

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

FROM: Sally Strutt, British Library representative

SUBJECT: AACR3 - Part I – Constituency Review of December 2004 Draft

Members of British Library staff have reviewed the draft Part I of AACR3 and also “trialled” the draft Part in the descriptive cataloguing of a small number of resources.

This response consists of a summary of our general comments and the overall impressions of our reviewers, presented below, and then specific comments on rules included in the template following. We found the template a little difficult to use and so some comments may appear in the “wrong” places, for which we apologise.

Summary of general comments on the draft of Part I of AACR3

- Some reviewers found the part easier to navigate than part I of AACR2, some found it more difficult – no overall consensus on this.
- Some reviewers felt that, in aiming to reach out to non-library communities, the sheer size of AACR3 and of this part in particular militates against it. One suggestion of what might be of real benefit to other metadata communities is: a set of simple but adequate guidelines, possibly set out by resource type (thesis, digital image, journal article etc.) that could be picked up and used without ploughing through a large complex document.
- This point is repeated in our general view of the approach to AACR3 as a product. The text as drafted in Part I is familiar to AACR2 users and there is great validity in generalizing, clarifying and improving this text to answer the continuing needs of these cataloguing users in our changing environment. However, in order to reach beyond the traditional AACR community and have the standard recognised and used by others, we think an additional, more radical product is required. One that is available on the Web, and that can be easily customised by whichever community needs instant content guidelines. We see the need for both the “gold standard” full AACR, and also a new product or products, based on this standard but slimline, linked, bulleted, illustrated and generally presented in a much more appealing and user-friendly way for non-traditional users.
- The language used, particularly in the introductory matter to this part, is not felt to be very approachable. We would like to see the style made direct rather than “discursive academic” in the Introduction and Preliminary Rules. We would also welcome flow charts, illustrations, bullet points, tables, and more categorization (one reviewer commented that “the tables at A1-57-A1-59 are great!”).

- Some reviewers felt it would have been preferable to have received more than just Part I to review, as the interplay between Part I and Parts 2 and 3 is close.
- One reviewer felt that the generalisation of the rules in Part I may result in a proliferation of house manuals being written to deal with specific types of material.

General overall impressions, in the words of the reviewers

Impressions on AACR3 related to digital monographic items, from e-media cataloguing team

The general approach of this first part of AACR3 appears to be more “user friendly”. We looked at the draft with regard to its impact on e-media items. The three part chapter A relating to the general rules for description – in particular the first part covering all types of resources – was clear and concise. Chapter C7, which deals specifically with digital media, is equally straightforward in its handling of digital resources.

General comments from a serials and e-media cataloguer

I can see the rationale for the new arrangement, but I think that in trying to be all things to all people, the needs of special materials such as e-media serials have been overlooked. The information for electronic serials has always been scattered, and in the draft it is just differently scattered (between A1, A2, A3, and C7). At present it is difficult to locate relevant rules without an index. Generally, there aren't enough electronic serial examples and C7, like Chapter 9 of AACR2, appears to be based on the monographic approach. Presumably bibliographic linking will be dealt with in the “access points” chapter.

General comments from a serials cataloguer

The arrangement seems to be more logical than the confusing array of chapters in AACR2, using chapter A.1 as an initial point of reference, then a succession of chapters gradually diminishing in scope to cover anything which chapter A.1 does not. However, for serials cataloguing, this has its drawbacks. In AACR2 you quickly gain knowledge of which chapter to consult for a particular situation; with AACR3 this is not as clear and there is likely to be more “to-ing and fro-ing” - a guide to AACR3 for serials cataloguers would help.

General comments from a conferences cataloguer

I found no problems using the review version; it will be easier to use because the general rules are in one section. I like the fact that there is more detail in the contents so it is easier to go to the relevant rule.

General comments from a monographs cataloguer

The actual text of AACR3 is much easier to digest than the old version, with a much better layout, particularly with all the general rules that apply to all types of resources in one section (A1) and then further chapters which give more specific rules on particular types of material. This hangs together better than the old version and makes it much easier to navigate. It is also much more comprehensive with much wider coverage and flexibility for the user than AACR2.

Comments on reaching out to non-traditional communities

Comment 1:

From my (limited) experience outside the traditional cataloguing environment, it looks to me as if there is a need for a standard like AACR. But, irrespective of how good its contents are, the sheer size of AACR3 militates against it. It is more a reference tool than a quick cataloguing manual which is what people are after. The time and financial constraints that we now work under do not allow thorough training of metadata creators. I therefore think the way to reach out to the non-library world may be to produce a Concise version, like the current Concise AACR2, and/or a sort of customised Concise version, tailored to describing certain types of resources, e.g. Describing electronic/digital resources.

