

## Total Tally of Voting IMEICC 1 and IMEICC 2 June 2005

Each country is allowed one vote. Where multiple votes were received for one country the majority vote was counted and a note of the split vote was recorded in the last column. Where there was no majority the vote was not counted.

Questions	Total votes Yes	Total votes No	Abstentions	Split vote
<p>ENG: Question 1 - Word order for names of persons to follow conventions of country and language (on manifestations or in reference sources)</p> <p><b>Q1.</b> 5.2. Forms of Names for Persons</p> <p>5.2.1. When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions of the <b>country and</b> language <b>most associated with</b> that person as found in manifestations or reference sources.</p>	<p>13 (IME ICC1) 17 (IME ICC2)</p>	<p>2 (IME ICC1) 0 (IME ICC2)</p>	<p>0 (IME ICC1) 0 (IME ICC2)</p>	<p>Russia</p>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>		
<p><b>Vote by country with comments –Question 1:</b></p> <p><b>1. Argentina: Yes [5 votes unanimous]</b></p> <p><b>2. Austria: Yes</b></p> <p><b>3. Bahamas: Yes</b></p> <p><b>4. Chile: Yes</b></p> <p><b>5. Colombia: Yes</b></p> <p><b>6. Costa Rica: Yes</b></p> <p><b>Comment by Sonia Gutierrez C.:</b> Statement is very clear.</p> <p><b>7. Croatia: Yes</b></p> <p><b>8. Cyprus: Yes</b></p> <p><b>9. Czech Rep: Yes</b></p> <p><b>10. Curacao: Yes</b></p> <p><b>11. Ecuador: Yes</b></p> <p><b>Comment by Ana Vargas B.:</b> This appears to be the way to go because researching citizenship or residency may lead to confusion or to looking for information that is not readily available thus, complicating making the cataloging decisions.</p> <p><b>12. Estonia: Yes [2 votes unanimous]</b></p>				

**Vote by country with comments –Question 1:**

**13. France: No [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by F. Bourdon:** We propose: 5.2.1. When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions of the country or, 5.2.3. When it is not possible to determine the country, the language most associated with that person as found in manifestations or reference sources. (We have in mind "Names of persons" now available on IFLANET.)

**Comments by P. LeBœuf:** We suggest the following wording, which reaffirms the basic principle that each country is responsible for establishing the authorized forms for the names of its authors (and composers, cartographers, illustrators, performers, etc.), without using the controversial words "nationals", "citizens", "country", and "language", while recognizing the possibility of a more practical treatment when that basic principle cannot be applied:

"When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions that prevail in the cultural environment of the National Bibliographic Agency that is responsible for establishing the authorized form for the name of the person in question. When that cultural environment cannot be determined, it is acceptable that a given agency follows other conventions.

**14. Germany: Yes [6 votes unanimous]**

**15. Guatemala: Yes**

**16. Honduras: Yes [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by G.E. Nuñez F.:** I think that the situation is very clear with respect to this rule; it is when there is ambiguity that the results are disastrous. This could not be any clearer as to its application and besides we should respect the identity of each person with respect to the country where they actually reside.

**17. Hungary: Yes**

**18. Italy: Yes**

**19. Jamaica: Yes [2 votes unanimous]**

**20. Mexico: Yes [4 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by A. A. Rodríguez G.:** Of course focusing on the entry word and language are without doubt two means through which the forms of personal names can bring consistency to the variants found on manifestations, never mind the fact that manifestations or reference sources themselves are often inconsistent and that is what unfortunately creates divergence in the form of the personal name.

**Comments by Esperanza Molina M.:** I am in agreement with this part [situation] as it is the most common; nonetheless we are not taking into consideration the cases in which a person is related with two or more countries and that this also implies the use of two or more languages.

