

**IME ICC5 Recommendations – Glossary**  
**Discussion and voting document *forwarded to previous IME ICC participants* [Tienie’s italics]**

**Please add your comments in the following table and indicate your vote to agree, disagree, or abstain**  
**Send to Barbara Tillett at [btil@loc.gov](mailto:btil@loc.gov)**  
**by December 28, 2007**

**Please also see the accompanying marked up version of the Glossary (November 16, 2007)**

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
<b>GLOSSARY</b>			
<p><b>1. IME ICC5 recommends:</b> Change wording under <b>Access point</b> “will be found” to “<b>may be searched and identified</b>”. So it would read:  <b>Access point</b> – A name, term, code, etc., under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference <i>may be searched and identified</i>. [Source: GARR modified per FRAD and IME ICC]  <i>See also</i> Controlled access point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• Comments:</li> </ul>			
<p><b>2. IME ICC5 recommends:</b> Add a definition for <b>Additional access point</b> (used in 7.1.3) and make a <i>see also</i> reference from ‘Access point’ and another <i>see also</i> reference from ‘Essential access point’.  <b>Proposed definition:</b>  <b>Additional access point: an access point that may be used to enhance the retrieval of bibliographic or authority records.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• Comments:</li> </ul> <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment: The word “additional” is the same as standard dictionary definition, so no separate definition is needed for the Glossary. The proposed definition could just as well as apply to “access point” so it does not define the “additional” quality.</i></p>			

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
<p><b>3. IME ICC5 recommends:</b> The Statement of principles includes the term “entity in several places: 2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships and 7.1.2. <b>Entities</b> – There is need to define the term “entities” in the Glossary. As found in FRBR, entities are divided into three groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The products of intellectual or artistic endeavor (work, expression, manifestation and item)</li> <li>2) The individual(s) or corporate bodies responsible for creating intellectual or artistic content, for producing or disseminating the content in physical form, or for maintaining custody of the products</li> <li>3) The subjects of intellectual or artistic expression (concept, object, event, place)</li> </ol> <p>Proposed definition:  <b>Entity:</b> An entity is a product of intellectual or artistic endeavour (work, expression, manifestation and item); or the agent responsible for creating that intellectual or artistic content, for producing and disseminating the content in physical form, or for maintaining the custody of the product; or the subject of intellectual or artistic expression.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• <b>Comments:</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment: ‘Entity’ in the principles and in FRBR is no different than a standard dictionary definition and does not need to be included in the Glossary. Webster’s 3<sup>rd</sup> has “something that has a unitary and self-contained character...something that has independent or separate existence...an abstraction, ideal concept, object of thought, or transcendental object.”</i></p> <p><i>FRBR has declared certain categories of entities (things) as Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3. So the ‘entities’ or things of interest to us for cataloguing are the entities in the FRBR Groups. Listing the types of things that are included in those groups is not a definition of “entity” in my view.</i></p>			

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
<p>4. <b>IME ICC5 recommends:</b> changing “indispensable access point” (7.1.2) to “Essential access point” in the principles, and offer the following definition for the Glossary:  <b>Essential access point:</b> An essential access point is an access point based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in bibliographic or authority records, which ensures retrieval and identification of those records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• Comments:</li> </ul>			
<p>5. <b>IME ICC5 recommends:</b> Add a “see” reference from Normalized to Authorized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• <b>Comments:</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment: If the IME ICC5 recommendation under 5.1 to change ‘normalized’ to ‘authorized’ is agreed, such a reference is not needed, because ‘normalized’ would not be used in the principles.</i></p>			
<p>6. <b>IME ICC5 recommends:</b> Add to the glossary <b>Uncontrolled access point</b> (5.1) and see also from “Access point”</p> <p><b>Uncontrolled access point:</b> An access point in a bibliographic record that is not controlled by an authority record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree?</li> <li>• <b>Comments:</b></li> </ul>			