Comment 2:

I have not got very far with this document, being something of a stranger to AACR. My first thought was that there is a real need in resource description circles for simple content standard guidelines that can be applied by sectors other than libraries and by people other than trained cataloguers. Of real benefit to people such as these would be a set of simple but adequate guidelines, possibly set out by resource type (thesis, digital image, journal article etc.) Metadata schemas are emerging for these resource types which employ simpler metadata models, but a set of rules governing the quality of the content is lacking. I think that is where there needs to be rather more of a trade-off than has already been made by AACR. Other products could be spun off it that will meet the needs of wider resource description communities and address the changes that the technological developments and new publishing patterns are raising.

AACR3 – Part I

Comments on the December 2004 Draft

Submitted by: Sally Strutt, British Library Representative

E-mail address: sally.strutt@bl.uk

Date: 22nd March 2005

Note: The chapter designators (A1, A2, A3, B1, etc.) in the draft of part I have been used in order to differentiate chapter and rule numbers for the new edition from those used in AACR2 for purposes of the constituency review. The final form of numbering for chapters and rules will be determined once the complete structure for AACR3 has been finalized.

1. Objectives and principles

General comments on the formulation or application of the objectives and principles established for part I:

Objectives:

Comprehensiveness

Consistency

Clarity

Rationality

Currency

Compatibility

Adaptability

Ease and efficiency of use

We think the principle of "Ease and efficiency of use" will be something of a judgement call depending on who is trying to use the rules. (This comment is from a perspective that assumes metadata will be created by non-cataloguers in a non-library context - for example, publishers, authors, digitisers etc...)

Format***Principles:*****Generalization****Specificity****Non-redundancy****Terminology****Reference structure****B. Functional Requirements**

[No comments]

2. Organization of the rules

Comments on the scope and organization of the sections and chapters in part I:

Section A – General rules***Scope and organization of chapter A1 – General rules for description***

Chapter A1 is very “bulky” and, while it is helpful to find what you want in the first section you look at, finding it *within* that section is not always straightforward, particularly in A1.1 – Title and statement of responsibility area.

A1.1B1. AACR2 rule 1.1B1 gives instructions on transcribing the title proper and how to transcribe words not meant to be part of the title, with good examples immediately following in 1.1B2. This same useful information is separated in the draft of AACR3 Part I, so you jump from A1.1B1 for transcribing title proper to A1.1B6 for the rule on any omissions. We would prefer a means of keeping those rules adjacent, as this would be more useful and less time-consuming when cataloguing.

A1.1B9. This rule only covers component parts of resources where the titles of the component parts appear on the same chief source of information as the collective title. There are no instructions in the “A1.1/Title and Statement of Responsibility Area” for recording the titles of parts of multipart resources (AACR2 13.4) where the focus of description is the resource as a whole and where the parts may or may not appear on the same chief source of information as the collective title (there are examples of this at A1.7B21 but no specific reference to the use of this note for multipart monographs). There is also no rule for recording the collective and part titles when the focus of description is the part (i.e. AACR2 13.3). This rule needs to cover multipart monographs as well as single part resources, and also needs to cover two different aspects of the focus of description (part or whole).

Suggested wording:

A1.1B9. Collective title and titles of parts/component parts.

a) *Single part resource.* If the chief source of information bears both a collective title and the titles of component parts, record the collective title as the title proper and record the titles of the component parts in a contents note (see A1.7B21).

[Examples]

b) *Multipart resources.*

i) If the focus of description is the resource as a whole, record the collective title as the title proper and record the titles of the parts in a contents note (see A1.7B21)

ii) If the focus of description is the part, record the title of the part as the title proper and the collective title in the series area.

[Examples]

A1.1B11. The wording of this rule suggests that a resource lacking a chief source of information is one that lacks a title (“For a resource lacking a chief source of information, either supply or devise a title proper”). There should therefore be a link between A1.0A1 and A1.1B11 so that the cataloguer has guidance on what to do if they have to devise a title because there are no alternative chief sources of information i.e. no parts of the resource or its container that bear a title for the aspect of the resource being described. A1.1B11 would be better reworded to make it specific to the lack of a title rather than the lack of a chief source of information

A1.1B11. Supplied or devised title. For a ~~resource lacking a chief source of information~~ resources lacking a title proper for the aspect of the resource being described, either supply or devise a title proper. ...

A1.1F1. 1.1F1 in AACR2 states in the initial paragraph that the statement of responsibility should be enclosed in square brackets if taken from anywhere other than the chief source of information. This is followed by relevant examples. A1.1F1 in AACR3 only lists this rule after lengthy examples half way down the next page and is easy to miss. We suggest adding the relevant sentence to the end of the first paragraph at 1.1F1, and supplying one or two relevant examples.

A1.4A1. There is concern from e-media cataloguers that the new rules on chief sources of information will mean that publication details for digital media will regularly be in square brackets, because they will not often appear on the chief

source of information. This did not happen with AACR2, because the chief source of information for electronic resources was clearly stated as the resource itself. Perhaps a specific rule could be added to chapter C7 to clarify the position.

