ISO/TC 46/SC 9 Secretariat **ISO/TC 46/SC 9 Secrétariat**

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, CANADA
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa, CANADA
K1A 0N4

Telephone - Téléphone
(819) 994-6939
Fax : (819) 953-0291
Internet: iso.tc46.sc9@nlc-bnc.ca

ISO/TC 46/SC 9 N 266
1999-04-30

To: Members of ISO/TC 46/SC 9

cc. C. Deschamps, ISO/TC46/SC9 Chairperson
S. Clivio, ISO Central Secretariat

SUBJECT: Summary of the systematic review of standards developed by ISO/TC46/SC9

The attached document shows the results of the most recent systematic review (1992-1998) for each of the International Standards developed by ISO/TC 46/SC 9. Standards published since 1994 are not included as they have not yet undergone the systematic review process.

ACTION REQUIRED:

- **For immediate distribution to delegates to the May 1999 meeting of ISO/TC 46/SC 9**
- **This document should be retained for future reference during the proposed review of SC 9's programme of work**

In 1998 the following ISO/TC 46/SC 9 standards were reviewed:

- ISO 2145 (Numbering of divisions and subdivisions in written documents);
- ISO 2146 (Directories of libraries, archives ... and their databases);
- ISO 7154 (Bibliographic filing principles);
- ISO 10957 (International standard music number).

The results and comments from the 1998 review are shown in the attached charts**. In light of the voting results, the TC 46/SC 9 Secretariat is recommending that ISO 2145, ISO 7154 and ISO 10957 should be confirmed and that ISO 2146 should be withdrawn.**

There will be an opportunity to discuss these recommendations during the May 1999 meeting of ISO/TC 46/SC 9.

With regards,

[original signed by]

Jane Thacker
Secretary, ISO/TC 46/SC 9

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 8:1977
Presentation of periodicals

Review period ended: **1992**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
China, P.R.				
Cuba				
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Finland	No		Withdraw	
France	Yes	No	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Germany	No	Yes	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway				
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	Revise	**Yes**
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden				
U.K.				
U.S.A.			Revise	

RESULTS of the 1992 review of ISO 8:

CONFIRM = 8. REVISE = 5. WITHDRAW = 1. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 9. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 3.

DECISION: **REVISE** [*Note: The ISO 8 revision project was withdrawn for lack of progress at the CD stage in 1998. The status of ISO 8 was consequently changed to* ***confirmed*** *until the next systematic review in 2002*]

Summary of the technical comments:

- Canada: Clauses 4.4 and 5.4 needs to be revised in light of the withdrawal of ISO 30 [and the biblid standard]. in 5.4, the "end of volume" information would be more useful at the end of the table of contents instead of on the last page of the text. In clause 9 the standard requires too much information for a single page's running head. Is the author's name required in addition to the title? Revision should also take into account the existence of ISO 9115 [*since withdrawn*] for the running head. The requirements outlined in clause 12.4 are not clear, e.g. if abstracts appear at the beginning of an issue, should they be placed last in the table of contents? How does one refer to a heading by its title and when would this be done? How does a heading have a first and last page?
  Clause 12.4 requires clarification as to the "information" to which the standard is referring.
- France: Practice is far from conforming to the standard, particularly for serials in literature, the humanities and social sciences.
- Germany: A revision is proposed to include the context of ISO/R30 and ISO 9115 [*now withdrawn*].
- Portugal: Do not agree with clause 6.2; roman numerals are still used in Portugal and other countries. In clause 4, add that all additions of fascicles should be indicated on the title page or in a relevant place. Include a new paragraph in clause 7.1, stating that publication date should coincide with the calendar year; in cases where that is not possible, recommend that volume numbering be corrected at the end of the year or at the end of the next calendar one.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 18:1981
Contents lists of periodicals

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	No	Yes	Revise	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden				
U.K.				
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 18:

CONFIRM = 12. REVISE = 4. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 9. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 5.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Finland: Electronic periodicals should be accommodated in the standard.
- Germany: Technical requirements applied in practice are only partly consistent with ISO 18, e.g. the specification for placement of the contents list is not generally followed in scientific journals. OPAC developments and corresponding indexing rules are not covered in the standard.
  References to ISO 30 should be deleted in clauses 2 and 6.1.
- Poland: Remove all references to ISO 30; update the reference to ISO 639. Shorten the definition of "contents list" in clause 3 (PKN supplied a new definition).
  There are no provisions for one-letter code in ISO 639 so change clause 4.4.2.
  There are no provisions for "issue-biblid" in ISO 9115 [now withdrawn] so change clause 6.1.
  Remove the reference to ISO 215 in clause 6.2, the updated edition of ISO 215 does not give specifications for the presentation of the title area in an article.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 214:1976
Abstracts for publications and documentation

