

**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 *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality:*  
*Rule Revision Proposals***

**Report**

*(February 27, 2001)*

Please note that the purpose of this document is to facilitate the work of the Committee and to provide a means for outreach to both library and non-library cataloging communities. This document is intended for the exclusive use of CC:DA and its cataloging constituencies, and is presented for discussion in the ongoing process of rule revision. Under no circumstances should the information here be copied or re-transmitted without prior consultation with the current Chair of CC:DA.

**Introduction**

The Task Force on the Review of Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals presented its report in August 2000. Subsequently, the Chapter 12 rule revision proposals were discussed at the Joint Steering Committee meeting in London in September and at a meeting of experts from the AACR, ISBD(S) and ISSN groups in November. These meetings resulted in a number of new documents, and the Task Force was asked to review these documents and provide comments and recommendations to CC:DA.

The Task Force reviewed the following documents:

- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response  
This is a complete clean copy of Chapter 12 and related rules, dated October 26, 2000; in the comments below, this document is identified as “[clean draft]”.
- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/LC response  
LC comments on the clean draft, dated December 15, 2000; in the comments below, this document is identified as “[LC comments]”.
- 4JSC/LC/49  
Additional proposals from the Library of Congress, dated December 15, 2000; in the comments below, this document is identified as “[LC/49]”.

- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/Chair follow-up  
Amendments to the clean draft reflecting provisional decisions taken at the AACR/ISBD/ISSN Meeting of Experts, dated December 28, 2000; in the comments below, this document is identified as “[Chair follow-up]”.

The comments below are arranged in a single sequence of rule numbers following the order in the clean draft, i.e., the rules in Chapter 12 followed by the related rules in rule number order. Each comment identifies the applicable rule number and the document in which it appears. Each of the items in the LC comments, LC/49 and the Chair follow-up have been addressed explicitly; in the clean draft, we support everything on which we have not commented below.

The Task Force was again assisted by the comments provided by members of the ALCTS Serials Section Committee to Study Serials Cataloging. We thank them for their contribution.

## General Issues

1. **Continuing resources:** We would like to call particular attention to the first comment below, on rule 12.0A1. The Task Force feels very strongly that the decision to postpone the introduction of the concept of continuing resources into AACR at this time leaves catalogers without a crucial conceptual tool for understanding both the scope of Chapter 12 and the new model of bibliographic resources being introduced into the code. We urge (a) that the drafting and approval of an introductory or conceptual chapter be expedited in any way possible, and (b) that the critical concepts, particularly *continuing resource*, be introduced into the scope rule for Chapter 12 (12.0A1) and into the Glossary.
2. **Organization of Part I of AACR:** The document 4JSC/LC/51 provides a broad discussion of alternative possibilities for organizing Part I of AACR2, and we look forward to discussion of a long-term resolution of this issue. Here we wish to address one aspect of that issue in the short- or medium-term. The preparation of the clean draft of Chapter 12 made it obvious the extent to which the chapter contains parallel sets of rules for (a) serials and (b) integrating resources. The obvious question is whether the combining of rules for these distinct types of resources is beneficial or whether separate chapters for these two types would be more effective.

The Task Force (and CC:DA at its Midwinter 2001 meeting) discussed this question. Arguments were presented on both sides. On the one hand, the focus of the combined chapter, as stated in the 2nd paragraph of 12.0A1, is on the continuing nature of serials and integrating resources and in particular on the ways in which the facts of change should be described. There is an advantage in having a single chapter that covers all continuing resources and juxtaposes and contrasts the different ways in which change is dealt with for serials and integrating resources. There is also no need to duplicate the many rules that are identical for both serials and integrating resources (not to mention those few cases in which a different distinction must be made; see for example, rule 12.7B23 in the LC comments).

