

IME ICC5 Recommendations – Principles
Discussion and voting document

Tally of Votes
January 3, 2008

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships			
<p>2.1.1 Add: “A description is based on the item as representative of the manifestation and may include data relating to work(s) and expression(s).” (See FRBR 3.2.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IME ICC5 Discussion. This principle now focuses on the manifestation, but indeed one needs an item to represent all items/copies that comprise a manifestation. Do you agree to recommend adding this sentence? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: prefer that the new sentence be given as the final sentence in this paragraph. The phrase “... may include data relating to work(s) and expression(s)” might be better given as “inherits attributes of the expression and work”. <u>Bahamas (Willamae Johnson)</u>: Would CIP records fall under the purview of ICP? If that is the case, then the item in hand would not be the same as the distributed item 00 the proof would be a representation of the manifestation. If CIP is not covered by the ICP then I would agree to add the sentence, although some might consider the sentence stating a logical given circumstances. <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Encuentro ambigüedad en el uso del término “item” y “ejemplar”. Me explico: En la definición del glosario (tanto en inglés como en español) se agrega entre paréntesis lo siguiente: “obra, expresión, manifestación e item”, este último término se utiliza como “ejemplar” en el punto 2.1 Entidades en los registros bibliográficos, de la declaración de principios en español. En la recomendación dada aquí mismo, se menciona además “items/copias”. Por todo lo anterior, propongo la siguiente redacción para el punto 2.1.1 La descripción se basa en el ejemplar como manifestación y puede incluir datos relacionados con la(s) obras(s) y expresión(es). Tanto en el Glosario, como en la Declaración, utilizar el término en español “ejemplar” cuando en inglés se hable de “item” [I find ambiguity in using the term “item” and “exemplar” Let me explain why : 	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA), but see suggestions (see comment) *Bahamas (but see comment regarding CIP) * China (3) * Costa Rica (but see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia (see comment) *France *Italy (1) *Japan (1) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia</p>	<p>*Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Italy (1) *Japan (2) (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment)</p>	<p>*Finland (see comment) *Japan (1) (see comment) *Slovenia</p>