**21. Panama: Yes**

**22. Peru: Yes [3 votes unanimous]**

**23. Puerto Rico: Yes**

**24. Russia: Yes – [3 votes - Split vote 2 Yes; 1 No]**

**Comments by E. Zagorskaya: vote No:** Priorities for choice requisite

**25. Slovenia: Yes**

**26. Spain: Yes**

**27. Sweden: Yes**

**28. St. Maartens: Yes**

**29. Trinidad & Tobago: Yes**

**30. UK: Yes**

**31. Vatican: No**

**32. Venezuela: Yes**

**Comment by M. Pirela:** I agree, so long as we keep in mind that the conventions of the country are related with the “country of origin of the person or the language that generally is related with the person” (that is to say nationality)

Questions	Total votes Yes	Total votes No	Abstentions	Split vote
<p><b>Question 2 - Word order for names of families to follow conventions of country and language (on manifestations or in reference sources).</b></p> <p><b>Q2. 5.3. Forms of Names for Families</b></p> <p>5.3.1. When the name of a family consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions of the <b>country and language most associated with</b> that family as found in manifestations or general reference sources.</p>	<p><b>13 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>17 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>2 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>0 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>0 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>0 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>Russia</b></p>
<p><b>TOTALS:</b></p>	<p><b>30</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>		
<p><b>Vote by country with comments –Question 2:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Argentina: Yes [5 votes unanimous]</b></li> <li>2. <b>Austria: Yes</b></li> <li>3. <b>Bahamas: Yes</b></li> <li>4. <b>Chile: Yes</b></li> <li>5. <b>Colombia: Yes</b></li> <li>6. <b>Costa Rica: Yes</b>  <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><b>Comment by Sonia Gutierrez C.:</b> Statement is very clear.</p> </li> <li>7. <b>Croatia: Yes</b></li> <li>8. <b>Cyprus: Yes</b></li> <li>9. <b>Czech Rep: Yes</b></li> <li>10. <b>Curaçao: Yes</b></li> <li>11. <b>Ecuador: Yes</b></li> <li>12. <b>Estonia: Yes [2 votes unanimous]</b></li> <li>13. <b>France: No [2 votes unanimous]</b>  <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><b>Comments by F. Bourdon:</b> Same answer as above for Q1.  <b>Comments by P. LeBœuf:</b> We suggest the following wording, which reaffirms the basic principle that each country is responsible for establishing the authorized forms for the names of its authors (and composers, cartographers, illustrators, performers, etc.), without using the controversial words "nationals", "citizens", "country", and "language", while recognizing the possibility of a more practical treatment when that basic principle cannot be applied:  "When the name of a family consists of several words, the choice of entry word should follow conventions that prevail in the cultural environment of the National Bibliographic Agency that is responsible for establishing the authorized form for the name of the family in question. When that cultural environment cannot be determined, it is acceptable that a given agency follows other conventions."</p> </li> </ol>				

**Vote by country with comments –Question 2:**

**14. Germany: Yes [6 votes unanimous]**

**15. Guatemala: Yes**

**16. Honduras: Yes [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by G.E. Nuñez F.:** As with the other before I'm in complete agreement. We should think on how the clarity of each rule enables us to apply it to each situation that is presented.

**17. Hungary: Yes**

**18. Italy: Yes**

**19. Jamaica: Yes [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by R. Runcie:** Can we be consistent and continue to use "reference sources" rather than "general reference sources". See Q. 1

**20. Mexico: Yes [4 votes]**

**Comments by A. A. Rodríguez G.:** But I reiterate that inconsistencies present problems when trying to compare [conform] the forms of names in manifestations and reference sources for this reason is it best to look for uniformity in both places that way one can select the entry element.

