

To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
From: Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
Subject: Persistent identifiers and URLs

CCC has reviewed the revised ACOC proposal and responds as follows to the questions posed in 5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev as remaining issues for discussion.

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?

CCC feels that the definition should be limited to identifiers assigned by registration agencies of other international standards bodies.

Question 2: Should the distinction between standard identifiers and other resource identifiers be retained?

CCC is in favour of retaining the distinction between standard identifiers and other forms of resource identifiers.

In response to the point mentioned in the 3rd bullet, examples of URN and DOI could still be added to the instruction if the wording proposed in 5JSC/ACOC/1/CCC response was adopted, i.e. "*an identifier scheme approved by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) or an equivalent international standards body such as the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)*". The DOI is under development as an ISO standard and the URN is a standard of the Internet Engineering Task Force.

Issue 3: Persistent identifiers and Standard identifiers

CCC notes ACOC's determination to have the term "persistent identifier" explicitly mentioned in RDA but feels that in doing so it is necessary to also supply an adequate definition of the term as a distinct type of identifier. On that basis we still have concerns about including the term in RDA.

Question 4: Where should the new instruction for Uniform Resource Locators be placed?

CCC suggests that this instruction be placed near 5.2. Terms of availability.

Question 5: Should the "Uniform Resource Identifier" (URI) be used in place of "Uniform Resource Locator"?

Since CCC notes that there appears to be no consensus that the URI will replace the URL, CCC suggests keeping "Uniform Resource Locator" (URL).

Question 6: Should "global" be removed from the definition of Uniform Resource Locator as recommended in 5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response?

Could ALA supply an example of a URL that would not be a global address? Otherwise, we see no need to remove the word "global" from the definition.

Question 7: Should cataloguers take URLs only from the browser address window displaying the resource as suggested in 5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response?

No. CCC feels that this is an area where RDA should allow for cataloguer's judgment to permit the URL to be transcribed from elsewhere in the item when appropriate. The address shown in the browser window may contain a mix of search query instructions in addition to the domain name and directory path.

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?

CCC does not agree that the instructions can be combined because the effect would be an instruction which implies that recording even one URL would be subject to the policy of the agency preparing the description. Could ALA accompany its proposal with a suggested wording that would avoid this implication?

Question 9: Should the second sentence be deleted as suggested in 5JSC/ACOC/1/ALA response?

CCC agrees with the deletion of the second sentence from the first bullet of X.X.0.4 in 5JSC/ACOC/1, i.e.: "*If readily available, also record the resolvable persistent identifier.*"

Issue 10 and Question 10 [1.7.7, Notes citing uniform resource locators for related resources]: Should the proposed new instruction be given, and if so, in what form?

CCC prefers the broader wording given in 5/JSC/ACOC/1/Rev, i.e.: "*Uniform Resource Locators for related resources can be cited in any note if appropriate.*"

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?

Our general feeling is no, but CCC would like more information to clarify the context of the question.