

TO: Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

FROM: Kate Harcourt, Chair, Task Force on the Review of ISBD(G), 2003 revision

RE: Report of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(G), 2003 revision

The **charge** (dated January 7, 2004) of the Task Force (TF) is to:

1. Prepare a review of the General International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD (G)) 2003 revision for transmittal to the Chair of the ISBD(S) Working Group by February 16, 2004. The revised ISBD (G) is available at:

http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/guide/isbdg_wrd.pdf
2. Pay particular attention to how the document may affect future directions for AACR2R.
3. Send the report of the Task Force to the Chair of CC:DA no later than February 6, 2004.

Membership of the TF is:

Kate Harcourt, Chair
Shelby Harken
Paul Weiss

The **report** of the TF takes the following form:

- I. General comments on the draft revision of ISBD(G)
- II. Comments on specific aspects of the draft revision of ISBD(G)
 - A. Effect on end users
 - B. Effect on catalogers and libraries
 - C. Clarity and consistency in meaning
 - D. Document usability
 - E. Document readability

I. General comments on the draft revision of ISBD(G)

The main issue faced by the TF is the extent, purpose and potential impact of our review. If we look only for areas in which AACR2R and the guidelines are not in conformance, we would have a rather brief report. The TF found the revised ISBD(G) to be generally consistent with AACR2R although our report will note some areas of concern. If, however, we step back and take a broader view, at least two questions arise of a more substantive and potentially more controversial nature.

The stated goal of this revision is to ensure conformity between the provisions of the ISBDs and FRBR's data requirements for the basic level national bibliographic record (BLNR). The TF recommends that a harder look be taken at the job the ISBDs do in creating what we want to see in our national records. In the environment of 2004, many of the directives in ISBD(G) seem anachronistic. To remain viable, the ISBDs need to be revised to keep current with the effects and functionality of technology, while continuing to be usable in a print environment, as well as with expectations of modern users and library staff.

The second major area of discussion for the committee was the incorporation of the FRBR model. It seems that a review of the ISBDs to ensure compliance with FRBR would have been an ideal time to utilize the more rigorous terminology of that standard, in particular *work*, *expression*, *manifestation*, and *item*. It seems especially unfortunate that ISBD(G) partially adopts the FRBR model, but not sufficiently to clearly lay out the relationship between the ISBDs and the FRBR model. We endorse the ISBD Review Group's idea to make the relationship clear, via a table or other method. It is regrettable that users of both standards would need to consult a table in order to interpret them. It would be much better to fully incorporate FRBR (as well as other relevant IFLA standards, such as *Guidelines for OPAC Displays*) into the ISBDs directly.

The TF recognizes that the 2003 revision is an interim document and recognizes that work may be needed to determine which of our recommendations below are appropriate for the current review and which may be more appropriate for future discussion. The impact of some suggestions on AACR2R could be considerable.

II. Comments on specific aspects of the draft revision of ISBD(G)

The section numbers refer to existing section numbers in the draft revision.

A. Effect on end users

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. We recommend:

Existing term	Recommended term
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]

0.1.1: What kind of standard are the ISBDs trying to be? The last sentence implies that one primary purpose is displays. This raises the question: What is the intended relationship between the ISBDs and IFLA's *Guidelines for OPAC Displays*? As written it seems to be confined to eye-readable punctuation flags.

It might be worth considering a two-level standard, for brief and full user displays, as many high-use web databases use both, and our users have become familiar with them in our ILSs. This would be analogous to MARC 21's full and minimal record standards.

0.1.2, etc.: 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. OCR scanning for metadata extraction would mostly be used for older records which are only available in print form.

0.1.3 third paragraph from end, etc.: It also seems anachronistic now to limit the ISBDs to what in the library community we call *description*. With the plethora of metadata standards created outside of our field (and some inside as well), *descriptive metadata* includes elements corresponding to our descriptive headings, subjects, etc. It is time for us to have one overarching standard for bibliographic records. AACR Part III will be defining authority records, in part to deal with bibliographic relationships. MARC21 tagging in 7XX fields provides for a number of relationships. ISBD(G) also does not seem to be defining a way to show the work-entity-manifestation relationships. There is no area at all for subject access yet FRBR says to provide them. It may now be time to suggest that new Areas be considered for ISBD(G).

