**To:**     Barbara Tillett, Chair
            IFLA's IME ICC Planning Committee

**From:**   Cheri Folkner, Chair
            ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**Re:**     Comments on *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access appreciates the opportunity to comment on the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*. In building on the *Paris Principles*, CC:DA looks to this new statement to cover the past and embrace the future of cataloguing. It is in that spirit that these comments are offered. The comments are based on the final report of the CC:DA Task Force to Review the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* but have been expanded and modified by the whole of CC:DA.

## Introduction

CC:DA understands that as a *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, the document aims for broad acceptance by agencies coming from a number of cataloguing traditions. This Principles document is closely aligned with the conceptual models presented in *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR) and *Functional Requirements for Authority Data* (FRAD). Like FRBR and FRAD, this statement of principles may be subject to ongoing revision in today's rapidly changing information environment. As a statement of principles, it is important that this document apply to all cataloguing environments and not be too closely aligned with any specific technology.

## General Concerns – Language, terminology, etc.

While the April 10, 2008 version of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* represents an improvement over earlier drafts, there is continuing unease with portions of the current language in the statement, which were found to be imprecise and inconsistent in some sections, with visible conceptual gaps. CC:DA advocates a careful editorial revision of the *Statement* to ensure clarity and precision.

**Record –** Use of the term "record" reflects a specific cataloguing environment. As expressed above, this contradicts the desire that the *Statement* not be too closely aligned with any specific technology. One possible resolution is to replace that term with "entity description."

**Bibliographic –** CC:DA believes that it would be an improvement to replace occurrences of "bibliographic record," and "bibliographic description" with a more generic term, "resource description," or "entity description." Occurrences of "bibliographic resource," in the *Statement* could similarly be revised to "resource."

**Principles vs. Instructions** – CC:DA has concerns that the *Statement* includes some text that may only be read as specific cataloguing instructions (e.g., 6.3.3.1). In the spirit of applying to

all cataloguing environments, CC:DA advocates a careful revision of the *Statement* to remove this intermingling of cataloguing principles with cataloguing instructions.

**Inconsistent use of terminology** – There is an inconsistent use of terms throughout the text and Glossary. Some examples include:

- Authorized, controlled, and preferred:  In the third paragraph at 5.2.1, the phrase "controlled forms of names" is used and yet is not defined in the glossary. If this phrase is synonymous with "authorized access points," for consistency "authorized access points" should be used throughout the text.
- Authorized access point for the work/expression:  Although this phrase is defined in the glossary and replaces the phrase "uniform title," it is rarely used in the text. For example, at 6.1.2 and 6.3.4.1 the phrase "preferred title for the work/expression" is used instead of "authorized access point for the work/expression."
- Predominantly found on manifestations:  Section 6 contains several slight variations on the phrase first presented at 6.1 as "predominantly found on manifestations" all with regard to the selection of the name for authorized access points. Other variations that each have a slightly different meaning include "found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script" (6.2), and "found in manifestations of the work in its original language" (6.3.4.1). CC:DA recommends consistent use of the phrase "found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script."

## Specific Comments

### 0.1 – convenience of the users of the catalogue

The use of this phrase in the *Statement* may require more context in order to convey its full significance within the cataloguing continuum. It is worth explicating and CC:DA suggests the following replacement text at General Objectives – 0.1:

0.1 *Convenience of the user of the catalogue.* In preparing resource descriptions and controlled forms of names for access, decisions should be made with the user in mind. User needs include the ability to support multiple search strategies effectively and efficiently. Readable, concise, and accurate resource descriptions should be considered another primary need of the various users of the catalogue.

The premise of "convenience of the user" was first promulgated by cataloguing pioneer Charles A. Cutter over 100 years ago and continues to represent a key criterion in the construction of bibliographic catalogues.

CC:DA notes that there are users of catalogue data beyond the catalogue itself.

**General objectives [10?] – bracketed comment re: subject thesauri**

The meaning of this sentence, in the final draft, is unclear to members of CC:DA. If the phrase "other directives" is in reference to the work of FRSAR, it would be clearer to say that specifically and to include FRSAR in the reference list. The IME ICC Planning Committee may also want to consider the IFLA document *Principles Underlying Subject Heading Languages (SHLs)* (1999).

While CC:DA is not the body within ALA to address subject thesauri, CC:DA proposes the following text, drafted in general consultation with textbooks by Arlene G. Taylor and Lois M. Chan, may be useful:

> Controlled subject vocabularies are used in assigning specific subject headings and subject terms to bibliographic records after conceptual analysis of the bibliographic entity has determined which subject terms to apply from a chosen subject schema. There are many standardized subject schemata to choose from, each with its own set of guidelines. It is highly recommended that for any bibliographic resource that lends itself to subject analysis, a minimum of one term from a standardized, controlled subject vocabulary be applied.

When the final statement is revised to include subject thesauri beyond placeholders, ALA's Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) will either be consulted or will provide comments directly to IFLA on those sections.