<p>In the glossary definition [in English and in Spanish] we have added in parenthesis the following “ work, expression, manifestation, and item” the latter to mean “exemplar” as found in 2.1 Entities in Bibliographic Records of the Statement of Principles in Spanish. In this same recommendation here we also include the mention of “items/copies” Because of this I propose the following editing be done to 2.1.1. The description should be based on the exemplar as manifestation and may include data related to the work(s) and expression(s). In the Glossary as well as in the Statement, use the term “exemplar” [in Spanish] when in English the term “item” is used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Estonia (Sirje Nilbe/National Library of Estonia):</u> We propose slight rewording for the paragraph now to retain the most important sentence first: “Bibliographic records should typically reflect manifestations. Although, a description is based on the item as representative of the manifestation and may include data relating to work(s) and expression(s). Manifestations may embody...” Of course, there may be a better solution. • <u>Finland (Eeva Murtomaa):</u> I understand this sentence as “cataloguer friendly” addition because we are usually working with an item in hand. This is especially OK, when cataloguing manuscripts, objects or rare-books. Anyway, I am so used to think on the conceptual “manifestation” level. Today we are creating records more and more to union catalogues, and I think, that a manifestation level would be the basis , and specific item level information should be given as holding information. I also would like to have manifestation to manifestation relationships, manifestation to item relationships and item to item relationships clear. In addition we are more and more describing web resources, digital collections (e.g. according to the topic) portals etc. In this case the first sentence does not work. In addition e.g., in Tom Delsey’s “ Mapping ISBD Elements to FRBR Entity Attributes and Relationships “ the lowest level is manifestation level. But if this first sentence helps- lets have it. • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group):</u> The suggested addition probably mainly intends to express that in the FRBR sense an item represents a manifestation. Nevertheless. We wonder why a new term “a description” is chosen now whereas the following sentences contain the wording “bibliographic record(s).” “May include data relating to work(s) and expression(s)” is only one possibility. Another one would be to mention “may link to data relating to work(s) and expression(s).” Our suggestion: Cancel the suggested addition. Add an explanation to the first sentence: Old version: “Bibliographic records should typically reflect manifestations.” New version: “Bibliographic records should typically reflect manifestations represented (or: 	<p>*Spain *Vatican</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>exemplified) by items.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Japan (Kayo Sakemi)</u>: I disagree this recommendation. Because I think these entities are abstract concepts. There seems to be a confusion between the model and the practice. I feel this sentence is too practical and doesn't belong here. "Item" and "Manifestation" are mostly the same thing in the actual cataloguing. It would appear to me that attributes of Item (FRBR Table 6.4) are the answer. • <u>Japan (Takahiro Watanabe)</u>: I am doubtful about whether it is suitable that a sentence about "description" appears before a sentence about "bibliographic record". • <u>Japan (Yukio Yokoyama)</u>: No, I disagree. The sentence about 'description' may appear in '4. Bibliographic Description.' • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I agree with this sentence: "the principle now focuses on the manifestation..." because this means that the focus will be on the manifestation and a separate bibliographic record will be created for each manifestation. The importance of this lies in providing information, which is more precise, more adequate. • <u>United Kingdom (Heather Rosie)</u>: This paragraph appears to confuse terms defined in the FRBR report and the Glossary. The term "Work" is being used as shorthand for "Expression of a work". A "Manifestation" is "the physical embodiment of an expression of a work" so it cannot "appear" in one or more physical units. Our interpretation of what this paragraph is trying to say is as follows: "A description is based on the item as representative of the manifestation where some data elements contained in the description are unique to the manifestation (e.g. extent) and some are common to both the manifestation and the expression (e.g. title). The totality of a bibliographic record therefore typically reflects a manifestation. Manifestations may embody a collection of expressions of works, an expression of an individual work, or a component part of an expression of a work. Each of these should be considered an expression of a work in itself. Manifestations may comprise of one or more physical units." This is quite a convoluted statement so maybe could be expressed succinctly as: "A description is based on the item as representative of the manifestation and inherits attributes of the expression and work". 			
<p>3. Functions of the Catalogue</p>			
<p>3.1 Delete "(real or virtual)" Do you agree? Comments:</p>	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see</p>	<p>*China (2) *Costa Rica (see</p>	<p>*Germany (Expert Group)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: The JSC agree with the deletion of this phrase as it does not add anything to the reader’s understanding of the word ‘collection’. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Me parece que la aclaración es conveniente, pero sugiero considerar el término “físico o virtual” [It appears to me that the clarification is useful, but I would suggest the term “physical or virtual”] • <u>Finland (Eeva Murtomaa)</u>: I think that when we have enormous mass of digitalized information, we will create “virtual collections” e.g. according to the topics. That’s why I liked “real or virtual”. • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We agree that it is not in the main scope of the statement to explain what a collection is. We abstain because the explanation “real or virtual” does not harm in this context. In our discussion, we received a mixed reaction how to vote on the suggested change. <p>The Glossary definition of “collection” for the time being does only include the “real” character of a collection, but not the virtual one. We suggest to add “real or virtual” to the glossary definition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I vote for deleting this expression: “real or virtual”. I think it is redundant. The collection should remain absolute. 	<p>comment) *Bahamas *China (1) *Czech Republic *Estonia *France *Italy (2) *Japan (4) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *United Kingdom *Vatican</p>	<p>comment) *Finland (see comment)</p>	<p>(see comment) *Spain</p>
<p>3.5 The statement should read, to help the user “to navigate within the catalogue...”</p> <p>Do you agree?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: The principle is clear either with or without ‘within’. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Considero correcto “navegar por un catálogo”. En español, navegamos por el río o por el mar, no dentro del río ni dentro del mar. [I think that it is correct to say “to navigate the catalogue” In Spanish one says: to navigate the river or navigate the sea not within the river or within the sea] • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We suggest instead to mention “within and beyond” because the navigation should as well open the “way outwards”. • <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: I don’t know if “navigate within” is an expression usually used. It seems “navigate” itself means getting around. Either “Navigate the catalogue” or “Navigate through the catalogue” is better? • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I opt for using the adverb <u>within</u>, which implies the logical arrangement of the bibliographic information. It triggers implicitly the idea of relationships / links between the four entities: work, manifestation, expression, and item. 	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment) *Bahamas *China (2) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Finland *France *Italy (2) *Japan (2) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *United</p>	<p>*China (1) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Japan (1) (see comment)</p>	<p>*Japan (1) *Spain</p>

