

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
1a. Does your jurisdiction have written materials providing direction and procedural guidelines regarding the review and data entry of business documents?	<p><b>1a. Yes: AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, IL, IN, KY, LA, MA, MN, NJ, ND, OH, OR, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WV, BC, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p> <p><b>No: CT, IA, KS, MD, ME, MI, MS, MO, MT, RI, VT, VA, WY, ON.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: CO:</b> Procedure manual and Rules. <b>IL:</b> Section 180.18 of the Administrative Rules. <b>LA:</b> UCC filings are made in parishes. <b>MA:</b> Regulation 950 CMR 140. <b>MT:</b> Employees are trained to enter the name exactly as it appears on the document with NO variations. There is no written material. <b>OR:</b> KB on-line tutorial and administrative rules. <b>VA:</b> We key left to right exactly how we see the name.</p>
1b. Could you provide a copy to the Indexing Standards Workgroup?	<p><b>1b. Yes: AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, IL, IN, LA, MA, MN, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WV, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p> <p><b>No: IA, KS, KY, MD, MT, RI, VT, VA, BC, ON</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: FL:</b> Our instructions are included in our in-house training manual for new employee's use. <b>IA:</b> Using the IACA model. <b>MN:</b> Follow RA9 IACA processing guidelines found on IACA's website. <b>NJ:</b> Search manual is on-line at <a href="http://www.nj.gov/njbgs">www.nj.gov/njbgs</a>. <b>ND:</b> Yes, an extract from a comprehensive manual. <b>OH:</b> Same as 1b and Page 1. <b>OR:</b> Can send administrative rules but not KB tutorial. <b>TN:</b> Filing Guide and Rules available on-line at <a href="http://www.state.tn.us/sos">www.state.tn.us/sos</a>. <b>Romania:</b> All documents are in Romanian.</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
<p>2a. Does your office currently perform manual review of documents that create or change organization names that are <b>submitted in paper form</b>?</p>	<p>2a. <b>Yes: AR, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT, VT, WV, ON, Romania.</b></p> <p><b>No: AK, CA, CO, LA, MN, MS, RI, SD, VA, WA, WY, BC, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: MO:</b> Review, yes; change No. <b>UT:</b> for changes. <b>BC:</b> If a secured party or debtor name changes its name, the Personal Property Registry is not involved. The client files an amendment on the system. <b>New Zealand:</b> No paper involved in the New Zealand PPSR, wholly electronic.</p>
<p>2b. Does your office currently perform manual review of documents that create or change organization names that are <b>submitted in electronic form</b>?</p>	<p>2b. <b>Yes: MN, VT, Romania.</b></p> <p><b>No: AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MS, MO, MT, NJ, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: CT:</b> Electronic filing of UCC documents is not available at this time. <b>MT:</b> We did the first four months the service was available, but with limited staff and time, we had to discontinue. <b>ND:</b> Electronic submissions not yet accepted. <b>RI:</b> We do not offer electronic filing at this time. <b>TN:</b> No electronic submissions.</p>
<p>3a. Does your staff currently modify organization names when presented on a <b>paper document</b> for filing (such as moving a leading “A” or “The” to the end)? If your answer to 3a is “Yes”, what modifications are performed?</p>	<p>3a. <b>Yes: AK, CO, VT. □</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CA, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: AK:</b> A, The (etc...) moved to the end of name. <b>CO:</b> "The" at the end. <b>TX:</b> Only thing that may happen is truncation if name exceeds maximum field length of 300 characters. <b>Romania:</b> The Romanian Law does not allow office personnel to perform any changes from the format that the information has been submitted.</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
<p>3b. Does your office currently modify organization names when presented <b>electronically</b> for filing (such as moving a leading “A” or “The” to the end)? If your answer to 3b is “Yes”, what modifications are performed?</p>	<p>3b. <b>Yes: AK</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CA, CO, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, OH, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: AK:</b> A, The (etc...) moved to the end of name. <b>CT:</b> Electronic filing of UCC documents is not available at this time. <b>OR</b> (Not applicable). <b>Romania:</b> The same as above.</p>
<p>3c. Has your office performed these modifications in the past, even if it is not your current practice? If your answer to 3c is “Yes”, have you undertaken to bring these records into compliance with current practice? Please describe any steps you have taken to bring these names/records into compliance.</p>	<p>3c. <b>Yes: AK, AR, CA, CO, IA, KS, KY, ME, MN, OH, OR, PA, UT, VA, WA, BC.</b></p> <p><b>No: CT, DE, IL, IN, LA, MA, MD, MI, MS, MO, MT, NJ, RI, SD, TN, TX, VT, WV, WY, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: AK:</b> Has always been the practice. <b>AR:</b> All filings have been changed to reflect the data as presented at the time of original filing with the office. <b>CA:</b> Data cleanup as part of data conversion to new system. <b>CO:</b> We are planning a data conversion within the next two years along with a rewrite of our system. At that time, we will have IT program a change for the names that they can, which fit certain criteria. <b>KS:</b> In the past, long names were entered in the name field and might have to continue on in an address field. Or certain words like Manufacturing were abbreviated. We have been doing database clean up actively and</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response
	<p>have fixed names that have continued into address fields. <b>KY:</b> All Pre-RA9 filings were re-indexed before RA9 went into effect. Kentucky was a county filing state, so the number was small. <b>ME:</b> In the summer and early fall of 2001, our office created lists of debtor names that fit into this category and corrected the index. <b>MN:</b> As a part of RA9 changes, data was entered according to RA9 rules starting approximately 1 year prior to 7/1/2001 and completed approximately 2 years after. <b>ND:</b> Maybe <b>OH:</b> Implemented RA9 standards. <b>OR:</b> Made manual corrections. <b>PA:</b> Previously, we have moved A, An &amp; The to the end of the corporate name. We have indexed entity names that begin with an individual name as last name comma first. We were limited to 40 characters in the debtor name, so any name with more characters was truncated. We began changing the indexing of these name November 2004 upon request from the customer. <b>UT:</b> Pre-RA9 filings. We bring them into compliance as identified by filers. <b>VA:</b> Prior to 7/1/2001, we ran exhaustive reports on our organization's file. We had programs recommend the best approach for undoing, if you will, past indexing standards as well as some other logical steps to correct the name. Then we reviewed each filing to ensure accuracy before flipping the org.</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
		name. <b>WA:</b> Yes, prior to 2001. The previous database was converted according to new standards of 2001.
<p>4a. Does your office follow a data entry format when indexing organization names that might be recognizable or are partially composed of individual names?</p>	<p>4a. <b>Yes: AK, CO, CT, ME, MA, MT, NJ, OH, OR, SD, TX, UT, VT.</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CA, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, ND, PA, RI, TN, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: ME:</b> Enter name as provided in the designated fields on the form. <b>MN:</b> Follow RA9 IACA Standards. <b>MT:</b> We have always entered the name exactly as it appears on the document regardless if the organizational entity contains an individual name. <b>OR:</b> If it appears that way on the form. <b>SD:</b> Enter whatever is in the field regardless of the information. <b>VA:</b> We key exactly what we see in the order in which we see it. <b>WA:</b> Enter exactly as presented according to the new standards.</p>
<p>4b. Are adjustments made to the word order when the organization name is entered into your system? Two example names to consider are “John Deere Company, Inc” and “The Robert Jones Trust”.</p>	<p>4b. <b>Yes: AK.</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
4c. In the past, has your office followed the practice described above in the answer to 4b?	<p>4c. <b>Yes: AK, AR, CA, CT, IL, KY, ME, MI, MN, MO, OH, OR, PA, TN, UT, VT, VA.</b></p> <p><b>No: CO, DE, IN, IA, KS, LA, MA, MD, MS, MT, NJ, ND, RI, SD, TX, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<b>Comments: UT: Pre-RA9.</b>



