

**Report on
IME ICC5 recommendations for Principles
forwarded to previous IME ICC participants for discussion and voting**

The information below explains what was sent forward to the other IME ICC Participants from the IME ICC5 recommendations. Also see the attached marked up copy of the latest Statement of International Cataloguing Principles.

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
Name of Statement	
<p>WG4: Term “cataloguing” to be updated; recommended possible term: “resource description”</p> <p>Comments: Rejected, because the focus is on the “cataloguing” activity, which is more than resource description (also includes access and authority control).</p> <p>Result: Not recommended</p>	
Introduction	
<p>WG5: Introduction, third paragraph: replace “all types of materials” with “all types of resources”</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Namibia</u>: Material refers according to Chambers dictionary to a matter as opposed to form; resources would be wider especially in view of digital resources - <u>SA</u>: The 2nd paragraph of the scope refers to 'resources', but it may be difficult to see objects as resources. Materials imply a physical entity - does the use of 'material' thus exclude digital resources? We feel neither strongly for nor against the change. <p>Recommendation: Leaning towards not changing 'all types of material' Retain “all types of material” - Elise Roberts</p> <p>Result: Not recommended</p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>Scope</p>	
<p>WG5: Recommended changing the phrase “bibliographic resources” to “resources”</p> <p>Comments: 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.</p> <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>WG1: Recommended changing the phrase “bibliographic record” to “catalogue record”</p> <p>Comments: Rejected, because bibliographic records may be independent of a catalogue.</p> <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships</p>	<p>2.0 Entities, Attributes and Relationships</p>
<p>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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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?</i> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<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> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG3: 2.2 Last sentence in the paragraph should read: “Entities that serve as subjects include:” - the French translation says this now. Comments: 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. - <u>Swaziland</u>: Definition as provided by FRBR should be included in the Glossary of Terms for the Statement of Principles. <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>WG3: 2.2 per above; alternatively recommend correction in French translation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue discussion about French <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>WG5: 2.2 Reject removing “Item” from the list (Note: this was suggested in discussions from the IME ICC4 recommendations) <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>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 Comments: Rejected, because multipart/multivolume resources are already covered in the principles along with all other types of manifestations. 2.4 is about relationships. <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
3. Functions of the Catalogue	3. Functions of the Catalogue
WG3: 3.1 Delete “(real or virtual)” <i>Result: Recommended</i>	3.1 Delete “(real or virtual)” Do you agree? Comments:
WG3: 3.5 The statement should read, to help the user “to navigate within the catalogue...” <i>Result: Recommended</i>	3.5 The statement should read, to help the user “to navigate within the catalogue...” Do you agree? Comments:
4. Bibliographic Description	
WG5: Add: 4.2 Descriptions <i>of works or aggregates</i> may be at several levels of completeness, based on the purpose of the catalogue or bibliographic file. Comments: Rejected, because the description is of a manifestation. <i>Result: Not recommended</i>	
5. Access Points	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.” <i>Result: Not recommended</i>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG2: 5.1 The term “Normalized form” is ambiguous. Preferred the term “authorized forms”</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>NB: IME ICC5 collective vote, 15/8/07 ends here. Individual countries’ votes are now recorded separately up to the end of the document – MADdK, Oct. 07</u></p> <p>Result: Recommended</p>	<p>5.1 The term “Normalized form” is ambiguous. Preferred the term “authorized forms”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Do you agree? Comments:</p>
<p>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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <p><i>- 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</i></p>	

