

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Nathalie Schulz, JSC Secretary
Subject: RDA Part I - Constituency Review of December 2005 Draft - Response Table

This table has been prepared to assist the JSC's discussion of the large number of comments received from the constituencies on the draft of RDA part I.

Methodology

- The first version of the table was prepared in June 2006.
- The JSC representatives briefly indicated in the table whether they agreed or disagreed with the comments made by the other constituencies (in blue font).
- There was then a period of review in which comments were assessed based on the other entries in the table (in red font).
- Each comment was then assigned a status:
 - A = Agree
 - AB = Agree, but an additional comment
 - D = Disagree
 - DI = Discussion requested
 - M = Minutes/Meeting
 - P = Proposal
 - W = Withdrawn
- The Editor then assessed the comments with "A" and "AB" status, to confirm that the draft could be revised based on those comments, without the need for further discussion (these comments have been shaded in grey).
- Comments which were withdrawn by the originator have also been shaded grey to indicate no further discussion is required.

At the October 2006 JSC meeting, the following line numbers were discussed, and these have been removed from this version of the table:

3, 4, and 224 (discussed with 5JSC/ALA/3 proposal)
443-611 (chapter 3)
687-697 (chapter 6 in general, 6.1, 6.2)
698-709 (6.3 Provenance will be reworked)
720-724 (6.6 Appraisal and accrual is not in scope for RDA)

The JSC members are asked to review their remaining comments and decide if any can be withdrawn, clarified, or modified. Wherever possible revised wording should be provided. The JSC representatives will consult with their communities as required in order to conduct this review.

The schedule for this work is as follows:

December 2006: Introduction to part I, chapter 1

January-March 2007: chapter 2

April 2007 meeting: chapters 4-6 (and any outstanding issues from chapters 1 and 2)

JSC members are asked to prefix the latest round of comments by the date they have been added.

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
INTRODUCTION TO PART I							
0.1.0 Purpose and scope							
1	Agree	1st para: prefer "tangible/intangible" Withdraw	Disagree (should be analogue / digital)	Agree	Agree	Disagree Moot: ALA withdrew	W
2	Agree	2nd para: lists may require adjustment dep on ch. 3	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
0.1.1 Relationship to other standards for resource description							
0.1.2 Functional objectives and principles of resource description							
5	Mention use of transcription to achieve objectives	agree	Agree	Disagree (Representation = Transcription) Go with majority	Agree. Include at 0.1.2.	Agree, as part of defining/explaining "transcribe" and "record" (Also ensure in the Representation principle)	AB
6	Agree to include Not considered necessary	Para a) specify "cataloguer user" in first sentence	Agree, I assume "catalogue user" is meant.	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree: need to clarify when "catalogue user" and when "user of rules"	AB
7	Agree	Standardize similar phrase used at 0.1.2a, 0.1.4, 0.1.6	Agree	Agree	Agree	See #6 (also #9)	AB
0.1.3 Terminology							
0.1.4 Structure of Part I							
8	Agree	2nd para: Standardize similar phrase used at 0.1.2a, 0.1.4, 0.1.6	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 7)	See #6 (also #9)	AB
9	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree, but don't feel strongly about it	Change wording on ch. 3, 4, 5 to remove "users make use of"	A
0.1.5 Presentation							
			Agree				

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
10	Agree change of caption needed.	Change caption to "Intended use" or merge into 0.1.4 Withdraw 2nd part of the comment	Agree change caption to "Intended use".	Discuss Prefer to leave as "Presentation" - dislike both proposed solutions	Agree basic point but dislike both of proposed solutions Reluctantly agree "intended use"	Agree: "intended use"; disagree: merge with 0.1.4 "Disagree" comment moot because ALA withdrew	DI
11	Agree. Prefer LC wording or "... the decisions to be made in ..."	2nd para: clarify "user" Line 12 (LC) ok instead	Agree as 6 supra.	Disagree Prefer LC wording	Prefer LC (x-ref 12) Confirm	See #6 (also #9)	W
12	Agree. See above.	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: Change wording to clarify "user"	A
13	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5th para: change "comb through" to "read"	A
0.1.6 Mandatory elements							
14	Agree	1st para: Standardize similar phrase used at 0.1.2a, 0.1.4, 0.1.6	Agree as 6 supra.	Agree	Agree (x-ref 7)	See #6 (also being rewritten per April discussion?)	AB
0.1.7 Options							
0.1.8 Language preferences							
15	Agree	Explicitly mention script preferences	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Disagree re scope for confusion but accept proposed change	Agree	A
16	Discuss. Currently all such data out of scope for RDA.	Discuss def of new data element "Language of the description"	Agree.	Disagree Out of scope for RDA	Agree	Is this MARC 040 \$b (language of catalogue)? Want to see proposal & justification for in RDA	DI
0.1.9 Examples							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
CHAPTER 1 - GENERAL GUIDELINES ON RESOURCE DESCRIPTION							
	1.0 Purpose and scope						
17	Agree	Agree	Agree	Replace "on determining" with "regarding"	Agree	Agree: it's an agency decision	A
	1.1 Terminology						
	1.1.1 Resource						
18	Agree. Prefer not to add 'object'	Reword to remove "center of focus"	Disagree	Agree with ALA rewording	Query "center of focus" Withdraw - covered by LC 19	Disagree; Prefer #19	W
19	Discuss. Resource not only used for works, but all FRBR levels. No need to introduce wording relating to types of content or carrier at this point. ACOC would like the wording of all these bullets to be simplified and clarified.	Discuss	Agree ("is the object?")	Disagree Agree with ACOC explanation	Agree - and covers CILIP point (x-ref 18)	1st bullet: reword	DI
20	Agree	3rd bullet: add "10,000 items" Withdraw - line 22 ok instead	Disagree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 22)	Prefer #22 Moot because ALA withdrew	W
21	Disagree. Three maps could be on a single sheet, therefore would not illustrate this concept.	agree	Disagree	3rd bullet: last example use "(e.g., three maps)" Withdraw	Disagree - prefer LC (x-ref 22) Confirm preference for LC 22	Prefer #22 Moot because CCC withdrew	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
22	Disagree. Current wording for 3rd bullet is about the number of units; 4th bullet about whether those units were issued together or later assembled.	agree	Agree	Disagree We do not see this as an overlap	Agree	3rd bullet: reword	D
23	Agree	4th bullet: remove "by a collector"	Disagree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree; see also #25	D
24	Agree	agree	Disagree	4th bullet: use "as a set"	Agree	Disagree; Prefer #25	D
25	Agree. Note: rewording of this bullet is not inconsistent with retaining original wording of 3rd bullet. Agree CILIP.	agree except see line 26 below	Agree	Agree	Agree, except "by a collector" (ALA, x-ref 23) and "after the fact" (ALA, x-ref 26)	4th bullet: reword	DI
26	Discuss. Rephrase to make distinctions between situations clearer. See comment 25	5th-4th bullet: remove "after the fact" Discuss if time allows	Agree if 4th bullet is meant	Disagree (assuming that this comment refers to 4th bullet) Agree with LC rewording on line 25	Agree	Agree	DI
27	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	6th bullet: reword	A
1.1.2 Mode of issuance							
28	Discuss - Mode of issuance.	discuss - Mode of issuance paper	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Discuss	Reword and combine with 1.1.3	P Mode
29	Discuss. Evaluate need for change in relation to later uses of these terms.	Use "issued or assembled"	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree	Defer until "issuance" discussion	P Mode
30	Discuss	1st bullet: Concerns re "logical unit"; expand to include sets of material issued in a single discrete container	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree	Defer until "issuance" discussion; agree "logical unit" is problematic term.	P Mode

