

TO: Kristin Lindlan, Chair: CC:DA

FROM: Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair, Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR)

RE: Final report of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR)

The charges (dated 16 April 2001) of the Task Force (TF) are to:

1. Prepare a detailed review of the proposed International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and Other Continuing Resources (ISBD (CR)) for transmittal to the Chair of the ISBD(S) Working Group by June 30, 2001. The proposed ISBD (CR) is available at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/pubs/isbd-let.htm>.
2. Pay particular attention to areas, if any, in which AACR2R and ISBD (CR) are not in conformance and areas, if any, in which the proposed ISBD is not in conformance with the provisions of the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)* (<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf>).
3. Suggest examples to supplement the text in order to ensure a broad international perspective in the standard, including examples for the appendices.
4. Send the report of the Task Force to the Chair of CC:DA no later than June 8, 2001.

Membership of the TF is:

Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair
John C. Attig
E. Ann Caldwell
Michael A. Chopey
Ruth E. Christ
Bradford L. Eden
Mary Grenci

The TF issued a preliminary report (CC:DA/TF/ISBD(CR)/3) dated June 5, 2001, so that its comments would meet the deadline of the ISBD(S) Working Group, with the plan of issuing a final report before the end of 2001. This plan of action was taken given that the cataloging of continuing resources is a complex matter, and given that the TF was constituted on April 16, 2001.

The report of the TF takes the following form:

- a. general comments concerning ISBDs as contrasted with AACR2R;
- b. general comments relating to ISBD(CR); and
- c. comments pertaining to specific sections of ISBD(CR)(hereinafter referred to as CR).

We regret that the short time frame meant we have not contributed any examples.

INTRODUCTION

A detailed review of CR and comparison of it with AACR2R would be most effectively done with a crosswalk from CR to the matching rule in AACR2R, and another crosswalk vice versa. The press of time did not allow the compilation of such a document; instead, members of the TF worked with the most current draft of Chapter 12 (4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/2), and other parts of AACR2R as appropriate (and as their collective memories permitted). This report is not a stand-alone document but rather is intended to be used in concert with the CR and 4JSC document.

For the purposes of this report, the TF focused on these major points from FRBR:

- ✓ provides a framework that identifies the objects of interest to the users of bibliographic data;
- ✓ discusses entities concerning products of intellectual or artistic endeavour: work; expression; manifestation; item
- ✓ discusses entities responsible for content, production, and/or dissemination: person; corporate body;
- ✓ discusses entities that may serve as subject of works: concept; object; event; place; and
- ✓ discusses the four user tasks that catalog records must answer: find entities corresponding to the user's stated search; identify an entity; select an entity appropriate to user's needs; acquire/obtain access to entity described

GENERAL COMMENTS ON ISBD'S AS CONTRASTED WITH AACR2R

1. A major difference between the ISBDs and AACR2R is that the latter is a single document, while the ISBDs are issued separately. The ISBDs might be intellectually more likely to be all of a piece if they were conceived of as being a part of one physical document. For example, in the latest draft, clean-copy of Chapter 12, 12.1B1 states, "Transcribe the title proper as instructed in 1.1B."

There is no equivalent statement in CR about transcribing the title proper as instructed in ISBD(G). This is a major structural difference between the two.

2. ISBDs have Mandatory and Optional as categories for presence of a field. In effect, AACR2R has an additional category, Mandatory if Applicable.
3. ISBDs are written in the passive voice; AACR2R is written in the active voice.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Content:

1. Too much emphasis is placed on the key title and ISSN being the major identifying points in a record. While the effort by CR to harmonize with the ISSN standard is commendable, the TF perceives that the effort has gone overboard in this area.
2. If the concept of an International Standard Serial Title (ISST) were at a different stage right now, then the TF could see going forward with the idea of that title (ISST) being the chief identifying title; but the key title lacks important standardization in the use of qualifiers, which precludes it being THE identifying title for an international database.
3. While in many cases CR effectively includes ongoing integrating resources wherever appropriate, and could be used as a model for AACR2R, as per the June 28, 2001 Memorandum from the Cataloging Policy and Support Office of the Library of Congress, CR seems not to address finite integrating resources, and is not consistent in its inclusion of integrating resources throughout the text, with some provisions lacking acknowledgment that they apply to integrating resources as well as to serials, (e.g., use of just “issue” instead of “issue/iteration” in 1.1.2.3, etc.).
4. The emphasis is on text materials. For example, ‘title-page’ is used often in rules about Area 1. The vast majority of cartographic materials and the majority of other mainly-non-text materials don’t have title pages. It’s fine to say that there is an unwritten ‘or equivalent for the given format’ — but CR needs actually to state this at least once.

Style:

1. CR places footnotes at the end of the document. The TF finds AACR2R’s method of placing a footnote on the same page as the footnoted statement to be far easier for the cataloger.

2. The term “title page” occurs 14 times without a hyphen (versus 96 times with the hyphen). There’s no grammatical, syntactical, etc., reason for the variance. AACR2R style is not to use hyphens in these situations.
3. “Title page substitute” appears in this document as:
 - “Title page substitute”
 - “Title-page substitute”
 - “Title page-substitute”

Is the second form the one that is intended? The third form appears only in the footnotes. As noted above, AACR2R style is not to use hyphens in these situations.