	Kingdom *Vatican		
--	---------------------	--	--

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
<p>5. Access Points</p>			
<p>5.1 The term “Normalized form” is ambiguous. Preferred the term “authorized forms”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IME ICC5 Discussion. Agreed to recommend rewording to “These authorized forms should be recorded in authority records along with variant forms used as references.” In English “normalized” refers to the machine normalization process to remove spaces, adjust capitalization, etc., which is NOT what we intend. • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AACR2 (JSC RDA): The JSC note that the word ‘normalized’ also appears in the preceding sentence, and could be misunderstood in the same way. Would ‘made consistent’ be a substitute for normalized in that sentence? Alternatively, could the sentence finish with the word ‘resources’ i.e., “Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources.” • Bahamas (Willamae Johnson): Would ‘standardized’ be a commonly understood alternative? • Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez): Pero considero que es “normalización” lo que está descrito como uno de los objetivos para la elaboración de los catálogos y en este sentido no presenta ambigüedad alguna y es este un proceso que ha sido, es y será siempre reconocido cuando se manejan las RDA [But I consider that something being “normalized” is one of the objectives for the creation of a catalog and in this meaning the word is not ambiguous and that this is a process that is, has been, and will always be recognized when one works with RDA] • Estonia (Sirje Nilbe/National Library of Estonia): But other cases with this word? Are they relevant? In the same paragraph “...and must be normalized following a standard.” In the Objectives for the Construction of Cataloguing Codes “Common usage. Normalized vocabulary used in descriptions...” • France (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR): Add "authorized form" in the glossary, because in the November version we have only "authorized heading". But it seems there is no difference between the two expressions ! Perhaps it is better to keep only "authorized form" and to delete "authorized heading" ? An "authorized form" <i>means</i> "a heading", no ? • Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): We agree to replace “normalized form” by “authorized form. We do not agree to “used as references” and suggest to 	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment) *Bahamas (see comment) *China (2) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia (see comment) *Finland *France (AFNOR) (see comment) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *Italy (2) (see comment) *Japan (4) (see comment) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *Spain *United Kingdom (see comment) *Vatican</p>	<p>*China (1)</p>	

<p>cancel the term (as commented in a former voting round).</p> <p>5. Access Points; 5.1.1 Choice of access points, 5.1.1.1</p> <p>We do not agree with section 5.1.1.1, second text block. According to the current usage in Germany and Austria, the corporate body would not be regarded as creator if according to the main source of information a person could be regarded as author. In consideration of the forthcoming increase of automatically proceeded acquisitions, we suggest to rely more on formally visible attributes.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>We would like to ask whether the subclauses of 5.1 contain a wrong numbering.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(Numbering of the draft)</td> <td>(Proposal for numbering)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.1</td> <td>5.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.1.1</td> <td>5.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.1.1.1</td> <td>5.2.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.2.1</td> <td>5.2.2</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Italy (Cristina Magliano / ICCU)</u>: I prefer term authorized. • <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: I like the rewording. [However]In this case, “These authorized forms” should be “the authorized forms”? There seems distance between the first and second “authorized forms.” • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: In my opinion, the expression <u>authorized forms</u> is more functional; it implies a certain degree of flexibility, while the word <u>normalized</u> imposes a kind of rigidity and austerity. • <u>United Kingdom (Heather Rosie)</u>: agree the change of wording and recommend removing the word “normalized” from the preceding sentence: “Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources and must be normalized created following a standard. 	(Numbering of the draft)	(Proposal for numbering)	5.1	5.1	5.1.1	5.2	5.1.1.1	5.2.1	5.2.1	5.2.2			
(Numbering of the draft)	(Proposal for numbering)												
5.1	5.1												
5.1.1	5.2												
5.1.1.1	5.2.1												
5.2.1	5.2.2												
<p>5.1.2 to 5.2.4 Choice of names for authorized headings and forms of names needs to <u>move</u> under: 6. Authority Records, because it is controlled by authority records (now shown on marked up copy as 6.1.1 through 6.3.4.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: It’s helpful to give this information separately. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: La ubicación en ese apartado dá mayor claridad. [The location suggested by this move will provide greater clarity.] • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We agree to the suggested move. Nevertheless, we prefer 6.3. 4 (Forms of uniform titles) to stay under caption 5 (Access points). “Uniform title for the work/expression” in caption 7.1.2 (Indispensable access 	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment) *Bahamas *China (2) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Finland *France(AFNOR)</p>	<p>*China (1)</p>											

<p>points) is used in an according meaning like “uniform title” as an access point was under caption 5</p> <p>We prefer a structure of an authority record for a uniform title, which separates the components of a uniform title into single elements, allowing the composition of elements to form a complete uniform title. That means, a name-title combination should rather be expressed as a relation, where required within one authority record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: I like the reconstruction! • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I agree for this since it will help one avoid the problem of variant names of a person, also it will enable him to use the uniform title widely known or most used / found in the manifestations. This will allow unifying the information. 	<p>*Germany (Expert Group) (see comment)</p> <p>*Italy (2)</p> <p>*Japan (4) (see comment)</p> <p>*Morocco (see comment)</p> <p>*Russia</p> <p>*Slovenia</p> <p>*Spain</p> <p>*United Kingdom</p> <p>*Vatican</p>		
--	---	--	--

