

IME ICC : Report of the  
1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, Frankfurt, Germany  
July 28-30, 2003

Reported by  
Dr. Barbara B. Tillett  
Chair, IFLA Cataloguing Section  
Chair, IME ICC Planning Committee  
and the Working Group leaders

(Ann Huthwaite, Claudia Fabian, Renate Gömpel, Gunilla Jonsson, and Monika Münnich)

*[The following is the text of the IFLA Cataloguing Section's Open Programme of August 5, 2003 in Berlin.]*

Welcome. I am Barbara Tillett, Chair of the IFLA Cataloguing Section and Chair of the Planning Committee for the International Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code – IME ICC.

The purpose of today's program is to share with you the latest news from IME ICC - this exciting meeting of rule makers and cataloguing experts from the European national libraries. The meeting was intended to be the first in a series of regional meetings worldwide to discuss a new statement of cataloguing principles with the rule makers around the world. It was a great opportunity to get these rule makers together, so they could get to know each other and to discuss together the basic principles of cataloguing in today's environment.

32 European countries participated, but the representatives from 4 countries were unable to attend at the last minute.

54 cataloguing experts met for two and a half days last week, July 28-30, in Frankfurt, Germany at Die Deutsche Bibliothek.

The meeting was sponsored by the IFLA Cataloguing Section with co-sponsorship from the IFLA National Libraries Section, and Die Deutsche Bibliothek.

The Planning Committee received funding for the meeting from IFLA, plus very generous support from OCLC for the conference dinner, as well as support from Swets Blackwell and K.G. Saur to partially subsidize food and beverages for the breaks, lunch, and a reception, respectively. Die Deutsche Bibliothek also contributed not only funds, but the personal time of many of their staff to assuring the success of this meeting and we are very grateful.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Planning Committee for also contributing to the success of this meeting: first those from the Cataloguing Section – Renate Gömpel, Mauro Guerrini, Gunilla Jonsson, Monika Münnich, and especially Natalia Kasparova. It was Natalia who began the idea for this meeting in Germany. In 2001, she noted that it was the 40-year anniversary of the Paris Principles, and that those principles were in need of updating for today's environment of online catalogues and Web OPACs (online public access catalogues). It took us more than 2 years to finally meet with a lot of help from these people you see listed here. Additional members of our Planning Committee were Marie-France Plassard, who at the time was the head of the IFLA UBCIM Programme Office, and also help from Susanne Oehlschläger of Die Deutsche Bibliothek, also Claudia Fabian, Hans Popst, Ann Huthwaite (who is the chair of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules), and the administration and staff at Die Deutsche Bibliothek.

The goal for this meeting was to increase the ability to share cataloguing information worldwide by promoting standards for the content of bibliographic and authority records used in library catalogues. This goal continues the goal of the 1961 International Conference on Cataloguing Principles to provide international standardization of cataloguing rules and principles.

The objectives were to examine cataloguing codes currently in use in Europe to compare their similarities and differences to see if we could get closer together and perhaps develop an International Cataloguing Code.

The desired outcomes were to work together to draft a new Statement of Cataloguing Principles that would apply to today's cataloguing environment and serve us for the future. Secondly, we wanted to have recommendations from the working groups for ways to harmonize cataloguing codes used today and possibly to suggest basic rules that might form the basis for an International Cataloguing Code. The participants intend that these principles would primarily be for libraries but also might apply to other organizers of information in the archives, museum, rights management, computer software industry, and Internet communities.

The meeting started with a report on the survey of cataloguing codes used in Europe as compared to the Paris Principles. We will come back to the other agenda topics, but let me say a few words about this code comparison. The results are posted on our meeting Web site and I will give you the URL in a moment.

First, let me remind you of the topics covered in the 1961 Paris Principles. The statement covers these sections:

Scope, function, structure of the catalogue, kinds of entry, use of multiple entries, choice of uniform heading, single personal author, entry under corporate bodies – very limited situations, multiple authorship, works entered under title, including principles for uniform headings for works and other issues related to serials, and finally the entry word for personal names.

We asked the rule makers in Europe to compare their codes in each area and explain where they differed, how they differed, and to explain why (if they could).

All 18 respondents to the survey indicated that their rules are based on the Paris Principles for choice and form of headings and entry words.