4. Some sections could be improved by sub-numbering the points. This would make the document easier to use in cases such as 0.5.4.1.1, which has the instruction, “when a corporate body, named anywhere in the title, changes, except as indicated below (see 0.5.4.1.2).” At this point, the cataloger then has to look through all of the 25 or so points to see which one(s) refer(s) to that situation. It would be much easier if that instruction could say, e.g., “see 0.5.4.1.2.xiv” or “see 0.5.4.1.2.j” or whatever is the preferred way to sub-number here.
5. AACR uses “if” and CR uses “when” (e.g., see in the latter 0.5.4.2.1)

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

0.1.1, First paragraph: AACR2R has in the past viewed ISBDs as giving the appropriate elements for a given type of bibliographic record, specifying the order of the elements, and specifying the punctuation between the elements. There seems to be a change in the intent of ISBDs recently, with the idea being that since ISBDs are used as cataloging codes in some countries, there should be an attempt to have the ISBDs and AACR2R be harmonized. This is a substantial change in how AACR2R perceives itself as operating vis-à-vis the ISBDs. Given cultural differences and the different ways in which different languages express the same concepts, it would seem unlikely that exactly the same wording will occur as much as one would like. If we can get the intent of the rules to be the same in the ISBDs and AACR2, that may be the best that can be done in some cases.

0.1.1, Second paragraph: CRs “consist of resources issued over time ...” It isn’t a good idea to use in a definition part of the term being defined. Possibly “entities” or “items” (unless the FRBR meaning of the latter would confuse matters) might work here.

0.1.1, Fifth paragraph, third sentence: “For example, serials in special categories of material will be described according to ISBD(CR) except for element 1.2 [gmd]... and area 5, Physical description.” What about Area 3, since it has different contents depending upon the item being described?

0.1.3. Use, First sentence in second paragraph: Re the national bibliographic agency in each country accepting responsibility for creating the definitive record for each publication issued in that country — for some countries, the number of publications (or items issued) make this impossible. Unless what is meant here is that the national bibliographic agency may take any other library's record and upgrade it.

0.1.3. Use, Last two sentences of second paragraph: Re the statement that mandatory elements aren't mandatory for everyone who wants to follow the standard — some members of the TF found this a bit peculiar. We suspect that AACR2R handles this by allowing different levels of cataloging (1.0D)

0.1.3.1, First paragraph, second to last line: “there is a measure of compatibility between the elements of the ISBD(CR) record and those of ISSN” — AACR2R mentions the ISSN number but not the ISSN record.

0.2. Definitions, general comments:

- a. How important is it that definitions in CR exactly match those in AACR2R? Is it acceptable (we hope) if they are the same conceptually? For example, these two definitions are not identical in wording, but seem to embody the same concept:

Accompanying material [AACR2R]: Material issued with, and intended to used with, the item being catalogued.

Accompanying material [CR]: Any material accompanying the main part(s) of the item being described, and intended to be used with it. (See also Insert/Inset.)

- b. As a matter of style difference, AACR2R definitions generally do not include a word that is part of the phrase being defined — although we note in the previous definition, the AACR2R definition does indeed include a word from the phrase being defined.
- c. These definitions are always very well cross-referenced.
- d. In some cases (e.g., “Insert/Inset” vs. “Supplement”), similar-sounding terms are not distinguished from each other clearly enough in their definitions.
- e. There are places where quod vides seem to be called for, e.g., when a glossary term is used in another term's definition.
- f. As an extension of the previous point — since this document will be issued in electronic form, is it a given that the markup will link every glossary term that occurs in a definition to its entry? This would be extremely useful for catalogers.

0.2. Definitions, specific comments:

Definitions absent and needed: *Chief source* (does define “prescribed source of information”); *expression*; *impression*; *item*; *loose-leaf*; *manifestation*; *tête-bêche* (we note that avant-titre is defined); *updating web sites* (updating loose-leafs **is** defined);

Definitions that improve in some way on their AACR2 counterparts: *alternative title*; *corporate body*; *facsimile*; *key title*

Absorption: add: (See also Merger; Split)

Accompanying material: definition has “See also Insert/Inset.” Would it not be appropriate to add “Supplement” to the “see also” here, as a means of making the distinction between the two terms “Supplement” and “Insert/Inset” more clear, and to point out the fact that supplements are *not* “Accompanying material”?

Area: add “See also Element.”

Avant-titre: is it necessary that an avant-titre occur “above” the publication’s title proper? Would “before” be better here? Useful to have this included in AACR2R.

Bibliographic description: Is the word “item” used deliberately here in preference to “resource” or “bibliographic resource,” and if so, why? An item (in the *FRBR* sense) forms the basis for a bibliographic description in the sense that in practice an item is in hand when a bibliographic description is created, but directly below this we have a definition that says a *bibliographic resource* forms the basis for a bibliographic description. Is this contradictory? Or confusing?

There are several cases in these definitions where “item” is used in a more abstract sense than the *FRBR* meaning of “item.” (For instance, in the definitions of “Common title,” “Dependent title,” and “Supplement.”) We follow the logic of the use of “item” in these definitions to mean something like “component piece” of a resource in an abstract sense, but then there should be an entry for “Item” (perhaps with two definitions, numbered 1) and 2)) in this glossary.

Bibliographic description: The use of the term “manifestation” in the definition of “bibliographic resource” might not be the appropriate term to use, given discussions as to whether a description should be based on the manifestation or the expression. The TF suggests that CR use the definition that is used in the clean copy of Chapter 12.

Caption title: The AACR2R definition is preferable in that it because it begins with, “A title ...” rather than “The title ...”; and it includes, “or, in the case of a musical score, immediately above the opening bars of the music

Cover title: As per AACR2, we suggest replacing, “The title,” with, “A title.”

Dependent title designation: “Numbering” should be included in the “see also” here.

Edition: Add “Issue” to the “see also.”

Facsimile: Add “Issue” to the “see also.”

Frequency: The TF proposes new wording: “The interval at which a continuing resource is issued.” (This wording covers integrating resources as well as serials.)