On the other hand, the fact of change is dealt with in quite distinct ways for the two types of resource. There might be an advantage in having two chapters that deal with things that change, one dealing with the successive-entry approach to changes in serials and one dealing with the latest-entry approach to change in integrating resources. There would be less opportunity for misreading the rules and more opportunity for explaining the differences, as well as the other unique characteristics of each type. [We note that there is another type of material that changes, namely multipart items, and that eventually this alternative might require a third chapter to cover them.]

The discussion was not decisive, but it was clear that there was no strong consensus for dividing Chapter 12 at this time. We are therefore *not* recommending such a change. We do wish to call the attention of JSC to this issue and to suggest that these comments be considered in the ongoing discussion of the organization of rules in Part I of AACR.

### Comments on the Chapter 12 Proposals

- **12.0A1** [LC comments]: CC:DA discussed the scope of Chapter 12 in some detail. We agree with JSC that there is a need for a fuller explication of the model of bibliographic resources than can be comfortably given in Chapter 12, and that this full explication must wait for the new introduction or the conceptual chapter suggested in 4JSC/LC/51. However, we feel that the interim approach adopted by JSC deprives catalogers of some critical conceptual tools for applying the new rules. In particular, we feel that it would be a significant help to catalogers to introduce the concept of continuing resources in Chapter 12 and in the glossary, and to define related conceptual terms. In order to accomplish this, we propose the following revision to the proposed 12.0A1:

**12.0A1.** The rules in this chapter cover the description of continuing resources, whether successively issued (i.e., serials) or integrating. The rules are also applicable to the description of finite integrating resources (i.e., those with a predetermined conclusion). The rules do not apply to the description of multipart items.

In conjunction with this revision, we will later support addition of “continuing resource” to the glossary.

We support the correction to the reference in the final sentence.

- **12.0B1 a)** [LC comments]: We support the restoration of the first sentence.
- **12.0B1 a)** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision; we are uncertain whether the LC comments constitute the additional wording referred to here. We therefore support both documents in spirit and await clarification.
- **12.0B1 b)** [LC comments]: We support the restoration of the first sentence.
- **12.0B2 a)** [LC comments]: We support the revision; we note that the same revision should be made to the footnote at 2.0B2.

- **12.0B3 a)** [clean draft]: For clarity and to parallel rules in other chapters, change “for each area of the description are described below” to “for each area of the description are set out below”.
- **12.0B3 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.0F** [clean draft]: Change “In other cases” to “For other inaccuracies”.
- **12.1B1** [LC comments]: We support the removal of the example and the addition of the loose-leaf example.
- **12.1B2** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision.
- **12.1B4** [LC comments]: We support the LC response, which extends these rules to all resources, and the addition of a loose-leaf example.
- **12.1B5** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.1B6** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.1B8 b)** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision in the spirit of harmonization, but note that the phrase “if considered to be important” is scattered far and wide throughout AACR2, particularly in this chapter and that this argument would apply to each and every instance!
- **12.1D1** [clean draft]: The second example does not appear to be a valid example except in the case of third-level description. The standard is to do second-level description, in which only the first parallel title would be transcribed unless the second parallel title were in English. Since the first parallel title is English, the second one (in French) would not be transcribed in second-level description. If this example is retained as is, a parenthetical needs to be given saying this is third-level transcription.

In the last example, a space is needed after the equals sign.

- **12.1D2** [LC response]: We support revision.
- **12.1E1 b)** [LC comments]: We support the LC proposal to delete the word “always”. Most instructions in AACR are not this explicit (including the parallel rules in 2.1B, which we suspect this rule is designed to mirror). This does not leave other title information optional for integrating resources, but rather leaves it up to the application of the rules for fullness of information (1.0D) and to cataloger judgment.

There may be a slight semantic problem with the suggested wording. The inclusion of both the “if” clause and the “unless” clause makes it unclear. We suggest separate sentences: “Transcribe other title information if considered to be important. Do not transcribe other title information that consists solely of words relating to the currency of the contents.”

In the third example, change “lawmarking” to “lawmaking”.

