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This is the article Rhonda Lawrence referred to in her introduction:

Believe it or not, new updating loose-leafs are still being published and you may actually need to create an original catalog record for one, or edit existing copy that you find in a shared cataloging environment.

Even if there are fewer new loose-leafs being published, records for existing print titles may need to be updated, ceased, and/or linked to new editions.

You probably have legacy records that you may want to convert according to the current standards and practices.
-- This is what we would like to achieve in the hour we have today:
-- We want to make sure you are aware of the main concepts, key issues, and recent changes -- including documentation and practice -- in cataloging a very specific type of library material, the updating loose-leaf, or print integrating resource (IR).
-- Today we will be talking about what we’re doing now, what we used to do, what we might do in the future, and what we think we should be doing.
-- We do not have time to go over every cataloging rule and every MARC 21 tag. We expect a familiarity with general cataloging rules and the MARC 21 format as we look at examples. In the examples, we will be focusing on elements that have to do with updating loose-leafs.
-- Here’s how we’d like to proceed:
-- To repeat, are taking a general approach and following up with simplified cataloging examples to illustrate our points.
-- We recognize ambiguity of rules/policies and celebrate differences of opinion/practice among colleagues – there may not always be one “right” answer, although we are interested in pursuing best practices.
-- We both come from PCC libraries, so our anecdotal experiences and specific cataloging examples are in the context of that national cooperative cataloging program; however, we also recognize the need to make local adjustments to our cataloging that may be separate from what we do in a shared cataloging environment.
Our “chief source”

• *Integrating resources: a cataloging manual*
  2010 revision
  Available at:
  http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/irman.pdf

2011 revision coming soon!

-- Our “chief source of information” regarding how to catalog print loose-leaves is Integrating resources: a cataloging manual – or: the IR manual, for short. This publication is available from the PCC Web site at the link listed above. The IR manual combines rules and guidelines from AACR2, Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, and PCC practice. PCC guidelines referenced in the IR manual include those for the CONSER standard record and the provider-neutral record for electronic integrating resources.
-- The IR manual has undergone a recent revision. The PCC’s Standing Committee on Training Integrating Resources Task Group (SCT IRTG) was formed on May 8, 2011. Its members include: George Prager (NYU Law School) and Valerie Bross (UCLA), co-chairs; David Reser (LC PSD), Manisha Bhattacharyya (GPO), and Renee Chin (UCSD). The group’s charge was to harmonize the IR manual with the SCCTP Integrating Resources Workshop materials. The 2011 revision was approved by the Standing Committee on Training on July 15, 2011, and was sent to the PCC Policy Committee.
-- The Policy Committee is also considering a change in treatment of field 588. If this change is approved, the manual will undergo further slight revision. It will then be mounted on the PCC Web site, as soon as the manual has been inspected for ADA compliance. When it is publicly available, we will send a message to the TS-SIS list.
Highlights of 2011 revision

- Changes /additions to MARC 21
- Genre/form terms
- Linking and added entries
- Examples updated

Following are just a few of the changes in the 2011 revision that may affect the cataloging of print integrating resources:

-- Introduction of new field 588 Source of description note; explanation of use of $3 with 490 and 8XX series fields ** (replacing joint use of 500 Publication history note and 8XX series fields); additional 006 and 008 elements included in fixed field sections.

-- Expanded and updated section on use of genre/form terms (IR.15).

-- Substantial revision of IR.11 to clarify when linking entries and related work/expression added entries are made; elimination of the phrase “one-way relationships.”

-- Record examples thoroughly reviewed and updated in line with current practices and current MARC 21 coding (IR.17), for example: consistent use of indicators “1#” for all 246 added entries, except parallel titles.

** LCRI 21.30L and LCPS 24.6B say to use field 500, not 490 $3, to give information on a former series title not on the latest iteration of the IR. LC’s Policy and Services Division states that it is better to use the 490 $3, and that the LCPS will be revised to agree with IR.9.1 (email correspondence on July 18, 2011).
It’s already been almost 10 years since the 2002 revision of AACR2, and we would like to briefly touch on some developments in the library and cataloging world that have affected how we approach the cataloging of loose-leafs.
-- The 2002 revision also introduced the concept of “continuing resources” in its renamed Chapter 12 (formerly entitled: Serials).
-- What this meant for updating loose-leafs was that they were recognized and treated as publications that are ongoing in nature, serial-like but with their own resource type: Integrating resources. Here is the **AACR2 definition of an integrating resource**: “a bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole.”
IRs were previously cataloged using Leader/07 Bibliographic level “m,” with various notes to explain their updating nature. In 2001, a new bibliographic level for integrating resources was added to MARC 21; also, the OCLC Serials format was renamed the Continuing resources format. In OCLC’s Continuing resources format, one can code the Leader/07 bib level either “i” for integrating resources or “s” for serials.