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
31	Discuss	2nd bullet: include "issued as a set" or "together"; add "monographic series" as an e.g.	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree	Defer until "issuance" discussion; disagree: monographic series not simultaneously issued.	P Mode
32	Discuss	add guidelines for replacement volume sets [New proposal]	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree -but terminology could be an issue as "replacement volume set" is ?unknown in UK	JAK note: Defer LC comment until BT returns. (also related to "issuance" discussion)	P Mode
1.1.3 Intended termination							
33	Agree in principle	Reconceptualise as "Intent to continue" and reword	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree	Prefer #28	P Mode
34	Agree, but prefer shorter version offered by CCC at comment 36.	Add text from AACR2 12.0A1	Discuss	Mode of issuance	Agree	Prefer #28	P Mode
35	Agree	2nd bullet use of "series" confusing	Agree it may be confusing, although usage is probably closer to what most non-cataloguers understand by series, i.e. a sequence	Mode of issuance	Agree	Agree that use of term could be confusing here; but "series" is more than "monographic series" - also covers multipart monograph and integrating resource (i.e., any resource that can be analyzed)	P Mode
36	Agree	Discuss	Discuss	2nd bullet: add an exception	Prefer ALA (x-ref 34)	Prefer #28	P Mode
1.1.4 Comprehensive, analytical, and multilevel description							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
37	Agree. Agree with issue raised by ALA; disagree with proposed change per CCC's comment	1st bullet: change "e.g." statement ALA still believes clarification is needed. Suggest "e.g. a book, ..." as a better example	Disagree	Disagree- <i>teacher's manual</i> is one of the parts of the kit	Agree	"monograph" is a mode of issuance; does not mean "book" Agree to ALA's further comment	D
38	Discuss.	2nd bullet: use "component description" instead of "analytical description" ALA will consider offering new proposal to deal with library-specific terminology	Agree. I think component description describes the process more clearly than analytical.	Agree	Disagree - don't regard solution as any improvement Confirm	Disagree (don't think suggested term is any better)	DI
39	Agree	3rd bullet: clarify	Agree	Agree	Agree	Prefer #40 Agree	A
40	Discuss. Willing to go with majority.	agree	Agree	Agree	No idea - existing term OK for UK, but that's doubtless the influence of AACR2... Will go with majority	3rd bullet: change "multilevel description" to "hierarchical description"	A
1.2 Type of description							
1.2.1 Comprehensive description							
41	Discuss 1. Agree 2. Disagree per BL & LC	1st para: Cover "a resource with accompanying material" and " a resource updated by parts that remain discrete " Withdraw the 2nd part of the comment	1. Agree 2. Disagree - supplement would need a separate record I think.	Disagree 1. Agree BL & LC 2. Disagree - agree BL & LC separate records required	Agree	1st: agree; 2nd: separate description for parts?	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
42	Agree	agree - prefer pdf to Web	Agree	1st para, i): PDF doc would be a better example. If retained, capitalize "Web"	Agree	Agree; personal Web site is almost always an integrating resource	A
43	Agree. Prefer revise v)	agree - prefer to revise v)	Agree	add "vi) an archival resource" or revise v)	Agree - prefer to revise v)	Agree; also need a definition of "archival resource" (different from archival control)	AB
44	Agree	2nd para: Reword; add "c) in a note"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	1.2.2 Analytical description						
45	Discuss. As per comment 38.	Use "component description" instead of "analytical description"	Agree	Agree	Disagree - don't regard solution as any improvement (x-ref 38) Confirm	See #38 Per CILIP, suggested term not better	DI
46	Discuss. Agree add online example, but not all web pages are integrating resources.	1st para, iv): Include example for a Web page	Agree. I think 3 is the absolute maximum for parenthetical examples.	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree but question how many examples to put in an "e.g." statement	DI
47	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para, v): use "set of lithographs"	A
48	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Last para, b) only use of term "In" note	See #742 ("component part" and "host") Agree	A
49	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Last para: add new d)	A
	1.2.3 Multilevel description						
50	Agree - Discuss	Suggest discussion on using multilevel description to express hierarchical relationships	Agree to discussion	Disagree Agree to discuss - too significant not to discuss	Discuss Confirm	Request discussion (prefer not to change instruction now)	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
51	Discuss. Uncertain what the intended meaning of 'linked' is - just an access point, or is more implied? Agree CILIP that footnote implies this only applies to archival resources, but it can apply to any collection, series, etc.	agree	Agree	2nd para, a) add "linked" and a footnote	Agree basic point, but unhappy re footnote's implication that might apply only to archival description Confirm	Agree but see also #52	DI
52	Agree	2nd para: Deals with display	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Disagree - it's integral to the understanding of what a multilevel description is Confirm	2nd para: move to App. D	D
1.3 Changes requiring a new description							
53	Add more guidance; add ref to "Differences between, changes within"	agree that more guidance is needed - discuss exact wording	Discuss - Mode of Issuance	Mode of issuance	Agree basic point. Does ALA promise to maintain DBCW?	1st: see #55; 2nd: see #56	P Mode
54	Agree if retained as is, but prefer to expand	Discuss - need to add guidance for non-serials	Agree	Heading should reflect that only applicable to serials	Prefer ACOC (x-ref 53)	Prefer #55	P Mode
55	Agree, prefer to expand further	discuss	Discuss - Mode of Issuance	Mode of issuance	Prefer ACOC (x-ref 53)	Expand and reword	P Mode
56	Agree. See ACOC comment 53.	Discuss - reconsider what level of guidance is appropriate for RDA	Discuss - Mode of Issuance	Mode of issuance	Agree basic point. Does ALA promise to maintain DBCW? (x-ref 53)	Add fn for "Differences between, changes within"	P Mode
1.4 Mandatory elements of description							
1.5 Language and script of the description							
1.6 Transcription							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
57	2nd option - use labels or coding to indicate this has been followed	discuss	Discuss record matching issue.	Disagree - Out of scope for RDA Agree to discuss if this is out of scope	Agree - but how/where?	Question: how much about record matching should be in RDA and how? In include, in instructions, in an appendix, as separate document?	DI
58	Discuss/re-evaluate after other changes to these rules have been completed. Agree, re-assess after other changes	Add option for early printed resources to allow full transcription	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree but wait for revised 1.6.	AB
59	Discuss - Punctuation. Relates to comments 61, 727.	Discuss	Agree	Add instruction that transcription covers punctuation as it appears	Agree	Agree but wait for revised 1.6	DI
60	Agree	agree	Agree	Add ref to app. D	Agree	Wait for revised 1.6 Agree	A
61	Discuss - Punctuation. Relates to comment 59, 727.	disagree	Don't see this as a problem. Transcription should mean transcription irrespective of the element.	Agree	No equivalent to AACR2 1.1B1	Isn't this an ISBD Issue?	DI
1.6.1 Capitalization							
1.6.1.1 Capitalization of titles							
62	Agree	agree	Agree	Disagree-other title information is also a title, cf. 2.3.0.1, 4th bul.	Agree. Also affects 1.6.1.2 (same wording)	1st para: reword	D
63	No opinion	Para a): reword	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree	Agree	Wait for revised 1.6 and 5JSC/LC/5/rev discussion	P LC/5/ Rev
64	Agree	Paras b) & c): apply to more than titles	Pending discussion of 1.6	Agree	Agree. Also affects 1.6.1.2	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
1.6.1.2 Capitalization of other transcribed elements							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
65	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: include wording from 2nd para	A
	1.6.2 Numerals and numbers expressed as words						
66	Discuss - 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	Reformat	Pending discussion of 1.6	To be rewritten	Disagree	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
67	Discuss - 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	Disagree - now moot with decision to make edition a transcribed element?	Pending discussion of 1.6	To be rewritten	Add exception to always transcribe in a note long statements or transcribe the edition statement as it appears	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
68	Discuss - 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	Prefer LC option treatment in LC/5/rev	Pending discussion of 1.6	To be rewritten	Add date in arabic numbers when roman numerals transcribed in imprint date	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
	1.6.2.1 Roman numerals						
	1.6.2.2 Numbers expressed as words						
69	Discuss - 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	Refer back to 1.6.2	Discuss	To be rewritten	Agree	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
	1.6.2.3 Oriental numerals						
	1.6.2.4 Inclusive numbers						
	1.6.2.5 Ordinal numerals						
70	Agree	Update fn. 4	Agree	To be rewritten	Update fn. 4	Agree	A
71	Agree, but simpler to change 'the arabic' to 'an Arabic'	3rd para: add "if it is present"	Pending discussion of 1.6	To be rewritten	Agree	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
	1.6.3 Accents and other diacritical marks						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
72	Discuss. If option at 1.6 is used, this instruction would not be applied.	Question applicability for automatically captured data	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree	Disagree. If ALA's position were accepted, then would have to include captitalisaion & spacing too (1.6.5). Also, last para of 1.6 provides sufficient flexibility to meet ALA concern	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
73	Discuss	Prefer to delete, if not add "when possible" or "if known"	Agree "if known"	Disagree	Disagree	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
74	Discuss	Prefer to delete but LC option is acceptable	Discuss	Agree	Disagree If you change caps to l.c. you're not "transcribing" what you see but changing it, and in doing so you should apply the conventions of the language	Reword to transcribe what you see, with option to add accents and diacritics (AACR2 1.0G1)	DI
1.6.4 Symbols that cannot be reproduced							
75	Discuss. If option at 1.6 is used, this instruction would not be applied.	Question applicability for automatically captured data	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree	Disagree. If symbol can't be reprocded you must do SOMETHING; you can't just tacitly drop it! Confirm	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
1.6.5 Spacing of initials and acronyms							
76	Disagree	Text does not apply to acronyms	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree	Agree	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
1.6.6 Letters or words intended to be read more than once							
77	Reinstate AACR2 rule	Reinstate AACR2 rule	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree, reluctantly	Agree. (note: option doesn't apply to just digital resources)	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
78	Discuss	Prefer to reinstate AACR2 rule (line 77) but option is ok	Pending discussion of 1.6	Add option to repeat a letter or word Withdraw	Prefer clear rule, even if it means reinstating AACR2! (x-ref 77)	See #63	W
79	Discuss	Discuss	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree Agree to discuss - relationship between access points versus notes still not clear	Strengthen rule to insist on an access point for any variant title(s) plus a note	See #63	P LC/5/ Rev
	1.6.7 Abbreviations						
	1.6.8 Inaccuracies						
80	Discuss. Agree re need for access point	discuss - ALA prefers to not require an access point for the incorrect form	Pending discussion of 1.6	Disagree Agree to discuss - relationship between access points versus notes still not clear	Add rationale statement	See #63; also question how much explanation to give	P LC/5/ Rev
	1.7 Formulation of notes						
	1.7.1 Capitalization						
81	Discuss. Reformulate in relation to 1.6.1	Delete guideline. If not, take into account 1.6.1.1	Appendices issue	Disagree	Prefer to retain, and take into account 1.6.1.1	Appendices Group discussing	P Chair/ 9
	1.7.2 Quotations						
82	Discuss. Reformulate in relation to option at 1.6.	Add option to not require insertion of quotation marks in captured metadata	Agree	Agree	Possibly agree; but option already exists as last para of 1.6; will that suffice? Confirm question	Agree	DI
83	Discuss - Punctuation. Add general instruction per CCC comment 727 to use accepted English usage (which we know varies)?	disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Query re use of double or single quotes Withdraw - may be covered by 727 or by cataloguer judgment or by style manual or by definition of what a quotation mark actually is	Disagree (it's presentation)	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	1.7.3 References						
84	Discuss. Agree to simplify.	Change to "Further information" and simplify text Agree to add new LC option (line 85)	Disagree, but when is a reference a citation?	Disagree We prefer existing wording which is based on AACR2 wording (1.7A3)	Agree, but needs to be combined with LC (x-ref 85)	Disagree	DI
85	Discuss. Citation of source implicit in existing 1.7.3. Examples relate to notes - how would this work for other data elements? See also 5JSC/ACOC/1 1.7.7 Notes citing URLs for related resources.	Agree Agree ACOC	Agreed.	Agree	Agree	Add new option to connect an information source to a specific element	DI
	1.7.4 Notes citing other works and other expressions or manifestations of the same work						
	1.7.5 Applicability of the information recorded in a note						
86	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Change "add an identification of" to "identify"	A
	1.7.6 Combining notes						
	1.8 Descriptive elements used as access points						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
CHAPTER 2 - IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESOURCE							
87	Agree	2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 and 2.11 do not have instructions for facsimiles and reproductions	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (or instead decide to give only once at beginning)	AB
2.0 Purpose and scope							
88	Agree	Does last sentence refer to other chapters in pt 1?	Reword	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	May need to reword with merger of part I and former part II	AB
2.1 Basis for identification of the resource							
89	Agree See also comment 93 1. No need for multilevel as it consists of a comprehensive and analytical description(s), and no separate source is needed. Footnote explaining this might help. 2. Agree re terminology	Multilevel description? Withdraw 1st comment Query re terminology	1 2. Agree - Identification & description are different	Multilevel - Disagree Terminology - Agree We think multilevel is already covered at 2.1	Agree both points	1st: isn't it presentation? 2nd: agree; let's have separate "basis of description" rule as in AACR2 1st moot: ALA withdrew	AB
2.1.1 Comprehensive description							
90	Agree - delete. Comments 97 & 100 relate	2nd para: Query meaning of "separate"	Agree with delete separate	Agree - delete "separate"	Agree LC	2nd para: delete "separate"	A
91	Agree	Agree	Agree	Create new section "Resource issued as a single unit"	Not strictly necessary, but adds clarity - so Agree	Agree	A
2.1.1.1 Resource issued in successive parts							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
92	Agree ALA & CCC	4th para: Move after 1st para; add ref to numbering peculiarities Withdraw 2nd comment	1. Agree reword 2. Disagree	1st para, ii) and iv) reword	Agree CCC, except prefer "numbering" to "numbers". Disagree ALA, but would welcome ALA having another go at this, as I had difficulty following this version Confirm	Prefer #94; ALA 2nd comment: too specific here? In 2.6.7 instead?	D
93	Agree. Relates to 2nd comment 89	Discuss	Disagree: description & identification are different	Final para: use "the basis for the identification of the resource"	Disagree Confirm - agree LC	Let's have separate "basis of description" rule as in AACR2 to avoid confusion Shouldn't status be "P Mode"?	P Mode
94	Discuss - Mode of issuance. Simplification removes instructions on when 1st/earliest issue not available? Agree with addition of option although consider implicit.	Agree	1. Agree reword 2. Agree Option	Mode of issuance	Agree, but would prefer "are known not to have been issued in sequence"	Simplify wording, add option for agencies that want to "back-up" the description [new proposal]	P Mode
2.1.1.2 Integrating resource							
95	Discuss need for references	1st para: add refs to areas of 2.2	?	Mode of issuance	Agree	What refs are being proposed?	P Mode
96	Agree	3rd para: move after 1st para	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Either okay.	A
2.1.1.3 No source of information identifying the resource as a whole							
97	Agree - delete. Comments 90 & 100 relate	Query re meaning of "separate"	Delete Separate	Agree	Agree	Paras a), b), c): delete "separate"	A
98	Discuss - example not appropriate?	Para a): clarify, add example Add e.g. statement (rather than example) from ALA response	Agree	Disagree Go with majority but question if example is correct	Agree both points	Agree	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
99	Discuss - example not appropriate?	Para b): add example Add e.g. statement (rather than example) from ALA response	Agree	Disagree Example is not appropriate	Agree	Agree	DI
100	Agree. Comments 90 & 97 relate.	Agree	Para b) iii): clarify	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
101	Agree	Para c): clarify	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
102	Agree	Add exception for replacement volume sets [New proposal]	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	JAK note: Defer LC comment until BT returns. (also related to "issuance" discussion)	P Mode
2.1.2 Analytical description							
103	Discuss - need to see revised text to evaluate. Would agree to 'an article in a journal'.	Para a) add "article" to e.g. 2.1.2a) (e.g. an article in a journal, one short story...")	?	Agree	Agree	Add where? Agree, per ALA's further comment	A
104	Agree.	Para c): add additional instructions	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
2.2 Sources of information							
2.2.1 Preferred source of information							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
105	1st para: use "within or on the resource itself" The footnote notwithstanding, 'within' may imply that a cover is not included. Perhaps use "a source on any part of the resource". Would apply to all source instructions (same phrase used in 2.2.3).	discuss	Disagree	Disagree "within" includes "on"	Agree	Don't understand. Would't it apply to all source instructions?	DI
106	Discuss. Comments 107 & 115 relate.	Reword and Reword footnote (incorporate principles from Editor follow-up/LC response)	Discuss	See CCC comment on line 107	Presume being covered elsewhere now	Discuss in October See ALA #116 and #119	DI
107	Agree. Comments 106 & 115 relate.	discuss	Discuss	Footnote 1: remove exclusions Agree to discuss - too significant not to discuss	Agree re container, but prefer accomp material to remain excluded Confirm	Agree but need to discuss in October See ALA #116 and #119	DI
108	Discuss	Discuss	Discuss	Disagree Agree to discuss - too significant not to discuss	Discuss	Prefer 5JSC/LC/1	DI
2.2.1.1 Resources comprising multiple pages or page images							
109	Discuss. Single page = resource & covered by 2.2.1.4? Comment 113 relates.	Reword - ALA recommends additional discussion	Discuss	Agree	Agree	Agree but need to discuss in October See ALA #116 and #119	DI
110	Agree	discuss	Discuss	2nd para: reword	Agree	Agree but need to discuss in October See ALA #116 and #119	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
111	Agree - Glossary	Agree	Discuss	3rd para: reword and define "formally presented"	Agree	Agree but need to discuss in October (like CCC suggestion of wording from CONSER manual) See ALA #116 and #119	DI
112	No opinion	Agree	Agree	Agree	Clarify whether the complete opening can be regarded as a single "title-page"	Agree (retain AACR2 concept)	A
113	Agree. Comment 109 relates.	discuss	Agree	Agree	Agree basic point, but final wording may need clarification	Use "pages or leaves"	DI
114	No opinion.	discuss Go with majority	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add sentence, add exception for early printed	A
115	Should this be against 2.2.1? Comments 106 & 107 relate.	discuss	Discuss	See CCC comment on line 107	Agree container, but wonder what's covered by the "etc." (x-ref 107)	Footnote: reword	DI
2.2.1.2 Resources comprising a set of graphic images							
116	Agree	Delete Prefer to discuss all comments on 2.2 and ALA proposal in October	Disagree	Unnecessary, if retained, fix typos	Agree to delete	Disagree: retain (discussed with LC graphics expert)	DI
117	Discuss. See comment 116. Agree, if retained	Agree	Discuss	Agree	Agree if this is retained, but prefer to delete (x-ref 116)	Use "a series of sheet maps"	DI
2.2.1.3 Resources comprising moving images							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
118	Agree "encoded metadata" Would agree 'embedded metadata' per LC	Reword LC suggestion "embedded metadata" ok	Agree	Agree	Agree, but incorporate CCC modification (x-ref 119)	Disagree with "encoded metadata" because term usually used to describe metadata built to serve as a surrogate (e.g., a MARC record); either keep "label" in quotes or consider "embedded metadata" because used in 1.6 option	AB
119	Agree	prefer ALA proposal Prefer to discuss all comments on 2.2 and ALA proposal in October	Agree	Reword option Withdraw	Prefer ALA overall (x-ref 118) subject to modification according to CCC Confirm	Agree	W
Resources comprising sound							
120	Agree to add provisions; integrate with moving images if possible?	Add provisions	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	AB
121	Agree to add provisions; integrate with moving images if possible?	prefer ALA proposal Prefer to discuss all comments on 2.2 and ALA proposal in October	Agree	Add provisions	Agree	Agree	DI
2.2.1.4 Other resources							
122	Agree. Comment 123 relates. Either wording.	Reword	Discuss	See CCC comment on line 123 Agree to discuss	Agree, but incorporate wording from LC (x-ref 126)	Discuss in October; note that ch. 9 source with "fullest information" causes problems: fullest information for current area 1 elements or fullest source overall but with less-good or no title?	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
123	Agree. Comment 122 relates. Either wording.	prefer ALA proposal	Discuss	Add para	Prefer ALA Confirm	Discuss in October as part of overall 2.2 discussion	DI
124	Agree - but see comment 126	prefer ALA proposal	Discuss	Last para: change first e.g.	Agree, if e.g. retained at all (x-ref 122 and 126)	Prefer #126	DI
125	Agree	Agree	Discuss	Prefer ALA rewording	Agree	1st para, a): delete "globe"	DI
126	Agree	discuss	Discuss	Prefer ALA rewording	Agree - incorporate into ALA wording (x-ref 122)	2nd para: delete "e.g." statement	DI
2.2.2 More than one preferred source of information							
127	Agree. See LC comment 130	Too wordy and confusing. ALA to do proposal? Withdraw - Line 130 ok	#130	Disagree Prefer line 130	Would welcome a proposal i.e. Agree	Prefer #130 Moot because ALA withdrew	W
128	Agree	Agree	#130	Disagree Prefer line 130	Clarify "first occurring" Withdraw as will be covered by 130	Note terminology is from AACR2; but prefer rewording of #130	W
129	Agree. See LC comment 130	LC proposal (line 130) takes care of this	Agree, don't understand why an order should be specified.	5JSC/LC/5/Rev (Internationalization)	Para a), iv): Query rationale for list of languages	Revision of that paragraph in 5JSC/LC/5/rev to use first occurring of sources	P LC/5/ Rev
130	Agree with proposed rewording. See CILIP comment 129 - query rationale for inclusion of iv).	Agree	Agree, but see 129	Agree	Agree, but perhaps omit "appropriate to the condition" or reinstate concept of preference?	Para a): reword	AB
2.2.3 Other sources of information							
131	Agree	If only applicable to certain elements, repeat some wording from 4.1	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
132	Agree	Reword	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.2.4 Information taken from sources outside the resource itself						
133	Agree - Discuss	Varying opinions - urge JSC to continue to discuss	Discuss	Discuss Agree to discuss	Discuss	Yes, discuss in October as part of overall 2.2 discussion	DI
134	Agree	Agree	Agree	Exception: suggest use "assembled collection" or "archival resource" instead of "collection"	Agree	Agree	A
	2.3 Title						
135	Agree - Discuss. Note convention of using 'or' is English language specific. See Comment 157.	Agree	Alternative title should be part of transcription of title proper.	Query no definition or instruction for alternative title	If concept retained (x- ref 157) then need instruction i.e. agree CCC	Agree to remove from title proper - see also #142	DI
	2.3.0 Basic instructions on recording titles						
	2.3.0.1 Definition						
136	Agree. Proposed rewording simpler, although current wording is not necessarily print centric.	discuss Go with majority	Disagree - don't see it	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	1st bullet: change wording so not print- centric	AB
137	Agree	2nd & 3rd bullets: broaden to be less print-centric	Agree	Agree	Agree - only the examples need updating?	Agree	AB
	2.3.0.2 Sources of information						
138	Agree. Will go with majority	Repeat instructions from 2.3.8.3 Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Feel this is wrong place & that refs are adequate	Disagree Moot because ALA withdrew	W
139	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Para a): add "and 2.2.2"	A
	2.3.0.3 Transcription						
140	Agree	Expand to include integrating resources;	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Agree	P Mode

