



**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS AND
INSTITUTIONS**

**WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS
80th IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, LYON
16-22 AUGUST 2014**

**STANDING COMMITTEE
CATALOGUING SECTION
(CATS SC)**

Meetings: Standing Committee I (SCI), Saturday August 16, 9:45-12:15 (Gratte Ciel 2)
Standing Committee II (SCII), Tuesday August 19, 13:15-14:45 (Tête d'Or 1)

Chair: Hanne Hørl Hansen
Secretary: Miriam Säfström

MINUTES: SCI	2
MINUTES: SCII	8
MINUTES ISBD STRATEGY MEETING	11
ATTENDANCE: SCI and SC II	15
OBSERVERS: SCI and SCII	15
APPENDIX I: FRBR RG: Report of activities 2013-2014	17
APPENDIX II: ISBD RG: Activities report 2013-2014	19
APPENDIX III: ISBD Survey Interim report	23
APPENDIX IV: ICP revision draft	28
APPENDIX V: ICP Task Group revision report 2013-2014	38
APPENDIX VI: Project proposal: Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Headings for Latin American Literatures	40
APPENDIX VII: Report on the ALA CC:DA, ALA Midwinter Conference 2014	45
APPENDIX VIII: Report on the ALA CC:DA, ALA Annual Conference 2014	53
APPENDIX IX: Financial statement 2014	61
APPENDIX X: Lyon meetings: FRBR RG	63
APPENDIX XI: Lyon meetings: ISBD RG	66
APPENDIX XII: Lyon meetings: ISBD Linked Data Study Group	67
APPENDIX XIII: Report from ISO/TC46 meeting 2014	68



The Cataloguing section meets in Lyon

MINUTES: SCI

Standing Committee I: Saturday, 16 August, 9:45-12:15, Gratte Ciel 2

For attendance, see “Attendance: SCI and SCII” and “Observers: SCI and SCII”

1. Welcome and introductions

The chair, Hanne Hørl Hansen, welcomed all Standing Committee (SC) members, and observers. This was followed by brief introductions of the SC members, as well as of the observers.

2. Agenda

This year the SC had three meetings. Besides the regular business meetings (SCI and SCII) there was a meeting dedicated to discussion of the ISBD strategy. The ISBD strategy meeting was held off-site, and as the seats were limited there was not much room for observers. Priority was given to members of the ISBD RG. The minutes from the meeting are included in this document.

3. Minutes of the 2013 CATS meetings in Singapore

In the minutes from last year’s meeting in Singapore (http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/reports/meeting_2013.pdf) information about the affiliation of one SC member was incorrect. Secretary Miriam Säfstrom will see to it that a corrected version is posted on the website. Besides this, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Announcements

4.1 Division and Section Programmes

This year CATS had an open session on the future of universal bibliographic control (UBC). This is a joint venture together with Bibliography, Classification and Indexing and UNIMARC Strategic Programme. The session lasted a whole day. The title was “Universal Bibliographic Control in the Digital Age: Golden Opportunity or Paradise Lost?” and the session included the following papers:

Authorities, Entities & Communities, Theodore Fons (OCLC, USA)

We are All Catalogers Now: Leveraging Do It Yourself Metadata for Research Collections, Rebecca L. Lubas (Claremont Colleges Library, USA)

Self-Publishing: a new challenge for Universal Bibliographic Control, Robert P. Holley (School of Library & Information Science, Wayne State University, USA)

Enrichir le catalogue local avec des données bibliographiques exposées : interactions avec le catalogue national via web service, Philippe Bourdenet (Université du Maine (DSI), France)

Authors and Authorities in Post-RDA Library Systems: A Case Study, Heather Lea Moulaison (The iSchool at the University of Missouri, USA)

Hitting a Moving Target: Cataloging in the Age of Emerging Technologies, Robert L. Bothmann (Library Services, Minnesota State University, Mankato, USA)

Linked data cloud in Farsi subject headings : case study at the NLAI, Mitra Samiee (National Library and Archives of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran) and Kuhyar Davallu (Pardis valliasr University, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran)

ISNI and VIAF – Transforming ways of trustfully consolidating identities, Anila Angjeli (Bibliothèque nationale de France, France), Andrew MacEwan (British Library, United Kingdom) and Vincent Boulet (Bibliothèque nationale de France, France)

A la recherche du temps perdu, retour vers le futur: CBU 2.0, Gildas Illien and Françoise Bourdon (Bibliothèque nationale de France)

Reuse of library thesaurus data as ontologies for the public sector, Mikko Lappalainen (National Library of Finland) and Matias Frosterus (Library Network Services, National Library of Finland) and Susanna Nykyri (Research Library, National Library of Finland)

FRBR and serials: the PRESSoo model, Patrick LeBoeuf, Bibliographic and Digital Information Department, Prospective and Data Services, Standards and Models Unit – National Library of France) and Franxois- Xavier Pelegrin (Bibliographic Data Section - ISSN International Centre)

The local in the global: universal bibliographic control from the bottom up, Gordon Dunsire (Independent Consultant, Edinburgh) and Mirna Willer (Department of Information Sciences, University of Zadar, Zadar, Croatia)

4.2 Thanks to translators

The chair extended her warm thanks to all translators who have helped with the programme papers.

4.3 Strategic input: IFLA trend report

Last year the IFLA trend report was launched. All sections have been asked to refer to it by connecting actions in their respective strategic/action plans to the trends identified in the report. To further discussion on the trends the document has been translated into many languages, see <http://trends.ifla.org/insights-document>.

4.4 Corresponding members

The chair has contacted a number of libraries in countries and regions that lack SC representation (e.g., Australia, India, Africa, Namibia and Malaysia) but has so far not received any names.

5. Reports I

5.1 FRBR RG and subgroups

Chris Oliver, chair of the FRBR Review Group (RG), presented a report of activities of the FRBR RG 2013-2014 (Appendix I). The group, which was enlarged to ten members last year, has had two resignations and is now back to eight members. These are:

- Gordon Dunsire, UK
- Elena Escolano Rodríguez, Spain
- Patrick Le Boeuf, France
- Françoise Leresche, France
- Tanja Merčun, Croatia
- Anke Meyer-Hess, Germany
- Chris Oliver, Canada
- Athena Salaba, USA

The Consolidation Editorial Group (CEG), led by Pat Riva, was created during WLIC 2013 and has achieved considerable progress towards consolidation of the models since its inception. There was a very brief description of the CEG work, with an invitation to attend the FRBR RG business meeting to hear more details.

5.2 ISBD RG and subgroups

Mirna Willer, chair of the ISBD Review Group (RG), presented a report of activities of the ISBD RG and ISBD Linked Data Study Group for the period 2013-2014 (Appendix II).

The RG has conducted an ISBD survey (the interim report is included in these minutes as Appendix III). The survey will be extended two months and the final report is scheduled for the end of the year.

The next issue of *Cataloguing & Classification Quarterly* (CCQ), is a theme issue on ISBD. It is due in October.

5.3 IFLA Namespaces Task Group

Gordon Dunsire, chair of the IFLA Namespaces Task Group, presented a report on its activities. There has been minimal activity during 2014 because funding of the group was being moved from a project basis, and the group was likely to develop into a new group with new terms of reference after discussion between the Professional Committee and the Committee on Standards. This was the main topic on the agenda for the group's meeting during IFLA 2014. For the time being it is still affiliated with the Classification and Indexing

Section. The work of the group continues to be of great interest to CATS. Information about the group and reports on its activities can be found at <http://www.ifla.org/node/5353>.

6. Revision of the ICP

Dorothy McGarry reported:

In 2012 a group consisting of Dorothy McGarry, Agnese Galeffi and Dave Reser was formed with the purpose of looking into if and how a revision of the ICP should be carried out. The group reported back to the SC in 2013 and the SC decided for a revision within the current structure of the ICP. A new group was formed consisting of Dorothy McGarry, Agnese Galeffi (chair), Bobby Bothmann and Maria Violeta Bertolini to carry out the revision. A draft revision was sent to the SC this summer (Appendix IV). The group suggested that the draft should undergo a short review period with the CATS SC and other interested groups, and then go for worldwide review. The group's comments on the draft and suggestions are included as appendix V. The revision of the ICP and the worldwide review will be included in the CATS SC action plan.

7. IFLA standards procedures manual/Report from the IFLA Committee on Standards

Patrice Landry made a short report from the IFLA Committee on Standards. The committee supports and advises the Professional Committee (PC) on standards-related work. This year a working group consisting of representatives from the different sections has prepared a draft IFLA standards procedures manual. The CATS representatives on the WG were Elena Escolano and Agnese Galeffi. The draft manual was sent for review to the IFLA sections early this summer, but the timing made it hard for CATS SC to coordinate a collective answer. During this conference the draft manual has been approved by the PC, but further input is welcome, to help improve the document.

As reported earlier the committee plans a satellite meeting in 2015 where the subject will be "impact of IFLA standards". Landry envisioned many papers coming from the former Division IV sections (i.e. Cataloguing, Classification and Indexing, and Bibliography).

8. IFLA Genre/Form Working Group

Bobby Bothmann reported that the Classification and Indexing section has started a working group on Genre/Form (<http://www.ifla.org/node/8526>), that is just starting its work and will meet during the WLIC. Georg Prager leads the group. Among its members are CATS SC members Bobby Bothmann and Patrick Le Boeuf.

9. PRESSoo

Patrick Le Boeuf reported on the work with PRESSoo, a model for describing serial works. PRESSoo bridges the differences between FRBRer and FRBRoo, and is adjusted to describe serial resources.

10. Names of persons

Miriam Säfström made a short report on the status of *Names of Persons*. Last year, Anders Cato and Françoise Leresche proposed that a part of the CATS web site should be devoted to *Names of Persons*, in the same way as a page of it is already devoted to the *International Cataloguing Principles* and all the translations in which they are available. For the management of the page a form should be created. This form can then be filled in by the various countries in order to document their policies. The form should also allow for the uploading of files (with the date of update). This suggestion was approved by the CATS SC.

But since then nothing has happened and we still have a lot of files that have been delivered to CATS, but that we have not been able to publish.

A working group was charged with the question of making a plan for publication, contacting the IFLA webmaster and proposing a plan for further management of *Names of Persons* (outreach to national libraries, collaboration, other). Maria Violeta Bertolini, Bobby Bothmann, Milena Milanova and Ricardo Santos volunteered for the working group. Säfström offered to help narrow down the task. Gordon Dunsire, current chair of JSC, serves as a liaison with RDA.

11. Anonymous classics

11.1 African manuscripts

Hanne Hørl Hansen reported that we still have no confirmation whether the published list of “African literatures: Epics and assimilated” can be moved from draft status. A possibility is instead of contacting members of the Cataloguing Section in Africa, which has been tried, to contact the African section of IFLA and ask for its help to find a local expert. Hansen met with Nadine Boddaert, Maria Violeta Bertolini and Ricardo Santos during IFLA in Lyon. Here Boddaert offered to write an introduction for the draft explaining the limitations and conditions of the content. What is needed especially are experts in the original languages who can contribute to and verify original titles. The group decided that the chair will wait for Boddaert’s introduction and then write the African Section for help. It was also decided that with this introduction the draft will be published as a first version on the web – open to corrections etc. from experts.

11.2 Latin America

Last year, Maria Violeta Bertolini took on the task of examining what could be done about a list of anonymous classics from the Latin American literature. This year Bertolini reported on her work and presented a project proposal (Appendix V). The proposal was approved by the SC, and Bertolini and Ricardo Santos volunteered to work with the project. In this they will also be supported by Nadine Boddaert, who already has started a list.

11.3 Other Anonymous Classics

Nadine Boddaert also started a first draft for the Korean and Japanese part of the Asian Anonymous Classic as well as a list of Byzantine works. Boddaert will clarify some details in the Byzantine list and when we received it we can put it on the web as a draft and welcome corrections etc. When the Korean and the Japanese lists are received, we will have to contact experts in the regions asking for help.

12. Reports II

12.1 Liaison to ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

Jay Weitz, liaison to the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (ALA CC:DA), presented two reports (Appendix VII-VIII) from the Committee meetings at the ALA Midwinter and the ALA annual conference. Weitz received special thanks for these interesting and thorough reports.

12.2 SCATnews

Newsletter editor Unni Knutsen reported that SCATnews has been published twice since the last SC meeting (December 2013 and June 2014). Knutsen and information coordinator Agnese Galeffi have already given SCATnews a “face lift” to make it more web friendly (more pictures, a clearer layout and short summaries of the articles). The SC considered this very successful. Knutsen invited all to contribute to the newsletter, in which she aims for true international representation.

12.3 IFLA website

As information coordinator Agnese Galeffi could not be present at this meeting, a written report was made. The website has been updated upon request, and no greater changes have been made. Last year Galeffi asked for pictures and short biographies from the ongoing and incoming SC members. This content is still of interest, especially as next year is an IFLA election year and we will have some new SC members.

The question was raised about the feasibility of moving all IME ICC (International meeting of experts on an international cataloguing code whose work resulted in the IFLA document *International cataloguing principles*, ICP) material to the IFLA website. The content is now divided into the five meetings and the material located according to this. Nothing was however decided on this question.

It was also reported that there are some dead links to IME ICC documents on the website. Miriam Säfström will contact IFLA headquarter about this.

12.4 MulDiCat

Already in 2012 Anders Cato and Gordon Dunsire reported that 90% of the MulDiCat content had been published in the Open metadata registry (OMR) (<http://metadataregistry.org/vocabulary/show/id/299.html>). A logical next step would be to make it possible for new translations to be incorporated by the translators themselves. This project lacks funding and has not been achieved yet.

The bigger question on how to move forward with MulDiCat is yet unresolved. Due to historic reasons MulDiCat is a project under Classification and Indexing, but has a more natural affiliation with the Committee on Standards which is now in place. CATS has together with Classification and Indexing and Bibliography been asked to write a short recommendation on the move of the MulDiCat project, and also recommend further development for MulDiCat. This will be presented to the Committee on Standards, which will take it to the PC.

13. Adjournment

The chair adjourned the meeting.

MINUTES: SCII

Standing Committee II: Tuesday 19 August, 13:15-14:45, Tête d'Or 1

For attendance, see “Attendance: SCI and SCII” and “Observers: SCI and SCII”

14. Welcome

The chair, Hanne Hørsl Hansen, welcomed all Standing Committee (SC) members and observers to this second meeting of the CATS SC. This was followed by brief introductions of the SC members and the observers.

15. Agenda

The agenda was updated with some items (inserted below).

16. Announcements

16.1 Leadership brief of the Library services division

Chair Hansen reported from the Leadership forum. Maria-Carme Torras i Calvo from Bergen University College, Norway, is chair of Division III (Library services).

The meeting highlighted the launch of the *Lyon declaration on Access to Information and Development*. This document outlines the need for access to information to be recognised in the United Nations post-2015 development agenda, and had by the time already been signed by more than 125 organisations.

Among the topics discussed at the Leadership briefing were many practical ones, as how to work proactively with section membership when Dutch law hinders the sections from getting lists of members and contact addresses. Another topic was how to engage SC members and get them to take on tasks, participate in working groups et cetera. The question of conference attendance was also raised. The sections were reminded that according to IFLA rule R18.26 any SC member that “does not attend two consecutive meetings of the committee and does not provide a reasonable explanation for these absences to the Chair...shall be considered to have resigned”.

A workshop was held on the subject of how sections can work together. This is something of great interest to the sections focusing on universal bibliographic control, UBC (CATS, Bibliography, Classification and Indexing and the UNIMARC Strategic Programme). This year's joint open session is a way of collaborating. Another suggestion (first raised at Bibliography's SCI) is a joint newsletter. The officers of the mentioned sections found this idea very interesting and worth investigating. The newsletter editors of each section should study the feasibility of a joint communication channel, be it newsletter, blog or something else. Unni Knutsen, newsletter editor of CATS, declared herself willing to contact the editors of the other section newsletters.

17. Finances

Treasurer Miriam Säfström presented the financial report including a draft budget for next year (Appendix IX). Some projects have not used their full allotted funding. Säfström will confirm with IFLA HQ that this can be used for extra meetings to finish the work that was originally funded.

