

Vote Summary with comments for the July-August 2005 balloting

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?

<p>Great Britain: I agree with the wording suggested by IME ICC2. Heather Rosie British Library</p>
<p>Guatemala: I agree with the text suggested by IME ICC2 María Emilia López Universidad del Valle de Guatemala</p>
<p>Italy: I prefer the IMEICC2 wording because I believe manifestations and reference sources are enough to determine the country and language of a person. The National Bibliographical Agency, responsible for establishing the authorized form for the name of persons, should know the country and the language most associated with that person and follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that person. The exceptions should be very few (language of the NBA in some case, for example: Francis, of Assisi, saint for AACR; Latin language for Greek author, for example: Homerus for RICA, etc.). Best wishes Maria De Panicis</p>
<p>RUSSIA: We agree with the wording by Barbara Tillett. Tatiana Maskhoulia Tatiana Parshina and Elena Zagorskaya (National Library of Russia)</p>
<p>Slovenia: I agree with the IME ICC2 wording. Irena Kavcic, National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia</p>
<p>SPAIN: I agree with this wording suggested from IME ICC2 Elena Escolano Rodríguez Biblioteca Nacional de España</p>
<p>16 votes from 11 countries were received: All agreed</p>

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.”

<p>Argentina: I agree with wording suggested by IME ICC2 Silvia Pisano Universidad de Buenos Aires Argentina ***** I agree with wording suggested by IME ICC2. Elsa Barber Department of Library and Information Science Universidad de Buenos Aires Argentina</p>
<p>Coatia: Agreed. Mirna Willer</p>
<p>Czech Republic: I agree with the wording suggested from IME ICC2 and providing paralell wording about the "reference sources". Edita Lichtenbergova National Library of the Czech Republic</p>

<p>Estonia: I agree with wording suggested by IME ICC2, without the word "general". Sirje Nilbe National Library of Estonia</p>
<p>Germany: We agree with the IME ICC 2 wording and the proposal to state "reference sources" in the same way for persons and for families. Does it make a difference in the meaning if "general reference sources" or just "reference sources" is used? If there is no difference, we prefer a consistent wording. If there is a difference in the meaning, we would like to learn about it. Renate Goempel Gudrun Henze ***** I agree with the IME-ICC2 suggested changing. Best regards Barbara Sigrist</p>
<p>Great Britain: I agree with the IME ICC2 wording and the proposal to drop the word "general". Heather Rosie British Library</p>
<p>Guatemala: I agree with the text prepared by the IME ICC2 for 5.3.1 María Emilia López</p>
<p>Italy: I prefer the IMEICC2 wording because I believe manifestations and reference sources are enough to determine the country and language of a family. I agree with the proposal to drop the word "general". Best wishes Maria De Panicis ***** I agree with the proposal to drop the word "general". I agree with Maria, Mauro</p>
<p>Russia: We agree with the wording by Barbara Tillet. Tatiana Maskhoulia Tatiana Parshina and Elena Zagorskaya (National Library of Russia)</p>

Slovenia:

I agree with the IME ICC2 wording.

Irena Kavcic,

National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Spain:

I agree with this wording suggested from IME ICC2

Elena Escolano Rodríguez

Biblioteca Nacional de España

A total of 17 votes from 11 countries were received: All agreed

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? [See also follow up question at end]

Argentina:

I agree with the wording of 5.4 by Barbara Tillett.

Silvia Pisano

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

I agree with the wording of 5.4 by Barbara Tillett.

Elsa Barber

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Croatia:

I agree with Barbara's suggestions.

Mirna Willer

NUL, Croatia

Czech Republic:

I agree with the wording of 5.4 by Barbara Tillett with an exception of 5.4.1.2.

1) I am not sure I understand it well - does it mean:

... when there is no conventional name and variant forms of the name are found in manifestations, one of them indicated as the official name, prefer the official name ...?

2) I am afraid that level of this suggestion is not consistent with that for personal and family names.

Edita Lichtenbergova

National Library of the Czech Republic

Estonia:

I think the IME ICC2 wording is not sufficient but Barbara's new proposal contains very detailed stipulations beyond principle level. There are some points where we have had different opinions, e.g. importance of the conventional and official names and prescribing the hierarchical order. May be it is better to avoid these points in the principles. On the other hand - we should remember the main principle for authorized headings, already agreed by all:

5.1.2. 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).