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
141	Agree	reinstate 12.1B1 at 2.3.1.7 a)	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree (x-ref 162)	Agree	P Mode
142	Agree - Discuss		Disagree - transcription.	See comments at 2.3 Agree with LC comment - see also line 157	X-ref 135	Agree to make alternative title be variant title, not part of title proper.	DI
143	Agree	discuss - Mode of issuance	Agree	Agree	Agree	Exception: reword and add text for introductory words	P Mode
2.3.0.4 Names of persons and corporate bodies							
144	Agree	Add "family" to caption	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
145	Agree	Expand reference	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Prefer #146 Go with majority	A
146	Disagree re delete. Disagree re change of caption: prefer not to have to repeat 'in a title' while in Title element.	Discuss Disagreement within ALA. Go with majority	Agree	Disagree Agree with ACOC comment	Agree	1st para delete (then change caption) - Withdraw	W
147	Discuss. Instruction still seems necessary.	Discuss	Agree	Agree	Agree	delete final para [change to AACR2 12.1B3]	DI
2.3.0.5 Introductory words, etc.							
148	Agree	Agree	Agree	At 2.3.0.3 reflect that this is an exception	Agree	Agree	A
149	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree but prefer to omit "and record the shorter form of the title as a variant title (see 2.3.4.3)"	Agree - or how about deleting the rule entirely...?	Add wording for "in case of doubt"	AB
2.3.0.6 Abridgment							
150	Agree	Prefer as an option under 2.3.0.3	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
2.3.0.7 Titles of parts, sections, and supplements							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
151	Agree, clarify	Clarify relationship with 2.3.1.6. Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree Agree with LC -not the same thing	Agree	Disagree: not same thing Moot because ALA withdrew	W
152	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: "enumeration or designation" may cause confusion	Happy to go along with this if someone can find a way, but don't see this as a problem	Agree (had been in ch. 12 and now generalized); need to see proposal.	AB
153	Agree	Agree	Agree	3rd para: give "monographic series" at 1.1.3 as part of the "e.g."	Agree	Agree but as part of #28	AB
154	Agree	Agree if this is an option	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add para for early printed resources	A
	2.3.1 Title proper						
	2.3.1.1 Definition						
155	Agree	Replace "title proper" OK to postpone discussion. ALA will consider developing new proposal to address library-specific terminology	Disagree	Agree	Agree, but need to discuss Feel too big a change to make without proper discussion	Disagree for now (willing to consider later)	DI
156	Agree - use chief name	Possible confusion with "chief title" in DCRM(B)	Agree	Agree to revert to "chief name"	Agree	1st bullet: change "chief title" to "chief name"	A
157	Discuss. See comment 135. Agree	Treat alternative titles as variant titles	Agree for access, but not transcription	Agree	Agree. ISBD issue? (x-ref 135)	Agree	AB
	2.3.1.2 Sources of information						
158	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add "and 2.2.2"	A
	Choosing the title proper						
	2.3.1.3 Title in two or more languages or scripts						
	2.3.1.4 Title in two or more forms						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
159	Agree	Use same terminology in caption and first sentence	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
160	Agree	Exception: apply to serials and integrating resources	Agree	Agree	Agree	Exception: change to apply to serials and integrating resources only	A
	2.3.1.5 Facsimiles and reproductions						
	2.3.1.6 Collective title and titles of individual contents						
161	Discuss. Contents list is an optional element. Agree (no harm in pointing out here that the ref is to an optional element).	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree - but since Contents isn't a mandatory element won't this be optional by default anyway? So agree with ACOC	Change creation of a contents list to be an option [Change to AACR2 1.1B10]	A
	Recording the title proper						
	2.3.1.7 Basic instructions on recording the title proper						
162	No opinion	Para a): change to apply to serials and integrating resources	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Para a): change to apply to serials and integrating resources only	P Mode
163	Agree	Agree	Agree	Para a), para 2: add comma after second occurrence of "etc."	Agree	Agree	A
	2.3.1.8 Other elements recorded as part of the title proper						
164	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Para a): change caption to "Type of musical composition" reword end of sentence	A
165	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree		A
166	Discuss - Glossary. Refine definition. Agree	Discuss where to include definition	Agree	Agree	Agree	Def proposed for Glossary	DI
	2.3.1.9 Resource lacking a collective title						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.3.1.10 Resource with no title						
	Change in the title proper						
	2.3.1.11 Recording changes in the title proper						
167	Discuss - Mode of issuance. Also, why would an agency revise a description to add an earlier title, in preference to revising the description to reflect that title?	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
	2.3.1.12 Major and minor changes						
168	Agree	Applies only to serials? If so, change caption	Agree	Add "in the title proper of serials"	Agree	Agree	A
169	Agree with principle	do not put long lists in running text	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree principle, but don't want to apply it to lists of parenthetical examples	Agree	AB
	2.3.2 Parallel title						
170	Discuss	Is there value in continuing the "parallel" distinction?	Yes.	Disagree Agree to discuss - ISBD & MARC issue	Discuss Feel there's value in continuing to distinguish	Yes, for ISBD display	DI
	2.3.2.1 Definition						
	2.3.2.2 Sources of information						
	2.3.2.3 Basic instructions on recording parallel titles						
171	Discuss. Would also require change to text 'basic instructions on recording titles' as 2.3.1.7 is not under the basic instructions.	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 already covers 2.3.1.7	Agree	1st para: add "and 2.3.1.7b";	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
172	Agree to reword	Agree with rewording	Agree	Agree with rewording	Prefer to retain. Agree rewording	last para: delete (or reword)	A
	2.3.2.4 Type of composition, medium of performance, key, etc.						
173	No opinion on deletion. Disagree re change of caption: prefer not to have to repeat 'in parallel titles' while in parallel title element. Agree with inclusion of 'musical', Editor to decide re parallel	Agree with rewording	Agree with rewording	Agree with rewording	Prefer to retain. Agree rewording	Delete (or reword)	AB
	2.3.2.5 Recording changes in parallel titles						
174	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167.	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword - refer to "backing-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
	2.3.3 Other title information						
	2.3.3.1 Definition						
175	Discuss. Definition covers AACR2 definition.	AACR2 definition is superior Agree with CCC - consider as part of Glossary review	Agree	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree	Agree	DI
176	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Not sure what LC's reason is for deletion - could not find LC comment	{Couldn't find comment in LC response} Disagree - OTI applies to series & 2.3.3 is referred back to from 2.10	2nd bullet: delete "series" [new comment]	D
177	Agree	Change 3rd bullet	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
	2.3.3.2 Sources of information						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
178	Agree re issue, devise appropriate wording	Change instruction as parallel title may be from a different source to the title proper Withdraw - line 179 ok	#179	Reflect that other title info may appear in conjunction with other than the title proper	Agree	Prefer #179 Agree with CCC	W
179	Agree re issue, devise appropriate wording	Agree	Agree	Agree with LC wording See also CCC comment on line 178 as series title is not addressed	Agree	Add sentence	AB
2.3.3.3 Basic instructions on recording other title information							
180	Disagree. Instruction equivalent to AACR2 1.1E1 & 2.1E1?	1st para: Limit to serials and integrating resources Withdraw - line 181 ok	Disagree	Agree - see CCC comment on line 181	Prefer CCC (x-ref 181) Confirm	But then would need an instruction for others (as in #181); don't understand #185 if want entire instruction to be limited Moot because ALA withdrew	W
181	Agree	Discuss—mode of issuance paper Agree	Agree	1st para: Reword	Agree, but can text duplication be avoided without affecting functionality of Web version?	Agree	P Mode
182	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 already covers 2.3.1.7	Agree	1st para: add "and 2.3.1.7b"	D
183	Agree	3rd para: Record data for what it is	Agree with LC	Agree to deletion	Agree, providing parallel change made at 2.3.0.6	3rd para: delete [change to AACR2 - 1.1E3]	AB
184	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5th para: delete	A
185	Agree	6th para: add option or limit to successively-issued and integrating resources	Agree	6th para: treat as exception for serials and integrating resources	Agree	6th para: make an exception for serials and integrating resources	A

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.3.3.4 Supplying other title information						
186	Agree	Add "family" after "person"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
187	Discuss. Agree to make optional	Delete instruction or make optional [Change to AACR2 1.1E6] Withdraw 1st part of proposal	Agree option	Agree to make optional	Agree to delete, but would otherwise support option + move	Agree to giving as option	A
188	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add wording as in AACR2 1.1E6	Agree	See 5JSC/LC/5/rev	P LC/5/ Rev
189	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para, a): reword	Agree	Agree	A
190	Discuss. Comment 234 relates. Disagree: scope of 2.3.7.4 currently limited to resources that don't bear a title.	2nd para b) Move to 2.3.7.4	Agree	Disagree 2.3.7.4 addresses devised titles but there is a title here	Agree	Agree	D
	2.3.3.5 Parallel other title information						
191	Agree	2nd para, option: add "also" Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree (doesn't seem necessary because instruction itself says to record data element in one of the languages Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	2.3.3.6 Recording changes in other title information						
192	Agree	Para b): change ref to 2.3.5.6a	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
193	Agree	Para c): Change refs to 2.3.5.6b	Agree	Para c) change refs to 2.3.5.6b	Agree	Agree	A
194	Agree instruction confusing	Para c) 2nd para: Make phrases consistent; Reword Withdraw - line 195 ok	#195	Disagree See CCC comment on line 195	Disagree (x-ref 195) Confirm preference for 195	Prefer #195 because ALA withdrew	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
195	Agree reword using 2.4.2 as template	Agree	Agree	Disagree Agree with ACOC comment to use 2.4.2 as template	Agree	Para c) 2nd para: reword	AB
	2.3.4 Variant title						
196	Discuss	Rename as "Other titles"?	Disagree. Variant titles seems clear enough.	Disagree	Disagree - don't regard solution as any improvement (but recognise problem)	Disagree on "other titles" because could be misunderstood as "other resources"	DI
	2.3.4.1 Definition						
197	Discuss	1st bullet: clarify that "other title information" may have variant forms	Disagree	Disagree Okay as is	Didn't understand this	Okay as is	DI
198	Agree	2nd bullet: add "title screen"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree to having more non-book locations	AB
199	Agree Now agree CCC	4th bullet: add ref back to 2.3.11-12 for major changes	Agree	Disagree Covered at 2.3.5	Agree, but numbering to be corrected	Agree	D
200	Discuss. Agree with principle, but consider covered by existing instructions - perhaps add eggs to para 3 ?	Discuss - prefer to adjust examples to adding new guidelines	Agree	Discuss Agree with ACOC	Agree basic point, but doubts re some of language used	Add bullet for visual resources [new proposal]	DI
	2.3.4.2 Sources of information						
201	Agree. Prefer "...from any source."	Agree	Agree Take variant titles from any source.	Agree	Agree alternative option	Simplify wording	AB
	2.3.4.3 Basic instructions on recording variant titles						
202	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 already covers 2.3.1.7	Agree	1st para: add "and 2.3.1.7b"	D

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
203	2nd para: "etc." is unclear Suggest change 2nd bullet to read "Indicate the source or basis for the variant title as appropriate "	Agree	Disagree, scope is expressed in previous para	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree - would adding "or basis" after "source" help?	Disagree but could reword to "variant title"	DI
204	Record variant titles not borne by the resource in the authority record. Need to treat variant names and titles consistently. Prefer to record variant names or titles borne by the resource in the resource description (and in authority record if there is one) ; record variant names and titles not borne by the resource in the authority record. See comment 265 re 2.4.3.8.	Discuss	Disagree - description is not limited to information borne by the resource	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree: won't have authority for every work/expression. Also concept "not borne by" already in AACR2	DI
2.3.4.4 Translations or transliterations of the title proper							
205	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 already covers 2.3.1.7	Agree	add "and 2.3.1.7b"	D
2.3.5 Earlier/later title							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
206	Discuss.	Delete and include instructions with section on variant titles	Disagree unless scope of variant title is redefined. I am not convinced that these are variant titles.	Mode of issuance	Disagree - prefer LC or similar (x-ref 207)	Agree that term is confusing but would have to redefine variant title in 2.3.4	P Mode
207	Agree. Add ref back to 2.3.11-12 for major changes? See ALA comment 213.	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Caption: add "not requiring a new record"	P Mode
	2.3.5.1 Definition						
208	Discuss - not considered necessary	2nd bullet: clarify that "other title information" may have variant forms	Disagree	Mode of issuance	Didn't understand this (x-ref 197)	Okay as is	P Mode
209	Agree	Discuss - Mode of issuance	Agree	Mode of issuance	Reword and add refs to 2.1.1.2 and 2.1.1.1	Don't disagree but seems case of "over-explaining" here and not elsewhere (2.3.5.2 already explains); would be easier if had separate basis of description instruction	P Mode
210	Discuss. Making this change would remove the clarity gained from CILIP's suggestion at Comment 209. Is 'earlier title' used this way in the instructions (i.e. apart from the changes suggested by LC)?	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
	2.3.5.2 Sources of information						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
211	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167. Would agree with beginning the sentences with the type of resource.	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
2.3.5.3 Basic instructions on recording earlier/later titles							
212	Use "online" instead of "remote access"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree - needs to be consistent elsewhere, of course	Agree	A
213	Discuss. Not needed if caption of instruction changed per LC comment 207.	Change caption	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree (x-ref 207)	Agree	P Mode
214	Discuss. Not needed if ref added per ACOC comment at 207.	1st para: add new first sentence	Agree but need to specify serials	Mode of issuance	Disagree	Agree to adding a sentence but problem with wording because only serials have major changes	P Mode
215	Discuss.	2nd para: use "variations in title"	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Agree but isn't 3rd para the same for "earlier"?	P Mode
216	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167.	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree, but incorporate ALA suggestion (x-ref 215)	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
217	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 already covers 2.3.1.7	Agree	1st para: add "and 2.3.1.7b"	D
218	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree basic point, but revised text better with some commas	3rd para: remove parenthesis	AB
2.3.5.4 Earlier and later variations in the title proper							
219	Agree	Para b): add ref to 2.3.1.12	Agree	Agree	Agree LC	Para b): add ref to 2.3.1.12b	A