18. Strategic Plan 2013-2015 /Action plan 2015

Some issues that have been discussed during this conference should be included in the CATS action plan for 2015, like the ICP worldwide review, the ISBD work and the consolidation work on the FR models. Hanne Hørl Hansen and Miriam Säfström will update the strategic/action plan and send it to the SC members for approval.

19. Evaluation of the satellite meeting

The satellite meeting on RDA that was held 13 August in Frankfurt was considered a great success and has gotten very good feedback. The chair thanked the organizing committee, and the generous hosts at the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. Presentations from the day can be found at www.dnb.de/iflasatellite.

20. Evaluation of the joint open programme

The UBC (universal bibliographic control) day was excellently organized, and the programme committee had made a great job on putting together the content, which was varied and of high quality. John de Santis, who acted as chair and also took a huge part in the planning, deserves a special mention for his contribution. A warm thank you also to all speakers.

The downside of having a whole day devoted to UBC is that it necessarily becomes rather long. Next time we might want the possibility to ask questions of the speakers directly after each presentation, and not at the end of the day.

21. Future CATS programmes

21.1 81th WLIC in Cape Town, 15-21 August, 2015

The theme for IFLA WLIC 2015 is "Dynamic Libraries: Access, Development and Transformation".

CATS has not applied for any satellite meeting next year, but will consider one for 2016. The Committee on Standards however, is planning a satellite meeting on the impact of IFLA standards, a satellite to which our section (together with Classification and Indexing, Bibliography and the UNIMARC Strategic Programme) has received a special invitation to contribute. Perhaps we could also offer the Committee to help form a conference planning group? Our input could be valuable in the planning.

The open session for 2015 was discussed. Although all were very happy with this year's UBC collaboration, it was considered better not to make a massive joint venture two years in a row. If any of the other sections is interested in a joint session next year, CATS is willing to cooperate, but otherwise we will hold a session on our own. A suggested topic is "FRBRoo/PRESSoo – explained!". If we reach some conclusion regarding a joint newsletter this could be communicated at the WLIC in Cape Town.

22. Reports III

22.1 Current projects: update on Lyon meetings

FRBR RG: Chris Oliver, chair of the group, reported on the Lyon meetings (Appendix X). The FRBR RG/Consolidation editorial group (CEG) plans for a full-day meeting 22 August.

ISBD RG: Mirna Willer, chair of the group, reported on the Lyon meetings of the ISBD RG and the ISBD Linked Data Study Group (Appendix XI and XII).

A short report on the ISBD strategy meeting was given by Hanne Hørl Hansen. (The minutes of the meeting are included in this document.) Five scenarios were discussed, and it was decided that the ISBD RG would study two of them more closely, to allow for further decision on the strategy. Hansen will apply for an extra meeting on this matter for next year too.

22.2 Reports from other institutions

Report from ISO TC46: The committee liaison, Paola Manoni, has sent a report on ISO TC46 activities 2014. (See Appendix XIII). Manoni received warm thanks for her work.

23. Other business

The SC has received a question about a formal liaison with IAML (International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres). This was welcomed and the IAML representative, Anders Cato, was accepted.

The SC has received a letter addressed to the whole section about the cataloguing of dissertations. Hanne Hørl Hansen will answer this.

24. Adjournment

The chair thanked all those present and adjourned the meeting.

MINUTES ISBD STRATEGY MEETING

Tuesday, 19 August, 9:00-11:00, ENSSIB

Standing Committee members present:

Viktoria Barsukova	National Library of Russia
Maria Violeta Bertolini*	IFTS No. 13, Argentina
Bobby Bothmann	Minnesota State University, Mankato, USA
Henriette Fog	Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library, Denmark
Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi*	Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Italy
Tuula Haapamäki*	National Library of Finland
Hanne Hørl Hansen	Danish Library Center, Denmark
Unni Knutsen	Oslo University Library, Norway
Patrick Le Boeuf	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Françoise Leresche*	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Dorothy McGarry	University of California, Los Angeles, USA
Milena Milanova	Sofia University, Bulgaria
Miriam Säfström	National Library of Sweden
Jay Weitz	OCLC, USA

Standing Committee members absent:

Manal Amin Abdelhalim	Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Egypt
Christine Frodl	Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Germany
Agnese Galeffi	Vatican School of Library Science, Italy
Hong Gao	National Library of China
Cha Kyung Lee	National Bibliographic Control Center, National Library of Korea
David Reser	Library of Congress, USA

Observers:

Julianne Beall	Library of Congress, USA
Gordon Dunsire	Independent, UK
Rachid Ghoufary	
Ben Gu*	National Library of China
John Hostage*	Harvard University, USA
Lynne Howarth*	Faculty of Information, University of Toronto, Canada
Natalia Kasparova*	National Library of Russia
Irena Kavčič*	National Library of Slovenia
Natalia Lelikova	NLR, Russia
Susan Morris	Library of Congress, USA
Chris Oliver	McGill University, Montreal, Canada
Luigina Orlandi	Vatican library
Mirna Willer*	University of Zadar, Croatia
Elena Zagorskaya	National Library of Russia

Members of the ISBD RG are marked with *.

1. Welcome

The chair of the Standing Committee (SC), Hanne Hørl Hansen, welcomed all SC members and observers to the meeting. This was followed by brief introductions of the SC members and the observers.

2. Background

Hansen recapitulated the background for the meeting.

Already in 2012 the PC asked the Cataloguing section to set up a strategic plan for ISBD development. This should make clear what CATS is doing and why. At last year's meeting the SC decided upon a roadmap for the work. Important points were:

- *IFLA WLIC 2013 – preliminary discussions in CATS SC and ISBD RG*
- *2013/2014: ISBD RG performs a survey about ISBD and compiles a report on the result*
- *Spring/summer 2014: The officers of the Cataloguing Section prepares a basis for a discussion and decision on future strategy*
- *IFLA WLIC 2014 – decision on future ISBD strategy*

Although the SC members were encouraged to discuss this question via email, this extra meeting was planned to give time and opportunity to discuss and decide on the CATS SC's future ISBD strategy.

Report on the ISBD survey

Irena Kavčič reported on the ISBD survey. 65 organizations from 46 countries answered the survey. Almost half of the answers were from national libraries. There were many individual comments to the survey, which will be included in the final report.

For various reasons some of the institutions that meant to answer had not filled in the survey. The ISBD RG has therefore decided to wait for these answers and leave the survey open for another two months. The final report will be published at the end of the year. For the interim report see Appendix III.

A discussion on the survey followed. The questionnaire had been circulated to all SC members in advance, but in spite of this extra reading the answers show that the questions could have been clearer. In the resulting answers it is hard to distinguish between "direct" use of the ISBD, and use through other codes, like AACR2 and RDA (which builds on the principles of ISBD). In the survey there were questions about whether the respondents planned to change their cataloguing code, but no direct question about what cataloguing code they foresee using in five years. Though this was not the aim of the survey, it would have been relevant to the strategy discussion. It was concluded that the survey gives valuable input, but that in some cases the questions could have been clearer.

Presentation of the scenarios

To help the discussion, a few different scenarios had been presented. These were:

- A) Continue IFLA's ISBD work at the same level as now including developing and maintaining the current consolidated edition. Maintaining or developing new tools to

make ISBD more attractive in a linked data world. Continue harmonization and mapping to RDA.

A2) Same as A, but including evolution towards a new structure reflecting the FRBR model.

B) Continue IFLA's ISBD work at a level, where only necessary maintenance of the consolidated edition and current ISBD Linked Data tools is done and harmonization to RDA-rules is done whenever good solutions can be found.

C) Continue IFLA's ISBD work with the purpose in the long run to make the consolidated edition shorter, simpler and more principal and maybe at one time also to consider a new structure reflecting FRBR. Implement the necessary changes in ISBD Linked Data tools in order to implement the changes. Harmonization to RDA-rules is done whenever good solutions can be found.

D) Scenario B plus at the same time at a political level investigate if RDA would be interested in a more formalized cooperation (formalize an IFLA influence on the content of RDA, find agreeable business models etc. - all in order to sanction RDA with a recommendation from IFLA in the long run)

E) Scenario C plus at the same time at a political level investigate if RDA would be interested in a more formalized cooperation (formalize an IFLA influence on the content of RDA, find agreeable business models etc. - all in order to sanction RDA with a recommendation from IFLA in the long run)

All SC members had received the scenarios in advance, and had had the opportunity to reflect and comment on them. After a short presentation of the scenarios, the SC members were all asked to present their views and indicate which scenario they found most appealing.

This round-table and the following discussion showed that CATS SC still holds the concept of universal bibliographic control (UBC) very high, and that one of two scenarios (A2 or C) were chosen by most of the SC members.

Many good points were raised in the discussion, among them:

- If countries cannot adopt RDA, there has to be an alternative.
- Different codes might be needed since the RDA approach is not "the unique way" to implement FRBR.
- What do we mean by "simpler"? Surely not "easier" but rather more high-level, conceptual.
- Scenario C strikes a balance between upholding UBC, and also moving forward
- CATS SC need to collaborate much more than we do now, and also consider the cost of not collaborating
- Will ISBD continue to be free (without cost)? "There's no such thing as a free lunch". Future ISBD revision costs might make a new business model necessary.
- Integration can be accomplished through mappings between the different codes. But should CATS aim for parallel work, which can later be mapped, or cooperation, collaboration and integration?

- There was also a concern that it might not be realistic to aim for a more formalized cooperation as the RDA community has already made large investments into the format

(The bullets above are a selection of comments from the discussion, and does not aim to be exhaustive.)

In conclusion: two scenarios were favoured over the others: A2 (continue the content of ISBD on the current level but change to reflect FRBR) and C (plan for a shorter and more principal ISBD).

These scenarios need further investigation to help inform the CATS SC decision on ISBD strategy. The ISBD RG was charged with making the study: to investigate both scenarios, and present plans for revision of the ISBD according to this. The ISBD RG will consider:

- the cost and the timeline for both scenarios - also the maintaining beyond this revision
- who will benefit and who will not from each scenario

The ISBD RG was asked to deliver the result to the SC by the end of May 2015 in order to give time to consider the case carefully.

Depending on the strategic discussion the revision process for ISBD (consolidated) was planned to start in 2015. This will not start until a decision on future strategy is reached.

Cooperation with the JSC

A question raised in the scenarios and the following discussion was whether it would be possible to further formalize the cooperation between the JSC and the CATS SC? There is already a formal protocols for the cooperation JSC and the ISBD RG.

There is a governance review for RDA that is open for comments until December of this year (http://www.rdatoolkit.org/sites/default/files/rda_governance_review.pdf). As CATS is an interested party, we must comment on this review. Chair Hansen will draft an answer, proposing some kind of formalized cooperation between the JSC and the CATS SC, and send it first to the other SC members. If the SC can agree on the content it will be sent as a CATS SC answer. Otherwise, the review is open for comments from individuals.

ATTENDANCE: SCI and SC II

Standing Committee members present:

Viktoria Barsukova	National Library of Russia
Maria Violeta Bertolini	IFTS No. 13, Argentina
Bobby Bothmann	Minnesota State University, Mankato, USA
Henriette Fog	Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library, Denmark
Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi	Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Italy
Tuula Haapamäki	National Library of Finland
Hanne Hørl Hansen	Danish Library Center, Denmark
Unni Knutsen	Oslo University Library, Norway
Patrick Le Boeuf	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Françoise Leresche	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Dorothy McGarry	University of California, Los Angeles, USA
Milena Milanova	Sofia University, Bulgaria
Miriam Säfström	National Library of Sweden
Jay Weitz	OCLC, USA

Standing Committee members absent:

Manal Amin Abdelhalim	Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Egypt
Christine Frodl	Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Germany
Agnese Galeffi	Vatican School of Library Science, Italy
Hong Gao	National Library of China
Cha Kyung Lee	National Bibliographic Control Center, National Library of Korea
David Reser	Library of Congress, USA

OBSERVERS: SCI and SCII

		SCI	SCII
Harriet Aagaard	National Library of Sweden, Sweden	X	
Ahmedabd	The School of research science, Dubai	X	
Alaa Alakal	The School of research science, Dubai	X	
Taaddi Ali	King Abdul Aziz Foundation, Morocco	X	
Christian Aliverti	Swiss National Library, Switzerland	X	X
Carsten Andersen	Danish Bibliographic Center	X	X
Sundus Arabi	The School of research science, Dubai	X	
Marie Balikova	National Library of the Czech Republic	X	X
Julianne Beall	Library of Congress, USA	X	
Anders Cato	Skåne University Hospital, Sweden	X	X
Charla Chebl	Notre Dame University, Louaize, Lebanon	X	
Philippe Chevrant	IFAO, Egypt		X
Gianolio Christelle	Public Library Strasbourg		X
Thierry Clavel	Library Network Western Switzerland	X	X
Gordon Dunsire	Independent, UK	X	X
Simon Edwards	CILIP, UK		X
Axel Ermert	Institute Museum Research, SMB-PK		X

Elena Escolano	Ministeria de Defensa, Spain	X	X
Grazyna Federowicz	National Library of Poland	X	X
Anita Goldberga	National Library of Latvia	X	
Angela Green	Texas A&M at Qatar, Qatar	X	
Mauro Guerrini	University of Florence, Italy	X	X
Renate Gömpel	German National Library		X
James Hennelly	American Library Association, USA		X
John Hostage	Harvard University, USA		X
Lynne Howarth	Faculty of Information, University of Toronto, Canada	X	X
Gildas Illien	National Library of France	X	
Khuloodah Kalbani	SQU University library	X	X
Takayo Kaneko	Nippon Records Management Co, Japan	X	
Natalia Kasparova	Russian State library, Russia	X	
Irena Kavčič	National Library of Slovenia	X	X
Mathilde Koskas	Bibliothèque Nationale de France		X
Jaesun Lee	Ministry of Culture, Korea	X	X
Emilie Liard	University of Poitiers, France	X	
Sinikka Luukkanen	National Library of Finland	X	
Mohamed Malchouch	King Abdul Aziz Foundation, Morocco	X	
Enrica Manenti	AIB, Italy	X	
Tatiana Maskhulia	Presidential Library, Russia	X	
David C McQuillan	University of South Carolina	X	
Tanja Merčun	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia	X	
Susan Morris	Library of Congress, USA	X	X
Jean-Hugues Morneau	SICD1 Grenoble	X	X
Alexandra Munoz	Library of Congress of Chile	X	
Miriam Nauri	National Library of Sweden	X	
Chris Oliver	McGill University, Montreal, Canada	X	X
Luigina Orlandi	Vatican library	X	X
Tadahiko Oshiba	National Diet Library, Japan	X	X
Federica Paradisi	Consultant, Italy	X	
Glenn Patton	OCLC, USA	X	X
Nikki Potgieter	National Library of South Africa		X
George Prager	New York University Law school, USA	X	X
Pat Riva	BDAQ, Canada	X	X
Sandy Roe	Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, editor-in-chief	X	X
Ricardo Santos	National Library of Spain	X	X
Marja-Liisa Seppälä	National Library of Finland	X	X
Ulrike Severin	German National Library	X	X
Lana Soglasnova	University of Toronto libraries, Canada	X	
Wen Song	Library of Chinese Academy		X
Grace Were	Kenya human rights commission, Kenya	X	
Mirna Willer	University of Zadar, Croatia	X	
Janis Young	Library of Congress, USA		X
Elena Zagorskaya	National Library of Russia	X	
Maja Žumer	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia	X	X
Stefanie Zutter	Bibliothèque nationale de Luxemborg	X	

APPENDIX I: FRBR RG: Report of activities 2013-2014

Membership

According to the terms of reference for the Review Group, membership may vary between eight and ten members. Up until 2013, membership had basically been eight members. 2013 was an election year and the Review Group expressed its appreciation to the members who had completed their terms: Pat Riva, former chair of the RG, Maja Žumer, and Rajesh Chandrakar. When five nominations were received, the Working Group proposed to the Cataloguing Section that it would like to accept all five nominations and expand its membership to ten members. During the Cataloguing Section meetings in Singapore, this proposal was approved. Since then, the Review Group received two resignations from members of the Review Group, so the Group has returned to its former number of members, that is, eight members.