General material designation: AACR2 uses a parenthetical “e.g.” to demonstrate what is meant by “class of material” here. Is there a reason why CR avoids using a term like “sound recording” as an example given? Without an example, “class of material” is so vague as to make this definition useless. AACR2R has a “See also Special material designation.”

Generic term: This is a useful definition for the idea that the addition/deletion of such a term is not a title change. The TF notes that this concept is still under discussion for AACR2R. There are situations where a one-word title that is a generic term may change to another one-word generic title; in this case, the change would be a major change. Is there a way to state this, so that in the latter case only, it would indeed be considered a major change?

Independent title resource: Formatting error; entry here is “Independent title,” and “resource” was meant to be the last word of the definition, not the last word of the term being defined.

Inset/Insert: The use of “resource” here is not consistent with the rest of the glossary, which would use “item” here instead. Useful to include in AACR2R.

Integrating resource: The TF suggests changing “updating Web sites” to “updating Web resources” both here and in the new Chapter 12.

Issue: What is meant by the second phrase of part 1, “the existing lowest level successive part of a serial”? The TF is unsure if this matches current understanding of the term. The TF suggests adding, “See also Edition, Facsimile, Reprint.”

Issuing body: The TF suggests changing, “The corporate body ...” to, “A corporate body ...” here.

Iteration: The TF suggests that a definition for iteration is needed in AACR2R; but there was a difference of opinion as to whether the CR definition should be taken as is, or if it is confusing and could lead to endless discussions and arguments.

Journal: Should “periodical” in the first clause be “periodicals” (plural)?

Masthead: The TF suggests a period instead of a semicolon after the first statement.

Merger: Add: (See also Absorption; Split)

Newspaper: The effect of using “serial” in the definition is to preclude integrating resources from being classified as newspapers. Is that the intent? This definition does not seem to exclude news magazines, such as Newsweek, Time, etc. The TF notes that AACR2R does not define “newspaper,” and wonders if the definition is needed; and if it is needed, then should not a definition for “magazine” be included, since it is used in the rules?

Numbering: Add “See also Dependent title designation, Section designation, Sub-series designation.”

Other title information: The TF suggests that this needs some see-also references, e.g., Avant-titre; Alternative title. Or perhaps alternative titles should be mentioned in this definition?

Parallel title: The TF suggests changing the first sentence to: “A title proper in a different language and/or script than the title proper chosen by the cataloguing agency, presented as an equivalent of the chosen title proper.”

Periodical: This definition is different from that in common use, at least in the United States. The TF suggests the removal of the final phrase, “and less frequently than semiweekly,” since there are some daily periodicals (non-newspapers). The definition should include more on the **content** of the serial, to distinguish newspapers from periodicals.

Preliminaries: The TF perceives that this could benefit from being less “text/print-centric.” Unlike “cover title” or “spine title,” which are purely physically descriptive concepts that don’t need to apply beyond print materials, “preliminaries” does need to apply more broadly (at least in AACR2R) because it is a factor in the latter’s rules for entry.

Prescribed source of information: The TF suggests changing this to: “The source or sources designated as the one(s) from which information is should be taken for ... “

Reprint: Add Issue to “see also.”

Section designation: Add Dependent title designation and Numbering to “see also.”

Series: The TF is unsure what is intended in part 2 of this definition: “A numbered sequence of issues within a serial known as ‘chronological series’, ‘chronological sequence’.” These latter two terms are new to at least some TF members; how do they differ from a “regular” series? If the terms stay, perhaps removing “within a serial” and placing “or” in between “... series” and “chronological sequence” might make the definition more understandable.

Specific material designation: See comments above on GMD; also, AACR2 includes in its definition the parenthetical, “usually the class of physical object.” Add “See also general material designation.”

Split: Add: (See also Absorption; Merger)

Sub-series: The TF suggests removing the word “numbered” from the first sentence; both the series and the sub-series may or may not have a designation.

Sub-series designation: Add Dependent title designation, Numbering to “see also.”

Title-page substitute: The TF suggests that in sentence 1, “continuing resource” be replaced with “item” or “publication.”

0.3. Area 3: The heading of this area is meaningless for serials, and would be better if changed to agree with AACR2R Area 3 in Chapter 12, “Numbering Area.”

0.3.2. Outline of ISBD (CR):

- a. The “General notes on the outline of ISBD (CR)” should be moved to the beginning (currently at the end).
- b. Elements 6.7–6.12 from ISBD(G), instead of being enumerated individually, are to the right of each of the 6.1–6.6 element numbers, following an ampersand. This is very easy to miss. The TF suggests that for clarity they be enumerated individually, each on its own line, starting below 6.6.
- c. Physical description area: 5.1 should not be listed as optional (it isn’t optional in section 5). It seems unlikely that AACR2R is going to consider illustration statement optional.
- d. 8.1 lists only the ISSN for this element; however, other numbers are also included. Change to read: “Standard number” or “International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) and Other Standard Numbers,” or perhaps use the wording of the heading that appears in that area of the text, “International Standard Number (or Alternative) and Terms of Availability Area.” The TF would suggest using the latter here, in 0.5.3.1, and in 0.5.3.2. That would make the document consistent, and would also solve the problem first mentioned.

0.3.3. Comparison of the ISBD (CR) and ISSN: Vital information is footnoted, and the footnotes aren’t included in the text (they are at the end). This means that either the reader must keep shuffling back and forth or, more likely, miss important information necessary in order to understand the comparison.