A1.8B2. There is an assumption in this rule that the focus of description is the “resource as a whole”. If the focus of description is the part (for a multipart monograph) then we feel that the ISBN for the part should be recorded first. The rule could be amended as follows:

Optionally, record more than one number and add a qualification as prescribed in A1.8E. If the focus of description is the resource as a whole, record a number for a complete set before the number(s) for the part(s). Record numbers for parts in the order of the parts. If the focus of description is a single part of a multipart monograph, record the number for the part before a number for the complete set. Record a number for ancillary material last.

A1.10 “IN” Analytics & A1.11 Multilevel description.

AACR2 rule 13.3 does not appear to be included in AACR3 as an option for the description of multipart monographs or monographs in a series. There needs to be an explicit rule to show that where the focus of description is “a single part of a resource comprising two or more parts” one option for description is for the collective title of the resource to be recorded in the series area (see comments at A1.1B9). It is partially covered by the last part of A1.1B8 (taken from 12.1B6) but A1.1B8 only relates to resources where the “title proper ... consists of a) the title common to all sections ... and b) the title of the section or supplement”. The title proper of a part of a multipart monograph or a part of a “monographic series”, where the focus of description is a single part of the resource, would not usually consist of these two elements.

Scope and organization of chapter A2 – Resources issued in successive parts

Scope and organization of chapter A3 – Integrating resources

Section B – Supplementary rules applicable to specific types of content

Scope and organization of chapter B1 – Text

Scope and organization of chapter B2 – Music

B2.3A1. It is good to have explicitly stated that the musical presentation statement is a transcription field – i.e. the text has to be quoted from the chief source of information.

Scope and organization of chapter B3 – Cartographic resources

B3.3B1. Statement of scale

In AACR2 and AACR3 proposals all examples of representative fraction scale statements use the non-metric format 1:200,000 with the comma. However, in *Cartographic materials, a manual of interpretation for AACR2, 2002 revision*, there is a statement that the metric convention (without comma) is used in the manual and there are policy statements for various libraries on whether or not they use the metric (no comma) or non-metric (comma) format. The preparation of AACR3 gives us the opportunity to align these rules and policies. In other words, there does not appear to be an option on use of comma in AACR2 or AACR3 but clearly in interpretation and practice there is an option. If the option is to be maintained, it needs to be stated in AACR3. If the option is not to be maintained, agreement will have to be reached with the British Library, Library and Archives Canada and the National Library of Australia, which use the metric format. This would best be accomplished through consultation with the Anglo-American Committee for Cataloging of Cartographic Materials (AACCCM).

B3.3B6. “Scale not given”

Both AACR2 and AACR3 proposals give at this point the instruction “Record a statement of scale for a resource with a nonlinear scale ... If no scale statement appears of the resource, record *Scale not given*. Do not estimate a scale.”

These are two separate issues combined awkwardly into one rule. Items with a nonlinear scale are separate from items on which no scale is given. The need for users to know that no scale appears on the item and for cataloguers to know how to express that is too important for the instruction to appear as an appendage to the rule that covers a much more obscure occurrence of a resource with a nonlinear scale. Thus, we would suggest that this rule be divided into two rules at the point “If no scale statement...”

Scope and organization of chapter B4 – Graphics

Scope and organization of chapter B5 – Three-dimensional resources

Scope and organization of chapter B6 – Sound

Scope and organization of chapter B7 – Moving images

Section C – Supplementary rules applicable to specific types of media

Scope and organization of chapter C1 – Print and graphic media

Scope and organization of chapter C2 – Micrographic media

Scope and organization of chapter C3 – Tactile media

*Scope and organization of chapter C4 – Three-dimensional media**Scope and organization of chapter C5 – Audio media**Scope and organization of chapter C6 – Projected graphic, film, and video media**Scope and organization of chapter C7 – Digital media***URLs**

We can find no mention of electronic location and access. We think this should be a requirement for remote resources. It is mentioned in MARC and we think it should be mentioned also in AACR.

Granularity (e.g. multiple files issued serially)

There doesn't seem to be much guidance on this. A1.0A1e/f gives some direction, but use of examples would be clearer.

C7 (like AACR2 Chapter 9) appears to be monographically based, with no reference to serials at all. Our serials e-media catalogue would like some cross-references to the serial/integrating resource chapters.

C7.2B4. We often catalogue CD-ROMs issued in "versions" as serials, in the same way that we often catalogue those issued in "editions" as serials (e.g. Ed.1- or Version 1.1-) as this is an economic way of processing. It would be helpful if there was a cross-reference to A2.2B3 for this sort of example.

3. Focus of the description

Comments on instructions in the Introduction and in rule A1.0A1 on focus of the description:

INTRODUCTION

We find the introduction quite wordy. Is there any possibility of repackaging some of the information provided in a section entitled 'How to use this manual'? With possibly a workflow diagram (the ones in the Dewey Decimal Classification are very popular with cataloguers) highlighting the main steps, e.g.: 1. Go to Part A2. If you are dealing with text, then go to Part B1, etc.. Or: 1. Choose the focus of your description, 2. Choose your chief source of information, etc..

