

**Discussion on Topics for IME ICC Statement of International Cataloguing Principles
Summary of responses received as of September 7, 2007**

Respondents:

Austria: Johann Winkler

Bahamas: Willamae Johnson

Bolivia: Elena Montalvo Calvimontes and
Jorge Huanca Cazas

China: (BG) Ben Gu; (WS) Wang Shaoping

Croatia: Mirna Willer

Egypt: Nedal Fayez al-Shourbagy

Finland: Eeva Murtomaa

France: Françoise Bourdon

Italy: (CM): Christina Magliano

(MdeP): Maria de Panicis; **(MG):** Mauro
Guerrini, with Carlo Bianchini and Giuliano
Genetasio

Japan: Yukiko Sakai

Mexico: Julia Margarita Martínez Saldaña

Russia: Natalia Kasparova

Slovenia: Irina Kavcic

Spain: Elena Escolano

Vatican: Paola Manoni

**To date comments have been received from 21 participants representing 15 countries:
9 countries from the IME ICC1; 3 from IME ICC2; 1 from IME ICC3; 2 from IME ICC4**

Topic 1. Controlled access points

There is considerable confusion over the intention and meaning. Should this mean the former "authorized headings" or also any form of name or title controlled through an authority record?

China	(BG) Glossary - 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..."?
France	We think that "controlled access point" is "for any form of name or title controlled through an authority record". An access point is "controlled" when it is managed through an authority record. All access points are not "controlled" because all access points are not managed through authority records: for example a title proper is an access point but can be not manage through an authority record.
Mexico	Agree with the comments made by the French colleagues when they say "...at least one of them must be normalized following a standard". Variant forms also provide consistency but are not normalized following a standard. " [see France's response in next section]
Spain	<i>My point of view is that a controlled access point is an access point over which an authority control work has been carried. As it is said in the principles it "should be recorded in authority records..." but in our catalogues there are many see references to an authority heading (what suppose authority work) without notes justifying it and the rest of notes of information that conform a complete authority record. This does not mean they are uncontrolled, because in fact they are controlled by the reference system. In the other hand I think now that for the caption of 5.2 it is better to use Authority Heading, and delete the first paragraph as the information is repeating the third paragraph of 5.1. The following paragraph is in accordance and is speaking all the time about the form that should be chosen for authorized heading. In addition in the end of this first paragraph it is "usually documented in authority record" what seems different to the 5.1 that says "should be recorded in authority records along with variant forms used as references".</i>

After the March voting, the results had us define "Controlled access points" under 5.1 and remove some of the language in 5.2. We would now have under 5.1:

Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources and must be normalized following a standard. These normalized forms (also called “authorized headings”) should be recorded in authority records along with variant forms used as references.

Do you agree with this?

Austria	Yes
Bahamas	Yes, the controlled access points should include all forms of the names and subjects used and should be a part of the authority records. However, this agreement assumes that there are guiding principles which govern the establishment of the variant forms that would be included in the authority records.
Egypt	Of course, yes.
Finland	Agree
France	No, replace "and must be normalized following a standard" by "at least one of them must be normalized following a standard". Variant forms also provide consistency but are not normalized following a standard. Variant form can be a crazy one when it appears on a resource.
Japan	In order to clarify that variant forms are also to be controlled, the last part of the 5.1 “along with variant forms used as references” could be erased out.
Mexico	Other than the asserted statement made by the Russian colleagues, I agree.
Russia	I agree
Spain	I would delete the part of “and must be normalized following a standard” as some variants are as they are found in manifestations and can not be normalized. This sentence deleted from here should be moved under 5.2 second paragraph, following the first coma: “ When forming an authorized heading, <u>normalized following a standard</u> , further...

As I understand it, “controlled” is intended to convey that the name or title or combination thereof is controlled through an authority record. Usually that authority record construction is also based on a given cataloguing code and set of principles. The principle does not now reflect that and is, in fact, ambiguous about whether the variant forms are controlled or not.

