies in defining the "resource itself" (see Mode of Issuance, Carrier Type, & Colour Content).
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?
5. Investigate how RDA should distinguish between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph.
6. Investigate the distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material.
7. Consider how extent of accompanying material of the same carrier type should be recorded: when is the extent recorded as "2 volumes" vs. "XX pages … + 1 [name of accompanying material] (XX pages)"? How should RDA be revised to support these various options?
8. Develop a joint discussion paper with CCC to be presented to the RSC addressing these inconsistencies, in time for discussion at ALA Annual in 2016.

Membership

CC:DA

 Netanel Ganin, Brandeis University
 Helen E. Gbala, College of DuPage Library
 Kathy Glennan (ex officio), University of Maryland
 Jessica Hayden, University of Northern Colorado
 Jeannette Ho, Texas A&M University
 Melanie Polutta, Library of Congress
 Patricia Ratkovich, University of Alabama
 Emily Thaisrivongs, Haverford College

CCC

Thomas Brenndorfer, Guelph Public Library
Emma Cross (chair), Carleton University
Leah Jones (adjunct), Library and Archives Canada
Bill Leonard (ex officio), Library and Archives Canada
Arouce Wasty (adjunct), Library and Archives Canada

I would like to thank the Joint Working Group membership for their time, thoughts, and hard work over the past six months.

Discussion Paper

As a result of our charge to create a joint discussion paper with the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Task Force is presenting a draft of the "RDA Steering Committee version" of this discussion paper, rather than one that is tailored to CC:DA. Please consult that document (below) for our methodology, summary of the issues, and recommendations for next steps.

To: RDA Steering Committee (RSC)

From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative
             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, prepared 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 require resolution; 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 February 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 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, 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 efforts to make 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. A draft of this discussion paper was 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.
  - ○ Co-chairs agreed to use 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 Toolkit 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 with one component treated as predominant and other components as the accompanying material.
- 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.

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.

For cataloguers requiring additional guidance on comprehensive vs. analytical description as it applies to accompanying materials, the following ways could be developed to impart this information:
- 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 the RDA Toolkit.
- accompanying materials training content such as PowerPoint slides for cataloguers to use.

Summary: recommendations for future action
- To RDA communities: For cataloguers requiring additional guidance, develop other ways to impart this information such as accompanying materials workflows in the RDA Toolkit, or in 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.

Joint Working Group members Melanie Polutta and Patricia Ratkovich devised a helpful accompanying materials flowchart (Appendix 1) to guide cataloguers through the 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 perhaps outlived its usefulness as a term. Using "predominant" and "secondary" in RDA would provide a clearer idea of the resources we are discussing. An alternative would be to use the terms "augmentations" or "augmenting materials". The group did not come to a clear consensus on which terms to use, so we leave this idea with the RSC to consider going forward.

The Joint Working Group also 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
- Consider if the term "accompanying material" has outlived its usefulness. If so, we suggest using "predominant" and "secondary," or "augmentations" or "augmenting materials," to express the idea of what we currently call accompanying material.

- Use a consistent definition of accompanying material (or predominant work/resource/carrier, etc.) throughout RDA Toolkit.
- 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 "any source".

However, this does not address the situation when an analytical description contains more than one component part. An analytical description may actually include accompanying material as part of the description, and/or it may include different carrier types.

To address this situation, the Joint Working Group recommends changing the definition of *resource* to allow accompanying materials to be considered part of the resource itself for analytical descriptions as appropriate.

The Joint Working Group further recommends rethinking the way "resource" is defined throughout RDA. Our meetings have revealed the diversity which exists in the community on how people interpret and use the terms within RDA. Terms such as "resource" have both a

physical and a intellectual application. Some parts of RDA are deliberately written to permit different interpretations and this is appropriate within an international context. However there are also instructions written on the assumption that cataloguers will interpret a term appropriately and in these cases it would be helpful to clarify. This particularly applies to all elements that use the term "resource" for source of information.

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
- Rethink the way "resource" is defined throughout RDA:
  - Modify the definition to allow accompanying materials to be considered part of the resource itself for analytical descriptions that include them.
  - Modify the definition to accommodate the description of carrier type(s) of accompanying materials in analytical descriptions.

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?

Determining the mode of issuance for a resource is dependent on whether it is catalogued using a comprehensive or analytical description, as noted above. The presence of accompanying material does not necessarily require describing the resource as a multipart monograph.

First, 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 not physically separate. For example, a single DVD may contain the movie, along with other content such as trailers, interviews, "making of" documentary, etc. Some members of the Joint Working Group wondered if the multipart monograph definition should be modified to remove the limitation to physical parts (or their intangible equivalents).

Secondly, 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
- The presence of accompanying material does not necessarily require describing the
  resource as a multipart monograph.
- Should the definition of multipart monograph be revised to remove the limitation to
  physical parts (or their intangible equivalents)?
- Analytical descriptions of multipart resources can involve identifying components as
  predominant and accompanying parts.

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 accompanying parts which
have the same carrier type. The group recommends revising 3.1.4 to accommodate all types of
accompanying material. See the examples in Issue #7 below for suggestions of potential third
examples to add to the first example box to show a multipart monograph with accompanying
material. In addition, we suggest adding a third example in the first example box that shows a
multipart monograph with accompanying material.

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 accompanying material with the same carrier type as its predominant part.
- Add an example to 3.1.4 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 somewhat 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 predominance and non-predominance (or secondary) 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 above.

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 accompanying material] (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, and an analytic description that records extent in separate statements. 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. 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
Book with supplement	2 volumes	150 pages 1 supplement (23 pages)	150 pages + 1 supplement (23 pages)
Multi-volume set with separate index volume	8 volumes	7 volumes 1 volume (62 pages)	7 volumes + 1 volume (62 pages)
Textbook + student workbook	2 volumes	300 pages 1 workbook (85 pages)	300 pages + 1 workbook (85 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 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.

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:
- clarifying definitions and usage for terms such as accompanying material, unit, and part;
- expanding several strategic instructions to allow description for accompanying materials with the same mode of issuance; and
- adding new examples to several instructions that demonstrate how the edited 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.

After all this interesting discussion, the Joint Working Group wonders if 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. During our conversations, the terms "augmentations" or "augmenting materials" were mentioned as possibly being more appropriate for the current situations and future projections where, for example, descriptions of components are embedded within the XML description of a resource. Another way to address the material is to refer to "predominant" and "secondary" materials. A change in terminology also provides the potential for connections with the work being done by other RDA 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 1

Accompanying materials flowchart devised by Melanie Polutta and Patricia Ratkovich.

The flowchart starts with the statement:

"*You have a resource (manifestation) which contains multiple component parts, which may or may not be physically separate*"….