

Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/ACOC/1/LC response

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR DATE: Mar. 10, 2006

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Persistent identifiers and URLs

LC appreciates the work of ACOC to include persistent identifiers and URLs in descriptions prepared using *RDA*, especially the useful separation of the concept of “resource identifiers” and “locations.”

After seeing the draft of Part I of *RDA* that so clearly distinguishes “elements,” and is not tied to the *AACR2* practice of treating some numbers/identifiers in Area 8 and others in Area 7, we are struck by how much easier it might be under *RDA* to combine 2.12.1 and 2.12.2 as a single element (resource identifier). In the context of *RDA*, the continued distinction does not seem important, and combining them may have the following advantages:

- Cataloguers would not have to judge whether an unfamiliar identifier should be treated under one rule or the other.
- It would not be necessary in the future to move “other” identifiers to “standard numbers” as the schemes progress through the standards process (as pointed out in the ACOC explanation of the treatment of DOIs); it is also clear that some identifiers approved by groups such as the IETF may decide not to seek ISO approval for various reasons.
- Because content designation schemes already accommodate the encoding of particular types of numbers (e.g., using tags, indicators, or subfields in MARC 21, or “type” attributes in identifier tags of certain XML schemas), the differences between identifiers are already distinguishable in resulting records.

LC, therefore, proposes the following:

1. Combine 2.12.1 (standard number) and 2.12.2 (other resource identifiers) and rename the element “Resource identifiers.”
2. Adjust the definitions in 2.12.0.1 to eliminate the second bullet, and combine the third and fourth bullets to provide a more generic definition of resource identifiers.
3. Keep the additional examples proposed for 2.12.2.1 as well as the new second paragraph.

4. Delete the first paragraph at X.X.0.5 (or make it an optional paragraph to X.X.0.4).
5. Adjust X.X.0.6 as follows, to clarify the distinctions between “adding” an additional URL, dealing with a “changed” URL (when a replacement is available), and dealing with a URL that no longer resolves and no replacement is available.
 - ~~If a Uniform Resource Locator is added or changed, revise the Uniform Resource Locator as appropriate. If a Uniform Resource Locator is deleted, delete the Uniform Resource Locator and record the deletion in a note.~~
 - If another Uniform Resource Locator becomes available, add it to the description, if appropriate (see X.X.0.4).
 - If a Uniform Resource Locator no longer resolves to the resource, revise the Uniform Resource Locator to reflect a location that is resolvable.
 - If a Uniform Resource Locator no longer resolves to the resource, and a resolvable location cannot be determined, remove the Uniform Resource Locator and record it in a note.
6. Adjust the proposed paragraph at 1.7.7 as follows to eliminate any possible confusion with “nature and scope” notes:
 - Uniform Resource Locators for related resources can be cited in any note that provides information on the ~~nature and scope~~ and location of the related resource.
7. Place the proposed X.X instructions with the terms of availability, etc., in Chapter 5 (ACOC’s *Option 3*).
8. If the JSC decides to maintain the distinction between Standard Numbers and Other Resource Identifiers, add the following as a second paragraph in 2.12.1.1:
 - In case of doubt as to whether a resource identifier is a standard number or not, treat it as an other resource identifier (see 2.12.2).