Spain	My point of view is that a controlled access point is an access point over which an authority control work has been carried. As it is said in the principles it “should be recorded in authority records...” and we have to work in this way as the ideal, but not always are companied by a complete authority record. This does not mean they are uncontrolled.
--------------	---

As you will recall from the presentations on VIAF, national or regional authority records hopefully will be linked through a global system to enable the search, retrieval, and display of the variant names used for an entity (FRBR’s Group 2 entities, but also naming of a work/expression). This helps meet the objective of displaying to the user a form of name that they can read “ in the language and script they understand and in a form that they recognize (conventional titles)”. With the VIAF system, the cluster of authorized and variant forms of names can all be “controlled” to enable the display of whatever form is preferred.

Do you have a suggestion on rewording 5.1 to clarify? What are your views on this?

Austria	It may be useful to add: “Variant forms may be uncontrolled”
Bahamas	Just as the controlled access points are established using cataloguing principles, the variant forms should be guided by principles as well. The variant forms, I believe, are often based on the local situation, so perhaps the international principles should be sufficiently general to enable local application that can still meet acceptable standards.

<p>Bolivia</p>	<p>We are in agreement with this revision because it is fundamental that access to bibliographic records in libraries be uniform and standardized and that there needs to be access to “authorized headings.” We’d like to suggest the following revision “Controlled access points include the authorized form of the form, or of the possible variant forms by which a person, institution, subject, etc. can be named with the objective of providing access to bibliographic and authority records. The controlled access points ...”</p>
<p>China</p>	<p>(WS) I agree that controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects ... Variant forms, if referenced by way of an authority record, are "controlled", but we cannot say they are "normalized". An entity may be given different authorized forms with its variant forms in different national or regional authority files. If they are pooled and connected in a VIAF, probably we can say they are both controlled and "normalized".</p> <p>(BG) – 5.2 - 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.</p>
<p>Croatia</p>	<p>My comment is the same as Elena's, so I would like to second it. The 5.2 Forms of controlled access points should be consistently edited.</p> <p>I would suggest the different order of the paragraphs, i.e. that a paragraph on Controlled access points precedes the one on Uncontrolled. The reader would first expect the positive (controlled) then the negative - that is what is left out.</p> <p>Regarding my comment on Topic 2: Uniform titles, I question the title proper as found on the manifestation as an uncontrolled access point. Please, see below.</p> <p>This leads to a question what is an uncontrolled access point opposed to a controlled one? The controlled one's objective/aim is "to provide “the consistency” needed for locating “sets of resources”", i.e. what the authority control does, and what is further elaborated. From that we can infer that an uncontrolled access point is everything outside the range of a controlled access point - "such things" as we can find in a bibliographic record and due to the possibilities of a LIS can be accessed. What is their objective/aim? They can also “locate sets of resources”, but while some of those access points cannot ensure “the consistency” (keywords), some can (language, year & physical medium) as they are normalized! Still other uncontrolled access points do not ensure sets of resources, but provide access to a single resource (bibliographic/authority record identifier or identifiers in general). These "things" I took over from 7.1.3 Additional access points.</p> <p>I suggest that we make it quite clear what is a controlled/an uncontrolled access point. The reader would need to know that.</p>
<p>Egypt</p>	<p>If there is a Japanese name, for example, and it should be written in an Arabic or English catalog, the name must be written in the language and script of the catalogue, and there is a link to the original script (Japanese)</p>
<p>Finland</p>	<p>Agree but if this causes still problems and we want to explain, that those variant forma may be controlled and sometimes also uncontrolled forms we could add to the end of 5.1 “In some cases variant forms may be uncontrolled”</p>
<p>France</p>	<p>Perhaps we could say : A controlled access point is an access point managed through an authority record in order to connect different forms of the name or title or combination thereof on which this access point is based. All these different forms provide access to bibliographic and authority records. According to cataloguing code and set of principles, in an authority record, normalized forms (also called “authorized headings”) are distinguished from variant forms. One authority record can contain several authorized forms, according language or script. But only one among the authorized forms can be used as heading of a bibliographic record in a given catalogue or of an authority record in a given authority file, when variant forms are always used as references.</p>
<p>Italy</p>	<p>(CM) The definition is not ambiguous, but also the variant forms should be > controlled and sources</p>