**21. Panama: Yes**

**22. Peru: Yes [3 votes unanimous]**

**23. Puerto Rico: Yes**

**24. Russia: Yes [3 votes; Split 2 Yes; 1 No ]**

**Comments by E. Zagorskaya: vote No:** Priorities for choice requisite

**25. Slovenia: Yes**

**26. Spain: Yes**

**27. Sweden: Yes**

**28. St. Maartens: Yes**

**29. Trinidad & Tobago: Yes**

**30. UK: Yes**

**31. Vatican: No**

**32. Venezuela: Yes**

**Comment by M. Pirela:** Related to the origin of the family

Questions	Total votes Yes	Total votes No	Abstentions	Split vote
<p><b>Q3. 5.4. Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies</b></p> <p>5.4.1. <b>The corporate name should be given directly under the name by which it is commonly known.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>11 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>16 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>3 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>0 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>1 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>1 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>Germany</b> <b>Italy</b> <b>Mexico</b> <b>Russia</b></p>
<p><b>TOTALS:</b></p>	<p><b>27</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	
<p><b>Vote by country with comments –Question 3:</b></p> <p><b>1. Argentina: Yes [5 votes unanimous]</b>  <b>Comments by E. Chahbenderian:</b> This can be very laborious and in many cases unnecessary. It should not be an obligated requirement for practical reasons (cost and benefits ratio)</p> <p><b>2. Austria: Yes</b></p> <p><b>3. Bahamas: Yes</b></p> <p><b>4. Chile: Abstain</b></p> <p><b>5. Colombia: Yes</b>  <b>Comments by R. Lopez:</b> When one is referring to a corporate body whose name in publications appears in different languages one should choose the name in the official language of the bibliographic agency.</p> <p><b>6. Costa Rica: Yes</b></p> <p><b>7. Croatia: Abstain</b>  <b>Comments by M. Willer:</b> What about subordinate bodies? In which direction should they be given?</p> <p><b>8. Cyprus: Yes</b></p> <p><b>9. Czech Rep: Yes</b></p> <p><b>10. Curaçao: Yes</b></p> <p><b>11. Ecuador: Yes</b>  <b>Comment by Ana Vargas B.:</b> This is very clear.</p> <p><b>12. Estonia: Yes [2 votes unanimous]</b></p>				

### Vote by country with comments –Question 3:

#### 13. France: No [2 votes unanimous]

**Comments by F. Bourdon:** We prefer 5.4.1. The corporate name should be given directly under the name commonly found on manifestations. Comments: "commonly known" is a too subjective a criteria. The manifestations should be the main sources.

**Comments by P. LeBœuf:** We agree that it is crucial to have at least one form that reflects the most commonly used name of a corporate body, under which most users will search it, but it is also important, especially in the context of the international sharing of authority data and bibliographic records, to include in an authority record for a corporate body a more structured form that reflects the rules that serve to disambiguate names of corporate bodies and to collocate sub-units of corporate bodies. Whether the "commonly known" form or the "structured, rules-compliant" form should be the authorized heading or just a variant form is most probably not as important as was thought in the past, but we definitely need both forms, which serve different purposes, to be present in authority records.

#### 14. Germany: Yes [6 votes – Split; 5 yes; 1 abstention]

**Comments by R. Albrecht:** I agree in general. However I believe "the name which is commonly known" might be unambiguous e.g., different communities could use different common names of a corporate body. What about the relationship "common name" - "official name"? The "common name" of a corporate body is in many cases a short form instead of the full. In Germany it is widely spread to use the form of name like "Universitaet Frankfurt" however, the full name is "Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universitaet" So what is "commonly known"?

**Comments by R. Gömpel:** I agree, but I would prefer to include the wording of the former draft "name in direct order" which seems much clearer to me compared with the new wording "directly."

**Comments by G. Henze:** I agree, but I would prefer to include "name in direct order" of the former draft text because this wording is much clearer than "directly". Proposal for 5.4.1: "The corporate name should be given (directly) under the name in direct order by which it is commonly known." I welcome the change from an artificial hierarchical structure of headings to a form in direct order. It is important to me that "reference" in 5.4.3 means reciprocal relationships between the corresponding authority records for the entities, but not records for references.

**Vote by country with comments –Question 3:**

**15. Guatemala: Yes**

**16. Honduras: Yes [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by G.E. Nuñez F.:** We completely agree. This makes very clear the jurisdictional situation of an institution and what should be used in regard to its locality.

**17. Hungary: Yes**

**18. Italy: Yes [3 votes – 2 Yes; 1 Abstain]**

**Comments by I. de Pinedo: Abstain** The form "under the name by which is commonly known" could be intended in different ways within a same country, depending by various factors. The corporate body's name should be given as found in manifestations or general reference source, keeping in mind that the corporate body's name could change in successive periods.

**19. Jamaica: Yes**

**20. Mexico: Yes [4 votes – Split vote; 3 Yes; 1 No]**

**Comments by A. Serrano C.: Vote No:** Directly under the name by which it appears in the [chief] source of information and other forms are linked through references.

**21. Panama: Yes**

**22. Peru: Yes [3 votes unanimous]**

**23. Puerto Rico: Yes**

**24. Russia: No – [3 votes – Split vote; 2 No; 1 Yes]**

**Comments by E. Zagorskaya: Vote No:** The commonly known name could be a variant form. It can be authorized form in some circumstances only.

