

**TO:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**FROM:** Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

**SUBJECT: Persistent identifiers and URLs**

---

CILIP greatly appreciates the clarity which ACOC has brought to the revised proposal, especially the way in which the revision pulls together all the outstanding strands from the original document and the constituency responses.

There are two places in this new version where the reader is referred to “Issue 10. *Persistent identifiers*”; CILIP has assumed these that these intended to refer to issue 3 and has responded accordingly.

**2.13.2.1.** The revised wording, avoiding the use of “resolvable”, certainly seems clearer in its meaning.

**5.X.0.5.** ACOC has managed to avoid the use of the term “resolvable” in its revised proposal for 2.13.2.1; it would be nice to avoid its use here, if that were possible.

Also in 5.X.0.5, it occurs to CILIP that most of the instructions are actually nothing to do with changes *in* the URLs themselves, but changes that cataloguers are asked to make to records as a consequence of some other situation occurring (additional URL becoming available, existing URL no longer resolving). Is there some way of reflecting this in the caption to 5.X.0.5?

**Question 1.** CILIP thinks it reasonable to expand the definition to include identifiers assigned by registration agencies of other standards bodies but can offer no specific suggestions for these.

**Question 2.** On balance it seems better to remove the distinction. Hopefully common sense (or “cataloguer judgment” as it’s sometimes known) would lead RDA users to prefer the “best” identifier in order to meet the requirements of 1.4.

**Issue 3.** CILIP agrees the proposed handling of persistent identifiers, noting that the final outcome is dependent on responses to earlier questions.

**Question 4.** There’s probably no “right” answer to this (only a few “wrong” ones), but CILIP would suggest placing the new instruction to precede 5.2.

**Question 5.** CILIP has a slight preference for “Uniform Resource Locator”, but agrees the ACOC suggestion that this might usefully be pursued with other resource description communities before a final decision is taken.

**Question 6.** Yes, remove “global” from the definition.

**Question 7.** Disagree. Whilst sympathetic to the accuracy issue that ALA highlighted in its original response, use of the URL in the browser window is often going to lead to a less permanent address being recorded than would be the case if some external source were used. For instance, the recognised and hopefully permanent URL for CILIP’s own website is

<http://www.cilip.org.uk>

but currently connections to this address produce in the browser window

<http://www.cilip.org.uk/default.cilip>

a URL which is less likely to stand the test of time than the simpler, advertised one above. This situation is quite common.

**Question 8.** Yes, combine them.

**Question 9.** CILIP notes that the revised ACOC proposal already omits the sentence referred to.

**Question 10.** Agree with ALA that the note should not be necessary. If it were to be retained, then CILIP prefers ACOC’s new wording.

**Question 11.** It seems problematic to make such explicit provision when similar provisions aren’t explicitly made for other elements. CILIP would prefer a silent approach to this issue on *RDA*’s part.