Before bib level “i” could be implemented in OCLC and many local systems, libraries (including LC) followed an interim practice of continuing to catalog print integrating resources using the Books format and adding an 006 field to express seriality. (In the case of online integrating resources, libraries added an additional 006 field to express the computer file aspects.) The 006 field has the same input standard as the fixed field, and is used to code for additional characteristics that can’t be accommodated in the fixed field.

-- We have a mix of records coded as both monographs and integrating resources in OCLC and of course in our own catalogs; this can affect retrieval of IRs depending on how your OPAC limits by “monograph” or “serial.” Depending on the type of search we do in OCLC when we search for cataloging copy, we may also miss records coded as one or the other in our pre-cataloging discovery process.
Serial vs. monograph styles

• “Both sides of the house” cataloging IRs
• Generally a positive thing
• That being said ...

-- IRs are cataloged by both serial and monograph catalogers, and sometimes the records reflect the approach, background and experience of one or the other.
-- This is in general a really good thing, because the IR record is such an interesting mix of monograph and serial that all expertise is appreciated, especially in a cooperative cataloging environment where we all build on, and benefit from, one another’s efforts.
That being said, however, there are a few things that one notices in records created or edited by people who are very focused on either a monograph or serial way of life:
-- Monographic : Detailed description, notes and added entries vs. linking fields.
-- Serial: Spartan description, cavalier approach to personal authors, notes in numerical (not AACR2) order; however, as to that last point: According to guidelines in the IR manual, institutions are allowed the flexibility of providing notes in either order.
Some recent trends that affect how we approach cataloging print integrating resources include:

-- Updating loose-leafs replaced by regularly-issued bound serial volumes (or by monographs if not updated as frequently).
-- Online versions of many loose-leaf treatises, sometimes with very different publication information and subtle indications regarding updates.
-- “In toto” replacements of loose-leafs due to publishers’ mergers and consolidations; also, entire reissues of a base volume for ease of updating (rather than printing the numerous replacement pages) -- according to the letter of the law, these constitute “in toto” replacements; but in the spirit of the law, they are really just new releases or updates. All three of these trends require updating existing cataloging records, and often creating new records.
Of course, we have the eventual implementation of RDA, with the accompanying changes to documentation and training issues.
Here are the most important characteristics of a record for an integrating resource:
-- IRs fall under the umbrella term of “Continuing resource” in AACR2, along with serials.
-- Unlike serials, which are cataloged based on the first or earliest available issue, IRs are cataloged based on the latest iteration available. ** This entry convention is called “integrated entry” and is coded in the 008/34 or the 006/17, depending on the primary nature of the resource being cataloged. For print IRs, we usually receive them immediately upon publication, so although our cataloging is technically based on the latest iteration, we may still be describing the first (and, as of yet, only) iteration.
-- Also unlike serials, all title changes for integrating resources, whether major or minor, are recorded in one record. Major title changes that for a serial would require the creation of a new record are reflected in title added entries (247 field) in a record for an IR.
-- The most important characteristic of IRs, and one that they do share with serials, is that as long as a title is still being published/issued, you will probably have to update the bibliographic record that describes it.
** Iteration is defined in AACR2 as “an instance of an integrating resource, either as first published or after it has been updated.”
Changes over time

- Title changes and variants: 245, 246, 247
- Place and publisher: multiple 260s, also FF
- Dates: 260, 362, also FF
- Series: 490, 8XX
- Source of cataloging: 500, 588
- Related titles, added entries: 7XX, also notes

As mentioned on the previous slide, since the description for an IR is based on the current iteration, changes in the publication that occur over time need to be recorded in the bibliographic record. Sometimes significant changes get missed until the publication ceases and/or a whole new edition arrives, which makes it difficult to piece together the publication history. This accounts for why sometimes there are so many duplicate bib records in shared databases, because catalogers literally can’t recognize records that do not match what they have in hand. It is also difficult to update a record for changes if you don’t have a clear picture of what came before.