Review period ended: **1997**

Member bodies	Is standard used?	Used without change?	Corresponding national standard	Vote / Participation *[not included on form]*
Australia				
Canada	**YES**	Yes	No	
China, P.R.				
Czech Rep.	**YES**	Yes		
Denmark				
Finland	NO			
France				
Germany	**YES**	No	DIN 1426	
Hungary				
Iran	**YES**	Yes		
Italy	NO	No	UNI 7053	
Japan	**YES**	Yes		
Norway	**YES**	Yes		
Poland	NO			
Portugal				
Russian Fed.				
South Africa	NO			
Spain	**YES**	Yes	UNE 50103	
Sweden	**YES**	No	SS 03 82 04	
U.K.				
U.S.A.	**YES**	NO	Z39.14-1997	

RESULTS of the 1997 review of ISO 214:

ISO 214 is used by 9 member bodies; 6 member bodies use ISO 214 without change.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Poland: The standard should be reviewed (an article about abstracts was attached to the comment).

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 215:1986
Presentation of contributions to periodicals and other serials

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	No	No	Revise	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Hungary				
Iran	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Sweden				
U.K.	Abstain			
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 215:

CONFIRM = 15. REVISE = 1. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 7. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 6.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Finland: Electronic serials should be taken into consideration.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 690:1987
Bibliographic references - Content, form and structure

Review period ended: **1992**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
China, P.R.				
Cuba				
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Finland	No	No	Revise	
France			Revise	Yes
Germany	No	Yes	Revise	Yes
Hungary	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway				
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Portugal	No	No	Revise	Yes
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
South Africa	Yes	Yes	Revise	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Sweden				
U.K.				
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of 1992 review of ISO 690:

CONFIRM = 9. REVISE = 5. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 9. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 2.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of technical comments:

- Canada: Defer the review until after the development of [ISO 690-2] on references to electronic documents is further advanced.
- France: Revise because the examples at end of the standard are in contradiction with the principles of the standard. The revision would permit references to electronic documents to be integrated.
- Germany: Audiovisual materials and short quotations should be included.
- Portugal: The standard has several gaps. Still concerns only a few types of documents and materials. The standard is not clear about the use of punctuation. It doesn't consider polemic cases, e.g. special headings. There is inconsistency in the application of principles and it lacks examples.
  In clause 9.3 (on citations) numbers 32 and 34 are bibliographical references, not citations; only no. 35 is a citation.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 1086:1991
Title leaves of books

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Hungary				
Iran	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Italy	Abstain			
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	No	No	Revise	Yes
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	Yes
Sweden				
U.K.				
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 1086:

CONFIRM = 14. REVISE = 1. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 8. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 5.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Finland: Title should be changed to "Information and documentation -- Title leaves of printed books". Another standard (maybe 1086-2) would be needed for title screens/title leaves of non-printed books.
- Poland: There is a discrepancy in the location of the ISSN in a book published within a series between ISO 1086 and the various specifications in ISO 2108, ISO 7275, and ISO 3297; the cross-references between some of these standards produces a vicious circle. ISO 1086's rules on the location of the ISBN are more categorical than those in ISO 2108. ISO 1086 should make it clear as to which of the various solutions in these different standards is preferred.
  The need for ISO 7275 as a separate standard should also be reconsidered since the scope and field of application of ISO 7275 belong entirely to the broader scope of ISO 1086. Both standards could be combined for the benefit of the publishing and library community.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 2108:1992
International Standard Book Numbering (ISBN)

