

**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:** Interim Report of the Task Force (June 13, 2007)

## Introduction

The Task Force understands that the current *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* dated Apr. 6, 2007 ([http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/download/070412\\_2.pdf](http://www.nl.go.kr/icc/download/070412_2.pdf)) remains in draft form pending the final International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts in South Africa during 2007. IFLA will issue the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* for worldwide review in 2008 and revise the *Principles* based on comments received at that time.

It is also understood that, as a statement of international principles, the document aims for broad acceptance by agencies coming from a multitude of cataloguing traditions. There was agreement among Task Force members that, given the draft status of this report, word-smithing and copy editing were outside the scope of this Interim Report. Our primary goal has been to focus on the “big picture” issues that cataloguing and cataloguers currently confront.

### Task Force Members:

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

## Core Concerns

The Task Force interpreted the intended scope of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* draft fairly broadly. Task Force members presume these *Principles* should encompass existing cataloguing traditions and library resources, as well as those non-published and non-self-describing resources comprising the library collections of today and tomorrow. The Task Force also grappled with the meaning and “reach” of such pragmatic issues as language and script within these *Principles*.

These concerns and this attention toward the cataloguers of tomorrow form the basis of this report. If a less visionary or lofty approach was intended, the introduction and scope of these *Principles* needs to be narrowed considerably.

While the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* draft represents an excellent start, several Task Force members indicated unease with portions of the current language of the draft, which they found imprecise in some sections, with visible conceptual gaps.

### **5.1.1 Choice of Access Points**

Given the title of this section, the current draft *Principles* and the accompanying glossary would do well to make explicit reference to concepts and terminology from the draft *Functional Requirements for Authority Data* (FRAD). The terms “preferred titles” and “preferred name entities” are particularly relevant, as the *Principles* document contains reference to identifiers. When they share certain relationships such as “created by”, *preferred name entities* and *preferred title entities* are combined to form eye-readable *work/expression identifiers*.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraphs of 5.1.1.1 offer an awkward description of when corporate bodies merit entry as preferred name entities, even though similar guidance for persons, families, conference names and titles is absent.

This section of the *Principles* may require significant revision to introduce and explain the Entity-Relationship Model forming the basis of *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR) and FRAD, and to indicate the importance of defining entities and the various relationships bibliographic and authority entities sometimes share. Given the prevalent role of preferred titles and work/expression identifiers within these draft *Principles* and their importance as organizational foundations for our increasingly complex catalogs, the Task Force believes such a revision may be necessary (see also comments at 5.2.4).

### **5.2.4 Forms of Uniform Titles**

As indicated in the comments at Section 5.1.1, several members of the Task Force expressed a strong desire to move away from the current AACR term “uniform title”, in favor of the FRAD term “preferred title”. Eye-readable identifiers will sometimes contain name/title combinations and sometimes only titles. Therefore, when referring to the title element of an eye-readable identifier, the Task Force expressed support for “preferred title” over continued use of “uniform title”.

The Task Force considers uniform titles to be only one component part of the “identifier” concept. For some resources, a uniform title alone does not constitute a work or expression “identifier”. Unfortunately, the customary definition of uniform titles is often extended to include a name/title combination, yet that represents a different concept.

The Task Force recommends that these *Principles*, and by extrapolation individual cataloguing codes such as RDA, abandon use of the term “uniform title”. Instead the Task Force recommends that this *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* fully explain and champion the use of “work/expression identifiers”.

#### 5.2.4.1

The Task Force expressed broad concern that the draft *Principles* focuses almost exclusively on textual and self-describing resources. This contradicts the following statement from the Introduction: “These new principles replace and broaden the Paris Principles from just textual works to all types of materials ...”

Significant revision will be necessary in order to broaden the scope of these *Principles* “to all types of materials.” There is a need to use “media”-neutral language. Much of the language in the current draft document is text-centric. The document also needs to provide principles for creating descriptions for resources representing “new” media types. Cataloguers need principle-based guidelines for creating a title for resources that may not provide one (e.g., non-textual resources that are not self-describing, such as realia or collections, etc.). [The Task Force recommends that IFLA consider guidance as provided in *Describing Archives: a Content Standard* (DACS) and *Cataloging Cultural Objects* (CCO).]

Some additional concerns with this section:

- “the uniform title should be the commonly known title”: The Task Force is concerned that the phrase “commonly known title” represents a shift from current AACR tradition. There was also uncertainty regarding the exact intent and meaning of the phrase “commonly known title.” Finally, the exact relationship between “commonly known title” and 5.2.4.1.2 is not clear.

If this rather slippery instruction for selecting preferred titles is retained, the Task Force recommends that IFLA consider the terminology “conventional title” as in 11.31 of the Paris Principles.

- The phrase “in the language and script of the catalogue” which first occurs in 5.2.4.1, concerned Task Force members as well.
  1. Within a diverse, ever-evolving, international user community intent upon creating and exchanging records, several Task Force members considered issues related to language(s) and script(s) to be “high-level” concepts that need to be addressed prominently in this *Principles* document (perhaps early on in Section 5, “Access Points”) rather than seemingly casually inserted here in this sub-rule.

Concern was also expressed with the inconsistent use here in 5.2.4.1 and in other guidelines employing similar phraseology (e.g., 5.1.3 states “in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue,” and 5.2.3.1.1 states “in the language and script best suited to the needs of

the users of the catalogue.” 5.2.4.1 then uses the phrase “in the language and script of the catalogue” with no references to users or their needs).

