RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 1 of 10

To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee
CC: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary
From: Robert L. Maxwell, NARDAC representative to RDA Steering Committee
Subject: Discussion paper on the development of extent elements in RDA

NARDAC and its constituencies thank the Extent Working Group for the extensive work that has gone into this discussion paper.

The document presents itself as a discussion paper, but then presents a series of recommendations, as though it were a revision proposal. This NARDAC response is written as a discussion response, without "voting" yes/no to the specific recommendations on the assumption that many if not most of these likely will change when the paper returns as a revision proposal.

NARDAC generally supports the direction of this discussion of treatment of extent in RDA. We are particularly pleased with the idea of making a distinction between the carrier and content aspects of extent. This will necessitate the creation of numerous subelements to cover this distinction, and therefore we also support the idea that the element *extent of manifestation* should be converted to a superelement.

NARDAC also generally supports the recommendations in the discussion paper, including the creation of new elements and revision of existing elements and their definitions.

We do have several comments and concerns, some general, some specific. NARDAC hopes these comments will be helpful to the WG as it develops this discussion paper into a revision proposal.

General Comments

- The "Impact of proposed changes on cataloguers" section is difficult for many to fully grasp or imagine. Does this proposal primarily concern ways extent can be recorded using linked data properties? Further, the statement of impact on catalogers only contains a statement of "opportunities" that will open up if we depart from legacy pratices, with no consideration of the actual impact on the day-to-day work of catalogers. Will the proposed changes mean more work for catalogers? Will catalogers need to analyse the materials they catalog in greater detail?
  - A comment specific to LC which LAC reports applies to them as well related to impact: If a revision flowing from this discussion paper is approved, there will be big impact to LC's RDA-related work.
    - LC is working on a series of SES MGDs for various transcription instruction based on the current RDA elements since mid-2024, including SES for extent. LC will need to rework some SES MGDs to accommodate the changes flowing from the discussion paper if they are approved. In essence, LC/PCC will be re-creating documentation to accommodate legacy practice.
    - The discussion paper says that "Policy statements associated with current instructions in Manifestation: extent of manifestation would need to be synchronized with the move of any of these instructions into Community

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 2 of 10

Resources". Right now there are 163 LC-PCC Policy Statements associated with Manifestation: extent of manifestation. It'll be quite some work for LC and PCC community to review/rethink/reassign/create relevant PS for this transition.

- ▪ LAC comment: As a bilingual institution, we have to wait until the update of the French Toolkit to work on the French PS and MGDs. It will require additional time and effort for our PS writer to keep the synchronization in both English and French PS and MGDs.

- Since many of the recommendations deal with issues related to music, we strongly recommend that the WG formally consult with the Music Library Association (and other members of the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives, and Documentation Centres) and that they be given the chance to review and respond to the paper before developing the paper into a revision proposal. Many of the changes involve aspects that are unique to their cataloging community.

- Additional examples within the discussion paper would lead to a better understanding of how these subelements are envisioned. Since extent inherently concerns quantification, there should be an explicit rationale for using the term "number of" in the name of some proposed elements and not in others. It would be especially helpful to have more examples in sections 4 (Manifestation: extent of embodied content), 5 (Manifestation: extent of aggregated unit), and 9 (Expression: extent of expression), as this is uncharted territory.

- We would like a fuller understanding of why elements relating to extent of content are classified under manifestation, since "content type" is clearly an expression level concept. For this reason, we also wonder if the presented ISBDM template may be too simplistic.

- We are concerned that the new instructions and definitions are overly complicated and challenging for catalogers to apply. One of us tried reading some of the new definitions of existing elements to a cataloger with above-average facility in RDA to see if she could identify the element being described, and she was unable to.

- The discussion paper proposes moving legacy string encoding scheme (SES) instructions and their related policy statements to the Community Resources and noted that new SES are expected to be controlled by cataloging communities. But it also developed new SES instruction in the Manifestation: dimensions element.

- As we are moving toward linked data, what kind of impact might these changes have on BIBFRAME? If not BIBFRAME, would the new attribute elements enhance the easiness of recording and access of the resources in an RDF environment?