Review period ended: **1997**

Member bodies	Is standard used?	Used without change?	Corresponding national standard	Vote / Participation *[not included on form]*
Australia				
Canada	**YES**	**Yes**	No	
China, P.R.				
Czech Rep.	**YES**	**Yes**		
Denmark	**YES**	**Yes**		
Finland	**YES**	No	SFS 3496	
France	**YES**	**Yes**	NF ISO 2108	
Germany	**YES**	**Yes**	DIN ISO 2108	
Hungary				
Iran	**YES**	**Yes**		
Italy	NO			
Japan	**YES**	**Yes**	JIS X0305-1988	
Norway	**YES**	**Yes**		
Poland	**YES**	**Yes**	PN ISO 2108	
Portugal	**YES**	**Yes**	NP 2022;1996	
Russian Fed.				
South Africa	NO			
Spain	**YES**	**Yes**	UNE 50130	
Sweden	**YES**	No	SS 62 15 09	
U.K.				
U.S.A.	**YES**	**Yes**	Z39.21-1988	

RESULTS of the 1997 review of ISO 2108:

ISO 2108 is used by 14 member bodies; 12 member bodies use ISO 2108 without change.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of technical comments:

- Canada: The ISBN system needs a policy on whether and how ISBN apply to networked documents. The current structure of the ISBN does not have the numbering capacity to extent the ISBN to networked publishing. In particular, such an extension would exhaust the capacity of the ISBN system to assign unique publisher identifiers, unless the system develops very restrictive criteria as to what constitutes a "publisher" on the Net. It is unclear, however, how such criteria would be defined or applied. This matter should be handled on an urgent basis by the ISO 2108 Registration Authority and member ISBN agencies. If it is not, then the simplest alternative would be to amend ISO 2108 to state that its scope excludes publications that have no physical carrier.
- Finland: Clause 4.2 of the standard should address networked documents. Too much emphasis is placed on physical carriers only. The demand for information on publishers will increase along with networked publications.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 2145:1978
Numbering of divisions and subdivisions in written documents

Review period ended: **1998**

Member bodies	Has it been implemented?	Corresponding national publication?	Identical to ISO 2145?	Vote	Willing to participate
Australia	NO			Abstain	NO
Canada	**YES**	No	Yes		
China, P.R.					
Czech Rep.	**YES**	CSN ISO 2145	Yes	**Approve**	NO
Denmark	**YES**	Yes	Yes	**Approve**	**YES**
Finland					
France					
Germany	**YES**	DIN 1421:1983-01	Equivalent	**Approve**	**YES**
Hungary	NO			Abstain	NO
Iran					
Italy	NO			**Approve**	NO
Japan	**YES**	Yes	Yes	**Approve**	NO
Norway				Abstain	
Poland					
Portugal	**YES**	NP 113:1989	No	**Approve** with changes	NO
Russian Fed.					
South Africa	NO			Abstain	
Spain	**YES**	UNE 50132:1994	No	Abstain	NO
Sweden	**YES**	SS 03 82 02	Yes	**Approve**	**YES**
U.K.	NO			Abstain	NO
U.S.A.					
Austria	**YES**	ONORM A 2721	Yes	Approve	**YES**
Egypt	NO			Approve	NO
Mongolia	NO			Approve	NO
Switzerland	NO		Yes [?]	Approve	NO

RESULTS: Approve = 6 + 1 (P-members); Disapprove = 0; Withdraw = 0; Abstain = 6.
ISO 2145 is used by 9 member bodies; 7 member bodies use it without change.
Only 4 member bodies would participate in its revision, if required.

DECISION: Secretariat recommends **CONFIRMATION** of ISO 2145.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Germany: Scope of DIN standard is broader as it covers presentation and numbering of texts. Requirements of ISO 2145 have been incorporated unchanged into the DIN standard.
- Portugal: The standard should be updated in light of new publication methods, especially electronic publications (on-line and off-line).

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 2146:1988
Directories of libraries, archives, information and documentation centres and their data bases

Review period ended: **1998**

Member bodies	Has it been implemented?	Corresponding national publication?	Identical to ISO 2146?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Australia	NO			**Approve**	NO
Canada	NO				
China, P.R.					
Czech Rep.	**YES**	CSN ISO 2146	**Yes**	**Approve**	**YES**
Denmark	**YES**	Yes	No	**Approve**	**YES**
Finland					
France					
Germany	NO			**Approve**/Revise	**YES**
Hungary	NO			**Approve**	NO
Iran					
Italy	NO			**Approve**	NO
Japan	NO			Withdraw	NO
Norway				Abstain	
Poland					
Portugal	NO			**Approve**/Revise	NO
Russian Fed.					
South Africa	NO			Abstain	
Spain	**YES**	UNE 50131:1996	No	Abstain	NO
Sweden	NO			Withdraw	
U.K.	NO			Abstain	NO
U.S.A.					
Austria	NO			Approve	**YES**
Egypt	NO			Approve	NO
Mongolia	NO			Approve	NO
Switzerland	NO		Yes [?]	Approve	NO

RESULTS: Approve = 5 + 2 (P-members); Disapprove = 0; Withdraw = 2; Abstain = 4.
ISO 2146 is used by 3 member bodies; only 1 member body uses it without change.
Only 4 member bodies would participate in its revision.