INTRODUCTION**Scope**

[1st sentence]: Why use "formulating bibliographic descriptions"? It's not the easiest opening! Why not just use a direct verb -"describing"? In the next section

there is the direct "description of library materials" and, following the Dewey Decimal Classification pattern, we would suggest that where the same thing is being said over and over, use the same terminology to set up a clear pattern. We're thankful we don't have another "formulating bibliographic descriptions" here!

[2nd sentence]: Adding in access points makes "catalogue entries" even more confusing - the difference between an access point and a catalogue entry may be fine to us but most non-librarians may well be lost. Also why "in most instances" - shouldn't qualifications be avoided wherever possible to keep the message clear?

Organization of the rules

There is a need for a clear statement at the start about why the Part is organized the way it is. This is a key point which should not be buried in the last paragraph. There then would be a better lead into the "APPLYING" section and an open and tacit link between these two overlapping sections.

We suggest something along the lines of: "Part 1 consists of three sections, A, B and C. Whatever you are describing, you start at Section A and only go to sections B and C if directed." Then list the sections/chapters etc. by using a table or bullet points.

The last paragraph is a little heavy and the examples are buried in the text. This could be pruned - e.g. is "relating to a particular element" really necessary when we're talking about additional instructions/supplementary instructions in the same sentence?

Perhaps something direct such as: "Section A provides links to the additional instructions in Sections B and C for specific types of content and media." And then examples removed from the body of the text for clarity. Examples are the life support for this sort of detailed textual explanation.

Applying general and supplementary rules

"Formulating a description for a resource": is this the same as "formulating bibliographic description" or "description of library materials"? This introduces a sentence that is not the easiest to read and again we think this could be pruned. It is really saying "When you describe a resource, you may need to add information on its contents and/or on the medium it is in." We suggest also: "Part 1 is organised so that you start at Section A and only go to Sections B and C if directed".

Determining the focus for the description

Guidance on "Determining the focus for the description" is in the Introduction to Part I and may be overlooked by cataloguers. We think that this information would be better placed at A1.0A1 at the section entitled "Focus for the description", although this would make the rule quite long.

Alternatively, a reference back to the Introduction would be helpful. Whilst this would contradict the general principle of only referring forwards, it might be wise to make references to the Introduction in the main text if we want to encourage users to read it, particularly for something as critical as focus of description.

Resources in an unpublished form

Starting off "For the most part, the rules in part 1" appears a little clumsy. How about something direct like : "Sections A, B, C apply to both published and unpublished resources. In cases where unpublished resources need different treatment, this is given as a separate sub-rule under the relevant rule."

An example would serve much better than the last sentence.

Options and omissions

ISBD areas

We think the original is clearer with "For this reason ..."

This could be followed by a bulleted list of what is affected. We suggest saying what it is used for directly and making the last sentence positive instead of negative i.e. what it applies to, rather than what it doesn't.

A1.0 PRELIMINARY RULES

[Another comment]:

A1.0 PRELIMINARY RULES

- Title of section
This section is called *Preliminary* rules. We realise this mirrors the general structure of each section but think the adjective "preliminary" is misleading in so far as it does not convey how important it is to read this section as it sets you off on the right track to start your description, i.e. choosing the focus, choosing the chief source, choosing the level of description.
- Structure
Some reviewers think Sections A1.0G to A1.0L should be higher up in the logical order of presentation, possibly straight after A1.0D3. They deal with how to deal with the resource, which is the theme of the sections before A1.0D3. The sections from A1.0E to A1.0F8 seem out of place in between.
- Examples.
Is it possible to include examples in A1.0A1 to clarify the instructions?

[Another comment]:

There is a muddle here with Focus for the description (A1.0A1) and (A1.0A2) Chief source of information. This starts with the "circular" instruction in A1.0A1 "The sources of information for a bibliographic description are dependent on the focus for the description". This is followed by "the chief source of information" - and this is not defined till A1.0A2.

How does the list a) to g) relate to the a) to f) list in DETERMINING THE FOCUS FOR THE DESCRIPTION?

Our multipart expert reviewer thinks there is an underlying assumption in many rules that description is of the “resource as a whole” (e.g. A2.6G). This has led to confusion in the past and may well do so again if the cataloguer is focusing on the part. The rules still do not address adequately the processing of finite multipart resources at the volume level.

4. Resources in an unpublished form

Comments on the scope and placement of rules pertaining to resources in an unpublished form:

General rules (A1.1B11, A1.2A1, A1.4C8, A1.4D9, A1.4F8, A1.7B12.2, A1.7B14, A1.7B30)

A1.2A1. These are useful rules for resources in unpublished form and direct the user to the section for specific media e.g. unreleased film etc., which AACR2 didn't do.

