

IME ICC5 Recommendations – Glossary
 Discussion and voting document
Vote Tally
January 4, 2008

| Recommendation | Agree | Disagree | Abstain |
|---|--|--|--|
| GLOSSARY | | | |
| <p>1. IME ICC5 recommends: Change wording under Access point “will be found” to “may be searched and identified”. So it would read: Access point – A name, term, code, etc., under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference may be searched and identified. [Source: GARR modified per FRAD and IME ICC] <i>See also</i> Controlled access point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costa Rica (Sonia Guitérrez): Mayor claridad [Clearer]. • France (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR): OK because “find” is the result of the action “search and identify” • Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): We suggest to delete “or reference” in the definition because references should not be considered to be records of their own. If the definition of access point is changed here, the definition of controlled access point should be changed accordingly and use the same terminology. • Japan (Rieko Koga): Is difference between the wording in definitions of “Access point” and “Controlled access point” on purpose? • Japan (Yukiko Sakai): I don’t catch the point of the changing. The functions of catalogue are “find” and “identify”, but why this definition uses the words “search and identify”? • Palestine (Najla Sharabati and Suhaila Abu-Gudeib): 1. Same meaning. 2. If yes, “will be found:” should be changed too in the definition of “Controlled access point”, 2nd line. • Peru (Catalina Zavala): La palabra buscar precisa y da un alcance adicional a la finalidad del punto de acceso. [The word “find” is more precise and gives adicional scope to the end result of an access point] • Sweden (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): Instead of “may be searched” we would | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) *China (1) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Ethiopia *France (AFNOR) (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Japan (1) *Lebanon *México *Namibia *Peru (see comment) *Russia | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *China (1) *Japan (1) *Palestine (see comment) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Japan (3) (see comment) |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>however prefer the wording “is searched” as being slightly more specific.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Vatican</u> (Paola Manoni): ‘A name, term, code, etc.’ or simply: ‘An instance’ under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference may be searched and identified... | <p>*Slovenia *Spain *Sweden (see comment) *United Kingdom *Vatican (see comment)</p> | | |
| <p>2. IME ICC5 recommends: Add a definition for Additional access point (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’.</p> <p>Proposed definition: Additional access point: an access point that may be used to enhance the retrieval of bibliographic or authority records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree? <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment:</i> 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.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>AACR2</u> (JSC RDA): The definition that has been suggested does not distinguish “additional access point” from “access point”. A modification is suggested below: Additional access point: an access point that may be used <u>in addition to the essential access point(s)</u> to enhance the retrieval of bibliographic or authority records. <u>Costa Rica</u> (Sonia Guitérrez): Mayor claridad. [Clearer] <u>Germany</u> (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): We consent to Barbara Tillett’s comment. <u>Japan</u> (Rieko Koga): Disagree - I agree with {Tillett’s} comment. <u>Japan</u> (Yukiko Sakai): Disagree - The definition and function of additional access points is already seen in the 7.1.3 statement and is self-explanatory following the statement 7.1.2 “Essential access points.” <u>Lebanon</u> (Bughdana Hajjar): 1. An access point (other than the main) that may be... 2. How can an additional access point retrieve an authority record? <u>México</u> (Julia Margarita Martínez Saldana): Estoy de acuerdo con Bárbara, a menos que | <p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) – agree, if revised (see comment) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Ethiopia *France (AFNOR) *Japan (1) *México (see comment) *Palestine (see comment) *Russia *Vatican</p> | <p>*China (2) *Czech Republic *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Japan (4) (see comment) *Namibia (agree with Barbara’s comment) *Peru (see comment) *Slovenia *Spain (see comment) *Sweden (see comment)</p> | <p>*Estonia [Lebanon - no vote, but see comment]</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>se le añade la palabra “secundario” a la definición, lo cual entra nuevamente a discusión por si con este término se puede confundir la intención de “adicional”. [I agree with Barbara, at least that we add the word “secondary” to the definition, on the other hand a discussion can be made that this term can be confused to mean “adicional”].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Palestine</u> (Najla Sharabati and Suhaila Abu-Gudeib): Yes, because it’s used in the principles (7.1.3). • <u>Peru</u> (Catalina Zavala): Coincido con el comentario de Barbara Tillett, la palabra adicional no modifica la definición de punto de acceso. {I agree with Barbara Tillett’s comments, the additional word does not change the definition of access point} • <u>Spain</u> (Elena Escolano): Agree with B.T. Spanish: estoy de acuerdo con el comentario de BT • <u>Sweden</u> (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): We agree with BT. Regarding the See also reference, we feel that the wording “indispensable access point” should be kept instead of “essential access point.” • <u>United Kingdom</u> (Heather Rosie): UK agrees with BT’s comment. | | <p>*United Kingdom (see comment)</p> | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|

