International Cataloguing Principles Task Group

Revision Report

August 2015 - August 2016

Members

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

Activities

The worldwide review (deadline June 1st, 2015) has helped the Task Group in perfecting the Statement and we thank so much all the persons and institutions that have answered the calls for review.

As already said, most comments concerned the same topics

- implicit request of a fuller review, changing the Statement's structure and deleting some sections (especially §7 Foundations for Search Capabilities)
- temporal coincidence with the FRBR consolidation process affecting the list of the entities
- too many instructions (e.g. both in some principles and in §5 Access Points)
- the deletion from §1 Scope of the mention of archives and museums.

Some suggestions have been useful in making some concepts more clear, while some comments have reinforced the conviction of our choices. The Task Group has worked all together, through a long series of email discussing point by point every single comment

At the end of this process, the task Group has submitted the Statement to the Committee on Standards by mean of the Standards approval request form, Appendix D of the Standards Procedures Manual.[1] Then the Committee on Standards has asked for an internal review by the chairs of chairs of

- Permanent UNIMARC Committee
- Bibliography section
- Classification and Indexing section
- FRBR Review Group
- and ISBD Review Group.

Furthermore, the Task Group has been asked to produce a document listing all the comments received during the internal and worldwide reviews, and presenting the groups' answers. The document *Comments to the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* is available as Appendix A to this Report.

---

[1] IFLA Standards Procedures Manual <http://www.ifla.org/node/8719>

Result

The Statement's final version is available as Appendix B to this Report (please, remember the version is waiting for approval by the Committee on Standards).

Respectfully submitted by the ICP Task Group

Appendix 1

Comments to the

Statement of International Cataloguing Principles

by the Task Group

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

INTRODUCTION

This document, prepared in request of IFLA Committee on Standards, lists the comments received during the internal review (chairs of Permanent UNIMARC Committee, Bibliography section, Classification and Indexing section, FRBR Review Group, and ISBD Review Group) and the worldwide review of the Statement of international Cataloguing Principles.

The Task Group has carefully taken into consideration each comment. This document describes the rationale behind quite every choice. Where no explication is given (*Accepted* or *Not accepted*) it means that the Task Group has discussed the proposal and decided for the best solution according to its judgment.

Furthermore, Statement's foreword presents most relevant issues addressed during the revision.

LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM IFLA RG AND WG

A. Christine Oliver (FRBR review group, chair)

B. Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (ISBD review group, chair)

C. Miriam Nauri: *"No further comments from us at this stage"*

D. Maja Žumer: *"unfortunate timing of the Statement - just before the final approval of LRM [i.e. FRBR consolidated model]"*

E. Pat Riva: some editorial remarks fully accepted.

WORLDWIDE REVIEW

1. American Library Association Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access - Robert Kendall <rr2205@columbia.edu>

2. Canadian Committee on Cataloguing in conjunction with Association pour l'avancement des sciences et des techniques de documentation and Canadian Library Association – Christine Oliver <Christine.Oliver@uottawa.ca>, Valoree McKay <vmckay@cla.ca>, and   Elise Boucher <eboucher@asted.org>

3. Committee on Cataloguing of the Japan Library Association - Watanabe, Takahiro (The Japan Library Association Committee on Cataloging, chair) <watanabe@hs.tezuka-gu.ac.jp>

4. <u>Deutsche Nationalbibliothek</u> - Susanne Oehlschlaeger (Office for Library Standards) <s.oehlschlaeger@dnb.de>

5. <u>Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA</u> - Alan Danskin (British Library) <Alan.Danskin@bl.uk>, and Dave Reser (Library of Congress) <dres@loc.gov>

6. <u>Kansallis Kirjasto</u> - Marja-Liisa Seppälä (The National Library of Finland) <marja-liisa.seppala@helsinki.fi>

7. <u>Karen Coyle</u> <u>http://kcoyle.blogspot.com/2015/05/international-cataloguing-principles.html</u> <u><kcoyle@kcoyle.net></u>

8. <u>National Library of New Zealand</u> - Chris (Christine) Todd (Cataloguing team leader) <Chris.Rae.Todd@dia.govt.nz>

9. <u>Norwegian Committee on Cataloguing</u> - Frank Berg Haugen <katkom@nb.no>

Dear Agnese,

It has been a brave venture to do this revision as the ground under us shifts with the consolidated model.

All I have heard from FRBR RG members has been that some have already made comments through other means. So no new comments from members. I reread this latest version of ICP and have one small comment.

Nomen remains a difficult point because it is defined as only pertaining to subjects. In note 10, ICP mentions that in FRSAD nomen is a superclass of name/identifier/controlled access point. But in the glossary, the relationships are not BT/NT, but RT with name and access points and not related at all to identifiers. So there seems to be a bit of an between the glossary and the body of the document. One possible way to proceed would be to extend note 10 to warn the reader that ICP will not be treating nomen as the superclass of name, identifier and controlled access point. Or one could change the RTs to NT/BT in the glossary as appropriate.

> *Accepted the option "that ICP will not be treating nomen as the superclass of name, identifier and controlled access point". Sentence added to note 10.*

I am not entirely clear whether names/identifiers/controlled access points are attributes or entities in ICP? At times, it seems that ICP treats name as an attribute, as FRBR does, and not as an entity, as FRAD and FRSAD do? If so, I am wondering whether it would be useful to state something in 3.2 or in a note that for the purpose of the current ICP, pre-consolidation of the models, name and access points will be treated as attributes? But then this might have a different impact on RT/BT/NT in the glossary.

> *In Task Group's opinion, ICP should not go further in detailing FR entities. The entities are just listed in ICP as a real <u>reference</u> model without claiming to be complete.*

Many thanks for extending your deadline.

Best wishes,

Chris

Dear Agnese,
despite asking a little delay in order to make comments from the Italian committee on cataloguing rules (Commissione REICAT), I must confess we had very little time to comment the ICP during our meeting, yesterday.
Just a few notes on some general issues, mostly reflecting personal ideas or the impression I had from the discussion at our meeting.
As you already know from other comments, and are well aware of, there is the question of time: working on principles when the model is undergoing a major change is certainly an issue. To me it is now unclear if the principles are "above" or "under" the model, that means if they should somehow apply the model or inform it.

As a consequence:

- if the principles should ignore the entities defined in the model, simply saying that there is a model defining which entities are part of the bibliographic world and take part to the function of the catalogue, or
- try to define entities that are then much better detailed in the model, or
- simply use them, leaving their definition to the model, that "dictates" the principles, but that seems a bit unnatural, as the principles are by definition or etymology "principal" and "first", or "genesis" of the bibliographic universe

Considering the fact that the model is changing, the first solution might be the most prudent one, just like attributes and relationships which are not listed in 3.2 and 3.3. A note saying that the model is changing and this is why entities are not defined in the ICP might help understanding.

> *The relationship among the IFLA standards (conceptual models, statements, etc.) is not an "a priori". ICP defines how the cataloguing codes should be constructed; in some sense, the mental attitude behind the rules. Conceptual models focus on how to draw the bibliographic universe, the entities that inhabit it and the relationships among them.*

> *In §2 General principles, the FR family entities affect the terminology ("work", "expression", etc.), scarcely the content.*

Concerning chapter 6, there was a bit of discussion, as one possible interpretation of 6.1 might be that e.g. really *all* names should be linked to a resource (let's say, *all* the people involved in the production of a motion picture, not the main agents), because this is the only way to find "all resources associated with a given person, family, or corporate body". Also on the definition (7.1.2) of essential access points seems a bit too extensive. The issue is that (at a glance) it seems unclear if these are functions that should be present in the structure of the catalogue or mandatory elements of each bibliographic record. Paragraph 1 seems to suggest the latter interpretation: "The principles in this statement are intended to guide the development of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make."! But maybe we

misunderstood, not being English our native language, or were too rigid and literal in our interpretation.

