To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: First issue versus latest (current) issue

CCC thanks DNB for this extensive discussion of the issues of basing descriptions on the first issue versus the latest issue. CCC is of the opinion that RDA must remain compatible with both the ISBD and ISSN.

While the discussion paper was focused on serials, this would have an impact on all multi-part resources issued over time, e.g., multi-volume monographs and series. Experience has shown that series titles flip-flop which would result in maintenance of the authorized access point, were the 'latest issue' approach offered as an alternative. Basing the description on the earliest issue provides stability and avoids ensuing maintenance headaches.

RDA's current method of presenting alternatives in the RDA Toolkit is not suited to this situation. Simply adding alternatives throughout RDA without scoping introduces the potential for confusion and mis-use. Agencies using the 'latest issue' will follow the entire package of practices presented in this discussion. It would be preferable to have the set of alternatives bound together and presented to cataloguers as a choice in their RDA Toolkit profile. By a click in the profile, the agency could display the 'latest issue' instructions and the 'first issue' instructions would be suppressed. The potential of using technology should be investigated further.

We do agree that changes over time could be more rigorously recorded. We agree with ACOC's suggestion in their response that DNB explore the possibility of introducing elements to cover all states of the resource. Once those elements are all in place, the basis of the description could become a local application decision. The cataloguing community is accustomed to working with differences created by local application decisions, e.g., LC's past practice of not following AACR2 in regard to reproductions.