The Task Force requests clarification on the intent of these variations if they are necessary. If they are not necessary, the Task Force recommends they be consistent. Where possible, the intent of phrases such as this should be explained clearly.

2. Task Force members were concerned that the current draft statement appears to systematically conflate issues of “language and script” although, in reality and in application, these two issues may need to be considered separately.

The Task Force therefore cautions CC:DA to consider this issue carefully.

The Task Force recommends that the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* document would do well to supply more context for the proposal to provide names in “multiple languages and scripts.” Concepts of working “in the language and script of the catalogue” may depend upon the interaction between local and international files. When considering ideal principles such as those presented in this *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, for clarity it is crucial to acknowledge that differing applications may affect implementation of the ideal principles of “language and script” for individual libraries, etc.

3. Task Force members were confused regarding access points and authorized headings “in languages and scripts” as described in these *Principles*, and their relationship to plans for a Virtual International Authority File (VIAF). The Task Force is excited at the prospect of a VIAF, and would very much like to see a description included of how cataloguing codes following these principles will further the goal of moving toward a Virtual International Authority File.
  - 5.2.4.1.1 and 5.2.4.1.2 implicitly restrict the application of identifiers to self-describing or published resources. What about addressing identifiers for performances, manuscripts, realia, etc.?

#### **7.1.2.1 Indispensable Access Points for Bibliographic Records**

The Task Force agrees that preferred titles/uniform titles should be an indispensable access point, because of their potential as identifiers (and component parts of identifiers), as well as their ability to both *collocate* and *distinguish* resources within large relational databases.

Nonetheless, because uniform title assignment and usage within the AACR cataloguing community is currently *optional*, adoption of this guideline will represent a significant and potentially traumatic break with current practice and legacy records.

The Task Force therefore cautions CC:DA to consider this guideline carefully.

## Appendix

### Synopsis of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (draft as of 6 April 2007)

#### Introduction

- (1) Provides background (Paris Principles, 1961) and outline of the Statement;
- (2) Declares that the Statement is built on “the great cataloguing traditions of the world” (identified in a footnote as Cutter, Ranganathan, and Lubetzky), FRBR, and FRAD;
- (3) Declares that the Statement extends the Paris Principles to subject cataloging.

#### 1. Scope

- (1) Used to develop cataloging codes. Apply to catalog records (bibliographic and authority) but can be extended to bibliographies and bibliographic databases;
- (2) Aims at consistency in cataloging;
- (3) Declares the highest principle in developing a cataloging code is user convenience.

#### 2. Entities, Attributes, and Relationships

- (1) Declares FRBR Group 1 entities as entities in bibliographic records;
- (2) Within this context, bibliographic records typically describe manifestations;
- (3) Declares FRAD entities as entities in authority records;
- (4) Recommends using attributes that identify an entity as elements in catalog records;
- (5) Recommends including “bibliographically significant” relationships in catalog records.

#### 3. Functions of the Catalogue

Identifies the FRBR user tasks — **Find, Locate** (single resources or sets of resources relating to/representing a given entity or sharing other characteristics), **Identify**, and **Select** — as functions of the catalogue, as well as **Acquire/Obtain access** and “**Navigate the catalogue**” (using relationships)

#### 4. Bibliographic Description

- (1) Declares that bibliographic description be based on an international standard (identified in a footnote as ISBD);
- (2) Allows description at various levels of completeness as appropriate.

## 5. Access Points

- (1) Distinguishes between controlled and uncontrolled access points;
- (2) Requires access points on bibliographic records for titles of FRBR Group 1 entities and Creators (defined in the draft Glossary as “an entity responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a work”); recommends access points for other entities deemed important for accomplishing FRBR user tasks;
- (3) Requires access points on authority records for authorized and variant forms of name; recommends additional access via related names;
- (4) Recommends that the authorized heading for an entity be either the form that predominates on manifestations or a “conventional” form better suited to users of the catalog;
- (5) For name headings, requires one authorized heading for each “distinct persona” (undefined);
- (6) Gives detailed guidance on selecting among multiple forms of name (though unclear whether this applies to all names or just corporate names);
- (7) Prefers that authorized headings be based on the original language and script, but allows a heading in a language better suited to the users of the catalog;
- (8) For headings for persons and families, prefers an entry word based on the conventions of the country and language most associated with them;
- (9) For headings for corporate bodies, recommends direct entry except for those that are parts of jurisdictions (which must begin with or include the *current* name of the jurisdiction) or that imply subordination (which must begin with the name of the superior body);
- (10) Defines “uniform title” to include both titles alone and titles in combination with name headings and other distinguishing elements;
- (11) Prefers uniform titles in a form “commonly known in the language and script of the catalogue when one exists for the resource”; otherwise the original title or the title predominating on manifestations (IME ICC4 recommendation not yet approved in 6 April 2007 draft)

## 6. Authority Records

Defines the purpose of authority records.

## 7. Foundations of Search Capabilities

- (1) Describes various “searching devices” (e.g., full form, keyword, truncation);
- (2) Declares “indispensable” access points for bibliographic and authority records;
- (3) Lists additional, optional access points, and access points that may be used for filtering or limiting.