All that being said, here are some of the fields that are usually changed or added as a publication changes. We will be showing more specific MARC 21 tagging in our cataloging examples.

The LC/PCC guidelines for creating multiple 260s can be found on the CONSER Web site at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/260field.pdf
When to create a new record

• Merger/split of bibliographic resources
• Change in:
  – Mode of issuance
  – Physical medium
  – Edition (explicit or implicit)
    “in toto” replacement

Most changes in subsequent iterations of an integrating resource do not require a new record, including gradual replacement editions. Here are some situations that do:

-- A publication changing from a loose-leaf to an annual bound serial is an example of a change in the mode of issuance.
-- A publication ceasing in print and continuing only online is an example of a change in the physical medium. (More often we encounter simultaneous publication of print and online, but this may change in the future.)
-- An “in toto” replacement, often (but not always) accompanied by a change in edition statement, is probably the most common situation requiring a new record. Sometimes the change of edition also involves a change of authorship. Many of us have recently cataloged 3rd and 4th editions of loose-leaves, and will probably soon be cataloging 5th editions.
-- IR.16 provides guidance about the types of changes that require a new record. LCRI 21.3B also contains an extensive discussion of LC/PCC practice regarding “in toto” replacements and when to treat them as new resources.
-- After creating a new record, you will need to update the existing related record, and also link the two. We will show some related and linked records in our cataloging examples.
There is no authorized genre/form term for “Loose-leaf publications.” There is, however, one for “Loose-leaf services,” a small subset of print integrating loose-leafs. The scope note for “Loose-leaf services” is: This heading is used as a genre/form heading for legal publications that bring together primary and secondary materials pertaining to a particular field or topic, and that are issued in binders and updated with replacement pages, sequential newsletters, or both.

The Law Genre/Form Project group had a lot of back and forth on loose-leaf services vs. loose-leaf publications, and decided on the first term, which is quite a narrower definition. “Loose-leaf publications” is really a format, and terms for format are not within the scope of the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Resources (LCGFT). Given the small number of bona fide loose-leaf services, and the confusion surrounding the term, the Law Genre/Form Project has recently reopened a discussion on whether this G/F term should be eliminated.

A library could use a locally-assigned genre/form heading for loose-leaf publications, as shown in the slide above.

“Loose-leaf publications” is a valid subject heading, but it is only to be used for works that are actually about loose-leaf publications. To add to the confusion, it has a UF from “Loose-leaf services.” (There is also a subject heading “Loose-leaf services, Legal” – again, for works about these types of publications.)

There are no special form subdivisions for updating loose-leafs.
Classification/Cuttering

- **Form subdivisions**
  - Loose-leaf services
- **Selected forms subdivided by:**
  - Continuing resources (Serials and loose-leaf editions)
  - Monographs
- **No date in call number**
  - Per *Classification/shelflisting manual G140 4c*
  - Extend cutter for new editions/continuations

-- Many of the KF form tables have a special form subdivision for Loose-leaf services, but none for Loose-leaf publications. Some of the larger number spans for Canadian and British law also have subdivisions for loose-leaf services (Canadian criminal law: KE8807.5 is a specific number for a loose-leaf service.)
-- Many form subdivisions have one form number for serials (or serials and loose-leafs) and another for monographs (treatises). The loose-leaf format is a secondary consideration when assigning a form table number, and the same intellectual decisions apply as for cataloging the resource itself – what is the resource? If it’s a compilation of court decisions, it would receive the form table number for court decisions that are published as a continuing resource (indicated in the table as the appropriate number for either serials, or serials and loose-leafs). If it’s a loose-leaf service, and the table has a number for that, it would receive that specific form table number. In many cases, the IR is a treatise, and would receive the general works number (successively cuttered without a publication date, if following LC’s practices).
-- LC does not add the date of publication to a call number for updating loose-leafs, according to the Classification/shelflisting manual. If you are assigning a call number for a loose-leaf that continues another one, extend the cutter so that the new edition files next to the earlier one.
Illustrative examples