DECISION: Secretariat recommends the WITHDRAWAL* of ISO 2146.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Germany: Add several data elements for: Date last verified; E-mail addresses; URL. In clauses 6.1.7/6.1.8 examples should be updated taking into account the changing scope of library activities. In clause 6.1.12.2 add data elements for help desk, virtual reference services; online help texts. In clause 7 add specifications for WWW presentations.
- Japan: This standard does not satisfy market needs.
- Portugal: Changes are needed to take into account new forms of information resources, not only databases but e.g. digital resources, networked information services, and the impact of these contents on protocol implementations.

*** NOTE - ISO's new review criteria require that if a standard is not used either directly or indirectly by at least 5 member bodies it should be withdrawn.**

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 2384:1977
Presentation of translations

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.				
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 review of ISO 2384:

CONFIRM = 11. REVISE = 0. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 1.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 2. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 8.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Comments: None

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 2788:1986
Guidelines for the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden				
U.K.	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 2788:

CONFIRM = 11. REVISE = 6. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 11. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 4.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of technical comments:

- Germany: ISO 2788 does not reflect the views of the whole/majority of experts. Technical requirements applied in practice are not consistent with the standard. Library authority files constitute a universal vocabulary, part of which practice agrees with the standard, but in a lot of cases libraries do not find rules in ISO 2788. Most thesauri are not so elaborated, do not distinguish relations, use descriptors in a broader sense (not just preferred terms). Daily work of libraries needs rules for subject authority files. Data processing should be included as well as other schools of thought.
- Japan: Standard needs to be adaptable to a wider variety of languages. Some clauses (e.g. 6.3) only apply to particular languages. It would be desirable to separate a) body of the standard and b) interpretive descriptions. Flexibility of usages of compound terms, if enhanced, would promote wider use of standard.
- Poland: Instructions on control of operations on thesaurus preparation, characteristic method of storing terms and instructions on thesaurus recording and updating should be removed.
- U.K.: Standard reflects old-fashioned and possibly discredited practice. It concentrates on semantic analysis of terminology, rather then establishment of relations between concepts. It ignores the primary objective of providing terms that meet the needs of the user. Provisions of standard are overly complex and it is inconsistent with ISO 999 (e.g. in definition and treatment of compound terms. Should be rewritten in plain language and addressing the needs of the index user. More definitions are needed. Examples should be improved. An index is needed. In its current form it is inappropriate for use by trainee indexers and therefore is counter-productive.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 5122:1979
Abstract sheets in serial publications

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Portugal	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.				
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 vote on ISO 5122:

CONFIRM = 11. REVISE = 0. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 1.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 3. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 7.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Comments: None.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 5123:1984
Headers for microfiche of monographs and serials

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Italy	Abstain			
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden				
U.K.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 5123:

CONFIRM = 15. REVISE = 1. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 9. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 5.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Germany: The standard should refer to ISO 9923 "Micrographics - Transparent A6 microfiche - Image arrangement". The ISO standards 2707, 2708, and 5126 that are cited in clause 2 have been replaced by ISO 9923.
- Poland: Normative references need to be updated; 3 withdrawn standards should be removed and replaced by ISO 9923. This also affects clause 3.5 of ISO 5123 and the definitions.
  The definitions should refer to ISO 6196 which is the vocabulary standard for micrographics.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 5963:1985
Methods for examining documents, determining their subjects, and selecting indexing terms

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 review of ISO 5963:

CONFIRM = 11. REVISE = 2. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 5. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 7.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Germany: Computer-aided indexing with a thesaurus or subject authority file should be added. Syntactical indexing should also be incorporated.
- United Kingdom: There is insufficient guidance on examining documents to determine subject matter. It also needs to cover selection of terms from natural language and from non-modifiable vocabularies. Standard is biased towards indexing of library documents and is not useful for content (i.e. back of the book) indexing or for indexing of non-bibliographic information or for indexing records that include a whole document. The revision should also take into account the new edition of ISO 999.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 5964:1985
Guidelines for the establishment and development of multilingual thesauri

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 review of ISO 5964:

CONFIRM = 10. REVISE = 3. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 4. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 8.

