[ISACV-192] Business - Formal Identifier properties Created:
12/01/12 Updated: 18/01/12 Resolved: 18/01/12

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	ARCHER Phil	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Fixed	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil
CITnet Message:	

Description

The proposed model has a small set of properties for the Formal Identifier class:

- identifier
- issuing authority name
- issuing authority URI (if they have one)
- issue date

Are these the right fields?

- The country or jurisdiction is implicit - should it be explicit?
- The registry is identified here - should it also be identified as a property of the Legal Entity class? (see Piotr's comments)

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [18/Jan/12 18:03]

Although it is recognised that the Formal Identifier may need further properties in future, the currently proposed model was resolved to be sufficient at the meeting on 12/1/12

[ISACV-191] Business - Country/Jurisdiction of origin Created: 12/01/12 Updated: 18/01/12 Resolved: 18/01/12

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	**Priority:**	Major
Reporter:	ARCHER Phil	**Assignee:**	ARCHER Phil
Resolution:	Fixed	**Votes:**	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil
CITnet Message:	

Description

Give then Formal Identifier Class, do we need a separate Country of Origin relationship for a legal entity?
Against:

- Data will be duplicated
- Duplicated data leads to possibility of conflicting data

For:

- It might be a more readily accessible data point.

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [18/Jan/12 18:03]

The meeting of 12/1/12 resolved to not include the country of origin property

[ISACV-149] Is there a controlled vocabulary for company status (active, in receivership etc.)? Created: 13/12/11 Updated: 05/01/12

Status:	Open
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	ARCHER Phil	Assignee:	ARCHER Phil
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, MÄÄRITS Martin, TAGGART Chris
CITnet Message:	

Description

Business registers record whether a company is active, dissolved etc. Is there a controlled vocabulary for this?

Comments

Comment by TAGGART Chris [05/Jan/12 11:41]

Can I suggest a naive approach, to allow status to be a string – either by having a separate status_text

attribute, or by having a status object which may have a complex set of attributes (e.g. status_code) including status text. Even where registers have status codes (e.g. UK, New Zealand), and are strict about enforcing it, there is still the problem of mapping these onto a common status, which IMHO is a separate job...

Comment by ARCHER Phil [05/Jan/12 11:27]

So this is clearly not clear! Hmmm... so it seems to me that we have two possible routes:

- define a term of 'status' that can be used (or not) be each register, perhaps using a sub class of status;
- not include status at all.

A decision for a meeting I think!

Comment by MÄÄRITS Martin [04/Jan/12 14:21]

In Estonia registered objects status is appointed (entered into the register, in liquidation, in bankruptcy and deleted) and we are ready to show it as a company's important information. Active or inactive attribute settings must be defined in our meaning. There will be dilemma - statuses in liquidation and in bankruptcy would classify as active or inactive. In the registry point of view companies are still in the register, so they should be active. If the word „active" means also economical activity, then we are not sure that any company which status is „entered into register" are really economically active. In Estonia "active" means principally "entered into register" ("active" consist of entered into register, in liquidation and in bankruptcy statuses) and "inactive" means deleted companies.

Comment by TAGGART Chris [22/Dec/11 13:44]

I don't think there is, and if there is it isn't used by the company registers 😉

One reason why it would be difficult would be that terms such as Receivership/Liquidation/Administration are to do with legal process and this presumably changes from country to country, even within Europe.

At OpenCorporates, we've abstract it to the most basic value: inactive. This indicates that a company is no longer active and cannot trade (NB: this is different from dormant). We then map a number of different status values, which are nearly always strings (e.g. forfeited, dissolved, deregistered, removed from register, etc, etc) to this.

Doing this means that users can see at a glance whether the company is active or not, and (shortly) can filter out inactive ones.

[ISACV-148] Business: Is there a recognised controlled vocabulary for business type (public limited company,

prviate company etc.) ? Created: 13/12/11 Updated: 18/01/12 Resolved: 18/01/12

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	ARCHER Phil	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Fixed	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, MADZIAR Piotr
CITnet Message:	

Description

Business registers have a 'company type' term - it would be good to use a controlled vocabulary for this

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [18/Jan/12 18:06]

It is clear that the answer is 'no' - at least for now. Resolution is to use a controlled vocabulary wherever possible but there is no specific recommendation that would work across the EU.

