

TO: Cheri Folkner, Chair, CC:DA

FROM: Elizabeth Mangan, Chair, Task Force on the Review of ISBD Consolidated (July 2006 draft)

SUBJECT: Report on review of *International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD). Consolidated Edition*, draft of July 2006

On 26 July 2006 the Task Force (TF) was charged with:

1. Preparing a review of this draft document, for transmittal to the chair of CC:DA by Oct. 6, 2006, so that CC:DA's response may be sent to the appropriate IFLA contact person by Oct. 15, 2006. The pertinent documents — cover memo and the draft — are available on the IFLA Cataloguing Section website.
2. Using the cover memo, "Invitation to: World-Wide review of ISBD: International Standard Bibliographic Description – 2006 consolidated edition," as the guide to developing its report, pay particular attention to "stipulations for those resources where the old ISBDs have not been revised, i.e. ISBD(PM) and ISBD(NMB) and not at the stipulations for older monographic publications, ISBD(A).
3. Preparing an appendix to the report to include issues that may impact rules in AACR2r and/or RDA, if any such issues are discovered during the review.

Members of the Task Force:

Elizabeth Mangan, Chair
Rebecca Culbertson
Greta de Groat
Kathy Glennan
Kristin Lindlan
Helen F. Schmierer
Paul J. Weiss

Introduction to the Task Force Report

In the review of the *International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD). Consolidated Edition*, draft of July 2006, the Task Force was mindful of the ISBD Review Group request that comments be identified as "for consideration now for the consolidated ISBD or for future work of the Review Group." Thus this report is divided into three parts: (1) current considerations, both general [p. 2] and specific comments [p. 4] on *ISBD Consolidated*; (2) future issues for the ISBD Review Group's consideration [p. 29]; and (3) identification of typographical errors in the current draft [p. 34].

The document beginning on p. 2 is intended as a draft response to the world-wide review. An appendix dealing with AACR2r and/or RDA will follow as a separate document.

Introduction

In preparing this report, we were mindful of the ISBD Review Group's request that comments be identified as "for consideration now for the consolidated ISBD or for future work of the Review Group." Since the purpose behind the creation of *ISBD Consolidated* was to create one document containing all elements of the existing ISBDs, "for consideration now for the consolidated ISBD" is taken to consist of the comments that accomplish the task of creating a single document of all ISBD elements. This includes some additions to the glossary since more terms need definition in a mixed format document than in a single format document. All other comments are included under "future work of the Review Group."

Thus this report is divided into three parts: (1) current considerations, both general [p. 2] and specific comments [p. 4] on *ISBD Consolidated*; (2) future issues for the ISBD Review Group's consideration [p. 29]; and (3) identification of typographical errors in the current draft [p. 34].

This arrangement does not deal with the issue of whether more than a "simple" consolidation should be done at this time. Some consideration of the "future" comments now by the Review Group would be appropriate in determining whether a different approach, such as is being done with the RDA, should be considered now, to accommodate changing technology, to accommodate a changing audience for the document, and to better cover all digital resources.

Current considerations: General comments

Editorial – Terminology

Generally use the imperative mood rather than the demonstrative mood in the impersonal passive voice.

Use the term "metadata" when possible, and use "data element" rather than "element."

Generally change "material" and "materials" to "resources," "items," or "manifestations," as appropriate.

Use "Area 7" instead of "note," to lessen confusion and to permit use of the word "note" as a verb when appropriate.

The term "ISBD" seems to be used in at least three ways in the document (the standard, the document, and a record conforming to the standard), which could lead to confusion. Be clearer on which meaning you intend at each instance. Consider using the following terms for the meanings described above: the standard, ISBD, and an ISBD record.

Standardize usage of terms of types of sources of information (prescribed source, preferred source, chief source) and review needs for their glossary entries.

Editorial – Terminology – Format labels

There is a definite problem with some of the terminology, especially as used in the labels identifying classes or types of materials. This problem seems to mostly be the result of combining various ISBDs without sufficient attention to the consolidation or generalization of the rules to reduce the ambiguity of the terminology used.

Monographic resources: Used frequently in the text as a synonym for "book" instead of relying on the glossary definition, which encompasses monographic resources in all classes of materials. Special problems occur when multiple phrases occur under a single stipulation. In many of these cases, the rule should be applied for monographic resources other than books and could be generalized, e.g. change title page to prescribed source, to extend the application of the rule.

Nonbook resources: ISBD Consolidated does not include a statement of what is covered by this category; even the glossary definition deals more with what is excluded than what is included. This term now covers more than what was included in ISBD(NBM), such as cartographic materials and notated music. However, this expanded use has not been addressed in the creation of ISBD Consolidated.

Continuing resources: Always separate into the separate categories of serials and integrating resources, for ease of finding the instructions in the text.

Review format labels for consistency. Remove “printed” from the labels in 0.4.2.1, 0.4.3.2, 0.4.3.6, etc. since those stipulations do not cover all printed resources (as defined in the glossary). Add “textual” in all cases when “monographic” is used to mean books. Define “nonprint” if used (5.1.2).

Standardize labels, including those that do not reflect an existing ISBD, e.g., resources in non-roman scripts (0.4.2.1), motion picture (1.5.2), sound recordings (4.4.6), transparencies and overlays (5.1.3), filmstrips (5.1.3), microforms (5.2.3), visual resources (5.2.3).

Editorial – Consistency

Create a style sheet to produce a more readable and consistently written document.

Review all of the typography for indentation and use of bold and italic conventions. For example, “Examples” halfway down p. 120 is not indented or italicized, and the headings for the stipulations under 5.2 are not consistently bolded.

Make sure that if indentation is not used to show the start of a new paragraph, each new paragraph is preceded by a blank line (cf. paragraphs, or assumed to be 3 paragraphs, under **For older monographs** (p. 10)).

Present examples consistently, always identifying “editorial comments” as such.

Example(s) should always be introduced by that word, and not by e.g. (cf. p. 60, mid-page).

Editorial – Spelling

Spell-check and copyedit the whole document to identify numerous errors and misspellings.

Spell “loose-leaf” and “multi-level” consistently.

Editorial – Use of GMD in examples

Consistently use valid GMDs in examples, and add them to examples whenever appropriate.

It is time to get of the unhelpful practice of giving “GMD” as the GMD, rather than using real examples. We don’t do this for any other element, and we should not do it for this one.

Editorial – Layout

The layout of the stipulations needs to be reviewed throughout for clarity and consistency. For example, on p. 24, the indentations of the paragraphs convey incorrect information. The outline really should read:

- For printed resources ...
 - For textual monographs ...
 - For older monographic resources...
 - For continuing resources ...
 - For cartographic resources ...
 - For notated music resources ...
- For nonbook resources ...
- For electronic resources ...

Glossary

Define “tête-bêche” to clarify if this term applies to “parallel language” texts when they are issued together but are **not** inverted.

Confine definitions to glossary instead of having them appear in the context of the stipulations. This change would make the text more readable, reduce redundancy, and increase consistency. Create an editorial convention in the main text to convey when terms have glossary entries.

Specification of elements – General

Include a section on what kind of information to expect at each data element. This is an important part of any well-conceived standard containing elements.

Current considerations: Specific comments

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Introduction	p.3	Paragraph 2: A sense of unease arises with the “national” bent of envisioned descriptive and cataloging rules. We understand that nationalness is part of IFLA’s approach to things, but the 40 years of ISBD not to mention the 30 some years of AACR, which in its first edition was translated and used in more than 90 countries, suggests that we are working not for nationalness but for internationalness. It would be beneficial if emphasis on national were reduced in the Introduction.
Introduction	p.5	The principles do not acknowledge public, special and school libraries. That public libraries are nowhere acknowledged is particularly unfortunate (we realize that these are principles that the Review Group either defined or were defined for it), but some inclusivity here for other types of libraries is critical. The public library is the people’s university.
Introduction	p.5	Objectives and principles: The second objective has not been achieved. ISBD has not achieved the uniformity in stipulations across types of resources that it could and should. The meaning of the third principle is not clear. The fourth principle has not been adhered to. It does not appear that the fifth principle has been adhered to. An objective or principle should be added about the records being usable by our patrons.
Introduction	p.6	Paragraph 2: at the very least the places where the change(s) have been made should be identified, if not in the text here, with a reference to the place in the <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> where it occurs.
0.1.2	p.8	Is this really to serve “national bibliographic agencies” in a primary way? Or is it, “... bibliographic agencies, particularly national bibliographic agencies, and throughout the ...” (that is, the service is to all bibliographic agencies, not first and foremost to national bibliographic agencies)
0.1.2	p.9	Paragraph at top, “records produced in one country”: Again this emphasis on nationalness that should be downplayed (cf. comment at Introduction, p.3)

