To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

Subject: **RDA – Draft for constituency review (December 2005) part I**

CCC has reviewed the RDA – Draft for constituency review (December 2005) part I and offers the following comments.

References have been made to some examples if they relate to clarification of the rules themselves. In those instances when examples are also affected, the comment is followed by *Also Examples Group*.

General comments
When optional guidelines provide an alternative to an instruction, CCC suggests using *alternatively* instead of *optionally*.

The Definitions were found to be very helpful, especially placed where they are most relevant. We note, however, some inconsistencies in the definitions. Some seem to indicate simply how the word or phrase is used in RDA (e.g. 4.3.0.1 scope of content, 4.10.0.1 related content); others provide a full definition of the word itself (e.g., 4.13.0.1 scale, 4.9.0.1 index, finding aid). The inconsistency proved distracting.

The distinction between *transcribe* and *record* was not always clear although this may be because of the former understanding of "transcribe" (e.g., 2.4.0.4 vs. 2.4.0.5, 2.4.0.6, 2.4.0.11).

Giving notes is identified by "make", whereas giving an access point is generally associated with "record". However, in some cases, an access point can be in the form of a note or vice versa (e.g., 2.3.4.3 and 2.3.8.3). As it appears to have some bearing on the use of terminal punctuation in the examples, is this distinction necessary when descriptive elements are used as access points? *Also Examples Group*

Without the appendix for abbreviations, it was sometimes difficult to identify where abbreviations would be or could be used. *Also Examples Group*

Chapter 1 General guidelines on resource description
1.0: This chapter states that it "provides general guidelines **on determining** the appropriate type of description to use [i.e., comprehensive, analytical or multilevel]". Since there are no guidelines for cataloguers to help them to determine which type of description is appropriate, we suggest rewording as follows:
> This chapter provides general guidelines <u>regarding</u> the appropriate type of description to use….

1.1.1: The term *archival resource* is used throughout the rules (e.g., 2.3.7.3, 2.9.5.3, 5.3.0.4, 6.3.1) and should be defined in a subsection of 1.1 as well as in the Glossary. The definition of *archival resource* should not leave any ambiguity as to whether a **collection** of two or more units

assembled by a collector, institution, etc., is or is not an archival resource. A definition inclusive of organic aggregations of records, papers, fonds, etc., and of collections is recommended.

1.1.1, bullet 3: Suggest that last example read: (e.g., three maps).

1.1.1, bullet 4: "as set" should read: "as <u>a</u> set".

1.1.3, bullet 2: Add as the second sentence the following as an ***Exception***:
> Consider resources that exhibit characteristics of serials but whose duration is limited (e.g., newsletters of events) as serials.

1.2.1, bullet 1, i): a "personal web page" is not a good example of a single part resource as it could be an integrating resource. Suggest that a single PDF document is a much clearer electronic example. If retained, note that "Web" site at both i and iii should be capitalized. Cf. 1.1.2, 2nd and 4th bullets.

1.2.1, bullet 1: Add: vi) an archival resource, or, alternatively, if archival resource is defined as recommended above, revise v) in terms of archival resource.

1.2.3, bullet 2, a): There are two ways of displaying multilevel descriptions, i.e., as separate descriptions or as hierarchical multilevel descriptions. D.1.4 addresses a hierarchical display but there is no display guidance for separate linked descriptions. CCC therefore suggests adding "linked" and a footnote as follows:
> *either* a) as separate <u>linked</u> descriptions[2]

> [2] For additional guidance, see *Describing Archives: a Content Standard* (DACS) and *Rules for Archival Description* (RAD).

1.3, heading: Since 1.3 is applicable to serials only, the heading should reflect this.

1.4, para 1: As there can be more than one person, etc., with principal responsibility in a single statement of responsibility, suggest the following (cf. 2.4.0.3):
> Statement of responsibility (persons, famil<u>ies</u>, or corporate bod<u>ies</u> with principal responsibility)[2]

Also suggest the addition of a see reference in the footnote:

> [2] If there is more than one statement of responsibility, include as a minimum a statement identifying the person<u>s</u>, famil<u>ies</u>, or corporate bod<u>ies</u> with principal responsibility for the intellectual or artistic content of the resource <u>(see 2.4.0.6)</u>.

