

Association for Library Collections and Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Classification Section
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

Task Force on the Review of ISBD(ER), 2004 Revisions

Report

May 12, 2004

A. Charge

The Task Force on the Review of ISBD(ER), 2004 Revision, is charged with preparing a review of this document, for transmittal to CC:DA by May 14, 2004, and to the appropriate IFLA body by May 17, 2004. The document is available at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/guide/isbder04.htm>. Particular attention should be given to areas, if any, in which AACR2R and this document are not in conformance.

B. General comments

- ✓ General grammatical/stylistic comment: In this document there is never a comma after “e.g.” or “i.e.” AACR always uses the comma.
- ✓ More explanation on the multiple-format issue would be helpful, preferably in the first couple of pages when it addresses these issues. For example, it would help to state explicitly that in the case of a serially released cartographic material that is electronic, one would start with ISBD(CM), and use other ISBDs — CR and ER — as needed.
- ✓ A more clear delineation between chief and prescribed sources would be useful to catalogers. AACR does this in a very clear way.
- ✓ Incorporating the FRBR model and its terminology into the ISBDs: Is this going to take place at some point? What is IFLA’s timeline in harmonizing these?
- ✓ Perhaps at some point — at the time of FRBRizing? — the ISBDs could move toward intuitive labels/namespaces to delineate between elements, instead of relying on punctuation that modern users of catalogs don’t understand, and for which they have no practical context. Not only many users but many librarians and catalogers have never used a card catalog. The CC:DA task force that reviewed ISBD(G) also noted this as an important change at least to be considered.

C. Specific comments

p.1, 0.1.1, paragraph 2:

Majority vote: This is a better definition of electronic resources than is what appears in AACR2 9.0A1 (e.g., the term, “computer-controlled,” used in ISBD(ER)).

Minority vote: The first sentence and most of the second are fine, but AACR’s use of “text” rather than “letters” is superior. It would be better either to use both “text” and “letters,” or to use “alphanumeric” (which consists of letters, numbers and other symbols).

p.2, paragraph 2

This discussion of editions may be more useful later in the document, in the section 2.1 on Edition. This paragraph also seems confusing to some members of the TF, who came away from reading it without a clear idea of when a separate bibliographic record would need to be created for a resource. The idea of creating separate bibliographic records only when there are significant differences in the intellectual or artistic content of the resources is a good general principle, but when the paragraph goes on to say that when “the differences are not found to be significant” ... “a bibliographic agency may choose to create multiple bibliographic records,” this leaves the TF wondering what will happen when different agencies have different ideas of what is a significant difference and what isn’t.

p. 1, 0.1.1, paragraph 4

Re line 1: “This definition is taken ...”: The sentence would read better if it were, “This definition of electronic resources is taken ...”

Re the phrase “by network or via telecommunications”: Is that distinction necessary? One or the other should be sufficient, since the TF could not think of with a situation where one would access a resource via “telecommunications” where a network of some sort wouldn’t be involved, and vice-versa.

The term “generally available” could be misinterpreted as “freely available”.

p. 1, footnote 6

This footnote appears to be in a different font size than footnotes 4 and 5.

p. 2, paragraphs 3 & 4

Although paragraph 3 mentions the case of a resource available “in a different output medium”, that situation is not discussed in paragraph 4. Paragraph 4 only discusses a resource being available on different physical carriers. What about a resource available on a physical carrier (such as a CD-ROM) and as a remote access electronic resource?

It may be necessary to define “output medium”. Initially, some members of the TF took these paragraphs to mean a delivery format (like PDF, HTML, MPEG, WAV) and thought the guidelines were calling for separate records for differing formats of remote access electronic resources (e.g., one record for a PDF version and one for an HTML version of the same electronic document).

p.2, 0.1.1, paragraph 8

There is a difference of opinion within the Task Force on this matter. One view is that this paragraph seems to describe how to apply the rules and may be more appropriate for as a general note for area 2. Another view is that with the possible exception of the last sentence (omitting edition area for remote resources), the decision as to whether or not to create a separate record is normally made before the descriptive aspect covered in area 2; indeed, the decision is ideally made before beginning to address the descriptive areas, although we concede that in practice this sometimes does not happen!

