

Report on Voting on the March 6, 2007 document of recommendations from Asia  
April 6, 2007 (updated April 13, 2007)

We received votes from the following 27 countries (IME ICC1, 2, and 3):

Argentina  
Bahamas  
Bolivia  
Chile  
Costa Rica  
Czech Republic  
Egypt  
Estonia  
France  
Germany – 3 respondents (including Expert Group)  
Guatemala  
Italy – 4 respondents (including RICA group)  
Jamaica – 2 respondents  
Mexico  
Netherlands Antilles  
Palestine – 2 respondents  
Panama  
Peru  
Portugal  
Slovakia  
Slovenia  
Spain  
Sweden – 2 respondents  
Tunisia  
United Kingdom  
Uruguay  
Vatican

Although we did not expect the Asians to vote again, the following 5 countries also responded:

China (Mainland, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) – 7 respondents  
Japan – 4 respondents  
Korea – 9 respondents  
Nepal  
Philippines

for a total of 32 countries and 57 votes. The results of these votes and the comments when given are included below.

In the past we have tried to give just one vote per country, and when country votes were not in agreement, they would cancel each other out. However, in order to reflect some of the reasons given for the no votes, the individual comments have been included in this tally of responses for your information. The participants in those countries with differing vote decisions may wish to collaborate on a country response in future.

Although there was a majority opinion in favor of the recommendations made by the Asians, there is still a need for further discussion. **\*\*\*A discussion document will be prepared in May to continue the dialog.** This will again be an opportunity to work with others in your country to reach consensus on a vote. It is hoped we can reach agreement by June at the latest. Once there is agreement on the remaining issues from all the IME ICC participants, the revised Statement will be posted on all the IME ICC Web sites as the latest draft, and that version will be the one used at the Pretoria meeting.

## Questions

1. Section 5.1.2 now covers the choice of names for authorized headings and 5.2 covers the form of name - how to construct the authorized heading.

Section 5.1.2 Authorized Headings - changes were made to the caption to clarify this focuses on "Choice of Names for Authorized Headings" and the first sentence was adjusted to reflect the preferred form of name (see first sentence).

Do you agree?

MAJORITY AGREE

**Yes:** 28 countries (actually 30 countries and 50 votes, but Germany and Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

**No:** 2 countries (actually 4 countries and 7 votes, but Germany and Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

Germany (2 of 3 votes): "Section 5.1.2 addresses the choice of names (commonly known, official), and the interrelationship of names and entities (personas, corporate bodies). 5.1.3, too, addresses the choice of names (language and script), and additionally 5.2.4.1 gives a conflicting statement for the preferred language and script for titles. We agree to the adjustment of the first sentence to reflect the preferred form of name."

Italy (3 of 4 votes) "Question 1: heading of 5.1.2 - NO

a) It seems not a matter of names only but of titles too;

b) only 5.1.2.1.1 refers to choice, the other parts of 5.1.2 refer to the principle of "one" authorized heading (of "uniform heading" in PP language)"

Slovenia

United Kingdom: "I think the original wording is clear without these additions."

2. Section 5.1.2 Second paragraph refers to the form of the authorized heading and is to be moved to 5.2.

Do you agree?

MAJORITY AGREE

**Yes:** 31 (actually 32 countries and 54 votes, but Italy had no agreement among its delegates)  
Nepal ? : "5.2 Add "and same place" after the same name."

**No:** 0 (actually 1 country and 3 votes, but Italy had no agreement among its delegates)

Italy (3 of 4 votes): Question 2: qualifications to 5.2 - NO

a) (see above) this section is \*not only\* "which" name, but which elements form an au. heading

b) (see below) section 5.2 is \*only\* order of elements

c) the sentence is for "an authorized heading" (like 5.1.2 caption) not for access points (like 5.2 caption)

3. Section 5.1.3 Languages was adjusted to be clear that it refers to preference "for the authorized heading" (see first sentence).

Do you agree?

MAJORITY AGREE – but would the Italian solution solve both concerns and address the comment from United Kingdom? – Change 5.1.3 caption to "Language of Authorized Heading" and leave original paragraph language as it was.

