

IME ICC4 Recommendations for the Draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles and the Accompanying Glossary

28 February 2007

Dear IME ICC 4 participants:

The following is a compilation of the responses to the second voting on the recommended changes to the Draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles and the accompany Glossary. At this stage we will need to go with the majority vote and send the recommendations out to all the IME ICC participants to get their reaction.

I will ask for comments on this next version by March 21, so this version of the draft can to on to the African participants for IME ICC5 this August. If you wish to again comment, you are welcome to do so when you get that next ballot. We will also publish that version (if approved) in the IME ICC4 report.

Thank you all for your good suggestions and comments.

– Barbara Tillett

IME ICC4 Responses as of February 28, 2007
Draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles and Glossary

SUGGESTION 1. (Statement) fix typographical error in Introduction

Correct the typographical error in Footnote 1, line 4: the publication year of Paris Principles should be 1961 (instead of 196). **Correct to:**

¹ International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (Paris : 1961). *Report.* – London : International Federation of Library Associations, 1963, p. 91-96. Also available in: *Library Resources and Technical Services*, v.6 (1962), p. 162-167; and *Statement of principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961.*

Unanimous agreement

SUGGESTION 2. (Glossary) “controlled access points”

This is the most complicated and a revised text of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles will be sent next week to show the recommended restructuring and rewording agreed to.

Defeated: Option A was to say “controlled” means the authorized heading and not the variant forms that are used for cross references (per GARR) add a note to the section 5 (not a majority) 4 Yes Votes: China (1), Korea (2), Sri Lanka (1)

Option B was to say “controlled” means to be controlled by rules, to include both authorized headings and all variant headings used as references, and to fix section 5.2 and possibly add subsection to 5.5 uniform titles under controlled forms of names and add a statement on variant forms of uniform titles.

******(majority) 13 Yes Votes: China (5, including Hong Kong and Taiwan); Japan (7), Korea (1)**

Add to Glossary:

Controlled access point – A name, term, code, etc. under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference will be found. [GARR modified] Includes access points designated as authorized or preferred forms as well as those designated as variant forms. Includes access points based on personal, family, and corporate names. Includes access points based on titles for works, expressions, manifestations, and items. Includes access points consisting of a combination of two names and/or identifiers, as in the case of a name/title access point representing a work that combines the name of the author with the name (i.e., the title) of the work. Includes access points based on the terms for events, objects, concepts, and places. Includes access points based on identifiers such as standard numbers, classification indicia, etc. Includes elements added to the name *per se* (e.g., dates) for the purposes of distinguishing between entities with identical or similar names. [Source: FRAD – goes on to note the focus of the model is on names and terms controlled through an authority file.]

***See also* Access point, Authorized heading, Authority record, Name**

Reorganize Section 5 as follows:

5. Access Points

5.1 General

5.1.1. Choice of access points

5.1.2. Authorized headings

5.1.3. Language

5.2. Forms of controlled access points

5.2.1. Forms of Names for Persons

5.2.2. Forms of Names for Families

5.2.3. Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies

5.2.4. Forms of Uniform Titles

Add to new 5.2 Forms of controlled access points. Describe this as authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities, formulated according to a set of rules or standards, in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These are usually documented in an authority record.

Rework Uniform titles section to reflect both authorized names of work/expressions/manifestations/items and variant forms of name.

Revised draft text to be sent soon.

SUGGESTION 3. uniform titles

The Group suggested the wording in 5.1.3 about preferring the name in the original language did not agree with the instruction in 5.5.1.1. (uniform titles) saying to prefer the uniform title in the language of the catalogue. Reorder the parts of the principle to give the commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue as the first part and then go on to the original and third to the most frequently found on manifestations.

Barbara Tillett's comment: In 5.1.3, the initial preference is for the original language and script, but the principle goes on to use the form found on manifestations in the language and script best suited to the users of the catalogue when the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue. So in fact, it is in agreement with the uniform titles principle. However, reordering the statements might make it clearer. The text now reads:

5.1.3. Language

When names have been expressed in several languages, preference should be given to a heading based on information found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script; but if the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be based on forms found on manifestations or in reference sources in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.