0.4.5: If prescribed punctuation is retained, do not treat area 6 differently. Use “. --” between multiple instances of area 6, just as with any other area.

0.5: It might benefit us to look at our principles of transcription. Are our users best served by transcription? Are there situations where cataloger's judgment in how to record information

would be more beneficial? Some on the TF think that we should move away from transcription as our principle for the data we give in our records, at least for some elements, e.g., omit statements of responsibility, and rely on access points. This ties into discussions of the need for role information such as relator terms.

0.8: It is not clear how users benefit from special capitalization rules. Why not just follow the language of the resource for transcribed data, and the language of the catalog for cataloger-generated data? Capitalization as a flag is not always a clean delineation.

1.6: Users would likely be better served by an approach where each work is given its own line (that is, repeated area 1s). Since some elements relate to more than one work, the list could be headed by some generic phrase. For example, using some of the examples at 1.6:

This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD] / Haydn
“Clock” symphony : (no. 101)
“Surprise” symphony : (no. 94)

This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD] / by Charles Dickens ; with seven illustrations by F. Walker and Maurice Greiffenhagen
Hard times
Hunted down
Holiday romance
George Silverman’s explanation

This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD]
Saudades do Brasil : suite de danses pour orchestre / Darius Milhaud
Symphonie concertante pour trompette et orchestre / Henry Barraud

1.6 second example: Why was the linking ampersand recorded?

1.6 second paragraph: It would be worth stating *and others*.

2.4 preceding punctuation: This prescribed punctuation in particular is misleading. In English, the comma generally has more narrow scope than most other punctuation characters. The example at 2.5 shows how confusing this is.

4.3: The TF wondered why this is still limited to distributors. It would be helpful to allow it for publishers and manufacturers as well.

4.5-4.7: These should go away as separate elements, and just become a repeatable instance of area 4. This would allow dates of manufacture that are different than dates of publication to be recorded.

6.5: This element is not consistent, in that it does not allow for ISBNs (of multipart items treated as series) or other standard numbers. From a FRBR perspective, the ISSN is not an attribute of the resource in hand, nor of the relationship between the resource and its parent, the series. It is an attribute of the series itself, and belongs on its bibliographic record in area

8. It would seem that in general this is not helpful to most users. Perhaps it could be part of the standard for full displays, but not for brief displays (see comment at 0.1.1 above).

8.2: The TF had difficulty seeing how key title would be of benefit to end users. There are many, many data elements that are useful to specific sets of users at some institutions, but we don't include them. The ISBDs outline the minimum of elements to display and it is always possible to add others.

B. Effect on catalogers and libraries

0.1.3 first paragraph: It seems beyond the scope of the ISBDs to recommend to national cataloging agencies how to structure their metadata records internally. For some agencies, it may be more efficient to create one bibliographic record that represents multiple physical formats, output media or display formats. What the ISBDs might indeed care about is that separate records are distributed.

1.6 second paragraph first sentence: The requirement to give the complete contents in area 7 is onerous. Cataloging agencies should be able to decide when to do this.

4 note second paragraph: This is much too broad as written, and could lead to wildly divergent practice.

C. Clarity and consistency in meaning

There are allusions in section 0.1 to prescribing the order of data elements, but there are no explicit statements to this effect.

2003 introduction: The section on mandatoriness should appear in the main part of the document. Also, data elements should be labeled in ISBD(G) as mandatory, mandatory if applicable, or optional, at the least stringent designation found in any of the specific ISBDs. The same is true for repeatability. The equivalent of mandatory if applicable appears in the first whole paragraph on p. iv.

The *Invitation to: World-Wide Review of "ISBD(G): General International Standard Bibliographic Description - 2003 revision"* says that *resource* replaces *publication* (assumedly when it means an object, rather than the process of publishing). A couple of places were missed: contents: area 3, 2003 Introduction, footnote 5, 0.3 outline (area 3), 1.5 definition, 3, index.