> *§ 5.2.1 limits the creation of mandatory authorized access points to the creators of works; while § 5.2.2 specifies that "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."*

Thank you for your patience, all the best
Massimo

Appendix 1 Robert Rendall, Chair ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

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

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

General comments

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

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

0 Introduction

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

> *Accepted*

1 Scope

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

> *See Statement's Afterword §6.*

2 General Principles

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

> *Both accepted*

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

> *Not accepted. The principle contains a very general instruction about how to deal with specific entities such as names of persons, corporate bodies, families and works. Otherwise, the principle sounds as a tautology.*

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

2.8 is in accordance with new principle 2.10 Interoperability

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

See above

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

Accepted

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

This principle comes from a previous sentence that closed the list in the 2009 ICP. In our opinion, "explained" is the right term in this context.

3 Entities, Attributes and Relationships
We suggest that the parenthetical statement after "Thema" be moved to a footnote.

Accepted

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

Accepted

5 Access Points
We recommend that the second paragraph in section 5.2.1, starting with the phrase: "A corporate body should be considered…" would fit better in 5.3.4.4.

Widely discussed among the Task Group. Rationale: Before considering the form for an authorized access point, it is necessary to accept such entity as possible access point. The paragraph remains in 5.2.1

We recommend that the two paragraphs numbered as 5.3.3.1.1.1 and 5.3.3.1.1.2 be listed using the letters (a), (b) instead of being numbered separately. Likewise for the two paragraphs numbered: 5.3.3.2.1 and 5.3.3.2.2. These are not separate statements but lists of choices that complete the statement above.

Accepted

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

Not accepted. This point has been discussed during the IME ICCs (2003-2009); this choice was the preferred by the majority of countries. If a change is needed, it should be discussed internationally.

6 Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue

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

Accepted

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

Accepted

8 Glossary

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

Appendix 2 Canadian Committee on Cataloguing in conjunction with Association pour l'avancement des sciences et des techniques de documentation, Canadian Library Association

We applaud the work to keep the International Cataloguing Principles current and updated and thank the IFLA Cataloguing Section for the opportunity to comment.

We acknowledge that it is a challenging time at which to revise the principles, when the IFLA conceptual models are in the process of being consolidated. When the original principles were approved in 2008, only FRBR had been published. Though FRAD had not yet been published, there was evident awareness of it in the original ICP, such as including the entity "family." But it is understandable that an update is needed in order to include FRAD fully and to add FRSAD as part of the theoretical foundation for the principles. This is not an easy task when the three models have inconsistencies between them. It is also difficult when the ICP revision cannot yet take into account changes that may be made during the consolidation process. At the next regular review of the ICP, we know we will see further changes to integrate the consolidated conceptual model.

We found that many of the changes improved the International Cataloguing Principles, both with more suitable wording, such as the principle of economy (2.7), and with changes to bring the context up-to-date, such as speaking about "data" rather than "records". We also thought that the addition of the principle of "interoperability" was a useful and important change. We particularly appreciated the broader perspective in the first sentence of the scope:

> The principles in this statement are intended to guide the development of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make.

It sets the ICP not just as a set of principles to be consulted by the few who construct cataloguing codes, but means that these principles should also form the basis for cataloguer judgment in daily cataloguing work.

We offer some comments for areas where we thought additional changes were needed. Some comments are more general and theoretical and some are editorial. We have separated them into two sections.

General comments

1. Bringing entities from the three models together
We support the way in which the WG has incorporated the entity "thema" and the way that concept, object, event and place are handled at 3.1.

We have problems with the juxtaposition of "name" and "nomen" as if they were equivalent entities, for example, 5.1.1, 7.1.1. Nomen is an entity and ICP does not need define the entities since they are considered to have the same definition as in the conceptual models. However, it may be confusing for the international cataloguing community to read a sentence such as this: Authority data should be constructed to control the authorized forms of name, nomens, variant forms of name, and identifiers used as access points (5.1.1). Since nomen is the superclass of name, identifier and controlled access point, it is unclear how to interpret the meaning of this sentence. One solution would be to delete "nomens" from the list. Or delete "authorized forms

of name", "variant forms of name", and "identifiers" from the list – so the sentence would now read: Authority data should be constructed to control nomens used as access points used as access points. We prefer the first solution: delete "nomens" from the list.

Accepted

At 7.1.1, there is the phrase "names and nomens." The implication seems to be that they are equivalent, but, according to FRSAD, this would not be true. Perhaps it should just be "nomens", or "nomens for entities". Or go back to the original text; "Names, titles, and subjects". But definitely not "names and nomens."

Accepted

The notion of "controlled nomens" is also problematic (7.1.2.2). How does "controlled nomen" fit with "controlled access point"? Is it a new concept? The phrase is not used in FRSAD so it is undefined.

Accepted

2. **General Principles**
   2.3 Representation

   The original 2009 principle was worded as a principle. In the revised version, it seems to be a mixture of principle and instruction.

   1st sentence fine. 2nd sentence ok. But the 3rd and 4th sentences read like a cataloguing instructions, not a principle. The choice of preferred title for the work is also repeated in the access point section (5.3.3.2) where it is more appropriate. We suggest removing the "instruction"-like aspect and ensuring that the wording here is appropriate for a principle.

   > *Not accepted. The principle contains a very general instruction about how to deal with specific entities such as names of persons, corporate bodies, families and works. Otherwise, the principle sounds as a tautology, taking into consideration agents, not works.*

3. **2.6. Significance –** new definition
   "Data elements should be relevant and noteworthy to the description and allow for distinctions among entities."

   This new definition causes some problems.

   Is noteworthy the right word to use?

   Is this principle really about making distinctions between entities (or is 2.5 saying that already?) Is *significance* supposed to mean that data included in descriptions has to be relevant to the purpose of a library catalogue (i.e., that it is a catalogue and not an encyclopedia, biographical dictionary, etc.)

   > *Yes, data should be relevant to the purpose of the catalogue. These Principles can be used for the design and implementation of other kind of tools, but this is out the ICP's mandate.*

4. **4. Bibliographic description**

We appreciate that no changes have been made since the original 2009 ICP. However, we wonder whether this section should be updated to reflect a changing landscape for bibliographic data.

4.1   It may not be wise to continue to state that manifestation-level descriptions *should* be created, any more. Does it not reflect the experience of a MARC environment? With Bib Frame on the one hand, and initiatives to digitize and describe single copies on the other, it may become less and less likely to happen in the strict "manifestation" sense. It might make more sense to say something like "A separate bibliographic description is generally created for each manifestation". This would reflect current reality, but does not dictate that how every cataloguing code must operate now and in the future.

> *Attributes are mandatory in order to describe the entity manifestation. There is no reference, hidden or explicit, to MARC format.*

4.2   Related suggestion: "A bibliographic description is typically based on the item as representative…"   for reasons above.

> *ICP are not prescriptive. Different solutions are allowed. Anyway, it is possible to describe a manifestation only by means of one item.*

5. **7.1.2.2 Essential access points in authority data**

This section has added "controlled nomens" to the list of essential access points for authority data, thus setting a minimum requirement that may be hard to achieve.

Related to the problem noted earlier, "controlled nomens" does not seem to exist in any of the models, so it is difficult to interpret what is meant. Depending on the meaning, this addition may make it difficult for libraries to fulfill their international obligations.   The examples suggest that every work must have subjects or classification numbers assigned? This would be an onerous demand.

> *Accepted*

Related point: variant names and variant forms of name for the entity – this was part of the list in 2009. It is a best practice, but should it be essential? Perhaps it should have been part of 7.1.3.2?

> *Variant forms are essential part of authority data. Furthermore, §5.1.1 says "Controlled access points should be provided for the authorized and variant forms of names for such entities as person, family, corporate body, work, expression, manifestation, item, and themas. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for collocating the bibliographic data for sets of resources".*

Editorial comments

0. **Introduction** – 3rd paragraph

1st sentence – move the word "explicitly":

"The 2009 Statement of principles replaced and explicitly broadened the scope of the Paris Principles ~~explicitly~~ from just textual resources …"

> *Accepted*

2nd sentence:

"It included not only principles and objectives (i.e. functions of the catalogue), but also guiding rules...."   The "i.e." statement doesn't make sense here, even if it only applies to objectives, and the sentence doesn't seem to need it. In both the 2009 and the current document "Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue" is a section title, where objectives are considered distinct from functions.

