

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Bill Leonard, CCC representative

Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1—6.28.1.8

CCC thanks the Music Working Group for preparing this discussion. CCC's response is informed by the Chair of the Canadian Association of Music Libraries (CAML) Cataloguing Committee who is also a member of the Music Working Group.

6.18.1.2

Question #1: Do you 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?

CAML does not wish to question such a basic instruction. The issue of rap music could become moot if a way was found to reinstate the notion of principal responsibility for a performer of popular & jazz music (see Question #8). The issue of associating popular music performers with works in AAPs is of concern and a stumbling block to RDA implementation for musical sound recordings.

CAML would prefer to see separate instructions created that would address the unique nature of popular and jazz music. Treating these as exceptions is not preferable.

Individual Work or Compilation of Works

Question #2: Do you agree that this paragraph is needed in 6.14.2.5?

Agree that such a paragraph would be useful but I think it would be better placed at 6.14.2.4, before a decision is made as to which instruction should be followed between 6.14.2.5 and 6.14.2.8.

Multiple excerpts from pasticcios

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

CAML is in favour of removing the exceptional practice.

Single excerpt from a pasticcio

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

CAML is in favour of removing the exceptional practice.

6.28.1.4

Question #5: Do you agree that a paragraph should be added to 6.28.1 for choreographic movement?

Agree.

6.28.1.5

Question #6: Do you 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?

Agree to adding the text to 6.14.2.3 and to 6.2.2.

Question #7: Do you agree that guidance for adaptors of musical works is appropriate in 19.2.1.1?

Agree. We see chapter 19 as being independent from the instructions on access points. In an implementation scenario where there are no access points, you have to rely on the instructions in chapter 19 to determine which agents are creators, contributors, etc. It makes sense to incorporate guidance about musical works that are adaptations into the basic instructions already in 19.2.1.1.

Instruction Language of 6.28.1.5.2

Question #8: Do you 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?

We do not support using the language of 6.27.1.5 at 6.28.1.5.2. The first condition basically states what an adaptation is. This is fine for non-musical works but for musical works adaptations are already explained at 6.28.1.5.1. A general statement would repeat the instructions for the existing specific categories, including for musical works. This would increase the potential for confusion because cataloguers will not be sure which is supposed to take precedence and how they are supposed to be interpreted and applied together.

The other proposed condition may be useful for textual works because the difference between a revision and an adaptation is often a matter of presentation, but this criterion has not been applied for music before. The cataloguer used his/her musical knowledge to evaluate whether the revision changed the work substantially enough to create a new work, without regard to the presentation of the information.

The presentation is not always useful, as is the case when two names are given together on equal footing, e.g., Bach-Gounod or Schubert/Liszt. The presentation can also be misleading, for example when we are clearly in the presence of an arrangement (not an adaptation) and only the name of the arranger is given on the resource. When a work clearly falls into one of the categories at 6.28.1.5.1, e.g., variations, no other criterion really needs to be applied. If there is doubt, then there is already a provision to consider the revision an arrangement. The second condition consequently only adds to the burden of the cataloguer. It is interesting to note that it has never been considered useful or necessary so far.

Admittedly, some colleagues would like to use this second condition to give performers of popular music/jazz the status of creators and reinstate to a certain degree the notion of performer “main entry”.

We are not opposed to that outcome but do not think that the change proposed here is the needed means to that end. There might be undesired results for other types of music if these instructions are revised simply for the sake of consistency.

6.28.1.6

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?

Since 6.28.1.6 could logically be an exception to both 6.28.1.5 and 6.28.1.2, a solution could be to leave it at its current location but to add references from 6.28.1.5 and 6.28.1.2 to 6.28.1.6.

6.28.1.8

Question #10: Do you agree that the above text is needed in 6.2.2.9.1?

Agree