Translations

FRBR

Arabic

- translated by the King Fahad National Library (KFNL).

Bulgarian

FRAD

Bulgarian

FRBR is now available in twenty-two languages including English. FRAD is now available in fourteen languages including English. There were no new translations of FRSAD. FRSAD is available in six languages.

Consolidation of IFLA Conceptual Models

Consolidation of the models is the principal activity in which the Review Group is currently involved.

The RG held one business meeting and one working meeting during IFLA WLIC in Singapore. The working meeting was an extended one (4 ½ hours long) to allow for a more detailed review and discussion of consolidation work.

During the IFLA 2013 conference in Singapore, the Review Group decided to form a Consolidation Editorial Group to lead the work of bringing the three conceptual models together into one coherent model. Consolidation work had reached a point where it required a small group to gather the results of numerous consultations, to identify areas that still needed attention, and to start giving shape to the consolidated conceptual model. The members of this group are Patrick LeBoeuf, Pat Riva, Miriam Säfström, and Maja Žumer. The small Consolidation Editorial Group worked closely with the Review Group, summarizing discussions and decisions as they occurred, and even setting up Skype meeting opportunities so that Review Group members could be involved. While the group was designed to be small in order to have the agility to accomplish a challenging task, it always welcomed the interest and participation of the members of the Review Group and of related groups, such as the

ISBD Linked Data Study Group. During 2013/2014, the Consolidation Editorial Group held two series of meetings. The first series were held in October (Oct. 14 and 15), in Paris, immediately preceding the meetings of the ISBD Linked Data Study Group. By arranging the meetings of the two groups within the one week, it provided an important opportunity for attendance by interested members of related IFLA groups and committees. The second series were held from March 31 to April 4th, in Den Haag, overlapping with the meetings of the CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group and allowing members to attend the relevant parts of the CIDOC CRM meetings (see below) in between their own meetings on consolidation. The Paris meetings were hosted by the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris. The Den Haag consolidation meetings were hosted by IFLA Headquarters. The Review Group thanks both institutions for their support of the project by providing excellent facilities for the meetings.

When the RG submitted its proposal for project funding to support the continuation of consolidation work, it submitted a 2-year plan. The project was called *Reassessment of properties in a consolidated conceptual model* and planned for 2013 and 2014 (project was approved in January 2013). Thus, it was not necessary to submit a detailed new plan to cover 2014 funding, but it was necessary to re-apply for 2014 funding. The project funding in both 2013 and 2014 was used to support the meetings held between the annual conferences in order to continue advancing the consolidation work. Since the project is now led by the Consolidation Editorial Group rather than the Review Group as a whole, the Chair and the past Chair decided that it would be more appropriate if a member of the Consolidation Editorial Group acted as the project leader. Pat Riva volunteered to act as the project leader and to be the contact point for administrative aspects, especially related to IFLA funding.

Working Group on FRBR-CRM Dialogue

The Working Group on FRBR-CRM Dialogue held two meetings during 2013-2014: the first in mid-October, in Heraklion, Crete, and the second in early April, in Den Haag. The meetings of this group are usually held at the same time and place as the CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group's meetings. IFLA was well represented at both meetings by its three long-standing members. The Review Group Chair was able to attend the April meeting. (This group is sometimes also called the International Working Group on FRBR-CIDOC CRM Harmonisation.) The group's main focus is FRBRoo, an object oriented formulation of FRBR/FRAD/FRSAD and an extension of the museum community's conceptual reference model (CIDOC CRM). As the models each develop, the group monitors changes to maintain harmony between the two.

Distribution List

The frbr@infoserv.inist.fr list currently has 791 subscribers, a slight decrease from last year's number (802). The automated list archive starting in December 2010 is accessible from <http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/arc/frbr>.

Chris Oliver
Chair of the FRBR Review Group
August 1, 2014

APPENDIX II: ISBD RG: Activities report 2013-2014

I. Cataloguing Section's Strategic Plan for ISBD review

a. Project and financial reports

Following discussions about the strategic plan for ISBD review and revision at the Singapore 2013 meetings of the Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee, ISBD Review Group and ISBD Linked Data Study Group, the project proposal was prepared and the funding received by the IFLA Professional Committee. The project *Development of ISBD Namespaces Alignments and Usage* (ID: 3-13-2-14) is a continuation of the project funded in 2013, *ISBD Namespaces Alignments and Publication as Linked Data* (G3.13.2-1/13). The ISBD Linked Data Study Group, responsible for carrying out the project activities, met twice in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, October, 16 – 18, 2013 (as part of the 2013 funded project) and April, 7 – 9, 2014. Funding approved for 2014: 1800 €.

At the ISBD Linked Data Study Group meeting in October 2013 the document on ISBD/FRBR semantic alignment was drafted. The work was based on the *Resource vs WEMI entity resolution: discussion paper*, which was subsequently approved and published as *Resource and Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item* [prepared by] Gordon Dunsire, 28 July 2013, Amended 6 October 2013, following comments by Patrick Le Boeuf and discussion at IFLA 2013.¹

Development of the application profile for ISBD was also part of the agenda. Namely, to represent the bibliographic data published as linked open data in RDF as consistent information about the resource described, application profile needs to be developed. The discussion of this issue started during the October 2013 meeting, and continued at the April 2014 meeting by the presentation of the work done by ABES and BNF.

The 2013 meeting also discussed and gave general direction for the development of *Guidelines for translations of RDF representations in ISBD*, which is being prepared for approval at the ISBD Review Group meeting in Lyon, 2014. The guidelines present specific implementation of the more general ones prepared and published by the Namespaces Technical Group as *Guidelines for translations of IFLA namespaces in RDF*.² The guidelines are needed to help translators of ISBD elements and value vocabularies to get acquainted with procedures and rules in publishing ISBD namespaces. The management service used for storing ISBD namespaces is Open Metadata Registry.³

The ISBD Linked Data Study Group meeting in 2014 continued the work on the ISBD/FRBR namespaces alignment, RDF representation of ISBD resources and use of ISBD classes and properties in library linked data triples, and ISBD application profile. The latter two involve issues to be resolved before designing the planned *Guidelines for use of ISBD as linked data*; discussion paper was decided to be prepared for the August 2014 meeting. Relationships and

¹ <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/resource-wemi.pdf>

² <http://www.ifla.org/node/5353>

³ <http://metadataregistry.org/>

future alignments with other namespaces was also discussed, specifically UNIMARC for bibliographic data namespaces, FRBRoo and PRESSoo, identifying these as tasks to be included in the plans for the next year activities.

The planned activity on the mapping between vocabularies of ISBD 0 Content form and media type area and ROF (RDA/ONIX Framework) namespaces started due to the setting up of the RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group by Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA in February 2014. The representative of the ISBD RG was invited to join the group.⁴ The Paris 2014 meeting discussed the draft mapping prepared by G. Dunsire, the chair of the ROF WG and decided to distribute the document to the ISBD Review Group for discussion and approval at Lyon 2014 meeting.

The ISBD Linked Data Study Group considered all these activities as part of the preparation for the regular ISBD revision process considering the use of the ISBD/FRBRer mappings as a basis for recommendations for FRBRized cataloguing rules.

For detailed information see ISBD Linked Data Study Group meetings' minutes.

b. International survey on the use of the ISBD

Part of the planned discussions for the preparation of the next revision of ISBD is the world-wide survey on the use of the ISBD which was conducted in March and April 2014. The preliminary report of the findings is published in the SCATNews, No 41, June 2014 issue,⁵ while the full report will be presented at the Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee and ISBD Review Group meetings in August 2014.

II. ISBD Review Group activities report

a. Elections

The ISBD Review Group issued a call for nominations for members to serve a four year term (2013-2017), which can be once renewed. Three positions were available, while four members completed their first terms in 2013, and they expressed interest in being renewed. The nominations received were María Violeta Bertolini (Instituto de Formación Técnica Superior No. 13, Buenos Aires, Argentina), Lynne C. Howarth (University of Toronto, Canada) and Ricardo Santos Muñoz (Biblioteca Nacional de España). These nominations were reported at the Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee meeting, 17 August 2013, and were approved.

b. ISBD consolidated edition online

The publishing of the online ISBD Consolidated edition, 2011 was not approved by IFLA. As the matter was considered to be urgent because the ISBD text is prerequisite for further development of ISBD application profile, publication of unconstrained ISBD

⁴ JSC/RDA, Terms of reference for the JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group, 9 January 2014, <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-Chair-10.pdf>, and JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group: 2014 membership and tasks, 16 January 2014, <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-Chair-10-2014.pdf>

⁵ <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/scatn/scat-news-41.pdf>

namespaces as well as the updating of published ones, for ISBD namespaces translations in other languages, and as a consultation document for online tool and service developments, it was decided to publish its pre-print March 2011 version.⁶

c. Mappings, alignments, profiles from ISBD to other bibliographic schemas

As a consequence of the work on the ISBD/FRBR alignment, it was decided to publish unconstrained namespaces for ISBD, which means a separate full set of ISBD elements as properties in RDF without defined domain and range. To this end, the document *ISBD unconstrained elements and other extensions*⁷ prepared by G. Dunsire for the ISBD Review Group was adopted at the meeting in Singapore 2013 and subsequently published. In order to understand the landscape around the ISBD namespaces mappings and alignments, the Singapore meeting discussed the *Alignments between the namespaces of ISBD, other IFLA standards, and external standards*,⁸ which the ISBD Linked Data Study Group at its meeting in October 2013 reconfirmed.

As part of the ISBD Review Group activity regarding the ISBD mapping to cataloguing rules, the mapping of ISBD specifications and RDA instructions was approved by the ISBD RG and Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee and published as *ISBD Profile in RDA: Constructing Functionally Interoperable Core Records, 19 December 2013, Version 1.0*.⁹ It can be considered the conclusion of discussions between ISBD Review Group and JSC/RDA on the harmonization of the two standards as the ISBD RG has fulfilled all the tasks regarding ISBD/RDA alignment.¹⁰ During the discussion process between JSC/RDA and ISBD RG, it was noted that some corrections should be made in the alignment of ISBD/RDA element sets document published in September 2012,¹¹ and that the update of the alignment was needed. This and any future work will become part of the activities defined by the protocol set up between the JSC/RDA and ISBD RG to "support the maintenance and development of functional interoperability between data created using the RDA and ISBD instructions and element sets".¹²

The *Alignment of the ISBD/RDA to the REICAT*, the new Italian cataloguing rules prepared by Simone Forassiepi, University of Florence, Italy under the supervision of Professor Mauro Guerrini, Version 1.0, 11 April 2013 was published on the ISBD Review Group's website.¹³ ISBD Review Group is interested in all such activities, and is inviting cataloguing rule-making bodies for such and similar cooperation.

d. Publications

⁶ http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/isbd-cons_20110321.pdf

⁷ <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/isbd-extensions.pdf>

⁸ http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/namespace-alignments_v1_20130725.pdf

⁹ http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/isbd_profile_in_rda_ver_1.0.pdf

¹⁰ See: [Action 19/12](#): Review Glasgow Outcomes, and propose actions based on the priorities of the ISBD Strategic Plan in: ISBD Review Group, Singapore, 2013. Draft Minutes, http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbdrg/meeting_2013.pdf

¹¹

http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/ISBD2RDA%20Alignment%20v1_1.pdf

¹² --- 6JSC/Chair/13 [Protocol between the JSC and the ISBD Review Group], <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-Chair-13.pdf>; - 6JSC/Chair/13/Shared documents [Documents shared between the JSC and the ISBD Review Group], <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC-Chair-13-Shared-documents.pdf>

¹³ http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/OtherDocumentation/isbd-rda-reicat_table.pdf

Cataloguing & Classification Quarterly issued in 2013 the call for papers for a special issue devoted to the evaluation and adoption of ISBD consolidated edition, 2011. Guest editors are M. Willer, J. Hostage and L. C. Howarth. The publication of the issue with ten articles is scheduled for the end of 2014.

Respectfully submitted by

Mirna Willer
ISBD Review Group, Chair
31 July 2014

APPENDIX III: ISBD Survey Interim report

International Survey on the Use of the ISBD

A full report

A proposal to start a survey on the use of ISBD was first discussed at the ISBD Review Group meeting during the 78th IFLA General Conference in Helsinki, Finland (2012). The text of the survey was approved at the ISBD RG meeting in Singapore (2013). The survey was conducted in March and April 2014. The invitation to fill in the survey was sent to the IFLA mailing lists, to the Conference of Directors of National Libraries (CDNL) and to the ISSN Network. The purpose of the survey was to obtain a worldwide overview of the use of ISBD, especially of the consolidated edition, and of plans and expectations for the future.

Responses were received from 65 organisations in 36 countries (one response from 26 countries, two or more responses from 10 countries)¹⁴. Thirty-one respondents were from national libraries (48%), 7 respondents (11%) from national, regional, or international rule-making bodies, 2 respondents (3%) from national cataloguing committees, and 25 respondents (38%) were from other types of institutions (academic libraries, regional libraries, cataloguing agencies, bibliographic centres, research libraries, etc.)¹⁵.

In the report responses from national libraries, national, regional, or international rule-making bodies, and national cataloguing committees (40 organisations from 30 countries/62% of the respondents)¹⁶ are represented more thoroughly because we believe these institutions have a crucial role in adopting international standards and developing national cataloguing rules.

The survey was divided into four sections: Use of the ISBD, Translations, Problems and Expectations, Other comments.

1 Use of the ISBD

1.1 Direct use of the ISBD for descriptive cataloguing

Twelve national libraries (Bosnia and Hercegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, South Africa, Spain), 2 rule-making bodies (Spain) and 1 national cataloguing committee (Bulgaria) use ISBD directly. Four national libraries use ISBD for some types of resources (Canada, China, Croatia, Slovenia). Fifteen national libraries, 5 rule-making bodies and 1 national cataloguing committee (in 16 countries) indicated that they do not use ISBD. In Bulgaria and Spain, ISBD is used directly by the national libraries, but it is not used by all rule-making bodies.

Six national libraries indicated that they use the consolidated edition (2011)¹⁷, 6 responded that they use the preliminary consolidated edition (2007)¹⁸ and 6 use one or more of the specialized ISBDs. The consolidated edition (2011) is also used by 2 rule-making bodies, and one national cataloguing committee.

¹⁴ Two responses from France, Germany, Japan, and South Africa, 3 from Argentina, Canada, and Denmark, 6 from Italy, 7 from Bulgaria, and 9 from Spain.

¹⁵ There are some doubts about rule-making bodies (all of them might not be responsible for developing cataloguing rules at national, regional or international level).

¹⁶ Two responses from Canada, Denmark, France, Germany and Japan, 3 from Bulgaria, and 4 from Spain.

¹⁷ The correct number of national libraries using the consolidated edition (2011) might be 5 (one of the libraries indicated that they do not use ISBD for descriptive cataloguing; they use AACR2 for most types of resources).

¹⁸ The correct number of national libraries using the preliminary consolidated edition (2007) might be 5 (one of the libraries indicated that they do not use ISBD for descriptive cataloguing; they use national cataloguing rules).

Among all the respondents 24 organizations (37%) use ISBD directly, 12 (18%) use ISBD for some types of resources, and 29 (45%) do not use ISBD. Fourteen organisations (23%) use the consolidated edition (2011), 11 organisations (18%) use the preliminary consolidated edition (2007), and 14 organisations (23%) use one or more of the specialized ISBDs. The 22 remaining responding organisations (36%) indicated that they do not use ISBD¹⁹.

1.2 ISBD used for display of records in the catalogue or in the national bibliography

ISBD is used for display of records in their catalogues or in their national bibliography by 26 national libraries, and national, regional, or international rule-making bodies (in 22 countries). Three organisations did not respond to this question.

Among all the respondents ISBD is used for display of records in their catalogues or in their national bibliography by 44 organisations (71% of the respondents).

