

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1/JSC response

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/2/JSC response

February 18, 2013

TO: Mirna Willer, Chair
ISBD Review Group

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, Chair
Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

SUBJECT: JSC Response to the two Discussion Papers from the ISBD Review Group –
6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1 Alignment of ISBD and RDA Element Sets
and
6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/2 and Mapping of ISBD Area 0

The JSC sends our thanks to the ISBD Review Group for submitting the discussion papers and recognizes the work of Gordon Dunsire in preparing these mappings and analyses. Gordon is now the CILIP Representative to the JSC, so we were able to benefit from his explanations during our Chicago meeting.

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1 Alignment of ISBD and RDA Element Sets

1. **RDA Appendix D.1.** After the joint meetings in Glasgow in 2011, the JSC expected the ISBD Review Group to review RDA Appendix D to assure it is in line with the current version of the Consolidated ISBD. We would welcome a proposal for any areas where you find they are not in alignment.
2. **Mappings. Elements not in ISBD.** In the ISBD/Discussion 1 regarding alignment of the ISBD and RDA element sets, we all recognize the elements will never be exactly the same, as ISBD does not include access data, but only description. Even for description, ISBD lacks some of the RDA elements, and we would be interested to know if ISBD Review Group is considering adding them or are these acceptable differences? Some examples are variant title, earlier title proper, later title proper, abbreviated title.

The table, "Alignment of the ISBD...element set with RDA...element set" is a valuable starter document to identify specific elements where it is felt that ISBD and RDA are different. The JSC would find it helpful if the ISBD Review Group would suggest where these differences are a barrier to interoperability and where they are not. We also would welcome suggestions regarding unconstrained ISBD elements and the mapping of RDA elements to them.

The JSC notes that many of the differences are due to RDA being more granular/detailed as well as the differences in coverage for the two standards being different (RDA covering both description and access, while ISBD covers description only). Is the ISBD Review Group suggesting that RDA should become less granular or the ISBD needs to be more granular?

The JSC feels it would be counterproductive to make RDA less granular, as our community has expressed the need for the existing elements.

3. **Comments on the mappings.** Not all of the mappings are completely clear at first glance. Some mappings to RDA do not seem to be at the equivalent element, but instead to either a broader or a narrower element. For example:

* ISBD 1.4 “Statement of responsibility relating to the title” show as being “=” to RDA 2.4 (Statement of responsibility), but it could be seen as “<” that element and “=” to RDA’s statement of responsibility related to the title proper?

* ISBD 3.2.1, Music Format statement is shown as “=” to RDA 7.20 (Format of notated music), when it is “=” 2.5 Edition statement. That is, RDA considers such statements (as transcribed from the resource) as a type of edition statement.

* ISBD 3.3.2, Numeric designation is shown as “>” two RDA elements, but there is an equivalent element at RDA 2.6 Numeric designation that would be “=”.

* ISBD 3.3.5, Parallel numbering system is shown as “<” Numbering of serials at RDA 2.6, but in fact RDA has specific numeric elements for more than one language or script at 2.6.2.4, 2.6.3.4, 2.6.4.4, and 2.6.5.4

* ISBD 3.3.7, Subsequent numbering system is shown as “<” RDA 2.6, but RDA has “=” at RDA 2.6.6

* ISBD 3.3.7, Subsequent numbering system shows on the table as “<” Numbering of serials at 2.6 in RDA, but there is a possible “=” mapping at RDA 2.6.6.

* In another situation, the ISBD is shown to be “>” when in fact there are several RDA elements that are “=” (e.g., Additions to place of publication in ISBD 4.1.9 has RDA 2.7.2.3, 2.8.2.3, 2.9.2.3, 2.10.2.3 for optional additions). It seems that these are ‘interoperable’, but RDA is more granular.

* ISBD 5.1.4, Pagination is shown to be “<” RDA 3.4 Extent, but there is RDA 3.4.5 Extent of Text which is “=”

*An example where RDA is more granular is ISBD 5.2.2 Composition of material, and RDA has Base material at 3.6, Applied material at 3.7, and Mount at 3.8.

There is an oddity at ISBD 7.0.3 Note on frequency, where the correct RDA Note on Frequency is 2.20.12, but is shown as “>”, which should be “=”; and the table also shows “>” RDA 2.14 Frequency – but it is not clear why that was included in this table.

Another oddity is at ISBD 7.0.5 Note on mode of access, where there is also the “=” RDA 3.3, Carrier type for Online resource.

For the Notes on bibliographic history at ISBD 7.2.3, we observe that RDA has many notes and relationships and as a whole is equivalent to ISBD, so it is not clear why some of these are shown as “<” or “>”.

The ‘notes’ column often helps explain the “<” and “>” assignments, but the notes are not always given – this would help considerably in understanding the accuracy of the mappings. Further annotation could be made to indicate when the elements are equivalent, if one considers levels of granularity to still be equivalent.

4. **Next steps?** Would it be helpful for the ISBD Review Group and the JSC to decide whether these hierarchical and granular issues reflect real differences for which interoperability is still achieved, or whether they must be brought in line with each other?

Is it important to note the granularity issues even where the resulting interoperability is not affected, so that the differences are recorded in a registry mapping namespaces?

Does the ISBD Review Group have an interest in being more granular than it is today, or will the mappings support interoperability? Should we use this table to identify the specific areas for future discussion? Perhaps the ISBD Review Group can make specific proposals.

Is the goal of this table to register the mappings for future systems to use for machine-actionable data? Is so, then we should reach agreement so such a table can be publicly available for various users.

We hope the ISBD Review Group can get funding to complete the reciprocal RDA to ISBD table.

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/2 describing the ISBD Area 0 vocabularies as they map to the RDA/ONIX Framework

The mapping information is very interesting and clearly only half of the picture. The JSC, at our November 2012 meeting, agreed that we now need to do a similar mapping of the RDA vocabulary and share our analysis with you. However, you may already be aware that our UK representatives (Alan Danskin and Gordon Dunsire) are working with the ONIX counterparts to open up discussion again about the RDA/ONIX Framework, and we look forward to further work in that area during 2013. **We would like to extend an invitation to your Group to participate with Alan Danskin and Gordon in those discussions.** If you are interested, please contact Alan at this email address: alan.danskin@bl.org. Those discussions may

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1/JSC response

6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/2/JSC response

February 18, 2013

change a mapping exercise, so we will put the task for a reciprocal mapping temporarily on hold until after those RDA/ONIX Framework discussions.

Regarding specific suggestions in your discussion paper, on p. 2, it is not clear how this mapping would fit into the RDA Appendix D.1, and we would still welcome a proposal for any updates to Appendix D.1 you wish to offer.

Priorities

Knowing that the members of our two groups are busy people, it would help to agree on priorities for next steps. What are the goals for the mappings? What elements do we need to address in order to establish interoperability? From these tables and mappings, it is not clear where the gaps are. Perhaps the ISBD proposal can identify those as a focus for further joint work.