0.3.3.1: Final sentence of paragraph A (2nd paragraph) is incorrect. Sometimes the common title does represent a separate bibliographic entity; that is, there is a resource carrying only the common title. See also the second to last sentence of paragraph B —

“it is an essential condition of a sub-series that a main series, with its own title and numbering, exists quite independently of the sub-series.” Thinking about a monographic series of maps issued by the U.S. Geological Survey (the I- series) and within that the various planetary series — yes, certainly a bibliographic record for the series as a whole exists independently of the bib record for each of the subseries, but each of the subseries items carries the main series numbering — the subseries numbering is embedded in the title. Perhaps this is not what is meant by the phrasing?

0.5. Sources of information:

- a. There was some difference of opinion concerning the statements about electronic resources. Some TF members found them to be excellent and perceived that AACR2R would do well to follow this. But another TF member noted the problem of referring only to “direct-access electronic serials;” why not to continuing resources, and why not remote-access electronic serials? Isn’t it better just to refer users to ISBD(ER) if CR isn’t going to give directions for all electronic CRs?
- b. A general comment on this area is that ISBD would benefit from defining and using the term and the concept “chief source” like AACR does, both in the glossary, and more importantly and usefully, in a prefatory statement along the lines of the one we have in 12.0B2. The very first time this phrase occurs in this document is right here in the rubric “Order of preference of chief source,” and “chief source” is never defined — not in the text, not in the glossary, not even in a footnote. The term “chief source” only occurs a total of four times in this whole document, versus the 37 times “prescribed source” appears, so it could be that CR is trying to avoid the concept altogether, and these four occurrences are oversights. This seems possible, since “Prescribed source” on the other hand is defined and explained well. If this is the case, then this is a difference from AACR2R.
- c. There are footnotes explaining the concept of “Title-page substitute,” which are sufficient as long as they appear at the bottom of the page that has 0.5.2.1 on it in the final document, but it wouldn’t hurt to use “or title-page substitute” after “title-page” where it occurs in the “Prescribed source(s)” sections of this document.

0.5.1: The TF notes that this seems to apply only to text materials, and perhaps only to book-format text materials.

0.5.2: The TF notes that under B., are the sources listed in order of preference? This should be stated, whether the answer is yes or no. Also, as written, this applies only to text, and mainly only to text book-format materials, since the majority of mainly non-text materials do not have a title page, and there’s no indication here that what is meant is “title page or equivalent.”

0.5.2.1. The TF recommends that “national bibliographies” **not** be considered a prescribed source for Areas 3 and 4, since this would mean that catalogers **must** consult national bibliographies when the information is not on the piece, and that information found in those sources would be indistinguishable from information found on the piece. The TF notes that the statement, “select the source according to the preferred order of sources (see 0.5.1),” appears here, but no order is given in 0.5.1.

See also the TF comment at 0.3.2 regarding the wording of Area 8 on this table.

0.5.3.1: The TF suggests that “or part” should be added after the first two occurrences of the word “issue”.

See also the TF comment at 0.3.2 regarding the wording of Area 8 on this table.

0.5.3.2: While CR notes that Area 3 is not used, AACR2R (12.3A1) states, “this area is not generally applicable.” See the TF comment at 0.3.2 regarding the wording of Area 8 on this table. The TF notes that the most current clean copy of Chapter 12 has these lists first and then discusses chief source and prescribed source of information; CR does the work vice versa.

0.5.4: The TF notes that the AACR community is still embroiled in a proposed appendix on major changes requiring a new title, with no final decision made.

0.5.4.1.1: The TF suggests changing the wording of “excepted as indicated below (see 0.5.4.1.2)” to “see 0.5.4.1.2 below for exceptions.”

0.5.4.1.2: The TF notes that the example under “an acronym or initialism vs. full form” also shows a change in the order of the elements. This is explained later, as another minor change (which is a new one), it does need another example to show acronym/initialism vs. full form; this example could be moved to the appropriate section (and further explained as being an example of two types of minor changes occurring at once).

Changes that will harmonize with AACR if the new “major changes” appendix is accepted: the change involves the name of the same corporate body...anywhere in the title; change involves words in a list.

In the first phrase at the very top of this section, “For serials, a new record is not required in case of minor changes in the title proper:” the TF suggests this would sound better if “case” were plural. Also, aren’t a few more words needed at the end? Something like “such as cases where” inserted before the colon would help. Either that or every point will have to begin with a word like “when,” as is done in 0.5.4.1.1 and 0.5.4.2.1. It would perhaps be more understandable in the active voice — but as per comment right at the beginning, passive voice appears to be ISBD style.

Finally, about halfway through this section is one of the four instances where “chief source of information” appears in this document without an explanation of any kind of its meaning. (below the “GBB” example: “the change is in the order of titles when the title is given in more than one language on the **chief source of information**, provided that the title chosen as title proper still appears as a parallel title;”)

0.7.4: The TF notes that CR recommends the use of ISO abbreviations. AACR2R has its own set of standard abbreviations (app. B); we do not know to what extent they follow ISO 832-1994. CC:DA does have a Task Force on ISO Harmonization.

0.8. Capitalization: The first sentence of this instruction “In general, the first letter of the first word of each area should be a capital” is contradicted by several examples in the text (e.g. ones at 3.1.1.1 “mai”, 5.1.3, 5.1.5, and 5.2). While the “in general” is still true, several TF members do not perceive that Area 5 should ever have the first letter of the first word capitalized (e.g., in cases where a map series is to be completed in an unknown number of maps, the preference is for “maps : col. ; 83 x 92 cm. or smaller” rather than “Maps : col. ; 83 x 92 cm. or smaller”).

0.10. Misprints: The TF notes that this disagrees with 1.1.4.1.

Area 1 / Punctuation pattern: Item C. seems to be missing some words; example 12 has typo in spacing of statements of responsibility.

Area 1 / Prescribed source: The TF suggests adding, “or title-page substitute” after “title page.” This is a long way away from the original footnote saying that title-page means title-page or title-page substitute.