1.3 Current cataloguing rules and changing to different rules

Organisations that do not use ISBD were asked to state their cataloguing rules²⁰. Seven national libraries indicated that they use RDA, for all or some types of resources (Australia, Canada, Canada (Québec)²¹, Ireland²², Japan²³, New Zealand, United Kingdom²⁴) and 6 use AACR2 (Brazil, Colombia, Czech Republic, Ireland²⁵, Philippines, Switzerland). National cataloguing rules (national standards) are used by 8 national libraries (China²⁶, Croatia²⁷, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan²⁸, Russia, Slovenia²⁹), 4 rule-making bodies (Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany) and 2 national cataloguing committees (Bulgaria, Japan).

Organisations that do not use ISBD were also asked whether their rules are based on the ISBD. Organisations that indicated they use AACR2 or RDA respectively, answered differently: some respondents indicated RDA and AACR2 are based (or partly based) on ISBD³⁰, others indicated that they are not. Seven national libraries, 3 rule-making bodies and 2 cataloguing committees indicated that their national cataloguing rules are entirely or partly based on ISBD: 1 national rules are based on consolidated edition (2011), 2 national rules are

¹⁹ Four organisations that do not use ISBD did not answer the question.

²⁰ The question was responded by organisations that do not use the ISBD, and by organisations that use the ISBD for some types of resources and RDA/AACR2/national cataloguing rules for other types of resources. It was also responded by six organisations which indicated that they use ISBD directly. The National Library of Latvia did not respond to this question, but in a comment to another question they explained AACR2 is used in the union catalogue and ISBD is used for national bibliography records. The national libraries of Cyprus and South Africa also did not respond to this question, but from their other responses and comments it is not clear whether they use ISBD or AACR2 or both (they both indicated that they use ISBD directly (preliminary consolidated edition (2007)) and that they use AACR2 for all types of resources).

²¹ The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec uses RDA, DCRM(B) for pre-1851 monographs and the French translations of some specialized ISBDs.

²² The National Library of Ireland uses RDA for printed monographs (AACR2 is used for other types of resources).

²³ RDA is used for cataloguing resources in foreign languages (national cataloguing rules are used for Japanese resources).

²⁴ They use RDA for published resources, supplemented by DCRM, where applicable.

²⁵ See 9.

²⁶ The National library of China uses ISBD for cataloguing resources in foreign languages, for Chinese resources national cataloguing rules are used (partly based on ISBD).

²⁷ The Croatian national library indicated that they use ISBD for some types of resources, for other resources they use national cataloguing rules.

²⁸ See 10.

²⁹ The Slovene national library indicated they use ISBD for some types of resources, for other resources they use national cataloguing rules.

³⁰ One respondent indicates RDA is based on the consolidated edition (2011), one respondent indicates RDA is based on the preliminary consolidated edition (2007), one respondent indicates RDA is partly based on the consolidated edition (2011) and one respondent indicates AACR2 is based on one or more of the specialized ISBDs.

based on preliminary consolidated edition (2007), 9 are based on one or more of the specialized ISBDs³¹.

Among all the respondents 27 (55%) indicated that their rules are based on the ISBD, 10 (20%) responded that the rules are partly based on the ISBD, and 12 (24%) responded negatively. Their rules are mostly based on one or more of the specialized ISBDs (18 organisations/49% of the respondents), other rules are based on the preliminary consolidated edition (2007) (12 organisations/32% of the respondents) and the consolidated edition (2011) (7 organisations/19% of the respondents).

All 40 national libraries, rule-making bodies and cataloguing committees responded to the question how long their current cataloguing rules have been in use: 4 of the rules have been in use for less than one year, 6 of them 1 to 5 years, 5 of them 5 to 10 years, and 25 for more than 10 years³².

The organisations were asked whether they intend to continue to use their current rules, or whether they are considering changing to different rules. Eight national libraries (Australia, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Canada, Cyprus, New Zealand, Romania, Russia, United Kingdom)³³ and 4 rule-making bodies (Bulgaria, Spain)³⁴ intend to continue to use their current rules. The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec intends to complete the change to RDA (in 2014)³⁵. Twelve national libraries (Colombia³⁶, Czech Republic³⁷, Finland³⁸, France³⁹, Germany⁴⁰, Ireland⁴¹, Japan⁴², Latvia⁴³, Luxembourg⁴⁴, Philippines⁴⁵, South Africa⁴⁶, Switzerland⁴⁷), 2 rule-making bodies (France⁴⁸, Germany⁴⁹) and 1 cataloguing committee (Japan⁵⁰) are considering changing to different rules. Nine national libraries (Brazil,

³¹ There seems to be some ambiguity regarding the German cataloguing rules: Deutsche Nationalbibliothek indicated that RAK is partly based on the preliminary consolidated edition (2007), and HeBIS (a rule-making body) responded that RAK is based on one or more of the specialized ISBDs.

³² Organisations which have used their cataloguing rules for less than a year were asked, which rules they used previously. The question was also responded by some other institutions. AACR2 was used in most cases, earlier editions of specialized ISBDs in French translations were applied in the Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec.

³³ Four national libraries use RDA, 3 use ISBD directly, and 1 uses national cataloguing rules.

³⁴ Two rule-making bodies use ISBD, 1 uses national cataloguing rules (it is not clear which rules are applied by one rule-making body).

³⁵ No decision has been taken about changing away from DCRM(B).

³⁶ Change to RDA in 2015.

³⁷ Change to RDA.

³⁸ Change to RDA by 2016.

³⁹ »As a long term objective, the switch to RDA cataloguing will occur once a number of changes have been introduced in the code (about internationalization, implementation of the FRBR model) – date not yet scheduled; in the meantime, develop FRBRized French cataloguing rules, based on a combination of RDA, ISBD consolidated edition and current AFNOR cataloguing rules – by 2016 or 2017; in the short term, incorporate ISBD area 0 – early 2015.«

⁴⁰ Change to RDA in 2015.

⁴¹ It is likely that they will change to RDA for cataloguing all types of resources (RDA is already used for cataloguing printed monographs).

⁴² A new version of cataloguing rules (Nippon Cataloguing Rules) is being developed to comply with RDA. It is scheduled to be published in 2017.

⁴³ Change to RDA in 2016.

⁴⁴ Change to RDA after 2015.

⁴⁵ Change to RDA in 2015.

⁴⁶ Change to RDA in 2015.

⁴⁷ Change to RDA.

⁴⁸ See 26.

⁴⁹ Change to RDA in 2015.

⁵⁰ A new version of cataloguing rules (Nippon Cataloguing Rules) is being developed to comply with RDA, referring to the ISBD Consolidated Edition (2011). It is scheduled to be published in 2017.

China, Croatia, Denmark, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain), 1 rule-making body (Denmark) and 1 cataloguing committee (Bulgaria) have not decided yet to change the rules or not. The Bulgarian national library did not choose any of the three options.

The organisations were also asked whether they will incorporate the changes that have been made in the ISBD Consolidated Edition if they intend to continue with their current rules⁵¹. Seven national libraries (Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Cyprus, Russia, Spain, United Kingdom) and 3 rule-making bodies (Spain) intend to incorporate the changes, 4 national libraries responded negatively (Canada, Canada (Québec), Ireland and Philippines)⁵². The remaining 14 national libraries and rule-making bodies that responded to the question have not decided yet.

Among all the respondents 7 organisations said that they use RDA (for all or some types of resources), 8 use AACR2, and 16 use national cataloguing rules. Forty-two organisations (65%) responded that their current cataloguing rules have been in use for more than 10 years, 10 of the rules have been in use 1 to 5 years (15%), 7 of them for 5 to 10 years (11%) and 6 for less than one year (9%). Twenty-two organisations (34%) intend to continue to use their current rules, 18 organisations (28%) are considering changing to different rules, 18 organisations (28%) have not decided yet. The remaining 6 organisations (9%) did not choose any of the three options. Fifteen organisations (31%) that intend to continue with their current rules will incorporate the changes that have been made in the ISBD Consolidated Edition, 28 organisations (57%) have not decided yet. Only 6 organisations (12%) responded negatively.

1.4 ISBD namespace

Organisations were asked to indicate how familiar they are with the ISBD namespace (that is, ISBD in RDF for use in the Semantic Web). On the scale from 1 (never heard of it) to 5 (very familiar) 1 was indicated by 11 respondents (17%), 2 by 17 respondents (26%), 3 by 22 respondents (34%), 4 by 6 respondents (9%), and 5 by 9 respondents (14%).

Nine organisations (14%) use or intend to use the ISBD namespace, 41 organisations (64%) have not decided yet whether they will use it, and the remaining 14 organisations (22%) responded negatively⁵³.

Fifty-two organisations (83%) indicated that personally they do not know any project involving the ISBD namespace in their country, 11 organisations (17%) responded positively and gave information on the projects.

2 Translations

Thirty-five organisations (58%) said that the ISBD Consolidated Edition is available in their language. 20 organisations (33%) responded negatively, 5 organisations (8% of the respondents) did not know the answer⁵⁴.

Of the 28 organisations responding to the question on planning a translation of the Consolidated Edition, 12 organisations (43%) said that they do not know or the decision has not been taken yet. Five organisations (18%) indicated that a translation is in progress, 1 organisation (4%) responded that a translation has not started yet.

⁵¹ Twenty-eight national libraries, rule-making bodies and cataloguing committees responded to the question (not only the organisations that intend to continue with their current rules).

⁵² Of 4 national libraries which already use RDA 2 indicated that they intend to incorporate the changes that have been made in the ISBD Consolidated Edition (Australia and United Kingdom), 1 has not decided yet (New Zealand) and 1 responded negatively (Canada). The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec that uses RDA for some types of resources and will complete the change to RDA in 2014 also responded negatively.

⁵³ 64 organisations responded to the question.

⁵⁴ 60 organisations responded to the question.

Of the 18 organisations responding to the question why a translation of the Consolidated Edition is not planned, 7 organisations (35%) replied that they use the English version (even if they have a different national language), 4 organisations (20%) do not have enough resources available, and 6 organisations (30%) indicated a translation is not needed. One organisation indicated that it never thought about it.

Thirty-four organisations (62%) do not know whether a translation of the ISBD namespace into their language is planned or the decision has not been taken yet. Six organisations (11%) replied that a translation is in progress, while 2 organisations (4%) replied it is planned but not yet started.

3 Problems and expectations

Seven organisations (24%) said that they have problems with using the ISBD Consolidated Edition. Some of the problems were described in detail (e. g. area 0, multi-part publications etc.). The expectations and suggestions will be used in further development of ISBD.

Conclusion

Responses to the survey were received from all continents: 5 from South America (3 of them from Argentina), 3 from North America (all from Canada), 4 from Asia, 4 from Africa, 1 from Australia, 1 from New Zealand, and 47 from Europe (24 countries). There were no responses from several European national libraries (Italy, Sweden, Netherlands, Norway, Greece, Slovakia etc.); neither were there any from the United States.

The results of the survey show that ISBD is widely used now and that it is going to be used by a number of organisations in the future, too. Of 65 organisations that participated in the survey 36 (21 countries) use ISBD entirely or for some types of resources (55% of the respondents). Thirty-seven of the respondents (26 countries) said that their rules are entirely or partly based on ISBD (55%). Nine organisations (6 countries) that currently use ISBD, intend to use it in the future. Three organisations (3 countries) intend to give up ISBD in order to change to RDA. Fifteen organisations (11 countries) that entirely or partly use ISBD have not taken a decision yet. The changes that have been made in the ISBD Consolidated Edition will be incorporated in their cataloguing rules by 15 organisations in 11 countries (31%)⁵⁵. In Russia, they will continue to use their national rules, based on ISBD.

The responses to the survey will certainly be useful in further development of ISBD. There were many individual comments that will be taken into account as work progresses, and a more detailed report on the results of the survey will be prepared following the conference. The survey shows that ISBD is very important to many libraries in the world, and that IFLA has been serving a great need.

⁵⁵ 49 organisations responded to the question.

APPENDIX IV: ICP revision draft

International Cataloguing Principles

0. Introduction

The Statement of Principles –commonly known as the “Paris Principles”– was approved by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in 1961.⁵⁶ Its goal of serving as a basis for international standardization in cataloguing has certainly been achieved: most of the cataloguing codes that were developed worldwide since that time have followed the Principles strictly, or at least to a high degree.

Over fifty years later, having a common set of international cataloguing principles is still necessary as cataloguers and users around the world use online catalogues as search and discovery systems. At the beginning of the 21st century, an effort has been made by IFLA to produce a new statement of principles (published in 2009) that are applicable to online library catalogues and beyond. The current version has been reviewed and updated in 2014 [and 2015, and the final version discussed and approved during the XXst IFLA General Conference and Assembly].

The 2009 Statement of principles replaced and broadened the scope of the Paris Principles explicitly from just textual resources to all types of materials and from just the choice and form of entry to all aspects of bibliographic and authority data used in library catalogues. It included not only principles and objectives (i.e., functions of the catalogue), but also guiding rules that should be included in cataloguing codes internationally, as well as guidance on search and retrieval capabilities. The current text takes into consideration new categories of users, the open access issue, and features of discovery tools.

This statement covers:

1. Scope
2. General Principles
3. Entities, Attributes, and Relationships
4. Bibliographic Description
5. Access Points
6. Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue
7. Foundations for Search Capabilities

This statement builds on the great cataloguing traditions of the world,⁵⁷ and also on the conceptual model in the IFLA Functional Requirements family of conceptual models.⁵⁸

It is hoped this statement will increase the international sharing of bibliographic and authority data and guide cataloguing rule makers in their efforts.

⁵⁶ *International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (Paris : 1961). Report.* – London : International Federation of Library Associations, 1963, p. 91-96. Also available in: *Library Resources & Technical Services*, v. 6 (1962), p. 162-167; and *Statement of principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961.* – Annotated edition / with commentary and examples by Eva Verona. – London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971.

⁵⁷ Cutter, Charles A.: *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog.* 4th ed., rewritten. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing office. 1904,

Ranganathan, S.R.: *Heading and Canons.* Madras [India]: S. Viswanathan, 1955, and Lubetzky, Seymour. *Principles of Cataloging. Final Report. Phase I: Descriptive Cataloging.* Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California, Institute of Library Research, 1969.

⁵⁸ <<http://www.ifla.org/node/2016>>

1. Scope

The principles stated here are intended to guide the development of cataloguing codes and the cataloguers' decisions. They apply to bibliographic and authority data, and consequently to current library catalogues, bibliographies and other data files created by libraries.

They aim to provide a consistent approach to descriptive and subject cataloguing of bibliographic resources of all kinds.

2. General Principles

Several principles direct the construction of cataloguing codes.⁵⁹ The highest is the convenience of the user.⁶⁰

- 2.1. *Convenience of the user.* Convenience means that all efforts should be made to keep all data comprehensible and suitable for the users. The word “user” embraces anyone who searches the catalogue and uses the bibliographic and/or authority data. Decisions taken in the making of descriptions and controlled forms of names for access should be made with the user in mind.
- 2.2. *Common usage.* Vocabulary used in descriptions and access points should be in accord with that of the majority of users. For the exchange of data and the discovery tools, the use of vocabularies facilitating automatic translation and disambiguation is highly recommended.
- 2.3. *Representation.* A description should represent a resource as it appears. Controlled forms of names of persons, bodies and families should be based on the way an entity describes itself. If it is not ascertainable, the controlled form should be based on the form commonly used in reference sources. Controlled forms of work titles should be based on the form appearing on the first edition or on the form commonly used.
- 2.4. *Accuracy.* Bibliographic and authority data should be an accurate portrayal of the entity described.
- 2.5. *Sufficiency and necessity.* Only those data elements in descriptions and controlled forms of names required to facilitate access for all types of users, including those with specific needs, to fulfill the objectives and functions of the catalogue, to describe or to identify, should be included.
- 2.6. *Significance.* Data elements should be relevant and noteworthy to the description and allow for distinctions among entities.
- 2.7. *Economy.* When alternative ways exist to achieve a goal, preference should be given to the way that best furthers overall expediency and practicality (i.e., the least cost or the simplest approach).
- 2.8. *Consistency and standardization.* Descriptions and construction of access points should be standardized as far as possible to enable consistency.