- Points not found in the discussion paper that a revision proposal needs to address
  - o The discussion paper does not address incomplete extent of unitary structure. For example, how does the proposed template account for and convey items in a set that may have been deaccessioned due to damage, or sets that were acquired with missing parts?
  - o The discussion paper does not address mixed unitary structures found, for example, in DVD/CD combos, audiovisual materials with accompanying booklets, and multimedia kits.

Comments on specific recommendations

- 1.1. Convert Manifestation: extent of manifestation to a superelement. NARDAC thinks the new definition of the element proposed on p. 8, "A quantification of a physical characteristic of a manifestation," isn't clear enough. "Physical characteristic" is too broad/general. There are too many physical characteristics that are measurable but not included in the scope of extent, such as

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 3 of 10

acidity level of paper, playing speed, encoded bitrate, file size, etc. Should some of these also be treated as subelements of extent?

- 2.1. Add Manifestation: extent of unitary structure as a subelement. The recommendation to define a new element, Manifestation: extent of unitary structure, should be accompanied with a recommendation to revise the element name of Manifestation: mode of issuance. The phrase "mode of issuance" is no longer appropriate since the element has been redefined and no longer indicates if a resource is a monograph, a serial or an integrating resource. The word "issuance" also seems to imply that it applies to published resources when the element also applies to unpublished ones, not to mention that the term "issuance" is problematic for translators. The term used in ISBDM for the equivalent element, "unitary structure", is a better fit and would be consistent with the label of the new element.

- 2.2. Create a new RDA Extent of Unitary value vocabulary Structure. Typo in recommendation. Should read: Create a new RDA Extent of Unitary **Structure** value vocabulary ~~Structure~~ which includes appropriate terms moved from the RDA carrier extent unit.

- 2.2. Create a new RDA Extent of Unitary value vocabulary Structure. Will the new RDA Extent of Unitary Structure vocabulary encoding scheme (VES) include both the current RDA Carrier Extent Unit VES and the RDA Carrier Type VES or just the RDA Carrier Extent Unit VES? With this move, will RDA Carrier Extent Unit VES still exist, will the RDA Carrier Type VES still exist? (Note carrier type is indexed separately in many databases for the user's faceted search.) The LC Audio/Video cataloging unit has a concern that currently The RDA Carrier Extent Unit VES has no moving image terms. If as stated in page 4 that most terms for the new VES would be sourced from the current RDA Carrier Extent Unit value vocabulary, this work would need significant input and development from moving image catalogers in the wider community.

- 3.1. Add Manifestation: extent of unit as a subelement. "Uses of the broader element Manifestation: extent of unit include: … 2. Record the total number of sheets that are bound in a volume or flipchart in terms of the number of leaves" (p. 12). Does this include leaves inserted as part of the binding process of the manifestation (i.e. by the publisher) that are not integral to the text block, e.g., fly-leaves, etc., which are often blank or patterned? Normally we ignore them when recording extent, though technically they do contribute slightly to the size of the volume and are indeed part of the extent. (We note here that in rare materials cataloging such sheets are included in extent statements.)

- 3.1. Add Manifestation: extent of unit as a subelement. "3. Record the value of a single dimension of a carrier, such as height of a volume …" (page 12). Some NARDAC constituents expressed a concern that splitting things in this way will cause problems in understanding the application of RDA. A single dimension is still a dimension. Users may go to Manifestation: dimensions for the instruction rather than realize that for a single dimension, they should go to the broader term Manifestation: extent of unit. For MARC coding, it may not make a big difference but for future linked data (as a predicate/property term), it will impact a lot. Similarly, farther down on p. 12 the paper states that element subtypes of Manifestation: extent of unit would cover instances where two or three quantities are considered, but where there is only one measurement, the broader element Manifestation: extent of unit is used. We don't understand the rationale for such a proposal.

- 3.2. Add Manifestation: numbering of recording tracks as an element subtype. The proposed label would be clearer but we are concerned that in practice the element could be confused with the number of tracks, that is songs or pieces, on a disc.