Suggest that only footnote 3 be given, i.e., the parenthetical statement at Publisher, distributor, etc., is unnecessary.

CCC notes that information on coordinates of cartographic content is an optional addition in AACR2. Should coordinates of cartographic content be considered mandatory now?

1.4, para 2, option: CCC does not support the option to provide a controlled access point in lieu of the mandatory statement of responsibility and suggests its removal. Although it may save key

strokes, it could have negative implications for the identification of the resource and authority control.

1.5, bullet 4, *Exception*: Suggest deleting "title or"; instruction to read:
> Record a quotation incorporated into notes in the language and script in which it appears on the source from which it is taken.

1.6: Suggest that more specific instruction be given to indicate that transcription covers punctuation as it appears. There should also be a reference to appendix D on giving additional punctuation not present on the source for greater clarity in presentation, or, substituting punctuation present on the source if there is conflict with prescribed punctuation for display (e.g., ISBD punctuation). See also comment at Appendix D.

1.6.2.1, bullet 2: The option at 1.6.2 for early printed resources applies only to the edition statement, a statement relating to a named revision of an edition, or date of publication, distribution, etc. There should also be an option for early printed books not to follow the instruction to change Roman numerals to lower case for paging and page references. Cf. AACR2 C.1A

1.6.2.5, bullet 1: Using both "transcribing" and "record" in the instructions might be an issue in cases such as, 2d versus 2nd. Suggest following AACR2 (C.8A):
> In the case of English-language sources, record ordinal numerals in the form *1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th,* etc.

1.6.2.5, bullet 2: same comment as at 1.6.2.5, bullet 1; additionally, add to the French example: 2^d (for *second*) and 2de (for *seconde*).

1.6.2.5, bullet 3: same comment as at 1.6.2.5, bullet 1.

1.6.3: CCC would like accents and other diacritical marks to be added in all cases, with the exception of early printed resources . Suggest that the wording of AACR2 1.0G1 (with the minor change) be followed with the exception noted:
> Add accents and other diacritical marks that are not present in the data found <u>on</u> the source of information in accordance with the usage of the language used in the context.

> *Exception:*
> For early printed resources, do not add accents and other diacritical marks not present on the source.

1.6.6: CCC notes that there are examples where it would be difficult to apply this instruction and suggests that an option be added to repeat a letter or word:
> *Optionally*, if a letter or word appears only once but the design of the source of information makes it clear that it is intended to be read more than once, repeat the letter or word without the use of square brackets.

1.6.8: The AACR2 practice of correcting inaccuracies in square brackets is preferred since: a) it conveys more succinctly and more helpfully the desired information; notes are often not included in brief displays or disregarded by users, and b) cataloguer's typos are more easily distinguished from dutifully transcribed errors.

Chapter 2 Identification of the resource

2.1.1, Contents: Add: 2.1.1.1   Resource issued as a single unit; renumber existing 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.2, and 2.1.1.3 to 2.1.1.2, 2.1.1.3, and 2.1.1.4 respectively.

2.1.1: Create a new section and reword the first bullet at 2.1.1 as follows:

    2.1.1.1. Resource issued as a single unit

- Choose as the basis for the identification of the resource a source of information identifying the resource as a whole.

The existing 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.2, and 2.1.1.3 should be renumbered to 2.1.1.2, 2.1.1.3, and 2.1.1.4 respectively.

2.1.1, last bullet: Renumber 2.1.1.3 as 2.1.1.<u>4.</u>

2.1.1.1, first bullet, ii and iv: Suggest the following rewording:

ii) a source of information identifying the earliest issue or part (i.e., the issue or part with the earliest date of publication, distribution, etc.), if the issues or parts are unnumbered or <u>were not issued in the order of their sequential numbers</u>

iv) a source of information identifying the earliest issue or part available, if the issues or parts are unnumbered or <u>were not issued in the order of their sequential numbers</u> and the earliest issue or part is not available.