⁵⁹ Based on bibliographic literature, especially that of Ranganathan and Leibniz as described in Svenonius, Elaine. *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000, p. 68. With regard to subject thesauri, there are additional principles that apply but are not yet included in this statement, as in *Principles Underlying Subject Heading Languages*. München : K. G. Saur, 1999.

⁶⁰ Principles 2.2 through 2.12 are in no particular order.

- 2.9. *Integration*. The descriptions for all types of materials and controlled forms of names of all types of entities should be based on a common set of rules to the extent possible.
- 2.10. *Interoperability*. All efforts should be made to ensure the sharing and reuse of bibliographic and authority data within and outside the library community.
- 2.11. *Openness*. Restrictions on data should be minimal in order to foster transparency and conform with Open Access principles expressed in the Glasgow Declaration on Libraries, Information Services and Intellectual Freedom.⁶¹ Any restriction to data access should be declared.
- 2.12. *Rationality*. The rules in a cataloguing code should be defensible and not arbitrary. If, in specific situations, the respect of all the principles is not applicable, then defensible, practical solutions should be taken and the rationale should be explicated.

3. Entities, Attributes, and Relationships

Cataloguing should take into account the entities, attributes, and relationships as defined in conceptual models of the bibliographic universe.⁶²

The entities are the key objects of interest to users in a particular domain. Each entity can be described by its primary characteristics, called attributes. The attributes of the entity serve also as the means by which users formulate queries and interpret responses when seeking information about a particular entity. The relationships explicate the connections between one type of entity and another type.

- 3.1. Entities: The following entities may be represented by bibliographic and authority data:

Work

Expression

Manifestation

Item⁶³

Person

Family

Corporate Body⁶⁴

Thema

Nomen.⁶⁵

⁶¹ <<http://www.ifla.org/publications/the-glasgow-declaration-on-libraries-information-services-and-intellectual-freedom>>.

⁶² The conceptual models taken in consideration are FRBR, FRAD and FRASAD, currently undergoing a harmonization process.

⁶³ Work, expression, manifestation, and item are the Group 1 entities described in the FRBR model.

⁶⁴ Person, family, and corporate body are the Group 2 entities described in the FRBR and FRAD models.

- 3.2. Attributes: The attributes that identify each entity should be used as data elements.
- 3.3. Relationships: Bibliographically significant relationships among the entities should be identified.

4. Bibliographic Description

- 4.1. In general, a separate bibliographic description should be created for each manifestation.
- 4.2. A bibliographic description typically should be based on the item as representative of the manifestation and may include attributes that pertain to the item and to the embodied work(s) and expression(s).
- 4.3. Descriptive data should be based on an internationally agreed standard. For the library community, this standard is the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD). When based on a national standard, all efforts should be made to provide open access to published mappings between the local and international standard, to foster better interoperability and accurate reuse of information.
- 4.4. Descriptions may be at several levels of completeness, depending on the purpose of the catalogue or bibliographic dataset. Information about the level of completeness should be conveyed to the user.

5. Access Points

5.1. General

Access points for retrieving bibliographic and authority data must be formulated following the principles (see 2. Principles). They may be controlled or uncontrolled.

- 5.1.1. Controlled access points should be provided for the authorized and variant forms of names for such entities as persons, families, corporate bodies, works, expressions, manifestations, items, and thema. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for collocating the bibliographic data for sets of resources.

5.1.1.1. Authority data should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names, nomen, variant forms of name, and identifiers used as access points.

- 5.1.2. Uncontrolled access points may be provided as bibliographic data for names, titles (e.g., the title proper as found on a manifestation), codes, keywords, etc., not controlled in authority data.

5.2. Choice of Access Points

- 5.2.1. Include as access points to bibliographic data the authorized access points for works and expressions (controlled) embodied in the resource,

⁶⁵ Thema and nomen are the entities described in the FRSAD model.

the title of the manifestation (usually uncontrolled), and the authorized access points for the creators of works.

5.2.1.1. Corporate body as creator: A corporate body should be considered as the creator of those works that express the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, or when the wording of the title, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work. This applies even if a person signs the work in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body.

5.2.2. Additional authorized access points for persons, families, corporate bodies, and subjects should be provided to bibliographic data, when deemed important for finding and identifying the bibliographic resource being described.

5.2.3. Include the authorized form of name for the entity, as well as the variant forms of name, as access points to authority data.

5.2.4. Additional access may be made through names of related entities.

5.3. Authorized Access Points

The authorized access point for the name of an entity should be recorded as authority data along with identifiers for the entity and variant forms of name. An authorized access point may be needed as a default display form.

5.3.1. Authorized access points must be constructed following a standard.

5.3.2. Language and Script of Authorized Access Points

5.3.2.1. When names have been expressed in several languages and/or scripts, preference for an authorized access point for the name should be given based on information found on manifestations of the work expressed in the original language and script;

5.3.2.1.1. If the original language and/or script is not normally used in the catalogue, the authorized access point may be based on forms found on manifestations or in reference sources in one of the languages and/or scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.

5.3.2.1.2. Access should be provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through a controlled access point, either the authorized form of name or a variant form of name.

5.3.2.2. If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversion should be followed.

5.3.3. Choice of Authorized Access Point

The name preferred as the authorized access point for an entity should be based on the name that identifies the entity in a consistent manner, either as most frequently found on manifestations or a well-accepted name suited to the users of the catalogue (e.g., 'conventional name') as found in reference sources.

5.3.3.1. Choice of Authorized Access Point for Person, Family, Corporate Body

If a person, family, or a corporate body uses variant names or variant forms of names, one name or one form of name should be chosen as the basis for the authorized access point for each distinct identity.

5.3.3.1.1. When variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and/or reference sources, and this variation is not based on different presentations of the same name (e.g., full and brief forms), preference should be given to:

5.3.3.1.1.1. a commonly known (or 'conventional') name rather than the official name, where this is indicated; or

5.3.3.1.1.2. the official name, where there is no indication of a commonly known or conventional name.

5.3.3.1.2. If a corporate body has used different names in successive periods that cannot be regarded as minor variations of one name, each entity identified by a significant name change should be considered a new entity. The corresponding authority data for each entity should be linked, usually by relating the earlier and later authorized forms of names for the corporate body.

5.3.3.2. Choice of Authorized Access Point for Work and Expression

When a work has multiple titles, one title should be preferred as the basis for the authorized access point for the work/expression.

5.3.4. Form of Name for Authorized Access Points

5.3.4.1. Form of Name for Persons

When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of first word for the authorized access point should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources.

5.3.4.2. Form of Name for Families

When the name of a family consists of several words, the choice of first word for the authorized access point should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that family, as found in manifestations or reference sources.

5.3.4.3. Form of Name for Corporate Bodies

For the authorized access point for a corporate body, the name should be given in direct order, as found in manifestations or reference sources, except:

- 5.3.4.3.1. when the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or territorial authority, the authorized access point should include the currently used form of the name of the territory concerned in the language and script best suited to the needs of the users of the catalogue;
- 5.3.4.3.2. when the corporate name implies subordination, or subordinate function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the authorized access point should begin with the name of the superior body.

5.3.4.4. Form of Name for Works/Expressions

An authorized access point for a work, expression, manifestation, or item may either be a title that can stand alone or it may be a title combined with the authorized access point for the creator(s) of the work.

5.3.4.5. Distinguishing among Names

If necessary, to distinguish an entity from others of the same name, further identifying characteristics should be included as part of the authorized access point for an entity. If desirable, the same identifying characteristics may be included as part of the variant forms of name.

5.4. Variant Names and Variant Forms of Name

Whatever name is chosen for the authorized access point, the variant names and variant forms of name should also be included for controlled access.

6. Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue⁶⁶

The catalogue should be an effective and efficient instrument that enables a user:

⁶⁶ 6.1-6.5 are based on: Svenonius, Elaine. *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.

- 6.1. to find bibliographic resources in a collection as the result of a search using attributes or relationships of the resources:
 - 6.1.1. to find a single resource
 - 6.1.2. to find sets of resources representing:
 - all resources belonging to the same work
 - all resources embodying the same expression
 - all resources exemplifying the same manifestation
 - all resources associated with a given person, family, or corporate body
 - all resources on a given thema
 - all resources defined by other criteria (language, place of publication, publication date, content form, media type, carrier type, etc.), usually as a secondary limiting of a search result;
- 6.2. to identify a bibliographic resource or agent (that is, to confirm that the described entity corresponds to the entity sought or to distinguish between two or more entities with similar characteristics);
- 6.3. to select a bibliographic resource that is appropriate to the user's needs (that is, to choose a resource that meets the user's requirements with respect to medium, content, carrier, etc., or to reject a resource as being inappropriate to the user's needs);
- 6.4. to acquire or obtain access to an item described (that is, to provide information that will enable the user to acquire an item through purchase, loan, etc., or to access an item electronically through an online connection to a remote source); or to access, acquire, or obtain authority data or bibliographic data;
- 6.5. to navigate within a catalogue and beyond (that is, through the logical arrangement of bibliographic and authority data and presentation of clear ways to move about, including presentation of relationships among works, expressions, manifestations, items, persons, families, corporate bodies and thema).

7. Foundations for Search Capabilities

7.1. Searching

Access points are the elements of bibliographic and authority records that 1) provide reliable retrieval of bibliographic and authority records and their associated bibliographic resources and 2) collocate search results.

7.1.1. Searching Devices

Names, nomen, and titles should be searchable and retrievable by means of any device available in the given library catalogue or bibliographic file (by full forms of names, by keywords, by phrases, by truncation, by identifiers, etc.). Data should be open and searchable even by non-library devices in order to increase interoperability and reuse.

7.1.2. Essential Access Points

Essential access points are those based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in a bibliographic description.

7.1.2.1. Essential access points in bibliographic data include:

- authorized access point for the name of the creator or first named creator of the work when more than one is named
- authorized access point for the work/expression (this may include the authorized access point for the creator)
- title proper or supplied title for the manifestation
- year(s) of publication or issuance of the manifestation
- controlled nomen and/or classification numbers for the work
- standard numbers, identifiers, and 'key titles' for the described entity.

7.1.2.2. Essential access points in authority data include:

- authorized name or title of the entity identifiers for the entity
- variant names and variant forms of name or title for the entity.
- nomen and variant nomen

7.1.3. Additional Access Points

Other attributes from bibliographic data or authority data may serve as optional access points or as filtering or limiting devices for a search.

7.1.3.1. Such attributes in bibliographic data include, but are not limited to:

- names of creators beyond the first
- names of persons, families, or corporate bodies in roles other than creator (e.g., performers)
- variant titles (e.g., parallel titles, caption titles)
- authorized access point for the series
- bibliographic data identifiers
- language of the expression embodied in the manifestation
- place of publication
- content form
- media type
- carrier type.

7.1.3.2. Such attributes in authority data include, but are not limited to:

- names or titles of related entities

authority data identifiers.

7.2. Retrieval

When searching retrieves several bibliographic records with the same access point, results should be displayed in some logical order convenient to the catalogue user, preferably according to a standard relevant to the language and script of the access point. The user should be able to choose among different criteria: date of publication, alphabetical order, relevance ranking, etc.

When possible, preference should be given to a display showing entities and relationships among them.

APPENDIX V: ICP Task Group revision report 2013-2014

I. Members:

María Violeta Bertolini, Robert L. Bothmann, Elena Escolano Rodríguez, Agnese Galeffi (chair) and Dorothy McGarry.

II. Revision process

According to the Report in 2013 at Cataloguing Section meeting in Singapore http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/reports/meeting_2013.pdf during the conference the Objects of the revision were delimited and recorded in the ICP Revision Project for 2013-2014.

The ICP text has been revised according with these mandates, the main issues to highlight are the following:

- the ICP structure has been kept for good: a long discussion happened about the evidence that the ICP doesn't refer just to principles.
- The sections sequence has been modified (former section 4. *Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue* is now section 6).
- In the 0. *Introduction* current revision is mentioned.
- The mention of the International Cataloguing Code has been removed.
- Editorial work has been undertaken in order to clarify that the ICP audience is the library community and not the museum or archival ones.
- Many definitions of principles have been extended.
- New principles (Interoperability, Openness and Rationality) have been added to the section 2.
- Use of terms as *code*, *catalogues*, *opac* have been revised using other broader terms more updated that comprise extended forms of collocated bibliographic information.
- The word *record* has been modified in *data*.
- The words *concept*, *object*, *event* and *place* have been replaced by *thema* and *nomen*, according to FRSAD. The ongoing harmonization process of FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD is mentioned.
- In the section *Bibliographic Description* the mention of ISBD as descriptive standard for the library community has been added.
- Section 7. *Foundations for Search Capabilities* has been extended.
- Bibliography has been updated.

III. Next steps

Necessary revision by other Sections and groups, at least:

- Classification and Indexing Section
- FRBR Review Group, especially to revise consistent use of terms *Nomen* and *Thema*
- Namespace Task Group

- Information Technology Section

Following this revisions and after accommodating comments, a World Wide Review should be undertaken due that the previous International Cataloguing Principles were agreed internationally by a set of IME ICC.

No face-to-face meeting to arrive together to the final agreement has been necessary.

Respectfully submitted by the ICP Task Group

APPENDIX VI: Project proposal: Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Headings for Latin American Literatures

Prepared by: Maria Violeta Bertolini

Introduction

Until 2014, the IFLA Cataloguing Section has published five lists for anonymous classics. The first two are now out of print but the more recent three are available in IFLA Cataloguing Section's website:

- *Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Headings for European Literatures*, 2nd edition revised, 2004.
- *Anonymous Classics: African Literatures: Epics and Assimilated*, draft, 2005.
- *Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Titles for Chinese Works*, 2011.
- *Anonymous classics: a list of uniform headings for European literatures*, 1978.
- *Liste internationale de vedettes uniformes pour les classiques anonymes = International list of uniform headings for anonymous classics*, 1964.

During the Cataloguing Section Standing Committee meetings in Singapore, in August 2013, I was asked to formulate an outline and proposal for creating a list of uniform headings for anonymous classics of Latin American Literatures. This topic is particularly relevant in the context of the Universal Bibliographic Control, theme for the Open Session of the Cataloguing, Classification and Indexing, and Bibliography sections and UNIMARC Core Activity, at IFLA WLIC 2014. The identification of works it is also very important in order to facilitate any initiatives based in Authority control, FRBR Models and Linked Data, and also any future possible implementation of RDA in Latin America.

This proposal aims at resuming a list of Latin-American works including pre-colombian and anonymous works of the first time of the colonial period. There is a draft according to the anonymous classics report⁶⁷ prepared by Françoise Leresche:

"Anonymous classics – Pre-Columbian literature (Central American): The draft is established. The part concerning the “Quiché” works has been approved by Guatemala. The parts concerning the Maya, Nahuatl and Quichua works are to be validated by the countries concerned. Nadine Boddaert has got contacts with some colleagues in these countries”.

Thus, the idea is to continue and extend this list with collaboration of national libraries and cataloguing agencies from the region.

Proposal of actions for 2014-2015:

1. Discuss this proposal in IFLA Cataloguing Section's SC meeting in Lyon, August 2014.

⁶⁷ Leresche, Françoise. *Anonymous Classics: Report of activities, 2010-2011*. IFLA Cataloguing Section.

2. Invite members of the Cataloguing Section SC, Bibliography Section SC and LAC SC Section interested in contributing with this project. If there are any volunteers create a small working group for this task.
3. Right after the WLIC, the WG will contact [Asociación de Estados Iberoamericanos para el Desarrollo de las Bibliotecas Nacionales de Iberoamérica \(ABINIA\)](#) informing about this compilation and requesting their partnership to foster participation of national libraries and cataloguing agencies from Latin America.
4. The WG will request the update of Anonymous classics section in IFLA Cataloguing Section's webpage including the current project and contact information to facilitate the submission of contributions from national libraries.
5. With support of ABINIA and IFLA Cataloguing Section, the WG will contact all cataloguing departments of each of the national libraries or cataloguing agencies from the following countries, associated to ABINIA: **Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Dominica Republic, Uruguay, and Venezuela.**
6. The WG will send to each of the national libraries an email with a template and instructions regarding content and format of the requested contributions that will have a **due date of 6 months from the date of receipt**. The WG will answer any questions they may have and follow up every two months.