**Comments by T. Maskhoulia): Vote No:** Not agree with 5.4.4. Our proposal: "the authorized form of corporate name should be official form or if the official form can not be established, the form as found in manifestations"

**25. Slovenia: Yes**

**26. Spain: Yes**

**27. Sweden: Yes**

**28. St. Maartens: Yes**

**29. Trinidad & Tobago: Yes**

**30. UK: Yes**

**31. Vatican: No**

**32. Venezuela: Yes**

Questions	Total votes Yes	Total votes No	Abstentions	Split vote
<p><b>Question 4. - Always add language and date (FRBR attributes of expressions) to uniform titles.</b></p> <p><b>Q4. 5.5. Uniform titles.</b></p> <p>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. <b>Always add language and date.</b></p>	<p><b>07 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>12 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>7 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>2 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>1 (IME ICC1)</b> <b>2 (IME ICC2)</b></p>	<p><b>Argentina</b> <b>Germany</b> <b>Mexico [Not counted]</b> <b>Peru</b></p>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>Vote by country with comments –Question 4:</b></p> <p><b>1. Argentina: Yes [5 votes- Split vote 3 yes; 2 no]</b></p> <p><b>2. Austria: Abstain</b></p> <p><b>3. Bahamas: No</b></p> <p><b>4. Chile: Yes</b></p> <p><b>Comments by P. Abumohor:</b> I would be interested in clarification of the phrase "<b>Under certain defined circumstances, a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue may be preferred ...</b>" as it is a little vague and could lead to confusion. It would also be appropriate to specify what language and date is meant to be used. I understand that language is used as a controlled access point for the item being described. But with respect to the date, is this the date the cataloger created the UT?</p> <p><b>5. Colombia: Yes</b></p> <p><b>6. Costa Rica: Yes</b></p> <p><b>Comment by Sonia Gutierrez C.:</b> The language and date should be added as a usual practice when it is readily available.</p> <p><b>7. Croatia: No</b></p> <p><b>Comment by M. Willer:</b> It is not possible to always give dates, so I suggest: Add language and date when necessary for identification or disambiguation.</p> <p><b>8. Cyprus: No</b></p> <p><b>9. Czech Rep: Yes</b></p> <p><b>10. Curaçao: Yes</b></p> <p><b>11. Ecuador: Yes</b></p> <p><b>Comment by Ana Vargas B.:</b> We should clarify a bit more in the glossary of terms exactly what constitutes a UT so that it is standard and thus clarify the meaning of this phrase.</p> <p><b>12. Estonia: Yes [2 votes unanimous]</b></p>				

**Vote by country with comments –Question 4:**

**13. France: No [2 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by F. Bourdon:** All resources are not textual, so the added statement should read: "Always add language (if any) and date of the expression embodied in the manifestation (in most cases, excluding reprints and facsimiles, the date of the manifestation can be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the date of the expression; in the case of reprints and facsimiles, the date of the original manifestation can be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the date of the expression)." Anyway, the wording such as it stands reads more like rules than like a principle. An actual Principle should read something like: "**The uniform title should make it possible to identify the work, and to collocate, through elements added to the part of the title that identifies the work, sets of expressions of the work.**"

**Comments by P. LeBœuf:** Please be more specific. The added statement should read: "Always add language (if any) and date of the expression embodied in the manifestation (in most cases, excluding reprints and facsimiles, the date of the manifestation can be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the date of the expression; in the case of reprints and facsimiles, the date of the original manifestation can be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the date of the expression)." Anyway, the wording such as it stands reads more like rules than like a principle. An actual Principle should read something like: "**The uniform title should make it possible to identify the work, and to collocate, through elements added to the part of the title that identifies the work, sets of expressions of the work.**"

**14. Germany: Yes: [6 votes; Split- 4 Yes; 2 Abstentions]**

**Comments by R. Albrecht: Abstain;** agree with everything except the last sentence. In my opinion in many, many cases it will take too much time and work for a cataloger to trace language and date of an original title (edition??). We must not forget to orientate modern cataloging rules on economical standards (did we mention this point so far?)

**15. Guatemala: No**

**16. Honduras: Yes:**

**Comments by G.E. Nuñez F.:** Totally in agreement. What is expressed by this proposal will help clarify the application to real life circumstances that often present themselves at the time of describing a work.

**Comments by E. Ortega V.:** In the case of adding language and date I believe that this should be left to the judgment of the cataloger taking into consideration above all the needs and interest of the user who is the one who ultimately benefits.