1.1: The TF notes that this entire section seems to be presented very differently from 12.1, but it generally matches what appears in AACR2R.

1.1.2: The TF notes that the term “chief title” is used here but not elsewhere; the term is not defined in glossary nor is it used in AACR2R.

1.1.2.2: The TF queries whether a cataloger would give as full title just the name of the corporate body/person that appears on the title page, without some sort of cataloger-supplied info to explain what the item is?

1.1.2.3: See TF comment for 1.1.2.2.

1.1.2.6: The TF notes that AACR2R does not use the term, “dependent title,” but tells the cataloger in 12.1B4 how this may be done. Both CR and AACR2R use exactly the same example: “Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica.”

1.1.3.2.1: The TF is surprised at the stipulation that “the title proper is selected from the right hand (recto) of two facing pages...” While this may currently be the case in AACR, we didn’t find it. It seems arbitrary; isn’t it better to select the most complete form of the title in this sort of situation? And what about the scripts/texts that go backward?

In the second paragraph, the term “tête-bêche” is used (and used later as well), and is never defined.

1.1.3.2.2: The TF wonders about this, since we thought that both items are described on the same record in AACR2R. How can there be two or more bibliographic records for the same issue of the same publication? Unless one is talking about such matters as “bound-withs”, for which separate records are created.

1.1.4.1: Paragraph 3 disagrees with 0.10.

1.1.4.2: In the third to last paragraph, is there a misprint in the see reference to 7.2.4.10? should it be 7.2.4.9?

1.1.5.3: The TF suggests that the third paragraph here might be a bit clearer if “a new record is not made, and” were added after the first comma:

For integrating resources, a new record is not made, and the title proper is replaced in the description with the new title and the earlier title is given in a note (see 7.1.1.6).

1.2. General material designation: This section needs to reference a list of terms to be used, and/or examples.

Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of 1.2 are examples of the different ways in which AACR2R — one intellectual and physical volume — and the ISBDs, being a set of documents — deal with the same situation. In 1.2.1, a general explanation of GMDs is given; while in Chapter 12 of AACR2R, in 12.1C1, there is exactly one sentence, because GMDs are explained in 1.1C: “Give immediately following the title proper the appropriate general material designation as instructed in 1.1C.”

1.2.4: AACR2R spells ‘multi-media’ without the hyphen.

1.3.3.2: The TF requests explanation of the phrase, “When national considerations do not prevail.”

1.4. Other title information: The TF asks, should the final sentence of paragraph 1 end with “or six, if the first word is an article”?

The TF notes that the second paragraph differs from AACR2R practice.

1.4.3: “May be given” differs from AACR practice (See 12.1E1-i.)

1.4.6: The TF notes that this is contrary to AACR2R for serials.

1.5. Statements of responsibility: This section includes instructions to use personal names in the statement of responsibility. AACR also includes instructions on when **not** to use personal names in statements of responsibility for serials; these latter instructions do not appear in CR.

This section seems to imply that a continuing resource may have corporate-body main entry, as does the most current clean copy of Chapter 12. While this is correct, the situations in which an item may have a corporate-body main entry are in AACR2R quite limited (21.1B2). Perhaps all the examples with corporate bodies in this section do fall within 21.1B2.

The TF asks, are most of the instructions on personal names are meant to be for loose-leafs? If so, this should be stated.

There are no instructions on when there is NOT a statement of responsibility. Does this mean these statements are always added, or that they may be added in every situation? If so, this would not conform to AACR2R rules for serials, which do not allow the addition of statements of responsibility not found on the chief source.

1.5.1: The TF notes a change in form of phrase — “bibliographical agency” instead of the “bibliographic agency” used everywhere else in the document.

1.5.2: On the content side, the entities listed include many which would not be included in serial records according to current practice.

On the format side, Section 1.5.2 is hard to read (it would be even harder to refer to quickly, which is what we catalogers do most of the time with our cataloging codes) because the different sets of instructions are not logically separated from each other. For example, 1.5.2.1–1.5.2.6 should be separate from 1.5.2.7–1.5.2.12 and 1.5.2.7–1.5.2.12 should have some kind of unifying structure and a unifying rubric above them, so a cataloger who has read all of these rules once can more easily go back and find a rule that s/he remembers reading. In contrast, the rest of 1.5 has bold-face headings so the cataloger can skim through the section and find the case s/he is looking for. 1.5.2 now covers too many different kinds of situations that are all just lumped together. The TF suggests that the current 1.5.2 should remain as is, and 1.5.2.1–1.5.2.6 should become 1.5.3.1–1.5.3.6, with the last phrase in 1.5.2, “A statement of responsibility can take various forms:” becoming instead a bold faced heading “Forms of Statements of Responsibility” of a new section 1.5.3. Then 1.5.2.7–1.5.2.10 could become 1.5.2.4 with some parallel structure under a new bold faced heading. Then the current 1.5.3 could be come 1.5.5, 1.5.4 becomes 1.5.6, and so forth.

1.5.2.3: The TF is sceptical about the need for this rule, and doesn’t find the sentence below the example to cover all cases; “Other nouns or noun phrases” that might appear on a title page are treated as all kinds of things besides statements of responsibility or other title information or they may be ignored.

1.5.2.4–1.5.2.6: The TF notes that these sections need examples, but on this short notice has none to provide.

1.5.2.6: The TF suggests changing “when its” in the last paragraph to “whose” (i.e., “A sponsoring body ~~when its~~ whose name forms an integral part ...”)

1.5.2.7–1.5.2.10: The TF suggests that these depart from the structure of 1.5.2.1–1.5.2.6, and are not as well worded as are those sections. Some kind of parallel structure and a unifying thematic heading is needed.