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
<p>6. Authority Records – NOT IME ICC5, but left over from IME ICC4</p>			
<p>IME ICC4 left over issue: Newly renumbered 6.3.4. Forms of Uniform Titles, carries forward the recommended changes from IME ICC4 that were still under discussion. The order of preference is following the overarching principles (now called “objectives for construction of cataloguing codes”) of <i>convenience of the user</i> and <i>common usage</i>, but by doing that violates the principle of <i>representation, standardization, and integration</i>.</p> <p>We have a couple of issues here: 1. “Uniform titles” – the term is ambiguous, as it has come to mean at least three different kinds of titles – can we instead refer to this as the “name of the work/expression”?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AACR2 (JSC RDA): 1. The JSC agree with the use of the phrase the ‘name of the work or expression’. • Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group): 1. We agree to introduce the new term “name of the work/expression” instead of “uniform title”. We note that the term “uniform title” is used in several clauses of the statement and should be replaced then all over the document. <p>To help understanding the change, we suggest to retain the term “uniform title” in the glossary as a reference to the new term “name of the work/expression”. The new definition should explain the function and make clear that “uniform title” was a term formerly used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Italy (Cristina Magliano / ICCU): I prefer “uniform titles” in our cataloguing rules. • Italy (Maria De Panicis / RICA): Yes, We can refer to the Uniform Title as the “name of the work/expression” • Japan (Takahiro Watanabe): I think there is no problem about use of “Uniform titles” because this term is defined on the Glossary. • Japan (Yukio Yokoyama): 1. We can use the expression “name of the work, expression, manifestation, or item” for the term “uniform titles”. • Russia (Natalia Kasparova): Disagree. The former term is better. • Spain (Elena Escolano): Before make my vote I would like to know which three 	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) – for issue 1 (see comment) *Bahamas (see general comment) *France (AFNOR) 1– yes for the name of the work/expression 2-yes for the original title first *Germany (Expert Group) (see comments) *Italy (1) for 1 *Morocco (see general comment) *United Kingdom (Agree with two issues, and see further comment) *Vatican (agree to use “name of the work/expression”)</p>	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) – for issue 2 (see comment) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic (see general comment) *Estonia (see comment) *Finland (see comment) *Italy (1) – issue 1 (see comment) and Italy (2) – issue 2 (see comments) *Russia (see comments)</p>	<p>*China (3) [No vote was cast by the 4 from Japan, but see comments] [No vote was cast by Slovenia] *Spain (see comment)</p>

