

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

**FROM:** Hugh Taylor, CILIP representative

**SUBJECT: Persistent identifiers and URLs**

---

CILIP's response follows the order and headings used in 5JSC/ACOC/1.

## **Background**

ACOC states a preference for “online resource” over the existing “remote access resource”, but doesn't offer any reasons to support this preference. CILIP's preference, on the other hand, is to retain the term “remote access resource”. Keeping that phrase clearly distinguishes remote from direct access e-resources. This can be an important distinction since the user may, for example, be unaware that s/he is viewing a direct access e-resource when it has been networked across a campus. Some may not wish to be aware, but some may care about what they are citing if they wish to cite from the e-resource. Very often resources are transformed over time; direct access and remote access versions can exist simultaneously before one supersedes the other. Which one are they citing? Eliding the distinction between the two types of e-resource would make these matters more complex to explain than they already are.

We note that all examples will be subject to review by the Examples Group and would like to draw particular attention to the second example at X.X.0.4 and the example proposed for 4.9. Both lack clarity outside the context which supplied them (although they are perfectly adequate otherwise as examples of the particular point under discussion).

### **1. Standard numbers and other resource identifiers**

### **2. Persistent identifiers**

CILIP recommends the following change to the definition of persistent identifier proposed for inclusion in the Glossary:

A persistent identifier is a permanent, ~~location-independent and~~ globally unique identifier for a resource.

### **3. URL of the online resource described by the bibliographic record**

CILIP notes that FRBR has URL as an attribute of Manifestation. RDA will need to be clear what it aims to say about the inclusion of URLs in bibliographic (rather than holdings) data, since to many potential users of RDA their inclusion in bibliographic records may be unexpected.

X.X.0.3. The instruction to record URLs for related resources needs to be considered in the context of Part II of RDA. We note, too, that URLs for related resources may well be appropriate as access points.

X.X.0.5. CILIP feels that this rule is misconceived. If it were followed, then it would debar many URLs from being included in records. The preference in the first paragraph for free and open access resources is an arbitrary one so far as the validity of the resource itself is concerned. The exclusion of paid-for resources' URLs in records should be the concern of system vendors and the like, not of a cataloguing code. If the rationale of the rule derives from the fact that paid-for resources' URLs should be in holdings records then it would be better to state that explicitly.

X.X.0.6. This rule doesn't read well, and it is difficult, therefore, to make complete sense of it.

CILIP suggests the following as the basis for rewording of the rule – we are conscious that it is not a finished revision, but being unsure whether we had the right sense of what ACOC was aiming to achieve, we have simply aimed to start a process of clarification.

Record subsequently created (identified?) URLs, including minor amendments, as additional instances of the element. Remove instances of the element for URLs which are no longer valid. Record deleted instances in a note.

#### Placement of the proposed instruction.

Option 1. This doesn't "fit" because the first part of a URL is the Internet protocol (http, ftp, etc.). MARC21 copes with this in tag 856 by using an indicator for the protocol, and subfield u for the URL, which therefore, and necessarily, repeats the protocol information. Note that this is part of an ongoing debate in the development of collection-level description metadata standards as to whether the URL of a digital collection should be treated as an attribute of location or service.

Option 2. CILIP feels that this is, in principle, the most appropriate of the options suggested. But we recognise that it requires a redrafting of the definition at 6.2.0.1 of the Part I draft.

Option 3. We have doubts about the desirability of aligning URLs so closely with 6.4 and 6.5. But we could accept the general approach of this option.

#### **4. URLs for related resources referred to in the record**

We would ask that the Examples Group consider including at 4.10.1.6 (or in any supplementary resource providing additional examples) an example showing multiple URLs for resources available in more than one language.