In the forerun of a vote requested by ICOM about a change of the acronym "ICOM-CIMCIM" to the short name "ICOM-MUSIC", a survey amongst the CIMCIM membership was run via the platform Google Forms. Participants could:

- Tell if they agreed with the change from "ICOM-CIMCIM" to "ICOM-MUSIC"
- Tell if they had a different proposal for a name change and write it down
- Leave a message if desired

My ICOM mem	bership number is: *
Kurzantwort-Tex	t
Please tell us y well.	۰۰۰ our opinion! You can agree with the proposal <u>and</u> have a different proposal as *
📃 I am o.k. wi	th "ICOM-MUSIC" as a new name for our International Committee
I have a diff	erent name proposal for our International Committee
My name prop	osal for our International Committee is:
Kurzantwort-Tex	t
Anything you w	vant to tell us?
Langantwort-Te	t

1. Timeline

2 July 2024: Send out to 274 individual and 53 institutional members, in total 327. Return: 21 failures for different reasons, and several out of office or other individual automatic responses.

5 July 2024: Survey forwarded to two members who had actualized their E-mail-addresses following a message on CIMCIM-L.

17 July 2024: Reminder sent out. 34 messages with automatic responses, whereof ca. 8 were out-of-office messages; the rest were failures.

23 July 2024: Last Reminder sent out. 34 immediate answers with failures and some out-of-office messages.

24 July 2024: Due to an access problem, the survey has been closed nine minutes late, but the last answer was submitted on 11:49h CEST, thus in time.

2. Methods for keeping anonymity and preventing fraud

The person leading the survey received from the CIMCIM treasurer a list of CIMCIM members' E-mailaddresses extracted from the ICOM IRIS database which served for the mailing of the link to the survey. In the survey, participants had to fill in their ICOM membership number. No other personal data, including the participant's E-mail-address, has been collected. During the proceeding of the results, the list of ICOM membership numbers has been extracted from the results table, sorted and sent to the CIMCIM treasurer for verification of valid and invalid numbers. The result was sent back to the person leading the survey.

Participations from invalid numbers were discarded. Double participations were unified, if an error from the participants' side was probable¹ and the contribution was the same.

There was no moment where one single person had the ICOM membership numbers and the contributions and the E-mail-Addresses at the same time. Each time of transmission of one of the elements, the order has been blurred by sorting.

3. Participation Turnout

There were 60 participations in total. Without counting invalid or otherwise addresses, the survey should have reached ca. 300 persons or institutions. This means an overall response rate of 20%. Of the 60 participations, the following had to be discarded:

- 3 double responses with each time the same content, counted as 3 single responses (-3)
- 4 non-existing membership numbers (-4)

This means a valid participation of 54 participants, or a participation turnout of **18**%.

4. Results

"I am o.k. with 'ICOM-MUSIC' as a new name for our International Committee"		91%
"I have a different name proposal for our International Committee"		9%
Total		100%

The form explicitly provided the possibility to declare one's "o.k." with "ICOM-MUSIC" AND propose a different short name, but no participant has chosen this option.

The proposals were:

ICOM-MUSIC-INSTRUMENTS

ICOM-CIMCIM (=keep the current acronym (2x))

ICOM-MUSIQUE (=ICOM-MUSIC in French)

ICOM Muse-ical (The participant provided 9 different proposals; the first one has been kept here)

5. Comments

The form provided the possibility to leave a short message. Amongst the 54 valid contributions there have been nine comments, several advocating for or regretting "ICOM-CIMCIM", and several bringing forward arguments for "ICOM-MUSIC", and, not to forget, some thanks for the survey.

6. Conclusion

The participant turnout for this survey was quite high and shows the interest in this question. A higher participation rate can be expected for the real vote ahead. The Security and Anonymity methods seem to work, seen with the simple technology used. As it is not excluded that invalid participations have

 $^{^{1}}$ e.g. twice the same contribution with few minutes of delay, recognizable from the time stamp of the contribution.

occurred by simple typing errors of the membership numbers, participants should remember to be careful in the final vote.

Frank P. Bär 26 July 2024