



Consolidated ISBD: a step forward

Elena Escolano Rodríguez

National Library of Spain, Madrid, SPAIN
Chair, ISBD Review Group

Dorothy McGarry

University of California, Los Angeles, USA (Retired)
Chair, Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBDs

145 Cataloguing

Meeting:

Simultaneous Interpretation:

no

WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS: 73RD IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND COUNCIL

19-23 August 2007, Durban, South Africa

<http://www.ifla.org/iv/ifla73/index.htm>

ABSTRACT

This is a presentation on the new version of the ISBD. It is new because the structure has been changed, integrating the description of all types of resources covered in the specialized ISBDs into one ISBD. At the same time, requirements for the description of all resources have been updated to bring the description of all materials to the same state of conformity with FRBR.

We shall give a short history of the background of the ISBD Review Group's work and discuss the reasons why the group considered this revision necessary. Then we shall describe the procedures followed in the work on consolidation and the most problematic issues encountered, so it will be clear what is not included in this first edition. Finally we shall explain our intention of further revision and updating in the near future.

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the ISBD is to provide the stipulations for compatible descriptive cataloguing worldwide in order to aid the international exchange of bibliographic records between national bibliographic agencies and throughout the international library and information community.

By specifying the elements that comprise a bibliographic description and by prescribing the order in which those elements should be presented, and secondarily the punctuation by which they should be separated, the ISBD aims to:

- make records from different sources interchangeable, so that records produced in one country can be easily accepted in library catalogues or other bibliographic lists in any other country;
- assist in the interpretation of records across language barriers, so that records produced for users of one language can be interpreted by users of other languages;
- enhance interoperability with other content standards

Although originally the development of the ISBDs was pushed by the automation of bibliographic control as well as the economic necessity of sharing cataloguing, the ISBD is independent of any specific format for information. It is useful and applicable for bibliographic descriptions of all kinds of bibliographic resources in any kind of catalogue, whether Online Public Access Catalogues or catalogues less technologically advanced.

The Statement of International Cataloguing Principles that is being developed by a series of regional IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code recognizes ISBD as the agreed-upon standard on which the descriptive portion of the bibliographic record should be based for the library community.

USES OF THE ISBD AROUND THE WORLD

Thus, for more than three decades, IFLA's ISBD program has yielded standards for representing bibliographic data for all types of library resources and maintained these standards through one or more revisions. The ISBDs have been officially translated into 25 languages. In turn, the ISBDs have guided the work of national cataloguing committees in updating their codes to promote internationally accepted practices, a point underscored by the compilations of practices by various rules that were prepared for the IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC)¹. From these overviews, the general impression is overall compliance and considerable harmony among the national codes and with IFLA's recommended stipulations.

- Europe has the greatest number of cataloguing codes in use, and one of them is AACR2.² For IME ICC1, rule makers in Europe were asked to compare their codes and 18 reports on their cataloguing codes were received³; in their overviews were two questions related to ISBD acceptance. The first one was: "Is your cataloguing code based on ISBD for rules for description?" The 18 responses were affirmative. The second was: "In what ways do you vary from the ISBDs and why (to meet what needs)? Please cite your rules that differ." The responses provided us with a list of issues to consider in the future, and some of them have already been addressed in this version. Most of them are related to the optional character of some stipulations in ISBD that are mandatory in the cataloguing codes.⁴
- The IME ICC for South America was structured a little differently from the European meeting. Unlike Europe, where there are several rule making bodies and different cataloguing rules, Latin America and the Caribbean countries typically follow the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules or the Spanish rules, Reglas de

catalogación. These codes were already compared in IME ICC1 and their basis on ISBD was confirmed.⁵

- “The Middle East has no rule making bodies and the countries typically follow the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules.”⁶
- From IME ICC for Asia reports, we know that “China, Japan, and Korea have a history of rule making bodies ... Many other countries in Asia follow the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules or have a local set of rules based on AACR2”⁷. So they recognized their rules are based on and consistent with ISBD, or simply that there are no locally developed descriptive standards.⁸

We still do not know the results of the IME ICC for Africa, but I think it could be said without fear that ISBD is the world wide agreed-upon standard for bibliographic description.

IME ICCs have been very useful for the ISBD Review Group’s work, as there have been many suggestions to be considered in the future. Suggestions that come from the recognition of the different languages and scripts and also “cultural” patterns of publications will be taken into account by the Review Group and will help to improve the ISBD and its interpretation.

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISBDs⁹

In order to understand the reasons for this consolidation, the history and development of the ISBDs will be summarized, and the considerations that have led us to develop this consolidated edition will be given.