**Form/Genre**

CC:DA notes the absence of directives in the *Statement* about access by form and genre. Given the increasing usage and the importance of form and genre headings, CC:DA notes that a final version of the *Statement* would do well to include reference to them. Especially because form and genre are sometimes considered part of descriptive cataloguing and sometimes considered subject access points, it is important to include specific mention of form and genre within these principles.

**2.1 – Entities in Bibliographic Records**

CC:DA has concerns that by distinguishing between entities in bibliographic (2.1) and authority (2.2) records, IFLA may be limiting the extensibility of the *Statement* unnecessarily. That is, the FRBR and FRAD conceptual models may be moving catalogues in the direction of entity-based systems that no longer distinguish between today's separate bibliographic and authority files. An entity-based system would have entity descriptions for each FRBR and FRAD entity that are connected through relationship links enabling navigation within the catalogue. If cataloguing does move toward an entity-based data structure, this document may prove obsolete.

While CC:DA does not want to limit the principles in covering future developments, the *Statement* must apply to all cataloguing environments. Therefore CC:DA believes the *Statement*

would be mistaken to advocate the design of catalogues only around futuristic models which may be capable of being implemented by some but not all libraries.

## 2.2 – Entities in Authority Records

CC:DA was initially concerned that names for Works and Expressions were not among those listed in the first sentence of 2.2 as possible authority record entities. However, as Section 6, Authority Records specifically lists each of the FRBR Group 1 entities (i.e., work, expression, manifestation, and item), and 6.3.4 addresses authorized access points for each of them, CC:DA presumes this was an editorial oversight to be corrected in Section 2.2 of the final *Statement.* CC:DA recommends that the first sentence at 2.2 be revised to read: "Authority records should document controlled forms of names for works, expressions, manifestations, items, persons, families, corporate bodies, and subjects."

## 4 – Bibliographic Description

For the reasons stated above at 2.1, CC:DA objects to the *Statement's* assertion in 4.1 and 4.2 that bibliographic descriptions are typically based on manifestations. This too seems to tie bibliographic descriptions to the current cataloguing environment and not to be looking toward an entity-based data structure.

CC:DA recommends deleting 4.2 and replacing the instruction at 4.1 with the text, "Each entity should be described."

## 4.X – Language and Script of Bibliographic Records

CC:DA encourages IFLA to consider adding text here to parallel the "Language of Authorized Access Point" text at 6.2. For example: "Bibliographic descriptions should use the original language and script of manifestations of the expression whenever possible. If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversions should be followed."

[NOTE: CC:DA recommends that the section header of both 4X and 6.2 be revised to read: "Language and Script of …"]. See recommendation at 6.2 below.

## 5.2.1 – Choice of Access Points

CC:DA has concerns that resource description access points for series statements are not addressed specifically. CC:DA recommends that the first sentence at 5.2.1 be revised to read: "Include as access points to a bibliographic record the titles of works and expressions embodied in the resource (controlled) and titles of manifestations ...", and that the third paragraph be revised to read: "Additionally provide access points to bibliographic records for the controlled forms of names of other persons, families, corporate bodies, and subjects, as well as access points for related works (including series), important for finding ..."

CC:DA recommends that the second paragraph at 5.2.1 addressing corporate bodies be revised to read:

Corporate bodies are to be treated as creators when:

1. the work is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, [footnote]  even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body; or,

2. the wording of the title or title-page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work. [footnote]

[NOTE: This text is from the original Paris Principles. The footnotes in the original text include examples of each situation and are referenced here to allow IFLA's IME ICC Planning Committee to decide whether to include them should they pursue this recommendation.]

## 6.2 – Language of Authorized Access Point

The text of this principle consistently refers to language **and script**. The caption should be revised to: "Language and Script of Authorized Access Point."

## 7.1.3.1 – Additional Access Points to Bibliographic Record

As another instance of inconsistent usage of terminology expressed above in the section on General Concerns, CC:DA is puzzled by the appearance of "authorized access point for the series" in this list. As an additional access point for bibliographic records, CC:DA recommends that this simply read "access point for the series."

## Glossary

**Family** – Typo:  "or who otherwise present themselves as a family."

**Name of the work/expression** – Typo: "recorded to control variant titles of different manifestations of the same work/expression."

## Sources

**FRAD** – Update the reference to the 2007/04/01 version.

**Appendix: CC:DA IME-ICC Final Vote Form Submitted June 30, 2008**

---

**IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles**
**Vote Form**
Please provide your name and the name of your institution, as well as the name of your country.  Make <u>one</u> vote
(add an "X" in your preferred column) to indicate your agreement or not with the Statement as written:
http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/icc/principles_review_200804.htm
Return the completed vote form to Barbara Tillett, Chair, IFLA IME ICC Planning Committee at btil@loc.gov or fax
+1 202-707-6629
by June 30, 2008

Name/institution: ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

Country: USA

| ☐ **Agree** | ☒ **Agree, with comments**<br><br>**Comment (additional pages may be added):**<br>Please see attachment | ☐ **Do Not Agree** – When voting "Do Not Agree", comments must accompany the vote to indicate what changes are necessary for you to accept the statement.<br>**Comment (additional pages may be added):** |
|---|---|---|