

Responses from the European Participants (IE ICC1) to Recommendations from IME ICC2*

Question 1 – All agree

Introduction --Add a footnote to cite the original Paris Principles at the end of the first sentence of the Statement's Introduction. This is missing from the December 19, 2003 Frankfurt draft version, but should have been included. It was agreed by all of the November 2004 respondents. It would look like the following:

The Statement of Principles - commonly known as the "Paris Principles" - was approved by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in 1961 [1].

... [1] International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (Paris : 1961). Report. - London : International Federation of Library Associations, 1963, p. 91-96. Also available in: Library Resources and Technical Services, v.6 (1962), p. 162-167; and Statement of principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961. - Annotated edition / with commentary and examples by Eva Verona. - London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 1: Yes=17 No=0

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name</u>
Croatia	Yes	<i>Willer</i>
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	Yes	<i>Beaudiquez, Bourdon, Le Boeuf</i>
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis, de Pinedo, Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina (for Russian participants)</i>
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	Yes	<i>Escolano</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 2 – Propose to move this statement (shown in red below) to a footnote. Please see comments below. Everyone seems to agree this is not a principle. We could just keep the sentiment as a footnote. Do you agree? – Barbara Tillet

3. Functions of the Catalogue

The functions of the catalogue are to enable a user

3.1 to find bibliographic resources in a collection (real or virtual) as the result of a search using attributes or relationships of the resources:

3.1.1. to locate a single resource

3.1.2. to locate sets of resources representing

- * all resources belonging to the same work
- * all resources belonging to the same expression
- * all resources belonging to the same manifestation
- * all works and expressions of a given person, family, or corporate body
- * all resources on a given subject
- * all resources defined by other criteria (such as language, country of publication, publication, date, physical format, etc.) usually as a secondary limiting of a search result.

It is recognized that, due to economic restraints and cataloguing practices, some library catalogues will lack bibliographic records for components of works or individual works within works.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 2: Yes=14 No= 4 (Germany is both yes and no)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	Yes	<i>Willer</i>
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	No	<i>Beaudiquez</i> : We are at the Principles level and not at the practice level; <i>Bourdon</i> : We are at the principles level, it would be a problem to introduce consideration on practices; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : A statement of "principles" should not account for "practices", unless we are in an upside-down world. The recognition of "economic restraints" was quite legitimate, as it has to do with sensible pragmatism, but practices are supposed to be based on principles, not the reverse. Economic restraints may explain why some practices do not embrace the principles, but the very principles should not say from the very beginning: 'We are but optional principles, practice will decide.'
Germany	Yes/No	<i>Albrecht</i> (no), <i>Gömpel</i> (yes), <i>Henze</i> (yes), <i>Wilkening</i> (yes)
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis</i> , <i>de Pinedo</i> , <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)

Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i> – For the same reasons as Bourdon and LeBoeuf, these are principles
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	No	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 3 – All agree

5.1.1. Choice of access points

5.1.1.1. Include as access points to a bibliographic record the titles of works and expressions (controlled) and titles of manifestations (usually uncontrolled) and the controlled forms of names of the creators of works.

In the case of corporate bodies as creators, ~~this~~ access by corporate name is limited to works that are by their nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body, or when the wording of the title, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work.

Additionally provide access points to bibliographic records for the controlled forms of names of other persons, families, corporate bodies, and subjects deemed to be important for finding, identifying, and selecting the bibliographic resource being described.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 3: Yes=17 No=0

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	Yes	<i>Willer</i>
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	Yes	<i>Beaudiquez, Bourdon, Le Boeuf</i>
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis, de Pinedo, Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina (for Russian participants)</i>
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	Yes	<i>Escolano</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 4 – Regarding the use in English of the Latin word “persona”, as Eeva Murtomaa points out, this debate continues within the IFLA FRANAR Working Group. Please note the comments below that also suggest we should leave this term “as is” for the English text and perhaps give an explanation in the Glossary to assist the translators, especially for Spanish and Italian that have a Latin base to their language. For now, I will leave the English as it stands. – Barbara Tillett

5.1.2. Authorized Headings

The authorized heading for an entity should be the name that identifies the entity in a consistent manner, either as predominantly found on manifestations or a well-accepted name suited to the users of the catalogue (e.g., “conventional name”).

Further identifying characteristics should be added, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name.

5.1.2.1. If a person, family, or a corporate body uses variant names or variant forms of names, one name or one form of name should be chosen as the authorized heading for each distinct **persona entity**. If there are variant titles for one work, one title should be chosen as uniform title.