The concept of the International Standard Bibliographic Description dates back to the 1969 International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts in Copenhagen, sponsored by the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing. The main goal was, and continues to be, to offer consistency when sharing bibliographic information. The ISBDs were intended to serve as a principal component of IFLA’s program to promote Universal Bibliographic Control.

The first of the ISBDs to be published was the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications (ISBD(M)), which appeared in 1971, with a revised text published in 1974 as the "First standard edition". Other ISBDs subsequently appeared for specific types of resources: ISBD(S) for serials was also published in 1974; ISBD(CM) for cartographic materials and ISBD(NBM) for nonbook materials were both first published in 1977; ISBD(A) for older monographic publications (antiquarian) and ISBD(PM) for printed music first editions were published in 1980; and the ISBD(CF) for computer files, first edition was published in 1990. Along the way, the need was felt for a general framework to which all the ISBDs would conform, resulting in production of ISBD(G) published in 1977; the primary utility of ISBD(G) was that of ensuring harmony among the other ISBDs. For article level publications, Guidelines for the application of the ISBDs to the description of component parts was issued in 1988. The entire inventory of

the ISBDs in all their editions is listed on IFLANET; in every case, at least the latest version of each ISBD is freely available in an HTML or PDF format¹⁰.

Schedule and procedures for issuance of new or revised ISBDs:

At the IFLA World Congress in Brussels, held in August 1977, the Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing made important new decisions in relation to IFLA's programme of ISBDs. It was decided that all ISBD texts would be fixed to a life of five years, after which revision would be considered for all texts or for particular texts.

More pragmatically, they have been revised as the need has arisen to implement general applicable changes or by the evolution of library materials, such as those that resulted in publication of the ISBD for electronic resources and, more recently, the ISBD for serials and other continuing resources. The ISBD(CR) was revised as part of a harmonisation effort with the ISSN Guidelines and with AACR2.

Procedures are essential in all standardization work in order to ensure that the steps by which a document becomes a new or revised standard are well known and consistently followed. The ISBDs are no exception to this rule. At the 1989 IFLA Conference, the Section on Cataloguing adopted a schedule and established procedures for development and distribution of such documents as new or revised ISBDs. In 2002, these procedures were updated to take advantage of the electronic environment opportunities to speed up the review process.

There are essentially five phases in the development of a new or revised ISBD.

- Creation of draft text. During this phase, a working group may be appointed comprising cataloguing experts and, when appropriate, format specialists from both within and outside of IFLA.
- Worldwide review. Once a draft text is completed, it is ready for worldwide review and comment. At this point, the text is forwarded for posting on IFLANET. Thereupon, an announcement is sent to IFLA-L and other appropriate electronic lists. Normally, two months are allowed for review of an ISBD and usually an additional month if the text is entirely new.
- Final revision. All comments are considered. In accordance with the group decisions, the editor revises the draft. At this point, special attention is given to provision of examples in a variety of languages in the text and appendices and the preparation of an index. When a final text is determined, the ISBD Review Group as a whole goes over the text.
- Balloting. The final version of the new or revised ISBD is then sent to the Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee and any co-sponsoring Section. The ballot provides only two options: to approve or to disapprove.
- Publication. If the outcome is a vote of approval as is typically the case, the text is scheduled for publication. Today, in all cases, the text is issued electronically.

Although some ISBDs have been developed or revised to meet particular needs, there have been two overall revision projects affecting the entire Family of ISBDs.

First General Review Project

Consequent to the decision taken in 1977, which was mentioned above, the initial overall revision resulted in the creation of the ISBD Review Committee, which first met in August 1981.

The Committee established three major objectives set out for the first general review project:

- (1) to harmonize provisions, achieving increased consistency,
- (2) to improve examples, and,
- (3) to make the provisions more applicable to cataloguers working with materials published in non-roman scripts.

In addition, two narrower objectives motivated this particular revision effort:

- (1) to review the use of the equals sign (as its use in bibliographic descriptions had been the source of some controversy); and,
- (2) to remove coverage of machine-readable material from the ISBD for Non-Book Materials.

By the end of the 1980's, the ISBDs had been re-published in "Revised editions."

- The standard for monographic publications ISBD(M) previously revised in 1978, was revised again in 1987,
- Cartographic materials ISBD(CM) was revised in 1987,
- Non-book materials ISBD(NBM) was revised in 1987,
- Serials ISBD(S) was revised in 1988,
- Printed music ISBD(PM) was revised in 1989,
- ISBD(G) was revised in 1992,
- In addition, a separate ISBD was created for Computer Files (1990), which, due to the rapid advances in technology, was soon superseded by creation of an ISBD for Electronic Resources (1997).