> *Accepted*

Last sentence:

The current text takes into consideration new categories of users, the open access issue, the interoperability and ~~the~~ accessibility of data, and features of discovery tools.

The phrase "open access issue" is vague and may be open to misinterpretation.

> *Now "open access environment"*

2. General Principles

This first paragraph does affirm that "convenience of the user" continues to be most important, but there is a potential for misreading this paragraph. "If there is a conflict .... the principle of interoperability should be rated higher than others".   The tight sentence construction of the 2nd sentence, while elegant, may obscure that it is only 2.2-2.13 where the principle of interoperability acts as a deciding factor. Maybe reword?

> *The sentence remains as it is*

2.3 Representation

We prefer the use of the full entity name "corporate body." This kind of shortening can cause problems during translation.

> *Accepted*

See no. 2 under general comments. If the sentences are kept – then suggest this change in 4th sentence:

"If this is not feasible, the form commonly used..."

Suggested change: "If this is not feasible, or does not reflect common usage, the form commonly used ..."

> *Accepted*

2.4 Accuracy.

  "... should be an accurate portrayal of the entity described" Portrayal was in the 2009 version, but some people find the word a bit artificial.

> *Not accepted*

2.5 Sufficiency and necessity

The definition has been loosened up from the 2009 original. We prefer the original definition of this principle.

Not accepted. Comments on user needs are conflicting. This principle is consistent with 2.12 Accessibility

2.10 Interoperability

The first sentence is fine, but the second one does not sound like a principle.

The Task Group is aware of this objection but we wanted to give a real example of the implications of this principle, otherwise it could appear much too vague.

5. Access Points

5.3.4.4 Form of Name for Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items

In the original version, this section only mentioned works and expressions. By adding manifestations and items without changing the rest of the text, it seems that the section is a little short on explanations, since only names and titles are mentioned. Perhaps the intention is to say that one starts with the form of name for the work and one adds relevant identifying characteristics to create a unique authorized access point for the expression, manifestation, or item, as needed. Though 5.3.4.5 applies to all the sections that precede it, 5.3.4.4 still seems to need a little clarification.

The title has been changed

7. Foundations for Search Capabilities

7.1.2.1 Essential access points

authorized access point for the work/expression (~~this may include the authorized access point for the creator~~)

redundant – already stated in 5.3.4.4 (and more fully stated there)

Not accepted

Appendix 3 Committee on Cataloging of the Japan Library Association

Reconsideration of 5.3.3.

5.3.4.4 refers "Form of Name for … Manifestations and Items". However there is no mention about the choice of preferred name   of Manifestations and Items under the 5.3.3 section.

Therefore we would like to propose a reconsideration of 5.3.3 to resolve this unmatch.

> *§5.3.3 refers generally to "authorized access point for an entity" and in 5.3.3.2 the title now states "Choice of Preferred Title for Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items"*

We are adding the example below:

・Change the 5.3.3.2 section

Caption: Changing from "Choice of Preferred Title for Works and Expressions" to "Choice of Preferred Title for Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items".

Text: Changing from "When a work has multiple titles, one title should be preferred as the basis for the authorized access point for the work/expression" to "When a work has multiple titles, one title should be preferred as the basis for the authorized access point for the work, expression, manifestation, and item ."

We hope these comments would be helpful.

> *Accepted.*

Yours sincerely,
WATANABE, Takahiro,
Chair, The Japan Library Association Committee on Cataloging
Tezukayama Gakuin Univ., Faculty of Human Sciences (Professor)
 e-mail: watanabe@hs.tezuka-gu.ac.jp

They apply to bibliographic and authority data, and consequently to current library catalogues, bibliographies and other datasets created by libraries.

> Do we really want to restrict the scope to libraries? What about museums, archives and other communities? To remove them at this point could be seen as a political statement that is reverse to what we initially intended and the current trends.
> At 2.10 you also speak of "… and outside the library community.

> > *See Afterword. The request is out of Task Group's mandate.*

Several principles direct the construction of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make.

> To direct the decisions seems a bit too strong to us. Maybe you could find a smoother term

> > *Not accepted*

Controlled forms of work titles should be based on the form appearing on the first manifestation of the original expression.

> For periodicals we know two principles: basing the controlled form on the first or the latest manifestation, both ways should be possible.

> > *Even if the principles give some specific indications (and it always causes criticism), the Task Group thinks that the mention of periodicals as a specific kind of work is a detail.*

 practicality Maybe add: practicality, in accordance to the information the user really needs to find

> *Not added*

The entities are the key objects of interest to users in a particular domain.

> These entities? or The entities below? Or maybe only Entities …

> *Not accepted*

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.

> Maybe a sentence could be added saying that attributes of an entity can be expressed also as relationships between entities?

> > *Not added. See also Attribute definition in Glossary. This indication is more suitable in a reference model.*

4. Bibliographic Description

> As the description is not limited to books, we recommend deleting "bibliographic" here and in the following paragraphs.

The use of "bibliographic" has been widely discussed both in 2009 and during this revision. It does not imply a relation with books but with all the resources bearing a "bibliographic" value.

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).

> This is limited to libraries. We suggest either adding other standards, e.g. "For the archive community, this standard is the ISAD(G)" or to delete this sentence and adjust the following sentence in a more general way.
> *ICP are produced by IFLA for the library community and it mentions just library-related standard and conceptual models. The request is out of Task Group's mandate.*

Controlled access points should be provided for the authorized and variant forms of names for such entities as person, family, corporate body, work, expression, manifestation, item, and other themas.

> we suggest to delete the word "other" as the reader could get the impression that this means all entities mentioned before are limited to thema

> *Accepted.*

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;

> Perhaps it would be useful to mention that there are also resources without an original language (e.g. official documents in multilingual countries or EU publications).

> *As above, specific indications are not provided. These provisions are more suitable in cataloguing standards, codes, or instructions.*

5.3.3 Choice of Preferred Name

> Do we still need a preferred name? The future will be: linking one variant form to another variant name, without choosing a Preferred Name

> *Not accepted. "Preferred" means one preferred form "locally" chosen among the variant ones. Linking variant forms is already possible.*

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)

> Please check; this should read "creators" (plural) or "performer" (singular)

> media type.

> Maybe, it is useful to include in this list also the carrier type

> *Added.*

Appendix 5 Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the 2015 edition of Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP).

ICP informs the cataloguing principles used throughout RDA: Resource Description and Access.

The Committee of Principals for RDA has identified the requirements of international, cultural heritage, and linked data communities as strategic objectives for the development of RDA. The JSC review of ICP was carried out in this context.

General Comments

The JSC finds sections of ICP to be too prescriptive and detailed for a statement of principles. Some parts of the text seem to be specific instructions rather than principles on which instructions and guidance should be based. Section 5 consists mainly of instructions, not principles. Sections 3 and 4 are concerned with the relationship between ICP and related IFLA standards, not principles. Section 6 gives the functions and objectives that the principles are intended to support. Section 7 is similar to an application profile.

> *Topic widely discussed even among the SC members. The statement's structure remains the same. The request is out of Task Group's mandate.*

The terminology used throughout ICP is becoming dated, does not reflect current practice, and in some cases is ambiguous. For example, what is a "searching device" (7.1.1) – "device" has two distinct meanings, exemplified by the Oxford Dictionary: 1) A thing made or adapted for a particular purpose, especially a piece of mechanical or electronic equipment; 2) A plan, method, or trick with a particular aim. Does ICP mean the catalogue as a device, or methods of searching, or both? ICP makes no clear distinction between bibliographic data and authority data. In most cases, the phrase used is "bibliographic and authority data". If no distinction is intended, it should be sufficient to refer to "data". The JSC thinks there should be recognition that the components of bibliographic and authority descriptions can be, and are being, used outside of the confines of the traditional catalogue

> *Since, at the present moment, the majority of cataloguing systems is based on bibliographic and authority data, we have updated the concept of "record" with the one of "data".*

The JSC is concerned about the significance accorded to authorized access points and the continuing emphasis on enforcing consistency, which are a reflection of discredited top-down approaches to universal bibliographic control.