	<p>of information specified for each of them > We agree with the order of the paragraph (instead of comments of Mirna)”</p> <p>(MdeP) I like Mirna’s suggestion according to which a paragraph on Controlled access point should precede the one on uncontrolled. We do not normalize each variant form. Sometimes the variant forms represent the form that we find in the manifestations and they may correspond to the user’s search criteria. I agree with Elena who would delete the part of "and must be normalized following a standard", as some variants are like they are found in manifestations and cannot be normalized.</p> <p>(MG) Maybe we should specify that among variant forms we have those which Are not attested in authority lists/files but which are transcribed from the resource and are nevertheless subject to authority control (e.g., typos and forms which result from obsolete transliteration systems)</p>
Japan	<p>Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources and must be normalized following a standard. These normalized forms (also called “authorized headings”) should be recorded in authority records.</p> <p>I understand that actual authority record systems include ‘a variety form’ of variant forms. However, it can be said that those are and should be controlled following one of standards to share them through a system like VIAF.</p> <p>I liked Shaoping’s comments on the difference between ‘controlled’ and ‘normalized’. Probably for non-English speaker, ‘normalized’ sounds a certain way of standardization for data sets as used in computer science or mathematics. I think ‘normalized’ is better than using only ‘authorized’, but is there better way to paraphrase the word ‘controlled’?</p>
Mexico	Agree with the text and the order proposed by Elena Escolano from Spain.
Spain	<p>“Controlled access points include the authorized and variant forms of names and subjects given to entities in order to provide access to bibliographic and authority records. Controlled access points provide the consistency needed for locating sets of resources and must be normalized following a standard. These <u>are</u> normalized forms (also called “authorized headings”) <u>that</u> should be recorded in authority records along with variant forms used as references”.</p> <p>(the underlined are additions)</p>
Slovenia	<p>I agree with Mirna who suggested different order of the paragraphs on controlled and uncontrolled access points (the paragraph on controlled access points should precede the one on uncontrolled access points).</p> <p>I agree with Elena who suggested that the part "and must be normalized following a standard" is omitted (some variants are in the form in which they appear in manifestations and cannot be normalized).</p>
Vatican	The definition is not ambiguous, but also the variant forms should be controlled and sources of information specified for each of them. We agree with the order of the paragraph (instead of comments of Mirna)

Topic 2. Uniform titles

After our voting we had the following but no majority vote:5.2.4. Forms of Uniform Titles

An authorized heading or uniform title for a work, expression, manifestation, or item 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.

5.2.4.1 The uniform title should be the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue when one exists for the resource, otherwise

- 5.2.4.1.1. the uniform title should be the original title or
- 5.2.4.1.2. the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work.

Many cataloging codes have followed the rule of preferring the earliest known name of a work as its uniform title. A fallback position when that earliest name is not known was to use a conventional title well-known to the users of the catalog (Conventional title is Paris Principles term). By putting the user first, the current draft, moves the naming of the work/expression to prefer first and foremost the name best known to users, then the earliest, and then a form found. The result actually is the same as if following the Paris Principles. It has been suggested that we use “Conventional title” which was used in the Paris Principles, instead of “commonly known title.” What are your views?