Second General Review Project and Current Activities

In the early 1990s, the Section on Cataloguing in cooperation with other Sections set up the Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). One immediate consequence of this development was the decision to suspend most revision work on the ISBDs while the FRBR Study Group pursued its charge to "recommend a basic level of functionality and basic data requirements for records created by national bibliographic agencies." This decision resulted in the permanent suspension of a project to identify the components of a "Concise ISBD(M)", because it was expected that FRBR's findings would in effect provide such a baseline. In 1998, the FRBR Study Group published its Final Report¹¹, and the ISBD Review Group was reconstituted to initiate a full-scale review of the ISBDs in order to implement FRBR's recommendations for a basic level national bibliographic record and ensure conformity between the provisions of the ISBDs and FRBR's data requirements.

In the ISBDs, national bibliographic agencies are called upon to "prepare the definitive description containing all the mandatory elements set out in the relevant ISBD insofar as

the information is applicable to the publication being described.” To facilitate implementation of this principle, the ISBDs designate as “optional” those data elements that are not mandatory when applicable or as “conditional” those data elements that are needed in certain circumstances but may otherwise be considered optional. Therefore, the main task in pursuing the second general review entailed a close look at the ISBD data elements that were now mandatory in order to ensure that no element that was mandatory in FRBR was optional in the ISBDs.

Another important task was consideration of the adaptation of ISBD terminology to FRBR’s terms “work,” “expression,” “manifestation,” and “item” to determine if they should be introduced in place of terms such as “publication” or “item”. The Review Group concluded that it was essential for IFLA to clarify the relationship between the ISBDs and the FRBR model. The group encountered difficulties in trying to achieve that alignment, owing in large part to the fact that the terms used in FRBR were defined in the context of an entity-relationship model conceived at a higher level of abstraction than the specifications for the ISBDs. While the entities defined in the FRBR model are clearly based on the elements forming an ISBD description¹², the relationships are too complex to be conveyed through a simple substitution of terminology. Taking into consideration Patrick Le Boeuf’s advice at the Frankfurt IME ICC in his paper on “Brave new FRBR world”¹³: “FRBR terminology should not be merely incorporated such as it stands into the ISBDs and cataloguing rules, but [these] should keep their own specific terminology, and provide accurate definitions showing how each term in this specific terminology is conceptually related to the FRBR terminology”. The Review Group thus decided that the development of a table to detail the relationship of each of the elements specified in the ISBDs to its corresponding entity, attribute or relationship as defined in the FRBR model, would satisfy the need to make clear that the ISBDs and FRBR themselves enjoy a harmonious relationship. Tom Delsey was commissioned by ICABS (IFLA-CDNL Alliance for Bibliographic Standards) to develop the mapping, and the Cataloguing Section’s Standing Committee approved the resulting document entitled “Mapping ISBD Elements to FRBR Entity Attributes and Relationships” on July 9, 2004¹⁴.

Nevertheless, the ISBD Review Group did decide to introduce some changes in terminology, beginning with the recently revised ISBD(G). Among them is the use of the term “resource” rather than “item” or “publication”. This decision was taken because the use of the term “item” in the ISBD was different from the term “item” as used in FRBR, and it is difficult not to confuse them.

ISBD(G), ISBD(M), and ISBD(CR) went through the general revision process and have been published. ISBD(ER) was submitted to the Cataloguing Section’s Standing Committee and approved. ISBD(CM) went through the world-wide review process and was revised following that process, but was not at that time submitted to the Standing Committee because work was begun on the consolidated ISBD. The ISBD(A) went through the world-wide review process in 2006.

REASONS FOR A CONSOLIDATED ISBD

The Review Group in 2002 established the ISBD Series Study Group, chaired by Françoise Bourdon. This effort reflected concerns that some inconsistencies and ambiguities appeared to have developed regarding the rules for recording information in area 6 for Series and related information presented in area 7 for Notes. Taking into account relevant rules from AACR2 and the ISSN Guidelines, this study group pursued three objectives:

- to clarify the purpose of area 6 and its relation with area 1 in ISBD(CR) and ISSN: identification or transcription;
- to verify the compatibility of sources of information recommended or prescribed in all ISBDs for area 6 and for area 1 in ISBD(CR) and ISSN; and
- to propose a common phrasing for area 6 in all ISBDs.

The Study Group agreed that through all the ISBDs, area 6 is mainly for transcription of data from the resource being catalogued and that obvious typographical errors should not be corrected, taking into consideration the great variety of publication practices and practices among national bibliographic agencies in treating such information.

