World-wide review of world-wide review of PRESSoo, an extension of the FRBRoo model

Response from the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on PRESSoo.

In general, the JSC finds the PRESSoo model to be an elegant, well thought-out extension to the FRBRoo model which will support the description of and access to serial resources. This fills a significant gap in the understanding of this type of resource, and the JSC expects that PRESSoo will be a useful tool for the future development of RDA.

The JSC has a numbe of specific comments on the text:

p.6, Introduction: The term "continuing resource" is used, but not defined. The term does not exist in FRBRoo. There is a reference to the ISBD definition, but the relationship between PRESSoo and ISBD is not explained.

p.6, Introduction: The first paragraph uses the term "periodical", but the second refers to "serial". The two terms are then used interchangeably in the rest of the text. Only the term "serial", however, is used for class labels.

p.15, Naming conventions, ninth bullet: This discusses transitive and symmetric properties, and explains the relevance of symmetric properties, but does not explain what "transitive" means or implies.

p.15, Property quantifiers: Instead of referring to presentation conventions in CIDOC CRM and FRBRoo, we think it would be better to restate them here, if this document is to function independently (with the exception of actual content not repeated here) from the other two.

p.16, second paragraph: There is a reference to the mapping with the ISSN Manual, but there is no explanation of what the ISSN is, or the ISSN Manual, or why the document includes a mapping with the ISSN Manual. There is also no citation for the ISSN Manual, or indication of which version was used.

p.16-21: It is not obvious what purposes the dashes, bold text and the italic text serve because the display conventions are not explicit in PRESSoo. A brief "key" would be useful.

p.22 [etc.]: The examples are not bulleted. This makes it more difficult to read them, and does not follow the style of FRBRoo and CIDOC CRM.

p.23, Z4 Temporary Substitution: The scope note does not qualify "replacement" with "temporary". This is potentially misleading, and is inconsistent with the wording used in Y14 substituted with (became surrogate through).

p.25, Z9 Storage Unit: We would be happy to support a more generic scope note, as suggested.

p.26, Z11 URL: This property seems to apply more generally to FRBRoo, and we wonder if it should be moved to FRBRoo.

p.27, Z14 Storage Unit Creation: This property seems to apply more generally to FRBRoo, and we wonder if it should be moved to FRBRoo.

p.45-50: Again, there are no explanations for the typographical conventions used here. Also, we note that the use of italics here (after the P, R, and Y entries in the mapping column) is inconsistent with the conventions used in FRBRoo Section 3.3. If the two documents are intended to be used together, they should be consistent in layout and design.

p.46, First entry and elsewhere: The convention of using "N …" in the Mapping is not explained.

p.46, Seventh entry and elsewhere: The convention of using subscripts in the Mapping is not explained. We think it must be denoting separate publication events, but it would be useful if an explanation was provided.

p.53: We note that this references version 2.0 of FRBRoo, not the latest version 2.2.

p.71: We note that this references version 5.1 of CIDOC CRM, not the latest version 6.0.

The JSC hopes that IFLA and the FRBR Review Group will find these comments helpful.

Gordon Dunsire
Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
19 April 2015