Supplementary rules applicable to text (B1.1B11, B1.1E6, B1.4F8)

Rules on resources in an unpublished form from AACR2 omitted from the draft of AACR3

5. Resources issued in successive parts

Comments on rules pertaining to resources issued in successive parts:

Numbering area (A1.3)

A1.3F. Ceased multipart resources. Recording the numeric and/or alphabetic designation for a multipart monograph is new to AACR3. All multipart monographs will cease, as, by definition, they are finite. The caption should give greater emphasis to these finite resources because the current caption suggests that the cessation of multipart resources is relatively uncommon.

A1.3F. Multipart monographs and serials that have ceased publication

Some examples of multipart monographs should also be included.

Title and statement of responsibility area (A2.1)

A2.1E1. This rule is based on serials practice, not monograph practice. For monographs it has always been obligatory to transcribe other title information (for second level description). The rule at A2.1E1 for all resources issued in successive parts introduces a new area of uncertainty for multipart monographs (i.e. “if considered to be important”). I would prefer to see this rule relate only to serials, not all resources issued in successive parts.

Edition area (A2.2)

Publication, distribution, etc., area (A2.4)

A2.4F1 Dates. One reviewer requests guidance for dealing with back runs of issues that are digitized and published after the current issues.

Technical description area (A2.5)

Series area (A2.6)

Note area (A2.7)

A2.7B27.1 c). This paragraph is an amalgamation of the preceding rules for numbered and unnumbered serials but most of it does not seem relevant for multipart monographs (e.g. “issues consulted”) and is also confusing. We suggest removing the introductory sentence at A2.7B27.1 as it is too far removed from the instructions for multipart monographs, and reword as follows:

c) *Multipart monographs.* Make a note of the part upon which the description is based if it is not based on the first or earliest part. For numbered multipart monographs, record the designation and number of the part consulted. For unnumbered multipart monographs, record the title of the part and its date of publication (as instructed in A1.7A4).

6. Integrating resources

Comments on rules pertaining to integrating resources:

Title and statement of responsibility area (A3.1)

A.3.1E1c) title consists of a corporate body – add addition to explain title. This is a useful change - it occurs quite often with electronic databases.

Edition area (A3.2)

Publication, distribution, etc., area (A3.4)

Technical description area (A3.5)

Series area (A3.6)

Note area (A3.7)

Standard number and terms of availability area (A3.8)

7. Assembled collections

Comments on the scope and placement of rules pertaining to assembled collections:

General rules (A1.4C8, A1.4D9, A1.4F8, A1.5B5, A1.5D3)

Supplementary rules applicable to text (B1.1B11)

Supplementary rules applicable to print and graphic media (C1.5D3)

8. Early printed resources

Comments on the scope, placement, and application of rules pertaining to early printed resources:

General rules (A1.4D1, A1.4G1)

Supplementary rules applicable to print and graphic media (C1.5B2.1.19, C1.5D1.1, C1.7B13.2, C1.7B28.1)

Rules on early printed monographs from AACR2 omitted from the draft of AACR3

9. Sources of information

Comments on the generalization and reworking of rules on sources of information (A1.0A):

A1.0A1. Lack of a definition of “chief source of information” at A1.0A1 is problematic. It is included in AACR2 at 1.0A3 before the term is used in the text.

In AACR3 the term is used before it is defined. Whilst definitions are included in the Glossary, it would be helpful to have it repeated here if this edition is intended to be “easier and more efficient for cataloguers to use and interpret”.

Some reviewers found the list a) to g) at A1.0A1 confusing in its relationship to the a) to f) list in DETERMINING THE FOCUS FOR THE DESCRIPTION (pages I-2 to I-3). We suggest removing the ‘Determining the focus for the description’ section from the Introduction and placing it at the head of A1.0.

A1.0A1 a). It is not difficult to determine the focus of description for a single-part resource as there really are no options (unless the resource is to be analysed) but there are options for multipart resources. This rule gives cataloguers the option to focus description on a part of a multipart resource. It therefore covers all monographs in a series where the monograph is described, whether the series is finite (a multipart monograph) or ongoing (a monographic series). Since the point of the rule is to allow description at the part level, this aspect should be emphasised, not included in parentheses:

a) If the focus of description is a *single-part resource* ~~(or a single part of a resource comprising two or more parts)~~ or a *single part of a multipart resource* (e.g. a monograph in a series, a volume of a multipart monograph), choose a chief source of information pertaining to that resource or part following the instructions in A1.0A2

A1.0A1 b). is confusing. Generally, for multipart monographs information relating to the part and the whole appears on the same source, i.e. the chief source of information for the part and the whole is the same, and the statement of responsibility may be shared (same person(s) write(s) the part and the collection). Maybe the rule should be reworded to say:

b) If the focus for the description is a resource comprising *two or more parts issued simultaneously*, and the resource contains a chief source of information for the resource as a whole ~~as well as~~ either in addition to or together with chief sources of information for its individual parts, choose a chief source of information pertaining to the resource as a whole following the instructions in A1.0A2. ...

