

**To:** Hanne Hørl Hansen, Chair  
IFLA Cataloguing Section

**From:** Robert Rendall, Chair  
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**Subject:** CC:DA Review of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*

---

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the unit of the American Library Association responsible for developing official positions on international cataloging standards, appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*. The comments below were prepared by a CC:DA task force charged with reviewing this draft, and have been approved by the Committee.

### **General comments**

After a careful review, we approve the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* (2015) as a useful and important resource for catalogers of all types of materials. We have identified a number of general and specific comments and concerns to consider.

We welcome this revision as a valuable update of the original ICP that reflects the ongoing move from a world of bibliographic and authority records to a web of statements of bibliographic and authority data in the form of linked data, and incorporates insights from FRAD and FRSAD.

### **0 Introduction**

There should be a bibliographic citation of the print 2009 edition of the ICP, not just the URL, as URLs tend to be unstable, including IFLA's.

### **1 Scope**

We feel the scope needs to be clarified, i.e. we wondered if the scope of “dataset creation” has been limited to libraries, as the earlier version included “archives, museums, and other communities.” If the scope has been limited to libraries, that concept needs to be clearer; if not, the text needs to be changed. However, we will point out that it is those “other communities” that create many of the datasets that we use.

### **2 General Principles**

We suggest that the first paragraph begin with wording as follows: “The following principles direct the construction...” instead of: “Several principles...” We also suggest a rewrite of the first part of the second sentence (“Whereas” seems inappropriate here) with the following: “Of these, the convenience of the user is most important, while principles...”

2.3. Representation. The 2015 version of the principle is inferior to that of 2009 and is written more as an instruction, not as a principle. We wonder if there is a reason for having two different sentences addressing description of forms of names and works. The statement that the controlled form of a work title should be based on the first manifestation contradicts the principle of common usage. In all cases the controlled form should be based on how the entity presents itself. We suggest combining the second, third and fourth sentences into one, something like “Description and controlled forms of names of a resource should be based on the way the resource represents itself.”

2.8. Consistency and standardization. While both the 2009 and 2015 versions assert that the purpose of standardization is to create consistency, the 2015 draft is inferior because it makes consistency a goal in and of itself. The 2009 draft refers to “greater consistency, which in turn increases the ability to share bibliographic and authority data.” This should be retained; otherwise, we recommend that “enable consistency” be enhanced to read: “enable consistency and to support interoperability.”

2.10. Interoperability. The second sentence about encouraging the use of automatic translation is not a principle and should be removed. If the last sentence in 2.8 is enhanced as suggested above, we recommend that the word “ensure” be replaced with the word “enable,” which would convey a more realistic goal and to align with wording in 2.8.

2.11. Openness. We recommend that a footnote be added to the IFLA Statement on Open Access (<http://www.ifla.org/node/8890>).

2.13. Rationality. We considered recommending that this principle be omitted; however, if it is retained, we recommend replacing the word “explained” with “justifiable.”

### **3 Entities, Attributes and Relationships**

We suggest that the parenthetical statement after “Thema” be moved to a footnote.

### **4 Bibliographic Description**

Section 4.3 includes an inconsistent use of italic type in reference to the “International Standard Bibliographic Description.”

### **5 Access Points**

We recommend that the second paragraph in section 5.2.1, starting with the phrase: “A corporate body should be considered...” would fit better in 5.3.4.4.

We recommend that the two paragraphs numbered as 5.3.3.1.1.1 and 5.3.3.1.1.2 be listed using the letters (a), (b) instead of being numbered separately. Likewise for the two paragraphs

numbered: 5.3.3.2.1 and 5.3.3.2.2. These are not separate statements but lists of choices that complete the statement above.

5.3.3.2. Choice of Preferred Title for Works and Expressions. This principle contradicts the principle of common usage with respect to Name for Persons/Families/Corporate Bodies in 5.3.3.1.1.1. Sections 5.3.3.2.1 and 5.3.3.2.2 should be reversed.

## **6 Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue**

We suggest that there is no need to number paragraphs 6.1.1 and 6.1.2; further, we suggest merging the two phrases to read “to find a single resource or sets of resources representing:” This change is needed because single resources also represent the WEMI concepts.

Section 6.1.2. We recommend changing “all resources belonging to the same work” to “all resources realizing the same work.”

## **8 Glossary**

We would welcome an opportunity to review the glossary once it has been completed.