

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Replacement of *RDA* 6.15 Medium of Performance

We congratulate the RSC Music Working group for this final set of revisions to the Medium of Performance instructions based on the feedback from earlier proposals and discussion papers. We agree with the goals of the proposal, and offer a few editorial revisions below.

Specific comments

6.15.1.1 Scope

The August 2016 release altered the wording of the scope, and inserted an additional paragraph with reference to 7.21. The existing text from that release should be retained.

6.15.1.3

1. The phrase “standard list” seems to be more commonplace in RDA than “controlled list”; we suggest that “standard list” be used.
2. The last sentence of the first paragraph (“Record the most specific term possible.”) could be seen as in conflict with some of the guidance found in the c)-f) that follow. For example, it may not be possible to record a term for an ensemble if the cataloger knows the individual instruments or voices, as the latter would represent the “most specific” terms. We would encourage the working group to rephrase the sentence (e.g., at an appropriate level of specificity), or possibly remove it in favor of agency guidelines.
3. The parenthetical “e.g.” list contains more terms than is recommended by the Editor’s Guide (section 7.6). If the list is limited to three terms, we suggest “sitar, soprano voice, tin can ensemble” to represent the three broad categories (instruments, voices, ensembles) as well as non-traditional instruments. The other terms may be used in examples, as appropriate. The Examples Editor has provided two other suggestions and indicates that she is happy to defer to whatever the RSC and Music WG prefer, including leaving the parentheticals: 1) provide short example boxes after each list item (see 3.4.5.3 for similar, but note that this list has 6 items it may be difficult to follow the flow of the instruction), or 2) provide an example box after the list with explanations that will clearly indicate which list item the examples correspond to.

4. The paragraph following the a)-f) list applicable to “language” will need to be removed if the proposal for RSC/LC/2 is approved. We also note that if this instruction is approved with that paragraph removed, **Proposed revision 3** in RSC/LC/2 should not be approved because the instructions currently at 6.15.1.5 will be at 6.15.1.3.

5. A full stop is needed after the simple list after the final entry “number of parts, ensembles, etc. (see 6.15.1.6).”

6. We suggest that the paragraph beginning “Record a medium of performance as a separate element, as a part of an access point ...” be moved to precede the paragraph referring to additional instructions as is standard elsewhere (e.g., 6.4.1.3, 6.5.1.3, 6.10.1.3). An example box could then be added before the paragraph, as shown at 6.11.1.3.

7. As noted above at “6.15.1.1 Scope” above, the final paragraph proposed for this instruction was appropriately moved to 6.15.1.1 in the August release.

6.15.1.4, 6.15.1.5

The addition of the sentence “Record the number of parts, hands, or performers (see 6.15.1.6), as applicable” in these instructions seems redundant because the reference to this additional instruction has already been made at 6.15.1.3; we suggest that the sentence be removed.

6.15.1.5

We ask that the working group reconsider whether the Optional Omission is necessary in these very general guidelines, or whether they are more appropriate to agency decisions. We note that there is not a similar Optional Omission at 6.15.1.4.

6.15.1.6

Use of “Etc.” in the caption alerts the cataloger that there are additional categories that can be numbered in this way, so we suggest that the first paragraph be made more precise:

Record the number of parts, performers, hands, and ensembles by applying these instructions, as applicable.

6.15.1.6.2

We suggest to the Examples Editor that the examples in 6.15.1.3.2 will need to be adjusted to reflect only the instruction about recording the number of hands, while still providing context about the instrument.

Appendix

Two concerns were raised by our review:

- 1) If the Medium of Performance information on the Tools tab needs to be adjusted in the future, would that responsibility be with the Music Working Group? If so, should the charge to the group be revised accordingly?
- 2) It is our assumption that the terms found on the Tools tab would not constitute an RDA Vocabulary Encoding Scheme for this element, and would not be registered in the RDA registry.