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.1.3	p.9	Paragraph 2, explaining mandatory, mandatory in certain situations, and optional is too important to be buried. Formatting into separate paragraph for each category might make the information more easily located and remembered. Text should be reviewed carefully to ensure that the working specified in the second paragraph of 0.1.3 is used consistently throughout the document.
0.1.3	p.9	Paragraph 3, re the national bibliographic agency ... again the nationalness. This paragraph might be broadened to comprehend the concept that a group of libraries, not just the “national bibliographic agency,” following the same rules, etc., work to create the definitive record for each resource.
0.1.3	p.9	Paragraph 4 should be removed if the object of these stipulations is to unambiguously meet the purposes set out at top of p.8. Many bibliographic agencies already add optional elements, if only to include the size (which is an optimal element). Many libraries other than “national bibliographic agencies” are preparing what is the “definitive record”; less latitude here is likely better.
0.1.3	p.9	Perhaps, paragraph 5 should precede paragraph 4.
0.1.3	p.9	Paragraph 7: “cataloging code” would read just fine in this paragraph without “national” (cf. comment above at Introduction, p.3).
0.1.4	p.10	Inset (2): this is display stipulation, which seems not appropriate at this juncture.
0.1.4	p.10	Paragraph 2, (beginning It is recommended ...) is the preferred approach. Thus, it should be presented first. The alternate approach covered by the first paragraph and (1) and (2) should be clearly identified as an Alternative approach (perhaps presented in a footnote)
0.1.4	p.10	The For ... headers: it is unclear to what these refer, of what they are subordinate, in part because there is no numbering or indentation to guide the reader.
0.1.4	p.10	At For multimedia resources ... : It is not clear why the alternative is specified repeating a paragraph above.
0.1.4	p.10	at bottom, For continuing resources ... , last 4 words: Use “described” rather than “catalogue”.
0.1.4	p.11	At For sound recordings : What does this stipulation mean? Describe the resource as a book and put on a note saying it’s a sound recording?
0.1.4	p.11	At For electronic resources , “For cataloguing purposes” should be “For the purposes of description are treated one way when direct access and another way for remote access.” A source is not treated “two ways”, there are two forms of treatment identified and one applies to each type of access.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.1.4	p.11	Paragraph 1 would end quite sensibly with the (e.g., a resource on a network). Getting into hard drives and storage devices is not helpful because almost everything on a network is on such a device. Other storage devices could comprehend a CD installed in a computer by a person and that computer is on a network for multiple users, which puts one back into the hybrid of one and two. What is not stated here and what might be useful is guidance of what path to take if you are not certain if it is direct access (that is, could you have a disc in your hand or do you need to have a disc in your hand to declare something direct access?).
0.1.4	p.11	If the purpose of 0.1.4 to describe the role of various physical presentations, then the commentary should be limited to that (which means that the musing over edition at For electronic resources is out of place here). If edition is so critical, there should be a reference forward to consult the Edition discussion later where it should be treated in detail.
0.3	p.11	The title of this section makes it unclear whether prescribed punctuation is an official part of the ISBD standard or not.
0.3.1	p.11	Make these elements repeatable: GMD; edition statement (especially for electronic resources); date of publication, production and/or distribution; date of printing or manufacture, physical description area, and note area.
0.3.1	p.11	A-B: Such statements are not the ideal way to show repeatability. Delete points A-B and add another column to the table (p. 12), as with Usage.
0.3.1	p.11	C: Move this also into the table (p.12), such as by adding a new value of "1" to the Usage column, meaning that only the first is mandatory.
0.3.1	p.11	D: Delete existing statement and replace with: Provide each data element, regardless of whether the information appears also in another data element.
0.3.1	p.11	Chart: 4. Publication... , 4.4 Date of publication... This is mandatory for monographic resources, but conditional for continuing resources .
0.3.1	p.12	At Note: ISBD continues not to define what a dash is. Because much of the time people are inputting or producing displays on computer terminals, it might be useful to stipulate two adjacent hyphens, if that is what is intended.
0.3.1	p.12	Move the note to 0.3.2. (same recommended for note on p. 13 as well)
0.3.1	p.12	The meaning of footnote 5 is not clear.
0.3.1	p.13	Move the note to 0.3.2.
0.3.1	p.13	At number 8 in the table, delete "Fingerprint (for older monographic resources)"; it is not part of the name of the area.
0.3.2.12	p.16	Hebrew example: this example is garbled. See correct version in ISBD(PM), p. 18.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.4	p.16	This whole section is ridiculously complex. Dictate much less strictly, favoring flexibility.
0.4.1	p.16	There should be a general stipulation for the “mode of issuance” stipulations.
0.4.1.2	p. 17	Adjust wording to read: Area 4: First and/or last iterations, if available
0.4.2	p.17	There should be a general stipulation for before the special stipulations.
0.4.2	p.18	At For older monographic resources , paragraph 4: This brings to mind that there is no stipulation at For printed monographic resources specifying the need for information in area 7 if information is taken from a substitute.
0.4.2.1	p.19	Buried in here one finds Resources in non-roman scripts (without any reference from other categories under this stipulation); how is one to know that this category exists?
0.4.2.3	p.20	Paragraph 1, “... is problematic because”: This is a change of tone. There should be a straightforward statement of how to proceed absent any title page or single equivalent source of information with agonizing about being “problematic”.
0.4.2.3	p.20	inset 2 a) refers to “Principle A” which has not been adduced. Is it no. 1 within the same inset?
0.4.2.3	p.20	inset 2, paragraph 2, last sentence. Because this is the overriding preference, it should be stated earlier and preferably more succinctly.
0.4.2.4	p.21	Paragraph 1: reference to “TEI header” and “HTML title” will date this document. Use only one; likely, the TEI header is the better choice as there are rules about its construction that lead to something that is more like title-page information. Unless ISBD plans a major change to use expression “metadata,” (it is only used in <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> three times!) better to identify as “encoded information”.
0.4.2.4	p.21	See also comment that follows re paragraph 3, and combining it with paragraph 1.
0.4.2.4	p.21	Paragraph 2: keep to one e.g. Reword as: When the resource is unreadable without processing (e.g., it is compressed), the information should be taken from the resources when it has been processed for use.
0.4.2.4	p.21	Paragraph 3: “source that provides the fullest and most complete information” suggests external source (that is covered in next paragraph).

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.4.2.4	p.21	Paragraph 3 could be combined into paragraph 1 to make clear that the stipulation currently in paragraph 3 applies to internal sources. It could be a second sentence in paragraph 1 following the sentence ending “labels” in the draft. If the carrier is considered to be “internal,” then how it and its label differ from “container” might be clarified (cf. paragraph 4, inset 2). The current last sentence in paragraph 1 (The metadata may be included ...) is out of place because it is talking about internal or external. Paragraph 1 is only internal sources).
0.4.2.4	p.21	Rewritten paragraph 1 (combining with paragraph 3): Sources internal to the resource itself. Preferred to all other sources, such information is taken from formally presented information, for example, in the title screen, main menu, program statements, first display of information, the header to the file including “subject” lines, home page, encoded information (for example, TEI header), and from the physical carrier and its labels. When the information varies in degree of fullness in these sources, the source that provides the fullest or most complete information is preferred.
0.4.2.4	p.21	Paragraph 4. Paragraph 1 on this page begins with a defining phrase (Sources internal to the resource itself). In the interests of consistency, paragraph 4 should also have a defining phrase: Sources external to the resource. In the interests of readability, Paragraph 1 (Sources internal to the resource itself) and Paragraph 4 (Sources external to the resource) should each be numbered or marked in some way so it is clear that paragraphs 2 and 3 relate to paragraph 1 (Sources internal to the resource itself).
0.4.3.4	p.22	Correct header from “Printed notated music resources” to “Notated music resources”.
0.4.3.4	p.23	At For older monographic resources: Wouldn’t the stipulation in parentheses re “title page” apply also to other printed resources? That is, if the “title page” is discounted what affect does this discounting have on other areas?
0.4.3.4	p.24	The inset note Note: For printed resources, the cover and/or spine are considered prescribed sources only if the resource was issued with the cover and/or binding. would apply to any printed material; it should thus precede the list of categories (it also applies to notated music) and be added to the paragraph at the top of the page.
0.4.3.4	p.24	At For nonbook resources, paragraph 2, the floating sentence “When any of these resources is in electronic form ...” needs to be placed elsewhere. Very early in <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> a statement about combining monographic and electronic, etc., appears; what is needed here is a reference to that stipulation (last paragraph of 0.1.3).

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.5	p.24	In the sentence reading "... transcribed from the resource and are, therefore, whenever practicable, in the language(s) and script(s) ...", the practicability here should be limited to script(s); language should not be an issue. ISBD should not support change in language.
0.5	p.25	Paragraph before For older monographic resources : it might be useful to recommend "systematic transliteration according to a published standard".
0.6.4	p.26	"... similar national standards": A cataloging agency typically chooses a national standard, not more than one. Instead of saying "national standard", "standard" might be better because there are association standards that have international acceptance.
0.6.6	p.26	Paragraph 2, beginning "When the meaning ...": The "etc." after "amico[rum]" should be removed.
0.7	p.27	Current ISBD(A) redraft has more robust stipulations for I J U V rendering.
0.8	p.27	Paragraph 1: Delete the second sentence. Or change it to read: Most examples are based on the description of existing resources.
0.8	p.27	At For older monographic resources : Does not current ISBD(A) keep the punctuation and not allow ambiguity about editions (cf. p.14)?
0.9	p.27	Do other languages or scripts not have an equivalent to "sic"?
0.10	p.28	"... note is made if necessary." What does that "necessary" mean? Elsewhere the wording is "if useful to the users of the catalogue".
0.11	p.29	It is not clear that the stipulation regarding imperfections should apply only to older monographic publications.
0.12.1.3	p.30	This stipulation should precede the rule of 5 because it trumps that stipulation.
0.12.2.1	p.30	"generic term" here is used with different meaning than at 1.1.3.5.
0.12.2.3	p.31	Last example illustrates only one form of treatment outlined in 0.1.4, where the other approach is to combine such things into one record (this example emphasizes the need for 0.1.4 to be clearly identified as an alternative)
0.12.2.4	p.31	Isn't this already covered in 0.12.1.1 because title as given is not the same? Should the example be moved to 0.12.1.1, with an editorial comment identifying the nature of the change?
1	p.37	Recommended punctuation. It would be useful to include the stipulation for the punctuation of alternative titles as an instruction.
1	p.39	At Continuing resources , the last sentence makes sense, but only after several readings. The "same language or script" here is not really the issue is it? The issue is continuing resource with manifestations of more than one work; each manifestation gets its own record (tête-bêche seems also a red herring here).