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
220	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167. Discuss deletion of "either for identification or for access". M/73.1 final para	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
2.3.5.5 Earlier and later parallel titles							
221	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167. Discuss deletion of "either for identification or for access". M/73.1 final para	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
2.3.5.6 Earlier and later other title information							
222	Discuss - Mode of issuance. See ACOC comment on 2.3.1.11 at comment 167. Discuss deletion of "either for identification or for access". M/73.1 final para	Agree	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Reword as not all agencies will "back-up" [new proposal]	P Mode
2.3.6 Key title							
2.3.6.1 Definition							
2.3.6.2 Sources of information							
2.3.6.3 Basic instructions on recording key titles							
223	Agree.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree, but would prefer without "as found" (tautology)	Change to "record it as found"	AB
2.3.6.1 Definition							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.3.6.2 Sources of information						
	2.3.6.3 Basic instructions on recording key titles						
	2.3.7 Devised title						
	2.3.7.1 Definition						
	2.3.7.2 Sources of information						
	2.3.7.3 Basic instructions on recording devised titles						
225	Discuss. Same para as CCC comment 228.	3rd para: exception is problematic [Change to AACR2 - 1.1B7]	What is the Ottawa decision?	Discuss Agree to discuss	Discuss	How does Ottawa decision to give info on square brackets one time at beginning affect this instruction?	DI
226	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add ref to 2.3.1.10	Agree	Agree	A
227	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: move instructions to 2.3.7.4	Agree	Agree	A
228	Agree. Note same para as ALA comment 225.	Agree	Agree	Penultimate para: delete see ref to 2.2.4	Agree	Agree	A
	2.3.7.4 Additional instructions on devising titles for specific types of resources						
229	Discuss Agree no need to duplicate uniform title, but the general instructions for devising a title don't seem to be sufficient for music.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Agree	Para a) delete	DI
230	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Para b) Reword	Agree	Agree to idea but prefer #232	D
231	Discuss. Comment 190 relates. Note: scope of 2.3.7.4 currently limited to resources that don't bear a title.	Para c) Move instruction on trailers here and broaden; use "film or video"	Disagree	Disagree See CCC comment on line 190; agree to use "film or video"	Agree	1st: agree; 2nd: agree	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
232	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Para b) and c): add "or an identification"	A
233	Discuss, prefer to expand 2.3.7.3	Discuss - prefer to adjust examples to adding new guidelines	Agree	Agree	Agree generally, but not keen on "aesthetic value" wording	Add new section for visual resources [new proposal]	DI
	2.3.8 Notes on titles						
	2.3.8.1 Definition						
	2.3.8.2 Sources of information						
	2.3.8.3 Source of the title proper						
234	Use "online" instead of "remote access"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 212)	Agree	A
235	Agree ALA need to reword (but prefer LC suggestion at 237) Agree CCC comment (relate to when [] are used?)	Reword and add option to not record the source Discuss	Discuss	Add exception for recording the source of a devised title of an archival resource	Agree both; suggest ALA wording modified to incorporate CCC point	Discuss in October as part of overall 2.2 discussion	DI
236	Agree (but prefer LC suggestion at 237)	Discuss	Discuss	Para b): reword	Agree	Discuss in October as part of overall 2.2 discussion	DI
237	Agree	Discuss Depends on 2.2.2 discussions	Agree with explain principle and delete a-c	Discuss Agree to delete a)-c) and explain principle	Agree option	Delete a)-c) and explain principle (or add new d))	DI
238	Agree	Discuss- should discuss. Disagreement within ALA about this	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss	Disagree Option is already permitted by last para of 1.4; redundant here therefore	Add new option to- always give a note- Withdraw	W
	2.3.8.4 Title variations, inaccuracies, and deletions						
239	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: use "occasional iterations"	Agree	Agree	A
240	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para, option: Query "in lieu of making a note"	Agree	Option okay as is- Agree	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
241	Agree	Agree that access point need not preclude a note and that instructions should be separate. Discuss requiring access point	Agree	Discuss Agree with ALA comment	2nd para: Treat identification and access requirements separately	Inaccuracy could be at end of a very long title where access wouldn't be important. For access, see #242.	DI
242	Discuss. No opinion re 2.3.1.7a). Agree re option, subject to change of wording equivalent to change made to 2nd para resulting from comments 240 and 241.	Discuss	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss	Disagree LC as written Agree ACOC	3rd para: change wording and add option	DI
2.4 Statement of responsibility							
243	Discuss. Consider being more expansive re statements to record; provide more guidance re access points?	Add more guidance for different formats	Disagree - my rda?	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree: training issue	DI
2.4.0 Basic instructions on recording statements of responsibility							
2.4.0.1 Definition							
2.4.0.2 Sources of information							
2.4.0.3 Recording statements of responsibility							
244	Option: statement of responsibility provides information on role. M/86.2. Suggest add to optional provision "Optionally, add a designation of role to the controlled access point (see 7.6)."	Agree	?	Disagree Agree with CILIP & LC comments	Agree, but what's being proposed?	Is a change being recommended?	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
245	Provide for instances where the major role cannot be determined. "In case of doubt about which statement(s) of responsibility relate to a major role, record the first statement." or "In case of doubt, record the first statement".	Agree	Agree	Disagree Agree with CILIP comment	Disagree - rule refers to "a major role" & would prefer left to cataloguer judgement	Agree	D
246	Discuss. Prefer to record first statement in case of doubt - see comment 245. The quoted names in LC's egs could be recorded as S/R with further info given in note if needed.	Discuss - ALA is reluctant to add more situations that call for use of notes	Agree	Agree	Agree generally , but don't like "complex"	Add new para for complex statements [new proposal]	DI
	2.4.0.4 Transcription						
247	Agree	Agree but prefer to delete 2.4.0.7	Agree	Agree to delete	Agree	If 2.4.0.7 not deleted, add reference to it	AB
	2.4.0.5 Statement naming two or more persons, etc.						
248	Agree. Ellipses seem preferable	Agree but prefer terminology "ellipses" to "marks of omission"	Agree	Include mark of omission in ch1 as generalized instruction?	Agree	Agree	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
249	Agree, prefer summarise	Agree with summarizing extent, disagree with use of et al.	Agree, but "and others," not Latin.	Disagree Go with majority	Summarize extent of omission or use "et. al." Can agree to use of English in place of et al. but would prefer to summarize	Agree, but prefer English [ALA had comment, too: "and others"]	AB
250	Agree. Disagree, as could be any group	Final para: clarify Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree Agree with LC that it could be any group	Agree	Disagree: could be any group Moot because ALA withdrew	W
2.4.0.6 More than one statement of responsibility							
251	Agree - Discuss	Inconsistency between 2.4.0.6 and 2.4.3.6 Examples exacerbate the problem but guidelines also need clarification	1. General principle: agree 2. Example	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Only examples addressed	DI
2.4.0.7 Titles of nobility, address, honour, etc.							
252	Agree - Delete	Delete [Change to AACR2 1.1F7]	Agree	Agree to delete	Discuss Agree re titles preceding names, but unhappy re strings of initials, academic posts, earlier works, etc following name	Delete [Change to AACR2 1.1F7]	DI
253	Discuss (CILIP provide wording for provision?)	Discuss - prefer to delete rule	Agree - option to transcribe ought to be available	Moot if deleted	Add provision for early printed books Provision would be to include everything, optionally	What would be the provision?	DI
2.4.0.8 Clarification of role							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
254	Discuss (already optional?)	Discuss	Agree	Agree	Disagree Inclusion assists the user; omission may mislead the user (depending on context)	Make optional Withdraw	W
	2.4.0.9 Noun phrases occurring in conjunction with a statement of responsibility						
255	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Simplify instruction [Change to AACR2 - 1.1F12]	A
	2.4.0.10 Statement of responsibility transcribed as part of the title proper or other title information						
256	Agree - Delete. (Although uncertain of the meaning of the ALA comment re 'of' and 'by')	Delete [change to AACR2 - 1.1F13] (if retained, clarify re-usage of "of") Agree LC. (ALA comment about usage of "or" should have been at line 255).	Agree	Agree to delete - transcribe as it appears	Agree LC. ALA 256 actually relates to 2.4.0.9 - prefer LC (x-ref 255)	Delete [change to AACR2 - 1.1F13]	A
	2.4.0.11 No person, family, or body named in the statement of responsibility						
	2.4.0.12 Words included in statements of responsibility that are neither names nor linking words						
257	Agree Prefer to rewrite as part of 2.4.0.4.	Agree to rewrite as instruction	Agree	Agree to rewrite as instruction	Agree; prefer to delete	Rewrite as instruction or delete	AB
	2.4.1 Parallel statement of responsibility						
	2.4.2 Change in statement of responsibility						
258	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Change wording	A
	2.4.3 Notes on statements of responsibility						
	2.4.3.1 Definition						
259	Agree	1st bullet: delete subsidiary	Agree	1st bullet: giving a note should not be restricted to subsidiary roles	Agree	1st bullet: delete "subsidiary"	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
260	Agree	2nd bullet: use "information on other names"	Agree	Agree	Disagree If 2.4.3.8 is retained (even optionally) then "variant" is correct. This bullet is not concerned with ALL other forms of name, but specifically with those covered by 2.4.3.8 and 2.4.3.9, hence need to retain wording.	Agree	D
	2.4.3.2 Sources of information						
	2.4.3.3 Editors of serials						
	2.4.3.4 Performers of music						
	2.4.3.5 Featured players, performers, narrators, and/or presenters						
261	Agree	Add "or spoken word sound recording"	Agree	Agree or use "etc."	Agree	Agree	AB
	2.4.3.6 Artistic and/or technical credits						
262	Discuss. Is there a need to limit?	Change wording	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree but don't give important info in parentheses	DI
	2.4.3.7 Other persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the resource						
263	Agree (but consider little potential for confusion)	Clarify use of "they" Withdraw	Disagree - seems clear enough	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree - but applies elsewhere too (e.g. 2.4.3.4)	Disagree: "they" used in others Moot because ALA withdrew	W
264	Agree	Agree	Agree - caption limited to the resource	Agree	Agree	Delete "or with previous editions" as covered in 4.10.0.3	A
	2.4.3.8 Variant forms of names						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
265	<p>Agree. Prefer to retain ability to record other forms appearing on the resource.</p> <p>Discuss: Need to treat variant names and titles consistently. Prefer to record variant names or titles borne by the resource in the resource description (and in authority record if there is one); record variant names and titles not borne by the resource in the authority record. See comment 204.</p>	<p>Paras 1 & 2: belong in an authority record, make optional</p>	Agree - part 3	Agree to delete	Agree	<p>Move instructions to part III</p>	DI
2.4.3.9 Change in statement of responsibility							
266	Agree	<p>Combine with 2.4.2</p> <p>Suggest having Editor come up with a better caption</p>	Disagree.	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Agree with LC</p>	Agree	<p>Disagree: would be same for each data element; perhaps a better caption? Accept ALA's later comment for editor creating better caption</p>	D
2.5 Edition							
267	<p>Discuss - Glossary. Is definition needed to apply instructions? See CILIP comment at 277.</p>	<p>Need to define "Edition" Link to existing glossary definition or repeat it here.</p>	Agree	Agree	Agree	<p>Agree is needed. Is ALA supplying proposal?</p>	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
268	Discuss - implicit? Agree, M/76.2	Address multiple edition statements	Agree	Agree	Agree	Wasn't this addressed by repeatability discussion in Ottawa? Agree	A
	2.5.0 Basic instructions on recording edition information						
	2.5.0.1 Definition						
	2.5.0.2 Sources of information						
269	Agree	Add new 2nd para	Agree in principle, but this seems wider than just edition	Agree	Agree - add as 2nd para to LC revision (x- ref 270)	Are there international aspects to consider? Consider giving just one as data element and other as note? {Also, is ALA intending to add new paragraph as 3rd paragraph?}	AB
270	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Simplify and include priority order	A
	2.5.0.3 Transcription						
	2.5.0.4 Facsimiles and reproductions						
	2.5.0.5 Edition information relating to issues or parts						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
271	Agree. Note: need to check all instructions with similar wording to ensure that this distinction is made where needed.	Agree	Only applies to comprehensive level description	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	A comprehensive level description for a resource of multiple issues or parts can itself also be an analytic description if those issues/parts belong to a larger whole. In such cases, what you call that description (comp. or anal.) depends upon perspective. So, think it unwise to label some instructions as applying only to comp. or anal. All relates back to 1.1.1 (whatever the resource is that is being described).	D
2.5.0.6 Change in edition information							
272	Discuss	Para a) add guidance	Disagree	Mode of issuance	Disagree - if issued simultaneously then there's not a change (which requires temporal aspect). Probably dealt with by LC proposal for 2.5.0.2 (x-ref 269)	Question if JSC adding too much detail.	P Mode
273	Agree	Para b) & c): add ref to 1.3 Discuss with proposal for 1.3 from p. 22 of ALA response (not on table, but same as ACOC comment at line 53)	Disagree	Disagree Agree with LC	How about simplifying - add "(see 1.3)" after "new description" in both cases?	Disagree: 1.3 doesn't cover edition yet. Should status be "P Mode"?	P Mode

