

**REPORT ON THE IME ICC4 MEETING,  
August 16-18, 2006 Seoul, Korea  
Jaesun Lee**

The Fourth IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC4) was held August 16-18, 2006 at the National Library of Korea in Seoul, Korea. Once again this fourth meeting provided an opportunity to get the cataloguing experts together, this time from the Asian countries. Most of them were meeting for the first time, getting to know each other and to discuss together the basic principles of cataloguing in today's digital Internet environment.

Invitations went out to 61 representatives from 17 countries in Asia: Bangladesh, Cambodia, China (also Hong Kong and Taiwan), Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam. Travel funds were again an issue for some country representatives, but we were able to find funding for a few of the participants. Even so, 44 participants joined us in Seoul, representing 12 countries in Asia. The members of the Planning Committee added 4 more countries: Canada, Italy, Spain, and the United States of America for a total of 16 countries and 49 registered attendees. There were also approximately 30 volunteers assisting with local logistics and serving as interpreters and recorders for the Working Groups. In addition to IFLA's support (primarily to cover the expense of simultaneous interpreters), very generous support was received from OCLC and from the National Library of Korea and the Library of Congress.

Chinese, English, Japanese, and Korean were the official languages of the meeting with simultaneous interpretation through the plenary sessions. Meetings of the Working Groups typically were held in English or Japanese with volunteer interpreters helping in other languages. As with the earlier IME ICC meetings, a Web site was offered, this time in Chinese, English, Japanese, and Korean. The plan for the published report is to present it in the 4 working languages of the meeting.

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

Objectives for this fourth meeting in Seoul were to examine cataloguing codes currently used in Asia to compare their similarities and differences with the 1961 Paris Principles; to review and update the April 2006 draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles from the earlier IME ICC meetings and to enhance the accompanying Glossary with terminology in the Asian languages for the key concepts in the principles.

Regarding the agenda of this meeting, background papers were presentation on ISBD by Elena Escolano Rodriguez, on FRBR terminology and concepts by Pat Riva, and on the Virtual International Authority File by Barbara B. Tillett.

One of the highlights of this particular meeting was the presentation of seven country reports: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. These reports shared information on the state of cataloguing rules and comparison to the Paris Principles and the draft IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles. China, Japan, and Korea have a history of rule making bodies and have followed the Paris Principles with a focus on the needs of publications in their region of the world. Many other countries in Asia follow the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* or have a local set of rules based on AACR2. The other Asian countries are invited to submit their reports to add to the published meeting report.

Much of the second day was devoted to working group meetings in order to discuss their topics and make recommendations. Optimal communication without a language barrier increases efficiency on the activity of working groups, so certified interpreters were provided to the Working Groups for English, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

The recommendations from each of the Working Groups are briefly described as follows:

#### WG 1, Personal Names (Ben Gu, leader)

This working group had no problems with the draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles or the Glossary. Their discussion centered on differentiation and over-differentiation of personal names and the question of whether “controlled” meant a separate authority record for each entity. They think that there are inconsistencies between ‘5.1.3 Language’ and ‘5.5.1.1’. In case of ‘5.1.3’, there was ‘... in original language ...’ but there was ‘... in the language and script of the catalogue ...’ in section 5.5.1.1. So they recommend that ‘should be’ be changed to ‘could be’ or ‘may be’. In addition, they suggested that the terms ‘controlled’ or ‘controlled access points’ are not clear. Many cataloguers think ‘controlled’ means ‘authority control’. It also means differentiation. For this, cataloguers make differentiation more often than need be. There were also specific suggestions for cataloguing rules related to Indonesian names.

#### WG 2, Corporate Bodies (Maria Lau, leader)

This group agreed with the draft Statement concerning corporate names, but suggested moving the access point for years of publication or issuance out of the “indispensable access points” list and into the list of “additional access points”, as they are more likely to be used to limit or filter a search than be a primary or mandatory access point. They also spotted a couple of typographical errors to correct in the next draft.

There are also some opinions. One of them is regarding the title of sections. About section ‘5.1.1 choice of access point’, one member questioned the appropriateness of the term ‘choice’. The suggestion was given to use ‘scope’ instead of ‘choice’. The group did not reach the consensus on the amendment but presented the opinion.