p. 2, 0.1.1, paragraphs 9-10

Because these paragraphs deal with different output medium or display format, they may be more appropriately grouped with the statement on p.3, 0.1.3, para 6, line 4 beginning “To describe a resource that is available in more than one physical format ...”

p. 3-10, Definitions

1. The TF came up with a list of definitions and cross references that it would be helpful to add to this list: carrier (see physical carrier); chief source of information; compiler (see editor); continuing resource; corporate body; disc; disk; distributor; editor; entities; file format/format; filing title (see uniform title); header/header file; integrating resource; jacket (see sleeve); joint author; local access (see direct access); machine readable data file (see electronic resource); metadata; mixed responsibility; opening screen; output medium; program statement [used in 0.5.1]; title frame; uniform title.
2. The TF would like to see more *See also* references throughout this section. Some of the TF perceive the existing references — both in ISBD(ER) and AACR — to be inconsistent. Also, some references are not reciprocal, and should be — for example: “Area” and “Element”; all of the different types of titles (common, dependent, key, section, title, title proper, etc.); all of the series (series, sub-series, main series); between the specific and general material designations; between “Edition statement” and “Parallel edition statement”; between “Access”, “Direct access”, and “Remote access”; “Internet” and “World Wide Web”.
3. The TF is very pleased to see the ISBD(ER) weigh in on the single vs. separate record debate in paragraph 6 on p. 3. This is sufficiently important that the TF strongly recommends splitting this paragraph in half, and starting a new paragraph with, “To describe a resource that is available in more than one physical format ...” This does again raise the question of what is meant by, “more than one output medium or display format”. The use of the term “display format” tends to make the TF think of the difference between a PDF and an HTML document, for example, and we were not sure if that is what is meant here. The TF also recommends strengthening the last sentence by stating explicitly that the choice of single or multiple bibliographic records is a choice made for one’s local catalog, not one made for shared bibliographic data.

4. Following are comments concerning specific definitions, or the need for specific definitions:

Chief source of information: The only definition for what constitutes a chief source in ISBD(ER) is at the beginning of 0.5.1. Finding it there would require a lot of serendipitous and needless hunting and pecking on the part of the users.

Container: The definition for container could include a see also reference to “physical carrier.” The AACR2 glossary does this.

Edition: Re the phrase, “an edition may be identified by an edition statement in the resource”: It may be necessary to address the occurrence of so-called edition statements such as “electronic edition” or “online edition.” This quoted phrase might lead a cataloger to think that if the statement “online edition” appeared in a resource, then it should be included as an edition statement in the bibliographic record. But on the other hand, on p. 34, paragraph 4 states that “differences that do not constitute a new edition include: ... differences in the output medium or display format (e.g. a remote access resource reproduced on floppy disk and optical disk.)” — which would lead a cataloger to perceive that s/he should not include “online edition” as an edition statement in the bibliographic record.

Element: A line break is needed between the definitions for “Element” and “File name”.

Entity: The glossary would be strengthened by the including a definition for “entities” since the word is used in some of the ISBD(ER) glossary entries. For an example, please see the glossary entry for “document”.

File name: Why is there “File name” but not “File format”? Or is it just for cartographic materials in electronic form where users need to know what the file format is?

General material designation: It would be helpful to include “(GMD)” after the phrase being defined.

Internet: The definition of Internet as “A large network ...” is too vague. It might be better to use the full name of “Internet Protocol” (IP) and change to TCP/IP (Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol). Perhaps substituting “global” for “large” network would improve the definition? The inclusion of E-mail per se as an Internet service seems to be accurate since libraries do have electronic journals for which the issues are sent to a person’s E-mail. But the remote login part should go. It’s important to add a phrase on what is currently the most important service (or at least the chief one we catalog) - a source for remotely accessed resources such as databases, documents, reports, books, journals, etc. The TF also notes that the World Wide Web is a subset of the Internet. The last sentence of this definition is troubling.

Key title: Perhaps remove the page break after “Key title”?

