RDA2

Beecher Wiggins:
Good morning everybody. I'm Beecher Wiggins, director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access here at the Library of Congress. I didn't momentarily forget what I do and where I am and who I am. I'm happy to welcome to you to an ongoing series of Library Services "LC's Digital Futures and You!"

Today we continue the series related to giving background on RDA [Resource Description Access] the descriptive cataloguing code that is being developed and expects to be published in early 2009. As we thought about this and how we could be assured that staff would have adequate background as to what RDA was about and what underpinned it, we talked to Barbara Tillett, the chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, to prepare a series of briefing sessions that would give staff background as to what supported and underpinned RDA, and how that affected some of the decisions that went into the code.

So today is the second of those series, and Barbara will talk about the principles that support bibliographic control, and how they are related to RDA, resource description, that will be, an access that will be issued by the end of 2008 or early 2009. So with that I introduce Barbara Tillett, the chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office. Barbara.

Barbara Tillett:
Thank you, Beecher, and as Beecher mentioned, this is the second presentation in a series to prepare you for RDA. We are looking at the influences that have been considered as we are developing this new cataloguing code. During the first presentation that I gave on the background and overview for RDA, I mentioned cataloguing principles.

First of all the Paris Principles that came out in the 1960s and influenced the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules [AACR] and other major cataloguing codes throughout the world and I also mentioned that there is now a new set of principles being prepared by IFLA, called the International Cataloguing Principal and those now are the major influence are RDA.

Your handouts include a copy of the April 10, 2008, final draft of IFLA's "Statement of International Cataloguing Principles" and also its accompanying glossary. Today's presentation is going to take a more in-depth look at these cataloguing principles and the challenges that they present to international

sharing of bibliographic and authority data and the challenges for developers of RDA in trying to follow the principles but also not creating too much change from AACR 2.

Elaine Svenonius in her book "The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization" that was published in the year 2000, said, and I quote, "Bibliographic principles are different from bibliographic objectives and bibliographic rules" -- principles, objectives, rules. "Objectives codify what a user can expect of a bibliographic system -- to find a document, to find all manifestations of a work contiguously displayed, and so forth. Principles, on the other hand, are the directives for the design of the bibliographic language used to create such a system. This language normally takes the form of a code of rules. However, principles themselves are not rules but guidelines for the design for a set of rules" end of quote.

So today we're turning our attention to the principles -- the directives that are helping us design the code of rules at this present time that are affecting the development of RDA. IFLA -- the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions -- has been the center for bibliographic standards for many decades. In 1961, they held a meeting of cataloguing experts in Paris that resulted in the famous Paris Principles, as we know them today. These principles formed the foundation of nearly all of the major cataloguing codes that are used throughout the world. This was an incredible step towards global harmonization of cataloguing principles, and it stills remains a worthy goal.

In 2001, Natalia Kasparova from the Russian State Library, who was then a member of the Cataloguing Section in IFLA, reminded us that it had been 40 years since the Paris Principles and was time again to review those principles to see if they still held up in today's digital and Web environment. In 2003, IFLA launched a series of worldwide regional meetings called the IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code, better known as IME ICC. The process should be completed this year following the worldwide review of the final draft of the statement of International Cataloguing Principles that you have as your handout.

I've had the privilege to serve as chair of the Planning Committee for this series of meetings, and we have to a lot to share with you today. There have been five meetings -- if you go back -- with invited cataloguing experts and rulemaking bodies from around the world. The first one was held in Frankfurt, Germany, in 2003; the second the Buenos Aries, Argentina, in 2004; the third in Cairo, Egypt,

in 2005; the fourth in Seoul, Korea, in 2006; and the fifth in Pretoria, South Africa, in 2007. You can see we were trying to reach all of the regions of the world.

The reports of these meeting and the background papers and presentations are all available on the Web sites that are here and also in your handout. The printed reports are also available from IFLA in the languages of the meetings. The first one was just in English. I've got copies up here for those of you who want to see them later. The second one from Latin America is in Spanish and in English. The third one for the Arabic speaking Middle East is in Arabic and English, and the fourth one that was for all of Asia, nice and thick one, is in English, Japanese, Chinese, and Korean. We are now preparing the fifth and final one that will be in English, Portuguese, and French.