<p>different kind of titles are know as uniform title. For uniform title I always understand the name of work/expression, and if necessary an access point for the name of manifestation and item although they are nor common. In my opinion should not be used new names for the same well established concepts. But if there is ambiguity, I would agree then should be changed.</p> <p>In Spanish - Antes de dar mi votación me gustaría saber que tres tipos de títulos se confunden bajo la denominación título uniforme. Siempre he entendido por título uniforme el nombre de la obra/expresión, y si es necesario el título que se le debe dar a una manifestación o item, aunque esto no suele ser frecuente. En mi opinión no se deberían dar nuevos nombres a conceptos bien establecidos. Pero si existe ambigüedad, entonces estaría de acuerdo en su cambio.</p> <p>2. By starting with the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue, we immediately present the cataloguer with a job of discovering a title in common usage. Most cataloguing codes today prefer the original title first (which can be presented in the script of the catalogue).</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u> AACR2 (JSC RDA): 2.</u> The JSC acknowledges the good intent of the proposed provision – enabling users to bring the vocabulary at their disposal to the catalogue and have a reasonable chance of success in discovering resources - but is concerned that the Statement causes more problems than it solves and that the probable outcome will have the opposite effect to the one intended. This same objective could be achieved more effectively by using authority files to facilitate discovery and to allow more user-friendly displays. <p>JSC considers it important that the Principles recognise explicitly that uniform titles are used both to collocate and to differentiate resources.</p> <p>Preference for the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue will result in less consistency between catalogues and greater complexity, leading to less efficient resource discovery at a higher cost. In multilingual countries it would be difficult to apply.</p> <p>To support consistency over time and place - and therefore also the international exchange of data - JSC favours the use of a uniform title/preferred name based on the language of the work (as in the RDA Draft). The JSC also supports the use of a reference from any commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue to the preferred name of the work or expression.</p> <p>JSC believes this will lead to greater consistency in naming works and parts of works,</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>thus meeting the needs of users to navigate the catalogue in order to find related resources.</p> <p>To assist cataloguers' ease of decision-making, JSC favours using the title found in manifestations of a work in its original language, or - in lieu of that - in reference sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Italy (Cristina Magliano / ICCU)</u>: I disagree with starting the choice of the common title in the language of the catalogue. <p>The uniform title is based on the title through which [the work] is generally identified. It should be the original title, chosen by the author or assigned in the first publication of the work, should be a variant or title adopted in the subsequent editions, should be the incipit, should be a traditional or conventional title, or a designation generally used. The choice of the common title should be one of the choices, but if there is a common title in the original editions, even if it is not the original title, or a traditional title, it should be preferred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Italy (Maria De Panicis / RICA)</u>: The Commissione RICA has come to the following decision: the Uniform Title is the title with which a work is prevalently presented in the editions in the original language. We adopt this title also if different from the title:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) initially attributed by the authorb) used in the first edition. <p>In the same way we adopt the title used more frequently in the editions in the original language, also if less complete than another used not very often.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: In order to follow the principle of representation, standardization, and integration, I would suggest the original preference: original title, most frequently found in the manifestation, and then commonly used. This wouldn't violate the principle of convenience and common usage, if the statement on variant forms could be added. For example: if commonly used titles are available, those should be added in the authority records as variant forms.• <u>Japan (Kayo Sakemi)</u>: I propose to use "conventional title" instead of "commonly known title." It could be<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Conventional title in the original language and script2. Conventional title in the language and script best suited to the users of the catalogue. Otherwise,3. the uniform title should be the original title pr4. the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work.			
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Japan (Takahiro Watanabe)</u>: I understand that VIAF project aims at linking authority records created by national agency of each country in order to enable worldwide users to access information using their own language or script. From this viewpoint, I support the order of preference of present draft. • <u>Japan (Yukio Yokoyama)</u>: 2. The principle of ‘convenience of the user’ has a priority over other principles. So, there is no violation, nor contradiction. • <u>Russia (Natalia Kasparova)</u>: Russian cataloguing rules prefer the original title first. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: We should be consistent with what is established as a general for all kind of names in the now stipulation numbered as 6.2: “in the original language and script”. But in order to establish an order of preference, and taking into account different scripts, the order should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1º conventional title, in the original language and script; 2º conventional title in the language and script best suited to the users of the catalogue, if the title is in other script; 3º original title; 4º the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work <p>In Spanish: Debemos ser coherentes con lo que se establece como estipulación general para todo tipo de nombres en la estipulación ahora numerada 6.2: “in la lengua y escritura original”. Pero teniendo que establecer un orden, y teniendo en cuenta el problema que se nos presenta de comprensión de los diferentes alfabetos, el orden debería ser: 1º título convencional en la lengua y escritura original; 2º título convencional en la lengua y escritura que mejor se adapte a los usuarios del catálogo, si el título es en otra escritura; 3º título original; 4º el título que se encuentre más frecuentemente en las manifestaciones de la obra.</p> <p>Please comment with further discussion on these issues and propose a solution.</p> • <u>Bahamas (Willamae Johnson)</u>: The interesting aspect of authority control for uniform titles is that the present form of title may not be the one commonly used in the future. The simple way would be to use the original title as the unifying element. The tracings should reflect popular usage. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: En mi experiencia, se ha manejado el concepto de “Títulos Uniformes” siempre, y no encuentro correcto cambiarlo en el texto por “nombre de la obra/expresión” aunque a veces lo sea. [In my experience we have handled the concept of “uniform titles” well and I do not find it correct to change 			
--	--	--	--

<p>the text to “name of the work/expression” even if it means that sometimes.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Czech Republic (Edita Lichtenbergova):</u> Ad 1) I prefer term “uniform titles”. I think it is a part of terminology and it is its purpose to cover different kinds of titles. Ad 2) I think in case of Bible and books of bible and similar historical etc texts commonly known titles play an important role and it would be difficult to change it. The uniform titles should be original titles or commonly known titles when they are used. • <u>Estonia (Sirje Nilbe/ National Library of Estonia):</u> We prefer the term “uniform title” but in the meaning 2 in the Glossary. We propose to delete meaning 1 for Uniform title in the Glossary. • <u>Finland (Eeva Murtomaa):</u> 1) Name of the work/expression, name of the entity person etc. are OK According to FRAD we could speak about creator-work/expression - titles as well In FRAD there are “controlled access points” and in FRSAR “constructed names”. There is confusion about the name for the concept “creator-/work / expression”, because we have different names for the same concept in cataloguing rules, MARC format, FRAD, and FRSAR. 2) Most cataloguing codes today prefer the original title first This is true especially in the rules for English speaking countries, and for other countries as well. For “commonly known title” we need immediately alternatives for bilingual or multilingual environment (to use the form and language most familiar to the users). I have noticed, that for music cataloguers the commonly known title might be important. Could we have directly alternative rule to choose of original title or the commonly known title? • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group):</u> We acknowledge that most cataloguing codes today (the cataloguing code used in Germany and Austria, RAK-WB, does this, too) ask for the original title first. It is clear that this title might be presented in the script of the catalogue or in the original script, as preferable or possible. We are not at all in favour of “counting manifestations” to ascertain which is the “most frequent” title. <p>We suggest the following order (the term “uniform title” has been replaced as suggested by “name of the work/expression”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The name of the work/expression should be the original title or 2. the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue when one exists for the resource, otherwise 			
--	--	--	--