0.1, footnote 5: It is not clear what this sentence means.

0.2: It is unclear what the value of the term *document* is, since it is only used in the definition of *record*.

0.2: Is *document* meant to be coextensive with the FRBR concepts of *work*, *expression*, and *manifestation*? If so, it would be clearer to use FRBR verbs: “ ... and is created, realized, and/or produced as a whole.” If *document* is retained, the phrase *in any medium or combination of media, tangible or intangible*, seems better situated in the definition of *document* rather than that of *resource*.

0.2: Since *corporate body* is not a generally understood term in English, it should be defined.

0.3C, 1.3 note second sentence: It is not clear what *transcribed as such* in 0.3C means. Transcribe as part of the earlier element? Transcribed in full at both elements? How should that sentence in 1.3 be interpreted? Parallel titles are therefore treated as what?

0.4.3: Indicate how to enter a dash on keyboards (two hyphens?) and printing (em dash?), parallel to the description of entering spaces in 0.4.1.

0.4.4: As written, this section would result in areas (other than area 1) without their first element having two instances of point-space-dash-space. Should this instead be ... *is replaced by the point*,

0.4.6: Modify to ... *is preceded or enclosed by the*

0.4.6: This section seems to not apply to 4.5-4.7

0.4.8: So commas around a conjunction between the first part of a title proper and the alternative title are not prescribed?

0.4.8A: This section states that square brackets are prescribed punctuation in area 5, but the section on area 5 does not say that.

0.4.8C: This section says parentheses are prescribed punctuation in area 5, but section 5 does not make any such statements.

0.4.9: The relationship between 0.4.9 and other sections is unclear. Does 0.4.9 only apply to 1.3, 2.2, 6.2, and 8.2, where parallel data elements are discussed explicitly? Does it apply to any element?

0.6 first sentence: The *and/or* in this case should be just *and*. Both the language and the script are transcribed.

0.7.1 & 1.5 note last sentence: These sections conflict.

0.7.3 paragraph 2: It seems that the self-reference is really meant to be to 0.7.2.

0.7.4: Perhaps it might be clearer to say *Otherwise, transcribe data in the form (abbreviated or spelled out) in which it appears in the resource*.

0.10 last sentence: It might be better to rephrase as *Letters or numbers that **appear to** have been omitted **inadvertently** from words may be inserted, enclosed in square brackets (in this case not preceded or followed by a space).*

1-8 definitions: The TF had some difficulty in this area. Some of the definitions are for an element in a record (such as 1.2 and 4.3), and some are for real-world things (such as 4.2 and 6.6). Sometimes it is an unclear mixture (such as 1.4, 1.5, and 2.1). This gets confusing, especially in training. It would be helpful to define the elements as such. If a term that refers to a real-world thing is used in the definition of an element, that term should be defined separately. For example, other title information in a resource and other title of information as given as an element are not the same thing. The current definition alludes to this when it mentions other title information for series titles, which are other-title-information-as-thing, but not other-title-information-as-element-1.4. Those are other-title-information-as-element-6.3. The references at the definitions for 6.2-6.4 back to area 1 imply that the definitions in area 1 are for real-world things, not elements.

1-8: The areas would also benefit from definitions. In some sense they are more than the sum of their elements.

1 second sentence: There would be benefit to examining the option of treating alternative titles more like parallel titles, rather than part of the title proper. This is likely closer to how users think of them.

1 second sentence: It would be clearer to say *It includes alternative titles and the conjunction linking an alternative title **with** the first part of the title proper.*

1 third sentence: It would be clearer to say *If the title of the resource has a title or designation insufficient to identify it, **its title proper consists of the title of its parent resource, followed by the title of the resource itself.***

1 third example: The title on the resource does not show commas, but the title proper does show them. Commas are not given as prescribed punctuation for area 1.

1 sixth example: If the purpose of this example is to show how to handle genitives in titles, supporting text would be helpful.

1 last example: Punctuation was changed from the title on the resource to the title proper, but there is not an explicit statement to do that.

1.1: This whole section is missing.

definitions at 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 4.2, 4.6, 6.6 second sentence, 8.3: The first few words of each of these should be the same. Perhaps it would be worth defining *statement*.