The participants from all of these meetings have found this to be a really exciting process. A side benefit of the regional meetings has just been an opportunity for the participates in each of the regions to get to know each other and to know their colleagues worldwide, but also, the rewarding experience of participating in a global effort to increase the sharing of cataloguing data through common standards. The international effort is one of the influences on the work of RDA -- Resource Description and Access. I do want to make it very clear though that RDA is not an IFLA activity, but it is firmly based on the IFLA principles, standards and conceptual models.

The goal of this series of IFLA regional meetings is to increase the ability to share cataloguing information worldwide by promoting standards for the content of bibliographic and authority records used in library catalogs. I'll come back to that goal of international sharing of cataloguing data because it also applies to the principles themselves, but may often be defeated by a competing goal to do what's best for local users. But, there may be ways for Web-based systems of the future to help us meet both goals at the same time -- both international sharing and serving our local users.

The IME ICC objectives are to develop a statement of international cataloguing principles and we have the drafts. Also to see if we can get closer together in cataloguing practices, which was accomplished a lot during the meetings themselves [by] talking to colleagues in the region. And thirdly, to make recommendations for a possible future international cataloguing code. This would be a code of rules for rule makers. To identify the rules that we agree should be in all cataloguing codes in the world, and it may be that the current

draft statement of principles includes what can be turned into those goals and serve that purpose.

Starting in December of 2003, after each of the IME ICC meetings IFLA annually produced a revised draft of the statement of the principles that was discussed and improved by the IME ICC cataloguing rule makers and experts worldwide. In each draft we found that the new principles update and reaffirm many of the 1961 Paris Principles, but what's new is that the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, which is ICP for short, is now bringing in FRBR concepts. Remember from the first presentation about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records? It also is expanding the focus of the Paris Principles beyond just books and card catalogs to today's environment of online Web-enabled catalogs that describe all kinds of resources. The new principles are written in the spirit of planning for future systems that focus on users and take advantage of system capabilities for better navigation through the bibliographic universe.

Before we look at the current draft of the International Cataloguing Principles, let me remind you of the scope of the topics that were covered in the Paris Principles. First of all, the scope of the 1961 Paris Principles was printed books and other library materials that had similar characteristics, very limiting in today's environment. The functions of the catalogue were finding and co-locating, and I'll come back to that when we compare the Paris Principles to some of the new ICP principles. The Paris Principles describe the structure of the catalogue and the kinds of entries very much centered on the card catalogs of the time. And today we're not limited to single linear card file as they were in 1961, so that part needed updating. And as you see here, the Paris Principles mostly covered entry and forms of headings.

What do you see is missing here? Subject and descriptive cataloguing. Actually, the descriptive elements themselves came later after the 1969 meeting that IFLA held which lead to the International Standards for Bibliographic Descriptions, the ISBDs. The new ICP principles include both descriptive and subject cataloguing and here is the outline of the topics that's in this new statement of principles, ICP. As I mentioned before, it's now out for worldwide review and will be discussed in August at the IFLA Conference in Quebec. So, further changes could still occur. But let's take a look now at what it covers.

You see there is an introduction and then a section on general overarching principles. In the current draft, they have labeled that as "General Objectives," which is a label that may change. That's then followed by a statement of the

"Scope" and then the "Entities, Attributes, and Relationships," notice the intentional use of FRBR terminology. And then, as we saw in the Paris Principles, we have a section on "Functions of the Catalogue." These are actually the objectives in Elaine Svenonius's "known use terms," or in FRBR terms it's the "user tasks" that we expect a bibliographic system to perform.

The next three sections cover bibliographic and authority data. Some of the early comments from the worldwide review are suggesting that we need to remove the term records to make the principles more open to future structures for bibliographic data, and we'll be considering that. The last section was added to guide systems designers and to state some essential elements that we expect in bibliographic and authority records, for example, titles and dates and so on.

So, now, lets look a bit more on the various parts of the ICP statement. The introduction to the statement starts with an acknowledgement of the importance of the Paris Principles for the international standardization and increasing importance of international sharing of data in today's world through online catalogs and beyond. Here and throughout the statement we're reminded that these principles are intended to create bibliographic systems for the convenience of the users. The introduction states the principles are intended to apply to the description and the access of all kinds of materials, unlike the Paris Principles that were basically for texts. These new principles cover both description and access not just the choice and form of headings, and we mean access to both bibliographic data and to authority data -- what we now call bibliographic records and authority records.