> *The planned revision was not intended by the Task Group to be a radical one, but an update. Deleting access points from the Statement would have been out of Task Group's mandate, requiring many others adaptations. Furthermore, it is an essential part of the Statement.*

The JSC notes the dependencies between ICP, the FR models, and ISBD, and further notes that ICP is likely to require further substantial amendment following the consolidation of the FR models and the expected review of ISBD. The JSC would find it useful if there was some indication of the specific interdependencies, and the schedule for completion of the revision processes.

> *This is a very interesting topic the SC (and hopefully the CoS) could discuss.*

Comments on specific sections

Section 0

Section 0, 3rd paragraph, first sentence: suggest replacing "… explicitly from just textual resources …" to "… explicitly from only textual resources …"

> *Not accepted*

Section 0, 3rd paragraph: The JSC suggests changes in user behavior resulting from the global availability of online information and portability of information-processing equipment should also be taken into consideration by ICP.

> *The planned revision was not intended by the Task Group to be a radical one, but an update. Anyway, the new principles are a first step toward this suggestion.*

Section 1

The JSC is concerned at the omission of archives, museums, and other communities related to the library community. Library resources overlap significantly with archive and museum resources, especially in digital environments, and GLAM (galleries, libraries, archives, museums) data is increasingly shared between these communities. The JSC notes the reference to "outside the library community" in Section 2.10.

> *As stated above, the Principles have been created by the library community. If other GLAM communities intend to use them, it is great but it does not require a specific mention. The Task Group has deleted the mention of museums and archives from the "scope" section; §2.10 recognizes the importance of data sharing. These are two different issues.*

Section 2

The JSC does not think the principles of openness (2.11) and accessibility (2.12) apply to "the construction of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make". Instead, they are better associated with policies on access to and exchange of data, which are functions and objectives of the catalogue.

> *First paragraph in §2 says "The following principles direct the construction and development of cataloguing codes, the decisions that cataloguers make and <u>policies on access to and exchange of data</u>"*

The principle of rationality (2.13) seems to have a priority above others ("if … it is not possible to respect all the principles …"), in contradiction with "If there is a conflict between these principles, the principle of interoperability should be rated higher than others."

If the principle of interoperability (2.10) has a higher priority than the others, except for the principle of convenience of the user (2.1), why isn't it listed as 2.2? If order is not significant, the use of numbering is confusing.

It is not clear in the wording that the principle of convenience of the user has the highest priority: "most important" is a weaker indicator than "the most important".

> *As stated "Of these [principles], the convenience of the user is the most important, while principles 2.2 through 2.13 are in no particular order. If there is a conflict among principles 2.2-2.13, the principle of interoperability should be rated higher than others."*

The JSC prefers the wording in Section 1: "… guide the development of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make" instead of "… direct the construction of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make". Principles are applied, not imposed, which is one interpretation of "direct".

> *Not completely accepted. Currently the sentence is "The following principles direct the construction and development of cataloguing codes, the decisions that cataloguers make and policies on access to and exchange of data."*

Section 2.1: The JSC finds the sentence "Convenience means that all efforts should be made to keep all data comprehensible and suitable for the users" confusing. The Oxford Dictionary defines "convenience" as 1) "The state of being able to proceed with something without difficulty" and 2) "The quality of being useful, easy, or suitable for someone". If the sentence is taken literally, then it excludes machine-readable data not designed for human comprehension. The JSC assumes this is not the intention of ICP, but the omission of references to the use of machine-readable access points in Section 5 weakens this view.

> *This topic has been widely discussed too. The very "final" user of any service is always a human. The omission does not imply any negative evaluation.*

Section 2.3: The JSC believes the last two sentences, "Controlled forms of work titles should be based on the form appearing on the first manifestation of the original expression. If this is not feasible, the form commonly used in reference sources should be used" are instructions, not part of the definition of a principle, and notes that the wording differs from that at Sections 5.3.3.2.1 and 5.3.3.2.2, which may be cause for confusion.

> *Not accepted. The principle contains a very general instruction about how to deal with specific entities such as names of persons, corporate bodies, families and works. Otherwise the principle sounds as a tautology.*

Section 2.4: The JSC notes that the term "accuracy" could be applied here in two different ways in relation to bibliographic data where the source contains errors (typos). Does accuracy mean replicating the errors, or accuracy in representing the true intent?

In this context, "Accuracy" implies precision in describing an entity, e.g., even in transcribing misprints in manifestation's attributes.

Section 2.5: The JSC finds the construction of the sentence awkward and restrictive. The JSC offers a possible rewording: "Include those data elements that are required to: facilitate access for all types of users, including those with specific needs; fulfil the objectives and functions of the catalogue; and describe or identify entities."

Accepted

Section 2.6: The JSC suggests "Data elements should be relevant to the description, noteworthy, and allow for distinctions among entities"

Accepted

Sections 2.8-2.9: The JSC sees little distinction between these principles. They both say that descriptions and access points should be standardized, and not much else. The JSC notes that RDA is diverging from this approach. Cataloguing codes should specify the attributes necessary to identify entities, so that these data can be used to construct access points in whatever configuration meets the requirements of other principles. The construction of access points need not be normative for all users of the code.

The principles are similar in so far they refer, broadly speaking, to consistency. 2.8 refers to the cataloguing products, that is, the set of all the descriptions and the set of all the access points. 2.9 Integration refers to the rules necessary to create descriptions and access points for different types of resources

Section 3

The JSC notes that the terminology used is still strongly rooted in the Entity-Relationship model, and recommends the inclusion of terms from other modelling techniques used for bibliographic and authority data, such as "class" and "property". Using phrases such as "entity class", "attribute property", and "relationship property" exposes latencies such as the equivalence of attributes and relationships in linked data models.

Widely discussed. Not added a reference to class/property modelling. See also Attribute definition in Glossary

Section 3.1: The JSC finds the introduction of the Nomen entity to be confusing. It does not have its own footnote; instead, it is included in the footnote for Thema, and the reference makes little sense. In the subsequent text, Nomen seems to be interchangeable with "name", leading to serious confusion between "name" and "access point".

The JSC also queries the listing of the entities when footnote 6 says "Since FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD are currently undergoing a consolidation process, here are listed all the entities described in the aforementioned conceptual models, despite some inconsistencies, especially about Group 3." This is even more confusing when "Group 3" is defined in footnote 10. The JSC recommends the entities are not explicitly listed.

> *The list of entities has been carefully planned, even in accordance with FRBR RG, in order to put together FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD, waiting for the consolidation process and FRBR LRM.*

Section 4

Section 4.4: The JSC notes that this seems to conflict with Section 2.5.

> *2.5. Sufficiency and necessity. Those data elements that are required to: facilitate access for all types of users, including those with specific needs; fulfil the objectives and functions of the catalogue; and describe or identify entities, should be included.*

> *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.*

> *§2.5 and §4.4 both says that the amount of data could vary in relation to users' needs and to objectives of the catalogue or dataset.*

Section 5

Section 5.2: The guidance at 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 is interrupted by specific rules about corporate bodies as creators, which properly belong in a cataloguing code and would be better referenced in Section 7.

> *This topic has been carefully discussed and other options taken into consideration. The paragraph remains in Section 5.*

Section 5.3: The JSC disagrees with the detail of the wording and its relevance to general cataloguing practises. There is confusion between "name", "access point", and the entity Nomen which must be clarified throughout. For example, what is the relationship between the apparent access point "name of item" and the attributes of the entity Item?

> *Section 5 terminology has been revised in accordance with FRBR RG.*

Section 7: The JSC finds it difficult to determine the purpose of this section. ICP gives no context for it, and it seems to underpin or complement detail in Section 5.

> *According to SC mandate, this revision should just update the Statement, not deeply modify its structure.*

The JSC hopes that IFLA and the Working Group on ICP will find these comments helpful.

