To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Qualifications after an identifier – Amendments to RDA 2.15.1.7

CCC thanks ACOC for preparing this proposal but we regret that we cannot support it. The proposal raises more questions that would best be remedied in a new proposal. These are the points that CCC wishes to mention for future consideration.

1. Qualifiers are sub-elements of the identifier statement, not part of the identifier as per 2.15.1.1. As such, it may be preferable to characterize them as *additions* to remain consistent with RDA terminology. As sub-elements, they could be separately established in RDA.
2. Qualifiers are added when needed, whether or not the publisher included the data. The sub-types of qualifiers may require separate instructions.
    a. qualifiers found on the resource. These might be added to the identifier as found, or they might be abbreviated per tradition and local preference;
    b. qualifiers added to the identifier by the agency preparing the description, in accord with local preference;
    c. designations of part found on, or derived from, the resource. These designations can be recorded and abbreviated according to B.5.5, or they may accepted as found when they are already abbreviated.

3. Generally, identifiers are recorded, not transcribed, but the main instruction 2.15.1.4 allows for recording identifiers as found – essentially transcription – when there is no prescribed display format.
4. The condition of the presence or absence of a prescribed display format should be out of scope for RDA.
5. The examples proposed for 2.15.1.7 give the impression that the identifiers for different manifestations would be recorded on the same record.

If this proposal is approved in this round, CCC would like to suggest the addition of the words "or format" to the second paragraph of 2.15.1.7 Qualification.

If the resource has only one identifier, add the type of binding or format, if considered important for identification