The ICP introduction states that the principles are built on the great cataloguing traditions of the world and on the conceptual models FRBR, FRAD -- remember that from the first section -- the Functional Requirements for Authority Data? And also FRSAR -- the Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records. These are all conceptual models from IFLA that are the foundations. So ICP is saying that we intend to keep what remains basic to organizing information, things like providing controlled access, and bibliographic relationships, and also states additional areas that are important.

The starting section that's numbered zero in the statement of principles is now labeled "General Objectives." But in the language of Elaine Svenonius and others, we'd call these the "Guiding Principles for Cataloguing Codes." RDA, Resource Description and Access, the new cataloguing code that's now being developed, includes these guiding principles in its own introductory chapters.

The Joint Steering Committee for the development of RDA has used these principal to help guide decisions about rules. When you look at these principles, starting with "Convenience of the user," you'll see that we should be striving to use terminology that the user would think of, "Common usage." We're to represent the resources that we are describing based on the way that an entity describes itself --"Representation. ""Accuracy" gets to faithfully describing an entity, then we have the minimally necessary elements to uniquely identify an entity and meet user tasks. That's the "Sufficiency and necessity."

We also want the information we provide to be bibliographically significant to the needs of our users. When there are alternatives ways to achieve a goal, the principal of "Economy" would have us prefer the least costly or the simplest approach. We are to standardize descriptions and the constructions of access points as much as possible. Such consistency increases the ability to stair bibliographic and authority data worldwide. "Integration" has us strive to base the description of all types of resources and the controlled forms of names for entities on a common set of rules, not a lot of special rules and case law exceptions, and when the principles collide in a particular situation, we should take a "Defensible," practical solution.

Next in the "Statement of Cataloguing Principles" is the "Scope." Section 1, ICP -- according to the statement -- is to guide the development of cataloguing codes. The principles apply to bibliographic and authority data that's used in current library catalogs and beyond. Notice here that the scope says, "These principles are intended to provide a consistent approach to both descriptive and subject cataloguing." They'll be further developed when the FRSAR model, the subject model, is approved.

Besides reminding us that the principles cover all kinds of resources, the scope also states that the highest principal for consulting cataloguing, constructing cataloguing codes, is the convenience of the users. So here we again have a focus on users. It's recognized that sometimes there are other principles that must be followed, and sometimes the convenience for one user may differ from that would be convenient for other users, but keeping the user at the center of our focus should always be our guide.

Section 2 of the ICP covers "Entities," "Attributes," and "Relationships," again using FRBR terminology. Do you remember the example that I used in the first presentation about on RDA about terminology, the FRBR terminology? We went through the example of a book and how the word "book" means so many

different things in English language, but it means very particular things, and we've chosen different terminology for the FRBR concepts. The FRBR conceptual model divides the bibliographic entities into three groups. You remember that from the first presentation, too. The group entities are the work, expression, manifestation, and item and these group one entities are the things that we represent in our bibliographic records for the most part. But the ICP covers not only bibliographic records but also authority records.

Section 2.2 of the ICP says that "authority records should document the controlled forms of names for all of the FRBR entities." You may wonder about controlling the name of a manifestation or an item but when they are the subject of a work we may need to name them specifically in a subject relationship, and we may wish to have an authority record to document that controlled form of a name.

Section 2.3 and 2.4 of the ICP cover attributes of entities and relationships. In my first presentation of this series, I mentioned that attributes are the data elements, the cataloguing data that we provide in bibliographic and authority records. ICP says that "attributes that identify each identity should be used as our data elements in bibliographic records and authority records." So you see we're back again to the FRBR user tasks, here it's to identify the entities. We're also told that bibliographically significant relationships should be identified through the catalogue through the principal of significance. In other words, we don't need to identify every possible relationship, but we should use our judgment to decide which are significant to our users.