In another area of effort, the ISBD Review Group had been attempting to provide improved guidance regarding the use of the ISBDs for bibliographic description of publications in multiple formats, for example, an e-book or serially issued maps. Recognizing the increasing incidence of resources published in more than one physical medium, and the challenges that these publications pose for bibliographic control, the Review Group appointed a Material Designations Study Group (MDSG), with Lynne Howarth as chair, charged to investigate three topics in particular:

- (1) use of multiple ISBDs and use of multiple general material designations (GMDs),
- (2) the order in which elements for multiple formats should be treated, and
- (3) the number of bibliographic records to be created for multiple versions.

The Review Group discussed these issues at its 2003 meeting in Berlin and reached the conclusion that the ISBDs should urge national bibliographic agencies and libraries participating in networks to create separate bibliographic descriptions for works issued in multiple formats. This practice would facilitate record exchange, one of the basic purposes of the ISBDs. Other libraries may select a single-record approach if they wish.

The MDSG was charged to develop an outline of problems and issues, taking into account relevant recommendations from IME ICC 2003 Working Group 5, which studied closely related issues and rendered useful recommendations. The Material Designations Study Group began discussions on two issues that it had identified for further work:

- placement of the general material designation (GMD)
- identification, clarification, and definition of content and nomenclature of the GMD, area 3, area 5, and area 7

Soon, it became clear that the Study Group's work on terminology and nomenclature would need to parallel and complement the work of the Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBDs, also set up in 2003, as the latter group prepared, first, the harmonized text, and, subsequently, the consolidated ISBD. The MD Study Group decided that, as individual

areas of the harmonized text are completed, it would examine and evaluate terminology used currently in the authorized ISBDs and make recommendations for the content and terminology to be used in the GMD, and areas 3, 5, and 7 as appropriate in the proposed consolidated ISBD.

The MD Study Group then turned its attention to problems associated with where to place or locate the general material designation within the bibliographic record. The Group agreed on the importance and primacy of the GMD as an “early warning device” for catalogue users, and after considering various options the Study Group put forward the following statement, which was approved by the Review Group at its August 18th, 2005 meeting in Oslo: “Recognizing the ongoing difficulties with the current optionality, terminology, and location/placement of the general material designation (GMD) ... the Material Designations Study Group proposes the creation of a separate, unique, high level component (not a numbered ISBD area) – a ‘content/carrier’ or ‘content/medium’ designation that would be mandatory – i.e., not optional as with the current GMD -- for recording in bibliographic records.

“The Material Designations Study Group emphasizes that this component is independent of system displays – that is, different systems can display the recorded content of the ‘content/carrier’ or ‘content/medium’ designation as each system vendor or client institution determines appropriate.”

The creation of a unique component, along with specification of its content, would help to focus the content of area 3 (i.e., truly unique/exceptional material), area 5, and, to some extent, area 7. Thus, terminology within each element would be more precise and distinct, addressing current problems with information overlap across related areas. Having determined a unique place for designating content/carrier, or content/medium, the Study Group could now focus on what information must be embedded within that component (GMD), as well as within areas 3, 5, and 7. The Material Designations Study Group planned to work closely with the Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBD, and also to have a liaison relationship with the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Tom Delsey, editor of Resource Description and Access (RDA) would be consulted as appropriate during the process.

The Series Study Group revealed that there were inconsistencies between the ISBDs, and one main task of the Review Group from its beginnings was to keep provisions harmonized and increase consistency. As has been said, the process of revision in order to maintain the currency of the ISBDs was slower than would be required given the evolution of types of publications, new investigations and rule changes. The Review Group then decided that it should consider the possibility of combining the ISBDs into a single document.

Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBDs

There have been seven specialized ISBDs, plus the General ISBD. These ISBDs have been revised and published at various times, with no method for incorporating changes made in newer texts that affect all the ISBDs into the older texts. For example, when it was decided to incorporate decisions on which data elements should remain mandatory in the ISBDs

based on those required in the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, these changes were incorporated into the ISBD(M) and the ISBD(CR) that were issued in 2002, and ISBD(G) in 2004 although they applied to all of the ISBDs.

In addition to this situation, publications that show characteristics of more than one format required the application of specifications from more than one ISBD. Because the ISBDs themselves had some inconsistencies, this brought major difficulties that caused the Review Group to decide in 2003 at the Berlin Conference to set up a Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBDs. This Study Group, chaired by Dorothy McGarry, decided that consolidation of the ISBDs was feasible. The Study Group was then charged by the Review Group with the task of preparing a definitive text. All the ongoing revisions of ISBDs were postponed except ISBD(A) as the SG considered it difficult to work on this consolidation at the same time as the review process for a specialized ISBD.

Its work has been guided by the following Objectives and Principles.

Objectives:

- To prepare a consolidated, updated ISBD from the specialized ISBDs in order to meet the needs of cataloguers and users of bibliographic information.
- To provide consistent stipulations for the description of all types of resources to the extent that uniformity is possible, and specific stipulations for specific types of resources as required to describe those resources.