2.1.1.1, last bullet: For consistency, suggest that "the basis for the identification of the resource" be used in place of "basis of the description".

2.1.2b, para 2: Renumber 2.1.1.3 to 2.1.1.<u>4</u>.

2.2.1, footnote 1: Suggest removing the exclusions noted in the footnote so that they are considered part of the resource itself. This would serve to simplify the decision of the cataloguer with regard to when any housing is an integral part of the resource (i.e., kits) and reduce the need for square brackets. The footnote can stand with the removal of "but excludes," or for greater clarity be reworded as follows:

The resource itself includes the storage medium (e.g., paper, tape, or film), any housing (e.g., a cassette or cartridge) that is an integral part of the resource, any accompanying material and any container that is separable from the storage medium and/or housing (e.g., case or box).

This change would also require a revision to 2.2.3, i.e., the removal of a) and b).

2.2.1.1, bullet 2: Suggest deleting "or an image…of preference indicated)" and rewording as follows:

a) a cover (or cover image)
b) a caption (or caption image)
c) a masthead (or masthead image)
d) a colophon (or colophon image).

2.2.1.1, bullet 3: The meaning of "formally presented sources" is ambiguous. A source cannot be formally presented; only the information can be formally presented. Suggest rewording as:

"giving preference to a source where the information is formally presented". Additionally, CCC suggests that a definition be given for "formally presented". The following is based on the definition found in the CONSER manual:

> Formally presented —i.e., appearing in isolation, as opposed to appearing embedded in text, and in a prominent location.

2.2.1.2: CCC feels that provisions for "Resources comprising a set of graphic images" are unnecessary and should be removed.

CCC suggests that "Resources comprising sound" would be useful with provisions for using a) information permanently printed on or a label affixed to the resource or, b) an electronic "label" in textual form or, c) accompanying material or container if it furnishes a collective title and other sources do not.

2.2.1.2, bullet 1: If retained as is, add a comma after the first occurrence of "etc."

2.2.1.2, bullet 2: If retained, add a comma after the closing parenthesis.

2.1.1.3, option: Suggest the following rewording:

> *Optionally*, use <u>eye-readable information</u> permanently printed on or <u>a label</u> affixed to the resource in preference to the title frame(s) or title screen(s).

2.2.1.4: With the addition of Resources comprising sound, suggest the following:

> **2.2.1.4. Other resources**
> - For a resource other than one covered under 2.2.1.1—2.2.1.3, use as the preferred source of information, the resource itself, giving preference to a source where the information is formally presented.

2.2.1.4, last bullet: Suggest that the first example read: (e.g., a title panel on <u>a folded map</u>…)

2.2.4, *exception*: In the parenthetical statement, suggest giving "assembled collection" or "archival resource" as an example rather than "collection".

2.3: There is no definition for an alternative title. Additionally, there are no instructions regarding the use of "or" (or its equivalent) (cf. AACR2, 1.1B1, para 3) although there are examples at 2.3.0.3 (Under the hill, or, The story of Venus and Tannhäuser) and 2.3.1.7 (Marcel Marceau, ou, L'art du mime) illustrating this.

2.3.0.1: Suggest that the section regarding devised title immediately follow 2.3.1 instead of being addressed at 2.3.7.

2.3.0.3: See comments at 2.3.

2.3.0.5: This instruction is an exception to the general transcription instruction. Suggest that it be reflected as such at 2.3.0.3.

2.3.0.7, bullet 2: Use of the terms "enumeration or designation" when referring to title of the part, section, or supplement may cause some confusion in transcription. It should be made clear that in such instances the title proper includes these "designations" and should, therefore, be

transcribed as per 1.6.2, bullet 1 and not the guidelines in 1.6.2.1-1.6.2.5 for "numeric and/or alphabetic designation, etc.", i.e., Series **II,** Reactors vs. Series **2**, Reactors.