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
274	See Mode of issuance discussion paper by Editor. Discuss deletion of "either for identification or for access".	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Change scope of a) and b)	P Mode
	2.5.1 Edition statement						
	2.5.1.1 Definition						
275	Agree	2nd bullet: reword 1st sentence	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.5.1.2 Sources of information						
	2.5.1.3 Recording edition statements						
276	Disagree	2nd para: add "if considered to be important" Withdraw	Agree	Agree	Disagree - it's not importance that matters but user's understanding Confirm	Agree	W
	2.5.1.4 Terms indicating edition						
277	Agree. Would this address ALA comment at 267?	Agree	Agree	Agree	Suggest include at 2.5.1.1 or put identification of an edition first	Agree; but note that for integrating resources (especially online resources), "version" does not indicate "edition"	AB
278	Discuss	Discuss	Agree	Agree	Take into account ISBD(ER) - related to 1.3	Disagree This info only if you are "in doubt"; if already know that "version" doesn't edition, wouldn't be here. (LC did propose adding edition to 1.3)	DI
279	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add "state" to the list	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
280	Discuss. ALA comment should read vi)?	Para iv) - vi add ref to 4.11 - Discuss need to clarify between this & format of notated music. See #281 - purpose of ref. forward is to attempt to clarify re 281.	Disagree	Agree	Disagree Comment at 281 is relevant to this	Disagree	DI
281	Discuss	query re "physical layout"	Agree	Agree	Agree - need to narrow down what counts as an edition statement	Agree. Good question because supporting difficulty LC cited earlier in discriminating between what qualifies as a musical presentation statement and what as edition information (in 5JSC/LC/4).	DI
2.5.1.5 Terms indicating regular revision or numbering							
282	Agree	Agree	Agree both	1st para: change rule ref to 2.11 2nd para: change rule ref to 2.6	Agree	1st: agree; 2nd: agree	A
2.5.1.6 Edition statement integral to title proper, etc.							
2.5.1.7 Parallel edition statement							
2.5.2 Statement of responsibility relating to the edition							
2.5.2.1 Definition							
283	Discuss	Needs to be linked to the presence of an edition statement	Disagree	Glossary review Disagree - agree with LC	Agree specific point	Disagree because last paragraph of 2.5.2.3 refers to first edition	DI
2.5.2.2 Sources of information							
2.5.2.3 Recording statements of responsibility relating to the edition							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
284	Agree - reword, but without 'area'	Discuss Agree ACOC. Suggest "Record all statements of responsibility as statements of responsibility relating to the title (2.4) rather than as statements of responsibility relating to the edition."	Agree reword.	Disagree Agree with LC	Final para: reword	Agree that wording confusing but CILIP wording not appropriate because it refers to ISBD area Like ALA's latter comment for rewording	DI
	2.5.2.4 Parallel statement of responsibility relating to the edition						
	2.5.3 Statement relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.3.1 Definition						
	2.5.3.2 Sources of information						
	2.5.3.3 Recording statements relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.3.4 Parallel statement relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.4 Statement of responsibility relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.4.1 Definition						
	2.5.4.2 Sources of information						
	2.5.4.3 Recording statements of responsibility relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.4.4 Parallel statement of responsibility relating to a named revision of an edition						
	2.5.5 Notes on edition information						
	2.5.5.1 Definition						
	2.5.5.2 Sources of information						
	2.5.5.3 Source of the edition information						
285	Agree - Delete	Delete	Agree	Agree	Agree	Delete	A
	2.5.5.4 Edition information relating to issues, parts, etc.						
	2.5.5.5 Changes in edition information						
	2.6 Numbering						
286	Agree	Use "Numbering (Serials)"	Agree LC	Reflect that applicable to serials only	Prefer LC solution	Add "of serials"	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
287	Agree	Place after 2.10	Disagree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Is order important in Web product? Go with majority	D
288	Discuss Agree, willing to consider proposal	Add option to use unformatted note [new proposal]	Agree	Agree	Would welcome a proposal	Agree	DI
2.6.0 Basic instructions on recording numbering							
289	Discuss. Prefer not to repeat if change made to element - see comment 286. Agree, Editor to decide whether to repeat	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add "of serials"	AB
290	Disagree. 2.6.0.3 instruction only about conventions of transcription.	Discuss	Agree	add reference to "if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part" Withdraw	Discuss	Prefer #294/#296.	W
2.6.0.1 Definition							
291	Agree to add ref	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add new bullet for numbering within series	A
2.6.0.2 Sources of information							
292	Agree	1st & 2nd para: reword	Agree	Agree	Agree	Prefer priority order in 2.6.0.2 (for consistency when taking scanned images) Agree	A
293	Agree	4th para: change wording - ALA now prefers LC proposal at line 293-294	Agree	Agree Go with majority	Prefer LC (x-ref 294)	See #292 Prefer #294	W
294	Agree, prefer ALA wording at comment 293. Go with majority	Prefer LC proposal to line #293	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree - but if there's anything in ALA (x-ref 293) that would further improve, should use it	4th para: change wording (see new option at 2.6.1.3)	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
295	Agree	5th para: change wording	Agree	Agree	Agree	See #292 Agree	A
	2.6.0.3	Transcription					
	2.6.0.4	Facsimiles and reproductions					
	2.6.1	Numeric and/or alphabetic designation					
	2.6.1.1	Definition					
	2.6.1.2	Sources of information					
	2.6.1.3	Recording numeric and/or alphabetic designations					
296	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: Reword and add new option	A
	2.6.1.4	Numeric and/or alphabetic designations in more than one language or script					
	2.6.2	Chronological designation					
	2.6.2.1	Definition					
297	Agree	Change "e.g." statement	Agree	Agree	Agree	No disagreement but is just an "e.g." statement	A
	2.6.2.2	Sources of information					
	2.6.2.3	Recording chronological designations					
298	Discuss. Should the ref be to 2.6.0 if it is intended to refer to all of the basic instructions?	Agree	Agree	Disagree Is this an editorial issue?	Agree	1st para: change ref to "(see 1.6)";	DI
299	Discuss. Prefer to make alternative an option. Prefer to add value where cost-effective to do so. Willing to go with majority - Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	last para: make an option	A
	2.6.2.4	Chronological designations in more than one language or script					
	2.6.3	No designation on first issue or part					
	2.6.4	Completed serials					
	2.6.5	New sequence of numbering					

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
300	Discuss. Consider issue for presentation of examples rather than rules.	Agree	Agree- presentation	Refer to Examples Group	Either split into two, or present examples differently Withdraw first part and agree ACOC/CCC re reference to Examples Group for second part; LC comment in response is a separate issue	Or change instruction so are not supplying: just take what you see.	DI
	2.6.6 Alternative numbering systems						
	2.6.7 Notes on numbering						
	2.6.7.1 Definition						
301	Agree. Perhaps say 'numbering discrepancies'?	Include "numbering errors"	Agree	Agree	Agree	No disagreement (although just in an "etc." listing)	AB
	2.6.7.2 Sources of information						
	2.6.7.3 Beginning and ending numbering not recorded in the numbering element						
	2.6.7.4 Complex or irregular numbering						
	2.6.7.5 Period covered						
	2.7 Publisher, distributor, etc.						
302	Instructions on names in a hierarchy is missing	Discuss Agree with LC comment but no strong feelings about this.	Agree some guidance is required	Agree	Agree	If principle is to "take what you see," wouldn't hierarchy be included? Perhaps ensure that some examples illustrate (Dept. of Spanish example now in 2.7.0.3)	DI
303	Discuss. Agree, Editor to propose?	Need instructions for facsimiles and reproductions	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 87)	Agree	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
304	Discuss. Agree, Editor to propose?	Add options for early and rare printed resources	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 58)	Agree	AB
	2.7.0 Basic instructions on recording names of publishers, distributors, etc.						
	2.7.0.1 Definition						
305	Agree	3rd bullet: use bulleted list	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
306	Agree	Agree if it is an option	Agree	Agree	Disagree - printers & booksellers acting in this capacity are already covered by 1st bullet Still believe this to be case, but will go with majority	Add bullet for early printed resources	AB
	2.7.0.2 Sources of information						
	2.7.0.3 Transcription						
307	Discuss. Rephrase to indicate that it applies only if the cataloguer knows the form is unusual. Go with majority	Para b: delete	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
308	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Add instruction to clarify name of publisher in square brackets	Agree re consistency, but unsure re [] vs note	Agree	D
309	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Yield	2nd para, c): move to part III	A
	2.7.0.4 Statement of function						
310	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree basic point, but revised text better with some commas	1st para: rearrange words	AB
	2.7.0.5 More than one publisher, distributor, etc.						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
311	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Generalize option to cover when two bodies are named but functions not explicit	Agree (in AACR2, it's with the 2.7.0.4 content)	A
	2.7.0.6 Name of publisher, distributor, etc., in two or more languages or scripts						
	2.7.0.7 Change in name of publisher, distributor, etc.						
312	Agree.	Agree, but discuss with Mode of issuance	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Change caption; reword instructions to account for changed publisher etc.	P Mode
313	Agree if not moot with new structure of these instructions. M/76.2	Agree	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree basic point, but won't some sort of note to explain the relationship be needed?	Add new option to repeat the data element [new proposal]	AB
314	Agree	Query ref to 8.3	Agree	Agree		Assume will be updated	A
	2.7.1 Name of publisher						
	2.7.1.1 Definition						
	2.7.1.2 Recording names of publishers						
	2.7.1.3 No publisher identified						
315	Discuss. May be preferable to move bullet to 2.7.0.1 Definition. Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	Agree	Change heading to "No publisher identified or no publisher"	Agree	Agree	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
316	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss	Use "Publisher not stated" or "Publisher not given"	Agree that "publisher unknown" has different meaning; agree to "publisher not stated" or "... not named (see #317)	DI
317	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss	Prefer CILIP (x-ref 316) Confirm	Use "Publisher not named"	DI
318	Agree	Final para: add "locally made recordings"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.7.2 Name of distributor						
	2.7.2.1 Definition						
319	Agree	Agree	agree	Agree	Agree basic point, but revised text better with some commas	Delete parentheses	AB
	2.7.2.2 Recording names of distributors						
	2.7.3 Name of manufacturer						
	2.7.3.1 Definition						
	2.7.3.2 Recording names of manufacturers						
	2.7.4 Notes on publisher, distributor, etc.						
	2.7.4.1 Definition						
	2.7.4.2 Sources of information						
	2.7.4.3 Details relating to publisher, distributor, etc.						
	2.7.4.4 Change in name of publisher, distributor, etc.						
	2.8 Place of publication, distribution, etc.						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
320	New data element: dates, times, and places associated with an event (518 tag)	Discuss Disagree LC - unlikely to have an authority record for a specific performance under current practices.	Agree - but don't understand LC comment on authority record	Discuss MARC/RDA mapping issue	Would welcome a proposal	Disagree: information should be in authority record for the event Want to see a proposal	P MAR C/RD A
	2.8.0 Basic instructions on recording place of publication, distribution, etc.						
	2.8.0.1 Definition						
321	Agree	2nd bullet: use bulleted list	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree (x-ref 305)	Agree	A
	2.8.0.2 Sources of information						
322	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st and 2nd paras: reword	A
	2.8.0.3 Transcription						
323	Agree	Prefer to clarify within the element	Agree	Agree	Need consistency with 2.7.0.3 (x-ref 308)	Agree	AB
324	Agree	Discuss Disagreement within ALA. Go with majority	Agree	Add instruction to clarify place of publication in square brackets	Need consistency with 2.7.0.3 (x-ref 308)	Agree	AB
325	Discuss. Covered by the existing instruction to transcribe in the form in which it appears?	Agree	Transcription	Agree	Make clear that associated prepositions should be included with the place. Rule deals only with "place", not associated text, therefore "what you see" doesn't help. Preposition is not part of the place	If taking "what you see," it won't be a problem.	DI
	2.8.0.4 More than one place of publication, distribution, etc.						
	2.8.0.5 Place of publication, distribution, etc., in two or more languages or scripts						
	2.8.0.6 Change in place of publication, distribution, etc.						
326	Agree.	Agree	Agree	Para b) and c) add sentence	Agree	Agree (in #327)	A

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
327	Discuss. Mode of issuance paper.	Discuss (Mode of issuance)	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree	Change wording	P Mode
	2.8.1 Place of publication						
	2.8.1.1 Definition						
	2.8.1.2 Recording place of publication						
	2.8.1.3 Place of publication not identified in the resource						
328	Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Disagree	1st para: reword	Agree	Disagree with "named" (see #346); agree—supplying in brackets—Go with majority	A
329	Discuss. May be preferable to move this to 2.8.0.1 Definition. Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3. Discuss placement of supplied names for unpublished resources (2.8.4).	Discuss Agree ACOC regarding discussing all alternatives	Agree	Change heading to "Place of publication not identified in the resource or no place of publication"	Agree	Agree Discuss per ACOC	DI
330	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	Disagree	Discuss Agree to discuss	2nd para: Use "Place not stated" or "Place not given" Confirm	Prefer #331 Discuss per ACOC	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
331	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss	Prefer CILIP (x-ref 330) Place definitely has a name, it's just not stated	2nd para: Use "Place not named" Discuss per ACOC	DI
332	Agree	Final para: add "locally made recordings"	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 318)	Agree	A
	2.8.2 Place of distribution						
	2.8.2.1 Definition						
	2.8.2.2 Recording place of distribution						
	2.8.3 Place of manufacture						
	2.8.3.1 Definition						
	2.8.3.2 Recording place of manufacture						
333	Discuss. Discuss in relation to required elements. If only place of publication is required, why is guidance on supplying place of manufacture needed?	Add guideline for "Place of manufacturer not identified in the resource" Agree also 2.8.2	Agree	Agree	Agree - but also add to 2.8.2.2?	Agree (also in 2.8.2?)	DI
	2.8.4 Place of production						
334	include "creation". Withdraw, refer to comment 337 - include in definition	Discuss	Agree	Agree	Disagree Prefer to include only in definition (like "fabrication" & "construction") - see 337	See #337 Moot because ACOC withdrew	W
335	fix typo	Agree	Agree	Agree	[Couldn't find comment in ACOC response]	Agree	A
	2.8.4.1 Definition						
336	Agree	Make more explicit	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
337	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree "creation" (is any corresponding change required in 2.8.4.2?); question "unpublished" (x-ref 336)	Change wording to include "creation"	AB
	2.8.4.2 Recording place of production						
338	Agree	Add provision for unpublished resource for which no place of production is known	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
339	Discuss. Prefer to be able to record place for organisational records where applicable.	Place not appropriate for unpublished, archival collections of papers or records	Discuss	Agree	Agree	See 338 Discuss	DI
340	Agree	Final para: add "locally made recordings"	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 318)	Agree	A
	2.8.5 Notes on place of publication, distribution, etc.						
	2.8.5.1 Definition						
	2.8.5.2 Sources of information						
	2.8.5.3 Details relating to place of publication, distribution, etc.						
341	Discuss. Incorporate in 2.8.4?	Add new data element for place of production for moving image material	2.8.4 covers production	Discuss Agree with LC comment	Agree basic point, but wonder if it could be incorporated into 2.8.5.3	Unsure if covered by 2.8.4 or only covers unpublished now?	DI
	2.8.5.4 Change in place of publication, distribution, etc.						
342	Agree	Agree	Agree	Paras a), b), c): Correct refs and typos	Agree	c) Correct wording	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
343	Agree - Discuss 'instead' M/76.2	Agree	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree basic point, but won't some sort of note to explain the relationship be needed?	Add new option to repeat the data element [new proposal]	DI
	2.9 Date of publication, distribution, etc.						
344	New data element: projected date of publication (263 tag)	Discuss Would welcome new proposal	Pending proposal	Discuss MARC/RDA mapping issue	Discuss, or would welcome new proposal	Don't disagree but want to see proposal	P MAR C/RD A
	2.9.0 Basic instructions on recording date of publication, distribution, etc.						
	2.9.0.1 Definition						
345	Agree	2nd bullet: use bulleted list	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree (x-ref 305)	Agree	A
	2.9.0.2 Sources of information						
346	Agree	Agree	Agree - identified	3rd para: need consistency "named" vs. "identified"	Disagree—feel— terminology is correct— here Agree	Agree: prefer "identified" because dates are not named Discuss per ACOC at #329	DI
347	Discuss	4th para: Query re beginning date; add "released"	n. 348	Agree	Agree	Prefer #348; also, 2.1.1.1 covers out-of- sequence situation	DI
348	Discuss	Discuss - Mode of Issuance	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree, but modify to incorporate ALA (x-ref 347) and check for consistency with 2.6.0.2	4th and 5th paras: change wording	P Mode
349	Discuss	5th para: Query re ending date	no. 348	Agree	See LC (x-ref 348)	Prefer #348	DI
	2.9.0.3 Transcription						
350	Discuss. Agree ALA/LC usually give year, can give more detailed date.	Disagree. ALA would prefer option to record more than the year	Disagree - possibly add examples of other more specific dates.	Make it clear that it is the year that is to be given as the date	Agree, unless change is intended	Disagree: explain that at least year is to be given; some resources need more than year to identify	DI
351	Agree	Agree	Agree	Option a) include "incorrect"	Agree	Agree	A