• Adapted from “real” cataloging records
• Selected bibliographic elements only
• Rules, MARC format, changing practices

-- Following are several examples taken from cataloging records we’ve recently encountered and/or edited in OCLC. Keep in mind that our examples may have been adapted to illustrate a particular guideline, practice or MARC coding element.
-- To make slides readable, we’ve used selected fields to illustrate whatever point we are discussing; please keep in mind that there are (of course) many more elements to a fully-cataloged record.
-- We are using these examples to illustrate specific cataloging and coding practices, some of which are open to interpretation.
Here's an example of a currently published updating loose-leaf, cataloged according to current rules/guidelines and MARC formatting. (Missing fields include: 700 added entry for the first-named author and the 650 subject headings -- remember: only selected fields are here, for illustration purposes.)

**Format and FF current vs. former practice (S/L has no former equivalent)**

**010** with $z$ for LCCN found in piece; this particular record was done by a PCC library, so they assigned a Library of Congress control number in the $a$. If you create an original record for a loose-leaf and you are not authenticating it for PCC, record the LCCN printed in the piece (usually on t.p. verso), but in a subfield $z$ and **NOT** in a subfield $a$.

**020** ISBN number qualified by (loose-leaf)

**050** call number – we will talk about this on the next slide

**260 $c** The cataloger had the first iteration of the loose-leaf in hand, and so was able to provide a starting date.

**300** “blank” v. (no enumeration of vols.– different than former practice)

**588** “Description based on” note is not necessary as the cataloger had the first iteration of the loose-leaf in hand. Since the title is taken from the chief source (t.p.) there is also no need for a “Source of title” note. This differs from CSR practice for serials, which always gives the source of title and basis of the description in a combined 588 note.
Now let’s build on this same example to show an earlier/later edition situation. This is the same bib record, with the addition of:

780 earlier title link to the previous edition, regardless of format of that previous edition (IR, serial, mono). The $z and $w are for the ISBN of the previous ed., and the Library of Congress and/or OCLC control numbers of the previous ed.

The 780 linking field is used instead of: 500 note “Revised ed. of …” (former practice) combined with an Added entry (either title or name/title) for the previous edition. When adding links to related works, use 500/580 notes only if, in your cataloger’s judgment, the relationship cannot be adequately expressed by notes generated from the 7XX linking fields themselves.

-- A few things we didn’t note on the previous slide:
050 with extended cutter (no date – different from former practice)
250 If no edition statement were given in this resource, we would need to supply a bracketed one, since the main entry (title) of this edition and the previous one is the same.

This bracketed edition statement would also be used in any linking fields that refer to this edition. (LCRI 1.2B4)
EXAMPLE 1c: Earlier edition, record updated/linked

Format: Books
Leader/07 Bibliographic level: m
006 ## $a suul 02
--------------------
010 ## $a 2004046323
050 #4 $a KH1477 $b .1368 2004
245 00 $a Takeovers : $b a strategic guide to mergers and acquisitions / $c Meredith M. Brown ... [et al.].
250 ## $a 2nd ed.
300 ## $a 1 v. (loose-leaf) ; $c 26 cm.
588 ## $a Description based on: Update 22, published in 2010.
785 00 $t Takeovers. $b 3rd ed. $z 7 $w ... (control #s)

-- Here’s the earlier (2nd) edition, cataloged using the Books format (according to pre-2007 practices). This is the resource represented in the 780 of the previous example. A library edited and replaced this record and linked it to the current edition. Since the library had the latest (and last) iteration of this resource, they also updated the description (nothing changed in the title or publication information), and noted the basis of the description in the 588 field, following current practice.
-- Since this record is in the Books format, the library that revised this record also added the 006 Additional material characteristics to bring out the seriality that can’t be coded in the fixed field.
-- If a PCC library had chosen to authenticate this record as an IR, they would have to go a bit further and change the bibliographic level from “m” to “i”, get rid of that 006 field (because now it’s not needed), add a new LCCN, move the old LCCN to $z, and add an 042 authentication code.