1.5.2.8: The TF notes that current U.S. practice for serials allows for statements of responsibility only when they are on the chief source. Inputting other statements in square brackets would be a major departure.

1.5.2.9: The TF wonders if this doesn't contradict 1.5.4.8?

1.5.3.1 & 1.5.3.2: More examples are needed to show the distinction being made between single and multiple statements of responsibility. The rule, "... or, although performing different functions, their names are linked by a conjunction," is not the case illustrated by the example here.

In addition, this instruction does not seem to the TF an appropriate rule to illustrate what is meant by a single statement of responsibility. It also seems to contradict the instruction in 1.5.4.3 that conjunctions can be supplied by the cataloger in transcribing a single statement of responsibility.

1.5.4.2: See TF comment for 1.5.2.8. Adding "or title-page substitute" after "title-page" here would clarify the rule.

1.5.4.3: The TF notes that the third sentence contradicts the statement in 1.5.3.1 that a conjunction linking names is one of the conditions determining that a single statement of responsibility is such.

1.5.4.5: This seems a bit vague and too open-ended; the TF suggests wording more like AACR2's 1.1F7.

1.5.4.8: The TF wonders if this might contradict 1.5.2.9?

1.5.4.9: The TF notes the need for examples.

1.5.4.10: See TF comment for 1.5.2.8.

1.5.4.11.1: Second paragraph, beginning "Statements of responsibility that do not apply ...," seems unclear to the TF. Does this statement take into account other types of statements of responsibility that are transcribed in other areas, e.g., those relating to an edition, a series, etc.

1.5.4.12.1: The TF notes that this is not AACR2R practice for serials.

1.5.4.12.2: See TF comment for 1.5.4.12.1.

Area 2: Liberal use of bracketing in the description and liberal transcription of editor information are departures from AACR2 practice.

2.1.1 B): The TF suggests deleting commas on both sides of “in intellectual or artistic content.”

2.1.2: It seems to the TF that the instruction, “If the edition statement consists solely or chiefly of characters that are neither numeric nor alphabetic, and which cannot be reproduced by ...,” excludes cases of edition statements in non-roman scripts (which are often not alphabetic).

The TF suggests changing, “characters that are neither numeric nor alphabetic, and which cannot be reproduced by ...,” to, “symbols or other matter that cannot be reproduced by ...,” i.e.,

If the edition statement consists solely or chiefly of ~~characters that are neither numeric nor alphabetic, and which~~ symbols or other matter that cannot be reproduced by the typographic facilities available (cf. 0.11), the characters are replaced by words or numbers, as appropriate, in square brackets. An explanation may be given in area 7 (see 7.2).

2.1.4.6: It seems to the TF that including this in edition statements is not current AACR2R practice. Perhaps “Statements indicating an inset/insert or supplement included in the issue” would be better in the notes area.

2.1.5.1: The TF asks, does this rule apply only to serials? Is that obvious?

2.1.6: The TF asks, is it a good idea to use the word ‘loose-leaf(ves)’? Then the rule applies only to mainly text material, and probably to those materials in book format.

2.3: As previously noted, the instruction to apply statements of responsibility for persons is contrary to AACR2R practice for serials.

2.3.2–2.3.4: The TF notes the need for examples.

2.4.1, 2.4.3: The TF notes the need for examples.

2.4.3: The TF had trouble figuring out what additional edition statements naming an unchanged impression might be. Having a definition for “impression” in the Glossary would help.

2.5: The TF notes the need for examples.

3.1: See TF comments for 0.5.2.1 for the third paragraph: “numbering data of the first and/or last issue or part may be given in area 3 if found in a national bibliography.” and “Prescribed source.”

There was a suggestion to use the Chapter 12 heading, “Numbering area,” but the problem with that is that CR notes this area includes also Area 3 for cartographic materials, music, and electronic resources, so therefore it isn’t just numbering.

Formatting problem? Second paragraph, first line — “<fn15>“ — surely this needs to be deleted.

Some members of the TF query the meaning of: “The area is omitted only if the source of the numbering data of *both* [italics added] the first and last issues is not available.” Wouldn’t that mean that fairly often the area would be omitted? 12.3.A1 states, “If the first *and/or* [italics added] last issue or part is not used as the basis of description, omit this area and provide a note to indicate the issue(s) or part(s) that form the basis of the description (see 12.7B23).” These two don’t seem to be saying the same thing. Other members of the TF perceive that the CR statement is correct (that is, if either one is available, then the area is not omitted), and that 12.3.A1 has a wording problem in that it calls for omission of the area when the last part is available but the description is based on the earliest available intermediate issue.

The TF notes that in “Punctuation pattern...,” point E is contrary to current AACR2R and to chapter 12 clean copy.

3.1.1.1: The TF notes that AACR serial rules (and chapter 12 revision) do not allow for completing incomplete dates, even with the use of square brackets. There is a rule proposal put forward by CC:DA within the last year that deals with putting questionable dates in brackets.

3.1.3: The TF asks if the last example in this section contradicts 3.1.1.1, or perhaps some further explanation would make it clear that this is not a contradiction.

3.1.9: The TF notes that instructions on how to show new designation patterns (n.s., etc.) differ from AACR and chapter 12 revision.

3.4: The TF notes that ALA may shortly be recommending that this area disappears for electronic resources.

Area 4 / Punctuation pattern, D: The TF notes a typo — “spance” should be “space.”

Area 4 / Prescribed source: See previous comment on national bibliographies.

4.0: This corresponds to current AACR2R, but not to current practice for most formats in the United States.

4.1.3: This differs from AACR2R.

4.1.5: This follows old AACR rules, not the current ones.