Comment by MADZIAR Piotr [14/Dec/11 16:31]

There were attempts in Europe, many years ago, to classify and align the legal forms of businesses in various MS. Those ideas have been abandoned as unworkable and now lawyers in most cases say UK's LLP and Greek EPE are a bit similar but never equivalent. To follow that route, to determine the legal form, one needs the Country of incorporation (or registration for non-corporate) and the type - to not confuse the French SA and Polish SA. In consequence the Country code would denominate the jurisdiction and then a jurisdictional code would denominate the type.

Thus if we talk about a controlled vocabulary, it would be rather a vocabulary of national juirisdiction and

not an EU one.

On top of this, the EU jurisdiction created specific legal forms (for example the European Economic Interest Group - EEIG). Such an entity, wherever it is registered, is equivalent to its peers across the border. Then the Country code would be EU.
A controlled vocabulary could be possibly created for those legal forms on EU level.

[ISACV-146] Business - Discuss the Core Business Vocabulary with e-CODEX Created: 09/12/11 Updated: 09/12/11

Status:	Draft
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	GOEDERTIER Stijn	Assignee:	GOEDERTIER Stijn
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	GOEDERTIER Stijn
CITnet Message:	Remember to use the workflow action **Submit Issue** when your request is ready to be processed.

Description

Ad discussed in the meeting of 8/12.

[ISACV-135] Core Vocabularies - metadata for language, temporal aspects, and uncertainty Created: 07/12/11 Updated: 08/12/11

Status:	Open
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	Greg POTTERTON	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business, Location, Person		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	DEKKERS Makx, GOEDERTIER Stijn, Greg POTTERTON, SKLARß Sebastian
CITnet Message:	

Description

There were a couple of metadata items that were mentioned in discussion on 01/12/2011. Are these valid Metadata? What additional metadata would you expect?

• Degree of certainty of data (on something like a DoB or Name)
• Language of attribute

Comments

Comment by DEKKERS Makx [08/Dec/11 20:10]

For uncertain dates, there is work at the Library of Congress on an "Extended Date/Time Format" (EDTF): http://www.loc.gov/standards/datetime/spec.html, which includes handling of (partial) uncertain/approximate, (partial) unspecified dates.

On the issue of language-dependency of names, a Google search on "named entity translation" brings

up a lot of research on the issue. It is more complicated than translating (e.g. "Mona Lisa" is the translation of "La Joconde", and you really wouldn't want to translate "John Baker" to "Jan Bakker"). You usually will need some sort of multilingual authority file where you can look up the different variants, as with the example of exonyms.

Comment by SKLARß Sebastian [07/Dec/11 19:27]

Here my view on the temporal aspect as part of a exchange format:

A Member State register has to track changes according to national laws and data protection legislation.The temporal aspect so seems very important for using the core person as a blueprint for a national register.
The Core Person as a pan Europan exchange format for information and queries across national or domain specific registers should not care for versioning and archiving, shouldn't it?

So tracking period of validity for every attribute like "gender", "name", "address" seems out of scope of a pan-European Register data exchange format where your rather are "googeling into a national snapshot" and where you will not have access to historical data (like former names, previous gender).

So Yes for tracking certainty / credibility
Yes for language but consider Exonyms (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_European_exonyms) that can not be solved by simply declaring the language
and
NO for temporal aspects from my current point of view.

Comment by GOEDERTIER Stijn [07/Dec/11 19:07]

These are indeed aspects of a generic nature that cross-cut the work of the individual task forces and that thus could be addressed at a general level:

- **Language aspect**: The fact that an individual can have a property or relationship that has many translations (e.g. the name of a location).
- **Temporal aspect**: The fact that an individual can have a property or relationship that changes over time, for example a name change or a status change.
- **degree of certainty**: The fact that an individual can have a property or relationship which is not known with complete certainty, such as a date of birth.

Of these three, the language aspect seems the easiest to address. It can be addressed by conceiving the attribute to be of a composite type, which consists of a text string and a language indicator. We have a similar solution in the ADMS conceptual model, where we define a core data type "text" to be a composite of a string and a language code. This solution can work in most common cases.

Temporal aspects can be dealt with in two ways. One solution is to model changes as "events" (e.g. a birth, a marriage, a death) with a timestamp, date, and location. These events can then be associated with an individual. Another solution is to embed a timestamp or a period of validity within properties (*fluents*).

For uncertainty, similar solutions could be conceived.

In general, we should ask whether we should address these complicated cross-cutting concerns in the

Working Group meetings.