### WG 3, Seriality (Naoko Harai, leader)

This group agreed with the principles and the glossary but had some suggestions to improve the ISBD (CR) to better meet the realities of serial publications and integrating resources in the Asian world. The main issues of seriality are the major changes in the title proper of ISBD (CR). There should be more consideration made in treating major changes of Asian countries. The group all agreed that there was a need to have change. For example, the first 5 words show the difficulties that these nations are facing. It is hard to apply this rule in Asian countries. And about serial cataloguing, there are some other problems in Asian countries: treatment of the materials that have no predetermined conclusion but have unique titles on their parts, the relationship between libraries and the national ISSN centers, display methods of changed title information. This group noted that non-English speaking countries have a hard time grasping some of the words in the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles.

### WG 4, Uniform Titles and GMD (Yukiko Sakai, leader)

The group suggested clarifying that a uniform title may be qualified by a personal name as well as any other names such as a corporate name and a place name and all kinds of attributes such as language and date. They also felt a strong statement should be made about the national responsibility of creating uniform titles at least about classics and scriptures created in the country. They had some suggestions for additions to the Glossary related to name/title uniform titles and general material designations, and needing a global list of GMDs. They also suggested the wording change from “should be” to “could be” in ‘5.5.1.1’, since the priority for the uniform title forms may not be decisive or the exception should be optional. In later discussion it was pointed out that the GMD is a topic currently under discussion within IFLA and the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR and that those developments will be coming soon and can guide the direction of updating the Statement in this area including the change of terminology for “GMD”.

### WG 5, Multipart Structures (Cheong-Ok Yoon, leader)

Although the group generally agreed with the Introduction and draft principles, they had several suggestions and questions about the convenience of the user and how that might relate to user-centric or a user friendly approach. About ‘1. Scope’, they suggested it broaden some aspects of the catalogue to be more user-centric and user friendly. There were questions on the meaning of indispensable and of why the entity “family” was added. That later was clarified as coming from the archival community where “family” is an important entity. The word “indispensable” is underlined in bold type in 7.1.2. They know the meaning, but they suggested that it should be more clearly defined in the draft or in the Glossary part. There was also discussion on the practices in each country with regard to multipart structures and the differences between rules and local practices. Especially, multi-volume issues are more obvious in Asian countries than Western countries, so more examples, based on the unique situations in Asian countries should be provided for the international standards.

About the Glossary, this group generally agreed with the definitions. One suggestion was made. There was a term “physical unit” in 2.1.1., but that term is not defined in the Glossary. They suggested that it should be added to the Glossary.

After the presentation of the working groups, the participants discussed the main issues one more time.

- The typographical error ‘1961’ indicated by working group 2 will be corrected.
- “User-centric” or “user friendly”, these issues will have more online discussion.
- 3.12 term “family” is an important part. So it will remain as it is.
- Section 5.3.1 and 5.5.1.1 will have more online discussions. But the term “could be,” or “may be” normally are not used in a principle.
- The term “Name/Title combination” will be added to “Uniform title” in the glossary.
- About “corporate name” and “place”, a way should be found to word these terms formally to avoid confusion.
- Regarding 5.5 Forms of Uniform titles, a new section of “5.5.2” on national responsibility will be recommended for the principles by Working Group 4.
- 7.1.2.2 Indispensable access points: “variant points” does not seem to include cross references. They wanted to discuss more.
- “the years of publication...”, this will need further discussion.
- About “Controlled access points”, it will be discussed more.

The recommendations from the Seoul meeting were shared with the other Asian participants through the IME ICC4 Email Discussion List on the homepage.

IME ICC4 draft will be posted on the web and will be shared with all those professionals who could not participate in this meeting worldwide. The finalized draft of the statement from IME ICC4 will be provided to the IME ICC5 prior to its meeting. The 5<sup>th</sup> IME ICC will be held in the National Library of South Africa in Pretoria. It is planned for 14-15 August 2007.

IME ICC4 was quite a significant meeting in the sense that it was the first time for all Asian cataloguers to meet together. For the past many years, the influential meetings concerning the global cataloguing community have been held mainly in western countries.

With this IME ICC4 as a momentum, I wish that many good Asian cataloguing practices will be normalized and established as the international cataloguing principles.