**Yes:** 30 countries (actually 31 countries and 53 votes, but Italy had no agreement among its delegates)

**No:** 1 (actually 2 countries and 4 votes, but Italy had no agreement among its delegates)  
Italy: (3 of 4 votes) Question 3: 5.1.3 – NO; A better change will be maintaining the sentence and modify the caption to: Language of authorized heading”  
United Kingdom: “unnecessary”

4. Section 5.2 was reorganized to address issues in a discussion about the forms of controlled access points. The new structure is:

- 5. Access Points
  - 5.1 General
    - 5.1.1. Choice of access points
    - 5.1.2. Authorized headings
    - 5.1.3. Language
  - 5.2. Forms of controlled access points
    - 5.2.1. Forms of Names for Persons
    - 5.2.2. Forms of Names for Families
    - 5.2.3. Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies
    - 5.2.4. Forms of Uniform Titles

So the new 5.2 would add:

#### 5.2. Forms of controlled access points

Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities, formulated according to a set of rules or standards, in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These controlled access points are usually documented in an authority record.

When forming an authorized heading, further identifying characteristics should be added to the preferred name for an entity, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name.

Do you agree with the new 5.2?

MAJORITY AGREE – but, what about adding the suggested “and its variants” per the United Kingdom comment (as shown below with double underline)?

There seems to be agreement that “controlled” means they are in an authority record that controls them. Note the comment from France – perhaps we could remove the phrase “formulated according to a set of rules or standards”, because the variant forms may not be following rules but just be forms found. It’s the “authorized forms of names” that follow rules, as shown below with strikethrough.

#### 5.2. Forms of controlled access points

Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities, ~~formulated according to a set of rules or standards,~~ in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These controlled access points are usually documented in an authority record.

When forming an authorized heading, further identifying characteristics should be added to the preferred name for an entity and its variants, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name.

However, please see further suggestions under the next question.

**Yes:** 26 countries (actually 29 countries and 48 votes, but China, Germany, an Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

United Kingdom: "Yes - with the following revision:

5.2. Forms of controlled access points

Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities, formulated according to a set of rules or standards, in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These controlled access points are usually documented in an authority record.

When forming an authorized heading, further identifying characteristics should be added to the preferred name for an entity and its variants, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name."

**No:** 3 countries (actually 5 countries and 9 votes, but China, Germany, and Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

China (1 out of 7 votes): "In 5.2, the word "should" in the sentence: "When forming an authorized heading, further identifying characteristics should be added to the preferred name for an entity, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name" will still mislead catalogers to make arbitrary differentiations. I recommend adding "if such identifying characteristics can uniquely identify the entity" after the whole sentence."

France (Only "authorized forms" must be formulated according to a set of rules or standards, but not variant forms. The first sentence of 5.2 must be reworded. Variant forms are "controlled access points" because they refer to the "authorized forms," but they have not to be formulated according rules or standards. Variant forms have only to reflect what forms users can use to search... and to find!

In fact the glossary the definition of controlled access point is good: "a name [...] under which a bibliographic or authority record [...] will be found" (which is the definition of FRAD). A record can be found via a search on a variant form, and this form can be a form commonly known by users without any reference to cataloguing rule of standard.

Question: In the glossary, add an entry for "variant form" and a see also from "controlled access point" to "variant form" and vice versa? The definition in UNIMARC Manual : authorities format, page 9 (<http://www.ifla.org/VI/8/projects/UNIMARC-AuthoritiesFormat.pdf>) could be a source for such a definition. But I am not sure this addition to the glossary will help! See also under question 9. "

Germany (2 of 3 votes): " The stipulation of 5.2 that an authorized heading should consist of a preferred name for an entity with further identifying characteristics, if necessary, is not consistent with the definition of an authorized heading in 5.1.2: "The authorized heading for an entity should be the preferred form that identifies the entity in a consistent manner [...]." We agree to the definition as given in 5.1.2. We refer to section 2.3 which indicates that "the attributes that identify each entity should be used as data elements in bibliographic and authority records.

Please have a look at our proposal on the structure of section 5 at the end of the questionnaire."

Italy (3 of 4 votes)

Slovenia

Vatican: "Only 'authorized forms' must be formulated according to a set of rules or standards, but not variant forms."

5. The sections 5.2.1-5.2.3. have been adjusted to reflect "authorized heading" connections (see document).

Do you agree with the new 5.2.1 through 5.2.3?

