

IME ICC5 Recommendations Discussion and Voting Document Principles and Glossary

From the Pretoria IME ICC5 meetings, August 14-15, 2007

RESPONSE FROM: _____

Date: _____

Principles:

[Note: The information below through the start of section 5 reflects the Pretoria discussion. You may still share further discussion on Sections 1-4, if you wish. For Sections 5-7, please indicate whether you agree or reject the proposed recommendation. At the end are the recommendations on the Glossary – Barbara Tillett]

WG4: **Name of Statement**, term “**cataloguing**” to be updated

- Recommended possible term: “**resource description**”

- Rejected, because the focus is on the “cataloguing” activity, which is more than resource description (also includes access and authority control).

WG5: **Introduction**, third paragraph: replace “all types of materials” with “all types of resources”

- **Continue discussion**

WG5: **Scope** and wherever it appears in document

- Recommended changing the phrase “bibliographic resources” to “resources”

- Rejected, because we want to be clear we are focussed on those things collected by libraries, archives, museums, etc. rather than any resource. In English, “bibliographic” is not limited to books, but is intended to include all things collected or organized by these institutions.

- Recommended changing the phrase “bibliographic record” to “catalogue record”

- Rejected, because bibliographic records may be independent of a catalogue.

2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships

WG5: **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)

- **Discuss. This principle now focuses on the manifestation, but indeed one needs an item to represent all items/copies that comprise a manifestation. Do we agree to recommend adding this sentence?**

WG3: **2.2** Last sentence in the paragraph should read: “**Entities that serve as subjects** include:” - the French translation says this now.

- Rejected for English, as FRBR specifically clarifies that those entities “serve as the subjects of works,” so we need to keep the wording in English as is. Consider correcting the French translation.

WG3: 2.2 per above; alternatively recommend correction in French translation?

- **Continue discussion about French** WG5: 2.2 Reject removing “Item” from the list (Note: this was suggested in discussions from the IME ICC4 recommendations)
- Agreed

WG5: 2.4 Add: Multipart/multivolume works should be catalogued in such a way that the needs of the users of the catalogue or/and the intention/editorial plan of the publisher/issuance nature of the work is reflected in the bibliographic description

- Rejected, because multipart/multivolume resources are already covered in the principles along with all other types of manifestations. 2.4 is about relationships.

3. Functions of the Catalogue

WG3: 3.1 Delete “(real or virtual)”

- Agreed

WG3: 3.5 The statement should read, to help the user “to navigate **within** the catalogue...”

- Agreed

4. Bibliographic Description

WG5: Add:

4.2 Descriptions *of works or aggregates* may be at several levels of completeness, based on the purpose of the catalogue or bibliographic file.

- Rejected, because the description is of a manifestation.

5. Access Points

WG3: Group could not agree on the scope of controlled access points under “Summary of responses” from the former IME ICC participants.

5.1 Group had problems with terms “normalized forms” versus “authorized headings.”

WG2: 5.1 The term “Normalized form” is ambiguous. Preferred the term “authorized forms”

- 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.

NOTE: This is where we had to stop in Pretoria. Please respond with your vote to agree or reject the following recommendations. Add any comments you wish to provide.

WG5: Add: **5.1.1.1**, 2nd paragraph: Include as access points to a record, elements that link related works or reflect the multipart nature of a work (see 3.5 for justification)

- **Do you agree?**

Barbara's comment: It may be better to make such an addition at the end of the first paragraph where it discusses access points for the works and expressions, to also indicate providing access points for the related works/expressions (Note: The principles already said under 2.4 that we want to include bibliographically significant relationships). If we agree to this, then do we need to add the names of the works/expressions that are in bibliographically significant relationships as part 7.1.3 additional access points, or is this included as part of 2.4? Adding them to 7.1.3 would move us more to rules on the technique to be used to express these relationships (i.e., making them access points).

I do not think we need to mention the multipart nature of a work, because that is usually indicated through the whole/part relationships that may be expressed in several ways in bibliographic records (added entries, contents notes, analytic records, series statements, etc.) – but those techniques are for cataloging rules. What do you think?

WG2: From **5.1.2 to 5.2.4** (choice of names for authorized headings and forms of names) needs to move under: **6. Authority Records**, because it is controlled by authority records – or perhaps vice versa.

- **Continue discussion. This proposes to bring together the aspects of what goes into the authority record. Would you like to see this information moved to section 6 on authority records?**

WG3: **5.1.3** Language – The Group agreed with the Caption changed to “Language of Authorized Headings,” as recommended in the “Summary of responses” from the former IME ICC participants. Further, the Group had no problems with the Statement.