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.9.0.4 Chronograms						
352	Discuss - 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	Disagree - prefer LC proposal in LC/5/rev	Disagree: should be transcribed	Disagree	Align with DCRM(B)	Disagree: circular because DCRM(B) based on AACR2; also see 5JSC/LC/5	P LC/5/ Rev
	2.9.0.5 Resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources						
353	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Match terms used with other instructions in 2.9.0	A
354	Agree	4th para: use "integrating resource"	?	4th para: Broaden to include all integrating resources	Agree	Background: specific- request from law- librarians when ch. 12- revised—not sure- applies to other- integrating Go with majority	A
355	Agree. Note: similar to LC comment 296 re 2.6.1.3.	Agree	Agree	Agree	6th para: Simplify by dropping option and rewording	Agree	A
356	Agree. M/76.2	Agree	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	Agree basic point, but won't some sort of note to explain the relationship be needed?	add new option to repeat the data element [new proposal]	AB
	2.9.1 Date of publication						
357	Add supplied dates between a range of years See also comment 359 and 362.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (see #362)	A
	2.9.1.1 Definition						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
358	Agree	Discuss Disagree with altering definition. Suggest changing 2.9.1.2 from "the" date to "a" date. 2.9.1.3 change 1st bullet to "If no date of publication is identified...record instead (in this order of preference)..."	Agree	Glossary review Agree that guidance would be useful	Need guidance for when there are multiple dates	Need to distinguish between different dates for different functions vs. multiple dates for same function; will situation be better now that Tom is handling the combining of elements as events? Otherwise, take latest?	DI
	2.9.1.2 Recording date of publication						
	2.9.1.3 Date of publication not identified in the resource						
359	Discuss. Consider 'cannot reasonably be determined' does indicate it's a last resort; but example given undermines this. Re "restore eg", see also comments 357 and 362.	Make clear that "[date unknown]" is a last resort, restore examples from AACR2	Seems unambiguous	Disagree Discuss - agree with ALA's extended comments	Agree	1st: seems clear (LC prefers "undated"); 2nd: same as #362	DI
360	Discuss	1st para: delete, replace with instruction at 1.4 and 2.9.0 Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Moot because ALA withdrew	W
361	Discuss. Consider unpublished thesis covered by final para & 2.9.5. Agree, but ensure 2.9.5 covers all unpublished resources, see comment 370.	Last para: clarify re dissertations	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
362	Agree. Note: 2.9.5.3 3rd para should also provide these options.	Disagree	Agree make examples normative	2nd para: examples should be part of the instructions, and include when span of dates is certain	Agree	Question if need to standardize (match on 008, rather than 260 \$c); if include, give as table?	D
363	Discuss. Agree prefer language neutral form. Also consider use of ISO 8601 per 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/2 as part of internationalisation process - provided intelligible to users.	Discuss	Disagree: looks like an open date	2nd para: Prefer [197-] etc.	Agree	Disagree: translations will use language style	DI
364	Discuss. May be preferable to move final bullet to 2.9.0.1 Definition.	Discuss Go with majority. ACOC suggestion ok (no strong opinion)	Agree	Change heading to "Date of publication not identified in the resource or no date of publication"	Agree	Agree	DI
365	Agree - Discuss. See comment 363.	Agree	Agree this looks odd and might affect matching.	Agree	2nd para: Disagree with use of trailing "s", suggest investigate ISO 8601 Confirm	Disagree: translations will use language style	DI
366	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3.	Discuss Agree ACOC	no 367	Discuss Agree to discuss	3rd para: Use "Date not stated" or "Date not given"	Prefer #367 Discuss per ACOC at #329	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
367	Discuss all alternatives: 'unknown', 'not stated', 'not given' & 'not named' for 2.7.1.3, 2.8.1.3 and 2.9.1.3. SEE also CCC comment 375.	Discuss Agree ACOC	undated	Discuss Agree to discuss	Prefer CILIP (x-ref 366)	3rd para: Use "undated" and reword Discuss per ACOC at #329	DI
	2.9.2 Date of distribution						
	2.9.2.1 Definition						
	2.9.2.2 Recording date of distribution						
	2.9.3 Copyright date						
	2.9.3.1 Definition						
	2.9.3.2 Recording copyright date						
368	Discuss. Why not record both? Do we need to explain what a phonogram date is, and why given preference?	Agree	Agree	Add para re phonogram date vs. copyright date	Agree	Disagree; existing 2nd-bullet now says latest; is CCC suggesting that there be a separate data element?— Discuss	DI
369	Discuss. Consider use of copyright symbol as available in UNICODE.	Moot - already agreed to use symbol or spell out		Disagree Agree that it is moot	Use complete word "copyright" not "c"	JSC decided In Ottawa to use symbol if available; if not, to use complete word	M/89. 6
	2.9.4 Date of manufacture						
	2.9.4.1 Definition						
	2.9.4.2 Recording date of manufacture						
	2.9.5 Date of production						
370	Need a general rule for unpublished resources	Agree	Agree	Agree	Unsure whe 2.9.5.3 isn't enough, but will go with majority view	Agree: to parallel 2.8.4	AB
	2.9.5.1 Definition						
	2.9.5.2 Recording date of production for a published resource						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
371	Agree	Prefer to take the date from any source	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.9.5.3 Recording date of production for an archival resource or a collection						
372	Note overlap with 4.3.0.3	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Noted, but disagree that change needed Confirm	Disagree: 4.3.0.3 = content; this is production	D
373	Agree	Need to allow date of original production for video, graphic, sound	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
374	Agree	Use "unpublished resource or collection"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree: unpublished and archival	AB
375	Discuss all alternatives	Discuss Discuss all alternatives	Discuss	Final para: prefer "date unknown" Discuss with line 359 and 367	Agree	Disagree: prefer "undated" Discuss per ACOC at #329	DI
	2.9.6 Notes on date of publication, distribution, etc.						
	2.9.6.1 Definition						
	2.9.6.2 Sources of information						
	2.9.6.3 Details relating to date of publication, distribution, etc.						
376	Final instruction belongs in ch. 4	Agree, but add reference here to Ch. 4	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	AB
377	Discuss. Query why considered a conflict?	Potential conflict between 1st & 3rd paras- Withdraw	What bullets?	Disagree	Disagree the ALA interpretation Confirm	Don't understand what the problem is. Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	2.9.6.4 Suspension of publication						
	2.10 Series						
	2.10.0 Basic instructions on recording series information						
	2.10.0.1 Definition						
	2.10.0.2 Sources of information						
	2.10.0.3 Transcription						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.10.0.4 Facsimiles and reproductions						
378	Agree	Clarify for when series information only relates to the original	Agree	Disagree Rewording seems to complicate the instructions with no benefit	Agree	Agree	D
	2.10.0.5 Change in series information						
379	Agree re a) Question applicability to b)	Agree	1st para a)&b): Qualify headings to make it clear that apply to comprehensive descriptions only	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree; See #271	D
380	Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Agree	Need provision for change in series info for multipart monographs issued simultaneously	Agree	Agree (related to LC's general comment about using labels "serials" and "multipart monographs," etc.)	AB
381	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference is appropriate	Agree	2nd para: change ref to "2.10.9.4"	D
	2.10.1 Title proper of series						
	2.10.1.1 Definition						
382	Agree to 2nd rewording. Consider 1st rewording more ambiguous. Combine BL suggestion with that given by LC at 383.	Agree	Use of "resource" is ambiguous, reword	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree; slight preference for 1st option	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Agree to 1st option	AB
383	Agree. Combine LC suggestion with that given by BL at 382.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree, but incorporate with BL (x-ref 382)	Reword to be consistent with 2.3.0.1	AB
	2.10.1.2 Sources of information						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
384	Discuss. 'Resource' is defined at 1.1.1, and is used here according to that meaning.	Agree	Reference to "resource" at 2.2.1 in this context is ambiguous	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Discuss; 2.2.1 reference is important if resource is other than text, etc., on paper	DI
385	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: add "and 2.2.2"	A
	2.10.1.3 Recording the title proper of the series						
386	Agree	Agree	Use of "the resource" is ambiguous - reword	Disagree Go with majority	Agree both points	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	A
387	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Reference to 2.3.0 should cover choice	Agree, but incorporate with BL (x-ref 386)	1st para: Change wording	D
	2.10.1.4 Title of series in more than one form						
388	Agree LC.	Either remove last sentence or present as an option	Delete, as relates to description of a series as a resource	Agree Agree to delete; covered by reference to 2.3.0 at 2.10.1.3; move last sentence to Part B	Prefer LC	Delete, move last sentence to part III	AB
	2.10.2 Parallel title of series						
	2.10.2.1 Definition						
389	Agree (as not needed in definition)	Agree	Delete "to which the resource belongs"	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	A
	2.10.2.2 Sources of information						
390	Agree should be same as 2.3.2.	Treatment is different to 2.3.2. Withdraw comment on parenthetical option - keep basic comment	Agree	Agree	Agree basic point; disagree parenthetical option	Disagree: it's a different data element - Go with majority	AB
391	Agree but note becomes moot If comment 390 is agreed.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: add "and 2.2.2"	AB
	2.10.2.3 Recording parallel titles of series						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.10.3 Other title information of series						
	2.10.3.1 Definition						
392	Agree (as not needed in definition)	Agree	Delete "to which the resource belongs"	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	A
	2.10.3.2 Sources of information						
	2.10.3.3 Recording other title information of series						
	2.10.4 Statement of responsibility relating to series						
	2.10.4.1 Definition						
393	Agree (as not needed in definition)	Agree	Delete "to which the resource belongs"	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree Go with majority	A
	2.10.4.2 Sources of information						
	2.10.4.3 Recording statements of responsibility relating to series						
	2.10.5 ISSN of series						
	2.10.5.1 Definition						
	2.10.5.2 Sources of information						
394	Agree. Delete 'within the resource'.	ISSN must be taken from the resource itself? Withdraw	Agree	Disagree Agree with CILIP	a) Yes; b) It doesn't; c) No, disagree. Confirm	OK as is because is transcription of data element; not description of the whole Moot because ALA withdrew	W
395	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1 What change is requested?	Agree	Use of "the resource" is ambiguous	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	DI
	2.10.5.3 Recording the ISSN of a series						
396	Discuss. Prefer to be able to follow instructions in 2.12.1.3	ISSN must be taken from the resource itself? Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree See CCC comment on line 394	x-ref 394	Okay as is: transcription, not about whole resource Moot because ALA withdrew	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
397	Agree	Agree	Agree	Shouldn't 2.12.1.3 apply for incorrect ISSNs?	Agree	Disagree: this data element is transcription (not recording) Discuss transcription vs. truth-telling in this data element	DI
	2.10.6 Numbering within series						
	2.10.6.1 Definition						
398	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st bullet: remove "successive"	A
399	Agree for consistency	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: use "accompanying caption"	A
	2.10.6.2 Sources of information						
400	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1	Agree	Use of "the resource" is ambiguous	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	DI
	2.10.6.3 Recording numbering within series						
	2.10.6.4 Chronological designation						
401	Discuss. Instructions seem consistent.	Inconsistency with 2.6? Withdraw	Be more specific. I don't want to guess.	Agree Go with majority	Disagree Can't see the inconsistency	What is the inconsistency? Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	2.10.6.5 New sequence of numbering						
	2.10.6.6 Alternative numbering systems						
402	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Reword and delete ref to 2.6.6	A
	2.10.6.7 Separately numbered issues or parts						
403	Agree ALA and CCC	Para a): Expand to all multipart monographs	Agree	Para a): use "multipart monograph" in the instruction	Agree	Agree	A
404	Agree	Agree	Reword	Disagree Prefer CCC comment on line 403	Agree	Disagree; Prefer #403	D
	2.10.7 Subseries						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
405	Agree. See also comment 409	Clarify whether recorded as in 2.3.0.7	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.10.7.1 Definition						
	2.10.7.2 Sources of information						
406	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1 See 407	Agree	Use of "the resource" is ambiguous	Disagree Go with majority	Agree, but LC wording avoids this (x-ref 407)	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	See 407
407	Agree		Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Agree	Change wording	A
	2.10.7.3 Title proper of subseries						
408	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1 Go with majority	Agree	Use of "the resource" is ambiguous	Disagree Go with majority	Agree	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	A
409	Agree. See also comment 405	Discuss - Moot with element/subelement structure? Otherwise agree	Agree	Discuss Agree to discuss; there seems to be confusion regarding 2.3.0.7 and 2.10.7.3	Agree, but incorporate with BL (x-ref 408)	Change wording to accomplish intent of 2.3.0.7	DI
	2.10.7.4 Title of series and subseries in more than one language						
410	No opinion	1st para: Conflict with 2.10.1.2, reword	Discuss	Discuss See CCC comment on line 409	Agree	Need JSC decision if main series and subseries are (1) one data element or (2) another kind of event (like publishing) where would be matching the separate data elements	DI
	2.10.7.5 "New series," "second series," etc.						
	2.10.7.6 Subseries or second series						
411	Agree	Use "separate series" and reword	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.10.7.7 Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of subseries						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	2.10.7.8 Parallel title, other title information, and statement of responsibility relating to a subseries						
	2.10.7.9 ISSN of subseries						
	2.10.7.10 Numbering within subseries						
	2.10.8 Resource in more than one series						
412	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1 Go with majority	Agree	Use of "resource" is ambiguous, reword	Disagree Go with majority	Agree both	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	A
	2.10.9 Notes on series information						
413	Discuss. Use consistent with definition in 1.1.1 Go with majority	Agree	Use of "resource" is ambiguous, reword	Disagree Go with majority	Agree both	Disagree; relates to 1.1.1 Go with majority	A
	2.10.9.1 Definition						
	2.10.9.2 Sources of information						
	2.10.9.3 Complex series information						
414	Agree	Discuss	Only applies to comprehensive description, add qualifier	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree; see #271	DI
	2.10.9.4 Change in series information						
415	Agree	Discuss	Only applies to comprehensive description, add qualifiers	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree basic point but shame there's not a more elegant solution	Disagree; see #271	DI
	2.11 Frequency						
	2.11.0 Basic instructions on recording frequency						
	2.11.0.1 Definition						
	2.11.0.2 Sources of information						
	2.11.0.3 Recording frequency						
416	Discuss. Notes vs. element?	Allow for notes for frequency Withdraw	As I read it, they are allowed.	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree: such notes not prohibited now. Moot because ALA withdrew	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
417	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: remove "Frequency varies" and "Frequency of updates varies" from the instruction	Agree	Replacing with a instruction for a general note? Agree	A
	2.12 Resource identifier						
	2.12.0 Basic instructions on recording resource identifiers						
	2.12.0.1 Definition						
418	Agree delete "uniquely".	1st bullet: "Uniquely" is incorrect for music plate numbers	Agree	Agree	1st bullet: Remove "uniquely"	Agree	A
419	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st bullet: Use "a number or code"	Agree	Agree	A
420	Discuss. Document does not seem to be used in this way.	4th bullet: "Document" is library jargon ALA to consider preparing proposal regarding usage of library-specific terminology	Agree	Agree	Agree	Okay as is (so many other terms more jargon-y: parallel title, other title information, etc.)	DI
	2.12.0.2 Sources of information						
	2.12.0.4 Facsimiles and reproductions						
421	Agree	separate data elements for facsimiles and reproductions	Agree these are different.	Discuss Go with majority	Agree separate elements	See #433 Agree	A
422	Agree	Agree	Agree	Should be 2.12.0.3	Agree	Agree	A
	2.12.1 Standard number						
	2.12.1.1 Recording standard numbers						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
423	Discuss. Doesn't ISO prescribe that the numbers are preceded by 'ISBN' and separated by either spaces or hyphens?	Discuss Would examples illustrate the specific standard?	Agree	Agree	For the ISBN "in the format prescribed by the relevant standard" is ambiguous Confirm	Agree; some data elements (e.g., ISBN) may be recorded in a machine-readable format different from the standard display format for that data element. (In ISBN manual, under Ch. 4 Structure of ISBN, it says "The ten-digit number is divided into four parts of variable length, which must be separated clearly by hyphens or spaces ..." and goes on to talk about data processing without hyphens or spaces.) So, suggest replacing 2nd sentence with "Record standard numbers in a form that will support the display of them in the format prescribed by the relevant standard."	DI
	2.12.1.2 Two or more standard numbers						
	2.12.1.3 Incorrect standard numbers						
424	Discuss. Prefer not to distinguish.	If distinction between invalid and incorrect numbers, clearly define	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree; Prefer #425	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
425	Agree. Need to consider how to present examples	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: change wording to remove directions on how to indicate the status of the number	AB
426	Agree. See comment at 425	Query use of parentheses	Agree	Agree	Goes away if LC adopted (x-ref 425/427)	Agree	AB
427	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	2nd para: delete	A
2.12.1.4 Qualification							
428	Agree	1st sentence: add "of the same type"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
429	Agree	2nd sentence: delete	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (& appendix D is incorrect)	A
430	Agree but consider that existing instructions are consistent with BL comment.	Agree	Only applies to comprehensive level description	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Disagree; see #271	D
2.12.2 Other resource identifiers							
2.12.2.1 Recording other resource identifiers							
431	Ref to App. D is incorrect. Confirm it's just the numbering that's a problem.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree If ACOC is saying it's the wrong Appendix, then agree. But if saying the ref is "inappropriate" and that abbrevs shouldn't be used, then confirm disagreement	Agree	A
2.12.2.2 Two or more resource identifiers							
432	Agree	Option: Query change from dash to hyphen	Agree	Option: Use dash instead of hyphen	Agree	Agree: dash	A
2.12.2.3 Music publishers' numbers and plate numbers							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
433	Discuss. ALA consider offering rewording?	3rd para: Conflict with 2.12.0.4 Consider defining new data element for resource identifiers for the original rather than relegating them to a note under 4.10.2. See ALA response 2e p. 10. ALA to do a proposal?	Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Agree	Agree; would welcome proposal	DI
	2.13 Published description						
	2.13.0 References to published descriptions						
	2.13.0.1 Definition						
	2.13.0.2 Sources of information						
	2.13.0.3 Recording references to published descriptions						
434	Agree	Remove "brief"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Remove "brief"	A
435	Agree.	Clarify footnote	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.14 Issue, part, or iteration used as the basis for the description						
436	Use "online" instead of "remote access"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 212)	Agree	A
437	Agree	Make terminology consistent with 2.1	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	2.14.1 Issue or part used as the basis for the description of a serial or multipart monograph						
438	Agree. See CCC comment 440.	Keep notes on earliest and latest parts consulted separate	Agree	Mode of issuance	No objection to current wording, but happy to remove if others wish	Agree	P Mode
439	Agree	1st para: add "released"	Agree	Mode of issuance	Agree - may need to check for other places?	Related to 2.1.1.1; prefer concept in #94	P Mode