We cannot think of many instances where a collective title of some sort would not appear on the resource for a multivolume work (as opposed to a multimedia work). It might occur with a set of works in a container where only the container bears the title for the collection as a whole (it would be helpful to have a statement here telling the cataloguer that a container is not to be considered part of the resource). Using the container as the chief source is not possible, however, from a literal reading of the rule because the options are to be taken in order, i.e. if the resource doesn't contain a chief source of information for the resource as a whole the instruction is to use “a chief source of information for the first part ...”. Since the focus of description is the collection and the resource does not contain a chief source of information pertaining to the resource as a whole, then the chief source of information for the first part is likely to contain only a title for the work contained within the first part and this would not be the most appropriate title for the resource

as a whole. Is option i) to be followed when the set of works has slightly different titles on each part, but each of the titles relates to the resource as a whole? In this case, there are multiple chief sources of information rather than no chief source of information so this option should probably come under A1.0A3. For a multivolume work, option iv) would often be the correct choice “a chief source of information on a container that is a unifying element for the resource”. When would ii or iii occur? If there is information on the resource that is “unifying” then wouldn’t that represent a “chief source of information for the resource as a whole?”

We would suggest not having an order of precedence at this section, rewording i (or moving it to A1.0A3) and deleting ii and iii. The rule would then read:

... If there is no chief source of information pertaining to the resource as a whole, or multiple chief sources relating to the resource as a whole, use one of the following as appropriate:

i) a chief source of information for the first part (i.e. the lowest numbered part), if the parts are consecutively numbered and the titles on each part relate to the resource as a whole

ii) a chief source of information on a container that is a unifying element for the resource

iii) a chief source of information on the part that is the main resource if the other parts are accompanying or related dependent supplements.

A1.0A1 c). It should be made clear that the focus of description is the whole of the resource:

c). If the focus of description is the whole of a *resource issued in successive parts*, choose a chief source of information pertaining to the first issue or part or, lacking this, the earliest available issue or part following the instructions in A1.0A2. ...

A1.0A2. Choice of chief source of information. AACR2 states that the source of the title proper should always be given for electronic resources (9.7B3). AACR3 states that the source of the title should only be given if it is from a source other than the chief source of information. As AACR2 “allowed” the cataloguer to use the whole item as a source of information, this is somewhat ambiguous. Is the implication that the source of title for e-media items is no longer of importance? Our e-media cataloguers believe that the chief source should always be given for electronic resources. For electronic serials this is necessary to determine whether something is a change of title or a variant.

A1.0A2. This area is now less prescriptive than it used to be, and lacks some of the detail in AACR2 9.0B. However, it is not practical to prefer the most complete source in the case of CD-ROM serials (no change to existing rule here), because this means that all subsequent issues need to be viewed if information is taken from other than the external source.

A1.0A2. In the case of e-journals the “most complete source” discussion should spell out some of the choices (e.g. publisher’s site v. host/archiving site v. aggregator information).

A1.0A2. We suggest placing the footnotes to this rule into the main text.

A1.0A3. Resources with more than one chief source of information. We think the caption at “c) *Chief sources of information for individual works contained in the resource*” should read: “Chief sources of information for component parts of a resource with no collective title” because the rule does not apply to resources comprising multiple physical parts. The rules for description of multipart monographs with “no chief source of information for the resource as a whole” are at A1.0A1 and currently there is no option to treat the chief sources of information for all the works as if they were a single source. The word “work” should be removed altogether because of its ambiguity and because it is not defined in the Glossary:

c) *Chief sources of information for ~~individual works contained in the resource~~ component parts of a resource with no collective title.* If the resource comprises two or more ~~works~~ component parts and contains no chief source of information for the resource as a whole (i.e. no collective title), treat the chief sources of information for all of the ~~works~~ component parts as if they were a single source.

A1.0A3 d) should also be at A1.0A1. It is confusing to have it under the heading “Resources with more than one chief source of information”. If the rules are to be used sequentially, then the cataloguer has already made a decision about the focus of description and the question of multiple chief sources of information should only relate to that aspect of the resource the cataloguer is describing. A1.0A3 d) concerns having a chief source of information for the part and a chief source of information for the resource as a whole; it is not addressing multiple chief sources of information for the aspect of the resource being described.

A1.0A5. We are unsure from the rules when it is acceptable for the title page and verso to be considered together as the chief source of information for printed material (as per the last sentence at A1.0A2) – always, or only when a statement of responsibility and/or publishing details do not appear on the title page? Also not sure of the rationale behind limiting the prescribed sources of information for the edition to the chief source of information; edition statements appearing only on the cover would now have to be recorded in square brackets, and those appearing on the tp verso might still be transcribed by the cataloguer, even when they do not reflect a change in content, depending on the cataloguer’s interpretation of the rules (if the verso is to be considered part of the chief source of information).

