

5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/2
1 April 2005

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Sally Strutt, Chair, JSC
Subject: AACR3 - Part I - Review by other rule makers of December 2004 Draft

These are comments on the draft Part I of AACR3 received from Françoise Pellé, Director of the ISSN International Centre.

Comments from the ISSN International Centre on the draft of AACR3–Part 1.

Françoise Pellé, Director, Alain Roucolle, Head of the Bibliographic section.

March 25th, 2004.

The International Centre would wish to express some comments on basic items of the draft of AACR3 Part 1. Our examination was concentrated on the chapters A1, A2 and A3 in particular.

The first comment is to regret the absence of a specific part in the draft, treating the continuing resources. As you know, the concept of continuing resources, developed in the framework of the revision of AACR2, was endorsed by the ISBD(S) and ISSN communities in their new cataloguing rules, at the end of the harmonization process. The scopes of the new standards (ISBD(CR) and ISSN Manual) were expanded to include continuing resources of all kinds, not only the serials but also the integrating resources. The concept of continuing resources allows to catalog in the same way all resources which have not predetermined conclusion. This concept reflects widely the reality of a part of the resources and publications. Furthermore it meets now the application of ISSN scope.

Since the adoption of this concept of continuing resources and the other complementary concepts, like bibliographic resources, many national cataloguing rules or standards were developed and based on these concepts. The application of same or similar rules by different libraries in different countries facilitates the exchanges of data between many libraries, documentation centers, union lists and others users of bibliographic records. The renouncement of a specific part of rules on continuing resources, in the AACR3 draft, will generate again different practices in the bibliographic communities and of course difficulties to exchange bibliographic data.

Moreover, the rules on title changes for continuing resources, which were also agreed upon by the bibliographic communities at an international level, don't seem to be included in the draft. These rules define the title changes in order to conclude if a new record is required or not. The application of these rules is again fundamental in the view of exchange of data. If the bibliographic communities don't share the same rules on title changes, the correspondence between the records will be not a one-to-one relationship.

The second comment is to remind the productive efforts made by the bibliographic communities to harmonize their cataloguing rules. The revision of the standards were finalized in 3 years by solving this difficult question of harmonization and by adapting the cataloguing rules to the new kinds of resources. The communities invested time and money to carry out this challenge. Knowing the progress accomplished by the harmonization effort, each community committed itself to continue to revise it's own standard on the same basis of exchange and cooperation. We hope that the AACR3 draft is a first step of a revision procedure open to the other bibliographic communities, and particularly to the ISSN community.

Finally we think that the revision of the cataloguing standards should raise some important and present questions on the cataloguing of the new types of resources. For example, the

question on the manifestations in different formats of the resources is only solved in the draft by making notes on the details of the formats, in one record.

It would be also relevant to investigate the cataloguing work in the light of the metadata. A lot of elements present in the metadata of online resources correspond to bibliographic data introduced by the catalogers in the records.