2.3.0.7, bullet 3: The term "monographic series" is being introduced here; could this term be given at 1.1.3 as part of the "e.g."?

2.3.1.7a, para 2: Add a comma after the second occurrence of "etc."

2.3.1.12: Given that this rule applies only to serials, suggest that "serials" appear in the heading as follows: Major and minor changes in the title proper of serials.

2.3.1.12 b) minor changes, v: Is this condition at "v" only applicable in the context of an ISBD presentation? See comments at 2.3.2.2.

2.3.2.2: In Canada, publications are often issued in the two official languages either as separate English and French publications or as bilingual publications. When issued bilingually, publications are either issued with a bilingual title page and with English and French in parallel columns or they are issued with separate title pages and with the languages inverted (tête-bêche). Following AACR2, the other language title is not considered a parallel title since it does not occur on the same source as the title proper. This is no longer the case with RDA - a parallel title can be taken from any source. For a labeled display, there is no problem; however, for an ISBD presentation, it would be misleading to display (and could cause difficulty in identification) to treat a title appearing on an added title page (or cover, etc.) as a parallel title. For this reason, CCC recommends that the source of information for a parallel title be the same source as the title proper.

2.3.3.2: Given that other title information may appear in conjunction with titles other than a title proper (e.g., parallel title, series title), suggest that this be reflected in the instruction.

2.3.3.3, first bullet: CCC suggests that cataloguers should not have to make judgements in considering what is important in all cases. This should only be limited to serials and integrating resources. The following rewording (cf. format at 2.3.1.4) is suggested:

> Record other title information appearing on the same source of information as the title proper following the basic instructions on recording titles (see 2.3.0).

> *Exceptions:*
> **a) Serials**
> Record other title information appearing on the same source of information as the title proper only if considered to be important (either for identification or for access).

> **b) Integrating resources**
> Record other title information appearing on the same source of information as the title proper only if considered to be important (either for identification or for access).

2.3.3.3, final bullet: These instructions should not apply to monographs. Suggest that these instructions be treated as *Exceptions* for Serials and Integrating resources.

2.3.3.4, first bullet: Suggest adding the following as in AACR2 1.1E6 (the wording is similar to RDA, 1.5, bullet 2):

…supply a brief addition as other title information, <u>in the same language and script as the title proper</u>.

2.3.3.4, bullet 2, a): Suggest rewording as follows:
> If the title proper of the resource does not include an indication of the geographic area covered <u>and/or subject portrayed</u>, and,
> > a) the other title information does not include such an indication
> > *or* b) there is no other title information
>
> add a word or brief phrase indicating the area covered<u>, and, if applicable, the subject portrayed,</u> as other title information.

2.3.3.6c: The see references to 2.3.5.6<u>c</u> in the second and third paragraphs should all be corrected to 2.3.5.6<u>b</u>.

2.3.7.3, first bullet: Suggest adding a see reference to 2.3.1.10 to relate recording a devised title as the title proper which also justifies the see reference to 2.2.4 at 2.3.7.3, bullet 3:
> If the resource itself bears no title <u>(see 2.3.1.10)</u>, and a title cannot be found in any of the other sources of information specified in 2.2.3, devise….

2.3.7.3, bullet 2: Suggest moving these instructions to be a subsection of 2.3.7.4. This would clarify that these instructions are additional to the specifications given in bullet 1 of 2.3.7.3.

2.3.7.3, penultimate bullet: Delete the see reference to 2.2.4 at the end of the sentence as it provides no additional guidance.

2.3.7.4b: Suggest rewording as follows:
> Always include in the devised title the name of the area covered<u>, and, if applicable, the subject portrayed.</u>

2.3.8.3: An exception should be provided for recording the source of a devised title of an archival resource, particularly if that resource is described comprehensively, e.g., a fonds or collection. The 5th example, Title devised by cataloguer [archivist, etc.], will be repeated for the vast majority of archival resources described comprehensively.