- **Do you agree?**

WG2: **5.2** Caption title should be **Forms of Authorized Headings**, because discussion in paragraph is about authorized headings.

- **Do you agree?**

WG2: **5.2** “These controlled access points are usually documented ...” change to : “These controlled access points **should** be documented ...”

- **Do you agree?**

WG4: **5.2.4.1. Forms of Uniform Titles** –Term “*uniform titles*” to be renamed.

- **What should it be instead? Need discussion. RDA uses the “name of the work,” etc.**

WG3: **5.2.4.1** The Group proposed that the statement should read: “The Uniform title should be the commonly known (conventional) title of a work, expression, or manifestation in the language and script of the catalogue when one exists for the resource or the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work.”

- The makes the 3 separately numbered sections into one sentence and introduces “(conventional)” as suggested in the “Summary of responses” from the former IME ICC participants. It was added by some of the former participants (though not yet agreed) to make the connection with “old” terminology from the 1961 Paris Principles. Perhaps that term is no longer needed (see WG4’s suggestion below). This IME ICC5 WG3 suggestion also adds “of a work, expression, or manifestation” and changes some of the ending wording. Please compare this to the March 6, 2007 draft in your Background papers document. Do you agree?

WG4: **5.2.4.1.** The term “*conventional title*” is unclear. Recommend preferring the term “*commonly known title*”.

- Is the recommendation then to not add the parenthetical “(conventional)” to 5.2.4.1.? Do you agree to retain the wording in the March 6, 2007 draft?

WG3: **5.2.4.1.**, continued. The Group thought that the last part of the statement “*or the title most frequently found in manifestations of a work*” may not be necessary. The statement could end with: “the original title”.

- Do you agree?

Barbara Tillett’s comment: “most frequently found on manifestations of the work” is a standard way IME ICC participants to date have agreed to indicate that the evidence for a decision is based on what you have or what others have found on manifestations. I would recommend we retain it here, if there is agreement to proceed with this recommendation to omit the phrase. However, if this is agreed, please explain the specific justifications for dropping this phrase – to help explain to the former IME ICC participants.

WG4: Re-number **5.2.4.1. - 5.2.4.1.2.**

- Is this taken care of in the above proposal that eliminates 5.2.4.1.1. and 5.2.4.1.2.? If not, how is it proposed to renumber?

7. Foundations for Search Capabilities WG3: **7.1. Search and Retrieval** Statement to read: “Access points are elements of bibliographic records that are used to provide reliable retrieval of bibliographic and authority records and their associated bibliographic resources; and to refine or filter the search results.”

- Do you agree? Perhaps needs more discussion as to why to drop the internal numbering and to change “limit” search results to “refine or filter”

WG3: **7.1.1. Searching Devices.** The Group was divided on the usage of the term “search devices”. Others were in agreement with the Statement, while some thought a device is a tool while names, titles, subjects, etc. are elements and access points of a bibliographic record.

- Is there further discussion? What should we recommend?

WG1: **7.1.2.** Change Indispensable access points into Essential access points.

- Do you agree?

WG3: **7.1.2.1.** The Group unanimously agreed that the year(s) of publication or issuance is an indispensable access point.

WG4: **7.1.2.1.** Indispensable access points, should include Year of publication / issuance

WG5: **7.1.2.1.** keep “the year(s) of publication or issuance”

- Note this recommendation from WG’s 3, 4, and 5 is the opposite response from WG1 below (see 7.1.3.). What do you wish to recommend?

WG4: **7.1.2.1.** Indispensable access points should include •Series uniform title

WG5: Move “**uniform title** of the series” from 7.1.3.1 to 7.1.2.1 Indispensable access points

- Do you agree?

Barbara Tillett’s comment: This is now under 7.1.3. as Additional access points. I do not see a strong case for this as an indispensable access point and would like to hear from WG4 and WG5 as to why it should be indispensable.

WG5: **7.1.2.1.** Move “Classification numbers” to 7.1.3.1 Additional access points

- Do you agree?

WG1: **7.1.3.** The date of publication should stay in 7.1.3 Additional access points.

Reasons: –date is not used as an access point in an index

–date is not used on its own as an access point.

- See opposite views of WG’s 3, 4, and 5 above under 7.1.2.1. Do you agree with WG1?

WG4: **7.1.3.** Move “the year of publication / issuance” to indispensable.

