

**IME ICC Voting Summary and Further Discussion
June 2005
(Prepared by Barbara Tillett 8 July 2005)**

Since many of the votes brought up further questions, I think we still need further discussion and ask you to please state your views on the following issues, using our email mailing lists for IME ICC1 and IME ICC2 (“reply all” should work to accomplish this). The complete tally of votes and comments is available at:
<http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/source/votesum-jun05.pdf>

Question 1, regarding the order of the words for names of persons.

The IME ICC1 wording was:

- 5.2.1. When the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of entry word should be determined by conventions of the person’s country of citizenship, or*
- 5.2.2. when that country 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 that person generally uses, as found in manifestations or general reference sources.*

The suggested change from IME ICC2 was:

- 5.2.1. 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.*

There were recognized problems with several words in the original statement. For example, we agree the cataloger should not be taking extra time to research a person’s “citizenship,” as it is too difficult a concept for a cataloger to determine, and means different things in different countries. In the future we may know the practice for entering names that is followed by all of the countries of the world (particularly with an update to *IFLA’s Names of Persons*), but that still will not tell us which country is associated with the person we are trying to name in our access point.

We will not always have clues about where the person resides or the language they generally use. Usually what a cataloger has at hand is an item to be cataloged, and he/she must use it as evidence, as the primary source of information, about the named person. In some situations the cataloger may refer to reference sources, but we usually want to limit such research to a minimum, in order to speed up the cataloging process and to keep costs down.

So the IME ICC2 participants suggested a solution to these problems by basing the decision about the word order on conventions of the country and language most associated with that person – with the evidence coming from the manifestation (actually the specific item at hand) or from reference sources (which might include *IFLA’s Names of Persons* for guidance on entry practices in different countries). All the voting countries agreed, except France (with comments) and the Vatican (without comment).

As I read the French suggestion for new wording, it essentially reorganizes the IME ICC2 proposal into two separate principles, so the “convention of the country” comes first (but is that the country of the cataloging agency, the country of publication, the country of the person, or what?), and when that is not possible to determine, then the cataloger looks at the language most associated with that person as found in manifestations or reference sources. We are very close to agreeing.

I believe the country and language belong together, as some countries have multiple official languages, and the wording suggested by IME ICC2 reflects that fact.

Shall we have the majority rule on this one? Please respond using our IME ICC discussion lists on email. I’ll be happy to forward any messages to the lists, if you are having difficulty sending them.

Question 2, regarding the order of the words for names of families

The IME ICC1 wording was:

- 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 the language that family generally uses, as found in manifestations or general reference sources.*

IME ICC2 suggested changing this to:

- 5.3.1. *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 general reference sources.*

The problems with the original wording parallel the problems noted above for personal names. Again we had only France (with comments) and the Vatican (no comments) disagreeing. Shall we go with the majority vote? Again, I think the French alternative wording is very close to the IME ICC2 wording, and perhaps they can live with the IME ICC2 wording as the principle?

If we agree, I would ask to have editorial permission to provide parallel wording about the “reference sources,” to drop the word “general,” so the principle for persons and for families is stated the same way, namely: “as found in manifestations or reference sources.”

Question 3, regarding forms of names for corporate bodies

The IME ICC2 wording lacked information about the order of the words or the construction of the name of a corporate body, so the IME ICC2 suggested the following:

5.4.1. The corporate name should be given directly under the name by which it is commonly known.

Unfortunately, this introduces the questions: as commonly know where?, and, does directly mean direct order found? We see that several of the voters had problems with this.

The French have a slightly different version, to use “given directly under the name commonly found on manifestations.” The Germans prefer to clarify that “directly” really means that it would be “in the direct order as found.” Can we go back to “The corporate name should be given in the direct order as found in manifestations or reference sources” to parallel the personal and family name principles? This reflects the larger principle of trying to use the form the users will expect, that they will find when looking at manifestations.