Back to the agenda- we continued with introductory papers on the ISBD (John Byrum, chair of the IFLA Cataloguing Section's ISBD Review Group), a paper on FRBR (Patrick Le Bœuf, chair of the IFLA Cataloguing Section's Working Group on FRBR), and presentation on the Virtual International Authority File (by Barbara Tillett).

Regarding the ISBD, it was acknowledged as a great achievement of international standardization for descriptive cataloguing that requires the transcription of identifying information from the item at hand to create the standardized areas of description and ISBD goes on to state the basic elements to include in such descriptions, the order of those elements, and the prescribed punctuation, so the resulting records are understandable worldwide, regardless of language or script.

We also took a few minutes to share how our rule making bodies operate in order to increase awareness of this process and again to get to know each other better.

We also heard a presentation of the draft Statement of Principles that had been prepared by Monika Münnich, Hans Popst, Charles Croissant, and others, and had time to discuss it again the final day of the meeting. Each of the Working Group leaders gave brief presentations reporting on the survey results of code comparisons responding to the code similarities and differences on their particular topic. And that was just the first day!

The second day consisted of Working Group discussions to make recommendations and in the afternoon each Working Group leader reported on their group's activities and suggestions.

Let's now hear from the Working Groups about their discussions and recommendations. Starting with Working Group 1, led by Ann Huthwaite who is the chair of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Unfortunately Ann cannot be with us today, so I will give her report.

## WORKING GROUP 1 PERSONAL NAMES

### Issues

1. Authorized vs. uniform heading

The group agrees that the term 'authorized' is the most practical term.

2. Is it practical to differentiate between personal names?

The group agrees that this is the goal (particularly for national bibliographic agencies) but it may not be practical in all circumstances. It is very important for the end user to differentiate between personal names.

3. Concept of a parallel heading

Parallel headings are formed by:

- different languages
- different scripts
- different cataloguing rules
- different user communities

The group endorses the investigation into the concept of a virtual international authority file to allow for the existence of parallel headings for personal names.

4. Choice of names, structure of names

The group recommends the use of IFLA's Names of Persons as a starting point.

5. Structure of authority records (source of information?)

The group recommends that there should be a mandatory field for source of information in authority records.

#### 6. Draft principles

The group endorses the draft principles. It suggests this change to 5.2.1:

When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word is determined by the person's nationality, or when that is not possible, by agreed usage in the country in which the person generally resides.

#### 7. Authority records/files

The group recommends that cataloguing rules include rules for authority records.

Next is Working Group 2 on Corporate Names. This group was led jointly by Claudia Fabian of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek & Mauro Guerrini, Università di Firenze. Claudia will report .

### **WORKING GROUP 2, CORPORATE BODIES**

The working group centered discussions on three issues:

1. Entity definition ("what is a corporate body")
2. Choice of the name (heading) of a corporate body (single aspects)
3. "Authorship" – "main entry under a corporate body" – "corporate body as a primary access point"

#### **Entity definition**

- a. Can we consider something to be a corporate body if the organization consists of only one person? (e.g. designer presenting himself as a commercial firm)

There was agreement in the group that according to FRBR 3.2.6 there is no number of persons indicated within the concept of "an organization". The question of number only arises within the second concept "group of individuals".

- b. collective pseudonym

A collective pseudonym which has the form of a personal name is by general agreement handled as a personal name. But the form (order of words, number of words) is an important factor in this decision. The group proposed to prepare a paper on an international level listing different forms of pseudonyms and proposing their treatment as a personal name or a corporate body and giving proposals how to handle references.

- c. List of entities which are considered to be corporate bodies

Different lists of these entities exist in different cataloguing codes and in international documents (e.g. FRBR, FSCH). These lists should be compiled, taking the AACR2

(21.1B1) list as a basis. The rule makers should be invited to comment which of these entities they take into account and which others they add to this list. This list should be done both for descriptive and subject cataloguing. It should be used as a basis for an international agreement for commonly applied corporate bodies. It may also serve as a basis for defining codes for the different types of corporate bodies.

- d. List of terms used to determine whether a subordinate body is to be recorded in the authority record for the parent body or as a separate identity.