MAJORITY AGREE. However, the Italian comments makes good sense that the section 5.2 is actually "Form of Names for Authorized Headings" (double underline below) and the first paragraph is part of '5.1 General' to explain "Controlled Access Points"; and then the second paragraph becomes a 'General' statement for additions to authorized headings.

Apologies, but a “name scheme” suggested by Germany is unfamiliar to me – not clear what that would be.

## 5.2. Form of Names for Authorized Headings

~~Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities, formulated according to a set of rules or standards, in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These controlled access points are usually documented in an authority record. {move some of this to 5.1}~~

When forming an authorized heading, further identifying characteristics should be added to the preferred name for an entity and its variants, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name.

More work to be done here.

**Yes:** 28 countries (actually 30 countries and 50 votes, but Germany and Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

**No:** 2 countries (actually 4 countries and 7 votes, but Germany and Italy had no agreement among their respective delegates)

Germany (2 of 3 votes): “We suggest to add “name scheme” to 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.2.1.

Proposal:5.2.1.1 “When the name of a person consists of several words, the name scheme and the choice of entry word for the authorized heading should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources.”5.2.2.1 “When the name of a family consists of several words, the name scheme and the choice of entry word for the authorized heading should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that family, as found in manifestations or reference sources.”

Italy: (3 of 4 votes) “The sections 5.2-5.5 were concerned with the choice of entry word (or the order of elements) for names and titles in controlled access points; the proposed change:

a) adds a new caption “controlled access points” including previous “names” and “uniform titles”

b) adds a new sentence (the first under 5.2) that is a repetition of 5.1, General, redundant and out of place, to remember that controlled access points include authorized and variant forms,

c) adds in previous 5.2-5.5 (now 5.2.1-5.2.4) a limitation to the rules “for the authorized heading”;

so which is the aim of this change? why variant and authorized headings have been put together in 5.2 to be separated in the following rules?

For consistency of section 5.2:

a) the first sentence should be reduced to a simple statement that: Authorized and variant forms of names for controlled access points should be formulated in a consistent order of their elements, choosing the most suitable entry word,

or something so,

b) additions to 5.2.1-5.2.3 should be rejected, as also variant forms need an entry word,

c) the second sentence must not be moved from 5.1.2 to 5.2,

d) the whole section 5.2.4 should be moved, because:

d1) there is no matter of order of elements nor entry word with titles,

d2) the elements to be included in an uniform title and the choice of its language are parallel to the same issues for authorized headings, and should be moved to 5.1.2.2”

Slovakia: “I would prefer the original wording: “for authorized heading and its variants.””

United Kingdom: “because the same principles apply to variants as well as the authorized heading (“for the authorized heading and its variants”). Prefer original wording.”

6. The section now numbered 5.2.4 on uniform titles reflects the reorganization of the principle in a new way, which also addresses the IME ICC3 discussion on this same issue. Please see the document for the reorganized approach.

[Do you agree with the new 5.2.4?](#)

MAJORITY AGREE, but with 15 “no” votes, we need further discussion. Let’s remember the Appendix “Objectives” that these principles are trying to achieve – especially the convenience of the user and common usage and representation, being the top 3. If a user sees a name on a manifestation, they may not know it is a pseudonym. Our original approved text said this same thing in a reversed order, but in the end one was to prefer the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue when there was one. This order suggested by IME ICC4 tries to make it clearer, much as IME ICC3 tried to do.

We also need further discussion on whether or not we wish to include manifestations and items as qualifying for uniform titles – certainly when we cite them in notes (e.g., refer to a specific manifestation or a specific item that was used for a reproduction) or wish to make a link (e.g., link to a digital item that is related in an accompanying relationship to the manifestation being catalogued), we need to have a standardized way of naming them, so that’s why they are included here with uniform titles – it’s not for use as the old “main entry” heading – it’s for naming the Group 1 entity that is relevant.

**Yes:** 22 countries (actually 26 countries and 41 votes, but China, Germany, Jamaica, and Korea had no agreement among their respective delegates)  
Germany (1 of 3 votes - yes, but “5.2.4 No Uniform Title for an item”)

**No:** 6 countries (actually 10 countries and 15 votes, but China, Germany, Jamaica, and Korea had no agreement from their respective delegates)

Argentina (prefer original title or most frequently found on manifestations; when different scripts in the catalog, use the title best known in the language and script of the catalog)

China (Taiwan) – 1 of 7 votes

Germany (2 of 3 votes): “The former draft text put the general clause first, then the exceptions. We do not agree to put the exceptions first now and to change the general clause to an exception.

