

6.1.3.0.2. CONSER recommends an option to use the citation as given in the related record. If the related resource was cataloged under older rules and doesn't have the correct entry according to new rules, the rule can be confusing to catalogers who think s/he should then recatalog the earlier record to the "correct" main entry.

6.2.2.2.1b.3 describes when not to provide an access point for series, including "having nothing in common but physical form," and "numbering only for control and postage purposes." Should this definition include some mention of such series being issued by commercial publishers? The current definition is too vague to indicate what really constitutes a "publisher's series."

6.4.1.2.1c.2: General guidelines on recording the source of a reproduction

This draft rule provides an alternative that allows for recording elements in parallel for the original and the reproduction, effectively making it a local option which set of elements to prefer in the catalog display. As one CONSER cataloger aptly put it, "this essentially allows the rule to be both a dessert topping and a floor wax, which is not at all a bad thing."

6.4.2.1: The definition of "reproduction" in 6.4.2.1 (and, presumably, in the glossary) needs to be more specific. A clarification would be helpful: "A reproduction is a resource produced using a previously existing resource as its source \*and intended to be used as a substitute for that resource\*." It is helpful to indicate distinctly what is a reproduction from extracts and other derivative situations (covered by 6.6). The intention for the reproduction to function as a substitute may affect some cataloging and policy decisions (e.g., it figures in the decision of whether serial reproductions, extracts, etc. are cataloged as serials or as monographs).

6.5: Some CONSER catalogers suggest consider handling format/format relationships as a type of edition/edition relationship, rather than splitting 6.5. and 6.8. Although we recognize the difference (i.e., formats have same content and editions have different content or language), it is not always easy to determine whether content is different in some situations, e.g., if you don't have access to the different versions of one online journal at the point of cataloging one of the electronic versions. It would be possible to recognize simultaneous editions and different formats as noteworthy examples of edition/edition relationships and the actual instructions in each section are not different. Maintaining the draft 6.5 vs. 6.8 split would give catalogers \*3\* possible places to put electronic counterparts of print resources: 6.4 (reproductions), 6.5 (format/format), 6.8 (edition/edition). At the operational level, splitting the rules this way is counterproductive to just getting cataloging done.

6.5.0.1.1: If a format/format relationship needs a definition (see remarks above on 6.5 in general), the specification "issued by the same publisher" should be removed, as it is not necessarily true. One cataloger questioned, "Will we run into problems distinguishing source/reproduction relationships from edition/edition relationships?", but we're just not certain that it matters.

#### 6.10.1.1.2

List includes "resources that are superseded by another resource". "Superseded by" is a pre-AACR2 term. Do we really want this term reintroduced in RDA?

#### 6.10.2.1.2

List includes "resources that supersede another resource". "Supersedes" is a pre-AACR2 term. Again, do we want to reintroduce this term to the rules?

#### 7.1.4.1.2

CONSER suggests using the word "corporate" preceding "bodies" consistently, as is done in other places in the text (e.g., 7.3.8.1 and 7.3.9.1.). If so, it should also be added to the text in 7.1.4.2.2 and 7.1.4.3.2.

#### 7.2.1.1.1

We suggest that the footnote be a rule instead of a footnote.

#### 7.2.1.4.1

CONSER desires a policy change, in RDA 1<sup>st</sup> edition or as a change in the near future: simplify and/or change instructions in RDA 7.2.1.4.1.

CONSER would prefer leaving up to cataloger's judgment whether a corporate body is responsible for creating a work, rather than having the instructions spelled out in such detail. When first reading RDA 7.2.0.1.1, some CONSER catalogers wondered, "No more categories as given in AACR2 21.1B2?" – and we were quite pleased at the thought of simplifying this rule! As part of the "Guidelines" for the upcoming CONSER Access Level Record, we considered that a simplification of this rule would most likely result in more serial titles with corporate body as the primary access point, but that would be a positive change, especially for generic titles. It would also save time, as catalogers often waste too much reading and re-reading AACR2 21.1B2 when they are the least bit unsure of the application of this rule.

Another change that would be helpful would be an option to allow for corporate body main entry for serial titles that consist solely of a resource and/or frequency words, with one exception: monographic series.

These ideas have been included in the text of the "Guidelines" for cataloging CONSER Access records:

**“Main entry heading (1XX)**

After applying existing rules and rule interpretations, in an case where the catalogers is still in doubt as to whether the main entry should be under title or corporate body, if the title is distinctive, designate the title proper as main entry and record relevant corporate body access point(s) as added entry heading(s); if the title is generic, i.e., if the title consists solely of words indicating type of resource and/or periodicity of resource, choose the corporate body as the main entry.”

Another possibility would be to add back in the REVERSE of the exception clause given in AACR2 21.1.B2 that was NOT included in RDA 7.2.1.4.1: “In case of doubt about whether a work falls into one or more of these categories, treat it as if it does.” (rather than “treat it as if it does not”).

#### 7.2.5.3.

Desired policy change in RDA 1<sup>st</sup> edition or as a change in the near future: an option to permit use of a secondary access point rather than primary access point for the original title when cataloging translations and language editions.

Unlike single part monographs, translations of serial titles can cause cataloging complications because a change in title of the original work may or may not occur in the language of the translation or language edition at the same time, requiring needlessly complex cataloging to provide access to the original or language edition. Does one create a new record for the time when the two titles are not in sync? And the cataloger may or may not always have the same issue in hand for the original and its translation; as a result, s/he may or may not know whether a title change has occurred, making it difficult to determine the appropriate primary access point. Use of a secondary access point provides collocation in the catalog without undue work on the part of the cataloger in such situations. This seems a desirable change in our efforts to streamline cataloging for the CONSER Access Level Record.

#### 7.3.4.1

greatly simplifies the unnecessarily complex AACR2 21.30K1, though it will lead to a (presumably slight) increase in name authority work, but we think it is worth it.