Example: Mayor of the City of New York

The authority record according to German rules is for “New York” and “Mayor of the City of New York” is a reference in this record.

According to AACR2 (and other cataloguing codes) there would be a separate record for “New York. Mayor”.

On the basis of the list of terms calling for this kind of treatment in RAK 2, we come to a common proposal which terms in subordination do not call for a separate record (cf. 4.B.2 of the code comparison indicates a number of different applications in this area).

### Choice of name

The discussion centered on the rewording of the draft principles 5.3 in accordance with FRBR 3.2.6, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph. It was agreed that priority should be given to the heading chosen for the authority file. The proposed version would be:

“The authorized heading of a corporate body should be the name which identifies the corporate body in a consistent manner and/or the name by which the body is most frequently identified in its publications.”

(Reflexion a posteriori showed that this may not be helpful. It would be better to introduce the wording of FSCH, 4.1, and say:

“The authorized heading of a corporate body should be the name which identifies the corporate body in a consistent manner (“conventional name”) or the form of the name in use on the publications of the body.”)

There was general agreement that the form found in the manifestation is to be introduced into the authority record in order to facilitate retrieval (and international exchange).

For multilingual bodies the proposal was to introduce into the rules the practice of some formats which is to add the language to the different name forms. If this is done, the choice of the heading can be done by machine intervention.

There was general agreement that working for the international harmonization of headings should continue and that there is need for these guidelines.

### Main entry

Cataloguing rules and applications largely differ on the use of corporate bodies as main entry (from the German position to abandon completely main entries under corporate bodies to the Italian code which defines corporate authorship in a full sense). The draft proposals indicate several options in this area (one without corporate body main entry, one making a difference

between continuing resources and finite resources, the later can have a main entry under a corporate body).

There is general agreement that the corporate body access must be assured and that it is an important factor for collocation. There is a clear tendency to recommend the use of corporate bodies as primary access points only in clearly defined cases: with a generic titles and (maybe) for administrative and legislative works.

A paper should be drafted giving examples for the results of such a decision.

The third Working Group dealt with Seriality and was jointly led by Gudrun Henze who chairs the Expert Group of RAK. Her co-leader was Renate Gömpel of Die Deutsche Bibliothek, who will present their report.

### **WORKING GROUP 3, SERIALITY**

#### **Goal:**

Agreement on standards and identification of where the rules do not agree with ISBD(CR) for what changes constitute a new work/expression to justify a new record

#### **Issues:**

Are current codes in alignment with ISBD(CR) and if not, how do they differ and why?  
Can they be brought together?

#### **General recommendations**

- We are cataloguing manifestations for the time being.  
If further work on FRBR is done:  
What constitutes a work / manifestation / expression in the FRBR sense for serials?
- Share the same basic rules!
- Apply and promote ISBD(CR)!
- Reconsider if necessary!
- ISBD should be more explicit on multilevel description for serials
- ISBD(CR): Appendix A – might be part of the main set of rules
- Connected to the results of WG 4 (Multipart structures)

#### **Statement of Principles (Draft)**

It should be further discussed generally:

- Is it feasible to base the principles on FRBR terminology? (2)
- Functions of the catalogue (3.1.2)
  - too much focussed on systems
  - “resource” used like “item” (3.1)?
- “Authorized/controlled access points instead of “authorized headings” (5,6,7)

#### **Statement of Principles (Draft): Questions & Suggestions**

- Introduction: “work identifier” used not in FRBR sense but a different one?
- “... and display functions for records ...” – instead of “... for lists”
- 3.3 + 3.4 “Expression” missing
- 4 “... according to a standard cataloguing code “ – should be more general (statement of principles)

- 5.2.1 ... choice of entry word ...  
should be replaced by:  
form of the name
- 5.3 “most frequently identified in its publication(s)” versus “official form of name”
- 7 “Search” – Retrieval  
Stipulations should be more general (both “too much” and “too limited” at the moment)
- 7.1 Access points: “Key title” is missing
- 7 + 8 Creator: Definition is missing
  - should be replaced (in part 2: name of persons and corporate bodies)
- 8.2 “corporate body” missing (might get main entry)
- 8.3 alternative should be added to 8.2:  
“in the case of a continuing resource whose title consists of a generic term that can be expanded by some formal attribute the title proper followed by the name of the associated corporate body in the form found in the item in hand (i.e. key title)”

### ISST (International Standard Serial Title)

- For discussion:  
Key title as ISST?
- Further interest in the ISST project?