Section 3 of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles is for the functions of the catalogue. It describes the objectives that Elaine Svenonius mentioned these are what a user can expect the system to do. In ICP, the functions of the catalogue are based on the user tasks consistent with FRBR to enable a user to find, identify, select and obtain information, all from FRBR. And the ICP also added to navigate within a catalogue and beyond through the logical arrangement and the bibliographic information and clear pathways. Both the Paris Principles and the International Cataloguing Principles have a section on the functions of the catalogue. So lets compare them now.

Under the functions of the catalogue, the Paris Principles focused on building an efficient instrument. With the International Cataloguing Principles, we see a change in focus to now stating that we're trying to help the user do certain things. It leaves more flexibility for system designers of the future to devise creative

devices to meet the user tasks. Early comments from the worldwide review want us to bring back this focus, though, from the Paris Principles on an efficient instrument, which I hope we can do. Both sets of principles preserve the finding and co-location functions. Remember Cutter's objectives, finding and co-locating?

But the ICP goes much further. We still want to find a particular book that a library has by searching for an author or a title, but ICP opens it up to locating a single resource not just by the author or title, but through any data element that we have given in a bibliographic description to assure finding a unique single resource. We still want to co-locate or display together all the works of an author, but now we want to provide the co-location of all of the resources not just the works that are associated with a person, family, or corporate body in any role like the contributor for the expression of work, such as an illustrator or a singer or an actor. The Paris Principles assured the co-location of the all of the editions of a work but we found the word "editions" to be very fuzzy. So now we're specifying to co-locate all of the expressions of the same work, all of the manifestations of the expressions of the same work and so on.

The International Cataloguing Principles also expand beyond just author and title access to declare that we want to find resources by subject and even want to enable limiting a search or filtering a search by other criteria like language, country, date of publication, content type, carrier type, and so on. And we continue beyond finding to the other FRBR user tasks of identifying, selecting, acquiring, or obtaining, and now the additional one of navigating, to navigate within a catalogue and also beyond the catalogue through clear pathways to get to the information users want.

In Section 4 of the ICP on bibliographic description, we again see that ICP uses the FRBR terminology even to the point of indicating that a separate bibliographic record should usually be made for each manifestation. Bibliographic description is to be based on an internationally agreed standard, and for the library community, that's currently the International Standard for Bibliographic Description, the ISBD. Next we're told that there maybe several levels of completeness to a bibliographic description depending on the purpose of the catalogue or the bibliographic file. For example, we could have a very brief description with just a few core elements, or we could give a very full description with as many attributes we feel are sufficient and necessary for our users, back again to the principles of necessary and sufficient.

Section 5 of ICP makes it clear that we want to take advantage of both controlled and uncontrolled access points. This dichotomy of controlled and uncontrolled access points terminology is from FRAD, the Functional Requirements for Authority Data. But it's presented some confusion in the international understanding of what we need here and we're still looking for better ways to convey the ideas. People often understand controlled to mean the authorized names, but really in the FRAD context it means all of the names that are controlled through an authority record, so the variant names as well as the authorized names. Uncontrolled then, in the FRAD context, means things that we don't try to regularize or control through authority records, like our transcribe data, like the title proper that we find on a manifestation, or keywords that can come from anywhere in a bibliographic or an authority record.

ICP tells us that we want to offer controlled vocabularies to provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources, back again to locating under the objectives, which are the functions of the catalogue. And we should do this by following a standard way of forming or constructing our authorized access points. So here again we have the guiding principal of standardization. ICP says to store these authorized forms of names and titles and their variant forms in authority records.

ICP next covers the choice of access points first for bibliographic records to include the titles of works and expressions -- which are controlled, and the titles of manifestations which are usually not controlled or are called uncontrolled, and the controlled names of the creators of works. This can be persons, families, or corporate bodies. As was true for the Paris Principles, the ICP puts limits on when a corporate body can be considered a creator of a work. You may be familiar with the Anglo-American Cataloguing rules 21.1B2, which talks about works that are emanating from a corporate body being the situations where we give main entry to corporate body.

In ICP, we are limiting the works of when a corporate body can be a creator to those that are reflecting the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, or when the title of the work and the nature of the work make it clear that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work. We can also add access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies and all kinds of other roles other than creator and we can also include subjects. So this looks very familiar, right? These are all of the access points that we are now doing in bibliographic records, the same things that we provide today in what we are now calling name entries and added entries in our MARC records. Access points to

get us to authority records include the authorized form of names for the identity represented by that authority record as well as the variant forms of name, and right now we treat the variant forms of names as references. We can also make access points for the names of related entities, which we now provide as "see also" references.

