

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Christine Frodl, DNB Representative  
Subject: Qualifications after an identifier - Amendments to RDA 2.15.1.7

DNB thanks ACOC for this proposal. We agree with the proposal and welcome the approach, not to abbreviate the qualification after an identifier; we welcome the introduction of the 13-digit ISBN and additional examples for electronic formats, but we also have some amendments.

We support the changes recommended by LC in their response (6JSC/ACOC/9/rev/LC response).

The word "brief" in the first sentence of RDA 2.15.1.7 is misleading, because a cataloguer might think of abbreviations.

We were wondering, if the qualification should be recorded in the language that appears on the resource or in the language preferred by the agency creating the data?

We would recommend, that the revised instruction would also state, *which* terms, concepts etc. are regarded as a qualifier in this instruction. Also an optional addition might be added that allows recording both forms: the form found on the resource (abbreviated or not) and also a form given by the cataloguer.

The first newly proposed example (hbk, ebk) refers to three different manifestations. One might conclude that all three identifiers belong to one manifestation.

The examples in the last examples box should be proofed. They should not show qualifiers with abbreviations, except they were found on the resource (see also Appendix B.5.11).