The fourth Working Group on Multipart Structures was led by Gunilla Jonsson of the National Library of Sweden.

## WORKING GROUP 4, MULTIPART STRUCTURES

### Multipart monographs

- Introductory remark: the discussions were limited to published materials
- Multipart monographs, definition:
- A manifestation containing one or more works, which is finite and which is published in more than one physical unit
- The recommendations aim to facilitate record exchange Single record description can be applied for publications which comprise one coherent work
- There should be a separate record for a separate work contained in a separate physical part
- As for the number of levels in a hierarchical description we felt that we could not prescribe for this as it is limited by systems

### Component parts

- There are limitations to what is feasible and potentially a great divide between what libraries are able to achieve and user expectations. Therefore it should be made clear to users of a catalogue what they can expect from it
- To the extent that bibliographic agencies find it possible to catalogue component parts it would be good to concentrate on certain types of publications, the contents of which can not be readily retrieved otherwise
- We would urge the Cataloguing Section of IFLA to explore the issue of co-operation with publishers for the supply of bibliographic data for the online environment

- The library community relies on indexing services and publishers to cover the description of component parts

### Multiple expressions

- We refer to ongoing projects and studies regarding the precise nature of the expression record. We did arrive at the very preliminary conclusion that an expression record is a kind of authority record, which should be constructed as needed
- As to the identification of an expression, we all agree that libraries can only go by the evidence on the manifestations

### Multiple manifestations

- All in principle agree on different records for different formats, However:
- there should be an option to register a surrogate reproduction on the record for the original from which it is derived

And the fifth Working Group discussed uniform titles and GMDs. The co-leaders were Monika Münnich, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg and Hans Popst from the Bayerische Beamtenfachhochschule. Monika will present the report.

## WORKING GROUP 5, UNIFORM TITLES AND GMDs ON THE EXPRESSION LEVEL

Prepare an accompanying document to explain the concepts of uniform title. Include the following points:

### 1. The purpose of the Uniform Title:

- a. Collocation,
- b. Distinction,
- c. Citation and
- d. Organizing files.

### 2. The choice of the Uniform Title should be

- Generally the title of the first expression in the original language
- in the case of classical anonymous works: The IFLA list of anonymous classics (to be available for Europe (Pt. 1 in 2003))
- Classical Greek, Latin and Byzantine titles: The national language or Latin form
- Sacred scripts generally in the language of the catalogue with exceptions:
- As an example of whole/part relationships: Bible as an example to include the hierarchies following some standard  
Two possibilities: Title of the whole bible with hierarchical subdivisions or titles of the parts, e.g., “Evangelium”.

3. For music UTs there should be appointed a group of IFLA’s Cataloguing Section, to investigate, whether the UTs should change to use singular forms for the titles consisting of the name of a type of composition, e.g. “symphony” instead of “symphonies”; also if such phrases as “piano concerto”, “string quartet” should be

used instead of inverted forms like “concertos, piano orchestra ...” or “quartets, strings”. This group should contact the IAML working group.

4. For collective titles including form headings the appointment of another group is proposed to investigate their necessity in relation to the goals above.

#### **General Material Designation (GMD)**

5. Use at the expression level:  
After thorough discussion the group decided, that designations pertaining to the form/mode of expression often provide useful information and probably should be retained. The group looked at two lists of candidate terms, one from FRBR and the other one suggested by Tom Delsey developed as a possible replacement for AACR part 1.

FRBR modes of expression:

alpha-numeric notation,  
music notation,  
other notation (e.g. choreographic),  
sound,  
still image,  
moving image,  
three-dimensional object,  
combination of above

List of Tom Delsey:

Text  
Music  
Cartographic resource  
Graphic resource  
Three-dimensional resource  
Sound recording  
Moving images resource  
Data  
Software  
Mixed content resource

Neither list was found to be entirely satisfactory, but both provided the desirable level of generality.