1.4 definitions 1-2: These sentences contradict each other. The first sentence says that other title information appears in conjunction with the title proper, but the second sentence says it can appear in conjunction other types of titles. It would be clearer to merge them into a single

sentence: *A word or phrase, or a group of characters, appearing in conjunction with, and subordinate to, a title of the resource.* Other title information for series is *not* part of this element, and should not be discussed here.

1.4 definition last sentence: This is confusing. Variant titles are not in the scope of the definition of other title information, so why say this?

1.4 note: The logic and phrasing here is not clear. A same-language original title does not fit the definition of other title information, since it is not subordinate to the title proper. In the previous paragraph, it was just stated that variant titles are *not* other title information. Other parts of the draft seem not to consider analytic titles as other title information.

1.5, etc.: All element names should be given either in the singular or plural.

1.5 first paragraph last sentence: This goes against the generally understood meaning of *statement*, which would already consider that a single statement.

1.5 definition second sentence: So statements of responsibility relating to production should not be given in this element? Would it then follow that the following types of statements would not be considered statements of responsibility: copyists of manuscripts, sponsors of manifestations (such as film producers), the second example in AACR2 1.1F6, engravers of maps?

1.5 note first sentence: Change *punctuation* to *order*.

1.5 note second sentence: Change to *The first statement **does not inherently relate** to the chief responsibility for a work.*

1.5 note third sentence: Change to *A statement of responsibility **may not name a specific person or body.***

1.5 Madame Bovary example: The phrase *after the novel by Flaubert* fits the definition of other title information, not statement of responsibility.

1.5 last example: The interpolated *par* does not seem to be called for by any part of the standard.

2.1 definition: This is a circular definition that does not help in the understanding of the term.

2.1 note: This would be very difficult for catalogers to follow as written. Who can really know anything about “all the copies of a resource”? This note cries out for FRBRization.

2.1 note last sentence: The definition of each data element should be the same for all materials. The specific ISBDs certainly benefit from examples of how the concept of *edition* plays out in various formats.

preceding punctuation at 2.3 & 2.5: Either give both here, or refer from both to 1.5.

2.3 definition: This would also be very difficult for catalogers to follow as written. The cataloger often does not know whether a statement has appeared in all editions, and certainly cannot know whether it will be used in all future editions.

2.3 note: This is also not always easy to follow. A resource may have an edition statement that is not clearly chronological, such as *Conference edition* or *Student edition*.

2.4 definition: This combines two very different kinds of data that are not usefully merged into a single element.

2.4 definition A: This definition does not make sense, given the definition at 2.1. Also, *issue* should be defined.

4 note first sentence: Change *library materials* to *resources*.

4.1 In London example: The *In* does not fit the definition. If this example is to be viewed as correct, the definition needs to be changed, and perhaps the name of the element (to *Statement of place of publication, distribution, etc.*).

4.2 definition, etc.: Change *or* to *and/or*.

5.3: The definition needs to be broadened to incorporate phrases such as *in glazed case* in the second example.

5.4: This should be broken down into sub-elements. As written, internal prescribed punctuation is not appropriate.

8.1: The definition is missing, or buried in the note.

Appendix A first sentence & examples B: These two sections do not agree on the scope of multilevel description.

Appendix A examples A second example: There is no provision in 4.4 for two dates to given in this element, or for the parentheses.

D. Document usability

Either give all page numbers in Arabic, or restart numbering when Arabic starts.

It is apparent that the section numbers were constructed in order to have area numbers match their section numbers, but this benefit is outweighed by the cost of illogical section hierarchies in section 0. Start section numbering with 1, and subdivide the number of the section on areas (whatever that ends up being) by area number. The TF suggests the following structure. Sections numbers in the brackets are the existing structure.