1. According to section 5.1.1.1 the title of the work and the creator(s) of the work shall be included in bibliographic records as controlled access points.

2. Are there uniform titles in the model which are not authorized headings? Which? In an authority record for a work, the person is needed in the creator role, not as part of the title. The name / title combination may be the citation form for the work – the controlled access point - not the authorized heading.”

Italy (4 votes - see comment under 9)

Jamaica (1 of 2 votes)

Korea (1 of 9 votes):” My objection is that manifestations and items are listed as eligible for uniform titles. With a certain amount of good will, I could maybe imagine a uniform title for a manifestation -- but for an item? Without further explanation, I’m not prepared to accept it. And it doesn’t tally with the glossary entry for Uniform title, which only mentions work and expression.”

Portugal :”As already pointed out by colleagues, it is difficult to consider the use of uniform titles for manifestations and items. It may be the wording of the rule that leads us to such situation and a new wording may solve the problem (or some examples on the use of uniform titles for manifestations and items?). Furthermore the Glossary does not include them on the definition or uniform title.”

Slovenia

Spain

Sweden (2 votes): "My objection is that manifestations and items are listed as eligible for uniform titles. With a certain amount of good will, I could maybe imagine a uniform title for a manifestation -- but for an item? Without further explanation, I'm not prepared to accept it. And it doesn't tally with the glossary entry for Uniform title, which only mentions work and expression"

7. In Section 7 on Searching capabilities, under 7.1.2 Indispensable access points, the IME ICC4 participants felt that the year (s) of publication or issuance more rightly belonged as additional access points, because this element is more likely to be used to filter or qualify a search rather than be used by itself.

Do you agree with moving it to 7.1.3 as an additional access point?

MAJORITY AGREE, but with 12 "no" votes, we need further discussion. Remember stating that access points are indispensable is not the same as mandatory – they are instead considered the "main" attributes and relationships of each entity. Good cases are made to retain year as "indispensable."

**Yes:** 23 countries (actually 26 countries and 44 votes, but Japan, Korea, and Sweden had no agreement among their respective delegates)

**No:** 6 countries (actually 9 countries with 12 votes, but Japan, Korea, and Sweden had no agreement among their respective delegates)

Bolivia (see under question 9)

Costa Rica

Estonia

Germany (3 votes): "The year of publication or issuance is an important attribute of an entity.

Therefore we hold on to handling it as an indispensable access point. In our opinion, it is much more than just a filtering help and an important factor of identification." "7.1.2: The year is an **indispensable** access point, also if it is used in combination with other access points."

Japan (1 out of 4 votes): " I would prefer the year(s) of publication or issuance as indispensable access points, since the year(s) is indispensable to limit search results."

Korea (2 of 9 votes): "My objection is that the year really is used as the main access point, maybe not so often by librarians, but by researchers looking for statistics, e.g. I admit that other access points (like language, publisher or country code, e.g.) often are used together with a year, but it is then the other access point that is used to filter the search."

Slovakia: "The year is essential for identification purposes."

Sweden (1 of 2 votes): "My objection is that the year really is used as the main access point, maybe not so often by librarians, but by researchers looking for statistics, e.g. I admit that other access points (like language, publisher or country code, e.g.) often are used together with a year, but it is then the other access point that is used to filter the search."

United Kingdom: "- it may "more likely be used" as a filter or qualifier for search purposes, but not exclusively. Moreover, for identification purposes, year is essential, so the ability to combine search terms (e.g. title and year) is essential. Basically I don't think year as an access point should be "optional".

8. The Glossary was updated to reflect changes to remove "Controlled form of name" and instead to add the definition for "Controlled access points" and all the related editorial corrections to references that it is linked to. Please see the document.

Do you agree?

MAJORITY AGREE

**Yes:** 29 countries (actually 31 countries and 52 votes, but China and Germany had no agreement among their respective delegates)

Sweden 2 votes (" Although I vote yes, I want to add that I feel reluctant towards the very lengthy definition of Controlled access point. I do think it should be kept at a more general and more concise level. The current definition tries to list too many things. It is never possible to specify everything in a definition anyway.")