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1.1.1	p.40	In examples: why is Julie ou La nouvelle ... recorded as that rather than as: Julie, ou, La nouvelle ...?
1.1.2	p.41	List presented is not exhaustive; why not use e.g., and list three examples. "Other matter that is not title proper information" is an interesting expression. What it says is, if you know what a title proper is you know what a title proper isn't; this guidance is a bit circular.
1.1.3.3	p.42	At For electronic resources : Here and elsewhere the use of "Note, however," is not needed. A simple declarative sentence works just as well, perhaps better. Remove "Note, however".
1.1.3.4	p.42	In examples, punctuation of alternative titles is inconsistent (several do not show commas before and after the "or" word)
1.1.3.5	p.42	Very weak stipulation. Letters and numbers should be included when they are presented as part of the title; the clause "when they are essential information to distinguish the title proper from other titles" should be dropped. That clause would render Tarkington's Seventeen title-less, 20,000 leagues under the sea to Leagues under the sea.
1.1.3.5	p.42	The circumstances when numbers should be recorded as a dependent section number is another matter.
1.1.3.5	p.43	At For notated music ... , perhaps "generic" term is acceptable; the AACR formulation "type of composition" is more instructive and better terminology (particularly as "generic" term gets advanced elsewhere with other meaning) cf. also 1.4.4.7.
1.1.3.6	p.43	This sentence (and many similar sentences) would read more helpfully with the "when" clause at the beginning.
1.1.3.6	p.44	At For nonbook resources , does it continue to make sense to have this video exception? If it does, then might it be stated starting with: Even when the credits are linguistically connected with the title, credits for performer, director, producer, presenter, etc., that precede or follow the title are not considered as part of the title proper. The distinction between title and title proper is useful here.
1.1.4.1.2	p. 44	There may be titles in other languages and scripts that are <i>not</i> parallel titles. The distinction needs to be made. In current description there seems little attention to the language of the publication; titles are routinely transcribed in the order in which they appear. Thus the last clause, top. of p.45, seems to be the practice.
1.1.4.2.3	p.45	Tête-bêche is not a condition; remove "condition".
1.1.4.3	p.45	Is space-semicolon-space being specified for contents notes as internal prescribed ISBD punctuation?

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1.1.4.5.1	p.46	Generally the common title is given in area 6, but continuing resources instructed to put it in area 7, although this is not usually done. But see below at 1.1.7 when for serials, the information is sometimes in area 6. This needs to be evaluated for consistency across types of material and with continuing resources. See also Area 8.
1.1.5.1	p.48	“Spacing” should also be included, because we remove spaces around person’s initials or other initials.
1.1.5.1	p.49	Why are asterisks being removed from titles? An asterisk is not punctuation. This seems quite wrong.
1.1.5.2.1	p.51	Older monographs, follows the stipulation in the first paragraph on the page. There is no need to repeat that information.
1.1.5.2.1	p.51	At For older monographic resources , paragraph 2: “stipulations above” means what? Above where?
1.1.5.4.1	p.53	May be helpful to add: “Additional information is supplied in Area 7 (cf. 7.1.1.2)
1.1.5.4.2	p.53	Repeats 1.1.5.2.2.
1.1.6	p.55	At For electronic resources : “file names” not selected as title proper: there is no section 1.1.2.3. What is meant here?
1.1.7	p.55	At For serials : paragraph 2, at “... the section becomes an independent title, i.e., it appears ...” This should be an e.g., as the situation described is but one situation where the common title is no longer needed. Perhaps a more typical example would be that the common title no longer appears on the publication.
1.1.7	p.55	Here the “series” information goes into area 6; earlier such info was going into area 7 (cf. above at 1.1.4.5.1; area 6 vs. area 7 needs to be evaluated for consistency across types of material and with continuing resources)
1.1.7	p.55	At For serials , under “For supplements and insets” – more understood terminology in the United States is “inserts” rather than “insets.” On page 47, “insert/inset” is used. Adjust to consistent use of terminology.
1.2	p.55	Reference to Appendix C for the list of terms, or give them here.
1.2.4	p.56	One of the ISBD’s major problems has been multitype resources. This draft does not yet achieve resolution. For example, at this section, have the GMD be repeatable, rather than defaulting to the GMD “multimedia” or “kit” for multitype resources.
1.3.1	p.57	Last paragraph beginning “When a parallel title is linguistically ...”: An example of this situation would be instructive.
1.3.2	p.57	This stipulation deals only with books, not all printed resources. This practice occurs throughout the <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> when the expression “printed resources” is used but what is meant is “printed textual resources”.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1.3.5.1	p.58	Paragraph 3, referring to 1.1.5.1, which talks not of the “transcription” of obvious typographic errors, but of their “correction”. This stipulation should likely be replaced with a simple: Transcribe the parallel title following the stipulations at 1.1.5.1. A simple reference works just fine, reduces repetition and the likelihood of inadvertent change in the text.
1.3.5.4	p.59	Because the “common title and dependent title” are the “title proper”, the stipulation would reasonably end with “... selected as the title proper.”
1.4.1	p.61	This stipulation is at odds with 1.1.5.1 p.50 for continuing resources.
1.4.2	p.61	Paragraph 1: use the wording at 1.1.3.6 which is more concise, or reconcile the differences between the two. In any event, use the same details at each stipulated in the same wording.
1.4.2	p.62	At For updating looseleafs ... , “... words relating to the currency of the content are not included ...”: An example of this would be illuminating.
1.4.3	p.63	Stipulation is at odds with 1.1.4.1.1 (p. 44) at Continuing resources , where the stipulation is exactly the opposite.
1.4.3	p.63	At For continuing resources , there is no mention of 1.1.4.1.1.
1.4.4.1	p.63	At For notated music , the reference to 1.1.3.5 is blind.
1.4.4.2	p.63	Here there are separate stipulations for continuing resources and for serials. Should the stipulation for serials be indented as a subset of the continuing resources? The same question applies to the heading for updating loose-leafs at the top of p. 64.
1.4.4.2	p.64	At For updating loose-leafs : This repeats stipulation from p. 62. Why?
1.4.4.3	p.64	Example introduced by e.g., rather than “Example”.
1.4.4.6	p.66	Defer to glossary Appendix for definition. Note that “Common title and dependent title” are the title proper in this instance. The use of “as a whole” is not needed.
1.4.4.6	p.66	Paragraph 2 should be moved after the examples as the examples do not exemplify its stipulations.
1.4.4.7.1.	p.66	Paragraph 2 should be moved after the examples as the examples do not exemplify its stipulations.
1.4.4.7.4	p.68	At For notated music ... , perhaps “generic” term is acceptable; the AACR formulation “type of composition” is more instructive and better terminology (particularly as “generic” term gets advanced elsewhere with other meaning)..see also earlier comment at 1.1.3.5.
1.5.2	p.69	It would be helpful to acknowledge that organizations do more than sponsor (whether intellectually or financially).
1.5.2	p.70	At For electronic resources , the style seems to be to use “e.g.” not “for example”.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1.5.3.3	p.71	Reference at end of stipulation to 1.5.3.7 takes you to 1.4 which is a better place to be sent directly from 1.5.3.3.
1.5.3.4	p.71	Definition of details relating to other descriptive elements should be consistent and consistently presented.
1.5.3.8	p.72	Paragraph 2: This is not an exception; a different condition is being described. Word better as: When the name of the responsible entity is explicitly repeated on the prescribed source of information in a formal statement of responsibility, the name of the responsible entity is transcribed as a statement of responsibility.
1.5.3.8	p.73	Last sentence: Why is this stipulation required?
1.5.4.4	p.74	Paragraph 2: unclear why referring to 5.4.2.
1.5.5.1	p.75	At For continuing resources , the content of paragraph 1 is repeated in paragraph 2. Is there some reason for this repetition?
1.5.5.4	p.77	At For nonbook resources : should the header be more specific and be: For sound recordings and moving image material ?
1.5.5.5	p.77	A when in doubt stipulation might be added as the last sentence.
1.5.5.9	p.78	Should the stipulation include the instruction, “in the language or script of the title page”?
1.5.5.10	p.80	At For nonbook resources and electronic resources : The first sentence (“When the prescribed source of information is composite in character (as in the case of a multipart or multimedia resource having no unifying principal source or the credit sequence of a motion picture), the statements of responsibility are given in logical order ...”) seems like it is talking about two different things: a collection of separate pieces with their own chief sources, and a film/video with credits. Are credits composite merely because all of the information does not appear on the screen at the same time? Credits do have a sequence of information presented in a certain order, just as a title page typically does (though if you take into account both beginning and end credits, that could be composite; sometimes the opening credits alone are sufficient, sometimes both sets of credits must be consulted to gather complete information). What does the stipulation intend? That motion picture credits should routinely be transcribed in a “logical” order?
1.5.5.12.4	p.85	At For older monographic resources , the stipulation begins “The latter is (are) ...” There is no antecedent for latter; what latter is this?
2	p.87	Line 1 is not a sentence.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
2.1.1	p.89	At For electronic resources , the long discussion of what constitutes an “edition” includes information that earlier at 0.1.4 (physical carrier) is not categorized as “editions”: Not all circumstances where a separate record is created are different editions. These stipulations should be looked at very carefully to determine if the details presented here in Area 2 are useful. Much of what is being cataloged as electronic resources are integrating (in which case many of the details that mark an “edition” are not known) or the publications very clearly announces its new and improved status, in which case the newness of it is clear.
2.1.1	p.89	Examples under B, example four should read . – Annual cumulated ed.
2.1.1	p.89	An example of an increasingly common form of edition statement should be included: . – 1st Carroll & Graf ed. For verification, the source is: Fairweather, Maria, 1943- Madame De Staël / Maria Fairweather. – 1st Carroll & Graf ed. – New York : Carroll & Graf Pubs., 2005. – xxii, 522 p.: ill. ; 25 cm.
2.1.1	p.90	The first paragraph is more or less impossible to follow. Who can really know anything about “all the copies of a resource”? This note cries out for FRBRization.
2.1.2	p.90	Second sentence could be expanded to identify the source used for abbreviations: Standard abbreviations from the cataloging agency’s cataloging code are used.
2.1.2	p. 90	Because the “local editions” are not local names for an edition but rather an edition named for a location perhaps “Location edition” or “regional edition” or “geographic edition” would be a more meaningful characterization than “Local edition”.
2.1.2	p.91	At For continuing resources . We are not familiar with the use of inserts/insets or supplements as edition statements, unless as in the first example a word indicating “edition” is present. There are resources in different editions issued with and without supplements or inserts, but they are typically identified as “teacher’s edition” or in some other manner. Is this somehow referring to integrating resources?
2.1.2.	p.91	At For continuing resources , last example is suspect. What might have been on the publication that results in interpolation of “with supplements” in brackets? Bracketed edition statements are generally troublesome, and this is more so than most.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
2.1.4.1	p.92	At For continuing resources, inset a: Change the wording to read "... indicating volume numbering, designation, or chronological coverage (e.g. (Vol. 3, no. 2 (Mar./Apr. 1990) are given in area 3 ...". (We are removing the "or" from before "designation)
2.1.4.1	p.93	At For continuing resources , inset b), an example of this would be instructive.
2.3.3	p.95	At For nonbook resources , this stipulation seems superfluous; this information would be included for any type of material.
2.3.4	p.95	See comment above at 2.3.3. Why are the first and third examples that seem to be illustrating the same point punctuated differently, with the third putting information in statement of responsibility?
3	p.99	Change the name to "Specific type of resource area".
3	p.99	Paragraph 3: Area 3 is also repeated for multiple occurrences of a mathematical data statement for a single cartographic resource.
3	p.99	"Score and parts" example does not seem to be appropriate for serials (i.e., this seems to be a finite entity)
3.1.1.1	p.100	Because "representative fraction" is use so few times, there seems no reason to use RF in its stead, particularly as RF, itself, is not used in the description as an abbreviation.
3.1.1.4-.5	p.101	The verbs use to describe the method of determining scale are inaccurate. Stipulation 3.1.1.4 should use "computed" rather than "derived" because the RF is calculated mathematically from a verbal scale statement. Stipulation 3.1.1.5 should use "derived" rather than "computed" because using a bar scale entails interpreting a scale indicator devise, which does not result in an exact scale.
3.1.1.5	p.101	Because this method does not result in an exact scale, the RF should be preceded by "ca."
3.1.1.5	p.101	Example 2: One would not use a bar scale as the source of the scale of the resource when a verbal scale statement is given, unless the verbal statement is inaccurate because the resource had been reduced or enlarged. A bar scale would be used to verify that the scale based on a verbal scale statement is accurate and, if inaccurate, this would not be the scale statement.
3.1.1.7	p.101	In sentence 2, should "or its equivalent in another language and/or script" be added following "Scale not given" ?
3.1.3.2	p.101	Paragraph 5, at last line on page: should "or its equivalent in another language and/or script" be added following "W, E, N, and S"?
3.2	p.103	Sentence 1 contains an incorrect use of "resource." In ISBD, the "resource" is what is being cataloged; thus the reference to other formats/manifestations as "resource" is not appropriate.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
3.2.1.1	p.104	Use of “subjoined”: Is there a better word?
3.3	p.105	Paragraph 3: This paragraph is wordy and confusing. The source for numbering is the entire resource. It might be simpler to say: If numbering is taken from any source other than the resource, the numbering may be given in area 3 enclosed in square brackets or given in area 7.
3.3.1.1	p.106	Second set of examples (and also 3.3.3, p. 107, second set of examples; 3.3.7, p.108 examples). We typically do not assume year and bracket in parts of years. We record the information found on the issue, that is if “75 is on the issue, “76” is transcribed not “[19]76”.
3.3.7	p.108	Example 1: Our practice would be to use “v.” for repeat of volume designation; thus example would read: Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1971)-v. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1975)
3.3.7	p.108	It would be useful to have an example of numbering that includes volume and number, and issue whole number.
4	p.110	Prescribed source, at For older monographic resources: The issue made here of “discounted title pages” makes more important a better placement of the information at 0.4.2.1 which applies to more than Older monographic resources .
4.0	p.110	Last sentence. If the intent is that the publication or production statement of the original is given in Area 7, even if it appears on the chief source (cf 7.2.4.2), this stipulation should make that point.
4.1.1	p.113	Is it only Older monographic resources that should have the source of place of publication identified in area 7 under certain circumstances?
4.1.5	p.114	The stipulated use of “etc.” may be confusing in the context of older records where [etc.], which was used to indicate that the place and/or publisher has changed during the lifetime of a serial. It may be preferable to use “[and other places] or [and other publishers] or the equivalent in the language of the cataloging agency” to be more specific about what the interpolation means.
4.1.9	p.115	Consider rewording stipulation as: If it is considered necessary for identification, a qualifier such as the name of a country, state, province, etc., is added, using standard abbreviations. A question mark is used if the qualifier is presumed to be in a particular larger jurisdiction, but it is not definite.
4.1.9	p.115	Example 7, change to “New Haven [Conn.]”
4.1.9	p.115	Add as example 8 “[Lansing, Mich.?”]
4.1.14	p.117	The stipulation is to provide “probable city or town” followed by a question mark. Would it also be helpful to add the name of the larger place (state, country) when city or town is not a well-known place?
4.1.16	p.118	Another script only? Not another language or script?

