To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Qualifications after an identifier—Amendments to RDA 2.15.1.7

LC thanks ACOC for following-up on their earlier Fast Track with this proposal.

We do not recall whether a qualifier to an identifier was specifically in mind during the development of Appendix B.5.11 (Other elements), but reluctance to be dogmatic may be the reason that the word “generally” was used there. LC’s current practice could be described as a “liberal application” of the word “generally,” in that we have instructed our catalogers to use either standard abbreviations or spelled-out forms when supplying qualifiers. We do not see a compelling need to eliminate the use of abbreviations in qualifiers, and we have no evidence that the form of the qualifier poses a difficulty for the public. In addition, we also work with software that automatically generates qualifiers (currently abbreviated) for records created at the pre-publication stage (e.g., via our Cataloging in Publication program’s publisher interface, or the use of ONIX data). We do not consider post-publication changes from abbreviated to full form (or vice versa) in qualifiers to be a worthwhile use of staff time. We have not documented our “in-house guideline” in an LC-PCC PS for B.1, Alternative, but will consider doing so. We also note that ISBD 8.1.3 allows both spelled-out forms and “standard abbreviations in the language chosen by the cataloging agency” in ISBN qualifiers.

That said, we are not opposed to the example revisions in the ACOC proposal, with the following considerations:

1. We believe that an example “explanation” should be added to the first two sets of examples in the first example box at 2.15.1.7:

   EXAMPLE
   ISBN 0-435-91661-0 (pbk.)
   **Qualifier is abbreviated on the source of information**

   ISBN 3-540-08266-2 (Germany)
   **Qualifier is abbreviated on the source of information**

2. We would like to change slightly the proposed explanation for the third set of examples in the first example box to be consistent with other example explanations in RDA:

   **ISBN 978-1-4094-4206-6 (hbk)
   **Qualifiers are abbreviated on the source of information**
3. We note that in the last example box for the instruction the qualifiers “(v. 1)” and “(v. 38)” are used, but there is not a similar explanation that the abbreviations were found on the resource. We think this explanation should be added to these examples as well.

4. We also noticed that the spacing in the last example box at 2.15.1.7 is different in the proposal than in RDA currently, but not marked as a change. (A lack of spaces between these examples would mean they are all applicable to one resource). We do not think this was intended as a change and wish the current spacing to remain.