

Comments on Responses to world-wide review of PRESS₀₀

British Library

The British Library thanks the FRBR Review Group for this opportunity to comment on PRESS₀₀.

This is a valuable extension of the FRBR₀₀ model and offers important insights into the process by which serials are created and by which they change over time.

The model is complex, but the explanations are clear and well-illustrated. For more consistency with FRBR₀₀ 2.2 and for ease of reading, consideration should be given to moving the explanatory text for each figure so that it follows the figure.

>> This will be done in a subsequent version of PRESS₀₀.

Alan Danskin

20/4/2015

>> Thanks for reviewing and commenting, Alan!

Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on PRESS₀₀.

In general, the JSC finds the PRESS₀₀ model to be an elegant, well thought-out extension to the FRBR₀₀ 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 PRESS₀₀ will be a useful tool for the future development of RDA.

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

p.6, Introduction: The term "continuing resource" is used, but not defined. The term does not exist in FRBR₀₀. There is a reference to the ISBD definition, but the relationship between PRESS₀₀ and ISBD is not explained.

>> None of the terms "continuing resource", "serial", "series", "periodical" or "integrating resource" was defined in the document, as all of them were thought to belong to the average librarian culture. However, such definitions can easily be introduced in a subsequent version of PRESS₀₀.

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.

>> In a subsequent version of PRESS_{oo}, we'll strive to make the terminology more consistent. On the whole, PRESS_{oo} focuses mainly on periodicals, but it deals with other types of continuing resources as well, including integrating resources, and with series.

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.

>> This paragraph was taken (with some adaptations) from the text of the CIDOC CRM Definition, where these notions are not defined either. Your remark will therefore be passed on to the CIDOC CRM SIG.

p.15, Property quantifiers: Instead of referring to presentation conventions in CIDOC CRM and FRBR_{oo}, 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.

>> This will be fixed.

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.

>> This will be fixed.

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 PRESS_{oo}. A brief "key" would be useful.

>> This will be fixed.

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

>> Examples are not bulleted in FRBR_{oo} either. The template used for PRESS_{oo} is the same as for FRBR_{oo}.

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).

>> This will be fixed.

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

>> This will be done.

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

>> This will be passed on to the FRBR_{oo} WG for their consideration.

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.

>> This will be passed on to the FRBRoo WG for their consideration.

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.

>> It is consistent with the way properties are mentioned in Scope Notes in the CIDOC CRM Definition. However, this can be changed.

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

>> We believe it can be easily understood. If it is really a problem, we can consider replacing "N ..." with "so and so".

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.

>> A subsequent version of PRESSoo will use indentations instead.

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

>> This will be fixed.

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

>> This will be fixed.

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

>> Thanks for reviewing and commenting, Gordon!