**No:** 1 country (actually 3 countries with 4 votes, but China and Germany had no agreement among their respective delegates)

China (1 vote out of 7): "I think the difference between "Access point" and "Controlled access point" is still not very clear, if we consider just the first sentence of the definition. Why don't we add the sentence "controlled by rules..."?"

Germany (2 of 3 votes): "Please note that the definition of "controlled access point" does not yet fit to the draft statement text. Paragraph 5.1 offers a definition of controlled access point which is not in accordance with the glossary definition. (Paragraph 5.1 explains that a controlled access point is a normalized form, also called an authorized heading.)

Please also look at the additional comments under point 9.

"Controlled access point" encompasses identifiers, authorized headings, variant forms of names, in short: elements of an authority record. We agree to this FRAD definition approach. Why does the glossary entry "controlled heading" then refer to "controlled access point"? It should hint to "authority heading" instead

Our subject cataloguing colleagues suggest to include FRBR terms and their definitions to the statement glossary and regret that ISO terminology (e.g. in ISO 5127) is different. We suggest to differentiate between object and concept in the glossary.

We welcome the substitution of FRANAR with FRAD and note that this change should be made in the statement text, too.

Slovenia

#### 9. Please add any other comments or suggestions you wish to make:

Bolivia: "In studying the proposed changes to the forms for controlled access points with regard to their application in library bibliographic cataloging, in our judgment, these changes serve to standardize and facilitate the use of Reglas de Catalogacion Angloamericanas (RCAA = AACR). We congratulate you for the advances made in this area."

France: "The definition of "controlled access points" under 5.1, third paragraph, must be revised also in the line of what is said under question 4 above. The second part of the first sentence should be deleted : "and must be normalized following a standard".

Germany : "5.2.4: No Uniform Title for an item!" Also the following:

- The **introduction** refers to the conceptual models of FRBR and FRANAR. The expanded form of FRBR should refer to the published title and read "for" instead of the preposition "of". As FRANAR is replaced by FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data), we suggest to mention and follow this change and to adjust the text and the footnotes 3,4, and 5 to FRAD. Footnote 8 refers to the ISBD editions at the moment and should be adjusted when the ISBD Consolidated which replaces the different ISBDs has been published.
- **2.2 Entities in Authority Records**  
We suggest to add "entities used as subjects". Proposal:  
"Authority records should document controlled forms of names at least for persons, families, corporate bodies, and *entities used as* subjects."

- **2.4 Relationships**

We suggest to replace “identified” by “represented”:

”Bibliographically significant relationships among the entities should be represented in the catalogue.”

- **3. Functions of the Catalogue**

At the IFLA Conference in Seoul, 2006, colleagues who work on the “Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records” (FRSAR) suggested in their meeting to add an additional function “to explore” to paragraph 3 (Functions of the Catalogue). We support this suggestion.

- **5. Access Points; 5.1 General**

Paragraph 5.1 introduces the term “controlled access point”. We suggest to change the wording in the third text block: “[...] and must be based on standardized forms for the representation of entity names, attribute terms and/or identifiers following rules or standards. These standardized forms along with variant forms should be recorded in authority records.” We suggest to introduce authorized headings in a later section. We do not agree to the addition of “used as references” and suggest to cancel the term.

Furthermore, we suggest to mention that an authority record includes forms of names as well as identifiers.

The definition of a controlled access point in paragraph 5.1 does not fit to the new definition in the glossary. Paragraph 5.1 explains that a controlled access point is a normalized form, also called an authorized heading. The definition in the glossary explains that a controlled access point may be an authorized form, a preferred form or a variant form. Identifiers may be controlled access points, as the glossary definition points out. Identifiers are missing in the third clause of paragraph 5.1.

- **5. Access Points; 5.1.1 Choice of access points, 5.1.1.1**

We do not agree with section 5.1.1.1, second text block. According to the current usage in Germany, the corporate body would not be regarded as creator if according to the main source of information a person could be regarded as author. In consideration of the forthcoming increase of automatically proceeded acquisitions, we suggest to rely more on formally visible attributes.

- **5. Access Points, 5.1.1 Choice of access points, 5.1.1.2**

The definition of an authority record as expressed in this clause does not fit to the glossary definition of an authority record. 5.1.1.2 mentions elements of an authority record which should be part of the glossary definition. Identifiers should be added to both.

We suggest to add “and entities” to the last sentence. Proposal: “Additional access may be made through access points to related entities.”