Section 6 of the draft's statement of International Cataloguing Principles builds on FRAD, the Functional Requirements for Authority Data, and we will be expanding it following the publication of the report on the Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data later. So we could have authority records for the authorized and the variant forms of names for all of the FRBR entities, any of which could be the subject of a work and may need to be controlled.

Section 6.1 is on the choice of names for the authorized access points. ICP says to use as the preferred form of name, the one that we find predominantly on manifestations, which is also what the Paris Principles said in another way. They said to use the name that was found most frequently following the principal of representations again. For example, we have Leo Tolstoy as our choice for the preferred form of name for this author, reflecting on how we're finding his name on most of the works that are published in English, not his transliterated full name of Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy. Or the ICP also lets us use common usage principle and prefer a well-accepted name that is suited to our users. For example, we would use the name of "Hamlet" for that work rather than its original title, "The Tragical History of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark."

The next section of ICP then brings up the issue of different personas or bibliographic identities. The issue is one discussed within the Paris Principles as well and the ICP decision reflects the representation principles. How an identity is represented on manifestations is the governing feature, using the names that we would expect a user to bring in their search in a catalogue. Some cataloguing codes of the past preferred to co-locate all of the names used by a real person under that person's full name, but since AACR2, we have declared bibliographic identities separately. So Charles Dodgson is separate from the entity of Lewis Carroll even though it's the same real person behind both of those names. But we do make a link so that a user can navigate to the related names.

ICP has chosen to focus on the convenience to the user of co-locating the works of a bibliographic identity with separate links to the names of related identities and entities. We recognize each persona, each identity separately and establish

a name for each one with all of its variant forms of names and link them with "see also" references to the related other identities.

In general terms, we're instructed to give a commonly known name over an official name. For example, we use Virginia instead Commonwealth of Virginia, or we use Rhode Island instead of its official name, which is the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Did you know that? ICP also allows us to use the official name when there is no commonly known or a conventional name. For corporate bodies that have changed their name over time and the change is not just a minor variation, we are to consider each significant name change as a new entity and to link the two. Does this sound familiar? This is still carrying over the same from the Paris Principles.

So you may have seen some television ads lately for Accenture that was formerly Arthur Anderson. Or we're all familiar with all the changes other time with OCLC and what does it really mean and was it really starting out as Ohio College Library Center and then going through all of the various changes over time. So each of these changes over time that are really significant major changes are to be treated as separate and related entities.

Titles are what we call the names of works. If there are variant titles for a work, the ICP says to just choose one of them as the basis for the preferred title for the work or the expression. This may seem like a no-brainer. We might find variant titles on manifestations or in reference sources or we may just know the fact that there are other variations of the names for a work. It's interesting to note that an expression does not have a title of its own but inherits the title of a work. We may add expression level information and attributes to identify the expression level to clearly make it known which expression we intend, but the expression itself doesn't have its own separate title. It's an interesting sort of revelation that hit some of us a couple of months ago.

There is another section of the ICP that deals with the form of the preferred names of entities, and we'll see that in just a moment. Remembering the user again, we want to make sure that if there are several variant names that we ensure access from all of them. That is when we choose one form of name as an authorized access point, we need to be sure all of the other variant forms are available as access points. For example, you see here that we have BBC, and we have chosen the full name British Broadcasting Corporation as its name, but we make cross-references for BBC and find that there are many subordinate and

related bodies whose names start with BBC. So we can get the user to where we have placed all of this information and co-located in a browse display.

The BBC name also has appeared on resources in Arabic and Chinese, so if a user has a citation from one of those variant forms of the name and searches that way, we can now get the user to the records that we have for the BBC. We could do that by either using the various forms of the names of an entry as cross references to lead the user to our chosen authorized form, or in the future we hope, we could let a system display the users' choice of a variant form based on their language and their script preferences. Language and script are big issues when we share information internationally. And here is also where we see the principles of representation that is trying to meet local users needs based on how an entity represents itself on a manifestation conflicting now with the principle of consistency, which would allow us to share the same form internationally.