The template will consist in a table headed by contact information from the contributing agency, and followed by a list of the selected works including the following data, when available: title, language, short definition (literary form, date/century of composition or of the oldest version known, etc.), variant of the title, parallel form of the title in another language for the same work, version of the work in another language, reference to a whole, reference to a part, supposed author, and any other comments.

7. The WG will gather and collect all contributions, organize them based on languages, identify duplicates and contacting the national libraries for any needed clarification.
8. The WG will create a draft and send it to be reviewed by the contributing institutions. The WG will then collect and incorporate all comments.
9. The WG will send a reviewed draft to IFLA Cataloguing Standing Committee members, and collect and incorporate all comments.
10. The IFLA Cataloguing Section will publish first edition of *Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Headings for Latin American Literatures*.

Estimated date of completion (EDC): **December 2015**

Criteria for the selection of the works

The criteria for the selection of works listed and for the establishment of their headings will be based in the previous lists published, especially the most recent one for Chinese works, in order to have consistency among all the IFLA Anonymous Classics lists.

List by language

As in the previous editions, the lists will be established by language and not by country. One list can be common to several countries and one country can be represented over several lists corresponding to several distinct literatures in distinct languages (Spanish, Portuguese, Quechua, Mayan languages, Guaraní, French, Aymara, Nahuatl, Italian). A source that can be used to identify the multiple languages of Latin America is the *Atlas sociolingüístico de pueblos indígenas en América Latina*⁶⁸ published in 2011 by UNICEF and FUPROEIB Andes with the support of the Agencia Española para la Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo (AECID) and other authoritative sources available online⁶⁹.

The anonymous classics that will be listed are:

- Texts from the **Pre-Columbian period and anonymous works of the first time of the colonial period**.
- Texts of unknown, legendary or dubious authorship
- Literary works, religious texts when they are the first in a vernacular language (excluding liturgical works of Christian churches and edition of biblical books which require special rules)
- Anonymous classics without variants or equivalent versions in other literatures are included to present a complete list of each literature.

Form of the uniform heading

The uniform heading will be chosen with preference being given to the title most frequently used in editions of the work, or, failing this, to a commonly used and often shortened title.

Definition of the work

If possible the list will give for each work a short definition (literary form, date/century of composition or of the oldest version known, etc.) to facilitate identification and help to distinguish eventual homonymous works.

Symbols used

The symbols used will be those recommended by the [Guidelines for authority records and references](#) and used in the previous list:

- < variant of the title
- << reference to a whole

⁶⁸ *Atlas sociolingüístico de pueblos indígenas en América Latina. Tomo 1:* http://www.unicef.org/honduras/tomo_1_atlas.pdf y *Tomo 2:* http://www.unicef.org/honduras/tomo_2_atlas.pdf

⁶⁹ *The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America:* http://www.ailla.utexas.org/site/lg_about.html

- >> reference to a part
- >> << version of the work in another language
- = parallel form of the title in another language for the same work

Variants of the title of a work

The variants of the title of a work or of another version in the original language are listed as excluded forms.

Versions in other literatures

Equivalent uniform headings for the versions of a work in another literature are provided, only when the work is listed somewhere in this document, it is preceded by the sign >> << (Cf. supra). Their inclusion is recognition that a particular anonymous classic may be part of several literatures as another version or adaptation and cannot be assigned easily to the literary heritage of one country and/or literature.

Language codes

The languages will be indicated according to [ISO 639-3 character codes](#).

Supposed author

When a work is attributed to an author – wrongly or not – the indication of the author's name will be given, as provided by the experts, but the qualifiers will be in English. For headings of personal names, each user will refer to national standards and authority files.

Index

At the end of the publication, an index of all titles including variants and supposed authors cited will be provided "**INDEX OF TITLES AND SUPPOSED AUTHORS**".

The index will list all titles cited in the publication, including variants, translations, etc. and supposed authors. The filing arrangements will follow those used in previous lists in order to achieve consistency in a multi-language context, as follows:

- a) entries are filed word by word;
- b) modifications to letters, accents, diacritical marks, etc. are ignored;
- c) combined Roman alphabet letters are treated as if they were not combined.
- d) abbreviations are filed as given.

Bibliography

- IFLA Cataloguing Section. (2004). [Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Headings for European Literatures](#). 2nd edition revised.

- IFLA Cataloguing Section. (2005). [Anonymous Classics: African Literatures: Epics and Assimilated.](#) Draft.
- IFLA Cataloguing Section. (2011). [Anonymous Classics: A List of Uniform Titles for Chinese Works.](#)
- IFLA Cataloguing Section. [Anonymous classics.](#)
- Leresche, Françoise. (2011). [Report of activities, 2009-2010](#)
- Leresche, Françoise. (2012). [Report of activities, 2010-2011](#)

APPENDIX VII: Report on the ALA CC:DA, ALA Midwinter Conference 2014

Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Midwinter Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 2014 January 25 and 27

Submitted to the Standing Committee of the IFLA Cataloguing Section by the IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

The American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met at the ALA Midwinter Conference in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, on Saturday 2014 January 25, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2014 January 27, 8:30-11:30 A.M. The full agenda is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?tag=agenda>.

CC:DA Chair Mr. Peter Rolla (Harvard University) reported on motions and other actions taken by CC:DA between July and December 2013 (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/chair201401.pdf>). Future official minutes of CC:DA meetings will be less detailed but more timely than in the past, with a focus on summaries of discussions and actions rather than near-transcriptions. Past minutes are available at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?tag=minutes>.

Library of Congress (LC) Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/LC201401.pdf>). Some of the highlights of his report:

- Mr. Tom Yee, acting chief of both Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the Asian and the Middle Eastern Division (ASME), retired on 2014 January 3. Mr. Beacher Wiggins, director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA), will serve as acting chief of PSD, and Ms. Angela Kinney, chief of the African, Latin American, and Western European Division, is serving as acting chief of ASME until the chief's position can be permanently filled.
- After an active year of experimentation with the high level model for the New Bibliographic Framework (BIBFRAME), *Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services* (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/news/bibframe-112312.html>) published by the Library in November 2012 and working with a group of "Early Experimenters" (George Washington University, National Library of Medicine, Princeton University, OCLC, British Library, and Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, in addition to LC), a new phase of the project has begun. This phase, scheduled to last a year, is for test implementation by organizations in the community. The testers will use the vocabulary that is published on the BIBFRAME site (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition>) and experiment with the model against various environments, exchanging issues and information. This group will be open to all who show that they are actually engaging in test implementations.

- The RDA Toolkit release in July 2013 contained 83 updates (new, deleted, and revised) to the Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements (LC-PCC PSs). Due to the closure of the U.S. federal government for sixteen days in October 2013, the planned November 2013 update of the policy statements had to be postponed. Those updates were published in the 2014 February 11 release of the RDA Toolkit.
- The pace of Romanization table development during 2013 was much slower than in 2012. During 2013, four revision proposals and four new tables were approved, and two new tables and three revision proposals are in varying stages of development:
 - Revisions to the Urdu, Pushto, and Sindhi tables, along with a new Tamashek table, were approved by ALA's Committee on Cataloging: African and Asian Materials (CC:AAM).
 - A proposed Coptic table is currently being reviewed by CC:AAM.
 - New Macedonian, Rusyn, and Serbian tables are approved by CC:DA. The Macedonian and Serbian tables were developed from the former combined Serbian-Macedonian table.
 - Revisions to the Bulgarian table were also approved by CC:DA.

Other tables in various stages of development include Tibetan (revision proposal based on Wylie transliteration scheme being developed by Ms. Luran Hartley (Columbia University); no target date has been identified); revision proposals for Mongolian and Uighur, initially submitted by Mr. Wayne Richter (Western Washington University) in 1998 and 1999 respectively, need additional editorial work and are awaiting automation support. A new table for Romanian (Cyrillic) is in the early review stages. All current ALA-LC Romanization tables are available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cps/roman.html>.

- LC and OCLC have signed an agreement to facilitate navigation between *Cataloger's Desktop* and *WebDewey*. When development underway in both organizations is completed, subscribers who classify materials using the Dewey Decimal Classification system will find it much easier to navigate among their cataloging documentation resources.

New ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), reported on the JSC meeting, 2013 November 4-8, and other JSC activities between July and December 2013. Her report is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/jsc201401.pdf>. Mr. Gordon Dunsire succeeded Ms. Barbara Tillett (LC) as the new JSC chair. Future JSC proposals will include a brief abstract to help the community understand the actions. Work on *Essential RDA*, a condensed companion to RDA with core elements and basic instructions, is underway.

Five proposals from Ms. Glennan were considered:

- "Revision of RDA 2.12.9.2 and 2.12.17.2: Source of numbering within series and subseries" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp->

[content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201301.pdf](http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201301.pdf)), strongly supported by the Continuing Resources community, was passed and will be proposed to the JSC.

- “Problems with RDA 3.4.5.9, Leaves or Pages of Plates” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201302.pdf>) will be fed into the ongoing work of the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data after the contradiction between the first and final paragraphs of the instruction are reconciled.
- “Revision of RDA 9.19 to address placement of instructions regarding ‘Spirit’” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201303.pdf>) will await the outcome of the April 2014 RDA update.
- “Core elements in Distribution and Manufacture Statements: What constitutes ‘applicable and readily ascertainable?’” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201304.pdf>) tries to solve the so-called “cascading vortex of horror” (Cornell University’s coinage) that results from some strict interpretations of RDA 1.3 and 2.8 through 2.11, regarding the Core status of publication, distribution, manufacture, and copyright statements. A small group was formed to refine the proposal according to the CC:DA discussion, and a larger task force will be created if needed.
- “Date of Production and Date of Manufacture elements: Should a priority order be provided to prefer data in the resource itself first?” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JSCrepGlennan201305.pdf>) suggests that archival practices should be taken into account for dates of manufacture and dates of production, paralleling RDA’s treatment of dates of publication and distribution.

The Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data reports that work is to be resumed on the RDA-ONIX Framework. In addition to the aforementioned “Problems with RDA 3.4.5.9, Leaves or Pages of Plates,” work on recording durations will also be harmonized with the work of this task force.

New JSC Chair Mr. Dunsire presented “RDA for Machines,” breaking down base content and base carrier categories into sets of attributes and analyzing their relationships.

Mr. John Myers (Union College), the CC:DA Liaison to the new MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), reported on the activities of the MAC. Because my OCLC colleague Mr. Rich Greene was unable to attend the conference, however, I represented OCLC in his stead at these first-ever meetings of the reconstituted Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI). My report follows. The meeting agenda can be found at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2014_age.html.

MARC Advisory Committee Report, ALA Midwinter Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2014 January 25 and 26

Here is a bit of historical background on MAC from its Web site

(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/advisory.html>): "From 1973-2013, the MARC Advisory Committee included the MARBI (Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee), an interdivisional committee of the American Library Association (ALA). Semiannual MARBI meetings were held at ALA conferences,

where proposed changes to the MARC formats were reviewed, evaluated, and voted on by MARBI members, with non-MARBI members of the MARC Advisory Committee serving an informational role. When MARBI ceased to exist in 2013, the MARC Advisory Committee took on the responsibility of continuing MARBI's mission to foster open discussion about the MARC standard and to review and vote on proposed changes to the MARC formats at the semiannual ALA conferences." In contrast to MARBI, all members of MAC (described as representatives of "national libraries, bibliographic utilities, and representatives of general MARC 21 users and specialist communities) are eligible to vote.

Mr. Matthew Wise (New York University) presided over the two meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee on 2014 January 25 and 26. The MAC reports to the MARC Steering Group, which consists of the Library of Congress, the British Library, Library and Archives Canada, and the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

Minutes of MAC meetings will consist of brief summaries of discussion and outcomes rather than the meticulously detailed back-and-forth accounts that have long been a MARBI tradition.

Mr. John Zagas (Library of Congress) reported that the MARC Concise documents will no longer be made available in printed form or as PDFs.

Ms. Sally McCallum (Library of Congress) noted that she was responsible for writing the "BibFrame Discussion" sections of the current proposals and discussion papers. In those sections, she has been attempting to look forward to a post-MARC world, hoping that the discussions may prove useful. In the case of this particular set of BibFrame Discussions, they were written just before the vocabulary was stabilized, and some things have actually changed between mid-December 2013 and mid-January 2014.

Here are the outcomes of the three proposals and four discussion papers:

- Proposal 2014-01: Defining Indicator Values for Field 588 Source of Description Note in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-01.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes defining the first indicator position of the 588 field as a display constant controller to facilitate the correct creation of the captions to the note and enable the data in the field to be treated more as a data element that could be readily mapped to other formats or used for other purposes.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. OCLC's Mr. Robert Bremer's findings about the huge variations in phrasings were cited. LC will harmonize the text of the Input Conventions with those of similar cases to make the use of either numeric First Indicator less proscriptive. A desire was expressed for the conversion of existing data to the extent possible.

- Proposal 2014-02: Making Subfield \$c (Location of meeting) Repeatable in Fields X10 and X11 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format and Fields X10 and X11 of the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-02.html>).

SUMMARY: Recording multiple location names in relation to conferences is sometimes needed (e.g., RDA 11.13.1.8). Subfield \$c (Location of meeting) is currently not repeatable in fields 110, 111, 610, 611, 710, 711, 810 and 811 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format and fields 110, 111, 410, 411, 510, 511,

710 and 711 of the MARC 21 Authority Format. Catalogers are instructed to record multiple adjacent locations in a single \$c subfield, which does not support optimal machine parsing of the data, potentially impeding identification and retrieval activities.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. AACR2 practice specified that "and" separate multiple place names. RDA Appendix E.1.2.4 specifies that multiple locations be separated by a semicolon, although best practices are still pending.

- Proposal 2014-03: Renaming and Redefining 347 \$f (Transmission speed) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-03.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes renaming and redefining 347 \$f to reflect the changes which have taken place in the equivalent RDA sub-element.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. According to WorldCat statistics from 2014 January 1, there are 165 occurrences of field 347 subfield \$f in Bibliographic records.

- Discussion Paper 2014-DP01: Designation in MARC that a Bibliographic Resource Intended for Publication Has Never Been Published (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp01.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper discusses a way to designate in a MARC bibliographic record that a bibliographic resource has never been published.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. Rather than any of the three options outlined in the paper, however, the British Library's suggestion of using the existing field 366, Trade Availability Information (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd366.html>), was enthusiastically embraced. In particular, the subfield \$c, Availability Status Code, and its specification of the ONIX Product Availability Codes (http://www.editeur.org/files/ONIX%20for%20books%20-%20code%20lists/ONIX_BookProduct_CodeLists_Issue_24.pdf) in subfield \$2 were seen as already dealing with this exact situation. Additionally, the 366 solution may be able to take advantage of any automated processing of ONIX data already in place. Several of the ONIX lists (including 54, Availability Status Code; 64, Publishing Status; and 65, Product Availability) provide promising codes for this purpose.

- Discussion Paper 2014-DP02: Relationships Between Subject Headings from Different Thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp02.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper discusses a way to designate relationships between entries of different thesauri in a MARC authority record.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. There was general support for this as an idea looking forward to a Linked Data future. In that spirit, the notion of using subfield \$8 (as in Example 5.2) to associate multiple headings that needed to be in conjunction with each other got some attention. There was corresponding concern about the ability to keep this sort of data current in MARC records.

- Discussion Paper 2014-DP03: "Miscellaneous information" in Topical Term Fields and Geographic Name Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp03.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper discusses a way to designate "miscellaneous information" in topical term fields and geographic name fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. In addition, the paper discusses the repeatability of subfield \$g "Miscellaneous information" in fields where it is already defined.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. In the X50 and X51 fields, it appears that there is no other usable subfield available. The idea promoted in this paper implies a serious change of current coding practice, Mr. John Attig (Pennsylvania State University) pointed out, for instance separately subfielding now-unsubfielded parenthetical qualifiers. That is unlikely. The proposal will extend this use of subfield \$g to several fields where it is not currently available and making it repeatable in most or all cases. According to WorldCat statistics from 2014 January 1, there are 129 occurrences of field 650 subfield \$g in Bibliographic records.