International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response
<p>*If yes, please describe the nature of and the approximate dates of any changes.</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> <b>AR:</b> Yes, filings have been changed to reflect data as originally received by the filing office. <b>CO:</b> No, we may attempt with our system rewrite. See 3C. <b>KY:</b> All Pre-RA9 filings were re-indexed before RA9 went into effect. Kentucky was a county filing state, so the number was small. <b>ME:</b> During the summer and early fall of 2001, our office corrected the index of the name of the debtor to reflect the name provided on the filing at the time presented for filing; created and appropriately linked Filing Officer Statements for all corrected names; and did a name search to verify the names would now appear using the name presented for filing. <b>MI:</b> In mid-2001, our vendor identified any organization names entered into the first and last individual name fields in the legacy database and moved them to an organization field. If a change was made, a filing officer statement was inserted into the record. <b>MN:</b> As a part of the RA9 changes, data was entered according to RA9 rules starting approximately one year prior to 7/21/2001 and completed approximately 2 years after. <b>ND:</b> Each county office is responsible for manually correcting the entries that originated in the county. Lists have been compiled from special data queries to identify the inconsistent entries. Entries must be compared to the actual documents and the entries changed accordingly. Clean-up project must be completed by March 15, 2008. <b>OH:</b> Debtor and Secured Party names are entered exactly as they are shown on the filing document. <b>OR:</b> Manual correction in 1996. <b>UT:</b> Only as requested by filer. <b>VA:</b> Same as 3c.</p>



