

**To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA**  
**From: Alan Danskin, United Kingdom Representative**  
**Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1–6.28.1.8. Response.**

---

The British Library and CILIP thank the Music Working Group for the discussion paper. The questions raised have been discussed by members of the CILIP/BL Committee on RDA. Here are our responses:

**Question #1:** Does the JSC agree with the Music Working Group’s analysis of the instruction? Should the Music Working Group pursue revision of 6.28.1.2 taking into account the issues raised above?

**Response #1:** We do not believe such a revision is warranted. The issue should be subsumed within the general discussion of AAPs in RDA, which is taking cultural bias into account.

**Question #2:** Does the JSC agree that this paragraph is needed in 6.14.2.5

Consider pasticcios, ballad operas, etc. to be individual works. If the pasticcio, ballad opera, etc. consists of previously existing ballads, songs, arias, etc. by various composers, consider the work to be a compilation of musical works by different composers (see [6.2.2.11](#)).

**Response #2:** Yes, we agree that this addition improves clarity. We suggest that all occurrences of etc. are deleted:

“Consider pasticcios and ballad operas to be individual works. If the pasticcio or ballad opera consists of previously existing ballads, songs, or arias by various composers, consider the work to be a compilation of musical works by different composers (see [6.2.2.11](#)).”

However, note that Caroline Shaw, Team Manager for Music Cataloguing has queried whether there is any need for 6.28.1.3. In her view, pasticcio would be adequately covered by the general instructions

Compilation of works by different creators [6.2.2.11](#) (a pasticcio could be added to the examples here)

Compilation of works by one creator [6.14.2.8](#)

Single work by one creator [6.27.1.2](#)

Collaborative works [6.27.1.3](#)

**Question #3:** Does the JSC agree with this analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

**Response #3:** We are in favour of eliminating exceptions wherever possible.

**Question #4:** Does the JSC agree with this analysis? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?

**Response #4:** We are in favour of eliminating exceptions wherever possible.

**Question #5:** Does the JSC agree that a paragraph should be added to 6.28.1 for choreographic movement?

**Response #5:** Yes, we agree this addition improves clarity.

**Question #6:** Does the JSC agree that the above text should be added to 6.14.2.3? Should general guidance on adaptations also be added to 6.2.2?

If the work is an **adaptation** ▼ choose as the preferred title the title of the adaptation. In case of doubt about whether the work is an adaptation, choose as the preferred title the title of the original work.

**Response #6:** Yes. Guidance is currently provided in the context of constructing the authorized access point for the work. This is on the basis that responsibility for creation of an adaptation may be different from the original. However, it is also possible that the title of the adaptation or revision may be different from the title of the original. Making the proposed additions at 6.2.2 and 6.14.2.3 would provide clarity at the point where the preferred title is being chosen.

**Question #7:** Does the JSC agree that guidance for adaptors of musical works is appropriate in 19.2.1.1?

**Response #7:** No. The guidance is in the right place. Attribution of responsibility is dependent on determination of what constitutes a new work.

The “and” in point e) is redundant or ambiguous. Does it apply only to d) or to all the preceding criteria?

Note also that there is a typographical error in point a) “the” should read “that”.

**Question #8:** Does the JSC agree that changes should be made to paragraphs 1 and 2 of 6.28.1.5.2 using language already present at 6.27.1.5?

**Response #8:** We are in favour of aligning the instructions for music as closely as possible with the general instructions. To that end, we recommend referring to the general instructions rather than replicating them.

We note that 6JSC/LC/33 proposes changes to the wording 6.27.1.5 which will also have to be taken into account if accepted.

**Question #9:** Should 6.28.1.6 remain at its current location, should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.5, or should it be moved to an exception at 6.28.1.2?

**Response #9:** No change is needed.

**Question #10:** Does the JSC agree that the above text is needed in 6.2.2.9.1?

Do not consider music and incidental music for dramatic works etc. to be a part of a work. Record the preferred title for the musical work by applying the instructions at **6.14.2**.

**Response #10:** No. Further discussion is necessary to understand the justification for what appears to be a significant change.