A1.0C. Punctuation. On the whole written a lot clearer in AACR3, apart from the sentence in A1.0C1 which we find very unclear “Precede or enclose each occurrence of an element of an area with standard punctuation prescribed at the head of each section of this chapter”. We think this needs further clarification.

A1.0F7. The example present in the equivalent rule in AACR2 has been removed. We would like it reinstated, to aid understanding of the rule.

10. General material designation

Comments on the revision of rules on general material designation and the terms used as GMDs (A1.1C):

A1.1C. General material designation. [Comment from e-media cataloguers]:
The term ‘electronic resource’ appears to have disappeared, to be replaced by a dual term describing both (and/or) content and media. Some e-media items will be very difficult to bracket using the terms put forward in this draft. Often, the content ranges across several of the new description terms put forward. Will clear guidance be given as to how these terms should be used? Is it a matter of content prominence, and judging the “quantity” of each against these lists? Is it possible to retain the term “electronic resource”?

A1.1C. We think that a GMD should be **compulsory** not optional for electronic resources, so that readers can distinguish easily between formats.

A1.1C1. If unpublished material is within scope of these cataloguing rules (e.g. A1.2A1), shouldn't they be explicitly catered for in the GMD? - e.g. 'manuscript' as a medium?

11. Publication, distribution, etc. area

Comments on the revision of rules pertaining to the publication, distribution, etc., area:

Elimination of the use of “s.l.” and “s.n.” (A1.4C6, A1.4D7)

One reviewer disagrees with the elimination of the use of “s.l.” and “s.n.” The place of publication and publisher are two crucial elements in bibliographic description. If the information does not appear on the resource and cannot be determined as prescribed, then it is important to state, in effect, “I looked but it wasn’t there.” Leaving these areas of the description blank facilitates the question “Was the information not there, or did the cataloguer just forget to put it there?” i.e., the difference between a conscious act and a mistake. The British Library has many records converted from our 19th century printed catalogues where there is no place and/or publisher, and they just look like sloppy workmanship. We understand the desire to simplify in this age of decreasing resources, but let’s not dumb down too much for the Google generation, and let’s not abandon those users (including ourselves) who do use publication data and do need to know where it doesn’t appear.

12. Technical description area

Comments on the scope, placement, and application of rules pertaining to technical description:

General comment:

One reviewer dislikes the change from “Physical description” to “Technical description”, because they believe that with the majority of types of items that these rules will be used to describe, the word “physical” is more appropriate and concise than the word “technical.” The word “technical” is appropriate for the description of digital and electronic resources, but the use of the term “technical” to describe a book, serial, map, sheet music, etc. is virtually nonsensical. They would suggest that the application comment at A1.5A1. is sufficient to direct those describing digital resources to the relevant area and that the term “Physical description” be retained.

General rules on extent (A1.5B)**A1.5B1. Number of physical units and A1.5B2. Number of components**

Our cartographic reviewer strongly objects to the changes made with these two rules to the way in which cartographic items are described. They understand that an increased consistency to the rules is being attempted, but believe this attempt brings more consistency but less sense. The result in the majority of cases of the physical description of cartographic resources will be either unnecessary repetition, or description which is less precise than rules under AACR2. Examples from the Dec 2004 draft:

AACR2r: 1 map
AACR3: 1 sheet (1 map)

The AACR2 rule allows the assumption that the 1 map is on 1 sheet. This assumption is reasonable because any situation where the assumption is false is described in a different way. Here, the AACR3 proposal makes for repetitious work for the cataloguer in a time when we are trying to increase efficiency rather than increase work.

AACR2r: 17 maps
AACR3: 17 sheets (17 maps)
AACR3 is repetitive and therefore wasteful.

AACR2r: 1 map on 4 sheets
AACR3: 4 sheets (1 map)

The AACR2 rule provides for a more precise and thus more useful description of the resource. It states clearly that in order to have the entire 1 map it takes 4 sheets. The AACR3 proposal is less precise and therefore vague: there are 4 sheets in the resource and there is 1 map, but is the 1 map on only 1 of the 4 sheets, or what?

AACR2r: 3 maps on 1 sheet : both sides
AACR3: 1 sheet (3 maps) : both sides

Again, the AACR2 rule provides a clearer and thus more useful description. The AACR3 proposal is not helpful to the user.

Additional examples:

AACR2: 6 maps on 1 sheet

AACR3: 1 sheet (6 maps)

Again, AACR2 is more precise. The AACR3 proposal suggests the question “what happened to the other 5 maps?”

There is also an inconsistency in the examples under A1.5B2. Why is it

327 p.

but

3 v. (1397 p.)?

Shouldn't the first example be

1 v. (327 p.)?

This suggests that the number of physical units (i.e., “1 v.”) is optional. If that is the case, it must be clearly stated, and then we should be allowed the option of saying “1 map” instead of “1 sheet (1 map)”.

While the cartographic reviewer understands the attempt at consistency amongst the various formats, they feel that in this particular case consistency results in less precise and less useful description. If possible, could the physical units and components rules be made optional for cartographic materials?