050 Call number with date (former practice) [Discussion: Since this is an LC-type call number, it should really be updated to reflect current practice (see previous slide)]
260 Multiple dates = “closed” (also in FF)
300 1 v. (enumeration of vols.) added when a title is ceased/closed
785 link to later title

-- In revising this record, a library could also add a 780 link to the previous (1st) edition as well, which was a monograph, although they are not required to do so.
Using existing records

- What to “fix” / what to leave alone
- Identifying and reporting duplicates
- LC IR record report form at:
  

-- When you use a cataloging record created under former practices and you have to add or change fields according to current ones, you need to strike a balance between just updating what you need (doing no harm) and taking the opportunity to increase the usefulness and readability of the catalog record, not just for OPAC viewers but for other catalogers. Sometimes this involves changing the bib level from “m” to “i” and sometimes this involves making sure related records are properly linked to one another. Generally, for elements in the record that do not affect access points or added entries, or that do not reflect a conflicting, outdated practice, we should leave anything that is basically correct alone, even if we don’t agree with the style or wording of a note or the inclusion of information that we ourselves may have added to the record.

-- When catalogers have vastly different iterations in hand and/or there is not a clear understanding of how to maintain existing IR records, duplicates happen. Depending on your institution’s policy, especially if you are a PCC member, you may have obligations to report duplicate records that you have discovered to LC or OCLC. IR.16.3 provides clear and detailed guidance on identifying and reporting duplicates.

Next we will look at another cataloging example involving both a change of edition and a change of authorship affecting the main entry ...
Now let’s look at an earlier/later edition situation in which the main entry changes from one edition to the next. Here is the bib record for the earlier edition (in this case, already cataloged as an IR), ceased and linked to the later (3rd) edition.

260 $a is bracketed, because it’s an inferred date. Use this when the first iteration of the resource is not available, but the date can be readily inferred. (1.4F8)

There is a 362 unformatted note with a question mark because the institution updating this record did not own the 2nd edition but was editing this record to link to the 3rd edition, which they had just received. The cataloger had to guess this date based on a reasonable (not exhaustive) examination of the 3rd edition as well anything that arrived with it, such as a letter from the publisher.

(This is also why the 588 note could not be updated to reflect the current iteration.)
This is the bib record for the later edition, also cataloged as an IR, and linked to the earlier edition.

**700** name-title work related added entry: As explained in IR11.1 and AACR2 21.30G, related work added entries are made for some closely related works outlined in AACR2 21.8-21.28. In this case, the 3rd ed. constitutes a major revision of the previous ed. (AACR2 21.12B: Original author no longer considered responsible.) Therefore, a name-title added entry is made under the heading for the original author and the title of the last edition to have been entered under the heading for the body or person responsible for the original. Because field 780 generates a display constant, it’s cataloger’s judgment whether or not to also add a 500 or 580 field.
Now we will take a look at records for print and online versions of updating loose-leaves. Obviously, “online loose-leaf” is an oxymoron – but it’s the best description for digital versions of print IRs that, although they may look very different than the original, are definitely not the same thing as updating Web sites or online databases.

This is the bib record for the print version, cataloged and edited according to current practices. Note the FF Type of “ell,” which we haven’t mentioned before, but will always be the code for updating loose-leaves.

**856** $u link should be non-institution specific (IR.10.21).

### EXAMPLE 3a: Print IR also issued online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format: Continuing resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader/07 Bibliographic level: i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed field 008/21 Type of continuing resource: 8 (“ell”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 050 00 $a KF133 $b .C35 |
| 245 00 $a California child and spousal support : $b establishing, modifying, and enforcing / $c ... |
| 246 1# $a Child and spousal support |
| 260 ## $a Oakland, Calif. : $b Continuing Education of the Bar—California, $c c2010- |
| 300 ## $a v. (loose-leaf) : $b forms ; $c 26 cm. |
| 776 08 $i Online version: $t California child and spousal support $w ... $w ... |
| 856 41 $u [URL] $z Subscription required |
EXAMPLE 3b: Online IR also issued in print

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>00 $a KF133 [no $b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>00 $a California child and spousal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$h [electronic resource] : $b establishing, modifying, and enforcing / $c ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>## $a Oakland, Calif. : $b Continuing Education of the Bar—California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>1# $a Began in 2010?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>## $a Title from title screen (OnLAW, viewed on Oct. 13, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>08 $i Print version: $t California child and spousal support $w ... $w ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>40 $ Su [URL] $z Subscription required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- This is the bib record for the online version, cataloged according to current practices. In addition to FF coding of: Format: Continuing resources, Leader/07 Bibliographic level: i, note that in this case the Type is coded “blank” because none of the other codes (for loose-leaf, Web site or online database) fit. Also, form of item is coded “o” for online. -- Since we are not covering the cataloging of online integrating resources, we only want to point out that this record also has a reciprocal 776 link for other physical format. There is excellent guidance and examples in the IR manual for cataloging online integrating resources.
What will change with RDA?

