ALA Webinar

Application profiles: a deeper dive (and how not to drown)

Melissa Parent 3rd/4th March 2022



STATE LIBRARY VICTORIA



Outline

Key information

• Application profile basics

Getting started

Refocusing

General advice

Whirlpools

- Entity based APs?
- Coherent & minimum description
- Your implementation scenario



Application profile basics



Guidance > Application Profiles specifications

- The RDA <u>entities</u> that may be included & their repeatability
- 0
- The RDA <u>elements</u> that may be included & their repeatability
- Minimum description requirements must be met



- Recording method per element
- Vocabulary Encoding Scheme and/or String Encoding Scheme per element *
- Transcription method per element *



Coherent and minimum description

Guidance > Resource description > Coherent description of an information resource

Coherent description of an information resource

Resource entity relationships for constructing a coherent

description

A coherent description of an information resource is formed by relating the descriptions of its Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item entities using the following relationship elements:

- An item is related to its manifestation using Item: manifestation exemplified ->=
- A manifestation is related to its item using Manifestation: exemplar of manifestation →
- A manifestation is directly related to its work using Manifestation: work manifested →
- A manifestation is related to its expression using Manifestation: expression manifested →
- An expression is related to its manifestation using Expression: manifestation or expression 1
- An expression is related to its work using Expression: work expressed → 1
- A work is related to its expression using Work: expression of work-3
- A work is directly related to its manifestation using Work: manifestation of work

Minimum description of a manifestation

A minimum description of a manifestation must include the following set of elements:

 Manifestation: appellation of manifestation → ○ or Manifestation: title of manifestation → ■ or Manifestation: title proper → or Manifestation: access point for manifestation → • or Manifestation: authorized access point for manifestation -• or Manifestation: identifier for manifestation ->] Manifestation: expression manifested -> with a value of: Expression: appellation of expression → ■ or Expression: title of expression → ■ or Expression: preferred title of expression → ■ or Expression: access point for expression → ■ or Expression: authorized access point for expression → ■ or Expression: identifier for expression → • or IRI for an expression • or Manifestation: work manifested → with a value of: Work: appellation of work → or Work: title of work → ■ or Work: preferred title of work → ■ or Work: access point for work → ■ or Work: authorized access point for work → ■ or Work: identifier for work → • or IRI for a work





The RDA <u>entities</u> that may be included & repeatability

Scenario C – AP work will be good enough

Non-MARC Implementations – AP work must be more considered





The RDA <u>elements</u> that may be included & their repeatability

Scenario C – repeatability according to MARC or according to RDA?

Non-MARC implementations – AP work will be good enough *



Minimum description requirements must be met



Scenario C

format type	Toolkitlabel	Curie	domain	range	Min	Max	MARC alignment	occurence minimum (M, MA, O)
01, monos	appellation of expression	rdae:P20311	Expression	Nomen	0	1+		МА
01, monos	appellation of work	rdaw:10329	Work	Nomen	0	1+		МА
01. monos	title proper	rdam:P30156	Manifestation	Nomen	1	1	245\$a	м

• No MARC alignment

- Dumbing up limitations of machine applications
 - Define narrower elements?



Getting started



All implementation scenarios

1. Consult current application profiles governing your intended metadata environment

2. Map elements to new RDA elements

3. Decide: format-based or entity-based APs

4. Test with practitioners





Some elements have been redefined

Scale

- Expression: scale
- Expression: scale designation
- Expression: additional scale information
- Expression: horizontal scale of cartographic content
- Expression: vertical scale of cartographic content

Use element scope and definition to choose AP elements





What does this mean for your application profile work? Recording

Record this element as a value of Place: **appellation of place** → **I** or as an IRI.

Record this element as a value of Agent: **appellation of agent** → **I** or as an IRI.

Record this element as a value of Timespan: appellation of timespan → or as an IRI.

Record this element as a value of a Nomen: **nomen string** → or as an instance of a **Nomen** → .

\rightarrow Recording method decision at the element





Format or entity-based APs?



Format-based pros:

Format-based cons:

- + Narrow focus on elements particular to a format
- + Creates a snapshot of elements
- + Easier to conceptualize

- Echoes of AACR

- Duplication of AP development work
- What about non-WEMI entities?





A challenge for any AP developer



Refocusing





- Is your implementation scenario clear?
- In scenario C, have you decided how to handle repeatability?
- Are you grappling with 'Record X as a value of...?
- Are you grappling with non-WEMI elements?
- Are you using the right tools?



General advice



Really general advice!

- Trust yourself and/or your cataloguers
- Give yourself time to get it wrong and then refine
- Excel is your go-to tool
- Look for APs in the Toolkit in the coming months



Thank you



Contact details Melissa Parent melissa.parent@rdatoolkit.org mparent@slv.vic.gov.au