In my opinion all conventional names do not identify the entity in a consistent manner, especially the short names.

I propose:

5.4.1. The corporate name should be given in the direct order in the form predominantly found in manifestations or reference sources.

5.4.1.1. When variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and one is indicated as the official name, the official name may be preferred.

5.4.1.2. When a conventional name is commonly known (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue) and identifies the entity in a consistent manner, the conventional name may be preferred.

5.4.2. For jurisdictions... [as already agreed by IME ICC1 and IME ICC2] -- may be placed as 5.4.1.3

5.4.3. If the corporate body... [as already agreed by IME ICC1 and IME ICC2]

Sirje Nilbe

National Library of Estonia

Germany:

1. we are still in favour of the IME ICC 2 wording (with "name in direct order" to clarify "directly"):

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

Additionally, we considered Barbara's new proposal and would like to offer our comments on it. Generally, it seems to be a bit strange to us if we give very short principles on persons and families, but very detailed stipulations for corporate bodies.

5.4.1 We agree. The proposed text explains "in the direct order" by mentioning manifestations or reference sources.

5.4.1.1 We agree.

5.4.1.2 We do not agree. For persons and families, where variant forms of names may show up, too, we do not have such stipulations in the "Principles". We are afraid that the proposed wording opens a door again to check every name and to do research in order to get an official name.

5.4.1.3 We do not agree.

5.4.1.3 is not already agreed on by IME ICC 1 and IME ICC 2. The new proposal goes beyond because it stipulates an hierarchical order and reintroduces the Paris Principle 9.62. Please compare the suggested wording with the wording the IME ICCs voted on, which says "include ... the form" without saying where:

[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.]

5.4.1.4 We do not agree. This reintroduces the Paris Principle 9.61 and stipulates an hierarchical order.

5.4.2 We agree. This is already agreed (as 5.4.3) by IME ICC 1 and IME ICC 2.

Renate Goempel

Gudrun Henze

As far as question 3, I prefer to abstain, because I still prefer to enter a publication under the official name of the corporate body.

Best regards

Barbara Sigrist.

GREAT BRITAIN:

I prefer the rewording by Barbara Tillett because it avoids the potential ambiguities of the IME ICC2 statement. However, the list of principles is also confusing. Why use a conventional form that does not appear in manifestations or reference sources? Where would the conventional name be found if not in these places? As in the Paris Principle, the general rule at 5.4.1 should only make reference to manifestations ("its publications"), not reference sources.

Reference sources might be included in the exceptions:

5.4.1. The corporate name should be given in the direct order found in manifestations, except

5.4.1.1. when a conventional name is commonly known (from reference sources?) (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, prefer a conventional name. If there is no conventional name, and one form is indicated as the official name, prefer the official name

Heather Rosie

British Library

Guatemala:

Agree with the text for 5.4.

María Emilia López

Universidad del Valle de Guatemala

Honduras:

Despues de leer atentamente sus comentarios, creo y me uno a ellos pues los veo muy bien acertados hacia lo que todos esperamos tener como guia para las descripciones documentales.

Estoy de acuerdo con la adición de la 5.4.1.1

GLORIA ESPERANZA NUÑEZ FLORES

COORDINADORA UNIDAD DIGITAL DE INFORMACION (UDI-CRA-UNAH)

Italy:**July 14, 2005**

I agree with the 5.4 of the text of Barbara Tillett, because this is a general principle that in the revision of Italian cataloguing rules we have adopted as the first point. As the second point we have said that the name *commonly known* is usually determined under the name found in original manifestations of the corporate body itself. I think that the new text proposed is too specific and not pertaining to the text of general principles.

Cristina Magliano**July 15, 2005**

Dear Barbara, sorry for my misunderstanding mail. Yes, I prefer the form as suggested by IME ICC2: The corporate name should be given directly under the name by which it is commonly known. I don't like the more specific principles because these are rules that should be present in the national code of cataloguing.

Cristina

Italy:

I apologize very much for my questions, but I'm not sure I understood. If I think the Italian translation, I'm in doubt.

Are 5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.2, 5.3.1.3 and 5.3.1.4 exceptions to the "direct order found in manifestations or reference sources"?

It seems to me these points establish different rules (I agree with these rules, but I think they are not exceptions to the "direct order").

It seems to me there are two different concepts (direct order and difference between the authorized heading and form found in manifestations or reference sources).