<p>3. the title most frequently found in manifestations.</p> <p>Other comments pertaining to 6. Authority records:</p> <p>Furthermore, we suggest to mention that an authority record includes forms of names as well as identifiers.</p> <p>We suggest to replace “references” by “variant forms”: “Authority records should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names and references <i>variant forms</i> used as access points [...]”</p> <p>6.1 Choice of Names for Authorized Headings, 6.1.1</p> <p>“If a person, family, or a corporate body uses variant names or variant forms of names, one name or one form of name should be chosen as the authorized heading for each distinct persona.”</p> <p>We do not agree that each distinct persona should get a separate authorized heading. In the case of uncovered pseudonyms we prefer to record a pseudonym and a real name together in one authority record.</p> <p>The numbering of the subclauses “6.1.1.1.2” should read “6.1.1.2” instead, as it follows 6.1.1.</p> <p>“5.2.4.1.1” should read “6.3.4.1.1”. “5.2.4.1.2” should read “6.3.4.1.2”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: Looking for the title commonly known or frequently used constitutes another burden on the cataloguer, so I opt for the original title, which is easier to be found. Doing so, we take into consideration the principle of the convenience of the user.• <u>United Kingdom (Heather Rosie)</u>: Agree that “name of the work/expression” is less ambiguous than “uniform titles”. Suggest that the preferred form of name should be the title most frequently found in manifestations in the original language rather than the commonly known title in the language of the catalogue. Suggested rewording: <p>6.3.4 Name of the work/expression</p> <p>The name of a work or expression is an authorised heading comprised of a title that can stand alone or a name/title combination. The title element of the name of the work/expression may be qualified by the addition of identifying elements such as a corporate name or a place (for a stand alone title) and language, date, etc. (for either a stand alone title or a name/title combination) where the title alone or the name/title combination is not unique to that work or does not adequately identify the expression.</p> <p>6.3.4.1. The name of the work/expression should be the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work in the original language or, if this does not apply, the original title.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
7. Foundations for Search Capabilities			
<p>7.1.2. and 7.1.2.1. and 7.1.2.2. Change <u>Indispensable</u> access points into <u>Essential</u> access points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: The JSC agrees that 'essential' is an improvement. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Ya hice el comentario [I have already commented on this] • <u>France (Françoise Bourdon for AFNOR)</u>: In French "indispensable" seems clearer than "essential". Are we sure that every country will understand "highly recommended" ? The problem of the words "indispensable" or "essential" is that until now they don't pertain to the terminology of. standardization. What is "essential " for some of us can be considered as "unnecessary" for others. The result can be inconsistent from one catalogue to another. • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We prefer to retain "indispensable" Both terms, indispensable and essential, avoid the firm "mandatory", but "essential" is much weaker than "indispensable". • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I agree, because <u>indispensable</u> means obligatory, while <u>essential</u> means important. Moreover, sometimes, some access points may not be found or discovered all at once. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: Yes, especially if the year and the GMD are included (they are to limit search results). <p>Spanish: Sí, especialmente si el año y la Designación General de Material se incluyen en la lista (son para limitar el resultado de las búsquedas)</p>	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment)</p> <p>*Bahamas</p> <p>*China (1)</p> <p>*Czech Republic</p> <p>*Finland</p> <p>*Italy (2)</p> <p>*Japan (4)</p> <p>*Morocco (see comment)</p> <p>*Russia</p> <p>*Spain (see comment)</p> <p>*United Kingdom</p> <p>*Vatican</p>	<p>*China (1)</p> <p>*Costa Rica (see comment)</p> <p>*France(AFNOR) (see comment)</p> <p>* Germany (Expert Group) (see comment)</p>	<p>*China (1)</p> <p>*Estonia</p> <p>*Slovenia</p>
<p>7.1.2.1. Move "Classification numbers" to 7.1.3.1 Additional access points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <p>IME ICC5 Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Namibia</u>: in certain cases circumstances will allow information material to be available without class no. - <u>South Africa</u>: Even for the basic level national bibliographic record a classification number is not a requirement: "...subject heading(s) and/or classification number(s) for the principle subject(s) of the work(s)" [Susan's 	<p>*China (2)</p> <p>*Czech Republic</p> <p>*Italy (2)</p> <p>*Morocco (see comment)</p> <p>*Vatican</p>	<p>*AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment)</p> <p>*China (1)</p> <p>*Estonia</p> <p>*France (AFNOR)</p> <p>*Germany (Expert Group)</p>	<p>*Costa Rica</p> <p>*Finland (see comment)</p> <p>*Japan (2) (see comment)</p> <p>*Russia</p>