Austria	“Conventional title” would provide a satisfying alternative.
Bahamas	These principles and terminologies are really to guide library personnel in how to standardize our work to make access easier for the user. What the user wants is to find the work using the term/expression with which he/she is most familiar. I believe 'common title' would be just as effective as 'conventional title' and is understood by library personnel and users.
Egypt	I prefer to use the earliest known name as a uniform title; this earliest title is a (<i>Conventional title</i>). In Arabic, there are many (<i>Commonly known titles</i>) are used to refer to (<i>Conventional titles</i>), and libraries are used to using the (<i>Conventional title</i>) as a uniform title. i.e. (<i>Conventional title</i>) is the uniform title.
Finland	Conventional title sounds OK
France	We consider it is preferable to use “commonly known title” because it is more clear. Concerning the “Conventional title” it is ambiguous to know what is the applied convention. There is a risk to make confusion between "conventional title" and "supplied title"
Italy	<p>(MdeP) I prefer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the conventional title in the original language and script (example: "Ars amatoria"), if the language is suitable to users of the catalogue 2) the title in the language and script which better suits to the users of the catalogue (example "Le mille e una notte" is preferred to "Alf laylh wa laylah". "Alf laylh wa laylah" is a language that does not suit to Italian users) 3) the title most frequently found in the manifestations of the work (in the original language). <p>"Le confessioni di un italiano" (the title most frequently found in the manifestations of the work) is preferable to "Le confessioni di un ottuagenario" (the title of the first publication).</p>
Mexico	I agree that we should use “conventional title” in keeping with the usage in the Paris Principles.
Slovenia	I like the suggestion from Maria De Panicis.
Spain	<p><i>I agree. It could be:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1° <i>conventional title in the original language and script;</i> 2° <i>conventional title in the language and script best suited to the users of the catalogue;</i> 3° <i>original title;</i> 4° <i>the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work</i> <p><i>Otherwise it would be inconsistent with 5.1.3 that is general for all kind of names, included titles.</i></p>

Another set of questions arises when there is no title found anywhere. What structure should be followed when naming a work/expression? Perhaps we don't all need to follow the same choice, but would we want references from other possibilities that have become used and known to the users of the catalogue?

France	To facilitate interoperability, it seems necessary to give generic rules to supply the title and to apply
---------------	---

	the same structure internationally. This structure is still to be defined internationally.
Vatican	No, it wouldn't be useful, we disagree. See the definition below.

Would it be useful to mention earlier in this section 5, that preference should be given to the language/script of the catalogue?

Austria	No
Egypt	Yes
France	Yes, and we add something about that earlier, just before topic 2. It is important to say that it is possible to have more than one normalized forms for a given entity (in the same authority record – in UNIMARC for example (or in different linked authority records in MARC21 for example) according to language or script of entity itself (e.g., United Nations, Alexandre Soljénitsyne, Coran) or of the catalogue in which this form is used.
Italy	(CM) No, it wouldn't be useful, we disagree. See the definition below (MdeP) Yes, it would be useful
Mexico	Yes, I would consider that to be useful.
Spain	No, I think it is clearly stated in 6.1.3 as it is.
Slovenia	No need.

The use of the term “uniform title” is seen by several of you as too card catalog based. One suggestion has been to instead replace that with the “preferred name of the work/expression” to include both title alone or title in combination with the name of the creator of the work and other distinguishing elements to uniquely identify the work/expression. What is your view of this idea?

Austria	Would “preferred name of the work/expression” mean “expression”?
Egypt	No, because the both cases “title alone” and “title in combination” can be called (Uniform title). There is no problem if we called “title in combination” a uniform title. In other words, the name of the creator or other distinguishing elements is a part the uniform title.
Finland	Preferred name of the work/expression – I am not sure about this we have normalized and authorized forms and now one new concept. Does RDA use “constructed title”?
France	In fact “uniform title” is an artificial expression, not very clear. We agree with “preferred name of the work/expression.”
Italy	(CM) We agree to include title alone or title in combination with the name of creator. (MdeP) I disagree to replace "uniform title" with "preferred name of the work/expression". I agree to include the title in combination with the name of the creator of the work and the title alone when the work is anonymous; other distinctive elements only to unambiguously identify the work/expression.
Mexico	If we are going to fuse with, or, make use of diverse international standards, such as obligating the use of FRBR by catalogers in this new international code, then we should foster the use of its terminology, which is why this statement should say: “Preferred name of the work/expression”.
Vatican	We agree to include title alone or title in combination with the name of creator.