- **12.1F3 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.1F4** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.1F5** [clean draft]: The reference to Chapter 21 should be more specific; “(see 21.3B1)”.
- **12.2B1 a)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.2B1 b)** [LC comments]: We support the LC proposal to delete the word “always”; see our comments above under 12.1E1 b). In this case, we do *not* support the proposal to add “if considered to be important”. We feel that, for integrating resources, a general instruction to transcribe, such as is given in other chapters, is appropriate. Serials should be an exception here.

Rule 9.2B8, which was just given final approval, states “If a remote access electronic resource is frequently updated, omit the edition statement and give the information in a note (see 9.7B7).” The application of this provision to integrating resources is not apparent from the rules in 12.2B. There may even be a contradiction. We suggest that JSC consider these rules, possibly adding a reference to 9.2B8 in 9.2B1 b).

- **12.2B4** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.2B5** [clean draft]: This rule should also deal with the question of whether an edition statement is recorded at all for Web resources.
- **12.2C-E** [clean draft]: These rules usually apply to integrating resources and are not typically recorded for serials. We suggest that this rule be divided into subrules for serials and integrating resources, with the instruction not to give for serials. This is similar to the rule at 12.3A1.

## **12.2C. Statements of responsibility relating to the edition**

### **12.2C1.**

- a) *Serials*. This element is not generally given.
- b) *Integrating resources*. Transcribe a statement of responsibility ...

## **12.2D. Statements relating to a named revision of an edition**

### **12.2D1.**

- a) *Serials*. This element is not generally given.
- b) *Integrating resources*. If an item is a named revision ...

## 12.2E. Statements of responsibility relating to a named revision of an edition

### 12.2C1.

- a) *Serials*. This element is not generally given.
- b) *Integrating resources*. Transcribe a statement of responsibility ...

- **12.2C1** [clean draft]: This rule refers to “editions of a resource” where other rules might refer to “editions of a work.” Is the term “resource” equivalent to “work”? There is a general concern that “resource” is ambiguous, sometimes being used to refer to works and sometimes to items. JSC should carefully consider the relationship of the term “resource” to the work and item entities in the Delsey model and the *FRBR* model before introducing the term wholesale into the code.
- **12.2F a)** [LC/49]: We support the expansion of this rule to cover the entire edition area. However, the phrasing “an element in the edition area” seems inaccurate. The “edition area” is a construct that we have created. What actually appears on an item is a “statement” that we transcribe *into* the edition area. It’s that statement that changes, not the “element of the edition area.” In order to expand the definition, perhaps the term “edition information” could be used instead.
- **12.3** [clean draft]: This might be the right time to consider changing the name of rule 12.3 and the terminology used in these rules, because the ISBD(S) is currently under revision. Given that the term “numbering” has been expanded to purely numeric designations, the terminology in these rules could be made much simpler by using the terms “numbering” and “enumeration” in this broader sense. We are not making this recommendation, but we are raising the issue in case JSC wishes to pursue it.
- **12.3, placement of rule** [clean draft, LC comments]: Rule 12.3B1 contains (as the 2nd paragraph) instructions about designations that consist of a year and a number. However, there is no such rule in 12.3C1 — which is the rule that covers chronological designations. Since the year is by definition a chronological designation and since 12.3C contains other rules that deal with a date as a level of enumeration, we would strongly prefer that this rule be included in 12.3C instead of (or, less desired, in addition to) 12.3B1. Specifically, since this is a case where both a numeric designation and a chronological designation are involved, we suggest placing this rule at the end of 12.3C4 as proposed by Jean Hirons and using her wording: “However, if the numeric designation is a division of the year, give the year before the number.” and examples.
- **12.3A1** [clean draft]: The phrase “If the first and/or last issue or part is not available” is not strictly accurate; Instead, use “If neither the first nor the last issue or part is available”.