Gordon Dunsire
Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
1 June 2015

Appendix 6 Karen Coyle

The 2015 draft of the International Cataloguing Principles (ICP) is a step forward in addressing how cataloging must be defined in relation to the current state of library catalog technology. Following on the 2009 draft, which introduced concepts developed in the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, this draft also includes sections on search and retrieval and additional access points. I wish to encourage the Working Group on ICP to take this draft even further and to correct some of the problems that are carried forward from the 2009 draft.

My comments can be summarized as:

- the *catalog* is a technology, and *cataloging* is therefore in a close relation to that technology
- some catalog principles are provided by the *catalog* technology but not *cataloging*
- authority control must be extended to *all* elements that have recognized value for retrieval

The catalog is a technology

It is of great importance that we recognize that the goals of cataloging cannot be separated from the technology that delivers the information in the catalog to the user of the catalog. In most cases, the ICP speak of cataloging without reference to the technology of the catalog. However, the catalog's technology is a necessary component for the achievement of the principles and cataloging data must surely be designed to facilitate the interaction that users have with the technology of the catalog.

Unlike card catalogs, in which the catalog entry was the only content of the catalog and alphabetical browsing was the only discovery method, systems today provide features that are not based on alphabetical browsing. These include keyword search across the entire catalog record, search limit facets such as date ranges and language, and links to external services such as book and album covers, tables of contents and reviews. It is expected that in a future environment that makes use of linked data there services based on data external to the catalog can be expanded. The services are not addressed as part of the standard catalog data, yet their presence may depend on information provided in the catalog record, and they may be considered essential for the ability of the catalog to perform its functions.

It may be seen as a slippery slope, but the goals of the *catalog* must be addressed in the cataloging principles. It is not possible to separate the system functionality from the data that it has to work with. The two must be developed in tandem, with full knowledge of current technology capabilities and of the characteristics and expectations of the early 21st century catalog user.

Some principles address *catalog* functions, not *cataloging* functions

While the technology and the cataloging data must interact, it is also important to be clear the roles that the two sides of this coin play, and how they interact with each other. There are two areas of the draft that speak to the role of the technology beyond the content of the catalog entries. The first is the highly commendable recommendation in section 2.11 that the catalog

should conform with the IFLA Statement on Open Access, and the second is in section 2.12 which says that the catalog must comply with international standards for accessibility. Both of these are extremely important principles for *catalogs*, but neither can be achieved through *cataloging*.

With these entries in the ICP 2015 the committee has already moved beyond the purview of cataloging and has addressed two areas that can only be principles of the technology of the catalog. This is evidence of the interdependence of the catalog data and the catalog system, and is proof that the features of the catalog system must be addressed to achieve the goals of the library catalog.

Authority control must be extended

The 2009 ICP were the first to include a list of data elements that are commonly used as secondary limits on, or as sort elements for, retrieved sets. These include date (of publication), language, place of publication, content form and media type. (cf. sections 71.2.1, 7.1.3.1 of the 2015 draft) This appears to be in response to developments in library systems that use similar data elements to allow users to narrow retrieved sets of catalog entries. This is called "faceting" and is also used extensively in non---library search systems such as product catalogs on the web.

The facets used in existing library systems are limited to data elements that have controlled values, such as personal names, dates, and languages. That these latter two have controlled values is an accident of the design of the common library data format, ISO 2709 (the standard for the MARC format). These values were not originally developed as search limitation facets; they were included in the record design long before that data was used for library systems. In the original design, these structured data elements served to facilitate re---use of the machine---readable data for the creation of computer---generated printed lists, primarily lists of new library acquisitions.

The list of possible secondary retrieval elements in the 2015 draft of the ICP includes elements whose values are not considered "authorized access points." Some, such as the place of publication, are not currently controlled as to their content. I hope that it is obvious that in order to function as facets or to be reliable as elements of retrieval, values must be taken from controlled lists of terms or codes or identifiers, and must be in a standard format. Free text values cannot be successfully used for the purposes of faceting or performing limits on retrieved sets.

There are some standard formats that are available, such as the standard format for dates, ISO 8601. This requires that year dates be in the form YYYY, and that extended dates be YYYY---MM (year then month) or YYYY---MM---DD (year, month and day). A textual representation of dates within a string of data, such as "New York, MacMillan, c1960" is not appropriate for use as a facet. There is also a standard format for languages in ISO 639. This is already used in MARC records.

There are no international standards or controlled forms for place of publication, content form or media type at this time. Some library partners have agreed on such lists within their communities, but only those communities with an authoritative list of allowed values will be able to fulfill the principles listed in 7.1.3.1 of the 2015 document. Therefore the document

should state that those data elements are only suitable for search and retrieval if governed by an authoritative controlled list of values. This is no different from the statements in the ICP regarding authority control of names, which must be controlled to provide catalog users with accurate results.

> *Karen Coyle's comments do not list specific criticism or proposals about the Statement. Her comments take stock of some issues raised even during this worldwide review.*
>
> *The most important one is the presence in a Statement devoted to cataloguing of the paragraph 7 about catalog functionalities. Cataloguing principles should help the construction of codes, standards or instructions that allow the generation of data capable of fulfilling the functions and objectives of the catalog.*
>
> *The catalog is a tool connected with technology and, therefore, progress. IME-ICCs decided that cataloguing principles should guide the technology development and its implementation. The boundary line between technology and principles (or standard...) is blurred.*

chapter 3: All the FRAD entities are not in the list. Is the exclusion intentional?

The list of entities has been carefully planned, even in accordance with FRBR RG, in order to put together FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD, waiting for the consolidation process and FRBR LRM.

chapter 4: ICP has a strong link to ISBD. Should RDA also be mentioned?

No, since RDA is not an IFLA standard. We have had long discussions about that.

chapter 7: Attributes are also from ISBD (e.g. content form). Should ICP be more neutral towards the rules?

The listed attributes are also in RDA.

chapter 7: The expression "authority data" reminds of authority records of MARC 21. Is the concept "authority data" still relevant when we have entity/relationship model?

Since, at the present moment, the majority of cataloguing systems is based on bibliographic and authority data, we have updated the concept of "record" with the one of "data".

Best wishes,

Marja-Liisa

Appendix 8 Comments from National Library of New Zealand cataloguing team leaders

Section 2. General Principles.

We would like to commend and endorse the reworded and extended general principles. Integration and Interoperability in particular are crucial in making catalogues, and the data they contain, available to potential users. We were encouraged by the presence of these two principles in this document.

1. **Location of Section 6**

We felt that it would be logical to follow Section 2 with the current Section 6, Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue, as this moves from general principles to the specific focus of these principles. Sections 3, 4 and 5 cover mechanisms for achieving the objectives of Section 6 and we felt these sections were better placed later in the document.

> *According to SC mandate, this revision should just update the Statement not deeply modify its structure. Anyway, we are aware of this issue.*

2. **Section 4. Bibliographic Description**

We agree with 4.1 and 4.4 as worded.

 In 4.2 we suggest the following rewording, with additions shown in italics.

"A bibliographic description typically should be based on the item as representative of the manifestation. Such a description may include attributes, or links to attributes, that pertain to the item and to the embodied work(s) and expression(s)"

Our suggestion is based on a concern that sections 4 and 5 appear to assume a cataloguing environment organized into bibliographic records and authority records. We do not see the document, as currently written, allowing for the possibility that bibliographic data might be assembled in different ways (e.g. as linked data where bibliographic data contain links to authority data through persistent URIs).

> *Accepted.*

At 4.3 we would like to suggest the following, with text to be omitted shown in italics and brackets:

"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 different standard]All efforts should be made to provide open access to published mappings between any standard used and the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD), to foster [better] interoperability and accurate reuse of information."

> *As ISBD is an IFLA standard (and the most successful one), its mention in the text is crucial. Similarly, among all the existing conceptual models only IFLA ones are cited*

3. **Section 5. Access points**

We have major concerns about the content of this section. Bringing together variant forms of names of entities in descriptions of those entities is an important aid to collocation. Determining a single authorized access point as the way to represent an entity is a mechanism that is widely-used at present, but which may not be as significant in the future. The prescriptive nature of this section and the level of detail it contains about the form of access points appear unwarranted in a statement of principles.

