

**AACR/ISBD(S)/ISSN Meeting of Experts**  
**2000 November 12-14**  
**Library of Congress**  
**Washington, D.C.**

Representatives from the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rule, the IFLA Section on Cataloguing ISBD(S) Working Group, and the ISSN Network met at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., on Sunday through Tuesday, 2000 November 12-14.

Those participating included representatives from eight countries (Australia, Canada, Croatia, France, Germany, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States):

from the JSC, Ann Huthwaite, Marg Stewart (also a resource person for the ISBD(S) Working Group), Sally Strutt, and Barbara Tillett;

from the ISBD(S) Working Group, Paul Bunn, Jean-Arthur Creff, Karen Darling, Jean Hirons, Unni Knutsen, Ingrid Parent, Reinhard Rinn, Alain Roucolle (also representing the ISSN Network), and Edward Swanson;

from the ISSN Network, Françoise Pellé, Regina Reynolds, and Jasenka Zajec.

**1. Welcome and introductions**

Ingrid Parent opened the meeting by reviewing the steps that led up to the meeting. The original plan was to hold the meeting a year ago, but not enough progress had been made on revision steps at that point. Funding for this meeting was provided by the United States National Commission on Library and Information Science.

The intent is that following this meeting each group will proceed to finish the revision of its standard and have it published.

**2. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda as distributed was reviewed. Items added to it included a discussion of romanization schemes, the edition versus dependent title question, and a study of the possible return to latest entry cataloging.

**3. Purpose of the meeting**

Ingrid Parent spoke about the purposes of the meeting. Since each of the three groups is in the process of revising its standards, this might be the time at which we can do something about harmonizing the three standards. While the ideal would be to have unanimity in the three, we probably never can reach that point. However, the time is right to do the best we can for everyone. In addition to specific

agreements, it is hoped that out of this meeting can come an agreement on a long-term strategy on how to move forward.

During the meeting we need to try to think outside of what we are currently doing. Being able to think more broadly will help in the discussions.

Ann Huthwaite indicated that the JSC is very interested in harmonization. They also are looking to find a practical way of doing it.

Françoise Pellé noted that the ISSN Network hopes that harmonization will go far enough to allow them to exchange records with others and to use others' records for their purposes. This would be a big step forward.

Reinhard Rinn stated the hope that some day one ISSN would equal one cataloging record. Synchronization of ISSN and cataloging records would help everyone. The lack of this synchronization hurts both systems.

Jean Hirons spoke of the need to take a larger look at all serials problems. While she was working on the proposed revision of AACR 2 Chapter 12, she tried to take a look at the bigger picture, rather than just looking at cataloging rules. Looking at this bigger picture could give the opportunity for much more cooperative cataloging.

Paul Bunn noted that the more successful we are at reaching a common understanding, the more we will safeguard the kind of accurate bibliographic records we want and need.

#### **4. Areas for harmonization**

##### **4.1 Scope**

This sounds easy to define, but it is also one of the knottiest problems. It also is one of the key areas.

Barbara Tillett pointed out that although the current proposed revisions to AACR2 do not use the term "continuing resource", the concept will be there.

Jean Hirons pointed out that in relation to the functional requirements, it was desired to group continuing resources together at the work level. This was why it was desired to keep integrating resources and serials together. It also was desired to keep the concept broad enough that it could work for some form of issuance not known about now.

It was asked if the first cut is between finite and not finite resources. The question of newsletters of an event being finite was pointed out. Paul Bunn asked if taking this type of resource out of the definition meant we are creating a group of items that are in limbo. It was decided to leave newsletters of an event in the definition.

Karen Darling pointed out that there is going to have to be a transition period during which we might keep finessing the definition for those who might get confused.

Regina Reynolds agreed to prepare a draft scope statement that would assist in defining the common universe of the three groups. This was presented and discussed further at the meeting on Tuesday and a preliminary draft agreed to.

## **4.2 Definitions**

All three groups agreed to the proposed definition of “bibliographic resource”.

Changed wording was agreed to for the following proposed definitions:

*Continuing resource* A bibliographic resource that is issued over time, usually with no predetermined conclusion. Continuing resources include serials and ongoing integrating resources.

*Integrating resource* A bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. Examples of integrating resources include updating loose-leafs and updating Web sites.

*Serial* A continuing resource issued in a succession of discrete parts, usually bearing numbering, and usually having no predetermined conclusion. Examples of serials include journals, magazines, electronic journals, continuing directories, annual reports, newspapers, newsletters of an event, and monographic series. [Note: The Joint Steering Committee will use “bibliographic resource” instead of “continuing resource” in the short term.]

*Updating loose-leaf* A bibliographic resource that consists of one or more base volumes updated by separate pages that are inserted, removed, and/or substituted.