[ISACV-129] Business - How is a Business different from a (natural) Person? Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 20/12/11 Resolved: 20/12/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Conceptual model, Use cases
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	GOEDERTIER Stijn	Assignee:	ARCHER Phil
Resolution:	Fixed	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, DEKKERS Makx, GOEDERTIER Stijn, TAGGART Chris
CITnet Message:	

Description

In the Virtual Meeting of 1/12, the issues was discussed that many persons have a "company" which does not have a legal entity nor a VAT number. If we consider such natural persons to be (or to have?) a business, what distinguishes a business from a (natural) person?

Is there a use case to clarify this?

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [20/Dec/11 13:35]

This issues was discussed on 8/12 and 15/12. The resolution is that the WG will focus purely on legal

entities for now, recognising that further work needs to be done in future to cover other types of trader.

Comment by DEKKERS Makx [08/Dec/11 20:23]

If I may comment from personal perspective: in Spain a Person can be registered as a Business, with most rights and obligations that a company has, for example for VAT purposes and hiring of staff. Could the fact that something is registered as a legal entity (Legal Person?), according to the laws of the country of origin, be the determining factor?

Comment by TAGGART Chris [08/Dec/11 16:14]

I like the idea of Agent, but bit confused about Virtual Organisation vs Legal Entity (I'm not sure what the legal status of W3c is). But to answer to question at the top, think the word Business in this context is a bit confusing, and what we really need to talk about is legal entities, as a business can mean too many things (including something done by an individual). In fact, I'd argue that a business is an activity rather than an entity.

Was agreed at meeting of 8 Dec that we'd limit to legal entities rather than persons who may conduct business (as a freelancer, as a contract worker, or in their spare time). Think this simplifies the task to a manageable one, and will cover all the use cases we've identified.

Comment by ARCHER Phil [07/Dec/11 12:39]

My suggestion for this issue is that we use the generic idea of an 'Agent' that can be a natural person or an organisation that may or may not be a business. An Agent is an abstract entity that is capable to 'doing work'.

Natural person is a sub class of Agent, so is organisation. Organisation has (at least) two sub classes: virtual organisations (W3C is a good example) and Legal Entity (a.k.a. company or business). Virtual organisations may or may not be linked to legal entities. Legal entities and natural persons may be related to organisations in some way.

What I suggest we need is the flexibility of the concept of an Agent. Then, in terms of the 'Business Core Voc' we can focus on the area that seems to be in most need of attention which is the legal entity/business/company.

[ISACV-127] Business - Provide a uses case for setting up a bank register Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 19/01/12

Status:	Open
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Use cases
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	GOEDERTIER Stijn	Assignee:	PERISTERAS Vassilios
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	Andreas WELLER, ARCHER Phil, GOEDERTIER Stijn, MÄÄRITS Martin, PERISTERAS Vassilios
CITnet Message:	

Description

During the meeting of 1/12 you mentioned: "we are setting up a register for banks". We would be grateful to receive the European Banking Authority (EBA) requirements for a core Business vocabulary.

Comments

Comment by MÄÄRITS Martin [19/Jan/12 13:22]

Banks are entered into Estonian Commercial Register like an ordinary companies, therefore they don't have special identifying attribute.

Comment by ARCHER Phil [07/Dec/11 12:41]

See Financial register Use Case

Comment by Andreas WELLER [07/Dec/11 12:02]

Have added a page under use cases to reflect the Financial Institution Register of EBA

Comment by GOEDERTIER Stijn [06/Dec/11 21:01]

During the meeting of 1/12 you mentioned: "we are setting up a register for banks". We would be grateful to receive the European Banking Authority (EBA) requirements for a core Business vocabulary.

[ISACV-126] Business - Provide use cases for multiple identifiers Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 18/01/12 Resolved: 18/01/12

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Use cases
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	**Priority:**	Major
Reporter:	GOEDERTIER Stijn	**Assignee:**	Thomas VERDIN
Resolution:	Fixed	**Votes:**	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, GOEDERTIER Stijn, MADZIAR Piotr, MITCHELL Aine, MÄÄRITS Martin, Thomas VERDIN
CITnet Message:	

Description

Thomas Verdin raised during the virtual meeting of 1/12: "we have some ideas on multiple identifiers (for instance, cross-country companies)".