5.3.1.1. when a conventional name is commonly known (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue), prefer the conventional name;

This point establishes that we may choose the conventional name in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue.

5.3.1.2. when variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and one is indicated as the official name, prefer the official name;

This point establishes that we may choose the official name when variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and one is indicated as the official name.

5.3.1.3. 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;

This point establishes that we have to place the name of the territory before the corporate body that is a part of a jurisdiction.

5.3.1.4. 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.

This point establishes that we have to place the superior body before the name that we find in manifestations.

For example:

If I find "Commission on Civil Rights" in the manifestation, I don't change the order of the words, but place "Stati Uniti d'America" before.

Maria De Panicis

.....
August 5, 2005

I agree with the wording of 5.3.1, 5.4.4 and 5.5

Mauro

July 19, 2005

> Do you agree to the addition shown above for 5.4.1.1?

> - Barbara

I do,

Mauro

July 17, 2005

> The effect in either case is that we prefer

> 1. a conventional name (principle of user convenience), and if none, then

> 2. an official name, and if none, then

> 3. the name found on manifestations.

>> Are we happy with that?

I agree

> We need to add the definition to the Glossary for a "conventional name" - (from the ALA Glossary and also found in AACR2): "a name, other than the real or official name, by which a corporate body, place, or thing has come to be known."

> Do you agree to the addition shown above for 5.4.1.1?

I agree.

For a "conventional name" I suggest to say:

"a name -- GENERALLY THE SHORT NAME --, other than the real or official name, by which a corporate body, place, or thing has come to be known."

Mauro

<p>Panama: I'd like to say that I agree with Elena Escolano Rodríguez's message of Aug. 3 has stated and also with the wording that Barbara Tillett has provided. Lidia de Salazar Escuela de Bibliotecología, Panamá</p>
<p>Puerto Rico: Yes, I agree with the addition to 5.4.1.1. Luisa del Carmen Vigo-Cepeda</p>
<p>Russia: We agree with the wording by Barbara Tillett. Tatiana Maskhoulia Tatiana Parshina and Elena Zagorskaya (National Library of Russia)</p>
<p>Slovenia: I agree with Barbara Tillett's wording of 5.4. "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;" - I prefer Barbara Tillett's wording (I do not think that the addition is necessary). "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;" - I am not sure if it is absolutely clear that we prefer a conventional name to an official name. Perhaps we should consider the following comment of Renate Goempel and Gudrun Henze: "it seems to be a bit strange ... if we give very short principles on persons and families, but very detailed stipulations for corporate bodies". Irena Kavcic, National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia</p>

SPAIN:

July 14, 2005

I agree with the wording of 5.4 by Barbara Tillett.

Elena Escolano Rodríguez
Biblioteca Nacional de España

August 02, 2005

I have been on vacations so it has not been possible for me to participate on time in the discussion. But I would like to give my opinion on this controversial issue. After one year, I think it continues the problem with what is wanted to say and mean with "direct order"/"directly", why do not avoid such problem using "just as found in manifestations" or as in Paris Principles "the name of a corporate body should be the name by which the body is most frequently identified in its manifestations or reference sources".

The other controversial question that arises is the order of the criteria of selection of the form of the name: first conventional then official or the contrary. As it has been said by Irena Kavcic, it is not clear the preference, as the order is established as "exceptions", what is strange to understand. I agree with Lictenbergová, we should be consistent in all the principles. Also I agree with Henze and Goempel, it should there be more compensation with the principles on other entities; but it is true that it has been always much problems with corporate bodies.

I voted Yes to the wording by Barbara Tillett, and I maintain it. But thinking on what Barbara said as:

"The effect in either case is that we prefer 1. a conventional name (principle of user convenience), and if none, then 2. an official name, and if none, then 3. the name found on manifestations."

I am not completely agreed with this: first is clear; but if in the third position is located the name found in manifestations, this means that the second official name is not in manifestations? I think third could be omitted, understanding that between all the forms found in manifestations, first is conventional name, then official name.

