

ISBD CONSOLIDATED EDITION

COMMENTS FROM THE CATALOGUING COMMITTEE OF THE SWEDISH LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AND THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SWEDEN

The Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association and the National Library of Sweden welcome the consolidated edition of the ISBD which will make the work of librarians world-wide much easier, now being able to use just one ISBD instead of several. The integration of the different ISBDs has been done very thoroughly and all in all we do believe that it is a very good product. We very much look forward to the integration of ISBD(A) as well, but before releasing the final version a few larger questions below need to be solved.

What is going to happen with the General material designation, GMD, within RDA? It is important to follow the discussion in the JSC to avoid different solutions to this problem. Why is the GMD in the title area? Should it stay there or should it be derived from coded information elsewhere in the bibliographic record and displayed in another way?

Areas 3 and 5 have still not been solved in a satisfactory way. We still find it questionable that area 3 has been dropped for most kinds of electronic resources. The question of an area 5 for electronic resources definitely needs to be settled before publishing the consolidated ISBD. This is a question that has been waiting for a solution for many years now. The general opinion in Sweden is that area 5 is needed for most electronic resources, except for most of those that are remote. But even in many of those cases area 5 is possible, and also foreseen in the draft to RDA, with a possibility of registering the number of pages for remote access resources with a fixed page numbering added to them, e.g. e-books in PDF format.

Several of the definitions in the glossary appear to be out of date and need to be updated to the new digital environment of today. Regretfully, due to lack of time, we have not been able to go through all the definitions in detail, but we strongly recommend that the glossary be thoroughly revised before the consolidated edition is published.

The text sometimes is a bit too wordy with many repetitions. For the needs of the users some repetitions might be put together. An easily readable text is much more used than one that is too elaborate.

We had been hoping for a greater step towards an adjustment to the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), but we realise that this might not have been possible in this first consolidated edition. However we do hope that this is an issue which the ISBD Working Group will look into further in the coming years.

Comments to specific paragraphs:

- 0.3.2.8 We note the changed use of punctuation in these two paragraphs, a use that should
- 0.3.2.9 facilitate the work of programmers greatly.

- 0.4.2.3 We appreciate the strict definition of what is the primary source of information.

- 0.6.2 Why use an abbreviation in Latin (et.al.) or other language in a non-Roman script, when there already are three full stops to indicate that information has been left

out? If bibliographic records are supposed to be exchanged between library systems then there should not be information that is not easily understandable by other users or cataloguers. Three full stops are enough to indicate the exclusion of information.

1. What is meant by the “unless...”-phrases on p. 37? The text does not seem to correspond with what is later exemplified in the examples. See e.g. 1.1.5.2.1. The examples are not written according to the “unless”-phrases.
- 1.1.5.2.1 The possibility to mention the first three titles in a numerous list is a new and appreciated approach.
- 2.1.4.2 The edition statement associated with only one of several works, is given preceded by a comma. Why is not full stop used? Comma makes the meaning ambiguous.
- 4.1.9 We find it a bit peculiar to add the full address to the place of publication in area 4. Is there not a more suitable place to put that kind of added information, e.g. a note? At least this information should be given only when absolutely necessary.
- 4.1.10 Alternative versions of a place name are more suitably registered in an authority record and not in the area for place of publication.
5. A new, revised, version of the ISBD(ER) is still lacking. This version has been wanted for several years now and we strongly regret that the library community has not been able to agree upon a revised, modernised standard.
- 5.1.1 We believe that the solution of adding a trade name or other identification of a particular technical system or format in parenthesis after the SMD should be considered one of several possible solutions. This information might very well come in a note as well.
- 5.4.1 It is stressed that, even though registered after a “+” sign, musical parts should not be considered accompanying material, but do belong to the resource itself, cf. the MARC21 format: \$a1 score (30 p.) ;\$c20 cm. +\$a16 parts, not +\$e16 parts

Anders Cato

Chair of the Cataloguing Committee of the Swedish Library Association