ANSWER :
In the XBRL Europe Business Registers, we consider that the same company may have multiple ID numbers:

- when, in the same country, there are multiple providers for ID numbers: Tax Agency (VAT Number) + (Business Register) (company ID) + Central Bank /Balance Sheet office + Private information providers (DUNS...)
- when the register uses multiple IDs: e.g. n France long ID (SIRET on 13 digit) and short RCS (SIREN with 9 digit)
- for branches: ID of the mother company in the original country + ID of the branch in the branch's country
- for companies that are located in multiple places: multiple headquaters in regions of a same country or european companies with headquarters in two or more european countries
- with supranational ID's, e.g. REID proposal for Europe (country code + local BR ID + 2 digits)

So our concept for company ID number

- includes VALUE (e.g. 123 456 789) + TYPE (e.g. www.infogreffe.fr/siren = webaddres (uri) to the ID description);
- may be repeated more than once for the same company.

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [18/Jan/12 18:05]

The meeting of 12/1/12 resolved that the proposed model of a single, mandatory legalIdentifier plus any number of additional identifiers is correct (with each identifier being given by the Formal Identifier Class)

Comment by MÄÄRITS Martin [04/Jan/12 13:37]

Adding a country code would make the Estonian Commercial Registry code unique in Europe. We can add a register identifier, but this isn't necessary to ensure uniqueness (register identifier is only extra information about the register. We are in favor of EBR REID numbering system (Date of issue/registration date and date of withdrawal/de-registration date should be rather attributes of company's data). (Although there were mentioned the VAT number, but Estonian Commercial Registry doesn't know company's VAT number).

Comment by MITCHELL Aine [23/Dec/11 11:12]

Here are some notes on the REID proposal for Europe.

The REID (Registered Entity IDentifier) numbering system provides a means of uniquely identifying entities in a register.
These entities would usually be corporate bodies but could include any other registered entity.
The standard provides a number that is unique at the world level.
It is compliant entirely with existing law and requires **no change** whatsoever in the data stored on the business register.
Use of the REID would greatly ease the identification of businesses for international actions and could be used by companies in conformity with the 1st Directive.

The requirements of the 1st directive state:
Member States shall prescribe that letters and order forms, whether they are in paper form or use any other medium, are to state the following particulars
(a) the information necessary in order to identify the register in which the file mentioned in Article 3 is kept, together with the number of the company in that register;
……
Member States shall prescribe that company websites are to contain at least the particulars mentioned in the first paragraph ……

The standard proposes the following structure for the REID which is modelled on the IBAN structure:

CCR..R.N..N-P

CC	ISO Country Code	Fixed 2 characters.

R**R	Register identifier within country as defined by the Directory of Registers (DOR).	Required where the company would not be uniquely identified without it otherwise is optional. Up to 6 characters consisting of 0-9, A-Z, -, /.
N**N	Number unique within the register	Up to 35 characters (deemed to be the longest company number in Europe).
PP	Check Digits	2 digits. Based on ISO 7064, Mod 97-10 international standard.

EBR has undertaken the task of compiling a Directory of Registers (DOR).
This involves assigning unique identifiers to each of the registers in all the member countries of EBR.
This is required only in the case of countries where multiple registers exist, for example in Germany, Italy or Spain.
For countries where there is a single register, for example the UK or Ireland, it is sufficient to use the two digit ISO country code as the identifier if this is desired.

The benefits of the use of the REID are:
• It is essential for inter-registry communications
• It has long been identified as a requirement for electronic commerce
• There are benefits in anti-money laundering and know-your-client practices particularly for foreign registered businesses

In summary the REID is the lowest cost option for a unique ID as it requires no changes in the registers and creates no obligation on companies.

Comment by MADZIAR Piotr [22/Dec/11 14:36]

In the EU draft legislation Member States shall ensure that companies have a unique identifier that allows for their unequivocal identification in communication between registers. This unique identifier shall comprise, at least, elements enabling the identification of:

•the Member State of the register,
•the domestic register of origin,
•the company number in that register
Knowing the Member State and the company number is not enough to identify the business due to the fact that many Member States have many local and regional registers.
I also read this draft in a sense that it gives much more priority to register identification that to any other attribute that is stored in that register like date of (de)registration.
What however worries me a bit is that the proposed legislation is not replacing the national registration numbers but creating a 'unique EU identifier' that will serve for cross-border exchange of data and multi-country search. Companies must (in commercial activities) and probably registers (in legal procedures and when disclosing data to its users) will however keep using the national ID numbers.
Definitely a CV giving reference to an ID number that will not be used in commercial activities is adding complexity and legal uncertainty instead of reducing it.

Comment by ARCHER Phil [13/Dec/11 17:50]

So we have a choice here. Either we follow the EBR route and concatenate identifiers into a single string that encodes who created the identifier and what type it is, or we define an identifier class and

provide fields for:

- issuing authority
- date if issue/registration date
- date of withdrawal/de-registration date
- identifier

Even if we concatenate strings, it seems that a single company might have multiple identifiers so my preference is to create an identifier class. It would still allow the encoding of an EBR number.