- 3.3. Move Manifestation: bibliographic format to become an element subtype of Manifestation:

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 4 of 10

extent of unit. We acknowledge that it is a bit tricky to slot blbiographic format into the proposed organization, but bibliographic format is a *layout* or *format* issue, and does not necessarily have anything to do with the extent of the unit. As such, it seems it would be more appropriate as a subelement Manifestation: extent of embodied content, which is defined as "An extent … that is a measurement of the *layout* of content …"

- 3.4. Move Manifestation: dimensions to become an element subtype of Manifestation: extent of unit. "The current element Manifestation: dimensions of still image (a subtype of Dimensions) is properly understood as a measurement of the layout of content embodied in a manifestation, and so would be covered under the element Manifestation: extent of embodied content. " (page 13) Dimensions of cartographic image typically correspond to the measurement of what is inside the neat line, so should that be mentioned here as well? Similarly, intaglio prints are usually measured using the plate mark (see *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics)* 5D0.1).

- 3.4. Move Manifestation: dimensions to become an element subtype of Manifestation: extent of unit. "Structured descriptions for values of Dimensions will consist of 2 or 3 whole numbers that measure 2 or 3 dimensions in the same unit of length. Fractions will be rounded to the nearest whole number" (page 13). The current guidelines (which as far as we know reflect all previous cataloging rules) are that fractions are rounded *up* to the nearest whole number. There is a very practical reason for this. In addition to recording the dimensions for the sake of accurate description, dimensions are used to determine if a physical item will fit in the allotted storage space. For example, at a particular library standard shelves are set 30 cm apart; anything above goes to quarto shelves. Currently a book that measures 30.4 cm – and thus will not fit on the standard shelves – is recorded as 31 cm, making it easy to determine that it needs to be stored on the quarto shelves. If the standard of measurement were changed to "the nearest whole number" this book's dimensions would be recorded as 30 cm, would likely be sent to be shelved on the standard shelves, then be set back to cataloging because it doesn't fit. We see no principled reason to change the standard of measurement; in most cases it may not really matter but in some cases it will cause disruption.

- 3.4. Move Manifestation: dimensions to become an element subtype of Manifestation: extent of unit. "For different carriers there would be a stipulated order for the dimensions, separated by the symbol "x" and spaces …" (page 13). The paper mentions several times that legacy string encoding schemes will be moved to Community resources: cataloging communities should devise their own policy about SCS. But isn't the type of recording dimension proposed here for the main RDA instructions itself an SES instruction?

- 3.4. Move Manifestation: dimensions to become an element subtype of Manifestation: extent of unit. "Update the instructions to reflect the focus on structured descriptions for two to three dimensions." (page 14). NARDAC objects to this big change to separate the recording of a single dimension vs. two to three dimensions under different elements. It's not intuitive. If the change will happen, a further clarification/better explanation/rationale should be given. (See also above comment under Recommendation 3.1.

- 3.4. Move Manifestation: dimensions to become an element subtype of Manifestation: extent of unit. General comment from CC:DA similar to LC's concerns above: This recommendation warrants further discussion or clarification. Bifurcating instructions for physical measurements (i.e., most single dimensions covered by Manifestation: extent of unit, while other dimensions covered by Manifestation: dimensions) could lead to unnecessary confusion. Are there reasons why single dimensions could not be covered by the newly defined Manifestation: dimensions?

- 4. Extent of embodied content. General comment from CC:DA: Consider reordering

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 5 of 10

recommendations to correspond to the order of the text, and adding subheadings to aid in understanding. The relationship between the recommendations and the discussion of the tête-bêche binding is opaque; we suggest that this be framed clearly as an example to avoid confusion. Here is an example of what we would like to see from this section.