We suggest that this section be completely removed from the Statement of Principles as it is essentially covered by the General Principles.

> *According to SC mandate, this revision should just update the Statement, not deeply modify its structure.*

If, however, it is felt that access points need to be addressed, we would like to suggest the following:

Section 5. Access Points

Access points for retrieving bibliographic and authority data should be formulated following the general principles (see 2. General Principles).

5.1 Choice of Access Points

5.1.1 Access points for works and expressions embodied in the resource, the title of the manifestation and the creators of works, should be included as access points to bibliographic data.

5.1.2 Additional 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.

5.1.3 Additional access may be provided through names of related entities.

5.2 Authority data

5.2.1 Descriptions of entities such as works, expressions, persons, families and corporate bodies, should be recorded as authority data or as links to existing authority data. Such data should include variant forms of the entity names and identifiers.

5.3 Authorized access points

5.3.1 If necessary, one form of name can be established as the authorized access point for an entity. An authorized access point may be used as a default form for searches and displays in the catalogue.

5.3.2 Authorized access points must be constructed following a standard.

5.3.3 Preference for an authorized access point should be given based on information found on manifestations of the work expressed in the original language and script (see General Principle 2.3)

> *As already said, Section 5 has been carefully analyzed and, when necessary, revised even in accordance with FRBR RG. Deleting references to controlled and uncontrolled access points would make the principles more vague.*

Section 7

We are uncertain of the function of this final section. In some ways it resembles a core record standard and we do not consider that it has a place in a statement of principles.

> *There have been many concerns about Section 7's usefulness because it refers to a technology. Furthermore, library data are more and more available through not-library platforms and devices.*

Appendix 9 Norwegian Cataloguing Committee

The Norwegian Committee on Cataloguing has read the proposed updated text for *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP)* with interest. The original text, published in 2009, reflects a process that started in 2003 when the first in a series of IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code was being held. Consequently the original statement does not reflect the vocabulary established by e.g. the *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)* or the movements towards linked data, increased need for interoperability and open access. The committee therefore welcomes a revision of the text.

The committee appreciates the way the text has been updated. The layout is also improved. We find the current text more accurate and consistent than the previous version. In 5.3.2.1.2 and 7.2., however, "language and script" could be changed into "language and/or script" to match the wording in 5.3.2.1.1.

> *Accepted*

The current, updated text reflects new user groups and new technological perspectives, and the terminology is more in line with the FRBR family of models. Added points, e.g. under 2 General Principles (interoperability, openness, accessibility and rationality), add new dimensions to the statement. We would like to comment that the new functions of the catalogue identified in *Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)* and *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)* (contextualize, justify and explore) could well be listed under 6 Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue.

> *This recommendation has not been accepted while widely discussed.*

We also generally approve of the rearranging of the text with the possible exception of 6 Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue, which we think should have been introduced earlier.

> *According to SC mandate, this revision should just update the Statement, not deeply modify its structure.*

All in all we find the revision successful and fully support the idea of republishing the statement when the consolidation process of FRBR has been completed.

Sincerely,

Frank Berg Haugen,
Norwegian Committee on Cataloguing

Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP)

by IFLA Cataloguing Section and IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code

2016 Edition

by Agnese Galeffi (chair), María Violeta Bertolini, Robert L. Bothmann,

Elena Escolano Rodríguez, and Dorothy McGarry

Approved by
IFLA Cataloguing Standing Committee and IFLA Committee of Standards

Table of Contents

0   Introduction

The original Statement of Principles - commonly known as the "Paris Principles" - was approved by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in 1961.[2] 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.

More than 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, IFLA produced a new statement of principles[3] (published in 2009) applicable to online library catalogues and beyond. The current version has been reviewed and updated in 2014 and 2015, and approved in 2016.

The 2009 Statement of Principles replaced and explicitly broadened the scope of the Paris Principles from just textual resources to all types of resources, 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, but also guiding rules that should be included in cataloguing codes internationally, as well as guidance on search and retrieval capabilities. This 2016 edition takes into consideration new categories of users, the open access environment, the interoperability and the accessibility of data, features of discovery tools and the significant change of user behaviour in general.

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,[4] as well as on the conceptual models in the IFLA Functional Requirements family.[5]

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

---

[2] *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.

[3] *IFLA Cataloguing Principles: Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP) and its Glossary*. München: K.G. Saur, 2009. (IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control; v. 37). Statement available online <www.ifla.org/publications/statement-of-international-cataloguing-principles>.

[4] 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.

[5] Functional Requirements: the FRBR Family of Models <www.ifla.org/node/2016>. Being currently under a consolidation process, this statement reflects some uncertainties of the transitional phase.

1 Scope

The principles in this statement are intended to guide the development of cataloguing codes and the decisions that cataloguers make. They apply to bibliographic and authority data, and consequently to current library catalogues, bibliographies and other datasets created by libraries.

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

2 General Principles

The following principles direct the construction and development of cataloguing codes, the decisions that cataloguers make and policies on access to and exchange of data. Of these, the convenience of the user is the most important, while principles 2.2 through 2.13 are in no particular order. If there is a conflict among principles 2.2-2.13, the principle of interoperability should be rated higher than others.

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 accordance with that of the majority of users.

2.3. Representation. A description should represent a resource as it appears. Controlled forms of names of persons, corporate bodies and families should be based on the way an entity describes itself. Controlled forms of work titles should be based on the form appearing on the first manifestation of the original expression. If this is not feasible, the form commonly used in reference sources should be used.

2.4. Accuracy. Bibliographic and authority data should be an accurate portrayal of the entity described.

2.5. Sufficiency and necessity. Those data elements that are required to: facilitate access for all types of users, including those with specific needs; fulfil the objectives and functions of the catalogue; and describe or identify entities, should be included.

2.6. Significance. Data elements should be relevant to the description, noteworthy, 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.

2.9. Integration. The descriptions for all types of resources 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. For the exchange

of data and discovery tools, the use of vocabularies facilitating automatic translation and disambiguation is highly recommended.

2.11. Openness. Restrictions on data should be minimal in order to foster transparency and conform to Open Access principles, as declared also in the IFLA Statement on Open Access.[6] Any restriction on data access should be fully stated.

2.12. Accessibility. The access to bibliographic and authority data, as well as searching device functionalities, should comply with international standards for accessibility as recommended in the IFLA Code of Ethics for Librarians and other Information Workers.[7]

2.13. Rationality. The rules in a cataloguing code should be defensible and not arbitrary. If, in specific situations, it is not possible to respect all the principles, then defensible, practical solutions should be found and the rationale should be explained.

3   Entities, Attributes, and Relationships

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 explain the connections between and among entities.

Cataloguing should take into account the entities, attributes, and relationships as defined in conceptual models of the bibliographic universe. The conceptual models taken into consideration are *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR), *Functional Requirements for Authority Data* (FRAD) and *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data* (FRSAD).

3.1 Entities: The following entities may be represented by bibliographic and authority data:[8]

> Work
>
> Expression
>
> Manifestation
>
> Item[9]
>
> Person
>
> Family
>
> Corporate Body[10]
>
> Thema
>
> Nomen.[11]

---

[6] <www.ifla.org/node/8890>

[7] <www.ifla.org/news/ifla-code-of-ethics-for-librarians-and-other-information-workers-full-version>

[8] Since the consolidation process involving FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD is currently underway, here are listed all the entities described in the aforementioned conceptual models. This brings some inconsistences about Group 3 entities and about nomen in relation to names and access points.

[9] Work, expression, manifestation, and item are the Group 1 entities described in the FRBR and FRAD models.

[10] Person, family, and corporate body are the Group 2 entities as described in the FRAD model.

[11] Thema (any entity used as a subject of a work) and nomen (any sign or sequence of signs by which a thema is known, referred to, or addressed as) are the entities introduced and described in the FRSAD model. Within the FRBR framework, thema includes Group 1 and Group 2 entities, and additionally, all others that serve as the subjects of works (i.e., Group 3 concept, object, event, and place). In FRSAD Nomen is a superclass of the FRAD entities name, identifier, and controlled access point. Being outside of its purpose, this Statement does not consider Nomen as the superclass of name, identifier and controlled access point.