Note that to be consistent with the change proposed at 2.2.1.2, the following rewording of b) is suggested:
> b) information permanently printed on or a label affixed to a resource comprising sound (see 2.2.1.2)

2.3.8.4, bullet 1: There can be *scattered* issues and parts but scattered iterations do not seem probable. Suggest "occasional" iterations.

2.3.8.4, bullet 2, option: The instruction "in lieu of making a note" implies that it is not possible to give both a note and an access point.

2.4.0.3, option: CCC does not support the option and suggests its removal. Although its application may save key strokes, it could have negative implications for the identification of the resource and authority control.

2.4.0.5: Reference is made to "mark of omission" (without …) at other instructions, e.g., 2.3.1.7b, 2.10.1.3, *Exception*. Should it be included with the appropriate "…"in chapter 1 as a generalized instruction? (Cf. AACR1 1.0C1)

2.4.3.1, first bullet: A note on a statement of responsibility should not be restricted to those playing subsidiary roles since it is possible that persons, families, and corporate bodies can play a major role and not be named in the resource.

2.5.1.5, first bullet: The rule reference should be to 2.11 (not 2.5.11).

2.5.1.5, bullet 2: The rule reference should be to 2.6 (not 2.5.6).

2.6.0, heading: Since Numbering is applicable to serials only, this should be reflected in the heading.

2.6.0: It is not clearly stated that numbering is to be given as numbering only "if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part" (cf. 12.3A1). This reference only appears at 2.6.1.3 and should appear at 2.6.0.3.

2.6.1: A reiteration of a reference to abbreviation at 1.6.7 is not necessary here?

2.7.0.3 and 2.8.0.3: Clarification of name of publisher and place of publication is not consistent with clarification of dates (e.g., fictitious, misleading dates at 2.9.0.3). Suggest that ability to supply in square brackets (instead of notes) be consistent for all these elements (i.e., place, name of publisher, distributor, etc., and dates). The CCC preference is not to make notes but to include this information in square brackets.

2.7.1.3 bullet 3: The publisher element is not appropriate for a resource in an unpublished form. The heading "no publisher identified" implies that a publisher must exist but just is not named. Suggest that the heading be changed to:
> **No publisher identified or no publisher**

2.8.0.4: There is no limit on the number of places of publication to be recorded. There should be provision not to transcribe all place names if it is not considered to be important to list them all.

2.8.0.6b: Add: If the changes have been numerous, a general statement may be made.

2.8.0.6c: Add: If the changes have been numerous, a general statement may be made.

2.8.1.3, first bullet: For consistency, instead of "identified", use "named" as at 2.9.0.2. Additionally, to illustrate that local jurisdiction, etc., can be included in the supplied place of publication, suggest the following rewording with appropriate examples. *Also Examples Group*:
> If the place of publication is not <u>named</u> in the resource, supply <u>in square brackets</u> the place of publication or probable place of publication, <u>including the larger jurisdiction if necessary for identification</u>, as follows (in order of preference):

2.8.1.3, bullet 3: The place of publication element is not appropriate for a resource in an unpublished form. The heading "place of publication not identified" implies that the place is just not named. Suggest that the heading be changed to:

Place of publication not identified in the resource or no place of publication

2.8.5.4 a), b), c): References should be to 2.8.0.6 a) b), c) instead of to 2.7.0.7 a), b), c) respectively.

2.8.5.4 b) & c): For consistency, add a comma after "etc." as at 2.8.5.4 a).

2.8.5.4 c), 1st sentence: "names of publishers, distributors, etc." should read "<u>places</u> of <u>publication</u>, <u>distribution</u>, etc.".

2.9.0.2, bullet 3: There should be consistency in the use of "named" vs. "identified" (cf. 2.9.1.3).

2.9.0.3: Rule 1.4F1 in AACR2 is very specific that it is the **year** that is to be given as the date. This should also be stated in RDA.

2.9.0.3 opt a: The option in this area differs from all other elements in that an explanation can be given in square brackets versus only in a note (cf. 2.7.0.3, 2.8.0.3). An actual date should be able to follow an incorrect date as well as a fictitious date:
> a) if the date as it appears in the resource is known to be fictitious or <u>incorrect</u>, follow it with the actual date

2.9.0.5, bullet 4: This instruction should be broadened to include all integrating resources and not be restricted only to "updating loose-leafs". Add "in square brackets".

