To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Ebe Kartus, ACOC Representative
Subject: Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1—6.28.1.8

ACOC thanks the Music Working Group for this Discussions Paper. It represents an excellent evaluation of the current instructions and suggests some positive ways forward.

Our comments on the specific questions are outlined below.

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?
Yes

Question #2: Does the JSC agree that this paragraph is needed in 6.14.2.5?
Yes.

Question #3: Does the JSC agree with this analysis [of instructions for multiple excerpts from pasticcios]? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?
Yes. Pursue removing exceptional practice

Question #4: Does the JSC agree with this analysis [of instructions for a single excerpt from a pasticcio]? Does the JSC want the Music Working Group to pursue revisions based on maintaining or removing this exceptional practice?
Yes. Pursue removing exceptional practice

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

Question #6: Does the JSC agree that the [proposed] text should be added to 6.14.2.3? Should general guidance on adaptations also be added to 6.2.2?
Yes

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

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?
Yes
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?
Keep 6.28.1.6 in its current location

Question #10: Does the JSC agree that the [proposed] text is needed in 6.2.2.9.1?
Yes