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, or link to 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).[12] When based on a different standard, all efforts should be made to provide open access to published mappings between the standard used and the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD), 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 should be formulated following the general principles (see 2. General Principles). The access points 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 person, family, corporate body, work, expression, manifestation, item, and themas. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for collocating the bibliographic data for sets of resources.

Authority data should be constructed to control the authorized forms of name, 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 Authorized access points for works and expressions (controlled) embodied in the resource, the title of the manifestation (usually uncontrolled), and the authorized

---

[12] *ISBD : International Standard Bibliographic Description*. Consolidated ed. Berlin, München: De Gruyter Saur, 2011. (IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control; v. 44).

access points for the creators of works, should be included as access points to bibliographic data.

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   The authorized form of name for the entity, as well as the variant forms of name, should be included as access points to authority data.

5.2.4   Additional access may be provided 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 used as a default form for displays in the catalogue.

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   However, 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 Preferred Name

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 Preferred Name for Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies

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.

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:

a) a commonly known (or 'conventional') name rather than the official name, where this is indicated; or
b) 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 Preferred Title for Works, Expressions, Manifestations, and Items

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

When variant forms of the work title are found in manifestations, preference should be given to:

a) the title appearing in the first manifestation of the original expression of the work, usually in the original language; or
b) the title commonly used.

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.[13]

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:

---

[13] *Names of persons : national usages for entry in catalogues.* 4th revised and enlarged edition. München, K.G. Saur, 1996. (UBCIM publications ; new series, v. 16) <www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/pubs/names-of-persons_1996.pdf>. Updated versions of *Name of persons* are available online <www.ifla.org/node/4953>.

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 body's 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, Manifestations, and Items

An authorized access point for a work, expression, manifestation, or item may be created either from a title that can stand alone or from 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 a 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 recorded as authority data for controlled access.

6 Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue

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

6.1 to find bibliographic resources in a collection as the result of a search using attributes or relationships of the entities:

to find a single resource or sets of resources representing:

all resources realizing 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 and explore

> within a catalogue, through the logical arrangement of bibliographic and authority data and the clear presentation of relationships among entities

> beyond the catalogue, to other catalogues and in non-library contexts.

7 Foundations for Search Capabilities

7.1   Searching

Access points 1) provide reliable retrieval of bibliographic and authority data and their associated bibliographic resources and 2) collocate and limit search results.

7.1.1   Searching Devices

Names 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

> dates of publication or issuance of the manifestation

> subject access points 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 of the entity

variant names and variant forms of name for the entity

identifiers for the entity

controlled names (e.g. subject access points and/or classification numbers) for the work.

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 creators (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 a large number of bibliographic data 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/or 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 the relationships among them.

8 Glossary

This Glossary includes terms found in the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP) that are being used in a specific way (not simply the usual dictionary definition). A few terms important for the comprehension of the Statement are also listed. At the end are terms used in the 2009 ICP version that are no longer used.

 BT = Broader term; NT = Narrower term; RT = Related term

Access point: A name, term, code, etc., by means of which bibliographic or authority data is searched and identified. Access points allow also the collocating function of the catalogue.
>   See also Additional access point [NT], Authority data [RT], Authorized access point [NT],
>   Controlled access point [NT], Essential access point [NT], Name [RT], Nomen [RT],
>   Uncontrolled access point [NT], Variant form of name [NT].
>   Sources: FRAD, IME ICC, ICP WG.

Additional access point: An access point that may be used in addition to the essential access points to enhance the retrieval of bibliographic or authority data.
>   See also Access point [BT], Essential access point [RT].
>   Sources: IME ICC.

Agent: An entity (person, family or corporate body) that has a responsibility relationship relating to works, expressions, manifestations, or items.
>   See also Corporate body [RT], Creator [NT], Family [RT], Person [RT].
>   Sources: ICP rev WG.

Attribute: Characteristic of an entity. An attribute can be inherent in an entity or externally imputed. Attributes may be recorded as mere literals or as URIs.
See also Conceptual model [BT], Entity [RT], Relationship [RT].
>   Sources: FRBR, ICP rev WG.

Authority data: Aggregate of information about a person, family, corporate body, work, expression, manifestation, item, or thema. Authority data should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names, nomens, variant forms of name, and identifiers used as access points.
>   See also Access point [RT], Bibliographic data [RT], Controlled access point [RT],
>   Identifier [RT].
>   Sources: FRAD, ICP rev WG.

Authorized access point: The preferred controlled access point for an entity, established and constructed according to rules or standards.
>   See also Access point [BT], Authorized form of name [RT], Controlled access point [BT],
>   Essential access point [RT], Name [RT], Preferred name [RT], Variant form of name [RT].
>   Sources: IME ICC.

Authorized form of name: The form of name chosen as the authorized access point for an entity.
>   See also Authorized access point [RT], Conventional name [RT], Name [BT], Preferred
>   name [RT], Variant form of name [RT].

Sources: IME ICC.

Bibliographic data: Data elements that describe and provide access to a bibliographic resource.
　　　See also Authority data [RT], Bibliographic description [NT].
　　　Sources: IME ICC, ICP rev WG.

Bibliographic description: A set of bibliographic data recording and identifying a resource.
　　　See also Bibliographic data [BT], Descriptive cataloguing [RT].
　　　Sources: ISBD cons.

Bibliographic resource: An entity, tangible or intangible, that comprises intellectual and/or artistic content.
　　　Sources: ISBD cons.

Bibliographic universe: The realm related to the collections of libraries. In a broader sense, it may include collections of other information communities such as archives, museums, and so on.
　　　Sources: IME ICC, ICP rev WG.

Bibliographically significant: A quality of an entity or attribute or relationship that has special meaning or value in the context of bibliographic resources.
　　　Sources: IME ICC.

Carrier type: A designation that reflects the format of the storage medium and housing of a carrier in combination with the type of intermediation device required to render, view, run, etc., the content of a resource.
　　　See also Content form [RT], Expression [RT].
　　　Sources: IME ICC.

Conceptual model: A model that conceptualizes the realm of the bibliographic universe using an analysis technique, such as entity/relationship modelling.
　　　See also Attribute [NT], Entity [NT], Relationship [NT].
　　　Sources: ICP rev WG.

Content form: The fundamental form or forms in which the content of a resource is expressed.
　　　See also Carrier type [RT], Expression [RT].
　　　Sources: ISBD cons.

Controlled access point: An access point recorded in authority data. Controlled access points include authorized forms of names as well as those designated as variant forms.
　　　See also Access point [BT], Authority data [RT], Authorized access point [NT], Essential access point [RT], Name [RT], Nomen [RT], Uncontrolled access point [RT], Variant form of name [NT].
　　　Sources: IME ICC.

Conventional name: A name, other than the official name, by which an entity has come to be known.
　　　See also Authorized form of name [RT], Name [BT], Preferred name [RT], Variant form of name [RT].

Sources: modified from AACR2 Revision 2002, Glossary, ICP rev WG.

Corporate body: An organisation or group of persons and/or organisations that is identified by a particular name acting as a unit.
    See also Agent [RT], Creator [RT], Entity [BT], Family [RT], Person [RT].
    Sources: FRAD.

Creator: A person, family, or corporate body responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a work.
    See also Agent [BT], Corporate body [RT], Family [RT], Person [RT].
    Sources: IME ICC.

Descriptive cataloguing: The part of cataloguing that provides both descriptive data and non-subject access points.
    See also Bibliographic description [RT], Subject cataloguing [RT].
    Sources: IME ICC.

Entity: An abstract category of conceptual objects.
    See also Attribute [RT], Conceptual model [BT], Corporate body [NT], Expression [NT], Family [NT], Item [NT] Manifestation [NT], Nomen [NT], Person [NT], Relationship [RT], Thema [NT], Work [NT].
    Sources: FRBR Consolidation Group, modified by ICP Rev WG.