Multi-part resource: The TF has some differences of opinion on this definition. The phrase “physically separate” seems odd, especially within the context of intangible electronic resources. While some suggest that the phrase might perhaps better be “A monographic resource in a finite number of intellectually separate parts ...”, others see this phrase as too broad. Generally, the TF prefers AACR definition, which works as is. The TF notes that the ISBD definition does away with the fact that the parts may or may not be numbered, which can be useful to catalogers. A remote access electronic resource could be a multi-part resource, with the different parts being located in different files on the same server.

Physical carrier: This definition could include a *see also* reference to the definition of “container”.

Record: Interesting that this definition doesn’t specifically mention “record” in the computer-file sense.

Remote access: The word “using” doesn’t seem the best choice, since it implies something active such as data manipulation in database or using interactive multi-media. Also the part about “maintained mechanically or by a computer technician” seems a bit awkward and is correct for local resources; for example, Cataloger’s Desktop in CD-ROM version is *direct* access and the new Web version is *remote* access, both involve maintenance by computer technicians. The detail about large storage devices will be inaccurate as technology changes. How about “A method of accessing electronic resources stored on a server and accessed through a computer network”?

Resource: If entities are works, expressions, manifestations and items, the word “entity” is too all-encompassing to be in the definition of the entity that is the basis of bibliographic description, a manifestation. The definition is missing a key part of the FRBR definition — that it is an object of interest to a user.

The restriction to “documents” is too limiting. For example, cartographic materials are not usually considered to be documents — generally only when one is discussing the U.S.-depository system for U.S. documents.

Would this be the place to add that electronic resources may be single part, serial or integrating or is that covered in the instruction to consult other ISBDs?

Section title: The definition is self-referential because it uses its own name to define itself. The term “title” is defined separately, but the term “section” is not. The definition states, “The title specific to a section ...” What is a section? A part? A division? And to what class of object does a section belong? A resource? A document? A record? Some clarification may be helpful.

Title: Is it correct to state that, “A resource will usually contain several titles”? “A resource may contain several titles ...” would be more accurate.

p.10, 0.2, 1st paragraph on page, line 2

What is meant by “opening frame” of a resource? More specificity would be helpful.

p.10, 0.3

Some gridlines would be very useful in this section; the tabular format is difficult to follow.

p. 12, 0.3.2, E

The TF suggests re-phrasing the first sentence to read: "... for area 3 of the ISBD(G) outline ..." to make it parallel with the second half of the sentence. All the prepositions in the current phrasing make the sentence awkward.

It might be appropriate to highlight what is not stated until p. 37 — that a record for an electronic resource may indeed have metadata in Area 3, but that it related to the material type from special ISBDs.

As an aside, the TF is curious as to why ISBD(ER) would name its Area 3 differently from the other ISBDs, when it doesn't use the area.

p. 14, 0.4.2

Need a comma after "(())" or else it looks like square brackets are parentheses.

p. 14, 0.4.5

Why do multiple instances of Area 6 have different punctuation conventions than every other area? It seems possible that the reasoning was based card-cataloging practices; it has the feel of an anomaly at this point.

p.15, 0.5

An explicit heading for sources of information would be useful here. AACR uses a heading for sources of information and breaks it down into chief and prescribed sources. Although the ISBD(ER) does state that the chief source is the resource itself within section 0.5.1 a separate heading for the sources would make the two documents more consistent.

p. 15, 0.5.1, last line

Typo: "or itls labels." It should be "its".

p.16, 0.5.2, paragraph 2

Typo: "Chief source of inforamtion" should be "... information".

p. 18, paragraph 1

Re: "the first letter of the first word of some elements (e.g. general material designation ...) should also be a capital: For each example that uses the GMD "electronic resource", the GMD "electronic resource" has capital letters for the "E" and the "R" which AACR does not do.

p.20 1.1.1 example 3: Welcome to CERN

AACR2R 1.1.B.1, second paragraph, states: "Do not transcribe words that serve as an introduction and are not intended to be part of the title. Give the title including these words in a note (see 1.7B4)." This rule has for its second example:

NASA quest

Note: Title appears on item as: Welcome to NASA quest

The TF therefore requests that this example be omitted, and an illustrative example of a title proper (that does not go against this AACR2R rule) be substituted.

p. 20, 1.1.2

Re: “The title proper is the chief title of a resource”: The TF prefers the AACR2 definition, which uses “chief name” instead of “chief title”.

p.22, 1.1.3.2.1, paragraph 1, line 2

Typos: “Surce of informaltion” should be “Source of information”.

p. 22, 1.1.4.2.1

Re: “When the number of individual works is very large, the first three titles may be given ...”: The example doesn’t show the marks of omission specified in the guideline.