Our colleague from Colombia reminds us that often corporate names may appear in multiple languages on the same manifestation, but we already have the principle 5.1.3 for multiple languages to cover those situations, so I would not recommend further wording about language here.

One of the Russian colleagues suggested retaining the official form of corporate name. I remind you of the Paris Principle that made exceptions to allow using official forms and conventional forms to the name found on manifestations:

*9.4. The form heading for works entered under the name of a corporate body should be the name by which the body is most frequently identified in its publications, **except that** 9.41 if variant forms of the name are frequently found in the publications, the uniform heading should be the official form of the name;*

9.42 if there are official names in several languages, the heading should be the name in whichever of these languages is best adapted to the needs of the users of the catalogue;

9.43 if the corporate body is generally known by a conventional name, this conventional name (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue) should be the uniform heading;

9.44 for states and other territorial authorities the uniform heading should be the currently used form of the name of the territory concerned in the language best adapted to the needs of the users of the catalogue;

etc.

So the only time we should now be resorting to an official form of name is when there are variant forms found on the manifestations (using FRBR vocabulary). We could even go with a conventional name when the body is generally known that way by our users. If we wish to retain these principles from the Paris Principles, but update the language, I would offer the following suggestion, and would appreciate your comments:

5.4. Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies

- 5.4.1. The corporate name should be given in the direct order found in manifestations or reference sources, except
 - 5.4.1.1. when a conventional name is commonly known (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue), prefer the conventional name;
 - 5.4.1.2. when variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and one is indicated as the official name, prefer the official name;
 - 5.4.1.3. when the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or territorial authority, the authorized heading should begin with 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;
 - 5.4.1.4. when the corporate name implies subordination, or subordinate function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the authorized heading should begin with the name of the superior body.
- 5.4.2. 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.

5.4.1.3 and 5.4.2 are already agreed by IME ICC1 and IME ICC2. What do you think about the addition of the other principles above that I've based on the Paris Principles?

Question 4, regarding additions to uniform titles

The IME ICC1 wording was:

- 5.5. *A uniform title may either be a title that can stand alone or it may be a name/title combination or a title qualified by the addition of identifying elements, such as a corporate name, a place, language, date, etc.*
 - 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.*

The suggested addition from IME ICC2 was to add at the end of 5.5.1:
Always add language and date.

There were many more no votes on this, with comments.

I am concerned, as I noticed some of you are as well, that this suggested change is moving us more to rules than principles for uniform titles. We already indicated language and date may be added, but this requirement to always add these two elements, lacks what the principle is we are trying to achieve here. It may be a practical solution, but as noted by our French colleagues, not all resources are textual. The French offer the following principle: "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.” I want to point out that a uniform title may be for a work, an expression, or even a manifestation (and in the case of unique manuscripts, one can even say an item).

The French proposal nicely captures the FRBR concepts and explains a principle we are saying should be followed, but perhaps can be expanded.

We would do well to also identify the principle behind the sentence in our existing 5.5.1 “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.” Some of the voters commented on problems with this sentence. Can we go back to the corporate body name parallel situation of making an exception for: “when a conventional name is commonly known (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue), prefer the conventional name” but here, for uniform titles, applied to the name of a resource? It could be as found in reference sources. This seems to get us closer to what users would expect.

If we agree, then the principle for 5.5 Forms of Uniform Titles would read:

- 5.5 A uniform title may either be a title that can stand alone or it may be a name/title combination or a title qualified by the addition of identifying elements, such as a corporate name, a place, language, date, etc.
- 5.5.1. The uniform title should make it possible to identify the work and to collocate sets of expressions of the work; and
- 5.5.2 the uniform title should make it possible to identify an expression of the work and to collocate sets of manifestations of a given expression of the work.
- 5.5.3 The uniform title should be the original title or the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work, except
- 5.5.3.1 when there is a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue, prefer the commonly used title as found in reference sources.

5.5 is already agree in the current draft and 5.5.3 is already agreed. What are your thoughts on this? Can we make it better? I am very open to other suggestions, but remember to stay at a “principle” level.