<p>emphasis]. We believe though that some form of subject access should be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2(JSC RDA)</u>: The JSC agrees that some form of subject access is essential, and this could be either subject headings or classification numbers. We do not support treating classification numbers as inessential. • <u>Finland (Eeva Murtomaa)</u>: usually at least one subject belongs to the requirements of minimal level cataloguing record • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We prefer to list “classification numbers” under 7.1.2.1 (Indispensable access points) because a classification number is important for placement, e.g. in bibliographies. • <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: Abstain – Classification number could be additional. Language should be essential, though. • <u>Japan (Kayo Sakemi)</u>: If we have to move classification numbers, I think we should also move the subject heading to 7.1.3.1. What should we be based on when we decide that this is essential access points? I feel that language is also essential access point. • <u>Japan (Takahiro Watanabe)</u>: I agree to the following [South Africa comment] (“some form of subject access should be provided”). It is not suitable to treat subject headings as “essential” and classification numbers as “additional”. If we consider that both subject headings and classification are not required, essential access points should be expressed as (for instance): “subject access points (subject headings, subject terms, or classification numbers)”. • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I agree, because I think that adding more access points implies providing more information. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: No. Especially if the year continues being considered essential, and classification number no, seems inconsistent. A search and access in the catalogue can be made only by the classification number alone, what is not possible to search and retrieve by a year alone. <p>Spanish: No. Especialmente parece incoherente si el año continúa siendo considerado esencial, y el número de clasificación no. Una búsqueda y acceso al documento se puede hacer solamente por el número de clasificación, lo que no es posible si hacemos la consulta solamente por la fecha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>United Kingdom (Heather Rosie)</u>: Demoting classification weakens the position of service managers seeking to justify either the implementation or maintenance of classification. 		<p>(see comment) *Japan (2) (see comment) *Spain (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment)</p>	<p>*Slovenia</p>
--	--	--	------------------

<p>7.1.3. Numbering: Insert 7.1.3.1 before “Such attributes in bibliographic records... and insert 7.1.3.2 before Such attributes in authority records...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AACR2 (JSC RDA)</u>: This change makes it easier to see the distinction between the two paragraphs. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Mayor claridad. [Better editing] • <u>Japan (Yukiko Sakai)</u>: I like the revision. Let’s make “bibliographic records” and “authority records” in either part bold. • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: I think this will allow us to make a clear distinction between attributes in bibliographic records and attributes in authority records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) (see comment) *China (3) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Finland *France (AFNOR) * Germany (Expert Group) *Italy (2) *Japan (4) (see comment) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *Spain *United Kingdom *Vatican 		
---	--	--	--