- 4.1. Add Manifestation: extent of embodied content as a subelement of Manifestation: extent of manifestation. "While the terms in the RDA Layout value vocabulary are not generally suitable as extent terms, some of them relate to the physical characteristics that are considered in quantification, such as "single sided" and "double sided", which refer to the sides of a sheet that have a layout of content" (p. 15). Is this intended only for volumes? Laserdiscs and videodiscs can be "single sided" or "double sided".
- 4.1. Add Manifestation: extent of embodied content as a subelement of Manifestation: extent of manifestation, proposed definition of column (p. 15). The current definition has the phrase "a unit of extent". The new definition doesn't mention that. Is "column" still a unit of extent? Will such a change of definition impact extent measurement?
- 4.1. Add Manifestation: extent of embodied content as a subelement of Manifestation: extent of manifestation, proposed definition of frame (p. 15). We suggest that the scope should be 1included withinin the new definition for better clarification.
- 4.1. Add Manifestation: extent of embodied content as a subelement of Manifestation: extent of manifestation, proposed definition of page (p. 15). We have two concerns about this definition:
  - This definition could be misunderstood as applying only to a resource that has content on one side of its leaves/sheets, and not also to resources with content on both sides of its leaves/sheets.
  - How do blank pages fit in here? What if a page is included in the numbering sequence but is blank, i.e. no content is actually embodied on that page - does it still count as embodied content? Are catalogers actually supposed to go through and only count the number of pages with embodied content (so if a book has its last numbered page as 200, but 5 of those pages in the sequence are blank, we instead record it as 195 pages)?
- 4.5. Replace Manifestation: configuration of playback channels with Manifestation: designation of sound channels and Manifestation: number of sound channels. The only example for Manifestation: number of sound channels seems to be describing the channel configuration commonly called "5.1" (five channel surround plus a subwoofer channel), but indicates that it would be recorded as "6 channels". If this interpretation is correct, there should be some justification included for describing the configuration in a way that is less likely to be understood by users. The element name is unclear because the element seems to include a value of a number + the term 'channels'. It doesn't match the naming conventions used for similar elements recorded as number + term pairs, such as 'extent of unitary structure'. Why should the term "channels" be included in the value when no other term would ever apply? What is the term 'channel' supposed to be here?
- 4.8. Create an RDA Layout of Embodied Content value vocabulary. NARDAC recommends using the alternative of expanding the RDA Layout value vocabulary.
- 5.1. Extent of aggregated content. Extent of aggregated content seems to conflate aggregates of expressions of the same work, and aggregates of expressions of different works. This can be a problem for music. Is the intent for extent of aggregated content to quantify the aggregate of expressions of the same work (e.g., 1 score and 2 parts, each an expression of the same musical work) or to also quantify the aggregated expressions of different works (e.g., 5 scores and 10 parts, in an aggregate of expressions of five distinct musical works, each expressed in 1 score and 2

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 6 of 10

parts)?

- 5.1. Extent of aggregated content. Definition (p. 18). The suggested definition uses the phrase "expressions of the same kind." However, "kind of expression" is not an element either in RDA or LRM. A phrase like "expressions of the same content type" or, even better, "expressions of the same category" would be a better fit for this definition. "Category of expression" would match with both the RDA element and LRM-E3-A1. And some of the terms for extent of aggregated content (such as "score") go beyond mere content type (which would be "notated music"), but the LRM clarifies that category of expression can describe a format of notated music such as "score" or "part. However, even the phrase "expressions of the same category" confuses the issue, because part of what extent of aggregated content is doing is providing a place to record expressions in more than one category (such as "1 score and 2 parts"). Unless the cataloger is supposed to use separate extent of aggregated content elements for each different category of expression? This is unclear.

- 5.1. Extent of aggregated content. Instruction on page 18. "If a manifestation embodies only a single expression, then a Content Type value is recorded with an implicit "1" for quantity." It seems odd that extent of aggregated content is applicable even when there is no aggregate because only 1 expression is present. Is there a better term for this element? The name implies one should only use it when dealing with an aggregate, but it certainly has use even when only 1 expression is present (e.g., it's useful for music patrons to see whether a piece of notated music is a "score" or a "part" or a "vocal score.")

- 5.1. Extent of aggregated content. General comment from CC:DA: Revise the instruction "If a manifestation embodies only a single expression, then a Content Type value is recorded with an implicit '1' for quantity" in order to clarify that this is not referring to using the Content Type value vocabulary in the proposed element Manifestation: extent of aggregated content. *Proposed rewording:* If a manifestation embodies only a single expression, then Expression: content type is recorded with an implicit '1' for quantity.

- 5.2. Create a value vocabulary for RDA Extent of Aggregated Content. General comment. It might be too early to discuss the interest of using the ISBDM vocabulary given as an example but we have some reservations about the categorization and the terminology for performed/recorded music. For example, the term "song" (as in "recorded song") cannot be used as a general term for any piece of music, including those that are not strictly songs, even though it is often encountered with that meaning.