Access should be provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through either the authorized heading or a cross-reference. If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversion should be followed.

5.5. Forms of Uniform Titles

A uniform title may either be a title that can stand alone or it may be a name/title combination or a title qualified by the addition of identifying elements, such as a corporate name, a place, language, date, etc.

- 5.5.1.** The uniform title should be the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work except
5.5.1.1. when there is a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue, preference should be given it.

Revised wording suggested:

- 5.5.1** The uniform title should be the commonly known title when one exists for the resource in the language and script of the catalogue, otherwise
5.5.1.1. the uniform title should be the original title or
5.5.1.2. the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work.

Agree to leave the statement worded as “should”

****Unanimously in favor

17 Yes: China (6); Japan (7), Korea (3), Sri Lanka (1)

Agree to reorder the parts of the principle to give commonly used title in language and script of the catalogue first then original and then most frequently found on manifestations.

****(majority) 9 Yes: China (1); Japan (5), Korea (2), Sri Lanka (1)

(minority view) 8 No, keep original order in statement: China(5), Japan (2); Korea (1)

SUGGESTION 4 no action needed about more clearly defining “indispensable access points”

Unanimous agreement

SUGGESTION 5 (Statement) move years of publication out of “indispensable access points” and into “additional access points”

Such dates are more likely to be used to limit or filter a search than be a primary or mandatory access point.

Revise as follows:

7.1.2. Indispensable access points are those based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in the bibliographic or authority record.

- 7.1.2.1.** Indispensable access points for **bibliographic records** include:
- the name of the creator or first named creator when more than one is named
 - the title proper or supplied title for the manifestation
 - ~~the year (s) of publication or issuance~~
 - the uniform title for the work/expression
 - a general material designation
 - subject headings, subject terms
 - classification numbers

standard numbers, identifiers, and 'key titles' for the described entity.

7.1.3. Additional access points

Attributes from other areas of the bibliographic description or the authority record may serve as optional access points or as filtering or limiting devices when large numbers of records are retrieved. Such attributes in bibliographic records include, but are not limited to:

- names of additional creators beyond the first
- names of performers or persons, families, or corporate bodies in other roles than creator
- parallel titles, caption titles, etc.
- uniform title of the series
- bibliographic record identifiers
- language
- country of publication
- the year (s) of publication or issuance
- physical medium.

Unanimous agreement

SUGGESTION 6 fix typographical error in Glossary

Correct to:

Bibliographic record – The set of data elements that describe and provide access to manifestations and identify related works and expressions. [Source: IME ICC]

Unanimous agreement

SUGGESTION 7. (Statement)

Review the issue of the GMD as it evolves during 2007 and 2008 in discussions within IFLA (ISBD Review Group) and in the development of Resource Description and Access: RDA (to replace Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules).

Resume this discussion about GMD being an indispensable element following the recommendations from the ISBD Review Group and the proposals coming from the RDA discussions. Consider the addition of type of content and type of carrier after seeing the recommendations from the RDA discussions. (Barbara Tillett will keep you informed about work on *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) related to this topic and any action within the IFLA ISBD Review Group).

Remove GMD for now?

****(majority)11 No: China (3), Japan (7), Korea (1) – we will not remove

5 Yes: China (3), Korea (1), Sri Lanka (1)

No response: Korea (1)

Agree to wait and later add elements based on results of discussion for RDA

****Unanimous 17 Yes: China (6), Japan (7), Korea (3), Sri Lanka (1)

SUGGESTION 8 (Glossary) add a term “physical units”

It is generally expected that a bibliographic record would be for the manifestation.

As for adding a definition for physical unit:

***(majority) 10 No action is recommended at this time: China (3), Japan (6); Korea (1) –
no further action will be taken

6 Yes: China (2), Japan (1), Korea (2), Sri Lanka (1)

No response : China/Taiwan (1)