UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR   DATE: Sept. 13, 2006

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Persistent identifiers and URLS

2.13.1 Standard Number

1. Athough LC still prefers to remove the distinction between "standard" and "other" identifiers, if the distinction is maintained, LC agrees to the switch from "standard number" to "standard identifier."

2. LC agrees to the "in case of doubt" clause.

2.13.2 Other resource identifiers

If this section is retained, LC agrees to the revisions. Given the concerns regarding "resolvable" or "actionable" in the last bullet of the instruction, LC proposes the following—it is somewhat wordier, but should leave little doubt as to what is meant:

% For other resource identifiers that are structured as Uniform Resource Identifiers (i.e., with Internet protocol and address) that resolve to an online resource using a standard Internet browser, see 5.X.

This same wording could be used at 5.X.0.1 and 2.13.1.1.

5.X Uniform Resource Locators

LC would prefer to refer to Uniform Resource Identifiers rather than Uniform Resource Locators.

In addition to the responses below (see questions 5, 6, 8, 9) LC offers the following suggestions on the 5.X proposals:

5.X.0.4: We don't believe the first bullet offers much assistance, and may contradict 5.X.0.3 by adding an additional stipulation (policy of the agency) even for "one" URI. Or, should it begin "Record more than one …" rather than "Record one or more …"?

5.X.0.5: The first bullet seems unnecessary, as the next three bullets cover the other conditions (add an additional URI, change to a better URI, delete a bad URI). If the first bullet is kept, the next three should be indented under it.

1.7.7 Notes citing Uniform Resource Locators for Related Resources

LC agrees with the proposed revisions, but would prefer "Identifier" over "Locator."

Remaining Issues

Question 1.
In general, we agree with CCC that restricting standard identifiers to ISO-approved schemes is limiting.

Question 2.
LC still feels that the separation between "standard" and "other" identifiers is unnecessary, but would accept this distinction if that is the method preferred by the other JSC constituents.

Question 3.
LC proposes the following re-wording of the definition of "standard identifier" intended to: 1) indicate that identifiers can apply to both a work and manifestation level, 2) mentions ISO but does not limit to ISO. Some "persistent identifiers" might meet this definition, but others won't, so we do not think it is appropriate to add the sentence regarding them.

  ☐ A **standard identifier** is a permanent, location-independent, and unique identifier for a work, expression, manifestation, or item. Standard identifiers are assigned following guidelines issued by authorized registration agencies for identifier schemes (e.g., the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)). Standard identifiers may be assigned to resources in both analog and digital formats.

Question 4.
LC would prefer to see the rules for Uniform Resource Identifiers for online resources added fairly early in Chapter 5 (e.g., after 5.2), but would accept other alternatives.

Question 5.
Yes, LC would prefer that "Uniform Resource Identifier" replace "Uniform Resource Locator".

Question 6.
Agree that "global" could be misunderstood. LC suggests a minor modification of the Wikipedia definition for use at 5.X.0.1 as follows:
  ☐ A **Uniform Resource Identifier (URI)** is a string of characters used to identify or name a digital resource. The main purpose of this identification is to enable interaction with representations of the resource over a network, typically the World Wide Web, using specific protocols. URIs are defined in schemes defining a specific syntax and associated protocols.

Question 7.
LC does not agree that URLs should be taken only from the browser address window; many URLs, specifically those that resolve to database entries, are the result of a query string that is resolved in some manner (e.g., CGI script, SRU/SRW string) and the on-the-fly search result page itself is not persistent. For this reason (among others) it is not uncommon to see resulting pages with info such as "do not bookmark this page."

Question 8.
Yes, this could simplify the approach—note, however, LC's question above about the usefulness of the first bullet at 5.X.0.4.

Question 9.
Agree.

Question 10.
Actually, LC asked to replace "nature and scope" with "scope and location" (not "nature and scope and location"); our concern was that use of the term "nature and scope" in 1.7.7 would be confused with section 4.3 (Nature and scope of the content). The ACOC-provided text for 1.7.7 found in this proposal (5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev) is fine from our perspective. Apologies for any confusion.

Question 11.
See LC response to Question 3 above, where "works" and "manifestations" are both mentioned.