- 5.2. Create a value vocabulary for RDA Extent of Aggregated Content. Comment from CC:DA. We recommend the alternative and recommend consulting with MLA about the terminology.
  - Many of the proposed terms in Manifestation: extent of aggregated content, such as "performed song", "recorded song", "score", "vocal score", and "part", pose problems for the music cataloging community. First, "song" is a defined subset of vocal music and has typically only been applied by the MLA community for vocal music; therefore, the use of the term for all performed music (regardless of whether the music is actually a song) could cause confusion. Secondly, splitting performances into "'live" and "studio" recordings invites needless and confusing granularity because it can be difficult to ascertain the differences between the two terms. In fact, both the LCGFT authority record entry for "studio recordings" and MLA Best Practices documentation have attempted to clarify the differences between these two terms. The MLA community would therefore prefer to leave this distinction, when feasible, to expression-level analysis. The definitions of the terms "score", "vocal score", and "part", are also not helpful for those who may not be familiar

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 7 of 10

with music, as their definitions are identical and all point to "notated music". The MLA community would therefore also welcome the opportunity to participate in refinement of these terms and their relationship to expression-level elements before this value vocabulary is finalized.

- o *Comment from ARLIS CAC on new value vocabulary:* Although the CC:DA recommends expanding the RDA Content Type value vocabulary as the basis for the new vocabulary, we would prefer terms that are on a more specific level. The RDA Content Type value vocabulary more or less mirrors the values in the MARC leader/06, which are very general. It is hard to imagine users helped by knowing how many still images, or texts, or three-dimensional objects are in a manifestation. We would prefer starting with something more akin to the ISBDM Extent of Aggregated Content value vocabulary, which has more specific terms, such as photograph, drawing, view, etc., but allowing for use of broader terms when listing all the different types is not feasible.   Whatever terms are included in the new vocabulary would of course need to be reviewed by the general and specialist cataloging communities (we gather that many of the music terms need replacement or refinement).
- o *Comment from ARLIS CAC on extent of textual works:* Graphic catalogers record extent for still images in terms of the number of images rather than the number of pages, e.g. 1 drawing or 2 drawings. When the number of images is the only extent recorded, it is understood that each drawing is on a separate sheet. If not, the number of physical units is specified, e.g. 2 drawings on 1 sheet, or 65 drawings in 1 volume. But quantifying textual manifestations in terms of embodied content is a new departure: in the past, only the extent of unitary structure and the extent of unit (to use the new names proposed for this information) were recorded for a textual manifestation. We assume that the new subelements can be used for texts as well as other formats. It would be good to have some examples of this, e.g., 1 novel, 18 short stories, 65 poems. We also wonder how one would quantify non-fiction. Would one simply record extent as "1 text"? If it is a book of reproductions of the paintings of Cezanne, with brief entries, how (if at all) would you quantify the aggregated texts and images?

- 5.2. Create a value vocabulary for RDA extent of aggregated content. Extent of aggregated content and extent of embodied content can interact with extent of unitary structure in a way that is not immediately clear. For example, consider a manifestation with the extent of unitary structure: 3 volumes and an extent of aggregated content: 1 score and 2 parts. This could be a manifestation with the score bound in 1 volume, and each of the parts in a separate volume. Or it could be the score printed in 2 volumes, with the parts bound together in a 3rd volume. In the past, a manifestation statement would intersperse extent of unitary structure with extent of aggregated content to solve this, like so:

    1 score (100 pages) + 2 parts (6 pages each)
    Or
    1 score (2 volumes (50, 50 pages)) + 2 parts (1 volume)

  But if these elements are separate they can no longer be integrated. Both are now:

    Extent of unitary structure: 3 volumes
    Extent of aggregated content: 1 score and 2 parts

- 6.2. Add Manifestation: dimensions of containers as a subelement of Manifestation: extent of manifestation. This element is referred to as "dimensions of container" or dimensions of containers" in the paper. Is this inconsistency intentional?