- **5. Access Points, 5.1.2.1**

We do not agree that each distinct persona should get a separate authorized heading. In the case of uncovered pseudonyms we prefer to record a pseudonym and a real name together in one authority record.

- **6. Authority Records**

We suggest to replace “references” by “variant forms”. Furthermore, we suggest either to define “name” as an umbrella term for “names” and “terms” or to use in the statement text always “names or terms” together.

Proposal:

”Authority records should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names *for*

*terms*] and *variant forms* used as access points [...]”.

- **7.1.3 Additional access points**

The heading contains a full stop between “additional” and “access”. Please delete the full stop.

- **Sequence within Section 5**

We would like to give an impression of the intent of our comments on section 5. We suggest the following order for the content of section 5.

The first column contains the suggested divisions of section 5, the second column contains the suggested subdivisions of each division.

Irrespective of some changes in content given in the third column, we would like to suggest the following sequence for section 5:

<b>Access points</b>	Uncontrolled access points:	Any text string or piece of text string, data element or piece of data element in a bibliographic or authority record may serve as uncontrolled access point to access the bibliographic or authority record.
	Controlled access points:	Controlled access points enable to search for the bibliographically significant relationships between the bibliographic entities (2.4). By searching with the controlled access point the user gets access to the bibliographic and/or authority records which are related to the entity represented by the controlled access point. Controlled access points may be realised in the form of standardized value strings naming the entities (citation forms), in the form of unique identifiers representing the entities or in the form of (embedded) rich representations of the entities.
	Controlled access points as standardized value strings:	Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and terms given to entities, formulated according to a set of rules or standards, in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. These controlled access points are usually documented in an authority record (5.2). Further identifying characteristics should be added, if necessary, to distinguish the entity from others of the same name (5.2). The attributes that identify each entity should be used as data elements (2.3).
	Access points to bibliographic records	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.(5.1.1.1.) Additionally provide access points to bibliographic records for the controlled forms of names of other persons, families, corporate bodies, and entities used as subjects deemed to be important for finding, identifying, and selecting the bibliographic resource being described.
	Access points to authority records	Include as access points to an authority record the authorized heading (authorized form of name for the entity), as well as the variant headings (variant forms of name), and identifying characteristics of the entity. Additional access may be made through access points of related entities.

<b>Authority Records</b>	Authority records	Authority records should be constructed to control the authorized and variant forms of names, the terms used for further identifying
--------------------------	-------------------	--

		attributes and the identifiers used as access points for such entities as persons, families, corporate bodies, works, expressions, manifestations, items, concepts, objects, events, and places (6.). Authority records should control, too, the access points to and from related entities.
<b>Authorized Headings</b>	Authorized headings	The authorized heading for an entity should be the preferred form of name that identifies the entity in a consistent manner ... (5.1.2).
<b>Choice of Name</b>	Choice of preferred form of name: commonly known or official name	When variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and/or reference sources, and this variation is not based on different presentations of the same name (e.g., full and brief forms), preference should be given <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to a commonly known (or conventional) name rather than the official name, where this is indicated; or</li> <li>- to the official name, where there is no indication of a commonly known or conventional name.</li> </ul>
	Choice of preferred form of name: language and script	When names have been expressed in several languages, preference for the authorized heading should be given to a heading based on information found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script; 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 reference sources in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.  Access should be provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through either the authorized heading or a <del>cross-reference</del> <i>variant forms</i> . If transliterations are desirable, an international standard for script conversion should be followed. (5.1.3)
	Choice of preferred form of name: Other variant names or variant forms of names	The variant forms of names not selected as the authorized heading for an entity should be included in the authority record for that entity to be used as access points or/and alternate display forms.
	Choice of preferred form of name: Titles	If there are variant titles for one work, one title should be chosen as uniform title.

<b>Name / Entity</b>	Choice of preferred form of name: Personae	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.
	Different names: Corporate bodies	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 have access points from the earlier/later forms.
<b>Name Encoding Schemes</b>	Persons	When the name of a person consists of several words, the scheme for encoding the name and the choice of entry word for the authorized heading should follow the conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources.