6. Use at the manifestation level:

The group strongly believes, that specific designations for carriers are needed and should be prominently displayed. The group recognized the possibility of encoding such designations for machine display and also recognized the possibility of displaying the terms within the bibliographic description itself.

Draft Statement of Principles

On the final day the participants discussed the draft statement, and I'd like now to quickly go through the sections with you and highlight some of the points that were made. The final text is still in progress, so I do not have it to share with you yet, but we hope to post it in September.

The statement includes an introduction and will include a glossary of terms and concepts.

The draft scope states that the statement is intended for current library catalogues and since most online catalogues and Web OPACs today include not only bibliographic records with descriptive and name/title access but also classification and subject access, the statement scope was broadened to provide a consistent approach to descriptive and subject cataloguing of bibliographic resources of all kinds. It was felt that these principles could be applied to bibliographies and data files created in other information communities, modified when appropriate.

The scope also includes the statement that the highest principle in cataloguing codes is the convenience of the user of the catalogue.

Then it goes on to describe the entities, attributes, and relationships of interest in the bibliographic universe – based on the FRBR and FRANAR reports.

The next section reviews the functions of the catalogue updated from the Paris Principles to reflect but also update the FRBR User tasks.

The next section reaffirms that the ISBDs are the basic foundation for rules for description.

Then there is a section on the choice and structure of authorized headings used for controlled access points – for now this is limited to name and title access points, but could be expanded following broader discussion to subject access.

The next section deals with authority records to be used for controlled access, which is so important for the precision of searches.

These last two sections of the statement (Searches and Displays) will be discussed further during August by the participants, but in the early draft were to provide guidance of basic search and display capabilities that should be in any catalogue.

Next Steps

The statement will be fine-tuned during August and a final draft statement will be made available in September.

For next steps, the participants overwhelmingly wanted to see a glossary of terms and concepts in English – even for English there are new meanings given to these terms – which is part of this change process. We hope to also link this glossary to a new online Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts developed by the IFLA Cataloguing Section, called MulDiCat.

By the end of August, the participants will have completed discussion and made final adjustments to the draft statement, and it will be publicly posted and distributed for discussion and comment. We especially want to share it within the appropriate IFLA section as well as with various professional library organizations throughout the world.

The report from the Frankfurt meeting will be published by IFLA – to include not only the draft statement of principles, but also the background papers, and Working Group reports and recommendations.

Follow-up papers from the participants as well as those papers suggested in several Working Group recommendations will also be posted on our Web site in addition to all of the presentations from the meeting itself. We plan to move the meeting Web site to the IFLANET page for the Cataloguing Section so it can be a resource for the future regional meetings and others interested in this topic.

This is the current Web URL: [http://www.ddb.de/news/ifla\\_conf\\_index.htm](http://www.ddb.de/news/ifla_conf_index.htm)

Other steps that we agreed to take are to continue the online discussion to hear from people on the Internet – you can subscribe to our public discussion list through our Web site. We also have a closed discussion list for the participants, at their request.

We have encouraged the participants to translate the draft statement, recommendations, and background papers into their own languages, and we will post those translations on our Web site.

We will be publishing a brief report of the meeting for *ICBC (International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control* – an IFLA quarterly journal) and encourage participants to publish articles and give presentations about the draft statement and recommendations.

The participants suggested contacting and involving other information communities to work towards a shared vocabulary, shared concepts, and shared goals – continuing work already started with Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). They also suggested seeking a broader worldwide review beyond IFLA to involve other standard organizations or to follow a process for worldwide review like that used for ISO standards. We will be exploring the best ways to do this.

This was the first of a series of regional meetings. The next ones are planned as follows:  
2004 Buenos Aires – Central and South America  
2005 place to be determined - Middle East

2006 Seoul, Korea, hosted by the National Library of Korea - Asia  
2007 Durban, South Africa – Africa.

The International Conference on Cataloguing Principles was in 1961 in Paris– 42 years ago. We have now started the exciting process of developing a statement for today's library catalogues that we also hope will be useful to other communities and serve us well into the future. There is a lot of work still to do to involve the rule makers and other cataloguing experts worldwide – the process will take at least four more years, through 2007, but we are all hopeful that it will lead to greater ability to share cataloguing information – bibliographic and authority records around the world.

Thank you for your attention and now open to questions.