

TO: Cheri Folkner, Chair: CC:DA

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

IN RE: AACR/RDA and ISBD Consolidated

During the review of the ISBD Consolidated the following elements were identified as having a possible conflict or potential impact with AACR2r and/or RDA.

- | | | |
|-----------|------------|--|
| 0.3.2.8 | p. 14 | AACR has not incorporated double punctuation such as this. |
| 0.3.2.9 | p. 15 | AACR has not incorporated the each element in its own bracket approach, probably as much as anything else because of decisions made in early LC MARC. |
| 0.4.2.1 | p. 18–19 | At For printed continuing resources : RDA has proposed greatly simplifying the choice of sources for title pages for continuing resources; this stipulation is much more complex. |
| 1.1.5.1 | p. 50 | 1 st paragraph: RDA uses “that varies from issue to issue”; ISBD uses “varies from issue or part to issue or part”. The examples seem to be serials and not integrating resources. ISBD is less specific than RDA here, although the end result may not matter. |
| 3.3.8 | p. 108–109 | Examples: Is coverage of an issue now indicated by use of a slash in RDA, even if a dash appears on the issue? That’s what serials catalogers have started doing recently with AACR2. |
| 4.2.4 | p. 120 | The ability to use “[etc.]” would be welcome in AACR2/RDA, since with videos and CD-ROMs, as well as Latin American books, we often have a profusion of bodies, all or none of which may actually be the publisher. |
| 5.1.1 | p. 138 | At For nonbook resources : Adding “the trade name or other indication of a particular technical system ...” would also be most welcome in AACR2/RDA. More current examples should be added to this stipulation. |
| 5.1.2 | p. 140 | At For printed serials : Current AACR2 practice uses only “v.” for serials. Should these instructions remain in sync with ISBD? |
| 5.1.4.1.5 | p. 144 | ISBD does not permit the AACR2 practice of: 1 v. (unpaged) |
| 7 | p. 175 | At For continuing resources : Note that the American serials preference is to put the order of notes is in MARC tag order, rather than the order prescribed by ISBD. |

- 7 p. 174 At **For continuing resources**: We long ago stopped using key title in notes/linking entries. Links are often hotlinked to the title in the 245 field and not to key title, so it doesn't make sense to use key title in linking fields any longer. Maybe other countries use this differently?
- 7 p. 175 At **For electronic resources**: Add the following to the end of this stipulation: "for monographic resources."
- 7.2.4.4 p. 190 Examples: Not all libraries provide access to 222 fields in their OPACs, but hotlink on 245 fields. As a result, these linking notes would be better phrased in citation form. Adjust the examples here (top of p. 190) and throughout the rest of ISBD where this situation occurs.