Principles:

- The primary purpose of the ISBD is to provide the stipulations for compatible descriptive cataloguing worldwide in order to aid the international exchange of bibliographic records throughout the international library and information community (e.g. including producers and publishers).
- Different levels of cataloguing will be accommodated, including those needed by national bibliographic agencies, national bibliographies, universities and other research collections.
- The descriptive elements needed to identify and select a resource are to be specified.
- The set of elements of information rather than their display or use in a specific automated system will provide the focus.
- Cost effective practices must be considered in developing the stipulations.

The work plan and time-line for the consolidated ISBD were as follows:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek prepared a first merger of the text of each area from the ISBDs, identifying the ISBD from which the text came by assigning individual colours. Working from that basis, the SG members reorganized the matrices to collocate elements within the areas from all of the ISBDs, placing the texts next to each other to determine where the stipulations were the same and where they differed.

The work received ICABS support for a first merger of the text of the seven ISBDs and two meetings in Frankfurt. Project money was also granted by the IFLA Professional Committee.

Primary problems and suggestions were highlighted for the ISBD Review Group to consider. This phase was completed by the end of 2005. This process and resulting tables were prepared four times, before getting a consolidated draft text.

Next, the Study Group worked on the stipulations, taking into consideration responses from Review Group members, in order to have a text ready for a meeting in April 2006 at the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. As a result of this meeting there was a text ready for world-wide review from late June until September 2006. The Study Group revised the text as a result of the comments received in the world-wide review. It met for four days toward the end of 2006 at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris, considering the comments, incorporating those that it accepted, and setting some aside for future consideration. Suggestions that would result in large changes were, for the most part, put aside for consideration for the first update. The texts of the post Standing Committee vote of the ISBD(ER) and the post world-wide review ISBD(CM) and ISBD(A) were used for updating the texts from the published ISBDs. The revised text was sent by the Study Group to the entire ISBD Review Group for consideration and comments on January 16, 2007, for responses by February 15. The text was approved by the RG. Following consideration of comments received, a “final” version was sent to the Cataloguing Section’s Standing Committee, which voted for acceptance before the end of March. The Standing Committee had decided at the 2006 Seoul conference that the consolidated ISBD would replace the specialized ISBDs.

From the beginning of the project, agreement was reached on the general outline to be followed for each area. In addition, it was decided to recommend that:

- the structure should be changed to a new structure of areas where general stipulations that apply to all types of resources are given first, followed by exceptions or additional stipulations that are needed for specific types of resources.
- present stipulations should fit into the new structure; therefore the order of stipulations has also been modified to make the text more logical and consistent.
- some changes should be made to generalize wording and to match wording as much as possible, also taking into account the stipulations that were considered mandatory, conditional, or optional in the already-revised ISBDs.
- the GMD should be moved from after the title proper to another location; (note: the content and location of the GMD are expected to be changed following recommendations still to be received from the Material Designations Study Group, so these were left as they had been previously).
- further changes to stipulations can be made at a later stage.

Considering the fourth principle of the Study Group that focus would be on the set of elements of information rather than their display, and looking for interoperability with other systems and display formats, the punctuation has been slightly changed. The Study Group recognizes the importance that ISBD punctuation has had in the past and continues to have in the context of different languages and scripts. However, the Study Group, conscious of other metadata systems and the need for searching and interoperability with other schemas and display formats decided to modify the punctuation slightly. Punctuation may now be repeated where an area ends with a full stop and the following area begins with a full

stop. Also, if different elements in the same area are supplied, each is enclosed in its own set of square brackets.

Definitions are very important, so that we all mean the same thing when we use a particular term. Therefore, definitions have been brought together in a Glossary.

Some major changes include:

- Area 3 will be limited to mathematical data for cartographic resources, to music format information, and to numbering for serials. Area 3 has been omitted for types of electronic resources.
- In area 6, the ISSN has been made mandatory if available for all resources.
- It was decided that the examples generally should exemplify only the stipulation being considered. Full examples will be published separately in a supplement, rather than being included in the ISBD itself.

During the world-wide review, several hundred individual comments were received from two international organizations (International Association of Music Libraries and IFLA IME ICC 4, WG4), 14 other organizations or institutions and 11 individuals from 15 countries (Australia, Canada, China, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden, USA, UK). In some cases the comments disagreed with each other, e.g. some liked repeating the full stop as mentioned above and some did not. Some preferred alternative definitions to those that were in the draft.

The Group decided to accept the suggestions when there was consensus on the issues.