The second part of the second sentence is based on the availability of the first issue only; end the second sentence after “omit this area.” and add a third sentence “If the first issue or part is not available, provide a note to indicate the issue(s) or part(s) that form the basis of the description.” Full text of the suggested rule:

- a) *Serials*. Give this area for serials (with the exception of unnumbered monographic series) if cataloging from the first and/or last issue or part. If neither the first nor the last issue or part is available, omit this area. If the first issue or part is not available, provide a note to indicate the issue(s) or part(s) that form the basis of the description (see 12.7B23).

- **12.3B1** [clean draft]: The 6th example (OPCS monitor) continues a typo that has existed in AACR2 for a long time. The comma following “PPL” should be removed.

In the 7th example (Miscellaneous reports), we recommend adding spaces before the hyphen. Although JSC decided to remove the *rule* that calls for adding blank spaces, we feel that the readability of the *examples* would be enhanced by the inclusion of more space (three blanks is standard among serials catalogers) in cases where the beginning date is omitted. Other cases of this are noted below.

The discrepancy in punctuation in the two examples under the 2nd paragraph is confusing. If 1-97 is transcribed as 97/1, why isn't 1-1998 transcribed as 1998/1? Or vice versa.

The 2nd example under the 2nd paragraph lacks the final hyphen: “1998-1-”

- **12.3B1** [LC comments]: We support the revision, but note our comment above suggesting moving this rule to the end of 12.3C4.
- **12.3C1** [clean draft]: The 4th example (International commercial television) is confusing. “1961-2” might represent either a combined year 1961/1962 or the 2nd issue for 1961. Given that the other examples in this rule are for simple chronological designations, we assume that the former is intended. If that is correct, we prefer the use of the slash to indicate a compound number, as is done in the 6th example. We are not sure why “1999-2000” on the item was transcribed as “1999/2000”, but we recommend that the 4th example follow the same convention: “1961/2” — perhaps with a similar parenthetical explanation.

In the 7th example (Daily mirror), add spaces before the hyphen to enhance readability (see comment on the 7th example under 12.3B1 above).

- **12.3C4** [clean draft]: In the fourth example, there is no obvious reason for the discrepancy in punctuation: “Jan.-Feb.” in this example vs. “Jan./March” in the previous example.
- **12.3D1** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.3E** [LC comments]: We support the revision, but note that (as indicated under 12.3 above) the definition of numbering may have an impact on all the 12.3 rules.
- **12.3E1** [clean draft]: Since numbering may be taken from the whole resource, we feel that this rule should not be restricted to “the order in which they are presented in the

chief source of information.” We recommend that this be changed to “the order in which they are presented.”

- **12.3G1** [clean draft]: In the final example, add additional spaces after the first hyphen and before the second hyphen, to enhance readability (see comments on the 7th example under 12.3B1 above).
- **12.3G1** [LC comments]: We support the revision; there seems to be no compelling reason to include the title and statement of responsibility area in any of the examples in this rule. We also note that its inclusion in the examples in 12.3B1, 12.3C1, 12.3C4 and 12.3F1 are equally questionable.
- **12.4F1** [clean draft]: In subrule a), the word “probable” should be included in front of “beginning date” in the last example.
- **12.4F1 a)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.4F1 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision. We note, however, that if the LC revisions to 12.4F1 a) and b) are accepted, then the two subrules are identical and we question whether the rule needs to be divided into subrules.
- **12.4F2 a)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.4F2 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.4G** [LC/49]: We support the revision in general, but we wonder why the rules is restricted to the name of the manufacturer and excludes the place of manufacture. In other cases, the change rules have been modified to be inclusive, and we are not sure why that should not be done here, particularly given the “if considered to be important” caveat.
- **12.5B1** [LC comments]: We support the revision and have no preference concerning which alternative is chosen.
- **12.5D1** [LC comments]: We support the revision and have no preference concerning which alternative is chosen.
- **12.5D2** [clean draft]: Regarding the 3rd example, there is no instruction in 10.5D to show the use of “or smaller” with three-dimension artefacts. We recommend that a different example be chosen.
- **12.7B2** [clean draft]: The 2nd and 3rd examples would be clearer if a semicolon were substituted for the comma in each case; this seems to be a long-standing situation, but one that should be corrected now.
- **12.7B3** [LC comments]: We support the addition of the loose-leaf example.
- **12.7B4.1** [clean draft]: We recommend that the 2nd paragraph (“Make notes on titles by which the resource is commonly known if considered to be important” should be added

to rule 1.7B4 and to other X.7B4 rules as appropriate. This is a useful rule, which is generally applicable.