*Numbering* The identification of each of the successive items of a publication. It can include a numeral, a letter, any other character, or the combination of these, with or without an accompanying word (volume, number, etc.), and/of a chronological designation.

ISBD(S) will change its definitions for “multipart item” and “monograph” to match those in AACR2. It was pointed out that the proposed change to the definition for “multipart item” may have repercussions for the other ISBDs.

## **4.3 Successive/Latest entry**

While all three communities follow successive entry for serials, ISSN is proposing successive entry for integrating, whereas AACR and ISBD(S) are proposing latest entry. Françoise Pellé began by pointing out that the ISSN is strongly linked to the key title, whose main purpose is to

identify, not describe. If latest entry cataloging were to be adopted, there could be a big discrepancy between the title proper and the key title. It is not easy to manage two different logics within the ISSN system. The same types of information will not be found in the same place in records. If latest entry cataloging is adopted, there still would be a need for separate entries. All successive titles would have to be recorded somewhere to make sure they are accounted for.

Regina Reynolds pointed out that if the change is not made, then the ISSN is going with a title no longer on the item. If the key title were to be changed, then there would be another situation. In terms of credibility of the ISSN and key title, one would need to know the complete history of an item. And then one would run the risk of assigning a key title and ISSN to something that is really a part of something else. It would be very hard to justify to publishers the different times when they would need a new ISSN.

Jean Hirons mentioned the differences in record structures between ISSN and the cataloging communities. There is the 247 field available in the MARC formats for recording earlier titles. Françoise Pellé stated that she didn't see how the ISSN system could ensure the future linking of citations. They have tried to see how they could adopt latest entry cataloging for harmonization purposes, but they aren't yet sure how this could be done. At the present time it is not possible to use the same records for both ISSN purposes and for cataloging. If it proves that latest entry cataloging is the best solution, the ISSN community is willing to revisit the question.

Jean Hirons mentioned that there still is an issue for AACR2, namely what to do with integrating resources that have a uniform title and the uniform title changes. She also stated that she would prefer not to call it "latest entry cataloging" but maybe something like "integrating entry cataloging".

Regina Reynolds pointed out that maybe we could have small records for the various titles and have the system pull them together. It would be difficult to pull latest entry records apart. Ann Huthwaite stated that successive entry cataloging reflects current practice. While there might be potential problems, they are theoretical at this point.

It was noted that duplicate records could be created following either latest entry/successive entry cataloging given that integrating resources are dynamic and rules disagree (i.e., for integrating resources: ISSN, successive entry; AACR and ISBD(S), latest entry).

There are not volumes of records that would be affected at this time. If more journals move to a database format, we may have a greater problem, particularly if these databases reflect only the latest title.

Further discussion took place at the Tuesday meeting.

### **4.3 Major/minor title changes**

#### **Major changes affecting successive entry**

In general, consider as a major change in title proper the addition, deletion, change, or reordering of any word of the first five words (the first six words if the title begins with an article). Consider also as a major change the addition, deletion, or change of any word after the first five words (the first six words if the title begins with an article) that changes the meaning of the title or indicates a different subject matter.

Also consider as a major change in title proper a change of corporate body named anywhere in the title.

#### **Minor changes affecting successive entry**

- the change is in the representation of a word or words (e.g., one spelling vs. another; abbreviated word or sign or symbol vs. spelled-out form; arabic numeral(s) vs. roman numeral(s); numbers or dates vs. spelled-out form; hyphenated words vs. unhyphenated words; one-word compounds vs. two-word compounds, whether hyphenated or not; an acronym or initialism vs. full form; or a change in grammatical form (e.g., singular vs. plural))
- the change involves the name of the same issuing body and elements of its hierarchy or their grammatical connection anywhere in the title (e.g., the addition, deletion, or rearrangement of the name of the issuing body or the substitution of a variant form, including an abbreviation)
- the change is the addition, deletion, or change of punctuation, including initialisms and letters with separating punctuation vs. those without separating punctuation, anywhere in the title
- articles, prepositions, or conjunctions are added, deleted, or changed anywhere in the title
- the change is in the order of titles when the title is given in more than one language on the chief source of information, provided that the title chosen as title proper still appears as a parallel title.
- the addition, deletion, or change of words that link the title to the numbering.
- two or more titles proper are used on different issues of a serial according to a regular pattern.
- the addition to, deletion from, or change in the order of words in a list anywhere in the title, provided that there is no significant change in the subject matter.
- the addition or deletion anywhere in the title of words that indicate the type of resource such as “magazine,” “journal,” or “newsletter” or their equivalent in other languages.

### **Major/minor changes affecting latest entry**

Françoise asked that former titles be given in structured notes in latest entry records.

For AACR2, add “In general” to *12.1B8 b) integrating resources* to accommodate slight variations in title that would be covered by a “title varies slightly” note. This is also needed in ISBD(S).

