Results of the March 2006 IME ICC 1-2 Vote on the IME ICC3 Recommendations on the draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles

SUMMARY: A total of 22 countries cast votes in this round. Votes were received from 18 IME ICC 1 countries and from 4 countries representing the IME ICC 2. All issues were approved by majority vote.

On Question no. 4 "Adding GMDs to indispensable access points," the Germans reminded us of the conflict with ISBD, FRBR, etc., where GMDs are NOT mandatory. The General Material Designator will be added to this version of the draft Statement to follow the results of the voting, but the topic will be reviewed again for further IME ICC discussion when there is news (expected in 2006 or 2007) from the ISBD Review Group regarding GMDs. The ISBD Review Group is looking into the GMD issues for the consolidated ISBD.

A "clean" version of the Draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles is attached for your information. Translators are asked to please send their translations of this version to Susanne Oehlschlaeger for posting on the IME ICC Web sites.

1. LANGUAGE (5.1.3) = Approved

Results:

18: Yes, I agree

0: No, I do not agree (keep Sept. 2005 wording)

0: Abstain

1 country split voted and the vote was not counted.

The September 2005 draft now reads:

5.1.3. Language

When names have been expressed in several languages, preference should be given to a heading based on information found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script; but if the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be based on forms found on manifestations or in references in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.

Access should be provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through either the authorized heading or a reference. If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversion should be followed.

The suggested revision of text would clarify that "references" means "reference sources" or means "cross-references" as follows:

5.1.3. Language

When names have been expressed in several languages, preference should be given to a heading based on information found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script; but if the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be based on forms found on manifestations or in reference sources in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.

Access should be provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through either the authorized heading or a cross-reference. If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversion should be followed.

IME ICC1	Vote	IME ICC2	Vote
Austria (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Argentina (2 votes)	Yes, I agree
Czech Republic (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Costa Rica (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
Estonia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Mexico (2 votes)	Yes, I agree

p. 2

Finland (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
France (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Germany (*2 votes split)	Yes, I agree/No		
Hungary (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Italy (3 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Russia (2 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Slovakia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Slovenia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Spain (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Sweden (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
United Kingdom (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Vatican City (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Total: 15 Countries – 19 votes	14 = yes	4 Countries – 6 votes	4=yes

^{*}The DDB sent in a consolidated vote for 13 members of the Expert Group for Descriptive Cataloging

2. CORRECT THE TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR = Approved unanimously

Please indicate:

19: Yes, I agree

0: No, I do not agree (keep original Sept. 2005 wording)

0: Abstain

The September 2005 draft now reads:

5.4.1.1. when the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or territorial authority, the authorized heading should begin with or 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;

5.4.1.2. when the corporate name implies subordination, or subordinate function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the authorized heading should begin with the name of the superior body.

The typo was corrected on the September 23, 2005 version as shown above in red ("from" should be "form"). This will be fixed on the next draft.

IME ICC1	Vote	IME ICC2	Vote
Austria (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Argentina (2 votes)	Yes, I agree
Czech Republic (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Costa Rica (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
Estonia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Mexico (2 votes)	Yes, I agree
Finland (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
France (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Germany (*2 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Hungary (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Italy (3 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Russia (2 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Slovakia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Slovenia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Spain (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Sweden (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
United Kingdom (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Vatican City (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Totals: 15 Countries - 19	Yes =15	4 Countries – 6 votes	Yes= 4
votes			

^{*}The DDB sent in a consolidated vote for 13 members of the Expert Group for Descriptive Cataloging

3. UNIFORM TITLES (5.5.1) = Approved

Please indicate:

16: Yes, I agree

1: No, I do not agree (keep original Sept. 2005 wording)

0: Abstain

1 country split vote; vote not counted

The September 2005 draft now reads:

- **5.5.1.** The uniform title should be the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work except
 - **5.5.1.1.** when there is a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue, preference should be given to the commonly used title as found in manifestations or reference sources.

The suggested revision of 5.5.1.1 would simplify and clarify that in some circumstances the commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue should be used rather than the title found in manifestations or reference sources, to read as follows:

- **5.5.1.** The uniform title should be the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work except
 - 5.5.1.1. when there is a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue, preference should be given to it.

IME ICC1	Vote	IME ICC2	Vote
Austria (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Argentina (2 vote)	Yes, I agree
Czech Republic (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Costa Rica (1 vote)	No, I do not agree
Estonia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Mexico (2 votes split)	Yes, I agree/No
Finland (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
France (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Germany (*2 votes)	Yes, I agree/		
	No		
Hungary (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Italy (3 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Russia (2 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Slovakia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Slovenia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Spain (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Sweden (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
United Kingdom (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Vatican City (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Totals: 15 Countries - 19	Yes =14	4 Countries – 3 votes	Yes= 2
votes			No =1

^{*}The DDB sent in a consolidated vote for 13 members of the Expert Group for Descriptive Cataloging

4. ADD GMDs TO INDESPENSABLE ACCESS POINTS = Approved by majority, but noted for future discussion following recommendations on GMDs from the ISBD Review Group. Please note the important observations from the German response.