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
4.2.6	p.120	Perhaps it is better to not to shorten the names of publishers but to transcribe them as they appear. Shortening of a publisher's name should not apply to organizations and agencies; these should be given in the form that appears in the chief source. For many cataloging situations, it is unclear how to even go about determining whether a shortened form of name of a publisher "can be understood and identified without ambiguity". Some of these publishers are not all that obvious from their shortened names. Even when it is, this is not a cost-effective way to determine form of name.
4.2.7	p.122	Reword to use ISBD expression "is given" not "repeated" and to make the full form in area 4 the choice: When the name of the publisher, producer, or distributor appears in full in Area 1, the full form is given in Area 4.
4.2.12.1	p.124	Agreement between monographic, cartographic, continuation and electronic <i>and</i> nonbook and notated music should be sought. Cf. suggestion above at 4.1.11
4.3.2	p.127	The embedded statement about "older monographic resources" in the final paragraph should follow the standard method for labeling stipulations dealing with a sub-set of resources.
4.4.4	p.129	"dates of the Christian era": This should be presented as "dates of the common era".
4.4.6	p.130	Examples: add an example illustrating U.S. usage: 1995, c1933.
4.4.6	p.130	Stipulation might include that the designation used to identify the copyright date is a standard abbreviation from the catalog rules used.
4.5.1&4.6.1	p.134	"must be given": wording needs adjustment to "are given".
4.5.1&4.6.1	p.134	These should refer back to the stipulation where the punctuation pattern is stipulated, using language such as "apply the punctuation pattern specified at Punctuation pattern (p.111)." Why if the stipulation is already described is it necessary to repeat instructions? It would be easier to refer back to punctuation pattern if there was a stipulation number associated with it.
5	p.137	At Electronic resources : The recently reviewed ISBD(CM) allows including the file size of remote-access cartographic electronic resources. This inclusion should brought into the scope for electronic resources in the consolidated ISBD.
5	p.137	At For electronic resources , there is no need to define or attempt to define Direct access here; it was defined earlier and is in the glossary; likewise remote access need not be defined here.
5	p.137	It should be allowed to give a physical description for remote access electronic resources.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
5.1	p.138	“... variations consequent upon the problems ...” this second sentence adds nothing and would usefully be removed.
5.1.1	p. 138	At For nonbook resources , more current examples would be welcome.
5.1.2	p.139	General stipulation speaks of “physical units”; for continuing resources and multipart monographic resources, stipulation speaks of “bibliographic units”. The use of bibliographic units may be a bit simplistic; there are many multipart monographs that are identified by physical units. This discrepancy/conflict needs attention.
5.1.2	p.140	At For nonprint continuing resources and nonprint multipart monographic resources : what do these stipulations add? Why is this category included? What does “nonprint” mean? Not textual?
5.1.4.1.5	p.145	At For nonbook resources : What types of nonbook resources are meant here? The stipulation clearly does apply to sound recordings.
5.1.4.2	p.147	At For printed textual resources : This stipulation seems also applicable to notated music.
5.1.4.2.2	p.148	A common situation is not addressed: Often the same preliminary matter is duplicated in each volume of a multiple volume set, even though the numbering of the text of each volume is given as one. If this is determined during cataloging to be duplicate numbering would it be recorded as: “2 v. (xx, 1578 p.)” or “2 v. ([xil], 1578 p.)”
5.1.6	p.149	What does “printed resources” mean here in Specific case of printed resources ? The stipulations in 5.1.6 treat of textual material, printed music and microforms. How does a stipulation for microform fit under “printed resources”?
5.1.6.1	p.149	At For notated music resources , paragraph 3: It is typically incorrect for e.g. to end with etc.; what the e.g. is attempting to convey is not clear.
5.1.6.1	p.149	Examples would be useful.
5.2.3.1	p.151	at For visual resources : Stipulation begins “Other visual resources ...” What other? Other as opposed to what?
5.2.4.1	p.152	At For older monographic resources : This repeats the stipulation in the first sentence of the general stipulation; why is it repeated? Is it because the second sentence of the general stipulation is not wanted? If so, why not?
5.2.4.2	p.152	Paragraph 1, examples: add: : b&w (tinted)
5.2.7	p.154	Table: apply better formatting.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
5.3.1	p.156	Give example information as the second sentence of the stipulation, it is not an example. 5.3.1. If the dimensions of the resource are given, they are given in terms of centimeters, or its equivalent in another language and/or script, rounded up to the next whole centimetre. A resource that measures 17.2 centimetres is described as “; 18 cm”.
5.3.1.1	p.156	Usual dimensions: Is this usual dimensions or is it Determining dimensions of resources in various formats. The recording of dimensions is specific to the format of the material.
5.3.1.1	p.156	Combine 5.3.1.1 and 5.3.1.2 to put all of the dimension information together for each type of material.
5.3.1.1	p.157	At For Cartographic resources , last sentence of the first paragraph: “The dimensions given, if not otherwise specified, are the dimensions of the part of the resource carrying the geographic detail”. This stipulation cannot be easily applied to a globe. What is meant by the “carrying the geographic detail” is that the dimensions are of the cartographic resource, not of the sheet on which it is printed, which the next paragraph describes, but this suggests that the statement does not apply to all types of cartographic materials.
5.3.1.1	p.157	At For nonbook resources : because sound discs and videodiscs are named as exceptions, also provide a reference to the stipulation that addresses them (5.3.1.1.3?).
5.3.1.1.3	p.158	Add a DVD example.
5.3.1.1.3	p.158	Sentence 1: List is likely not exhaustive; it should read: (e.g., discs, cassettes, reels of tape, reels of film)
5.3.1.1.3	p.158	It is not clear how to deal with MP3 files here. Would we have “1 sound disc (CD-ROM)”? How would we indicate that it contained MP3 files? What about online MP3 files? What about video files on CD-ROM or DVD-ROM or online?
5.3.1.2	p.159	At For sound discs : either change “i.e.” to “e.g.” or add “, or the disc is irregularly shaped” to the parenthetical comment.
5.3.1.2	p.159	See comment above at 5.3.1.1 re putting all dimension information for a type of material together.
5.3.2	p.161	There is no definition for “bibliographic format” here or in the glossary and there should be.
5.4.3	p.163	At For electronic resources : when does this situation arise? If the resource is remote, one might have documentation, but “accompanying material” is a bit difficult to imagine unless it is also online.
6	p.164	Paragraph 2, begins “Area 6 ...”. See our comments earlier (at 1.1.4.5.1, etc.) Area 6 vs. Area 7 for series needs to be evaluated for consistency across types of material and with continuing resources.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
6	p.166	At For multipart monographic resources : Is this the correct heading for the stipulation? The stipulation is not addressing all types of multipart monographic resources, but a specific kind with containers and labels.
6	p.166	Paragraph 2 (the paragraph before “For electronic resources”) also deals with electronic resources.
6	p.166	At For Electronic resources , how is it that the source for title proper is simply at p. 39: <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The resource itself, documentation, other accompanying material, container</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">and for series it becomes very complex? TEI header is not listed elsewhere as a specific source, although it is mentioned in 0.4.2.4.</p>
6.1.1	p.167	If “typographical errors are not corrected” it would be helpful to stipulate that one may record the correct form in area 7.
6.1.2	p.167	This stipulation would read more understandably if it began” The title proper of a series ...”
6.1.3	p.168	Subseries with a distinctive title. The area 6 vs. area 7 issue also needs attention as it appears elsewhere the <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> (cf. comment at 6, above)
6.2.1	p.169	What does “when necessary for identification” mean in this context? “are included” should be “are given”.
6.3.1	p.169	What does “when necessary for identification” mean in this context?
6.3.2	p.170	“... whole title proper”: If the common title and section title are defined as the title proper, then the expression “whole title proper” is not required.
6.3.3	p.170	“is treated” should be “is given”.
6.4.2	p.170	cf. comment above at 6.3.2.
6.5.2	p.171	Should cf. to earlier stipulation.
6.6.4	p.172	Should this be language and/or script?
7	p.174	Scope, 3rd line: Formal description (a new term), by which is meant Area 1-6? (If so, why not say it specifically?)
7	p.174	Under paragraph 3, the fourth example is NOT the combining of two notes, if that is the intention ... What is the intention?
7.03/7.04	p.176	Can these notes be combined? It is not clear why punctuation is specified (top p.177) Isn’t that covered in section 0?
7.04	p.177	Gopher example may be useful for history, but not for present. More current examples would be welcome.
7.1.1.2	p.179	At For electronic resources : examples, how is the first example (Title from title screen) different from: Title from printout of title screen?