Since the “rule of three” has not been invoked concerning authors (see section 1.5.4.3 on p. 29), should it be invoked here, to limit the number of works listed in the Title Proper? Could this section also read “the number of titles transcribed is at the discretion of the bibliographic agency” or “the number of titles transcribed after the first three s at the discretion of the bibliographic agency”?

p.22 1.1.4.2.1, second example

Shouldn’t this example have the marks of omission after “Verbal communication”?

p. 23, 1.1.4.2.3, line 2

Are we referring to 1.1.4.2.1, and not 1.1.4.2.2? Should we explicitly refer in the rule to 7.1.1.2 for documenting that the title is supplied by the cataloger?

p. 27, 1.5.2, paragraph 2, line 1

This seems to be inconsistent terminology, in that it is the only place in the document in which “corporate bodies” are called “corporate entities”.

p. 29, 1.5.4.2, last sentence

It would be more specific (and reciprocal) to refer to 7.1.5, just as 7.1.5 refers to 1.5.4.2.

p. 29, 1.5.4.3

Re: “When the names of several persons or corporate bodies are represented in a single statement of responsibility, the number of names transcribed is at the discretion of the bibliographic agency.”: It might be a good idea to specify that the first three persons/corporate bodies will be transcribed, and that the remaining are at the discretion of the bibliographic agency.

p. 34, paragraph 4

Re: “Normally, differences that do not constitute a new edition do not warrant the creation of a separate bibliographic record, although a bibliographic agency may choose to create multiple bibliographic records.”: There are differing views within the TF. One view asks Under what circumstances would a bibliographic agency choose to create multiple bibliographic records? Does this mean multiple records for a local catalog or multiple records

in a shared catalog? The other view is that, to be consistent, ISBD(ER)'s detailed exposition on p. 34 in the Area 2 section makes more sense in the introduction. If "edition" concerns — having to do with differentiation of bibliographic resources — are addressed in the introduction, then perhaps there would not be the confusion regarding edition statements, such as "online edition". Area 2 could focus on *what to transcribe*, with the understanding that the decision on whether the record represents a distinct edition has already been made

p. 35, 2.1.3, line 3

Should the edition statement not be in the language of "the title proper", as opposed to the language of "the prescribed source of information" — especially to accommodate resources with prescribed source(s) of information in multiple languages/scripts (as per AACR 9.2B3)?

p. 38-40, 4.1

All the examples for place of publication seem to be for direct access resources or with a reasonably obvious place of publication. Determining the place of publication is one of the thornier parts of cataloging remote access resources. For example, when the resource is a PDF of a book, but it is mounted on a website and the cataloger can only guess at the place of publication of the website. It would be helpful if there were more examples of the type contained in AACR2, 9.4 — the ones that show "the best the cataloger could come up with", e.g., "United States : ..." — or at least some more examples with bracketed question marks.

p.39, 4.1.9, 1st paragraph, 2d sentence

Re: "It [qualifier of name of place of issuance] is enclosed in parentheses if transcribed from the prescribed source of information or in square brackets if transcribed from another source." Does AACR ever use parentheses in this case? Does it mean situation where the qualifier is transcribed from the prescribed source of information but the name of place plus qualifier is not taken exactly from the piece — e.g., if the place of pub is given as Cambridge, and somewhere else in the prescribed source of information is stated they mean the one in Massachusetts?

Page 41: 4.2.6

AACR no longer uses an abbreviated form of the publisher names, e.g., "The Board", "The Institute". The TF's group memory is under the impression that the rule was changed because of duplicate records were being added to the utilities (such as OCLC) because of problems in matching forms of name in 260. For example, software doesn't recognize "The Institute" as being the same as "Institute for Advanced Chinese Studies".

