To: **Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA**

From: **Alan Danskin, United Kingdom Representative**

Subject: **Revisions to instructions for additions to access points representing musical works with distinctive titles (6.28.1.10 and 6.28.1.10.1). Response.**

_____

The British Library and CILIP thank the Music Working Group for the proposed revisions. We are in favour of clarifying the instructions, but we would prefer to see an approach that is more consistent with the general instructions in RDA.

Change 1

We prefer option 1A because it offers greater flexibility than 1B; however we do not agree with all of the proposed changes.

> Add <u>an element from</u> one of the following~~elements~~ <u>categories</u>, as appropriate <u>(in this order of preference)</u>:

We do not think this change is justified. The proposed use of "categories" is not acceptable. RDA does not use "categories" to refer to elements. Categories is only used to refer to types of resource.

We understand that the reason for the introduction of the term is the need to refer to two elements collectively, however we do not believe that the following instruction belongs in RDA

> Use ~~the same type of~~ <u>an </u>addition <u>belonging to the same category</u> for each of the access points for different musical works with identical titles.

This guidance is too prescriptive for general cataloguing instructions. It would be much more appropriate as a community policy. This comment applies whichever option is preferred.

Change #2

For the reasons given above, we also do not agree with exception a) In general, we see the logic and value behind the exception, but it is not appropriate within an international cataloguing code, nor would it be enforceable.

Change #2a Same issues apply.

Change #3 Okay