This is also where the idea though of a virtual international authority file comes in, where all of the world's authority records could be linked and could be used to display a users choice of language and script. It would enable us to accomplish both of the goals of representation and of sharing and consistency internationally. With the VIAF, the Virtual International Authority File, all of the forms are treated equally and are available for display. But for a default, we set up rules to prefer one of those forms of names. The ICP says to first follow the principal of representation choosing the original language and script whenever possible. For example, we have many languages and script variations for Shakespeare, but we prefer the original language and script for the access point.

ICP also says though that if the original language and script is not a language or script normally used in a catalogue, we can prefer one that is found on the manifestations or in reference sources in the language and script best suited to our local users. For example Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich. Here we have followed the principal of common usage in our environment, preferring the form of name that's best suited to the users of our catalogue. The authority record for Tchaikovsky also gives 43 other Latin script variant spellings for his name, and soon it will be added to by cross-references from various script forms of his name; however, for the sake of international sharing, we are encouraged in the Statement of Principles to provide the original language and script whenever that's possible either as an authorized access point or at least as a variant form.

If we choose to transliterate a script -- for example in the United States, we prefer a Latin script for the majority of our users when they get a non-Latin script as the

original -- we are told in ICP to follow an internationally accepted standard for script conversion. The Library of Congress, of course, is using our LC ALA transliteration tables. So you see here the example for the parliament in Japan. It's called Kokkai in Japanese. For the Library of Congress users, we want the transliterated form of the Japanese characters in Latin script but we will also provide cross-references from other languages and soon from other scripts.

The Paris Principles said that a uniform heading should normally be the name or title most frequently used in editions of the work cataloged, or in references to them by accepted authorities. Further, if there where several language editions preference should go to the heading found in the original language, but if that language was not normally used in the catalogue, the heading could be derived in edition and references in one of the languages normally used. Basically, ICP follows the same principles. To build an authorized access point from basic preferred name for an entity, we can add further identifying characteristics to distinguish the entity from others with the same name.

For example, Winston Churchill, it's the name of a famous prime minister. It's also the name of an English nobleman from the 1700s, and a grandmaster engraver, and even the name of an orchid, and a fuscia flower and many other things have this name of Winston Churchill. With the ICP principles, we are told to add some qualifying data to distinguish among the entities, so we have things that are familiar to us like the life dates, or titles that maybe given to a person.

ICP then looks at the forms of names starting with how to select an entry word. This is the first word that's displayed when you have a list or a browsed linear display. The instructions for persons and for families is the same: to follow the convention in the country and the language that's most associated with that person or family as found in manifestations or reference sources, again the principle of representation. How those people represent themselves on the manifestations, but we also have here the principle of common usage. In the United States, our convection for married women is to choose the entry word as the surname of the husband. So for example, Hillary Rodham Clinton. We would follow our countries conventions and use Clinton as the entry word.

ICP next addresses corporate names, putting them in direct order, which is the same as the Paris Principles. And lets begin with -- let us begin with or include the name of a jurisdiction when the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or a territorial authority. When we have a subordinate body with a name that cannot

stand alone or as ICP puts it, "is insufficient to identify it," we go back to the FRBR users tasks. We should begin with the name of the superior body, so we can identify it properly. Our example is here is the Cataloging Policy and Support office here at the Library of Congress. Any number of organizations might have a cataloguing and policy support office, so we need the higher-level corporate body name to identify the subordinate body.

ICP next addresses the expressions and how the forms of names are constructed. It says the name can be a title that stands alone or its name can be a name-title combination -- we usually call it author-title combination -- with the name of the creator combined with the preferred title for the work, and that we can also add further qualifying information if we need to, to distinguish the name. For the preferred title, we follow the familiar pattern of choosing one of the most frequently found forms in manifestations in the original language. This is again looking at the international standardization sharing view, or we can focus on local users taking the preferred title that we may find in reference sources or that shows up most frequently on manifestations that we may have in hand at our local environment. When we have this competition of goals to strive to share internationally and also to meet local user needs, the principles try for an international choice but always leave open the door to focus on local users needs when that opportunity exists.