| Recommendation | Agree | Disagree | Abstain |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>3. IME ICC5 recommends: The Statement of principles includes the term “entity in several places: 2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships and 7.1.2. Entities – 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"> 1) The products of intellectual or artistic endeavor (work, expression, manifestation and item) 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 3) The subjects of intellectual or artistic expression (concept, object, event, place) <p>Proposed definition: Entity: 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> <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment:</i> ‘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 3rd 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.”</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AACR2 (JSC RDA): Abstain – Although ‘entity’ is being used in a standard way, it is used several times in the Statement of Principles to specifically refer to the FRBR entities. An alternative to providing a Glossary definition might be to provide a reference back to 2.1 and 2.2 as needed, within the text. • Costa Rica (Sonia Guitérrez): En el glosario, ninguna definició està de màs, si la intenció es la claridad. [In the Glossary no definition should be considered unnecessary that is if the intent is to clarify.] | <p>*Costa Rica (see comment) *Ethiopia * Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *México *Namibia *Russia (see comment) *Sweden (see comment) *Vatican</p> | <p>*China (1) *Czech Republic *Japan (5) (see comment) *Lebanon (see comment) *Palestine (see comment) *Peru (see comment) *Spain (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment)</p> | <p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment) *China (1) *Estonia *France (AFNOR) (see comment) *Slovenia</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>France</u> (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR): At the beginning of the glossary we can read “This Glossary includes terms found...in a specific way (not simply the usual dictionary definition).” This is in contradiction with the addition of Entity in the glossary. But we want to avoid any misunderstanding...so why not? I vote for abstention. • <u>Germany</u> (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): A majority agreed that “entity” should be defined. “Entity” is not so common in German dictionaries and often used in a philosophical meaning. Some preferred a definition that groups the entities like the FRBR explanation. • <u>Japan</u> (Rieko Koga): I agree with {Tillett’s} comment. • <u>Japan</u> (Yukiko Sakai): I do understand that “Entity” is one of the difficult concepts for non-native English speakers. Therefore, we may need the definition. The listing of things is not the definition as Dr. Tillett pointed out, though. Why don’t we have the definition from Webster’s and add the list as examples? • <u>Japan</u> (Takahiro Watanabe): Disagree - I agree Dr. Tillett’s comment and think that adding definition is not required. • <u>Lebanon</u> (Bughdana Hajjar): I agree with Barbara. • <u>Palestine</u> (Najla Sharabati and Suhaila Abu-Gudeib): Disagree - We agree with Barbara • <u>Peru</u> (Catalina Zavala): El término entidad es ambiguo, su definición en el glosario no precisa su significado para la catalogación. • <u>Russia</u> (Natalia Kasparova): Definition of the term ‘Entity’ is indispensable. • <u>Spain</u> (Elena Escolano): Agree with BT. Spanish: De acuerdo con el comentario de B.T. • <u>Sweden</u> (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): Though well known to many, we think the term “entity” could be defined in this glossary. • <u>United Kingdom</u> (Heather Rosie): Agree with BT. The FRBR entities are listed within the statement of principles at 2.1 & 2.2 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Recommendation | Agree | Disagree | Abstain |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>4. IME ICC5 recommends: changing “indispensable access point” (7.1.2) to “Essential access point” in the principles, and offer the following definition for the Glossary: <u>Essential access point: 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.