**17. Hungary: Yes**

**18 Italy: No [3 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by C. Magliano:** We don't agree that these qualifiers are always added but only if necessary: for example to distinguish or to order and to bring together different manifestations. We prefer this version: Language and date may be added, if possible. In case of homonymous uniform title should be added to differentiate the title together with other appropriate qualifiers.

**Comments by I. de Pinedo:** Qualifications as language and date should be given when needed for differentiating synonyms.

**19. Jamaica: Yes**

**Vote by country with comments –Question 4:**

**20. Mexico: Split vote - Not counted [3 yes; 3 no]**

**Comments by A.A. Rodríguez G.:** **Vote yes:** Because the UT form that is currently used with its optional additions does not permit identification of the original languages of either the work or the expressions.

**Comments by E. Molina M.:** **Vote No:** I think that this statement as currently written is very general as to when to add the language and date and there are exceptions. My suggestion is the following: The UT should be the original title or the title that is most frequently found on manifestations of the work. When dealing with manifestations in languages other than the original always add the language and date. Under certain predefined circumstances prefer as the UT a title that is most commonly used in the language and script of the catalog instead of the original title.

**Comments by A. Serrano C.:** **Vote no:** Do not add language and date because these are additions and they only help to separate the UTs rather than keep them uniform.

**21. Panama: Abstain.**

**Comments by L. Pérez de S.:** I consider that adding the language and date is not relevant and this could bring some complication for catalogers.

**22. Peru: Yes [3 votes Split vote; 2 Yes; 1No]**

**Comments by C. J. Rojas L.:** Only the date should be added and then only in the case of laws, treaties, etc. (25.15. 25.16.). In the case of Sacred Works 25.18A13, I don't think it is necessary as it does not provide much; furthermore, in the majority of cases the date will appear in its respective area.

**23. Puerto Rico: Yes**

**24. Russia: No [3 votes unanimous]**

**Comments by T. Maskhouliya):** Proposal for the last sentence: **“When necessary language and date should be added”**

**Comments by E. Zagorskaya:** Language and date are obligatory under certain defined circumstances only (for defined works, for example Bible)

**25. Slovenia: No**

**26: Spain: No**

**27. St. Maartens: Yes**

**28. Sweden: Yes**

**Comments by G. Jonsson:** I vote yes, but still would wish to have a more precise guideline here. It is stated in the question that language and date are to be understood as FRBR attributes of expressions, couldn't that precision be added to the last sentence? And further, which language code should be applied if a uniform title is constructed in another language than the original title?

**29. Trinidad & Tobago: Abstain**

**Comments by K. Rankine:** It is difficult to determine by our experience since uniform titles are hardly used in describing English language publications from the Caribbean.

**30. UK: Yes**

**31. Vatican City: No**

**32. Venezuela: Yes**

**Comments by M. Pirela:** So long as it is needed, such as in the case of laws or literary works.

<b>IME ICC1 --by County</b>	<b>IMEICC2 - By country;</b>
<b>Austria 1</b> <b>Croatia 1</b> <b>Cyprus 1</b> <b>Czech Rep1</b> <b>Estonia 2</b> <b>France 2</b> <b>Germany 6</b> <b>Hungary 1</b> <b>Italy 3</b> <b>Russia 3</b> <b>Slovenia 1</b> <b>Spain 1</b> <b>Sweden 1</b> <b>UK 1</b> <b>Vatican 1</b>	<b>Argentina 5</b> <b>Bahamas 1</b> <b>Chile 1</b> <b>Colombia 1</b> <b>Costa Rica 1</b> <b>Curaçao 1</b> <b>Ecuador 1</b> <b>Guatemala 1</b> <b>Honduras 2</b> <b>Jamaica 2</b> <b>Mexico 4</b> <b>Panama 1</b> <b>Peru 3</b> <b>Puerto Rico 1</b> <b>St. Maarten 1</b> <b>Trinidad &amp; Tobago 1</b> <b>Venezuela 1</b>
<b>15 countries from the IME ICC1 out of a total of 27 voted</b>	<b>17 countries from the IME ICC2 out of 32 voted</b>
<b>Grand total: 32 countries voted out of a possible 59 countries</b> <b>54 individual members voted out of a possible 126</b>	