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Ross Bourne stated in 1991 that "Authority control is a time-consuming but essential feature of bibliographic work. If one of the major functions of a catalogue or bibliography is to bring together publications of a particular author, then it is important to ensure that that author's name is presented consistently, with appropriate references from forms of that name under which a catalogue user might reasonably be expected to search." 2

Since Ross Bourne's statements, during 1990s, technological evolution gave impacts on information creation and access:

Cooperative database construction
Growth of databases - volume and variety
Growth of database creators
The Internet
Multimedia databases
National information policies

These technological developments have reciprocating effects, timely or not, with administration and managing of the systems. Awareness of record creators (input operators) has advanced from a workplace within a wall to invisible global community. Her / his products would offer unlimited access from anywhere, anytime.

Development of cooperative database construction gave rise evolution on recognition of administration of the systems. Governance of a single systems development immediately requires compatibility with counterparts / competitive systems both domestic and abroad. Investment and innovation would benefit outside of the system concerned. Here is the implication of the information resources on the
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Internet and 'individual' decision making.

Recorded knowledge in Chinese, Korean and Japanese scripts are increasingly cross-referred and used among these three nations and other regions. Computerization and network use of national bibliographies and national union catalogues among these nations have reached a point where names of authors of each language is appearing in databases other than national / domestic creation. It is, therefore, an urgent demand for standardized handling / processing of names, especially author names in Chinese, Korean and Japanese languages for advancing scholarly communication. The Workshop aims at fact-finding, understanding each other, and pursuing common solutions by experts of national bibliographies and national union catalog databases among related nations.

Name, the simplest access key towards the recorded knowledge in every sort, has been one of the major concerns among the library database construction. Growth of databases in variety and complexity asks linking the names that appears in every database for assuring the access and precision. Names in China, Korea and Japan are written in Chinese character. Of course, local / national practices have changed by various reasons and diversified as the times go by. Chinese name, for example, appears in Japanese text such as classics, newspapers. In many occasions, they are written in modern Japanese style, and reading (pronunciation), either romanised or localized, is uncertain. Here is the need of a discussion among the East Asian countries on names for database creation and access.

Program: membership, dates, achievements

The workshop was initiated as a part of an international cooperative research program entitled "International Sharing of Japanese Information" funded grant-in-aid by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology for the fiscal year 1998 and 2000. The NII Leadership Fund also supported it for the FY 2000.

The model of this concern, among many fore-runners, is the One day Workshop held in the 62nd IFLA Conference, Beijing, China in August 29, 1996 organised by Suzine Har Nicolescu. 3

Aims of the workshop was stated as "to pursue a standardised or harmonised cumulating of the name authority data of Chinese, Korean and Japanese language in other countries."

Scope of the workshop was simply stated as "Names are, in the first instance, Author Name, then followed in future if the project factors allow, by proper nouns that are used in other countries in local usage other than original usage."

Target, with expectation, was set as "CJK Interchange Format of Authority Data" that conforms to the IFLA UNIMARC Authorities Format."

In early November 2000, a call for participation was sent out by the National

---

Institute of Informatics (NII), Tokyo to the National Library of China (NLC), Beijing, National Library of Korea (NLK), Korea Education and Research Information Services (KERIS), both in Seoul. The National Diet Library (NDL), Tokyo agreed to collaborate the workshop. Thus the workshop was organized by 5 organizations.

In January 10 and 11, 2001, the first workshop (CJK Authority 1) was held at NII. It was a simple fact-finding meeting to introduce each other's authority work. However, the status of computer application, the degree of domestic networking, the development of shared cataloging systems among three countries were so different that the fact-finding was far primitive than expected. This also characterized the vital importance of this kind of professional meeting among the neighboring countries to maintain expert knowledge and professional discussion. The first meeting was also characterized by the fact that we did not share a common methodology or common target of the work.

Homework was suggested in the end of the first meeting to collect authority records of 60 authors, 20 each of three countries, in the databases of the participating institutions, and to be compared them in the second meeting. Variation of descriptive rules for author names were anticipated though all the participant institutions based on the Paris Principle of 1960.

In March 28-29, 2001, the second CJK authority workshop was held at the very end of the fiscal year and the final year of the three-year project. Membership was maintained as the first meeting, and it was the one exceptionally well aware of the importance of an expert meeting.

At the second workshop, 60 names were collected from the participating institutions. The cumulating of the raw data from each authority files shows variations that currently exist among them. They are created by individual house description rules though all of them claims the common characteristics with degree to the Paris Principle.

Mrs. Marie France PLASSARD, IFLA UBCIM, was invited in the second workshop to introduce the UBCIM efforts and a framework. Although some special attention was paid to East Asian practices by IFLA UBCIM, it was benefitable for both ways that participating experts were informed on the most recent UBCIM achievement.

Future

Names of the East Asia are used not only in this geographic area but also referred in other parts of the world. More to it, East Asian names are being input in other parts of the world. Core authority data, with responsibility of the originating country, is required for an improved creation and access of databases.

Framework of this cooperative planning shall be those set by IFLA UBCIM. However, house rules and practices are of great diversity, with participating libraries of each cooperative construction which also holds house rules and practices. Continuous liaison with IFLA UBCIM is required, though the participating institutions have, in practice, very little experience in these international activities.
It is too early to predict the outcome of this effort. Organisation is in ad-hoc manner and without firm financial backing. The two gathering showed the simple fact-finding endeavor by experts from five organisations in three countries. In the East Asian region there are many more libraries and institutions that create bibliographic and other databases utilising names as one of fundamental access keys with authority control. Variety and volume of databases they are creating is also rapidly increasing.

Development at the participating libraries of each cooperative database construction (shared cataloging systems) would require consensus on taking any new step within each member institution, within the system, and require further investment and resource at every levels.

Recognition is required of domestic and international roles of the participating institutions. So far only two types: national library in one hand and national information/bibliographic utility on the other. Responsibility and roles are different from each other according to their mission.

Significance of this type of endeavor is still ambiguous. It shall be determined by domestic and international backing, and how much can we gain such backing?