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 8 of 10

- 6.4. Create an RDA Container Type value vocabulary for case, portfolio, and other terms commonly used for containers. The example "1 portfolio (40 prints)" gives us pause. In North American practice, containers are sometimes treated as carrier units, as in this example, and sometimes not (e.g., "in case 17 x 24 x 6 cm"). There does not seem to be a logical rationale for the difference in treatment and catalogers waste time trying to figure out which treatment is appropriate. This development could be an opportunity to treat containers in a uniform manner in displays. For example, if portfolios are to be considered as containers, the example could read instead: 40 prints, in portfolio.
- 7. Manifestation extent statement. Having both "manifestation numbering of extent statement" and "manifestation extent statement" as narrower elements of "manifestation statement" seems to invite confusion between them.
- 7.1. Add a new manifestation statement element. Discussion on p. 26. LC wonders whether in some circumstances, catalogers may feel confused between using "manifestation numbering of extent statement" vs. "extent of unit" vs. "extent of embodied content". If page sequence varies, it is easy to decide that "manifestation numbering of extent statement" is the correct property to use for "iv, 323 pages". However, since only last number of each sequence will be recorded with an applicable unit, will multiple elements be correct for the same value, e.g., a book with 543 pages and the last page is 543:

  > Manifestation <has manifestation numbering of extent statement> 543 pages
  > Manifestation <has manifestation extent of embodied content > 543 pages

  A book with 55 leaves and the last number is 55:

  > Manifestation <has manifestation numbering of extent statement> 55 leaves
  > Manifestation <has manifestation extent of unit > 55 leaves

  Will the WG recommend a better element to record the value in those circumstances or is it OK to have multiple options for the same value?
- 7.2. Add a new manifestation statement element: Manifestation: manifestation numbering of extent statement. "If the focus is on recording the actual number of leaves then the element Manifestation: extent of unit is applicable. If counting all the pages that have content, then the element Manifestation: extent of embodied content is applicable." (p. 29). Comment from LC: This statement may answer our question above. However, LC wants to make sure that in some cases, it depends on cataloger's work focus/intention to choose the property among these attribute elements and their values can be exactly the same. And in those cases, no one element is better than the other.
- 7.2. Add a new manifestation statement element: Manifestation: manifestation numbering of extent statement. Comment from CC:DA: We recommend a definition of Manifestation: manifestation numbering of extent statement be added to the document. Contextualized examples of when this element would be utilized would be helpful.
  - *Minority opinion:* In lieu of a definition, the section describes traditional methods within the library community for recording extent, and attempts to reframe it as a manifestation statement. There are several issues with this.
    - First, it is not, and should not be, the aim of new standards to justify previous standards, especially when those previous standards are particular to a single community within the target audience for the new standards.
    - Second, if we grant that historical recording methods must continue to be an available option, a stronger justification for conceptualizing this as a new element, rather than a series of options for recording Manifestation: extent of

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 9 of 10

> > manifestation, should be provided. Data provenance can be indicated without resorting to the creation of a distinct element with an opaque name.
> > - Third, if a new element should be created, considering it as a manifestation statement would expand the scope of the manifestation statement concept to the point that it would be less useful. The reasoning for considering this method of recording extent to be a manifestation statement seems to hang on its being recorded using information found in the manifestation, but this is also true for other elements that are not manifestation statements (e.g., title proper), and scores of other elements allow transcription as a recording method. Furthermore, this extent statement is not even completely transcribed, since it consists of a prescribed combination of transcribed and supplied information. A manifestation statement is defined as "a statement appearing in a manifestation" and "how the manifestation represents itself". The proposed element is neither. If we reinterpret these parts of the definition to mean that a manifestation statement incorporates in any way a piece of information appearing in a manifestation, no matter how it is manipulated or added to by the recorder, nearly any RDA element should also have a parallel manifestation statement.
> > - *Additional comment from a CC:DA member:* I am concerned that this element blends numbering as it presents itself on the manifestation with supplied information (e.g., recording numbering and supplying the term "pages"). Perhaps an easier method for recording numbering in this way may be through condition options in Manifestation: extent of embodied content that reference particular transcription guidelines?