Comment by ARCHER Phil [07/Dec/11 14:24]

Some input from Sebastian Sklarß on this suggests that we actually need a little core vocabulary on identifiers: issuer, issuing agency, year of issuing etc. We also noted during the call on 1/12 that a single business might indeed have multiple identifiers so my suggestion here is that we invoke the concept of an Identifier Class and look at defining its properties in some follow up work.

[ISACV-125] Business - how is a Business different from an Organisation? Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 20/12/11 Resolved: 20/12/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Use cases
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	GOEDERTIER Stijn	Assignee:	ARCHER Phil
Resolution:	Fixed	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	0 minutes		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, GOEDERTIER Stijn
CITnet Message:	

Description

During the Virtual Meeting of 1/12, the issue was raised whether there is an actual difference between a business and an organisation. That a business is **for profit**, not necessarily is a good discriminant. In the UK many non-profit organisations have a legal entity of the same form as companies.

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [20/Dec/11 13:46]

Resolved following discussion on 8/12 and 15/12 that we will only focus on legal entities for now.

[ISACV-124] Business - consider the existing work by OASIS xPIL on Organisation Details and Organisation Info

Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 06/12/11

Status:	Open
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Related work
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	WINSTANLEY Peter	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	WINSTANLEY Peter
CITnet Message:	

Description

: OASIS have xPIL which contains Organisation Details and Organisation Info:

http://hr-crm-client.sourceforge.net/apidocs/oasis/names/tc/ciq/xpil/_3/OrganisationDetailsType.html

[ISACV-123] Business - trading name Created: 06/12/11 Updated: 05/01/12

Status:	Open
Project:	ISA e-Government Core Vocabularies
Component/s:	Conceptual model, Use cases
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Issue	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	WILLIAMS Stuart	Assignee:	ARCHER Phil
Resolution:	Unresolved	Votes:	0
Labels:	Business		
Remaining Estimate:	Not Specified		
Time Spent:	Not Specified		
Original Estimate:	Not Specified		

Participant:	ARCHER Phil, MADZIAR Piotr, MÄÄRITS Martin, TAGGART Chris, WILLIAMS Stuart
CITnet Message:	

Description

In the UK I believe there is a "Trading Name" eg. I know of one company "Outdoor Active" trading as "The Canoe and Kayak Store".

Comments

Comment by ARCHER Phil [05/Jan/12 10:17]

And so it gets interesting! We have several situations to cover:

- names have no legal status (I believe Chris you said this is the case in some US states?);
- several cases where there is one and only one recognised name;
- different names, perhaps in different languages that are not simple translations of each other;
- variant spellings of single names, additional trading names etc.

From this we can see that there are cases where more than one name is recognised and others where to have more than one name is seen as bad practice.

We're trying to identify or, where necessary, define a set of terms for describing a legal entity. As a Core Vocabulary, IMHO, we shouldn't make any term mandatory, rather, we provide the terms that can be used. In the Person TF we're discussing elements that are as 'optional' as alternative names seem to be here (indeed, one of them is alternative name!). My feeling is that we should provide a term for alternative name but we should also make it clear that several jurisdictions do not recognise these.

Comment by MADZIAR Piotr [05/Jan/12 9:45]

The Polish business register (KRS), in its on-line edition, doesn't indicate anything else than "current name". Anyway, I'm afraid that in the Polish business tradition using other names than registered names would be treated at least as a business malpractice if not confusing and dishonest and is not common.

Comment by MÄÄRITS Martin [04/Jan/12 12:36]

Estonia has only one (official) business name and register doesn't know (doesn't store) other names.

Comment by TAGGART Chris [22/Dec/11 13:48]

I'd perhaps suggest treating TradingName as a subclass of OtherName (in turn is this a subclass of Name, and is LegalName also a subclass of Name?). Sometimes it's a legal concept, and needs to be registered, other times it's an abbreviated, alternative spelling/representation.

We should prob allow start/end date though in practice this is rarely known.

Comment by ARCHER Phil [07/Dec/11 14:27]

UK has a specific concept of Trading Name (I've seen it on cheques too "Foo Ltd. T/A Bar Stuff" where T/A is a recognised acronym for Trading As. The more general case is simply 'alternative name.'

Generated at Wed May 09 10:05:46 CEST 2012 by Michiel DE KEYZER using JIRA 4.3.4#620-r152668.