- Discussion Paper 2014-DP04: Recording RDA Relationship Designators in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp04.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper presents options for recording RDA relationship designators in the Bibliographic and Authority formats to ensure that user-friendly versions of the designators will be available for public display.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper was resolved in a manner that does not require a formal proposal. JSC Chair Mr. Gordon Dunsire noted that the JSC is seriously studying Relationship Designators during 2014. Its findings may very well obviate the need for any further action. Strong sentiment was voiced in most quarters for Option 1 ("Issue RDA best practices for display text and rely on existing MARC 21 coding"), which would eliminate the unfriendly (and to users, mysterious) parenthetical qualifiers from Relationship Designators. Because the issue would be dealt with via best practices and existing coding, no proposal was deemed to be necessary.

Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) reported on the activities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/PCC201401.pdf>). Among her points:

- The end date for AACR2 cataloging in the PCC is 2014 December 31, after which point all new BIBCO and CONSER cataloging must follow RDA in order to be coded PCC.
- As of November 2013, undifferentiated personal names (Authority 008/32 code "b") are no longer being created, in accordance with the "PCC Post RDA Test Guidelines" (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/PCC%20Post%20RDA%20Test%20Guidelines.html>). Instead, the provisions of RDA 9.19 and its LC-PCC PSs will be followed to create a unique authorized access point.

- The report of the Task Group on Microform Reproductions will be ready for public review soon. It favors allowing the status quo of AACR2 treatment of most reproduction to continue.
- The rare materials community has asked the PCC Standing Committee on Standards to incorporate the new *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics)* (DCRM(G)) (<http://rbms.info/dcrm/dcrmg/>) into the BIBCO Standard Record (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.docx>).

Mr. James Hennelly is the new representative from ALA Publishing Services, who reported that Fiscal Year 2013 turned out well for RDA, with a steady growth of subscriptions up 115% to some 8400 users. Growth has continued into the current Fiscal Year 2014. Through December 2013, the renewal rate was 95%. About 30% of users are non-U.S. In 2013, the print RDA sold 387 copies. Pricing for RDA has been restructured to make it more affordable to smaller institutions. The *RDA Toolkit* now allows a quick switch among the English, French, and German versions as well as a dual-pane option for side-by-side comparisons of the texts. National Library of Australia Policy Statements are to be part of the February 2014 update. The projected August 2014 update may be delayed to accommodate major revisions of the French and German versions and the possible addition of the Spanish version. A Finnish version is expected later. Mr. Thomas Brenndorfer (Guelph Public Library, Ontario, Canada) has been contracted to write *Essential RDA*, which will be the RDA analogue to *Concise AACR2*. The Music Library Association's best practices for RDA will eventually be incorporated into the *RDA Toolkit*.

CC:DA Webmaster Ms. Melanie Polutta (LC) will step down at the end of her current term in June 2014.

The JSC Places Working Group has several members in common with the CC:DA Task Force on Place Names, so coordination between the groups should be easy. Both groups will co-exist for the time being. The JSC Group will try to harmonize all RDA areas that touch upon place names in time for the November 2014 JSC meeting.

Since ALA Annual in June 2013, work has continued on the joint effort of the Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee's Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee (MLA/BCC/DCS) and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers' RDA Revisions Task Force (OLAC) "Discussion paper on the inconsistency between the Statement of Responsibility element in Chapter 2 and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter, and Artistic and/or Technical Credit elements in Chapter 7" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/mla2013-1.pdf>). In time for ALA Annual in June 2014, MLA's Ms. Tracey Snyder (Cornell University) and OLAC's Ms. Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon) will propose changes to RDA 2.4.1.1 to remove references to RDA Chapter 7, add text early in RDA Chapter 7 to allow artistic/technical credits, and make related alterations that will clarify the relationship between transcribed statement of responsibility elements (such as field 245 subfield \$c) and recorded statement of responsibility elements (such as fields 508 and 511).

In an attempt to make RDA's treatment of duration more consistent, Ms. Snyder and Ms. McGrath also presented the paper "RDA 7.22 (Duration): Discussion of possible approach to revision in 2014" (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/mla201401.pdf>). Also in time for ALA Annual in June 2014, they will propose changes to add the detail found in RDA 7.22.1.3 into RDA 7.22.1.4 through 7.22.1.6. This work will also be coordinated

with, and possibly folded into, the work of the Extent of Expression Task Force and the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data, as appropriate.

An updated version of the “Fast track proposal to change certain terms in RDA Appendix J” (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Appendix-J-proposal-rev.pdf>) is pending. It will revise some Relationship Designators, move some to different categories, and attempt to establish some consistent linguistic patterns in RD construction, where possible. The CC:DA meetings at ALA Annual in June 2014 will be Mr. Rolla’s final as chair.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist, WorldCat Quality Management Division,

OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2014 February 7

APPENDIX VIII: Report on the ALA CC:DA, ALA Annual Conference 2014

Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, 2014 June 28 and 30

Report on the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ALA Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, 2014 June 28 and 30

Submitted to the Standing Committee of the IFLA Cataloguing Section by the IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

The American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met at the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, on Saturday 2014 June 28, 1:00-5:30 P.M.; and Monday 2014 June 30, 8:30-11:30 A.M. The full agenda is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?tag=agenda>.

CC:DA Chair Mr. Peter Rolla (University of California, San Diego) reported on motions and other actions taken by CC:DA between February and June 2014

(<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/chair20140601.pdf>). These CC:DA meetings in June 2014 are the last in Mr. Rolla's term as chair. At the end of these meetings, he was succeeded by Mr. Robert Rendall (Columbia University).

Library of Congress (LC) Representative Mr. David Reser reported on activities and news from LC (<http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/LC201406.pdf>). Some of the highlights of his report:

- The *Cataloger's Desktop* user interface is to be overhauled and simplified in mid-September 2014.
- The *RDA Toolkit* had releases in February and April 2014, including 28 and 62 new, deleted, or revised Library of Congress/Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements (LC/PCC PSs), respectively. The next update to the PSs will be in October 2014. The August 2014 release of the *Toolkit* contains no changes to the PSs or to the English text of RDA; it will be devoted exclusively to an update of the German text and the addition of policy statements from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB).
- The National Library of Malaysia has asked LC and the PCC to follow the alternative passed by CC:DA for RDA 16.2.2.12, which includes both state and country name as part of local place names for Malaysia.
- The Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BFI), known as BIBFRAME, has moved into its test implementation phase, including testing of the editor interface.
- Two new ALA-LC Romanization Tables have been approved so far during 2014, Coptic and Romanian (Cyrillic script). Corrections and revisions have been made to the Malayalam and Non-Slavic Language tables. Three tables are in various stages of revision:

- Tibetan: The revision proposal based on the Wylie transliteration scheme being developed by Ms. Lauran Hartley (Columbia University) is expected to be submitted to LC by 2014 August 1.
- Uighur: The revision proposal, initially submitted by Mr. Wayne Richter (Western Washington University) in 1999, is expected to be ready in early July 2014.
- Mongolian: The revision proposal, initially submitted by Mr. Richter in 1998, needs additional editorial work and does not have a target completion date at this point.

All current ALA-LC Romanization Tables are available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/roman.html>.

ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Ms. Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), reported on JSC activities between January and June 2014. Her full report is at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/KPG201408.pdf>. Three new working groups have been created: the JSC Places Working Group, the JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group, and the JSC Technical Working Group. The existing JSC Music Working Group was “refreshed” and the RDA Examples Group 3 was dissolved in favor of having an Examples Editor, Ms. Kate James (LC). A draft set of principles and guidelines for RDA examples is currently under review.

There was follow-up on two proposals originally presented at the CC:DA Midwinter meetings in January 2014:

- Clarifying Instructions for Sequences of Plates (RDA 3.4.5.9): The base instruction is to record plates if they are unnumbered or if they are referred to in a note. It also clarifies the definition of “plate” beyond the definition in the current proposal (see the CC:DA blog at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=1058>), without the word “text.” The entire “If/and/then” sequence in the proposal for 3.4.5.9 was deleted, so that the revision begins with “Record the sequence” An example of a note will be added, illustrating a case where the number of figures does not correspond to number of plates (physical leaves). Ms. Glennan will do a final pass on this proposal because of the extent of editorial changes and CC:DA will vote on it during coming weeks.
- Clarifying core element status for “not identified” elements in the Distribution and Manufacture Statements (RDA 2.9 and 2.10): This has come to known as the “Cascading Vortex of Horror.” Any unknown publication element must be included because it is RDA Core, but following elements may be omitted. This is the single place in RDA where we are purposely told to record that something is not found. Mr. Reser raised questions concerning the continued efficacy of “Core If.” (In the case of published resources, place, publisher, and date are core, and all three are needed if one or more are present.) The proposal’s “Background” statement will be expanded to include some of the CC:DA discussion for JSC consideration to consider changes to “Core” and “Core If.” The proposal was approved to send forward to the JSC.

The Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data did not meet its goal of creating a discussion paper on a machine-actionable model for complex extent in time for this meeting. The group

is examining the RDA/ONIX Framework's terms of extent and analyzing whether they are content or carrier attributes, and is nearly ready to hand this off to the related JSC group. Ms. Diane Hillman (Metadata Management Associates) is working on simplifying the excellent spreadsheet compiled by Mr. Francis Lapka (Yale University) on this. The group hopes to submit a discussion paper in time for ALA Annual in January 2015.

A discussion paper on "Production Statement (RDA 2.7) Transcription Guidelines" wants to treat the production statement much differently than publication, distribution, and manufacture statements because of the significantly different purpose that the production statement serves for unpublished resources. This will require considerable reworking of the current instructions in RDA 2.7. This paper, which will be considered in the context of the related British Library paper in progress, moves closer to the practices of *Cataloging Cultural Objects* (CCO), relying less on transcription (although not as extremely as does CCO). DCRM(M) talks about recording what is accurate, and only then transcribing what is on an unpublished resource. This paper will serve as the basis of a discussion paper to be forwarded to the JSC and may potentially lead as well to future related work for unpublished resources regarding title, at least. CC:DA voted to authorize Ms. Glennan to create the JSC discussion paper.

Three proposals from the Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee (MLA-BCC) and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers Cataloging Policy Committee (OLAC-CAPC) were discussed:

- The paper "Addition of New Chapter 3 Elements for Optical Disc Physical Standard, Optical Disc Recording Method, and Optical Disc Content Type" tries to account for technical aspects of optical discs that are currently missing but that can be determined and understood by generalists and be helpful for users:
 - Optical Disc Physical Standard is intended to identify the kind of machine needed for the resource. CAPC has suggested using the *AV & Nonprint Glossary* (<http://olacinc.org/avglossary/>) as source of terms and to add terms for any that are needed.
 - Optical Disc Recording Method describes how the data are put on the disc, either "stamped" (usually mass-produced resources) or "burned" (usually smaller production runs or unique resources).
 - Optical Disc Content Type needs to be renamed because of the conflict with RDA "Content Type." It is intended to identify either Audio, Video, or Data, in most cases. Adding a short list of the most common terms to RDA, might be the best idea, with reference out to the *AV & Nonprint Glossary* for any additional terms.

Additional work needs to be done for ALA Midwinter by Ms. Hillman and Ms. Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon) on this proposal, so that RDA elements for these concepts and all controlled vocabularies will be compatible. The whole issue of including controlled vocabulary lists within RDA is a larger one for the JSC.

- Revision Proposal on Recording Duration (RDA 7.22) attempts to formalize the consistent uses of "approximately" and of abbreviations for time periods, to codify flexibility of choice for catalogers to record various types of durations and how they may be expressed, and to standardize what to do when stated and actual durations are

not the same. Expressing the duration of the whole and the durations of parts not mutually exclusive. Among the suggested changes: that the different subinstructions for various kinds of durations be consolidated, that machine-actionability also be considered, that instructions be divided between when the duration is stated on resource and when it is not, that “performance time” (RDA 7.22.1.5) needs to be generalized to include performed text. Ms. Tracey Snyder (Cornell University) will revise the proposal in light of these discussions.

- The paper on Basic Instructions on Recording Statements of Responsibility (RDA 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.17.3, 7.23, 7.24) proposes to delete RDA 7.23 and 7.24 elements and to accommodate these instead in appropriate areas of Chapter 2. In RDA 2.4.1.1, the current sentences referring to Chapter 7 will be reformulated into sorts of examples without direct reference to Chapter 7. The proposal was accepted with pending revisions.

The work of the Task Force on Appendix K had not quite been completed when Dan Lipcan (Metropolitan Museum of Art), representing the Art Libraries Society of North America, left CC:DA earlier in 2014. The JSC has approved the use of gender-specific relationship terms (granddaughter and grandson versus grandchild, for instance). A new chair and reconstituted task force is being formed, including remaining members of the group Mr. Robert Maxwell (Brigham Young University), Mr. Randy Roeder (University of Iowa), and Mr. Adam Schiff (University of Washington). Structural work has been done on the group’s report, but content work still remains. Ms. Glennan hopes it could be completed by Midwinter.

Mr. John Myers (Union College), the CC:DA Liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), reported on the activities of the MAC. My OCLC colleague Mr. Rich Greene attended his final MAC meetings during this conference and officially retired from OCLC on 2014 July 1. He had served on MAC’s predecessor organization the Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) since 1979/1980. I have been assigned to be his successor in the position of OCLC Liaison to MAC. My report follows. The meeting agenda can be found at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2014_age.html.

MARC Advisory Committee Report, ALA Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, 2014 June 28 and 29

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC, the successor to MARBI) met on Saturday morning, June 28, and Sunday afternoon, June 29, at the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas, Mr. Matthew Wise (New York University) presiding. Three proposals and three discussion papers were on the agenda:

Proposal No. 2014-04: Adding Miscellaneous Information in Topical Term and Geographic Name Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-04.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes a way to designate "miscellaneous information" in topical term fields and geographic name fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. In addition, the paper proposes the re-definition of subfield \$g "Miscellaneous information" as a repeatable subfield in fields where it is already defined.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. This constitutes more a structural than a semantic change. Different systems will either use or not use this structural change to subfield \$g according to their needs.

Proposal No. 2014-05: Designating Relationships Between Subject Headings from Different Thesauri in the MARC 21 Authority Format
(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-05.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes a way to designate relationships between entries of different thesauri in a MARC authority record.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. The distinctions regarding equivalent, broader, narrower, and related mappings that are made in this proposal are widely used in world of thesauri. The Canadian and Spanish communities were also amenable to this proposal.

Proposal No. 2014-06: Defining New Field 388 for Time Period of Creation Terms in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats
(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-06.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes the establishment of new field 388 in the Authority and Bibliographic formats to record the time period of creation or origin of works and expressions.

OUTCOME: Proposal was accepted. All international partners who had voiced an opinion were in favor of this proposal. This acceptance had some additional fallout. It may have some impact on FAST. Ms. Sally McCallum (LC) noted that field 370 (Associated Place) should have been defined for the Bibliographic as well as the Authority format, as should all such fields that may apply to the FRBR Work. She will deal with the Bibliographic 370 and will double-check to be sure other fields were not overlooked. Bibliographic field 648 (Subject Added Entry – Chronological Term) had its First Indicator defined as “Type of Date or Time Period” as part of MARC Update No. 16 in April 2013, but this implementation is now rescinded. That implementation was to have been part of the OCLC-MARC Update 2014, Phase II, but is now considered withdrawn. Bibliographic 648 will continue to be defined strictly for subject use for “Date or Time Period Covered or Depicted.” Because the 648 First Indicator had not yet been implemented in Connexion, no conversion of existing records should be necessary. The captions for the 388 field and for the subfield \$a were both edited to read “Time Period of Creation Term.”

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP05: Adding Dates for Corporate Bodies in Field 046 in the MARC 21 Authority Format
(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp05.html>).