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Costa Rica</u> (Sonia Guitérrez): Prefiero el término acceso indispensable. [I prefer the term “indispensable access”] • <u>France</u> (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR): The problem of the words “indispensable” of “essential” is that until now they don’t pertain to the terminology of standardization. • <u>Germany</u> (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): We prefer to retain “indispensable” (cf. our statement vote). • <u>Japan</u> (Rieko Koga): English is not my mother language, so maybe I can’t strictly recognize difference of meanings between essential and indispensable, and actually the word “essential” is more familiar to me. But it doesn’t seem necessary to change nor list on the glossary. • <u>Japan</u> (Yukiko Sakai): If the definition and function is well described in the statement, the glossary for “Essential access point” may not be needed as well as the definition for additional access point. • <u>Lebanon</u> (Bughdana Hajjar): Are we talking here about main entries? This is redundant IMHO • <u>Slovenia</u> (Irene Kavčič): This definition is already included in 7.1.2 and there is no need to repeat it in the glossary. (If there is a definition for “essential access point” in the glossary, there should also be a definition for “additional access point” (which is – in my opinion – not necessary).) • <u>Sweden</u> (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): We agree with the definition; but as our voting concerning the Statement [of Principles] pointed out, we prefer the expression “indispensable.” • <u>United Kingdom</u> (Heather Rosie): Already clear from the statement at 7.1.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) *Czech Republic *Ethiopia *Japan (1) *México *Namibia *Peru *Russia *Sweden (see comment) *Vatican | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *China (1) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Japan (4) (see comment) *Slovenia (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *China (1) *Estonia *France (AFNOR) (see comment) [Lebanon – no vote, but see comment] *Palestine |
| <p>5. IME ICC5 recommends: Add a “see” reference from Normalized to Authorized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p><i>Barbara Tillett’s comment: If the IME ICC5 recommendation under 5.1 to change ‘normalized’</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) agree, if | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *China (2) *Czech Republic | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><i>to 'authorized' is agreed, such a reference is not needed, because 'normalized' would not be used in the principles.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>AACR2 (JSC RDA): Please see our comments on the recommendations [for the Principles]. There is a second occurrence of normalized in 5.1. We agree with eliminating both.</i> <i>Costa Rica (Sonia Guitérrez): De todas formas, mi preferencia es Normalizado y no autorizado, ya que la normalización ha sido, es y sera un concepto siempre paralelo al uso de las RDA y no debe desaparecer con termino en los Principios. [No matter what, my preference is "Normalized" and not authorized. Normalized is, has always been, and will always be a parallel concept with the use of RDA and the term should not disappear as a term in the Principles.]</i> <i>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): We agree to replace "normalized" by "authorized" in the statement and consent to Barbara Tillett's comment.</i> <i>Japan (Yukiko Sakai): Disagree, because I have agreed to the change in 5.1 ;-)</i> <i>Japan (Takahiro Watanabe): Disagree - I agree Dr. Tillett's comment.</i> <i>Palestine (Najla Sharabati and Suhaila Abu-Gudeib): No. We agree with Barbara.</i> <i>Slovenia (Irene Kavčič): I prefer the term "authorized form" (if "normalized" is not changed to "authorized", a reference is needed).</i> <i>Sweden (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): Disagree – We agree with BT</i> <i>United Kingdom (Heather Rosie): Agree with BT, provided an additional change is made at 5.1 to the preceding sentence to remove the word "normalized" from the statement.</i> | <p>retained (see comment) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Ethiopia *France (AFNOR) *Lebanon *México *Namibia *Peru *Slovenia (see comment)</p> | <p>*Estonia *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Japan (5) (see comment) *Palestine (see comment) *Russia *Sweden (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment) *Vatican</p> | |
| <p>6. IME ICC5 recommends: Add to the glossary Uncontrolled access point (5.1) and see also from "Access point"</p> <p>Uncontrolled access point: An access point in a bibliographic record that is not controlled by an authority record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree? Comments: <i>Costa Rica (Sonia Guitérrez): Aclara el concepto. [This clarifies the concept]</i> <i>France (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR): I wonder if this definition is not too restrictive. Some data in a bibliographic record can be managed through a referential list but not really by an authority record: for example the function of an agent (author, translator, illustrator, etc. expressed by the \$4 in MARC format). Can we say that ISSN or ISBN are "uncontrolled access points"? I propose to add something like "not controlled by an</i> | <p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) *China (1) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Ethiopia *France (AFNOR)</p> | <p>*China (1) *France (AFNOR) – no for the definition (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) to the</p> | <p>[Lebanon – no vote, but see comment]</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>authority record or a frame of reference” but I am not sure of the right word in English to express the French word “référential”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Germany</u> (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): An access point may either be a controlled access point or an uncontrolled access point. An uncontrolled access point may occur not only in a bibliographic, but also in an authority record (authority record is missing in the definition of “uncontrolled access point” suggested by IME ICC5). E.g., a special standard number – which is not controlled by an authority record – may