2.9.0.5, bullet 6, opt: For consistency (cf. 2.9.0.3), add "in square brackets" as follows:
> *Optionally*, supply <u>in square brackets</u> the beginning and/or ending publication date in the…

2.9.1.3, bullet 2: These examples should be part of the text of the instructions and should not be considered as examples (cf. format of AACR2 1.4F7). The examples should illustrate the rules and not have the rules be implicit in the examples. Additionally, the listing should also cover the following situation:
> [between 1850 and 1900]
> (*Span of dates certain*)

Preference is also given to retaining [197-], etc., instead of [1970s], etc., since the RDA forms of uncertain dates are not language neutral.

2.9.1.3, final bullet: This instruction is also a case where the date of publication is not applicable. Suggest that the heading be changed to:
> **Date of publication not identified in the resource or no date of publication**

2.9.3.2: Add a second bullet:
> If both a phonogram date and a copyright date appear in the resource, record only the phonogram date.

2.9.5.3, final bullet: There is an inconsistent use of terminology between this rule ("undated") and 2.9.1.3 ("date unknown") in regard to the absence of date information for the resource. **Undated** means simply that there is no date on or in the resource. **Date unknown** means this *and*

that the cataloguer, etc., is unable to find or estimate a probable date or range of dates. For this reason, date unknown is preferred in both rules.

2.10.0.5: Since changes between parts can occur, provision has not been made for a change in series information for multipart monographs issued simultaneously.

2.10.3.3: Reference should be to 2.3.3 since 2.3.3.5 is also applicable.

2.10.5.3: Refers to 2.12.1.1 for recording incorrect series ISSNs, but shouldn't 2.12.1.3 actually apply?

2.10.6.7a: Retain within the instruction "multipart monograph" as in the rule heading, i.e., not "multipart resource".

2.11.0.3, bullet 2: For consistency, remove "Frequency varies" or "Frequency of updates varies" from the text of the instruction and have them appear only as examples. *Also Examples Group*

2.12.0.1, 1st bullet: Add "a", i.e., is "a" number or code….

2.12.0.4: Should read 2.12.0.<u>3</u>?

2.12.2.2, option: CCC notes that music numbers often include hyphens and proposes that a dash be used instead of a hyphen when recording consecutive numbers.

2.14.1a) and c): CCC notes that combining information in a single note is not done in practice. We are submitting this comment to see if other JSC constituents follow this instruction since it has been taken from AACR2. If not, we suggest that this provision be removed.

2.14.1c: Delete the last sentence since numbering is not applicable to multipart monographs (cf. 2.6.0.1 definition).

Chapter 4 Content description
4.1: Suggest that it be stated explicitly that information used for content description should first be taken from the resource itself, and then, if not clear, be taken from sources outside the resource (or any source). A similar provision is given at 3.1.1.

4.3 and 4.6: Archival standards do not differentiate between **nature and scope of the content** and **summarization of the content**. ISAD, RAD, and DACS all have in common a context-setting element of description called **Scope and content**. The last two examples under rule 4.6.0.3 (Summarizing the content) are good examples of a scope and content for an archival resource. The terminological differences are bound to be a source of confusion as applied to archival resources. Is there sufficient distinction to justify two separate elements?

4.4.0.3: Is the term "closed captioning" without mention of any specific language an example of a language difference? The "Closed-captioning in German" example does not make this obvious. (Cf. AACR2 7.7B2) *Also Examples Group*

4.8: Add a period after "8" in the heading.

4.9.0.1: The following definition of finding aid is preferred:

A finding aid is a descriptive tool providing access to a resource. The finding aid may have been received by the repository along with the resource or may have been created by the repository in the course of establishing administrative or intellectual control over the resource.