Other comments considered included:

- Use of the term “nonbook” was deleted, following some suggestions, because cartographic materials, notated music, electronic resources, etc., are also “nonbook” and so the term is misleading.
- There was a suggestion to use “integrating resources” where we used “updating looseleaves”, but the SG decided to keep the specific term.
- Some wanted no use of abbreviations, and others wanted to continue the use. The SG had to decide where to continue to allow abbreviations in this version.
- The SG had changed the name of area 4 to “Publication, production, distribution, etc., area”. A suggestion was made to go back to “Publication, distribution, etc., area”, but most of the SG preferred the new name, especially in terms of cataloguing various types of resources.
- Some suggestions were made to do away with “s.l.” and “s.n.” and use English terms in the English ISBD, but the SG thought that “s.l.” and “s.n.” would be more in keeping with ISBD’s internationalism.
- A number of comments were received not considered relevant to the ISBD.
- One group asked not to put “et al.” after ellipses, but just to use the ellipses. The SG thought the implication of the two methods was different, and decided that “et al.” should continue to be used.
- There was some concern that punctuation for the alternative title is not specified, but with different cataloguing agencies using different practices, the SG could not choose one method above others.

- There were some comments suggesting changing the choice of title proper for continuing resources to the acronym or initialism rather than the full form if the acronym or initialism comes first on the prescribed source of information, as in other types of resources. The SG decided this practice could not be changed without discussions with the ISSN Network and the AACR community, because it was set up in discussions with them during the work on the ISBD(CR).
- Some suggestions were made to put back an area 3 for electronic resources other than cartographic resources, notated music, and numbering for serials. The SG had discussed this at great length previously, and had decided this was not useful. Information wanted that had previously been in area 3 could be put into notes.
- Also there was a suggestion to delete area 3 for notated music, but this suggestion would have to be discussed with the music community..
- Suggestions were made to include or exclude “cover” from the “preliminaries”. The majority of the SG preferred not to include it there because of usage in their countries.
- Suggestions were made that more harmonization of the extent element in area 5 would be needed.. But on the other hand, the Cartographic and Notated music communities were consulted and they preferred to continue with the same practices.

Some examples of suggestions put off for future consideration by the Review Group include:

- Is it possible to reconcile sources of information further for the different types of resources?
- Should the ISBD be extended to cover unpublished resources?
- Update further the stipulations for audiovisual resources, sound recordings, videorecordings, and still and moving images.
- It is necessary to relook at the stipulations covering what constitutes a major change for a serial; this was stressed as an outcome from the IME ICC 4.
- Should numbering of a main series be placed in area 6 along with the title and numbering of a subseries, rather than putting the numbering of the main series in area 7?
- Why is it necessary that all issues be in the same series to use area 6?
- What other definitions are needed in the Glossary, and which definitions may need revision?
- Unicode should be looked at for non alphabetic or numeric characters. For example, the use of the copyright symbol for “cop.” should be looked at.
- Location of the names of members of a group, performers, etc., for music should be considered in terms of placement in the statement of responsibility or in a note.
- Further consideration of when an electronic resource is or is not a new edition is needed.
- Some suggestions objected to giving the full address of a place of publication in area 4, rather than in a note if it is wanted.
- Some suggestions were made about adding further stipulations in area 5 about description for remote-access electronic resources.

- Further work must be done in upgrading the stipulations for ISBD(NBM) and ISBD(PM), which had not been revised recently.
- Some suggestions were made that “usual dimensions” should not be used, and that dimensions should not be excluded for any resources (e.g. “usual dimensions” for microfiche, for tape cassettes, etc.)
- The order of notes should be re-considered, and compared to the order in FRBR.

Most of the comments related to the General material designation and the Specific material designation are expected to be addressed when the final report of the Material Designations Study Group is available.

The Review Group does not expect this text to solve all the problems that are present in today’s cataloguing processes. However it is intended to serve as a definitive text for description of all types of published resources and to make easier the cataloguing of resources that share characteristics of more than one format. It will also facilitate and speed up the work of keeping the ISBD updated and consistent in the future.

At the Seoul meeting the Review Group decided to recommend both an electronically remote access publication on the Cataloguing Section’s IFLANET site and a printed publication in loose-leaf format as a consequence of changing the review process to make changes faster in the future. This was decided on in order to avoid the economic reasons that lead some libraries to continue using previous versions instead of the latest one. The loose-leaf format is excellent for accommodating regular, periodic updating, and is a more economical option for active cataloguing agencies. In addition, it will make it easier to keep translations updated.

For the future:

Today’s publication patterns are changing, largely as a result of the electronic environment in which we increasingly function. As interest in metadata to promote control and access to electronic resources increases, the ISBDs will enjoy new opportunities to influence content and use of other metadata schemas, because most of them will define data elements already familiar to the ISBDs. On the other hand, not only are there new bibliographic situations to consider, but also not every bibliographic practice already in place continues to be as useful now as it was formerly. Therefore, it is necessary for IFLA to continue to keep the consolidated ISBD abreast of current requirements and to pursue doing so in cooperation with national bibliographic agencies and national and multi-national cataloguing committees.