<p><i>bibliographic records (added entries, contents notes, analytic records, series statements, etc.) – but those techniques are for cataloging rules. What do you think?</i></p> <p>- SA: 5.1.1.1 Discussions identified three aspects that needed consideration: Should this be added as suggested? AND If yes, Where should it be added? Should the phrase 'or reflect the multipart nature of a work' be retained After much deliberation we concluded that this is already implicit in the draft statement <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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?</i> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<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). <i>Do you agree?</i> <i>Comments:</i></p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do you agree?</i> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>The caption was already agreed by the IME ICC 1-4 participants. Please see marked up copy of the Principles, to be sure you also agree now.</p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG2: 5.2 Caption title should be Forms of Authorized Headings, because discussion in paragraph is about authorized headings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments -SA: The caption should ultimately match the language of the Statement of principles. We prefer retaining the caption as is in the Draft <i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>The caption was already agreed by the IME ICC 1-4 participants. Please see marked up copy of the Principles, to be sure you also agree now.</p>
<p>WG2: 5.2 “These controlled access points are usually documented ...” change to : “These controlled access points should be documented ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments: -SA: Our initial response was that it should not change. We discussed the nature of the word 'should' and agreed that it is not prescriptive. This is essentially an unnecessary change from our point of view. <i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>This was not accepted by the IME ICC 1-4 participants in their final voting. Please see marked up copy of the Principles to be sure you also agree now.</p>
<p>WG4: 5.2.4.1. Forms of Uniform Titles –Term “<i>uniform titles</i>” to be renamed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should it be instead? Need discussion. RDA uses the “name of the work,” etc. <p>Comments: - Namibia: leave as is - Swaziland: retain phrase “uniform title” <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Comments: <u>-SA:</u> After discussion we felt that the statement as proposed in the Draft principles is clear enough as is. The only change that we propose in agreement with what was discussed by WG3 is to add after 'commonly known', 'or conventional' instead of '(conventional)'. <i>Result: Partial recommendation (i.e., disagreement to change the whole statement BUT change as indicated above.</i></p>	<p>This was not accepted by the IME ICC 1-4 participants in their final voting. Please see marked up copy of the Principles to be sure you also agree now.</p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG4: 5.2.4.1. The term “conventional title” is unclear. Recommend preferring the term “commonly known title”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Namibia</u>: use “commonly known or conventional” without parenthesis - <u>Swaziland</u>: agree with IME ICC5 WG3 to include “conventional” in parenthesis - <u>SA</u>: see above <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>This was not accepted by the IME ICC 1-4 participants in their final voting. Please see marked up copy of the Principles to be sure you also agree now.</p>
<p>WG3: 5.2.4.1., continued. The Group thought that the last part of the statement “<i>or the title most frequently found in manifestations of a work</i>” may not be necessary. The statement could end with: “the original title”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>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.</i> <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG4: Re-number 5.2.4.1. - 5.2.4.1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Comments: - Namibia: leave numbering as is <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>6. Authority Records</p>	<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>. We have a couple of issues here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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”? 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><i>Please comment with further discussion on these issues and propose a solution.</i></p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>7. Foundations for Search Capabilities</p>	<p>7. Foundations for Search Capabilities</p>
<p>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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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” <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there further discussion? What should we recommend? <p>Comments:</p> <p>- <u>Namibia</u>: leave “of any device” within text</p> <p>- <u>Swaziland</u>: in agreement that there’s a difference between search devices and access / search points</p> <p>-<u>SA</u>: We are uncomfortable with the word 'devices' which implies a physical tool. We would like to make the following changes - Change the caption to read 'Searching capabilities'</p> <p>Change the statement to read: 'Names, titles, and subjects should be searchable and retrievable by any means available in the given library catalogue...'</p> <p>Recommendation: Agree to changes as stipulated above</p> <p>Disagree - keep the word 'devices' Nicolene Barnard</p> <p>More comment: there were no further comments on this and the majority (either through agreement or silent consent) agreed with</p>	

the recommendation to change ‘devices’ to ‘capabilities’ and to change the statement to read as suggested above

Result: Need further discussion – for now we will not put this forward until we have agreement on what to recommend.

- Sénégal : the french text is very clear. So I understand the position of those who recommend to change the statement to read: ‘Names, titles, and subjects should be searchable and retrievable **by any means available** in the given library catalogue...’ to stick to the french text. I agree to change as stipulate above.

But I disagree to change the caption to read ‘Searching capabilities’ instead of ‘Searching Devices’ because I consider that Names , titles and subjects which are elements and access points of a bibliographic record constitute the elements which enable the searching and the retrieval of information thus they are searching devices. So I think that the caption ‘Searching devices’ should be maintained. Henriette NKUNKU.

