

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Ahava Cohen, Europe representative
Subject: Formal response to RSC/ExtentWG/2025/6, Proposal for container and storage subelements of Manifestation: **extent of manifestation**

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.

EURIG would like to see a more complete modelling of the prerecording and recording sections for the new elements “number of containers”, “dimensions of containers” and “extent of storage space” and an inclusion of recording methods and related elements in standard RDA element page layout.

Recommendation 1:

Approve.

Recommendation 2:

Approve.

Recommendation 3:

Approve.

Recommendation 4:

Approve.

EURIG would, however, appreciate clarification as to why this element would only apply to collection manifestations. The concept of a collection manifestation is optimized for “bound with” scenarios and other local collection decisions. But equally, a container may undergo no adaptation between the point of publication and storage.

Recommendation 5:

EURIG would appreciate clarification why it was felt necessary to make a distinction between “folder” and “bradded folder” in the new VES “RDA Containers”. If this kind of distinction is drawn, then we’d like to understand whether overlapping terms such as “open ring” will be adopted from the separate VES “Type of binding”.

All of the VES term definitions in “RDA Containers” reference a collection manifestation and we’d like to understand why the scope does not include published manifestations.

Recommendation 5.1:

Disapprove due to wordsmithing, not fundamentals.

The proposed definition does not draw a clear enough distinction between *case* and *box* and should be refined before approval.

Recommendation 5.2:

Approve.

Recommendation 5.3:

Approve.

Recommendation 5.4:

Disapprove due to wordsmithing, not fundamentals.

The proposed definition does not draw a clear enough distinction between *case* and *box* and should be refined before approval.

Recommendation 5.5:

Approve.

Recommendation 5.6:

Approve.

Recommendation 5.7:

Approve. It should be noted that there is a chance of misunderstanding due to the article in the phrase "an open side" – some sleeves (such as for trading cards or coins) may have an open side to each section while the entire enclosure is considered the sleeve, such that there are a number of open sides on the whole.