- **12.7B4.1** [LC comments]: We support the deletion of the examples and the addition of dates to the example.
- **12.7B4.2 a)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.7B4.2 b)** [clean draft]: In the 2nd example, the question mark seems incorrect. It is unlikely to be transcribed from the source and there is no rule calling for use of a question mark to indicate uncertain information.
- **12.7B4.2 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.7B4.2 b)** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision in the spirit of harmonization, even though we find that the proposed example contains no information that is likely to be of value to any user.
- **12.7B4.2, last paragraph** [LC comments]: We support the revision, but note that, in the example, “previously ... former title” seems redundant. We prefer “All issues previously published under the title ...”
- **12.7B5.1** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.7B6.2 a)** [clean draft]: In the final example, add spaces following the hyphen to enhance readability (see comment on the 7th example under 12.3B1 above).
- **12.7B7.2 b)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.7B8** [clean draft]: In the first example under subrule b), a semicolon should be substituted for the comma between the words “chemistry, and:” i.e., “chemistry; and:”.

The first example uses a colon after the word “and” and before the second title, but the second example doesn’t have one. The two examples should be consistent.

Under subrule c), a semicolon again should be used instead of a comma in both examples, i.e. after the words “Energy” and “wastes” in the examples.

Under subrule e), the instruction “If a resource is translated, give the name of the translation.” seems a little odd; substitute “If a resource is translated into another resource, give the name of the translated resource.”

In the first example under subrule f), there should be no space before the colon.

In the last example under subrule f), “Numerous editions” should be “Numerous eds.” (following Appendix B and given examples in 12.7B9.1 and 12.7B9.2)

Similarly under subrule g), shouldn’t abbreviations from Appendix B be used? Thus

Has suppl.:  
 Suppls. accompany some no.  
 Numerous suppls.

In other words, when should the Appendix be followed in notes and when shouldn't it?

- **12.7B8 c)** [clean draft]: In the 3rd example, change “Continued by:” to “Split into:”. We prefer that “Continued by” be used for one-to-one relationships and “Split into” for one-to-many relationships. At least we prefer that the example be consistent in this regard.
- **12.7B9.2** [LC/49]: We support the intent of the revision, but again (see comments on 12.2F) argue that the rule should be stated in terms of changes to edition information, not to the edition area as such.
- **12.7B11.1** [clean draft]: In the 2nd paragraph, we find the restriction to known dates of publication to be unnecessarily restrictive. Either delete “known” or change to “known or probable”.
- **12.7B11.1** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.7B11.2 a)** [LC/49]: We support the changes, but wonder again why this is restricted to the name of manufacturer and not the place of manufacture.
- **12.7B11.2 b)** [clean draft]: In the first example, based on information provided in parentheses, the dates in the first example should be given as c1994-[1997?].
- **12.7B11.2 b)** [LC/49]: Same comment. Otherwise, we support the changes, but again wonder why this is restricted to the name of manufacturer and not the place of manufacture.
- **12.7B13** [clean draft]: In the final example, change “fulltext” to “full text”.
- **12.7B13** [LC comments]: We support the deletion of the examples.
- **12.7B16** [LC comments]: We support the addition of the example.
- **12.7B17 a)** [clean draft]: In the 6th example, change “Each” to “Every”.
- **12.7B17 b)** [clean draft]: Delete the 2nd example because there is not agreement that the item is an integrating resource.
- **12.7B18-19** [LC comments]: We support the proposal to reverse the order of these rules.
- **12.7B19** [LC comments]: We support the revision to the text of the rule; we accept the suggestion to delete the caption from one of the examples, but note that typically we have been trying to make such captions consistent on other rules, particularly in Chapter 9.
- **12.7B20** [clean draft]: Add a caption to the example as is done in 1.7B19, 2.7B19, 3.7B19, etc.: “Supt. of Docs. no.: HE 20.3047:”