The TF wonders both for this and 4.2.3. — would “et al.” be more accurate here? “Etc.” could mean that the full form of the place name is abbreviated.

4.1.9: This differs from AACR2R.

4.1.12: This differs from AACR2R.

4.1.14: The TF asks if there is a typo in final editorial comment — should “as” be “of”?

4.2.3: This differs from AACR2R.

The TF asks if both for this and 4.1.5, would “et al.” be more accurate here? “Etc.” could mean that the full form of the publisher’s name is abbreviated.

4.2.6: The TF notes that while the last phrase isn’t in AACR2R, it would be a useful addition.

4.2.11.1: TF asks, does this — “... and these changes do not require a new description for the serial ...” refer to 0.5.4.2.1? “See” reference should be added. Another good argument for the sub-numbering of 0.5.4.2.1.

4.4.1: The TF wonders if “Publication history” seems like a misstatement of what Area 4 by itself contains; perhaps “issuance” would be better here.

4.4.2: See the TF’s earlier comment, re national bibliographies as prescribed source.

4.4.7: This is a different style from AACR2R.

4.4.8: This differs from AACR2R.

The TF notes that the instruction is unclear; does this mean it may be added before the date of publication, or following it?

4.5: Both 4.5 and 4.6 are optional, which seems to differ from Chapter 12, in which this information is supplied if no publisher information is given, and is optional when publisher information is available.

4.5.2 & 4.6.2: Shouldn’t this be “bibliographic agency” rather than “bibliographical agency”? The former is used elsewhere in the document.

5.1.3: The TF notes that Chapter 12 uses “v.”, and CR uses “vol.” although “e.g.” is given before the example. CR doesn’t seem to have “v. of braille” (tactile) rules, nor does there seem to be an equivalent in CR to “12.5C2 Change in other physical details” or “12.5D2 Change in dimensions.” Also, the TF suggests changing, “The respective designations are given in their standard abbreviated form,” to, “The ~~respective~~ designations are given in their standard abbreviated forms.”

- a. The TF notes that this rule includes examples within the instruction, plus another example as an e.g. It is helpful to catalogers to have them all one place or all another.

- b. The TF asks, what is meant by the word “nonprint”? The examples include microfiches, sound discs, filmstrips, electronic tape cassettes, and microfilm reels. The options seem to be one of the following:
 - i. non-paper
 - ii. items that are mainly non-text
 - iii. items that are not run through a printing press; this is usually compared with items made by human hands.

5.3: The TF notes that this is given as optional in the outline, but is not optional in the body of the document. Which is correct? In 1.5E of AACR2R, the instructions are to give details of accompanying material in one of a couple of different ways. Also, the method for notating changes in the dimensions is different from AACR2R.

6. *Series area:* The first paragraph seems to mean that multiple series statements can't be given; or perhaps they can only be given when the series itself changes title. Either way, this is not current practice in the United States for serials, and it doesn't seem to the TF that the rule as stated in CR will work in practice. Multiple series statements are routinely input when the title is published in a series for awhile and then falls out of the series, or the series changes name, or it starts being issued in another series. This poses a substantial problem here and in the section “Series statement” below, if CR is equating “all issues of the series [serial?] are published within the series” with “all issues bear the series statement in question.”

6.3: The note of “Optional” contradicts 6.3.1, which gives the instructions “is given only when it is a necessary complement...” In those instances, it seems to be required. If it is never required, change wording to “*may be* given only when...” These instances are what in the AACR2R world is called, “mandatory if applicable.”

6.3.2: The TF suggests the following rewording:

~~The~~ Edition statements relating to a series ~~is~~ are treated as other title information. ~~It~~ is They are given according to the provisions in area 2.

6.6.1: The TF suggests that the second paragraph should go before the example, and notes that series numbering is not used for serials unless the numbering stays the same on each issue.

6.6.3: The TF is unclear as to the meaning of this rule. Does it mean that the volume number is actually input following the title proper in that language (with other titles following the volume number); or does it mean that the volume numbering is given in the same language as the title proper? In either case, examples are needed.

6.7: See the second paragraph of TF comments for 6.

6.12.1: The TF asks if “denomination” should be “designation,”

and if the statement, “When all issues or iterations of a resource within a sub series have the same number ...,” should also be included in the rules for main series.

7. Note area, paragraph 2: The TF suggests that an “e.g. ...” after this paragraph would be useful.

7. Note area, paragraph 3: The TF notes that a result of CR not including instructions regarding assignment of main entry (whether corporate body or uniform title) is that instructions on linking notes say to use key title, rather than the catalog entry as found on the related record. This will not harmonize with AACR. Also, use of key title in linking entries is an old practice (at least an old CONSER practice) that to best of the TF’s knowledge is no longer generally in use in the United States.

Re the wording of “title from...” notes — generally accepted wording in AACR2R is different.

7. Note area: The last paragraph under “Punctuation” explains the different punctuation when using key title or title proper in a note. This difference doesn’t seem especially useful, particularly since machine-generated records input according to MARC21 won’t show a difference between key title and title proper, so the different punctuation won’t be possible.

A more important point is the preference for key title in these notes. It is understandable if there is no concept of a catalog entry, no uniform titles, etc.; but these latter forms of entry are used in AACR2R in the manner in which CR uses key title and ISSN. This is an important difference between CR and AACR2R, and one which will make harmonization difficult at best.

7. Note area / Punctuation pattern: Here, and in a few other places in the Area 7’s examples (e.g. “Title proper taken from cover” or “Title on *the* cover:”), an English-language note is given as an example in a style of wording that wouldn’t be used in AACR2R; the TF suggests AACR2-style wordings instead, e.g., from 12.7B3, “Title from cover.”

