

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**From:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative

**Subject:** **Editor's follow-up to constituency responses on focus of the description and sources of information**

The ACOC comments primarily address the issues on which the Editor specifically requested feedback.

### ***Related documents***

*5JSC/LC/1/Rev/ACOC response*

*5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response*

### **1. The adequacy and clarity of the guidelines for “setting up the description” under 1.2**

The use of simple English (i.e. the use of readily understood words for non-bibliographic concepts, the use of short sentences, and the use of simple structures for sentences and paragraphs) is highly desirable. However appropriate terminology, defined in the Glossary, can be used when it is needed.

ACOC would prefer to avoid the use of long lists: the enumeration of each category in the 1.2 rules obscures their purpose, which is to outline the choices available. In general ACOC finds the style of 1.2.1 in *5JSC/AACR3/ACOC/Editor follow-up/1/LC response* clearer.

ACOC supports the outline of the Editor's approach in 1.2.2, i.e. Using a comprehensive description, Using an analytical description, and Using descriptions for both the whole and its parts. However, a briefer outline of the choices to be made, without the enumeration, would be welcome.

We note that the question of when to create a new description is tied closely to these rules. A paragraph addressing change in a resource could usefully be added to the Editor's draft as per A0.1B in *5JSC/LC/1/Rev*.

ACOC support the inclusion of information about relationships in 1.2.3, however this information might be given more succinctly if it was divided into analytical descriptions and comprehensive descriptions.

### **2. The feasibility of simplifying and “homogenizing” the specifications for preferred and alternative sources set out in the table and footnotes under 2.0.2.2.**

The amalgamated table given under 2.0.2.2 highlights the need to simplify the rules and streamline the process of selecting the descriptive elements as much as possible. If it is not possible to use a single listing of alternative sources regardless of resource type, the number of types should be minimised and generalised, even if this means some difference from past practice. In general, the simpler style of the corresponding section 1.2.4 in *5JSC/AACR3/ACOC/Editor follow-up/1/LC response* is preferable to the table given here under 2.0.2.2.

Even with a simplified table of prescribed sources, some principles-based guidance, such as that given in *5JSC/AACR3/I A1.0A2*, is needed, especially for remote access digital resources. We note that such guidance (i.e. to use ‘formally presented evidence’ and preferring the source with ‘the most complete information’) was previously given in *AACR2 9.0B1*.

**3. The placement of instructions on preferred sources of information (at 2.0.2.2 or under 2.1.1.2)**

If a prescribed priority order of sources for the selection of a title proper were to be used as per the *5JSC/LC/1/Rev* suggestion it would be preferable to give a general rule for the selection of all elements, and to treat the selection of the title proper separately and in more detail.

**4. Changes affecting current practices for bracketing information in the description**

In principal ACOC agrees that the use of square brackets should be limited to information supplied from outside the resource, and that square brackets can be omitted for resources that normally require the data element to be supplied. In most areas of the description, the use of square brackets is only for the benefit of the cataloguer, assisting them to recognise whether or not a bibliographic description represents the item in hand.

ACOC would like JSC to consider the use of a note on the source of the title proper instead of the use of square brackets, as this would be a more effective way of communicating this information to both cataloguers and users of the bibliographic description.

**5. The order of preference for sources of information for edition, numbering, publication, distribution, etc., information, and series statements**

Please see our comments under **2.** above.