International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
<p>5a. Has your office <b>ever</b> required or allowed abbreviation by data entry personnel of words submitted as part of an organization name?</p>	<p>5a. <b>Yes: AK, CA, CO, IL, IA, KS, KY, ME, MA, MI, OR, PA, SD, UT, WA.</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CT, DE, IN, LA, MD, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, RI, TN, TX, VT, VA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: CA:</b> Field length limitations dictated the use of abbreviations. <b>CO:</b> We have content that was submitted from various counties that could have abbreviations. We will fix those as we find them. <b>IL:</b> It has not been current practice since RA9. <b>KS:</b> When field lengths were too short, we abbreviated some names. <b>MI:</b> The legacy database last name field had a 35-character limit and required abbreviation of some names. If the customer abbreviated a name, the name was entered as given including the abbreviation. <b>ND:</b> That's not a guarantee that it never happened because some errors of this nature have been discovered by chance. <b>SD:</b> Pre RA9 abbreviated names. <b>UT:</b> Pre-RA9. <b>WA:</b> Only prior to 2001; records were converted to new standards 10/2001.</p>
<p>5b. Does your office <b>currently</b> abbreviate words submitted as part of an organization name?</p> <p>If your answer to 5a or 5b is “Yes”, have you undertaken to bring these records into compliance with current practice? Please describe any steps you have taken to bring these names/records into compliance.</p>	<p>5b. <b>Yes: *</b></p> <p><b>No: AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response
<p>*If yes, please describe the nature of and the approximate dates of any changes.</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> <b>AK:</b> Yes, in 1998, new indexing database created which separated the fields. <b>CA:</b> Until August 1994, our data entry practice was to use common abbreviations in keying debtor names due to field length limitations. Our old cert program would store the full word equivalents in a table and would reflect both abbreviated version and full-length version in standard search logic results. We've gone thru 2 new system conversions since then and went thru data clean up efforts (some automated, some manual) to identify and replace affected records to reflect the name actually submitted. <b>CO:</b> Not yet, see comment in 5A. <b>IL:</b> No action has been undertaken by the filing office. If a filer notifies the filing officer of a name that has been altered, we will correct that name and file a filing Officer Statement on the record. In November 2005, approximately 3300 Trust names were corrected. <b>IA:</b> Yes, review abbreviated words like "mfg" and "manufacturing" in the name field and then reviewed the document. In cases where we did a substitution, we corrected the entry and placed a filing office statement in the record. We always review both the abbreviated word and the abbreviation. We found that we had substituted in both directions!! <b>KS:</b> We change names as we find the need, and we have had a database clean up project to find and fix names that are not complete. Our most recent database project spanned 2006. <b>KY:</b> All Pre-RA9 filings were re-indexed before RA9 went into effect. Kentucky was a county filing state, so the number was small. <b>ME:</b> During the summer and early fall of 2001, our office corrected the index of the name of the debtor to reflect the name provided on the filing at the time presented for filing; created and appropriately linked Filing Officer Statements for all corrected names; and did a name search to verify the names would now appear using the name presented for filing. <b>MA:</b> Years ago, the wang system only provided one data entry field that was limited to 40 characters. Any organization name that was longer than 40 characters was abbreviated. These organizations have since been manually re-data entered and corrected so the entire name is listed in the organization field. <b>MI:</b> The</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
	last name and organization fields now accept 250 characters. Records are corrected on a case-by-case basis with a filing officer statement, if required, given the name on a document does not agree with the data entered name. <b>OR:</b> Manual correction in 1996. <b>PA:</b> We began changing the indexing of these names November 2004 upon request from the customer. <b>UT:</b> Only bring into compliance as requested by filer.	
6a. Has your office <b>ever</b> removed corporate name endings during data entry?	<p>6a. <b>Yes: AK, KY, MN, PA, UT. *</b></p> <p><b>No: AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, LA, ME, MA, MD, MI, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, RI, SD, TN, TX, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments: AK:</b> Prior to 1998. <b>PA:</b> We were limited to 40 characters in the debtor name, so any name with more characters was truncated. <b>UT:</b> Pre-RA9.</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response	
<p>6b. Does your office <b>currently</b> remove corporate endings during data entry?</p> <p>*If “yes”, do you remove the first ending, all endings, a set number of endings or other? Please indicate your response in the box to the right.</p> <p>If your answer to 6a or 6b is “Yes”, have you undertaken to bring these records into compliance with current practice, if current and past practice are not the same? Please describe any steps you have taken to bring these names/records into compliance.</p>	<p>6b. <b>Yes:</b></p> <p><b>No: AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY, BC, ON, Romania, New Zealand.</b></p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p>
	<p>First ending: Yes:           No: <b>OH, OR, RI</b>  All endings: Yes: <b>AK, UT</b>       No: <b>OH, OR, RI</b>  A set number of endings: Yes: <b>MN</b>       No: <b>OH, OR, RI</b>  Other: Please describe:</p>	
	<p><b>AK:</b> Yes, prior to 1998 new database conversion. <b>KY:</b> All Pre-RA9 filings were re-indexed before RA9 went into effect. Kentucky was a county filing state, so the number was small. <b>UT:</b> Only as requested by filer. <b>MN:</b> Descriptive statements such as "general partnership" that were not considered part of the name were not entered. <b>PA:</b> We began changing the indexing of these names November 2004 upon request from the customer.</p>	