[This was formerly 6.2 and as recommended in Buenos Aires : “persona” would become “entity”]

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 4: Yes=12 No= 5

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : 5.1.2.1 is better placed here than in 6.2, but the change of "persona" for "entity" is not acceptable. The paragraph as a whole is too compact: it deals with "variant" and "related" headings in the same breath which makes the use of "persona" as well as "entity" unacceptable. A suggestion: make 5.1.2.1 for "variant headings", i.e., "variant forms of names", and 5.1.2.2 for "related headings", i.e., "variant names" with possible additional short explanation of such a use. In this way, there need not be a reference to "persona" or "entity": 5.1.2.1 If a person... uses variant forms of names, one form of name should be chosen as the authorized heading. If there are variant titles... 5.1.2.2 If a person... uses variant names "for different intellectual or artistic productions or due to changes of names in successive periods(?)", each name should be chosen as the authorized heading. In this way, the change of a corporate body name - which is not a "persona = assumed identity" or "entity" which associates with the FRBR E-R model, would be dealt with here on a general level. See, in this respect, 5.4.2 which, in fact, repeats this, using "new entity" for this concept. In this way, the Principles would openly accept the changes of names - personal, family, corporate - as "new bibliographic identities", and in this way would level out this concept for all types of "headings". Of course, if accepted.
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>

Finland	No	<i>Murtomaa</i> : this "entity" "persona" discussion is still in progress at the FRANAR group - besides "persona" there are suggestions like "assumed identity" etc.
France	Yes	<i>Beaudiquez, Bourdon, Le Boeuf</i>
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis, de Pinedo</i> (Happy to see that also other countries had problems with the term persona and that without the need of a trained lexicographer it has been found an acceptable solution. Would it be then consistent also to add the term entity to the Glossary?); <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)
Slovenia	No	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i> : "Persona" (or "assumed identity"), is more accurate to the principle, but maybe itid necessary an explanation of its use of the word in English. I agree with Mirna Willer's comment on the compact paragraph where "variant forms of names" and "variant names" are mixed, thi could be confusing, it is better to split it up in two statements.
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	No	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 5 – This received a mix response, so it is recommended to leave the issue open for further discussion. – Barbara Tillett

5.2. Forms of Names for Persons

5.2.1. When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should **be determined by** follow conventions of the **country and the person's country of citizenship, or**
~~5.2.2. When that county of citizenship is not determinable, by agreed usage in the country in which the person generally resides or~~
~~5.2.3. If it is not possible to determine where the person generally resides, choice of entry word should follow agreed usage in the~~ language most associated with that person **generally uses**, as found in manifestations or **general** reference sources.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 5: Yes=13 No= 5 (Germany is both yes and no)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : The first version is more clear and precise. If accepted as such, I suggest "... the country and/or language most associated...".
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>

Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	No	<i>Beaudiquez</i> : Each country is responsible for the establishment of the authority name of its natives. This is feasible in the majority of case and it is a good principle. To take into account the country and the language most associated with a person can be just an alternative when the first principle could not be respected; <i>Bourdon</i> : One working group on names of persons in Buenos Aires reaffirmed the following principle: each country is responsible for establishing the authorized form for its nationals; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : "The country and language most associated with that person" does not make much sense, although we recognize that this formulation is far better than what was proposed during IME ICC2 in Buenos Aires. One of the 2 WGs on names of persons in Buenos Aires reaffirmed (http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/source/WG1B-recommendations.pdf) 'the basic principle of Universal Bibliographic Control, about the responsibility of each country for establishing the authorized form for the names of its authors.' That was a good idea, and perhaps an acceptable compromise for 5.2 (BTW, if there is only one paragraph, there is no need for numbering it "5.2.1.") might read like: 'As a principle, each country is responsible for establishing the authorized form for its nationals according to its own conventions and cultural traditions, and the resulting authorized form should be adopted by other countries at least as a cross reference. In such cases where it proves unfeasible to determine the country that a given person is a national of, and that person is responsible for textual outputs, the language of expression or main language of expression of that person can be regarded as an appropriate default criterion for establishing the authorized form for the person's name.' This formulation supports both UBC and the VIAF project.
Germany	Yes/ No	<i>Albrecht</i> (no): The phrasing "most associated with the person" is highly imprecise and lacking of any practical aspect for catalogers; <i>Gömpel</i> (yes), <i>Henze</i> (yes), <i>Wilkening</i> (yes)
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i> : The whole sentence will be as follows: When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources.
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis</i> , <i>de Pinedo</i> , <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	No	<i>van Otegem</i> : The original version is much more precise. In the case of an author writing in Dutch, it is not at all clear if the author is Dutch or (Flemish) Belgian, but the rules determining the choice of entry word are quite different. Many publishers have establishments in both countries, so that is decisive either. There are so many immigrants from various countries, of whom it not clear what their nationality or residence is, and writing in more than one language at the same time that a very precise rule is absolutely necessary.

Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina (for Russian participants)</i>
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i> : I agree with the LeBoeuf comment and proposal.
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 6 – This received a mix response, so it is recommended to leave the issue open for further discussion. – Barbara Tillett

5.3. Forms of Names for Families

5.3.1. When the name of a family consists of several words, the choice of entry word should ~~be determined by conventions of the country most associated with that family or~~ ~~–5.3.2 if it is not possible to determine the country most associated with that family, choice of entry word should follow agreed usage in~~ conventions of the country and language most associated with that family **generally uses**, as found in manifestations or general reference sources.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 6: Yes=13 No= 5 (Germany is both yes and no)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : The first version is more clear and precise. If accepted I suggest "... the country and/or language..."
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	No	<i>Beaudiquez</i> : see remark above; <i>Bourdon</i> : see comments on question 5. When it is unfeasible to determine the country of "citizenship", and just in this case, the language of expression or main language of expression can be considered as an appropriate default criterion for the establishment of authority form of the family's name. In addition: we don't need the numbering "5.3.1." because there is no "5.3.2." ! ; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : See comments on question 5. Once again, if there is only one paragraph, there is no more need for numbering it "5.3.1.". We propose: 'As a principle, each country is responsible for establishing the authorized form for its nationals according to its own conventions and cultural traditions, and the resulting authorized form should be adopted by other countries at least as a cross reference. In such cases where it proves unfeasible to determine the country that the members of a given family are nationals of, and they are responsible for textual outputs, the language of expression or main language of expression of that family can be regarded as an appropriate default criterion for establishing the authorized form for the family's name.'

Germany	Yes/No	<i>Albrecht</i> (no: see no. 5); <i>Gömpel</i> (yes); <i>Henze</i> (yes); <i>Wilkening</i> (yes)
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i> : The whole sentence will be as follows: When the name of a family consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that family, as found in manifestations or reference sources.
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis</i> , <i>de Pinedo</i> , <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	No	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i> : Same comment as in number 5.
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Questions 7 – This received a mix response, so it is recommended to leave the issue open for further discussion. Do you agree? – Barbara Tillett

5.4. Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies

5.4.1. **The corporate name should be given in direct order, as commonly found on manifestations.**

5.4.2. For jurisdictions, the authorized heading should 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.

5.4.3. If the corporate body has used in successive periods different names that cannot be regarded as minor variations of one name, each significant name change should be considered a new entity and the corresponding authority records for each entity should be linked by see-also (earlier/later) references.

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 7: Yes=13 No= 5 (Italy is both yes and no)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : The statement about the corporate body name is too simple for the complex conditions in which names are found on manifestations, on one hand, and different types of names and the rules/practices for their forms in the headings, on the other hand – see Structures of corporate name headings: final report and Guerrini's paper. However, the need for stating something about the form of name is obvious. For 5.4.3 see above comment under 5.1.2.
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>

France	No	<i>Beaudiquez</i> : Direct order is better as a variant form, not as authority form; <i>Bourdon</i> : But the "corporate name in direct order" should be given as a variant form; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : We propose: 'The corporate name in direct order, as commonly found on manifestations, should be given at least as a variant form, among cross references.'
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes/No	<i>de Panicis</i> (yes); <i>de Pinedo</i> (no: Suggested change: The corporate name should be given in the form commonly found on manifestations); <i>Guerrini</i> : (yes in many cases; but in other in my opinion is better the "short name" or the "common name"; e.g. not "Societas Iesu" but "Jesuits", the well known name; in other words: not always the name that we find on the manifestations but the "conventional name", the name that the users know.)
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	No	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i> : This statement is not clear; the typology of corporate entities is more complet to be so treated. Accepting it means to change the well accepted Paris principle 9.4.4 and 9.6.
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 8 – This received a mix response, so it is recommended to leave the issue open for further discussion. – Barbara Tillett

5.5.1. The uniform title should be the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work. Under certain defined circumstances, a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue may be preferred to the original title as the basis for the authorized heading. **Always add language and date.**

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 8: Yes=6 No=12 (Germany is both yes and no)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : No, because it unnecessarily repeats 5.5 which is a clear statement about this issue. Besides, in 5.5 it is "may" which is more appropriate, while here it is "always" which is not possible, i.e. in the case of dates. Also, there is a question why to "always" add language to the uniform title? What about other additions to the title, like in the case of musical works? Obviously, the concept of uniform title is worth pursuing further.