Another issue with “Uniform titles” was whether or not we should be including names of manifestations and items. We certainly cite them in notes, for example to refer to a particular manifestation or a specific item that was used to produce a reproduction or when we wish to make a link to a digital item

that is related to the manifestation being catalogued. Are we in agreement then that it is appropriate to keep manifestation and item listed under uniform title?

Austria	I do not regard it necessary to add manifestations and items in this context.
Bahamas	Yes -- the more information available to the user about a particular title, in one place, the better.
Bolivia	<p>We agree that we should keep "uniform title", because the use of uniform titles provides the means to group in one place all the entries for a given work. Especially when the editions, translations, etc. have appeared under various titles as well as when there is a need to correctly identify a work such as when the title may not be clear due to publishing conventions and placement on the title page, this helps to group bibliographic entries and to organize the catalog. There should not be a change to the term uniform title because this concept is so well known and any change would only create confusion.</p> <p>We also should not include the names of the manifestations or items because as indicated these are more appropriate as notes.</p>
China	<p>The priority in choice of the authorized form of uniform title should be in conformity with the general principle outlined in 5.1.3. Language. If we consider user convenience and change the order of priority to "the best name to users, then the earliest, and then a form found", why not to do the same to 5.1.3, which should certainly be put with the user first.</p> <p>I don't see any sense in changing the term "uniform title", which is familiar to catalogers.</p> <p>I think whenever we talk about "uniform title", we refer to the name of a work or an expression. If a manifestation or item is mentioned with a uniform title, we are exactly referred to the work/expression level a manifestation or item belongs to. So I don't think it is appropriate to list manifestation and item under uniform title.</p>
Croatia	<p>I apologize for raising an issue which by now should have been considered solved. My comment is on the level of a principle: if it was decided to "dismantle" the concept of the Uniform heading for names (I won't go into the agreed reasons and techniques to overcome that), why not do so for titles? Thus, we could have Controlled access points for titles, with ""normalized form" (also called "authorized heading")" for a title of a work, and variant forms for expressions, manifestations and items (for manifestation see the comment on Topic 1!). See also 5.2.4 Forms of Uniform titles.</p> <p>What we have remained with to solve is the name/title concept - the one which still echoes the concept of UBC, and which is needed for the "internal linking" within the catalogue (citation form!). If this concept is intrinsic to a particular catalogue, i.e., cataloguing rules, can IME ICC principles demand that UBC concept (uniform title/name) be followed in this particular case? Or shouldn't they "dismantle" it as well?</p>
Egypt	Yes, we have to keep manifestation and item listed under uniform title?
Finland	I would not to add manifestations and items to this.
France	Yes, we think it is appropriate to keep manifestation and item listed under uniform title, specially for subject access, and when a musical work without any title proper is named from its manuscript or its first edition. Bit we disagree to consider "a link" to a digital item as an access point.
Italy	<p>(CM) As the base of the uniform title element, in general it's preferred the form of title in which a work is commonly known. This heading is determined on the occurrences of that title expressed in the original language in manifestations of the same expression. But if the work/expression is known as a traditional or conventional title, this is preferred. For works/expressions in a non-roman language, the original script is adopted or it is given in a romanization form"</p> <p>(MG) "Conventional title" could be a satisfying alternative to "Uniform title" (the uniform title is a conventional title, although there are "conventional titles" which aren't "uniform titles"). Anyway we don't agree with "preferred name of work/expression".</p> <p>(MdeP) I think it is not necessary, though it looks more correct.</p>