The revision process will be continued:

1. Changes in the ISBD will be made following the results coming from Material Designations Study Group;
2. Stipulations will be reviewed further for those resources where old ISBDs have not been revised recently, that is ISBD(PM) and ISBD(NBM);
3. Suggestions remaining from the world-wide review comments will be considered further;
4. Suggestions from IME ICCs will be considered further.

In addition, the Review Group considered that examples are very important to understand and apply the ISBD. The Review Group set up a Study Group to prepare a publication that can be issued later, as a supplement to the ISBD. This group is chaired by William Garrison and Jaesun Lee.

We anticipate that the first update to the ISBD will be issued in two years.

Further developments regarding the ISBD will be announced on the ISBD Review Group's Web page at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/isbd-rg.htm>.

Acknowledgement of working group members preparing revisions of specialized ISBDs that were not published post-revision:

Members of the ISBD(A) Study Group (for 2006 revision)

Gunilla Jonsson (Chair), National Library of Sweden
Gerd-Josef Bötte, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
Elisabeth Coulouma, Agence bibliographique de l'enseignement supérieur (ABES), France
Mauro Guerrini, Università di Firenze, Italy
Sirkka Havu, National Library of Finland
Dorothy McGarry, University of California, Los Angeles, USA (Retired)
Simon May, British Library
Elizabeth Robinson, Library of Congress, USA
Maria Enrica Vadalà, Biblioteca Umanistica, Università degli studi di Firenze
Ruth Weiss, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
Mirna Willer, National and University Library, Croatia

Members of ISBD(CM) Working Group (as of June 2004):

Göran Bäärnhelm (Chair), The Royal Library—National Library of Sweden
Theo Bauer, Bavarian State Library, München, Germany
Francis Herbert, Royal Geographical Society, London, UK
Mary Larsgaard, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA
Olivier Loiseaux, Bibliothèque nationale de France
Elizabeth Mangan, Library of Congress, USA (Retired)
Dorothy McGarry, University of California, Los Angeles, USA (Retired)
Mira Miletic Drder, National and University Library, Croatia
Velma Parker, Library and Archives Canada

Members of the ISBD Review Group (as of February 2004) who worked on the ISBD(ER):

Françoise Bourdon, Bibliothèque nationale de France
John D. Byrum, Jr. (Chair), Library of Congress, USA

Elena Escolano Rodríguez, Biblioteca Nacional, Spain
William Garrison, Syracuse University, USA
Renate Gömpel, Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Germany
Mauro Guerrini , Università di Firenze, Italy
Ton Heijligers (Corresponding member), Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Lynne C. Howarth, University of Toronto, Canada
Philippe-Corentin Le Pape, SICD des universités de Toulouse, France
Cristina Magliano, ICCU-Rome, Italy
Dorothy McGarry, University of California, Los Angeles, USA (Retired)
Eeva Murtomaa, Helsinki University Library, Finland
Glenn Patton, OCLC Online Computer Library Center, USA

The consolidated ISBD was prepared for approval by the ISBD Review Group by Members of the Study Group on Future Directions of the ISBDs (as of November 2006):

Françoise Bourdon	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Elena Escolano Rodríguez	Biblioteca Nacional, Spain
Renate Gömpel	Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Germany
Lynne C. Howarth	University of Toronto, Canada
Agnès Manneheut (from August 2005)	Agence bibliographique de l'Enseignement supérieur, France
Dorothy McGarry (Chair)	University of California, Los Angeles, USA (Retired)
Eeva Murtomaa	National Library of Finland
Mirna Willer	National and University Library, Zagreb, Croatia
John Hostage (Consultant, from August 2006)	Harvard University

¹ http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/afs/imeicc_index.htm

http://www.d-nb.de/news/pdf/code_comp_2003_europe_2.pdf and

http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/source/code-comparisons_final-summary.pdf

2Tillet, B. IME ICC: Report of the 1st Meeting, Frankfurt, Germany, July 28-30, 2003: . Regarding the ISBD, it was acknowledged as a great achievement of international standardization for descriptive cataloguing that requires the transcription of identifying information from the item at hand to create the standardized areas of description and ISBD goes on to state the basic elements to include in such descriptions, the order of those elements,

and the prescribed punctuation, so the resulting records are understandable worldwide, regardless of language or script.