Cyprus	No	<i>Andreou</i> : I don't agree with the word "Always"
Estonia	No	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i> : Always sounds mandatory. Sometimes this information is not available prefer: "If possible add language and date"
France	No	<i>Beaudiquez</i> : What is the nature of the date considered here ? What type ? it is not enough precise; <i>Bourdon</i> : The proposal for the addition is not clear : date and language of the work ? of the expression ? of the manifestation ?; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : Language and date of what? Of the work, of the expression, or of the manifestation? This principle should be more specific. We propose: 'Always add language and date of the expression of the work; if date of expression is unknown, as most often is the case, date of manifestation can be regarded as an appropriate default value.'
Germany	Yes/No	<i>Albrecht</i> (no); <i>Gömpel</i> (yes), <i>Henze</i> (yes)
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	No	<i>de Panicis</i> , <i>de Pinedo</i> , <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	No	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	No	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)
Slovenia	No	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	No	<i>Escolano</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i> : I have some reservations about "Always add ... date". What date is implied? Date of original edition or date of work? Might be tricky do decide. Would prefer a more flexible principle or more precise instructions.
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	No	<i>Rosie</i> : The text of 5.5 would need to be changed if this addition is made to 5.5.1. If a uniform title is used as an added entry for a related work, is the addition of language and date appropriate?
Vatican	No	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 9 – Recommend to leave as ‘persona’ (see Question 4 above) – Barbara Tillett

6. Authority Records

6.1. Authority records should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names and references used as access points for such entities as persons, families, corporate bodies, works, expressions, manifestations, items, concepts, objects, events, and places.

6.2. If a person, family, or a corporate body uses variant names or variant forms of names, one name or one form of name should be chosen as the authorized heading for each distinct persona **entity**.

If there are variant titles for one work, one title should be chosen as uniform title. [moved to 5.1.2.1]

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 9: Yes=15 No=2

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	No	<i>Willer</i> : See comments above under 5.1.2
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	No	<i>Murtomaa</i> : discussion about the "entity" "persona" "assumed identity" is in progress at the FREANAR group
France	Yes	<i>Beaudiquez; Bourdon</i> : If we transfer 6.2. in 5.1.2.1. we don't need any more the numbering 6.1; <i>Le Boeuf</i> : If there is only one paragraph under "6.", there is no need for numbering it "6.1."
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis, de Pinedo</i> : See comments at 5.1.2.1; <i>Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>
Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina</i> (for Russian participants)
Spain	Yes	<i>Escolano</i> : Yes about the moving of the principles 6.1 and 6.2 to be 5.1.2.1 and 5.1.2.2. Not about the change of "persona" for entity.
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

Question 10 – All agree

7.1. Search and Retrieval

Access points are the elements of bibliographic records that provide 1) reliable retrieval of bibliographic and authority records and their associated bibliographic resources and 2) limit search results.

[moved the placement of the 1)]

Do you agree with this change?

Results for question 10: Yes=17 No=0

<u>Country</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Name/ Comments</u>
Croatia	Yes	<i>Willer</i>
Cyprus	Yes	<i>Andreou</i>
Estonia	Yes	<i>Nilbe</i>
Finland	Yes	<i>Murtomaa</i>
France	Yes	<i>Beaudiquez, Bourdon, Le Boeuf</i>
Germany	Yes	<i>Albrecht, Gömpel, Henze, Wilkening</i>
Hungary	Yes	<i>Berke</i>
Italy	Yes	<i>de Panicis, de Pinedo, Guerrini</i>
Netherlands	Yes	<i>van Otegem</i>

Norway	Yes	<i>Spangen</i>
Russia	Yes	<i>Kuligina (for Russian participants)</i>
Slovenia	Yes	<i>Kavcic</i>
Spain	Yes	<i>Escolano</i>
Sweden	Yes	<i>Jonsson</i>
Switzerland	Yes	<i>Balzardi</i>
United Kingdom	Yes	<i>Rosie</i>
Vatican	Yes	<i>Manoni</i>

*[Document updated Feb. 16, 2005 to include vote from Spain]