Japan	I would prefer “commonly known title” to “conventional title”, since the former sounds more user-oriented.
Mexico	No, I do not consider it necessary.
Slovenia	I do not think it is necessary.
Spain	No. Uniform titles for manifestation and item level are exceptional not the general situation, and the principles should address the general situations. 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...” Not to cite manifestations and items don’t prevent to make uniform titles when needed.
Vatican	As the base of the uniform title element, in general it’s preferred the form of title in which a work is commonly known. This heading is determined on the occurrences of that title expressed in the original language in manifestations of the same expression. But if the work/expression is known as a traditional or conventional title, this is preferred. For works/expressions in a non-roman language, the original script is adopted or it is given in a romanization form

Topic 3. Year(s) of publication or issuance (Section 7 Indispensable access points)

Remember that stating an access point is indispensable is not the same as “mandatory.” As you will note in the response tally of April 6 for the March 6, 2007 vote, many good arguments were made to justify retaining this as an indispensable access point. For example, it was indicated the importance of year for identification of the resource (in the “identify” task for FRBR), and as being essential or limiting or filtering searches. Is there now agreement to retain it as an indispensable access point?

7.1.2. Indispensable access points are those based on the main attributes and relationships of each entity in the bibliographic or authority record.

7.1.2.1. Indispensable access points for bibliographic records include:

- the name of the creator or first named creator when more than one is named
- the title proper or supplied title for the manifestation
- the year (s) of publication or issuance
- the uniform title for the work/expression
- a general material designation
- subject headings, subject terms
- classification numbers
- standard numbers, identifiers, and “key titles” for the described entity.

Austria	Yes
Bahamas	Yes – the date is an indispensable access point
Bolivia	We agree that the “year(s) of publication or issuance” should remain as an indispensable access point, as has been stated this is an element that is very important in the identification of the resource as well as to assure successful searches.
China	I agree to retain Years of publication of issuance as an indispensable access point
Croatia	Agree
Finland	Agree
France	Yes
Italy	MdeP I think it is an additional access point (CM) We disagree. It is an additional access point (MG) We think that the "year(s) of publication or issuance" should remain an indispensable access point; although the year of publication is not a primary/autonomous access point, it is an essential element of research and/or filtering; it is one of the fundamental citation elements and it is important to distinguish the different expressions of a work.
Mexico	Yes

Russia	I don't agree with the following terms. The former definitions were better, they are as following: basic (or mandatory) access points and additional (or faculty) access points.
Slovenia	I think the year(s) of publication or issuance is an additional access point
Vatican	We disagree. It is an additional access point

Topic 4. Language and script

The suggestion was made in the March voting to correct the caption for 5.1.3 to "Language of authorized heading", because the text that follows refer to the authorized heading for the various entities. Is this agreeable?

Austria	Yes
Bahamas	Yes
Egypt	Yes
Finland	Yes
France	Yes
Italy	(MG) Yes, we agree to correct the caption (MdeP) Yes, I agree to correct the caption
Mexico	Yes
Russia	I suppose that there would not be perspectives of the term "language of Catalogue" I new internet-technology. What language of catalogue would be in the multilingual catalogue, in multilingual elements of bibliographic record? I offer to include the term "language of [national] user". The term "language of user" cover all multitude of complex situation in choice of language of headings. We can find the simple rule if there are some difficulties in choice of language/script of the headings, one should use the language and form on the language of [national] user. The language of national user is the official state language of the country. The residents of this country are national users. The same language (or more 1 language) is the language of the bibliographic Agency. Remember You and respect to You
Slovenia	I agree to correct the caption
Spain	Yes
Vatican	Yes, we agree to correct the caption

It also was pointed out that the principles are not consistent in how we indicate language. Mostly we have tried to focus on the language/script of the users of the catalogue (or intended users of the catalogue), but here are some of the variations:

4.2.4.1. **[CORRECT reference is to 5.2.4.1]** language and script of the catalogue

5.1.3 - "the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue." With "access provided in the original language and script whenever possible, through either the authorized heading or a cross-reference."

5.2.1.1. - "conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources"

5.2.2.1 - "Conventions of the country and language most associated with that family, as found in manifestations or reference sources."