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Scope [0.1.1]
 - 1.2. Purpose [0.1.2]
 - 1.3. Use [0.1.3]
 - 1.4. Examples [0.9]
2. Definitions [0.2]
3. General
 - 3.1. Order [data appears in the order described in this document; 4.4 note second sentence, 8 note, etc.]
 - 3.2. Applicability [relevant sections from 2003 introduction, 0.4.10]
 - 3.3. Identifying parts of the description
 - 3.3.1. Delimiting areas [0.4.3]
 - 3.3.2. Delimiting elements [0.4.1 first sentence & last sentence; 0.4.4]
 - 3.3.3. Delimiters adjacent to other delimiters or transcribed punctuation [0.4.1 fourth sentence; 0.4.7]
 - 3.3.4. Other delimiters and indicators
 - 3.3.4.1. Information found outside the prescribed sources of information [0.4.8A first paragraph second sentence, second paragraph]
 - 3.3.4.2. Omission of some part of an element [0.4.8B]
 - 3.3.4.3. Additions [relevant parts of 0.10]
 - 3.3.5. Spacing around delimiters [0.4.1 second sentence; 0.4.2]
 - 3.3.6. Delimiters in right-to-left text [0.4.11]
 - 3.3.7. Optional delimiters [0.4.1 third sentence]
 - 3.4. Units of data [generalized version of 1.5 first paragraph last sentence]
4. Areas and elements
 - 4.0. General elements
 - 4.0.1. Parallel elements [generalized statement, drawing on 0.4.9, 1.3, 2.2, 6.2, 8.2; not repeated in 4.1-4.8]
 - 4.1. Area 1 [1]
 - 4.1.0. Resources without a collective title [1.6]
 - 4.1.1. Element 1 [what should have been 1.1]
 - ...
5. Element values
 - 5.1. Sources of information
 - 5.1.1. Transcription [general principle, 0.5, 0.7.4]
 - 5.1.2. Data supplied by the cataloger [general principle, list of elements, such as 1.2, 2.1]
 - 5.2. Language and script
 - 5.2.1. Transcribed data [0.6 first paragraph first sentence, third paragraph bullet 2, etc.]
 - 5.2.2. Non-transcribed data [0.6 first paragraph second sentence & bullets, third paragraph & bullets 1 & 3, etc.]

5.3. Modifying data

- 5.3.1. Punctuation [reference to 0.4.7]
- 5.3.2. Capitalization [0.8]
- 5.3.3. Form of numerals [generalized 2.1 note next-to-last paragraph third sentence]
- 5.3.4. Abridgement [0.7.1 first sentence]
- 5.3.5. Abbreviation [0.7.2 & 0.7.3]
- 5.3.6. Inaccuracies and mistakes [parts of 0.10 not moved to new 3.3.4.3]
- 5.3.7. Characters that cannot be utilized fully [0.11, 0.6 fourth paragraph]

Appendixes

- A Outline of ISBD(G) areas and elements [0.3 outline]
- B Multilevel description [Appendix A]
- C Records containing scripts with different directionality [Appendix B]

Do not repeat statements throughout the document. Standards are best written as concisely as possible. Repeating information, when stated slightly differently, often leads readers to assume that there is some subtle difference in meaning.

Topic	Recommended instance(s) to retain	Other instance(s)
order of elements	0.1	1-8
parentheses enclosing elements	0.3, 0.4.2, & 1-8	0.4.8C
square brackets enclosing elements	0.3 & 1-8	0.4.8A s1
Prescribed plus sign	0.3 & 5.4	0.4.8D
Spacing	0.4.1-0.4.2	1-8
preceding punctuation for areas	0.4.3	0.3 note
ellipses indicating omissions	0.4.8B	0.7.1 s2
parallel data	0.4.9	0.3 & 1-8
nature of examples	0.9	0.7.3 2nd paragraph, 5 2nd paragraph, 1 st sentence
parallel series titles	6.2	1.3 definition
principle of transcription	non-language parts of 0.6	2.1 note next-to-last paragraph 1st sentence, 4.1 definition (<i>as named on the resource</i>), etc.

The nature of the examples in this document is inconsistent, and not always as helpful as could be. The TF suggests that examples at each element should contain only that element. Then, at the end of each area, there could be examples of whole areas.

It would also be helpful if examples were given with both the form in the resource and the form recorded, as was done at 1. This would clarify that portions of certain examples were indeed transcribed, not generated by the cataloger.