Available at http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/ime_icc_report_berlin.pdf

3 AACR2; Regeln für die alphabetische Katalogisierung - RAK (Austria, Germany); Rakovodstvo za azbučni katalogi na knigi (Bulgaria); Pravilnik i priručnik za izradbu abecednih kataloga - PPIAK (Croatia); Anglo-americká katalogizační pravidla (Czech republic); Katalogiseringsregler og bibliografisk standard for danske biblioteker (Denmark); Suomalaiset luettelointisäännöt (Finland); AFNOR Cataloguing Rules (France), List of AFNOR Cataloguing Rules; Magyar Szabvány 3423, 3440, 3424 and Konyvtári Szabályzat (Hungary); Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori - RICA (Italy); Kompiuterinių bibliografinių ir autoritetinių įrašų sudarymo metodika (Lithuania); Pravilnik i priručnik za izradu abecednih kataloga - PPIAK (Macedonia); Regels voor de titelbeschrijving (Netherlands); Russian Cataloguing Rules (Russia); Pravilnik i priručnik za izradu abecednih kataloga - PPIAK (Slovenia); Reglas de catalogación (Spain);

Katalogiseringsregler för svenska bibliotek (Sweden); AACR2 compliant cataloguing code (Vatican Library)

4 Results of rule comparisons, ISBD paper http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/code_comp_2003_europe_2.pdf

5 Tillet, B. Report of IME ICC2 Meeting, August 17-18, 2004 Buenos Aires, Argentina http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/source/IMEICC2-report_IFLA-BA_2004.pdf

6 Tillet, B.B. Report on the IME ICC3 Meeting, Dec 12-14, 2005 Cairo, Egypt. http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/pdf/Report-IMEICC3_brief.pdf

7 Jaesun Lee. Report on the IME ICC4 Meeting, August 16-18, 2006 Seoul, Korea http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/paper/report_1.pdf

8 Ben Gu, Chinese Cataloguing Rules and International Cataloguing Principles: a report of similarities and differences: Specific reports on China cataloguing codes said it “was based mainly on ISBDs and AACR2, with the consideration of Chinese characteristics and without the consideration of the concept of main entry”

http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/paper/22_1.pdf

Haruki Nagata. Nippon (Japanese) Cataloguing Rules and International Cataloguing Principles: similarities and differences: Nippon (Japanese) Cataloguing Rules “is consistent with ISBD. When contradictory with the past NCR rules, an alternative article is supplied to conform to ISBD”

<http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/down/060919.pdf>

Soo Kim. The Present and Future of KCR.: “Korean Cataloging Rules, published in 1981 accepted the principles prescribed in the International Standard Bibliographic Description and adopted the cataloging method, which completes records only with description. ... KCR3, the fourth edition of “Korean Cataloging Rules (KCR4) was released in 2003, and basically employed the description system of KCR3 with an addition of diversity in bibliographic features of multiform media including publications but without specific prescriptions for the selection and form of headings.

<http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/paper/KCR-kim.pdf>

Others: Nepal and Sri Lanka reports recognize that AACR2 is used in almost all libraries. The report on Indonesian Cataloguing Rules did not address the issue. The Cambodia representative reported that given the situation of libraries in that country “Information covering adoption of descriptive standards is not readily available. Adherence to descriptive standards such as ACR2R is limited to a very small number of libraries and there are no locally developed descriptive standards, except possibly within individual libraries. Another factor that affects descriptive cataloguing in Cambodia is the lack of local publishing standards....”

<http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/down/060906.pdf> ; <http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/down/060811.pdf> ;

<http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/paper/Cataloguing%20in%20Cambodia.pdf>

9 For a more detailed introduction to the ISBDs, see: Byrum, John, “The birth and re-birth of the ISBDs: process and procedures for creating and revising the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions”, 66th IFLA Council and General Conference, Jerusalem, Israel, 2000. Available at <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla66/papers/118-164e.htm>

10 <http://www.ifla.org/VI/3/nd1/isbdlist.htm>

11 Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records - Final Report , available at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.htm>

12 Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records - Final Report: “The principal sources used in the analysis included the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBDs), the Guidelines for Authority and Reference Entries (GARE), the Guidelines for Subject Authority and Reference Entries (GSARE), and the UNIMARC Manual.”

“2.2 Scope: For the purposes of this study a bibliographic record is defined as the aggregate of data that are associated with entities described in library catalogues and national bibliographies. Included in that aggregate of data are descriptive data elements such as those defined in the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBDs);...”

13 Le Boeuf, Patrick. Brave new FRBR world. In: IFLA Cataloguing Principles: steps towards an International Cataloguing Code: report from the 1st IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code, Frankfurt, 2003. – München: K.G. Saur, 2004
Also available at http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/papers_leboeuf.pdf

14 The “Mapping” document is available on IFLA’s Web site:
<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/pubs/ISBD-FRBR-mappingFinal.pdf>