To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Ahava Cohen, Europe representative
Subject: Formal response to RSC/ExtentWG/2025/2, Proposal for Manifestation: extent of unitary structure

EURIG thanks the Extent WG for this family of proposals.

We acknowledge the development of RDA as a standard which is optimized for machine actionability and linked data applications and that for these applications a more granular approach to recording values for extent may be desirable.

We would also like to see a more complete modelling of the prerecording and recording sections for "extent of unitary structure" and an inclusion of recording methods and related elements in standard RDA element page layout.

Recommendation 1.1:
Approve.

Recommendation 1.2:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.1:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2:
Reject. The VESs "RDA Unitary Structure" and "RDA Carrier Type" are proposed to record the new element "extent of unitary structure". It is further proposed that the term "atlas" will henceforward be a "category of work" rather than a unit of extent, but that the new value "sketch book" should be adopted in the VES "RDA Unitary Structure". We query this apparent contradiction and whether other values of extent may be treated as values of category elements going forward. According to examples modelled in the Official RDA Toolkit, it is already possible to record the value "text" for both the elements "content type" and "category of expression". The fact that "category of manifestation" has no prescribed VES attached to it or examples modelled for it leaves open the question as to whether values for "carrier type" may also be used to record "category of manifestation."

Until these fundamental issues are resolved we cannot approve the suggested list of recommended terms.

Approval of specific terms below is merely approval of definition and scope, not approval of their use as terms in the proposed RDA Unitary Structure VES.

Recommendation 2.2.1:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.2:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.3:
Reject. The definition of collage is very narrow and will hamper further use of the term as we bring other types of resources under the RDA umbrella. In a related problem, the definition of sheet specifies that the material must be "thin" which is not objective or quantifiable.

Recommendation 2.2.4:
Approve, but suggest that the limit of the two-dimensional background to painted be removed.

Recommendation 2.2.5:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.6:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.7:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.8:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.9:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.10:
Reject. There is an entire class of jigsaw puzzles which are not flat, thin sheets and there is no justification provided for the exclusion of such puzzles from the category.

Recommendation 2.2.11:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.12:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.13:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.14:
Approve, with the same caveat as in **Recommendation 2.2.3**; it is unclear why the determination of what is and is not a painting includes the thickness of the surface to which the pigment is applied.

Recommendation 2.2.15:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.16:
Provisionally approve. Though a cataloger could ascertain whether a postcard is capable of being mailed, it is doubtful they would know or be able to ascertain the intention of the agent

who created the postcard that such mailing actually occur. Commemorative or souvenir postcards may look exactly like postcards intended for mailing but not actually have been created with that intention.

Recommendation 2.2.17:
Reject, with the hope that a refinement of the definition will allow for approval.
It is unclear why the thickness of the backing image is specified but not the other dimensions – could a sticker also qualify for the term *poster*? Also, the problem of a cataloger's ability to discern the creator's intent, raised in **Recommendation 2.2.16**, is applicable for this recommendation. Finally, the limit of decorative intent to a room is unclear, as there are many other surfaces which could potentially be decorated.

Recommendation 2.2.18:
Reject. What distinguishes a print from other terms is the means of production and not the type of image reproduced and that is what was removed to create the new definition.

Recommendation 2.2.19:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.20:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.21:
Reject. Once again the distinction between this term and others relies on a cataloger's ability to determine intent; it is unclear why this proposal is so certain that a cataloger can ascertain intent.

Recommendation 2.2.22:
Approve.

Recommendation 2.2.23:
Approve, but as above, the term "intended" is problematic. We would prefer the original "appropriate" be returned to the definition in its place.

Recommendation 2.3:
Approve, though it is unclear why cases are required for an object to meet the definition of an exhibit, as not all exhibits use cases for display. We would support the expansion of the definition to include moving images, since many modern exhibits use video.

Recommendation 2.4:
Reject. Though in principle we agree that *atlas* is not a unitary structure term, there is no statement of impact on the cartographic resources community. It is unfair to defer music questions until the Music Working Group can start work but not consult (or document consultations which took place) when discussing other, similarly distinct communities.

Recommendation 2.5:
Reject. If a sketchbook is only a sketchbook when it is filled with still images, then the term is as much a genre term as an atlas and their treatment should be equal. If a sketchbook can be defined by the intention of its creator, the definition should say so, though this would once again entangle us in the question of whether a cataloger can deduce intention after the fact.