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7.1.1.3	p.179	At For electronic resources : Words present are not a sentence. What is the stipulation?
7.1.1.4	p.180	Paragraph 1: Needs reference to 1.1.4.1.1 for exception for continuing resources.
7.1.1.4	p.180	Acronym vs. spelled out form inconsistent between serials and other publications; would be nice to get this consistent.
7.1.1.4	p.180	Paragraph 1: Needs reference to 1.1.4.1.1 for exception for continuing resources.
7.1.1.5	p.180	Is this “descriptive information” determined by the cataloger from examining the resource? Such information may not be “taken from outside the resource”.
7.1.2.1	p.181	“... is necessary” should be “is given only if”.
7.1.2.2	p.182	“... is necessary” should be “is given only if”.
7.1.2.2	p.182	Add examples: Articles in English or Japanese; summaries in English Text in German. Summaries and tables of contents in Russian and French
7.1.2.2	p.182	At For nonbook resources and electronic resources : “... a note may specify” should be: “... a note may be given to identify language”.
7.1.2.2	p.182	At For nonbook resources and electronic resources : Translations are covered at 7.2.4.1 which seems where this stipulation and examples belong.
7.1.3	p.183	Examples: Parallel title (from container): The four seasons ... and other titles from container give the appearance of illustrating the stipulation in the sentence following the examples, rather than the sentence preceding.
7.1.4.1	p.185	At Serials , footnote 16? Where is it?
7.1.4.1	p.185	At Integrating resources : Example should be preceded by Example (not e.g.)
7.2.1	p.186	All of these stipulations are specialized stipulations; note that 7.2.1 is numbered differently than 7.2.3 which are also specialized stipulations.
7.2.3.2	p.188	This is a general stipulation that may be applied to resources of all types and which should appear at 7.2.3 as: Details of the bibliographic history of the resource may be given if important to the users of the catalog.
7.2.3.2	p.188	What does “if required” mean?
7.2.4	p.188	Entire suite of stipulations needs to be rethought; notes of this type are made for other types of materials, not just continuing resources.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7.2.4.2	p.189	Stipulation at 7.2.4.2 for reproduction note, but refers back to 2.1.1 (which at 2.1.3, p. 92, has an example of [reproduction en facsimilé]. If this form of an edition statement is envisioned for reproductions, it would be helpful to have explicit instructions at 2.1.1+ instead of vague instructions telling you to put in an edition statement even if there isn't one.
7.2.4.2	p.189	The examples of this stipulation are only serials. Other examples would be helpful.
7.2.4.2	p.189	For motion pictures, it is extremely important to have the original date of creation/release — preferably somewhere searchable. Some monograph and non-book examples should be added here.
7.2.5	p.194	Paragraph 2: It is imperative that you know that two things have been issued together. Seems that the stipulation should read: “a note is given”.
7.3.2	p.194	To be consistent in form with 7.3.1 For notated music resources: notated music/music format statement , the stipulation title at 7.3.2 should be: For cartographic resources: mathematical data
7.3.2.3	p.195	This stipulation combines two different concepts for digital cartographic resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - digital graphic representation, which is given in area 3, and - geographic reference method, which we given in area 7. <p>In <i>ISBD Consolidated</i>, because digital graphic representation is not included area 3 or area 5 it appears that the only treatment for the information is in area 7. Either area 3 or area 5 seem a more appropriate place for this structured information; if treating it as a note, then stipulation 7.3.2.3 should be limited to digital graphic representation followed by sub-stipulations, 7.3.2.3.1 thru 7.3.2.3.8, all of which are related to digital graphic representation.</p>
7.3.2.3	p.195	Notes not included in area 3 including, for electronic cartographic resources, topology, compression, and the storage method used, digital graphic representation. When recording digital graphic representation the data type, object type, the number of the objects, and the format name may be given.
7.3.2.3.1	p.195	Delete as duplicate information to 7.3.2.3.
7.3.2.3.2 to 7.3.2.3.4		Renumber to 7.3.2.3.1 to 7.3.2.3.3.
7.3.2.3.5 and 7.3.2.3.6		Renumber to 7.3.2.3.3.1 and 7.3.2.3.3.2 as these are both methods of object counts and therefore should be sub-stipulations to 7.3.2.3.3.
7.3.2.3.7 and 7.3.2.3.8		Renumber to 7.3.2.3.4 and 7.3.2.3.5.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7.3.2.4 [new]		The other cartographic aspect included in 7.3.2.3 is the encoding method used to reference the spatial location of points and lines. Add the following stipulation: When available for electronic cartographic resources, the horizontal reference system (latitude and longitude, map projection, grid coordinate system, etc.) and the vertical reference system (e.g., altitude, depth) used for encoding spatial location are given.
7.3.3.4	p.197	Stipulation might also indicate that notes may also made about numbering errors.
7.5	p.198	Example: here and elsewhere: “tête-bêche” is characterized as a format, which it is not; change 8 th example to “. – Tête-bêche layout.”
7.5	p.198	Add new example: Text in English and French, each with title page and separate paging; French text on inverted pages <i>Editorial note:</i> Catalogue record is English
7.5	p.199	At For nonbook materials , (p.199), this is among the first places where description of notes for a category begin with “these may also include ...” A better beginning might be: “Notes may also include those on variations ...”
7.5	p.199+	Examples for electronic resources should be reviewed and whenever possible replaced with current examples.
7.7	p.202	Add example: . – Includes bibliographical references (p. 143-146) and index
7.7.1	p.202	Identified as being For Cartographic resources : As the stipulation is written, it would also apply to other types of materials — printed monographs, notated music (and perhaps as such, the stipulation belongs also at For multipart monographic resources , p. 202); the reference to 1.1.2.4 is a blind reference.
7.7.8	p.204	A way should be found/developed to give original date of production/ release in the contents note for moving images — along with all the other information including running time. ISBD has never included an example with title, running time, date, and statement of responsibility; for moving images we routinely include all of this. The addition of an example illustrating this point would be welcome.
7.8.2	p.205	At For continuing resources , the stipulation says to provide a note (cf. 8.1.3, p. 212 example) when the standard number is incorrect. Those preparing descriptions may not know that an incorrect number appears on the resource unless they have access to the ISSN database.
7.9.1	p.206	Stipulation should read “A note (mandatory) is given when the description ...” to follow the ISBD statement of wording at 0.1.3.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7.9.3/7.9.4	p.206	Combine the viewed on information after the source of title or description based on information (we never present alone). Description based on: 1995 ed. (viewed Sept. 14, 2006) Title from TEI header (viewed Sept. 14, 2006)
7.10.2	p.207	The first sentence about “factual, non evaluative account” applies to any summary and should precede the specialized stipulations.
7.10.4	p.208	Notes on numbers appear on publications other than electronic resources. Stipulation needs statement that is generalization before specific stipulations. It is also unclear how the numbers stipulated here are different from numbers covered in 8.1.4 and its sub-stipulations, which also apply to all types of materials.
8.1.2	p.212	At For notated music resources the stipulation should begin: “The publisher’s number is given when known. (cf. 0.1.3)”
8.1.4.3	p.213	Stipulation applies to more than commercially issue slide sets; this type of publisher control number appears on most types of visual materials. We assume that one always gives the company name and the number.
8.3.1	p.213	The i.e. to ISO 4217 should refer to/be in apposition to the standard not to the symbol; it would be better as: as in ISO 4217.
8.4.1	p.215	At For printed monographic resources and notated music resources : Binding might be a note, but it seems wrong as standard no. information when there is nothing to qualify.
8.4.1	p.215	At For nonbook resources “artist’s signed edition”: So long as this is being added, and as long as ISBD permits bracketed edition information, why isn’t this in the edition area?
Appendix A	p.217	It is unclear how having multilevel description optional (as opposed to either making it an alternative, mandatory or banning it) “provide[s] the stipulations for compatible descriptive cataloguing worldwide” or “aid[s] the international exchange of bibliographic records” (the first principle in the Introduction).
Appendix B	p. 219	Either go fully into technical encoding issues (character sets, syntactic markup, end-of-record markers, etc.) or delete this appendix.
Appendix C		Needs to be rewritten with all available GMDs listed in one column with the corresponding SMDs listed in an adjacent column (as in p. 221-222). Revising this appendix would allow for a single, complete list of GMDs and would reduce the duplication in this section, such as the abbreviations for colour and sound appearing on both p. 224 and 225.
Appendix C		This is the English version of the <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> , but it would be instructive to see some appendices added for other languages and/or scripts, which would appear in <i>ISBD Consolidated</i> in the other languages/scripts.