As I understand the issue:

1° is the principle of user convenient: the conventional name (from any source. I think it is not necessary to specify the sources, with more probabilities we will get it also in manifestations)

2° the representation principle: the name found in manifestation is the name by which the entity (person, corporate entity) describe itself (in original manifestations of the entity is the more accurate). Besides, when there is not a conventional name with more probabilities the user will know the name found in manifestations than other names (official names not found in manifestations). And if with this name, found in manifestation, is enough to achieve the sufficiency and necessity principle, we also are fulfilling the economy principle in cataloguing, and no more investigation would be necessary. I think it is not necessary in the principles to enter in deciding if in case of variant forms in a manifestation (one of them official) which one we should chose, as any have to be recorded in an authority record, this could be left for a Cataloguing code.

3° if there is not information in manifestation to uniquely identify the entity, then it is necessary a research outside.

Could be redacted something more general in this way? But it is being already said in 5.1.2 at a general level.

I agree with the definition of the "conventional name" in the Glossary, it is completely necessary.

Elena Escolano

21 votes from 14 countries were received. There was not enough consensus to reach agreement . This question will be reformulated and sent out for vote again soon.

BT sent to list July 15, 2005

Heather Rosie's suggestion would adjust 5.4.1.1. to indicate where a conventional name would be confirmed (although it's assumed to be "common knowledge"). She suggested confirmation in reference sources or on manifestations, and I agree that it could be confirmed in reference sources (but is that necessary?). However, I don't think it's necessary to say that one might find the "conventional name" appearing on a manifestation, because if it's on a manifestation, it more likely is considered another variant, and one still would need to know if it is the form of name by which that entity has come to be known...so one is more likely to need to find the form documented in a reference source (to confirm it's based on "common knowledge"). I personally think it read ok without this addition, but I can see making a case to include it. The principle could be reworded to:
"5.4.1.1. when a conventional name (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue) is commonly known or found in reference sources, prefer the conventional name;"

or we could leave it as suggested in my summary (omitting the "or found in reference sources").

The effect in either case is that we prefer

1. a conventional name (principle of user convenience), and if none, then
2. an official name, and if none, then
3. the name found on manifestations.

Are we happy with that?

We need to add the definition to the Glossary for a "conventional name" - (from the ALA Glossary and also found in AACR2): "a name, other than the real or official name, by which a corporate body, place, or thing has come to be known."

Do you agree to the addition shown above for 5.4.1.1?

- Barbara

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.

<p>Great Britain: I agree with Barbara Tillett's rewording of 5.5. Heather Rosie, British Library</p>
<p>Guatemala: I agree with the text prepared by Barbara for 5.5 María Emilia López Universidad del Valle de Guatemala</p>
<p>Italy: I agree with Barbara Tillett's rewording of 5.5. In my opinion it's very clear and I appreciate that it gives more principles than rules. Maria de Panicis</p>
<p>RUSSIA: We agree with the wording by Barbara Tillett. Tatiana Maskhoulia, Tatiana Parshina, and Elena Zagorskaya (National Library of Russia)</p>
<p>Slovenia: I agree with Barbara Tillett's rewording of 5.5. Irena Kavcic, National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia</p>
<p>SPAIN: I agree with the Barbara Tillett wording, but I would like to be changed the exception of 5.5.3 and the last point 5.5.3.1. This possibility should be restricted. If it is necessary to add something, it would be better to repeat what is being said at a general level in 5.1.3 Language "but if the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be based on forms found on manifestations or in references in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue." Elena Escolano Rodríguez Biblioteca Nacional de España</p>
<p>16 votes from 11 countries were received. Consensus was not reached. The question will be reformulated and sent out for vote again.</p>

Summary of votes July-August 2005

A total of 14 countries voted, although not all counties voted on each question. In some cases more than one vote was from each county. Comments in the response column signify that although there may have been majority agreement there were too many questions or comments to qualify as a vote for agreement.

Country

1. Argentina

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 2

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 2

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 2

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 2

2. Croatia

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

3. Czech Republic

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

4. Estonia

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Comments

No. of persons voting: 1

5. Germany

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 3: Comments

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 4: Comments

No. of persons voting: 3

6. Great Britain

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Comments

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

7. Guatemala

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

8. Honduras

Question 1: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 2: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

9. Italy

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 3: Comments

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

10. Panama

Question 1: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 2: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

11. Puerto Rico

Question 1: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 2: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: No. vote

No. of persons voting: 0

12. Russia

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 3

Question 4: **Agree**

No. of persons voting: 3

13. Slovenia

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

14. Spain

Question 1: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 2: Agree

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 3: Agree with comments

No. of persons voting: 1

Question 4: Comments

No. of persons voting: 1