as well be an access point in a bibliographic as in an authority record. • <u>Lebanon</u> (Bughdana Hajjar): Or maybe not authorized? • <u>Palestine</u> (Najla Sharabati and Suhaila Abu-Gudeib): Yes. Because there is a definition for “Controlled access point” • <u>Peru</u> (Catalina Zavala): Estoy de acuerdo porque hay puntos de acceso controlado, como los números normalizados, números de clasificación, etc., que no están controlados a través de un registro de autoridad o sus referencias. Quizás habria que precisar que un “punto de acceso no controlado”, no esta relacionado con los puntos de acceso designado como autorizados. [I agree, because there are controlled access points such as standardized numbers, classification numbers, etc. that are not controlled through an authority records nor thru references. Perhaps it is best to clarify that “ an uncontrolled access point” is not related to the access points that have been designated as authorized.] | <p>yes, for the addition (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) to add a term to the glossary (see comment) *Japan (2) *México *Namibia *Palestine (see comment) *Peru (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *Spain *Sweden *United Kingdom *Vatican</p> | <p>wording (see comment) *Japan (3)</p> | |
|---|---|---|--|

| OTHER COMMENTS | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group):</p> <p>a) Creator</p> <p>Only via “agent” does “creator” lead to the important conclusion that a corporate body may be a creator. A creator may be a person, family, or a corporate body.</p> <p>We suggest to replace “an entity responsible” by “an agent responsible”. Some comments we received expressed general problems with “agent – creator – author”. Why does the explanation of “agent” not include “family”?</p> <p>b) “See also”</p> <p>We would like to know if “see also” points from a higher level to a lower level or from a lower level to a higher one and if “see also” works reciprocally. How many levels does “see also” cover in height or depth?</p> <p>Please add to the entry “access point”: <i>See also</i> Controlled access point, <i>Uncontrolled access point</i>.</p> <p>c) Sources</p> <p>We suggest to check the sources. Instead of ISBD(CR), we suggest to name the latest ISBD publication, the ISBD Consolidated edition of 2007.</p> <p>d) Relationship</p> <p>If a term like “entity” will be included in the glossary, the term “relationship” should be defined, too. Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relationship defines: “A relationship is a specific connection between objects, entities, or concepts.”</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Lebanon</u> (Bughdana Hajjar): Following the Glossary introductory paragraph – I have the feeling that in the paragraph above we are explaining the obvious. I think the word Glossary in itself conveys what you want to say that these terms are related to specific use and area of discipline and application. I would be fine with: Glossary of the terms established (or used) in the International Cataloguing Principles</p> <p>Agent – [add “composer” to the examples at the start of the definition]</p> <p>Author – This has to be changed, it feels funny when it is used then you refer to it in the see also cross reference. Do we have to keep the word “textual”?</p> <p>Bibliographic description – [Bughdana, do I have this right ?– you suggest rewording to: “A set of bibliographic data describing a bibliographic resource.” - bt]</p> <p>Controlled access point – Please change the paragraph into: An entry that could be a name, term, code, etc., under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference will be found [GARR modified]. Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access points designated as authorized or preferred forms as well as those designated as variant forms. • access points based on personal, family, and corporate names. Includes access points based on titles for works, expressions, manifestations, and items. • 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. • 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 <i>per se</i> (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.] <p>Essential access point – I need an explanation here to understand if it differs from the main entry and how. What is the rationale of this change?</p> | | | |
|---|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Person – How can a person be established by an individual or a group? {BT's response: It says the persona established or adopted by an individual or group – for example the persona of Lewis Carroll as the writer of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland or the persona Betty Crocker used by the General Mills corporation.]</p> <p><u>Sweden</u> (Anders Cato and Miriam Säfström): Regarding the Glossary's definitions of "Access point", "Controlled access point" and "Uncontrolled access point" (as BT we think that "Additional access point" does not need to be included), we think that they could be better aligned with each other.</p> <p>Under "Access point": "A name, term, code, etc., under which a bibliographic or authority record or reference may be searched and identified." (in the above we propose the wording "is searched and identified")</p> <p>Under Controlled Access Point: "A name... will be found" The text continues with different examples of controlled access points, but to our eyes no term definition as clear as the one for its opposite ("Uncontrolled access point") which is defined "An access point in a bibliographic record that is not controlled by an authority record."</p> | | | |
|---|--|--|--|