Please see 7.1.2.1. above.

WG4: **7.1.3.** Additional access points: Add (**e.g., publisher**) after “...*in other roles than creator*”

Barbara Tillett’s comment: Adding an example may be helpful, but I highly recommend we NOT use “publisher.” All but the AFNOR rules omit publisher from being an access point at all. Perhaps to add an example, we could list some of the roles at the expression, manifestation, and item levels, such as animator, narrator, translator, manufacturer, printer, broadcaster, owner, custodian? This needs further discussion as to whether this is necessary in the principles. If it is seen as a recommendation for IME ICC5, which terms do you wish to add?

WG5: **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...”

- Do you agree?

WG2: **7.1.3 Additional access points** currently reads, “Such attributes in authority records include, but are not limited to”: This is not acceptable. All attributes should be listed, e.g., source of information, cataloguing rules used in establishing the authorized heading.

Barbara Tillett’s comment: It would be impossible to include every possible attribute, so the early decision from IME ICC1 was to list only those mentioned. It is notable that IFLA’s GARR has an area for an authority record that includes the sources of information. However, there are cataloguing rules where source of information and the cataloguing rules used are not mentioned. Is there further discussion on why this is wanted in the principles?

Appendix

WG2: The Appendix contains important information. It must be part of the main body of the document, for example as part of the Scope.

WG5: Move this entire section out of the appendix and include it just after the introduction and before the Scope

- Do you agree?

WG5: Number this section 0. Objectives for the construction of cataloguing codes.

- If you agree to the above suggestion, do you agree to this solution for its name and number?

WG3: •Standardization – standardized to the extent and level possible should read “standardized **as far as possible**”

- Do you agree?

WG3: •Integration –to the extent possible should read “**as far as possible**”

- Do you agree?

Glossary

WG3: The Group felt that the following terms should be changed as follows: **Access point** “will be found” to change to “**may be searched and identified**”.

Do you agree?

WG1: Add a definition for **Additional access point** (7.1.3) and a *see also* reference from Access point.

Do you agree? If so, does someone have a definition to propose?

WG5: Add to glossary definitions of Multipart, Multivolume, aggregates and components:

•**Aggregates and components**: Aggregate is an entity comprised of multiple works and a component is a sub-unit of a work. This entity is recursive, any component can in turn consist of smaller components (Ed O’Neill, *Relational models for aggregates*).

- An **aggregate** is a type of work that comprises various component parts that may in themselves be regarded as individual works. (IME ICC5 WG5)
 - An **aggregate** may also be “a set of individual monographs brought together by a publisher to form a series” (FRBR 3.3)
 - An **aggregate** may include kits, multimedia works
- Component part:** a manifestation with more than one work, but one physical unit (IME ICC 3 recommendation)
- See also ‘**Collection**’ in the glossary, which relates to Aggregates & components
 - Multipart item:** A monograph complete, or intended to be completed, in a finite number of physically separate parts that may or may not be numbered (AACR2). A library may decide to bind the parts together (ODLIS)
 - Multipart volume:** A work published in two or more physically separate parts that together constitute a single bibliographic volume. Reference works too large to be bound as a single volume are published in this manner, for example, some volumes of *Dictionary of literary biography*. Compare with multivolume work. (ODLIS)
 - Multivolume work:**
 - A multivolume work is a single entity with a single title published in two or more numbered or unnumbered volumes (WG5) based on ODLIS (below)
 - A work published in two or more numbered or unnumbered volumes under a single title (example: *Oxford English Dictionary*), sometimes over an extended period (*Dictionary of American Regional English*). A multivolume work is catalogued as a single entity, with the volumes owned by the library listed in the holdings statement. Compare with multipart volume and series. (ODLIS)

Barbara Tillett’s comment: I need to reject this suggestion because the terms are not used in the Statement of principles and the Glossary is only for terms used in the Statement. “Component part of a work” is used, but that should be self-explanatory. Do you agree?

WG4: Need to add definition for **Authority data**.

Do you agree? Does someone have a definition to propose?

WG2: Definitions for “**authority record**” & “**authorized heading**”: the source is IME ICC. Why not the definitions from GARR?

Barbara Tillett’s comment: GARR has the following

Authorised heading. The uniform controlled heading for an entity. Previously known as Uniform heading. See also Entry.