4.11: CCC does not object to transcribing statements about the musical layout of music, e.g., "vocal score" or "piano reduction", as format. However, it is inconsistent to transcribe format elsewhere when it includes a statement of responsibility. Format should be treated like edition information and always be transcribed in the same place. In order to do this, the instruction should be modified to allow transcribing statements of responsibility related to format and using abbreviations as for edition information.

4.10.1.5: There are two opening parentheses and only one closing one.

4.12.0.3, bullet 2: This works only for notated music; order is not specified in sound recordings.

4.13.0.2: 4.13.0.3, bullet 3 states that a scale can be found *outside the resource*, and bullet 4 states that a scale can be estimated. For consistency, there should be another bullet at 4.13.0.2 to allow for this (cf. 2.3.1.2, bullet 2):

If there is no scale provided within the resource itself, take the scale of cartographic content from outside the resource.

4.13.1: Why is punctuation given as part of the instruction here? If here, why not also at 4.7.0.3? **Cf. 5JSC/Sec/4 (Punctuation within elements)**

4.13.1a: Should the term "cataloguer" be retained?

4.13.2: The ACMLA rep feels strongly that the options at 3.3B4 in AACR2 should be included at 4.13.2:

Optionally:

a) If the description is of a cartographic item with two or more scales, and the projections and/or coordinates are also different for each main item, give each scale in a separate scale statement. If there is more than one title, give the scale statements in the same order in which the titles are given. If there is only a collective title, give the largest or larger scale first.

[*example not transcribed*]

b) If the description is of a cartographic item with two or more scales, and the projection and coordinates are the same for each main item, give the scales in one scale statement. If there is more than one title, give the scales in the same order in which the titles are given. If there is only a collective title, give the largest or larger scale first.

[*example not transcribed*]

4.15.0.2: Add another bullet:

If there is no coordinates provided within the resource itself, take the coordinates of cartographic content from outside the resource.

4.17.0.3, para 3: "record" the scale(s) vs. "make notes" on the scale (4.13.5)—terminal punctuation? *Also Examples Group*

4.18.0.3: Explicit instructions on using prescribed punctuation seem to be out of sync with the rest of the guidelines. Suggest that an option similar to the 2nd option at 1.6 and 1.7.1 be given:

> *Optionally*, if the information used in a note is derived from a digital source using an automated scanning, copying, or downloading process (e.g., by harvesting embedded metadata or automatically generating metadata), record the information as it appears on the source.

4.19.0.1: Add a comma after "etc."

Chapter 5 Information on terms of availability, etc.
No comments.

Chapter 6 Item-specific information
Chapter heading: Not all the instructions in this chapter address "item-specific" information, e.g., 6.4 and 6.5 are more general.

6.2.0, heading: Add a period after "0" in the heading.

6.3: The definition of provenance is not one which is accepted in archival standards; rather it defines the concept of "custodial history". We support renaming this section Custodial history and immediate source of acquisition.

6.3.0, heading: Add a period after "0" in the heading.

6.4.0, heading: Add a period after "0" in the heading.

6.5.0, heading: Add a period after "0" in the heading.

6.6.0, heading: Add a period after "0" in the heading.

Appendix D
As part of the instructions on presentation of data, there should be an option to add punctuation if it clarifies the description of the resource (e.g., the addition of commas to a list of names or titles presented vertically on the source), or to substitute punctuation present on the source when it is in conflict with prescribed punctuation for data display (e.g., the replacement of a colon with a comma between the name of a person and his or her function).

D.1.2.0, first bullet: Suggest adding the following to the end of the sentence (cf. ISBD(G) 0.43):

> …unless the area begins a new paragraph, in which case the full stop, space, dash, space may be omitted or replaced by a full stop given at the end of the preceding area.

D.1.2.2: Suggest adding:

> Precede a subsequent statement relating to an edition by a comma.

Instructions on how to transcribe edition statements associated with different works in a resource lacking a collective title (AACR2 1.2B6) are lacking.

D.1.2.7: Add instruction from AACR2 1.7A3 about punctuation used when information in notes corresponds to that of the body of entry.