SUMMARY: This discussion paper considers the options for accommodating date of establishment and date of termination of a corporate body.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. Two options were put forward. Option 1 defined two new subfields, subfield \$q for “Date of Establishment” and subfield \$r for “Date of Termination.”

Option 2 broadened the definitions of existing subfield \$f, “Birth Date” to include “Date of Establishment,” and subfield \$g, “Death Date” to include “Date of Termination.” International responses were split between the two options, but after discussion, a straw poll came down on the side of Option 1 being cleaner for display and for mapping to RDA elements. The captions and/or definitions of the two new subfields may need some editorial work, especially to take into

consideration the ambiguities surrounding the beginning and ending dates of corporate bodies (founding, incorporation, period of activity).
Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP06: Defining Values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
(<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp06.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper considers the definition of values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 to sequence sources of acquisition.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. There was general agreement that if this use of Bibliographic field 037 were to be approved, it would apply only for acquisition sources that are universally applicable, not those that are specific to a particular institution. There were various objections to this proposal, including the violation of Provider-Neutral principles, the use of ISSNs with the "ISSN" designation as "stock numbers," the potential for extensive ongoing data maintenance. Subfield \$3 (for differentiating suppliers of chronological portions of a continuing resource) and/or subfield \$5 (identifying a specific institution) were also discussed as possible additions to a proposal. It was noted that the lack of an acquisitions format has caused us to try to squeeze this sort of data into the Bibliographic and Holdings formats.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP07: Broaden Usage of Field 088 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp07.html>).

SUMMARY: This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 088 (Report Number) in bibliographic records to include series numbers (in particular for series in technical report and government publications) by deleting the sentence "Not used to record a number associated with a series statement" in field 088's field definition and scope.

OUTCOME: Discussion paper will return as a proposal. Series numbering often serves a double role as report numbering, as well. The original restriction on not using Bibliographic field 088 for numbering associated with a series statement was likely intended to reduce redundancy, although it has always been difficult to distinguish report and series numbers of these similar types. The aim of this paper was to assist in retrieval, with general agreement that a new field was not necessary.

Business Meeting

The Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus for Music (LCMPT) has been made available at
<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/performanceMediums.html>.

MARC 21 Update No. 18
(http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update18_online.html) was made available on April 28, 2014.

Discussion Paper No. 2014-DP01: Designating Never Published in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2014/2014-dp01.html>) had been discussed in the MAC meetings at ALA Midwinter in January 2014, concluding with the recommendation that the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB) look into using the existing Bibliographic field 366 (Trade Availability Information). Mr. Reinhold Heuvelmann reported that field 366 would meet the DNB's requirements. Using usage statistics compiled by Mr. Roy Tennant (OCLC), the DNB was able to determine the most useful ONIX Code for their purposes, specifically from List 54, Availability Status Code "AB" for "Cancelled" to be used in subfield \$c. The DNB will not use subfield \$m (Identification of Agency). The DNB plans to begin use of field 366 in mid-September 2014.

The retiring Mr. Greene reminisced about his long tenure on the committee, citing it as among his proudest professional accomplishments.

Ms. Lori Robare (University of Oregon) reported on the activities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). On 2014 June 20, LC and the PCC issued a joint statement in support of BIBFRAME (<http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/bibframe-pcc.html>). The PCC will end all AACR2 cataloging as of 2015 January 1. Self-instruction PDFs are available for all RDA NACO training and for training on Relationship Designators for Bibliographic records; Authorities training materials will be available next.

Current CC:DA Webmaster Ms. Melanie Polutta (LC) rotates out of the position, to be replaced by Mr. Richard Guajardo (University of Houston). From now on, the Webmaster should be contacted directly to get a profile set up. Mr. Guajardo will look into the prospects for better marking up of documents for comments on the blog.

Mr. James Hennelly of ALA Publishing Services reported that subscription and usage through the end of May 2014 was up 15% and ahead of budget projections. There are 6600 users (subscriptions are priced per user since January) with a 90% renewal rate. There has been a decrease in page views but an increase in sessions, suggesting that users are getting more efficient in using the RDA Toolkit. ALA Publishing has a new arrangement with the DNB for RDA Toolkit access for 400 institutions across Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The MLA Best Practices document has been added to the Toolkit as a PDF but will eventually be more interactive, similar to the LC-PCC PSs. The August release of the Toolkit will include an updated German text. The October release may include British Library options (PS-like) and an update to the French translation. The Spanish translation is expected in February 2015 and the LC update in April 2015. There is interest in adding Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM) documents to the Toolkit. The Chinese translation is complete, but is available only in print right now. The soon-to-be-implemented new content management system for The Toolkit should simplify editing and authoring. The RDA print update for 2014 is in progress but about 70% of pages have changed, so this needs to be worked out; in any case something will be available in late 2014. Some 481 print units of RDA have been sold, but only three e-book versions this year. There is speculation that a tablet version might be better received.

The Task Force on Recording Relationships reported that their work on structured relationships is in progress.

The Task Force on Pseudonymous Corporate Bodies reported that it is also looking at pseudonymous families and fictitious bodies, for the sake of consistency. In wondering why

the JSC did not take this up in the first place, it was guessed that the issue was probably just overlooked. The group will try to keep practices parallel to those already in RDA for both pseudonymous persons fictitious persons.

Ms. Glennan presented three additional proposals:

- Using the Mark of Omission in Preferred Titles (RDA 6.2) is an attempt to document current practice for multipart and continuing resources. Mr. John Hostage (Harvard Law School) objected to beginning a preferred title with a mark of omission, citing common sense and the convenience of the user. In the context of a title proper, an initial mark of omission is understandable, but is much less so in a constructed preferred title. In a straw poll, it was decided 19 to 14 to make an exception for not allowing a mark of omission at the beginning of preferred titles. Mr. Reser suggested looking at how the exceptions for the removal of initial articles was dealt with in RDA for principled guidance on the preferred title issue. Ms. Glennan will revise the proposal to include that exception and then put forward to the JSC.
- Date of Expression for the Bible and Parts of the Bible (RDA 6.24.1.4) was excepted with the proviso that additional explanation is needed for the “Bible. French. Martin” example at RDA 6.30.3.2.
- Creating Instructions for Using Nominative Case for Titles (RDA 6.2) and Names (RDA 8.5) now also includes names of places (RDA 16.2.1). Various complications of grammatical cases were pointed out (genitive, possessive, ablative, locative). This proposal is trying to describe current practice but may inadvertently be introducing more confusion and/or overlooking other cases that need to be considered. In general, the revisions for name and place aspects seemed acceptable, but the title aspects need more work. Ms. Glennan requested assistance with wording and examples from those with expertise in inflected languages, including the DNB. It was also pointed out that it needs to explain why catalogers would be changing things to nominative case at all.

The RDA Subcommittee of the Subject Access Committee (SAC) is considering work on the subject access portions of RDA, including subject Relationship Designators. This work will not require CC:DA approval because SAC has dealt with it, but any individuals are welcome to comment once the SAC proposal has been shared.

Respectfully submitted by

Jay Weitz

Senior Consulting Database Specialist, WorldCat Quality Management Division,
OCLC

IFLA Cataloguing Section Liaison to ALA CC:DA

2014 July 8

APPENDIX IX: Financial statement 2014

FINAL RESULT OF THE YEAR 2013

	Admin	FRBR: Reassessment of properties in a consolidated conceptual model (G3.13.1-1/13)	ISBD Namespaces Alignments and Publication as Linked Data (G3.13.2- 1/13)	Total
Allotment, 1 Jan. 2013	300	3 000	1 500	4 800
Expenditures to 31. July 2013	0	0	0	
Expenditures to 31. Dec. 2013	0	3 008 ^a	1 512 ^b	4 820
Balance, 31 Dec. 2013	300 -> 0	-8 -> 0	-12 -> 0	-20 -> 0

Notes:

- All amounts in € (Euros, EUR)
 - IFLA allots new funds at beginning of each year. **Balances returned to IFLA at end of year.**
- a) FRBR RG meeting Paris Oct. 14-15 2013: Gordon Dunsire EUR 47,31 + GBP 269,79, Elena Escolano Rodríguez EUR 700, Tanja Merčun EUR 451,77, Pat Riva EUR 394, Maja Žumer EUR 451,77. CIDOC-CRM/FRBRoo meeting Heraklion Oct. 21-25 2013: Pat Riva EUR 333,19, Maja Žumer EUR 352,86. Total 3 008 according to IFLA HQ.
- b) ISBD RG meeting Paris Oct. 14-18 2013: Elena Escolano Rodríguez EUR 450, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi EUR 264,72, Mirna Willer EUR 98,56 + HR KN 2008 + GBP 366,5. Total 1 512 according to IFLA HQ.

PROJECTED CASH FLOW 2014

	Admin	FRBR: Reassessment of properties in a consolidated conceptual model (3-13-1-14)	Development of ISBD namespace alignments and usage (3-13-2-14)	Total
Allotment, 1 Jan. 2014	300	3 400 ^a	1 800	5 500
Expenditures to 31. July 2014	0	2 405 ^b	877 ^c	3 282
Projected exp. July- Dec. 2014	300	995	923	2 218
Balance, 31 Dec. 2014	0	0	0	0

Notes:

- All amounts in € (Euros, EUR)
 - IFLA allots new funds at beginning of each year. **Balances returned to IFLA at end of year.**
- a) € 3 000 for meetings during 2014, € 400 for payment to MMA for batch upload of data.
- b) FRBR editorial group meeting in Hague 30 March 30- 4 April (Le Boeuf € 145, Zumer € 612,55, Riva € 711,20 + CAD 259,44. Total about € 1 640 according to IFLA HQ). Air fare for Chris Oliver to the meeting (CAD 1 109,24 -> about € 765).
- c) Meeting in Paris 7-9 April 2014 (Gentili-Tedeschi € 209,66, Willer € 180,50 + HR KN 1 967 + GBP 190. Total about € 877).

BUDGET PROPOSAL 2015

	Admin	[FRBR RG]	[ISBD RG]	Revision ICP^d	Total
Expenditures 2015	300	x	y	0 ^a	300+x+y
Balance, 31 Dec. 2015					

Notes:

- All amounts in € (Euros, EUR).
 - IFLA allots new funds at beginning of each year. **Balances returned to IFLA at end of year.**
- a) The work is planned to be conducted by email, Skype, plus any in-person meetings during the IFLA conference.

APPENDIX X: Lyon meetings: FRBR RG

The FRBR Review Group held two meetings during the conference, a business meeting on Sunday, August 17, and a full day meeting primarily devoted to the consolidation of the models, held on Friday, August 22.

Business Meeting (August 17)

After approval of the minutes and announcements of membership changes, the Chair gave a brief report (see Report of Activities, Appendix I).

This was followed by a brief report from Pat Riva, member of the Consolidation Editorial Group (CEG), who gave a synopsis of the work accomplished during the year. The CEG met twice during the year, once in the fall and once in the spring. Details of the consolidation were not discussed during the business meeting but were reserved for in-depth discussion during the all-day meeting on consolidation (August 22). The focus during the year was reviewing the attributes of the entities, streamlining some, suggesting changes to achieve a comparable level of granularity. Relationships were also reviewed. In some cases, something previously identified in one of the models as an attribute was considered to fit better into the consolidated model as a relationship, for example, subject. Since the CEG is taking charge of the consolidation project, the project funds request came directly from the CEG, with the Review Group's endorsement. So Pat also reviewed the funding situation. Pat also revealed some of the ideas for the presentation of the model: a document in tabular format instead of discursive text, but with a discursive overview and introduction. The final document will probably include a brief bibliography and a section describing the relationship between the consolidated model and the three original models. The plan is also to retain access to the three original models by maintaining an archive on the IFLA website. Members of the CEG stressed the importance of the Friday meeting because the CEG needed confirmation of support from the whole Review Group for the basic structure of the consolidated model and for the decisions the CEG had made.

Two draft statements prepared by Patrick LeBoeuf (member of the FRBR/CIDOC CRM Harmonization Working Group) had been circulated to members of the Review Group. If approved by the Review Group, the two statements would express the Review Group's endorsement of these object-oriented models as having a valid relationship with FRBRer/FRAD/FRSAD.

The first statement stated:

The IFLA FRBR Review Group endorses the version 2.0 of the FRBROO model (an object-oriented interpretation of the FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD models in the form of an extension of the CIDOC CRM model) as a valid ontology that can be used to express the semantic relationships embedded in descriptions provided by libraries (i.e., bibliographic and authority data) for the entities that make up the "bibliographic universe." The ontology described in FRBROO is based on IFLA's conceptualization of bibliographic and authority data such as expressed in the FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD entity-relationship models, although it also somewhat deviates from the original models on some points. The differences between FRBROO version 2.0 and the FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD models are not sufficient for FRBROO version 2.0 to be regarded as a distinct model that IFLA (and more particularly, the

IFLA Cataloguing Section) would not endorse and recommend, but any possible users of FRBROO version 2.0 should be made aware of them.

The first statement goes on to summarize the key points of difference between FRBRoo and the original FR models.

The second statement stated:

The FRBR Review Group endorses PRESSOO as a valid ontology that can be used to express the semantic relationships embedded in descriptions provided by libraries (i.e., bibliographic and authority data) for continuing resources in a way that is fully compatible with FRBROO. The second statement goes on to summarize the differences between PRESSoo and the original FR models.

The two statements received unanimous approval from all the members. A suggestion was made to go beyond RG endorsement and take the two models through the formal IFLA approval process for standards. The suggestion was approved by all and made into an action plan for the Review Group. Since version 1 of FRBRoo had already been approved in 2010, version 2 will be taken through the IFLA process for updating a standard. This decision was communicated to the Cataloguing Section and the Classification and Indexing Section during their 2nd meetings.

The Review Group then discussed a draft protocol document received from the Joint Steering Committee on Development of RDA (JSC). The discussion was led by Gordon Dunsire as Chair of JSC. The protocol would ensure formal communication between the two groups, communication that so far has been informally achieved through the accident of committee memberships (such as Gordon being both a member of JSC and of the Review Group). The protocol would ensure that each party would be aware of possible major changes that might have a significant impact on them. The Review Group agreed with the idea of developing such a protocol with JSC. The actual wording will be developed and approved later.

The namespace for FRBRoo has been prepared in spreadsheet form to be bulk uploaded into the Open Metadata Registry (OMR) to be housed there along with the other FRBR namespaces. The actual loading has been delayed due to scheduling issues, but should still occur before the end of 2014; 400 euros has been allocated in this project for the one-time programming expense relating to the upload. Further updates will then be done manually within the OMR.

Discussion of 2015 meeting plans was deferred to the Friday meeting.

Consolidation of IFLA Conceptual Models (August 22)

The day-long meeting began with an overview of the final document. There will probably be eight sections and these were described: introduction (context, approach used), methodological introduction, user tasks (and users considered), overview of the model, formal model definition, aggregates (interpretation of aggregates in the model), appendices (tables matching user tasks and attributes/relationships), bibliography.

There was a PowerPoint presentation describing the salient aspects of the consolidated model and focusing on the key points where the CEG needed the Review Group's approval of decisions they had made. The Review Group agreed with the direction taken by the CEG and

with the decisions about entities, relationships and attributes. Agreement on the bare bones of the model allows the CEG to progress towards completing the first draft. The CEG planned to review the model for consistency and completeness and then begin filling in the text of the model, definitions, explanations, overview, etc.

It was a very full day, with a brief break in the park for lunch. However, even during lunch, consolidation was the topic of discussion as CEG and Review Group members discussed possible names for the consolidated model.

The Review Group briefly discussed plans for WLIC 2015 in Cape Town. The group decided to follow the same pattern as this year: one business meeting (2 hours) during the conference and one full-day meeting to discuss the consolidated model.

Chris Oliver
Chair of the FRBR Review Group

APPENDIX XI: Lyon meetings: ISBD RG

to be added

APPENDIX XII: Lyon meetings: ISBD Linked Data Study Group

to be added

APPENDIX XIII: Report from ISO/TC46 meeting 2014

Report from Meeting 41th ISO/TC46 – Information and documentation. Washington D.C.,
May 5th - 9th 2014

See document on <<http://www.ifla.org/cataloguing/reports>>