DECISION: **CONFIRMED**.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Germany: Modern practice no longer corresponds to the standard. Computer applications should be taken into account. Examples need to be revised and the international clearinghouses for deposit of thesauri should be verified.
- Portugal: In general, thesaurus management software doesn't respect ISO 5964. Standard should be revised bearing in mind easier and simpler application procedures.
- U.K.: ISO 7275 only deals with establishing equivalence between different language versions of a thesaurus. Reference to ISO 2788 for construction rules may not always be valid. ISO 5964 needs to include guidance about actual linking of equivalent terms in an online system. It also ignores the fact that a term is partially or wholly defined by its superordinate and subordinate terms. In some cases Broader Term/Related Term/Narrower Term relations may have to be redefined. Users now have more experience with using multilingual thesauri, especially in online systems, which may indicate a need to revise ISO 7275.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 5966:1982
Presentation of scientific and technical reports

Review period ended: **1997**

Member bodies	Is standard used?	Used without change?	Corresponding national standard	Vote / Participation *[not included on form]*
Australia				
Canada	**YES**	**Yes**	No	
China, P.R.				
Czech Rep.	**YES**	**Yes**		
Denmark				
Finland	**YES**	No		
France				
Germany	**YES**	No	DIN 1422-4	
Hungary				
Iran	**YES**	**Yes**		
Italy	**YES**	**Yes**	UNI ISO 5966	
Japan	NO			
Norway	**YES**	**Yes**		
Poland	NO			
Portugal				
Russian Fed.				
South Africa	NO			
Spain	**YES**	**Yes**	UNE 50135	
Sweden	**YES**	NO	SS 03 82 06	
U.K.				
U.S.A.	**YES**	NO	Z39.18-1995	

RESULTS of the 1997 review of ISO 5966:

ISO 5966 is used by 10 member bodies; 6 member bodies use ISO 5966 without change.

DECISION: Standard was already under **REVISION** at time of review. *[The revision of ISO 5966 is now at the Committee Draft stage*]

Summary of the technical comments:

- Finland: ISO 5966 should be revised to deal with reports that are electronic publications; Finnish standard varies in placement of bibliographic elements on cover and title leaf of technical reports.
- Germany: ISO 5966 is currently under revision.
- Poland: ISO 5966 should be revised.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 6357:1985
Spine titles on books and other publications

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	No	**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	No	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	No	No	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 review of ISO 6357:

CONFIRM = 11. REVISE = 1. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 1.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 3. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 8.

DECISION: CONFIRMED

Summary of the technical comments:

- France: For the back of books, French publishing practice is different than the choices in ISO 6357.
- Germany: Reference about the labeling of electronic publications should be included.
- Japan: The standard is only useful for spine titles in Latin languages; in Japan, spine titles are occasionally printed vertically.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 7144:1986
Presentation of theses and similar documents

Review period ended: **1996**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with national and internat'l. practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Denmark	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Finland	No	No	Revise	No
France	Yes		**Confirm**	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Italy	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Portugal				
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden				
U.K.				
U.S.A.			**Confirm**	

RESULTS of the 1996 review of ISO 7144:

CONFIRM = 15. REVISE = 1. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 0.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 7. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 6.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Finland: In the very future many theses will be produced and/or published in electronic form. The presentation of such theses should be accommodated in the standard.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 7154:1983 (Bibliographic filing principles)
Review period ended: **1998**

Member bodies	Has it been implemented?	Corresponding nat'l publication?	Identical to ISO 7154?	Vote	Will participate?
Australia	No			Abstain	No
Canada	**Yes**	No	No		
China, P.R.					
Czech Rep.	No			**Approve**	No
Denmark				Abstain	
Finland					
France					
Germany	**Yes**	DIN 31638	No	**Approve**	**Yes**
Hungary	**Yes**	MSZ 3493:1982	Equivalent	**Approve**	No
Iran					
Italy	No			**Approve**	No
Japan	No			Withdraw	No
Norway				Abstain	
Poland					
Portugal	No			**Approve**/Revise	No
Russian Fed.					
South Africa	No			Abstain	
Spain	No			Abstain	No
Sweden	**Yes**/No	SS 03 81 03		Disapprove/Revise	**Yes**
U.K.		BS 6478	Yes	Withdraw	**Yes**
U.S.A.					
Austria	**Yes**	ONORM 5007-2:1998	Yes	Approve	**Yes**
Egypt, Mongolia and Switzerland	No			Approve	No