In FRBR, publisher is a group 2 entity and needs to be under some control or it won't be clear in FRBRized catalogs that a manifestation has been produced by a particular corporate body.

p. 42, 4.4.1, paragraph. after the example

Typo: "(e.g. Word Wide Web sites)" should be "World".

p. 42, 4.4.8, No date of publication

Perhaps a distinction is needed for remote and direct access resources. For serials and integrating resources, this would represent quite a different practice from AACR's 12.4F1-2

and 1.4F8. Recording supplied dates for integrating resources here rather than in a note seems to be setting catalogers up for never-ending, non-essential record maintenance when using or updating these records. Since these records are so dynamic and everyone is responsible for keeping them up to date, this is not a practice we in the U.S. would like to follow.

p. 43, 4.4.6, paragraph 1

Beginning with this example, the abbreviation of “copyright” as “cop.” is inconsistent with AACR2 abbreviation, which is “c”. Could it be that “c” has another common meaning in non-AACR countries’ cataloging or life generally?

p.45-48 Area 5

For all examples: AACR uses a full stop after the m of “cm”.

Physical description area, 3rd paragraph in introductory note

While Area 5 is repeatable, does AACR permit this usage? Isn’t it for such matters as, say, kits that contain more than one medium? AACR options in this situation seem to be limited to putting several SMDs in one extent statement, or selecting one as the main SMD and listing the others in the note.

p. 45, 5

The introductory note states that the provisions for physical description are intended to be used for direct access resources, but that a bibliographic agency may choose to apply them to remote access resources. If that is the case, there needs to be an example of how that would look. Since there are no physical dimensions and “1 web site” doesn’t seem very descriptive, the TF is having some difficulty picturing how it might look.

p. 45, paragraph 3 “(1) Each different physical carrier ...”

At every point where ISBD(ER) uses “electronic [remainder of SMD],” AACR2 uses “computer [remainder of SMD].” For example, for the SMD “electronic optical disc,” the AACR2 SMD is “computer optical disc”.

p. 45, 5, paragraph 1, especially the last line

The note needs to state the normative practice for remote resources if it is going to state an alternative practice: “Normally, physical description is not given for remote resources, optionally, a bibliographic agency may also choose ...” or the like. Examples of the alternative practice do need to be included.

p. 45, 5.1.3

AACR2 in 9.5B1 uses the following language to describe this situation: “*Optionally*, use conventional terminology to record the specific format of the physical carrier.” The TF prefers AACR’s phrase, “conventional terminology,” to ISBD(ER)’s “in common use.”

p. 46, 5.1.3

Isn’t “PhotoCD” a copyrighted/trademarked term?

p. 46, 5.2.3 1st sentence

What about a resource that may be viewed either in shades of gray (ranging from black to white?) or in color, depending upon software used?

p. 47, 5.3.2.3, 1st sentence

Re: “The length and height of a tape cassette are given when they are other than the standard size (10 x 7 cm) ...”: For how long in the computer world is any one going to know what all those standard sizes are? Generally speaking but not always, AACR has the dimensions.

p. 47, 5.3.4

Typo: Shouldn't the dimension be “9-14 cm” not “9-14 c”?

p. 50, 6.1.1 last sentence

Re: “except that typographical errors [in title proper of series or subseries] are not corrected”: Wouldn't AACR use “[sic]” or “[i.e.]” in the series statement, and make appropriate title entries under correct and incorrect spelling?

p. 52: 6.6

AACR uses “v.” in series numbering statements, instead of “vol.”

p. 53, paragraph 1

Do the notes have to be confined to “any aspect of the physical make-up of the resource or its contents”? On p. 45 in paragraph 1, the guidelines state that “a bibliographic agency may also choose to apply the following provisions to an electronic resource that is available by remote access.” (These are provisions for physical description.) So could the Note Area also contain the option for “a bibliographic agency to apply its provisions to any aspect of the resource or its contents”?

p. 53 Area 7, paragraph 2

This indicates that the “order of notes is optional.” In AACR, order of notes is not optional.

p. 53, 7.1.

