

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION (Session 6)

Rappprteuse:

Valerie Gilbert

*Aslib, London, United Kingdom*

The following points were made in connection with Dextre's paper on the BSI Root Thesaurus:

In response to an enquiry Dextre explained that patented trade names such as Hovercraft should not be used in a thesaurus, i.e. instead of 'Viewgraph' read overhead projector. There may be a conflict of interests between in-house indexers, who would find it more convenient to employ abbreviated forms, and searchers using the published thesaurus, which would have to contain the full correct term.

In reply to a question as to whether ROOT had been compared with other systems such as the term bank in Ottawa, Dextre replied that the system had not yet been compared with indexes to term banks but Ottawa had made initial enquiries about the machine readable form, maybe with this purpose in mind. We heard that a French version of ROOT is available in machine readable form and as a preliminary in hard copy.

We learned that the file of definitions of terms in ROOT is only available as a card index at present. Only one definition had been selected for each term, i.e. the one most suitable for the ROOT application, but terminologists might prefer to see all possible definitions. Selective marketing would be needed to determine users' needs before further forms were made available.

A delegate wished to know if ROOT had been coordinated with what had already been done in the field of classification, and was told that the classification structure for ROOT was evolved in collaboration with ISONET. This was satisfactory for BSI's needs, but meant that some areas not covered by standards were excluded e.g. agriculture, military.

Dextre was asked if a survey, for example of Translators' Guild members, might be a useful method of establishing user reaction by sending subject relevant subsets in hard copy. This suggestion was welcomed, but due to lack of resources is unlikely at present. BSI was concentrating on setting up bibliographic data bases.

The following points were made in connection with Moore's paper on Longman's dictionary publishing programme:

In answer to a question on entry numbers for headwords the speaker explained that entry numbers were just running numbers, not a code.

A delegate asked if subject coding was multiple or exclusive, and wished to know whether the method of coding would be made public. He was informed that at present the system is rather crude and that subject coding into fields was not exclusive: up to five codes might be allocated for each definition.

When asked if it was correct to say that it was impossible to check whether a word had been used correctly in context in a computerised system, the speaker confirmed that terms were not validated by the computer as it has no way of looking at the context: validation is an editorial function.