	Families	When the name of a family consists of several words, the scheme for encoding the name and the choice of entry word for the authorized heading should follow the conventions of the country and language most associated with that family, as found in manifestations or reference sources.
	Corporate bodies	For the authorized heading for a corporate body, the name generally should be given in direct order, as found in manifestations or reference sources.
<b>Access point encoding schemes</b>	Corporate bodies as part of jurisdiction	When the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or territorial authority, the controlled access point should begin with or 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.
	Subordinated corporate body without independent name	When the name of the corporate body implies subordination, or subordinate function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the controlled access point should begin with the name of the superior body.

Italy: "If I understand, I don't agree with 5.2.4.1. change. I should like to distinguish the use of the script and the use of the language that we don't use in the catalogue. A script not used in the catalogue can be transliterated. If it is not possible, it could be used a title in the language of the catalogue. A original title in the script of the catalogue, but in a language not used in the catalogue, can be used always. The substitution must be absolutely exceptional. Obviously we will be given additional access points (variant forms) in the language and script of the catalogue."

Japan: "1) The current last paragraph in 5.1 General seems to state: controlled access points=normalized forms=authorized headings. If it could be more accurately described, the paragraph would be:  
Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources and must be normalized following a standard.  
The normalized forms should be recorded in authority records which include preferred forms as authorized headings with variant forms used as references.  
2) The statement for the variant forms in 5.1.2.3.would include the variant forms of uniform title as follows:  
The variant forms of name \*and uniform titles\* not selected as the authorized heading for an entity should be included in the authority record for that entity to be used as references or alternate display forms."

Mexico : "I reviewed the Glossary and found 3 terms that from my point of view would benefit by improving the definitions. These are: Bibliographic description, Place, and name.  
Bibliographic description – A set of bibliographic data recording and identifying a bibliographic resource. [Source: ISBD(CR)]  
In this concept there are two needless repetitions.  
In its place I propose that the definition say: A set of information elements that represent and identify a resource.

Place – A location [ Source: FRBR]

In its place I propose that the definition say: A determined portion of a geographic area

Name – A character or group of work and/or characters by which an entity is known; includes the words/characters designating a person, family, corporate body; the terms by which concepts, objects, events, or places are known as well as the title given to a work, expression, manifestation, or item. [Source: FRBR as modified in FRAD]

In its place I propose that the definition say: The set formed by the forename and surnames by which an entity is known; includes the words/characters designating a person, family, corporate body; the terms by which concepts, objects, events, or places are known as well as the title given to a work, expression, manifestation, or item. [Source: FRBR as modified in FRAD]

Nepal : It would be suitable to include the name year and place of the conference in additional access points (7.1.3) although it can be covered under corporate bodies. Because the additional access points are not only for the cataloguer or end user but it is also meant for users. Users will be more than happy if they could retrieve information regarding conferences through countries and dates of conference held in a particular year."

Slovenia: Which access points are controlled (authorized headings only or both authorized and variant forms):

5.1 Controlled access points provide ... These normalized forms (also called "authorized headings") should be recorded ... with variant forms used as references.

5.2 Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names ...  
We still have doubts regarding questions 4 and 8.

Spain: "All my comments are related to point 6:

Firstly, I think it should be a typographical error the use of “or” instead “of”: An authorized heading or uniform title... as the point 5.2.4 is Forms of the Uniform Title.

Secondly, it has been added “...title for a work, expression, manifestation, or item may...”. Uniform titles for manifestation and item level are exceptional not the general situation. And the principles should address the general situations. As it is now it will increase the authority control work at a point it is not economic, and which is the function we want to achieve with it? Collocation, identifying? In addition this wording is inconsistent with definition for Uniform title in Glossary: “1. The particular title by which a work or expression is to be identified...”

Finally, I don't agree with 5.2.4.1 change, neither as it was before. What is the intention here? If it is to allow that a uniform title in a language and script of the catalogue could be used when the original title is in a script, and obviously in a language, not used by the users of the catalogue, then I agree. But when it is in the same script “

Sweden: “ As far as 5.2.4 is concerned we do not agree with the proposed change. In this the old exception has been changed to a rule and vice versa. We prefer the old writing of the paragraph (5.5.1).”

“I have occupied myself a great deal with provenance information and how to record it in a useful way lately. (I'll send you an article later in the year, when it has been published.) I checked the statement and found that it doesn't prevent the developments I would like to see in this field. Although it isn't explicitly mentioned, you can actually find phrases to support what I would want to do. That is good, and it is a consequence of being sufficiently general. The statement should not get too specific, I think.”