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Appendix C	p.222	Cassette: the sum of the housing and its workings is probably not a "system".
Glossary		While many of the SMD terms are defined in the glossary they are not all included and they all should be; none of the cartographic resources SMDs are included in the glossary.

Alternative title: Delete this entry and eliminate the use of the term throughout the document. [*Note: Dependent on future considerations decisions.*]

Antiquarian: Change the term to "antiquarian manifestation".

Caption title: Change the term to "caption". Change the text to: "A presentation of metadata given at the beginning of the first page of a manifestation."

Component part: Add: definition.

Continuing resource: Change the second sentence to: "A continuing resource is either a serial or an ongoing integrating resource." Delete the see also reference.

Core resource: Add an entry for this term with this text: "A resource that is an essential part of a multipart resource; a multipart resource exclusive of any subsidiary resources."

Direct access: Change the term to "tangible electronic resource". Change the text to: "An electronic resource that has a physical carrier, such as a disk/disc, cassette, or cartridge, designed to be inserted into a computer or peripheral by the user."

Edition: Delete this entry, as a non-technical term. Prefer "resource identifier" for the technical term. [*Note: Dependent on future considerations decisions.*]

Electronic resource: Most all of the other definitions are given as singular.

Electronic resource: Change the text to: "A resource that is intended to be processed by a computer for human consumption." Add glossary entries for "electronic data" and "software".

Extent: Change the text to: "The number of units making up the resource."

Film cartridge/Film cassette/Filmloop/Film reel: Split into entries for "film loop" and the generalized terms "cartridge", "cassette", and "reel".

Filmstrip: Make separate entries for "single frame" and "double frame".

Fingerprint: Delete "older monographic".

Format (Older monographic resources): Change the term to "Sheet format".

Frequency: Change "updates" to "iterations".

Graphic: Change the term to "still image". Delete the last sentence.

Homepage: Change the term to "home page". Change the text to: "The main or opening web page of a website or portion of a website."

Impression: Change the text to: "All copies of a manifestation produced at one time or in one operation. (See also Issue, State, Variant.)"

Insert/inset: need to clarify use of "inset" when referring to maps

Issue: Change the first definition to "The lowest-level successive part of a serial."

Issuing body: This entry is unclear.

Microfilm cartridge/ Microfilm cassette/ Microfilm reel/ Microfilm slip: See comment at Film cartridge/Film cassette/Filmloop/Film reel.

Microform: Change the text to: “A resource with images too small to be read by the typical unaided human eye, intended to be magnified at use.”

Monographic resource: Change the term to “monograph”.

Multipart resource: Change the text to: “A resource composed of discrete parts, conceived, created, realized, embodied, or arranged as a unit.”

Music format: Change the term to “notated music format”.

Newspaper: Change the text to: “A serial issued frequent intervals, usually daily, weekly or semiweekly, that reports events and discusses topics of current community interest.” The entry is out of alphabetic order.

Nonbook resources: This definition isn’t a definition and does not explain what categories of materials are covered by the term. Delete this entry and eliminate the use of the term throughout the document.

Notated music: Change the text to: “An expression that uses a symbolic system to represent music. “

Numbering: Change the text to: “The sequential identification of each part of a resource, usually a number and/or letter with or without an accompanying word (volume, number, etc.), or a chronological designation.”

Object: Change the text to: “Anything described other than a resource that is primarily bibliographic.”

Older monographic resources: Find a different, more technical term. Why are these limited to monographs?

Other title information: Delete this entry and eliminate the use of the term throughout the document. [*Note: Dependent on future considerations decisions,*]

Parallel edition statement, Parallel title: What is the value of continuing with the distinction between “parallel” information and other variants? Encoding the language of a title, whether “parallel” or “variant”, would gain us more than treating them differently. Delete these entries and eliminate the use of the terms throughout the document. Prefer “... in another language or script”. [*Note: Dependent on future considerations decisions.*]

Part(s): Change the term to “Music part”.

Physical carrier: Change the term to “carrier”, as the current term implies that there might be non-physical carriers, which would seem nonsensical. Change the text to: “The physical medium of a manifestation on or in which an expression is embodied. For certain categories of material, the physical carrier consists of a storage medium (e.g. tape, film) sometimes encased in a plastic, metal, etc., housing (e.g. cassette, cartridge) that is an integral part of the manifestation. (See also Container.)”

Picture: Delete the second sentence, which does not belong in a glossary entry.

Plate: Change the term to “plate number”. Change the text to: “The number identifying the printing plates from which an edition was printed. A plate number can consist of a

combination of numbers, letters and symbols; the name of a publisher may be included. In printed notated music, the plate number often appears at the foot of a page.”

Prescribed punctuation: Change the term to “encoding”. Change the text to: “Punctuation that precedes or encloses an area or data element, which helps identify the area or element.”

Printed resource: Change the term to “printed manifestation”. Change the text to: “A manifestation produced by a machine rather than directly by a human or animal, that is intended by legible by the human eye or (for visually impaired persons) by finger.”

Producer (Electronic resources): It is not clear what the value of this term is.

Producer (Motion picture): Change the text to: “An entity which has overall responsibility for a motion picture resource. Specific responsibilities may include various creative, technical and financial responsibilities.”

Producer (Sound recordings): It is not clear what the value of this term is.

Production company (Motion picture): Delete in favor of inclusion under “publish” or “publisher”.

Production (i.e. recording) company (Sound recording): Delete in favor of inclusion under “publish” or “publisher”.

Publication: Change the entry to “A published manifestation.”

Publish: Define

Publisher’s number (Notated music): Change the term to “publisher’s number”. Change and the text to: “A number assigned to a manifestation by its publisher, that identifies that manifestation and facilitate ordering and distribution. The name of a publisher may be included. For printed notated music, it usually appears on the title pages.”

Realization: Do not conflict with FRBR terminology. Replace this definition with the FRBR one. Give a separate entry for “performance”, with this text: “An event intended to be observed by one or persons other than the performers, in which a work is realized into an temporal expression, which can be recorded.”

Remote access: Change the term to “online manifestation”. Change the text to: “An electronic resource that is stored on a server and accessed through a computer network.”

Resolution (Electronic resources): Change the term to “resolution (visual content)”. Change the text to: “A measure of the visual sharpness of the visible embodied expression of a manifestation, often expressed as the total number or density of pixels, such as dots per inch, pixels per line, or lines per millimeter.” The cartographic sense of resolution does not appear to be used in the document, so just delete it. If it does get used, use the term “resolution (cartographic resources)” and give the text “The smallest dimensions of a feature that a map can depict.”

Reissue: Something is wrong with the qualification when one is a sub-category (motion picture) of the other qualifier (nonbook resources). Wouldn’t it be better to qualify the first definition with the categories of materials it actually applies to?