If any change in the title proper occurs on a subsequent iteration, change the title and statement of responsibility area to reflect the current iteration and, in general, give the earlier title in a note.

### **4.5 Edition/Physical format changes**

#### **Edition statement**

A proposal will be sent to all three communities to treat as a major change a change in the edition statement that indicates a substantial change in the scope, coverage, or language of the serial as a whole. [This is the wording used in the draft CC:DA appendix.]

#### **Physical format**

There was agreement by all three communities that a change in physical format at the level of the GMD (e.g., print to electronic) constitutes a major change. Agreed to: “In general, a new record is required when the physical medium changes.”

How specific to be at the lower levels (e.g., CD-ROM vs. remote, different file formats within remote) needs further exploration. JSC will test the viability of creating records at the expression level. It was agreed that all three communities should give this further consideration and then coordinate on a decision.

### **4.6 Basis of description.**

There was general agreement that the basis for the description for titles would be the first or earliest available issue. For place and publisher, ISSN will continue to use the current publisher. [Further discussion on publisher took place on Tues.]

AACR2: It was noted that in the revision of Chapter 12, the newly revised rule 12.0B1 a) lacks the concept of the earliest available issue.

Agreed language:

Base the description of a serial on the first issue or, lacking this, on the earliest available issue.

This will be submitted to the JSC as part of the LC comments. A subsequent sentence is also needed to express the preferred source of the description being based on an issue rather than a source that covers the whole (such as a later issued title page, or home page). There may also be a need to consider whether this is better placed under 12.0B2 (chief source of information). A third concept of which issue to use when the numbering and chronological designations are not in line (e.g., no. 1 is issued later than no. 2) also needs to be separately added. Once complete, Barbara will forward the revised language to Ann and Ingrid.

ISBD(S) Substitute “current” for “latest”.

## **5. Discussion of title transcription issues**

### **Acronyms and initialisms**

Agreed to follow ISSN practice: When the title appears in full and in the form of an acronym or initialism in the chief source of information, choose the full form as the title proper.

### **Omissions from the title for dates, names, etc., that are not the designation**

Agreed that ISBD(S) and ISSN will use AACR wording: If the title includes a date, name, number, etc. that varies from issue to issue, omit this date, name, number, etc., and replace it by the mark of omission, unless it occurs at the beginning of the title, in which case do not give the mark of omission.

Report on the ... Conference on Development Objectives and Strategy  
Supply estimates for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March ...  
Frommer’s Washington, D.C. on \$ ... a day  
The annual report of Governor ...  
Annual report not ... Annual report

{examples have been included for use by ISBD(S) and ISSN if desired}

### **Omissions from the title of words that link the title to the designation**

This issue is not critical for harmonization, but Françoise will take it to the Directors for consideration. ISSN currently does not record such words. AACR2 and ISBD(S) will retain current practice of recording the words but not considering changes in such words to be major.

### **Choice of title proper when there are multiple titles in different languages**

All in agreement to evaluate content first, then order or layout, as expressed in AACR 1.1B8:

If the chief source of information bears titles in two or more languages or scripts, transcribe as the title proper the one in the language or script of the main written, spoken, or sung content of the item. If this criterion is not applicable, choose the title proper by reference to the order of titles on, or the layout of, the chief source of information. Record the other titles as parallel titles.

### **Common title/section title and series/subseries**

Judith Kuhagen from the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office was present at the Tuesday meeting to speak about this problem.

The problem as described in the papers prepared for the meeting involves analyzable subseries, i.e., monographic series for which there are two series statements on the piece, one of which is a subseries of the other. The problem has two aspects: (1) whether the main series is numbered or not, and (2) whether the title of the subseries is dependent or not.

In AACR2 a main series can be either numbered or unnumbered. When both parts of the title appear on the same source, they are recorded together. If they are not on the same source, they are recorded as two separate series. In ISBD(S), a main series can be treated in a series/subseries construct only when it is numbered. For ISSN, the only decision to be made when dealing with a series/subseries construct is whether the subseries title is dependent or independent.

The problem is being able to collocate analytics with the records for the whole.

It was pointed out that moving toward the AACR2 position would be a major change for ISBD(S).

Perhaps the IFLA Section on Cataloguing could undertake a study of the whole series area given that series is a broader issue than just the ISBD(S) standard.

### **Changes in publisher statement**

Also discussed was how to deal with cases where place and or publisher changes over the course of publication of a continuing resource when the title proper does not change.

The question was raised as to whether the current information about publisher is so important that we need to find a place for it. Possible options include leaving the original publisher in area

4 and recording later ones in a note; changing area 4 to include the latest publisher; or some combination.

