To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Mirna Willer, IFLA, Cataloguing Section's ISBD Review Group, chair

Discussion paper: Alignment of the ISBD element set with RDA element set – RDA, Appendix D.1

Background

The ISBD RG, ISSN Network with JSC/RDA harmonization meeting, Glasgow, November 2011[1] stressed the importance of the alignment of the three standards, and agreed that "the purpose of harmonization is to make RDA, ISSN and ISBD records functionally interoperable. That is, records valid under one of the standards should be capable of being mapped to either of the other standards. It is recognised that some issues will take longer to resolve than others and a few issues may prove to be irreconcilable, but steps can be taken to limit the impact of such differences".[2]

Actions 6 and 24 of the Outcomes specifically dealt with this issue:

> 6. Appendix D.1, ISBD Presentation in RDA: ISBD RG will submit a proposal to JSC to update Appendix D in line with the current version of the consolidated ISBD. Appendix D will also be developed into an application profile by the addition of guidelines regarding mandatory elements and choice of alternatives and options

> 24. Mappings: JSC and ISBD agreed to set up a task group to look at Appendix D mappings between RDA and ISBD and between ISBD and RDA elements.

As a first stage in furthering the outcomes of the harmonization meeting, the ISBD Review Group adopted at its meeting on 13 August 2012 the appended document *Alignment of the ISBD: International Standard Bibliographic Description element set with RDA: Resource Description & Access element set*. The Cataloguing Section's Standing Committee had approved the document on 24 September 2012. The document is versioned 1.1, 24 September 2012.

ISBD Review Group would appreciate JSC/RDA's comments on the alignment in order to publish the new version approved by both committees.

Alignment issues

The following issues caused particular problems, so further discussion is expected:

1. Elements for identifiers. The difficulty arises because of the undetermined relationship between ISBD's Resource entity and RDA's Work/Expression/Manifestation/Item entities. Although ISBD is implicitly focused on Resource = Manifestation, it necessarily has to cover Item, Expression, and Work. One argument is that

---

[1] http://www.rda-jsc.org/2011jscisbdissnoutcomes.html
[2] http://www.rda-jsc.org/JSCISBDISSNOutcomesfinal.pdf

the ISBD identifier elements should be confined to Manifestation identifiers, but the ISBD text covers any identifier assigned by a publisher to a resource. So, for example, if an International Standard Work Number system was developed, the ISBD identifier elements should include it.

2. Elements for series and subseries. ISBD treats series and subseries with the same elements, whereas RDA has separate elements.

3. Elements for ISBD aggregate statement components. ISBD has common title, dependent title, and dependent title designation elements which are combined to form title (proper) elements; the title elements are therefore aggregate statements, and there is a part/whole relationship between the components and the aggregation. The alignments of these ISBD component elements with the RDA elements for titles use "narrower" (<), although this is not quite the same, semantically, as the correct (component) "part" alignment.

Appendix D.1

The alignment will form part of a future proposal to update Appendix D.1. Information about the application of ISBD punctuation will be discussed by ISBD Review Group during 2012/2013 as it continues to work on the outcomes of the harmonization meeting.

The lack of an alignment from RDA elements to ISBD elements is not viewed as a barrier to the revision of Appendix D.1 or the ongoing development of a profile for applying RDA instructions to ISBD elements.

Mappings

The alignment will form the basis of the development of mappings between ISBD and RDA elements in Resource Description Framework, using the ISBD and RDA namespaces.

JSC/RDA is asked to note the observations that

•   There are elements lacking in one or the other content standard.
•   The definitions of elements with the same label can be broader or the same irrespective of the standard.

These have implications for the methodology given in 6JSC/Chair/4 *Mapping ISBD and RDA element set*, and specifically in the context of unconstrained elements. For example, it will be necessary to develop unconstrained ISBD elements and map RDA elements to them.
ISBD Review Group would appreciate JSC/RDA's comments on these issues.

ISBD Review Group has so far been unable to develop an alignment from RDA element to ISBD elements due to lack of funding. ISBD Review Group will endeavour to work on this alignment in 2013 if resources permit.
ISBD Review Group asks JSC/RDA to note the position, and would welcome alternative suggestions for furthering the work.