A1.5B2; A1.5C4; A1.5E1. [Comment from music cataloguer]: At the moment we can say simply e.g.: '1 score (100 p.)', but now am I right that we would have to say e.g. '1 v. (1 score, 100 p.)', or is it just a coincidence that none of the examples show this form. If so, this is not an improvement - it is more clumsy.

General rules on other technical details (A1.5C)

General rules on dimensions (A1.5D)

General rules on ancillary material (A1.5E)

Supplementary rules applicable to print and graphic media (C1.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to micrographic media (C2.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to tactile media (C3.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to three-dimensional media (C4.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to audio media (C5.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to projected graphic, film, and video media (C6.5)

Supplementary rules applicable to digital media (C7.5)

Potential for further generalization of rules on technical description (e.g., X.5C10)

13. Note area

Comments on the scope, placement, and application of rules pertaining to notes:

A1.7B8 gives a much better explanation about how to record names of people/bodies different to those recorded in title but thought to be important enough to mention, with good examples. AACR2 had same examples in 1.7B6 but no explanatory notes at all to accompany them, so not as clear to user.

Generalization of rules on notes (e.g., A1.7B15)

A1.7B17. The second example probably only occurs on “resources issued in successive parts” and is more about how to record changes (the resource changes over time in terms of the series in which it appears). We suggest that the example would be better placed at A2.7B17.2.

A1.7B30 Restrictions on access. These are a useful new addition.

Potential for further generalization of rules on notes (e.g., X.7B21)

A1.7B27. The rule relates to resources published over time. Multipart monographs are now included under the instructions for “resources issued in successive parts”. The explicit reference to multipart monographs should therefore be removed:

A1.7B27. Issue, part, or iteration described. For resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources, ~~and multipart monographs~~, if the description is not based on the first issue, part, or iteration, identify the issue, part, or iteration used as the basis of the description (see A1.0A1). ...

14. Glossary

Comments on the terms and definitions included in the glossary:

Component. Glossary definitions for terms containing the word “component”:

- “Component” is a “presentation subunit” (e.g. page, frame, map)

- “Component part” – “A discrete unit of content within a resource” – but not a physical unit of resource in itself. Where the component part is contemporaneous with the physical part, it becomes “a part”.
- “Component resource” – “A part or component part of an aggregate resource”.

The term “component” on its own is used in the body of the text in relation to the technical description only (‘A1.5B2. Number of components’). So component is a technical attribute rather than an intellectual attribute. “Component part”, however, is an intellectual attribute (the intellectual content). Using the same word for two completely different entities is confusing. Could an alternative term be used for the technical description?

Micrographic. There is no definition of the term micrographic. Yet ‘microform’ and ‘microfilm’ are defined. Shouldn’t micrographic?

Publisher. There is no definition of publisher. This has been raised as a query/issue at a meeting about describing webpages. It would be useful to have a definition supported by examples.

Work. There is no definition for Work. (All the other three FRBR terms ‘expression’, ‘manifestation’ and ‘item’, are defined.)

15. Style

Comments on matters of style:

General

We feel that the overall structure of part 1 and how to use it is not clear. An overall top statement would be useful - just something simple to say that you start with A1 and only if directed go to A2 for this, A3 for that, B, C etc. for the other. Then, when you’ve described the resource, you look at access points (Parts 2 and 3). There is a lot of prose that can be simplified and pruned and thus made much more approachable.

We would recommend flow charts, bullet points, tables, categorization to be used a lot more and the style to be made direct rather than “discursive academic” in the Introduction and Preliminary Rules. We find the language used in the actual rules to be generally fine.

We assume that the FRBR model will be referred to in the overall Introduction to AACR3. It would be useful to have a small chart to refer to, to aid understanding of the FRBR terms. The terms are in the Glossary but not in relationship to each other.

Tables of contents for chapters and areas

Captioning of subrules

References to related and supplementary rules

There are several examples of references back to rules rather than forwards, e.g. at A2.1E1 there are references back to A1.1B7, A1.1E4, A1.1E6, A1.7B7.

Clarity of instructions

A1.1A2 Punctuation. The "Precede the title..." sentence is very long - we would break before "in which case" and also give an example.

16. Typographical and grammatical errors, etc.

Please reference errors, etc., in the form: [page number] - [rule number] - [paragraph or example number]

Page A1-9, Rule A1.0C1, third paragraph. The reference in parentheses is incorrect. It should be A1.3A4, not A1.3A3.

Page A1-33, Rule A1.2B3, last paragraph. A2.2B3 only applies to serials, so the reference should read:

“For instructions pertaining to edition statements for ~~resources issued in successive parts~~ serials and integrating resources, see A2.2B3 and A3.2B3.”

Page A1-55, Rule A1.5A6, fourth sentence. Spelling error:

“If the extent includes more than one designation of components, ~~preceed~~ precede the second and subsequent designations by a comma.”