ICP next has Section 7 that covers foundations for search capabilities. This was an addition made at the very first IME ICC meeting in Germany. The participants there felt a very strong desire to give guidance to systems designers about what libraries feel are important for searching and retrieving bibliographic and authority records. They begin by reminding us that we need to provide access points that will result in reliable retrieval of both the bibliographical and authority records, but also for retrieving associated bibliographic resources. So the participants wanted to go beyond just not recording the surrogate records but getting to the digitized objects themselves or resources whenever that was possible. They noted some of the typical devices that are used in searching like searching by full forms of names, by keywords, by phrases, by using truncation, but they also left open the possibility by throwing in "et cetera."

Many of the IME ICC participants were involved in getting new systems and were very conscious about mandatory data elements and what they're communication formats were declaring as mandatory. So they wanted the international cataloguing principles to also state, again for systems designers but also for

catalogers, what elements are considered essential. So here you see the ones that everyone has agreed to after all five of the IME ICC meetings.

So we have the name of a creator, the preferred title for the work, or the expression, the title proper, the years of publication or issuance, subject headings or subject terms, classification numbers, standard numbers, identifiers and key titles. For authority records, they declared that the authorized name for an entity, identifiers for an entity and variant forms of the name were all essential. They also included other elements to use optionally either access points, or for filtering or limiting devices, and for bibliographic records those are names of creators beyond the first, names of persons families or corporate bodies in other roles than creator, variant titles, authorized access points for series, bibliographic record identifiers, language, country of publication, content type, and carrier type. We also have the access points, additional access points for authority records. We can additionally provide names of related entities and authority record identifiers. And notice it's saying that we can include but its not limited to these. So we could provide additional information if we found that was important.

Here it has the authority record identifiers, and remember before identifiers for the entity were already covered as essential access points and now we're here we have the record identifiers as being additional access points. So they are making a distinction there. At the Library of Congress, we often think of our LC control numbers as being a record identifier but also identifying the entity that that record represents -- interesting dilemma.

In the initial draft from IME ICC 1, we also had a Section 8 for displays, but that was removed after discussion about it being too oriented toward systems applications. However, the IME ICC participants agreed that it would be useful for IFLA to issue guidance for designers about the desirable features of displays that would meet the objectives of library catalogues and stated at the start of these principles. There is also another IFLA working group that issued a report on OPAC displays and their report is available through the IFLA net at ifla.org.

So now what are the next steps? All of the participants from all of the IME ICC meetings 1 through 5 have agreed on a final text that went out for worldwide review on May 1, 2008. The worldwide review deadline is June 30 of 2008. So if you would like to participate, you are encouraged to go to the URL that I have on the next slide. Comments will be discuss amongst the members of the IME ICC planning committee during the IFLA conference that's going to be held in Quebec

this August, and it's hoped that a final version of the statement of International Cataloguing Principles will follow that meeting.

The timing is very good as there are several bodies reviewing their cataloguing codes right now that expect to have them completed in 2009. For example, the Italian code that that's known as RICA and also RDA, Resource Description and Access. The Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA has been mindful to be in sync with the IME ICC principles as its been developing RDA. With the World Wide Web and increased efforts toward internationalization of principles and cataloguing codes, we can look forward to even greater collaboration in bibliographic control to help not only the world's libraries but people seeking information anywhere.

ICP sets out basic general cataloguing principles. It does not cover all of the special exceptions that may be needed for very large complex research collections. The principles are to be used by rule makers. They are the principles behind the cataloguing rules, and there will be then rules to further refine the principles when needed. But for the ICP, we'll remember that the principal of the user convenience overrides other principles when that's necessary. In AACR 2 you were told that those rules were based on the Paris Principles, but AACR 2 never told you what those principles were.

In RDA, you will be told. In the general introduction of RDA, the objectives and the principles are laid out, and then in chapter eight, related to the names for entities, you are told the guiding principles for those. The intention is that by stating the principles, a cataloger will be able to judge what to do in any situation that may present itself. The Library of Congress and many large libraries, though, have huge legacy data bases of records created over, sometimes hundreds of years, and many of those records either don't follow any principles at all, or they were based on case law or various rules that had been devised in that time span.

So our new principles may not necessarily help the end users of today's legacy databases, but they will guide the creation of future records and hopefully future systems. And the principles most certainly are already guiding the development of new cataloguing codes such as the Italian rules and RDA, Resource Description and Access. Thank you for your attention.

[applause]

[music]

[end of transcript