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

From: Everett Allgood, Chair
CC:DA Task Force to Review the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*

Re: Final Report of the Task Force

Introduction

The Task Force 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 model presented in *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR). Like FRBR, this statement of principles may be subject to ongoing revision in today's rapidly changing information environment. The recommendations made in this Task Force report represent a contribution toward that ongoing revision. There was broad agreement among Task Force members in terms of the contents of this report. However, some topics included within the report did not receive unanimous support.

   Task Force Members:
        Everett Allgood, Chair
        John Attig
        Laurel Jizba
        Edgar A. Jones
        Dorothy McGarry
        Robert Maxwell
        Hideyuki Morimoto
        Keiko Suzuki

Core Concerns

The Task Force interpreted the scope of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* document fairly broadly. Task Force members presume these *Principles* encompass existing cataloging traditions and library resources, in addition to those non-published and non-self-describing resources comprising library collections of today and tomorrow. In addition, the Task Force tried to reconcile specific sections of these principles that appear to combine separate cataloging traditions in contradictory and confusing ways (e.g., Section 6, Authority Records).

While the April 10, 2008 version of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* represents an improvement over earlier drafts, several Task Force members expressed continuing unease with portions of the current language in the statement, which they found imprecise and inconsistent in some sections, with visible conceptual gaps.

General Concerns – Language, terminology, etc.

Bibliographic – As a general concern, some Task Force members noted that the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* text, while improved over earlier drafts, remains biased towards printed resources. While some Task Force members do not agree that the term "bibliographic" bears an inherent print bias, one recommended improvement was to consider replacing occurrences of "bibliographic record," and "bibliographic description" with the more generic term, "resource description." Occurrences of "bibliographic resource," in the *Statement* could similarly be revised to "resource."

Authorized, Controlled, Preferred – Task Force members expressed confusion with the use of terms in Sections 5, 6, and the Glossary that in some cases appear to be synonymous, but in others each seems to have a slightly different meaning. The terms are: authorized, controlled, and preferred. Could this usage be made consistent or clarified? As one Task Force member wrote:

> *Additionally provide access points to bibliographic records for the controlled forms of names of other persons, families, corporate bodies, and subjects ...*

> "This part refers to access points in **bibliographic** records; and it instructs cataloguers to provide 'controlled forms of names.' 'Controlled forms of names' are not defined in the glossary. Are they synonymous with 'controlled access points'? If so, I have an objection. 'Controlled access points' in this document encompasses both authorized/preferred forms and variant forms. While I do recognize that some catalogues routinely add variant forms of names, etc., together with authorized forms, in each affected bibliographic record, it is so done as a solution to local mechanical limitations. Mention of such should not belong in a statement of cataloguing principles. If, on the other hand, 'controlled forms of names' are synonymous with 'authorized access points,' I certainly support the **idea**, but, then, I believe 'controlled forms of names' should be replaced with 'authorized access points' to make this part clear to everyone."

Another Task Force member interpreted this same part differently, presuming the draft statement possibly meant catalogers "could use any controlled forms of names (either authorized/preferred or variant forms) in the bibliographic record, because theoretically, as long as all the controlled forms are present in the authority record, it would not matter whether an authorized or variant form is recorded in the bibliographic record."

Inconsistencies in Section 6 – 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. For such a critical decision that cataloging agencies would like to see applied consistently, it seems that this *Statement of Principles* would do well to examine this section carefully and make these phrases as consistent as possible. 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).

The Task Force 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

Some Task Force members expressed concern that the use of this phrase in the statement may require more context in order to convey its full significance within the cataloguing continuum. The TF suggests the following 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 catalogs."

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

Some Task Force members were puzzled that this final draft of the *Statement* lacks a clear statement of objectives regarding subject cataloging. This is especially disconcerting given the sprinkled references to "subjects" and "subject cataloging" throughout the document.

The Task Force requests clarification regarding the exact intent of the phrase, "there are other directives that apply but are not yet included in this statement," and proposes the following text drafted in general consultation with textbooks by Arlene G. Taylor and Lois M. Chan:

> 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.

Several Task Force members noted the absence of directives in these Principles about access by form and genre. Given the increasing usage of form and genre headings within resource descriptions, the Task Force notes that a final version of these Principles would do well to include reference to them.

2.1 – Entities in Bibliographic Records

Some Task Force members expressed concern that in distinguishing between entities in bibliographic (2.1) and authority (2.2) records, IFLA may be limiting the extensibility of these *Principles* unnecessarily. That is, many catalogers believe that the FRBR and FRAD conceptual models are moving catalogs in the direction of entity-relationship databases that no longer distinguish between today's separate bibliographic and authority files. Within such an Entity-Relationship database, as one Task Force member wrote, "there would be ENTITY records for any of the FRBR entities that would be linked by relationship links. If we really move forward to an ER [Entity-Relationship] data structure, this document would be obsolete pretty fast and that would be too bad." In a related matter and for the same reasons, some Task Force members objected to the Statement's categorical assertion in 4.1 that bibliographic descriptions are typically based on the manifestation. This, too, seems to be tying the bibliographic description to the current model and not to be looking toward an entity-relationship data structure.

Conversely, other Task Force members believe the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* would be mistaken to advocate the design of catalogues around futuristic models which may only be capable of being implemented by some but not all libraries.

2.2 – Entities in Authority Records

Task Force members were initially concerned that names for Works and Expressions were not among those listed in the first sentence here 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, the Task Force presumes this was an editorial oversight to be corrected in Section 2.2 of the final *Statement.*

We recommend 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.X – Language and Script of Bibliographic Records

Task Force members encourage 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: The Task Force 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

Task Force members recommend that the second paragraph 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 to decide whether to include them should they pursue this recommendation.]

Task Force members expressed concern that resource description access points for series statements are not addressed specifically. We recommend 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 manifestation ...", 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 ..."

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

Verifying the inconsistent usage of terminology expressed above in the section on General Concerns, Task Force members were puzzled by the appearance of "authorized access point for the series" in this list. Shouldn't this simply read "access point for the series"?

Glossary

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

Sources

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