Resource: Change the text to: “A bibliographic entity; a work, expression, manifestation, or item. A resource may:

be tangible (e.g., an audiocassette) or intangible (e.g., a Web site),

consist of a single unit (e.g., a single photograph) or two or more units (e.g., three sheet maps),

represent two or more units produced and/or issued as set, or it may represent two or more units assembled after the fact by a collector, etc., and

conceptually or physically form part of a larger resource.”

One benefit of revising the definition is that it opens up several data elements to apply at multiple levels. For example, we currently distinguish between serials and integrating resources based on how they are issued, which is a manifestation attribute. This distinction is important in the way we manage our resources. Our users however would be better served by distinguishing on how new content is intended to be used, a work or expression attribute. It doesn't matter to them whether the manifestation of the *Encyclopedia of Associations* is successively issued or integrating; it is the fact that the content is kept up to date that matters. Redefining “resource” has the impact of making the seriality vs. integrating aspect be applicable to any of the four levels.

Score: Change the text to: “Notated music showing all the parts of an ensemble meant to be heard simultaneously, normally arranged one underneath the other on different staves.” Also change “musical notation” to “notated music” in the other glossary entries for terms including the word “score”.

Serial: Change the text to: “A continuing resource issued in a succession of discrete issues, usually bearing numbering. Examples of serials include print and electronic journals, magazines, ongoing directories, annual reports, newspapers, and ongoing monographic series.”

Series: Change the text to: “A resource composed of separate resources that were conceived, created, realized, or embodied as a unit. (See also Multipart monograph, Serial, Subseries.)”

Slide: It is unclear whether microscope slides are intended to be included here or not.

Sound cartridge/ Sound cassette/ Sound reel; Sound disc: See comment at Film cartridge/Film cassette/Filmloop/Film reel

Sound recording: Change the text to: “A manifestation intended to produce sound, designed for playback via particular equipment.” Do not exclude manifestations that are both sound and visual recordings; treat those as manifestations that are of two types.

State (Older monographic resources): Change the text to: “One or more items of one manifestation distinguished from other items of that manifestation in any respect that the publisher has not identified as representing a discrete publishing effort. (See also Edition, Impression, Issue.)”

Stereograph: Change the text to: “A pair of separate or superimposed images designed to be perceived as a single three-dimensional image when used with a special viewer. “

Subseries: Change the text to: “A series that forms part of a larger series.”

Tête-bêche: What if the text of the second part isn't inverted? Change the text to: “A pair of core manifestations inverted in relation to one another within a single carrier, with the result that they are each at the ‘front’ of that carrier.”

Title: Change the text to: “A word, phrase, or other group of characters that names a resource. Many resources have several titles, some found in the manifestation (on the

prescribed source of information, elsewhere on the resource, on the container, etc.), and some not (determined by scholars, a popular name used by society at large, etc.). (See also Common title, Dependent title.)”

Title page, screen, etc.: Change the text to: “A page (or facing pages), screen display, etc., at the beginning of a manifestation containing a formal presentation of the title, and often other metadata about the manifestation, its embodied expression, or its realized work.”

Title-page substitute: Delete this entry and eliminate the use of the term throughout the document. [*Note: Dependent on future considerations decisions.*]

Title proper: This term is very much cataloger jargon, especially with the adjective following the noun. Change to a term such as “primary title”, “citation title”, or “chief title”. Change the text to: “The designated chief title of a resource.” The rest of the current entry is not a definition, but instructions on selecting the title proper, which is appropriately already covered in the Specification of Elements section.

Transparency: Delete “bearing an image and” as transparencies can also contained text, notated music, etc.

Uniform Resource Locator: (blind cross reference to Uniform Resource Identifier)

Updating looseleaf: Change the term to “updating loose-leaf”.

Videocartridge/Videocassette Videoreel/Videodisc: See comment at Film cartridge/Film cassette/Filmloop/Film reel.

Videorecording: Change the text to: “A manifestation intended to produce moving images, designed for playback via particular equipment.”

Web page: Change the text to: “A web document encoded in a format that is generally native to web browsers.” This rewording is meant to exclude PDF, Microsoft Word or Excel files, etc.

Future considerations: Issues for ISBD Review

General

Attention to reconciling the differences between various types of printed material and their sources would be useful. We appreciate why notated music uses the “first page of music” as a source (and other monographic printed material does not) and that should be continued; what should be harmonized is the different order for colophon and cover, and the non-use of spine for notated music.

This draft reproduces a major fault of the previous editions — a failure to come to grips with digital materials, especially digital versions of materials that may have appeared in analog format. They still don’t seem to have a solution for describing both the aspects of content and of carrier. There seems no way of recording MIME types.

It is time for us to realize that we are not in the cataloging business. We are in the information services business. In the past, our traditional cataloging supported those services. However, the world is a vastly different place than it was when we first standardized cataloging. Metadata is far more generally available than it used to be, and comes in many more varieties of types, formats, sources, extents, and qualities. Administrators in libraries and their parent organizations continue to face limited budgets and increased calls for accountability. We need to ensure that our policies and practices are cost-effective. That is, we need to show that we deliver metadata that is worth

more than the cost of producing it. This draft does not lead to such cost-effective instructions. As a profession, we need to face the new reality and evolve, or we will die. If we don't produce a 21st century standard, others with far less experience with metadata will.

One example of an issue for which changes in the world around us necessitate our reconsidering the cost-effectiveness of what we are doing is duplicate detection. Some of us feel that duplicate records had a far more negative impact in the past than they do now. We need to consider the possibility of simplifying some rules so that metadata production will be faster and cheaper and able to be created by people other than fully trained catalogers, recognizing that we may generate some duplicate records along the way. It may be more cost-effective to generate 100 metadata records that may duplicate a couple of pre-existing records than only generate 70 records with no duplication.

Another aspect of our environment that has changed is our ability to display different views of a record. We do not need to display the same data to both catalogers and users. ISBD should take advantage of the ability to distinguish between metadata for public consumption (descriptive metadata such as author, title, and subject) and metadata for other catalogers (administrative metadata such as identification of the chief source).

As University of California's Bibliographic Standards Task Force report states, "It can be helpful to think of metadata provision as an ongoing process versus a one-time event." We need to design ISBD for a world where metadata gets created in one place but then gets copied, modified, abridged, expanded, translated, mapped into another system, etc. ISBD needs both to produce records that are repurposable (including use by metasearch engines) and to provide for the repurposing of non-ISBD data.

The ISBD's use of the terms *description* and *descriptive* does not match the use of those terms in other library communities, nor by the larger metadata community. For example, the NISO document *Understanding Metadata* defines *descriptive metadata* as "metadata that describes a work for purposes of discovery and identification, such as creator, title, and subject." Furthermore, we currently use *description* in two different ways: a set of descriptive data for a resource, and the normal dictionary definition. Context does not always provide sufficient evidence to quickly and easily decide which meaning is intended.

The traditional cataloging segmentation of bibliographic data into descriptive data (or descriptive and name/title authority control data) and subject data is an artificial one, that is not shared with the larger metadata community or, we would venture to say, our user communities. Not covering subject headings, but including nature and scope of the content will not make sense to those uninitiated in traditional cataloging. We need a document that looks — at the highest level — at what a whole bibliographic metadata record should be: general philosophy, element list, references to other standards. If ISBD doesn't provide this top-level perspective, it is likely that others (most likely computer folk, not librarians) will, and ISBD will be relegated to a lesser role in metadata circles. This is a golden opportunity for our community, and we should not hesitate to seize it.

Continued value of the ISBD

The current draft of the consolidated ISBD has outmoded assumptions, structure, perspective, approach to data elements, and even purposes. Traditional practices need to be re-examined in light of our current environment and priorities. To remain viable, the ISBDs need to keep current with the effects and functionality of technology, as well as with expectations of today's users and library staff, while continuing to be usable in a print environment. FRBR and other recent work provide a much better framework for bringing library metadata into the twenty-first century.

The conceptual soundness and usability of ISBD are being compromised by having the treatment of one concept being split up to various sections, where it is dealt with differently for

no apparent reason other than tradition. This also makes training much lengthier and more difficult. The biggest example of this is whole resource/part resource. These are now covered under common title/dependent title (1.1.1, 1.1.3.7, 1.1.4.5, 1.1.5.3, etc.), multipart resources (spread throughout), series (area 6), contents note (7.7), and multilevel description (Appendix A). Text on titles is spread all over. Notes related to particular data elements should be discussed at those data elements, not in a separate section.

Continuing distinction between information recorded in statements and notes is not helpful in our modern world. There are metadata standards, such as Dublin Core, that do not even have a concept of note.

One section that is missing is one on what kind of information to expect at each data element. This is an important part of any well-conceived standard containing elements. See these resources for examples of this:

- CONSER Cataloging Manual, Introduction to Part 1, paragraph 5
- CONSER Editing Guide, D1. Content, Organization, and Layout
- Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata, Organization of the Standard
- DCMI Metadata Terms, Section 1. Introduction and Definitions
- Encoded Archival Description Tag Library, Tag Library Conventions
- Getty vocabularies (Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names, Art & Architecture Thesaurus, or the Union List of Artist Names), About the [vocabulary], Information in the Record (Fields)
- Library of Congress Subject Headings, Components of Entries
- MARC 21 format (any), Introduction, Organization of This Document, Components of the Detailed Descriptions
- Medical Subject Headings, XML MeSH Data Elements, Key to element information
- Thesaurus of Graphic Materials, Introduction, I.C. Structure and Syntax
- UDC MRF Database Development and Design, Database structure
- UNIMARC Manual : Bibliographic Format, 2. Organization of the Manual
- VRA Core Categories, Category attributes
- many XML DTDs and schemas

Restructure as a data dictionary

We suggest restructuring this consolidated ISBD as a data dictionary, similar to ISBD(G). Such resources as MARC 21, EAD, VRA Core, and METS also provide good models of a data dictionary structure. The data dictionary structure enforces consistency across element descriptions and makes it much quicker to find needed information in the standard.