- RDA “core” elements
- Minimal use of abbreviations
- Elimination of the “Rule of 3”
- Replacement of GMDs by:
  - Content
  - Media
  - Carrier

Most differences in RDA are due to differences between it and AACR2, and are not related to different rules for updating loose-leaves or IRs. For example, RDA core does not require:

- Other title information (245 $b)
- Parallel title (245 $b)
- Additional statements of responsibility relating to the title proper (245 $c)
- Extent of resource (300 $a), if resource is incomplete, or extent is unknown
- Dimensions of resource (300 $c)
- Notes (500)

The complete list of RDA Core elements can be found at RDA 0.6.

RDA places a much greater emphasis on relationships than AACR2. It is mandatory to record the primary relationship between a manifestation and the work/expression manifested, and there are various methods by which to do this in RDA. LC/PCC will need to determine guidelines for when to choose which method for indicating relationships between resources. Until such guidelines are in place, we offer one best practice for now: Be judicious in use of related work/expression added entries. They are not useful if the main entry is the same, or the main entry changes from author/title to title. Linking entries alone should suffice.
Relator terms and codes are optional.

**Edition statement (250):** Not abbreviated unless abbreviations appear in the chief source.

Option: Follow agency’s preferences regarding capitalization, punctuation, etc.

**Physical carrier (300):** For incomplete resources, record the term designating the type of unit without the number (RDA 3.4.1.10).

RDA 3.4.1.10 alternative: You can omit the extent of a resource ($a) for incomplete resources, or when the total extent is unknown.

Confusing the picture: 3.4.5.2 Single volume: gives the example of 1 volume (loose-leaf).

RDA 3.4.5.19 Updating loose-leaves, gives the example: 3 volumes (loose-leaf), but also refers to 3.4.1.10.

Explanation from LC help desk: Sometimes you know that a resource will be complete in a certain number of volumes, so then you can put extent for incomplete updating loose-leaf. But if you don’t know for sure, then omit the number of volumes.

TS-SIS Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Group discussion: we all agreed that in most cases, it’s best to omit the number of volumes of an incomplete loose-leaf. [As was pointed out by an audience member during the presentation, IRs in the two series: Tax management portfolios, and: Corporate practice series, are always published in one volume, so according to the “letter of the law,” it would be fine to use “1 volume (loose-leaf)” for any title in these two series, regardless of whether the title is still being published.]

RDA Core: For incomplete resources, information on the physical carrier is not core, so in many cases the 300 field can be omitted from the record (RDA Core, 0.6.2; Extent, 3.4.5; Illustrative content, 7.15; Dimensions of carrier: Volumes, 3.5.1.4.14).
Content, media, and carrier terms (336-338):
You can use terms, codes, or both; codes may be helpful for international record exchange (being language neutral).

Authorized access point for related expression, also using relationship designator (MARC 700). Optional under RDA. RDA 26.1.1.3 (specific guidelines on authorized access points for expressions) refers to the general guidelines at RDA 24.4.2, which in turn refer you to 6.27.3. These last instructions tell you to add any one (or more) of the following, which aren’t listed in priority order:

a). Term indicating content type (6.9)
b). Date of the expression (6.10)
c). Term indicating language of the expression (6.11), and/or:
d). Term indicating another distinguishing characteristic of the expression (6.12).

We have chosen to go with the last choice, and have selected the edition statement for the Second edition as the best term to differentiate it from the later edition. In RDA, edition statements given as words are transcribed as they appear on the resource itself. Therefore “Second edition” is used in the $s of the 700 field (as well as $b of the 780 field). Rather than adding the edition statement to the authorized access point, the date of the second edition could have been added in $f of the 700 field.

Structured description expressed here as Linking entry + Identifiers: MARC 780. Optional in RDA. LC Core requires for serial type reciprocal relationships (LCPS 26.1).
Thank you!