Recommendation	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Appendix “Objectives for the Construction of Cataloguing Codes”			
<p>The Appendix contains important information. It must be part of the main body of the document. Move this entire section out of the appendix and include it just after the introduction and before the Scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bahamas (Willamae Johnson)</u>: There should be further elucidation of minimum requirements for descriptive cataloguing. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Se destaca y está relacionado con la información inicial que se está brindando [This is well known and is related to the initial information that is being presented] • <u>Russia (Natalia Kasparova)</u>: If you insert the “Objectives” between the Introduction and the Scope, it will break the integrity of the text of the Principles. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: Yes I agree to move here in the Principles, but I don’t like the title “Objectives for the construction of the cataloguing code”. They are not objectives, they are traditional principles well accepted we have to have in mind when making cataloguing decisions, building and managing the catalogue, that should be recommended also in a cataloguing code. Suggestion: “Traditional Principles” ? <p>*Spanish: Sí estoy de acuerdo con el movimiento a esta parte de los principios, pero no me gusta el título de “Objetivos para la construcción de Códigos de catalogación”. No son objetivos, son principios tradicionales bien aceptados que tenemos que tener en mente cuando tomamos decisiones de catalogación, construimos o gestionamos el catálogo y que deben estar recomendadas también en un código de catalogación. Sugerencia: “Principios tradicionales”?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) *Bahamas (see comment) *China (3) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Finland *France (AFNOR) *Germany (Expert Group) *Italy (2) *Japan (3) *Morocco *Spain (see comment) *United Kingdom *Vatican 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Russia (see comment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Japan (1) *Slovenia
<p>• Standardization – standardized to the extent and level possible should read “standardized as far as possible”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Mejor redacción [Better editing] • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We prefer the former version, which is clearer because it contains an explanation. “Standardized” as a process has to be defined, and “to the extent and level possible” serves this purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) *Bahamas *China (2) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *China (1) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *United Kingdom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Spain (see comment)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: The expression “as far as possible” means necessarily doing one’s best. This will ensure a high degree of standardization. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: It is a proper English wording problem, I do not see the problem in the Spanish translation. Spanish: Es un problema de redacción en un Inglés correcto, no afecta a la traducción en Español. • United Kingdom (Heather Rosie): Prefer not to add any additional text following the word “standardized”. The sentiment is “should”, not “must”, so there is no need to add anything further. <p><i>Standardization.</i> Descriptions and construction of access points should be standardized to the extent and level possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Finland *France (AFNOR) *Italy (2) *Japan (4) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *Vatican 	(see comment)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration –to the extent possible should read “as far as possible” • Do you agree? • Comments: • <u>Bahamas (Willamae Johnson)</u>: Delete the phrase. • <u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez)</u>: Debe existir congruencia y concordancia en ambas versiones. [There should be congruence and concordance between both versions] • <u>Germany (Gudrun Henze for the Expert Group)</u>: We prefer the former version, which is clearer because it contains an explanation. • <u>Morocco (Abderrahmane Rachik)</u>: “As far as possible” here is the other way of saying: “It is forbidden to violate the rules only when this is impossible.” This strengthens the importance of the idea of integration, which is one of the main objectives of the construction of cataloguing codes. • <u>Spain (Elena Escolano)</u>: It is a proper English wording problem, I do not see the problem in the Spanish translation. <p>Spanish: Es un problema de redacción en un Inglés correcto, no afecta a la traducción en Español.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *AACR2 (JSC RDA) *China (2) *Costa Rica (see comment) *Czech Republic *Estonia *Finland *France (AFNOR) *Italy (2) *Japan (4) *Morocco (see comment) *Russia *Slovenia *Vatican 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Bahamas (see comment) *China (1) *Germany (Expert Group) (see comment) *United Kingdom (see comment above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Spain (see comment)
<p>Other comments:</p> <p><u>Costa Rica (Sonia Gutiérrez) for the translators of the Spanish version–</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considero invaluable la traducción de los documentos que ha hecho Elena Escolano, y me permito al respecto, sugerir lo siguiente: {I consider that the help that Elena Escolano has provided in translating the documents invaluable but I respectfully suggest the following:} <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cada vez que se traduzca el término “language” se haga como “lengua”, ya que a veces 			

<p>aparece como lenguaje y es una acepción diferente (eje. en 6.3.4.1) [Any time the term language is used in English the word "lengua" should be used; this has not always been the case see example 6.3.4.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traducir siempre "item" por "ejemplar" [Translate always "item" as "ejemplar"• Traducir siempre "bibliographic file" como "archivo bibliográfico" y no utilizar fichero bibliográfico [Translate always "bibliographic file" as "archivo bibliografico y do not use bibliographic catalog.] <p>2. Considero necesario agregar el el Glosario la dfinición de "titulo propio" y utilizar siempre este término, como por ejemplo, en la definición de "Titulo clave" sustituir el término "titulo propiamente dicho" (herencia de las AACR) por "titulo propio". [I think it is necessary to add to the Glossary an entry for the definición of "title proper" and then always use this term, for example in the definition of "key title" substitute the term "titulo propiamente dicho" (legacy from AACR) with the term "title proper"</p> <p>3. Se que por traducción de "físical format" en el Glosario en español aparece "Formato físico", que en mi opinión es redundante. Es mi experiencia de que utilizamos el término solo como formato, hablamos de diferentes formatos, y casi nunca decimos formatos físicos. [In the Glossary the term "physical format" appears as "Formato físico" and in my opinión this is redundant. In my experience we use the term soley as format and we often speak of different formats but we never say physical format [In Spanish]].</p>			
--	--	--	--