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG1: 7.1.2. 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>Uganda</u>: Actually, the two mean the same thing - <u>Swaziland</u>: indispensable means: cannot do without it <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<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>
<p>WG3: 7.1.2.1. The Group unanimously agreed that the year(s) of publication or issuance is an indispensable access point.</p> <p>WG4: 7.1.2.1. Indispensable access points, should include Year of publication / issuance</p> <p>WG5: 7.1.2.1. keep “the year(s) of publication or issuance”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Namibia</u>: date is essential - <u>Swaziland</u>: year of publication is necessary in all bibliographic citations; therefore, it is an essential / indispensable access point <p>-<u>SA</u>: WG3 7.1.2.1 to WG5 7.1.2.1 should be read and discussed with WG1 7.1.3 to WG4 7.1.3 - Only WG1 recommends leaving year of issuance as an additional access point. Even though the date of issuance is not an access point (whether as an Indispensable or additional access point) it is essential to have that information available for the correct identification of a manifestation. Recommendation: Keep as an 'Essential' access point</p> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>The IME ICC 1-4 also agreed to retain years as essential in their final voting. Please see marked up copy.</p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG4: 7.1.2.1. Indispensable access points should include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Series uniform title <p>WG5: Move “uniform title of the series” from 7.1.3.1 to 7.1.2.1 Indispensable access points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <p>- <i>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.</i></p> <p>-SA: Although not all works have a series title, if a work has one, the uniform title should be an indispensable access point. The series title should be authorized in order to 'locate sets of resources' (3.1.2) and with all the variations of series title found on works the necessary authority control should be performed. The basic level national bibliographic record requires a series.</p> <p><i>Result: Needs further discussion – will not send forward for now until reach agreement on what is to be recommended.</i></p> <p>- Sénégal : I agree with the SA position. Henriette NKUNKU</p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG5: 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>- <u>Namibia</u>: in certain cases circumstances will allow information material to be available without class no. -<u>SA</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 emphasis]. We believe though that some form of subject access should be provided. <i>Result: Recommended</i></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? • Comments: <p>IME ICC5 Discussion. - <u>Namibia</u>: in certain cases circumstances will allow information material to be available without class no. -<u>SA</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 emphasis]. We believe though that some form of subject access should be provided.</p>
<p>WG1: 7.1.3. The date of publication should stay in 7.1.3 Additional access points. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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? <p>Comments:</p> <p>- <u>Swaziland</u>: see comment above <i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	<p>See above for 7.1.2.1.</p>
<p>WG4: 7.1.3. Move “the year of publication / issuance” to indispensable. Please see 7.1.2.1. above. <i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>See above for 7.1.2.1.</p>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>WG4: 7.1.3. Additional access points: Add (e.g., publisher) after “...in other roles than creator”</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>- <i>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?</i></p> <p>- <i>Namibia: not necessary in Principles</i></p> <p>-<i>SA: By adding a few examples this could be a limiting factor, even though the intention is not to limit.. Recommendation: Disagree. The wording of this sentence should be corrected to: '... in roles other than creator'</i></p> <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>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...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p> <p>-<i>SA: Disagree: Can retain internal numbering, but revisit “refine or filter”. Could also be “limit or filter” in line with “filtering or limiting” in 7.1.3 Elise Roberts.</i></p> <p>More comment: no further comments were received and by agreement or silent consent the recommendation is agreement to match the numbering structure in 7.1.2.</p> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></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>

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>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.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>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?</i> - <u>Swaziland</u>: “e.g.” means: for example, therefore one does not have to list all the attributes - <u>SA</u>: leave statement as is <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	

Recommendation	To IME ICC1-4
<p>Appendix</p>	<p>Appendix “Objectives for the Construction of Cataloguing Codes”</p>
<p>WG2: The Appendix contains important information. It must be part of the main body of the document, for example as part of the Scope.</p> <p>WG5: 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> <p>- <u>Namibia</u>: part of Introduction...</p> <p>- <u>SA</u>: move to Scope</p> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<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? • Comments:
<p>WG5: Number this section 0. Objectives for the construction of cataloguing codes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you agree to the above suggestion, do you agree to this solution for its name and number? <p>Comments:</p> <p>- <u>Namibia</u>: ... no numbering necessary</p> <p>- <u>SA</u>: no numbering</p> <p><i>Result: Not recommended</i></p>	
<p>WG3: •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> <p>- <u>SA</u>: (grammatically better)</p> <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<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? • Comments: <p><i>IME ICC5 Discussion.</i> - <u>SA</u>: (grammatically better)</p>
<p>WG3: •Integration –to the extent possible should read “as far as possible”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p><i>Result: Recommended</i></p>	<p>•Integration –to the extent possible should read “as far as possible”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree? <p>Comments:</p>
<p>Glossary on separate document</p>	