7.0: The TF notes that this is different from CONSER practice and probably from AACR2R. The wording of the note in the final example is contrary to AACR2R practice.

The TF notes that “Continuously updated” differs from clean-copy chapter 12 example, “Continually updated,” and CR wording is much better and more accurate in most cases than is the wording of clean chapter 12.

7.1.1.4: The TF questions whether the phrase, “Title proper” is useful to the general public, or sufficiently useful to catalogers that it should appear in a note. The TF suggests using the CONSER phrase, “Expanded form of title.”

7.1.1.5: The TF has a question as to the meaning of this rule: would this note be in addition to adding other title information to Area 1 in square brackets? Or instead of doing that? Or, does the rule refer to a contents or scope note? The rule may or may not agree with AACR2R, depending on what is intended. The TF also asks why “/iteration” appears after “issue.”

7.1.1.6: The TF suggests that in the last paragraph under “Serials,” there be a change from “resulting from or leading to” to “related to.”

The section on “Electronic serials” is the only place these resources are specifically addressed. While they do need to be addressed here, it is unclear whether a new record should be created in this instance, or whether they are treated like integrating resources. More explanation is needed.

The TF suggests the wording in clean-copy chapter 12:

“If an electronic serial does not retain earlier titles, treat it as an integrating resource and make a note.”

7.1.2–7.1.3: The TF notes that examples are needed.

7.1.4.1: The TF has a few questions. Does item 4 refer only to loose-leaf publications? We are unsure as to how it would apply to serials, since they normally don’t have a “previous edition” in the same sense. If it is only to be applied to loose-leaves, that should be stated; if it is also to be applied to serials, an example would be helpful.

Is the TF correct in perceiving that the examples at the end of this section do not apply to the fifth item listed in the section? The TF is unsure as to what that last item means, and would appreciate an example. The examples already given should be placed immediately below the point that each illustrates.

7.1.4.4: The TF has some questions and comments:

- ✓ Does the first sentence refer to instances where the corporate body changes name, and the publication has title main entry? We hope this interpretation is correct, but aren’t sure (because main entry isn’t included in ISBD), and the examples given after paragraph two seem to say otherwise. Then again, the final sentence of the section seems to say that these changes are included.
- ✓ What is the meaning of the final phrase of paragraph two, “where linguistically applicable”?
- ✓ We must be blind; we cannot find the note on frequency (12.7B1 in AACR2R).
- ✓ The phrase, “minor changes,” may wind up not being AACR2R-ese. It depends on how the Appendix on Major Changes fares in JSC.

- ✓ The TF finds this whole rule somewhat confusing; it would seem to make more sense to tell catalogers when to make new bibliographic records, rather than listing all the situations in which catalogers do not make new records.

7.2: It seems to the TF that these should be two separate rules: Notes on the edition area; and, Notes on the bibliographic history of the continuing resource. Clean-copy Chapter 12 places bibliographic-history notes in 12.7B8 and edition notes in 12.7B9).

7.2.4.1: Examples of other reproduction formats would be very useful.

7.2.4.2: The TF would appreciate an example for the first scenario.

7.2.4.4: The TF notes that instructions in paragraph 1 and 2 of this rule differ from instructions in 7.2.4.5–7.2.4.11, in that the note is, “*of the title (or, when applicable, the key title and ISSN).*” The other instructions all say simply to give a note “*of key titles and ISSNs*”.

7.2.4.8 (deleted rule): The TF suggests that this rule should be deleted only if the example is to be included under 7.2.4.4.

7.2.4.8 (rule not deleted) and 7.2.4.9: Chapter 12 deals with supplements in “12.9. Supplements” by stating, in 12.9A, “Describe supplements as instructed in 1.9.” 1.9 deals with supplements issued independently and dependently; this section of CR appears to be dealing only with dependent supplements, which in 1.9 may be dealt with either in Area 3, in notes, or in multilevel description. Key title is not mentioned in Chapter 12.

7.4.1: The TF requests more examples.

7.5: The TF notes that this does not follow current AACR2R practice. If retained, more examples are needed for other (non-dimensions) examples. What is the difference between supplements (as discussed in CR) and accompanying materials (as discussed in AACR2R)?

7.6.2: The TF requests examples.

7.6.4: The TF requests an example of how to write this note.

7.9: The TF notes that in chapter 12, this is called “Summary” (12.7B18).

7.10.2: This is the only place where the TF could find unnumbered monographic series specifically addressed; they need to be mentioned elsewhere, particularly in Area 3.

7.11: The TF requests examples.

8.1.1: The TF asks, is this rule saying that the ISBN is given in records for serials, as well as in records for loose-leaves and integrating resources? If this is what is being said, it

would be a problem, in that it would result in constant updating of the bibliographic record each time a new volume arrives.

Footnote 9: The TF notes that “th” should be “the”.

Appendix A: AACR2R uses “multilevel;” CR uses “multi-level.”

Under paragraph 1, point 4 includes the term “component part analysis.” Although a cite is given to another IFLA document, a short definition would be very helpful.

Paragraph 4 (immediately above “Multi-level description”) references ISBD(S). Does it mean ISBD(CR)?

General comments on Appendix A: The TF asks: What is the object of the appendix? Is this type of description being recommended? It is unclear to the TF whether the example under the sub-heading “Multi-level description” represents one record or two records. How would this translate into the real world of catalogs, e.g., is all the information to be found in one huge record/catalog card (if people have cards, that is)? If not, how are the records attached to each other? While we realize this is covered in an entirely different document in detail, without some more explanation here this appendix isn’t very helpful. This seems to be approximately equivalent to AACR2R’s 13.6.

Appendix B: The TF notes that this will be extremely useful when the examples are inserted into the final copy.