RESULTS: Approve = 4 + 1 (P-members); Disapprove = 1; Withdraw = 2; Abstain = 5.
ISO 7154 is used by 5 member bodies; 3 member bodies use ISO 7154 without change.
4 member bodies would participate in the revision of ISO 7154, if required.

DECISION: Secretariat recommends CONFIRMATION of ISO 7154 for this review period, on the understanding that it may be revised after the review of SC9's programme of work.

Summary of the technical comments:

- Canada: In automated systems some aspects of the principles in ISO 7154 are impractical. The principles have less relevance in an automated environment as a system will retrieve the required filing unit without the user necessarily knowing the exact filing order.
- Germany: Scope of DIN standard is broader as it also covers the contents of ISO/TR 8393. Some requirements of ISO 7154 have been modified to provide for alphabetical arrangement based on the specifics of the German language.
- Japan: The standard does not satisfy market needs.
- Portugal: ISO 7154 may have been valid in a manual environment but the existence of databases that deal with records coming from different systems, different cataloguing rules and different languages and scripts pose particular problems. Future content of ISO 7154 must take character sets (e.g. UNICODE) into consideration.
- Sweden: Withdraw the word "bibliographic" in the title and change the scope accordingly.
- U.K.: Standard is old-fashioned and user-unfriendly. Provision relating to the order of headings does not conform to modern practice as embodied in ISO 999. ISO 7154 is largely ignored by the user community.

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 7275:1985
Presentation of title information of series

Review period ended: **1995**

Member bodies	Best possible internat'l solution?	Consistent with nat'l and internat'l practice?	Vote	Willing to participate?
Canada				
China, P.R.				
Cuba	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Czech Rep.				
Denmark				
Finland				
France	Yes	No	**Confirm**	No
Germany	No	Yes	Revise	**Yes**
Hungary				
Iran				
Italy	No		Revise	
Japan	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Poland	Yes	No	Revise	**Yes**
Portugal	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Russian Fed.	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
South Africa	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	**Yes**
Sweden	Yes	Yes	**Confirm**	No
U.K.				
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1995 review of ISO 7275:

CONFIRM = 8. REVISE = 3. WITHDRAW = 0. ABSTAIN = 1.
WILL PARTICIPATE if revised = 4. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE if revised = 6.

DECISION: CONFIRMED.

Summary of the technical comments:

- France: As a general rule, ISO 7275 is neither known nor followed in France.
- Germany: References about electronic publications should be included.
- Italy: Revise to cover the effects of the development of new formats, particularly electronic formats, on the specifications for series in this standard.
- Poland: A new version of ISO 8 is being developed to cover the presentation of all types of serials. In light of that work, clause 4 of ISO 7275 should be revised. [*Note: ISO 8 project has been suspended]*

Table of replies from the systematic review of ISO 10957:1993
International Standard Music Number (ISMN)

Review period ended: **1998**

Member bodies	Has it been implemented?	Implemented without change?	Corresponding national standard?	Vote / Participation *[not included on form]*
Australia	No		No	
Canada	**Yes**	Yes	No	
China, P.R.				
Czech Rep.	**Yes**	Yes	CSN ISO 19957	
Denmark	**Yes**	Yes	DS/ISO 10957	No
Finland	**Yes**	Yes	SFS 5793	
France				
Germany	**Yes**	Yes	DIN ISO 10957:1994-2	
Hungary	**Yes**	Yes	MSZ 10957	
Iran	No		No	
Italy	No			
Japan	No			
Norway	No		No	
Poland	No			
Portugal				
Russian Fed.				
South Africa	No			
Spain	No			
Sweden	**Yes**	Yes	SS-ISO 10957	
U.K.				
U.S.A.				

RESULTS of the 1998 review of ISO 10957:

ISO 10957 is implemented by 7 member bodies; all 7 implement ISO 10957 without change.

DECISION: Secretariat recommends CONFIRMATION of ISO 10957.

Technical comments: None