- **12.7B21** [LC comments]: We support the additional examples.
- **12.7B22** [clean draft]: In the example, the comma before the “and:” should be a semicolon (cf. comment on 12.7B8 b) and c) above)
- **12.7B23** [LC comments]: We support the revision, but suggest that it would be clarified by adding a sentence to section b) iii): “For remote access integrating resources, see 12.7B23a.”
- **12.8B1** [clean draft]: It is not common practice to give ISBNs assigned to individual issues of a serial. The rule as stated seems to encourage recording such ISBNs, and we strongly recommend that the rule include some statement indicating that ISBNs assigned to individual issues of a serial are not normally recorded.
- **12.8B1** [LC comments]: We support the additional examples.
- **12.8E2** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **12.10** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **1.4F8** [clean draft]: Regarding the Vancouver example in subrule a), the rule uses the word “ascertained.” If 1998 is the “ascertained” date then I don’t see why it would be given with a question mark. The question mark indicates a probable date, not an ascertained date. There may be a real issue here confusing ascertained and probable/questionable dates. The rule needs to accommodate both possibilities.

The last example under a) “, 1988-[1999?]” raises the same issue. If 1999 is “ascertained” to be the last year, then it is unclear why a question mark would be included. The date given is a probable or questionable date not an ascertained one.

Under subrule b), the first sentence is confusing. If the description is based on the first iteration, then the date on it **is** the earliest date.

The issue of probable date versus ascertained date occurs in the second paragraph and in the final example of section b).

The third and final examples under subrule c) have probable dates, not ascertained dates.

- **1.4F8** [LC/49]: We support the revision with the following exceptions:

In first example, change “serial” to “resource.” Make the same change in the Smithsonian example.

The comments above about “ascertained” versus “probable” dates still apply in this iteration of the rule.

- **1.6G1** [clean draft]: In last paragraph, should there be an instruction to use abbreviations and numerals as instructed in Appendixes B and C?

In the Scottish History Society example, there is a discrepancy between how this is recorded and the instruction given in 12.1E1 a) iii), where it says to add other title information in brackets for titles that just consist of the name of a corporate body. The transcription principle should be same for series.

There should be a parenthetical in the Scottish History Society example that says something like: "(Numbering sequence appears as: Fourth series)"

- **1.7B23** [clean draft]: "Part" should be given as "Pt." per Appendix B.
- **2.0B1** [clean draft]: The text of the rule was revised, we believe, to eliminate the offensive term "oriental"; however, footnote 1 to 2.0B1 continues to refer to "oriental publications."
- **21.2A1** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision. We also support the proposal in the Canadian response to add the phrase "unless the change belongs to one or more of the types listed in 21.2A2" at the end of the first paragraph and "(See also 21.2A3c)." at the end of the third paragraph.
- **21.2A2 h)** [LC comment]: We do not support the revision, since this subrule has been deleted in the Chair follow-up.
- **21.2A2** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision, with the following editorial suggestions:

Under subrule c), change "abbreviation" to "abbreviation or acronym".

Under subrule d), change "the change is the addition ..." to "the change consists of the addition ..."

We question whether subrule e), which covers parallel titles, needs to be restricted to titles appearing "in the chief source of information."

Under subrules f) h) and i), the phrases that appear here do not follow on grammatically from the word "if:" which is in the first sentence of 21.2A2; add something like "the change consists of" at the beginning of each.