The data structure needs to be clearer, cleaner, more hierarchical, and more extensible.

Although there are many significant problems with RDA, it has made some worthwhile steps toward a more modern, useful, interoperable direction. Review its drafts for ideas to incorporate into ISBD, especially on objectives and principles.

Prescribed punctuation

The use of punctuation to delimit data elements is generally unfamiliar to users. It seems time for the ISBDs to call for labeled displays, in the language of the catalog. For shared electronic records, system tagging can be used to generate the displays. For shared printed records, a page of translations from the language of the source cataloging agency to one of IFLA's official languages would suffice in helping destination cataloging agency to interpret the records.

Changes requiring a new description

When to create a new record is covered for serials, integrating resources, and even for multipart monographic resources but not for single part monographic resources. Do we want to suggest that ISBD document when a new description is needed for them also?

ISBD and FRBR

ISBD needs to much more fully incorporate the FRBR models (not just the ER model but also the model of user tasks), and their concepts and terminology. This lack of FRBR influence is disappointing and perplexing, especially because the primary audience for ISBD is rule-makers as opposed to line catalogers.

Single-record approach

It is not clear whether the draft allow for the highly-used and pragmatic single-record approach, which utilizes a single record for multiple entities in certain instances. This approach needs to be sanctioned in order to reduce user confusion and realize cost-effectiveness in cataloging.

Reproductions

ISBD instructs to base the description of a reproduction on the reproduction, rather than on the original. It is a long-standing practice that libraries in the United States will likely continue to follow regardless of what ISBD says, and for good reason, describing a reproduction based on its original needs to at least be an option. Evidence shows that users primarily want and need the data about the original publication, not the specifics on when it was digitized or microfilmed. Another option would be to follow FRBR more closely and either create descriptions for both and treat them as related resources, or in one description record data for both, with each data element labeled as to which it belongs to.

Terminology

When there is a concept in the standard, the term we use for it should be in the language of the standard. If an existing term exists in the common parlance, use it. If not, but common terms can be combined in a way that regular users of the language would likely understand, use that. Only if that still does not work should we make up a word, or a non-obvious phrase. And since space is not the problem it was in card catalog days, there is substantially less motivation to use prescribed abbreviations. This is all true especially for words that users will see. For many years, it has not been an accurate assumption that the majority of our users know Latin words and abbreviations. It is time to switch to terms in the language of the catalog. I recommend:

<i>Existing term</i>	<i>Recommended term</i>
i.e.	that is
title proper	citation title
other title information	subtitle
et al.	and others
s.l.	[nothing; do not give the element]
s.n.	[nothing; do not give the element]

The following glossary entries seem unnecessary: absorption, access, acronym, analytical title page, art reproductions, avant-titre, bibliographic description, broadside, chorus score, colour, coloured illustration, common title, content standard, data set name, dependent title, dependent title designation, dimensions, directory, documentation, element, file name, fixing of the sound, former title, game, generic term, hologram, illustration, independent title, initialism, insert/inset, ISSN network, jigsaw puzzle, journal, laboratory kit, logo, main series, map series, map sheet title, merger, periodical, photograph, piano (violin, etc.) conductor part, planetarium, postcard, poster, print, reissue, reprint, scale, section (continuing resources), section title, series title page, split, study print, trade mark name, variant, version, wallchart, web site, World Wide Web, and World Wide Web site.

We would find it helpful if the Glossary included entries for the FRBR/FRAR terms, particularly: work, expression, manifestation, item; realization, embodiment (or their verb forms); aggregate, component; person, family.

We suggest deleting glossary entries for terms including the word “statement” or “designation”. If considered important, instead give generalized entries for the terms “statement” and “designation”.

Typographical Errors

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0.4	p.16	Two periods at end of first sentence.
1	p.39	Prescribed sources: Multipart monographic resources: 2nd line, "prescribed" not "prescribed"; 3rd line, "available" not "available".
1.1.1	p.40	5th paragraph contains incorrect references to 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.3.2. These references should be to 1.3.1 and 1.3.2.
1.1.3.4	p.42	5th example should be "Tantz-Kunst" not "Tants-Kunst" (according to DLC record in OCLC)
1.1.3.6	p.43	Examples: why is "classical" capitalized in "University of California publications in classical archaeology"?
1.1.4.1.1	p.44	last line, "choice" not "coice".
1.1.4.3	p. 46	In first example at top of page, "Tomorrow" should read "Tomorrowland."
1.2.5	p.56	Correct GMD examples 1 and 2 from [Printed music] to [Notated music].
1.3.1	p.57	Examples should be "Alles in allem", not "allemn" (per record in OCLC)
1.3.2	p.57	Correct GMD in example 1 from [Printed music] to [Notated music].
1.3.4	p.58	At end of stipulation, sentence ends with two periods.
1.4.2	p.62	For older monographic resources, Examples should be "Chemische Erfahrungen bey meinen ", not "meinem" (per record in OCLC).
1.4.4.2	p.64	"Updating loose-leafs" not "Updating loose-eafs".
1.4.4.5.1	p.65	Example 1 should be "Heart of darkness ", not "Heat".
1.4.4.5.1	p.65	Correct GMD in example 2 from [Printed music] to [Notated music]
1.4.4.7.3	p.67	Correct GMD in example 2 from [Printed music] to [Notated music]
1.5.2	p.69	Paragraph 2, change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4, as the former does not exist.
1.5.2	p.69	"For serials", change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4; remove extraneous 2nd periods.
1.5.2	p.70	"For nonbook resources ...," change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4.
1.5.3.7	p.72	Paragraph 2, change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4.
1.5.3.9	p.73	Change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4.
1.5.4.4	p.74	Paragraph 2, change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4.
1.5.5.1	p.75	"For continuing resources," change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4 (paragraph 1 and 3).
1.5.5.2	p.76	Change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4 (occurs twice).

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1.5.5.4	p.77	Paragraph 1, change reference from 7.1.5 to 7.1.4.
1.5.5.10	p.79	Paragraph1, add period at end.
1.5.5.11.1	p.80	Example 1 should be “National accounts statistics “ not “account” (per OCLC).
1.5.5.12.4	p.84	Example 1 should be “The white devil “ not “while”.
1.5.6	p.86	“Integrating resources”, correct reference from 7.1.5.1 to 7.1.4.1.
2.1.4.2	p.93	Example2 should be “Dr Burnet’s” not “Bumet’s”
3	p.99	Area label should be in all caps as MATERIAL OR TYPE OF RESOURCE SPECIFIC AREA
3.1.3.1	p.102	Sentence ends in two periods.
3.1.3.3	p.103	Example 3, delete period after equinox.
3.1.3.3	p.103	paragraph 5, last line, epoch is followed by two quotation marks.
3.2	p.103	Change “notated music statement” to “notated music specific statement”.
3.3.7	p.108	Examples (heading is “Example” but “Examples” is needed).
3.3.7	p.108	Example 9 has a hyphen separating last 2 dates in second set of parentheses. Should it be “=”, that is, the equals sign?
4.0	p.110	Example 2: change “Pockett” to “Pocket”.
4.2.11	p.124	Example: do all catalogers know what STC (Short Title Catalogue) is? Should be spelled out.
4.2.12.2	p.125	Example 3, change “Krakóww” to “Kraków”.
4.4.3	p.127	Example 2, “[distributor]”, not “[distributor]”.
4.4.4	p.128	Last example: The editorial comment should be 15 Mar. not 25 Mar.
4.4.10.2	p.132	2nd example. Why is there a semi-colon at end of “In area 3 Vol. 1, pt. 1 (Dec. 1989);”?
5.1.4.1.5	p.145	At For nonbook resources ... “etc., (i.e.”: the comma is not needed.
5.1.4.2.1	p.147	Stipulation number and title need to be boldface.
5.1.7.	p.150	Stipulation number and title need to be boldface.
5.4.1	p.162	Final sentence: “to” appears to have been omitted in the final sentence, which should read “It may be added to the extent ...” rather than “It may be added the extent ...”
6.2.1	p.169	Line 1, at end: “monographic” not “monogreahic”.
6.3	p.169	Sentence ends with 2 periods.
7.0.2	p.176	Use of “Bimonth” not “Bimonthly”? Is this a typo?
7.0.3	p.176	All examples: change the spacing around the semicolons to match the stipulation in ISBD (space, semicolon, space).

<i>Rule</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7.1.1.4	p.180	Line 2: add comma after “resource” to improve clarity.
7.1.1.6.1	p.180	Sentence 1: change “title proper of serials” to “title proper of a serial”.
7.3.1	p.194	Change text in example from “printed music specific statement” to “notated music specific statement”.
7.7.8	p.204	Single quotes around New in the example are different forms (smart vs. plain; grave vs. quote).
7.10.1	p.207	Change header from “For printed music” to “For notated music” .
8	p.210	E, Examples: abbreviate plate number and publisher’s number in these examples, as instructed in 8.1.2.
8.1.3	p.212	Add space in “beingdescribed”.
App. A	p.217	1st word: “Multi-evel” should be “Multi-level”.
App. A	p.217	4, paragraph 2: Change “Multilevel” to “Multi-level”; remove extra period at end of sentence 3.

Glossary

ISMN: Change “printed music” to “notated music”.

Notated music, sentence 2: Change “Printed music” to “Notated music”.

Notated music: Re-alphabetize Glossary entries so that Notated music follows Nonbook resources.

Plate number (Notated music): Change “printed music” to “notated music” in definition.

Publisher’s number (Notated music): Change “printed music” to “notated music” in definition.

Reissue (Motion picture): “rerelease” or “re-release”?