

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
FROM: Alan Danskin, British Library representative to JSC
SUBJECT: Persistent identifiers and URLs

General Comments

Where is the coverage for URLs for resources in multiple languages?

Specific Comments on proposed revisions

2.13.1.1

1. BL supports the ACOC proposal.
2. BL supports the ACOC proposal.

2.13.2.1. BL Supports the ACOC proposal

5.X BL Supports the ACOC proposal

2.13.01. The instruction is to treat persistent identifiers as a type of standard identifiers. This seems pragmatic, but persistent identifiers don't necessarily conform to the definition for standard identifiers. Specifically the issue of ISO approval. BL suggests moving this sentence to a separate bullet and amending as follows:

“Treat persistent identifiers as if they were a type of standard identifier.”

Question 1.

Should the definition of Standard identifier be expanded to include identifiers assigned by registration agencies of other standards bodies, and if so which ones?

This becomes moot if the distinction between standard identifiers and other resource identifiers is removed.

Question 2.

Should the distinction between Standard identifiers and Other resource identifiers be retained?

BL is not convinced that this is a valuable distinction. It is more important to know what the identifier is rather than to assign it to a class. There may also be a maintenance issue as “other” identifiers become standards.

Question 4

Where should the new instruction for Uniform Resource Locators be placed?

No opinion.

Question 5

Should the “Uniform Resource Identifier” (URI) be used in place of “Uniform Resource Locator”?

Yes. URI is the generic term encompassing URNs, which we presumably do not want to exclude, as well as URLs.

Question 7

Should cataloguers take URLs only from the browser address window displaying the resource as suggested in *5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response*?

BL supports this proposal in principle, but suggests it should be recommended rather than mandatory as there may be some practical obstacles. For example if access requires mediation, such as password.

Question 8

Should the instructions at 5.X.0.3 and 5.X.0.4 (single and multiple URLs) be combined as suggested in *5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response*?

BL supports the ALA recommendation to combine these instructions.

Question 9

Should the second sentence be deleted as suggested in *5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response*?

5.X.0.4 only has one sentence.

Issue 10. 1.7.7. Notes citing uniform resource locators for related resources

5JSC/ACOC/1/LC response recommends replacing 'nature or scope' with 'nature and scope and location'. ACOC notes that the intention of their initial proposal was not to limit the type of notes in which a URL can be cited, and so would prefer rewording in the broadest possible terms.

Question 10

Should the proposed new instruction be given, and if so, in what form?

BL supports the new instruction.

Question 11

Should RDA explicitly provide instructions for recording identifiers at all FRBR levels (work, expression, manifestation, and item), and if so, where should these instructions be placed?

BL 1)Yes. 2) We have no view on this.