In addition to these editorial suggestions, we further recommend that the list of conditions under 21.2A2 be rearranged in order of significance so that the most important conditions are stated first. Note that the draft Appendix of Major Differences and Changes (4JSC/ALA/34/Rev) contains such an arrangement at F.5A1 and F.8A1 (although with a slightly different text; we prefer the text in the Chair follow-up, with the modifications suggested here).

- **21.2C1** [clean draft]: Under subrule b), add a final sentence: "Make an added entry (see 21.30J) under any earlier title(s) considered necessary for access."
- **21.3B1** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revision, with the following correction:

Under subrule a) section ii), "lober" should be "longer".

- **21.30J1** [clean draft]: Add to the end of the last paragraph: “or for any earlier title(s) of an integrating resource.”
- **21.30J1** [LC/49]: We support the revision.
- **21.30L**: This rule also needs to be revised to include an instruction to make added entries under the series headings of earlier iterations of integrating resources considered necessary for access.
- **Glossary: Bibliographic resource** [LC comment]: We note that the term “item” may be ambiguous; it seems to have different meanings in the Delsey model and in the FRBR model. This proposal seems to use the term in the FRBR sense, not the sense in which Delsey argues that it is used in AACR2. We agree that there should be some acknowledgement of the practices of rare books and manuscripts catalogers, but we are not convinced that this wording accomplishes this. Unfortunately, we have no alternative suggestions.
- **Glossary: Continuing resource** [LC comments]: As noted under 12.0A1 above, we feel that it is critically important to introduce this concept into the rules as soon as possible, in order to offer catalogers the conceptual tools for understanding the model of bibliographic resources being introduced into AACR2. We therefore strongly urge that the definition be added at this time.
- **Glossary: Continuing resource** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revised definition.
- **Glossary: Integrating resource** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revised definition.
- **Glossary: Loose-leaf service** [LC comments]: We support revision to 12.8E2 and therefore the deletion of this glossary entry.
- **Glossary: Section (Serials)** [LC comments]: We support the revision.
- **Glossary: Serial** [Chair follow-up]: We understand that a revised definition is being proposed to the AACR, ISBD(S) and ISSN groups that would remove the uncertainty about whether indeterminacy is a defining characteristic of a serial (by removing the “usually” preceding “having no predetermined conclusion”). We support this definition. And, in the light of our recommendation to add “Continuing resource” to the Glossary at this time, we recommend that “A bibliographic resource” be changed to “A continuing resource”.
- **Glossary: Updating loose-leaf** [Chair follow-up]: We support the revised definition.

## Conclusion

In spite of the extent of these comments, the Task Force feels that this revision is moving in the right direction and that the proposals currently under consideration successfully address the problems that caused the Anglo-American cataloging community to undertake this revision. We commend, first of all, Jean Hirons for the work that she and the CONSER working group have done in raising these issues and proposing revisions. We likewise commend the extensive comments on the Hirons proposals from the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing and the Library of Congress, as well as the extensive work done by the Library of Congress in preparing the clean draft, the LC comments, and the additional proposals. Finally, we could not be more delighted in the success of the efforts of the AACR, ISBD(S) and ISSN groups to achieve a common set of specifications for describing continuing resources; they were able to accomplish much more than we could have expected, and the benefits of this harmonization cannot be overstated. Once all the pieces are in place — the introductory/conceptual explication of the model for bibliographic resources and the specifications for major changes, as well as the revised ISBD(CR), the ISSN Guidelines and the International Standard Title — catalogers of all types of continuing resources will have the tools they need to provide quality bibliographic descriptions for this critical set of resources. The revised Chapter 12 of AACR, as it is shaping up in the documents we have reviewed here, is an important first step, and we look forward to its approval and publication.

### Task Force members

John C. Attig, chair  
Everett Allgood  
Ruth E. Christ  
Mark Crotteau  
Laurel Jizba  
Judy Knop  
Ann Sitkin  
Mitch Turitz