- 7.3. Add a new set of RDA transcription guidelines. Comment from CC:DA. This section would benefit from greater clarity as to the intended scope of "pages, leaves, etc." Which instructions in Manifestation: extent of manifestation would not move, or move to different elements? In particular, we would like clarification as to whether the option to record the number of files with a term from the RDA File type VES would be included, and if not, which element this option would be moved to in the new set of elements. The introduction of transcription guidelines for a particular element blurs the distinction between Guidelines and element options.
  - *Additional comment from a CC:DA member:* In principle, I agree, but with reservations. RDA transcription guidelines currently apply to all "unstructured descriptions of manifestation elements and elements of other RDA entities where the option to use transcription guidelines is specified" (see Guidelines on normalized transcription). It seems unusual to create separate transcription guidelines for one element. Could the existing guidelines on Numbering be expanded to accommodate the numbering scenarios mentioned in the discussion paper?
- 9.1. Extent of expression, suggested definition (p. 30). LC thinks some clarification and some examples are needed for this definition. What aspect does the definition refer to--the extent of the content?
- 9.1. Extent of expression. Comment from CC:DA: A new definition must be clearer than the old one; this new definition is very abstract and while it adds brevity, is less instructive than the definition currently in place. Values can be all over the map depending on what kind of expression is being described. A good idea is to have some examples to help clarify different expressions.
- 13.2.1. Sheet. Efforts have been made to remove "etc." from definitions in the past years. This would be an opportunity to revise the definition of "sheet" to read something like this:

RSC/ExtentWG/2024/1/rev2/NARDAC response
11 October 2024 [received by RSC Secretary on Saturday 12 October, because of time difference]
Page 10 of 10

A carrier type that consists of a flat, thin piece of paper, plastic or other material.

- <u>13.2.3. Gathering</u>. Have 348 leaves and 384 leaves been transposed in the example?
- <u>13.2.4. Leaf</u>. From a rare book cataloging perspective, the definition isn't very clear. A broadside is 1 leaf and not a volume, per se. It might be bound, it might be lying loose in a portfolio, or it might be alone protected inside a mylar enclosure. We suggest: "A physical unit that derives from a single sheet (unfolded or folded into gatherings) and embodies two pages (one on each side), whether content is found on one or both (or neither) of the pages. [Scope note] Each leaf is often (but not always) a subunit of a volume."
- <u>13.2.8. Panel</u>. Example at top of p. 35. LC wonders whether the example is for a new resource or it's the same resource as the previous example using different extent elements. Somehow it's difficult to imagine 3 panels on 1 folded sheet with both sides on total 6 pages but the last sequence number is 5.
- <u>13.3. Add the new term photographic print to the Extent of Unitary Structure value vocabulary</u>. Definition of photograph (p. 36). LC wonders whether the definition considers cyanotype a type of photograph, which doesn't require a lens.
- <u>13.3. Add the new term photographic print to the Extent of Unitary Structure value vocabulary</u>. From ARLIS CAC: We recommend that "photograph" rather than "photographic print" be used as a value for the Extent of Unitary Structure. The Art & Architecture Thesaurus defines "photographic prints" as "Opaque photographs, usually positive (i.e., reproducing appearances without tonal reversal, otherwise use "negative prints"), usually on paper, and generally, but not always, printed from a negative" (http://vocab.getty.edu/page/aat/300127104). The term "photographic print" would not apply to many other types of photographs, such as cased photographs (e.g. daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, tintypes), slides and transparencies, and negatives. (See the AAT hierarchical display for Photographs by form (linked to from http://vocab.getty.edu/page/aat/300127008)). It would be better to use the broader term "photograph" for both Extent of Unitary Structure as well as for Extent of Aggregated Content. Finer distinctions between different types of photographs can be made as more specialized terms are added to the vocabularies. [NARDAC notes, however, on this ARLIS CAC comment, that this would contravene the principle according to which each label in RDA Reference must be unique.]
  - *Additional comment from a CC:DA member:* I strongly agree with the ARLIS CAC on this recommendation. The term *photographic print* excludes photographic negatives. Either the broader term *photograph* should be retained with a revised definition covering both prints and negatives, or a term covering negatives should be added to the vocabulary. The current and proposed definitions are also not entirely correct. Photographs are often made with a lens and camera, but not always; the only requirement is the use of light- or radiation-sensitive materials. Photograms are a good example of photographic prints made without a lens. Some "alternative process" photographic prints, such as cyanotypes and brownprints, may also be photograms made without a lens.
- <u>14.2. Reorganization</u>. Review RDA Format of Notated Music value vocabulary. We recommend that MLA be given the chance to review the terms.