Please indicate:

15: Yes, I agree

0: No, I do not agree (keep original Sept. 2005 wording)

2: Abstain

2 countries split vote; votes not counted

The September 2005 draft now reads:

- **7.1.2.** <u>Indispensable</u> access points are those based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in the bibliographic or authority record.
 - **7.1.2.1.** Indispensable access points for **bibliographic records** include:

the name of the creator or first named creator when more than one is named the title proper or supplied title for the manifestation the year (s) of publication or issuance the uniform title for the work/expression subject headings, subject terms

classification numbers standard numbers, identifiers, and 'key titles' for the described entity.

Even recognizing that the general material designators are under much discussion just now, the concept is still felt to be a mandatory one to include. The suggested revision would make the GMD mandatory, as follows:

7.1.2. <u>Indispensable</u> access points are those based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in the bibliographic or authority record.

7.1.2.1. Indispensable access points for **bibliographic records** include:

the name of the creator or first named creator when more than one is

the title proper or supplied title for the manifestation

the year (s) of publication or issuance

the uniform title for the work/expression

a general material designation

subject headings, subject terms

classification numbers

standard numbers, identifiers, and 'key titles' for the described entity.

Austria (1 vote) Yes, I agree Argentina (2 votes split) Yes, I agree Estonia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Mexico (2 votes split) Yes, I agree Estonia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Mexico (2 votes split) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Abstain Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree – with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 Argentina (2 votes split) Yes, I agree Costa Rica (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree Abstain Syes = 2	IME ICC1	Vote	IME ICC2	Vote
Czech Republic (1 vote) Yes, I agree Estonia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Mexico (2 votes split) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree — with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes, I agree				
Estonia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Mexico (2 votes split) Yes, I agree/No Finland (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Abstain Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree — with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinida	Austria (1 vote)	Yes, Lagree	Argentina (2 votes split)	Yes, I agree/Abstain
Estonia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Mexico (2 votes split) Yes, I agree/No Finland (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree France (1 vote) Abstain Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree — with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinida				
Finland (1 vote) France (1 vote) Abstain Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree — with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote) Yes, I agree - with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with fragre, and ISBD, the optional ISBD, the optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Yes, I agree Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2		-	` '	
France (I vote) Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree – with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (I vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (I vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (I vote) Abstain Spain (I vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (I vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (I vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Estonia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Mexico (2 votes split)	Yes, I agree/No
Germany (*2 votes) Yes, I agree – with comment: The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes= 2	Finland (1 vote)	Yes, I agree	Trinidad and Tobago (1 vote)	Yes, I agree
The addition of GMDs to indispensable access points is not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes = 13 4 Countries – 2 votes Yes = 2	France (1 vote)	Abstain		
not in accordance with FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR, GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Germany (*2 votes)	Yes, I agree – with	n comment:	
GMDs are not mandatory (SMDs are). In ISBD, the optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Vatican City (1 vote) Yes = 2		The addition of GMI	Ds to indispensable access points is	
optional FRBR elements are treated as optional ISBD elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Vessel (1 vote) Yes = 2		not in accordance wi	th FRBR and ISBD. In FRBR,	
elements. It is important that the treatment of GMDs is done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD. Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Ves, I agree Ves, I agree Yes = 2				
done in accordance with the consolidated ISBD.				
Hungary (1 vote) Yes, I agree Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2				
Italy (3 votes) Yes, I agree Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2		done in accordance v	with the consolidated ISBD.	
Russia (2 votes) Yes, I agree Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Hungary (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Slovakia (1 vote) Yes, I agree Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Italy (3 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Slovenia (1 vote) Abstain Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Russia (2 votes)	Yes, I agree		
Spain (1 vote) Yes, I agree Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Slovakia (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Sweden (1 vote) Yes, I agree United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Slovenia (1 vote)	Abstain		
United Kingdom (1 vote) Yes, I agree Vatican City (1 vote) Yes, I agree Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	Spain (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Vatican City (1 vote)Yes, I agreeTotals: 13 Countries - 17Yes = 134 Countries - 2 votesYes = 2	Sweden (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
Totals: 13 Countries - 17 Yes = 13 4 Countries - 2 votes Yes = 2	United Kingdom (1 vote)	Yes, I agree		
		Yes, I agree		
votes	Totals: 13 Countries - 17	Yes =13	4 Countries – 2 votes	Yes= 2
1000	votes			

^{*}The DDB sent in a consolidated vote for 13 members of the Expert Group for Descriptive Cataloging