There has been discussion within the MARC21 community about changing the structure of the 260 field so as to accommodate multiple publishers over the history of a title; no decision has been made thus far.

There is need for more consultation with the various communities on this question. The group agreed to take the question under advisement and not to try to harmonize at this point.

## **6. The International Standard Serial Title (ISST)**

Jean Hirons presented a discussion on the proposed ISST. The idea of an ISST was an outgrowth of the proposal for a benchmark title that was discussed at the ISBD(S) Working Group meeting in January. A small group met in Ottawa in June to work on it further. The paper on the ISST prepared by Hirons for this meeting approached topics such as: Why an ISST?, What is the ISST?, Who would assign?, To what would it be assigned?, What are the key stumbling blocks to the ISST?, Who is developing the ISST?, and Current status.

The general reaction of other groups with whom the concept has been discussed is that it is a good thing. This was the general consensus of the Meeting of Experts, although it was felt that more information is needed. It was also pointed out, however, that the progress made at the meeting on aligning title change provisions may have reduced the need for the ISST.

It was decided that a coordinating group would be set up, under the direction of ISSN, that would address issues such as a needs analysis, a feasibility study, possibilities for funding, higher-level approval, and finally a pilot project. ISSN will look into finding a project manager.

The question was raised about whether a change to a qualifier used in a uniform title or key title would be a major or minor change. This is something that the ISST might resolve. It does not affect the major/minor change question in ISBD(S).

## **7. Other areas for harmonization**

### **Romanization**

The major problem is that different communities are using different standards. For example, the ISSN Network use the ISO romanization tables, while the AACR2 community is using the ones developed by the Library of Congress.

It was thought that maybe the solution is to let each group use its own scripts. The target would be to incorporate the original scripts into the records. It was decided that a possible solution to this problem lies in the implementation of Unicode.

### **Edition statement/Dependent title questions**

This arose in a memorandum to the ISBD(S) Working Group from the Dutch Cataloguing Committee, a copy of which was distributed to the group.

It was suggested that this be given to the IFLA group that will be looking into series/subseries titles.

### **Return to latest entry cataloging**

This was a follow-up to the discussion on Sunday. Jean Hirons mentioned that this may not be the right time to address this. As the future becomes more electronic, the need for successive entry is not clear. This change to electronic formats might simplify holdings and multiple versions questions.

There is a renewed interest in returning to latest entry cataloging, and this probably is going to increase. The question was raised as to what the benefits would be in going back to this practice. Also questioned was who might do such a study. It is possible that there would be real benefits--and real drawbacks--to this change. Perhaps they would outweigh each other.

Marg Stewart suggested that further study be deferred until we have gained experience with latest entry cataloging for integrating resources.

We need to address what effect retitling has on citations. It is not possible just to wipe out earlier titles.

## **8. Coordination of revisions to ISBD and revisions to national cataloguing codes and to ISSN**

Ingrid Parent welcomed John Byrum, Chair of the ISBD Review Group, to discuss coordination of rule revisions. John Byrum noted that he was asked by the ISBD Review Group to develop a mechanism to ensure such coordination. The objective would be to keep informed of decisions made in AACR, evaluate impact for the ISBDs and provide feedback to JSC. A discussion of the ISBD and AACR revision processes followed. Issues that emerged from the discussion included: the need for a more continuous process of revision for the ISBDs; the need for an editor to assist JSC; the use of Web sites as communication mechanisms to alert the library community of items in progress; the tension between international consultation beyond the JSC constituents and accelerating the pace of AACR rule revision. It was agreed that Ann Huthwaite and John Byrum would continue to work on ways to increase the communication between the two communities.

## **9. Timetable for revision of each standard**

### ***Joint Steering Committee***

A draft of the revisions to chapter 12 will be distributed with a request for responses by end of February. Ann Huthwaite will prepare a Chair document including decisions made at this meeting. The Joint Steering Committee meets in April, and they hope to have the final version by the end of the year.

### ***ISBD(S)***

This will be a new ISBD standard, including the name and scope change agreed to at the January meeting (ISBD(CR)). It is intended to have the draft to the Working Group members by January 1, with a deadline for comments by January 31. Following this there will be a four-month worldwide review. Comments received from that review will be reviewed in June, following which the standard will be submitted to the ISBD Review Group for their review (approximately one month), then to the IFLA Sections on Cataloguing and Serial Publications in August, with a final vote by e-mail.

### ***ISSN***

The next group meeting is at the end of February. They should be working more or less within the same timeframe as the other two groups. The question was raised about the problem of handling any big issues that might be raised during the review of the other two. The ISSN Community will wait to see the results of the others' reviews before they publish their document.

## **10. Concluding remarks**

Everyone felt that this had been a profitable exercise. There is a need for ongoing coordination of items that haven't been solved now. We will try to remain in contact with each other.