Essential access point: An access point based on a main attribute or relationship of an entity recorded in bibliographic or authority data that ensures retrieval and identification of those data.
    See also Access point [BT], Additional access point [RT], Authorized access point [RT], Controlled access point [RT].
    Sources: IME ICC.

Expression: The intellectual or artistic realization of a work in the form of alpha-numeric, musical, or choreographic notation, sound, image, object, movement, etc., or any combination of such forms.
    See also Carrier type [RT], Content form [RT], Entity [BT], Item [RT], Manifestation [RT], Work [RT].
    Sources: FRBR.

Family: Two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status, or otherwise presenting themselves as a family.
    See also Agent [RT], Corporate body [RT], Creator [RT], Entity [BT], Person [RT].
    Sources: FRAD, as modified by IME ICC.

Form of content See Content form

Identifier: A number, code, word, phrase, logo, device, etc., that is associated with an entity, and serves to differentiate that entity from other entities within the domain in which the identifier is assigned.
    See also Authority data [RT]
    Sources: FRAD.

Item: A single exemplar of a manifestation.
    See also Entity [BT], Expression [RT], Manifestation [RT], Work [RT].
    Sources: FRBR.

Key title: The unique name assigned to a continuing resource by the ISSN Network and inseparably linked with its ISSN.
    Sources: ISBD cons.

Manifestation: The physical embodiment of an expression of a work. A manifestation may embody a collection of works, an individual work, or a component part of a work. Manifestations may appear in one or more physical units.
    See also Entity [BT], Expression [RT], Item [RT], Work [RT].
    Sources: FRAD, FRBR, IME ICC.

Name: A character, word, or group of words and/or characters by which an entity is known. Includes the words/characters designating a person, family, or corporate body; includes the title given to a work, expression, manifestation, or item. Used as the basis for an access point.
    See also Access point [RT], Authorized access point [RT], Authorized form of name [NT], Controlled access point [RT], Conventional name [NT], Nomen [RT], Preferred name [NT], Variant form of name [NT].
    Sources: FRBR as modified in FRAD.

Nomen: Any sign or sequence of signs by which a thema is known, referred to, or addressed as. A thema may have one or more nomens and a nomen may refer to more than one thema. Used as the basis for an access point.
    See also Access point [RT], Controlled access point [RT], Entity [BT], Name [RT].
    Sources: FRSAD.

Person: An individual or a single identity established or adopted by an individual or group.
    See also Corporate body [RT], Creator [RT], Entity [BT], Family [RT].
    Sources: FRBR as modified in FRAD, modified by IME ICC.

Preferred name: The name for an entity chosen according to rules or standards, used as the basis for constructing an authorized access point for the entity.
    See also Authorized access point [RT], Authorized form of name [RT], Conventional name [RT], Name [BT].
    Sources: IME ICC.

Relationship: A specific connection between entities or their instances.
    See also Attribute [RT], Conceptual model [BT], Entity [RT].
    Sources: based on FRBR.

Subject cataloguing: The part of cataloguing that identifies themas and nomens used to refer to them.
    See also Descriptive cataloguing [RT], Thema [RT].
    Sources: IME ICC, ICP rev WG.

Thema: Any entity used as a subject of a work. Themas can vary substantially in complexity. Simple themas may be combined or aggregated, resulting in more complex themas.
  See also Entity [BT], Subject cataloguing [RT].
  Sources: FRSAD.

Type of carrier See Carrier type.

Uncontrolled access point: An access point that is not controlled in authority data.
  See also Access point [BT], Controlled access point [RT].
  Sources: IME ICC, ICP rev WG.

User: Any person, family, corporate body or automaton that searches the catalogue and uses the bibliographic and/or authority data.
  Sources: ICP rev WG.

Variant form of name: A form of name not chosen as the authorized access point for an entity. It may be used to access the authority data for the entity or be presented as a link to the authorized access point.
  See also Access point [BT], Authorized access point [RT], Authorized form of name [RT], Controlled access point [BT], Conventional name [RT], Name [BT].
  Sources: IME ICC.

Work: A distinct intellectual or artistic creation (i.e., the intellectual or artistic content).
  See also Entity [BT], Expression [RT], Item [RT], Manifestation [RT].
  Sources: FRAD, FRBR, as modified by IME ICC.

9 Sources

FRAD – Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model. München : K.G. Saur, 2009. (IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control; v. 34). Available online at: www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frad/frad_2013.pdf

FRBR – Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Report. – Munich : Saur, 1998. (IFLA UBCIM publications new series; v. 19). Available online at: www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-series-on-bibliographic-control-19 (Sept. 1997, as amended and corrected through February 2008)

Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD): Final Report. – Berlin, München : De Gruyter Saur, 2011. (IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control; v. 43). Available online at: www.ifla.org/files/assets/classification-and-indexing/functional-requirements-for-subject-authority-data/frsad-final-report.pdf

GARR – Guidelines for Authority Records and References. 2nd ed., rev. – Munich : Saur, 2001. (IFLA UBCIM publications new series; v. 23). Available online at: www.ifla.org/files/assets/hq/publications/series/23.pdf

IME ICC – IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (1st-5th : 2003-2007), recommendations from the participants.

Introducing the FRBR Library Reference Model / Pat Riva, Maja Žumer.– Paper presented at: IFLA WLIC 2015 - Cape Town, South Africa in Session 207 - Cataloguing. Available online at: http://library.ifla.org/1084

ISBD – International Standard Bibliographic Description. Consolidated edition. – Berlin, München : De Gruyter Saur, 2011. (IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control; v. 44).

Webster's 3rd – Webster's Third New International Dictionary. – Springfield, Mass. : Merriam, 1976.

10 Terms no longer used in 2016 Statement

Authority record *See* **Authority data**
Bibliographic record *See* **Bibliographic data**
Collection
Concept *See* **Thema**
Content type *See* **Content form**
Event *See* **Thema**
Object *See* **Thema**
Place *See* **Thema**

Terms no longer used in 2009 Statement

Bibliographical unit *See* **Manifestation**
Heading *See* **Authorized access point**, **Controlled access point**
Reference *See* **Variant form of name**
Uniform title *See* **Authorized access point**, **Authorized form of name**, **Name**

11 Afterword

This revision of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles is a goal defined in the Cataloguing Section's Action Plan for 2012.[14] Through the Meeting reports, it is possible to follow the decisions taken by the Working Group and approved by the Standing Committee.

In this Afterword some issues that affect the revision in general are mentioned:

1. the 2009 Statement of International Cataloguing Principles' structure has been kept, even though it is acknowledged that the Statement doesn't refer just to principles;
2. the ongoing harmonization of FRBR, FRAD and FRSAD has largely affected the revision. In 2010, FRSAD has substituted the FRBR entities "concept", "object", "event" and "place" with "thema" and has created the superclass "nomen". Many efforts have been made to merge in the Statement all the entities in use avoiding conceptual overlapping and misunderstandings;
3. Principles *Interoperability*, *Openness*, and *Accessibility* have been introduced;
4. the sequence of sections has been modified: former §4. *Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue* is moved to §6;
5. in the introduction, the mention of the International Cataloguing Code has been removed according to the IFLA Cataloguing Standing Committee's decision;[15]
6. in §1 *Scope*, the mention of "archives, museums, and other communities" has been omitted. The Statement is based on library activities, conceptual models, standards, and tools. Even if the other communities' participation in data creation, management and sharing is always welcome, the cooperation doesn't imply the adoption of the same principles or definitions;
7. the §7 *Foundations for Search Capabilities* has been extended and terms "code", "catalogues", "opac" has been replaced using terms that comprise extended forms of collocated bibliographic information;
8. the word and concept of "record" (either bibliographic or authority) has been modified to "data" taking into consideration that the "record" is one way the data can be aggregated and visualized.

---

[14] www.ifla.org/publications/cataloguing-section-action-plan

[15] *2012 Minutes, Appendix IV Expansion of the ICP to form an international cataloguing code?* www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/reports/meeting_2012.pdf