Please include the example: “Title from HTML source code”.

p. 53, 7.1.1.2

In the U.S., catalogers seem to use the italicized word “mandatory” for elements that are not optional. Instead of “The source of the title proper is recorded in all cases”, the phrase would probably be “... is *mandatory*”.

p. 54, 7.1.1.2, last example

The TF couldn't come up with an instance when a cataloger would use an e-mail header for cataloging, unless it were an e-mail that were being cataloged.

p. 54, 7.1.3 & 7.1.4

Should the example under these rules be indented?

p. 55, 7.2.2, second and third examples

The TF feels very strongly about not including last update in bibliographic records, since it means endless maintenance. The third example of a **continuously updated** resource with an update date is especially egregious. It is more appropriate to indicate the date the cataloger viewed it and what the version was when it was cataloged.

p. 57, 7.5.2

The URL does not belong here.

p. 58, 7.9

In the example, “Description based on home page dated 09/06/96” it is not clear whether the date meant the date on the home page, or the date the page was viewed. It is more clear is written as it is on p. 66 in Example 6 “Title from home page (viewed Feb. 28, 2003; last updated Jan. 8, 2002)”.

p. 58, 7.9

Again, the document refers to “continuing resources” here, but that phrase is not defined in the document. If the terminology is going to be used, it should be defined in the glossary.

It would be helpful to state, “remote access continuing resource and/or integrating resource,” for this rule (and define the latter in the glossary as well, which can be finite or continuing) — or alternatively, as in AACR 9.7B22, simply refer to “remote access resources”.

p. 59, 7.10, second example

The second example is not indented and is in a different font size.

p. 65-72

1. The TF strongly recommends deleting the label “American” in this context, since Canadians, Mexicans, Cubans, Brazilians, Argentineans, etc., are all American. Perhaps the phrase “United States example” would be better (and more accurate) here. The TF considered recommending changing the label from "American examples" to "AACR2r examples". But that would mean that the document would have to group together all the examples from the U.S., Britain, Canada, and any of the other countries in the appendix that use AACR. This doesn't seem like a good idea, since for example spelling conventions of Canadian, British, and Australian words varies from the U.S. spelling. Seeing the country of the cataloging agency will help distinguish such variations, especially in non-transcription areas, such as Area 7.
2. Everywhere in the examples where ISBD(ER) uses “electronic [remainder of SMD]”, AACR2 uses “computer [remainder of SMD]”.
3. There seem to be an unduly large number of U.S. examples. Most of the countries have two examples each: one direct access, the other remote access. France and Spain are only represented once, yet Italy, like the U.S., has ten examples. Being egalitarian in our

examples would make the document more representatively international in terms of its scope, and would also reflect the intent of the document.

4. The designation of whether an example is for a direct or remote access resource is sometimes italicized and sometimes not; this should be made consistent.
5. It would be best not split an example between two pages.
6. It looks as if the examples from AACR countries are modified for inclusion in ISBD(ER). For example, one of the TF members looked up in OCLC the first two examples and found these differences in between how the records are cataloged by AACR rules, and how they appear under ISBD(ER). It should be noted at the beginning of the examples that these modifications have been made.
 - a. p. 65, example 1
The OCLC record (#49543395) for this resource shows the title proper as: “Travis 2.0” and the dimensions of the CD are “4 ¾ in.”, not 12 cm. Why are we not representing the example as it appears in reality — especially considering the provision for using inches in footnote 9 of ISBD(ER) 5.3.1 on p.47?
 - b. p. 65, example 2
The OCLC record (#52785119) for this resource uses the AACR2r abbreviation for “copyright”; the ISBD(ER) example uses “cop.”. It also changes the inches to centimeters, and does not include the variant title in the second 246 field from the MARC record.
7. As noted before in Area 5 comments on SMDs, Everywhere ISBD(ER) uses electronic [whatever, AACR2 uses computer [whatever].
8. What is the reason for using “CD-ROM” in examples 3-5, and “electronic optical disc” in other examples? SMDs in all of these examples seem inconsistent.
9. AACR uses commas between the city of publication and its state? E.g., “Washington, (DC).” The commas are lacking throughout the “American examples”.

p.65, Appendix C, 3rd example

Typo: “eletronic” should be “electronic”.

p. 66, example 6

Beginning here and continuing for each example where “Mode of access” is used, the field would usually not include the URL for the resource, although it can appear in the Mode of access note field as well as in the required MARC21 856 field.

p. 66, end of page

The final American example is not numbered (which, when added, will throw off the numbering of subsequent examples).

The OCLC record (#32389968) for this resource states “1 computer optical disc”.