**International Federation of
Library Associations and Institutions**

### ISBD Review Group
### https://www.ifla.org/isbd-rg
### ISBD Editorial Group

## Impact of the IFLA LRM on the ISBD
## Preliminary recommendations and questions

### Context

Following their meeting from November 12 to November 14 2018, the ISBD Editorial Group produced a preliminary assessment of the impact of the IFLA-LRM on the ISBD, in the form of a table that links the attributes of the Manifestation entity with the corresponding ISBD elements. This table was circulated to the ISBD Review Group. Please note that this is only a *preliminary* assessment that calls for further review and discussion, thanks to feedback from the ISBD RG and in later in-person meetings of the Editorial Group.

The present document synthesises both the discussions and the preliminary assessment table by submitting a number of questions and recommendations to the ISBD Review Group. For further information, a detailed account of the meeting can be found in the minutes that were circulated to the ISBD RG.

### Terminology

A majority of the Editorial Group is in favour of shifting from "resource" to "manifestation", not systematically but in those instances when "resource" is used to specifically designate a manifestation. The Editorial Group advises that this shift should be done very cautiously and should be limited to those cases where there is an exact match with the definition of "Manifestation" in the model, as there will be no ISBD-specific definition of Manifestation.

**=> Question 1**: does the ISBD RG agree to use the precise term "Manifestation" when (and only when) it matches with the definition of "Manifestation" in the IFLA-LRM?

### Punctuation

The Editorial Group believes an extension of the current set of punctuation signs is needed, as the objective of unambiguous sharing of data is not completely fulfilled in the current version of the standard. For instance, use the pipe (|) to signal an empty area, thus allowing for more parsable information.

**=> Question 2:** does the ISBD RG agree to further investigate the extension of the punctuation set, notably in order to allow for machine processing as well as human understanding?

Instructions for display, while being one of the strengths of the ISBD and very useful in the past, may be less relevant today, depending on the context. Most online catalogues do not provide an ISBD display. The Editorial Group therefore recommends that the future standard should establish a clear-cut distinction between instructions for display (punctuation and Areas), and instructions for data input. What is at stake here is the perception of the standard: by linking too intrinsically instructions for data input and instructions for punctuation, the standard will not be perceived as the modern standard it still is, and risks being associated with card catalogues.

**=> Question 3**: is it possible to validate the use of ISBD instructions for data input without the prescribed punctuation for display? Consequently, does the ISBD RG agree to separate instructions for display and instructions for data input?

**Structure**

The structure of the revised ISBD should reflect the double ambition of the standard, which is to promote LRM-compatible cataloguing, while supporting all cataloguing contexts. This means that we need a flexible structure that exists both as a stand-alone, online application *and* as an extraction of the standard to serve as a pdf printout.

**=> Question 4:** does the ISBD RG endorse this structure and allow further investigation in that direction?

**General recommendations**

There is a gap between the definitions given in the text and the definitions found in the OMR, which were used to create the initial alignment (from ISBD to IFLA-LRM). The Editorial Group recommends that in the future definitions should be used consistently, so as to provide one single source of information and avoid confusion.

The element table is sometimes not consistent with the body of the text. This arises from the fact that paragraphs, and not elements, are numbered. In the future, consistent numbering should be assigned to each element of the ISBD. This should help better define what an ISBD element is and how it should present itself. The recommendation of the Editorial Group on that matter is that:

- each element should have its own place and numbering in the element hierarchy;
- each element should provide specific instructions for source and choice of order.

Although encoding formats are out of the scope of the group, the Editorial Group strongly recommends that the ISBD RG reach out to format communities such as the Permanent Unimarc Committee and the MARC21 Advisory Board, in order to inform them of the changes to come, prepare future alignments, and ultimately create easy-to-use manuals.

**=> Question 5**: does the ISBD RG endorse those general recommendations?

**General chapter**

The Editorial Group recommends that a general chapter be included in the overall structure of the revised standard. This introductory chapter would contain instructions for punctuation, organisation in Areas, and possibly a section about serials. It would look like Chapter A in the current version of the ISBD, but limited to instructions relating to the Manifestation level.

**=> Question 6**: does the ISBD RG agree to further investigate a general chapter?

**Area 0**

The current definition of "media type" mixes mediation device and carrier. In order to align on the IFLA-LRM, everything that relates to the mediation device should be moved to the Expression level, and therefore out of scope of the present work; the Manifestation level should focus on the "type of carrier" only.

**=> Question 7**: does the ISBD RG endorse the distinction between "media" (at the Expression level) and "carrier type" (at the Manifestation level) in Area 0?

**Area 6**

Area 6 currently mixes two different concepts, which are "Series" and "Multipart Monographic Resources", which contradicts the modelling of the IFLA-LRM. The Editorial Group does not have an issue with those two elements being in the same area, but since these are two different concepts, they should at least be distinguished, *i.e.* have their own separate element ("Statement of series" on the one hand, and "Statement of multipart monographic resources" on the other). This would be consistent with the IFLA-LRM modelling of continuing resources.

**=> Question 8**: does the ISBD RG agree to distinguish between "Series" and "Multipart Monographic resources"?


Respectfully submitted,
Mélanie Roche
November 18, 2018