5.2.3.1.1. - "in the language and script best suited to the needs of the users of the catalogue"

Would someone like to propose a solution?

Bolivia	Yes, we agree with the wording in 5.3.1.1 "in the language and script best suited to the needs of the users of the catalogue"
China	(WS) It is agreeable to change the caption of 5.1.3 to "Language of authorized headings", that will be more to the point. "Language of the catalog" is rather ambiguous. I prefer "the language best suited to the users of the catalog", or "the language best suited to the needs of the users of the catalog", which clearly accentuates the needs of users.

Croatia	When referring to the users of the catalogue, I would suggest “best suited to the users of the catalogue” for the case of brevity. However, we should just bear in mind that in 1. Scope the term convenience is used - “the convenience of the users of the catalogue”, to express the highest principle for the construction of cataloguing codes, which is in line with the Appendix
France	<p>We prefer "5.1.3 - "the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue". But to facilitate international interoperability, it is necessary to register, in the authority record, the form of the name in the conventions of the country and language most associated with that entity, as found in manifestations or reference sources, because these forms are the pivot for the international exchange of data.</p> <p>A solution (currently applied in the BnF main catalogue BN-OPALE PLUS) : to establish several "authorized forms" for the same entity in a given authority record. One is the form the most known by the users of the catalogue (French form) and the other is in the language of the entity (international form). See for example the authority record for Juan de la Cruz in the BnF main catalogue (http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark-12148-cb11909164j/PUBLIC)</p> <p>All authorized forms have the same status within the authority record, and each of them is identified by its language, its script or the cataloguing rule or transliteration system applied. Just one of the authorized forms can be used as heading of bibliographic records in a given catalogue, but the choice could be let to the end-user (unfortunately it is not yet the case in BnF, but in the authority records disseminated in authority products, it is possible to switch the authorized forms according to the need of the client). Automatically, for the search, all the other existing authorized forms are managed as variant forms.</p>
Italy	<p>(MdeP) I agree to keep the 5.2 structure according to the last draft.</p> <p>(CM): We agree to maintain the structure of 5.2 according to the last draft with the same caption.</p> <p>(MG) As to language and script, we think much confusion is due to an overlapping of tradition in the rules and new needs (e.g., catalogue vs user perspective). In a traditional view, language of the user is the best choice, but in a global environment, there is no "language of the user" at all. This is the main reason for the creation of the VIAF, for example. We would need a new approach, in which two general “ worldwide Principles should be defined: the first one relates to the description, or representation of resources (these include any entity of any FRBR Group), that should be made in the original language and script; the second one is that, if each cataloguing agency retains the first principle not applicable “ generally or in specific cases “ should define a substitute language and/or script chosen to best fit its users' needs. This means that, except for description of resources, language and script are to be recognized as local conventions.</p>
Mexico	I agree with the interpretation that Mario Guerrini from Italy makes “...This means that, except for description of resources, language and script are to be recognized as local conventions.”

Spain	<p><i>I propose that 5.2 would be renumbered as 5.1.4; the caption "Forms of Authority Headings"; delete de first paragraph (which repeat information in 5.1 or move it to there as it is related). I propose this because the rest of numbers bellow and its wording is always speaking about authorized heading.</i></p> <p>In summary the proposal is:</p> <p><i>5.1.4 Forms of Authority Headings</i> <i>5.1.4.1 Forms of Names for Persons</i> <i>5.1.4.2 Forms of Names for Families</i> <i>5.1.4.2 Forms of Names for Corporate Bodies</i> <i>5.1.4.3 Forms of Names for Uniform Titles</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p><i>The Uniform title should be:</i> <i>1º conventional title in the original language and script or</i> <i>2º conventional title in the language and script best suited to the users of the catalogue;</i> <i>3º original title;</i> <i>4º the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work</i></p>
Vatican	<p>We agree to maintain the structure of 5.2 according to the last draft with the same caption</p>