Authority record. A record in an authority file for which the organizing element is the authorized heading for an entity (person, corporate body, or work/expression) as established by the cataloguing agency responsible. In addition to the authorized heading, the record contains, as applicable: information notes; a record of all variant and related headings from which references have been made (tracings); notes recording sources consulted, etc.; an identification of the cataloguing agency responsible for the entry; and (when implemented) the International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN).

However, the above GARR definitions are outdated, so earlier IME ICC's suggested the current Glossary definitions.

WG4: Need to add a definition for **Bibliographic data**.

Do you agree? Does someone have a definition to propose?

WG4: **Controlled access point** "Includes access points based on identifiers such as standard numbers...." Please explain.

Barbara Tillett's explanation: Let me try saying it the other way around to see if that helps: A standard number, like an ISBN, ISSN can be used as the basis of an access point. These standard numbers or codes are referred to as identifiers in FRAD. How that access point may be formed or tagged is not specified, so it just says the access point "is based on" that identifier. Does that help?

WG1: Add the reference **Conventional title** *see also* Uniform title or equivalent.

Do you agree?

WG2: "**Entity**" should be explained in glossary

WG3: 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 ODLIS FRBR entities are divided into three groups

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)

Barbara Tillett's comment: Most of the Glossary terms are singular, so Entity would be the term. FRBR just says entities are the "key objects of interest to users of bibliographic data," which isn't that helpful. The Webster's dictionary says "something that has separate and distinct existence and objective or conceptual reality." The proposal from WG3 adds further examples rather than a definition. Does someone have a definition to propose?

WG1: Add a definition for **Essential/Indispensable** access point (7.1.2) and a *see also* reference from Access point

Do you agree?

WG3: **7.1.2**. The Group agreed that the term "**GMD**" be defined in the Glossary of Terms.

Barbara Tillett's comment: We are hoping this year we can remove GMD's entirely, as the ISBD Review Group continues to make progress on a replacement for this element. The principles would replace "GMD" with whatever element or elements that are approved (such as type of content, type of carrier as being proposed for RDA). I highly recommend that we not include GMD. Do you agree?

WG4: Need to add a definition for **Indispensable access point**.

Do you agree? Does someone have a definition to propose?

WG2: **5.1.2.1.2**. What constitutes a “**minor variation**”? Definition in glossary or example?

Does someone have a definition to propose?

WG1: Add the reference **Normalized form** *see* Authorized heading (5.1)

WG3: The Group felt that the following terms should be changed as follows: **Authorized heading** – Need a **See reference** from “Normalized forms”.

WG4: Need to add definition for **Normalized form** [5.1]

Do you agree?

Barbara Tillett’s comment: Perhaps the term to be defined could be “normalized form of heading” or “normalized form of name” – somehow need to explain form of what.

Suggestions? Anyone have a definition to propose?

WG1: Definition for **Persona** to be changed to the following: an individual or a persona established or adopted by an individual or two or more individuals acting as one person. *Do you agree?* *Barbara Tillett’s comment: We also need to leave “group” or “corporate body” as there are situations where a corporate body uses a personal name as a persona (Betty Crocker as a persona/spokesperson for General Mills).*

WG2: “**Persona**” should be explained in glossary in order to solve the problem with the concept of “group” in the definition of “Person”

WG4: Need to add definition for **Persona**.

Barbara Tillett’s comment: It would just be a dictionary definition – is it really necessary?

WG3: 2.1.1 Define the term “**physical unit**”.

Barbara Tillett’s comment: This would be no more than a usual dictionary definition – is it really necessary? If so, does someone have a definition to propose?

WG1: Add to the glossary **Uncontrolled access point** (5.1) and *see also* from Access point

WG2 : Need definition of **uncontrolled access point**.

WG4: Need to add definition for **Uncontrolled access point**.

Do you agree? Does anyone have a definition to suggest?

WG4: –Uniform title [Replace with “Commonly known title”]

Barbara Tillett’s comment: These are not the same thing. The uniform title isn’t always the commonly known title. It may be a constructed title based on cataloguing rules when there is no commonly known title or a title found most often on manifestations. I need to reject this suggestion.

WG1: Add definition for **Variant forms** (5.1) and a *see from* reference to Variant forms

Do you agree?

WG2: The explanation of terms and phrases in a glossary should be definitive. Therefore “etc.” poses a problem.

Barbara Tillett’s comment: If this is seen as a problem, what is proposed to do about this? The use of etc. is a common technique to indicate that there are many more of the same type of thing. Comments?

[Note: The summary of other recommendations from the IME ICC5 meeting will be included as a separate document for the group to consider taking action.]