Example	Portion not clear whether transcribed or cataloger-generated
1.2 second	the conjunction and its punctuation
1.5 Handley Cross	the single quotation marks

0.2 third paragraph: It would be worth considering placing all definitions here, rather than spreading them throughout the document. ISO standards now have all definitions in their own section before the main text. This makes it easier to find a definition when it is needed.

0.3 areas 3 & 7: It would be helpful to have text here saying to see the specific ISBDs for elements and punctuation.

0.4.5, 0.4.6: It would be more concise to integrate 0.4.5 into 0.4.3, and 0.4.6 into 0.4.1. For example, modify the beginning of 0.4.3 to *Each instance of an area...*

0.9 second paragraph: It would seem that the examples would generally be most useful if they are in the language and script of the ISBD(G) document itself. For example, it is not clear what the value of non-English examples is in this English document, beyond showing parallel information. This paragraph could be rewritten as *Examples are given in the language and script of this document, unless showing how to handle text in other languages or scripts.*

0.11, last sentence: The first part of the sentence should include a reference to 0.4.8A. The last part of the sentence would be more appropriately located somewhere in section 7.

1-8: It would be more logical to put definitions in each subsection before prescribed punctuation.

1-8: Some sections outside of 7 (such as 6.1) give instruction on when to record something in area 7, but not in all cases which may apply (or even all the most common ones). Perhaps it would be best to either give none, or at each area, so as not to give the impression that some are more important than others or that only a few exist.

1: It would be helpful to treat the parts of the title proper element for a common title/section title situation as sub-elements. Each piece could then be defined, discussed, and exemplified separately: title of parent resource, numbering, title of the child resource.

1.2: The practice of giving *GMD* as the GMD is not helpful. Real GMDs should be used in examples. We don't do this for any other element, in particular the SMD. It is not clear how the current practice is helpful.

1.3 note third sentence: This is already clearly in the scope of the definition, so should be deleted.

1.6 second paragraph second sentence: It would be worthwhile to give an example of this.

3 note second paragraph second sentence: Delete this, as it will get out synch when new area 3s are defined.

4 note: Pull out the definition and label it as such.

5.1 footnote 7: This does not add any value to this section, and should be deleted.

5.1: It would be easier and more consistent to treat parenthesized parts as a separate element.

6.1 note first and second sentences: If common and dependent titles are to be used here, it would seem that actual text should be given. It seems odd for ISBD(G) to refer to a specific ISBD for instruction that can apply to all material.

Appendix A second sentence: There are no examples “see”.

E. Document readability

2003 introduction, first sentence: A space is needed between *to* and *1969*.

0.1 footnote 5: This references section 1.2.3, which does not exist in this document.

0.2 third paragraph: Using a comma after *ISBD(G)* would eliminate a reader interpreting the beginning of the sentence as *In the definitions within ISBD(G) ...* .

0.3 element 6.4: The semicolon should not be italicized.

0.4.1 last sentence: *In certain cases* does not add value to the sentence, and can be deleted.

0.4.8A first paragraph second sentence: This would be more concise as *Square brackets enclose information not found in the prescribed sources of information (see 0.5, 0.6, 0.7.2, 0.10, 0.11)*. There is one principle here; the current sentence makes it look like there are two.

0.4.8D: This does fit in this section, as it cannot *be used in all or most areas*. Also, the introductory sentence in 0.4.8 says three punctuation symbols, not four.

1 examples: These would be easier to read if they were shown something like this:

title of a motion picture:

Non-destructive inspection - a dollar saving diagnostic tool

title proper:

Non-destructive inspection

title of a sound recording:

L'Ascension, hymne pour grand orchestre

title proper:
L'Ascension

etc.

3 note first paragraph: Condense this paragraph to:

*This area **appears in some of** the specialized ISBDs. **It** contains data that are unique to a particular class of library material or type of publication.*

6: Delete *or sub-series* throughout this section, as it is superfluous.

8.1 note first paragraph last sentence: Delete the duplicate period.

Appendix A examples A last example: Indent the second-level description.