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
440	Agree. See ALA comment 438.	Discuss - CONSER combines in a single note but this may not be ideal future practice	Agree	Paras a) and c) Do any constituencies combine information in a single note?	No objection to current wording, but happy to remove if others wish	Agree (same as #438) Isn't status "P Mode"	P Mode
441	Agree	Agree	Agree	Para c): delete last sentence	Agree	Agree	A
	2.14.2 Iteration used as the basis for the description of an integrating resource						
	2.14.3 Date of viewing of a remote access resource						
442	Use "online" instead of "remote access"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 212)	Agree	A
CHAPTER 3- TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
CHAPTER 4- CONTENT DESCRIPTION							
4.0 Purpose and scope							
612	Agree re quotation marks. Discuss use of FRBR terms e.g. "... their requirements regarding the form, language, intended audience etc. of the work or expression"	Don't use quotation marks around "intellectual". Use FRBR terms?	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 212)	1st: agree; 2nd: agree	DI
4.1 Sources of information							
613	Agree (although note ALA comment 446 re 3.1.1)	Prefer LC wording line 614		State explicitly that info should first be taken from the resource itself	Agree	Prefer #614 (no priority)	D
614	Discuss	Agree	Agree, but not the proposed wording - the original seems clearer, but needs a more prescriptive tone.	Disagree Prefer line 613	Dislike this & not sure it's a good use of parentheses Confirm	Change wording	DI
4.2 Type and form of content							
4.3 Nature and scope of the content							
615	Discuss. See also ALA comment 632. Are first 3 examples correctly included? Can wording be improved to show the distinction? Also consider moving 4.6 after 4.3.	Discuss	Distinction seems clear.	4.3 and 4.6 - is there significant distinction to justify two separate elements?	Retain, but note that ALA has also raised this (x-ref 632) Confirm	Keep two elements and move the two 4.6.0.3 examples to 4.4.0.3.	DI
4.3.0 Basic instructions on describing the nature and scope of the content							
4.3.0.1 Definition							
4.3.0.2 Sources of information							
4.3.0.3 Describing the nature and scope of the content							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
616	Note overlap with 2.9.5.3. Withdraw	Disagree		Disagree	Disagree change required (x-ref 372) Confirm	Disagree Moot because ACOC withdrew	W
617	Agree	Some examples more approp. at 4.11? If so need instructions at 4.11	Examples	Examples Group Related to line 615	1) For Examples Group 2) Agree 4.11 needs something for when transcription usn't appropriate/possible	Or are examples being moved?	DI
	4.4 Language, script, etc., of the content						
	4.4.0 Basic instructions on recording language, script, etc.						
	4.4.0.1 Definition						
618	Agree	Script: reword		Glossary review Go with majority	Prefer LC (x-ref 621) Confirm	Agree	D
619	Agree	Symbol system: reword	Agree	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
620	Agree. Consider as subpoint under Language definition rather than 4th para?	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Delete 4.4.1 and add new para here	AB
621	Discuss 'writing system' vs. 'characters'. If change made to 'is conveyed', need to make consistent throughout RDA.	Discuss	Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Agree; check capitalisation of Cuneiform - definitely lower case	2nd para: change wording	DI
	4.4.0.2 Sources of information						
622	Agree	Agree		Agree	Disagree; OK as is Yield	Make terms consistent with 4.4.0.3	A
	4.4.0.3 Recording language, script, etc., of the content						
623	Discuss.	Discuss	Disagree	Query re "closed captioning" without mention of any specific language	Disagree	Don't understand: "closed captioning" only in note; proposal?	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
624	Agree	Agree		Agree	Disagree; OK as is (x-ref 622) Yield	Make terms consistent with 4.4.0.2	A
	4.4.1 Programming language						
625	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 620)	See 4.4.0.1	A
	4.5 Intended audience						
	4.5.0 Basic instructions on describing the intended audience						
626	Discuss. 'Identify' is very specific & also an FRBR term. Agree 'recording' per ALA comment.	Agree with need to change "describing but prefer "recording" to "identifying"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Use "identifying the intended audience" Accept "recording"	A
	4.5.0.1 Definition						
627	Discuss. Agree add 'persons with disabilities'. Disagree delete 4.6.0.3.	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree wording, but disagree this replaces 4.6.0.3 (x-ref 633) Confirm	Change wording and then delete 4.6.0.3	DI
	4.5.0.2 Sources of information						
628	Discuss. 'Identify' is very specific & also an FRBR term. Agree 'recording' per ALA comment.	Agree with need to change "describing but prefer "recording" to "identifying"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Use "identifying the intended audience" Accept "recording"	A
	4.5.0.3 Describing the intended audience						
629	Discuss. Film classifications (G, PG, R etc) would seem to be covered by instruction. Perhaps add examples.	Film ratings included? Would be happy to see examples of film ratings added here rather than adding new wording. Refer to Examples Group?		Covered by examples	Not appropriate; would need something new or separate, and generalised, e.g. Classification & categorisation, not specific to film/tv Confirm	Agree	D

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
630	Discuss. Prefer instruction not specify 'brief'. 'Identify' is very specific & also an FRBR term. Agree 'recording' per ALA comment.	Agree with need to change "describing" but prefer "recording" to "identifying"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Use "identifying the intended audience" Accept "recording"	A
631	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	add new para	A
	4.6 Summarization of the content						
	4.6.0 Basic instructions on summarizing the content						
	4.6.0.1 Definition						
	4.6.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.6.0.3 Summarizing the content						
632	See also CCC comment 615.	Clarify overlap with 4.3 Prefer to keep separate to clarify		Disagree See CCC comment on line 615	Agree; also agree distinction exists & needs to be kept	Agree	D

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
633	Discuss. Note that this element is optional. Consider alternative: "Provide a brief objective summary of the content of the resource if considered to be important for access (e.g. for audiovisual resources; for resources designed for use by persons with disabilities), unless another part of the description provides enough information." ALA & LC suggestions do not address the need to provide summary of the content of the resource to support FRBR task 'Select'.	2nd para: Instruct elsewhere to indicate aspects of a resource intended for use by persons with disabilities Agree ACOC comments	Agree	Agree with LC comment on line 627	Agree	Prefer #634	DI
634	See ACOC comment on ALA comment 633 above.	Agree		Agree	Disagree but agree ACOC point & possible solution	2nd para: Delete (see 4.5.0.1 and 4.5.0.3)	D
	4.7 Contents list						
	4.7.0 Basic instructions on listing contents						
	4.7.0.1 Definition						
	4.7.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.7.0.3 Listing contents						
635	Agree re 'state of completeness'.	2nd para: reword to clarify OK to go with line 636		Disagree Prefer line 636	(1) Agree; (2) disagree "needed" by whom? Confirm	Prefer #636	D

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
636	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Reword option and add to 1st para use "duration"	A
637	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree		A
638	Discuss. Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree Yield, so long as option NOT to do something in an element that is already optional can be made sense of by editorial team	final para: make optional [Change to AACR2 3.7B18]	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
639	Discuss. Go with majority	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree, but would prefer to offer more flexibility as part of revised 1st para than by having separate option Confirm	add option based on AACR2 5.7B18 AACR2 permits simplifying in this way as a means of reducing the length of complicated contents notes. Such notes are especially characteristic of musical works with generic titles that each have several elements. By eliminating repetition of the title, the element they all have in common and which the title of the manifestation has already made clear is the same for every work, the contents note is shorter and clearer. See the final ex. in 5.B18, where every work would have the same title, e.g., "Sonata," or "String quartet."	DI
4.8 System of arrangement							
640	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add period to heading	Agree	Agree	A
641	Agree. Prefer to extend to any collection.	Clarify relationship to archival materials		Disagree Seems clear as is	Agree	Agree	D
4.8.0 Basic instructions on noting system of arrangement							

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	4.8.0.1 Definition						
	4.8.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.8.0.3 Noting system of arrangement						
	4.9 Indexes and finding aids						
642	Discuss. Disagree	Broaden to "assistance- resources" Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree Seems clear as is	Agree basic point, but hate the term suggested! Confirm dislike - is this term in general use elsewhere?	Disagree Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	4.9.0 Basic instructions on noting indexes and finding aids						
	4.9.0.1 Definition						
643	Agree	Index: reword Suggest Editor incorporate wording from both 643 and 644		Disagree Prefer line 644	Incorporate with LC (x- ref 644)	Disagree: prefer #644	see 644
644	Agree, prefer ALA wording. Agree, combine. □ An index is a systematic guide to the contents of one or more resources, consisting of an ordered arrangement of terms or other symbols representing the contents and references, code numbers, page numbers, etc., for accessing the contents.	Prefer 643 ALA wording		Agree	Agree, but modify to incorporate ALA (x-ref 643)	Index: Change wording	DI
645	Agree. Prefer CCC or LC's wording.	Finding aid: Reword OK to go with 647 instead		Disagree Prefer line 647	Agree ALA has since yielded	Disagree: prefer #647	W