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response
<p>7. Do you currently connect the true or legal name of an entity to any and all former name or other fictitious names or assumed names used by that entity? For example, will searches on the former name of “ABC Original Investments” and/or the fictitious or assumed name of “Quick Monies, Inc.” find and connect to the true or legal name now on your records of “ABC Modified Investments”?</p>	<p><b>Yes: AK:</b> No, only connected by serial numbers. <b>AR, CT:</b> If they appear on subsequent filings to the original financing statement. <b>DE:</b> Yes, we connect but only to the true and legal former name as our office does not recognize fictitious or assumed names. <b>KS:</b> Only if those names were changed on a UCC Filing and become part of the UCC Record – as in adding a debtor name to the record, if a filing was made to change the debtor. <b>ME:</b> As with any other UCC-3 filing that amended an existing record, our office links it to the appropriate UCC-1 filing. <b>MA:</b> Name changes were captured by our system commencing in 1982. From 1982 forward, all prior names will connect to the most recent entity name. <b>PA. RI:</b> If you query under "Quick Monies, Inc." the search will yield "Quick Monies, Inc." identified as a "fictitious business name" and opens to the record of "ABC Original Investments" <b>WV.</b></p> <p><b>No: CA, CO, IN, IA:</b> Not in our system yet. <b>KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NJ, ND:</b> only if search is conducted under FEIN, <b>OR, SD, TN, TX, UT:</b> not on UCC System. <b>VA, WA, WY, BC, ON:</b> This will only occur if the registrant takes such action through the filing of an amendment. <b>Romania:</b> If an entity has changed the name (legal) and the creditor hasn't submitted the change, then, if a search on the new name (legal) is performed, the result will be null. Any way, people are encouraged to perform searches not only having as criteria the name of the legal entity, but it's numerical attribute (fiscal code) as well as this one doesn't change. <b>New Zealand.</b></p> <p><b>IL:</b> Not Applicable. <b>OH:</b> Pre-RA9 if cross-referenced within the debtor box on the financing statement. Post-RA9 only if shown as an additional debtor on standard form.</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

Survey Question	Response
<p>Revised Question 7a: Do you currently index all party names on a UCC filing including current (if amended) and original names?</p>	<p>Yes, we index all names including current (amended) and original names:  <b>AK, AL, CA, CO, FL, GA, IL, KS, KY, LA, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NE, NV, OH, TN, TX, WA, WY, BC, Romania</b></p> <p>No, only the current name is maintained on the index:  <b>IN, OK, UT*, Bermuda</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> <b>UT:</b> Only the amended name is indexed as an ACTIVE party</p>

International Association of Commercial Administrators  
Indexing Standards Workgroup Survey – STS Organization Names

**Section II: Secured Transactions  
Survey**

<b>Survey Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Revised Question7b</p> <p>If your business entity and secured transaction databases are linked, do you index the UCC filing against the true and legal name of the entity along with all former and/or fictitious or assumed names?</p>	<p>Yes, we index current, former, and fictitious/assumed party names against the UCC filing:</p> <p>Yes, we index current and former names against the UCC filing but our jurisdiction doesn't record/index fictitious/assumed names:</p> <p>No, we only index the names as presented on the UCC filing:</p> <p><b>IN, OH, UT, BC, Bermuda</b></p> <p>Not applicable; we do not link our business entity and secured transaction databases:</p> <p><b>AK, AL, CA, CO, FL, GA, IL, KS, KY, LA, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NE, NV, OK, TN, TX, WA, WY, Romania</b></p>