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
646	Agree. No opinion re 'repository' vs. LC's 'agency' in comment 647.	Prefer 645 ALA wording but ok to go with 647 instead		Finding aid: Reword Prefer line 647	Prefer ALA (x-ref 645) ALA has since yielded	Disagree: prefer #647	W
647	Agree	Prefer 645 ALA wording but ok to go with 647 instead		Agree	Prefer ALA (x-ref 645) ALA has since yielded	Finding aid: change wording	A
	4.9.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.9.0.3 Noting indexes and finding aids						
648	Agree	Discuss when to still use "if considered to be important" for optional omissions	Agree	Disagree Leave as is (i.e., if considered important)	Remove "if considered to be important" Confirm	Disagree Discuss per ALA	DI
	4.9.1 Cumulative indexes to serials						
649	Agree. Consider merge.	Remove restriction to serials. Merge with 4.9.0.3?	Agree	Agree to remove restriction but keep 4.9.1	Agree	Agree	AB
	4.10 Related content						
650	New data elements: location of related materials and originals/duplicates (535 and 544 tags)	Discuss Would welcome new proposal	Discuss	Discuss MARC/RDA mapping issue	Agree, but can't offer to prepare proposal(s)	Need to see proposal. (Is tag 535 same as 4.10.2?)	P MAR C/RD A
	4.10.0 Basic instructions on describing related content						
	4.10.0.1 Definition						
	4.10.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.10.0.3 Describing related content						
	Analytic and comprehensive relationships [new proposal]						
651	Agree	Agree	Agree	Covered in new ch. 6	Agree	Add section	AB
	4.10.1 Preceding, succeeding, and simultaneously issued resources						
652	Agree (CILIP provide wording?)	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add explanatory introductory sentence	Won't this now be in part I-B?	AB
	4.10.1.0 Notes on preceding, succeeding, and simultaneously issued resources						
	4.10.1.1 Continuation, sequel, prequel, etc.						
	4.10.1.2 Merger						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	4.10.1.3 Split						
	4.10.1.4 Absorption						
653	Agree. Discuss whether also useful for mergers and splits?	2nd para: add option to add date of absorption	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	AB
	4.10.1.5 Translation						
654	Agree	Agree	Agree	Correct typo	Agree	Agree	A
	4.10.1.6 Simultaneous edition						
655	Agree	Add instructions for replacement volumes (New proposal)		Mode of issuance	Agree	JAK note: Defer LC comment until BT returns. (also related to "issuance" discussion)	P Mode
	4.10.1.7 Supplement						
	4.10.1.8 Issued with						
656	Discuss. Need further info. on ALA's concern. Re microfilm example, need to examine overlap with Ch 6 component/component relationships.	Narrow wording	Agree	Agree	(1) Disagree; (2) Agree (1) Will agree if suitable wording found	Agree	DI
	4.10.2 Original of a facsimile or reproduction						
	4.10.3 Facsimile or reproduction of an original						
	4.11 Format of notated music						
657	Discuss. Note: change from AACR .	Discuss - Agree with always transcribing the same data in the same place. Would these statements of responsibilities become a transcribed element?	Discuss	Allow transcription of statements of responsibility related to format	Disagree Confirm	Agree (was LC's point in 5JSC/LC/4)	DI
	4.11.0 Basic instructions on recording the format of notated music						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	4.11.0.1 Definition						
658	Discuss. The potential overlap with 2.5.1.4 needs to be clarified.	Make reference to 2.5.1.4	Discuss	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree	What is the distinction? (raised in 5JSC/LC/4) Discuss	DI
	4.11.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.11.0.3 Recording the format of notated music						
	4.12 Medium of performance of musical content						
	4.12.0 Basic instructions on recording medium of performance						
	4.12.0.1 Definition						
	4.12.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.12.0.3 Recording medium of performance						
659	Discuss	1st para: Disconnect with 4.10.0.3 Withdraw	Disagree	Disagree Agree with LC	No change or additional instruction needed Confirm	Disagree: only an example Moot because ALA withdrew	W
660	Discuss. Can the instruction be applied to sound recordings - alternatively, does the order need to be specified for notated music?	Discuss - voices and instruments MAY be listed on a recording. Specify to record if applicable?	Discuss	2nd para: works only for notated music, order is not specified in sound recordings	Disagree specifics of CCC point, but rewording required to accommodate basic point Confirm	1st comment: disagree; 2nd: disagree because can apply to sound recordings	DI
	4.13 Scale of cartographic content						
661	Discuss.	4.13-4.17: Mix of transcription and non-transcription; If "resource itself" excludes the carrier there will be contradictions	Discuss	Agree	a) Agree, but what's being proposed?; b) consider with 2.2.1 (x-ref 107/108)	1st comment: Tom will be clarifying "transcribe" and "record"; 2nd comment relates to sources not yet decided Discuss	DI
662	Discuss.	Mention all three types of scale [new proposal] Withdraw	Discuss	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree; cover all in one instruction	All 3 in 4.13.0.1. Is ALA preparing proposed wording? Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	4.13.0 Basic instructions on recording scale of cartographic content						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	4.13.0.1 Definition						
	4.13.0.2 Sources of information						
663	Agree.	Agree	Agree	Add para for scale found outside the resource	Agree	Agree	A
	4.13.0.3 Recording scale						
	4.13.1 Additional scale information						
664	Discuss - Punctuation. Not covered by ISBD. Is there a need to standardise - if not, delete.	Discuss	Discuss	Query inclusion of punctuation in instruction	Agree - but how does with fit with 496?	Agree	DI
665	Agree - delete.	Agree	Agree	Para a): Query use of "cataloguer"	Agree	Agree: delete	A
	4.13.2 Variations in scale						
666	No opinion. If added, use 'multiple scales'.	Use "Variations in scale; multiple scale"	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree; give as two separate instructions	AB
667	Discuss. Prefer add as general provision, refer to Cartographic Materials for specialist cataloguer.	Agree	Discuss	Include options from AACR2 3.3B4	[no idea]	Agree; but shouldn't "scale statements" be data elements; also note that the RDA option for a) says to give each scale separately	DI
	4.13.3 Cartographic content not drawn to scale						
	4.13.4 Nonlinear scale						
	4.13.5 Vertical and horizontal scales						
	4.14 Projection of cartographic content						
	4.14.0 Basic instructions on recording projection of cartographic content						
	4.14.0.1 Definition						
	4.14.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.14.0.3 Recording projection						
	4.15 Coordinates of cartographic content						
	4.15.0 Basic instructions on recording coordinates of cartographic content						

A = Agree ; AB = Agree, but; D = Disagree; DI = Discussion requested ; M = Minutes/Meeting; P = Proposal;
W=Withdrawn

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	4.15.0.1 Definition						
668	Agree	Reword		Glossary review Go with majority	Agree	Agree with need to reword but disagree with replacement I1358:I1383 Go with majority	A
	4.15.0.2 Sources of information						
669	Agree	Continue to take from any source		Disagree Prefer line 670	Agree (x-ref CCC 670)	Agree	D
670	Agree	Agree but change "is" to "are"	Agree	Add para	Agree	Agree if #669 not approved	AB
	4.15.0.3 Recording longitude and latitude						
	4.15.0.4 Recording strings of coordinate pairs						
671	Agree	Move option to 4.15.0.3	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	4.15.0.5 Recording ascension and declination						
	4.16 Magnitude of cartographic content						
672	Discuss.	Delete, not required Agree LC better in 4.17	Discuss	Agree	No view on whether better to delete or merge	Disagree: in 4.17	DI
	4.16.0 Basic instructions on recording magnitude of cartographic content						
	4.16.0.1 Definition						
	4.16.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.16.0.3 Recording magnitude						
	4.17 Other details of cartographic content						
	4.17.0 Basic instructions on noting other details of cartographic content						
	4.17.0.1 Definition						
673	Discuss. ALA to identify perceived inconsistency - mathematical data has been used?	Use consistent wording	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	DI
	4.17.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.17.0.3 Noting other mathematical data						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
674	Agree	Caption: Use "Notes on scale, projection, and coordinates" Add "magnitude" to caption		Agree	Agree	Disagree (magnitude included) Discuss if can generalize caption rather than listing	DI
675	Disagree. Geodetic datum etc found on many topographic maps. This is information about content & suitability to purpose.	2nd para: better placed at 3.9? Withdraw		Disagree	[no idea]	Disagree: 2nd paragraph about content, not carrier Moot because ALA withdrew	W
676	Agree	Agree	Agree	3rd para: "record" vs. "make notes" in 4.13.5?	[don't understand] so count as an "agree"!	Agree	A
	4.17.0.4 Noting other features of cartographic content						
	4.18 Dissertations						
677	Discuss. This info. could be recorded as a note in any case?	Broaden section, treat each piece of information as a separate element	Agree	Disagree Agree with LC	Agree	Agree to broadening section; disagree about treating each piece of information as separate data element (adding too much detail; is that detail more appropriate for other notes [e.g., relationships?])	DI
	4.18.0 Basic instructions on recording dissertation information						
	4.18.0.1 Definition						
	4.18.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.18.0.3 Recording dissertation information						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
678	Discuss - Punctuation. Not covered by ISBD. Is there a need to standardise - if not, delete & cover by general instruction per CCC comment 727.	Delete punctuation instruction	Agree LC	Agree LC	Agree LC	Move parentheses instruction to App. D	DI
679	Discuss - Punctuation. Prefer to delete unless needed.	Prefer to remove punctuation instruction	Disagree	Add option	Agree; or stop requiring statement in specific format? (x-ref 678)	Disagree because would apply to any note	DI
	4.19 Awards						
	4.19.0 Basic instructions on recording information on awards						
	4.19.0.1 Definition						
680	Agree. Consider 'merit'. Also discuss whether to expand this instruction.	Not always for "excellence" Agree LC that "etc." covers it - probably not worth JSC discussion		Glossary review Agree with LC that "etc." covers this	Agree	Disagree (already has "etc.")	D
681	Agree	Agree	Agree	Correct typo	Agree	Agree	A
	4.19.0.2 Sources of information						
	4.19.0.3 Recording information on awards						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
CHAPTER 5 - INFORMATION ON TERMS OF AVAILABILITY, ETC.							
	5.0 Purpose and scope						
	5.1 Sources of information						
	5.2 Terms of availability						
	5.2.0 Basic instructions on recording terms of availability						
	5.2.0.1 Definition						
682	Discuss. Existing broader definition seems preferable. Go with majority	Reword	Agree	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree	Agree	A
	5.2.0.2 Sources of information						
	5.2.0.3 Recording information on terms of availability						
	5.3 Contact information						
	5.3.0 Basic instructions on providing contact information						
	5.3.0.1 Definition						
683	Agree Leave to Editor to match terms used here with those used elsewhere	2nd & 3rd bullets: change introductory phrases		Glossary review Go with majority	Disagree As LC (so still disagree on first bit)	1st: disagree; 2nd: agree Go with majority	DI
684	Discuss.	Contact information: reword- Withdraw	Disagree	Glossary review Go with majority	Agree basic point - but delete "specific" (adds nothing meaningful) & seek alternative to "get in touch with" (clunky)	Disagree Moot because ALA withdrew	W
	5.3.0.2 Sources of information						
	5.3.0.3 Providing contact information for published resources						
685	Discuss. What are the implications for RDA?	Agree	Agree	Agree	Need to recognize that the provision of a full address is not solely for the purposes of contact	Agree (really a data element for chapter 2?)	DI

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
686	Discuss. Change wording for both 5.3.0.3 and 5.4.0.4 that covers street, postal and email addresses?	Agree to include email, prefer to not use the phrase "contact information"	Agree	Agree	Agree basic point, but would like to drop the parenthetical text & allow concept of "usefulness", not just importance	Change wording to allow for email addresses	DI
	5.3.0.4 Providing contact information for archival resources						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
CHAPTER 6 - ITEM-SPECIFIC INFORMATION							
	6.4 Restrictions on access						
710	Would fit better with a revised scope for ch. 5	Moot with elimination of orig. chapter 6	Agree	Awaiting Editor revisions	Agree	Agree	M - Ch.6
711	Overlap with examples at 6.5	Agree	Examples	Awaiting Editor revisions Agree there is overlap with examples	Disagree Just examples	Disagree (only examples)	D - Exam ples.
	6.4.0 Basic instructions on recording restrictions on access						
712	Reword New 6.4.0 on immediate source of acquisition	Agree	Discuss	Awaiting Editor revisions Related to line 709	Agree (x-ref 709)	Confused: is this the old 6.4.0 or the new 6.4.0 cited in #709?	DI
713	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add period to heading	Agree	Agree	A
	6.4.0.1 Definition						
714	Agree	Remove "physical"	Agree	Glossary review	Agree	Agree	A
	6.4.0.2 Sources of information						
	6.4.0.3 Recording restrictions on access						
715	Agree	Agree	Agree	Awaiting Editor revisions	Agree new sentence; disagree "specific" change	Add sentence to match DACS	AB
	6.5 Restrictions on use						
716	Would fit better with a revised scope for ch. 5	Moot with elimination of orig. chapter 6		Awaiting Editor revisions	Agree (x-ref 710)	Agree	M - Ch.6
717	Overlap with examples at 6.4	Agree		Awaiting Editor revisions Agree there is overlap with examples	Disagree (x-ref 711) Just examples	Disagree (only examples)	D - Exam ples
	6.5.0 Basic instructions on recording restrictions on use						
718	Agree		Agree	Add period to heading	Agree	Agree	A
	6.5.0.1 Definition						
	6.5.0.2 Sources of information						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
	6.5.0.3 Recording restrictions on use						
719	Discuss If literary rights aren't restrictions on use per CILIP comment, should they be placed here?	Why separate bullet on literary rights? Withdraw	Discuss	Awaiting Editor revisions Disagree; agree with CILIP	Disagree. Quite different - restriction on use vs restricted access to info re use Confirm	Agree	W
	6.6 Appraisal and accrual						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
APPENDIX D - PRESENTATION OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA							
725	Present information in format at AACR2 1.0D. Display same record in ISBD and MARC	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree both	Agree	A
726	Discuss - Punctuation	Include punctuation instructions not from ISBD in appendix, and designate as such. Align spacing conventions with ISBDs	Discuss	Discuss Agree	Agree both	Isn't first comment related to #731? Second comment: agree.	DI
727	Agree	Discuss Go with majority	Agree	There should be an option to add punctuation if it clarifies the description, or to substitute punctuation	Agree	Agree (related partially to #731).	A
D.0 Purpose and scope							
D.1 ISBD presentation							
D.1.1 Order of elements							
728	Agree	Correct title of ISBD(CR) Change "Continuing Resources" to "Serials and Other Continuing Resources" - this isn't a citation of the exact title but still needs to be corrected	Agree	Agree	Agree	MARC record has only ISBD(CR) in 245 \$a- with long form in \$b- Go with majority	AB

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
729	Agree	Add guidance that punctuation precedes the element	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
730	Agree	Element names need to match captions in text	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
731	Discuss	Add instructions that appear in AACR2	Agree	Agree	Agree (x-ref 726)	Disagree (not in ISBD) unless explain	DI
	D.1.2 Prescribed punctuation						
732	Agree	Add provisions from 0.4.8 of ISBD(G)	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	D.1.2.0 General instructions						
733	Agree	Agree	Agree	1st para: add text	Agree	Agree	A
	D.1.2.1 Title and statement of responsibility area						
	D.1.2.2 Edition area						
734	Agree	Agree		Add sentence	Disagree – isn't this the same as the 2nd-bullet? Yield	Agree	A
735	Agree	Agree	Agree	Instructions lacking on transcription of edition statements associated with different works in a resource lacking a collective title	Agree	Agree	A
	D.1.2.3 Material (or type of publication) specific area						
736	No opinion.	Numbering, 2nd para: use "chronological designation" instead of date	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
737	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Give guidance about the order of multiple area 3s	A
	D.1.2.4 Publication, distribution, etc., area						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
738	Discuss. What additional guidance would be needed? Agree, but what should the guidance be?	Agree	Agree	Disagree at line 313 Agree with LC	Agree	If options at 2.7.0.7, 2.8.5.4. and 2.9.0.5 agreed, add guidance	DI
	D.1.2.5 Physical description area						
	D.1.2.6 Series area						
739	Agree	Add practice from AACR2 1.6G3	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	A
	D.1.2.7 Note area						
740	Discuss - Punctuation. Discuss order of info. Agree	Agree	Agree	Add instruction from 1.7A3	Agree	Agree	A
741	Discuss. Is this best placed here or at 1.7? Confirm - also what is the guidance?	Agree that guidance is needed but is this an ISBD issue?	Agree	Agree	Agree	Suggested additions	DI
	D.1.2.8 Standard number (or alternative) and terms of availability area						
	D.1.3 "In" Analytics						
742	Discuss - match new Ch 6. Agree, also agree re aggregate/component	Agree but prefer Aggregate/component rather than "host"	Agree	Agree but prefer "Aggregate/component" to "host"	Use "component part" and "host"	Agree; also agree with ALA and CCC	DI
	D.1.3.1 Definition						
	D.1.3.2 Presentation of an "In" analytic						
743	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Add option to point to new 4.10.0.4	A
	D.1.3.3 Parts of "In" analytics						
	D.1.4 Multilevel description						
	D.1.4.1 Definition						
	D.1.4.2 Presentation of a multilevel description						
	D.2 OPAC displays						

Com	ACOC	ALA	BL	CCC	CILIP	LC	Stat.
744	Moot - JSC decided not to include OPAC displays in initial release at April 2006 meeting?	Include examples of OPAC displays that illustrate the single record technique. ALA to provide example?		Disagree	Agree	Agree	M/89. 14
	D.3						